

Guidelines for Proposers to ROSES Dual-Anonymous Peer Review Programs

1. Introduction

NASA's Science Mission Directorate is strongly committed to ensuring that the review of proposals is performed in an objective and fair manner. To this end, SMD will evaluate proposals to many ROSES program elements using dual-anonymous peer review (DAPR). Under this system, not only are proposers unaware of the identity of the members on the review panel, but the reviewers do not have explicit knowledge of the identities of the proposing team until after the evaluation and rating of all proposals is complete. The objective of dual-anonymous peer review is to minimize the impact of cognitive or unconscious bias in the evaluation of the merit of a proposal.

This document provides instructions to proposers submitting to DAPR ROSES program elements. See also <https://science.nasa.gov/researchers/dual-anonymous-peer-review>

Specialized instructions for proposers to any of the Astrophysics Guest Investigator/Guest Observer (GI/GO) programs solicited under ROSES are provided in a separate document entitled, "*Dual-Anonymous Peer Review Guidelines for Proposers to Astrophysics General Investigator/General Observer ROSES Programs*", which is available for download at SMD's Dual Anonymous Peer Review web page (<https://science.nasa.gov/researchers/dual-anonymous-peer-review>).

2. The Anonymized Proposal Document

2.1 Submission of Proposals

Proposers should note that for programs that follow the 2-Step proposal process, anonymization of the Step-1 proposals may or may not be required. Proposers should refer to the guidance provided in their specific program element of interest to determine whether anonymization is required of Step-1 proposals. Regardless of the approach followed for the Step-1 proposals, Step-2 proposals must be anonymized according to the guidelines in the program element.

Even for DAPR programs, proposers should continue to fill in all required information on the NSPIRES cover page (e.g., team members, institutions) in a not-anonymized fashion. The forms filled out on the NSPIRES web pages with Proposal Summary, Budget, Proposal Team and Program Specific and Business Data known as the NSPIRES "cover pages" will be partly hidden for the peer reviewers. The one exception is the Proposal Summary (see Section 2.2) but all other sections of the NSPIRES cover page should be completed as normal and NSPIRES will hide the identifying information from the reviewers.

2.2 Proposal Summary

The Proposal Summary of a Step-2 or full proposal must be anonymized, omitting names of the team members or their institutions as well as any other individually-identifying information.

The anonymized proposal summary shall be provided only as part of the NSPIRES cover page. Proposers should not include a copy of the anonymized proposal summary in the main body of the uploaded proposal PDF file.

2.3 Scientific/Technical/Management Section

Proposers are required to write the Scientific/Technical/Management (i.e., science justification) section of the proposal in an anonymized format, i.e., in a manner that does not explicitly identify the names of the team members or their institutions. The requirements for proper anonymization are as follows:

- a) Do not claim ownership of past work or use possessive pronouns that indicate ownership. This especially applies to self-referencing. When discussing references and their contents in the text, use third person neutral wording. For example:
 - Instead of statements like:
"Under my previously funded work [12], I modeled the shock propagation..." or
"As we have shown in our previous work [17], the inversion layer..."
 - Use statements like:
"Previous modeling studies of shock propagation [12] ..." or
"It has been demonstrated in [17] that the inversion layer..."
- b) Do not use the proper names of people or institutions anywhere outside of the reference list in the anonymized proposal document. This includes, but is not limited to, page headers, footers, diagrams, figures, watermarks, or PDF bookmarks. The only exceptions to this prohibition are for named phenomena, objects, or general use facilities such as:
 - The Van Allen Radiation Belts, Comet Hyakutake, Barnard's Star, the NIST Atomic Spectra Database, the Mikulski Archive for Space Telescopes, etc.
- c) Do not associate proposal personnel with named teams or collaborations. This includes named laboratories/laboratory groups or other facilities that are proprietary to one institution. This prohibition includes statements such as:
 - "The PI is a member of the IceBridge Science Team."
 - "Co-I 1 chairs the steering committee of the NExSS Research Coordination Network."Exceptions might be allowed in cases where the named collaboration is large and the role of the team member in the collaboration is not specified. However, when in doubt, contact the cognizant program officer for guidance.
- d) Do not include institutional logos or other identifying insignia anywhere in the anonymized proposal document.
- e) Do not use pronouns that indicate the sex of team members (e.g. he, she, his, her, etc.) anywhere in the anonymized proposal document.
- f) Reference callouts in the text must be written in numerical format, e.g. [1], with each number corresponding to the full citation in the reference list. It is recommended that callouts appear in numerical order in the text and that the reference list is presented in numerical order to simplify navigation between the proposal and the reference list for reviewers.

