



Peer review handbook

Research project grant 2025
Humanities and Social Sciences

Contents

Foreword.....	4
Introduction.....	5
New features in the review process 2025	5
New instructions for doctoral students in applications.....	5
Important starting points and principles	5
Peer review	5
Conflict of interest	6
Gender equality.....	6
Confidentiality and integrity.....	6
AI in the assessment of applications.....	6
Roles in the review process	7
Chair and vice chair.....	7
Panel member	7
Observer.....	7
Swedish Research Council personnel.....	7
Secretary general for scientific council	7
Preparations	8
Prisma	8
Allocation of applications.....	8
Reporting any conflict of interest	8
Technical preparations.....	8
Preparations: summary	9
Review period 1	10
Individual review	10
Deviations in the application	10
Irrelevant information.....	10
Do not disseminate information about the application	10
Ethical aspects	10
Sex and gender dimensions	11
Doctoral students in applications.....	11
Assessment criteria	11
Guiding questions	11
Grading scales.....	13
External reviewers	14
Review period 1: summary	14
Sifting meeting in the spring.....	15
First review panel meeting.....	15
Discussion of applications	15
All applications shall be treated equally	15
Conflict of interest during the review meeting	16
Prioritisation for stage 2.....	16

Starting points for prioritisation.....	16
Applications that do not proceed to stage 2.....	16
Sifting meeting in the spring: summary.....	17
Review period 2.....	18
Individual evaluation	18
Assessment of project budgets.....	18
Activity level and salary costs	18
Instructions for budget assessment	19
Review period 2: summary	19
Prioritisation meeting in the fall.....	21
Second review panel meeting	21
Discussion of applications	21
All applications shall be treated equally	21
Conflict of interest during the review meeting	21
Prioritisation	22
Redistribution	22
Proposal for budget.....	22
Prioritisation meeting in the fall: summary	23
Final statement.....	24
The rapporteur writes a final statement	24
The chair reviews all final statements.....	24
General advice and recommendations on final statements	24
Completing the final statements, you must.....	24
Completing the final statements, you must not.....	24
Final statement: summary.....	25
Decision and follow-up	26
Decision	26
Follow-up.....	26
Complaints and questions	26

Foreword

I would like to welcome you as a review panel member within humanities and social sciences at the Swedish Research Council. We are deeply grateful that you are taking on this task. You make an important contribution to the continuous work of ensuring that the Swedish Research Council supports research of the highest scientific quality. A well-executed and systematic peer review of applications is the foundation for ensuring that the best research receive funding. It is very important that each application is reviewed by experts in the field with the highest possible scholarly competence. We are therefore thankful that you are willing to give input to this work.

To ensure the scientific review is conducted on clear quality criteria within the framework for good research practice, the Swedish Research Council has adopted a number of guidelines for the review work. This handbook is an important tool for you as a review panel member. It contains instructions for how the review process within humanities and social sciences is carried out.

We hope you will find the review process you have ahead of you rewarding to you personally and once again I warmly welcome you as a panel member to the Swedish Research Council.

Henrik Ekengren Oscarsson

Secretary General
Scientific Council for Humanities and Social Sciences
Swedish Research Council

Introduction

This handbook is designed to reflect the review process step by step. We want to make it easy for you as a panel member to find the information you need for the tasks to be carried out in each step.

Project grants aim to give researchers the freedom to formulate by themselves the research concept, method and implementation, and to solve a specific research task within a limited period. Read the call text here: [Research project grant within humanities and social sciences](#).

Calls for undirected research project grants within Humanities and Social Sciences are issued once a year, and applications are reviewed in nine review panels:

- HS-A: Aesthetic disciplines
- HS-B: Business administration, Economics, Economic History, Economic Geography, Human Geography, Statistics, Demographics
- HS-C: Sociology, Anthropology, Social Work
- HS-D: Law, Criminology, Philosophy, Ethics
- HS-E: Political Science, Peace and Conflict Research, Media and Communication Studies
- HS-F: Psychology
- HS-I: Historical disciplines, Archaeology
- HS-J: Linguistics
- HS-K: Religious Studies, Theology, Ancient History, Ethnology and Gender Studies

New features in the review process 2025

New instructions for doctoral students in applications

In this year's call text, it has been clarified that doctoral students' participation in projects will be assessed from several perspectives. Applicants are instructed to describe the role of the doctoral student, both in the project organisation in the research plan and in the project's budget.

