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**Foreword**

The evaluation of research and doctoral training is being carried out in the years 2010–2012 and will end in 2012. The steering group appointed by the Rector in January 2010 set the conditions for participating in the evaluation and prepared the Terms of Reference to present the evaluation procedure and criteria. The publications and other scientific activities included in the evaluation covered the years 2005–2010.

The participating unit in the evaluation was defined as a Researcher Community (RC). To obtain a critical mass with university-level impact, the number of members was set to range from 20 to 120. The RCs were required to contain researchers in all stages of their research career, from doctoral students to principal investigators (PIs). All in all, 136 Researcher Communities participated in this voluntary evaluation, 5857 persons in total, of whom 1131 were principal investigators. PIs were allowed to participate in two communities in certain cases, and 72 of them used this opportunity and participated in two RCs.

This evaluation enabled researchers to define RCs from the “bottom up” and across disciplines. The aim of the evaluation was not to assess individual performance but a community with shared aims and researcher-training activities. The RCs were able to choose among five different categories that characterised the status and main aims of their research. The steering group considered the process of applying to participate in the evaluation to be important, which lead to the establishment of these categories. In addition, providing a service for the RCs to enable them to benchmark their research at the global level was a main goal of the evaluation.

The data for the evaluation consisted of the RCs’ answers to evaluation questions on supplied e-forms and a compilation extracted from the TUHAT – Research Information System (RIS) on 12 April 2011. The compilation covered scientific and other publications as well as certain areas of scientific activities. During the process, the RCs were asked to check the list of publications and other scientific activities and make corrections if needed. These TUHAT compilations are public and available on the evaluation project sites of each RC in the TUHAT-RIS.

In addition to the e-form and TUHAT compilation, University of Leiden (CWTS) carried out bibliometric analyses from the articles included in the Web of Science (WoS). This was done on University and RC levels. In cases where the publication forums of the RC were clearly not represented by the WoS data, the Library of the University of Helsinki conducted a separate analysis of the publications. This was done for 66 RCs representing the humanities and social sciences.

The evaluation office also carried out an enquiry targeted to the supervisors and PhD candidates about the organisation of doctoral studies at the University of Helsinki. This and other documents describing the University and the Finnish higher education system were provided to the panellists.

The panel feedback for each RC is unique and presented as an entity. The first collective evaluation reports available for the whole panel were prepared in July–August 2011. The reports were accessible to all panel members via the electronic evaluation platform in August. Scoring from 1 to 5 was used to complement written feedback in association with evaluation questions 1–4 (scientific focus and quality, doctoral training, societal impact, cooperation) and in addition to the category evaluating the fitness for participation in the evaluation. Panellists used the international level as a point of comparison in the evaluation. Scoring was not expected to go along with a preset deviation.

Each of the draft reports were discussed and dealt with by the panel in meetings in Helsinki (from 11 September to 13 September or from 18 September to 20 September 2011). In these meetings the panels also examined the deviations among the scores and finalised the draft reports together.

The current RC-specific report deals shortly with the background of the evaluation and the terms of participation. The main evaluation feedback is provided in the evaluation report, organised according to the evaluation questions. The original material provided by the RCs for the panellists has been attached to these documents.
On behalf of the evaluation steering group and office, I sincerely wish to thank you warmly for your participation in this evaluation. The effort you made in submitting the data to TUHAT-RIS is gratefully acknowledged by the University. We wish that you find this panel feedback useful in many ways. The bibliometric profiles may open a new view on your publication forums and provide a perspective for discussion on your choice of forums. We especially hope that this evaluation report will help you in setting the future goals of your research.

Johanna Björkroth  
Vice-Rector  
Chair of the Steering Group of the Evaluation
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1 Introduction to the Evaluation

1.1 RC-specific evaluation reports

The participants in the evaluation of research and doctoral training were Researcher Communities (hereafter referred to as the RC). The RC refers to the group of researchers who registered together in the evaluation of their research and doctoral training. Preconditions in forming RCs were stated in the Guidelines for the Participating Researcher Communities. The RCs defined themselves whether their compositions should be considered well-established or new.

It is essential to emphasise that the evaluation combines both meta-evaluation and traditional research assessment exercise and its focus is both on the research outcomes and procedures associated with research and doctoral training. The approach to the evaluation is enhancement-led where self-evaluation constituted the main information. The answers to the evaluation questions formed together with the information of publications and other scientific activities an entity that was to be reviewed as a whole.

The present evaluation recognizes and justifies the diversity of research practices and publication traditions. Traditional Research Assessment Exercises do not necessarily value high quality research with low volumes or research distinct from mainstream research. It is challenging to expose the diversity of research to fair comparison. To understand the essence of different research practices and to do justice to their diversity was one of the main challenges of the present evaluation method. Understanding the divergent starting points of the RCs demanded sensitivity from the evaluators.

1.2 Aims and objectives in the evaluation

The aims of the evaluation are as follows:

- to improve the level of research and doctoral training at the University of Helsinki and to raise their international profile in accordance with the University’s strategic policies. The improvement of doctoral training should be compared to the University’s policy.
- to enhance the research conducted at the University by taking into account the diversity, originality, multidisciplinary nature, success and field-specificity,
- to recognize the conditions and prerequisites under which excellent, original and high-impact research is carried out,
- to offer the academic community the opportunity to receive topical and versatile international peer feedback,
- to better recognize the University’s research potential.
- to exploit the University’s TUHAT research information system to enable transparency of publishing activities and in the production of reliable, comparable data.

1.3 Evaluation method

The evaluation can be considered as an enhancement-led evaluation. Instead of ranking, the main aim is to provide useful information for the enhancement of research and doctoral training of the participating RCs. The comparison should take into account each field of science and acknowledge their special character.

---

1 The panellists did not read research reports or abstracts but instead, they evaluated answers to the evaluation questions, tables and compilations of publications, other scientific activities, bibliometrics or comparable analyses.

2 Policies on doctoral degrees and other postgraduate degrees at the University of Helsinki.
The comparison produced information about the present status and factors that have lead to success. Also challenges in the operations and outcomes were recognized.

The evaluation approach has been designed to recognize better the significance and specific nature of researcher communities and research areas in the multidisciplinary top-level university. Furthermore, one of the aims of the evaluation is to bring to light those evaluation aspects that differ from the prevalent ones. Thus the views of various fields of research can be described and research arising from various starting points understood better. The doctoral training is integrated into the evaluation as a natural component related to research. Operational processes of doctoral training are being examined in the evaluation.

**Five stages of the evaluation method were:**
1. Registration – Stage 1
2. Self-evaluation – Stage 2
4. External evaluation
5. Public reporting

### 1.4 Implementation of the external evaluation

**Five Evaluation Panels**
 Five evaluation panels consisted of independent, renowned and highly respected experts. The main domains of the panels are:
1. biological, agricultural and veterinary sciences
2. medicine, biomedicine and health sciences
3. natural sciences
4. humanities
5. social sciences

The University invited 10 renowned scientists to act as chairs or vice-chairs of the five panels based on the suggestions of faculties and independent institutes. Besides leading the work of the panel, an additional role of the chairs was to discuss with other panel chairs in order to adopt a broadly similar approach. The panel chairs and vice-chairs had a pre-meeting on 27 May 2011 in Amsterdam.

The panel compositions were nominated by the Rector of the University 27 April 2011. The participating RCs suggested the panel members. The total number of panel members was 50. The reason for a smaller number of panellists as compared to the previous evaluations was the character of the evaluation as a meta-evaluation. The panellists did not read research reports or abstracts but instead, they evaluated answers to the evaluation questions, tables and compilations of publications, other scientific activities, bibliometrics and comparable analyses.

The panel meetings were held in Helsinki:
- On 11–13 September 2011: (1) biological, agricultural and veterinary sciences, (2) medicine, biomedicine and health sciences and (3) natural sciences.
- On 18–20 September 2011: (4) humanities and (5) social sciences.

[^1]: TUHAT (acronym) of Research Information System (RIS) of the University of Helsinki
[^4]: Supervision of thesis, prizes and awards, editorial work and peer reviews, participation in committees, boards and networks and public appearances.
1.5 Evaluation material

The main material in the evaluation was the RCs’ self-evaluations that were qualitative in character and allowed the RCs to choose what was important to mention or emphasise and what was left unmentioned.

The present evaluation is exceptional at least in the Finnish context because it is based on both the evaluation documentation (self-evaluation questions, publications and other scientific activities) and the bibliometric reports. All documents were delivered to the panellists for examination.

Traditional bibliometrics can be reasonably done mainly in medicine, biosciences and natural sciences when using the Web of Science database, for example. Bibliometrics, provided by CWTS/The Centre for Science and Technology Studies, University of Leiden, cover only the publications that include WoS identification in the TUHAT-RIS.

