

De: FCT-peerreview <FCT-peerreview@esf.org>
Enviado: quarta-feira, 4 de Junho de 2014 08:39
Para: João Sebastião
Assunto: RE: CIES position on the process of Evaluation of Portuguese R&D units 2013

Dear Coordinator,

Thank you for your email and for sharing your concerns with us.

Please note that according to the established procedure, any comments on the remote reviews must be submitted in the frame of the rebuttal procedure (and via the rebuttal facility). The formal rebuttal you provided in that frame was duly noted and circulated to the review panels for consideration.

It is very important to note that the three assessments you were given access to are provided to the review panel in order for its members to have additional points of view and perspectives, substantiated by text and comments. Review Panels are composed with high-level international experts who are used to sit in evaluation committees and have a sound knowledge of the disciplines their panel is covering and are well aware of potential discrepancies between reports provided.

In cases such as yours, where there are discrepancies between assessments (this naturally occurs in any evaluation campaign), review panel members look closely at the reasons underpinning this difference and discuss the elements put forward by the referees. In this context, you can be sure that review panels consider inputs from applicants with great interest.

Indeed, the panel discussions and consensus step are there to put things in context and to discuss all the information provided. Should the panel consider that some points put forward do not reflect the quality of an application and/or consider that one of the referee misunderstood (part of) the plan, it can (and will) reflect this in its consensus. The final position is decided by the review panel and represents its consensus.

You will easily understand that we cannot discard one (or more) reviewer(s) upon request from an applicant. The panel, however can consider whether a reviewer's position is valid or not (thus the critical importance of the rebuttal step) and will also relay to us (in parallel) any comments it may have on the reviews themselves.

Yours sincerely,

The ESF Peer Review Team

Peer Review Services, Science Projects Office
European Science Foundation