

Standard Operating Procedure for the Management of Conflicts of Interest in ASEICA Scientific Activities

ASEICA ensures that all scientific evaluation processes associated with the Congress (abstracts, awards, and calls for grants or funding) are carried out according to criteria of independence, objectivity, and transparency.

Selection of Abstracts

- The abstracts submitted to the national congress will be evaluated through an external peer-review process [conducted by reviewers not belonging to the Executive Board] and a blinded review process.
- Each abstract will be assessed by at least two external reviewers, who will provide a score.
- After the initial evaluation by external reviewers and classification based on the scores obtained, the final assignment to presentation formats (oral, selected highlight, or other formats) will be determined by the Scientific Committee and subsequently validated by the Executive Board.
- In this process, in addition to scientific quality, strategic aspects such as gender balance will be considered in line with ASEICA's commitment to equity.

Congress Awards

Congress awards will be evaluated by an independent committee composed of external reviewers who are not part of the Executive Board and who have no conflict of interest.

Calls for Grants and Funding

Competitive calls promoted by ASEICA will be evaluated by independent external committees, ensuring an objective and merit-based process. The jury may include representatives of the Executive Board and the funding entity, who must declare any potential conflicts of interest and abstain when necessary. Members of the ASEICA Executive Board and researchers from their groups are not eligible to apply as candidates to research funding calls promoted by the association.