Important starting points and principles

Peer review

The Swedish Research Council regards peer review as a guarantor that our support goes to research of the highest scientific quality in all fields. The Board of the Swedish Research Council has formulated guidelines for peer review based on eight principles. [Read the guidelines for peer review](#).

Conflict of interest

To avoid any conflict of interest situation, we have established strict guidelines. [Read the Swedish Research Council's conflict of interest policy and guidelines for managing conflicts of interest.](#)

If you have a conflict of interest, you must not take part in the handling or assessment of that application during any part of the process. The following applies for panel members:

- Any application where you are the applicant or participating researcher must not be reviewed by your review panel.
- Any application where a close relative of yours is the applicant (does not apply to participating researchers) must not be reviewed by your review panel.

You are obliged to notify any conflict of interest for all applications handled by your review panel.

Gender equality

The Swedish Research Council aims to ensure that women and men have the same success rates and receive the same average grant amounts, taking into account the nature of the research and the form of support. Before the review panel agrees on the priority list, the approval rate shall be calculated for women and men respectively. Any differences must be commented on by the review panel. [Read our policy and our guidelines concerning gender equality.](#)

Confidentiality and integrity

Handle the applications and the review of them in a confidential manner:

- Do not disseminate documents that you get access to.
- Delete documents that relate to the review work after completing the task.
- Do not speak to outsiders about what was discussed during the review.
- Do not use information in the application for personal gain.
- Let the Swedish Research Council personnel manage all communications with applicants.

AI in the assessment of applications

Generative AI tools (ChatGPT or similar) must not be used in the scholarly/scientific assessment of the applications. There is however no prohibition against using digital AI tools for tasks such as improving the language in written statements on applications, as long as this does not entail factual contents or the applicant's personal data being disseminated.

Roles in the review process

Chair and vice chair

The role of the chair is to lead and coordinate the work of the panel. The vice chair's task is to stand in for the chair of the review panel in situations where they cannot or should not take part, such as when the chair has a conflict of interest.

Panel member

As a panel member, you may be a reviewer or a rapporteur. In both roles, you shall read and grade applications ahead of the review panel meetings. The rapporteur is responsible for presenting the application for discussion at the meeting. As rapporteur, you are also responsible for summarising the review panel's final statement on the application after the prioritisation meeting in the fall.

Observer

An observer from the scientific council will monitor and safeguard the quality of the review panel's work. The observer reports back to the scientific council and the secretary general after the review.

Swedish Research Council personnel

The research officer and senior research officer ensure that the rules and procedure established for the process are complied with. They also support the chair and panel members in the review process.

Secretary general for scientific council

The secretary general has the overall responsibility for the review process and for questions of a scientific nature. The secretary general also handles any complaints following the grant decision.

Preparations

Prisma

As a reviewer, you work in the web-based system Prisma. The first thing to do is to create an account in Prisma, if you do not already have one. Make sure all your account information and personal data are correct. You must also decide whether or not you want to receive remuneration for your review work. Follow the instructions in [Prisma's user manual](#).

Allocation of applications

Once the call has closed, the applications are allocated to the review panels. Each application is allocated to the group the applicant has listed as their first choice. However, if the chair considers that an application should be reviewed by another panel, it might be moved. An application may also be moved due to conflict of interest.

When any re-allocations between review panels have been completed the chair will allocate the applications to members of the review panel. Each application shall be read by at least three reviewers, one of which is given the role of rapporteur.

Reporting any conflict of interest

Once you have been notified that the applications are accessible in Prisma, you must report any conflict of interest. You should therefore check who the project leader and participating researchers are for all applications allocated to the review panel. Please contact the Swedish Research Council personnel and/or the review panel chair if you have any questions about conflict of interest. If you discover later on in the process that you have a conflict of interest, this must be reported as soon as possible to the chair and the research officer.

Technical preparations

The review panel meeting will be held via the digital platform Zoom. [Download Zoom Desktop client to your computer before the meeting](#).

