Reviewer Response Template for Rating Applications 2021/22

Particulars of Reviewer

Surname		Title		Initials	
Institution					
Department					
Position					
Email address(es)					
Area(s) of specialisation					

Before you commence with the review it is important that you take **cognisance** of the following:

CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST

This will certify that in the review of all applications for evaluation and rating submitted to the NRF:

i.   I will treat all information contained in all applications for evaluation and rating and/or reviewer reports in the strictest of confidence and will not reveal that information to any third party without the prior written consent of the NRF. **Please note that the review is anonymous and no correspondence with the applicant should be entered into**.

ii.   I will not do or allow anything to be done which might compromise the interest of the NRF or any of the proposers in respect of any intellectual property rights flowing from the confidential information.

iii.   I will not use the information contained in those applications for evaluation and rating for any reason other than for the purpose of providing a peer reviewed report or assessment for the NRF.

iv.   I will not participate in a review process where a conflict of interest exists. Should there be doubt about an apparent conflict of interest, I will advise the NRF, who will then indicate whether participation in the review process is permissible or not.

		Please✓
1.	I have read the confidentiality and conflict of interest agreements and agree to abide by it.	
2.	This is an assessment of the applicant's research output and **NOT** a request to review a **funding proposal** or an application for a **job promotion** (testimonial).	
3.	The **usability** of your report will be assessed by the members of the Assessment Panel. A useful report will address all of the **issues raised in the preamble** to each section and will weigh more in the outcome decision**.**	
4.	Reviewers should be **familiar** with the **research field(s)** of the applicant as it is a **peer review** system ("A peer is a researcher or a person with a research background who has the requisite knowledge and experience and the ability to exercise objective fair judgment of the applicant and to provide an appropriate assessment of the applicant's research and research standing. The emphasis should be on the person's experience and ability to provide an appropriate assessment").	

5	Although the review should cover the **full portfolio** of the applicant for the **past eight years** (2012-2018) copies of the applicant's self-selected **five best outputs** are attached to the application to assist you in assessing the quality of the outputs.	
6.	The report should focus on the **quality** and **impact** of the **research outputs** and not on the character of the applicant (see item 2).	
7.	Only **standing** derived from the quality and impact of the **research outputs** should be commented on.	
8.	The report should focus on the **contribution of the individual** to multi-authored research outputs and not on the team/research group. This information is obtained from a compulsory data field for each research output to which the applicant had contributed.	

1.   Background knowledge of the applicant's research/research field(s) / Peer status

A.   Please indicate whether you:

	Yes	No
• Have knowledge of the field(s)/research of the applicant to enable an assessment of the **FULL** research portfolio (during the last eight years).		

	Yes	No
• Have read the five best research outputs* embedded in the application (either before or after being requested to perform this review) to assist with the assessment of the **quality** of the research profile of the applicant.		

*Copies available as part of the reviewer documentation

Any additional information:

> Please provide information to explain your above responses:

B.   Please indicate whether you have:

	Yes	No
• Collaborated/co-published with the applicant in the past (if yes, provide more information in the comments block below).		

	Yes	No
• Cited any of the applicant's work.		

OR

	Yes	n/a
• Any other relevant form of association or collaboration with the applicant (e.g. doctoral supervisor)		

Any additional information:

> Add any additional comments with regard to the three points above that you may wish to include here:

1. **Appraisal of the quality and impact of research outputs in the last eight years**
   - Please focus your appraisal on:
     - Your **judgement** of the **quality of** the full portfolio of **research outputs** listed in the application over the **past eight years (2013 – 2020).**
     - Your opinion on the standing and **appropriateness** of the **publication outlets** used by the applicant. The NRF has statements on **ethical publication practices** (available at https://www.nrf.ac.za/rating). Your comments on the presence (or absence) of any unethical publication practices will be valued.
     - The significance of the research in the broader context of the **discipline/field**. Discuss the **impact** you feel that the applicant's work has had on its specific research field and whether it has impacted on other fields and / or the solution of broader **societal / industry** problems.

   - If the research outputs are those of a **group**, kindly assess the applicant's **contribution** to the group as outlined in the "own contribution" data field for each research output.

   > Please add comments here:

3. **Estimation of applicant's current standing as a researcher as benchmarked against global peers***

   Please indicate how you would rate/benchmark the applicant **relative to his/her peers** in the field and justify/substantiate your reasons with **reference** to the quality of the **research outputs** (section 2 above). If possible, comment on both national (usually South African, though some applicants may have conducted their recent research in another country) and international standing. As the applicant's current standing is being evaluated, please base your judgement primarily on the research outputs of the last eight years (2013 – 2020). The members of the Assessment Panel would appreciate your comments on the **size** of the applicant's **research field** (as indicated, for example, by the number of researchers working in it), and on the current **importance** of the **field** of the applicant's research within the discipline / solution of societal and/or industry problems.

   > Please add comments here:

4. **Reviewer's recommendations for future development of research**

   You may wish to formulate your own feedback relating to the applicant's future planning of his/her research that you feel potentially helpful.

   > Please add comments here:

*see Definition of Rating Categories below:

<h1 style="text-align:center; color:blue">Definition of NRF Rating Categories</h1>

1.   Established Researcher Categories

1.1. Established Researcher Category

Established researchers with a sustained recent record of productivity in the field who are recognised by their peers as having:
- *produced a body of quality work, the core of which has coherence and attests to ongoing engagement with the field; and*
- *demonstrated the ability to conceptualise problems and apply research methods to investigating them.*

1.2. Established Researchers with Considerable International Recognition

(see https://www.nrf.ac.za/rating - doc 12 for more information which is discipline specific and refers to hallmarks of recognition such as a h-indices, keynote presentations, publications in high impact journals, monographs by highly reputable publishers etc.)):

Researchers who enjoy considerable international recognition by their peers for the high quality and impact of their recent research outputs.

1.3. Global Research Leaders

Researchers who are unequivocally recognised by their peers as leading international scholars in their field for the high quality and impact of their recent (2012-2019) research outputs

2.   Emerging Research Category

*Young researchers (40 years or younger), who have held the doctorate or equivalent qualification for less than five years at the time of application, and who are recognised as having the **potential** to **establish (see item 1.1 above for criteria)** themselves as researchers within a five-year period after this evaluation, based on their performance and productivity of quality research outputs during their **early post-doctoral careers.***

3. Future International Research Leaders

*Young researchers (normally younger than 35 years of age), who have held the doctorate or equivalent qualification for less than five years at the time of application and who, on the basis of **exceptional potential** demonstrated in their published doctoral work and/or their research outputs in their **early post-doctoral careers** are considered likely to become **future international leaders** in their field.*