



RESEARCH EVALUATION FOR DEVELOPMENT 2019 EXPERT PANEL REPORT

Institute of Biomedicine

Introductory Remarks

Section A – Background and Research Standing

- [A1. Background](#)
- [A2. Research standing](#)

Section B – Leadership

- [B1. Leadership](#)
- [B2. Recruitment and B3. Career structure](#)
- [B4. Funding](#)
- [B5. Feedback and evaluation](#)

Section C – Complete Academic Environment

- [C1. Collaboration](#)
- [C2. Relevance and impact on society](#)
- [C3. Research-teaching linkages](#)

Section D – Academic Culture

- [D1. Academic culture](#)
- [D2. Publication](#)
- [D3. Facilities and research infrastructure](#)
- [D4. Transverse perspectives](#)

Section E – Support

- [E1. Internal research support](#)
- [E2. Faculty and University-wide support](#)

Section F – Other Matters

- [F1. RED10 evaluation](#)
- [F2. Other matters](#)

Concluding Recommendations

Introductory Remarks

Panelists:

Leif Andersson, chair

Maria Fällman

Risto Renkonen

Kjetil Tasken

Sabine Tejpar

The evaluation of the Institute of Biomedicine was divided into two parts: Biomedicine 1 and Biomedicine 2, where the former corresponds to the Department of Infectious Diseases and the Department of Microbiology and Immunology, and the latter to the Department of Laboratory medicine (former Department of Pathology and Genetics and the Department of Clinical Chemistry and Transfusion Medicine) and the Department of Medical Biochemistry and Cell Biology. A third panel was going to review the Sahlgrenska Cancer Center, which is hosted by the Institute of Biomedicine. However, during the visit, it was agreed that Sahlgrenska Cancer Center should be evaluated together with Biomedicine 2. While this subdivision was useful for conducting the site visit in a timely manner, the panel is instructed to deliver an aggregated report on the Institute of Biomedicine as a single unit which also includes the Sahlgrenska Cancer Center. The report therefore has comments pertaining to different departments, but is aggregated to an overall report for the whole institute.

Report: Observations and Analysis

Section A – Background and Research Standing

A1. Background

Organisation

The Institute of Biomedicine is divided into four departments:

- Department of Infectious Diseases
- Department of Microbiology and Immunology
- Department of Laboratory Medicine
- Department of Medical Biochemistry and Cell Biology

The Department of Infectious Diseases and the Department of Laboratory Medicine are clinical departments whereas the Department of Microbiology and Immunology and the Department of Medical Biochemistry and Cell Biology are more oriented towards basic science. The Department of Laboratory Medicine is a new constellation since January 2019 and is the result of merging two previous departments, the Department of Pathology and Genetics and the Department of Clinical Chemistry and Transfusion Medicine. This was part of an ambition to focus the research. Following a recommendation in RED10, the institute reduced the number of departments from six to four.

Executive steering group of the institute: The institute is headed by Professor Sven Enerbäck, with Professor Marianne Quiding-Järbrink as Deputy Head. In addition to the Head and Deputy Head of Institute, the executive steering group includes two Assistant Deputy Heads, Claes Gustafsson, responsible for research and Magnus Braide, responsible for teaching, and Chatrine Butler, Head of Administration as well as Niclas Lundh, Administrative Coordinator. The steering group meets every week to deal with everyday questions related to economy and human resources.

The management group consists of the executive steering group extended by the four department heads. This group meets monthly to coordinate work within the institute and to disseminate information and discuss matters relevant for the individual departments and upcoming issues concerning the institute.

Institute Board: This board, which functions as an advisory board for the institute head, consists of representatives from different personnel categories (five teachers, two technical and administrative staff, and a student representative). The other members of the management, together with representatives from the Trade Unions and Future Faculty, are also invited to meetings. The Institute Board meets approximately five times a year and consists of representatives from different personnel categories.

Department heads: Each department is led by a Head of Department.

Institute interaction with faculty and university level: The faculty management, under leadership of the Dean, meets regularly with institute heads. The relations with the faculty management appears to be good, the institute leadership members find that they can address issues concerning research or other business and also influence central decisions. They also appreciate that the faculty and university levels allow freedom in academic leadership and respect their work in developing the scientific environment at the institute with a focus on excellence and academic freedom.

