



Research grants from *Insamlingsstiftelsen* and associated foundations, for 2024-2026

General information

The funds in Insamlingsstiftelsen (and associated foundations) are donated by the public. An application for funding must involve medical research. When assessing the applications, it is important to consider the below criteria of the project in relation to the maximal amount of grants from Insamlingsstiftelsen (and associated foundations) usually is ~100-300 KSEK/year; the amount varies between research purposes.

Guidelines to assess the applications

Each reviewer is initially assigned a set number of applications. After all the applications are assessed, a triage is conducted. The reviewers then read those applications they initially were not assigned in preparation for the Review Panel meeting.

The applications are assessed using similar criteria also applied by the Swedish Research Council (VR). The following text is extracted from VRs peer-review handbook:

The scientific quality of the project (1-7)

Strengths and weaknesses of the project's question and methodology, including potential for future scientific activities.

- Will the project, if successful, significantly advance our understanding of the field?
- Is the research proposal relevant for medical research and are the definitions of the problems, and proposed solutions, clear, convincing, and compelling?
- Does the study design, its research questions, and hypotheses and theoretical framework, 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 research question?
- Are there relevant scientific collaborations?
- Are methods for data analysis and statistics well described?
- Has the applicant in a satisfactory manner described the possible importance of sex and/or gender for the research project? If not, is there a clear description to why?
- If a gender and diversity perspective is described as relevant to the research project, has the applicant considered gender and diversity in the description of the proposed work, for instance as part of preliminary data, the choice of samples or study population, or data analyses?

The merits of the applicant (1-7)

Scientific qualifications and merits in relation to the proposed project.

- 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 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.



UMEÅ UNIVERSITET

FS 2.1.6-73-24

A **seven-grade scale** is used to evaluate the scientific quality of the project and the merits of the applicant.

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

Feasibility (1-3)

Carry out an evaluation of the feasibility of the proposed project.

- 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 work plan, including the budget and timeframe, 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?

A three-grade scale is used:

- 1. Not feasible**
- 2. Partly feasible**
- 3. Feasible**

The relevance of the project in relation to the purposes marked by the applicant (Yes or No)

Evaluate the relevance of the project in relation to the purposes the applicant has marked. Choose between **Yes** or **No**.

Overall grade (1-7)

Criteria above will together form an overall grade that will reflect an overall assessment of the application. With respect to all scores, use the total scale, where 1 will reflect the lowest quality of the applications you have assessed and a 7 will reflect the best.

Ranking

You shall also rank each specific application against all the others you have reviewed. The ranking shall be a supplement to the grading when the review panel compares applications. You must rank all the applications you have been allocated.

Triage to screen out applications

To enable discussion of all applications assessed to have a reasonable chance of being awarded a grant, a triage will occur, excluding the applications that have the least chance of securing funding based on the combined scores and ranks of the reviewers. The triage is carried out, by the appointed chair and vice-chair of the Review Panel, based on the panels scoring and ranking. A general rule is that around 60 % of the applications shall be discussed at the panel meeting, with some variation between calls. The triage shall be carried out with the gender distribution in mind, to ensure the process is not applied differentially for women and men.



UMEÅ UNIVERSITET

Applications where the ranking or the scoring differs considerably, despite having a low ranking, should be identified, and discussed at the meeting.

The list of applications up for discussion shall be made available to all panel members ahead of the meeting. All panel members can always ask for an application to be brought up for discussion at the meeting, even if it has been proposed to be excluded ahead of the meeting.

Discussion on applications at the review panel meeting

Each application is assigned a presenter prior to the meeting. At the review panel meeting, the application discussion is initiated by each presenter. The discussion uses the scoring and ranking as the starting point. All scores from the different criteria are then combined to produce a final score for each application.

The chair leads the discussions and is also responsible for including any assessments from external reviewers in the discussions.

The review panel has equal responsibility for each application reviewed by the panel, and each one shall be evaluated based on its own merits. At the same time, the applications shall compete with each other on equal terms. No application may therefore be given a higher or lower score because it belongs within a certain subject area. Nor shall the panel carry out any quota-based allocation between the different scientific disciplines represented.

Note that the meeting time is finite. It is therefore important to try to find a balance in the time allocated for each application. Conflicts of interest are established before any scoring and ranking commences. If you discover any further possible conflict of interest (your own or others) during the meeting, please bring this up with the chair, preferably prior to the meeting.

Prioritizing

Once all applications have been discussed, and grades are determined for each application, the panel shall carry out a recommendation of the applications with focus on the overall highest scientific quality based on the summary score. The recommendation for grant allocation is an overall approval rate of approximately 45-47 %, and the granted applications should be grouped into the Faculty Board's decided prioritization levels:

Approx. 5 % of awarded grants receive level 1, i.e., 100 % allocation of the fixed amount for the respective research purpose.

Approx. 20 % of awarded grants receive level 2, i.e., 60 % allocation of the fixed amount for the respective research purpose.

Approx. 75 % of awarded grants receive level 3, i.e., 30 % allocation of the fixed amount for the respective research purpose.