

6 May 2008

Dear Chandra Cycle 10 Reviewer,

Thank you for your participation in the peer review. Enclosed is a CDROM containing copies of the proposals assigned to your panel, rules for the review, and some lists you might find helpful. Please take a minute, as soon as possible, to check your review assignments. Please see the Conflict of Interest section below and Section 5 of the Rules for Peer Review and let us know if you think you have a conflict of interest with any of these assignments.

### **CDROMS AND HARDCOPIES**

We distribute only CDROMs of the proposals unless hardcopies are explicitly requested. For each proposal there are two files (the RPS form 10\*\_f.pdf and the Science Justification 10\*\_sj.pdf), and the results of our conflict checker (one file per proposal 10\*.conflict). Proposals will also be available on the Reports website via the grading form.

A small number of proposals exceeded the page limits for the science justification or previous *Chandra* programs as stated in the Call for Proposals. The excess pages have been removed from both hardcopy and electronic files. The resulting files have “cut” added to their file names so you will be able to identify them. The hardcopies have been stamped accordingly.

We also provide electronic versions of this letter and the review rules, information on bringing your laptops to the review (will be emailed later) and lists of proposals in the panel ordered by proposal number and by primary and secondary reviewer.

Panel chairs and pundits will also receive an additional CD including all LP and VLP proposals.

Please bring your CDROMs to the review and leave them in your panel rooms at your departure. We will shred them along with any hardcopies you may have brought.

### **READING PDF FILES**

We have spot-checked the proposal PDF files for clarity and problems during display on the computers and confirmed that all print clearly. For display, most display problems (such as fuzzy fonts or the need to zoom on subscripts) are fixed using acroread8.0. Acroread can be obtained from Adobe at [www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/readstep2.html](http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/readstep2.html). Generally ghostview (gv) is also able to display PDF files/figures. Mac Users may wish to use the Preview application instead. If you have problems with any proposals please let us know.

### **GRADES AND REPORTS**

We request that you fill out two sets of forms in advance of the review via our reports website. Links will appear on your “Reviewer Home” webpage after login by May 15th.

The first set includes preliminary reports for all proposals for which you are primary or secondary reviewer. Each reviewer is assigned ~ 10 primary and ~ 10 secondary reviews. We ask that you fill out a report for each of your assigned proposals by 5pm (EDT) on Friday, June 13th to ensure they are available at the review and used in the triage. These reports will be available for edit to the primary reviewer for a given proposal on the website at the review, allowing for update following discussion within the panel and insertion of comments from the secondary reviewer. You will also be able to view all reports for which you are secondary reviewer on this website.

The second form is for preliminary proposal grades. Please read all the proposals in your panel, assign a preliminary grade, and fill out the form on the website before 5pm (EDT), Friday June 13th. This can be done in several stages as you read the proposals, saving as you go. We recommend you save often to avoid losing work. A compilation of all preliminary grades will be ready for your panel when the review starts, Tuesday June 17th. *These grades are important because they will be used for triage in order to focus the panel's time on those proposals most likely to succeed.* Please read the description of the grading scale (Rules for Peer Review, section 4). The process will work best if all reviewers use the same grading system.

The final report for each proposal will be the responsibility of the primary reviewer at the review. If the proposal is not recommended for approval, it is very important to write exactly why it was not ranked higher and, if the proposal is recommended, to state any recommended modifications clearly. Each report should be signed off, via the website mechanism, by both the primary reviewer and the deputy chair before they leave the review.

### **SPECIAL PROCEDURE FOR LARGE AND VERY LARGE PROJECTS**

Both Large and Very Large Projects will be graded by two panels as far as is possible given the conflict of interest rules. Each panel will produce a Peer Review Report following their discussion and decision process. The reports will be updated and combined as needed, following the deliberations of the Big Project Panel. If major revisions are needed the panel chair will be contacted to review the report before it is finalized.

You should send in a preliminary grade for all large projects in your panel except for those for which you have a conflict-of-interest.

### **FINAL PEER REVIEW REPORTS**

As noted above, each reviewer will be provided with access to the primary and secondary reports for proposals for which he/she is primary reviewer via our website at the review. It is the responsibility of each primary reviewer to update the Peer Review Report for his/her proposals to reflect the discussion and decisions made at the review and to approve the final version via the web-based interface. The Panel Chair and Deputy Chair will have access to all reports in their panel and the Deputy Chair is requested to review and approve all the panel reports before leaving the review. More information on this process will be given to you at the review.

### **INTERNET ACCESS AT THE REVIEW**

Wireless and wired access to the internet will be available in the panel rooms and throughout the floor on which the review is being held (but not in your hotel rooms). There will also be one computer in each panel room, in addition to the one used primarily by the Panel Facilitator, and several in "the email room" connected to the internet. The options for updating reports via the website are therefore: to bring and use your own laptop, to borrow a laptop from our administrative office, to use the computer in the panel room or to use a computer in the email room. If you bring your own laptop, please be sure to also bring your internet access card/port as well. The wired internet access is likely to be more stable when hotel networks are busy so we recommend its use over the wireless if you have a choice.

## **LAPTOPS AT THE REVIEW**

We encourage you to bring your own laptop to the review. However, in order to ensure that no computer virus infects our review network, we ask all those who will be bringing their own laptop to the review to update them with the latest updates and also to have antivirus/firewall software installed. We will email you with a reminder and any new instructions during the week before the review. Please see the separate, detailed notice entitled “Laptops and Internet at the Review” (to be emailed later).

