

# German Innovation Award on Gambling Research

## Nomination and Evaluation Procedure

### I. Purpose and Scope

This document outlines the nomination and evaluation process for the German Innovation Award on Gambling Research ("the Award"). It is designed to maintain a high standard of fairness, rigor, confidentiality, and transparency, to recognize and promote innovative research in the field of gambling research.

### II. Nomination Process

#### A. Eligibility for Nomination

The call for nominations for the Award is open to scientists at accredited academic institutions or universities in a German-speaking country (Germany, Switzerland, Austria). Eligible candidates should have a proven track record of expertise in the specific field relevant to the research prize. This expertise may be demonstrated through published research, significant contributions to the field, or other relevant indicators of their knowledge and experience.

##### Criteria

The research must make a novel contribution to the study of gambling and/or gambling addiction. It should also have an outstanding contribution to the public interest in gambling in the sense of § 1 GlüStV 2021.

##### Author Eligibility

To be eligible for the German Innovation Award on Gambling Research, the nominee(s) must be affiliated with an academic research institution based in a German-speaking country (Eligible Authors). This includes Germany, Austria, and Switzerland. This ensures that the award is recognizing scholarship and promoting innovation within this specific region.

In the case of research conducted by a team, only Eligible Authors may receive prize money but all contributing authors to the study are considered part of the nomination of the award (Contributing Authors<sup>1</sup>). The contribution of each author to the research should be clearly indicated. Eligible Authors are expected to have made a substantive contribution to the conceptualization, methodology, investigation, and/or supervision of the research.<sup>2</sup>

The nominating institution is responsible for identifying all Eligible and Contributing Authors and coordinating the division of the prize money among Eligible Authors. This includes

---

<sup>1</sup> Contribution Authors are not eligible to receive part of the prize money but would get credit of the award.

<sup>2</sup> See CRediT author statement: <https://www.elsevier.com/authors/policies-and-guidelines/credit-author-statement>

obtaining explicit agreement from all contributing authors on the nomination prior to submitting the nomination. The institution's role in this regard ensures a fair and transparent process, recognizing all contributors to the innovative research appropriately.

Authors at any stage of their career may be nominated for the main award. A Young Researcher Award is available for researchers within 10 years of receiving their terminal degree (e.g., PhD, Master). The Young Researcher Award and related prize are allocated only to lead authors.

### Institutional Nomination

The research must be conducted in affiliation with, and nominated by, an academic institution from Germany, Switzerland, or Austria with which the nominee(s) is/are associated. This criterion serves to reinforce the Award's dedication to maintaining the highest standards of academic integrity and quality.

The nominating institutions is responsible for the ethical conduct of the nominated research. This includes:

- **Ethical Oversight:** Academic institutions are responsible for providing ethical oversight of the research conducted under their purview. This often involves an Institutional Review Board (IRB) or Ethics Committee that reviews and approves research protocols to ensure they are designed and carried out in a manner that respects the rights and welfare of the research subjects.
- **Education and Training:** Institutions play a crucial role in educating researchers about ethical standards and practices. This typically includes training on responsible conduct of research, protection of human subjects, and other relevant ethical issues.
- **Research Integrity:** Institutions are responsible for fostering an environment that promotes research integrity. This includes policies and practices that discourage misconduct and encourage honesty, accuracy, efficiency, and objectivity in research.
- **Conflict of Interest and Author Credit Assignment:** Academic institutions have a dual role of managing conflicts of interest and ensuring proper credit assignment among authors. Conflict of interest can potentially compromise the integrity of the research, leading to undue influence by external interests. Institutional policies must require researchers to disclose financial or other relationships that could influence their research, as well as processes to manage any identified conflicts.

In the context of the German Innovation Award on Gambling Research, the nominating institution is required to confirm the authorship of the nominated research and how credit is apportioned among authors. This confirmation is an important part of the nomination process, ensuring that the award recognizes the correct individuals for their contributions. It underscores the Award's commitment to promoting research integrity, transparency, and fairness in the recognition of scholarly work.