Traditional bibliometrics are seldom relevant in humanities and social sciences because the international comparable databases do not store every type of high quality research publications, such as books and monographs and scientific journals in other languages than English. The Helsinki University Library has done analysis to the RCs, if their publications were not well represented in the Web of Science databases (RCs should have at least 50 publications and internal coverage of publications more than 40%) – it meant 58 RCs. The bibliometric material for the evaluation panels was available in June 2011. The RC-specific bibliometric reports are attached at the end of each report.

The panels were provided with the evaluation material and all other necessary background information, such as the basic information about the University of Helsinki and the Finnish higher education system.

Evaluation material
1. Registration documents of the RCs for the background information
2. Self evaluation material – answers to the evaluation questions
3. Publications and other scientific activities based on the TUHAT RIS:
   3.1. statistics of publications
   3.2. list of publications
   3.3. statistics of other scientific activities
   3.4. list of other scientific activities
4. Bibliometrics and comparable analyses:
   4.1. Analyses of publications based on the verification of TUHAT-RIS publications with the Web of Science publications (CWTS/University of Leiden)
   4.2. Publication statistics analysed by the Helsinki University Library - mainly for humanities and social sciences
5. University level survey on doctoral training (August 2011)
6. University level analysis on publications 2005–2010 (August 2011) provided by CWTS/University of Leiden

Background material

University of Helsinki
- Basic information about the University of the Helsinki
- The structure of doctoral training at the University of Helsinki
- Previous evaluations of research at the University of Helsinki – links to the reports: 1998 and 2005

The Finnish Universities/Research Institutes
- Finnish University system
- Evaluation of the Finnish National Innovation System
- The State and Quality of Scientific Research in Finland. Publication of the Academy of Finland 9/09.

The evaluation panels were provided also with other relevant material on request before the meetings in Helsinki.
1.6 Evaluation questions and material

The participating RCs answered the following evaluation questions which are presented according to the evaluation form. In addition, TUHAT RIS was used to provide the additional material as explained. For giving the feedback to the RCs, the panellists received the evaluation feedback form constructed in line with the evaluation questions:

1. Focus and quality of the RC’s research
   - Description of
     - the RC’s research focus.
     - the quality of the RC’s research (incl. key research questions and results)
     - the scientific significance of the RC’s research in the research field(s)
   - Identification of the ways to strengthen the focus and improve the quality of the RC’s research

The additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s publications, analysis of the RC’s publications data (provided by University of Leiden and the Helsinki University Library)

A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, innovativeness
   - Strengths
   - Areas of development
   - Other remarks
   - Recommendations

Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)

2. Practises and quality of doctoral training
   - Organising of the doctoral training in the RC. Description of the RC’s principles for:
     - recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates
     - supervision of doctoral candidates
     - collaboration with faculties, departments/institutes, and potential graduate schools/doctoral programmes
     - good practises and quality assurance in doctoral training
     - assuring of good career perspectives for the doctoral candidates/fresh doctorates
   - Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to the practises and quality of doctoral training, and the actions planned for their development.

The additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s other scientific activities/supervision of doctoral dissertations

A written feedback from the aspects of: processes and good practices related to leadership and management
   - Strengths
   - Areas of development
   - Other remarks
   - Recommendations

Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)

3. The societal impact of research and doctoral training
   - Description on how the RC interacts with and contributes to the society (collaboration with public, private and/or 3rd sector).
   - Identification of the ways to strengthen the societal impact of the RC’s research and doctoral training.

The additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s other scientific activities.

A written feedback from the aspects of: societal impact, national and international collaboration, innovativeness
   - Strengths
   - Areas of development
   - Other remarks
   - Recommendations

Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)
4. International and national (incl. intersectoral) research collaboration and researcher mobility
   - Description of
     - the RC's research collaborations and joint doctoral training activities
     - how the RC has promoted researcher mobility
   - Identification of the RC's strengths and challenges related to research collaboration and researcher mobility, and the actions planned for their development.

A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, national and international collaboration
   - Strengths
   - Areas of development
   - Other remarks
   - Recommendations

Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)

5. Operational conditions
   - Description of the operational conditions in the RC's research environment (e.g. research infrastructure, balance between research and teaching duties).
   - Identification of the RC's strengths and challenges related to operational conditions, and the actions planned for their development.

A written feedback from the aspects of: processes and good practices related to leadership and management
   - Strengths
   - Areas of development
   - Other remarks
   - Recommendations

6. Leadership and management in the researcher community
   - Description of
     - the execution and processes of leadership in the RC
     - how the management-related responsibilities and roles are distributed in the RC
     - how the leadership- and management-related processes support
       - high quality research
       - collaboration between principal investigators and other researchers in the RC
       - the RC's research focus
       - strengthening of the RC's know-how
   - Identification of the RC's strengths and challenges related to leadership and management, and the actions planned for developing the processes

7. External competitive funding of the RC
   - The RCs were asked to provide information of such external competitive funding, where:
     - the funding decisions have been made during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and
     - the administrator of the funding is/has been the University of Helsinki
   - On the e-form the RCs were asked to provide:
     1) The relevant funding source(s) from a given list (Academy of Finland/Research Council, TEKES/The Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation, EU, ERC, foundations, other national funding organisations, other international funding organisations), and
     2) The total sum of funding which the organisation in question had decided to allocate to the RCs members during 1.1.2005–31.12.2010.

Competitive funding reported in the text is also to be considered when evaluating this point.

A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, innovativeness, future significance
   - Strengths
   - Areas of development
   - Other remarks
   - Recommendations

8. The RC's strategic action plan for 2011-2013
   - RC's description of their future perspectives in relation to research and doctoral training.

A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, processes and good practices related to leadership and management, national and international collaboration, innovativeness, future significance
   - Strengths
   - Areas of development
9. Evaluation of the category of the RC in the context of entity of the evaluation material (1-8)

The RC's fitness to the chosen participation category
A written feedback evaluating the RC's fitness to the chosen participation category

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)

10. Short description of how the RC members contributed the compilation of the stage 2 material
Comments on the compilation of evaluation material

11. How the UH's focus areas are presented in the RC's research?
Comments if applicable

12. RC-specific main recommendations based on the previous questions 1-11

13. RC-specific conclusions

1.7 Evaluation criteria

The panellists were expected to give evaluative and analytical feedback to each evaluation question according to their aspects in order to describe and justify the quality of the submitted material. In addition, the evaluation feedback was asked to be pointed out the level of the performance according to the following classifications:

- outstanding (5)
- excellent (4)
- very good (3)
- good (2)
- sufficient (1)

Evaluation according to the criteria was to be made with thorough consideration of the entire evaluation material of the RC in question. Finally, in questions 1-4 and 9, the panellists were expected to classify their written feedback into one of the provided levels (the levels included respective descriptions, 'criteria'). Some panels used decimals in marks. The descriptive level was interpreted according to the integers and not rounding up the decimals by the editors.

Description of criteria levels

Question 1 – FOCUS AND QUALITY OF THE RC'S RESEARCH

Classification: Criteria (level of procedures and results)

Outstanding quality of procedures and results (5)

Outstandingly strong research, also from international perspective. Attracts great international interest with a wide impact, including publications in leading journals and/or monographs published by leading international publishing houses. The research has world leading qualities. The research focus, key research questions scientific significance, societal impact and innovativeness are of outstanding quality.

In cases where the research is of a national character and, in the judgement of the evaluators, should remain so, the concepts of "international attention" or "international impact" etc. in the grading criteria above may be replaced by "international comparability".
Operations and procedures are of outstanding quality, transparent and shared in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are documented and operations and practices are in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of outstanding quality.

**Excellent quality of procedures and results (4)**

Research of excellent quality. Typically published with great impact, also internationally. Without doubt, the research has a leading position in its field in Finland.

Operations and procedures are of excellent quality, transparent and shared in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of excellent quality.

**Very good quality of procedures and results (3)**

The research is of such very good quality that it attracts wide national and international attention.

Operations and procedures are of very good quality, transparent and shared in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of very good quality.

**Good quality of procedures and results (2)**

Good research attracting mainly national attention but possessing international potential, extraordinarily high relevance may motivate good research.

Operations and procedures are of good quality, shared occasionally in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are occasionally documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of good quality.

**Sufficient quality of procedures and results (1)**

In some cases the research is insufficient and reports do not gain wide circulation or do not have national or international attention. Research activities should be revised.

Operations and procedures are of sufficient quality, shared occasionally in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are occasionally documented and operations and practices are to some extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of sufficient quality.

---

**Question 2 – DOCTORAL TRAINING**

**Question 3 – SOCIETAL IMPACT**

**Question 4 – COLLABORATION**

**Classification: Criteria (level of procedures and results)**

**Outstanding quality of procedures and results (5)**

Procedures are of outstanding quality, transparent and shared in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and management are documented and operations and practices are in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of outstanding quality. The procedures and results are regularly evaluated and the feedback has an effect on the planning.

**Excellent quality of procedures and results (4)**

Procedures are of excellent quality, transparent and shared in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and management are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of excellent quality. The procedures and outcomes are evaluated and the feedback has an effect on the planning.

