Evidence matters to me — because I care about the future of my farm, and the community around it.
— Tim Ashton, farmer, Shropshire

Evidence is important to me to make educated decisions about the best treatment available for Georgina.
— Alex Smith, mother of a child with a rare heart condition

Evidence matters to me because I care about the future of my farm, and the community around it.
— Tim Ashton, farmer, Shropshire

Evidence matters to us because it helps us assess the benefits (or drawbacks) of new schemes to make positive changes to social housing.
— Paul Murphy, housing officer, Glasgow

Evidence matters to us because it is delivering the proof that marine plastic is not just an eyesore on our beaches, but is causing serious harm.
— Claire Wallerstein, Cornish Plastic Pollution Coalition

I think that the rules around standing should be based on evidence and clubs should have the choice to introduce safe standing areas if they see fit.
— Amanda Jacks, football supporter, east London

At Women's Aid, evidence matters to us because domestic abuse has historically been hidden, ignored or misunderstood.
— Sarika Sephardi, research and evaluation manager, Women’s Aid

Evidence matters to us because it helps us identify areas that need support and put forward the case for projects and the benefits of play.
— Paul Hocker, development director, London Play

Evidence matters to us because I need to know that in my classroom the limited resources and time I have with the children are being spent on things that work.
— Ahmed Moustafa, secondary school teacher, Corelli College, Greenwich

Evidence matters to us because it helped us make the case for our founding, and it directs the way we use our resources.
— Sophie Andrews, CEO, The Silver Line

Evidence mattered to me as a doctor because quite simply, evidence-based medicine saves lives.
— Dr Martyn Lobley, retired GP
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In 2016, the Oxford English Dictionary made post-truth its word of the year. It was a common word in our year at Sense about Science too. The alleged arrival of the post-truth era caused much handwringing and demoralisation among people who advocate for better use of evidence in public life. But, as we argued again and again, new kinds of misinformation don’t denote a public that cares little for truth.

That is why we took 100+ people from across the UK to Westminster to remind politicians that evidence matters. They asked for a discussion of evidence (and better research) on everything from football stadiums to counseling — and rejected the suggestion that politicians serve them best with soundbites and easy answers. It was a message that drew responses from all sides and both houses.

This is the empowering side of science: the ability to ask questions about the forces that shape our lives — natural or social — in ways that give more reliable answers. The evidence it yields may not help or decide public discussion. Answers are only as good as the questions that were asked. So more people need to be scrutinising that. The goal of the evidence movement should surely be to help people to ask scientific questions, questions capable of transcending our perception to show what is really going on, not to pull more decisions away from them, into closed committees where evidence or experts can arbitrate.

Over 2016 we said it was time to acknowledge that the evidence movement houses some real differences in goals concerning the public. There are some who argue that big areas of decision-making be left to experts and for some research papers not to be published lest they disturb settled policy questions. And while engaging the public in a frank discussion about what we know and don’t know is applauded for a museum interactive, it clearly creates unease in public policy on health or the environment. On some issues, evidence — its strengths and limits — is hard to discuss. For all the interest in public engagement, it is disturbingly often avoided.

But what if we had a culture of transparent decision-making — one where other considerations (values, the limits of what has been researched, cost) are legitimate but just need to be explained. That’s a question that has informed a large tranche of our work. This year we published Transparency of evidence, an assessment of policy proposals scored against a transparency framework. We found huge variation between government departments. But for every cagey practice, we found many instances of open, trusting behaviour and showed how they can be replicated. We also found people fighting for the public value of evidence and openness in all areas of public life.

I want to thank them and the great number of people who have been working with us over the past year to achieve all you’ll read about in the following pages. Our long-term partners who have helped our work to evolve and grow; the foundations and trusts who lend their support; the volunteers and friends who give their time or funds each month. There are many more who didn’t make these pages — we know you’re out there, and we appreciate all you’re doing, perhaps challenging misleading claims, asking for evidence or alerting others when you see it misrepresented.

