Standard Operating Procedure

Number: **015**

Name: **Peer reviewing**

Title: Procedure for the peer-reviewing datasets hosted on the EU Pollinator Hub

Category: Data management

Status: Approved

Version: 1.0

Date: 2024-02-07

Authors: Michael Rubinigg

This document is intended for the regulation of processes within the EU Pollinator Hub. It is published under the CC BY 4.0 licence. You may distribute, transform, adapt and build upon the material in any medium or format, including for commercial purposes, as long as you give credit to the author.

Table of contents

1 Document history 3
1.1 Current Release 3
1.2 Change history 3
2 Abbreviations 4
3 Introduction 5
4 Validity 6
4.1 Area 6
4.2 Time 6
4.3 Related Documents 6
4.4 Related Tasks 6
5 Procedure 7
5.1 Peer reviewing scheme 7
5.2 Implementation of the reviewing scheme 8
5.3 Reviewing process 9
6 References 11
7 Annexes 12

1 Document history

1.1 Current Release

1.1.1 Drafted

Submitted on 2023-06-23 by Michael Rubinigg, quality manager.

1.1.2 Reviewed

Reviewed on 2023-06-30 by Noa Simòn Delso, general manager.

1.1.3 Approved

Approved on 2024-02-07 by Michael Rubinigg, quality manager.

1.2 Change history

n.a.

2 Abbreviations

EU	European Union
EUPH	EU Pollinator Hub
n.a.	not available
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure

3 Introduction

The current SOP regulates the implementation and maintenance of a procedure for the peer-reviewing datasets hosted on the EU Pollinator Hub.

4 Validity

4.1 Area

The of validity of this document is limited the peer-reviewing of datasets hosted on the EU Pollinator Hub.

4.2 Time

The period of validity of this SOP begins on 2024-02-07 and ends with its revocation.

4.3 Related Documents

Document type	Document ID	Title
SOP	001	SOP instructions
SOP	004	Organisation chart
SOP	014	Data asset rating
SOP	028	User management

4.4 Related Tasks

Persons who have been assigned one of the following tasks, as defined in SOP-004, assume a responsibility within this SOP:

- Quality management
- Software development

5 Procedure

5.1 Peer reviewing scheme

5.1.1 Responsibilities

- The person responsible for quality management, as defined by SOP-004, is responsible for the process described in section 5.1 of this SOP.
- The task of carrying out certain parts of this process can be transferred to another person.

5.1.2 Life cycle of the peer reviewing scheme

5.1.2.1 Development of the peer Reviewing Guidelines

- A Reviewing Guideline is developed that contains the following elements:
  - General guidelines for effective feedback.
  - Time to submit a review.

5.1.2.2 Annual revision of the reviewing scheme

- The Reviewing Guideline is revised annually.

5.1.3 Life Cycle of a Peer Reviewer Agreement

5.1.3.1 Development of a Peer Reviewing Agreement

- A Peer Reviewer Agreement is created that contains at least the following elements:
  - Source of the provided data;
  - Requirements to become a peer reviewer;
  - Provisions on the storage of data by the peer reviewer;
  - Provisions on the rights on the data to be reviewed;
  - Provisions on the process of peer reviewing;
  - Provisions on the payment of peer reviewers;
  - Provisions on duration, termination and cancellation of the agreement;

5.1.3.2 Annual revision of the a Peer Reviewing Agreement

- The Peer Reviewer Agreement is revised if the information contained therein should change.

5.2 Implementation of the reviewing scheme

5.2.1 Responsibilities

- The person responsible for software development, as defined by SOP-004, is responsible for the process described in section 5.2 of this SOP.
- The task of carrying out certain parts of this process can be transferred to another person.

5.2.2 Integration of the reviewing scheme in the software module

- The Reviewing Guidelines are integrated into the peer reviewing module on the EU Pollinator Hub.
- The Reviewer Agreement are integrated into the peer reviewing module on the EU Pollinator Hub.

5.3 Reviewing process

5.3.1 Responsibilities

- The person responsible for quality management, as defined by SOP-004, is responsible for monitoring the complete and correct implementation of the process described in section 5.3 of this SOP.

5.3.2 Assignment

5.3.2.1 Assignment of a dataset to a peer reviewer

- The person responsible for the reviewing process assigns a dataset to an individual to which the role of a peer reviewer has been assigned according to SOP-028.

5.3.3 Peer Review Report

5.3.3.1 Rating

- The peer reviewer rates the dataset according to the criteria contained in the criteria catalog prepared in accordance with SOP-014.
- In section *Rating* of the *Peer Review Report* the peer reviewer summarises the results of the rating.
- Section *Rating* of the Peer Review Report is publicly visible.

5.3.3.2 Summary

- In section *Summary* of the *Peer Review Report* the peer reviewer summarises what the dataset claims to contain, gives an overview of the strengths and weaknesses of the dataset and recommends a course of action according to the reviewing guidelines.
- Section *Summary* of the *Peer Review Report* is visible to the data provider, the person responsible for the reviewing process and the person responsible for quality management, as defined by SOP-004.

5.3.3.3 Discussion of major issues

- In section *Discussion of Major Issues* of the *Peer Review Report* the peer reviewer specifically addresses major issues (essential issues the data provider needs to address before a dataset can receive a positive rating).
- Section *Discussion of Major Issues* of the *Peer Review Report* is visible to the data provider, the person responsible for the reviewing process and the person responsible for quality management, as defined by SOP-004.

5.3.3.4 Discussion of minor issues

- In section *Discussion of Minor Issues* of the *Peer Review Report* the peer reviewer specifically addresses minor issues (non-essential issues that do not affect the overall quality of the dataset).
- Section *Discussion of Minor Issues* of the *Peer Review Report* is publicly visible.

5.3.3.5 Confidential comments

- In section *Confidential Comments* of the *Peer Review Report* the peer reviewer provides confidential comments about the dataset and information on potential conflicts of interest.
- Section *Confidential Comments* of the *Peer Review Report* is visible to the person responsible for the reviewing process and the person responsible for quality management, as defined by SOP-004.

5.3.4 Final decision

5.3.4.1 Criteria for passing the peer reviewing process

- For a dataset to pass the peer review process, the following criteria must be met:
  - The dataset fully complies with the rating, as described in section 5.3.3.1.
  - The dataset contains no major issues, as described in section 5.3.3.3.
  - The dataset contains no information, as described in section 5.3.3.5, that would impede the dataset to be published or render the peer review invalid.

6 References

There are no sources in the current document.

7 Annexes

There are no annexes in the current document.