- g) Use of unpublished findings, exclusive access datasets, and or proprietary tools should be cited using language such "obtained in private communication" or "from private consultation". When using this type of citation, do not identify with whom the personal communication took place, i.e., do not refer to the names of individuals or provide a description of the associated team or group.
- h) Do not include statements designed exclusively to promote the general knowledge, experience, facilities, and past accomplishments of the proposing team or the characteristics and capabilities of the proposers or proposing institution(s), even in anonymized format. Such language is allowed only insofar as necessary to establish the team's ability to execute the specific tasks proposed. This prohibition includes statements such as:
- "The proposing team has more than 50 combined years of experience and a successful record of funding under NASA, NSF, and DARPA programs..."
 - "Over the past decade, the team has built a comprehensive laboratory that is fully complemented with the latest instrumentation and internationally recognized as the preeminent facility for research in the field of..."
 - The PI institution has a proven track record of producing flight hardware for applications in more than a dozen NASA suborbital and suborbital-class missions."

Validation of the qualifications and capabilities of the proposing team occurs after the review of the anonymous proposal and is explicitly excluded from consideration during the merit evaluation of the anonymized proposal. Inclusion of material touting the proposer's credentials not only consumes space in the page-limited S/T/M section with information that is not salient to the merit evaluation but also undermines the spirit of the DAPR process.

As always, the reviewers expect proposers to describe the past work in the field to put the proposed work into context and how the proposed work would improve, build-upon, complement, contradict, or complete that past work. Using the above guidelines, proposers should be able to successfully accomplish this in an anonymized manner.

2.4 Open Science and Data Management Plan

Proposals to all ROSES program elements must include an Open Science and Data Management Plan (OSDMP) as part of the anonymized proposal document (See Section II.c of the *ROSES Summary of Solicitation*). In most cases, the OSDMP is included as a separate 2-page section of the anonymized proposal document, outside of the Scientific/Technical/Management (S/T/M) section. However, there are some program elements that require the OSDMP to be included within the page-limited S/T/M section so proposers should be careful to follow the instructions in the program element to which they are proposing.

Proposers are required to write the Open Science and Data Management Plan section of the proposal document in an anonymized format that does not explicitly identify the names of the team members or their institutions (see guidelines in Section 2.3 above).

2.5 Table of Personnel and Work Effort

The Summary of Work Effort, including the Table of Work Effort must be included in anonymized fashion (e.g., PI; Co-I-1; Co-I-2) in both the main proposal document, in the place indicated by Table 1 of ROSES, and in non-anonymized fashion in the separate "Expertise and Resources Not Anonymized" document (see Section 3).

2.6 Budget and Budget Narrative

As usual for ROSES, proposals should include a redacted budget, i.e., one with the costs of things but not salary, fringe or overhead. For DAPR programs, this redacted budget must also not include any names of persons or organizations. Similarly, the proposal should include a budget narrative that may discuss the financial support for the PI, Co-Is, etc., but it must not identify the names or institutions of these individuals. Travel budgets should not name the origin city for any travel, as that may reveal the proposing organization. Please review tabular budget summaries, as they sometimes contain information that identifies individuals or organizations. Please review the final PDF file for bookmarks that contain the names of merged budget files that reveal team member names or organizations.

2.7 Additional Considerations

2.7.1 Supporting Letters or Statements

Any Statements of Commitment and Letters of Support, Feasibility, or Endorsement are to be included in the separate "Expertise and Resources Not Anonymized" document. However, when such documents are provided, the proposal should mention this fact in the anonymized proposal just to set reviewer expectations.

2.7.2 Facilities and Equipment

The complete Facilities and Equipment section must not be included in the main proposal document submitted in response to a program element that employs dual-anonymous peer review. Instead, this information (including Letters of Resource Support) will be gathered in the separate "Expertise and Resources Not Anonymized" document. However, the main body of the proposal should address the need, utilization, and salient capabilities of the facilities and equipment necessary for the proposed research in an anonymized manner.