**Very good quality of procedures and results (3)**

Procedures are of very good quality, transparent and shared in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and
management are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of very good quality.

**Good quality of procedures and results (2)**

Procedures are of good quality, shared occasionally in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and management are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of good quality.

**Sufficient quality of procedures and results (1)**

Procedures are of sufficient quality, transparent and shared in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and management are occasionally documented and operations and practices are to some extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of sufficient quality.

**Question 9 – CATEGORY**

Participation category – fitness for the category chosen

The choice and justification for the chosen category below should be reflected in the RC's responses to the evaluation questions 1–8.

1. The research of the participating community represents the international cutting edge in its field.
2. The research of the participating community is of high quality, but the community in its present composition has yet to achieve strong international recognition or a clear break-through.
3. The research of the participating community is distinct from mainstream research, and the special features of the research tradition in the field must be considered in the evaluation. The research is of high quality and has great significance and impact in its field. However, the generally used research evaluation methods do not necessarily shed sufficient light on the merits of the research.
4. The research of the participating community represents an innovative opening. A new opening can be an innovative combination of research fields, or it can be proven to have a special social, national or international demand or other significance. Even if the researcher community in its present composition has yet to obtain proof of international success, its members can produce convincing evidence of the high level of their previous research.
5. The research of the participating community has a highly significant societal impact. The participating researcher community is able to justify the high social significance of its research. The research may relate to national legislation, media visibility or participation in social debate, or other activities promoting social development and human welfare. In addition to having societal impact, the research must be of a high standard.

**An example of outstanding fitness for category choice (5)**

The RC's representation and argumentation for the chosen category were convincing. The RC recognized its real capacity and apparent outcomes in a wider context to the research communities. The specific character of the RC was well-recognized and well stated in the responses. The RC fitted optimally for the category.

- Outstanding (5)
- Excellent (4)
- Very good (3)
- Good (2)
- Sufficient (1)

The above-mentioned definition of outstanding was only an example in order to assist the panellists in the positioning of the classification. There was no exact definition for the category fitness.

---

5 The panels discussed the category fitness and made the final conclusions of the interpretation of it.
1.8 Timetable of the evaluation

The main timetable of the evaluation:
1. Registration November 2010
3. External peer review May–September 2011
4. Published reports March–April 2012
   - University level public report
   - RC specific reports

The entire evaluation was implemented during the university’s strategy period 2010–2012. The preliminary results were available for the planning of the following strategy period in late autumn 2011. The evaluation reports will be published in March/April 2012. More detailed time schedule is published in the University report.

1.9 Evaluation feedback – consensus of the entire panel

The panellists evaluated all the RC-specific material before the meetings in Helsinki and mailed the draft reports to the evaluation office. The latest interim versions were on-line available to all the panellists on the Wiki-sites. In September 2011, in Helsinki the panels discussed the material, revised the first draft reports and decided the final numeric evaluation. After the meetings in Helsinki, the panels continued working and finalised the reports before the end of November 2011. The final RC-specific reports are the consensus of the entire panel.

The evaluation reports were written by the panels independently. During the editing process, the evaluation office requested some clarifications from the panels when necessary. The tone and style in the reports were not harmonized in the editing process. All the reports follow the original texts written by the panels as far as it was possible.

The original evaluation material of the RCs, provided for the panellists is attached at the end of the report. It is essential to notice that the exported lists of publications and other scientific activities depend how the data was stored in the TUHAT-RIS by the RCs.
2 Evaluation feedback

2.1 Focus and quality of the RC’s research

- Description of
  - the RC’s research focus
  - the quality of the RC’s research (incl. key research questions and results)
  - the scientific significance of the RC’s research in the research field(s)
- Identification of the ways to strengthen the focus and improve the quality of the RC’s research

ASPECTS: Scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, innovativeness

The RC represents the research and doctoral training done at the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology and by Markus Heikinheimo from the Department of Pediatrics in Helsinki University. The strengths of the RC are in HPV, Chlamydia, genetics and cancer research related to women’s health. The problem with this RC is that it does not have a clear focus but it covers all the research and doctoral training done in the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology. The RC has a good production of scientific articles and some in excellent journals like Nature, Nature Genetics, Lancet, NEJM which shows potential excellence in this RC. The material provided in RC-specific stage 2 is quite thin compared with other RCs and it was even impossible to find out that Prof. Markus Heikinheimo is a director of the National Graduate Programme of Clinical Sciences and Docent Aila Tiitinen is the steering committee which actually shows that the RC has merits in doctoral training. The RC led by two almost emeritus professors is not the best choice for the future. Younger group leaders should have been more involved in the compilation of the material for the evaluation.

Recommendation for the RC is that it should try to focus the research and let the younger group leaders show their insights in the research and doctoral training which they most likely have done but it is not obvious in the material provided for the panel.

Numeric evaluation: 3 (Very good)

2.2 Practises and quality of doctoral training

- Organising of the doctoral training in the RC. Description of the RC’s principles for:
  - recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates
  - supervision of doctoral candidates
  - collaboration with faculties, departments/institutes, and potential graduate schools/doctoral programmes
  - good practices and quality assurance in doctoral training
  - assuring of good career perspectives for the doctoral candidates/fresh doctorates
- Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to the practises and quality of doctoral training, and the actions planned for their development.
- Additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s other scientific activities/supervision of doctoral dissertations

ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management

The RC has produced enough MD/PhDs and as stated before, Prof. Markus Heikinheimo is a director of national doctoral programme in clinical sciences, which is an important position in the development of doctoral training in clinical sciences. Clinical MD/PhD training has nowadays many more obstacles than before. To have a MD/PhD as such is not always the merit as it used to be even in the University Hospitals. It is very challenging to have MD/PhD training and specialization at the same time, and this clearly is the important area to develop further. The funding for MD/PhD should not be a problem due to EVO funding,
which should be directed to excellent research and doctoral training. Ear-marked funding from the Ministry of Culture and Education and Academy of Finland to the national doctoral programme of clinical sciences should be continued.

**Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)**

### 2.3 The societal impact of research and doctoral training

- **Description on how the RC interacts with and contributes to the society (collaboration with public, private and/or 3rd sector).**
- **Identification of the ways to strengthen the societal impact of the RC’s research and doctoral training.**
- **Additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s other scientific activities.**

**ASPECTS:** Societal impact, national and international collaboration, innovativeness

The RC is satisfied and comfortable with the current situation which is most likely not true. HPV vaccination, cancer screening and findings of the importance BRCA1/2 genes in breast cancer are of importance but when the RC states that it is not the RC’s highest priority it is difficult to see the future of this RC.

**Recommendation:** Let the young group leaders show their views.

**Numeric evaluation: 3 (Very good)**

### 2.4 International and national (incl. intersectoral) research collaboration and researcher mobility

- **Description of**
  - the RC’s research collaborations and joint doctoral training activities
  - how the RC has promoted researcher mobility
- **Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to research collaboration and researcher mobility, and the actions planned for their development.**

**ASPECTS:** Scientific quality, national and international collaboration

The RC has excellent international and national collaboration in HPV and Chlamydia research and also in cancer genetics, which are also seen in cutting edge publications such as Lancet, NEJM and Nature Genetics.

**Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)**

### 2.5 Operational conditions

- **Description of the operational conditions in the RC’s research environment (e.g. research infrastructure, balance between research and teaching duties).**
- **Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to operational conditions, and the actions planned for their development.**

**ASPECTS:** Processes and good practices related to leadership and management

The description of the RC provided by Prof. Jorma Paavonen is very traditional in a clinical department in the university hospital but does not seem to observe the future challenges and views how to improve clinical research with previously strong track record.
2.6 Leadership and management in the researcher community

- **Description of**
  - the execution and processes of leadership in the RC
  - how the management-related responsibilities and roles are distributed in the RC
  - how the leadership- and management-related processes support
    - high quality research
    - collaboration between principal investigators and other researchers in the RC
    - the RC's research focus
    - strengthening of the RC's know-how
- **Identification of the RC's strengths and challenges related to leadership and management, and the actions planned for developing the processes**

**ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management**

The RC is too much led by the older professors and younger group leaders should have more to state how they would lead the department in the future. The statement that OB/GYN department is the biggest in Europe should also mean that leadership and management would be more challenging than described in a few lines outlined in the material.

2.7 External competitive funding of the RC

- **The RCs were asked to provide information of such external competitive funding, where:**
  - the funding decisions have been made during 1.1.2005–31.12.2010, and
  - the administrator of the funding is/has been the University of Helsinki
- **On the e-form the RCs were asked to provide:**
  1) The relevant funding source(s) from a given list (Academy of Finland/Research Council, TEKES/The Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation, EU, ERC, foundations, other national funding organisations, other international funding organizations), and
  2) The total sum of funding which the organisation in question had decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005–31.12.2010.

**Competitive funding reported in the text is also to be considered when evaluating this point.**

**ASPECTS: Scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, innovativeness and future significance**

The RC gets most of their funding from EVO and the Academy of Finland which is at an excellent level and shows the importance of this RC.

