

Dear Devi and Héloïse,

Thank you for your deep and constructive analyses of our preprint submitted to PCI Organization Studies that are very helpful for improving it.

You will find below our comments on your suggestions as recommenders, and on the suggestions of the two referees.

### **ANSWERS TO THE RECOMMENDERS' ADVICES AND SUGGESTIONS.**

It is true that this preprint is not a proper research article. We thus followed your suggestion and modified the title to indicate it a **perspective**.

**Ranking:** we have added several paragraphs on ranking, with particular reference to DORA and Coara (specific new paragraph page 3 “Quantitative versus qualitative assessment”). However, as our preprint concerns individual evaluation, we do not address the problem of international ranking of research organizations and universities.

**Restrictive view of work and hidden work:** we have developed and detailed this section (mainly within the new paragraph page 3 “Quantitative versus qualitative assessment”).

**Connection with broader institutional changes:** thank you for your suggestions and we added some discussions and references, notably for bibliometry (page 4, within the new paragraph “Quantitative and qualitative assessment”). The mention to Table 3 is less clear in your comments since Table 3 focuses on open science assessment in different European organisations, which does not –to our opinion – corresponds to this larger and general view developed here.

**Context of INRAE and Higher Education in France:** you are right; this was missing and added (page 2), as well as for the following item concerning the historic part of assessment at INRAE (page 5 in “Peers for a qualitative assessment scientists work”).

**INRAE precursor?** As added in our new version (in the conclusions, “A shared assessment between organizations”), INRAE does not pretend to be the first and only research organization to modify the ways assessment is conducted. We work in connexion with other French research institutes and this is needed since any change in a process of science needs to be globalized. However, we are probably the first to enter those changes (on qualitative assessment) within a theoretical scheme, the one developed by Christophe Dejours.

**Subjectivity:** your comment on the importance of subjectivity in qualitative assessment is interesting and we referred to some published works to comment on it pages 11 and 12, “Evolution of qualitative assessment criteria”.

**Miscellaneous assessment practices:** we described more how the social groups are represented in the committees, how we ensure the rules are followed, how we regulate eventual conflicts and the cost of assessment (page 6, before Table1). However, we did not comment other aspects concerning promotions since the preprint is devoted only to regular

assessment not linked to promotion, added in the introduction: “This articles concerns the regular assessment throughout the career and thus does not deal with promotions,”

**“There appears to be a dichotomy between the front-end of the paper on beauty, and the rest of the paper on the analysis of career assessment, categories, etc.”:** We apologize but we do not understand well the issue. The beauty judgment is the backdrop of the whole process of evaluation. So the parts of the paper that are more directly describing the process (for instance open science, partnership, ...) do not mention the beauty judgment per se because they only represent elements on which the peers will and could express their judgment. Therefore, for us, there is no dichotomy. But perhaps we misinterpreted your comment. As asked by the reviewers, we developed the beauty judgment in several places in the manuscript and sorry, it is difficult to list them all here.

**Interdisciplinarity:** we have tried as well to go into further details on the interdisciplinarity item page 13 (“Practices of interdisciplinarity”).

**Transferability:** we added some parts in the text on how the change of paradigm (such as the one proposed by PCIs) on evaluation could be accepted and used (page 4 for the paradigm). And we developed again the idea that the changes proposed and applied by INRAE are helpful for organizations and scientists, and have to be shared (see conclusions), even if INRAE is not the only one (hopefully) to enter the game of qualitative and multicriteria assessment by peers.

**Minor revisions:** we have taken care to follow the minor revisions you have indicated.

#### **ANSWERS TO REVIEWER 1’S ADVICES AND SUGGESTIONS.**

The main concerns expressed by Reviewer 1 are i) theoretical anchor of this work and ii) the beauty judgment that needs to be explained in further details and more integrated. We have tried to extend some parts of the manuscript (following recommenders and Reviewer 2’s advices as well) with more references to published work and analyses. We have as well developed at different levels the beauty judgment that represents the general frame in which peers can perform their work of scientist assessment, through a multicriteria and qualitative approach. All those aspects are indicated in several part of the new version and I hope Reviewer 1 will have more elements to understand the perspective we propose.

#### **ANSWERS TO REVIEWER 2’S ADVICES AND SUGGESTIONS.**

Reviewer 2 pointed out “the lacks a conceptual framework and a thorough literature review”: we have extended several discussions on the different items of the preprint, as suggested as well by the recommenders and Reviewer 1. The main conceptual framework we anchor this perspective is the one of Christophe Dejourns (beauty + utility judgements). In this new version, we tried to refer more onto published works and analyses (refer to our answer to the recommenders) and we hope this fits with Reviewer 2’s expectations.

More details of the INRAE process: this point was suggested as well by the recommenders. We thus have added elements that were missing and I paste here the answers we did to the recommenders: *we described more how the social groups are represented in the committees, how we ensure the rules are followed, how we regulate eventual conflicts and the cost of assessment* (page 6, before Table1). *However, we did not comment on gender balance for instance or other aspects concerning promotions since the preprint is devoted only to regular assessment not linked to promotion, added in the introduction: “This articles concerns the regular assessment throughout the career and thus does not deal with promotions”*. The link with the hierarchy has been developed page 7 in the paragraph “An advice-based assessment”.

The comment of Reviewer 2 on “The absence of a broader impact assessment in the evaluation of individuals...” is very interesting. INRAE did not yet work on these aspects, at the individual level (ASIRPA methods is today applied only to group impact). We have added a paragraph dedicated to this in our conclusion and perspective part of this new version (“Impact of evaluation for scientists and INRAE”).

The last comment concerns a broad comparison of individual scientists’ assessment outside France. Table 3, mentioned by Reviewer 2, proposed this kind of comparison, linked with open science practices assessment, which represented already an important work. The comparison of assessment processes (independent of open science practices) ongoing in different universities and research organisations in different countries is a very interesting point. But to our opinion, this requires a specific, long-term and pluri-partners work grouped in a network all the organizations (and others) mentioned by Reviewer 2; that could consist in a European project for instance. We could not have this ambition in the actual perspective we propose.