2.7.3 High End Computing

If a proposing team is requesting an allocation of NASA's High-End Computing resources, the Scientific/Technical/Management section of the proposal document must provide a brief anonymized overview of the computing resources required, and state that a separate HEC request form is included. Proposers are still required to submit a separate PDF copy of the official HEC request form (see <https://www.hec.nasa.gov/request/science.html>) for guidance on requesting NASA

HEC time). In NSPIRES, upload the not-anonymized PDF HEC form as attachment type "Optional HEC request".

2.8 Return without Review of Unanonymized Proposals

SMD understands that dual-anonymous peer review represents a major shift in the preparations and evaluation of proposals and, as such, there may be occasional minor errors in writing anonymized proposals. However, SMD reserves the right to return without review proposals with anonymization errors so pervasive and/or numerous that it is deemed impossible to fairly evaluate the proposal within the context of the dual-anonymous process.

SMD further acknowledges that some proposed work may be so specialized that, despite attempts to anonymize the proposal, the identities of the Principal Investigator and team members may be discernable. As long as the guidelines are followed, SMD will not return these proposals without review.

2.9 Common Pitfalls in the Preparation of Anonymized Proposals

Below is a non-exhaustive list of common pitfalls when preparing anonymized proposals. Proposers should be careful to avoid these common errors when preparing and submitting their proposals:

- a) Including metadata (e.g., PDF bookmarks, document properties) that reveal the name of the PI.
- b) Recycling proposals prepared prior to dual-anonymous peer review and not carefully anonymizing the text.
- c) Providing the names of organizations or investigators in the proposal summary, title page, table of contents, or in a header or footer.
- d) Use of pronouns that indicate the sex of proposal team members, especially in the summary of work effort and budget justification.
- e) Providing the origin of travel for professional travel (e.g., conferences).
- f) Mentioning the institution name in the Budget Narrative.
- g) Including the PI or Co-I names or institutional insignia in budget tables.
- h) Attempting to "redact" identifying information by inserting a black rectangle over parts of the text, versus formally redacting the text using specialized software.
- i) Including some or all of the content of the "Expertise and Resources Not Anonymized" document within the main proposal PDF.
- j) Failing to remove all editorial comments and other markups entered during the drafting and revision of the proposal prior to its submission.

Many of these issues may be resolved by carefully searching the anonymized proposal document for identifying information, e.g., PI name, Co-I name(s), institution(s) before submission.

3. The Separate "Expertise and Resources Not Anonymized" Document

Proposers will also be required to upload a separate "Expertise and Resources Not Anonymized" document (hereafter, simply the "E&R document"). As the name suggests,

the contents of the E&R document are not anonymized. There is no overall page limit to the E&R document, but page limitations might apply to individual components of the document. See the relevant program element for any applicable limitations. In addition to the instructions provided below, proposers must follow any instructions regarding the required content and applicable page limits of the required E&R document provided in the program element to which they are responding. Moreover, proposers must restrict the material contained in the E&R document to the elements described below. In NSPIRES, upload as Attachment type "Expertise and Resources Not Anonymized". (For proposers with an HEC appendix, there will be two uploaded attachments, in addition to the proposal itself and the Total Budget file.)

The "Expertise and Resources Not Anonymized" document will contain the following elements:

- a) On the first page, a list of all team members, together with their institutional affiliations and roles (e.g., PI, Co-I, collaborator).
- b) Brief descriptions of the scientific and technical expertise each team member brings, emphasizing the experiences necessary to be successful in executing the proposed work.
- c) A brief discussion of the roles and responsibilities of each team member in the implementation of the proposed investigation.
- d) A discussion of specific resources ("Facilities and Equipment", e.g., access to a laboratory, observatory, specific instrumentation, or specific samples or sites) that are required to perform the proposed investigation.
- e) A summary of work effort, to include the non-anonymized table of work effort. Given that the program element requires an anonymized version of this table in the main proposal body, the table here should be identical, but with the roles now also identified with names (e.g., Sandra Cauffman PI; Nicky Fox Co-I-1; Lori Glaze Co-I-2).
- f) Biographical sketches: use [the new NASA grants policy format for biographical sketches \(docx\)](#). See [the grants policy list of requirements for what to include here \(PDF\)](#) and refer to the grants policy video at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qXraCMrhSeE>
- g) Statements of Current and Pending support: use [the new grants policy format for current and pending support \(docx\)](#). See [the grants policy list of requirements for what to include here \(PDF\)](#) and refer to the grants policy video at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qXraCMrhSeE>
- h) Letters of resource support, if required by the program element.
- i) Any other required content that might identify proposers, (e.g., demonstration of access to required facility) or other specialized documentation explicitly required by the program element.

