FOREWORD

Welcome as an expert reviewer for the Swedish Research Council’s peer review process in Medicine and Health for 2018 and our calls for project grants, starting grants, and grants for half-time position in clinical research. Your assignment as a member of one of our review panels is an important position of trust and the evaluation of research applications constitutes the foundation for the work of the Swedish Research Council. Your work is very important and I hope you realize how much we and all the scientists that are applying for funding this year appreciate your efforts.

This handbook has been written to assist you in your forthcoming work and describes the review process step by step. The purpose is to make it easy to find the information that is relevant for the tasks to be carried out. It contains important practical instructions on the grading of applications as well as how final statements to be sent to applicants shall be written. In addition, you can find information on the Swedish Research Council’s general guidelines and on our conflict of interest policy and gender equality strategy. Please read both the instructions and the appendices carefully, so that you are well prepared for your review work.

Jan-Ingvar Jönsson
Secretary General, Medicine and Health
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INTRODUCTION

The major call in Medicine and Health 2018 contains five separate calls.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call</th>
<th>Reviewed by panel*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Project Grant</td>
<td>A1-H2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Project Grant – Development of methods to replace, reduce and refine animal experiments (3R)</td>
<td>3R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Project Grant – Pharmaceuticals science</td>
<td>PHARM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting Grant</td>
<td>A1-H2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant for Half-time Position in Clinical Research Environment</td>
<td>A1-H2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The review panels are listed on page 8-9 and in Appendix 9.
Clicking on any of the headings of the grants listed above will bring up the call text. You can also find the call text on the bulletin board in Prisma.

This handbook will give you the information needed to fulfil the tasks for the peer review process. The starting point is a section with general guidelines and principles followed by a checklist summarizing the different tasks for the panel. The various tasks are described in more detail in separate sections with a summary of the tasks to be carried out.

General starting points and principles
There are certain guidelines and principles which apply during all steps in the review work, and which are important for you to know about as a reviewer.

Peer review
The portal paragraph to the Swedish Research Council’s Instruction Ordinance establishes that “the Swedish Research Council shall give support to basic research of the highest scientific quality within all fields of science”. The fundamental principle for assessing scientific quality is the peer review of applications for research grants that is carried out by the various review panels within each subject area. In order to provide a basis for the scientific review, the board of the Research Council has formulated guidelines for peer review based on eight principles. Some guidelines are already in place, while some are in the process to be implemented (see Appendix 3).

Conflict of interest
A process involving peer review means that the evaluation of applications is carried out by researchers who are themselves part of the scientific community applying for grants. This creates a particular risk of conflicts of interest. In order to avoid any situation involving a conflict of interest, the Swedish Research Council has established strict guidelines (see Appendix 5 and 6).

As a panel member, you are obliged to report any conflict of interest in relation to the applications you will be reviewing. In the event of any doubt, please confer with the chair and the Research Council personnel. Ultimately, the responsibility rests with the Research Council. In case of a conflict of interest, another reviewer will be appointed.

Gender equality
The Swedish Research Council promotes gender equality within its area of activities, and has therefore decided on a gender equality strategy (see Appendix 7). One of the operational goals for the gender equality strategy is
to “ensure that women and men have the same success rates and receive the same average grant amount, taking into account the nature of the research and the type of grant”. Against this background, before adopting its proposal for allocation of grants, review panels shall consider the gender equality goal and work out the success rate in its proposal, as well as considering and if necessary commenting on the outcome. Gender equality is used as a borderline condition, and when ranking applications of equal quality, applicants from the under-represented gender shall be prioritised.

Confidentiality
Throughout the review process, applications must be treated confidentially. Any third parties must not be informed of what was discussed at the meeting, or of the views of the reviewers in the ongoing evaluation. You should not be in contact with individual applicants, either during or after the review process. All communications with applicants and the Swedish Research Council concerning the review process or the grounds on which decisions are made shall be carried out via the Research Council’s research officer responsible.

Rejecting applications on formal grounds
An application may be rejected on formal grounds. This entails rejection from further evaluation without being quality assessed or graded. When this happens, the application is no longer shown in Prisma. Rejection of an application on formal grounds requires a decision by the Swedish Research Council. The Scientific Council or a review panel cannot itself decide to reject an application on formal grounds. However, if, during an assessment, a reviewer identifies a reason for an application to be rejected on formal grounds, he or she is responsible for raising these with the review panel’s research officer. The research officer then takes over responsibility for further handling of the matter.

Prisma
All the review work is carried out in the web-based system Prisma. In order to carry out the review work in Prisma, you must register as a user in the system – further information on this is available in Prisma’s User Manual. If you have any questions concerning the system and cannot find the answer in Prisma’s user manual, please contact the research officer responsible.

Roles in the review process

Chair and vice chair
The role of the chair is to lead and coordinate the work of the panel, and to ensure in collaboration with the Swedish Research Council personnel that rules and policies are complied with. The chair decides how to allocate the applications between reviewers and is responsible for identifying any need for external reviewers. The chair is also responsible for ensuring that the final statements issued by the review panel reflect the panel’s discussion and assessments. The chair reviews all the applications within a panel.

The vice chair is appointed by the panel chair in consultation with the Research Council personnel. The vice chair’s task is to stand in for the chair of the review panel in situations where she or he cannot or should not take part, such as when the chair has a conflict of interest. In such cases, the vice chair should ensure that the final statements reflect the panel’s discussion and joint assessment.

Panel member
The tasks of panel members are to review, grade and rank the applications received by the review panel. The review panel shall also discuss applications during the review panel meeting, and give feedback to applicants whose applications have been discussed.

Swedish Research Council personnel
In addition to their roles as administrators for the review panel, the research officer and senior research officer also have the task of ensuring that the rules and procedure established for the process are complied with, and to pass on the board’s intentions for the review. The Swedish Research Council personnel does not participate in the review work.
Coordinator of the evaluation process and Coordinator of the Scientific Council
The coordinator of the evaluation process and the coordinator of the Scientific Council assist the Secretary General in his work and coordinate (internally and externally) the practical aspects of evaluation process.

Observer
Scientific Council-MH members participate as observers in the review panels. Their main purposes are to be a link between review panels and the decision-making body, and to give feedback on the panels’ work. Along with the Swedish Research Council personnel, the observers are a part of our continuous quality assurance process for evaluations.

Secretary General and Deputy Secretary General
The Secretary General has overall responsibility for the review process and for questions of a scientific nature. The Secretary General is also the person who deals with any complaints following the grant decision. The Deputy Secretary General assist the Secretary General in his work.
CHECKLIST

Below is a summary of the various tasks you have during the different stages of the process.

| Call and preparation | □ State account information in Prisma.  
□ Book travel ahead of the workshop for reviewers  
□ Book travel ahead of the review panel meeting.  
□ Report any conflict of interest. |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Review                | □ Grade and write detailed comments (preliminary statement) on all applications for which you are the rapporteur.  
□ Grade and write comments (assessment) on all applications for which you are a reviewer.  
□ Rank all applications allocated to you (as rapporteur or reviewer).  
□ Prepare for the meeting by reading other panel members’ comments.  
□ Check the list of the screened-out applications on the bulletin board in Prisma to determine whether any of the screened-out applications should be brought up for discussion at the meeting.  
□ Read those applications remaining after sifting that you have not already reviewed.  
□ Please contact the Swedish Research Council personnel and the chair if you discover during the review that you do, after all, have a conflict of interest with any of the applications you are to review, or if you discover any problem with an application. |
| Review panel meeting  | □ Agree on grades for each individual criterion and on an overall grade for each application discussed.  
□ Agree on a priority list or nominations depending on grant type.  
□ Contribute with feedback on the review process. |
| Final statement        | □ Write the review panel’s final statement in Prisma on the applications for which you have been the rapporteur. The final statement shall be entered into Prisma no later than one week after the review panel meeting.  
□ As necessary, supplement final statements following review by the chair.  
□ Submit receipts for any expenses to the panel’s research officer responsible. |
| Decision and follow-up| □ Refer any questions about the evaluation of individual applications to the Swedish Research Council’s personnel.  
□ Be prepared to assist the chair and the Secretary General responsible in the event of any questions. |
1. CALL AND PREPARATION

**Allocation of applications to review panels**
Once the call has closed, the applications are checked and allocated to the various review panels. Usually, each application is allocated to the group the applicant has listed as the first choice. However, if the chair considers that an application should be reviewed by another panel, it might be moved.

**Creating an account in Prisma**
During this step, you as a panel member must log into Prisma (or create an account if you do not already have one), and ensure that the account and personal data is correct. It is important that your contact details are up to date, so that the Research Council personnel and the panel chair can contact you easily. Throughout the review process, you will receive instructions via email when it is time to carry out the various steps of the review work. You also have to decide whether or not you want to receive remuneration for your review work. There are detailed instructions for how to do this in Prisma’s User Manual.

**Reporting any conflict of interest**
When the applications allocated to your review panel have become available in Prisma, you must report any conflict of interest as soon as possible. This is done in Prisma. Only when all panel members have reported any conflict of interest the chair can allocate applications to individual members. It is a good idea to communicate to the chair or the Swedish Research Council personnel if any doubt arises, or on issues of conflict of interest or competency to review.

**Allocation of applications to reviewers**
After the conflict of interest step the chair allocates the applications between the panel members. If the chair considers that an application should be reviewed by another panel, it might be moved. Each application is allocated to five reviewers, of which one is given the role of rapporteur. The rapporteur is the reviewer who is responsible for presenting the application for discussion at the meeting, and for summarising the review panel’s final statement following the meeting.