Post-truth may have been the word of the year, but why accept it? To do so is to abandon the empowering side of the evidence movement just as it’s winning through. Let’s not forget that this past year has also been defined by the public’s quest for truth and a hearing for evidence. These include the inquests into the 96 deaths of Liverpool fans at Hillsborough stadium after a 27-year campaign; the end of a 10-year evasion of the environmental impact of diesel vehicles; clearer reporting of hospital outcomes; monitoring of wildlife populations and changes to the treatment of Parkinson’s disease. At Sense about Science they included the Ask for Evidence initiative and the thousands of patients who joined the AllTrials campaign to see clinical trial evidence reported.

Evidence and expertise may often look like counsel to the knowing, but we prefer to see it as what it could be: the means by which the less powerful can call the world to account.

Tracey Brown OBE
Director, Sense about Science
We mobilise the public to ask for evidence, offering insight into how to analyse evidence and ask the right questions.
Our public campaign encourages people to ask for the evidence behind news stories, marketing claims and policies. This year, with the help of a cow, a pig and some flying suits, we also asked: who writes the internet anyway...?

Animating critical thinking

On the heels of our popular Ask for Evidence lesson plan, this year we launched three animations on Facebook and Instagram targeted directly at 13-16 year olds in the UK which complement and support the messages of the lesson plan and campaign. The animations encourage young people to think critically about claims they see, especially online. The three messages: “Who writes the internet anyway?” “It’s ok to #AskforEvidence” and “Don’t jump to conclusions, #AskforEvidence” have been widely shared on social media.

“Anyone decides what goes on the internet, you can’t just believe it.”
— 15-year old Ask for Evidence workshop participant

Lesson plan updates

Our Ask for Evidence lesson plan, encouraging critical thinking among teens, continues to attract attention; we are delighted that teachers are using it and talking about it, and we plan to update it in the coming year to make it more flexible for use in different lessons. On top of that...

» BBC Learning got in touch to find ways of integrating critical thinking into their science activity packs.

» The lesson plan was presented at ResearchEd this year, the foremost conference for teachers interested in improving teaching methods and education research.

» We have discussed the plan with the Cabinet Office ‘What Works’ unit and hope to present it to the Department of Education.

“The Ask for Evidence lesson you have produced really helps my students read behind headlines.”
— Sixth form biology teacher

Our #AskforEvidence animations will reach 360,000 UK teens on Facebook and Instagram
This year we continued to see a range of requests on our Ask for Evidence website — check out the sample below. We are always on hand to assist with evidence requests and to help people to analyse the responses they receive.

Evidence ambassadors

The Ask for Evidence ambassador programme, launched last year with support from the Wellcome Trust, has been one of the great successes of the campaign. Ten energetic ambassadors have been spreading the Ask for Evidence message far and wide, engaging with a range of audiences of all ages all across the country. The ambassadors visited pubs, clubs, and community groups as well as enlisting academic audiences at universities and research institutes to help spread the word that anyone can ask for evidence. We are seeking support to extend this much needed programme.
The research community should work with the public to frame questions about evidence. We took this message, and our Ask for Evidence call, to many different forums including:

- **EuroScience Open Forum (ESOF)** where we partnered with Elsevier to present a session on Citizen Science in the EU.
- A **What Works Global Summit** where we hosted sessions on how to campaign to make policymakers listen, how to improve accountability for evidence in policy, and more.
- The marches for science in April – we had friends, colleagues and supporters in London, Brussels, Dublin, New York, Washington DC and Vancouver.

### Peer review partnerships

Sharing the value of peer review with the public is a central part of our work in helping people make sense of science and evidence. This dates back to 2005 when we published the world’s first public guide to peer review, *I Don’t Know What to Believe*, which remains our most popular publication. This work wouldn’t be possible without the help of our many long-standing partners who support our work in this area.