After the review panel has completed the evaluation and rating of all its proposals, the E&R documents for only those proposals that may realistically be considered for selection under the program (as determined by the distribution of grades and the projected selection rates) will be distributed to the review panel. The panelists will review the contents of the E&R documents to assess the qualifications, capabilities, and

related expertise of the team and the facilities, instruments, equipment and other resources or support systems required to execute the proposed investigation.

The following is an example list of team members and statement of team member roles and expertise (items a and b in the above list):

List of investigators, institutional affiliations, and roles:

- Dr. Karen St. Germain, NASA Headquarters (PI)
- Dr. Nicky Fox, NASA Headquarters (Co-I)
- Dr. Lori Glaze, NASA Headquarters (Co-I)
- Dr. Paul Hertz, NASA Headquarters (collaborator)

Team expertise:

Dr. Karen St. Germain has extensive experience in the development, management, and oversight of space-based science missions. She will coordinate the project and be responsible for obtaining the samples. Dr. Nicky Fox is an expert in telematics and satellite communications, and previously served as the Project Scientist for NASA's Parker Solar Probe. Dr. Fox will integrate the laboratory data with the supercomputer-derived models. Dr. Lori Glaze brings expertise in the conceptualization and development of planetary instrumentation. Dr. Glaze will refine the machine learning algorithm that is necessary to complete the proposed work. Dr. Paul Hertz is an expert in X-ray emission from neutron stars, black holes, and globular clusters. Through his institutional affiliation, Dr. Hertz has access to the synchrotron beamline necessary to complete the proposed work.

4. Total Budget File

Most ROSES proposals require that a "Total Budget" file for all direct and indirect costs at U.S. organizations, including those at government laboratories, be uploaded as a separate document in NSPIRES, see Section IV(b)iii of the *ROSES Summary of Solicitation*. The "Total Budget" document is not released to reviewers and should not be redacted or anonymized.

5. Summary of Requirements for Anonymized Proposals

Each program element using the DAPR process will include a table of requirements similar to that shown below. The instructions in the table below represent the default for ROSES, but maybe superseded by instruction in any given program element.

Item	Requirement
Proposal Document PDF file	In addition to anonymizing the content, ensure that any PDF bookmarks are anonymous, and the document properties do not reveal names of author or organization.

Science-Technical-Management (S/T/M) section of proposal	The S/T/M section must be anonymized per the instructions in the document, “ <i>Guidelines for Proposers to ROSES DAPR Programs</i> ” (see link on NSPIRES page for program element). Reference callouts in the proposal text must be in numerical format (e.g. [1], [2], etc.). It is recommended that the callouts appear in numerical order in the text.
References	Follows the S/T/M Section but is not included in the page limit for that section. Citations should use easily understandable, standard abbreviations for journals and complete names for books The full citations may include names of authors.
Open Science and Data Management Plan	Unless specified otherwise in the program element, the OSDMP should be included in the main proposal document and must be anonymized.
Table of Personnel and Work Effort	Include in an anonymized fashion (e.g., PI; Co-I#1; Co-I#2) in the main proposal document and in non-anonymized fashion in the separate "Expertise and Resources Not Anonymized" document.
Redacted Budget and Narrative	Include both redacted budget and narrative in proposal document in an anonymized format. Redacted budgets must not include institutional logos or insignia.