2.8 The RC’s strategic action plan for 2011–2013

- **RC's description of their future perspectives in relation to research and doctoral training.**
  
  **ASPECTS: Scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, processes and good practices related to leadership and management, national and international collaboration, innovativeness, future significance**

With a few words the RC states clearly that the first priority is to increase scientific productivity and that the number of residents in doctoral training is increasing.

  Recommendation: Let the young group leaders state their own opinion.
2.9 Evaluation of the category of the RC in the context of entity of the evaluation material (1-8)

The RC’s fitness to the chosen participation category.
Category 2. The research of the participating community is of high quality, but the community in its present composition has yet to achieve strong international recognition or a clear break-through.

The RC fits within the chosen category.
 Numeric evaluation: 3 (Very good)

2.10 Short description of how the RC members contributed the compilation of the stage 2 material

The compilation of the material was clearly done only by Prof. Jorma Paavonen.

2.11 How the UH’s focus areas are presented in the RC’s research

Focus area 6: Clinical research

2.12 RC-specific main recommendations

Recommendations:
1. Try to focus on the research
2. Let the young group leaders have more influence on strategic actions and evaluations like this.

2.13 RC-specific conclusions

The RC describes all the research and doctoral training done at the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology without any clear focus of the research or doctoral training. Some results are excellent, but better description and further actions are missed in the material compiled only by the director of the RC. Very excellent in this RC is that there are young group leaders like Heikinheimo, Markus and Oskari. Prof. Markus Heikinheimo has an important position to lead and direct the national doctoral programme of clinical sciences. The material provided for the evaluators was not compiled in a most successful way and hopefully in the future the young group leaders would take more responsibility that their own views of the research and doctoral training are properly presented for the evaluators.

2.14 Preliminary findings in the University-level evaluation

The RC should have more focus, and the younger group leaders should have shown their own views about the future of the research and doctoral training. Partly excellent results are not properly presented in the evaluation material. Leadership and management and strategic action plan are not really described such a way to taken seriously. The RC has excellent funding and excellent production of articles and PhDs. Some of the papers have been published in cutting edge journals like Nature, Nature Genetics, Lancet and NEJM, but the scope and focus is missing from the RC.
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RC-SPECIFIC MATERIAL FOR THE PEER REVIEW

NAME OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Women’s Health Research Program (Women’s Health)

LEADER OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Professor Jorma Paavonen, Institute of Clinical Medicine, Faculty of Medicine

RC-SPECIFIC MATERIAL FOR THE PEER REVIEW:

- Material submitted by the RC at stages 1 and 2 of the evaluation
  - STAGE 1 material: RC’s registration form (incl. list of RC participants in an excel table)
  - STAGE 2 material: RC’s answers to evaluation questions
- TUHAT compilations of the RC members’ other scientific activities 1.1.2005-31.12.2010
  (analysis carried out by CWTS, Leiden University)

NB! Since Web of Science(WoS)-based bibliometrics does not provide representative results for most RCs representing humanities, social sciences and computer sciences, the publications of these RCs will be analyzed by the UH Library
(results available by the end of June, 2011)
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

1 RESPONSIBLE PERSON

Name: Paavonen, Jorma
E-mail: jorma.paavonen@hus.fi
Phone: +358-50-427 2060
Affiliation: Institute of Clinical Medicine, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Street address: Haartmaninkatu 2, 00290 Helsinki

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTICIPATING RESEARCHER COMMUNITY (RC)

Name of the participating RC (max. 30 characters): Women's Health Research Program
Acronym for the participating RC (max. 10 characters): Women's Health
Description of the operational basis in 2005-2010 (eg. research collaboration, joint doctoral training activities) on which the RC was formed (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): Research on women’s health has evolved and expanded during recent years. This research program involves a large research consortium. Our department is the largest department of obstetrics and gynecology in Europe with approximately 15 000 deliveries and 150 000 outpatient visits/year. The strengths of the program include huge base for clinical patient-oriented research, unique biobanks, utilization of health registry networks and integration of translational and basic research.

3 SCIENTIFIC FIELDS OF THE RC

Main scientific field of the RC’s research: medicine, biomedicine and health sciences
RC’s scientific subfield 1: Obstetrics and Gynecology
RC’s scientific subfield 2: --Select--
RC’s scientific subfield 3: --Select--
RC’s scientific subfield 4: --Select--
Other, if not in the list: 

4 RC’S PARTICIPATION CATEGORY

Participation category: 2. Research of the participating community is of high quality, but the community in its present composition has yet to achieve strong international recognition or a clear break-through
Justification for the selected participation category (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): We feel that physician-scientist is endangered and threatened species since it has been increasingly difficult to recruit and retain physician-scientists to maintain academic medicine in frontline and to build better career pipelines. Our goal is to meet these major challenges by producing high impact research in general and specifically high impact clinical research in women’s health. The unique perspective physician-scientists...
bring to medical research is that scientific questions arise in the clinic at the bed-side. Overall, we are
convinced that our productivity has been strikingly high and of extremely high quality. This justifies us to
look for international recognition and appreciation through evaluation. This is particularly important since
our program includes almost 50 graduate students to be trained as the next generation of distinct in clinical
research scientists.

5 DESCRIPTION OF THE RC’S RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING

Public description of the RC’s research and doctoral training (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): We are
training large number of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows who will then become trained
scientists in the fields of women’s health research including infection, reproduction, tumours, and genetics.

Significance of the RC’s research and doctoral training for the University of Helsinki (MAX. 2200
characters with spaces): We are training large number of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows who
will then become trained scientists in the fields of women’s health research including infection,
reproduction, tumours, and genetics.

Keywords: Women’s health, infection and inflammation, cervical screening, reproduction, menopausal
physiology, ovarian cancer, breast cancer, pregnancy and genes

6 QUALITY OF RC’S RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING

Justified estimate of the quality of the RC’s research and doctoral training at national and international
level during 2005-2010 (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): We have included a complete list of
publications representing the time period under evaluation (TUHAT). We also provide h-indexes of principal
investigators to justify the quality of the research training at national and international levels (Web of
Science).

Comments on how the RC’s scientific productivity and doctoral training should be evaluated (MAX. 2200
characters with spaces): We have included a complete list of publications representing the time period
under evaluation (TUHAT). We also provide h-indexes of principal investigators to justify the quality of the
research training at national and international levels (Web of Science).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>PI-status (TUHAT-check, lista 29.11.)</th>
<th>Title of research and teaching personnel</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paavonen</td>
<td>Jorma</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>IV Professor</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butzow</td>
<td>Rafal</td>
<td></td>
<td>III Senior researcher</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heikkinhimo</td>
<td>Markku</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>IV Professor</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heikkinhimo</td>
<td>Oskari</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>III Senior researcher</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laivuori</td>
<td>Hannele</td>
<td></td>
<td>III Senior researcher</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikkola</td>
<td>Tomy</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>III Senior researcher</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevanlinna</td>
<td>Heli</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>III Senior researcher</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieminen</td>
<td>Pekka</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>III Senior researcher</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tittinen</td>
<td>Aila</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>IV Professor</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilkuna</td>
<td>Olavi</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>IV Professor</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andersson</td>
<td>Noora</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anttila</td>
<td>Ahti</td>
<td></td>
<td>III Senior researcher</td>
<td>Finnish Cancer Registry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anttonen</td>
<td>Mikko</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apter</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td></td>
<td>III Senior researcher</td>
<td>Family Federation of Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giessler</td>
<td>Mika</td>
<td></td>
<td>III Senior researcher</td>
<td>National Institute of Health and Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heino</td>
<td>Sanna</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurskainen</td>
<td>Ritva</td>
<td></td>
<td>III Senior researcher</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joki-Korpela</td>
<td>Päivi</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassus</td>
<td>Heini</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemenen</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>III Senior researcher</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loukovaara</td>
<td>Mikko</td>
<td></td>
<td>III Senior researcher</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lytytinen</td>
<td>Heli</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niinimäki</td>
<td>Maarit</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>University of Oulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puolakkainen</td>
<td>Mirja</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>III Senior researcher</td>
<td>HU, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salonen</td>
<td>Jonna</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savolainen-Peltonen</td>
<td>Hanna</td>
<td>III Senior researcher</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahonen</td>
<td>Satu</td>
<td></td>
<td>III Senior researcher</td>
<td>Helsinki City Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikkanen</td>
<td>Minna</td>
<td></td>
<td>III Senior researcher</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuomikoski</td>
<td>Pauliina</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulander</td>
<td>Veli-Matti</td>
<td></td>
<td>III Senior researcher</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unkila-Kallio</td>
<td>Leila</td>
<td></td>
<td>III Senior researcher</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Välsänen-Tommiska</td>
<td>Mervi</td>
<td></td>
<td>III Senior researcher</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aalto-Viljakainen</td>
<td>Tia</td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farkkilä</td>
<td>Annina</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halla</td>
<td>Ulla-Maija</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>University of Oulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hautamäki</td>
<td>Hanna</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heikkilä</td>
<td>Tuomas</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoikkala</td>
<td>Hanna</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyden-Granskog</td>
<td>Christel</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaisišuo</td>
<td>Janina</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaikiala</td>
<td>Ilkka</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauppinen</td>
<td>Marjut</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koivisto-Korander</td>
<td>Riikka</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koskela-Koivisto</td>
<td>Tiina</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuronen</td>
<td>Elina</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrölähti</td>
<td>Antti</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leinonen</td>
<td>Maarit</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Finnish Cancer Registry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leminen</td>
<td>Henri</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>HUS, Hyvinkää Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leppälähti</td>
<td>Suvi</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luostarinen</td>
<td>Tapio</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lylykäinen</td>
<td>Erika</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>University of Oulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lönnberg</td>
<td>Stefan</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Finnish Cancer Registry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentula</td>
<td>Maarit</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merikukka</td>
<td>Marko</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>University of Oulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Männistö</td>
<td>Jaana</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>University of Oulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niemi</td>
<td>Suvi</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parviainen</td>
<td>Helka</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelkonen</td>
<td>Sari</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>University of Oulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahkola</td>
<td>Päivi</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riihimäki</td>
<td>Outi</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soini</td>
<td>Tuuli</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>HUS, Hyvinkää Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomalainen-König</td>
<td>Sanna</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Helsinki Univ Central Hosp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sälevaara</td>
<td>Mari</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Family Federation of Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarjanne</td>
<td>Satu</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommola</td>
<td>Päivi</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vattulainen</td>
<td>Sanna</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>UH, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vylla</td>
<td>Pia</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>University of Tampere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhall</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>University of Oulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öhman</td>
<td>Hanna</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>University of Oulu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Name of the RC’s responsible person: Paavonen, Jorma
E-mail of the RC’s responsible person: jorma.paavonen@hus.fi
Name and acronym of the participating RC: Women's Health Research Program, Women's Health
The RC’s research represents the following key focus area of UH: 6. Kliininen tutkimus – Clinical research