**Planning and preparation ahead of the workshop for reviewers**
A workshop will be organized the 24th of April with the purpose to jointly discuss the summer’s review work as well as the two-day panel meeting in the fall.
You need to book your travel to the meeting, and provide information about any dietary requirements. The travel is booked via the Swedish Research Council’s travel agent. Please see the bulletin board in Prisma for information about the Research Council’s procedures and policy on travel.

**Planning and preparation ahead of the review panel meeting**
The date of the meetings are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Musculo-skeletal diseases, Oral health and Maxillofacial diseases</td>
<td>12-13 Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Musculo-skeletal diseases, Anaesthesiology and Radiology</td>
<td>12-13 Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Endocrinology/Metabolic diseases, Gynaecology and Reproduction/perinatal research</td>
<td>22-23 Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Endocrinology/Metabolic diseases including Gastrointestinal diseases</td>
<td>22-23 Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Infections</td>
<td>29-30 Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Infections, Respiratory tract diseases and Allergy including Dermatology</td>
<td>29-30 Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Nervous system diseases</td>
<td>19-20 Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Nervous system diseases and Psychiatry</td>
<td>19-20 Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Nervous system diseases including Sensory Organs</td>
<td>19-20 Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Cardiovascular and Urogenital diseases, Transplantation and diseases of haematogenous organs</td>
<td>5-6 Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Cardiovascular and Urogenital diseases, Transplantation and diseases of haematogenous organs</td>
<td>5-6 Sep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You also need to book your travel to the meeting, and provide information about your needs for accommodation and any dietary requirements. The travel is booked via the Swedish Research Council’s travel agent. Please see the bulletin board in Prisma for information about the Research Council’s procedures and policy on travel.

Summary of your tasks

- State account information in Prisma
- Book travel ahead of the workshop for reviewers
- Book travel ahead of the review panel meeting
- Report any conflict of interest
2. REVIEW

The review period lasts from the time you get access to the applications to be reviewed in Prisma, until approximately 3 weeks before the review panel meeting. During this period, you read, grade and rank the applications allocated to you, and write evaluations (assessment or preliminary statement). Please note that if you at this stage discover that you have a conflict of interest, you must immediately report to the chair and the research officer responsible.

After the review period Prisma is closed for editing. At the same time the system opens for reading, so that you can read the assessments made by the other reviewers. This will help when you prepare for the discussions held at the review panel meeting. During this stage, a first sifting of the applications is also carried out by the chair.

Individual review

For the applications you are rapporteur, you need to write a preliminary statement, which shall consist of a numerical grade and detailed written comments on all evaluation criteria. In the role as reviewer, you shall write an assessment, which shall also consist of a numerical grade and written comments, but here the comments do not have to be as detailed. This work is carried out in Prisma. It is strongly recommended that you conduct this task as input from the other reviewers is an important tool for the rapporteur to finalize a high-quality statement communicated to the applicant.

Your assessment should be based on the application. Thus, any additional “informal” information outside the application should be avoided during your individual work or at the review meeting. Examples of information that is not relevant can be comments on the applicant’s private life, rumours of lacking research ethics or assumptions that someone else might have written the application.

Typically, the content of an application and the information about the applicant should not be shared with others during the review process. Sometimes there are questions if it is acceptable to consult with a colleague on certain parts of the content of a research plan. This can be motivated as long as the application is not shared, instead limiting the consultation to specific questions, such as the use of statistics or new research findings.

Immediately contact the Scientific Research Council if you suspect that there may be deviations from ethical guidelines or good research practice, or if you suspect any scientific misconduct. The Scientific Research Council will ensure that the matter is further investigated. This year the applicant and the administrating organization confirms that the applicant has not been found guilty of misconduct in research during the last two years by signing the application.

Evaluation criteria and grading scales

Your review is based on four evaluation criteria – the scientific quality of the project, novelty and originality, the merits of the applicant and the feasibility of the project. These four criteria are the Research Council’s basic criteria for evaluating the overall quality. The criteria are evaluated against a seven- or three-point grading scale (as detailed below), and are intended to reflect the application’s “quality profile”. To facilitate the evaluation of the various criteria, there are also a number of guiding questions to be taken into account in the evaluation work. In the call for Research Project Grant – Development of methods to replace, reduce and refine animal experiments (3R) and Research Project Grant – Pharmaceuticals science, an additional criterion is used called Relevance.
Guiding questions

The scientific quality of the project
- Will the project, if successful, significantly advance our understanding of the field?
- Is the research proposal relevant for medical research and the definition of the problems and proposed solutions clear, convincing and compelling?
- Does the study design, its research questions and hypotheses, meet the standards of highest scientific quality?
- Are the hypotheses clearly defined and based on the appropriate literature and/or preliminary data?
- Are potential problems and alternative strategies identified and presented?
- Does the program present preliminary data to support the hypothesis?
- Are there relevant scientific collaborations?
- Are methods for data analysis and statistics well described?
  - Especially for Starting Grants:
    - Does the applicant demonstrate the ability to formulate scientific questions that are clearly independent of the research the applicant performed as a doctoral student and postdoc, and the research of former advisors?
  - Especially for 3R:
    - Is the project significant to the development of methods to replace, reduce and/or refine animal experiments?

Novelty and originality
- Does the project extend or challenge current understanding, opinion or practice in its field?
- Is the project built on a unique combination of ideas, preliminary data, and different methodologies to create novel approaches to address the question at hand?
- Is there potential for creation of new knowledge, novel technologies, or new directions for research and advancement of the field?
- Will completion of the aims improve scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice?
- Does the researcher propose a line of research that has the potential to significantly advance current knowledge in the field or is he/she simply adding details to existing knowledge?

The merits of the applicant
- Does the applicant have sufficient research experience, expertise, level of independence and scientific network for implementation of the proposed project?
- How does the applicant’s academic qualifications and achievements relate to his or her career stage and active time for research?
- Does the applicant have a documented independent line of investigation?
- Does the publication record suggest a coherent line of investigation? Does the applicant report publications as senior author? Focus is on the most relevant and important publications and reports, with emphasis on quality rather than quantity.
  - Especially for Starting Grants:
    - Has the applicant shown the ability to work independently of former advisors?
    - Has the applicant shown the ability to work in new (international) research environments, for instance during postdoctoral work?
A seven-grade scale is used to evaluate the criteria the scientific quality of the project, novelty and originality, and the merits of the applicant:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Exceptionally strong application with negligible weaknesses</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Very strong application with negligible weaknesses</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good to excellent</td>
<td>Very strong application with minor weaknesses</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Strong application with minor weaknesses</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Some strengths, but also moderate weaknesses</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>A few strengths, but also at least one major weakness or several minor weaknesses</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Very few strengths, and numerous major weaknesses</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feasibility

- Considering the project as a whole, including any participating researchers, does the applicant or project group have sufficient competence needed for completion of the project?
- Is the general design, including the time frame, realistic for implementing the proposed project?
- Are the materials, methods, experimental models, and when appropriate, patient cohorts adequate and well adapted to the hypothesis or research question?

A three-grade scale is used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feasible</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly feasible</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not feasible</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For all criteria, you can mark “Insufficient” if you consider the application insufficient to allow a reasonable evaluation to be made of the criterion.

**Overall grade**

After you have graded the individual criteria for each application, you need to weigh them together into an overall grade according to the seven-grade scale above. The overall grade is not the same as an average grade or a summary of the grades for the individual criteria; instead, it should reflect the scientific quality of the application as a whole. It is not a condition that the quality concept covers all aspects of the various criteria, nor that they have the same relative weight for all applications. In normal cases, however, a strongly positive evaluation of only one criterion cannot outweigh other weaknesses of an application when weighed together. For project grants and starting grants, “Scientific quality” should be given more weight in the overall grade. In contrast, for grants for half-time positions in clinical research, “Merits of applicant” should be given more weight in the overall grade.
Additional assessment criterion used in the 3R review panel

The additional criterion of “Relevance” is used by the 3R review panel for applications related to the development of methods for replacing, reducing and/or refining animal experiments. The seven-grade rating scale shall be used for this criterion. The “Relevance” criterion must not be weighed into the overall grade. Instead, it is to be weighed into an application’s ranking in relation to others. Thus, an application can be of high relevance, but low scientific quality (or vice versa). The following additional guiding questions have been adapted for use in the 3R review panel:

Relevance:
- Is this a strategically important 3Rs area?
- Will the proposal replace/reduce animal use by a significant number of animals?
- Will the proposal refine a severe/moderate procedure (even if the number of animals affected is low) OR refine a mild procedure where animal numbers are high?
- Could the outcomes be applicable to other models/research areas?
- What is the likelihood of a local impact on animal use and adoption by other groups nationally/internationally?
- What is the overall potential 3Rs impact?

Additional assessment criterion used in the PHARM review panel

The additional criterion of “Relevance” is used by the PHARM review panel for applications in response to the special call for proposals within the area of the pharmaceuticals science. The seven-grade rating scale shall be used for this criterion. The “Relevance” criterion must not be weighed into the overall grade. Instead, it is to be weighed into an application’s ranking in relation to others. Thus, an application can be of high relevance, but low scientific quality (or vice versa). The following additional guiding questions have been adapted for use in the PHARM review panel:

Relevance:
- Will the proposal aid the development of Swedish research within the field of pharmaceuticals science?
- Is this a strategically important area within the field of pharmaceuticals science?
- Could the outcomes be broadly applicable in the field of pharmaceuticals science?