## **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

If you have a conflict of interest or feel uncomfortable with reviewing a proposal assigned to you, please contact the CXC (cxoreview@head.cfa.harvard.edu) as soon as possible and we will assign it to another reviewer. If you wish to discuss conflicts further, please call/email:

Belinda Wilkes - 617 495 7268 - belinda@cfa.harvard.edu

We try to minimize conflicts of interest as we make our proposal assignments but the community is small and there are grey areas where the decision should be made in consultation with the CXC and your panel chair.

As you know, you cannot be primary or secondary reviewer of a proposal on which you are PI or Co-I or for which the PI and/or a Co-I is from your institution. The listed review assignments probably achieve this.

There will, however, probably be proposals in your panel on which you are a Co-I or with PIs/Co-Is from your institution. You should leave the room while these are discussed and voted on. But, some large institutions have many divisions which are quite separate and almost independent from one another. There may be no institutional conflict in these cases.

If in doubt as to whether you have a conflict of interest, please discuss it with us and/or your panel chair via email or phone. During the review, the panel chair can make decisions.

Our aim is to ensure a competent and unbiased review so a balance needs to be made between excluding reviewers due to conflicts and avoiding the exclusion of ALL competent reviewers from the discussion.

## **CONSTRAINED OBSERVATIONS**

As noted in the CfP, we have strict policies on constrained observations. Please note that any constraints which are described in the text but not specified in the RPS form will not be accepted. Misclassified constraints cannot be moved to a more difficult constraint category if approved. Please be diligent in notifying us at the CXC if you find any constraints buried in the text of a proposal or any that you believe are misclassified or incorrectly specified in the RPS forms. In such a case, your discussion at the review MUST be on the basis of the proposed observation and your report should explicitly state whether or not the panel believes that, to the best of its knowledge, the constraints specified (1) are required to achieve the science goals (2) have been correctly and completely specified and (3) have been correctly classified at the review (easy/average/difficult).

## TECHNICAL HELP

If you need technical advice concerning the Chandra instruments or other aspects of the mission, the following CXC experts can provide assistance. If you contact them by email, please copy [cxoreview@head.cfa.harvard.edu](mailto:cxoreview@head.cfa.harvard.edu) This will allow us to make sure your question is answered. Any technical reviews they complete will be available on the review website from the report form for a given proposal. Access to any relevant input sent by the PI after the proposal deadline will also be provided.

Mission Planning	Pat Slane	<a href="mailto:mp_peer@head.cfa.harvard.edu">mp_peer@head.cfa.harvard.edu</a>
Mission Planning	Jan Vrtilik	<a href="mailto:mp_peer@head.cfa.harvard.edu">mp_peer@head.cfa.harvard.edu</a>
Mission Planning	Dan Patnaude	<a href="mailto:mp_peer@head.cfa.harvard.edu">mp_peer@head.cfa.harvard.edu</a>
HRC	Mike Juda	<a href="mailto:mjuda@cfa.harvard.edu">mjuda@cfa.harvard.edu</a>
ACIS		<a href="mailto:cxoreview@cfa.harvard.edu">cxoreview@cfa.harvard.edu</a>
HETG	Herman Marshall	<a href="mailto:hermanm@space.mit.edu">hermanm@space.mit.edu</a>
LETG	Jeremy Drake	<a href="mailto:jdrake@cfa.harvard.edu">jdrake@cfa.harvard.edu</a>
Aspect	Tom Aldcroft	<a href="mailto:taldcroft@cfa.harvard.edu">taldcroft@cfa.harvard.edu</a>

## NON-DISCLOSURE AGREEMENT

If you have not already done so, please sign the Non Disclosure and Conflict of Interest Statement which is available on the peer review website and FAX it to Lauren Bortolami, 617 496 7577, as soon as possible.

## MISSING PROPOSALS

If your CDROM is missing a proposal, contact us and we will arrange for you to receive this proposal.

## PROPOSAL CONFIDENTIALITY

Remember, the content of the proposals is confidential. **Please do not discuss them with your colleagues for any reason.** If you dispose of a hardcopy, please do not leave it in plain view of a lot of people. If you copy any proposals onto your home/work computer, please be sure they are protected from access by others.

## TOPICAL PANELS AND CHAIRS

Stars:	1. Leisa Townsley	Penn State University
	2. Manuel Guedel	Institute of ETH, Zurich, Switzerland
Supernova Remnants:	3. Robert Fesen	Dartmouth College
	4. Jules Halpern	Columbia University
Binaries:	5. Robert Hynes	Louisiana State University
	6. Jean Swank	NASA/GSFC
	7. Marat Gilfanov	Max-Planck-Institut, Garching, Germany
Galaxies and Clusters:	8. Ginevra Trinchieri	Osservatorio Astronomico di Brera, Milano, Italy
	9. Marshall Bautz	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
	10. Somak Raychaudhury	University of Birmingham, UK
AGN:	11. Kirpal Nandra	Imperial College London, UK
	12. Jim Ulvestad	NRAO
	13. Chris Done	University of Durham, UK

## BIG PROJECT PANEL: PUNDITS

Knox Long	Space Telescope Science Institute
Ken Pounds	University of Leicester
Caty Pilachowski (Chair)	Indiana University

**I look forward to seeing you on June 17th,**

**Belinda Wilkes**  
**Assistant Director, Chandra X-ray Center**

*Enclosures:*

- 1. This letter*
- 2. README: listing contents of the CD*
- 3. List of reviewers on your panel including their email addresses*
- 4. A list of proposals in your panel, with titles and PI name ordered by proposal number*