This year’s peer review highlights included:

- Taking part in Peer Review Week, a celebration of the many ways people are involved in the process.
- Chairing a Peer review: the nuts and bolts session at **EuroScience Open Forum (ESOF)** in July 2016.
- Discussing peer review as a way for citizens to hold policymakers to account at well-attended ESOF meetings and at the **EU commission’s regulatory scrutiny board** and the **International Network for Government Science Advice** conference.
- Presenting our work on peer review and sharing copies of the Mandarin translation of our public guide to peer review in **Wuhan, China** in March 2017.
We call for accountability for the use of evidence in decision-making in the UK and EU.
Evidence Matters

As the idea of a post-truth public took hold last summer, we found ourselves asking what it meant for public values of truthfulness and accountability. Our director Tracey Brown was a vocal opponent of this caricature, pointing out that it was an easy excuse for politicians, civil servants and policymakers to shy away from public discussion.

Many members of the public were uneasy too. So on 1st November 2016 we took 100+ people from across the country to Westminster to tell parliamentarians, ministers and officials that evidence matters to them, and they expect it to matter to government too. 15 of them spoke, each for one minute, about how the use of evidence has impacted their lives. They came from all across the country, from all walks of life, with very different stories, but with the same message: evidence matters.

Collectively, they told policymakers that:

- We expect government to use evidence when making policy.
- We expect ministers to explain their reasoning.
- We expect parliament to seek and to scrutinise reasoning behind policies.

Parliamentarians from both sides responded warmly to this call, among them: MPs Debbie Abrahams, Tom Brake, George Freeman, Chi Onwurah, Stephen Metcalfe, and Carol Monaghan. This event has ignited a conversation between members of the public, ministers, MPs and officials about the importance of evidence in policymaking. In addition to those in the room, many more friends and supporters wrote to their MPs or joined in the discussion on social media.

Watch our 3 minute video of the event at senseaboutscience.org
Ahmed Moustafa, a secondary school teacher, brought some of his students to parliament to hear him speak.

Evidence matters to me because I need to know that in my classroom the limited resources and time I have with the children are being spent on things that work.

— Ahmed Moustafa, teacher, Corelli College, Greenwich

Evidence is important to me to make educated decisions about the best treatment available for Georgina.

— Alex Smith, mother of a child with a rare heart condition

15 people from all walks of life each spoke for one minute about why evidence matters to them.
How well does the government show its workings? Can we tell what evidence has been used to make a policy? Can we tell how the government has assessed or used this evidence?

People need to see government’s chain of reasoning to understand what it is trying to do. Without transparency, the public cannot engage with proposals, and researchers can’t evaluate the evidence they are based on, or improve on it.

The report found that the public and researchers would struggle to follow the government’s reasoning, with standards of transparency varying widely between and within departments. But it also found good practice, and demonstrates clearly what departments need to do to improve.

To support a move towards greater transparency, in early 2017 we held a series of evidence transparency workshops for civil servants from departments, agencies and devolved governments, with more planned for the future.

“This greater scrutiny provides extra impetus for departments to lay out the data and analysis behind policy announcements. But the real reason we should do this is because it’s good government.”

— David Halpern, national advisor on What Works, Civil Service Quarterly

This project was funded by the Nuffield Foundation, but the views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Foundation.

To download and read the report, please visit our website: senseaboutscience.org

The report found that the public and researchers would struggle to follow the government’s reasoning, with standards of transparency varying widely between and within departments.

Transparency of evidence shares what we found. It highlights examples of how transparency about the use of evidence is being achieved and warns of the kinds of practices that will lead to low scores when we rate departments in 2017.

In 2016, Sense about Science assessed a year of government policy proposals to see how transparent they were about their evidence and compare good and bad practice across departments.

Transparency of evidence shares what we found. It highlights examples of how transparency about the use of evidence is being achieved and warns of the kinds of practices that will lead to low scores when we rate departments in 2017.

So how does it work? Researchers counted a total of 593 policy announcements between May 2015 and May 2016 from 13 domestic government departments. They scored a sample of the underlying policies against the evidence transparency framework, asking ‘Can we tell what evidence has been used? Can we tell how the government has assessed or used this evidence?’ under each of the following headings:

- **Diagnosis**
  The issue the policy is designed to address

- **Proposal**
  The government’s chosen intervention

- **Implementation**
  How the intervention will be introduced and run

- **Testing and evaluation**
  Plans to assess whether the policy has worked
Algorithms in decision-making

In February 2017, the House of Commons science and technology committee launched an inquiry into ‘Algorithms in decision-making’ following a compelling pitch from our policy manager Dr Stephanie Mathisen.

