

Discussion:

Dual Anonymous (DA) Review

1. What is good? & What is bad?
2. DA for intensive programs?
3. Penalty?
4. Gender & PhD year information

1. What is good? & What is bad?

- **Bad:** “Title” with “PI name” in SJ
- Referring to the proposer's past papers, works, or observations is allowed only when treated as those by third parties.
 - **Incorrect:** We revealed that A is B (Tanaka, et al. 2023).
 - **Correct:** Tanaka, et al. (2023) revealed that A is B.
 - **Incorrect:** The equivalent width was measured in ten objects in our past observation (Tanaka, et al. 2023).
 - **Correct:** The equivalent width was reported in ten objects in Tanaka, et al. (2023).
- The name of a survey or other observation projects can be included in a proposal if the project is referred to as led by third parties. In other words, you cannot state the project name in a way it is clear that the project is led by the PI or other members of the team.
 - **Incorrect:** In the FOO Survey, we have conducted 6 nights of observations and found xxx.
 - **Correct:** Investigations of the data taken by FOO Survey have found xxx (private communication).

2. DA for intensive programs?

- Currently, both normal and intensive proposals are reviewed through DA.
- Classical review process is better for intensive proposals(?)
 - DA was implemented for normal programs due to a clear gender bias.
 - How about intensive programs? No evidence.
 - Previous research activity and results may be more important for the review process.
- DA is better(?)
 - DA review by the referees & normal review with interview by TAC. Complementary.

3. Penalty?

- Penalty for DA violation?
 - If no penalty, let's violate! → unfair
- Deciding on the penalty system feels like a penalty for TAC.
 - Finding guilty or not guilty for all proposals every semester.
 - Handling complaints.
 - How to impose penalties? Reducing referee's score? How much?

4. Gender & PhD year information

- We need to monitor unconscious biases on gender and position, at least for a few years, or forever.
- Currently, no way to get those information from PI.
- TAC (chair) collects those information by hand.
- I propose to collect those personal information (gender & PhD year) of PI through ProMS?
 - SAC agreed.
 - not appearing in proposals.
 - Style, like “Gender: Male, Female, Other, Prefer no to say”
 - Who can see the info.?