Ranking of applications

You need to rank all the applications you have reviewed within the same grant type (i.e., both those for which you are the rapporteur, and those for which you are a reviewer). This is done in Prisma. The ranking is used as a supplement to the grading when the review panel’s applications are compared to each other. Before the review panel meeting, the individual rankings of all reviewers are weighed together into a preliminary joint ranking for each application. For more detailed instructions, please see Prisma’s User Manual.

It is very important to complete the ranking in time as some of the applications will be sifted before the panel meeting. We recommend to rank the applications towards the end of your review work and not too early as it might happen that you are allocated further applications to review at a late stage (for instance, if a conflict of interest is discovered late).

External reviewers

External review may be justified if the scientific character of an application does not correlate to the joint competence of the review panel, or in case of substantial conflict of interest within the review panel. It is the panel chair’s responsibility to identify application that requires external review, and shall propose reviewers in consultation with the personnel.
Sifting
In order to allow enough time at the panel meeting to discuss the applications having a reasonable chance of being awarded a grant, the Scientific Council has decided on a sifting process, where the applications judged not suitable for financing are screened out before the review panel meeting.

It is the chair’s task to propose which applications to be sifted. The proposal is based on the preliminary joint ranking for each application. The chair identifies a breaking point in the list, where applications below have received such low rankings that it is not assumed that they will be awarded funding. A maximum of 50 per cent of the applications can be sifted. For the applications sifted, the chair proposes an overall grade of 4 or less. Applications with an overall grade of 5 or higher cannot be sifted. The same applies for continuation grants. The chair also has the possibility to identify any application that, despite having a low ranking, should still be discussed at the meeting. This could, for example, be the case for an application where the ranking or grading by the reviewers differ considerably. In order to ensure that the process is not applied differentially for women and me, the sifting is carried out with the gender distribution of the applications in mind.

The proposed list of applications to be sifted is made available to all panel members on the bulletin board in Prisma ahead of the panel meeting. As a panel member, you always have the opportunity to ask for an application to be brought up for discussion at the meeting, even if the chair has proposed that it is sifted.

All reviewers read all applications remaining after sifting
From 2018, the Scientific Council of Medicine and Health has decided that in order to enhance the discussion at the meeting all applications that were not sifted should be read by all reviewers before the meeting (except in case of conflict of interest). After the sifting is done you need to check which applications you have not previously read that are to be discussed at the meeting and read these. You should not submit any individual grading or ranking in Prisma for these applications, but note your grades and comments and bring them with you to the meeting.

Summary of your tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>When to complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade and write detailed comments (preliminary statement) on all</td>
<td>You find the deadline for your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applications for which you are the rapporteur</td>
<td>panel in Prisma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade and write comments (assessment) on all applications for which</td>
<td>You find the deadline for your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you are a reviewer</td>
<td>panel in Prisma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank all applications allocated to you (as rapporteur and reviewer)</td>
<td>You find the deadline for your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare for the meeting by reading other panel members’ comments and</td>
<td>Before the meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preparing a short presentation of the strengths and weaknesses of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the applications where you are the rapporteur.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check the list of the screened-out applications on the bulletin</td>
<td>Before the meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>board in Prisma to determine whether any of the screened-out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applications should be brought up for discussion at the meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read the applications remaining after sifting that you have not</td>
<td>Before the meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>already reviewed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please contact the Swedish Research Council personnel and the chair</td>
<td>As soon as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if you discover during the review that you do, after all, have a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conflict of interest with any of the applications you are to review,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or if you discover any problem with an application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediately contact the Scientific Research Council if you suspect</td>
<td>As soon as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that there may be deviations from ethical guidelines or good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research practice, or if you suspect misconduct.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. REVIEW PANEL MEETING

At the review panel meeting, the applications remaining after sifting are discussed in more detail, using the grading and ranking done by you and the other panel members ahead of the meeting as a starting point. The review panel shall decide on a joint grade for each criterion as well as on an overall grade. Depending on grant a priority list is agreed upon or applications are nominated to the second step of evaluation. At the meeting, panel members are encouraged to provide feedback on the review process.

Sifted applications
At the start of the meeting, panel members can ask to have sifted applications raised for discussion.

Discussion on applications
The applications are discussed on the basis of the individual review, taking into account the five different criteria used in the review. For each application, the chair leads the discussion. It starts with the rapporteur presenting his/her assessment focusing on the strengths and weaknesses of the application, which is followed by the other reviewers giving their assessments. The chair is also responsible for including any assessments from external reviewers. For each application, the panel shall agree on the grades for each criterion and on an overall grade. The rapporteur for each application must take notes in order to finalize a comprehensive final statement.

The reviewers of an application should prepare for the discussion by reading the assessments and grades given by the other reviewers. As the meeting time is limited and all applications need to be discussed, it is important to find a balance in the time allocated to each application. The chair and the Swedish Research Council personnel will keep track of the time.

Occasionally questions are raised from panel members to the possibility to gain access to applications or assessments from previous years in order to compare progress and content of an application. However, it is important to stress that an application/applicant needs to receive a new assessment each time he/she applies to the Swedish Research Council. For that reason, the review panel will not have access to any previous applications or assessments.

If you discover any possible conflict of interest (your own or another’s) during the meeting, please bring this to attention to the chair and the Research Council personnel, and not in front of the entire panel.

Prioritisation or nomination of applications
Once all applications have been discussed, and the panel has agreed on an overall grade for each application, the panel shall, depending on grant type, prioritize or nominate the applications with the highest scientific quality.

Research Project Grants:
The panel draw up a priority list in which the panel lists the applications proposed for a grant award. The number of application in the priority list can be maximized to the numbers indicated by the estimated success rate, plus an additional 10 per cent.

Special initiatives for Research Project Grants - Infections and Antibiotics / Aging and Health:
There are special initiatives in certain areas that the Swedish Research Council has a responsibility to support or are considered to require special attention. In this call, it applies for Infections and Antibiotics and Aging and Health.
Infection and Antibiotics: To be considered under this initiative, an application must have been received by one of the Infection review panels (C1 and C2). These two panels assess the significance to the initiative by evaluating the project plan. The panels determine which applications in the priority list that falls within the Infection and Antibiotics area (for the definition of the area read Appendix 4).

Ageing and Health: To be considered under this initiative, an application can be reviewed by any of the panels A1-H2. Each panel determines which applications in the priority list that falls within the Ageing and Health area (for the definition of the area read Appendix 4). The applications that have been identified as relevant for the area are nominated from the A1-H2 panels to the second step of the evaluation (the Ageing and Health panel). The task of this panel is to rank the nominated applications and give recommendations on which applications to fund. This recommendation is the basis for the Scientific Council of Medicine and Health’s funding decision.

Starting Grants:
The panels from the same subject area (for example A1 and A2) can nominate no more than 20 per cent of the starting grant applications within the panels to the second step of the evaluation (to the Starting grant panel). Nominated applications must have an overall grade of at least 5. The nominated applications should not be ranked. After the joint evaluation of each application is done in each panel, the chairs from the specific subject area meet at the end of day 1 of the panel meeting to agree upon which applications to nominate. The starting grant panel then assesses each applicant’s “potential to be an outstanding young researcher” and gives recommendations on which applications to fund. (See Appendix 4) This recommendation is the basis for the Scientific Council of Medicine and Health’s funding decision.

Grants for Half-time Position in Clinical Research Environment:
The panels nominate high quality applications to the second step of the evaluation (to the Appointment panel). Nominated applications must be ranked. The appointment panel then recommends support for up to 3 applications. This recommendation is the basis for the Scientific Council of Medicine and Health’s funding decision.

Research Project Grant – Development of methods to replace, reduce and refine animal experiments (3R) and for Research Project Grant – Pharmaceuticals science:
The panel draw up a priority list in which the panel lists the applications proposed for a grant award within the given budgetary framework, including a number of reserves. This recommendation is the basis for the Scientific Council of Medicine and Health’s funding decision.

Special conditions
Gender equality shall be a special condition for prioritising applications of equivalent scientific quality. This means that in conjunction with the overall prioritisation, the review panel shall take into account the success rate of women and men, and if necessary prioritise applications from applicants of the under-represented gender when applications are deemed to be of equivalent quality.

Feedback
In conjunction with the review panel meeting, the panel is encouraged to provide feedback on the review work and various aspects of the process. This is usually a concluding item on the meeting agenda.

Summary of the tasks of the review panel

- Agree on grades for each individual criterion and on an overall grade for each application.
- Agree on a priority list or nominations depending on grant type.
- Contribute with feedback on the review process.
4. FINAL STATEMENT

Following the review panel meeting, it remains to write the panel’s final statement on the applications for which you have been the rapporteur. It is then the task of the chair to screen the final statements and to ensure they reflect the discussion by the review panel. As rapporteur, you may be asked to supplement the final statement.

The rapporteur writes a final statement

Following the review panel meeting, you need to finalize the panel’s statements for the applications for which you have been the rapporteur and were discussed at the panel meeting. Since the final statement is applied for funding decision and is also sent to the applicant, it is important that the discussion at the review panel meeting forms the basis how it is written. Please be advised that the statement must correspond to the grades, and describes the main strengths and weaknesses of the application, and also includes any necessary clarifications.

The preliminary statement you have entered into Prisma ahead of the review panel meeting should form the basis for the final statement. It shall, however, be modified to reflect the review panel’s joint overall evaluation. You should therefore go back to your notes from the meeting, so that the final statement includes all opinions. Usually you have one week to enter your final statements in Prisma following the end of the review panel meeting.