As Steph argued, algorithms — quite rapidly and without debate — have come to replace humans in making decisions that affect many aspects of our lives, from criminal justice to education. Algorithms in themselves are neither ‘good’ nor ‘bad’, but where the public has little access to information about the workings of algorithms in decision-making, there is a serious lack of transparency and therefore accountability and choice. This is an issue that many supporters have raised with us, especially since the 2013 Sense about Science lecture given by Cory Doctorow.

“Algorithms are being used in everything from sifting job applications, calculating credit scores and offering loans and mortgages to deciding whether to release prisoners on bail,” wrote Steph in her op-ed in Public Technology. “What’s different about computer algorithms is the sheer volume and complexity of the data that can be factored into decisions, and the potential to apply error and discrimination systematically.”

Over 2017 we are developing plans to help people to understand data science and to develop ways of assessing quality in the era of big data.

Missing Evidence

We continue to pursue the recommendations of Missing Evidence, our inquiry into the scale and sources of delayed publication of government research, led by former Sense about Science board member, Rt Hon Sir Stephen Sedley. It was released in June 2016 but reported on in last year’s review. At the heart of the recommendations is a call for a central register of government-commissioned research.

Whitehall waste

Sir, You reported the Cabinet Office’s assessment of the money government wastes on policy that has already been dismissed (“Whitehall wastes £500 million a year on rehearsed policies”, Jan 24, and letters, Jan 25).

In his inquiry into non-publication of government-commissioned research last year, Sir Stephen Sedley found that the government spends about £2.5 billion a year on research for policy but does not always know what was done or what was found. Research, paid for by the public, that is unrecorded and unpublished exists only in the memory of the officials who commissioned it. Only four government departments maintain a database of the research they commission and, crucially, there is no central register. Sir Stephen recommended a standardised central register of government research so that this information is available, and continues to be available, to the rest of government, parliament, the research community and the public.

The government has yet to set up this central register but ought to do so as a matter of urgency.

DR SÍLE LANE
Sense about Science
Evidence and experts in policymaking

In October 2016 Sense about Science and the Nuffield Foundation worked with RAND Europe to provide an overview of emerging trends and social changes which may affect the way in which the British public understand and engage with the political process, policymaking, services and information sources, and the role of evidence and expert opinion within this.

The report inspired a challenging discussion about democratic values and the evidence movement at a meeting of organisation leaders hosted by Sense about Science and the Nuffield Foundation.

The report discusses key social, technological and political changes that may affect the policymaking environment in the years to come. These range from demographic change to the spread of rumours and misinformation.

To download and read the report, please visit our website: senseaboutscience.org
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Social change and public engagement with policy and evidence

Katherine Stewart, Talitha Dubow
Joanna Hoffman, Christian van Stolk

Sense about Science EU launch

Sense about Science has opened an office in Brussels. The office was launched with a series of events including a discussion on open science held under the auspices of the Dutch presidency of the EU in June and discussion panels and a reception at EuroScience Open Forum (ESOF) in July 2016. We will be working with EU citizens, researchers and the European parliament to scrutinise and share evidence behind European policymaking. The office is led by Sofie Vanthournout, who came to us from the Royal Belgian Academies, and who previously launched a Brussels office for the European Academies Science Advisory Council, an organisation that gives independent scientific advice on EU policy. It has been a busy few months; both Sofie and our director Tracey Brown have been in huge demand at conferences, panel discussions and meetings at the European commission and parliament.

We are grateful to all those MEPs, non-profits and community and research organisations who have welcomed us so warmly, especially those who have helped us establish the Voice of Young Science network in Brussels. We look forward to the work ahead, expanding the network and helping citizens to ask for evidence in EU policymaking.
We offer public forums to talk about the difficult issues for science and society, like plant science and energy.
This year we had great success hosting AMA ("Ask Me Anything") sessions on the popular discussion website, Reddit. This enabled us to reach an even wider audience, and we received very positive feedback both from the panellists and the people who asked questions and joined in the discussion. These AMAs are available via our website, so please do take a look if you’re curious about what people are asking, or want to see how AMAs work.