Comments for selecting/not selecting the key focus area:

1. Description of the RC’s research focus, the quality of the RC’s research (incl. key research questions and results) and the scientific significance of the RC’s research for the research field(s).

The research focus is women’s health including large projects on infection, reproduction, tumours and genetics (Figure 1). Research on women’s health has evolved and expanded significantly during recent years. Our department is the largest department of obstetrics and gynecology in the whole Europe. Thus, the major strengths of the RC include huge base for clinical patient-oriented research, utilization of unique biobanks and health registry networks, large multidisciplinary re-search consortium, and integration of clinical research with basic research and translational re-search. Selected examples of the key research questions are:

1. Defining key host factors of the immune response to C. trachomatis infection which is the main cause of tubal factor infertility. What are the best immune response biomarkers predicting tubal damage caused by C. trachomatis.

2. What is the efficacy and cost-effectiveness of HPV vaccination against high grade cervical, vaginal and vulvar precancer as defined in a large randomized trial. Our large community-randomized HPV vaccination trial will answer the question of the best strategy of HPV vaccination from the public health point of view. Linking the registry of the vaccinated individuals and cancer registry of Finland will ultimately answer the question of the vaccine efficacy against invasive cervical cancer. 3. We want to test new biomarkers in predicting preterm birth. This is possible based on the clinical material of cervicovaginal samples of 6,000 pregnant women.

4. Introducing HPV-DNA testing in primary screening for cervical cancer, to replace conventional Pap smear.

5. Implementing elective single embryo transfer in routine IVF treatment, to avoid multiple pregnancies.

6. What are the health effects of sex steroids in early or late postmenopausal hormone therapy. How to best optimize hormonal therapy.

7. Implementation of medical pregnancy termination, to replace conventional surgical termination. 8. Pregnancy is a window to women’s health – is this a lost opportunity?


10. In the pregnancy and genes project we want to focus in the genetics of the most common obstetric disorders, pre-eclampsia and gestational diabetes.
The scientific significance of research on women's health has tremendously expanded during recent years. Some years ago women's health research primarily focused on reproductive health only. The current broad concept has led to the recognition that research priorities in women's health must be comprehensive and interdisciplinary and should include the full spectrum of research from clinical research to molecular and genetic research including prevention of important diseases and studies of outcomes of new interventions such as HPV vaccination. Research on reproduction has also expanded from menarche to the natural history of menopausal transition and focuses also on the interaction of hormones and environment and genetic susceptibility to significant malignancies such as ovarian cancer and breast cancer.

Our goal is to meet these important challenges. We have been able to produce high impact research and specifically high impact clinical research in many fields of women's health. Our productivity has been strikingly high and of extremely high quality. This justifies us to look for international recognition through evaluation.

- Ways to strengthen the focus and improve the quality of the RC's research.

The central theme of this research program is women's health. The scientific goals of the program will be accomplished through extensive interaction between clinical and basic research. Our re-search program includes distinct interrelated projects established by experienced group leaders. The strong synergy and coalition between the programs has already been demonstrated by excel-lent track record in research productivity. We plan further strengthen the focus by increasing clini-cal patient oriented research and by increasingly utilizing biobanks and health registry networks. Our goal is to build a better physician-scientist career pipeline and motivate increasing number of young residents to do clinical and translational research. We are convinced that our RC will revital-ize the physician-scientist career through commitment to research training of residents and gradu-ate students.

- How is doctoral training organised in the RC? Description of the RC's principles for recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates, supervision of doctoral candidates, collaboration with faculties, departments/institutes, and potential graduate schools/doctoral programmes, good practises and quality assurance in doctoral training, and assuring good career perspectives for the doctoral candidates/fresh doctorates.

We have already enrolled almost 50 residents and PhD students in the Women's Health Program. 5-6 doctoral candidates complete their PhD programs annually. The group leaders of the program are extremely effective in recruiting new doctoral candidates and have extensive experience in supervising doctoral candidates. We have established a clinical graduate school at our university by the Departments of Obstetrics and Gynecology and Pediatrics. Four positions are available for doctoral candidates. Large number of candidates have been seeking these positions. In addition doctoral candidates can seek appointment by the National Clinical Graduate School of Finland. Currently at least three doctoral candidates of the Women's Health Program have been recruited in this graduate school. We have been organizing annually 2-3 research retreats for the doctoral can-didates, the last retreat took place February 3, 2011. There were seven scientific presentations by the doctoral candidates of the Women’s Health Program. Every doctoral candidate has at least two supervisors. In addition these candidates have an evaluation board with annual meetings in which the progress of the research is evaluated and further strengthened.
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• RC's strengths and challenges related to the practises and quality of doctoral training, and the actions planned for their development.

  Strengths:
  Large pool of residents and PhD students.
  Experienced academic chief investigators involved in undergraduate and postgraduate teaching and clinical bedside work.

  Challenges:
  Increase and improve the systematic structure of doctoral training.

3 SOCIETAL IMPACT OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

• Description of how the RC interacts with and contributes to the society (collaboration with public, private and/or 3rd sector).

  The several key research topics of the Women's Health Program have major contribution to the society. For instance HPV vaccination, medical abortion, cervical cancer screening program, pregnancy and genes research, and pregnancy – a health window project. Therefore this research community must interact and contribute to the society by translating research outcome into public health. Women's Health Program also has extensive collaboration with many research institutes outside the university such as National Public Health Institute, Cancer Registry, Family Federation of Finland and also big pharma (GlaxoSmithKline, Sanofi Pasteur, MSD, Bayer-Schering).

• Ways to strengthen the societal impact of the RC's research and doctoral training.

  This is not our highest priority. We are satisfied and feel comfortable with the current situation.

4 INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL (INCL. INTERSECTORAL) RESEARCH COLLABORATION AND RESEARCHER MOBILITY (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

• Description of the RC's research collaborations and joint doctoral training activities and how the RC has promoted researcher mobility.

  International collaboration has long and successful track record as can be seen from several major landmark publications in high impact journals during recent years. Women's Health Program has international collaboration at global level (for example, HPV vaccination trials), European level (for example, EPIGEN Chlamydia Consortium), Scandinavian level (for example, biobank networking), and national level (such as research collaboration between the five ob/gyn university departments in Finland). Most group leaders have spent several years abroad in the best academic institutions and universities, and subsequently continued productive research collaboration. One of our collaborators and supervisors recently received the Nobel Prize (Harald zur Hausen, Heidelberg, Germany).

• RC's strengths and challenges related to research collaboration and researcher mobility, and the actions planned for their development.

  The strengths are listed above.

  One challenge is to recruit more international junior and senior collaborators to the program on site in Helsinki. We have already invited one Visiting Professor from the Emory University, Atlanta (Prof. Kevin Ault) who is joining the program later this year.
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Another challenge is to organize Master Class Symposia on different aspects of Women’s Health and invite participants from other university clinics in Finland and also abroad. Our experience of two of such Master Class Symposia is extremely positive (external funding from Big Pharma). However, funding is a major challenge.

