

# JARDS Reviewer Guidelines

May 18, 2022

## General Procedure

The entry point of the JARDS reviewing system is the following URL (Figure 1): <https://www.jards.itc.rwth-aachen.de/jards/WEB/review/login.php>

NHR  
NATIONALES  
HOCHLEISTUNGS  
RECHENEN

Electronic project application form for NHR

## Login to application reviewing system

E-mail Callback **RegApp**

We will send an e-mail with a link. By using the link in this e-mail you can continue with the reviewing process.

Login mail address

**(1)**

callback

**(2)**

IT Center - RWTH Aachen University  
[Disclaimer](#) [Privacy Notice](#) [Site Credits](#)

Figure 1: Login Page

JARDS uses a call-back authentication mechanism, which makes it unnecessary to set and remember yet another password. You have already been registered as a JARDS user using the same e-mail address as the one we used to send you the invitation to act as a reviewer. Please enter it (1) and press the "callback" button (2) as indicated on Figure 1.



## Electronic project application form for NHR

✔ Callback mail sent to [\[redacted\]](#)

An E-mail for your identification is on the way.  
This might take a few minutes. Please, also check your spam folder.  
The link sent is valid for the next 30 minutes.

Figure 2: Callback confirmation

From jards@itc.rwth-aachen.de  
Subject **Review system identification**  
To [REDACTED]

Plain text

[Source](#)

This is an automatically created E-Mail. (Please do not reply to this message.)

An identification request for the NHR4CES reviewing service has been submitted for this E-Mail address. By clicking on the URL below, you can continue with the reviewing process and confirm that you are the registered owner of this E-Mail address.

[REDACTED]

The URL is valid until 16.05.2022 12:28

It is possible that another person specified your E-Mail address by mistake. In this case, please ignore this message.

--  
RWTH Aachen University IT-ServiceDesk  
Tel.: +49 241 80 24680  
Email: servicedesk@itc.rwth-aachen.de

Figure 3: Callback E-Mail

Upon successful initiation of the authentication process, JARDS will respond by showing a **green** confirmation field as shown in Figure 2. If the address entered is not registered, an error message will be displayed instead. An e-mail containing a one-time login link will be sent to you shortly after (Figure 3). It could take several minutes before the e-mail gets delivered. The login link is only active for a limited amount of time as indicated in the message text.

CONTENT

Select active call:

2022/2

select

Collection of your applications to review in call 2022/2

Show/hide/move columns (5)

Export

Config

Search:

Review	App ID	Application documents	Principal investigator	Title of project	Topic	Comments
(3) <a href="#">edit review</a>	20026	<a href="#">Current application to review</a> The "Current application to review" contains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Application form</a></li> <li><a href="#">Project description</a></li> </ul>	PI Some Dr.	Tolle Sachen	Geotechnics, Hydraulic Engineering	<a href="#">add</a>

Showing 1 to 1 of 1 entries

Overview

Show/hide/move columns (1)

Config

Search:

(1)

Category	Close at	Reviews	Description
<a href="#">SCI 2022/2 NHR4CES</a>		1 (2)	

Showing 1 to 1 of 1 entries

Figure 4: Overview screen

Upon successful login into JARDS you will be presented with a list of the active calls that you have access to and the relevant groups within those calls (Figure 4). Only categories where you can act as a scientific reviewer are displayed. For each category the number of completed (green), in-progress(yellow) and still pending reviews (red) are displayed in the Reviews column (2). Click on the category name (1) to open it or (3) to edit the review to an specific application. In the Application documents column (4) relevant documents can be downloaded. Those are also accessible after entering the review screen.

The screenshot shows the 'Scientific Review' interface. At the top, there is a navigation bar with the breadcrumb '2022/2 / SCI 2022/2 NHR4CES / 20026 / Add review', a search bar, and the NHR logo. Below the navigation bar are menu items: OVERVIEW, CATEGORY, ACCOUNT, and HELP. A user status indicator shows 'logout in 119 minutes'.

## Scientific Review

Here you can enter your review. The table in the next section summarizes information about the application to be reviewed, followed by the section where you can enter your review. You can work on the review until the review system is closed. When pressing the save button at the bottom of the page all data entered in the form is saved and a message will be shown indicating whether all required data is entered and whether the review is complete. The review is finished as soon as all required fields are filled. Missing fields will be marked in red.