Panel comments

The research topics investigated at the institute are very broad and can appear as non-focused. This was highlighted in RED10 and there have been some efforts to focus on specific areas, as described by the management. This is presented as four main focus areas within the institute: “Infection and Immunology”, “Cancer and Stem Cell Biology”, “Genetics and Molecular Medicine” and “Cell and Molecular Biology, including Glycobiology”. The panel does not, however, see this as a focus of the research at the institute; the areas are all very broad and together they can include nearly all types of research. The “Stanford strategy” to focus on excellence in a wide variety of scientific questions with some common interests and complementarity is used by many successful academic institutions worldwide and the panel did not perceive the broad scope as a major problem as the institute appears to successfully foster excellence in research. Despite this, there may be opportunities missed for coordination, collaboration and cohesion within this model. Weaker groups and young PIs may be less well taken care of in such an environment.

The general impression from the interviews was that the executive steering group was well functioning as a group with very open communication, where all participants feel involved in the decision-making process and share responsibilities in making and executing decisions.

There are notes taken from these meetings, in order to keep track of different current issues. These notes are regarded as working material and are therefore not made public. However, while information seems to circulate well within the steering group, the mechanism for dissemination of information to department heads or to people at the departmental level appear to be less efficient. Lack of information and an apparent lack of possibilities for involvement and for having influence was a recurrent theme in many of the meetings the panel had and at all levels.

There seemed to be no or very little discussion and awareness regarding institute strategies at the departmental level. There were clear signals that the transparency regarding ongoing discussions and decision-making was considered low, for example with respect to decisions regarding recruitment and strategic plans for the future. Another issue raised, which might partly contribute to the observed feeling of not taking part in planning future directions, was the composition of the executive steering group, where three out of four in the academic leadership are affiliated to the Department of Medical Biochemistry and Cell Biology. It was also obvious that the PIs at the different departments had little knowledge of ongoing strategic discussions at the institute level, and the gap was even larger for the faculty/university level.

The panel can understand that certain decisions, for example about new hires, are complex and involve present and expected future teaching needs, upcoming retirements etc. However, despite this, the panel would recommend efforts to improve the communication from the institute to the departmental level, even just about the decision process and any uncertainties. This could already clarify a lot and likely also create more understanding for the complexity. In addition to including the department heads in strategic discussions, departmental-wide information from the executive steering group would also be desirable in order to avoid inconsistent information/interpretation from different levels. Such information meetings would also contribute to reducing the gap between the PI level and the institute leadership. Except the SCC and the Department of Microbiology and Immunology, the departments in the institute do not appear to have PI meetings on a regular basis.

The role for departmental heads does not appear very attractive. There appears to be no extra funding to be used by the heads. One major task is to distribute teaching, which is important, but there are also other less advanced tasks that is put on the heads, such as handling technical equipment and other general duties associated with running daily work, as well as taking care of upcoming practical questions.

Recommendations

- Involve departmental heads more in strategic discussions.
- Improve communication to the departments about ongoing issues, directly from the institute leadership, not only via the departmental heads and also directly to the faculty members.
- Start regular faculty member / PI meetings at the institute level.

A2. Research standing

Although this evaluation does not focus on the research quality *per se*, the panel can conclude that the standard of research output is high. Researchers at the institute publish regularly as corresponding

authors of high-impact papers in internationally-leading journals, and are highly competitive in receiving external funding. Several prestigious national and international grants have been awarded to researchers within the institute. A lot of the research at the Department of Infectious Diseases and Department of Microbiology and Immunology is in some aspects connected to the areas of vaccine and mucosa biology and immunity, also in relation to cancer, as well as research about biomarkers and also rather new research topics, including pioneering research on new bacterial species. In the vaccine area many of the strong profiles are past or close to retirement.

The Department of Medical Biochemistry and Cell Biology is a strong department with excellent standing in research on metabolism and mitochondria, cancer cells signalling, glycobiology and mucosal biology. The Department of Laboratory Medicine is more diverse in research topics and standing.