» Professor Christine Raines, University of Essex, the lead researcher on the Rothamsted GM wheat trial answered questions on everything from enzymes and pesticides to the effect of the weather.

» Derek Stuart, professor of plant and food chemistry at James Hutton Institute, Dundee and Heriot Watt University Edinburgh, answered questions about sustainable food.

» Professor Sarah O’Connor from the John Innes Centre, held an AMA about plants in medicine and her research in this area.

Over the coming year we will move to create new resources to help the public discuss questions in terms of risks and trade-offs with a particular focus on energy and agriculture.

Our public-led, expert-fed plant science panel, supported by BBSRC and other leading research institutes and learned societies, offers direct access to independent researchers who will answer real unedited questions from the public.

17,000+ people read Professor O’Connor’s AMA on Reddit*

Stay tuned; join the conversation on Twitter using #plantsci.

* Plus she received almost as many ‘upvotes’ as Harrison Ford!
We run the AllTrials campaign, calling for the publication of all clinical trials.
The AllTrials campaign is now global. This year the UN added its voice to those calling for the registration and reporting of all clinical trials.

We continued to gather support around the world — from the AARP (formerly the American Association of Retired Persons) representing 38 million US citizens to a coalition of 20 patient groups and medical organisations in Norway representing 1.2 million people.

UN releases landmark report

On 14 September 2016, the UN released a landmark report calling on governments worldwide to pass legislation requiring clinical trials to be registered, and their methods and results to be fully reported. The report, authored by a high-level panel appointed by UN secretary general Ban Ki-moon, explicitly calls for clinical trial study designs, protocols, data sets, and test results to be made publicly available. This was a huge win for the AllTrials campaign! Last year the WHO added its voice, and now the UN. We know our message is being heard.

90,000+ individuals have signed the petition
720+ organisations have joined AllTrials

“If thousands of trials have never published results, that’s hundreds of thousands, maybe millions, of volunteers whose trust is betrayed.”

— Dr Síle Lane gave a TEDx talk in Madrid and was interviewed by El País, one of Spain’s bestselling newspapers. Watch her at TEDx Talks on YouTube.
A roadmap to transparency

TrialsTracker

In November 2016, academics at the University of Oxford launched TrialsTracker, a new automated tool that identifies trials on the world’s largest clinical trial register, ClinicalTrials.gov, that haven’t published results two years after the end of the trial. It showed that 45% of all trials from major sponsors have not published results, shining a spotlight on the best and worst performing companies and universities. Researchers estimated that 8.7 million patients were enrolled in the 11,714 trials identified by the tracker as missing results.

“Everyone has been talking about this problem for far too long. We hope that increasing accountability will help to drive change forward. The TrialsTracker helps to identify the individual universities and companies with the most overdue trials. If any institution is concerned that it is doing badly in our league tables, then there is one simple thing they can do: publish their trial results, using their trial registry number, so that this information can be accessed and read by doctors, researchers, and patients.”

— Dr Ben Goldacre, co-founder of the AllTrials campaign and one of the academics behind TrialsTracker

AllTrials USA

The AARP (formerly the American Association of Retired Persons), representing 38 million US citizens, and The National Comprehensive Cancer Network, a not-for-profit alliance of 27 member institutions, were just two of the organisations to join the campaign this year. And we were all delighted when Senator Elizabeth Warren wrote in the New England Journal of Medicine in support of the ICMJE proposal to make data sharing a condition of publication of clinical trials in major medical journals. Former Vice-President Joe Biden also had strong words about clinical trial registration, proposing in his Cancer Moonshot initiative that research institutions that do not publish clinical trial results should lose funds.

Visit alltrials.net or join in the conversation on Twitter using #AllTrials.
We call for open and honest reporting of research, and we support researchers who speak out in the face of hostility or intimidation.
The John Maddox Prize for standing up for science is a prize like no other. Now in its fifth year, it recognises the work of individuals who promote sound science and evidence on a matter of public interest, facing difficulty or hostility in doing so.