Make sure you have access to a stable network connection. Your computer also needs to have a built-in or external camera and microphone. We recommend that you use a headset with a microphone, as this provides the best sound, both for yourself and for other participants. If you do not have access to one, you may buy one at the Swedish Research Council's expense, at a maximum cost of 50 EUR or equivalent. We also recommend that you use a large screen next to your laptop, if possible.

Preparations: summary

What you need to do	When
<input type="checkbox"/> Provide account information in Prisma.	Before the first meeting
<input type="checkbox"/> Download Zoom and check your technical equipment.	Before the first digital meeting
<input type="checkbox"/> Report any conflict of interest.	Before the deadline in Prisma

Review period 1

During the first review period, you shall:

- read the applications allocated to you,
- write assessments and preliminary statements,
- grade all the applications you have reviewed.

Once the review process has ended, you will get access to all panel members' assessments in Prisma. Prepare for the discussion at the sifting meeting in the spring by reading the other panel members' assessments.

Individual review

Each application is reviewed and graded by at least three members of the review panel: one rapporteur and two further reviewers.

When are the rapporteur, you write a *preliminary statement* and when you are reviewer you write an *assessment*. Both consist of a numerical grade and written comments on all evaluation criteria.

Your comments will be a support in the discussion during the review panel meeting and you should highlight strengths and weaknesses of the project. The written assessments can be short, for example in bullets.

Deviations in the application

If you suspect that the content of an application does not follow good research practice, please inform the Swedish Research Council personnel as soon as possible. Continue with the review unless we notify otherwise. The Swedish Research Council is responsible for further investigation in cases of deviations in the application.

Irrelevant information

Base your assessment only on the contents of the application itself. Irrelevant information must not impact on the assessment. Disregard facts that you believe you know despite them not being included in the application.

Do not disseminate information about the application

You must not disseminate information about the applications or applicants outside of the review panel. Only in exceptional cases, and on condition that you do not show the application itself, it may be justified to ask a colleague about for example the use of specific methods or new research findings.

Ethical aspects

The applicant shall state whether there are any requirements for permits and approvals for the research planned. If there are such requirements, the applicant

shall also describe how the permits and approvals will be obtained. If parts of the research will be conducted abroad, the applicant must be able to describe how this may affect any requirements for permits or approvals. Necessary permits and approvals must be in place when the research begins. The assessment of legal and formal requirements is a part of the **feasibility criterion**.

The assessment of ethical aspects also includes examining how applicants reflect on ethical considerations. The evaluation of ethical considerations is part of the criterion for the **scientific quality of the project**.

Sex and gender dimensions

The assessment of scholarly/scientific quality includes scrutinising how sex and gender dimensions are included in the applications. This may involve drawing attention to whether sex and gender dimensions are missing where they should have been included given the research question, or paying attention to whether the sex and gender dimensions in an application are anchored in previous research. The chair is responsible for ensuring that sex and gender dimensions are included in the review. Competence in the area is also represented in all review panels.

Doctoral students in applications

In cases where doctoral students participate in applications, you shall evaluate how the doctoral student will be recruited, who the intended supervisors are and their roles in the project, as well as the explanation for how the doctoral student will be financed for the time that is not paid by the Swedish Research Council.

Assessment criteria

You shall assess the scholarly/scientific quality of the application based on four basic criteria:

- Scientific quality of the project
- Novelty and originality
- Merits of the applicant
- Feasibility

The purpose of using several basic criteria is to achieve a multi-faceted assessment. The criteria are evaluated on a seven-degree or a three-degree scale.

Please use the guiding questions we have produced for each criterion to support the assessment of the application.

Guiding questions

Scientific quality of the project (1–7)

Assess the quality of the project's research question and method, and also its potential for future research.

- To what extent is the project and its research questions of the highest scholarly/scientific quality?
- To what extent is the project description clear and systematic in its definition of the research question, the theoretical basis and the relationship to previous research?
- To what extent are the methods for material/data collection and analysis appropriate and can be expected to have an impact?
- Are the ethical considerations properly described and addressed? Does the applicant adequately consider the possible risk/value/of suffering to humans, animals, nature and/or society?

Novelty and originality (1–7)

Assess how well the applicant develops and implements new theories, concepts, methods, and questions.

