Peer review handbook

Medicine and health 2024

Contents

Foreword **5**
Introduction **6**
New features in the review process 2024 6
Additional calls 6
Subfocus area precision medicine 6
Additional information regarding the applicant's competence and merits 6
Publications and other research outputs 6
The research plan 6
Changes specific for Project grant within medicine and health 7
AI in the assessment of applications 7
AI in applications 7
Important starting points and principles 7
Peer review 7
Conflict of interest 7
Gender equality 8
Confidentiality and integrity 8
Roles in the review process 8
Chair and vice chair 8
Panel member 8
Observer 9
Swedish Research Council personnel 9
Secretary general 9

Call and preparations **10**
The call 10
Prisma 11
How we allocate applications to review panels 11
Reporting any conflict of interest 11
Reviewers and rapporteurs 11
Chair meeting 12
Workshop for reviewers 12
Technical preparations 12
Preparations: summary 12

Review **13**
Individual review 13
Deviations in the application 13
Irrelevant information 13
Ask for advice from others only in exceptional cases 14
Ethical aspects 14
Sex and gender perspectives 14
Assessment criteria 14
Guiding questions 15
Additional assessment criterion used in the 3R review panel 17

Additional assessment criterion for assessment of Project grant for research into viral zoonoses (MH-04B) 17
Additional assessment criterion for assessment of Grant for research time within primary care (MH-13) 18
Grading scales 18
Ranking applications 19
External reviewers 19
Review: summary 19

Sifting and review 21
Sifting 21
All reviewers read all applications remaining after sifting and give overall grades 21
Prepare for the meeting 21
Review: sifting and review 22

Review panel meeting 23
Sifted applications 23
Discussion of applications 23
All applications shall be treated equally 23
Conflict of interest during the review meeting 24
Prioritisation 24
Project grants 24
Starting and Consolidator grants 24
Grant for research time in a clinical environment 25
Grant for research time within primary care 25
Feedback 25
Review panel meeting: summary 25

Final statement 27
The rapporteur writes the final statement 27
The chair reviews all final statements 27
General advice and recommendations on final statements 27
Completing the final statements, you must 28
Completing the final statements, you must not 28
Statement: summary 28

Decision and follow-up 29
Decision 29
Follow-up 29
Complaints and questions 29
Decision and follow-up: summary 29

Appendix 1: Review panels within medicine and health 30
MH-01A: Molecular medicine 30
MH-01B: Molecular medicine 31
MH-02: Molecular medicine and therapy 31
MH-03A: Immunity and inflammation 32
MH-03B: Immunity and inflammation 32
MH-04A: Infection 33
MH-04B: Infection 33
MH-05: Circulation and respiration 34
MH-06: Surgical disciplines 35

MH-07: Women's and children's health....35
MH-08A: Cancer....36
MH-08B: Cancer and hematology....36
MH-09: Endocrinology, gastroenterology and metabolism....37
MH-10: Neurosciences....38
MH-11: Neurology and sensory organs....38
MH-12: Mental health....39
MH-13: Health care sciences....39
MH-14A: Public health sciences....40
MH-14B: Public health sciences....41
MH-3R: Development of methods to replace, reduce and refine animal experiments....41
MH-CARRER (Career grant panel)....42

Appendix 2. Relevance for subfocus areas....43
For applications in precision medicine....43
Guiding questions:....43

Foreword

Welcome as an expert reviewer for the Swedish Research Council's peer review process in Medicine and Health for 2024 and our calls for project grants, starting grants, consolidator grants and grants for research time. 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 the final statements for the 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 the instructions carefully, so that you are well prepared for your review work.

Thank you for your efforts and welcome as a reviewer for the Swedish Research Council!

Madeleine Durbeej-Hjalt

Secretary General, Medicine and health

Introduction

This handbook is designed to reflect the review process step by step. We want to make it easy for you as a panel member to find the information you need for the tasks to be carried out in each step. The different steps of the review process are:

New features in the review process 2024

Additional calls

This year we have two topic specific additional calls; Grant for research time within primary care and Project grant for research into viral zoonoses. The latter initiative is part of the national research programme on viruses and pandemics.

Subfocus area precision medicine

In addition to the general budget for undirected grants in medicine and health, we have this year earmarked funding for the specific subfocus area precision medicine. The applicants are asked to state if the proposed research is relevant for precision medicine or not. If they have ticked “Yes”, and the application is nominated/ranked, the panel should decide if the relevance is sufficient for being granted funds earmarked for this type of research. There is a relevance text and specific guiding questions to facilitate this step.

Additional information regarding the applicant’s competence and merits

A new contextualising part has been introduced in the application, which should be seen as a complement to the other parts of the application that describes the applicant’s competence. In this part, the applicant should describe how the merits that have been listed in the CV and under “Publications and other research output” show the competence to carry out the proposed research.

Publications and other research outputs

The list of publications in the application is now called “Publications and other research outputs.” It consists of two parts where the applicant must separate between publications and research outputs that have been peer-reviewed and not peer-reviewed.

The research plan

The subheading "Clinical significance" has been removed from the research plan. The reason is that the Swedish Research Council funds all types of research within medicine and health, including basic research. If relevant, the

applicant can still describe the clinical significance of the project under the subheading "Significance and scientific novelty".

Changes specific for Project grant within medicine and health

For the Project grant within medicine and health, there is a new section in the application where the applicant is asked to describe results from previous grants from the Swedish Research Council that end 2024 or earlier and that have not been reported yet. There is also a new guiding question for evaluation of the criterion Merits of the applicant (that applies to all calls): "To what extent has the applicant previously demonstrated that he or she can successfully execute a research project?"

As described in detail in the section "Review panel meeting" below, the ranking procedure at the review panel meeting has been modified.

AI in the assessment of applications

Generative AI tools (ChatGPT or similar) must not be used in the scientific assessment of the applications. The assessment is a task that must be carried out by a specialist researcher, who has been recruited based on their expertise in the area. On the other hand, there is no prohibition against using digital AI tools for tasks such as improving the language in written statements on applications, as long as this does not entail factual contents or the applicant’s personal data being disseminated.

AI in applications

There is no prohibition against the applicants to use generative AI or other tools (digital or of another type) when they draw up the application. At present, they do not need to state whether they have used AI. Read the guidelines for the use of AI tools.

Important starting points and principles

Peer review

The Swedish Research Council regards peer review as a guarantor that our support goes to research of the highest scientific quality in all scientific fields. The board of the Swedish Research Council has formulated guidelines for peer review based on eight principles. Read the guidelines for peer review.

Conflict of interest

To avoid any conflict of interest situation, we have established strict guidelines. Read the Swedish Research Council’s conflict of interest policy and guidelines for managing conflicts of interest.

If you have a conflict of interest, you must not take part in the handling or assessment of that application during any part of the process. In addition, the following applies for panel members:

- You are not allowed to be a panel member of panels MH-01A - MH-14B if you are applying to an undirected project or career grant within medicine and health.
- You are not allowed to be a panel member of panels MH-3R, MH-04B or MH-13 if you are applying to the focused grants that are specifically reviewed by these panels.
- Any application where you are the participating researcher must not be reviewed by your review panel.
- Any application where a close relative of yours is the applicant (does not apply to participating researchers) must not be reviewed by your review panel.