Write the statement for each grade as bullets and use the headings “Strengths” and “Weaknesses”. The bullets under these two headings should reflect the definition of the grade. For example, a high grade like 6 or 7 should have more strengths listed under the heading “Strengths” and fewer weaknesses listed under the heading “Weaknesses”. Contrary, a grade of 4 or 5 should have less strengths listed under the heading “Strengths” and more weaknesses listed under the heading “Weaknesses”.

Please note that you do not write a final statement for sifted applications as they will receive an overall grade and a standard final statement explaining the sifting process. These final statements are produced by the Research Council personnel.

The chair reviews all final statements

Once the final statements have been entered into Prisma, the chair will with help of the senior research officer screen all statements to ensure that they reflect the panel’s discussion, and that the written motivations correspond to the grades. It is not the task of the chair to carry out comprehensive editing. As a rapporteur, you may therefore be asked to adjust the final statement.

General advice and recommendations on final statements

When completing your final statements, you should consider the following:

- **Focus on describing both the main strengths and weaknesses of the application.** Try to emphasise relevant conceptual, structural and/or methodological issues as discussed at the review panel meeting.
- **Make sure that the written comments correspond to the grades.** It is helpful to use the definitions of the grading scale in the justifications (Outstanding, Excellent, Very good to excellent, Very good, Good, Weak, and Poor). For example, if a grade of 4 is given, the justification should contain both strengths and minor weaknesses in line with the definition of this grade.
- **Consider the guiding questions** for the different criteria when you formulate the final statement.
- **Write concisely** - the content rather than the length of the text is of significance. However, too brief justifications may counteract the aim, which is to help the applicant understand the grounds for the assessment.
• If applicable, comment on whether divergence from the general instructions for the application has been weighed into the assessment of the application.
• Use a language that is constructive and objective.

In the statements, you should avoid the following:
• Do not include a long summary about the applicant or the research described in the application. The focus should be the assessment of the application, not a description of the project.
• Do not state any individual comments (such as “I think” or “In my view”). The final statement is from the review panel collectively.
• Do not include quantifiable data, such as the exact number of publications, or bibliometric data.
• Do not include personal details (such as gender or age).
• Do not include any recommendation on whether to refuse or grant an application.
• Do not state that an application does not belong to or is unsuitable for the review panel, or for the Swedish Research Council. The review panel is obliged to review all applications in the panel.

Summary of your tasks

☐ Write the review panel’s final statement in Prisma on the applications for which you have been the rapporteur. The final statement shall be entered into Prisma no later than one week after the review panel meeting.
☐ As necessary, supplement final statements following review by the chair.
☐ Submit receipts for any expenses to the panel’s research officer responsible.
5. DECISION AND FOLLOW-UP

Decision
The board of the Swedish Research Council has delegated the decision on grants to the Scientific Council of Medicine and Health. This decision is based on the priority lists from the review panels and the Scientific Council will weigh in any justifications from the chairs regarding the priority lists and the review panels’ final statements. The decision is published shortly thereafter on vr.se and in Prisma, and the applicants are informed of the final outcome.

Follow-up
Following the review of each annual call, an internal follow-up of the process and the outcome is carried out. An important starting point for this follow-up is the feedback you provide as a panel member in conjunction with the review panel meeting. In addition, statistics of various kinds are produced.

Questions and Complaints
If you as a panel member receive any question about the evaluation of an individual application, you must refer this to the Swedish Research Council’s personnel. All complaints or questions about clarification shall be registered and then handled by the Secretary General for Medicine and Health in consultation with the chair and senior research officer of the review panel. The chair may contact you as a panel member if necessary.

Summary of your tasks

- Refer any questions about the evaluation of individual applications to the Swedish Research Council’s personnel.
- Be prepared to assist the chair and the Secretary General responsible in the event of any questions.
APPENDIX 1. THE SWEDISH RESEARCH COUNCIL IN BRIEF

The Swedish Research Council finances more than one-tenth of the research carried out at Swedish higher education institutions. Only direct government appropriations fund a larger share. The Swedish Research Council provides support for research of the highest scientific quality in all fields of science. Most of this relates to basic research.

A large part of the funding provided by the Research Council consists of support of scientific projects for which the researchers themselves have formulated the research concepts and project aims, and developed methods to arrive at conclusions. In order to facilitate career development for researchers and make it easier for them to gain broader experience of the research community, the Research Council offers career and mobility support. In addition, it provides funding for research infrastructures, research environments, graduate schools, various forms of collaboration, and Swedish membership in a number of international organisations and major research facilities.

In addition to funding research, the Swedish Research Council is also responsible for communication about research and research results. The Research Council is also tasked with preparing analyses relating to research policy, acting an advisor to the Government on research policy issues and evaluating research, and also with supporting and developing the prerequisites for clinical studies.

The vision of the Swedish Research Council is to play a leading role in developing Swedish research of the highest scientific quality, and thereby contribute to the development of society.

6.4 billion SEK for research in 2016

In 2016, the Swedish Research Council paid out 6.4 billion SEK in funding, mostly to basic research in all areas of science and to research infrastructures. A large part of the research funding went to projects that were proposed by the researchers themselves (researcher-initiated research).
Peer review

The Swedish Research Council recommends peer review as the best method of assessing scientific quality. The confidence of the research community in the Swedish Research Council is premised on the review being conducted in a knowledgeable, objective, impartial and transparent manner.

A total of 784 researchers served as members of review panels in 2016, with 39% of the members of the review panels being associated with higher education institutions outside Sweden.

Administration and organisation of the Swedish Research Council

The Swedish Research Council is a government agency within the Ministry of Education. The Research Council is headed by a board and a director general, who is the head of the agency.

The board of the Research Council has overall responsibility for operations as a whole, and makes decisions on general and strategic research issues according to the directives and guidelines adopted by the Riksdag and Government. Six of the members are elected by an assembly of electors, which, in turn, is appointed by the higher education institutions in Sweden. The chair and two further members of the board are appointed by the Government.

Below the board, there are the scientific councils for humanities and social sciences, medicine and health, and natural and engineering sciences, the council for research infrastructures, as well as the committees for educational sciences, artistic research, and development research. There are also committees for clinical therapy research and for national coordination of clinical studies.

The majority of the members of scientific councils, councils and committees are selected by the research community. As in the case of the election of the board members, they are elected by an assembly of electors. Some of the members are appointed by the board of the Swedish Research Council, while several additional members are appointed by the Government.

The Director General is responsible to the board for ensuring that operations are conducted in accordance with the directives and guidelines decided by the board. The Swedish Research Council has about 190 employees, and is divided into five departments – the departments for research funding, research policy, research infrastructure, communication and administration.

Read more in the Swedish Research Council’s Instruction Ordinance.
APPENDIX 2. SPECIFIC GUIDELINES FROM THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL FOR MEDICINE AND HEALTH

Role of the Scientific Council
The Scientific Council for Medicine and Health at the Swedish Research Council has an overarching responsibility to stimulate the best research by evaluating and funding grant proposals for medical research, and also by engaging in issues with long-term strategic impact on medicine and health. Through its work, the Scientific Council shall contribute to the Swedish Research Council being an internationally highly respected funding body of medical research, including both basic research and clinical research.

Goals of the Scientific Council
The Scientific Council should work towards achieving:
1. Increased support for research of the highest scientific quality
2. Sweden being a successful research nation
3. Collaboration and coordination of society’s research resources
4. Broad understanding of the significance of investment in medical research
5. Equality and variety within medical research
6. Increasing society’s knowledge of medical research and its results

As one means of achieving its goals, the Scientific Council has adopted the following guidelines for the evaluation process in 2018:

- The average grant level for project grants should be 1 100 000 SEK.
- The standard funding period for project grants should be four years, with the possibility to three years, and with some individual grants of five years with very high scientific quality.
- The minimum amount awarded as a project grant shall be 800 000 SEK per year, unless the call stipulates otherwise. Grants will be awarded in fixed amounts of 800 000 SEK, 1 200 000 SEK or 1 800 000 SEK.
- Starting grants will be awarded in a fixed amount of 1 500 000 SEK per year for four years.

1 The application always sets the limit, so an applicant cannot be granted more years or a higher amount than applied for.
APPENDIX 3. THE SWEDISH RESEARCH COUNCIL’S PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES FOR PEER REVIEW

The Board of the Swedish Research Council has adopted eight principles for peer review at the Swedish Research Council. The purpose of the principles is to provide a basis for safeguarding the scientific assessment, based on clear quality criteria with competent reviewers, within the framework of a sound peer review culture and good research practice. Based on these principles, guidelines for the Swedish Research Council’s peer review of research funding has been developed. The guidelines provide concrete guidelines for how the principles for peer review shall be complied with. The guidelines concern peer review of research support.

The guidelines for peer review of applications have been subsumed under the principles and brief preambles adopted by the Board, where the principles are clarified. The principles are numbered from 1 to 8. It should, however, be noted that when applying a guideline, several principles may need to be considered. The Board’s decision to adopt the principles states clearly that: “The principles should be read together. They may conflict with each other and therefore need to be balanced against each other. How the principles are balanced against each other must be discussed in each individual case. Implementing the principles in practice needs to be the subject of an ongoing discussion. The principles should therefore be recurrently raised in the review work.”

While the guidelines are general, there is room for variation justified by factors such as differences between calls and/or research areas, or variation justified by testing new ways of working. This means that different guidelines differ in character to some extent. Some guidelines consist mostly of clarifications of legislation or other mandatory regulations, or follow from requirements for the review work adopted by the Board. These guidelines must be complied with, and follow-up should be carried out in the event deviations from such guidelines are nevertheless noted. Other guidelines are of the character “comply or explain”.