5 OPERATIONAL CONDITIONS (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

- Description of the operational conditions in the RC’s research environment (e.g. research infrastructure, balance between research and teaching duties).

All senior group leaders of the Women’s Health Program have extensive teaching duties and participate both in undergraduate and postgraduate teaching. Many are also involved in bedside clinical work. This is extremely important since most important questions often arise bedside. Prof. Jorma Paavonen is the overall program leader (H-Index 50) and each major project has a group leader. Each project has several senior chief investigators. Overall, there are 10 senior investigators who are in charge of the program. The group leaders have biannual investigators’ meetings. In addition, group leaders organize 2-3 research retreats for doctoral candidates annually. This leadership and management strengthens collaboration and ensures high quality research.

- RC’s strengths and challenges related to operational conditions, and the actions planned for their development.

The major strength is that Women’s Health program represents clinical research in the first place. Clinical research has exceptionally strong track record in Finland.

The major challenge is how to translate the successful and productive program into better and increasing funding opportunities through and augmented by the Research Programs Unit.

6 LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT IN THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

- Description of the execution and processes of leadership in the RC, how the management-related responsibilities and roles are distributed in the RC and how the leadership- and management-related processes support high quality research, collaboration between principal investigators and other researchers in the RC, the RC’s research focus and strengthening of the RC’s know-how.

These have been described above.

- RC’s strengths and challenges related to leadership and management, and the actions planned for developing the processes.

Strengths:
Leadership under exceptionally experienced and productive senior investigators.
Huge basis and potential for clinically oriented research.
Wide spectrum of women’s health research.
The home base is the largest OB/GYN Department in Europe providing unlimited research opportunities.
Extensive networks, biobanks and health registries.
Large pool of doctoral candidates.
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Senior investigators who also participate in undergraduate and postgraduate academic teaching and have clinical appointments at the University Hospital.

Challenges:
Challenge building a better physician-scientist pipeline revitalizing the physician-scientist career.
Motivation of young residents to do clinical and translational research.
Recruiting more post-doctoral fellows to be trained as the next generation of distinct research scientists.
Establishing a clinical trial center for patient-oriented research.
Better office space for doctoral candidates.
Professional biostatistician for doctoral candidates.

7 EXTERNAL COMPETITIVE FUNDING OF THE RC

- Listing of the RCs external competitive funding, where:
  - the funding decisions have been made during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and
  - the administrator of the funding is/has been the University of Helsinki

- Academy of Finland (AF) - total amount of funding (in euros) AF has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010: 1470000

- Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation (TEKES) - total amount of funding (in euros) TEKES has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010: 270000

- European Union (EU) - total amount of funding (in euros) EU has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010: 250000

- European Research Council (ERC) - total amount of funding (in euros) ERC has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010:

- International and national foundations – names of international and national foundations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros).
  - names of the foundations: Cancer Society of Finland
  - Päivikki Solhberg Foundation
  - Juho Vainio Foundation
  - Yrjö Jahnsson Foundation
  - Antti and Jenny Wihuri Foundation
  - NFUG
  - Jane ja Aatos Erkko Foundation
  - The Finnish Medical Foundation
  - Nordic Cancer Union
  - Sigrid Juselius Foundation
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- total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned foundations: 2120000

Other international funding - names of other international funding organizations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros).
  - names of the funding organizations: Columbia University, USA
  - NHGRI, NIH, USA
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: 30000

Other national funding (incl. EVO funding and Ministry of Education and Culture funded doctoral programme positions) - names of other national funding organizations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros).
  - names of the funding organizations: EVO funding
  - Helsinki University funding
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: 2100000

8 RC’S STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN FOR 2011–2013 (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

Description of the RC’s future perspectives in respect to research and doctoral training.
First priority is to increase scientific productivity. The outlook is very promising. For instance the impact factors have constantly been over 350 and we are confident that this trend continues. Also the total number of residents in doctoral training is increasing.

9 SHORT DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE RC MEMBERS HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO THE COMPILATION OF THE STAGE 2 MATERIALS (MAX. 1100 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES).

All chief investigators have provided complete CV’s including information required for TUHAT database.
1 Analysis of publications

Associated persons are: Jorma Paavonen, Jorma.Paavonen@helsinki.fi, Ralf Butzow, ralf.butzow@helsinki.fi, Markku Heikinheimo, Markku.Heikinheimo@helsinki.fi, Oskari Heikinheimo, Oskari.Heikinheimo@helsinki.fi, Jonna Salonen, Jonna.Salonen@helsinki.fi, Päivi Rahkola, paivi.rahkola@helsinki.fi, Tomi Mikkola, tomi.mikkola@helsinki.fi, Heli Nevalä, heli.nevala@helsinki.fi, Tuomas Heikkinen, tuomas.heikkinen@helsinki.fi, Ilkka Kalliala, ilkka.kalliala@helsinki.fi, Riitta Kivistö-Korander, rii.t.kivistokorander@helsinki.fi, Piai Tommola, piai.tommola@helsinki.fi, Peter Matula, peter.matula@helsinki.fi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication type</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total Count 2005 - 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Refereed journal article</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Review in scientific journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Unrefereed journal article</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Contribution to book/other compilations (non-refereed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Article in professional journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of publications

A1 Refereed journal article

2005
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Women’s Health/Paavonen


2006


Women's Health/Paavonen
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Women's Health/Paavonen


Women's Health/Paavonen


Women's Health/Paavonen


Duodecim, vol 13, no. 9, pp. 641-654.


Jay, PY, Blenkins, M, Erlich, JM, Männistö, S, Pu, WT, Heinikinheimo, M, Wilson, DB 2007, 'Impaired mesenchymal cell function in Gata4 mutant mice leads to diaphragmatic hernias and primary lung defects', *Developmental Biology*, vol 301, no. 2, pp. 602-614.
Women's Health/Paavonen


Women's Health/Paavonen


Women's Health/Paavonen


Women’s Health/Paavonen


Women's Health/Paavonen

2009


Heikkinen, O, Gisler, M, Suuronen, S 2009, ‘Can the outcome of the next pregnancy be predicted at the time of induced abortion?’, Human Reproduction, vol 24, no. 12, pp. 3174-3180.


Women's Health/Paavonen
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Women's Health/Paavonen


Women's Health/Paavonen

Paavonen, J 2010, 'At What Age Should We Be Vaccinating for Human Papillomavirus?', Gynecologic and Obstetric Investigation, vol 70, pp. 233-236.


Rahkola, P, Rutila, N, Nuutila, M, Sainio, S, Sorsa, T, Paavonen, J 2010, 'Elevated levels of decidual insulin-like growth factor binding protein-1 in cervical fluid in early and mid-pregnancy are associated with increased risk of spontaneous preterm delivery', BJOG, vol 117, no. 6, pp. 701-710.


INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF PUBLICATIONS DATA 2005-2010
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A2 Review in scientific journal

2006

2007


2008


2009


Puolakkainen, M 2009, ‘Innate immunity and vaccines in chlamydial infection with special emphasis on Chlamydia pneumoniae’, FEMS Immunology and Medical Microbiology, vol 55, no. 2, pp. 167-177.


A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)

2005
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Women's Health/Paavonen


2006


2007

2008

A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)

2006

2008

2010
B1 Unrefereed journal article

2005
Tiitinen, A 2005, 'Commentary: Live birth rate after single-embryo transfer plus frozen embryo transfer was only slightly lower than after double embryo-transfer', Evidence - Based Obstetrics & Gynaecology, vol 7, pp. 87-88.