You are obliged to notify any conflict of interest for all applications handled by your review panel.

Gender equality

The Swedish Research Council aims to ensure that women and men have the same success rates and receive the same average grant amounts, taking into account the nature of the research and the form of support. The review panel shall calculate the approval rate for women and men and, when ranking applications of equal quality, applicants from the under-represented gender should be prioritised.

Confidentiality and integrity

Handle the applications and the review of them in a confidential manner:

- Do not disseminate documents that you get access to.
- Delete documents that relate to the review work after completing the task.
- Do not speak to outsiders about what was discussed during the review.
- Do not use information in the application for personal gain.
- Let the Swedish Research Council personnel manage all communications with applicants.

Roles in the review process

Chair and vice chair

The role of the chair is to lead and coordinate the work of the panel. The vice chair’s task is to stand in for the chair of the review panel in situations where they cannot or should not take part, such as when the chair has a conflict of interest. A supplement to this handbook, made available to all chairs and vice chairs, describes their tasks in detail.

Panel member

As a panel member, you may be a reviewer or a rapporteur. In both roles, you shall read, grade and rank the applications ahead of the review panel meeting. As rapporteur, you are responsible for starting the discussion of the application at the meeting, and for writing a final statement on the application after the meeting.

Observer

An observer from the scientific council for medicine and health will monitor and safeguard the quality of the review panel's work. The observer reports back to the scientific council and the secretary general responsible after the review.

Swedish Research Council personnel

The research officer and senior research officer ensure that the rules and procedure established for the process are complied with. They also support the chair and panel members in the review process.

Secretary general

The secretary general has overall responsibility for the review process and for questions of a scientific nature. The secretary general also handles any complaints following the grant decision.

Call and preparations

The call

The major call in Medicine and Health 2024 contains seven separate calls:

Call	Reviewed by panel
Project grant within medicine and health	MH-01A through MH-14B
Project grant for development of methods to replace, reduce and refine animal experiments (3R)	MH-3R
Project grant for research into viral zoonosis	MH-04B
Starting grant within medicine and health	MH-01A through MH-14B
Consolidator grant within medicine and health	MH-01A through MH-14B
Grant for research time in a clinical environment	MH-01A through MH-14B
Grant for research time within primary care	MH-13

The review panels, contact information to personnel and meeting dates are listed in Appendix 1 (page 30).

Clicking on any of the grants listed above will bring up the call text. You can also find the call texts on the bulletin board in Prisma.

Prisma

As a reviewer, you work in the web-based system Prisma. The first thing to do is to create an account in Prisma, if you do not already have one. Make sure all your account information and personal data are correct. You must also decide whether or not you want to receive remuneration for your review work. Follow the instructions in Prisma's user manual.

If you have any technical questions and cannot find the answer in Prisma's user manual, please contact the research officer responsible.

How we allocate applications to review panels

Once the call has closed, the applications are allocated to the review panels.Preferably, each application should be allocated to the group the applicant has listed as their first choice (or parallel group when applicable). However, if the chair considers that an application should be reviewed by another panel, it might be moved. An application may also be moved due to a conflict of interest.

Reporting any conflict of interest

Once you have been notified that the applications are accessible in Prisma, you must report any conflict of interest. You should therefore check who **the project leader and participating researchers** are for all applications allocated to the review panel. Please contact the Swedish Research Council personnel and the review panel chair if you have any questions about conflict of interest. If you discover later on in the process that you have a conflict of interest, this must be reported as soon as possible to the chair and the administrator responsible.

Reviewers and rapporteurs

When all the re-allocations between review panels have been completed and all review panel members have reported any conflict of interest, the chair will allocate the applications to members of the review panel. Each application is normally reviewed by five reviewers, one of which is given the role of rapporteur. The rapporteur is responsible for presenting the application for discussion at the meeting. As rapporteur, you are also responsible for summarising the review panel's written final statement on the application after the meeting.

The aim is to allocate the applications to the panel members with the most suitable scientific background, especially when it comes to the rapporteur. Most panel members will however be allocated some applications that are outside of their main area of expertise.

If specific expertise is missing in the panel, external reviewers will be asked to review these applications, in addition to the five reviewers from the panel. You may be asked to serve as an external reviewer for applications that are reviewed by another panel if your expertise is needed for this particular application.

External reviewers only provide a written evaluation in Prisma, they do not participate in the panel meeting.

Chair meeting

The chairs are invited to a physical chair meeting on 24 April 2024 in Stockholm. The purpose of this meeting is to communicate the guidelines of the Swedish Research Council and the scientific council for medicine and health regarding the review process, to discuss the assessment criteria and the role of the chair, etc. At the chair meeting, there will also be time for exchange of experiences from the review panel work and for discussing re-allocation of applications between the panels.

Workshop for reviewers

A digital workshop for all reviewers will be organised for each panel separately during May. The workshop is mandatory for new reviewers and it is recommended that everyone participates. The purpose is to discuss the review process and to give the reviewers a chance to ask questions and to (digitally) meet their fellow panel members. In addition to the workshop, we also have two films, one film describing the review process and one film describing our framework for quality.

Technical preparations

The review panel meeting will be held via the digital platform Zoom. Download Zoom Desktop client to your computer before the meeting.

Make sure you have access to a stable network connection. Your computer also needs to have a built-in or external camera and microphone. We strongly recommend that you use a headset with a microphone, as this provides the best sound, both for yourself and for other participants. If you do not have access to one, you may buy one at the Swedish Research Council's expense, at a maximum cost of 50 EUR or equivalent. We also recommend that you use a large screen next to your laptop computer, if possible.

Preparations: summary

What you need to do	When
☐ Provide account information in Prisma.	Before the deadline in Prisma
☐ Download Zoom and ensure that your technical equipment is suited for participation in a digital panel meeting.	Before the first digital meeting
☐ Report any conflict of interest.	Before the deadline in Prisma

Review

During the review period, you shall:

- read the applications allocated to you,
- grade and write assessments and preliminary statements,
- rank the applications you have reviewed.

Individual review

Each application is reviewed and graded by at least four or five members of the review panel: one rapporteur and three or four additional reviewers. If you are the rapporteur, you shall write a *preliminary statement.* This shall consist of a numerical grade and detailed written comments on all evaluation criteria. The comments shall highlight strengths and weaknesses in the proposed research project.

In the role as reviewer, you shall write an *assessment*. The assessment shall consist of a numerical grade and written comments, but the comments can be less detailed. Your notes will be a support in the discussion during the review panel meeting, and also after the meeting; they are very helpful when the rapporteur writes the final statement. You should therefore end your review of each application by listing the strengths and weaknesses that your assessment is based on.

Deviations in the application

If you suspect that the content of an application does not follow good research practice, please inform the Swedish Research Council personnel as soon as possible. **Please do not wait until the review panel meeting.** This also includes if you think that there is incorrect information in the application or if the application is written in Swedish. Continue with the review unless we notify otherwise. The Swedish Research Council is responsible for further investigation in cases of deviations in the application.