A further type of guideline states that those responsible for each call or area shall formulate instructions or justify choices made specifically for a call or a subject area.

The three types of guidelines are differentiated through the use of terminology. In the first case, the word “shall” is part of the wording of the guideline. In the second case, the word “should” is used. In the third case, the guidelines state that those responsible for the call shall formulate instructions for, or specifically justify aspects of the peer review.

The guidelines are currently in the implementation phase, which means that certain activities based on these have been executed while other guidelines will be implemented in the future.

The Swedish Research Council’s Principles for Peer Review and Guidelines for Peer Review of Applications for Research Funding

Extract from the board's minutes 2017-11-15

1. Expertise in the assessment

_The assessment of applications shall be carried out by experts with a documented high scientific competence within the research area or areas or the disciplinary area or areas to which the application relates and the scientific review shall be based on clear quality criteria. Reviewers shall be appointed according to clear criteria in a systematically documented process._

---

2 Or artistic competence when relevant.
Guidelines:
1. The Swedish Research Council’s peer review shall be conducted with the help of review panels with broad and deep scientific expertise of relevance to the form of grant to be reviewed.
2. Review panel meetings shall constitute a central element of the review.
3. Scientific assessment and prioritising of applications should be separated from decisions on grants.
4. Scientific expertise is required to recruit review panel members and external reviewers.
5. For each call, there shall be documented instructions for:
   - who is recruiting review panel members and external reviewers,
   - what merits shall be represented on the review panel,
   - any requirements on the composition of the review panel, such as research area competence, limits on the number of members, and gradual replacement of members between calls for the same form of grant,
   - percentage of international members of the review panel.
6. The maximum mandate period for a review panel member shall be six years on the same review panel. After this, a waiting period of minimum three years shall apply.
7. The maximum period as chair is three years, as part of the overall mandate period of six years on a review panel. After this, a waiting period of minimum three years shall apply.
8. Review panels shall comply with the Swedish Research Council’s gender equality strategy and have numerical equality (i.e. minimum 40% of each gender).
9. Appointments to review panels shall comply with the Swedish Research Council’s conflict of interest policy.

2. Objectivity and equal treatment

All assessments shall be carried out in an equivalent manner and be based on the quality of the research planned and performed and on the applicant’s merits, irrespective of the origins or identity of the applicant. To avoid any conflict of interest or partiality, assessments shall be based on clear quality criteria and formalised processes.

Guidelines:
1. Ahead of each call, instructions shall be formulated for which grading criteria to be applied and prioritised. The application and prioritising between grading criteria shall be reflected in the instructions for submitting an application.
2. The instructions for the project plan, CV and publication list shall be designed to optimise the basis for review within each research area and form of grant.
3. Bibliometrics shall be used only with caution in the review, and only as part of an overall assessment of the merits carried out by reviewers with expertise in the area in question. Bibliometrical data gathered in conjunction with the application shall be relevant to the research area and the form of grant the call concerns.
4. The basis for assessment shall be the application, which is assessed using the reviewers’ scientific competence and judgment. Information that is not relevant to the assessment shall not be used.
5. The assessment criteria shall be defined through guiding questions, so that it is clear what is to be assessed. The assessment criteria decided by the Director-General shall always be used, and additional criteria and guiding questions shall be adapted to each research area and form of grant.
6. All assessments shall comply with the Swedish Research Council’s conflict of interest policy.
3. Ethical considerations

*The assessment presumes an ethical approach and high level of integrity. The reviewers shall not carry out any preliminary ethical review, but should take into account how the applicant discusses the research and formulates the research question with regard to good research practice. If an application includes research that clearly breaches ethical rules and/or clearly is not in compliance with Swedish or international law, this should be reflected in the assessment of the quality and/or feasibility of the research.*

**Guidelines:**

1. There shall be clear instructions for how applicants shall account for, and how reviewers shall assess the account of, the ethical considerations relevant to the research project in question, and whether the research project may entail any potential risk to humans or the natural world.
2. The assessment shall pay attention to the requirement for ethical review of research relating to humans or animals.
3. Instructions shall be drawn up in conjunction with the call for how deviations from ethical guidelines and good research practice as well as misconduct in research shall be managed in the peer review, and how such deviations shall impact on the assessment.

4. Openness and transparency

*The assessment shall be based on and justified by the documentation requested by the Swedish Research Council, which in a typical case is an application for research funding. The assessment of the application shall be based on rules and guidelines set in advance and publicly known.*

**Guidelines:**

1. All steps in the review process shall be known to the applicants, the reviewers and other researchers.
2. Information on the members of the review panel should be publicly available before the call opens.
3. The reviewers shall base their assessment on the current application and not have access to previous assessments, and should only exceptionally refer to previous applications. In the event the review process requires access to previous applications, this shall be made clear in the instructions for the call in question.
4. For each call, there shall be instructions for how final statements should be written and what they should include.

5. Appropriateness for purpose

*The peer review process shall be adapted to the call and the research area, and shall be proportional to the size and complexity of the call without neglecting legal security.*

**Guidelines:**

1. At least three panel members shall review each application ahead of the review panel’s collective prioritising.
2. When deciding on the composition of the review panel, the adaptation of the group to the nature of the task and the number of applications the panel has to assess shall be justified.
3. For each call where applicable, there shall be instructions for how applications are sifted.
4. There shall be instructions for how consultation between panels or external reviewers shall be used in the assessment.
6. Efficiency

The total resources used in the application and assessment, in terms of both time used and cost shall be minimised for all involved, i.e. applicants, reviewers and Swedish Research Council personnel, with consideration for maintaining quality, objectivity, transparency and appropriateness for purpose.

Guidelines:
1. For each decision about a call or review, it shall be taken into consideration what can be done in order to minimise the time spent and resources used (for applicants, review panel members, external reviewers and Swedish Research Council personnel) during the process from call to decision.
2. The call, application and review processes shall be predictable and changes to the processes shall be implemented with a long-term perspective.

7. Integrity

All participants in the review process shall respect the integrity of the process and shall not disclose to any third party what has been discussed at the meeting or the opinion of other reviewers in the ongoing processing of applications. The final assessment shall always be documented and published once a decision has been made.

Guidelines:
1. The review task shall be carried out with great integrity. Reviewers shall not have contacts with individual applicants regarding the application or the review, either during or after the review process.
2. All communication between applicants and the Swedish Research Council concerning the review process, including the grounds on which decisions are made, shall be carried out via the personnel responsible at the Swedish Research Council.
3. There shall be instructions for how reviewers shall proceed when they encounter limitations or problems in reviewing parts of the subject content of an application.

8. The peer review shall be prepared and followed up in a structured manner.

Review processes and reviewers shall be prepared and followed up according to clear criteria. All reviewers shall have access to the same type of documentation for the review.

Guidelines:
1. Review panel members and the review panel chair, as well as external reviewers, shall receive training at an early stage of the review process in:
   - how the assessment shall be made and what is to be assessed,
   - application of conflict of interest rules and the Swedish Research Council’s conflict of interest policy,
   - the application of the Swedish Research Council’s gender equality strategy in the review of applications,
   - how unconscious bias can affect opinions,
   - good research practice and ethical considerations,
   - how the final statements shall be formulated,
   - rules for communication among reviewers and between reviewers and applicants,
• the chair shall also receive training in all the stages of the review, including recruitment practices and the design and group dynamics of the review panel meeting.

2. There shall be written descriptions for the task of the chair, panel members, and observers (if any participate).

3. The peer review shall always be followed up in a systematic way in order to continuously improve the review processes.

4. The follow-up of a call shall include the overall number of persons asked to participate in a review panel or, if any, as external reviewers, and a summary description of the reasons given for why panel members and external reviewers have declined participation.

5. There shall be instructions relating to the handling of feedback and complaints from applicants.
APPENDIX 4. HANDLING OF SPECIAL INITIATIVES, APPLICATIONS FOR PROJECT GRANTS AND STARTING GRANTS

Project grant applications under the Infection and Antibiotics initiative

To be considered under the Infection and Antibiotics initiative, an application must have been received by one of the Infection review panels (C1 and C2). These two review panels assess the significance to the initiative by evaluating the project plan. The panels are responsible for determining which applications fall within or outside the Infection and Antibiotics area. Applications that cannot be financed via funds from the special initiative then compete, in the usual way, for grants within the Swedish Research Council’s budget framework.

The Swedish Research Council’s description of the Infection and Antibiotics area

Infectious diseases are one of the main causes of illness and mortality in the world. Pneumococcal infection, tuberculosis, acute respiratory infections like pneumonia, as well as infections associated with childbirth all lead to high mortality, not least in children and the new-born. HIV, malaria, diarrhoea are other examples of severe infections, as well as different kinds of influenza epidemics that are often spread to several parts of the world.

Parallel to this, increased antibiotic resistance among pathogenic bacteria, and the spread of these bacteria among humans and animals is a major global health challenge. Efficient antibiotic treatment is crucial in all kinds of procedures that increase the risk of infection, such as cancer treatment, transplantations and surgical procedures. This means that antibiotic resistance is a threat to modern health care, and it is also a significant burden from a socio-economic perspective.

The area of Infection and Antibiotics includes both basic and clinical research in areas such as immunology, microbiology and health care and public health research. Examples of important research topics are studies on molecular mechanisms in bacterial infection, development of new antibacterial agents and efficient new diagnostics methods, mechanisms for resistance development, healthcare-associated infections, vaccines and other infection prevention and control measures, how antibiotics are processed within humans and animals, health economics and the effects of antibiotics on the environment.

