

SOF evaluation criteria 2025

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 innovative projects that are targeting essential needs in oral healthcare, showing promising potential for societal and national healthcare impact. Projects that collaborate with strong research environments projects and support the involvement of doctoral students, postdocs or junior faculty are encouraged.

Scoring

Each application is reviewed according to the following evaluation criteria:

- **Originality and clinical relevance** (see detailed explanation below)
- **Method and scientific quality** (see detailed explanation below)
- **Competence and feasibility** (see detailed explanation below)
- **Patient Involvement** (see detailed explanation below)

A 7-point scale is used to score all these criteria.

- **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.
- 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. **Junior applicants are considered ones who have attained their PhD degree less than 5 years ago.**

Originality and Clinical Relevance

The extent to which the project, contributes to new and incremental knowledge in dental research, assuming it can be **implemented in an original and clinically innovative and meaningful way,**

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 should be explained. All research must be conducted with high quality. Methodological originality is a merit and innovative approaches are prioritized. Statistical methodology should be elaborated.

Competence and Feasibility

The applicant's competence and ability to conduct the research. Evidence of access to relevant patient data, infrastructure, personnel, strong research environment should be demonstrated. Prior funding availability is a merit. Description of patient recruitment strategy and patient number sufficiency should be justified. Ethical and any other necessary approvals granted should be provided or their planning and timeline should be described. For applicants

over 67 years old, a contingency plan for the proposed research line should be justified. Motivation of the budget should be provided.

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 involvement assessment criterion should include:

- **Plan for Implementation:** Description of how the knowledge generated in the project can be implemented in dental care and how it brings novel insights, compared to previous approaches. The planned process for transferring scientific findings to applicable clinical practice should be highlighted. The project timeline should be outlined.
- **Clinical Anchoring:** Description of how the dental care organization (from Region Stockholm) is utilized in the project.
- **Generalizability of Expected Results:** Description of how the results can be interpreted, used, or developed in dental care. The project's design should allow for conclusions that are applicable to a broader patient population, potentially beyond the cohort recruited in the specific project. If the obtained results can be applied to other clinically related areas/diseases, this should be indicated.
- **Patient Involvement:** A description of how patient involvement has been considered either in the planning of the research project and/or in the future implementation of the findings.

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.

Reviewer Panel

- Ingegerd Johansson, Umeå University (Panel Chair)
- Julia Davies, Malmö University
- Farida Fortune, Queen Mary University of London
- Wim Teughels, KU Leuven
- David Rice, University of Helsinki