Irrelevant information

Base your assessment only on the contents of the application itself. Irrelevant information must not impact on the assessment. Disregard any rumours or unsubstantiated information that you believe you know and instead contact the Swedish Research Council personnel as soon as possible if you have any questions or think that something is wrong with an application.

Ask for advice from others only in exceptional cases

You must not disseminate information about the applications or applicants outside the review panel. Only in exceptional cases may it be justified to ask a colleague about any specific information, for example relating to the use of statistics or new research findings, on condition that you do not show them the application itself.

Ethical aspects

The applicant shall state whether there are any requirements for permits and approvals for the research planned. If there are such requirements, the applicant shall also describe how the permits and approvals will be obtained. If parts of the research will be conducted abroad, the applicant must be able to describe how this impact any requirement for permits or approvals. Necessary permits and approvals must be in place when the research begins. The assessment of legal and formal requirements is a part of the feasibility criterion.

The assessment of ethical aspects also includes examining how applicants reflect on ethical considerations. The evaluation of ethical considerations is part of the criterion for the scientific quality of the project.

Sex and gender perspectives

The assessment of scientific quality includes scrutinising how sex and gender perspectives are included in the applications, when relevant to the research. For more information, please read the instructions for applicants.

Assessment criteria

Please note that the Swedish Research Council funds various types of research and that the applications to medicine and health may include different types of studies (preclinical, translational, clinical etc.). It is the quality of the research that should be assessed and no type of study should be prioritised over another.

You shall assess the scientific quality of the application based on four basic criteria:

- Scientific quality of the project
- Novelty and originality
- Merits of the applicant
- Feasibility

The purpose of using several basic criteria is to achieve a multi-faceted assessment. In addition to the basic criteria, some applications are also assessed using an additional criterion (Relevance). The criteria are evaluated on a seven-, three- or two-point grading scale.

Please use the guiding questions listed for each criterion to support the assessment of the application.

Guiding questions

Scientific quality of the project (1–7)

Assess the quality of the project's research question and method, and also its potential for future research.

- Is the research proposal relevant for medical research? (**Not relevant for 3R or viral zoonoses project grant applications**)
- Is the definition of the problems and proposed solutions clear and compelling?
- Do the study design, research questions and hypotheses meet the standard of the 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?
- Are methods, including data analysis and statistics, appropriate for the project and well described?
- Are the ethical considerations for the proposed project described and addressed properly? Does the applicant adequately consider risk/value/suffering for humans, animals, nature and/or society?
- If sex and gender is described as relevant to the research project, has the applicant considered sex and gender in the description of the proposed work, for instance as part of preliminary data, the choice of samples or study population, or data analyses?

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?

Novelty and originality (1–7)

Assess how well the applicant develops and implements new theories, concepts, methods, and questions.

- 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?

Merits of the applicant (1–7)

Merits are assessed in relation to the applicant's career age and to the research task. The main focus should be on the applicant's ability to carry out the proposed research, not just an evaluation of the applicant's overall achievements as a researcher. Only take into account the "active research years" years when assessing the scope of scientific production. Time off for parental leave, sick leave, or similar circumstances should be deducted.

- Does the applicant have sufficient research experience, expertise, level of independence and scientific network for implementation of the proposed project?
- How do the applicant's academic qualifications and achievements relate to his or her career age?
- 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.
- To what extent has the applicant previously demonstrated that he or she can successfully execute a research project?

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?

Especially for Consolidator grants:

- How significant is the applicant's scientific productivity, impact and other merits in a national and international perspective, in relation to the research area?
- Is the researcher internationally recognized and a leader in her/his research field, or show the potential to become so?
- Has the applicant shown the ability to work in new (international) research environments, for instance during postdoctoral work?
- Does the researcher have the ability to establish a creative research environment through her/his research leadership?

Especially for Grant for research time within primary care:

- Has the applicant shown the ability to work independently of former advisors?

Feasibility (1–3)

Assess the feasibility of the proposed project. Please note that you should not asses the budget part of the application. An application must be graded as 2 or 3 for feasibility in order to be funded. A grade below 3 must be explained in the final statement.

- Considering the project as a whole, including participating researchers, does the applicant or project group have sufficient competence for completion of the project?
- Is the project leader's level of activity within the project sufficient with regard to the proposed research plan?
- Is the general design, including the time-frame, realistic for implementing the proposed project?
- Are the materials, methods (including statistics and/or power calculations), experimental models, and when appropriate patient/study cohorts adequate and well adapted to the hypothesis or research question?
- Does the applicant adequately consider relevant legal and formal requirements for the proposed research, such as ethical permits and guidelines?

Overall assessment (1–7)

Weigh together the above subsidiary criteria into an overall grade that reflects the review panel's joint assessment of the application's scientific quality. For Project grants, Consolidator grants and Starting grants, "Scientific quality of the project" should be given more weight in the overall grade. For Grants for research time, "Merits of the 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. A seven-point grading 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).

Relevance (1-7)

- To what extent will the proposal lead to significant replacement/reduction or refinement of animal use?
- 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?

Additional assessment criterion for assessment of Project grant for research into viral zoonoses (MH-04B)

The additional criterion of "relevance" is used by the review panel MH-04B for applications related to research in the field of zoonoses. A two-point grading 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). An application must have a grade 2 in relevance in order to be funded.

Relevance (1-2)

- To what extent is the proposal relevant to
  - viral zoonoses and/or mechanisms for transmission, prevention, surveillance and management of spread of infection, and/or
  - changes in climate, ecology, and demography impact on the emergence and transmission of viruses?

Additional assessment criterion for assessment of Grant for research time within primary care (MH-13)

The additional criterion of "relevance" is used by the review panel MH-13 for applications related to research in the field of primary care. A two-point grading 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). An application must have a grade 2 in relevance in order to be funded.

Relevance (1-2)

- Does the research have a close connection to primary care?
- Does the project have the potential to contribute to the development of new pharmaceuticals, prevention, diagnostics, medical devices, therapies or digitalisation?
- Will the project contribute to the inclusion of results in primary care?

Grading scales

A seven-grade scale is used for the criteria the scientific quality of the project, novelty and originality, merits of the applicant and the overall grade.

Grade	Explanation
7	Outstanding Exceptionally strong application with negligible weaknesses
6	Excellent Very strong application with negligible weaknesses
5	Very good to excellent Very strong application with minor weaknesses
4	Very good Strong application with minor weaknesses
3	Good Some strengths, but also moderate weaknesses
2	Weak A few strengths, but also at least one major weakness or several minor weaknesses
1	Poor Very few strengths, and numerous major weaknesses

Please note that the grading scale is an ordinal scale, where it is not possible to specify distances between the different values.

A three-grade scale is used for assessment of feasibility.

Grade	Explanation
3	Feasible
2	Partly feasible
1	Not feasible

For all criteria, you can also mark “Insufficient”, if you consider that the application lacks sufficient information to allow you to make a reasonable assessment of the criterion. Please note that any such mark should only be used in the individual review before the review panel meeting, and not in the final grade to the applicant.

