The Proposal Evaluation Interface
Grading for Distributed Peer Review (DPR)
General information

• For a general introduction on the Distributed Peer Review (DPR) grading, please carefully read these guidelines.

• Make sure you mark on your calendar the deadline for delivering the grades and comments. For this please check the deadline.

• Please remember that failing to deliver the reviews in due time will lead to the rejection of the DPR proposals for which you are PI/dPI and/or for which you have been delegated as reviewer.

• If you have questions and/or doubts, please do not hesitate to contact us.
Accessing PEI

• Click on this link: www.eso.org/pei for direct access.
• Alternatively, go to the main ESO web-page.
• Go to the User Portal and enter your credentials.
• Select Proposal Evaluation Interface from the left menu.
Sign the ESO Confidentiality Agreement

• You will first be presented with the ESO Confidentiality Agreement.
• Read it carefully.
• Sign it by ticking the checkbox at the bottom of the window.
• Submit the signed agreement by clicking on the “Confirm” button.
• You will be given access to your DPR area.

ESO Confidentiality Agreement

For the Reviewers of the ESO Distributed Peer Review

In accordance with the VLT/VLTI Science Operations Policy document (approved by ESO Council on 10.06.2020) and the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of the ESO Observing Programmes Committee (approved by ESO Council on 04.12.2013), I acknowledge that during my service in the ESO Distributed Peer Review (DPR) I may be given or have access to confidential information which may be supplied in tangible form or verbally or by demonstration (“the Confidential Information”). I understand that observing proposals and any respective discussion (in written or oral form) are considered Confidential Information, as they may contain unpublished research and/or proprietary information. I further acknowledge that the Confidential Information will be made available to me only for the purpose to:

- fulfill my duties as Reviewer of the ESO DPR in accordance with the applicable sections of the VLT/VLTI Science Operations Policy document and the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of the ESO Observing Programmes Committee,

I AGREE:

(a) to use the Confidential Information only for the Permitted Purpose;

(b) to keep the Confidential Information secret and confidential and not to disclose it in any form to any third party (including to any persons or party at my employer, including research colleagues, graduate students, post-doctoral or research associates) without the prior written consent of ESO;

(c) on the written request of ESO to deliver to ESO any tangible items of Confidential Information in my possession;

I understand that this Confidentiality Agreement does not apply to any item of Confidential Information, which is disclosed to me by any third party without the breach of the present Confidentiality Agreement, or which comes into the public domain through no fault of mine, but that otherwise this Agreement will continue in force without limit of time. ESO may release me in writing from the Agreement.

I hereby confirm that I understood and will comply with the above confidentiality requirements.
Proposal navigation

- Scroll the list of your assignments on the left
- Use Expand/Collapse to show/hide details
- Click on the proposal you wish to review
Proposal review

My DPR reviews

Proposal 106.20W3
My assignment: DPR reviewer

Proposal 106.20W3
My expertise
Provide here a self-evaluation of your expertise.

My DPR grade(s)
Grade by proposal

Display full PDF
Display rationale only
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APPLICATION FOR OBSERVING TIME

106.21QK

IMPORTANT NOTICE
By submitting this proposal, the PI takes full responsibility for the content of the proposal, in particular with regard to the names of CoIs and the agreement to act according to the ESO policy and regulations, should observing time be granted.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROGRAMME

A- Scientific Rationale
Despite of the text anonymisation, you may encounter possible conflicts.

We recommend you check all proposals for conflicts before starting the scientific review.

To report a conflict, click on the “Conflict” button. This will pop-up the conflict declaration window.

Select one of the three types of conflicts.

If you wish to provide more details on the conflict, use the text box “Comment”.

When done, push the “Confirm” button.
Report a conflict/2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106.20W3</td>
<td>CONFLICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.20YT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.210E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.210Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. A conflict must be flagged only under **exceptional** and **well justified** circumstances.

2. The action is **not reversible**. Please make sure you have checked that all is correct before confirming.

3. The corresponding proposal will get a flag in the list to the left. From that point on you will not be able to view the flagged proposal.

4. Note that you can report a **maximum of two** conflicts.

5. The proposals for which you report a conflict will not be replaced by new assignments.
Report anonymisation issues/1

• Please carefully read the anonymisation guidelines for reviewers.

