



# TRUSTLEVEL

| Proof of Achievement          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Proposal                      | 1200193                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Link                          | <a href="#">Redesign of Catalyst's proposal review system and methodology</a>                                                                                                                                               |
| Milestone                     | 4                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Status                        | Approved                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Last Update                   | 30th September 2025                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| Contributors                  | Dominik Tilman                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| Milestone Acceptance Criteria | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Updated system prototypes incorporating improvements.</li><li>• Community testing report detailing user feedback, usability issues, and performance.</li></ul>                      |
| Video                         |  Screen Recording 2025-09-30 at 14.27.52.mov                                                                                             |
| Github                        | <a href="https://github.com/TrustLevel/Grant_Review_Tool">https://github.com/TrustLevel/Grant_Review_Tool</a>                                                                                                               |
| Dework                        | <a href="https://app.dework.xyz/i/6XD8VlwKKWMam7uOyYQGxe">https://app.dework.xyz/i/6XD8VlwKKWMam7uOyYQGxe</a>                                                                                                               |
| Gitbook                       | <a href="https://app.gitbook.com/o/1DBK0R4XUa0nwyYfDgB0/s/nwEPkfKxcHVHEzAxTHrH/tools-and-apps/grant-review-tool">https://app.gitbook.com/o/1DBK0R4XUa0nwyYfDgB0/s/nwEPkfKxcHVHEzAxTHrH/tools-and-apps/grant-review-tool</a> |

---

## 1. Overview

[Participation and Testing Setup](#)

[Results and Data Collected](#)

[Milestone Deliverables Completed](#)

## 2. Community Feedback

[Positive Feedback](#)

[Main Issues Encountered](#)

[Suggestions for Future Improvements](#)

[Overall Assessment](#)

## 3. Analysis of new Proposal Evaluation Method

[New Proposal Evaluation Method:](#)

[Test Results:](#)

---

# 1. Overview

The goal of this milestone was twofold:

1. **Evaluate the reliability and usability of the Review Tool in a real-world setting**
2. **Collect authentic user-generated reviews to test and validate our new proposal evaluation method**

## Participation and Testing Setup

From 4th to 17th September, we conducted an open beta-testing phase.

A total of **27 community members** registered as beta testers.

Out of these, **20 actively participated** by submitting reviews and using the tool features.

## Results and Data Collected

During the testing period, users generated the following dataset:

- **105 written reviews**
- **215 peer-reviews** (review assessments by other testers)

In addition to the reviews themselves, we gathered qualitative insights through:

- **14 completed feedback forms**
- **16 bug reports and improvement suggestions**

This combination allowed us to test both functionality and user experience, while also gathering representative input for our new evaluation logic.

## Milestone Deliverables Completed

- **Codebase adjustments:** Minor fixes and refinements were implemented based on early tester input (see repository update log).
- **Community Feedback Report:** Compiled user feedback, including the structured response form (see Chapter 2).
- **Deep Dive on the new Evaluation Method:** Detailed explanation and analysis based on the collected reviews (see Chapter 3).

- **Bounty Board published on Dework:** Tasks and incentives for ongoing contributions have been set up (link included).
- 

## 2. Community Feedback

→ Link “Google Form - Feedback & Bug”:

 Copy of TrustLevel Test - Feedback & Bug Report (Responses)

*Notes on the Feedback form:*

- *Most bugs were already fixed and incorporated at the time of submitting the M3 report.*
  - *Only server.js & admin.js needed to be updated - see last commitment:*  
[https://github.com/TrustLevel/Grant\\_Review\\_Tool/commit/22e29e710ec4b24326f388828ab50f009d705896](https://github.com/TrustLevel/Grant_Review_Tool/commit/22e29e710ec4b24326f388828ab50f009d705896)
- *For feedback, we included an additional question on the perceived “quality of reviews” in order to find indications of a change from the baseline parameters from Milestone 1. The other metrics mentioned there (correlation between ratings & outcomes, success rate & reviewer engagement) are not yet available.*

## Positive Feedback

- **Intuitive Review Flow:** Review and peer-review processes are described as straightforward, with clear guiding questions and the ability to give both positive and negative ratings (e.g., -3).
- **Design & Usability:** Professional, clean interface; easy navigation; quick tool to support decision-making.
- **Peer Review:** Anonymization works well; low-quality flags mostly appropriate; enjoyable and efficient.
- **Transparency & Reputation:** REP point visibility for actions is appreciated; reviewers like seeing how contributions translate into reputation.
- **AI Support:** Summaries and analysis often perceived as helpful and surprisingly accurate in some cases.
- **General Impression:** Tool is considered a major improvement over Catalyst; mix of review quality is expected, but overall better structured.

