

PHILOSOPHY

MIXED MODEL: PEER REVIEW AND LOTTERY

27.12.2018



Gaetan Burgio @GaetanBurgio · Dec 5, 2018



Replying to @GaetanBurgio

This paper also demonstrate that after a first selection, the peer review process is unable to distinguish the best applicants and become a semi random process. Having been on #NHMRC grant review panel, I've seen this too and I think we can generalize to others funding agencies



Gaetan Burgio

@GaetanBurgio

I found very interesting the idea of mixed model (peer-review and lottery) to select the applications with a random process (lottery) after a first selection based on peer-review for scientific merit. Would be definitively more fair to the applicant and less biased IMO. pic.twitter.com/1fKcOTpCmC

♡ 7 10:31 AM - Dec 5, 2018



Top-ranked applications would be funded, applications deemed of low quality would be denied funding and applications for which this discrimination cannot be made would enter a process of random allocation of funds. Randomization would therefore be *focal*, as it would only be applied to a number of applications selected by the peer review committee, which would be otherwise forced to make decisions on applications in which peer review has consistently shown weaknesses [65].

It is important to emphasize that this procedure would not replace peer review with random allocation of funds. It would leave peer review at the position where rational decision has been shown to perform at its best, and use focal randomization to allocate grants beyond the limits of peer review.

 [See Gaetan Burgio's other Tweets](#)



When googling the above text, I found the [text source](#) but even more important [an earlier blog entry](#) as well as a twitter survey



Dorothy Bishop

@deevybee



Question for people with experience of applying for competitive research funding. Should awards be assigned at random to subset of applications that exceed a quality threshold? (Rather than via committee decision/ interview)

♡ 35 2:00 PM - Apr 6, 2018



31% YES: I'm currently funded

35% YES: Not currently funded

17% NO: I'm currently funded

17% Open peer review failed

1,060 votes • Final results

💬 108 people are talking about this