Another sign of the academic standing is the relatively high number of researchers that are members of the Swedish Royal Academy of Sciences, and this does not only include researchers that are close to retirement, but also newly-recruited group leaders are represented.

Hosted centres

CARe (Centre for Antibiotic Resistance Research at the University of Gothenburg)

The new multidisciplinary CARe centre was a timely strategic initiative that has developed very successfully, reaching international and national recognition on many levels. The localisation at the Department of Infectious Diseases appears ideal with regard to the topic and the closeness to CCUG (Culture Collection of the University of Gothenburg), which should provide unique opportunities for antimicrobial research. Research within antibiotic resistance has been boosted due to the recruitment of Joakim Larsson and the establishment of CARe. As CARe is translational, spanning several faculties (medicine, natural science, economics, and humanities), this research milieu has proved beneficial for networking that leads to new ideas.

SCC

The Sahlgrenska Cancer Center (SCC) was founded in 2010 and first headed by Göran Stenman. It is a centre for translational cancer research hosted by the Institute of Biomedicine. SCC is a cross-departmental construct and matrix organisation that includes about 20 research groups from 12 departments affiliated to the Institutes of Biomedicine, Clinical Sciences and Medicine. Yet some of the most high-profile cancer researchers in the institute are not working in SCC. Most of the PIs have clinical affiliations and many members of the research groups are clinicians active at Sahlgrenska University Hospital. Reporting for the SCC with respect to publication output appears problematic as they may or may not be listed on papers as an adjunct affiliation, thus resulting in a seemingly lower productivity than what may actually be the case. SCC offers access to biobanks in a large variety of tumour material and manages the PDX-biobank at the animal facility that is the largest collection of humanised and personalised mouse cancer models in Sweden.

SCC functions well as a virtual construction. It serves as a cohesive effort in translational cancer research and provides space and access to instrumentation and technology that has been valuable, particularly for new and smaller groups. It remained unclear to the panel on what basis research groups are selected to the centre. There are groups doing cutting-edge translational cancer research at other departments in the institute, which are not included in SCC. Inclusion of these research groups

would increase the critical mass at SCC, unless currently available laboratory space forms a limiting factor.

There are however threats for the SCC. It remained unclear what the medium- and long-term vision is. SCC does not appear to go into research areas such as precision cancer medicine and immune oncology in a coordinated fashion. A strategy for developing relations to industry or for innovations was not apparent. The big grant that offered a dedicated budget (BioCARE) is terminated and co-funding from the Vice-Chancellor has decreased annually over the past few years. Without solid core funding, investment in disruptive cancer research-related technology will be on the wane and the bench-fees raised to levels unaffordable for many groups.

The panel recommends discussions between the leaderships of Biomedicine, Sahlgrenska Academy and UOGT to reach strategic decisions on how to secure continuation of the successful translational cancer research at SCC.

Section B – Leadership

B1. Leadership

B1.1 Department leadership

The strategy for developing a strong research environment at the institute very much builds on attracting the best possible candidate for any given position and providing them with good opportunities to perform their research. The aim is a flat organisation with many strong, independent research groups working on different scientific questions, but also with some common interests and complementarity, which is believed to promote fruitful collaborations contributing to scientific renewal. All research initiatives are expected to come from the research groups, the leadership does not deal with developing new research initiatives. Although striving for excellence in research, teaching is an important matter at the institute, and all researchers are involved in teaching. The flat organisation is expected to provide stability by not being linked to single individuals, and is also believed to promote creativity, with individual group leaders who are free to think for themselves. This type of strong creative research environment is also expected to increase the attractiveness of the institute as a place for other researchers to situate their research, which facilitates future top recruitments, and contributes to excellence and scientific renewal by bringing in new ideas and techniques to the institute.

Today, a variety of research topics are investigated at the institute, spanning from basic biological research to advanced translational research embedded in clinical investigations. The breadth of topics displayed is partly a consequence of associated teaching missions that demand expert knowledge covering many scientific areas. As a consequence, this does not allow the specialisation and scientific focus that can be seen in certain scientific institutions.

