

APS Water & Electrolyte Homeostasis Awards Committee Conflict of Interest Policy

The New Investigator Award and Trainees Awards require judging that is somewhat subjective. Therefore, it is particularly important that there be neither actual bias nor the appearance of bias in the selection process. If a member of the Water & Electrolyte Homeostasis Section Awards Committee has close ties with an applicant **and** subsequently participates in the awards rating process, this can create the appearance of bias (whether or not there is actually bias involved). Therefore, the following policy outlines the procedures guiding the participation of members of the Awards Committee involvement in the review of the applications.

Conflict of interest policy for Trainee Awards

A. Committee members who co-author an abstract for an applicant in the current trainee pool will recuse themselves from the review of that abstract. They can be involved in reviewing trainee abstracts for other applicants and in judging the trainee finalists as long as one of the finalists is not the applicant who co-authored with the committee member. *If a committee member co-authors an abstract for one of the trainee finalists, the committee member must recuse himself/herself from judging all finalists for that award. The committee member may judge finalists for the other trainee award (predoctoral or postdoctoral).*

B. Committee members who are in the applicant's department will recuse themselves from the review of that abstract. Committee members who are in the applicant's department also have a perceived, if not direct, conflict of interest and should recuse themselves from reviewing that specific application. However, the committee member can be involved in reviewing other applications and participate in the finalist judging as long as one of the finalists is not the applicant who co-authored with the committee member. *If a committee member shares the department with one of the trainee finalists, the committee member must recuse himself/herself from judging all finalists for that award. The committee member may judge finalists for the other trainee award (predoctoral or postdoctoral).*

C. Committee members who are volunteer / assigned mentors to a finalist in the trainee oral competition. Committee members who are mentors for a trainee who is a finalist in the oral competition for the postdoctoral or predoctoral competition must recuse themselves from judging all of the 3 finalists in the same category as their mentee. *The committee member may judge finalists for the other trainee award (predoctoral or postdoctoral).* When they find themselves in conflict, the committee member should notify the Awards Chair as soon as possible so that an alternate judge can be arranged for the oral competition.

Conflict of interest policy for New Investigator Awards

Committee members who are in the applicant's department or have close collaborations with an applicant will recuse themselves from all of the review process. Committee members who are in the applicant's department or close collaboration with the applicant also have a perceived, if not direct, conflict of interest and should recuse themselves from reviewing all applications for the NIA. *It is incumbent on the committee member to inform the committee chair as soon as s/he is aware of the application of a member of his/her department or close collaborator, including information on the level of collaboration between the committee member and the applicant. This will allow the chair to decide whether the committee member should participate in the review process.*

For questions regarding this policy, please contact the Chair of the Awards Committee Carrie Northcott, PhD (Carrie.A.Northcott@pfizer.com; cell 860-910-8624).