Requirements for Expertise and Resources Not Anonymized Document

Separate "Expertise and Resources - Not Anonymized" document	Upload as a separate document in NSPIRES. Choose Attachment Type = "Expertise and Resources Not Anonymized". This document provides a list of all team members, their roles, institutional affiliations, expertise, and contributions to the work. The document should also discuss any specific resources that are key to completing the proposed work, as well as a summary of work effort. Statements of Current and Pending Support must also be included.
Table of Personnel and Work Effort	Include non-anonymized in the "Expertise and Resources Not Anonymized" document.
Biographical Sketches	Do not include in main proposal document. Include in separate "Expertise and Resources Not Anonymized" document. Use the new NASA grants policy format for biographical sketches (docx) .
Current and Pending Support	Do not include in main proposal document. Include in separate "Expertise and Resources Not Anonymized" document. Use the new grants policy format for current and pending support (docx) .
Letters or Statements	Unless otherwise specified in the program element, all Statements of Commitment and Letters of Support, Feasibility or Endorsement are to be included in the separate "Expertise and Resources Not Anonymized" document

Facilities and Equipment	The Facilities and Equipment Section is to be placed only in the separate "Expertise and Resources Not Anonymized" document. However, the S/T/M Section of the anonymized proposal should address the need for and capabilities of facilities and equipment necessary for the proposed research in an anonymized fashion. Any unique/identifying descriptions of facilities and evidence of access to or affiliation with facilities are to be included in the separate "Expertise and Resources Not Anonymized" document.
--------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Separately Uploaded Files

Total Budget	Upload as a separate document in NSPIRES. Choose Attachment Type = Total Budget. The mandatory total budget file is full and complete with all costs for those at U.S. organizations, including those at government laboratories. It is not redacted or anonymized.
High-End Computing (HEC) request	Submit optional not-anonymized PDF HEC form as attachment type "Optional HEC request" in NSPIRES. The S/T/M section in the main proposal must state that a HEC request is included and must provide an outline of the computing resources required in an anonymized fashion.

Special note for Grants.gov proposers. Content should not be duplicated in a Grants.gov submission. All material that belongs in the "Expertise and Resources Not Anonymized" document should only be provided in that document. If Grants.gov requires the attachment of separate files (e.g., Bio sketches or facilities and equipment, etc.) please attach a dummy file that simply states: "see E&R document".

6. Evaluation of Proposals in Dual-Anonymous Peer Review

The overarching objective of dual-anonymous peer review is to reduce the impact of cognitive bias in the evaluation of the merit of a proposal. To achieve this goal, the review panels will be instructed to evaluate proposals based on their scientific merit, NASA relevance, and cost reasonableness without taking into account the identity of the proposers. Here are some specific instructions that are provided to reviewers:

- i. Evaluate proposals solely on the scientific/technical merit of the work proposed. Remember to discuss the science and not the people.
- ii. Do not spend any time attempting to identify the PI or the team.
- iii. In the panel discussions, do not speculate on identities, insinuate the likely identities, or instigate discussion on a possible team's past work.
- iv. When writing evaluations, use neutral language focused on the work and not the people (e.g. instead of saying, "what they propose to investigate" or "the team has previously evaluated similar data" say "the proposed project is designed to address" or "the proposal summarizes a previous evaluation involving similar data").

In addition, if at any point a reviewer suspects they know the identities of the proposing team, they are instructed: (1) to inform the cognizant program officer of the situation; and (2) not to share their suspicions with their fellow reviewers. There are procedures in place for assessing and mitigating any such issues.

Each DAPR review panel is assigned a “leveler” who is present in the panel room throughout the discussion and rating of all proposals. The leveler serves as a facilitator or process monitor only. They are not there to participate in the technical evaluation of proposals. The leveler’s job is to ensure that the panel deliberations focus on the evaluation criteria that we provide, and do not stray into speculation about the identities of the proposers, their perceived attributes, or the quality of their past work. If a panel discussion does stray into conjecture about the identities of the proposers, it is the leveler’s responsibility to step in and redirect or refocus the discussion. Levelers even have the authority to stop the discussion of a proposal if their efforts to redirect the panel are unsuccessful.

As a final check, and only after the evaluation and rating of all the anonymized proposal documents assigned to the panel has been completed, panelists will be provided with the E&R documents for the subset of proposals that scored highly enough that they may reasonably be considered for selection. The fraction of the proposals that go through this validation process is determined by the cognizant program officer based on the distribution of ratings and the expected selection rate for the program. If applicable, the accompanying request for NASA's High-End Computing resources will be released to reviewers at this time as well. Based on this information, the panel will assess the qualifications, capabilities, and related expertise of the team and the facilities, instruments, equipment and other resources or support systems required to execute the proposed investigation.

