

# Guidelines for the Proposal Review Committees

## General

- All proposals are submitted via the [DUO web interface](#). Written forms and email attachments cannot be accepted.
- The proposals need a clear and precise definition of the proposed experiments and a well written scientific justification why these experiments should be performed.
- The aim of the experiment should clearly be stated and the proposal should be specific.
- Each proposal must be accompanied by a sample declaration form (included in the DUO application).
- A reasonable time estimate should be included.
- The strategy/method of data treatment should be described.
- Previous/preliminary data should be shown if available.

## Types of proposals

Four types of proposals are defined:

- Normal proposals: Asking for beamtime in the next allocation period to perform an experiment with a specific scientific goal. The results of such experiments must be published in the open literature. Besides statistical information, proposals should contain the equivalent of one to two A4 pages of detailed description.
- Long term proposals: (NonPX beamlines): Long term proposals run for 18 months and can be granted to users investing time or resources into novel experiments or methods. Examples: building a new end station, making a new instrument or method available to the general user community, developing a novel detector, etc. A beamline typically does not commit more than 30% of the user beamtime to long-term proposals. Besides the statistical information, proposals should contain the equivalent of one to max three A4 pages of detailed description.
- Test proposals: Users wanting to perform feasibility tests may submit a test proposal, asking for no more than 3 shifts at non PX-beamlines or no more than 1 shift at the PX-beamlines. Acceptance criteria for test proposals are lower than for normal proposals. Results from such test proposals may later be used to support normal proposals. Besides the statistical information, these proposals should contain the equivalent of one A4 page of detailed description.

Maximum length of the proposals is set to 3 pages. Text exceeding 3 pages should not take into account for grading the proposal.

## Proposal status "resubmission" and "continuation"

### Resubmission

- The resubmission function for a proposal is available for the Main-Proposer, Principle Investigator as well as for Co-Proposers.
- The main text of the proposal is identical to the previously submitted proposal. In addition, a brief explanation of maximum 200 words must be provided to justify the request for a resubmission.
- Resubmission is available for refused proposals only.
- Supported is one resubmission per refused proposal.

- Resubmission is restricted to proposals of the last 3 calls.

Continuation

- Available for continuation are accepted proposals from the last 3 calls.
- The continuation function for a proposal is available to the Main-Proposer and Principal-Investigator only.
- The main text of the proposal is identical to the previously submitted proposal, including the list of proposers and publications list. Only the sample declaration and number of requested shifts can be modified. In addition, a brief explanation of maximum 200 words must be provided to justify the request for a continuation.
- The limit is one accepted continuation per proposal.
- For already measured proposals an experimental report is necessary to enable a continuation.

**Evaluation**

All proposals are rated by the PRC. The rating is done in accordance with the [IUPAP recommendations for large scale facilities](#), section 3.2) and is based on

1. Scientific merit for fundamental and applied research (relevance, impact, innovation, potential of the scientific- and/or technological case and/or relevance and applied importance of instrumental development)
2. Technical feasibility and safety relevant experimental conditions (based on the comments of the beamline scientist and the safety officer)
3. Previous record of the proposers, if appropriated, associated reports as well as publication output of the proposers related to SLS experiments and compliance of the co-authorship and acknowledgment standards
4. Availability of the resources required

The main author of a proposal (proposer) is asked to submit a short (1-2p) Experimental Report within few months after the experiment, at latest as input to the next proposal. This Experimental Report should contain preliminary information about the measurement describing what has been measured and what are the results expected. Missing Experimental Reports should be reflected in grading the proposal by the PRC. For example, if more than about 25% of the Experimental Reports are missing the proposal should be clearly downgraded, however, it should be evaluated whether the missing reports are related to the research activities of the main author (and principle investigator).

**The grading scale is 1 to 5.5.**

The % assignment for each grade is given as a guideline to help the Panels to correctly distribute the scoring of their proposals for a particular round.

Score	Guidelines	% Assignment
5 - 5.5	<p><b>Outstanding Proposal</b>            The proposal is outstanding: well-written, involving innovative research into exciting science, the scientific case is compelling and the proposal is timely. A successful outcome would have a significant impact on the research field in question.</p>	up to 5 %

<b>4 - 4.9</b>	<b>Excellent Proposal</b> Excellent proposal which is complete, scientifically compelling and timely, and should be done at the SLS during the current proposal round.	<b>~25%</b>
<b>3 - 3.9</b>	<b>Good Proposal</b> A good proposal with a relevant scientific case which fully deserves beam time but is of lower priority in a competitive environment, or a potentially excellent proposal which is lacking some information, e.g. preliminary results, further explanations. In this case, the Panel should specify the additional information required in the comment.	<b>~45%</b>
<b>2 - 2.9</b>	<b>Sound Proposal</b> The proposal is based on a sound scientific case but is considered scientifically less compelling or less timely than competing proposals, or the need for SLS is not obvious.	<b>~25%</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Rejected Proposal</b> The proposal is technically or scientifically flawed and cannot be done, or the scientific case is not worthy of synchrotron time, or the scientific case cannot be evaluated due to poor writing of the proposal.	

### **The average grade should be around 3.5**

In order to ensure a unified treatment of the proposals from the different committees, the following procedure should be followed:

1. The grading should be done with one decimal point.
2. A minimum of three reviewers should give grades on each proposal prior to the meeting. The PRC management appoints the three principal reviewers; other members who feel competent are also encouraged to add their comments.
3. Expert evaluators should disregard any excess pages of proposals which are exceeding 3 pages.
4. At the meeting, the grades may need to be confirmed.
5. In general, lengthy discussions should be limited to cases where
  - (a) the standard deviation on grades is large ( $>0.5$ )
  - (b) a member of the committee asks for a clarification or general discussion.
6. In case of rejections, the committee should give clear indications to the following questions:
  - (a) Why was the proposal rejected?
  - (b) Is resubmission encouraged?
7. For all proposals, comments from the committee are strongly encouraged in order to give useful feedback to the proposers.

8. In general, the number of shifts recommended by the beamline scientist should be respected.

S. Müller  
SLS Coordinator  
31.8.2017