Call for Application for ArCS II International Early Career Researchers Program: Review Guidelines

1. Review procedure

1) Reviewer

The review will be conducted in a closed session by the Review Committee for the Call for International Early Career Researchers Program (hereinafter referred to as the "Review Committee") established by the ArCS II project.

2) Review process

A document review will be conducted based on the submitted application documents. If necessary, an interview may be conducted.

The Review Committee will decide on selection by consensus based on comprehensively evaluating the results of the document review and the interview. In some cases, depending on the review result, the amount of the support fund may be reduced.

3) Notification of acceptance or rejection

The ArCS II Secretariat will notify the acceptance or rejection of all applications by e-mail to the e-mail address of the Host Researcher indicated in the application form.

2. Perspectives in the review

- Is the project expected to help the research of both the Candidate and the Host Researcher to grow?
- Will it contribute to the advancement of Arctic studies in Japan and internationally?
- Has a close prior consultation been conducted between the Candidate and the Host Researcher to formulate a concrete research plan?
- Is the Host Institution adequately prepared to accept the Candidate?

The review committee will make a comprehensive judgment based on the significance and necessity of international joint researches and the feasibility of the research plan including preparation status.

3. Review policy

- In addition to the scores of the document review, reasons, opinions, etc. will also be fully considered in the discussion.
- The decision to be made by the review will be either acceptance or rejection only.

4. Review criteria etc.

1) Document review

(1) Review score

Sore	Evaluation
5	Superior
4	Excellent
3	Adequate
2	Somewhat insufficient
1	Insufficient

(2) Comments concerning the score

- The Review Committee members will score the Candidate for each item of the "2 Perspectives in the Review." When, especially, the member assigns a score other than 3, he/she shall describe concrete grounds and reasons for his/her evaluation, including positive and negative aspects.
- Overall comments provide especially important input for the acceptance-or-rejection decision and, therefore, must be entered as overall findings without fail. Conditions or opinions for improvement of the plan shall be entered as issues and points to be noted.

2) Interview

Based on the results of the document review, if the Review Committee deems it necessary, an interview will be conducted with the Host Researcher. The interview may be conducted online depending on the situation.

3) Consensus review (Decision on acceptance or rejection)

The Review Committee will decide on acceptance or rejection by consensus based on comprehensively evaluating the results of the document review and the interview. In doing so, the Review Committee may provide conditions and/or opinions for improvement as necessary (including possible reduction of the amount of support).

5. Conflict of interest

1) No interested party included

Members of the Review Committee with a conflict of interest with the Host Researcher or the Candidate shall notify the secretariat thereof and refrain from participating in the relevant review process. The scope of conflict of interest is as follows:

(i) When the Review Committee member is the Host Researcher

(ii) When the Host Researcher belongs on a full-time basis to the same organization (faculty,

department, lab, etc.) as the Review Committee member; or if the Host Researcher's research field is the same as the Review Committee member's though the Host Researcher has another concurrent position.

(iii) When the Host Researcher or the Candidate has a close relationship (e.g. family or relative) with the Review Committee member.

(iv) When it is deemed difficult for the Review Committee member to make an evaluation from a neutral and fair standpoint.

6. Information disclosure

1) The evaluations made by the Review Committee members and summary minutes of the meetings will be, in principle, non-disclosable.

2) All applicants will be notified of the decision on acceptance or rejection. With regard to the accepted applications, if there are any points to be noted or conditions for implementation, the applicant will be notified thereof.

3) The Review Committee members must not disclose or leak any information obtained in the course of the review, except for the information that has been already made public. Also, the Review Committee members must strictly control the information that they have obtained in their capacity as a member of the Review Committee.