For most programs, the ability of a team to write a highly meritorious anonymized proposal provides strong evidence that they are well qualified to conduct the work that they proposed. Consequently, the process of validating the associated E&R document involves simply confirming that the information it contains supports that expectation. After reviewing the E&R document, the panel assigns it to one of the three following categories:

- **Uniquely Qualified:** The E&R document demonstrates that the team is both exceptionally capable of executing the proposed work and has singular access to expertise or resources upon which the success of the investigation critically depends.
- **Qualified:** The team has appropriate and complete expertise to perform the work, and appropriate allocations of their time are included. Any facilities, equipment and other resources needed to execute the work are available.
- **Not Qualified:** The E&R document demonstrates severe deficiencies in the necessary expertise and/or resources to execute the proposed investigation.

It is NASA’s expectation that the overwhelming majority of E&R documents will fall in the “Qualified” category. If the panel categorizes an E&R document as either “Uniquely

Qualified” or “Unqualified”, they are required to provide a written statement justifying their categorization. Panels may or may not provide comments in support of a “Qualified” categorization. The E&R categorization, together with any findings documented by the panel, is captured in a separate evaluation form, which is returned to the proposing team along with other documentation from the review. This validation process may not be used to "upgrade" proposals for having particularly strong team qualifications, nor may it be used to re-evaluate proposals.

The process described above for validating the contents of the E&R document constitutes the default approach that will be used by the vast majority of program elements. However, a small fraction of program elements may choose to follow a modified, more rigorous approach to the review of the E&R documents. Under the modified process, written panel findings (strengths and weaknesses) from a more stringent evaluation of the E&R documents are recorded. The results of that evaluation are used to assign the proposed investigation to one of the three following categories:

- Exceeds Expectations: The qualifications of the team, the specialized tools and facilities to which they have access, and the capabilities of the proposing institution(s) significantly exceeds the level required for successful implementation of the proposed investigation. Any concerns voiced by the panel are minor in nature and unlikely to significantly impact the overall success of the investigation.
- Meets Expectations: The qualifications of the team, the specialized tools and facilities to which they have access, and the capabilities of the proposing institution(s) are likely sufficient to successfully implement the proposed investigation. Weaknesses identified by the reviewers may be substantive but are correctable and, subject to corrective action, there is a high likelihood that the investigation can be executed successfully.
- Does Not Meet Expectations: Taken as a whole, the qualifications of the team, the specialized tools and facilities to which they have access, and/or the capabilities of the proposing institution(s) are clearly not sufficient to successfully implement the proposed investigation. One or more weaknesses identified by the reviewers are substantial and, even with remedial action, there is a significant likelihood that the proposed investigation will not be fully successful.

The findings and categorization of the E&R document are subsequently provided to the selecting official along with the written merit evaluation and rating of the anonymized proposal document and both are considered in making selection decisions. In the rare cases where it is used, the intent to follow the alternative evaluation process for the E&R documents will be clearly called out and described in the text of the associated program element along with the evaluation criteria that will be applied.

7. Example Text for Anonymized Proposals

Much of the following text has been reproduced, with permission, from the Hubble Space Telescope dual-anonymous peer review website.

Here is an example of text from a sample proposal:

Over the last five years, we have used infrared photometry from 2MASS to compile a census of nearby ultracool M and L dwarfs (Cruz et al, 2003; 2006). We have identified 87 L dwarfs in 80 systems with nominal distances less than 20 parsecs from the Sun. This is the first true L dwarf census a large-scale, volume-limited sample. Most distances are based on spectroscopic parallaxes, accurate to 20%, which is adequate for present purposes. Fifty systems already have high-resolution imaging, including our Cycle 9 and 13 snapshot programs, #8581 and #10143; nine are in binary or multiple systems, including six new discoveries. We propose to target the remaining sources via the current proposal.