- To what extent does the project expand or challenge current knowledge, ideas, and practice within its field(s)?
- To what extent does the project combine concepts and theories, approaches, and methods, and/or material/data in a novel way?
- To what extent do the project's goals have the potential to achieve scholarly/scientific and/or societal impact?

Merits of the applicant (1–7)

The assessment of the applicant's merits shall be done based on their relevance for the specific research project and in relation to the applicant's career age. Time off for parental leave, sick leave, or similar circumstances should be deducted.

- To what extent do the project participants have the necessary research experience and expertise?
- To what extent have the project participants demonstrated the ability for independent and creative scholarly/scientific work?
- How do the project participants' research output and other merits compare in a national and international perspective?
- To what extent do the project participants have relevant and supplementary competence to assure the success of the project?
- If the application includes doctoral students, do the potential supervisors have previous experience of supervising doctoral students?

Feasibility (1–3)

Assess the feasibility of the proposed project. An application must have a grade of 2 or 3 for feasibility in order to be funded.

- To what extent do the project participants have the competence and time required to implement the project?
- To what extent is the project's work allocation and time plan realistic?

- Do the participants have access to the material/data, equipment, research infrastructure and/or other resources that are required for implementing the project?
- Has the applicant adequately considered relevant legal and formal requirements for the proposed research, such as ethical permits and guidelines?

Overall assessment (1–7)

Weigh together the above subsidiary criteria into an overall grade that reflects your assessment of the application’s scholarly/scientific quality.

Grading scales

The assessment of the scientific quality of the application, novelty and originality, and merits of the applicant is done on a seven-degree scale.

Grade	Explanation
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

The assessment of feasibility is done on a three-degree scale.

Grade	Explanation
3	Feasible
2	Partly feasible
1	Not feasible

For all criteria, you can also mark “Insufficient (0)”, if you consider that the application lacks sufficient information to allow you to make a reasonable

assessment of the criterion. Please note that any such mark may only be used in the individual review before the review panel meeting, and not in the final grade.

External reviewers

External review may be used if the joint competency of the review panel is not sufficient for a thorough review or in a conflict of interest situation. In normal cases, the chair determines the need for external reviewers and the research officer will contact the suggested reviewers.

Review period 1: summary

What you need to do	When
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade and write comments on all applications for which you are the rapporteur or reviewer.	Before the deadline
<input type="checkbox"/> Prepare a summary of strengths and weaknesses as well as similarities and differences in other reviewers' assessments for the applications where you are the rapporteur.	Before the meeting
<input type="checkbox"/> Prepare for the meeting by reading other panel members' comments and any external assessments.	Before the meeting
<input type="checkbox"/> Contact the Swedish Research Council personnel and the chair if you discover during the review that you do, after all, have a conflict of interest with any of the applications, or if you discover any problem with an application.	As soon as possible
<input type="checkbox"/> Contact the Swedish Research Council personnel if you suspect any deviation from ethical guidelines or good research practice.	As soon as possible

Sifting meeting in the spring

First review panel meeting

The goal of the spring meeting is to agree on which applications will proceed to review round 2. Only those applications that are deemed to have a reasonable chance of being funded will proceed to the prioritisation meeting in the fall. This is to allow for more in-depth discussions of the applications that are of higher quality.

At the review panel meeting, the applications are presented and discussed based on the grading that you and the other panel members have made prior to the meeting. If the review panel receive significantly more applications than expected there are special guidelines for handling this and you will receive more information if that is the case.

Discussion of applications

The chair leads the discussion of the applications. As a rule, the rapporteur begins by presenting the strengths and weaknesses of the application as well as the similarities and differences in the reviewers' assessment. The other reviewers are then given the opportunity to share their assessment. The chair is responsible for ensuring that any external assessments are included in the discussion.

For each application discussed at the meeting, the panel must agree on an overall grade. For applications that do not proceed to the second round, the review panel must also agree on all subsidiary grades.

Before the discussions, the panel should agree on if, and how, the subsidiary grades are weighed against each other when deciding on which applications that go to the second round. The chair is responsible for presenting a proposal.

During the review panel meeting, the review panel must ensure that sex and gender dimensions are included in the assessment when relevant in the applications. The chair is responsible for ensuring that this is considered.

