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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.\(^2\)
- 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
3. TUHAT\(^3\) compilations on publications and other scientific activities\(^4\)
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.

---

\(^3\) 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
   - 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

Strengths: High quality scientific research, combination of basic and clinical research. Application into common and therefore important skin and allergy diseases. Development of treatments for common diseases, and therefore high societal impact and scientific significance. Societal impact is also accomplished by visible presence at high level international meetings, in media etc. The research is innovative.

Good networking and scientific cooperation with various research groups outside dermatology and allergy. Intensive international cooperation.

Areas of development correspond to those which can be expected in the future to be important in the fields of dermatology and allergy.

Good level of publications. Of positive note is the involvement of many young talented scientists and the promotion of their careers.

Recommendations: Recommendation that the group continues their successful work as in the past, and the support by the university to the clinical and research efforts is increased.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

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 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.
- 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

Very good selection and recruitment of doctoral candidates. Stimulation of physician-scientist or MD/PhD careers.

Very good supervision of doctoral candidates, excellent collaboration with other faculties, institutes and programs.

Good practice and quality assessment in doctoral training and assurance of career perspectives by the doctoral candidates/fresh doctorates.

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 interacts very well with the society. It is present at many large international meetings, and its work is highly visible and well known. An intensive international research network contributes to the visibility of research.

The societal impact is very high due to high quality research in very important skin and allergic diseases which are common in the general population. Major contributions have been made in these fields by the RC.

Recommendations: Please consider a higher presence in mass media which are quite interested in the fields of skin cancer and allergies.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

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

Very strong research collaborations and joint activities, among others within EU programs. Very good researcher mobility. The panel's recommendation is to continue this successful effort at the same level.

EU funding (6 m €) for ten partners for the future research in MAARS (Microbes in Allergy and Autoimmunity Related to Skin) is excellent and secures the RC's position in international collaboration.

Numeric evaluation: 5 (Outstanding)

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

From the description of work provided by Professor Ranki, the impression arises, that university support could be increased. The work and output provided by the RC are important for the university and the general public, and the research environment should be improved. The difficulties faced by clinicians/scientists are the same all over the world with a difficult splitting of time between clinical work, research and teaching as well as administrative duties. This can only be improved if the staff number is increased so that researchers have fewer duties in clinical and teaching terms.

Recommendation: The university, hospital (EVO-funding) and state should consider creating additional research positions or research rotation schedules to improve the research environment.
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**

No specific comments in this respect. It seems that the RC is very well led and managed, and the group leaders strongly support high quality research. There are collaborations, both clinical ones and those based on research work, and there is an excellent working atmosphere for young researchers.

No specific recommendation on how to further improve this highly satisfactory situation.

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 RCs 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 competitive funding of the RC is very good, and among others the funding by EU and other national and international agencies is highlighted.

The group works in very relevant fields which are important particularly due to the high prevalence of the diseases under investigation.

The group competes well with comparable groups in other European countries and is networking very well within Europe.

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**

Professor Ranki has been among the people in Helsinki who developed strategic planning for the future directions of the faculty. Members of the RC have been successful in acquiring external funds in important research fields which will direct their future in the next few years. Therefore, the actions for 2011 – 2013 are well funded and determined by the recent acquisition of funds.
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 1. The research of the participating community represents the international cutting edge in its field.

The RC fits very well to the chosen participation category.

*Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)*

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

The compilation of the evaluation material has been described by Professor Ranki. No further comments.

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

*Focus area 6: Clinical research*

The program fits very well into the UH’s focus areas.

2.12 RC-specific main recommendations

The RC has organized itself very well in the past, has sufficient funding for the years to come, is well established within the European networks, works on important research fields with high impact in the society and recruits excellent young scientists. The recommendation is to consequently follow the path of the past years which has proven to be successful.

2.13 RC-specific conclusions

The program is involving a highly visible research group within the University of Helsinki with an excellent international reputation. This success is based on not only one but several strong researchers who enjoy great respect in Europe.

The RC works on important topics in the field of dermatology and allergy which pertain to large segments of the population.

There is a very positive impression of the work of the group both concerning the past and the future perspectives. A stronger support of the group by the university and the hospital should be considered.

2.14 Preliminary findings in the Panel-specific feedback

—
2.15 Preliminary findings in the University-level evaluation

Research Focus
Strengths: High quality scientific research, combination of basic and clinical research. Application into common and therefore important skin and allergy diseases. Development of treatments for common diseases, and therefore high societal impact and scientific significance. Societal impact is also accomplished by visible presence at high level international meetings, in media etc. The research is innovative.

Good networking and scientific cooperation with various research groups outside dermatology and allergy. Intensive international cooperation.

Areas of development correspond to those which can be expected in the future to be important in the fields of dermatology and allergy.

Good level of publications. Of positive note is the involvement of many young talented scientists and the promotion of their carriers.

Recommendations: Recommendation that the group continues their successful work as in the past, and the support by the university to the clinical and research efforts is increased.

Practices and Quality of Doctoral Training
Very good selection and recruitment of doctoral candidates. Stimulation of physician-scientist or MD/PhD careers.

Very good supervision of doctoral candidates, excellent collaboration with other faculties, institutes and programs.

Good practice and quality assessment in doctoral training and assurance of career perspectives by the doctoral candidates/fresh doctorates.