## Main Issues Encountered

### 1. Bugs / Technical Problems

- Reviews and peer-reviews are sometimes not saved when navigating back.
- Duplicate peer-review assignments for the same proposal.

- Proposal titles missing in peer-review view.
- Demo peer-review remains visible after completion.
- Rewards and REP points not consistently visible after claiming.
- Error messages when submitting reviews.
- The Mission tab sometimes fails to reflect completed work.
- In some cases, AI Analysis produces misleading or unclear summaries.

## **2. User Experience Gaps**

- Progress in peer-reviews not saved when exiting to dashboard.
- Review and peer-review requests can't be made simultaneously.
- Due dates phrased confusingly ("due in overdue").
- Lack of automatic notifications when receiving new assignments.
- No way to export results or share reviews.
- Images/screenshots in proposals not rendering well.

## **Suggestions for Future Improvements**

### **● Criteria & Process**

- Reduce or refine number of review criteria (e.g., relevance overlaps with challenge fit; team & feasibility highly correlated).
- Consider randomizing criteria order to avoid score anchoring.
- Add new peer-review guiding question: "Does this review show critical thinking?"
- Allow reviewers to flag obviously AI-generated or copy-paste reviews.
- Move temperature check earlier in the process as a moderator gatekeeping step.

### **● AI & Transparency**

- Provide minimum requirements in AI analysis for easier cross-referencing.
- Display the AI prompt used for generating analysis (transparency).
- Create a public page or simple explanation of rating algorithms.

### **● Platform Features**

- Wallet/DID login for identity.
- Reviewer profiles with skill differentiation, reputation, and rating options.
- Email notifications for new assignments.
- Better progress saving in reviews/peer-reviews.
- Option to export/share reviews.

### **● Quality Control**

- Weight low-quality flags by reviewer expertise instead of simple majority.
- Ensure reviewers understand evaluation criteria and how they themselves will be peer-reviewed.
- Add option to directly flag superficial reviews.

## Overall Assessment

- **General Sentiment:** Strongly positive, with many testers praising the design, usability, and peer-review structure.
  - **Quality of Reviews:** Still mixed (as expected for an “open” round), but overall much better than Catalyst baseline; flags and reputation system add accountability.
  - **Improvement Areas:** Transparency around algorithms and AI analysis, more flexible workflow, and enhanced reviewer identity/reputation features.
- 

## 3. Analysis of new Proposal Evaluation Method

### New Proposal Evaluation Method

- Overview / tl:dr:  
[https://github.com/TrustLevel/Grant\\_Review\\_Tool/blob/main/backend/Fund14\\_analysis/REX\\_System\\_TL\\_DR.md](https://github.com/TrustLevel/Grant_Review_Tool/blob/main/backend/Fund14_analysis/REX_System_TL_DR.md)
- Full documentation:  
[https://github.com/TrustLevel/Grant\\_Review\\_Tool/blob/main/backend/Fund14\\_analysis/REX\\_System\\_Technical\\_Documentation.md](https://github.com/TrustLevel/Grant_Review_Tool/blob/main/backend/Fund14_analysis/REX_System_Technical_Documentation.md)

### Test Results

- Summary & Results:  
[https://github.com/TrustLevel/Grant\\_Review\\_Tool/blob/main/backend/Fund14\\_analysis/README.md](https://github.com/TrustLevel/Grant_Review_Tool/blob/main/backend/Fund14_analysis/README.md)
  - Original json files:  
[https://github.com/TrustLevel/Grant\\_Review\\_Tool/tree/main/backend/Fund14\\_analysis/results](https://github.com/TrustLevel/Grant_Review_Tool/tree/main/backend/Fund14_analysis/results)
-