

本院第 1-2 類型新增計畫審查資訊暨時程

1. 審查時程

每年 3 月初受理申請，4 月初申請人提供申請意願書(包含推薦審查人名單)，5 月初截止收件，6-8 月初審作業，8-9 月複審作業，10 月通知審查結果，次年 1 月開始執行計畫。

2. 審查程序

數理科學組計畫審查分為物理科學、天文學、地球科學、數學統計資訊等四項子領域。

審查分為兩階段：

第一階段是書面初審 (First Round Peer Review)，以邀請院外專家審查為原則，根據計畫內容與主持人的過往表現給予個別計畫評分。

第二階段是複審(Second Round Panel Review)，各子領域由 2-5 位資深學者(大多數為國外學者)，依照第一階段書面審查的結果，及各類型計畫的審查重點，每位委員負責主審 3-6 件申請案，於視訊會議中逐案討論，以各子領域分別排序。

生命科學組計畫審查分為兩階段：

第一階段是書面初審 (First Round Peer Review)，每件申請案由 3 位相關專業領域之學者審查 (國外專家學者占多數)。

第二階段是複審 (Second Round Panel Review)，包含書面複審與複審視訊會議。

以當年度申請的計畫內容，分類為數項領域，再依各領域分佈之比例，邀請該領域的專家學者組成計畫審查委員會，每件申請案由 2 位委員審查、每位委員審查 7-8 件計畫為原則。委員進行書面審查並參考初審意見，於視訊會議逐案討論，同時亦綜合不同計畫類型討論，最後依委員評分排序。

人文及社會科學組計畫審查分為三階段：

第一階段是預審：由人文組副院長與學諮總會該學組副執行秘書討論後，依該年度申請案所屬專業領域聘任院內外專家學者組成計畫審查委員會，在預審會議上共同決定各申請案書面初審委員名單。

第二階段是書面初審(First Round Peer Review)：每申請案分送 3 位國內、外專家學者進行審查並撰寫評審意見。

第三階段是複審(Second Round Panel Review)：由該計畫審查委員會依據初審結果共同審議所有案件，議決推薦通過名單。

3. 審查重點 Review Criteria – Summary

- 3.1 How significant is the specific problem to be addressed?
- 3.2 To what extent is the idea innovative?
- 3.3 What is the extent of anticipated impact?
- 3.4 How feasible is the Research Plan and proposed approach?
- 3.5 Do the applicants have relevant expertise? Are they committed?
- 3.6 Is the proposed project internationally competitive?

4. 審查迴避暨保密原則

4.1 審查委員遇有下列情形者，應迴避不予評審：

4.1.1 審查委員為申請人之配偶或三親等以內之血親或姻親。

4.1.2 審查委員為申請人之博士論文或博士後研究員之指導教授。

4.1.3 審查委員為申請人近五年發表論文或研究成果之主要共同作者。

4.1.4 審查委員為申請人其他直接利益相關或利益衝突關係者。

4.2 審查資料之保密

為確保審查作業之保密性，所有審查結果均由本院正式函知。審查委員未經授權，同意保密並不會將相關審查資料、審查會議討論過程之意見或審查結果等，私自保留或洩漏予他人。

Review Information and Timeline for New Academia Sinica Type 1 and Type 2 Projects

1. Review Schedule

Applications will be accepted starting in early March. Applicants must submit a **Letter of Intent** (including a list of recommended reviewers) in early April. The application deadline is in early May. The first and second rounds of review take place from June to September. Applicants will receive the final results of the review in late October and selected projects will commence in January of the following year.

2. Review Procedures

The review for projects in **the Division of Mathematics and Physical Sciences** is divided into four sub-fields: Physical Sciences, Astronomy, Earth Sciences, and Mathematics, Computer Science and Statistical Science. The review process consists of two stages:

First Round Peer Review: The review is conducted mainly by external experts. Each proposal is scored based on the content of the proposal and the past performance of the Project PI(s).

Second Round Panel Review: Each sub-field panel consists of 2–5 senior experts (primarily individuals working outside of Taiwan). Taking into consideration the comments from the first round of review and the review criteria of each type of proposal, each panelist reviews 3–6 applications, which are discussed on a case-by-case basis via video conferencing and ranked by sub-field.

The review for projects in **the Division of Life Sciences** consists of two stages.

First Round Peer Review: Each application is reviewed by three experts (primarily international).

Second Round Panel Review: The applications are divided into sub-fields based on their content. Experts of each sub-field constitute a review panel. Each application is reviewed by up to two panelists and each panelist reviews 7–8 applications. Keeping in mind the comments from the first round of review, each panelist provides their own written report and then all applications are discussed on a case-by-case basis via video conferencing. All applications are scored and ranked by all panelists.

The review for projects in **the Division of the Humanities and Social Sciences** consists of three stages.

Pre-review: The Humanities and Social Sciences Vice President and a Deputy Executive Secretary of the Central Academic Advisory Committee invite internal and external experts to constitute a review panel. Those selected for the panel are experts of sub-fields in line with the applications received for the year. The list of reviewers for each application is jointly decided at this stage.

First Round Peer Review: Each application is reviewed by three experts (domestic and international), who will provide written comments.

Second Round Panel Review: The panelists review all applications keeping in mind the comments from the first round of review to determine a recommended list of projects.

3. Review Criteria – Summary

- 3.1 How significant is the specific problem to be addressed?
- 3.2 To what extent is the idea innovative?
- 3.3 What is the extent of anticipated impact?
- 3.4 How feasible is the Research Plan and proposed approach?
- 3.5 Do the applicants have relevant expertise? Are they committed?
- 3.6 Is the proposed project internationally competitive?

4. Academia Sinica Rules on Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality for Reviewers

4.1. Conflict of Interest

In any of the circumstances listed below, a panelist or reviewer must decline to review an application.

- 4.1.1 A panelist or reviewer has, or has had, a personal relationship with the applicant.
- 4.1.2 A panelist or reviewer was a doctoral thesis supervisor of the applicant, or has supervised the applicant as a postdoctoral fellow.
- 4.1.3. A panelist or reviewer has published in collaboration with the applicant within the last five years, especially as a primary co-author.
- 4.1.4 A panelist or reviewer is involved in any situation they consider to be a conflict of interest with the applicant.

4.2 Confidentiality

To ensure the confidentiality of the review process, Academia Sinica will provide the final results of the review to the applicants. Each panelist or reviewer agrees not to disclose to others information associated with the review, including discussions and results arising from the review meetings, without prior authorization by Academia Sinica.