Here is the same text, re-worked following the anonymizing guidelines:

Over the last five years, 2MASS infrared photometry has been used to compile a census of nearby ultracool M and L dwarfs [6,7]. 87 L dwarfs in 80 systems have been identified with nominal distances less than 20 parsecs from the Sun. This is the first true L dwarf census a large-scale, volume-limited sample. Most distances are based on spectroscopic parallaxes, accurate to 20%, which is adequate for present purposes. Fifty systems already have high-resolution imaging available from two recent HST snapshot programs [REFERENCE]; nine are in binary or multiple systems, including six new discoveries. We propose to target the remaining sources via the current proposal.

Here is another example of text from a sample proposal:

In Rogers et al. (2014), we concluded that the best explanation for the dynamics of the shockwave and the spectra from both the forward-shocked ISM and the reverse-shocked ejecta is that a Type Ia supernova exploded into a preexisting wind-blown cavity. This object is the only known example of such a phenomenon, and it thus provides a unique opportunity to illuminate the nature of Type Ia supernovae and the progenitors. If our model from Rogers et al. (2014) is correct, then the single-degenerate channel for SNe Ia production must exist. We propose here for a second epoch of observations which we will compare with our first epoch obtained in 2007 to measure the proper motion of the shock wave.

Here is the same text, again re-worked following the anonymizing guidelines:

Prior work [12] concluded that the best explanation for the dynamics of the shockwave and the spectra from both the forward-shocked ISM and the reverse-shocked ejecta is that a Type Ia supernova exploded into a preexisting wind-blown cavity. This object is the only known example of such a phenomenon, and it thus provides a unique opportunity to illuminate the nature of Type Ia supernovae and the progenitors. If the model from [12] is correct, then the single-degenerate channel for SNe Ia production must

exist. We propose here for a second epoch of observations which we will compare with a first epoch obtained in 2007 to measure the proper motion of the shock wave.

Here is a third example of text from a sample proposal:

Before and after radiolysis, we will test changes in ice composition with our established cryogenic mass spectrometry technique (2S-LAI-MS) [Henderson and Gudipati 2014; Henderson and Gudipati 2015]. Our technique uses an IR laser tuned to the absorption wavelength for water to gently eject the sample into the gas phase, where it can be ionized by a UV laser and analyzed by time-of-flight mass spectrometry. A key advantage of our technique is that compositional information can be obtained directly in situ, for temperatures that are relevant to Europa (i.e., 50, 100, 150 K), without a need for warming to room temperature or other sample preparation. We will also perform continuous mass spectral analyses (using a residual gas analyzer and a quadrupole mass spectrometer already installed) during radiation to quantify the amount of sputtered material and evolved gas byproducts.

Here is the same text, again re-worked following the anonymizing guidelines:

Before and after radiolysis, we will test changes in ice composition with an established cryogenic mass spectrometry technique [12,13]. This technique uses an IR laser tuned to the absorption wavelength for water to gently eject the sample into the gas phase, where it can be ionized by a UV laser and analyzed by time-of-flight mass spectrometry. A key advantage of this technique is that compositional information can be obtained directly in situ, for temperatures that are relevant to Europa (i.e., 50, 100, 150 K), without a need for warming to room temperature or other sample preparation. We will also perform continuous mass spectral analyses during radiation to quantify the amount of sputtered material and evolved gas byproducts.

Another common situation that occurs in proposals is when a team member has institutional access to unique facilities (e.g., access to a laboratory, observatory, specific instrumentation, or specific samples or sites) that are required to accomplish the proposed work. An anonymized proposal does not prohibit stating this fact in the Scientific/Technical/Management section of the proposal; however, the proposal must be written in a way that does not identify the team member. Here is an example:

"The team has been awarded XX days of telescope time on Keck to observe Titan" or "The team has XX days at the NASA Ames Vertical Gun Range to study impacts on Titan" or "The team has XX days in the NASA Venus In-situ Investigations Chamber, which will enable us to examine the properties of sulfuric acid rain on Venus."

Note: in this situation, NASA strongly recommends that the team provide detailed supporting information (e.g., a letter of resource support) in the "Expertise and Resources Not Anonymized" document to validate the claim.

This document was last updated on March 4, 2025. Additional information, as well as frequently asked questions, may be found at <https://science.nasa.gov/researchers/dual-anonymous-peer-review>. Comments and questions on this document may be directed to douglas.m.hudgins@nasa.gov and SARA@nasa.gov.