Societal Impact
The RC interacts very well with the society. It is present at many large international meetings, and its work is highly visible and well known. An intensive international research network contributes to the visibility of research.

The societal impact is very high due to high quality research in very important skin and allergic diseases which are common in the general population. Major contributions have been made in these fields by the RC.

Recommendations: Please consider a higher presence in mass media which are quite interested in the fields of skin cancer and allergies.

International and National Collaboration
Very strong research collaborations and joint activities, among others within EU programs. Very good researcher mobility. The recommendation is to continue this successful effort at the same level.

The group competes well with comparable groups in other European countries and is networking very well within Europe.

Leadership and Management
No specific comments in this respect. It seems that the RC is very well led and managed and the group leaders strongly support high quality research. There are collaborations, both clinical ones and those based on research work, and there is an excellent working atmosphere for young researchers.

No specific recommendation on how to further improve this highly satisfactory situation.

External Funding
The competitive funding of the RC is very good, and among others the funding by EU and other national and international agencies is highlighted.

The group works in very relevant fields which are important particularly due to the high prevalence of the diseases under investigation.
The group competes well with comparable groups in other European countries and is networking very well within Europe.

**Strategic Action Plan**
Professor Ranki has been among the experts in Helsinki who developed strategic planning for the future directions of the faculty. Members of the RC have been successful in acquiring external funds in important research fields which will direct their future in the next few years. Therefore, the actions for 2011 – 2013 are well funded and determined by the recent acquisition of funds.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**
The program is involving a highly visible research group within the University of Helsinki with an excellent international reputation. This success is based on not only one but several strong researchers who enjoy great respect in Europe.

The RC works on important topics in the field of dermatology and allergy which pertain to large segments of the population.

The RC has organized itself very well in the past, has sufficient funding for the years to come, is well established within the European networks, works on important research fields with high impact in the society and recruits excellent young scientists. The recommendation is consequently to follow the path of the past years which has proven to be successful.

There is a very positive impression of the work of the group both concerning the past and the future perspectives. A stronger support of the group by the university and the hospital should be considered.

The RC has organized itself very well in the past, has sufficient funding for the years to come, is well established within the European networks, works on important research fields with high impact in the society and recruits excellent young scientists. The recommendation is consequently to follow the path of the past years which has proven to be successful.

**Summary of the evaluation**
The research, doctoral training, international and national collaboration, leadership and management, external funding and strategic action plan received positive comments in the evaluation. The group has been successful in the past and offers a good strategic outlook which is supported by recently acquired funding. The good perspective is also supported by the recruitment of young talented scientists who will carry on the work performed in the past. The group is encouraged to continue their work on the same level as previously.
3 Appendices

A. Original evaluation material
   a. Registration material – Stage 1
   b. Answers to evaluation questions – Stage 2
   c. List of publications
   d. List of other scientific activities

B. Bibliometric analyses
   a. Analysis provided by CWTS/University of Leiden
   b. Analysis provided by Helsinki University Library (66 RCs)
NAME OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Department of Skin and allergic diseases (Skin and allergy)

LEADER OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Professor Annamari Ranki, Departments of Dermatology, Allergology and Venereology, Institute of Clinical 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: Ranki, Annamari
E-mail: Annamari.Ranki@helsinki.fi, Annamari.Ranki@hus.fi
Phone: 47186300 or 0400-875761
Affiliation: Department of Skin and allergic diseases
Street address: Meilahdentie 2, 00250 Helsinki

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTICIPATING RESEARCHER COMMUNITY (RC)
Name of the participating RC (max. 30 characters): Department of Skin and allergic diseases
Acronym for the participating RC (max. 10 characters): Skin and allergy
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):
The Department of Dermatology and allergology (including also venereology) is among the oldest clinical departments of the University Hospital and trains specialists for Skin and allergic diseases. The multidisciplinary composition of the Department is unique at the European level. The unit’s research focuses on the following interconnected main areas: skin cancer, inflammation and immunity. Also, studies on the genetics of multifactorial disease, especially psoriasis, lupus erythematosus and autoinflammatory diseases, in collaboration with international genetics groups and centers of excellence are an important part of the research. The departments’ PhD students are often funded through the National Clinical Graduate School, and the major research groups have external funding from e.g. the Academy of Finland, Tekes and EU FP7. International collaboration is very active, foreign scientists and exchange students pay annual visits and our own scientists and PhD students visit foreign collaborating labs regularly.

3 SCIENTIFIC FIELDS OF THE RC
Main scientific field of the RC’s research: Dermatology
RC’s scientific subfield 1: Allergology
RC’s scientific subfield 2: Oncology
RC’s scientific subfield 3: 
RC’s scientific subfield 4:
Other, if not in the list: Autoinflammatory and autoimmune skin diseases, borreliosis, venereal diseases

4 RC’S PARTICIPATION CATEGORY
Justification for the selected participation category (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): 1 (justification was given on the webpage already)
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

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):
The research performed at the Department of Skin and allergic diseases reflects a combination of clinical (atopic eczema, CTCL and HIV DNA vaccine studies) and experimental (molecular background of melanoma and non-melanoma skin cancer and skin lymphomas, mechanism of contact allergy, mouse models for psoriasis and contact dermatitis) activities. The department is currently participating in three EU-supported research projects or networks: the MAARS, the EPIDERM and the SYSGEMET. Also, the department is a member of the EORCT Cutaneous Lymphoma task Force. The research is mostly translational, based on clinically relevant problem-solving and applying the demands of personalized medicine. Our department has had a pioneering and active role in establishing the National Clinical Graduate School. The research-supporting atmosphere of the department has apparently allured young scientists, since more than half of those applying for a resident post have already achieved their PhD in some theoretical field.