2006
Women’s Health/Paavonen

2010


B2 Contribution to book/other compilations (non-refereed)

2009


2010


D1 Article in professional journal

2010

Women's Health/Paavonen

1 Analysis of activities 2005-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes and awards</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research journal</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of manuscripts</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of candidates for academic posts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in research network</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for written media</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in TV programme</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of activities 2005-2010

**Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis**

**Jorma Paavonen**, Jorma.Paavonen@helsinki.fi
- Supervision of MD thesis / Halmesmäki Karoliina, Jorma Paavonen, 2007, Finland
- Supervision of MD thesis / Lehtovirta Päivi, Jorma Paavonen, 2007, Finland
- Supervision of MD thesis / Tikkkanen Minna, Jorma Paavonen, 2008, Finland
- Supervision of MD thesis / Jakobsson Maja, Jorma Paavonen, 2009, Finland
- Supervision of MD thesis / Lylykäinen Erika, Jorma Paavonen, 2010, Finland
- Supervision of MD thesis / Rahkonen Leena, Jorma Paavonen, 2010, Finland

**Oskari Heikinheimo**, Oskari.Heikinheimo@helsinki.fi
- Supervision of MD thesis / Lehtovirta Päivi, Oskari Heikinheimo, 12.10.2007, Finland

**Hannele Maaret Laivuori**, hannele.laivuori@helsinki.fi
- Supervision of PhD thesis / Peterson Hanna, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 01.01.2005 → 16.01.2010, Sweden
- Supervision of MD thesis / Villa Pia, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 18.08.2007 → ..., Finland
- Supervision of MD thesis / Aalto-Viljakainen Tia, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 2008 → ..., Finland
- Supervision of PhD thesis / Sandbacka Maria, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 29.05.2009 → ..., Finland
- Supervision of MD thesis / Klemetti Miira, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 2010 → ..., Finland

**Heli Nevanlinna**, heli.nevanlinna@helsinki.fi
- Supervisor of PhD thesis / Eerola Hannaleena, Heli Nevanlinna, 2001 → ..., Finland
- Supervisor of PhD thesis / Vehmanen Paula, Heli Nevanlinna, 2001 → ..., Finland
- Supervisor of PhD thesis / Sarantaus Laura, Heli Nevanlinna, 2002 → ..., Finland
- Supervisor of PhD thesis / Vahteristo Pia, Heli Nevanlinna, 2003 → ..., Finland
- Supervisor of PhD thesis / Kilpivaara Outi, Heli Nevanlinna, 2007 → ..., Finland
- Supervisor of PhD thesis / Aaltonen Krsman, Heli Nevanlinna, 2008 → ..., Finland
- Supervisor of PhD thesis / Tommiska Johanna, Heli Nevanlinna, 2008 → ..., Finland

**Pekka Juhani Nieminen**, pekka.z.nieminen@helsinki.fi
- Supervisor of doctoral thesis / Kotaniemi-Talonen Laura, Pekka Juhani Nieminen, 2009
- Supervisor of doctoral thesis / Kaatila Ilkka, Pekka Juhani Nieminen, 2010

**Aila Tiitinen**, aila.tiitinen@helsinki.fi
- Supervisor of doctoral dissertation / Eviö Sirpa, Aila Tiitinen, 2006
- Supervisor of doctoral dissertation / Polkkuus Pia, Aila Tiitinen, 2007

**Mirja Puolakkainen**, Mirja.Puolakkainen@helsinki.fi
- Supervisor: Transcriptional analysis of persistent Chlamydia pneumoniae infection in vitro, Mirja Puolakkainen, 2000 → 2011
- Supervisor: CD8+ T cell response in experimental Chlamydia pneumoniae infection, Mirja Puolakkainen, 2005
- Ongoing PhD supervision: Juha Kortonen, Mirja Puolakkainen, 2007 → ...
- Ongoing PhD supervision: Suvi Niemi, Mirja Puolakkainen, 2009 → ...

**Prizes and awards**

**Olavi Ylikorkala**, olavi.ylikorkala@helsinki.fi
- Maud Kuistila Foundation's Price for the supervising and teaching of medical doctors 2006, Olavi Ylikorkala, 2006, Finland
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Editor of research journal
Jorma Paavonen, Jorma.Paavonen@helsinki.fi
Editorial Board Member, Sexually Transmitted Diseases (USA), Jorma Paavonen, 1990 → ..., United States
Sexually Transmitted Diseases, Jorma Paavonen, 01.01.1990 → ...
Editorial Board Member, Infectious Diseases of Obstetrics and Gynecology (USA), Jorma Paavonen, 1994 → ..., United States
Associate Editor, Sexually Transmitted Infections (Genitourinary Medicine), UK, Jorma Paavonen, 1996 → ..., United Kingdom
Editorial Board Member, International Journal of STD & AIDS (UK), Jorma Paavonen, 1996 → ..., United Kingdom
International Journal of STD & AIDS, Jorma Paavonen, 01.01.1996 → ..., United Kingdom
Sexually Transmitted Infections, Jorma Paavonen, 01.01.1996 → ...
Acta Obstetricia et Gynecologica Scandinavica, Jorma Paavonen, 01.01.1999 → ..., Denmark
APMIS, Jorma Paavonen, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2005
Clinical infectious diseases, Jorma Paavonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Suomen Lääkärilehti, Jorma Paavonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Associate Editor, Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand (UK), Jorma Paavonen, 2010 → ..., United Kingdom

Markku Heikinheimo, Markku.Heikinheimo@helsinki.fi
Annals of Medicine, Markku Heikinheimo, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Annals of Medicine, Markku Heikinheimo, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Endocrinology Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism, Markku Heikinheimo, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United States
Endocrinology and Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism, Markku Heikinheimo, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, United States

Oskari Heikinheimo, Oskari.Heikinheimo@helsinki.fi
European J of Contraception and Reproductive Health Care, Oskari Heikinheimo, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Human Reproduction, Oskari Heikinheimo, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005

Heli Nevanlinna, heli.nevanlinna@helsinki.fi
Human Molecular Genetics, Heli Nevanlinna, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2005
Clinical Genetics, Heli Nevanlinna, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Journal of Medical Genetics, Heli Nevanlinna, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005

Pekka Juhani Nieminen, pekka.z.nieminen@helsinki.fi
Acta Obstetricia et Gynecologica Scandinavica, Pekka Juhani Nieminen, 1999 → ...

Aila Tiltinen, aila.tiltinen@helsinki.fi
Acta Obstetricia et Gynecologica Scandinavica, Aila Tiltinen, 01.01.2000 → ..., Finland
Duodecim, Aila Tiltinen, 2000 → ..., Finland
Human Reproduction, Aila Tiltinen, 2000 → ...
Molecular Human Reproduction, Aila Tiltinen, 2000 → ...
European Journal of Obstetrics, Gynaecology and Reproductive Biology, Aila Tiltinen, 2004 → ...

Olavi Ylikorkala, olavi.ylikorkala@helsinki.fi
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Acta Obstetricia & Gynecologica Scandinavica, Olavi Ylikorkala, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2009
Annals of Medicine, Olavi Ylikorkala, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
European Journal of Contraception, Olavi Ylikorkala, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2006
Fertility Sterility, Olavi Ylikorkala, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2006
Gynecological Endocrinology, Olavi Ylikorkala, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2006
Human Reproduction, Olavi Ylikorkala, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism, Olavi Ylikorkala, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Obstetrics and Gynecology, Olavi Ylikorkala, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2006
Annual of Medicine, Olavi Ylikorkala, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006
Breast Cancer, Olavi Ylikorkala, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006
Climacteric, Olavi Ylikorkala, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006
Gynecological Medicine, Olavi Ylikorkala, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006
Maturitas, Olavi Ylikorkala, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2005
Women’s Health, Olavi Ylikorkala, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006

Arto Leminen, arto.leminen@hus.fi

Suomen Lääkärilehti, Arto Leminen, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2005

Mikko Loukovaara, mikko.loukovaara@hus.fi


Peer review of manuscripts

Hannele Maaret Laivuori, hannele.laivuori@helsinki.fi

European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 19.12.2003 → ...
Human Molecular Genetics, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 06.01.2003 → ...
Acta Obstetricia et Gynaecologica Scandinavica, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 02.03.2004 → ...
Acta Paediatrica, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 27.12.2004 → ...
Journal of Assisted Reproduction and Genetics, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 02.02.2005 → ...
Molecular Human Reproduction, European Society of Human Reproduction and Embryology, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 28.03.2005 → ..., United Kingdom
Suomen Lääkärilehti, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 21.08.2005 → ..., Finland
American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 15.04.2006 → ..., United States
Diabetes, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 08.02.2006 → ..., United States
Duodecim, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 20.06.2006 → ..., Finland
BMC Medical Genetics, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 30.12.2007 → ...
British Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 21.08.2007 → ...
Human Genetics, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 06.06.2007 → ...
Human Reproduction, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 12.09.2008 → ...
The Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology Research, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 14.12.2008 → ...
European Journal of Human Genetics, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 28.06.2009 → ...
Archives in Obstetrics and Gynecology, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 09.02.2010 → ...
BMC Research Notes, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 04.12.2010 → ...
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Mirja Puolakkainen , Mirja.Puolakkainen@helsinki.fi
Referee, Mirja Puolakkainen, 2005
Referee, Mirja Puolakkainen, 2006
Referee, Mirja Puolakkainen, 2007
Referee, Mirja Puolakkainen, 2008
Referee, Mirja Puolakkainen, 2009
Referee, Mirja Puolakkainen, 2010

Assessment of candidates for academic posts
Hannele Maaret Laivuori , hannele.laivuori@helsinki.fi
Assessment of candidate for the rank of scientist, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 2009, United States
Assessment of Candidate for Professor of Genetic Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 2010, Australia

Membership or other role in research network
Hannele Maaret Laivuori , hannele.laivuori@helsinki.fi
Member of study board, FINNPEC (The Finnish Genetics of Preeclampsia Consortium), Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 2007 → ..., Finland
Member of study board, FinnGeDi (The Finnish Gestational Diabetes Study), Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 2009 → ..., Finland
Member of study board, PREDO (Prediction and prevention of Pre-eclampsia), Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 2009 → ..., Finland
Preeclampsia CoLaboratory Program, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 09.10.2010 → ..., United States

Pia Maria Villa , pia.villa@helsinki.fi
Member of study board of PREDO (Prediction and prevention of pre-eclampsia), Pia Maria Villa, 2009 → ...
Membership of ISSHP (International Society for the Study of Hypertension in Pregnancy), Pia Maria Villa, 2010 → ...

Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board
Jorma Paavonen , Jorma.Paavonen@helsinki.fi
International Center for Reproductive Health, University of Ghent, Jorma Paavonen, 1995 → ..., Belgium
FIGO Expert Advisory Panel on STDs, Gynecological Infections, Parasites &amp; HIV, Jorma Paavonen, 1997 → ...
Cancer Organizations of Finland, Jorma Paavonen, 2005 → ..., Finland
Biomedicum Helsinki, Steering committee member, Jorma Paavonen, 2007 → ..., Finland
ESIDOG (European Society of Infectious Disease in Obstetrics and Gynecology, Jorma Paavonen, 2009 → ...

Markku Heikinheimo , Markku.Heikinheimo@helsinki.fi
Board for M.D.-Ph.D. Program, University of Helsinki, Markku Heikinheimo, 2006 → 2011, Finland
Duodecim, Markku Heikinheimo, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Lääkäriseura Duodecim, Markku Heikinheimo, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Thesis Committee Board of the Faculty of Medicine, Markku Heikinheimo, 2007 → 2011, Finland
Board for Research Funds, Helsinki University Central Hospital, Markku Heikinheimo, 2008 → ..., Finland

Oskari Heikinheimo , Oskari.Heikinheimo@helsinki.fi
Raskauksenkeskeytyksen käyppä hoito -ryhmä, Duodecim, Oskari Heikinheimo, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Suomen Menopaauksentutkimusseura, Oskari Heikinheimo, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Hannele Maaret Laivuori , hannele.laivuori@helsinki.fi
Member of the International Council, International Society for the Study of Hypertension in Pregnancy (ISSHP), Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 2004 → ..., United Kingdom
Treasurer of the Finnish Society of Medical Genetics, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 16.03.2007 → 27.03.2009, Finland
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Scientific officer of The Faculty of Medicine Research Council, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 01.01.2009 → …, Finland
Secretary of the Finnish Society of Medical Genetics, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 27.03.2009 → 19.03.2010, Finland

Tomi Sakari Mikkola, tomi.mikkola@helsinki.fi
Finnish Menopause Society, President, Tomi Sakari Mikkola, 2009 → …, Finland
Helsingin yliopiston Lääkiteleollisuuden tiedekunnan dosenttitoimikunnan jäsen, Tomi Sakari Mikkola, 2010 → …, Finland

Pekka Juhani Nieminen, pekka.z.nieminen@helsinki.fi
European Colposcopy Society, Pekka Juhani Nieminen, 2001 → …
Suomen Kolposkopiayhdistys ry., Pekka Juhani Nieminen, 2001 → …, Finland
Gynecologisen onkologian piirryhmä, Pekka Juhani Nieminen, 2005 → …, Finland

Aila Tiitinen, aila.tiitinen@helsinki.fi
International Federation of Fertility Societies, Aila Tiitinen, 2004 → 2007
European Board and College of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Aila Tiitinen, 2010 → …

Olivu Ylikorkala, olavi.ylikorkala@helsinki.fi
European Society of Gynecology, vice-president, Congress President, tieteellisen järjestelytoimikunnan puheenjohtaja, Olavi Ylikorkala, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2006
European Society of Gynecology, Olavi Ylikorkala, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006
Gynecological Endocrine Society, Olavi Ylikorkala, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006

Arto Lemenen, arto.leminen@hus.fi
Naksettautien eettinen toimikunta, Arto Lemenen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Mirja Puolakkainen, mirja.puolakkainen@helsinki.fi
American Society for Microbiology, Mirja Puolakkainen, 1992 → …, United States
HUS-piirin Koordinoiva Eettinen toimikunta, Mirja Puolakkainen, 2005 → …
European Society for Chlamydial Research, Mirja Puolakkainen, 2006 → …
Kliiniset Mikrobiologit ry, Mirja Puolakkainen, 2006 → …
Suomen Kliiniset Mikrobiologit, Mirja Puolakkainen, 2006 → …
Update on current care guidelines: Diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted infections, Mirja Puolakkainen, 2009 → 2010

Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization

Markku Heikinheimo, markku.heikinheimo@helsinki.fi
Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Markku Heikinheimo, 01.03.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Sosiaali- ja terveydenhuollon ministeriö (EVO-uudistusta valmistelevassa STM:n toimikunnassa), Markku Heikinheimo, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Oskari Heikinheimo, oskari.heikinheimo@helsinki.fi
Schering Advisory Board, Oskari Heikinheimo, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Schering International Advisory Board, Oskari Heikinheimo, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005

Hannele Maaret Laivuori, hannele.laivuori@helsinki.fi
VALVIRA, Hannele Maaret Laivuori, 01.06.2006 → …, Finland

Pekka Juhani Nieminen, pekka.z.nieminen@helsinki.fi
STAKES, Pekka Juhani Nieminen, 2002 → …

Aila Tiitinen, aila.tiitinen@helsinki.fi
Nordic Society of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Aila Tiitinen, 2009 → …
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Olavi Ylikorkala, olavi.ylikorkala@helsinki.fi

Biphosphonates for Gynecology, Expert Group Meeting in Berlin, Olavi Ylikorkala, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Choice Investigators Follow-up Group, Meetings in Rome and Vienna, Olavi Ylikorkala, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Instrumentariumin tutkimussäätiö, Olavi Ylikorkala, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Novartis Oy:n kansainvälinen Board: luento: Controversies on HRT: where we are now?, Olavi Ylikorkala, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Helsingin yliopiston tutkimusapurahanjoen jakotomikunta, Olavi Ylikorkala, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Instrumentariumin tiedesäätiö, Olavi Ylikorkala, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Kela:n sos.lääketiet. neuvoeltokunta, Olavi Ylikorkala, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Markku Heikinheimo, Markku.Heikinheimo@helsinki.fi

Nordic Society for Paediatric Hematology and Oncology (NOPHO), Markku Heikinheimo, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Sweden
Nordic Society for Pediatric Hematology and Oncology(NOPHO), Markku Heikinheimo, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Oskari Heikinheimo, Oskari.Heikinheimo@helsinki.fi

Duodecim seura, vaalivaliokunnan jäsen, Oskari Heikinheimo, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Duodecim seura, valtuuskunnan jäsen, Oskari Heikinheimo, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Pekka Juhani Nieminen, pekka.z.nieminen@helsinki.fi

Suomen kliinisen sytologian yhdistys, Pekka Juhani Nieminen, 2001 → ...

Aila Tiitinen, aila.tiitinen@helsinki.fi

Suomen Gynakologiyhdistys, pienyöryhmä, Aila Tiitinen, 1995 → 2008, Finland
Suomen Gynakologiyhdistys, hallitus, Aila Tiitinen, 2002 → ..., Finland
Suomen Gynakologiyhdistys, hallituksen puheenjohtaja, Aila Tiitinen, 2009 → ..., Finland
Suomen Gynakologiyhdistyksen puheenjohtaja, Aila Tiitinen, 2010 → 2011, Finland

Arto Leminen, arto.leminen@hus.fi


Mirja Puolakkainen, Mirja.Puolakkainen@helsinki.fi

Kuukauden mikrobi, Mirja Puolakkainen, 2007
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Participation in TV programme
Jorma Paavonen, Jorma.Paavonen@helsinki.fi
TV-ohjelma 17.7.2002, Jorma Paavonen, 02.06.2006, United States

Aila Tiitinen, aila.tiitinen@helsinki.fi
Useita lehti-, radio- ja TV-haastatteluja. Luontoja lääketieteen toimittajille, luentoja yleisölle (Sydänpäivä, Migreeniyhdistys jne). Hyvä terveyden toimituskunta, uusia kirjoituksia lehdessä, Aila Tiitinen, 2003 - 2011, Finland

Olavi Ylikorkala, olavi.ylikorkala@helsinki.fi
Useita lehti-, TV- ja radiohaastatteluita, Olavi Ylikorkala, 01.01.2006 – 31.12.2011, Finland
Research Group: Paavonen J

Basic statistics
- Number of publications (P): 406
- Number of citations (TCS): 5,056
- Number of citations per publication (MCS): 12.66
- Percentage of uncited publications: 22%
- Field-normalized number of citations per publication (MNCS): 1.83
- Field-normalized average journal impact (MNJS): 1.43
- Field-normalized proportion highly cited publications (top 10%): 1.90
- Internal coverage: .91

Trend analyses

Collaboration

Performance (MNCS) by collaboration type
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING 
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI 
by CWTS, Leiden University, the Netherlands
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Threshold: $P \geq 10$