Proposers have crafted their PDFs to be anonymous in accordance with proposer guidelines in the Call for Proposals. They were to:

- Exclude names and affiliations of the proposing team, including in figures and references to personal websites.

- Cite references in the third person, including references to proprietary data and software.

- Do not claim ownership of past work, e.g., "my successful HST program (GO-######)…" or "Our analysis shown in Jones et al. 2012…"

They were encouraged to describe the work proposed in an active voice, e.g., "We propose to do the following…" or "I will measure the effects of…".

Proposers *can* provide reviewers with all the relevant information.

Proposers must submit a Team Expertise and Background exposition with their Phase I submission. This section is not anonymous, and will be used in a final stage of the review after the scientific ranking is completed.

Proposers are not required to submit detailed Management Plans for any proposals, including Large, Treasury, and Archival programs. These will still be required in budget proposals.

Consider proposals solely on the scientific merit of what's proposed. Follow the scientific evaluation criteria we have provided you.

Do not spend any time attempting to identify the PI or the team. Even if you think you **<u>know</u>**, discuss the science and not the people.

Be mindful not to make statements that might break the anonymous review, for example, do not make guesses on identities, insinuate the likely identities, or instigate discussion on a possible team's past work.

- Levelers will be present in each room to help insure this doesn't happen.

Also keep in mind that language can be important. Utilize the appropriately neutral pronouns (e.g., "what they propose", or "the team has evaluated data from a Cycle 27 program").

THE ROLE OF LEVELERS

Levelers are present to keep the panel discussions focused on scientific merit. Unlike the chairs, they are not listening for issues pertaining to the science, rather they are focused on the discussion itself.

If the discussion veers to comments on the proposing team, their past work, their validity, or their identities, the leveler's job is to refocus that discussion.

<u>They have the authority to stop the discussion on a proposal.</u>

If, in the deliberation of a given proposal, an investigator's self-revealed identity becomes impossible to ignore, and that identity has a clear impact on the discussion, the proposal should be flagged for disqualification. The levelers may bring this to the attention of the panel if they feel this threshold has been crossed.

PROPOSAL COMPLIANCE WITH ANONYMIZING GUIDELINES

Proposals that have not been sufficiently anonymized should be considered non-compliant and flagged for possible rejection.

Proposers will have done their job if it is reasonably ambiguous who submitted the proposal in discussion.

However, this is new, and there may be an occasional slip-up. If the slip-up can be ignored and not impact the anonymity of the discussion, then do so. However, if the mistakenly revealed identity simply cannot be ignored, flag it.

- Levelers will be present in each room and can help with that decision.

Please identify proposals to SPG or PSS that are not compliant with the anonymizing guidelines.

In some ways conflicts are easier— no need for "major" and "minor" categories. When a reviewer is conflicted, they leave the room.

We rely more on self-identified conflicts (e.g., interpersonal, close collaborators, and competitors/competing proposals). We will continue to track collaborative/competitive conflicts, and may declare some conflicts in advance of the review.

As a panelist, if you **strongly** suspect you have a conflict with a given proposal, **you are conflicted** and should leave the room during the discussion.

However, keep in mind that the anonymizing process makes it very tough to know for certain who the proposers are.

TEAM EXPERTISE AND BACKGROUND EVALUATION

HST time is openly available to any scientists who presents a highly compelling scientific case. However that time is a highly valued resource that is to be used responsibly.

After the scientific ranking is complete, the panel be given the list of investigators (alphabetized) and the Team Expertise and Background sections for those proposals above their nominal orbit-allocation line.

The panel should break (recommend 20+ mins.) to review those materials.

Panelists should raise specific proposals for discussion. If there are clear, compelling deficiencies in the expertise required to see through the goals of the proposal, the panel must decide by consensus to flag the submission for disqualification, and provide a detailed justification in their comments to the Director.

TEAM EXPERTISE AND BACKGROUND EVALUATION

The criteria for sufficient expertise is left to the panels in order to evaluate cases as necessary (e.g., particularly difficult datasets, difficult analyses, or programs of exceptionally high risk).

General inexperience with HST data should not, in itself, be a disqualifier. Nor should the failure to publish past datasets, unless there's an extraordinary issue with the team's publication history.

Proposals can only be eliminated in this final review. It will not be used to re-evaluate or upgrade programs below the nominal allocation line.

If a panel should chose to essentially disqualify a proposal after the scientific ranking, that panel effectively loses those orbits.

Comments to the proposers should be based on scientific discussion, i.e., the discussion leading to the scientific ranking. It should not include comments on the team or their expertise.