Significance of the RC’s research and doctoral training for the University of Helsinki (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces):
Many of our senior scientists act as Board members and opinion-leaders in both scientific and professional societies of our disciplines in Finland, in Europe and worldwide. Through this activity, both science policy and health care decision-makers are informed and influenced, like through the European Dermatology Forum (Prof. Ranki as Secretary-General in 2007-2009 and as President in 2010). Prof. Karvonen acted as the Chief Executive Physician for Helsinki and Uusimaa health care district and is actively involved in science policy, too. At the European level, our hospital is one of the centres of excellence in the Global Allergy European Network (Galen). We have produced a considerable number of PhD theses, several approved with distinction.

In implementing research IPR we have been very active, several patent applications have been filed (two patents granted) and we have produced new diagnostic tools, currently being commercialized by Finnish companies. Also, based on our initial scientific work, clinical trials with a Finnish HIV DNA vaccine trials are ongoing. We are also actively collaborating with several patient associations and small companies, our potential clients. This has lead to improved awareness of the burden of skin diseases and skin cancer.

Keywords: dermatology, contact allergy, atopy, skin cancer, lymphoma, psoriasis, TRAPS, borrelia

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 assume the evaluators will respond to this question. All our active senior scientists have a Hirsch index between 31 - 41, perhaps this tells you something.

Comments on how the RC’s scientific productivity and doctoral training should be evaluated (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): Normal evaluation criteria can be applied.
### LIST OF RC MEMBERS

**NAME OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:** Skin and allergy  
**RC-LEADER:** A. Ranki  
**CATEGORY:**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>PI-status (TUHAT, 29.11.2010)</th>
<th>Title of research and teaching personnel</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranki</td>
<td>Annamari</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>IV Professor</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saksela</td>
<td>Olli</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>IV Professor</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reitamo</td>
<td>Sakari</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>IV Professor</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauerma</td>
<td>Antti</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>IV Professor</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remitz</td>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>III Senior Researcher</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heikillä</td>
<td>Hannele</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>III Senior Researcher</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pannelius</td>
<td>Jaana</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>III Senior Researcher</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ackermann</td>
<td>Leena</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>III Senior Researcher</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Väkevä</td>
<td>Liisa</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hahtola</td>
<td>Sonja</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomela</td>
<td>Sari</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koskenmies</td>
<td>Sari</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>II Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtanen</td>
<td>Hannele</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesonen</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannula-Jouppi</td>
<td>Katarina</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouchard</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timonen</td>
<td>Kaisa</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mäkipää</td>
<td>Tarja</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>II Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuivanen</td>
<td>Tiina</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiltunen-Back</td>
<td>Erja</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>II Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kainu</td>
<td>Kati</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeskanen</td>
<td>Leila</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karvonen</td>
<td>Seija-Liisa</td>
<td>IV Professor (deceased)</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saarialho-Kere</td>
<td>Ulpiu</td>
<td>III Senior Researcher (deceased)</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maliniemi</td>
<td>Pilvi</td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsson</td>
<td>Emilia</td>
<td>I Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nilanen</td>
<td>Kirsi</td>
<td>III Senior Researcher</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siltanen</td>
<td>Annika</td>
<td>II Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
<td>Dept. of Dermatology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Name of the RC’s responsible person: Ranki, Annamari
E-mail of the RC’s responsible person: Annamari.Ranki@helsinki.fi
Name and acronym of the participating RC: ): Department of Skin and allergic diseases, Skin and allergy

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: The Department of Dermatology and allergology (including also venereology) is among the oldest clinical departments of the University Hospital and trains specialists for Skin and allergic diseases. The multidisciplinary composition of the Department is unique at the European level. Translational research, starting from research targets identified bedside, brought to the laboratory and back to the clinic for diagnostics or therapy are central in our research. Currently, the research focuses on the following interconnected main areas: skin cancer, inflammation and immunity. Also, studies on the genetics and pathomechanism of multifactorial disease, especially psoriasis, lupus erythematosus and autoinflammatory diseases, in collaboration with international genetics groups and centers of excellence are an important part of the research.

FOCUS AND QUALITY OF RC’S RESEARCH (MAX. 8800 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

- 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 unit’s dermatologic research focuses on two main areas: skin cancer (incl. cutaneous lymphomas) and immune-mediated skin diseases. Studies on the genetics of multifactorial disease, especially psoriasis, asthma, lupus erythematosus and autoinflammatory syndromes are conducted in collaboration with international genetics groups which has resulted in several original discoveries.

Within skin cancer, the aim of Prof. Ranki’s group is to provide new means for the diagnosis, classification and, ultimately, targeted therapy of cutaneous T-cell lymphomas (CTCL) and recently, aslos for some other common cancers. The first CTCL-associated gene translocation/deletion has been identified, patented and is being developed for a new molecular biologic diagnostic test and biomarker.