Project grant applications under the Ageing and Health initiative

To be considered under the Ageing and Health initiative, an application can been received by any of the panels A1-H2. The panels are responsible for determining which applications fall within or outside the Ageing and Health area. The identified applications from the eighteen panels are nominated to the second step of the evaluation (the ageing and health panel). The ageing and health panel rank the nominated applications and gives recommendations on which applications to fund. This recommendation is the basis for the Scientific Council of Medicine and Health’s funding decision. Applications that cannot be financed via funds from the special initiative then compete, in the usual way, for grants within the Swedish Research Council’s budget framework.

The Swedish Research Council’s description of the Ageing and Health area

For many persons, ageing is associated with deteriorating health, and many suffer from age-related diseases or diseases that almost exclusively occur in older persons. Older patients with health problems are one of the greatest challenges within medical care.

Ever increasing numbers of older patients will require life-long treatment, where knowledge about subsidiary groups of diseases and the effects of medicines needs to increase to achieve optimal effect with minimised side
effects. The side effect panorama also differs in older patients compared to younger ones, and is significantly less well documented.

More research is required to understand specific factors and molecular mechanisms that impact on the onset of diseases in ageing individuals, and that impact on health and the disease. Basic research is important for facilitating the transfer of molecular and genetic findings into clinical practice and treatment. The area of “personalised medicine”, or individualised medicine, aims to tailor medicines and other forms of treatment according to the patient’s individual prerequisites, and thereby enable offering more effective treatment, with greater precision and fewer side effects. The area covers many different fields of research, such as the development of individualised diagnostics, prevention and medication, more efficient use of existing medicines and the development of new treatments for treating disease in older persons. The large amount of data that is in part already available, or can be generated by new research, constitutes a major resource for characterising disease mechanisms and disease progress in an ageing population. Collection and analysis of and research into this considerable material provides entirely new prerequisites for increasingly individualised treatment, where the results are expected to provide new knowledge about disease mechanisms and where it is possible to predict the type of treatment a certain patient needs.

Starting grants

Applications for starting grants are evaluated by the regular review panels in medicine and health (A1–H2). These applications are evaluated as a separate category and are not compared to regular project grants, but reviewed and graded separately. Applications for starting grants compete for a budget specially allocated for this purpose.

Nomination

Panels from the same subject area (for example A and A2) are given the opportunity to nominate 20 per cent of the starting grant applications reviewed by the panels in total. Nominations should mirror the application ratio between the genders. Nominated applications must have an overall grade of at least 5. The nominated applications should not be given an internal ranking. After the joint evaluation of each application is done in the separate panels the chairs from a specific subject area will have a scheduled meeting in the end of day 1 at the review panel meeting in order to agree upon which applications to nominate.

Assessment

Since the Starting panel reads the final statements for the nominated applications, it is crucial that the statements identify each application’s strengths and weaknesses to serve as a basis for the final evaluation. It is not the task of the Starting panel to reconsider field-specific, scientific assessments, but to assess the researcher’s potential to develop into a successful researcher. It is the Starting panel’s task to assess the support letter.

Funding/budget

In order for a final funding decision to be made by the Scientific Council, the Starting panel shall produce a list of the applications that are recommended for funding. This recommendation must mirror the application ratio between the genders. The Starting panel shall also submit a reserve list for funding.

Panel composition and meeting

The Starting panel shall consist of international members. It will meet on 8 – 9 October to prepare its recommendation for funding prior to the Scientific Council’s decision meeting.
The Swedish Research Council’s Conflict of Interest Policy

Decision 10 April 2014

1. Why does the Swedish Research Council have a conflict of interest policy?

The conflict of interest policy is an important tool in safeguarding the principle of objectivity laid down in the Swedish constitution. This means that government agencies must maintain objectivity and impartiality, and consider the equality of all persons before the law. Its purpose is to prevent conflicts of interest involving representatives of government agencies, in situations where their objectivity could be questioned. The conflict of interest policy is significant not only in terms of the protection of legal rights, but also in terms of public confidence in government agencies.

The Swedish Research Council differs from many other government agencies in that the majority of the members in the Council’s decision-making and reviewing bodies are active researchers chosen by the research community. They are thus directly affected by the agency’s allocation of research funds. Moreover, the application selection process comprises a number of intermediate steps that can potentially affect the outcome of decisions, such as the control of formal requirements, decisions to screen out applications, the distribution of applications among the review panels and reviewers, assessments made by individual reviewers and by the review panels, the implementation of decisions and the management of complaints. The Swedish Research Council also provides assessments, appoints representatives to external agencies, is involved in strategic planning, responds to proposals, participates in communication activities, etc. Some of this work is done by peer reviewers, i.e. experts within a certain field of research who assess applications in the same field. In order not to jeopardise the rule of law or public trust, it is important that all the Swedish Research Council's work is conducted in a manner that not only prevents conflicts of interest, but also allows for the handling of ambiguous and sensitive situations.

Responsibility for ensuring the conflict of interest policy is complied with rests with the Swedish Research Council, but also on its individual administrators. The term “administrator” is used here in a broad sense to denote anyone within the Swedish Research Council organisation who could affect the outcome of a matter, and includes officials, appointed reviewers and elected members.

2. What is conflict of interest?

Provisions regulating conflicts of interest can be found in the Administrative Procedure Act (1986:223).

Section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act – which is applicable to the Swedish Research Council as a government agency – stipulates that an administrator enters into a conflict of interest if:

- the matter in question concerns himself or his spouse, parents, children, brothers or sisters or someone else who is closely related to him, or if he or someone closely related to him can expect extraordinary advantage or detriment from the outcome of the matter; or
- there is some other special circumstance that is likely to undermine confidence in his impartiality in the matter.

3. Consequences of a conflict of interest

Section 12 of the Administrative Procedure Act describes the consequences of a conflict of interest. It states that:

- someone who has a conflict of interest may not handle the matter in question;
• someone who is aware of a circumstance that could be interpreted as a conflict of interest must disclose it of their own accord; and
• if an issue regarding conflict of interest has been raised, the government agency must immediately take action and reach a decision.

The general rule is that the person who has a conflict of interest may neither undertake any preparatory measures nor participate in the resolution of the matter. It is therefore very important that an administrator, regardless of the grounds of the conflict of interest and at every step of the review process, avoids administering any application in which a conflict of interest has been established. In addition, someone who is aware of a circumstance that could be interpreted as a conflict of interest must disclose it of their own accord. If an issue regarding conflict of interest has been raised, the Swedish Research Council must immediately take action and resolve the issue.

4. Situations that may involve a conflict of interest
The following situations present a particular conflict of interest risk and/or can be interpreted as ambiguous in terms of credibility. Individual situations must be assessed on their nature and extent as well as on how long they have been going on.

The following situations typically constitute a conflict of interest:
• when there is a relationship of dependency between an administrator in a certain matter and an applicant/participant in another matter. For instance, if the applicant/participant has been asked to evaluate the administrator's qualifications, grant application, institution or subject area;
• when an administrator has an ongoing or recently terminated close collaboration with an applicant/participant, such as a teacher-student relationship, or runs a joint research project with an applicant/participant. The relationship between a doctoral student and his/her supervisor is considered a conflict of interest regardless of how long ago the collaboration occurred;
• when there is evident friendship, enmity or difference of opinion;
• when there is financial dependence; and
• when there is a manager-employee relationship.

The following situations may constitute a conflict of interest:
• the co-authorship of books or articles. As a rule, case administration should be avoided in cases of research collaboration and co-authorship which occurred in the last 5 years. A joint article or a joint chapter in an edited book is enough to establish co-authorship. Co-authorship that occurred more than five years ago can also constitute conflict of interest. The determining factor will be whether or not it was the result of close, professional collaboration, and will be judged on a case-by-case basis;
• when an administrator belongs to the same institution (particularly small and medium-sized ones) or a similar financially independent entity as an applicant/participant; and
• when the nature of someone's involvement in the matter easily arouses suspicion that the basis for impartial assessment is compromised.

5. Prevention of conflict of interest
The following guidelines have been established by the Swedish Research Council in order to prevent conflict of interest situations.
• Applications should be assigned to the administrators of the relevant Scientific Councils, committees and review panels at an early stage, and the administrators shall be requested to report any possible conflicts of interest.
• Conflicts of interest should be addressed and avoided when the review panels are appointed and the applications are distributed. In some cases, this can be achieved by postponing the appointment of the review panels until after the applications have been received, or through the redistribution of an application to another group.
• An administrator at risk of conflict of interest shall not be appointed rapporteur.
• An administrator at risk of conflict of interest shall not be present when an application is evaluated by the review panel.
• Even in terms of participants, possible conflicts of interest should be taken into account as far as possible. The term “participant” refers to researchers who play a crucial or central role in the implementation of the proposed research.
• In the recruitment, preference should as far as possible be given to administrators who do not intend to apply directly for grant funding or join a grant application during their time as administrators.
• Collective administration of matters, i.e., the administration of several matters in parallel, for example when a Scientific Council decides on a large number of applications at once on the basis of a list of priorities established by a review panel, attention must in so far as possible be paid to potential conflicts of interest.
• Applications for research funding from members of the Board, the Scientific Councils, the councils, the committees and the review panels shall not be considered by the group of which the member is Chair, Member or Observer. This Th applies whether the member is an applicant or a participant.