By requiring the nominated research to be conducted in affiliation with and nominated by an academic institution, the German Innovation Award on Gambling Research is ensuring that the recognized research has undergone the ethical oversight and scrutiny that these institutions provide. This requirement underscores the Award's commitment to promoting research that not only advances our understanding of gambling and/or gambling addiction but does so in a manner that upholds the highest ethical standards.

## Eligible Research

The nominated research must be the Contributing Authors' own original work. The nominated research must be theoretical, empirical, or methodological scientific work written in English. It should be a single study or a closely related group of studies that have been accepted for publication in one or more peer-reviewed academic outlet(s) in the last five (5) years prior to the application period.

## B. Nomination Submission

The nomination submission process is designed to ensure a comprehensive and rigorous review of the nominee's research contribution. It involves the following components:

- **Research Summary:** The nominator should submit a summary of the research work that is being nominated. This summary should succinctly describe the objectives, methodology, results, and implications of the research. It should highlight why the research is innovative and how it advances our understanding of gambling and/or gambling addiction.
- **Research Impact Statement:** The nominator should provide a statement explaining how the research contributes to the field of gambling studies. This can include implications for regulatory requirements for consumer protection, addiction prevention, public policy, management science, or other relevant areas that benefit consumers and/or the public.
- **Relevance to Award Mission:** The nominator should describe how the research aligns with and contributes to the mission of the German Innovation Award on Gambling Research and the German Foundation on Gambling Research.
- **Evidence of Publication:** As proof of the research's acceptance in a peer-reviewed academic outlet, the nominator should include a copy of the acceptance letter from the relevant academic journal or conference, or a verifiable citation to the published work.
- **Author Details:** The nominator should provide details about the nominee, including their affiliation, academic background, and role in the research. If the research was conducted by a team, details about all nominated authors should be included.

Significant emphasis is placed on acknowledging 'the integrity and moral standards demonstrated by the authors. This focus extends beyond their scholarly contributions to include the ethical qualities that underscore their work. Attributes such as adherence to research ethics, commitment to truth and accuracy, integrity, respect for diversity and inclusivity, and dedication to the responsible use and dissemination of knowledge are all vital considerations in our evaluation. These qualities not only enhance the credibility of their research but also serve as a model for other scholars and practitioners in the field.

- **Institutional Endorsement:** The nominator should include a letter of endorsement from a senior representative (e.g., Dean/Vice Dean, Institute Director, President/Vice President's Office) of the nominating institution, confirming the institution's support for the nomination and attesting to the integrity and quality of the research.

All nomination materials should be submitted in both English. Nominators are encouraged to ensure their submission is thorough and well-prepared to facilitate a comprehensive review. The German Foundation on Gambling Research shall provide a submission template.

## III. Evaluation Process

### A. Jury

The applications shall be evaluated by an internationally recognized scientific jury (“Jury”) in the form of an advisory board. Members of the Jury shall have the following qualifications:

- **Academic Excellence:** Members will have a strong academic background, holding a PhD or equivalent qualification in a relevant field. They should be renowned for their own scientific contributions, evidenced by their research publications, and other scholarly activities.
- **Professional Experience:** Members should possess extensive experience in their relevant field of research. This should ideally include years of research, teaching, or policy development in their area.
- **Interdisciplinary Understanding:** Given the multifaceted nature of gambling research, which encompasses psychology, sociology, economics, public health, and other fields, Jury members should have diverse scientific disciplines.
- **International Recognition:** Members should have achieved recognition beyond their own country. This might be indicated by international collaborations, positions held in international organizations, awards received from international bodies, or service on the editorial boards of international journals.
- **Ethical Standing:** Jury members should have an impeccable ethical record. This includes adhering to research integrity standards, maintaining confidentiality in the review process, and avoiding conflicts of interest.

The Jury may consist of up to eight people.

### B. Criteria

Our evaluation framework is composed of five key criteria that we believe capture the most important aspects of impactful research. These criteria provide a comprehensive and balanced approach to assess the merits of the research nominated for the Award. They are designed to highlight the depth and breadth of the research's contribution to the field, the novelty and rigor of its methodology, the potential societal and policy implications of its findings, and its alignment with our mission and goals.