### Information for application No. 20026

Config
Search:

Detail	Information
<b>Application documents</b>	<p><a href="#">Current application to review</a></p> <p>The "Current application to review" contains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Application form</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Project description</a></li> </ul>
<b>Principal investigator</b>	Dr. Some PI
<b>Title of project</b>	Tolle Sachen
<b>Topic</b>	Geotechnics, Hydraulic Engineering <span style="font-size: 0.8em;">?</span>
<b>Acronym</b>	

Showing 1 to 5 of 5 entries

Figure 5: Review screen - Application information

Upon entering the review screen, you are first shown application information (Figure 5). Here the relevant documents can also be downloaded.

**No review data stored yet**

Reviewer's summary of project: \*

**(a)**

0 characters (4000 remaining)

Reviewer's judgement including a detailed justification for reviewer's computing time recommendations: \*

**(b)**

0 characters (4000 remaining)

Feedback for the applicant (to improve the quality of future applications):

**(c)**

0 characters (4000 remaining)

Figure 6: Review screen - Free-form text fields

The review feedback consists of several free-form text fields shown in Figure 6:

- (a) short summary of the project (up to 4000 characters)
- (b) overall judgement of the project's applicability (up to 4000 characters)
- (c) feedback on improving the quality of future submissions, to be passed on to the applicant (up to 4000 characters)

Overall judgement?

Quality \*

excellent  very good  good  average  below average

Priority \*

very high  high  medium  low  very low

Scientific relevance? \*

excellent  very good  good  average  below average

Experience of PI? \*

excellent  very good  good  average  below average

Soundness of technical program? \*

excellent  very good  good  fair  not sound

High-performance-computing approach? \*

excellent  very good  good  average  below average

Experience of PI in high-performance-computing? \*

excellent  very good  good  average  below average

Realistic time-frame? \*

excellent  very good  good  fair  not realistic

Are the requested resources adequately justified in the project description? \*

yes  no

Figure 7: Review screen - Fixed fields

There are also fixed fields (Figure 7) that mirror criteria in accordance with the NHR grant regulations:

**Quality** Overall quality of the project, e.g., write-up, articulation of ideas, adequacy of the methods and software used

**Priority** Priority of the research

**Scientific relevance** To what extent is the project outcome relevant to the corresponding scientific field?

**Experience of PI** How experienced is the PI in the particular field? e.g., based on the past relevant publications (if provided), years of previous research, etc. (please choose the neutral "average" if hard to assess)

**Soundness of technical program** How well-described are the project steps/stages, implementation, computational needs of the methods in use, etc.?

**HPC approach** How well-suited the computational approach is for use on HPC systems like the RWTH Compute Cluster?

**Experience of PI in HPC** How experienced the PI is in performing computations on HPC systems? e.g., demonstrated level of understanding of the performance and scalability of the methods and codes used (see also the remark in "Experience of PI")

**Realistic time-frame** How likely it is that the project's stated goals will be achieved within the give time-frame?

**Adequate justification of the resources** Does the project description contain a sufficiently elaborate justification of the requested compute time?

Please estimate for the proposed project:

- a. Minimum resources, i.e., the least amount of computing time for each resource applied for to be still useful for the project.
- b. Recommended resources, i.e., the amount of resources you would recommend to approach the proposed tasks.

Please justify your estimates in the field **Reviewer's judgement** above.

Minimum resources: \* Recommended resources: \*

mio. core-h  mio. core-h

\*  Scientific Review Completed

[IT Center - RWTH Aachen University](#)  
[Disclaimer](#) [Privacy Notice](#) [Site Credits](#)

Figure 8: Review screen - Required resources

The last two fields will be taken into account by the awarding committee in case the cluster is overbooked (Figure 8).

**Minimal resources** Absolute minimum amount of CPU time needed for the completion of the project (in million core-hrs), e.g., compute time without the project parts considered non-essential for its completion

**Recommended resources** Recommended amount of CPU time (in million core-hrs), e.g., after reduction of obviously excessive demands

**Scientific Review Completed** The review has been completed and is ready for submission.



Experience of PI in high-performance-computing? \*

excellent  very good  good  average  below average

Realistic time-frame? \*

excellent  very good  good  fair  not realistic

Are the requested resources adequately justified in the project description? \*

yes   no 

---

Please estimate for the proposed project:

- a. Minimum resources, i.e., the least amount of computing time for each resource applied for to be still useful for the project.
- b. Recommended resources, i.e., the amount of resources you would recommend to approach the proposed tasks.