6. Management of conflicts of interest
The preceding guidelines cannot completely prevent the occurrence of conflicts of interest. Common conflict of interest situations arise:
• when a Research Council member or Board member applies for a grant; or
• when an application falls within a highly specialised field where it is not possible to find review panels members without close links to the applicant.

In such cases, written assessments must be obtained from at least two external experts.

The following measures must be taken when administering a case of conflict of interest:
• The individual who has a conflict of interest must leave the room. This provision remains in effect for the duration of the evaluation process.
• Any conflict of interest, i.e., both in cases where it exists and where it has been examined and found not to exist, must be documented throughout the evaluation process.
• If the minutes of a meeting are not recorded, a record of conflict of interest must be registered regardless.

7. Communication of the conflict of interest policy
Questions and discussions regarding conflicts of interest may arise within all of the Swedish Research Council's activities. It is therefore essential that all administrators are well-informed about the Swedish Research Council's conflict of interest policy. To ensure this:
• all new employees should be informed of the Swedish Research Council's conflict of interest policy and its implications should be discussed as part of their work introduction;
• administrators involved in the application review activities should be given the opportunity to discuss conflicts of interest and the procedure for handling such conflicts before and after the application review, in order to raise suggestions for ways to improve the work;
• the conflict of interest policy should be included in the instructions for reviewers;
• the conflict of interest policy should be communicated to the scientific councils, councils, committees, review panel chairs and review panel members;
• handling procedures for grants that are entirely or partially evaluated without coordination by the scientific councils or committees should include methods for managing conflicts of interest;
• the appointed official should play a central role in communicating the conflict of interest policy when the review is conducted entirely or partially outside of the review work coordinated by the scientific councils or committees;
• it should be made clear during review panel meetings that questions regarding conflicts of interest may be raised for discussion at any time; and
• the Chief Legal Officer should have overall responsibility for the Swedish Research Council's management of conflict of interest issues.

8. Validity
This conflict of interest policy takes effect on 1 May 2014, and will remain in effect until further notice. It hereby replaces previously adopted rules for conflict of interest.
Clarification of specific conflict of interest situations in medicine and health
A conflict of interest exists when the persons in question have been involved in a scientific collaboration or joint production within the preceding five (5) years. A jointly authored article is sufficient to count as joint production. When the collaboration has been particularly close, the five-year period may be extended. A conflict of interest exists in the relationship between a doctoral student and the supervisor, no matter how long ago the collaboration took place. A further exception from the five-year rule may be made for collaborations in the form of multicentre studies. These are assessed case by case.

Reporting a conflict of interest
Shortly after the deadline for applications, the chair and panel members shall report (in Prisma) any conflicts of interest in the panels with the same subject orientation. For example, a member of A1 shall report conflicts of interest for the applications submitted to both A1 and A2, a member of B2 shall report conflicts of interest for the applications submitted to both B1 and B2, etc. This is to reduce the number of applications that must be reallocated at a later stage to other members owing to conflict of interest.
If applications are identified that need to be moved to another alphabetical group (A-H), the members of the panel to which an application is moved will be informed and asked to report any conflict of interest in respect of the “new” application.

Handling of reported conflicts of interest in review panel meetings
At each review panel meeting, there is a list of all the conflicts of interest reported by all persons present in the room (i.e. chair, vice-chair, members, observers and Swedish Research Council personnel). Before each application is discussed, Swedish Research Council personnel will check the names on the list and ask the persons who reported a conflict of interest to leave the room. They may only return once the discussion of the application has finished and the other reviewers on the panel have agreed on joint grades. Members who become aware of a conflict of interest during a meeting must immediately report this. The chair, the member and the Swedish Research Council personnel will then discuss how to proceed with the matter.

Special handling of applications from a Scientific Council member
When an application is submitted by a Scientific Council member or a member of the Swedish Research Council’s board, written statements must be obtained from two external reviewers. The external statements are weighed into the final assessment given by the review panel responsible for evaluating the application.
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The Swedish Research Council’s gender equality strategy

Goals for achieving gender equality at the Swedish Research Council
In compliance with its instruction, the Swedish Research Council promotes gender equality throughout its sphere of activities. The strategy for achieving this aim is to strive for gender equality throughout the organisation. Hence, the Swedish Research Council has established the following operational goals:

The Swedish Research Council shall:
1) achieve and maintain an equal gender distribution in its review panels;
2) ensure that the percentages of female and male applicants for grants from the Swedish Research Council correspond to the percentages of women and men among the potential research grant applicants;
3) ensure that women and men have the same success rates\(^1\) and receive the same average grant amounts, taking into account the nature of the research and the type of grant\(^2\);
4) include a gender equality perspective in each analysis and evaluation, where possible;
5) integrate a gender equality perspective in the Research Council’s external communication.

The board has the responsibility for implementation of the Swedish Research Council’s strategy. Achieving the goals requires the involvement of the entire agency, including the scientific councils and other councils and committees (SCCCs)\(^3\).

Unless otherwise specified, the Director General is responsible for advancing the efforts towards achieving equality.

Introduction
This strategy applies to the Swedish Research Council as a research funding body. A special equal opportunities plan addresses the work of achieving equality within the Swedish Research Council as a public agency.

The primary objective of the Swedish Research Council is to allocate funding to research of the highest scientific quality and that best promotes innovation. Achieving this objective requires impartial assessment of grant applications. Impartial assessment implies gender neutrality; the Swedish Research Council shall support the best researchers, regardless of gender.

The Swedish Research Council assumes that research capacity exists to the same extent in both sexes. Moreover, the Swedish Research Council assumes that research is benefited when both genders participate and apply their expertise and experience.

---

\(^1\) Attainment of the goal must of course be assessed in the context of a sufficiently large number of decisions.

\(^2\) Success rates for women and men refer to the percentage of applications approved among total applications received from women and men respectively.

\(^3\) These include the Scientific Council for Humanities and Social Sciences, the Scientific Council for Medicine and Health, the Scientific Council for Natural and Engineering Sciences, the Council for Research Infrastructures, the Educational Sciences Committee, the Committee for Artistic Research, the Committee for Development Research and the Committee for Clinical Treatment Research.
Gender equality is also a matter of justice. Women and men should have equal opportunities to conduct research and develop professional careers as researchers.

Achieving gender equality throughout the Swedish Research Council’s spheres of activity requires persistent, long-term effort and continuous attention to assure that the ground gained towards equality is not lost. The agency must continually monitor and analyse its activities from an equality perspective and take necessary steps based on the results. The Swedish Research Council should also inform others about its actions in gender equality.

Moreover, the Swedish Research Council must consider how the results of gender research might contribute towards improving equality throughout the Research Council’s sphere of activity.

Laws, ordinances, and appropriation directions
Equality between women and men is addressed by a body of laws and regulations, such as the Instrument of Government Chapter 1 Section 2 (part of the Swedish constitution), the Discrimination Act (2008:467), the Higher Education Act (1992:1434), and the Higher Education Ordinance (1993:100).

The objective of the governmental gender equality policy is that women and men are to have the same power to shape society and their own lives. This overall objective has four interim objectives: (i) economic equality; (ii) equal division of power and influence; (iii) equal distribution of unpaid housework and provision of care; (iv) men’s violence against women must stop. The operations and gender equality strategy of the Swedish Research Council relate primarily to the first two interim objectives.

According to the Swedish Research Council’s Instructions Ordinance (2009:975) Section 1 Item 14, the Swedish Research Council must promote equality between women and men within its sphere of activity. In accordance with the requirements established by its government directive, the goals achieved must be presented in the annual reports of the Swedish Research Council.

Processes for achieving goals
The Swedish Research Council must analyse its activities from a perspective of gender equality and follow up on the extent to which the goals have been achieved. This should be done annually in conjunction with the presentation to the board regarding the outcome of the year’s general call and in conjunction with producing the annual report. Equality issues must be discussed by the board and by other parts of the organisation, and necessary actions must be taken. Furthermore, a comprehensive analysis of gender equality must be conducted at the end of the board’s three-year term of office. When a new board takes office, it must review the gender equality strategy and where necessary decide on changes to the strategy.

The following points describe how the operational goals should be achieved.

1. Equal gender distribution in Swedish Research Council review panels

“In the Swedish Research Council should achieve and maintain an equal gender distribution in its review panels.” (Goal 1)

In this context, equal gender distribution is considered to exist in a panel when neither of the sexes comprises less than 40 % of the panel members.

Gender distribution should be considered before appointing review panels, not least with respect to the chair positions. Work involving equality should take a long-term perspective. This means, for example, that in certain areas where women or men are greatly underrepresented among teachers and researchers at higher education institutions, the Swedish Research Council must be observant not to over-utilise those few women or men.

If the composition of a review panel, or review panel chair proposed to a scientific council, council or committee falls outside of the 40 % to 60 % range, this must be specified in the documentation prepared for the decision. This documentation must also include a justification for the deviation and describe the actions taken to achieve an equal gender distribution.

Gender equality aspects should also be considered when appointing participants to other groups and when making decisions concerning Swedish Research Council representation on external (national and international) bodies.
2. Grant application rates by women and men

“The Swedish Research Council should ensure that the percentages of female and male applicants for grants from the Swedish Research Council correspond to the percentages of women and men among the potential research grant applicants.” (Goal 2).

Currently, women and men are applying for research grants from the Swedish Research Council at rates corresponding to their proportion in the potential pool of research grant applicants. Should this situation change in the future, the Swedish Research Council would actively recruit more applications from the underrepresented gender.