The group has also shown that this new cancer-associated gene is aberrated and correlates with patients survival in colorectal cancer and brain tumors. Also, the group has made novel findings on inflammation and cancer in a subtype of CTCL and functional studies on the gene aberrations identified are being carried out.

Mechanisms in epithelial carcinogenesis and invasion (basal and squamous cell cancers) constituted the main objectives of the late Prof. Saarialho-Kere’s group. The role of proteases and inflammation, in particular, in the processes of epithelial cell migration during normal and aberrant cutaneous and intestinal wound repair (chronic wounds, inflammatory bowel disease), tissue destruction and inflammation were studied both on cell and tissue levels utilizing epithelial cell cultures and overexpressing cell lines, regulation studies, patient tissue samples, and certain mouse and array models.
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The unit’s melanoma research focuses, firstly, on identifying genes and proteins responsible for human melanoma progression using genome-wide microarray expression and proteome analyses. Doc. Saksela’s group has identified several gene expression changes potentially involved in invasiveness and metastasis. The goal is to use the expression profiling data in the development of assays for detecting clinically occult melanoma micrometastases in sentinel lymph nodes. Samples have been collected from over 500 melanoma patients. Secondly, the regulation of melanocyte proliferation and apoptosis in response to different growth factors are targeted. The factors influencing survival of melanocytes have been studied in a novel model of a three-dimensional collagen gel developed by Dr. vonWillebrand.

Psoriasis is one of the major chronic skin diseases, and our psoriasis research focuses, firstly, on tumor suppressor protein NF1 (neurofibromin) and its function in psoriatic epidermis and in keratinocyte cultures (late Dr. S-L. Karvonen). Clinical trials with new, biologic treatments for psoriasis are ongoing, too.

In collaboration with geneticists, the susceptibility genes for psoriasis and lupus erythematosus, and TNF-receptor SF1A mutations underlying the periodic fever syndromes like TRAPS have been studied. Original findings, such as the discovery of the HCR gene and TNFRSF1A mutations causing TRAPS have been made, and functional characterization of the corresponding altered proteins were recently described. Furthermore, both genotype-phenotype correlation and linkage studies involving other psoriasis susceptibility loci are ongoing as well as cloning of susceptibility genes in HCR-negative patients.

Both basic and clinical studies on atopy form one major research area. Prof. Lauerma’s group focuses in skin immunology, allergology, and microbiology, and the combination of these three. The group’s research quality is high and the group has good, direct approaches in research questions in our field that have a major impact on the research problems in our fields.

Clinical studies on atopy, performed by Dr. Reitamo’s group, target the introduction of new immunomodulatory therapies with improved risk/benefit ratio compared to corticosteroid-based treatment. The ongoing research includes topical immuno-modulatory treatment for childhood atopic dermatitis, mechanism of intermittent preventive treatment and studies on the adverse events associated with topical immunomodulatory treatment.

The strong clinical immunologic knowledge within the department has resulted also in the active participation in DNA vaccine trials for HIV infection (Prof. Ranki), and all information thus obtained will now be exploited in tumour vaccine development for CTCL (MIMOVAC EU-LOI approved).

The Department’s research has resulted in broad international networking and co-operation (e.g. participation in two EU-funded projects and networks, EORTC Cutaneous lymphoma Task Force, ISCL Board). The senior group leaders of the Skin and allergy RC are appreciated international opinion-leaders, based both on their research and clinical knowledge.

- Ways to strengthen the focus and improve the quality of the RC’s research.
  Identification of key target areas, in relation to competitiveness in the international field, joining as well methodological skills as intellectual knowledge and creativity. Joint major grant applications are a target in the future. Quality of the research can be improved only if more research-privileged time can be
guaranteed to our medical PhD students and especially to the clinical seniors supervising the work. This has not been the case during the past, since the community finances (hospital budget) has dictated the work load. The University Hospital does not enough respect clinical research although the Academy of Finland has woken up on this matter lately.

International research exchange is also important and we do have good experience already.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 PRACTICES AND QUALITY OF DOCTORAL TRAINING (MAX. 8800 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **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 doctors.

  Currently about 50% of those applying for a resident position in Skin and allergic diseases has already a PhD degree. We have 9 resident positions in the clinic and currently ca. 18 residents candidates in the line. Thus, research is encouraged for those waiting for their permanent residency. Prof. Ranki was the primus motor and chairperson for working group to create the National Clinical Graduate School - now supported by the Academy of Finland. Thus, a proportion of the PhD students are enrolled in this or the HBGS graduate schools. During the past years, also M.Sc.-based Ph.D. students have been recruited through formal recruitment and interview processes. However, when possible, M.D./Ph.D. students are recruited like Ph.D. students, but due to their scarcity as full-time scientists, this is a goal that needs to be solved during next period.

  Doctoral candidates are supervised by post-docs in the group and through group meetings, as well as weekly seminars. All PhD students regularly present their data at the National Skin Research event, and in international meetings.

Assuring good career for the PhDs is almost impossible within the hospital setting but the Medical faculty/University has now initiated a tenure track system which will help the medical PhDs. One main problem is that the University has absolutely no other funds than the salaries for the permanent staff! Even staff has to take leave of absence without pay for the summer months. Thus, very difficult to cope with e.g. well-funded international groups and the rising ones from China/India in the future.