Ranking applications

Rank every application in relation to the other applications of the same grant type that you have reviewed. The ranking is a supplement to the grading when the review panel’s applications are compared with each other. You shall rank all the applications you have been allocated, both those that you are rapporteur for, and the other ones you have reviewed. It is very important to complete the ranking in time for the applications to be sifted before the meeting. Ahead of the sifting and the review panel meeting, the individual rankings of all the reviewers are weighed together into a preliminary ranking factor for each application. For instructions, please see Prisma’s user manual.

External reviewers

The review panel chair should identify applications that require external review, and propose external reviewers. External review may come into question if the scientific character of an application means that the joint competency of the review panel is not sufficient for a thorough review, or if the conflict of interest situation within the panel makes an application difficult to evaluate. In normal cases, the administrator responsible at the Swedish Research Council will contact the external reviewers.

Review: summary

What you need to do	When
☐ Grade and write detailed comments (preliminary statement) on all applications for which you are the rapporteur.	Before the deadline

What you need to do	When
☐ Grade and write comments (assessment) on all applications for which you are a reviewer.	Before the deadline
☐ Rank all applications allocated to you.	Before the deadline
☐ 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, or if you discover any problem with an application.	As soon as possible
☐ Contact the Swedish Research Council personnel if you suspect any deviation from ethical guidelines or good research practice.	As soon as possible

Sifting and review

Sifting

A proportion of the applications with the lowest grades are sifted, which means that they are not discussed in detail at the review panel meeting, and therefore do not receive any specific written comments on the grades. This process enables more in-depth discussion of the applications that have a reasonable chance of being funded.

The chair produces a proposed list of the applications to be sifted. The proposed list is based on the review panel's joint preliminary ranking of the applications. The chair identifies a break-off point on the list where it is reasonable to assume that applications below the break-off point will not be considered for funding. At least 40 per cent of the applications should be discussed at the panel meeting.

For calls with a relevance criterium, applications with high scientific quality can be sifted due to low relevance for the call. The applications that are listed for discussion at the review panel meeting shall include both women and men to such an extent that there is a good chance of achieving a gender-equal outcome in relation to the number of applications received. Ahead of the meeting, you as a panel member should consider the sifting proposal, including the proposed grades. If you do not agree, you can demand that a sifted application is brought up for discussion at the meeting. **This should be communicated to the research officer within two days after the sifting proposal is made available.**

All reviewers read all applications remaining after sifting and give overall grades

In order to enhance the discussions at the meeting, the scientific council of medicine and health has decided that all applications that have not been sifted should be read by all reviewers before the meeting (except in case of conflict of interest). After the sifting process is complete, you need to read and set an overall grade for each remaining application that you have not previously evaluated. The grading will not be performed in Prisma, instead you will write the grades in an Excel document found on the bulletin board in Prisma or provided by the research officer.

Prepare for the meeting

Before the meeting, you should prepare brief presentations of strengths and weaknesses of the applications for which you are the rapporteur. If there are any

external reviewers, their assessments should also be presented. The presentation should be brief and to the point, power point presentations are not needed.

Please also prepare for the meeting by reading other panel members' comments. They become available in Prisma when the system closes for editing.

Review: sifting and review

What you need to do	When
☐ Check the list of sifted applications and decide whether any of the sifted applications should be brought up for discussion at the meeting.	Before deadline
☐ Read and give overall grades for those applications remaining after sifting that you have not already reviewed.	Before deadline
☐ Prepare for the meeting by reading other panel members' comments and any external assessments.	Before the meeting
☐ Prepare a brief presentation of strengths and weaknesses in the applications for which you are the rapporteur.	Before the meeting
☐ 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, or if you discover any problem with an application.	As soon as possible
☐ Contact the Swedish Research Council personnel if you suspect any deviation from ethical guidelines or good research practice.	As soon as possible

Review panel meeting

Sifted applications

At the start of the review panel meeting, the sifting proposal, including the suggested grades for the sifted applications, is officially confirmed.

Discussion of applications

The chair leads the discussions of the applications that have not been sifted. They are discussed in the order of the ranking factor, starting with the highest, one grant type at the time. The rapporteur begins by presenting the application's strengths and weaknesses and also presents the views of any external reviewers. Thereafter, the other reviewers give their assessments. The chair is responsible for ensuring that any external assessments are included in the discussion. The grading and ranking done by you and the other panel members are the starting point for the discussion and are not communicated to the applicants. Instead, for each application discussed at the meeting, the panel shall agree on subsidiary grades and an overall grade. The rapporteur shall take notes during the discussion to be able to formulate the panel's final written statement to the applicant.

All applications shall be treated equally

The review panel is responsible for ensuring that each application is assessed on its own merits.

- Irrelevant information shall not be presented or discussed. This includes e.g. the applicant's age or sex.
- The panel's applications shall compete with each other on equal terms.
- No application shall be given a higher or lower grade because it belongs within a certain subject area.
- The panel shall not carry out any quota-based allocation between the scientific disciplines included in the panel.
- An application is guaranteed a new assessment under each call – even if it has been submitted in conjunction with previous calls. For this reason, the review panel will not have access to any previous applications or assessments.
- Be aware that the meeting time is limited, with many applications to be discussed. It is therefore important to try 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.

Conflict of interest during the review meeting

A person who has a conflict of interest in relation to an application shall not take part in, or listen to, the discussion of that particular application and will be temporarily put in a digital waiting room.

If you discover any possible conflict of interest (your own or another's) during the meeting, you should bring this up with the chair and the Swedish Research Council personnel in private.

Prioritisation

Once all applications within a specific call have been discussed, and the panel has agreed on the joint grades for each application, a prioritisation shall be carried out of the applications with the highest scientific quality.

In this step, the review panel shall take into account the approval rate for women and for men and as necessary prioritise applications from applicants of the under-represented gender when applications are deemed to be of equivalent quality.

The panel shall also identify applications which qualify for earmarked funding for special initiatives, so called subfocus areas, as outlined in Appendix 2 (page 43). Only applications where the applicant has checked "yes" for relevance for the subfocus areas can be considered. The relevance texts and guiding questions in Appendix 2 are meant to aid the discussions at the panel meeting. This year, the only subfocus area is precision medicine. Please note that there is no grade for the relevance. Instead, the panel should decide (Yes or No) if ranked or nominated applications, where the applicant has checked a box for a precision medicine, do indeed belong to this subfocus area.

Project grants

For the research project grants, the panel should carry out a prioritisation of the applications with the highest scientific quality. This prioritisation should conclude with the review panel's proposal for applications to be awarded grants within the panel's budgetary framework and some reserves.

For the Project grants within medicine and health, maximum 35 per cent of the applications can be prioritised, if the panel thinks that they are all fundable. New for this is year is that the top 15 per cent do not have to be ranked in relation to one another, since they are all more or less guaranteed to get funding. However, the reserves do have to be ranked.

For the project grants within 3R or viral zoonoses, the top application all have to be ranked.

