

# **NSLS-II Beamline Development Proposal Reviewer Guidelines**

## **Review Criteria**

All Beamline Development Proposals (BDPs) will be reviewed based on the following five evaluation criteria:

- **Science Case:** Does the research enabled by establishment of the proposed beamline have the potential to address important scientific and/or societal questions?
- **User Demand:** Is there evidence of significant interest, engagement, and support for the proposed beamline facility by the scientific community?
- **Performance:** Will the proposed beamline provide the performance necessary to fulfill its scientific mission, with characteristics well matched to the NSLS-II source?
- **Technical Feasibility:** Is achieving the proposed beamline capabilities technically feasible?
- **Quality of Proposers:** Are the proposal team members experienced in the proposed field of research and/or technique and are they representative of the corresponding user community that would be served by the beamline?

## **Reviewer's Comments**

Each BDP is assigned to three reviewers in a given Review Study Panel by the Panel Chair prior to the Study Panel Review Meeting. These three reviewers are asked to review each assigned proposal by commenting on the proposal's strengths and weaknesses in each of the five review criteria listed above. Each of the three reviewers should bring a draft reviewer's report to the Study Panel Review Meeting.

Each BDP proposal team will be expected to make an oral presentation at the Study Panel Review Meeting and to answer any questions or concerns from the Panel. The reviewers may wish to revise their review comments based on what they hear during the oral presentation and the discussions at the meeting.

## **Summary Assessment**

Each Study Panel will provide a Summary Assessment for each of the BDPs reviewed by the Panel, in addition to the comments from the three reviewers assigned to the BDP.

The Summary Assessment for each BDP should contain specific comments on the proposal's strengths and weaknesses and a numeric score between 1 to 5 (with 1 being the best) in each of the five review criteria. The scoring should be based on the following scoring guidelines:

<b>Score</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>	<b>Scoring Guidelines</b>
1	Outstanding	Exceptionally strong with negligible weaknesses
2	Excellent	Very strong with minor weaknesses that can be easily addressed
3	Very Good	Strong but at least 1 moderate weakness that would lessen impact
4	Good	Some strengths but at least 1 major weakness that severely limits impact
5	Fair	Very few strengths and major weaknesses that lead to very little impact

It is expected that the panel will take an initial poll of the five scores from each member of the panel during a closed discussion period after each BDP presentation. The panel will then finalize the comments and the five scores during an executive session after hearing all presentations.

Both the Summary Assessment and the three reviewers' comments are intended to be released to the BDP proposal team after the full SAC review. The three reviewer's names will be kept confidential.

### **Panel Executive Summary**

Each Study Panel will provide a Panel Executive Summary on all BDPs reviewed by the Panel. The Panel Executive Summary will contain

- an overall assessment of all proposals that the Panel reviewed
- recommendations on modifications of BDPs, such as consolidation of BDPs or other adjustments

The Panel Executive Summary will be considered confidential.