



# Review Process and Writing a Grant Proposal

Mari Norgren, professor

Deputy head Department of Clinical Microbiology

Chair of review panel MR-04A Infection 2021

Medicine and Health

Swedish Research Council

# Review Process SRC MH



- Review panels
  - Members appointed by panel chair in collaboration with VR staff
  - Faculties and researchers can nominate reviewers until beginning of November
  - International reviewers at least 40 %
  - Gender balance required
  - Competencies in relation to research area of the panel
  - At least 8 members, depends on width of the subject area of the panel
  - Members of panel should preferably be appointed before the new year



Swedish  
Research  
Council

# Process

- Deadline for submission of proposal second half of March
- Panel chair distribute application among panel members in the following month
  - Applicant has indicated which panel should preferably review the application
  - Application can be moved between panels
- In June reviews get access to the application
- Calls reviewed by panels
  - Project grants
  - Starting grants
  - Half time clinical position

# Grading and ranking

- Each proposal is graded by at least 5 reviewers/evaluator
- External reviewers may be appointed
  - One reviewer is appointed as rapportuer, the rest evaluators
  - Applications are made available in Prisma
- Rapporteur and evaluators rank all application distributed to them
- Grades and ranking lists are submitted in Prisma; middle - end of August
- The results are compiled in excel files by VR staff



# Sifting



- Proposal with the lowest grades will not be discussed during the panel meeting and are graded but no statements written
- A cut off level is suggested by VR staff according to the calculated joint ranking
  - The chair and vice chair review the list
  - If large differences in the grading among reviews the application will not be sifted
- Max 50 per cent of the applications can be sifted
- Proposal with overall grade of 5 and higher can not be sifted
- Continuation grants can not be sifted
- List made available to all panel members for comments
- Sifted applications can be suggested to be discussed at the meeting

# Panel meeting



- Reviewers meet for 2 days to discuss the result of individual grading and ranking
- Applications are discussed according to the ranking list, starting with top ranked applications and then in declining order
- After discussions adjustments of the grades and overall grade are made
- Rapporteur writes a statement with focus on strength and weaknesses for each graded area which should reflect the view of the panel
- The chair and VR staff review all statements

# Nomination of Applicants for Starting Grant to International Review Board

- Review and grading by review panels
- Written statement and grades compiled
- Nomination of proposals to an International Board
- Second review by International board
  - Each reviewer ranked the applications into three groups
  - Panel meeting with discussions
- Suggests fundable applications to The Research Council MH for decision



# Decision and budgeting



- Made by the Scientific council – middle of October
- Based on suggestion from the review panel
- Project grants 3-5 yrs
  - 1.8 mKr
  - 1.2 mKr
  - 800 tkr
- Starting grants 4 yrs
  - 1,5 mKr
- Granted funding never higher then amount the applicant has applied for



# Conflict of Interest

- Conflict of interest are reported in Prisma by all reviewers and chair before distributing the applications among panel members
- Panel members with conflict of interest can will not review an application nor participate in the disussions, has to leave the room.
- Issues of conflict of interest can be identified late in the process then the application is allocated to a new reviewer.
- Also during the panel meeting any late identified conflict of interest has to be reported.

# Cause for Conflict of Interest

- Economic or other dependency circumstance
  - applicant or participating researcher has an assignment to evaluate the competence, application, department or subject of the person taking part in the handling of the matter.
  - Head or deputy head of the applicant's department
- Ongoing or recently terminated close collaboration
  - such as a teacher-student relationship
  - joint research project
  - doctoral student and his/her supervisor is considered a conflict of interest regardless of how long ago the collaboration occurred
  - evident friendship
  - enmity or difference of opinion
  - manager-employee relationship
- Handling of another context related to the applicant, e.g. as a representative of another public agency or organization.

# Gender Equality

- “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”.
- Before adopting its proposal for allocation of grants, review panels shall take into account the gender equality goal and work out the success rate in its proposal, as well as considering and, if necessary, commenting on the outcome.

# Independence

- **Change of environment**
  - International, national, or new department
- National or international collaborations initiated by you
- Think about how you **formulate yourselves**
  - Who initiates collaborations
  - What is the role of partners - not just a list of names
- **Clear demarcation in the project's** focus in relation to postgraduate or post doc supervisors
- **Explain clearly the role of partners in the project**
  - Especially important if you have not changed department and / or faculty after dissertation or post doc.
- Grants received, also smaller grants

# Title

- Important that the title reflects the aims and rational of the project/methods

# Aims

- Limit number of aims, preferably 3 that clearly relate to the overall goals of the project
- **Formulate a hypothesis or research question** that should also include a description of what you intend to achieve with the project

# Introduction

- Members are not experts in everything - provide some basic background
- State of the art – the most recent advances in the research field
- Avoid using abbreviations
- Clear language
  - Write with complete sentences
  - Choice of words
- References should be recent
- Use an external reader to check the language
- **Be concise - no more than 2 pages - time for reviewer limited**

# Project plan

- Start from clearly formulated hypotheses
- Explain preliminary results even if these have been submitted for publication - preliminary for the reviewer - extremely important
- Material
  - Clearly described
  - Motivation for choice of bacterial strains, cell lines etc.
  - **Statistics -power calculations if relevant**
- Choice of methods
  - Competence to carry out the project
    - Your own competence
    - Coworker
    - Collaborating partner at another university
    - Access to equipment and user competence
  - **Contingency plan** for critical parts of the project
    - Demonstrate knowledge of critical points and how these can be handled
    - Alternative methods
    - Extended reference material
    - etc

# References

- Use a format that include name of authors and title
- Up to date
- Reflect state of the art

# CV

- Follow instructions carefully
- Describe international experience
- Publications
  - Use a format that includes list of authors and title
  - Use separate headings for
    - Original articles
    - Review
    - Book chapter
- List assignments, management tasks, review assignments
  - Institution
  - Faculty
  - University
  - Nationally
  - Internationally