Starting and Consolidator grants

Each panel can nominate up to 20 per cent of the Starting grant applications and up to 20 per cent of the Consolidator grant applications within the panel to the

second step of the evaluation, i.e. the review by the MH-CAREER panel. All nominated applications must have an overall grade of at least 5 for Starting grants and at least 6 for Consolidator grants. If there are truly excellent applications (overall grade of at least 6) that the panel wishes to nominate in addition to the top 20 per cent, this can be discussed with the secretary general.

The MH-CAREER panel then assesses the nominated applications and gives recommendations on which applications to fund by presenting priority lists with reserves. This recommendation is the basis for the scientific council for medicine and health's funding decision.

Grant for research time in a clinical environment

The panels nominate excellent high-quality applications to the second step of the evaluation, i.e. to evaluation by the appointment panel. The overall grade for nominated applications should be at least a strong 5. If more than one application is nominated they should be ranked. The appointment panel then recommends funding for three to four applications and presents a priority list with reserves. This recommendation is the basis for the scientific council of medicine and health's funding decision.

Grant for research time within primary care

Similar to the research project grants, the panel MH-13 should carry out a prioritisation of the applications with the highest scientific quality. This prioritisation should conclude with the review panel's proposal for applications to be awarded grants within the panel's budgetary framework and some reserves. The top applications should be ranked.

Feedback

In conjunction with the review panel meeting, the panel members are encouraged to provide feedback on the review work carried out. We will ask for comments on various aspects of the process. Comments about the quality of the applications will be considered when the scientific council of medicine and health decides on the allocation of the grants.

Review panel meeting: summary

What you need to do	When
☐ Agree on grades for sifted applications.	At the review panel meeting
☐ Agree on subsidiary grades and an overall grade for each application discussed.	At the review panel meeting
☐ Agree on a proposal for the applications to be awarded funding within the review panel's budgetary framework.	At the review panel meeting

What you need to do	When
☐ Contribute with feedback on the review process.	At the review panel meeting

Final statement

The rapporteur writes the final statement

The discussion at the review panel meeting forms the basis for the review panel's joint final statement. The final statement is the end product of the review process and forms the Swedish Research Council's basis for decision-making in the matter, and is also sent to the applicant in conjunction with the grant decision being published.

You are responsible for writing final statements on the non-sifted applications for which you have been the rapporteur. After the meeting, you shall modify the preliminary statement that you drew up before the meeting so that it reflects the review panel's joint assessment of the application. Please check your notes from the meeting, the assessments from the other reviewers in Prisma and make sure that the main strengths and weaknesses in the application that motivate the grades are included. You usually have one week in which to write final statements following the end of the review panel meeting. Please note that the statements for the nominated career grants (Starting grants, Consolidator grants and Grants for research time in a clinical environment) should be completed first so that they reach the secondary panels in time.

Only applications that have been the subject of discussion at the meeting receive a full final statement. The sifted applications are instead handled by the Swedish Research Council personnel. These applications receive a standard final statement describing the sifting process and including the grades confirmed by the panel.

The chair reviews all final statements

Once the final statements are completed, they are checked by the chair and by the Swedish Research Council personnel. The chair is responsible for ensuring that the final statements on the applications discussed at the review panel meeting reflect the panel's discussion, and that the written justifications correspond to the grades. In conjunction with the chair's review, you may be asked to supplement or adjust a final statement.

General advice and recommendations on final statements

The final statement shall reflect the review panel's joint and overall assessment, including any external assessments.

Write the statement for each grade as bullet points and use the headings "Strengths" and "Weaknesses". The bullet points under these two headings should reflect the definition of the grade. For example, higher grades should be motivated by more strengths and fewer weaknesses/less severe weaknesses and vice versa for the lower grades. Examples of how to write final statements will be available.

Completing the final statements, you must

- 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.
- ensure that the written justifications correspond to the grading – feel free to use the definitions in the grading scale in your written comments.
- consider the guiding questions for the different assessment criteria.
- write concisely, but not too briefly – the content is more important than the length of the text.
- comment on whether the review panel has weighed in deviations from the Swedish Research Council's general instructions in the assessment of the application.
- be constructive and factual in your comments.

Completing the final statements, you must not

- make a long summary of the contents of the application or the merits of the applicant.
- introduce personal comments – the final statement shall constitute the review panel's joint assessment.
- state quantifiable data such as number of publications, years or bibliometric data.
- state or comment on any personal information about the applicant, such as sex or age.
- write any recommendation whether to refuse or approve an application in the final statement.
- comment on whether an application belongs in the review panel, as all the applications allocated to the panel shall be assessed.

Statement: summary

What you need to do	When
☐ Write the review panel's final statement in Prisma on the applications for which you are the rapporteur.	One week after the review panel meeting
☐ Supplement final statements following review by the chair if you have been asked to do so.	After the review panel meeting

Decision and follow-up

Decision

The Board of the Swedish Research Council has delegated to the scientific council for medicine and health to decide on grants in medicine and health. The decision is based on: the priority lists (including reserves) arrived at by the review panels; any justifications from the chairs; and the review panels' final statements. The decision is published shortly thereafter on vr.se and in Prisma. In conjunction with the publication, the applicants are informed about the outcome.

Follow-up

Following each review, internal follow-up is also carried out of the process and the outcome. An important starting point for this follow-up is the feedback you provide as a panel member in conjunction with the review panel meeting. We also produce statistics of various kinds.

Complaints and questions

If you as a review panel member receive any question about the assessment of an individual application, you must refer this to us. The Swedish Research Council personnel make sure that all complaints or requests for clarification are registered and handled by the secretary general responsible in consultation with the chair of the review panel. The chair will contact you as necessary.

Decision and follow-up: summary

What you need to do	When
☐ Refer any questions about the assessment of individual applications to the Swedish Research Council personnel.	As they arise
☐ Be prepared to assist the chair and the secretary general responsible in the event of any questions.	As they arise

Appendix 1: Review panels within medicine and health

Review panels, their members and contact information for the Swedish Research Council personnel.

Madeleine Durbeej-Hjalt, Secretary General Medicine and Health
phone: + 46 (0) 73 6407263,
email: Madeleine.Durbeej-Hjalt@vr.se

Carolina Hertzman Johansson, Coordinator Evaluation Process, Medicine and Health
phone: + 46 (0) 76 526 71 31,
email: carolina.hertzmanjohansson@vr.se

Johan Wigren Scott, **Coordinator Research Officer**
phone + 46 (0)8 546 44 019,
email: Johan.WigrenScott@vr.se

Louise Rügheimer, Coordinator Scientific Council for Medicine and Health
phone: + 46 (0) 8 122 136 18,
email: Louise.Rugheimer@vr.se

MH-01A: Molecular medicine

Basic disease mechanisms / Cell- and molecular biology / Biochemistry / Genetics

Panel meeting: 3-4 September 2024

Member	Organisation	Country
Krister Wennerberg, Chair	University of Copenhagen	Denmark
David Andersson	King's College London	UK
Emma Börgeson	University of Gothenburg	Sweden
Maria Eriksson	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden
Lars Forsberg	Uppsala University	Sweden
Vasili Hauryliuk	Lund University	Sweden
Alison Lloyd	University College London	UK
Lykke Sylow	University of Copenhagen	Denmark
Tone Tønjum	University of Oslo	Norway