The institute intends to recruit a number of new staff members over the next few years at all different levels, due to both increased economy and the retirement of a number of PIs. As much as 10 new full professors are planned to be recruited in the next five years. There are also plans to launch a

programme for the recruitment of young scientists. Regarding research, there are ambitions to strengthen translational research at the institute.

Panel comments

From the beginning, most of the panel members questioned the lack of research focus at the institute, however, after the interview sessions the panel agrees that what appears from outside as a “non-strategy”, indeed is a strategy that seems to work, at least in fostering excellence. The clear focus on developing a strong research environment that is competitive in the international arena was repeatedly explained to the panel in different ways. The institute has been successful in recruiting strong researchers both at senior and junior levels. This seems to have paid off well, the external funding received in national and international competition has increased substantially. The leadership also noted an increased interest from young scientists to locate at the institute, which is a promising sign. The broadness regarding research areas can indeed be challenging and cause obstacles regarding the strive for an interactive and creative research environment.

There is an ongoing and quite substantive generation shift at the institute, where strong researchers who have had very big groups are about to retire, for example in the areas of vaccinology, and adjuvance research and in mucosal biology, which have all been internationally-recognised with high impact – the panel has some concerns about how this is planned to be handled in future. However, it was shown that other researchers at the department who are working on related topics ensure the succession and contribute to further development of the research area of mucosal regulation and immunity. The institute leadership was clearly aware of this, and explained a clear opinion about their view, which prioritised renewal over conservation.

The ambition to increase the possibilities for high-quality translational research is appreciated, but there were only vague plans for how this was to be implemented. This will require some actions to “open up” between departments to increase the interaction between researchers. The panel also understood that the clinical units might move to a new building in the future, which can be an excellent opportunity for increased interactions, but again, interaction between clinical departments and non-clinical departments also needs to be increased.

B1.2 Faculty/University level leadership

The panel has not separately addressed this question.

B2. Recruitment and B3. Career Structure

For upcoming recruitments, the same strategy as before with broad and open calls for the positions will be employed. This means that internal people have to apply via these competitive calls, there is no other way to be promoted than through this selection. As mentioned, at least 10 new, full professors are planned to be recruited, and the aim is to find the best researchers who are also good teachers. The recruitment process aligns with the standard in Swedish academia, and involves an external evaluation of the applicants' research and teaching merits. Interviews are also held, and are an important part in ensuring that the candidate is a good fit and that they have the ability to both contribute to and also benefit from the environment at the institute.

So far there have not been any open calls to recruit young scientists to the institute; several new group leaders who have started at the institute have come with their own salary. Several new group leaders have recently started at the institute this way. There are several sources for this funding available in Sweden today, and the institute supports applicants who they find suitable for the institute and competitive enough in the application process. It is also possible to get co-funding from the university for those who receive establishment grants from the Swedish Research Council (VR), and here the institute also adds support by paying two years' salary on top of the four years covered by the grant. After this time, usually 9-11 years post-PhD, researchers are expected to be competitive in open calls for senior positions. The institute has recruited a large number of early-career scientists this way, many of whom have recently started establishing research groups. Their salaries are paid by external resources, such as VR or the Wallenberg Centre for Molecular and Translational Medicine.

At the national level, however, there is also a new mechanism of regular open calls for tenure-track positions for young scientists. This is an opportunity to further increase chances to pick the best possible candidates for the research environment. The decision on tenure for this type of position, "*biträdande lektor*", comes quite early and as the tenure track system is very recently implemented in Sweden, there are several question marks about how this type of employment will work in reality, which the institute leadership are aware of. One is that the candidate cannot have a PhD older than five years, and also that the processes for evaluation and eventual termination are still unclear. At present, the institute has therefore chosen not to make use of this mechanism and does not have a strategy for how to use it.

Panel comments

The institute leadership has clear metrics to drive new hires, which are presented for the panel in a consistent way. We can see the complexity of the work on planning new recruitments, aligning with the different teaching needs combined with the thrive for excellence. The majority of newly-recruited senior and junior scientists are external, which is very positive, since it will ensure renewal of research at the institute. It was however noted that many of the recruited young researchers completed their PhD at Sahlgrenska Academy, but had then been away for some years for a postdoc.