This year the prize was awarded to Professor Elizabeth Loftus, a cognitive psychologist at the University of California, Irving for her leadership in the field of human memory which continued in the face of personal attacks and attempts to undermine her professional status and research.

Professor Loftus is best known for her ground-breaking work on the “misinformation effect” which demonstrates that the memories of eyewitnesses are altered after being exposed to incorrect information about an event, as well as her work on the creation and nature of false memories. In addition to her research, Professor Loftus has appeared as an expert witness in numerous courtrooms, consulting or providing expert witness testimony for hundreds of cases. Her findings have altered the course of legal history, in showing that memory is not only unreliable, but also mutable.

Patron of the prize, Bronwen Maddox, daughter of Sir John, presented the prize at a joint reception with one of our longtime partners, the Royal Pharmaceutical Society. It was a huge bonus that Professor Loftus came all the way from California to receive the prize in person. She was in great demand from fans in the field of human memory, not to mention reporters, and spent a packed three days in London in all. When receiving the award, Professor Loftus spoke warmly (and tearfully) about her passion and persistence in pursuing her work.

“Receiving this honor helps to erase the pain of insults, death threats, and lawsuits. And I love the idea that, forever, my CV will contain the name of the late Sir John Maddox whom all respect for his tireless defense of science.”

— Professor Elizabeth Loftus

“Elizabeth Loftus has championed scientific insight in a way that perfectly epitomises the values of the John Maddox Prize”

— Sir Philip Campbell PhD
Editor-in-Chief, Nature, and judge

The Maddox prize is a joint initiative of Sense about Science, science journal Nature, and the Kohn Foundation. Just a few days before the prize was awarded we were saddened to hear of the death of Sir Ralph Kohn. An extraordinary man, a great philanthropist and a true friend to science, Sir Ralph’s foundation has supported the Maddox prize since it was founded.
Our public engagement team draws from extensive networks and over a decade of working on some of the trickiest issues concerning evidence. Our ethos is public-led, expert-fed - which means engaging early and directly with the public and addressing people’s questions and concerns.

Children’s Heart Surgery

Last year we reported briefly on our public engagement partnership with UCL, University of Cambridge and the Children’s Heart Federation, Understanding Children’s Heart Surgery Outcomes (childrenheartsurgery.info) which was released in June 2016. The aim of this project was to make children’s heart surgery statistics more accessible. We co-developed a website with researchers, parents of children who have had or will have heart surgery and those who might use this information professionally.

The website showed the results of different surgical units in the UK and Ireland in a new way. Parents, patients, regulators and doctors could now see and understand why a hospital’s survival rate needs to be shown in the context of what was predicted for that hospital, taking into account how severe their cases were. It was a complex proposition, but from the website and animations, parents understood why direct comparisons between units, for instance in league tables, would be crass and misleading. The website was welcomed by parents and doctors alike. Representatives from both groups had helped to design it.

Since then the website has also been linked to by high-traffic website NHS choices and included as a reference in a letter to Bristol parents following the recent publication of several reports on children’s heart surgery.

“This has been a humbling and invaluable experience. I thought I knew something about communicating statistics, but sitting listening to enthusiastic users struggling to understand concepts made me realise my inadequacy.”

— Sir David Speigelhalter

The Libel Reform Campaign

As founding members of the Libel Reform Campaign, our involvement continues. At present the focus is on Scotland and Northern Ireland, the two UK jurisdictions which did not adopt the Defamation Act 2013. In June 2016, 372 supporters co-signed a letter from the campaign to the Scottish Law Commission urging libel reform in Scotland. The Commission will report soon. In Northern Ireland, the campaign welcomed the Department of Finance’s report which recommends substantive reform to better protect free speech and the public interest. We will continue to support efforts to ensure the Northern Ireland Assembly adopts a libel reform bill. Our thanks to The JRSST Charitable Trust for supporting our work in this area.
Our popular “making sense of” guides address real questions and concerns the public have about complex and controversial scientific issues.