Karolina Wallenborg Bjelic, Senior Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 137842,
email: Karolina.WallenborgBjelic@vr.se

Dilek Türkoglu, Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 546 44 175,
email: Dilek.Turkoglu@vr.se

MH-01B: Molecular medicine

Basic disease mechanisms / Cell- and molecular biology / Bioinformatics / Systems medicine /Genomics

Panel meeting: 28-29 August 2024

Member	Organisation	Country
Magda Bienko, Chair	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden
Francesca Aguilo	Umeå University	Sweden
Chaira Ambroggio	University of Turin	Italy
Raffaele Calogero	University of Turin	Italy
Claudio Cantù	Linköping University	Sweden
Xingqi Chen	Uppsala University	Sweden
Katarzyna Koltowska	Uppsala University	Sweden
Bénédicte Manoury	Institut Necker Enfants Malades	France
Lucas Pelkmans	University of Zurich	Switzerland
VACANT		

Carolina Hertzman Johansson, Senior Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 546 44 007,
email: Carolina.HertzmanJohansson@vr.se
Anna Sundin, Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 546 44 097,
email: Anna.Sundin@vr.se

MH-02: Molecular medicine and therapy

Basic disease mechanisms / Biomaterials / Biotechnology / Pharmacology / Pharmaceutical sciences / Toxicology / Related research areas

Panel meeting: 10-11 September 2024

Member	Organisation	Country
Jason Matthews, Chair	Oslo University	Norway
Rongrong Fan	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden
Susanne Gabrielsson	Karolinska institutet	Sweden
Per Larsson	Uppsala University	Sweden
Catharina Margrethe Lerche	University of Copenhagen	Denmark
Jan Lötvall	University of Gothenburg	Sweden
Pia Maly Sundgren	Lund University	Sweden
Alexandra Teleki	Uppsala University	Sweden
Jeremy Turnbull	University of Liverpool	UK

Member	Organisation	Country
Per Uhlén	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden

Carolina Hertzman Johansson, Senior Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 546 44 007,
email: Carolina.HertzmanJohansson@vr.se
Joar Rehn, Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 546 44 072,
email: Joar.Rehn@vr.se

MH-03A: Immunity and inflammation

Immunity / Inflammation / Autoimmunity / Transplantation / Related research areas

Panel meeting: 28-29 August 2024

Member	Organisation	Country
Yenan Bryceson, Chair	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden
Børre Fevang	Oslo University Hospital	Norway
Gunnel Nordmark	Uppsala University	Sweden
Anna Rudin	University of Gothenburg	Sweden
Anne Spurkland	Oslo University	Norway
Michael Uhlin	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden
Anette Wolff	University of Bergen	Norway
VACANT		

Abraham Mellkvist-Roos, Senior Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)31 757 41 64,
email: Abraham.Mellkvist-Roos@vr.se
Tung Le, Research Officer,
phone + 46 (0)8 546 12 301,
email: Tung.Le@vr.se

MH-03B: Immunity and inflammation

Immunity / Inflammation / Allergy / Dermatology / Related research areas

Panel meeting: 17-18 September 2024

Member	Organisation	Country
Lena Öhman, Chair	University of Gothenburg	Sweden
Silke Appel	University of Bergen	Norway
Luis Francisco Santamaria Babí	University of Barcelona	Spain
Clare Bennett	University College London	UK
Jonathan Coquet	University of Copenhagen	Denmark
Olov Ekwall	University of Gothenburg	Sweden

Member	Organisation	Country
Lena Uller	Lund University	Sweden
Eduardo Villablanca	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden

Karolina Wallenborg Bjelic, Senior Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 137842,
email: Karolina.WallenborgBjelic@vr.se
Tung Le, Research Officer,
phone + 46 (0)8 546 12 301,
email: Tung.Le@vr.se

MH-04A: Infection

Infection, primarily within bacteriology, mycology and parasitology / Related research areas

Panel meeting: 17-18 September 2024

Member	Organisation	Country
Artur Schmidtchen, Chair	Lund University	Sweden
Gemma Atkinson	Lund University	Sweden
Jose Bengoechea	Queen's University Belfast	UK
Ulrich Dobrindt	University of Münster	Germany
Maria Fällman	Umeå University	Sweden
Anders P Håkansson	Lund University	Sweden
Anna Norrby Teglund	Karolinska institutet	Sweden
Ute Römling	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden
Arnfinn Sundsfjord	UiT The Arctic University of Norway	Norway
Sam Wassmer	London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine	UK

Amanda Klein, Senior Research Officer (from end of April),
phone: + 46 (0)8 XXXXXXX,
email: Amanda.Klein@vr.se
Elisabeth Tehler, Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 546 44 229,
email: Elisabeth.Tehler@vr.se

MH-04B: Infection

Infection, primarily within virology / Related research areas

Panel meeting: 11-12 September 2024

Member	Organisation	Country
Gabriella Scarlatti, Chair	San Raffaele Scientific Institute in Milan	Italy
Pietro Alano	Istituto Superiore di Sanità	Italy
Andrea Cara	Istituto Superiore di Sanità	Italy

Member	Organisation	Country
Alex Evilevitch	Lund University	Sweden
Zaida Herrador	National Centre for Tropical Medicine, Health Institute Carlos III	Spain
Marianne Jansson	Lund University	Sweden
Andres Merits	University of Tartu	Estonia
Guilia Marchetti	University of Milan	Italy
Gerry McInerney	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden
Christiane Moog	INSERM Strasbourg	France
Stefan Schwartz	Uppsala University	Sweden
Nigel Temperton	Kent University	UK
Lia van der Hoek	Amsterdam University Medical Centers	Netherlands
Tim Willinger	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden

Teresa Ottinger, Senior Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 546 44 286,
email: Teresa.Ottinger@vr.se
Johan Wigren Scott, Research Officer,
phone + 46 (0)8 546 44 019,
email: Johan.WigrenScott@vr.se

MH-05: Circulation and respiration

Cardiology / Clinical physiology / Vascular biology / Pulmonology / Nephrology / Related research areas

Panel meeting: 27-28 August 2024

Member	Organisation	Country
Ulf Hedin, Chair	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden
Maria Gomez	Lund University	Sweden
Bente Halvorsen	Oslo University	Norway
Machteld Hylkema	University of Groningen	Netherlands
Christer Janson	Uppsala University	Sweden
Thomas Jespersen	University of Copenhagen	Denmark
Helle Jørgensen	University of Cambridge	UK
Stephen Malin	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden
Vladimir Matchkov	Aarhus University	Denmark
Rikke Nørregaard	Aarhus University	Denmark
Araz Rawshani	University of Gothenburg	Sweden
Fredrik Palm	Uppsala University	Sweden
Åsa Tivesten	University of Gothenburg	Sweden

Isabel Dellacasa Lindberg, Senior Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 546 44 085,
email: Isabel.DellacasaLindberg@vr.se

Åsa Eklöf, temporary Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 120 617 06,
email: asa.eklof@vr.se
Filip Poignant, Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 546 123 11,
email: Filip.Poignant@vr.se

MH-06: Surgical disciplines

Anaesthesiology / Intensive care / Surgery / Odontology / Medical imaging / Orthopedic surgery / Radiology / Urology / Related research areas

