



Prince Sultan Military College of Health Sciences
VICE DEANSHIP OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

2020 RESEARCH GRANT

PROPOSAL EVALUATION AND EXTERNAL REVIEW (PEER)
GUIDELINES

1. The PSMCHS Research Applicant (Principal Investigator) must be a full-time faculty member position as Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor.
2. The research grant application form must have complete details and submitted in soft copy and hard copy to the Scientific Research Unit Office.
3. The application form must be submitted to research@psmchs.edu.sa prior to the funding application submission deadline (July 31, 2020, at 5:00 pm).
4. The external reviewer may not be a PSMCHS faculty member/employee.
5. The peer reviewer must be academically and demonstrably qualified to conduct the review and must be endorsed by the College Dean.
6. When considering potential reviewers, research grant applicants should avoid doing anything that could be perceived to compromise the review process, such as contacting members of a review panel who might be involved in the review of a submitted research grant application.
7. Research grants 2020 awardees will be selected based on the feasibility, scientific, and clinical significance of the research proposal.
8. The peer reviewer must keep the confidentiality concerning the proposal review, must not use any information contained in the research application, and must agree to provide the Vice Deanship of Postgraduate Studies with written feedback within 10 days.
9. The peer review must adhere to the **MC-PG-SR-02 Scientific Integrity Policies and Procedures, 5.9 Peer Review Guidelines** that states:



- a. Express his/her opinion impartially with integrity in arbitrating research and scientific production or practice.
- b. Present and referee research and scientific output or activity with the highest confidentiality and neutrality, and only to the degree of his/her expertise. He/she may recommend that any of his/her colleagues be nominated to perform in areas that are not within his/her expertise.
- c. Submit remarks, views, criticisms, instructions, and results of additional tests to the party requesting peer review, if available, in connection with the scientific research or output or activity being referred.
- d. Assess and arbitrate academic research with the utmost professionalism and neutrality, exhibiting and recording the remarks and criticism of the thesis.
- e. Refrain from engaging in the assessment or arbitration of the results of his / her own scientific research or activity results, or outputs of scientific research or activity or any other scientific activity that he/she supervised or was involved in the supervision thereof.
- f. Refrain from engaging in the peer-review process of any research output, event or plan, or research project documents for a person or party to whom he/she is associated or linked with any kind of inherent common interests.
- g. If the referee finds plagiarized materials in the scientific material he/she is refereeing, or for any type of scientific error, the referee is forced to identify the plagiarized parts along with the original source from which the material is unlawfully used. Likewise, in the event of any scientific error, the referee must correctly and honestly indicate the error.
- h. Discern concisely between reduction errors when citing the reference in a quoted material and plagiarisms, and aim to explain whether the error committed was deliberate or the result of negligence and lack of expertise on behalf of the researcher whose work is being assessed.