



Advice for Project Reviewers

IUPAC operates using a project-driven system. This is done to ensure that only high quality projects bear the IUPAC label, to encourage participation by the worldwide chemistry community, to optimize the use of IUPAC's limited financial resources, and to simplify management and accountability. As part of the procedure the Union asks experts in the field of chemistry to review proposals for new projects. These reviewers should be experts in the appropriate field and are, in general, chosen to avoid the appearance of conflict of interest. The reviews are kept anonymous, with the exception that the names of the reviewers are disclosed to the members of the funding body(ies) (Division or Standing Committee, Project Committee).

For your guidance, IUPAC does not fund original research. It does support projects of importance to the international scientific community, for example, in the areas of nomenclature, terminology and symbols; validated and compiled data; standard methods and procedures; education and the public understanding of chemistry; or any subject requiring the development of a consensus among chemists worldwide. More detailed criteria for suitable IUPAC projects can be found at [Guidelines for IUPAC Projects](#).

Your critical assessment of the accompanying proposal, based on your expertise in the field, will be a significant determining factor in the project approval process. Please evaluate the Project application for its qualitative and quantitative information content. An overall assessment of the Project's scientific soundness and quality should also be provided in one or two paragraphs.

The following questions should be considered: (rev Apr '08)

1. What is your judgement on the value of the project? Should changes be considered to improve the project?
2. Will the results of this project have the stated impact as suggested by the proposers?
3. Is the Dissemination Plan adequate?
4. If this project falls into the category Nomenclature or Standard Methods and Procedure, are there adequate processes to ensure international consensus?
5. Should the project be supported by a different organization or is it duplicative of efforts by other organizations?
6. Is the expertise of the Chair and Task Group Members ideally suited to carry out this project? Should additional members or experts be recruited? Is the proposed group suitably diverse?

7. Is the budget appropriate and justified? Do the benefits justify the costs?
8. Are there any possible conflicts of interest or copyright problems?
9. Overall rating: Very Suitable - Suitable but should be improved - or - Not Suitable

Please describe, if not covered previously.