Panel meeting: 27-28 August 2024

Member	Organisation	Country
Eva Angenete, Chair	University of Gothenburg	Sweden
Knut Magne Augestad	Oslo University	Norway
Lars I Eriksson	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden
Anna Fahlgren	Linköping University	Sweden
Jussi Hirvonen	Tampere University	Finland
Marie Lagerquist	University of Gothenburg	Sweden
Sandra Lindstedt	Lund University	Sweden
Kevin Mani	Uppsala University	Sweden
Jacob Rosenberg	University of Copenhagen	Denmark

Teresa Ottinger, Senior Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 546 44 286,
email: Teresa.Ottinger@vr.se
Johan Wigren Scott, Research Officer,
phone + 46 (0)8 546 44 019,
email: Johan.WigrenScott@vr.se

MH-07: Women's and children's health

Gynecology / Obstetrics / Pediatrics / Perinatology / Reproduction medicine / Related research areas

Panel meeting: 10-11 September 2024

Member	Organisation	Country
Ulrika Ådén, Chair	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden
Stefan Enroth	Uppsala University	Sweden
Vineta Fellman	Lund University	Finland
Nandor Gabor Than	Hungarian Academy of Sciences	Hungary
Fredrik Lanner	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden
Tina Lavender	Liverpool Scool of Tropical Medicine	UK
Samuli Rautava	University of Helsinki	Finland

Member	Organisation	Country
Kristiina Tammimies	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden
Jone Trovik	University of Bergen	Norway
Thorkild Tylleskär	University of Bergen	Norway

Karolina Wallenborg Bjelic, Senior Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 137842,
email: Karolina.WallenborgBjelic@vr.se
Dilek Türkoglu, Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 546 44 175,
email: Dilek.Turkoglu@vr.se

MH-08A: Cancer

Molecular cancer research / Oncology / Related research areas

Panel meeting: 17-18 September 2024

Member	Organisation	Country
Göran Jönsson, Chair	Lund University	Sweden
Line Bjorge	University of Bergen	Norway
Anja Bosserhof	Friedrich-Alexander-Universität	Germany
Helena Carén	University of Gothenburg	Sweden
Kamila Czene	Karolinska Instiutet	Sweden
Mariona Graupera	Josep Carreras Leukaemia Research Institute	Spain
Eleonora Leucci	KU Leuven	Belgium
Mitchell Levesque	University of Zürich Hospital	Switzerland
Andreas Lundqvist	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden
Peter Naredi	University of Gothenburg	Sweden
Johan Staaf	Lund University	Sweden

Johan Wigren Scott, Research Officer,
phone + 46 (0)8 546 44 019,
email: Johan.WigrenScott@vr.se
Filip Poignant, Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 546 123 11,
email: Filip.Poignant@vr.se

MH-08B: Cancer and hematology

Molecular cancer research / Oncology / Blood disorders / Haematopoiesis / Related research areas

Panel meeting: 11-12 September 2024

Member	Organisation	Country
Helena Jernberg Wiklund, Chair	Uppsala University	Sweden

Member	Organisation	Country
David Bryder	Lund University	Sweden
Oriol Casanovas	Catalan Institute of Oncology	Spain
Theodoros Foukakis	Karolinska institutet	Sweden
Bengt Hallberg	University of Gothenburg	Sweden
Toril Holien	Norwegian University of Science and Technology	Norway
Annika Keller	ETH Zurich	Switzerland
Roger Olofsson Bagge	University of Gothenburg	Sweden
Galina Selivanova	Karolinska institutet	Sweden
Theresa Vincent	NYU Grossman School of Medicine	USA
Pernilla Wikström	Umeå University	Sweden

Kristian Haller, Senior Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 546 12 307,
email: Kristian.Haller@vr.se
Maria Jakobsson, Research Officer,
phone + 46 (0)8 546 44 041,
email: Maria.Jakobsson@vr.se

MH-09: Endocrinology, gastroenterology and metabolism

Andrology / Diabetes / Hepatology / Obesity / Nutrition / Related research areas

Panel meeting: 27-28 August 2024

Member	Organisation	Country
Anders Tengholm, Chair	Uppsala University	Sweden
Daniel Agardh	Lund University	Sweden
Sofia Carlsson	Karolinska institutet	Sweden
Helena Edlund	Umeå University	Sweden
Martin Jastroch	Stockholm University	Sweden
Hanne Louise Kissow	University of Copenhagen	Denmark
Riitta Korpela	University of Helsinki	Finland
Mattias Lorentzon	University of Gothenburg	Sweden
Jussi Pihlajamäki	University of Eastern Finland	Finland
Kei Sakamoto	University of Copenhagen	Denmark
Uwe Tietge	Karolinska institutet	Sweden
VACANT		

Amanda Klein, Senior Research Officer (from end of April),
phone: + 46 (0)8 XXXXXXX,
email: Amanda.Klein@vr.se
Dilek Türkoglu, Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 546 44 175,
email: Dilek.Turkoglu@vr.se

MH-10: Neurosciences

Neurosciences / Neurodegeneration / Related research areas

Panel meeting: 17-18 September 2024

Member	Organisation	Country
Gilad Silberberg, Chair	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden
Konstantinos Ampatzis	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden
Veerle Baekelandt	KU Leuven	Belgium
Laura Busse	Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München	Germany
Åsa Fex Svenningsen	University of Southern Denmark	Denmark
Ilona Grunwald Kadow	Bonn University	Germany
Martin Ingelsson	Uppsala University	Sweden
Merab Kokaia	Lund University	Sweden
Åsa Mackenzie	Uppsala University	Sweden
Kirsten Møller	University of Copenhagen	Denmark
Peter Nilsson	Linköping University	Sweden
Michael Schöll	University of Gothenburg	Sweden
Eric Westman	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden

Abraham Mellkvist-Roos, Senior Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)31 757 41 64,
email: Abraham.Mellkvist-Roos@vr.se
Åsa Eklöf, Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 120 617 06,
email: asa.eklof@vr.se

MH-11: Neurology and sensory organs

Neurosciences / Neurology / Audiology / Logopaedics / Muscular disorders / Neurophysiology / Ophthalmology / Rehabilitation medicine / Related research areas

Panel meeting: 3-4 September 2024

Member	Organisation	Country
Per Petersson, Chair	Umeå University	Sweden
Michela Deleidi	Institut Imagine, INSERM	France
Lena Gunhaga	Umeå University	Sweden
Eric Hanse	University of Gothenburg	Sweden
Sonja Pyott	University Medical Center Groningen	Netherlands
Mathias Toft	Oslo University Hospital	Norway
Pete Williams	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden
Peter Zygmunt	Lund University	Sweden
VACANT		
VACANT		

Louise Rügheimer, Senior Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0) 8 122 136 18,
email: Louise.Rugheimer@vr.se
Elisabeth Tehler, Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 546 44 229,
email: Elisabeth.Tehler@vr.se

MH-12: Mental health

Clinical addiction research / Psychiatry, including compulsory care and forensic psychiatry / Related research areas