- **RC’s strengths and challenges related to the practises and quality of doctoral training, and the actions planned for their development.**

  Chronic lack of money from the University and the steadily decreasing State subsidy (EVO) for research is a major limitation for recruiting especially post-doctoral scientists, returning from excellent labs abroad. Also, difficulty in obtaining research months after the PhD and to hire skillful lab technicians for longer periods. Postdocs are in demand as cores of research groups.

  The Department has modern laboratory space at the clinic itself, next to the dermatopathology lab, and also in Biomedicum Helsinki. This intimate relationship provides advantages to the research being performed in the form of effectiveness and easy access to expert opinion.
Coordination between research groups to increase efficiency in research is necessary, and there seems to be still too little cross talk and collaboration between the two disciplines (Dermatovenereology-Allergology) in ideas, utilizing machines and patient materials. Also, more interaction with FIMM needs to be initiated, along the Translational research center (originally suggested to HUCH by Prof. Ranki).

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 popularisation of science and medicine during the last two decades through media has lead to a confrontation between scientists and an informed and critical public. With people getting better education, they have to be made aware not only about benefits but also about the risks and problems in modern research. Scientific facts are often replaced by a network of contradictory findings especially in the internet.

We have made a serious attempt to leave ivory tower by publicizing our research projects, giving more lectures both to all levels of health care professionals and general public through patient organizations. Our professors also act as Section Editors/ Editorial Board members for several Journals of our field. As a general trend in most Western countries, society and politicians have pushed the University for not only academic research but also for business orientation. Professor Ranki’s group has been developing a HIV vaccine by active collaboration with a Finnish non-governmental biotechnology company. Both the patient associations and small companies can be seen as our potential clients whom we have invited to collaborate in the development of research projects. This has lead to improved awareness of the mutual benefits of collaboration.

Skin diseases, such as allergy, will be the burden of more than 50% people in generation now in their twenties (born during 1980’s), according to research done in Helsinki Metropolitan Area (See Pallasaho et al., 2008). Skin cancer problems will double or triple during next 20 years, as life-expectancy raises about two- or three-fold in population over the age 70 (See Tilastokeskus publication, 2010). Thus, novel interventions need to be established. The Skin and allergy RC has regularly filed patents and some granted patents are being further developed by commercial companies at the moment.

- Ways to strengthen the societal impact of the RC’s research and doctoral training.

The RC is performing mostly translational research which implies everyday contact to the public (university) hospital sector and also, to the Pharma. Prof. Ranki is member of the University Hospital University Committee, the Board for Medical care and also deputy member of FIMM Board and through these activities the societal impact of the RC’s research will be communicated. As the President of the EDF, prof. Ranki arranged a meeting with the EU Commissioner of Health, Mr. John Dalli in June 2010, and activities with his office will continue in the coming years as agreed and through the EDF. The RC senior members will be active in delivering lectures on our research topics (like skin cancer and
allergology) for the general public (Studia Generalia, EPIDERM project) and all PhD students will be involved in such activities, too. The students will participate in the national Student Fair, too. We shall keep active our contact with the various patient organizations (psoriasis, atopy, allergology, APECED etc.). Recently, some new research activities have been initiated together with a patient organization and some PhD students are involved in this activity, too. SME companies will be considered as important partners (as is the case for our ongoing EU grants and applications) and our PhD students will thus get insight into future career possibilities. At the international level, we shall expand e.g. Erasmus, Marie Curie and CIMO student exchange.

---

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

Research collaborations:
The group of late Prof. Saarialho-Kere collaborates with the following groups: Dr. Marikki Laiho, Prof. Veli-Matti Kähäri, Univ. of Turku; Dr. O. Rollman; Dr. Jyrki Vuola and Dr. Virve Koljonen, Dept. of Plastic Surgery, Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki; Prof. Juha Kere, Karolinska Institute, Novum, Huddinge; and Department of Medical Genetics, UH; Outi Elomaa, PhD, and group at the Department of Medical Genetics, UH; Esko Kankuri, MD, PhD, Institute of Biomedicine, Pharmacology, UH; Tuula Nyman, PhD, Institute of Biotechnology, Protein Chemistry Laboratory, UH; Raija Sormunen, PhD, Core Facility of Electron Microscopy, University of Oulu.

Also, Dr. Hannula-Jouppi’s research is carried out in collaboration with Prof. Juha Kere’s group. One doctoral thesis has been finished in the LERU-program between these two universities (Sara Bruce 2009) and a second doctoral thesis is underway (Mari Muurinen).

Research on atopic diseases:
The thesis project of Dr. Maria Pesonen was performed as a joint project of the Department of Dermatology and Allergology, and the Department of Pediatrics, University of Helsinki. Through the work of mainly acting Prof. Reitamo and Prof. Lauferma, the RC is one of 10 leading groups in skin allergology and immunology in its own fields.

Melanoma field researchers collaborate with groups at the Dept. of Biomedicine, UH (Doc. Hölttä), Dept. of Plastic Surgery (Doc. Jahkola, Tiina); Poland (Podlasz, Piotr); and the pathologists from Helsinki and Tampere University Hospitals.

