



STScI | SPACE TELESCOPE
SCIENCE INSTITUTE

EXPANDING THE FRONTIERS OF SPACE ASTRONOMY

HST Cycle 34: Dual Anonymous Peer Review (DAPR)

Amy Jones
STScI Science Policy Division

May 4, 2026



Why Dual Anonymous Peer Review?

Primary objective of peer review process:

Best-Justified Science

Anonymising proposals:

Places focus directly on **Science**

Removes focus from **Team**



DAPR: What it is and what it isn't.

What it is:


- Proposing team identity ambiguous.
- Removes focus from team, encourages focus on **science**.

What it isn't:

- Completely anonymous (eliminating all possibly-identifiable information).
- A **challenge** or **test** for reviewers.



Impact: Enticing New Proposers





DAPR for **Proposers**: The Do Nots

- ✗ Names or affiliations of proposing team
- ✗ Discussions of the team, even anonymously
- ✗ Links to personal websites, ADS libraries, private versions of in prep or embargoed work
- ✗ Claims of ownership:
 - *In **our** recent analysis, **we** showed ... (Tinsley et al. 2015).*
 - *Combined with data from **our** JWST Cycle 1 program (GO-1234), we will....*
 - ***We** have discovered 5 new candidates (Tinsley et al., in prep)....*
 - *We will use **our** proprietary software tool MySuperPipeline to perform...*



DAPR for **Proposers**: The Dos

- ✓ Focus on work proposed.
 - *We propose to... This program will measure the effects of...*
- ✓ Provide all relevant information needed to assess scientific merit.
- ✓ **Fully and properly cite relevant work. (DAPR is *not* an excuse to skip citations.)**
 - *In a recent analysis, Tinsley et al. (2015) showed....*
 - *We will supplement this with data from JWST Cycle 1 program GO-1234 to....*
 - *Recently, 5 new candidates were discovered (Tinsley, **private communication**)...*
 - ***By prior agreement** with the developers, we will use *proprietary* MySuperPipeline to perform...*
- ✓ Proprietary data and software should also be cited.
 - *private communication, by prior agreement, in prearranged collaboration*



DAPR for Reviewers: The Do Nots

✘ Do not try to guess the proposing PI or team!

✘ This is **not** a challenge or a test.

✘ Do not discuss, guess, imply or insinuate information about the identity of the proposing team.

- *Oh gosh, who could have written this proposal.*
- *Well I think we all know who wrote this.*

✘ Do not discuss the experience and expertise of the team. (There will be opportunities for this later.)

Guesses are
often **wrong!**



DAPR for **Reviewers**: The Dos

- ✓ Focus on the **scientific merit** of the work proposed.

- ✓ Refer to the **proposal** not the **proposers**.
 - *Try to use 'it' instead of 'they' when discussing the proposal*

- ✓ Assume the team can do the work (without discussion).

- ✓ *Private communication* is **not** code for “hey, we’re the team”. It can (and often does!) mean information was communicated privately.



Non-Compliant Proposals

- ⚠ Egregious breaches of anonymity or minor accidental slip-ups.
- ✅ **Report** any cases to your **PSS** and your **SPD manager**.
- ✅ Not sure? **Report** it anyway.

Major violations, we will probably:

- ❌ Remove from consideration. Disqualify.

Minor slip-ups, we will probably advise you to:

- ✅ Ignore the instance and proceed with your review of the **scientific merit**.
- ✅ Highlight anonymity concern in feedback comments.
- ⚠ If you find you can't ignore it, **report** again.



Panel Support Scientists



- STScI staff members supporting the panels.
- Monitor panel discussions.
- Refocus discussion to keep focus on **science**.
- They have the authority to stop a discussion to refocus it, or halt it completely.



Team Members & Team Expertise Statements

- ⚠ **Not** anonymous.
- ✗ **Not** considered during scientific discussions and ranking.
- ✅ Only **recommended** proposals **after** ranking phase.
 - ~20 minutes to read expertise statements. You cannot opt out.
 - Raise clear, **compelling** deficiencies in expertise required to **meet science goals**.
 - By **consensus**, panel can recommended disqualification, and must provide a **detailed justification**.

✗ If a proposal is disqualified, **orbits cannot be re-allocated**.



“Compelling Deficiencies”

- At discretion of panelists.
- Looking for the 10-sigma **outliers**.
- Possible examples:
 - *Exceptionally* difficult datasets.
 - *Exceptionally* difficult analyses.
- Things that **aren't** compelling deficiencies:
 - Inexperience with HST data.
 - Failure to publish past datasets.

In 8 years, no proposal has ever been removed at this stage.

⚠ Comments to proposers should be based on the **scientific discussion**, not on the team or their expertise.



Conflicts of Interest

- Panelists **must leave the room** for a conflict of interest.
 - *PI or Col on proposal, competing proposal, close personal connection to PI or Col, close collaborator of PI or Col, former student/postdoc/advisor of PI or Col.*
- Most identified by automated checks and info provided by you.
- **Report** additional conflicts immediately.
 - If you **strongly** suspect you have a conflict with a given proposal, **you are conflicted.**
- When you have a conflict:
 - ✓ State that you are conflicted.
 - ✗ Do not announce the **reason** for your conflict.



Summary of Key DAPR Points

✓ Focus on the **scientific merit** of the proposals.

✗ Do not try to guess the proposing team.

- Proposals should not include identifying information, but should cite relevant work.
- **Report** non-compliant proposals to your PSS and SPD manager.
- PSSs will be present to refocus discussions on **science**.
- Do **not** declare the **reason** for conflicts of interest.
- Team expertise review is done **after** ranking. Disqualified proposals **cannot** be replaced.