The recruitment system of open competitive calls seems to have worked well so far, and has led to a variety of research topics present at the institute. However, this breadth can present a challenge for the work on developing the research environment. Heterogeneity may complicate the prioritising of next investment in core platforms and at its worst can even weaken the centre in a rapidly evolving scientific landscape.

The institute seems to manage the long-term budget and has a good mastery of the complex metrics that will affect their budget. The willingness to develop the curriculum and participate more in integrating teaching for medical students appeared low for the same reasons. It is clear that the institute leadership is aware of the limited opportunities this creates for young internal PIs who have to compete with senior external candidates, but this is a clear policy of the institute. This naturally creates a lot of anxiety for young scientists in non-tenured positions, but since the institute cannot permanently employ every young group leader, this is unavoidable, and necessary for maintaining the high level of excellence. There is, however, no structured system for progress evaluation of young scientists, which would be especially important not only for the current non-tenured group leaders, but also for the planned new tenure-track positions (discussed below).

The panel can understand the reluctance to advertise "*biträdande lektorat*", since it is challenging to identify star researchers already five years post-PhD and it is out of step with international practice. This seems very early compared to international standards for these types of positions. The panel have

also learnt that the Swedish employment system is rigid in the sense that it can be difficult to terminate an employment. The panel finds it important that before starting the use of such a tenure-track system, that the faculty implement a transparent and efficient system for hiring to these positions, setting out clear criteria for tenure, following-up (mentoring, enabling strategies) in a transparent system that is clear for both the employee and for the institute leaderships. It is important to handle this strictly and consistently to ensure fair and equal treatment of the candidates up for tenure. To ensure the influx of new competence and experiences it is important to ensure that the number of such positions (*biträdande lektorat*) is balanced against, and does not replace, open calls for senior scientists.

From the interviews with the young researcher leaders it became clear that a more structured mentorship system would be desirable. As it is now, the amount of mentoring received differs a lot from person to person. Extra help for non-Swedish PIs to understand the Swedish system was pointed out as important. The panel also notes that there is no structured system for selecting PhD students to be admitted and that the young group leaders handle this by themselves. The panel understands that there are courses in scientific leadership at the university / faculty level that have been offered to some young group leaders, which have been very good and cover many important aspects of being a research leader, including the recruitment of group members; however, it was not clear to all young group leaders that these existed.

Given the strict system of having no other way of gaining a senior position other than via open competitive calls, it is very important to have clear communication about this. Optimal career development should still be addressed, both to increase the chance of tenure for some, and to maximise career outflow capacities for others. Junior leaders clearly get opportunities for high-impact publications through the opportunities offered by the institute, such as access to unique core facilities and interactions with excellent scientists, and some topical nodes. Are there ways to improve this, so that a stay at UGOT, even temporarily, is a major step forward in a career, even more than it is now? Structural collaborations after leaving, partial appointments?

Most of the postdocs appeared to appreciate the environment and many of them were very positive regarding the possibilities for teaching. For PhD students, there were complaints about the compulsory course package, which was perceived as less good, both regarding its content and that it was often not possible to take the introductory part upon the start of the PhD, but instead at a later time point, when that type of training had already happened locally and informally. This was also emphasised by the supervisors of PhD students. A more flexible system in concert with the aims of individual study plans should be developed. There are several funding schemes for MDs to PhDs which appear to function well. UGOT does not, however, have a MD/PhD track for early recruitment of medical students to research.

Recommendations

- Continue the strategy of open calls for all positions.
- Put efforts into offering good opportunities for top-level research to young researchers.
- Offer courses in scientific leadership to all new young group leaders.
- Clearly communicate criteria for promotion and qualification requirements for senior positions.
- Implement a mentorship programme for young research leaders as well as a structured system for evaluation of their progress.
- Implement a transparent and efficient system for handling "*biträdande lektorat*" at the faculty level.