Prof. Ranki’s group currently collaborates with Doc. Sampsa Hautaniemi, DTech, Computational Systems Biology Lab., Institute of Biomedicine, UH; Doc. Hannu Haapasalo and Prof. emer. Kai Krohn, Tampere University Hospital; Prof. Martti Färkkilä, Dept. of Gastroenterology, HUCH; Prof. Christine Leib-Moesch, Inst. of Virology, GRCEH, Neuherberg, Germany and Ass. prof. Christoph Klein, Div. of Oncogenomics, Univ. Regensburg, Regensburg, Germany, and Professor Rudolf Stadler, Comprehensive Cancer Center,
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University of Hannover, Medical Centre Minden, Germany and with the whole of the EORTC Cutaneous Lymphoma Task Force.

- RC's strengths and challenges related to research collaboration and researcher mobility, and the actions planned for their development.
  The RC's international research collaboration is active and fruitful: EU-funded EUROTransBio, EPIDERM and MAARS projects, and the MIMOVAC project which has passed 1st step. EORTC clinical trials participation. We have annually 2-4 international medical students working in the lab for short periods and currently one Erasmus student. We will exploit European and also other international mobility programmes and our wide personal contacts worldwide.
  As an example of the international networking, Prof. Ranki was recently awarded the International League of Dermatological Societies' (ILDS) Award Certificate of appreciation.

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).
  The RC has a shared research lab together with the Department of Oncology in the Biomedicum Helsinki. This has eased cell culture, molecular biology, and transfection and more sophisticated new research activities. As permanent research resources, we have 1.5 technicians from HUCH and two modern and fully equipped research laboratories (with e.g. Metasystems Metafer-working station, LightCycler® 480, sorting FACS), one in Biomedicum Helsinki and the other in the Skin and allergy hospital, in close proximity to the operation rooms. The animal facilities we use are in Biomedicum Helsinki. Continuing discussions and collaborations with labs representing other relevant disciplines at Biomedicum and possibility to easily attend high-class basic research seminars is very valuable. PhD students at our department are strongly encouraged to interact and collaborate with other research groups in the Biomedicum and to seek international contacts by presenting their data in European and American meetings. However, limited space, especially office tables for individual PhD students and group leaders, is still a problem.

  Important interests of the group are also clinical investigator-initiated research projects at the moment (e.g. the MAARS project to start in 2011). The laboratory, deep-sequencing, and bioinformatics strengths are in collaborations within Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, Karolinska Institutet, King's College London, Heinrich Heine University of Duesseldorf, INSERM Paris, as well as a bioinformatics start-up company in Edinburgh.

  Balance between research and teaching duties is not a major problem, but rather balance between the heavy clinical burden and research. We do not have privileged time for research. The first step would be to generate enough part-time research positions (like in e.g. Karolinska Sjukhuset) to the HUCH. This has been discussed for at least a decade but only a few such competitive positions are currently available.
RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

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

A major challenge is how to cope with the strong mismatch between research expectation & support within the HUCH and with the almost non-existing resources from the faculty and for staff development. The cost of investigator-initiated clinical research is very high due to several factors such as the hospital charges for study patients. This makes future academy-initiated clinical trials almost impossible. Also, the operational structure/bureaucracy within the organisation has become very complicated without corresponding benefits for the research. These problems must be targeted jointly, one RC alone cannot do much.

We have main strengths to obtain our goals in Europe. However, competition with NIH-funded research coalitions in the U.S.A. face us a problem, if we want to be the first in our fields globally.

We will continue to recruit enough research-active postdocs although their later positions in the HUCH setting is difficult to guarantee. Also, our main target is to harmonize the somewhat diverse spectrum of interests of the principal investigators within our RC and we have already made progress in this aspect. Although the growing Meilahti campus, Biomedicum and the large Helsinki University network provides proactive partnerships for research projects, we must be active in being part of the translational research network within the campus. We have already started our own Skin Research and genodermatosis sample biobanking [at the FIMM facilities]. Also, in 2011 we finally got the long-sought skin cancer and cutaneous lymphoma registries, which will include biomarker data as well. These registries are unique and most complete (virtual) at the international level and e.g. the ISCL will modify its own registry accordingly.

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.

The individual research groups within the RC are independent but also, our research is highly networked. Our projects are in forefront of today’s dermatological science. As today funding from outside sources is critical, our base is strong both from Academy of Finland and European Commission. Thus, the management responsibilities are within each group itself and according to the structure described in each Academy/ EU project. Professor Ranki as department chair favours individual responsibility and her task is to coordinate the joint goals in e.g. infrastructure funding, recruitment and outside communication for the department. Both Prof. Ranki and Prof. Lauerma have degrees in Administration.

The RC is relatively small so that everyday communication between PIs is a reality and poses no problems. We have altogether 14 Ph.D. students, top collaborators, funding from, e.g., Academy of Finland and European Commission, and clear vision of future research in the EU-funded project MAARS.
RC’s strengths and challenges related to leadership and management, and the actions planned for developing the processes.

Since the RC is relative small so that everyday communication between PIs is a reality and poses no problems. We will, however, organize regular bi-monthly meeting for the whole RC in the future to facilitate interaction and coordination.