#### Relevance to the field

This criterion assesses how closely tied the research is to the field of gambling and/or gambling addiction. It considers whether the work addresses key issues, challenges, or gaps in knowledge in these areas. An excellent evaluation in this category would denote research that can make a substantial contribution to the field, addressing critical questions or problems, and potentially guiding policy or interventions related to gambling and/or gambling addiction.

#### Innovation

This measures the degree of novelty and originality in the research. It considers whether the work introduces new theories, methodologies, or insights to the study of gambling and/or gambling addiction. It can also address whether the research addresses a unique aspect or perspective that has not been thoroughly explored before. Research that scores high in this

category would break new ground and potentially lead to a paradigm shift in how we understand or approach gambling and/or gambling addiction.

#### Scientific Rigor

This criterion assesses the quality of the research design, methodology, and analysis. It considers whether the work is methodologically sound, the results are robust, and the conclusions are well supported by the evidence. An excellent score in this category would denote research that exemplifies best practices in research design and methodology.

#### Potential Impact

This evaluates the potential of the research to make a significant impact on our understanding of gambling or prevention of gambling addiction, or improvement of consumer welfare. It considers whether the research could guide policy, influence practices, and/or contribute to improving the lives of gamblers, their friends and family, and broader community. High scoring research in this category would have clear, demonstrable potential to affect meaningful, positive change in the real world with relation to gambling and/or gambling addiction, beyond just academic contributions.

#### Alignment with Mission

This criterion assesses how well the research aligns with the mission and values of the German Foundation on Gambling Research. It considers whether the work contributes to promoting innovative research that contributes to the better understanding and prevention of gambling addiction and the improvement of consumer welfare, including research on the full spectrum of gambling (pathological and non-pathological). An excellent score in this category would denote research that is closely aligned with and significantly contributes to the mission and goals of the Foundation, including § 1 GlüStV 2021.

### C. Initial Review

Upon receipt of the completed nominations, each member of the Jury shall perform an initial review of each nomination. This evaluation will focus on the innovation, scientific rigor, potential impact of the research, and alignment with the mission statement of the German Foundation on Gambling Research.

### D. Shortlisting of Candidates

Following the initial review, the Jury shall meet to compile a shortlist of possible award recipients, which is achieved through a collective appraisal of the submissions. During this phase, the Jury's aim is to include all applications that demonstrate legitimate potential to be contenders for the award, ensuring they move forward to the subsequent stage of peer review.

### E. Peer Review

The peer-review process can involve eliciting the views and insights of external experts who are distinguished in the field of gambling research and/or are subject matter experts in closely related disciplines. These experts, who are not part of the Jury, are chosen on an ad-hoc basis for their knowledge and understanding of the specific areas of research the shortlisted applications represent not already mirrored by the jury.

Each peer reviewer is assigned an application that aligns with their area of expertise. Their task is to provide an in-depth review of the submission, assessing the scientific merit, the originality

and innovative nature of the research, the potential impact of the work, and the suitability of the nominee(s).

In their review, the peer reviewers are encouraged to elaborate on the nominated research's distinctive contributions and comment on its relevance and applicability to the larger field of gambling research. They are also asked to place the work in a broader scientific context, helping the Jury understand its significance and potential ramifications.

The role of peer reviews is advisory in nature, providing a comprehensive understanding of the work's merit and potential impact within the field. However, the final decision rests on the collective wisdom of the Jury, who decide which nomination best resonates with the German Innovation Award on Gambling Research's aim and most significantly contributes to the progress of the field.

## F. Final Deliberation and Decision

Following the peer-review process, the Jury will reconvene to deliberate and decide on the final awardees. Their decision-making process is holistic, considering all five key criteria.

The deliberation process is as follows:

To be considered in the final round for potential award recipients, there should be unanimous approval of the nomination among the Jury. A unanimous decision signifies a clear consensus among all members of the Jury about the value and importance of the research.