Panel meeting: 4-5 September 2024

Member	Organisation	Country
Marie Carlén, Chair	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden
Estelle Barbier	Linköping University	Sweden
Christian Broberger	Stockholm University	Sweden
Santiago Canals	Instituto de Neurociencias	Spain
Åsa Petersén	Lund University	Sweden
M. Victoria Puig	IMIM, Barcelona	Spain
Carl Sellgren	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden
Wolfgang Sommer	Bethany Hospital for Psychiatry	Germany
VACANT		
VACANT		
VACANT		
VACANT		

Amanda Klein, Senior Research Officer (from end of April),
phone: + 46 (0)8 XXXXXXX,
email: Amanda.Klein@vr.se
Maria Jakobsson, Research Officer,
phone + 46 (0)8 546 44 041,
email: Maria.Jakobsson@vr.se

MH-13: Health care sciences

Occupational therapy / Audiology / Physiotherapy / Gerontology / Health psychology / Logopaedics / Nursing / Reproductive health / Evidence-based practice / Health economics / Health services research / Related research areas

Panel meeting: 4-5 September 2024

Member	Organisation	Country
Claudia Lampic, Chair	Umeå University	Sweden
Maria Ahlberg	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden

Member	Organisation	Country
Dimitri Beeckman	Örebro University	Sweden
Mathilda Björk	Linköping University	Sweden
Katja Boersma	Örebro University	Sweden
Malin Lövgren	Marie Cederschiöld University	Sweden
David Moulaee Conradsson	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden
Per Nilsen	Linköping University	Sweden
Andre Nyberg	Umeå University	Sweden
Susanne Reventlow	University of Copenhagen	Denmark
Jacqueline Sin	School of Health & Psychological Sciences	UK
Minna Stolt	University of Turku	Finland
Hilde Verbeek	Maastricht University	Netherlands

Lucas Pettersson, Senior Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 546 44 277,
email: Lucas.Pettersson@vr.se
Joar Rehn, Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 546 44 072,
email: Joar.Rehn@vr.se

MH-14A: Public health sciences

Social medicine / Occupational medicine / Environmental medicine / Global health / Lifestyle / Related research areas

Panel meeting: 11-12 September 2024

Member	Organisation	Country
Amy O'Donnell, Chair	Newcastle University	UK
Frank de Vocht	University of Bristol	UK
Magnus Domellöf	Umeå University	Sweden
Kristina Jakobsson	University of Gothenburg	Sweden
Tea Lallukka	University of Helsinki	Finland
G.J. Melendez-Torres	University of Exeter	UK
Matthew Prina	Newcastle University	UK
Cecilia Ramlau-Hansen	University of Aarhus	Denmark
John Reilly	University of Strathclyde	UK
VACANT		
VACANT		

Nina Rökaeus, Senior Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 546 44 213,
email: Nina.Rokaeus@vr.se
Tung Le, Research Officer,
phone + 46 (0)8 546 12 301,
email: Tung.Le@vr.se

MH-14B: Public health sciences

Epidemiological studies, e.g. in registries and cohort studies / Related research areas

Panel meeting: 3-4 September 2024

Member	Organisation	Country
Agneta Åkesson, Chair	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden
Johan Ärnlöv	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden
Sara Hägg	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden
Berit Heitmann	University of Copenhagen	Denmark
Jacob Hjelmborg	University of Southern Denmark	Denmark
Henrik Larsson	Örebro University	Sweden
Øyvind Erik Næss	University of Oslo	Norway
John Norrie	University of Edinburgh	UK
Trine Rounge	Cancer Registry of Norway	Norway
Stefan Söderberg	Umeå University	Sweden

Carolina Hertzman Johansson, Senior Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 546 44 007,
email: Carolina.HertzmanJohansson@vr.se
Åsa Eklöf, Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 120 617 06,
email: asa.eklof@vr.se

MH-3R: Development of methods to replace, reduce and refine animal experiments

Panel meeting: 25-26 September 2024

Member	Organisation	Country
Klas Abelson, Chair	University of Copenhagen	Denmark
Gunnar Cedersund	Linköping University	Sweden
Kristian Dreij	Karolinska institutet	Sweden
Mattias Goksör	University of Gothenburg	Sweden
Barbara Rothen-Rutishauser	University of Fribourg	Switzerland
Katja Schenke-Layland	University of Tübingen	Germany
Lynne Sneddon	University of Gothenburg	Sweden
Patricia Turner	University of Guelph	Cananda
VACANT		

Kristian Haller, Senior Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 546 12 307,
email: Kristian.Haller@vr.se
Anna Sundin, Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 546 44 097,

email: Anna.Sundin@vr.se

MH-CARRER (Career grant panel)

Panel meeting: 9-10 October 2024

Member	Organisation	Country
Sven Nelander, Chair	Uppsala University	Sweden
Jordana Bell	King's College London	UK
Ivan Bogeski	Heart Center Göttingen	Germany
Mihaela Crisan	University of Edinburgh	UK
Tim Hucho	University of Cologne	Germany
Anna Keski-Rahkonen	Helsiniki University	Finland
Tarja Malm	University of Eastern Finland	Finland
Antonio Moschetta	University of Bari	Italy
Joachim Weischenfeldt	University of Copenhagen	Denmark
Nicola Zamboni	ETH Zürich	Switzerland
Manuela Zucknick	University of Oslo	Norway
VACANT		

Kristian Haller, Senior Research Officer,
phone: + 46 (0)8 546 12 307,
email: Kristian.Haller@vr.se
Tung Le, Research Officer,
phone + 46 (0)8 546 12 301,
email: Tung.Le@vr.se

Appendix 2. Relevance for subfocus areas

In addition to the general budget, we have specific funding for one subfocus area and the applicants are asked to state if the proposed research is relevant for this area or not. If they have ticked “Yes”, and the application is nominated/ranked at the review panel meeting, the panel should decide if the relevance is sufficient for being granted funds earmarked for this type of research. The relevance texts and guiding questions below are meant to aid the discussions at the panel meeting. Please note that there is no grade for the relevance. Instead, the panel should decide (Yes or No) if ranked or nominated applications, where the applicant has checked a box for a subfocus area, do indeed belong to this subfocus area. Please note that a majority of the guiding questions should be met to warrant a Yes.

For applications in precision medicine

Precision medicine refers to a development towards ever more individually adapted care within Swedish health and medical care. New opportunities for precision medicine are based on advances in recent years in areas such as molecular biosciences and bioinformatics, as well as the emergence of new high-resolution imaging techniques. The area covers research that can contribute basic knowledge of disease conditions, as well as knowledge of how these various conditions differ at the molecular level. The research may, for example, relate to how genes and biomarkers are combined with knowledge about lifestyle and other factors linked to disease progression and therapy outcomes, which may lead to ever more tailored therapies. In this context, precision medicine refers to diagnostic methods and therapies for individually adapted investigation, prevention and treatment in all disease areas, including rare diseases and health conditions. As basic research in the area is very closely linked to application, research carried out in collaboration between researchers in higher education and health and medical care or the business sector is particularly relevant.

Guiding questions:

- Does the research have potential to lead to more individually adapted health care and medical care?
- Is the research closely linked to an application?