### 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: Ranki A 2005-2006 100000, late U Saarialho-Kere 180000, S Suomela 41000

- **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: Ranki A 2003-2005 122752 e

- **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: Ranki EuroTransBio 2007 49900, Ranki EPIDERM (HUCH), Lauerma/Ranki MAARS 6m€

- **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: Sigrid Juselius Foundation; Finnish cancer Association, Finska Läkaresällskapet
  
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned foundations: Ranki 390000; Saarialho-Kere 121000; Saksela 340000, Panellius 60000

- **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: Vetenskapsrådet, Sweden; AF
  
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: will be completed later
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- 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: Helsinki University Hospital Research Funds
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: Ranki 230000, Saarialho-Kere 130000, Saksela 130000, Suomela 70000

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.
  Prof. Ranki has actively participated in the Faculty’s plans to improve various aspects of the doctoral training when acting as Vice Dean. An important target will be to facilitate methodological knowledge through active international exchange, as has already been done. Short visits by collaborating professors are planned through various funding possibilities. The EU-funded MAARS (Microbes in Allergy and Autoimmunity Related to Skin) project will be one central activity during the future years. Antti Lauerma is Vice-Coordinator of the project and Annamari Ranki the PI for UH. The project is in final signature phase in European Commission, and will include 6.000.000 euros funding over 2011-2015 for the project, distributed among 10 Partners. Also, a recent external funding for Prof. Ranki and collaborating international research groups on inflammation and autoimmunity will be among the central topics. UH Research department, however, declined this funding which has now been redirected through the CRI-HUCH.

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

Sorry to say but this time the evaluation process information has NOT reached the research community very well. The RC members have not quite internalized the effort although Prof. Ranki as Dept. Chair has forwarded all available information. E-mails from unknown persons in University Administration are not very encouraging. Even I myself, although centrally participating in the first UH research evaluation, have had great difficulties in grasping what to do and when. No help or time for this work has been allocated. Thus, the RC has rather concentrated on ongoing research and clinical activities in the clinic. It’s had to perform this task on top of a 12-hour day!
## Analysis of publications
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<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>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Review in scientific journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Unrefereed journal article</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Article in professional journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Article in professional hand or guide book or in a professional data system, or text book material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Associated person is one of Annamari Rinkari, Annamari.Rinkari@helsinki.fi, Sakari Reitamo, sakari.reitamo@helsinki.fi, Anti Laumerme, anti.laumerme@helsinki.fi, Antti Marianne Rentz-Reitamo, antti.rentz@helsinki.fi, Hannale Hakkola, hannela.hakkola@helsinki.fi, Jaana Panevius, jaana-panevius@helsinki.fi, Leena Ahokas, leena.ahokas@helsinki.fi, Saara Kivistö, saara.kivisto@helsinki.fi, Sari Koskenmies, Sari.Koskenmies@helsinki.fi, Hannele Virtanen, hannela.virtanen@hus.fi, Laura Bouchard, laura.bouchard@hus.fi, Tarja Mäkeläinen, Tarja.Makela@helsinki.fi, Tiina Kuivanen, tiina.kuivanen@helsinki.fi, Eija Hiltunen-Back, eija.hiltunen-back@hus.fi, Kati Hannele Kainu, Kati.Kainu@helsinki.fi, Leila Jeskanen, leila.jeskanen@hus.fi, Saara-Kaisa Kunnari, saara-kaisa.kunnari@helsinki.fi, Antti Siitonen, antti.siitonen@helsinki.fi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis. The statistics should indicate 10 instead of 3. Correction requested by Rinkari, Sept. 2011.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes and awards</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research journal</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of manuscripts</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in review committee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for written media</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in radio programme</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in TV programme</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2 Listing of activities 2005-2010

Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis
Katarina Sara Eriikka Hannula-Jouppi, Katarina.Hannula@helsinki.fi
Valdis Kirs, Katarina Sara Eriikka Hannula-Jouppi, 01.05.2006 – 02.2009
Ulpu Saarialho-Kere

Prizes and awards
Katarina Sara Eriikka Hannula-Jouppi, Katarina.Hannula@helsinki.fi
The Endocrine Society and Pfizer, Inc. International Award for Excellence in Published Clinical Research in the Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism 2009, Katarina Sara Eriikka Hannula-Jouppi, 2009 – ..., United States

Editor of research journal
Annamari Ranki, Annamari.Ranki@helsinki.fi

Sakari Reitamo, sakari.reitamo@helsinki.fi
Sari Suomela, Sari.Suomela@helsinki.fi
Forum for Nordic Dermato-Venereology, Sari Suomela, 01.10.2010
Katarina Sara Eriikka Hannula-Jouppi, Katarina.Hannula@helsinki.fi
Pediatric pulmonology, Katarina Sara Eriikka Hannula-Jouppi, 01.01.2006 – 31.12.2005
Ulpu Saarialho-Kere
Acta Dermatovenerolog, Ulpu Saarialho-Kere, 01.03.2005 – 31.03.2005, Sweden
Annales Medicine, Ulpu Saarialho-Kere, 01.03.2006 – 31.03.2006
Cell Tissue Res, Ulpu Saarialho-Kere, 01.01.2006 – 31.01.2005
Oncology, Ulpu Saarialho-Kere, 01.08.2006 – 31.08.2006
Skin and allergy/Ranki

FEBS Letters, Ulpu Saarialho-Kere, 30.05.2007 → 31.12.2011
Human Molecular Genetics, Ulpu Saarialho-Kere, 21.05.2007 → 31.12.2011, United Kingdom
Int J Cancer, Ulpu Saarialho-Kere, 14.08.2007 → 31.12.2011
Journal of Dermatological Science, Ulpu Saarialho-Kere, 02.05.2007 → 31.12.2011
Am J Pathol, Ulpu Saarialho-Kere, 10.08.2006 → 31.12.2011, United States
J Invest Dermatol, Ulpu Saarialho-Kere, 07.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, United States
J Pathol, Ulpu Saarialho-Kere, 26.06.2006 → 31.12.2011, United Kingdom