All applications shall be treated equally

The review panel is responsible for ensuring each application is assessed on its own merits.

- Irrelevant information shall not be discussed.
- The applications shall compete with each other on equal terms.
- No application shall be given a higher or lower grade because it belongs within a certain subject area.
- The panel shall not carry out any quota-based allocation between disciplines.

- An application is guaranteed a new assessment under each call – even if similar applications have been submitted in conjunction with previous calls.
- There must be a balance in the time the review panel allocates to each application.

Conflict of interest during the review meeting

Persons who have a conflict of interest in relation to an application should not take part in the discussion of that particular application. They will be placed in the digital waiting room while the application is discussed. If you discover any possible conflict of interest (your own or another's) during the meeting, you should bring this up with the chair and the Swedish Research Council personnel in private.

Prioritisation for stage 2

Once all applications have been discussed and the panel has agreed on grading for each application, the panel should make a preliminary ranking of applications based on the overall grades. The panel will then identify a cut-off point in the list where it is reasonable to assume that those applications below are not eligible for funding.

Starting points for prioritisation

A rule of thumb is that approximately 25 – 35 percent of the applications should proceed to stage 2. If the number of applications in the review panel is very high (clearly over 100), it is recommended to set a ceiling at around 30 applications.

All applications that for some reason have not been fully evaluated, for example because any external reviews have not arrived in time or because a reviewer is sick, must proceed to stage 2. If, after discussion, the panel cannot reach a joint view on an application, this application should also be included in the second round.

The review panel should also take into account the success rates for women and men and ensure that the applications that proceed to stage 2 can enable an equal outcome in the final proposal for funding.

Applications that do not proceed to stage 2

Applications that do not proceed to stage 2 are formally rejected only when the Scientific Council for Humanities and Social Sciences has made its funding decision, usually at a meeting in October. After the decision, applicants will be notified of their overall grade, all subsidiary grades and a standard statement describing the process. These applicants will not receive any other written comments.

Sifting meeting in the spring: summary

What you need to do

- Agree on an overall grade for all discussed applications.
 - Agree on a proposal for the applications to take forward to stage 2.
 - Agree on subsidiary grades for the applications that will not be taken forward to stage 2.
-

Review period 2

The second review period runs from the sifting meeting in the spring until approximately two weeks before the prioritisation meeting in the fall. During this period, you will review all applications that has proceeded to the second stage, except for those where you have a conflict of interest. For applications where you are the rapporteur, you will also assess the project's budget.

After the review period has closed, you will have access to all panel members' assessments in Prisma. Prepare for the discussions at the review panel meeting by reading the other reviewers' comments. This is especially important in your role as rapporteur, as you will provide a summary of the application's strengths and weaknesses, as well as similarities and differences in the reviews.

Individual evaluation

The review is based on the same principles as in review period 1, see pages 10–14 of this handbook. It is important that you check and, if necessary, update your grading and comments for the applications that you read in step 1. Keep in mind that your assessments also serve as support for the rapporteur when writing the final statement after the meeting.

Assessment of project budgets

The assessment of the project's budget is carried out separately from the assessment of the project's scholarly/scientific quality and the starting point for this assessment should be that the budget is sufficient to carry out the research proposed in the application.

Before the review panel meeting in the fall, you shall make an assessment of the amount granted for the applications for which you are the rapporteur. Your assessment will be presented orally during the review panel meeting and the review panel shall jointly agree on a proposal for the granted amount based on your assessment.

You should also be prepared to accept or propose changes to the budget proposals for the other applications you have reviewed.

Activity level and salary costs

Evaluate whether the project participants' activity level in the project is reasonable in relation to the research task. Note that within this call, the Swedish Research Council normally finances a maximum of 80 percent of a full-time salary for applicants and participating researchers.

The activity level of doctoral students can be a maximum of 75% activity level for four years or 100% for three years. If a doctoral student participates, project

funds may not be paid out as salary during teaching, other departmental duties, or courses that are not directly relevant or necessary for the implementation of the project.

Instructions for budget assessment

Assess the application according to the following three steps before the meeting. Note that indirect costs should not be included in your assessment as this part of the budget is decided by the project's higher education institution.