In the final deliberations, the jury will strive for a unanimous decision in selecting the award recipient. If a unanimous decision is not possible, a majority decision will be implemented. In the event of a tie, where two or more nominations receive the same number of votes, a tie-breaker process will be initiated. The Jury may seek a deciding vote from an external non-Jury expert. This individual shall hold similar professional qualifications as the Jury and will only consider the applications that form the tie.

### Abstention

There may be situations where a Jury member chooses to abstain from voting. An abstention could occur when a Jury member feels they cannot make an impartial decision, such as when there is a conflict of interest with a specific nomination, or when a Jury member believes they lack sufficient expertise to judge a particular nomination adequately. Abstentions are respected and do not count towards the total votes. The decision will be made based on the votes cast by the remaining members. Abstaining jurors may elect to end their abstention if the remaining Jury members eliminate the specific nomination that led to the abstention from contention.

## IV. Other Considerations

### A. Revisions

Policies and procedures are subject to review and revisions as necessary, ensuring it continues to reflect best practices and maintain the highest standards of fairness and rigor that are consistent with the mission of the German Innovation Award on Gambling Research.

## B. Confidentiality and Transparency

The German Innovation Award on Gambling Research is committed to balancing the need for confidentiality to ensure the integrity of the evaluation process with a desire for transparency in its operations. The goal is to inspire trust and credibility, all while safeguarding the privacy of the nominees and the deliberations of the Jury.

### Transparency of Process

The award process's general structure is publicly accessible, demonstrating the comprehensive and objective nature of the proceedings. However, to ensure the authenticity of the selection process, specifics regarding the Jury's internal discussions, deliberations, and scoring will remain confidential.

### Confidentiality in Peer Review

The peer review process must maintain strict confidentiality to allow the candid exchange of scientific evaluations and opinions. This openness is critical to ensure a comprehensive and unbiased assessment of each nomination.

### Non-Disclosure of Nominees

The names and specific research details of the nominees will not be disclosed during the evaluation process. This safeguard is in place to protect the privacy of all applicants and prevent potential external influence on the process.

### Confidentiality Agreement

Each member of the Jury, the external peer reviewers, and the administrative staff involved in the award process will sign a confidentiality agreement. These documents reaffirm their dedication to protecting the nominees' privacy and intellectual property.

### Breach of Confidentiality

Any breaches of confidentiality will be treated with utmost seriousness and addressed promptly. Any individual found to have violated their confidentiality agreement may be dismissed from their role and could face further repercussions.

### Announcement of Awardees

After the final decision is made, and the awardees have been informed, the awardees' identities and a general explanation for their selection will be made public. This disclosure allows the Foundation to honor and recognize excellence and innovation in gambling research.

### Unsuccessful Nominees

Information about unsuccessful nominations, including the identities of the nominees, will remain confidential. However, aggregate statistical information about the number and broad areas of research of the nominations may be disclosed in the interest of transparency.

### Request for Transparency

The Foundation is committed to openness and will endeavor to respond to queries about the process and award criteria. However, these responses will be within the boundaries set by the need to respect nominee privacy and maintain the integrity of the process.

## C. Meeting Minutes

Minutes will be recorded for all Jury meetings. These minutes will document the procedural elements of the meetings, including which members were present, key topics of discussion, and general decisions made, without disclosing specific details about the nominations or the deliberations concerning them.

Minutes will be made available to all Jury members to ensure mutual understanding and agreement on the proceedings. However, they will remain confidential documents, not released to the public or the nominees, to protect the privacy of the discussion and the integrity of the decision-making process.

In rare cases, if a transparency issue arises, a redacted version of the minutes, omitting confidential and sensitive information, may be provided upon official request. This decision will be at the discretion of the Award Committee and will be made with utmost consideration to uphold the balance between transparency and confidentiality.

This policy on minutes reinforces the award's commitment to process integrity, ensuring a recorded trail of decisions while still safeguarding the candid exchange of scientific opinions and evaluations, the privacy of the nominees, and the overall fairness of the award process.

\*\*\*

Munich, 2024/02/23