

Diabetes UK Reviewer Confidentiality, Privacy, and Conflict of Interest

Your Confidentiality

The identity of reviewers (peer and panel) will be kept strictly confidential and will not be disclosed by Diabetes UK and the members of its Advisory Committees without your prior written consent. Where your comments may be shared with applicants, this will be made explicit on the review form. You should inform Diabetes UK in writing if your comments should not be shared.

Your Obligations

All information relating to applications is confidential. In order to ensure this confidentiality, you should:

- Keep applications secure and destroy all electronic and paper copies of applications (including any attachments and your notes relating to applications) promptly after completing your review
- Not disclose to any third parties including applicants that you are reviewing applications
- Not discuss applications with any third parties without the prior permission of Diabetes UK
- Not contact applicants to discuss any issues you identify in their applications without the prior permission of Diabetes UK
- Not copy applications in whole or in part other than is necessary for the purposes of your review
- Not use any information or ideas contained in applications for any purpose other than your review of such applications on behalf of Diabetes UK
- If you have any conflict of interest in relation to an application (for example, if you have recently worked with the applicant), please inform Diabetes UK promptly.

Research Privacy Notice

Our [Research Privacy Notice](#) explains how we collect, handle and look after your personal data throughout our grant application and funding process.

Conflict of Interest

Diabetes UK staff choose which reviewers to approach and in doing so will not ask a reviewer to review a grant they are deemed to have a direct interest in.

A direct interest applies to any of the following situations:

- The reviewer concerned is the sole applicant on the funding proposal
- The reviewer is a joint applicant and co-applicant on the proposal
- The reviewer is a collaborator on the proposal

- A relative of the reviewer is the sole applicant, joint applicant or co-applicant on the proposal, where this is known
- An applicant on the proposal is a business partner of the reviewer, where this is known
- An applicant on the proposal is a member or employee of the same institution as the reviewer concerned
- The individual concerned can be seen as a direct competitor of the reviewer, i.e. they are currently being funded or are currently applying for funding on a project of a similar nature to the proposal under discussion
- The reviewer has collaborated or published with the sole applicant, joint applicant or co-applicant within the past three years
- The reviewer is aware of any other issue that might reasonably be expected to give rise to, or give rise to the perception of, a conflict of interest.

There may be some instances where areas of research lack numerous appropriate and qualified reviewers and in this case it may be deemed that a reviewer will need to be approached who has published with the sole applicant, joint applicant or co-applicant within the past three years. Where this is the case this will be judged on a case-by case basis taking into account the extent of joint publication history.

Trustees of Diabetes UK will not be approached to review applications.

If you feel that you may have a Conflict of Interest please do let us know. Please refer to our full conflict of interest policy available on our <https://www.diabetes.org.uk/research/for-researchers/apply-for-a-grant/our-funding-process>

Use of artificial intelligence

Reviewers are selected for their expertise and experience in their field, and we value their unique and expert perspectives. 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. In addition, 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.