1. Does the application cover four years? In such cases, is the need for a fourth project year well justified in the application? Note that there is a special section in the application where this must be justified. If it is not well justified, deduct the amount for the fourth year from the total budget.
2. Are there salary costs of more than 80% for any of the project participants? Assess whether this is well justified in the application. If it is not justified, reduce the salary costs so that they are 80% of the stated full-time salary.
3. Are there any larger budget items (at least SEK 100,000) that are clearly unnecessary or of unreasonable scope? Reduce these costs to a reasonable level or remove them.

Based on this, make a proposal for the total amount granted for the project and indicate the number of years that should be granted.

If the applicant's original budget seems reasonable after you have gone through the above three steps, present the total amount stated in the application as your budget proposal.

Review period 2: summary

What you need to do	When
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade and write detailed comments (preliminary statement) on all applications for which you are the rapporteur.	Before the deadline
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade and write comments (assessment) on all applications for which you are a reviewer.	Before the deadline
<input type="checkbox"/> Prepare a summary of strengths and weaknesses as well as similarities and differences in other reviewers' assessments for the applications where you are the rapporteur.	Before the meeting
<input type="checkbox"/> Assess the project budget, suggest a granted amount and number of years for all applications for which you are the rapporteur.	Before the meeting

What you need to do	When
<input type="checkbox"/> Prepare for the meeting by reading other panel members' comments and any external assessments.	Before the meeting
<input type="checkbox"/> Contact the Swedish Research Council personnel and the chair if you during the review discover that you do after all have a conflict of interest with any of the applications you are to review, or if you discover any problem with an application.	As soon as possible
<input type="checkbox"/> Contact the Swedish Research Council immediately if you suspect any deviation from ethical guidelines or good research practice, or if you suspect scientific misconduct.	As soon as possible

Prioritisation meeting in the fall

Second review panel meeting

At the review panel's fall meeting, the applications are presented and discussed based on the grading that you and the other panel members have made prior to the meeting. The goal of the meeting is to agree on which applications should be funded.

Discussion of applications

The chair leads the discussion of the applications. As a rule, the rapporteur begins by presenting the strengths and weaknesses of the application as well as the similarities and differences in the reviewers' assessment. The other reviewers are then given the opportunity to share their assessment. The chair is responsible for ensuring that any external assessments are included in the discussion.

The panel should agree on subsidiary grades and overall grade for each application. The rapporteur makes notes to support the formulation of the panel's final statement.

Before the discussions, the panel should agree on if, and how, the subsidiary grades are weighed against each other in the prioritisation phase. The chair is responsible for presenting a proposal.

During the review panel meeting, the review panel must ensure that sex and gender dimensions are included in the assessment when relevant in the applications. The chair is responsible for ensuring that this is considered.

All applications shall be treated equally

The review panel is responsible for ensuring each application is assessed on its own merits.

- Irrelevant information shall not be discussed.
- The applications shall compete with each other on equal terms.
- No application shall be given a higher or lower grade because it belongs within a certain subject area.
- The panel shall not carry out any quota-based allocation between disciplines.
- An application is guaranteed a new assessment under each call – even if similar applications have been submitted in conjunction with previous calls.
- There must be a balance in the time the review panel allocates to each application.

Conflict of interest during the review meeting

Persons who have a conflict of interest in relation to an application should not take part in the discussion of that particular application. They should therefore

leave the room while the application is discussed. If you discover any possible conflict of interest (your own or another's) during the meeting, you should bring this up with the chair and the Swedish Research Council personnel in private.

Prioritisation

Once all applications have been discussed and the panel has agreed on a joint assessment of each application, a prioritisation shall be carried out of the applications with the highest scholarly/scientific quality. This prioritisation shall result in the review panel's proposal as to who should receive grants within the panel's budget framework. A priority list of reserves shall also be drawn up. The highest ranked reserves go on to the redistribution panel (see below).

The review panel shall jointly consider the success rate for women and men when making the overall prioritisation of applications. The aim is to equal success rates for women and men in relation to the gender distribution in the applications allocated to the review panel. When applications of equal quality are compared, the application that gives a more even outcome in terms of success rate shall be prioritised.

Redistribution

The Scientific Council for Humanities and Social Sciences allocates 15% of the available funds for undirected project grants to a redistribution panel. The best reserves from all review groups compete in this panel, thereby increasing the possibility that the best applications submitted to the call for project grants in the humanities and social sciences will be granted funds.