• If you notice anonymisation violations, we kindly ask you to flag them in PEI.

• Anonymisation violations can be reported at any time during the process, but only before you submit your reviews.

• Once you have reported the problem, just ignore it and proceed reviewing the proposal. The report/s will only be seen by the Observing Programmes Office.

• To report an anonymisation issue, click on the button Anonymization issues.
Report anonymisation issues/2

• You will be presented with a dedicated text box.

• Cut-and-paste from the proposal the sentences violating the anonymisation guidelines.

• Add any comments you may have.

• Click “Confirm” when done.

• Click “Reset” if you wish to remove the comment (in case of mistakes) after submitting it.

• Click “Cancel” to exit without saving the comment.
Declare your expertise level

• For each proposal you are asked to provide a self-evaluation of your expertise level for the science case under review.

• After having reviewed the proposal, select one of the three available options.

• This information will be used for pure statistical purposes (e.g. to compare the self-perception with the scores attributed by the proposal distribution algorithm).

• This information will not be shared with the PIs.

• The expertise level can be changed at any time before submitting the evaluations.
Proposal grading

• Enter the grades: 1=best, 5=worst. 
  See this for more details on the grading scale.

• For proposals containing more than one run you can chose one of the two options:
  a) grade by proposal: all runs will automatically get the same grade;
  b) grade by run: runs can have different grades. The proposal pre-grade field will remain empty.
Scientific evaluation/1

- Enter any comment you may have in the text field “My scientific evaluation”.
- The comments are saved automatically as you type. A red asterisk * will appear when saving.

My scientific evaluation

Earth’s centrality and immobility are fundamental tenets of Aristotelian cosmology. Their validity has been recently questioned by new experimental evidences, which challenge our understanding of the universe.

Strengths: The proposed observations are very well justified and have the potential of disproving the assumptions on which Aristotelian cosmology is based on. The targets are well selected and the observing strategy and data reduction are properly described and well thought.

Weaknesses: The proposal, however, lacks a proper explanation about how the data will be interpreted. In particular, it is not clear how they will allow the discrimination between the two chief systems of the world. While on the one hand the confirmation and the characterisation of the phases of Venus will provide a strong argument for it to be orbiting the sun, it is not clear why this should then apply to Earth. The arguments put forward by the proposal are not convincing and not sufficiently quantitative. The proposal should have included a thorough discussion on how the proposed observations will lead to the rejection of the Ptolemaic model, and at which confidence level.
The comments you enter will be passed to the PI verbatim. Please carefully read the guidelines for formulating a proper feedback.

The feedback you provide to the PI is a very important aspect of the review process. You should formulate it in the way you would like to receive it for your own proposal(s). The criticism (if any), should be constructive and helpful.

Note that you need to provide a minimum number of characters (500).

Once you have filled in all the required fields, the corresponding proposal will get the flag ready on the list to the left.

This means that the review of that proposal is ready for submission.
Submission of reviews/1

• Once you have completed the review of all proposals assigned to you, they will all be flagged as READY.

• If you are sure about the completeness of the reviews, you can submit them all in one go by clicking on the button “Submit all reviews”.

• WARNING! This action is not reversible!

• You will not be able to make any change after you have submitted a given review. Therefore, before submitting, make sure all reviews are final!

• The submission will be followed by a confirmation pop-up message.
Submission of reviews/2

- A final confirmation message will be displayed, signalling that your work has been completed.

Thank you for completing the submission of all your reviews.

- You can now logout from your User Portal account. Thanks!
The grading scale

The grade scale to be used is defined as follows:

1.0 – outstanding: breakthrough science
1.5 – excellent: definitely above average
2.0 – very good: no significant weaknesses
2.5 – good: minor deficiencies do not detract from strong scientific case
3.0 – fair: good scientific case, but with definite weaknesses
3.5 – rather weak: limited science return prospects
4.0 – weak: little scientific value and/or questionable scientific strategy
4.5 – very weak: deficiencies outweigh strengths
5.0 – unsuitable

Grades can and should be specified with one decimal digit (e.g. 2.7)

Please make use of the full grade range and use also intermediate values (e.g. 1.3, 2.7, …). For more advices on how to run the review, visit this page.