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From application ...... to grant
Overview - calls 2018

The Swedish Research Council provides different forms of research grant funding in order to best support Swedish research. The table below gives you an overview of calls during 2018.

Additional calls will be launched, for example at the request of the Swedish government. The information below is therefore updated continuously. Please note that not all detailed requirements have yet been finalised. Full guidelines for applicants will be published in the respective call texts when a call is launched.

Calls open for all subject areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of grant</th>
<th>Call opens (2 p.m)</th>
<th>Call closes (2 p.m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Postdoc (HS, AR, MH, NE, ES)</td>
<td>Call 1: 24 January, Call 2: 22 August</td>
<td>Call 1: 27 February, Call 2: 25 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference grant (HS, AR, MH, NE, ES)</td>
<td>Call 1: 24 January, Call 2: 22 August</td>
<td>Call 1: 27 February, Call 2: 25 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of grant</td>
<td>Call opens 2 p.m</td>
<td>Call closes 2 p.m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Postdoc</td>
<td>Call 1: 24 January</td>
<td>Call 1: 27 February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Call 2: 22 August</td>
<td>Call 2: 25 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference grant</td>
<td>Call 1: 24 January</td>
<td>Call 1: 27 February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Call 2: 22 August</td>
<td>Call 2: 25 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidator Grant</td>
<td>Project outline: 24 January</td>
<td>Project outline: 27 February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full application: 7 June</td>
<td>Full application: 28 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tage Erlander Visiting Professorship</td>
<td>24 January</td>
<td>27 February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Project Grant</td>
<td>7 March</td>
<td>10 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting Grant</td>
<td>7 March</td>
<td>10 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof of Concept Grant Life science</td>
<td>23 March</td>
<td>8 May</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From application ...... to grant
The Peer-Review process

- Evaluation panels consisting of researchers
  - Around **600** researchers and nearly **70** evaluation panels
  - Between **5** and **11** members in each panel
  - Wide academic and geographical spread
  - Foreign researchers (also sit on the evaluation panels) in order to
    - contribute with an international perspective
    - when there is a lack of Swedish experts within a particular field
    - because of the risk of conflict of interest.
  - External experts (don’t sit on the evaluation panels) could be used in some cases

- Evaluation panels are constantly changing
  - The term of office is **1 year**, but this can be extended for a max period of **6 years**
  - When a panel member applies for a grant, he/she cannot participate on the evaluation panel which will deal with his/her own application.
  - **In accordance with the VR’s equality strategy, evaluation panels should aim for an even spread between the sexes and also grants of similar size.**
Guiding Questions when assessing the applications

Novelty and originality
- Does the proposed project define new, interesting scientific questions?
- Does the proposed project have the potential to substantially increase the knowledge within its scientific area?
- Does the proposed project use new ways and methods to address important scientific questions?
- When applicable, does the proposed project show a clear progression and novelty in relation to the previous research of the applicant?

Scientific quality of the proposed research
- Is the proposed research scientifically significant?
- How does the proposed project relate to the state of the art of the research area?
- Do the scientific questions have the purpose to fill in significant knowledge gaps, and is the project description sufficiently detailed and of sufficient quality to reach, or to in a significant way approach these objectives?

Especially for Starting Grants:
- Does the applicant show the ability to formulate a scientific question that is clearly independent of the research the applicant has performed as a doctoral student and postdoc?

Merits of the applicant
The assessment should concern the merits of the applicant to perform the proposed project. The assessment of the co-applicants’ complementary expertise is mainly of relevance for the feasibility of the project.

- How significant is the applicant’s scientific productivity, impact and other merits in a national and international perspective, in relation to the research area, and the applicant’s career age? Here the emphasis should be put on the recent scientific achievements (including up to the last eight years).
- What is the applicant’s scientific competence within the research area of the application? The future potential should also be included in the evaluation when assessing Starting Grant applications. Especially for Starting Grants:
  - Has the applicant shown the ability to work independently?
  - Has the applicant shown the ability to work in new (international) research environments, for instance during postdoctoral work?

Feasibility
- Are the available equipment, infrastructure and other resources adequate for the proposed project?
- Considering the project as a whole, including the participating researchers, does the project group have sufficient competence to perform the proposed research?
- Only for Starting Grants: Does the host institution’s support letter show that there is a need for the applicant’s competence and an explicit interest for the suggested research direction in a broader sense? Does the host institution’s support letter show that the research environment is the right one for the applicant and for carrying out the research project? Is there a plan for the future employment of the applicant?
Assessment Criteria

4 quality components

7-grade scale

Novelty and originality

Scientific quality of the proposed research

Merits of the applicant(s)

3-grade scale

Feasibility

Overall grade

3 Feasible

2 Partly feasible

1 Not feasible

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 a few major weaknesses or several minor weaknesses

1 Poor

Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses
Distribution of grades 2013-2016 NT
Review panels: Natural and Engineering Sciences

- NT-1: Mathematical sciences
  - Algebra; Computational mathematics and numerical analysis; Discrete mathematics; Geometry; Mathematical logic; Mathematical analysis; Optimization; Probability theory and statistics; Systems theory; Applied mathematics

- NT-2: Computer science
  - Computer architecture; Systems engineering; Computer engineering; Interaction Technologies; Human-Computer Interaction (Interaction Design); Software engineering; Language technology (Computational linguistics); Information systems; Theoretical computer science

- NT-3: Subatomic physics, space physics and astronomy
  - Accelerator physics; Astrophysics; Astronomy; Astroparticle physics; Fusion; Cosmology; Mathematical physics; Nuclear physics; Plasma physics; Particle physics; Space physics; Radiation physics (non-medical aspects)

- NT-4: Atomic and molecular physics, optics and condensed matter physics
  - Atomic and molecular physics; Computational physics; Chemical physics; Cluster physics; Condensed matter physics; Quantum Information and quantum optics; Quantum liquids and quantum materials; Macromolecular physics; Optics; Statistical physics; Structural and vibrational physics

- NT-5: Analytical, physical and theoretical chemistry
Instruction for reviewers, Natural and Engineering sciences

The review process for applications submitted to the Swedish Research Council’s Scientific Council for Natural and Engineering Sciences is now underway. Naturally, each one of us involved is committed to working towards the best possible final result in allocating research funds. A condition for achieving this goal is access to good information regarding all aspects of the review process. This review handbook is intended to give you, as a reviewer, the basic support necessary to carry out your task in the best way.

The review handbook contains instructions and guidelines on the review process and on how to review the various types of grants offered by the Scientific Council for Natural and Engineering Sciences. It contains information about the Swedish Research Council’s general guidelines and the policies specific to the Scientific Council for Natural and Engineering Sciences. In the review handbook you will also find practical information on how to grade the grant applications, as well as instructions on how to write the preliminary and final statements. Although the goal of the review process is to allocate the Scientific Council’s funds to the best science, it is also essential that we produce high-quality reviews in order to provide adequate feedback to the applicants.

The work of reviewing grant applications is the foundation of the Scientific Council’s activities. Serving as a member of one of the Scientific Council’s Review...
SUBMIT IN TIME!!!
More information and contacts

- vr.se
- Contact person for each call
- Newsletter
- Older call texts
- Chatt – new for 2018