



STScI | SPACE TELESCOPE
SCIENCE INSTITUTE

EXPANDING THE FRONTIERS OF SPACE ASTRONOMY

JWST Cycle 5: Dual Anonymous Peer Review (DAPR)

Rebecca Levy

STScI Science Policy Division

November 12, 2025



Why Dual Anonymous Peer Review?

Primary objective of peer review process:

Best-Justified Science

Anonymising proposals:

Places focus directly on **Science**

Removes focus from **Team**



DAPR: What it is and what it isn't.

What it is:


- Proposing team ambiguous.
- Removes focus from team, encourages focus on **science**.

What it isn't:

- Completely anonymous (eliminating all possibly-identifiable information).
- A **challenge** or **test** for reviewers.



Impact: Enticing New Proposers





DAPR for **Proposers**: The Do Nots

- ✘ Names or affiliations of proposing team
- ✘ Discussions of the team, even anonymously
- ✘ Links to personal websites, ADS libraries, private versions of in prep or embargoed work
- ✘ Claims of ownership:
 - *In **our** recent analysis, **we** showed ... (Cannon et al. 2015).*
 - *Combined with data from **our** JWST Cycle 1 program (GO-1234), we will....*
 - ***We** have discovered 5 new candidates (Tinsley et al., in prep)....*
 - *We will use **our** proprietary software tool MySuperPipeline to perform...*



DAPR for **Proposers**: The Dos

- ✓ Focus on work proposed.
 - *We propose to... This program will measure the effects of...*
- ✓ Provide all relevant information needed to assess scientific merit.
- ✓ **Fully and properly cite relevant work. (DAPR is *not* an excuse to skip citations.)**
 - *In a recent analysis, Cannon et al. (2015) showed....*
 - *We will supplement this with data from JWST Cycle 1 program GO-1234 to....*
 - *Recently, 5 new candidates were discovered (Tinsley, **private communication**)...*
 - ***By prior agreement** with the developers, we will use *proprietary* MySuperPipeline to perform...*
- ✓ Proprietary data and software should also be cited.
 - *private communication, by prior agreement, in prearranged collaboration*



DAPR for Reviewers: The Do Nots

- ✗ Do not try to guess the proposing PI or team!
- ✗ This is **not** a challenge or a test.
- ✗ Do not comment on the experience and expertise of the team.

Guesses are
often **wrong!**



DAPR for **Reviewers**: The Dos

- ✓ Focus on the **scientific merit** of the work proposed.
- ✓ Comments refer to the **proposal** not the **proposers**.
- ✓ Assume the team can do the work.
- ✓ *Private communication* is **not** code for “hey, we’re the team”. It can (and often does!) mean information was communicated privately.



Non-Compliant Proposals

⚠ Egregious breaches of anonymity or minor accidental slip-ups.

✓ **Report** any cases to your **PSS** and your **SPD manager**.

✓ Not sure? **Report** it anyway.

Major violations, we will probably:

✗ Remove from consideration. Disqualify.

Minor slip-ups, we will probably advise you to:

✓ Ignore the instance and proceed with your review of the **scientific merit**.

✓ Highlight anonymity concern in feedback comments.

⚠ If you find you can't ignore it, **report** again.



Team Members & Team Expertise Statements

- **You will not see these.**
 - **Not** anonymous.
 - **Not** considered during scientific merit review.
 - If you have serious concerns about expertise for *exceptionally* complex programs, leave a comment in the **Technical Notes** section. (We expect these comments to be **extremely rare**.)
- ⚠️ Comments to proposers should be based on the **scientific merits**, not on the team or their expertise.



Summary of Key DAPR Points

- ✓ Focus on the **scientific merit** of the proposals.

- ✗ Do not try to guess the proposing team.
 - Proposals should not include identifying information, but should cite relevant work.

 - **Report** non-compliant proposals to your PSS and SPD manager ASAP.