In the past we’ve covered screening, testing, GM, and allergies among others. This year we were approached by a group of forensic geneticists at EUROFORGEN (European Forensic Genetics Network of Excellence) to help them produce a public guide to the field of forensic genetics and its use in the criminal justice system.

This guide shares what DNA analysis can currently do in the criminal justice system, what its limitations are, and what might be possible in the future. It includes graphics and real-life cases where DNA evidence has been a game changer in investigations as well as where its misuse has led to miscarriages of justice. Whatever your level of knowledge, the guide makes for fascinating reading. (Everyone in the office learned something new!) It is already being used as a resource by lecturers and was distributed at CrimeFest, a convention of crime writers and fans.

Sense about Science’s unique way of putting together public guides is one of our stand-out offerings. Here’s what the lead researcher had to say about working with our public engagement team:

“The collaboration with Sense about Science made a big difference for us; it was positive beyond expectations. They worked smoothly and efficiently to convert very complex information into simple and straightforward messages, and instructive graphics. Continuously receiving feedback from key audiences including police, lawyers, judiciary, journalists and interested readers during this process was essential to allow the EUROFORGEN researchers to adapt the guide to make it as accessible as possible for a wide audience.”

— Peter Schneider, professor of forensic molecular genetics, Institute of Legal Medicine, University Hospital of Cologne, Germany and EUROFORGEN coordinator

The guide received financial support from the European Union Seventh Framework Programme. This guide, and all the others in the “making sense of” series, is available to download for free on our website: www.senseaboutscience.org
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We support early career researchers in standing up for science.
The Voice of Young Science programme, engaging early career researchers to play an active role in public debates about science, had another successful year. The network continues to expand across the UK and into Europe.

— James Shaw, PhD student, University of Reading

I strongly recommend joining one of Sense about Science’s future events to meet some brilliant students, academics, publishers and entrepreneurs, and learn about where peer review is going next.

— James Shaw, PhD student, University of Reading

Promoting peer review

We held two peer review workshops for early career researchers in London and Glasgow supported by our popular guide: Peer review: the nuts and bolts. Here’s what two of the participants had to say:

Standing up for Science

We hosted Standing up for Science workshops in Manchester, Warwick, London and Glasgow. During these full-day events, participants meet scientists who have engaged with the media and learn from respected science journalists about how the media works, how to respond and comment and what journalists want and expect from scientists.