Peer review of manuscripts
Katarina Sara Erilikka Hannula-Jouppi, Katariina.Hannula@helsinki.fi
GeneReviews Genetic Disease Online Reviews, Katarina Sara Erilikka Hannula-Jouppi, 2001 → ...
Pediatric Pulmonology, Katarina Sara Erilikka Hannula-Jouppi, 2005 → ...
American Journal of Medical Genetics, Katarina Sara Erilikka Hannula-Jouppi, 2006 → ...
Orphanet Journal of Rare Diseases, Katarina Sara Erilikka Hannula-Jouppi, 2006 → ...
Medical Science Monitor, Katarina Sara Erilikka Hannula-Jouppi, 2007 → ...
Pediatric research, Katarina Sara Erilikka Hannula-Jouppi, 2007 → ...

Membership or other role in review committee
Annamari Ranki, Annamari.Ranki@helsinki.fi
C2I Infektion , luftvägarnas sjukdomar och allergi inkluderande hudsjukdomar, Annamari Ranki, 09.09.2010 → 07.09.2010, Sweden

Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board
Annamari Ranki, Annamari.Ranki@helsinki.fi
University of Helsinki - Deputy Board member of The University Pharmacy, Annamari Ranki, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2009, Finland
European Dermatology Forum, Annamari Ranki, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2008, Switzerland
International Society for cutaneous Lymphomas (ISCL), Annamari Ranki, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006
Axel Hirsch pria, Annamari Ranki, 25.06.2007 → 31.12.2011, Sweden
Swedish Research Council Medicine, Annamari Ranki, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Sweden
Lääketieteellinen tutkimuskunnan, Annamari Ranki, 20.10.2010 → 20.10.2014, Finland
Sakari Reitamo, sakari.reitamo@helsinki.fi
European Immunodermatology Society, Sakari Reitamo, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006
Ulpu Saarialho-Kere
European Society for Dermatological Research Poster reviewer for ESDR Meeting, Ulpu Saarialho-Kere, 01.05.2005 → 31.05.2005
European Society for Dermatological Research, Ulpu Saarialho-Kere, 01.09.2006 → 30.09.2006, Switzerland

Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization
Annamari Ranki, Annamari.Ranki@helsinki.fi
HUSLAB in kuntaannon liitottimen johtokunnan, Annamari Ranki, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Skin and allergy/Ranki

HUSLAB johtokunta, Annamari Ranki, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

TEO, Lääkärin ja hammashäiskärin toimes neuvottelukunnan jaos, Annamari Ranki, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Helsinki University Hospital, HUS, Strategic planning committee, Annamari Ranki, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2011

Helsinki University Hospital, HUS, University Committee, Annamari Ranki, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Tartumatoon neuvottelukunta, Annamari Ranki, 01.11.2010 → 31.10.2013, Finland

Ulpu Saarialho-Kere

Institut: EB opas, Ulpu Saarialho-Kere, 09.03.2006 → 31.12.2011

Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation

Annamari Ranki , Annamari.Ranki@helsinki.fi

European Dermatology Forum, Annamari Ranki, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Switzerland

Ulpu Saarialho-Kere

European Dermatology Forum, Ulpu Saarialho-Kere, 01.01.2008 → 31.01.2006, Switzerland

European Society for Dermatological Research, Ulpu Saarialho-Kere, 01.09.2006 → 30.09.2006, Switzerland

Participation in interview for written media

Annamari Ranki , Annamari.Ranki@helsinki.fi

Keski-Helsingin Sotaveteraanit ry:n vuosikokous, Annamari Ranki, 17.03.2008, Finland

Ulpu Saarialho-Kere

Arcada: Ihohoitajakurssi, Ulpu Saarialho-Kere, 14.03.2008, Finland

Participation in radio programme

Anita Marianne Remitz-Reitamo , anita.remitz@helsinki.fi


YLE-Ekstrem, Anita Marianne Remitz-Reitamo, 12.12.2006, Finland

Katarina Sara Eriikka Hannula-Jouppi , Katarina.Hannula@helsinki.fi

The axon guidance receptor gene ROBO1 is a candidate gene fir developmental dyslexia. PLOS Genetics 2005, Katarina Sara Eriikka Hannula-Jouppi, 2005, Finland

Participation in TV programme

Katarina Sara Eriikka Hannula-Jouppi , Katarina.Hannula@helsinki.fi

The axon guidance receptor gene ROBO1 is a candidate gene for developmental dyslexia. PLOS Genetics 2005, Katarina Sara Eriikka Hannula-Jouppi, 2005, Finland
Research Group: Ranki A

Basic statistics
- Number of publications (P): 119
- Number of citations (TCS): 1,177
- Number of citations per publication (MCS): 10.41
- Percentage of uncited publications: 24%
- Field-normalized number of citations per publication (MNCS): 1.35
- Field-normalized average journal impact (MNJS): 1.31
- Field-normalized proportion highly cited publications (top 10%): 1.52
- 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

Research profile

![Research profile chart]

Threshold: $P \ll \delta$