The redistribution panel assesses a total of 36 applications. The number of applications that each review panel may send to the redistribution panel is based on the number of applications received to the panel in this year's call. This means that large groups may send more applications to the redistribution panel. However, there is a minimum of two applications per review panel.

Proposal for budget

The review panel shall at the meeting agree on a proposal for the granted amount and number of years for all prioritised applications, including all reserves. The rapporteur shall start the budget discussion with their assessment of the budget. The review panel shall then jointly consider the proposal and agree on a reasonable project budget considering the feasibility of the project.

The number of applications that can be prioritised within the review panel's budget framework depends on the proposed project budgets. In a second phase of the budget discussion, it is therefore examined whether the highest-ranking project on the reserve list can be financed if the budgets for all projects proposed to be funded are slightly reduced. Such cuts may not exceed 10% of the project

budgets and are made by the same percentage for all projects, both those proposed for financing and those on the reserve list.

Prioritisation meeting in the fall: summary

What you need to do

- Agree on subsidiary grades and an overall grade for each application discussed.
 - Agree on a proposal for the applications to be awarded funding within the review panel's budgetary framework, as well as reserves and applications to the redistribution panel.
 - Agree on the amount and number of years granted for all prioritised applications.
-

Final statement

The rapporteur writes a final statement

The discussion at the review panel meeting forms the basis for the review panel's joint final statement. The final statement is the end product of the review process. It forms the Swedish Research Council's basis for decision-making, and is also sent to the applicant when the grant decision is published.

After the meeting, you should write *final statements* that reflects the review panel's joint assessment of the applications. You are responsible for writing final statements on the applications for which you have been the rapporteur. You usually have one week to complete the final statements following the end of the review panel meeting.

All applications that have been the subject of discussion at the prioritisation meeting in the fall receive a final statement.

The chair reviews all final statements

Once the final statements are completed, they are checked by the chair and by the Swedish Research Council personnel. The chair is responsible for ensuring the final statements on the applications discussed at the review panel meeting reflect the panel's discussion, and that the written justifications correspond to the grades. In conjunction with the chair's review, you may be asked to supplement or adjust a final statement.

General advice and recommendations on final statements

The final statement shall reflect the review panel's joint and overall assessment, including any external assessments.

Completing the final statements, you must

- focus on describing the main strengths and weaknesses of the application.
- ensure the written justifications correspond to the grading – feel free to use the definitions in the grading scale in your written comments.
- consider the guiding questions for the different assessment criteria.
- write concisely, but not too briefly – the content is more important than the length of the text.
- comment on whether the review panel has weighed in deviations from the Swedish Research Council's general instructions in the assessment of the application.
- be constructive and factual in your comments.

Completing the final statements, you must not

- Summarise the content of the application or the merits of the applicant.

- introduce personal comments – the final statement shall constitute the review panel’s joint assessment.
- state quantifiable data.
- state any personal information about the applicant.
- write any recommendation whether to refuse or approve an application in the final statement.
- comment on whether an application belongs in the review panel, as all the applications allocated to the panel shall be assessed.

Final statement: summary

What you need to do	When
<input type="checkbox"/> Write the review panel’s final statement in Prisma on the applications for which you are the rapporteur.	One week after the meeting
<input type="checkbox"/> Supplement final statements following review by the chair if you have been asked to do so.	After the meeting

Decision and follow-up

Decision

The Board of the Swedish Research Council has delegated to the Scientific Council for Humanities and Social Science to decide on project grants in this field. The Scientific Council's decision is based on: the priority lists (including reserves) recommended by the review panels; any justifications from the chairs; and the review panels' final statements. The decision is published shortly thereafter on vr.se and in Prisma. In conjunction with the publication, the applicants are informed about the outcome.

Follow-up

Following each review, internal follow-up is also carried out of the process and the outcome. An important starting point for this follow-up is the feedback you provide as a panel member in conjunction with the review panel meeting. We also produce statistics of various kinds.

Complaints and questions

If you as a review panel member receive any question about the assessment of an individual application, you must refer this to us. The Swedish Research Council personnel make sure that all complaints or requests for clarification are handled.