SciLifeLab FAIR Storage Guidelines for Review
Established 2023-11-14

The intended audience for the SciLifeLab review guide is SciLifeLab reviewers of applications for FAIR storage resources.

This document is maintained and updated as deemed necessary by SciLifeLab Head of Data Centre.

The time to read this document is about six minutes.

Contents

1 SciLifeLab Data Centre, IT and Software Services

SciLifeLab Data Centre provides storage capacity and advanced user support for Swedish life science research as set forth in the SciLifeLab FAIR Storage Guideline for Applicants and Administrators.

2 Conflicts of interest

SciLifeLab reviewers should observe the Swedish Research Council policy regarding conflicts of interest, VR Ref. No 113-2014-1792.

3 Roles

3.1 The SciLifeLab FAIR Storage Allocation Board

The SciLifeLab FAIR Storage Allocation Board, FAB, is appointed by the SciLifeLab board. One FAB member will be assigned the duty as Data Centre Allocation Secretary.

The responsibilities of FAB are:

- Evaluate project applications, including applications for project continuation, within Rounds and to decide storage allocation to applicants.
- Pursue relevant administrative duties relating to evaluation and allocation of projects.
- Initiate and implement allocation checklist as deemed necessary.

The Head of Data Centre will appoint *Proposal deciders* from within FAB with a mandate to evaluate and decide upon applications that adhere to predefined criteria.

3.2 Data Centre Allocation Secretary

The secretary coordinates the FAB and leads the joint resource assignment process. The secretary should have a good overview, organise meetings as necessary, and ensure that the duties are undertaken satisfactorily. The secretary should also coordinate with other relevant SciLifeLab bodies.

Responsibilities for the DCA Secretary

- Administer SciLifeLab Rounds in collaboration with FAB.
- Prepare and publish information about SciLifeLab Rounds.
- Draw up minutes by FAB meetings.

The DCA Secretary is appointed, for as long as necessary, by the Head of Data Centre.

4 Reviewing

4.1 Confidentiality

Throughout the process all applications, and any appraisal, shall be treated confidentially. Reviewers should not disseminate the documents made available to them during their work

as FAB members and must delete them after completing the assignment. Third parties should not be informed of meeting discussions or the views of other reviewers in the ongoing review process.

4.2 How to review in SUPR

The reviewer must have registered a SWAMID federated identity or a client certificate to use either of those methods to log into SUPR (*https://supr.naiss.se/*). A third option is to log in using an email address and the corresponding SUPR password. An option *Request Password* is available on the SUPR login page if needed. When logged in, reviewers can choose the link *Reviews* in the menu bar on the left side of the site.

4.3 Working with SUPR

Select the contemporary SciLifeLab round, and look for applications awaiting review.

If there is a need to communicate with the applicant, use the field *Comments to PI* and revert the project proposal to editing status.

Notice the findings of the review in the section *Do Immediate Technical Review*.

If the application fulfils the requirements below, fill in the amount to be granted and approve the proposal. Otherwise, work out a resolution together with the applicant. If that is not possible, the proposal can be denied.

💡 It may be easier for all parties to deny a proposal and encourage the applicant to write a new one.

💡 The aggregated capacity requested per resource is presented on the *Round page* in SUPR.

4.4 Reading proposals and writing reviews

You shall base your review only on the application contents. Information that is irrelevant to the review must not be used. It can sometimes be difficult to distinguish irrelevant information from expertise in the field. Examples of irrelevant information are details of the applicant's private life or various types of rumours.

The starting point for the assessment is that the contents of an application and the information about the applicant **shall not be shared** with colleagues outside FAB. Sometimes, questions arise where it is acceptable to consult with a colleague on specific parts of the proposal. That may be justified, as long as the application is not shared with third parties and the consultation is limited. It is your task as a reviewer to assess the application in its entirety.

If you suspect any **scientific misconduct** or deviation from good research practice, you must immediately contact the DCA Secretary. The DCA Secretary will ensure that the matter is further investigated.

5 Review

Project proposals for SciLifeLab FAIR resources from researchers are subject to technical review. The criteria and help questions are subject to review and update by the Head of Data Centre when deemed necessary.

If the proposal lacks sufficient information for a sensible evaluation, the applicant can be requested to complement it.

FAB / Proposal deciders, may reject or adjust allocations listed in project proposals.

Infrastructure needs are handled separately from this process, decided by the head of Data Centre.

When in doubt, consult with your colleagues within the FAB group.

5.1 Questions to ask

a) Is the PI eligible, as set forth by the SciLifeLab FAIR Storage Guideline for Applicants and Administrators?

b) Is a Data Management Plan (DMP) present in the SciLifeLab Data Stewardship Wizard?

c) Does DMP include Persistent Identifiers (PIDs), e.g. Digital Object Identifier(s) (DOIs), for the collected research outputs from the project?

d) Does the storage asked for match the amount of data foreseen by the project according to the data management plan?

e) Have all the mandatory questions under the "Before Submitting the DMP" phase in the DMP been answered?

f) Does the applicant have the ability to transfer the data described in the proposal to and from the resource?

g) Does the applicant have the ability to manage the data described in the proposal on the resource?

h) Do the resources listed in the proposal have the space requested in the proposal available?

i) Is the data management plan clear and well-justified? Does it address open science appropriately?

j) If the project proposed will use sensitive data, are the resources adequate for such usage?

k) If the project proposed will use sensitive data, are relevant permits in place according to the information in the application?

l) Is this project best placed on the proposed resource?

5.1.1 Questions to ask for continuation projects

a) Has the proposal been updated from previous proposals?

b) Is the data management plan updated? Have all the mandatory questions under the "Before Finishing the project" phase in the DMP been answered?

c) Is the DMP and PID/DOI updated to provide details of all published related research outputs.

d) Is the usage so far in line with the intended purpose of the resource?

e) Are the research outputs proportional to the resources used, and broadly in accordance with the plan of the previous proposal?

6 Decision

The decision regarding the application should be communicated with the PI and documented in SUPR.

- Storage capacity should be expressed in terms of its size (GiB), the number of files, and time (months).

For storage, FAB may prematurely terminate, extend, or change the allocation within the limits of the round. Any such decision shall be communicated with the PI and documented in SUPR.

Decisions by FAB are final and cannot be appealed.