— Susanne van der Veen, PhD student, University of Salford

After a full afternoon of discussion, lots of eye-opening input from experts as well as researchers just starting out in academia, I have formed a lot of ideas about what peer review actually is and why it is necessary.
We received donations towards our aim of challenging the misrepresentation of science and evidence in public life from 284 individuals totalling £156,299 and from the following organisations: Biochemical Society (£100-1000); British Pharmacological Society (£2001-5000); Fondation de Luxemborg (£5001-10,000); Institute of Physics and Engineering in Medicine (£100-1000); John Innes Foundation (£2001-5000) and Laura and John Arnold Foundation (30,001-40,000).
### Donations towards our projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Our work</th>
<th>Funding band</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AllTrials grant *</td>
<td>AllTrials campaign: for all clinical trials to be registered and their results reported</td>
<td>£40,001-£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask for Evidence teenagers grant *</td>
<td>Ask for Evidence: critical thinking for 13-16 year olds</td>
<td>£30,001-£40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBSRC</td>
<td>Plant Science Panel</td>
<td>£5001-10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemical Society</td>
<td>Voice of Young Science: Standing up for Science workshops and campaigns for early career researchers; and Plant Science Panel</td>
<td>£2001-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BioMed Central</td>
<td>AllTrials campaign: for all clinical trials to be registered and their results reported</td>
<td>£2001-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Institute of Radiology</td>
<td>Voice of Young Science: Standing up for Science workshops and campaigns for early career researchers</td>
<td>£100-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Pharmacological Society</td>
<td>AllTrials campaign: for all clinical trials to be registered and their results reported</td>
<td>£100-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge University Press</td>
<td>Peer Review: the nuts and bolts workshops for early career researchers</td>
<td>£100-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>Sharing the value of peer review with the public and engaging early career researchers in public discussions about science</td>
<td>£20,001-30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1000Research</td>
<td>Peer Review: the nuts and bolts workshops for early career researchers</td>
<td>£1001-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Genetics Society</td>
<td>Plant Science Panel</td>
<td>£100-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindawi</td>
<td>Peer Review the nuts and bolts workshops for early career researchers</td>
<td>£1001-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Physics and Engineering in Medicine</td>
<td>Voice of Young Science: Standing up for Science workshops and campaigns for early career researchers</td>
<td>£2001-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Innes Centre</td>
<td>Plant Science Panel</td>
<td>£1001-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds University</td>
<td>Voice of Young Science: Standing up for Science workshops and campaigns for early career researchers</td>
<td>£2001-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Research Council</td>
<td>Voice of Young Science: Standing up for Science workshops and campaigns for early career researchers; and Peer Review: the nuts and bolts workshops for early career researchers</td>
<td>£5001-10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRC/CSO SPHSU, University of Glasgow</td>
<td>Public engagement partnership: dissemination of the Understanding Health Research Tool</td>
<td>£5001-10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Publishing Group</td>
<td>John Maddox Prize for Standing up for Science</td>
<td>£2001-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuffield Foundation</td>
<td>Benchmarking government’s transparency about the use of evidence; and leadership on how evidence and expertise can be empowering</td>
<td>£40,001-£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Our work</td>
<td>Funding band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Press</td>
<td>Peer Review: the nuts and bolts workshops for early career researchers</td>
<td>£2001-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publons</td>
<td>Peer Review: the nuts and bolts workshops for early career researchers</td>
<td>£2001-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rothamsted Research</td>
<td>Plant Science Panel</td>
<td>£2001-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Meteorological Society</td>
<td>Voice of Young Science: Standing up for Science workshops and campaigns for early career researchers</td>
<td>£100-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Society of Biology</td>
<td>Plant Science Panel</td>
<td>£2001-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAGE</td>
<td>Peer Review Programme: workshops for early career researchers and a public awareness campaign</td>
<td>£2001-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sainsbury Laboratory</td>
<td>Plant Science Panel</td>
<td>£100-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Society for Applied Microbiology</td>
<td>Peer Review Programme: workshops for early career researchers and a public awareness campaign (2015 and 2016)</td>
<td>£2001-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Experimental Biology</td>
<td>Voice of Young Science: Standing up for Science workshops and campaigns for early career researchers</td>
<td>£2001-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor &amp; Francis Group</td>
<td>Peer Review: the nuts and bolts workshops for early career researchers</td>
<td>£20,001-£30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The JRSST Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Missing Evidence: An inquiry into the delayed publication of government-commissioned research; and libel reform</td>
<td>£20,001-30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Kohn Foundation</td>
<td>John Maddox Prize for Standing up for Science</td>
<td>£1001-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College London</td>
<td>Workshops and advice to help researchers communicate children's heart surgery statistics to parents; and a case study to inform researchers' public engagement plans</td>
<td>£10,001-20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Birmingham</td>
<td>Voice of Young Science: Standing up for Science workshops and campaigns for early career researchers</td>
<td>£5001-10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nottingham</td>
<td>Voice of Young Science: Standing up for Science workshops and campaigns for early career researchers</td>
<td>£2001-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Reading</td>
<td>Voice of Young Science: Standing up for Science workshops and campaigns for early career researchers</td>
<td>£1001-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of St Andrews</td>
<td>Voice of Young Science: Standing up for Science workshops and campaigns for early career researchers; Peer Review: the nuts and bolts workshops for early career researchers</td>
<td>£1001-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Stirling</td>
<td>Voice of Young Science: Standing up for Science workshops and campaigns for early career researchers</td>
<td>£1001-2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Help with equipment, facilities and services has also been received from:

University of Manchester, SAGE, Institute for Government, University of Warwick, Springer Nature, Francis Crick Institute, Royal Society, Glasgow Caledonian University, Royal Pharmaceutical Society, University of Glasgow, Institute of Physics, HM Treasury.