- At the institute level it will be important to implement a flexible system for future recruitment, reaching a balance of promoted lecturers and externally-recruited senior researchers.
- Implement a system for selection of PhD students to be registered with a systematic procedure, where one part involves several PIs assisting in the evaluation of candidates to ensure that the most talented students are selected.
- Look over and modify the course package for PhD students, create a package that is more flexible and adapted to the individual students.

B4. Funding

The funding situation at the Institute of Biomedicine is currently very good, there has been a strong growth in external funding over the last eight years. This is paralleled by increased support from the government to the national research system, but UGOT and the institute appears to collect a competitive share of this increase. The institute pays full salary and rent for office space for all permanently employed professors and associate professors, and salary costs for PhD students are subsidised by 40%. There is no other direct research money distributed, the scientists are expected to compete for external money for their research. The OH cost is kept very low. There are also possibilities to apply for additional funding for PhD students from the faculty. From the university level, there is a kick-back system providing 25% additional support for certain large competitive grants to cover OH costs, and to support younger scientists, and certain prestigious project grants are topped up with SEK 750,000 annually.

Panel comments

There is an obvious focus on promoting external funding, the incitements with possibilities to obtain top-up grants helps to keep up competitiveness of the researchers for grant renewal. The funding from VR, which is very competitive, is relatively low, just covering parts of the projects applied for. The co-funding of PhD students is generous.

The central Grants and Innovation Office appeared to be appreciated and to be doing a good job. The coaching of ERC applicants was especially highlighted, but also the assistance with NIH and EU grants was considered well-working by the PIs who were interviewed.

The organisation has been “slimmed” and there is very little internal funding. Internal equipment is commonly run by “user clubs”, some departments have a bench-fee system for funding equipment and other common needs.

B5. Feedback and evaluation

The panel has not separately addressed this question.

Section C – Complete Academic Environment

C1. Collaboration

The researchers at the institute collaborate extensively internationally and there are examples of strong international collaborative projects, of which some are also funded by prestigious international grants.

C2. Relevance and impact on society

There are several examples showing the impact of research from the institute, including the drinkable cholera vaccine that was developed by institute researchers. Research from the Centre for Antibiotic Resistance Research at the University of Gothenburg (CARE) contributes a lot to reducing the risk of antibiotic resistance, and stakeholders from all over the globe use information from the centre for their decision-making. There are also many contacts with the pharmaceutical industry.

CARE is another excellent example of contribution to society. This centre, which is one of the UGOT Challenges centres, has already had a significant impact on international policies, particularly with regards to reducing risks associated with environmental discharge of antibiotics. CARE regularly provides scientific advice to international stakeholders, including the WHO, CDC, EFPIA, JPIAMR and the EU Commission. Visitors from 124 countries have used the website www.care.gu.se to gain an overview of funded research, members, symposia, published research, outreach and other activities, or to participate in online courses arranged by the centre. CARE will be one of the novel flagships of UGOT/ Sahlgrenska Academy. CARE has timely research topics, top-quality performance, cross-disciplinary approach and it focuses on the WHO sustainable development goals.

In general, the descriptions of societal impact were meagre compared to other parts of the self-evaluation, and the awareness of RRI, user involvement and other societal trends seemed to remain on the lower side.

C3. Research-teaching linkages

The panel has not separately addressed this question.

Section D – Academic Culture

D1. Academic culture

The institute prioritises small and medium-sized independent research groups working side by side in the environment. The atmosphere was generally perceived as collegial, with a positive view of research and teaching. There are common activities, such as weekly international seminars and common PhD seminars. Journal clubs and project meetings are arranged by individual groups but open for members of other research groups.

New young group leaders are expected to build their own independent groups.

A clear interest in developing teaching methods and new courses was obvious at the departments, where teaching in some areas was presented as being tightly connected to ongoing research. There is also a demand that everyone should participate in teaching, and teaching contributions are registered in a common database.

Panel comments

The strategy for recruiting teachers using broad open calls has led to a wide variety of research topics at the institute. Some researchers have joined forces and work on complementary questions with joint grants. For more junior researchers, the topics are more fragmented. An active overview at the institute level of potential synergies (across departments), collaborations, and mentoring would be recommended.

