



# We thank the reviewer for their comments...

## Challenge

Increase fairness and transparency in peer review processes, including funding panels and publishing

There should be a mixture of time frames for funding calls, ranging from long and visionary to short and more specific.

Eliminate last-minute calls to use up excess funds at the end of financial year.

Ethical behaviour and mentorship should be considered as part of track record.

Roles should be redefined on proposals to move away from PI or co-I structure with justification required around leadership roles.

To address the power dynamic, anonymise authors and applicants, but name reviewers.

Create opportunities to host or mentor researchers from young institutions at well-established research centres.

Athena SWAN or Juno awards should be important in evaluating suitability of host institutions for grants.

Publishers and funding agencies should provide training for reviewers with clear guidance on how they should evaluate and comment on submissions.

The same training could be offered to applicants and authors, particularly from minoritised backgrounds.

Publish information on successful applicants for transparency and visibility as role models.