3. Same success rates for women and men

“The Swedish Research Council should ensure that women and men have the same success rates and receive the same average size of grants, taking into account the nature of the research and the type of grant.” (Goal 3).

Before the Swedish Research Council decides to introduce a new type of grant or makes a new research investment the effects on gender equality must be analysed and consideration given to whether any special measures are necessary. The analysis should address gender equality at the total level and also be according to the different types of grants and subject areas.

The task of the Swedish Research Council to promote gender equality throughout its sphere of activities, as well as gender equality as a factor for raising quality should be emphasized. The texts of calls, evaluation criteria and review formats should be considered from an equality perspective.

Members of scientific councils and other councils and committees and the members of review panels must be informed about the Swedish Research Council’s gender equality strategy. The review panels shall be instructed on gender equality issues during the information meetings prior to the review work. Other experts involved must also be informed of the strategy (available in Swedish and English).

The Swedish Research Council’s review handbooks must include written instructions for the review panels, giving attention to the following:

- that all evaluation criteria must be clear and explicit. When the call is issued, the criteria and the instructions for applicants must be published on the Swedish Research Council’s website;
- that only “active research years” should be considered in evaluating the extent of scientific productivity, i.e. time off for parental leave, sick leave, or similar circumstances should be deducted.

Prior to each new review cycle, the research officers at the Swedish Research Council must discuss the above instructions with the review panels.

Before a review panel submits its proposal for allocating research grants, it must calculate the proposed success rates and average size of grants for women and men, respectively.

The secretaries general must present the review panels’ grant allocation proposals, from an equality perspective, to the respective scientific council, other council or committee (SCCC), commenting on possible gender disparities in success rates and average grant amounts. These presentations must be delivered before the SCCCs make their decisions. The respective SCCCs must attach to their decision a collective assessment of the results in relation to the Swedish Research Council’s gender equality strategy. These assessments should include comments by the SCCCs concerning possible disparities, as mentioned above, and a plan/strategy to rectify them. A written consensus opinion from each of the SCCCs must be forwarded to the board.

In conjunction with the Director General’s and the SCCCs’ presentation to the board regarding the outcome of the annual calls for proposals, the success rates for women and men must be presented for each SCCC and each grant type. The average grant amount must also be reported by gender. A summary of the results shall be

---

4 See Note 1.
included in the Swedish Research Council’s annual report. Presentations by the SCCCs to the Board must include comments on possible disparities as regards the matters mentioned above, and a plan to rectify any disparities.

4 Gender equality perspective in analyses and evaluations

“The Swedish Research Council should include a gender equality perspective in each analysis and evaluation, where possible” (Goal 4).

A gender equality perspective should be included in every analysis and evaluation in so far as possible. This should also apply to memoranda, responses to consultations, documentation for discussion and decision-making, where relevant and possible. Direct and eventual indirect consequences for gender balance should be discussed in each analysis and evaluation. In those cases where a gender equality perspective has been deemed not possible or relevant, a specific justification should be given. Gender balance should always be strived for in review panels and where external authors or experts are used. A statement of how the Research Council has fulfilled this objective should be provided annually to the board.

5 A gender equality perspective in external communications

“The Swedish Research Council shall integrate a gender equality perspective in its external communication” (Goal 5).

A gender equality perspective shall be integrated in the Research Council’s external communications in all communication channels; it should also be clear in relevant contexts that the Swedish Research Council works to attain gender equality. The external image conveyed by the Swedish Research Council shall be gender-neutral in other respects too, and not reinforce gender stereotypes of, for example, researchers or subject areas. A statement of how the Research Council has fulfilled this objective should be provided annually to the board, at the latest when the annual report is submitted to the Government.
APPENDIX 8. ETHICS PRINCIPLES: APPROVALS AND GOOD RESEARCH PRACTICE

The administrating organisation is responsible for ensuring that the research project complies with the terms and conditions established by Swedish law.

The applicant (project leader) has the responsibility to acquire all necessary approvals for the research that receives a grant from the Swedish Research Council.

- Research involving animal experiments requires approval from the Ethical Committee on Animal Experiments, in accordance with the Swedish Animal Welfare Act (1988:534).
- Research concerning humans and biological material from humans, and which falls under the Act on Ethical Review of Research Involving Humans (2003:460), requires review and approval from an ethical review board.
- Some research may require additional approvals, such as research involving pharmaceuticals, genetically modified organisms, or ionising radiation.

The Swedish Research Council assumes that the necessary permits and approvals have been obtained for the research covered by a grant application to the Swedish Research Council and that research conducted with funding from the Swedish Research Council adheres to good research practice. For applications to the Swedish Research Council the following applies:

- Approvals and permits should not be sent to the Swedish Research Council.
- The applicant must present in the application the ethical issues associated with the research and describe how they will be addressed during the research project.
- The applicant and the administrating organisation confirm by signing the application that the necessary permits and approvals are in place at the start of the project, for example in relation to ethical review, and that the project will be conducted in accordance with Swedish law.
- The project leader and the representative of the administrating organisation confirm, when they accept the terms and conditions of the funding decision, that they take responsibility for obtaining any necessary approvals.

1 Administrating organisation: A state agency or physical or legal person within whose organisation the research is conducted. Universities or higher education institutions often serve as the administrating organisation for research conducted with funding from the Swedish Research Council.
APPENDIX 9. REVIEW PANELS WITHIN MEDICINE AND HEALTH

Review Panels and their members
Chairs are indicated with an asterisk*

A1: Rörelseorganens sjukdomar, oral hälsa och käkens sjukdomar
Muscolo-skeletal diseases, Oral health and Maxillofacial diseases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maria Bokarewa*</td>
<td>Göteborgs universitet (GU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helene Alexanderson</td>
<td>Karolinska Institutet (KI)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagihan Bostanci</td>
<td>Karolinska Institutet (KI)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Michaelsson</td>
<td>Uppsala universitet (UU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Rice</td>
<td>University of Helsinki</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Søgaard</td>
<td>University of Southern Denmark</td>
<td>Danmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piet van Riel</td>
<td>Bernhoven</td>
<td>Nederländerna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A2: Rörelseorganens sjukdomar, anestesiologi och radiologi
Muscolo-skeletal diseases, Anaesthesiology and Radiology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eva Forssell-Aronsson*</td>
<td>Göteborgs universitet (GU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Karlsson</td>
<td>Göteborgs universitet (GU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lars Larsson</td>
<td>Karolinska Institutet (KI)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lars Lönn</td>
<td>University of Copenhagen</td>
<td>Danmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pia Maly Sundgren</td>
<td>Lunds universitet (LU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodil Steen Rasmussen</td>
<td>Aarhus university</td>
<td>Danmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddie Weitzberg</td>
<td>Karolinska Institutet (KI)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo Baslund</td>
<td>Rigshospitalet</td>
<td>Danmark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B1: Endokrinologi/metabola sjukdomar, gynekologi, reproduktion/perinatalforskning
Endocrinology/Metabolic diseases, Gynecology and Reproduction/Perinatal research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carina Mallard*</td>
<td>Göteborgs universitet (GU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tore Bengtsson</td>
<td>Stockholms universitet (SU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineta Fellman</td>
<td>Lunds universitet (LU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Herlenius</td>
<td>Karolinska Institutet (KI)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo Jacobsson</td>
<td>Göteborgs universitet (GU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valeriya Lyssenko</td>
<td>Lunds universitet (LU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flemming Pociot</td>
<td>Herlev hospital</td>
<td>Danmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inger Sundström Poromaa</td>
<td>Uppsala universitet (UU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anders Tengholm</td>
<td>Uppsala universitet (UU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B2: Endokrinologi/metabola sjukdomar inkluderande gastrointestinatala sjukdomar
Endocrinology/Metabolic diseases including Gastrointestinal diseases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henrik Sjövall*</td>
<td>Göteborgs Institutet (GU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattias Bluher</td>
<td>University Hospital Leipzig</td>
<td>Tyskland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Carlsson</td>
<td>Uppsala universitet (UU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid Dahlman</td>
<td>Karolinska Institutet (KI)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommy Olsson</td>
<td>Umeå universitet (UMU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefano Romeo</td>
<td>Göteborgs universitet (GU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Svensson</td>
<td>Uppsala universitet (UU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrik Thorlacius</td>
<td>Lunds Universitet (LU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ola Winqvist</td>
<td>Karolinska Institutet (KI)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C1: Infektion

**Infections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ann-Beth Jonsson*</td>
<td>Stockholms universitet (SU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesca Chiudi</td>
<td>Karolinska Institutet (KI)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristina Eriksson</td>
<td>Göteborgs universitet (GU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heiko Herwald</td>
<td>Lunds universitet (LU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jörgen Johansson</td>
<td>Umeå universitet (UmU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Larsson</td>
<td>Linköpings universitet (LU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Maule</td>
<td>Queen's university of Belfast</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Ranford-Cartwright</td>
<td>University of Glasgow</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo Söderquist</td>
<td>Örebro universitet (ÖU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C2: Infektion, luftvägarnas sjukdomar, allergi inkluderande hudsjukdomar

**Infections, Respiratory tract diseases, Allergy including Dermatology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gunnar Nilsson*</td>
<td>Karolinska Institutet (KI)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilkka Harvima</td>
<td>Eastern University of Finland</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans Jürgen Hoffman</td>
<td>Aarhus University, Danmark</td>
<td>Danmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Jansson</td>
<td>Lunds universitet (LU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Jenmalm</td>
<td>Linköpings universitet (LiU)</td>
<td>Sverige</td>
</tr>
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