There seems to be a culture of sharing only within the different departments, which was pointed out by many of the group leaders. The departments within the institute are at different locations and there does not seem to be interactions and sharing of equipment between researchers at different departments. Awareness of research and equipment at other departments is surprisingly low among PIs, postdocs and PhD students. Regarding the institutional structure aiming at serving the best research needs, it would be important to ensure that all researchers across the institute are aware of each other's research, which for example could be made by having "institute research days". Further, there should be easy collaborations and use of infrastructure across departments. Infrastructure at the university's Core Facilities seems available for all researchers, whereas there are departmental infrastructures/equipment that are less available for researchers outside that department.

Further, the ambitions to increase translational research need to be implemented. There are many good examples of translational research within the clinical departments. Even if many researchers at non-clinical departments seem to have good connections with clinicians for samples, and vice versa, for clinicians of different methodologies, this is very much on a "knowing each other basis". The translational approach would be even more facilitated and available for newly-arrived scientists if there were more structured interactions between the non-clinical and clinical departments.

Concerning teaching, there were some concerns about the distribution of teaching sometimes not being optimal and not always transparent and easy to understand.

There are currently limitations regarding laboratory space at the institute, which is lifted as a challenge for the future development of the institute's research environment. However, this might be solved in connection to a relocation of administration, which will give opportunities to expand. Space allocation did not appear to be transparent.

Recommendations

- Stimulate interactions between researchers at different departments to increase possibilities for the best research needs and to increase the critical mass.
- Stimulate interactions between researchers in defined areas for new research possibilities and for creating networks for joint applications.
- Stimulate interactions between non-clinical and clinical departments to boost the ambitions of increasing translational research.
- Develop and support a system for user fee-based user clubs that allows open usage and maintenance of important equipment over departmental borders.

- Develop a website with information of all equipment available at the departments within the institute.
- Implement a space allocation policy.
- Arrange institute days focused on research, involving active participations from senior, junior, postdoc and PhD levels.

D2. Publication

The panel has not separately addressed this question.

D3. Facilities and research infrastructure

The panel has not separately addressed this question.

D4. Transverse perspectives

D4.1 Equal opportunities and gender equality

The panel has not separately addressed this question.

D4.2 Internationalisation

The environment is international, many of the employees have an international background and English is used as a working language at larger institutional gatherings. The researchers at the institute collaborate extensively internationally and there are examples of strong international collaborative projects of which some also are funded by prestigious international grants.

Section E – Support

E1. Internal research support

The panel noted from several of the interviews (with PIs and administrators) that there are problems regarding administrative support. Administration is organised as a separate line with a total of 28 staff (quite high), and the administrators are not localised at the departments they serve. A new move to the Lundberg Laboratory is now planned for part of the administration.

There seems to be a serious problem regarding the functionality of the administration, which urgently needs to be corrected. The panel heard a number of examples where researchers do not get the administrative support they need with respect to accounting on external grants, purchasing or in hiring.

Rotation of administrative staff seems very high, and competence, case history insight, and knowledge frequency low. This also pertains to teaching administration. Different questions from the researchers regarding administrative matters (many minor) appeared frequently to be very difficult to solve, often required a lot of extra time and caused frustration, as reported in many of the interviews. Part of this seems to be due to a lack of direct contact with the administrative personnel handling the requests, as they are located elsewhere and work in pools.

Interviews with administrative staff indicate low job satisfaction, as they frequently do not have access to all necessary information from the researchers and the leadership. There appear to be elements of micro-management and bottlenecks in the flow of information.

It therefore appears important to organise a system of better integration with the departments to serve the administrative needs of research and teaching, and where administrators and researchers/teachers meet physically. A higher degree of delegation and access to primary sources of information appear to be important to arrange, as would efforts to improve the work environment of administrators in order to counteract frequent rotations.

Another important interface is that between the university and the hospital, where seamless operation of administrative support is required to facilitate interactions and collaborations between researchers at the university and the hospital.

E2. Faculty and University-wide support

The panel has not separately addressed this question.

Section F – Other Matters

F1. RED10 evaluation

The panel has not separately addressed this question.

F2. Other matters

(None).

Concluding Recommendations

The panel has not separately addressed this question.