

Reviewer Guidance

The review of all applications is done in a digital platform, Researchweb. If you have not used to platform before you first need to register an account at <https://www.researchweb.org/is/stockholm>

- A start page in Swedish opens. If you like you can change the settings to English on the top panel by clicking on **"Språk"**.
- Click at **"Log in"** at top right hand corner.
 - Select **"Register new account"** and complete the form
 - Enter your login details and proceed

Conflict of interest

Before you begin the review, check for conflict of interest (co-publications during the last 5 years, supervision etc., see Karolinska Institute's rules for Conflicts of interest, <https://staff.ki.se/media/7285/download>).

- You can see all applications and report any conflict of interest on **"Individual review report"** in the left menu. The system will suggest conflict of interest on certain applications based on your history in the system but may not detect all instances of conflict of interest. Therefore, check the list, select Yes or No in the column for conflict of interest and click on **"Save"** at the bottom of the table.
- When everyone in the group has checked for any conflict of interest, the chairman will distribute the applications for which you will be assigned rapporteur. When this has been done, you can start reviewing and scoring of the applications. You are asked to write a short feedback on the applications for which you are rapporteur.

To review an application

- Log in to the Researchweb application system.
- Click on **"Review applications"** in the left menu.
- The system displays a list of all current applications. The tabs show the status of the applications. **"To review"** means that you have not reviewed the applications. **"Preliminary"** means that you have preliminarily reviewed applications. **"Reviewed"** means that you have completed your reviews.
- Click on the title of an application to review it.
- At the top you will see the name of the main applicant and the title of the application. You can unfold information about the applicant by clicking on **"Show more info"** in the

box with the name. You can also print the application here, using the **"Print"** button. The application is printed without attachments.

- The question mark at the fields means that there is a help text. Click on the question mark to read the help text. After filling in the fields, click on **"Save"** to save your review. You will now return to the list of remaining applications that you should review.
- Repeat steps 4, 5 and 6 until you have reviewed all applications.
- When you feel ready to submit your reviews, click on the **"Preliminary"** tab, where you can see a summary of your review for each application.
- You can either execute the reviews of the applications individually by clicking on the **"Execute review"** button under the application or execute all at once by clicking on **"Execute all applications"** in the top menu.

Scope of the SOF call

SOF welcomes applications for clinically oriented projects in all areas of dentistry and are intended for research carried out within the Stockholm County. SOF supports projects targeting essential needs in oral healthcare, showing promising potential for societal and national healthcare impact. Projects that collaborate with strong research environments projects and involve doctoral students or postdocs are encouraged.

Scoring

Each application should be reviewed according to the following evaluation criteria:

- **The clinical relevance of the project** (see detailed explanation below)
- **Method and scientific quality** (see detailed explanation below)
- **Competence and feasibility** (see detailed explanation below)
- **Patient benefit and patient involvement** (see detailed explanation below)

A 7-point scale should be used to score all these domains.

- **Score 7:** Outstanding. Exceptionally strong, highest international level.
- **Score 6:** Excellent. Very strong with negligible weaknesses.
- **Score 5:** Very good to excellent. Very strong with minor weaknesses.
- **Score 4:** Very good. Strong with minor weaknesses.
- **Score 3:** Good. Some strengths but also some weaknesses.
- **Score 2:** Weak. Few strengths and one major or several minor weaknesses.
- **Score 1:** Poor. Few strengths and several major weaknesses.
- **Score 0:** Not possible to evaluate – information is lacking.

- Ratings are in whole numbers only (no decimal ratings).
- For each review criterion, the strengths and weaknesses within that criterion should be considered.
- For each application that you are assigned as presenter (presenter is assigned by chair of the review board) make sure to write a short comment/feedback to the applicant. After the review meeting you might need to update the feedback to reflect the whole group's view.
- **Junior applicants receive an additional 2 points.** Reviewers add 2 points to the junior criterion for junior applicants.
- The sum of the mean of each evaluation criterion is the number that will be used to rank applications. All junior applicants receive an additional 2 points to the sum of the mean of the evaluation criteria. The final ranking list will be distributed before the review meeting to all reviewers.

Clinical Relevance of the Project

The extent to which the project, assuming it can be successfully implemented in an innovative and meaningful way, contributes to increasing knowledge for dental research.

Method and Scientific Quality

The extent to which the hypothesis or research question, study design, methods, and analysis are correctly applied, well-integrated, and appropriate for the aim of the project. All research must be conducted with high quality. Innovative and original approaches should be rewarded.

Competence and Feasibility

The applicant's competence and ability to conduct the research. Is there access to relevant patient data, infrastructure, personnel, strong research environment and funding? Projects that involve doctoral students or postdocs should be encouraged. Is the project sufficiently clinically anchored and able to recruit a sufficient number of patients? Are ethical and any other necessary approvals granted? For applicants over 65 years old, regeneration in the project group should be addressed.

Patient Benefit and Patient Involvement

Clinical research should lead to patient benefit, contribute to opening opportunities to achieve health, alleviate and cure disease, and/or streamline resource utilization in dental care (or healthcare).

The patient benefit and patient involvement assessment criterion should include:

Plan for Implementation: Description of how the knowledge generated in the project can be implemented in dental care. What is the intended process for transferring scientific findings to clinical practice? What is the timeline? How applicable is the result?

Clinical Anchoring: Description of how the dental care organization is utilized in the project.

Generalizability of Expected Results: Description of how the results can be interpreted, used, or developed in dental care. Does the project's design allow for conclusions that are applicable to a broader patient population than the one included in the project? Can the results be applied to clinically related areas/diseases?

Patient Involvement: Is there a description of how patient involvement has occurred in the planning of the research? If patient involvement has not occurred, a justification should be provided.

Junior applicants receive an additional 2 points

All junior applicants will receive an additional 2 points to the sum of the mean of the evaluation criteria. Junior points are added by the reviewers in Researchweb. Eligibility of junior applicants are done by the SOF administrators before the review process.

Review meeting

The chair of the review board will contact the reviewers to decide on a date for a digital review meeting (end of August). Approximately one week before the meeting, members receive a compilation of the total assessment scores in descending order (ranking list).

During the review meeting the presenting reviewer gives a short explanation of the strengths and weaknesses of the project plan and the applicant and a motivation of his/her scoring of the application. After the presentation, the group discusses the application and compares their assessments, which can influence the overall evaluation. Consensus is sought. If necessary, the scores are adjusted to match the proposal for approval/rejection that the group agrees upon. The presenting reviewer should also adjust the feedback to the applicant to reflect the whole group's opinion.

The gender equality perspective

Given high quality, the approval rates for women and men should be as equal as possible. In cases of equal scientific merit, gender equality should be decisive.

Reviewers

- Magnus Hakeberg, University of Gothenburg, Folktandvården Västra Götalandsregionen
- Ingegerd Johansson, Umeå University
- Gunilla Klingberg, Malmö University
- Bruno Loos, Academic Center for Dentistry Amsterdam
- David Rice, University of Helsinki

Technical problems?

- There may be a temporary fault in the internet connection between your computer and our server. If the link above does not work, try again after a while.
- If you have forgotten the password, you can click just below the box for the password (see the instructions below the box for entering the password). A new temporary password will then be sent to your email. If you have changed your e-mail address and cannot access your old one, you need the help of Researchweb support (support@researchweb.org).
- If you have other technical problems, please contact the Researchweb support support@researchweb.org.