

## **Peer-review Code of Conduct**

We use peer reviewers to provide impartial, objective and transparent assessments of grant applications as a part of our decision-making process. Peer reviewers are asked to agree to this Code of Conduct which outlines our expectations regarding confidentiality and managing conflicts of interest. This supports the integrity and independence of our application review process.

Our [Board of Trustees](#), [Grants Committee](#) and [Advisory Panels](#) are covered by separate policies (available on request).

## **Confidentiality**

- All documents, correspondence and meeting discussions relating to applications are strictly confidential. This information must be kept and disposed of securely and must not be disseminated to or discussed with others outside the review process.
- Expert advisers can expect that their comments will be treated in confidence by our staff. Grant applicants will receive anonymous versions of referees' comments.
- Expert advisers should refuse any requests for information or feedback and direct these to our Funding and Impact team ([funding@bartscharity.org.uk](mailto:funding@bartscharity.org.uk)).

## **Conflicts of interest**

Expert advisers are asked to declare any potential conflicts of interest with any application that they are invited to review. Declarations will be assessed to ensure the interest will not, or be perceived to, affect the impartiality of the assessment. Potential conflicts include (but are not limited to):

- Professional relationship with any of the applicants (e.g. active or recent collaboration, acting as a mentor, etc.) or their host organisation.
- Personal relationship with any of the applicants.
- Financial interest in any part of the application.

## **Use of artificial intelligence**

Peer reviewers are selected for their expertise and experience in their field, and we value their unique and expert perspectives.

Peer reviewers must not input any content from confidential grant applications or peer reviews into generative AI tools, or use them as part of their assessment activities. Doing so breaches the confidentiality agreement above.

In addition, peer reviewers must not take into account or speculate within their assessment whether generative AI has been used to develop the application or allow this to influence their judgement of the quality of an application.