Please justify your estimates in the field **Reviewer's judgement** above.

Minimum resources:

 mio. core-h

\*

Recommended resources:

\*

 mio. core-h

\*  Scientific Review Completed 

Figure 9: Review screen - Missing entries

✔ Data saved successfully.

⚠ This review is not yet completed. Please, check for missing fields or errors.

## Scientific Review

Here you can enter your review. The table in the next section summarizes information about the application to be reviewed, followed by the section where you can enter your review. You can work on the review until the review system is closed. When pressing the save button at the bottom of the page all data entered in the form is saved and a message will be shown indicating whether all required data is entered and whether the review is complete. The review is finished as soon as all required fields are filled. Missing fields will be marked in red.

### Information for application No. 20026

Config Search:

Detail	Information
<b>Application documents</b>	<a href="#">Current application to review</a> The "Current application to review" contains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><a href="#">Application form</a></li><li><a href="#">Project description</a></li></ul>
<b>Principal investigator</b>	Dr. Some PI
<b>Title of project</b>	Tolle Sachen
<b>Topic</b>	Geotechnics, Hydraulic Engineering ⓘ
<b>Acronym</b>	

Showing 1 to 5 of 5 entries

Figure 10: Review screen - Some fields have not been populated

Clicking the "save" button at the bottom of the page saves the content of the review. In case there are still fields with no values or with wrong values, a warning message will be displayed as shown in Figure 10. The missing or incorrectly filled fields will be highlighted in red (Figure 9).

Please estimate for the proposed project:

- a. Minimum resources, i.e., the least amount of computing time for each resource applied for to be still useful for the project.
- b. Recommended resources, i.e., the amount of resources you would recommend to approach the proposed tasks.

Please justify your estimates in the field **Reviewer's judgement** above.

Minimum resources:

mio. core-h

\*

Recommended resources:

mio. core-h

\*

\*  Scientific Review Completed

(2)

save

reset



(1)

Figure 11: Review screen - Download submitted review

✓ Data saved successfully.

✓ The review is completed.

## Scientific Review

Here you can enter your review. The table in the next section summarizes information about the application to be reviewed, followed by the section where you can enter your review. You can work on the review until the review system is closed. When pressing the save button at the bottom of the page all data entered in the form is saved and a message will be shown indicating whether all required data is entered and whether the review is complete. The review is finished as soon as all required fields are filled. Missing fields will be marked in red.

### Information for application No. 20026

Config
Search:

Detail	Information
<b>Application documents</b>	<p><a href="#">Current application to review</a></p> <p><i>The "Current application to review" contains:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Application form</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Project description</a></li> </ul>
<b>Principal investigator</b>	Dr. Some PI
<b>Title of project</b>	Tolle Sachen
<b>Topic</b>	Geotechnics, Hydraulic Engineering <span style="color: #000080;">i</span>
<b>Acronym</b>	

Showing 1 to 5 of 5 entries

Figure 12: Review screen - Review completed successfully

Otherwise, an all green message indicates that the review is complete (Figure 12). At the bottom of the page you will be able to download the submitted review as PDF by clicking the button marked (1) (Figure 11). The indicator next to the "review" link in the application list will also change to green. This concludes the review task.



Do you really want to delete this review data?  
All data within this panel will be removed.



yes

no

## Scientific Review

Here you can enter your review. The table in the next section summarizes information about the application to be reviewed, followed by the section where you can enter your review. You can work on the review until the review system is closed. When pressing the save button at the bottom of the page all data entered in the form is saved and a message will be shown indicating whether all

Figure 13: Review screen - Reset confirmation dialog

If you can clear all entries by clicking the "reset" button marked (2) (Figure 11). In that case confirmation dialog will appear (Figure 13).

## **General Tips**

- The review text should justify the choice of scores given. A detailed comment on the scientific aspect of the project will be greatly appreciated, but is not strictly required.
- JARDS sessions expire after two hours. It is recommended that you compose the free-form texts in an external text editor and copy-and-paste them at the end. This will prevent loss of work due to unexpected session expiration.