PUBLICATIONS OF THE ACADEMY OF FINLAND 1/14

RESEARCH PROGRAMME ON SUBSTANCE USE AND ADDICTIONS 2007–2010

EVALUATION REPORT

Evaluation Panel

Professor Jennifer O'Loughlin, chair
Department of Social and Preventive Medicine
University of Montreal, Canada

Research Director Astrid Skretting
Norwegian Institute for Alcohol and Drug Research,
Norway

Professor Betsy Thom
University of Middlesex, United Kingdom

Docent Pekka Hakkarainen
Department Director
National Institute for Health and Welfare, Finland

Research manager Tuukka Tammi, expert panel secretary
A-Clinic Foundation, Finland

ACADEMY OF FINLAND IN BRIEF

The Academy of Finland is a leading public funding agency for cutting-edge scientific research in Finland. We finance high-quality and innovative research aiming at scientific breakthroughs, act as a science policy expert and strengthen the position of science and research.

The Academy has several funding opportunities to support researchers at different stages of their career. We also encourage researcher mobility in a number of ways: between universities and research institutes, within public administration and business and industry, and internationally as well. Our cooperation with research organisations and funding agencies in other countries is active and fruitful.

Academy funding is based on open competition and independent peer review. In 2014, we will make funding decisions worth about EUR 310 million. Each year, some 6,000 people work on Academy-funded projects.

The Academy of Finland is an agency within the administrative branch of the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture.

For more information, go to our website at www.aka.fi/eng.

ISSN 0358-9153
ISBN 978-951-715-877-0 (PDF)

Page layout: DTPage Oy

CONTENTS

DESCRIPTION

<table>
<tr><td>Publisher</td><td>Academy of Finland</td><td>Date
5 December 2014</td></tr>
<tr><td>Author(s)</td><td colspan="2">Evaluation panel</td></tr>
<tr><td>Name of publication</td><td colspan="2">Research Programme on Substance Use and Addictions.
Evaluation Report 2007–2010</td></tr>
<tr><td>Abstract</td><td colspan="2">In November 2005, the Board of the Academy of Finland decided to launch the four-year Research Programme on Substance Use and Addictions for 2007–2010 to exhaustively investigate substance use and addictions. The research was focused on addictions to alcohol, drugs, tobacco and gambling, and on the mechanisms behind these addictions. The programme's perspectives and methods ranged from health sciences to biosciences and psychology and from the social sciences to the humanities and law.

Within the programme, funding was granted to 13 projects; six of these were consortia (one Finnish, two Finnish-Canadian, two Finnish-Russian and one Finnish-Canadian-Russian). The Academy of Finland funded the programme with a total of EUR 5.5 million. The other funding sources were the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, the Institute of Neurosciences, Mental Health and Addiction (INMHA) of the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (RFBR) and the Russian Foundation for the Humanities (RFH).

In 2011, the Academy invited an international panel of experts to evaluate the research programme as a whole. The panel was charged with the task of evaluating the programme paying special attention to the following aspects: programme preparation and content planning, the funding decisions and the funded projects as facilitating programme implementation, the scientific quality and the results, and the added value generated by the programme. The panel was also expected to make recommendations (with justifications) for further development.

This report includes the results of the evaluation. According to the panel, the programme achieved most of the set objectives with excellence. The programme involved a number of highly relevant and successful research projects in different fields; some of these projects have significantly promoted research on substance use and addictions. The Academy's investment in the programme has accelerated the growth in knowledge in this specific field and further contributed to the introduction of new methods and theories. The programme has also greatly increased the capacity of addiction research in Finland, both by promoting doctoral training and by providing opportunities for early-career researchers. In addition, thanks to the programme, addiction research and substance use issues have also gained somewhat more visibility in Finland.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Keywords</td><td colspan="2">research programme, drugs, addiction, evaluation, research funding</td></tr>
<tr><td>Name and number of series</td><td colspan="2">Publications of the Academy of Finland 1/14</td></tr>
<tr><td>ISSN</td><td colspan="2">0358-9153</td></tr>
<tr><td>ISBN</td><td>Print</td><td>PDF
978-951-715-877-0</td></tr>
<tr><td>Number of pages</td><td colspan="2">35</td></tr>
<tr><td>Distributed by</td><td colspan="2">Academy of Finland, POB 131, FI-00531 Helsinki</td></tr>
<tr><td>Published by</td><td colspan="2">Academy of Finland</td></tr>
<tr><td>Place and date of printing</td><td colspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td>Other information</td><td colspan="2">www.aka.fi/publications</td></tr>
</table>

KUVAILULEHTI

Julkaisija	Suomen Akatemia	Päivämäärä 5.12.2014
Tekijä(t)	Arviointipaneeli	
Julkaisun nimi	Substance Use and Addictions. Evaluation Report 2007–2010	
Tiivistelmä	Suomen Akatemian hallitus päätti marraskuussa 2005 käynnistää nelivuotisen Päihteet ja addiktio -tutkimusohjelman vuosille 2007–2010. Tutkimusohjelma pureutui laajalla rintamalla päihteiden käyttöön ja riippuvuuksiin. Tutkimuskohteina olivat alkoholi-, huume-, tupakka- ja peliriippuvuudet sekä addiktion synty-mekanismit. Ohjelman näkökulmat ja metodit ulottuivat terveystieteistä biotieteisiin ja psykologiaan, yhteiskuntatieteistä humanistisiin tieteisiin ja oikeustieteeseen. Rahoituksen sai 13 hanketta, joista kuusi oli konsortioita (yksi suomalainen, kaksi suomalais-kanadalaista, kaksi suomalais-venäläistä ja yksi suomalais-kanadalais-venäläinen). Suomen Akatemia rahoitti ohjelmaa 5,5 miljoonalla eurolla. Muita rahoittajia olivat sosiaali- ja terveysministeriö, kanadalainen Institute of Neuro-sciences, Mental Health and Addiction (INMHA) of the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), Venäjän perustutkimusrahasto (RFBR) ja Venäjän humanistinen tiederahasto (RFH). Vuonna 2011 tutkimusohjelmaa arvioimaan nimitettiin kansainvälinen arviointipaneeli. Paneelin tehtävänä oli arvioida ohjelma kokonaisuudessaan kiinnittäen erityistä huomiota seuraaviin seikkoihin: ohjelman valmistelu ja sisällöllinen suunnittelu, rahoituspäätökset ja rahoitetut hankkeet ohjelman edellytysten luojina, tulosten tieteellinen laatu ja tulokset sekä ohjelman tuottama lisäarvo. Paneelin tuli lisäksi antaa suosituksia perusteluineen. Tämä raportti sisältää arviointipaneelin työn tulokset. Paneelin mukaan tutkimusohjelma toteutti suurimmaksi osaksi tavoitteensa erinomaisesti. Ohjelma sisälsi koko joukon hyvin relevantteja ja onnistuneita eri alojen tutkimusprojekteja, joista osa on merkittävästi edistänyt päihde- ja addiktiotutkimusta. Suomen Akatemian panostus tähän tutkimusohjelmaan kiihdytti kyseisen tutkimusalan kasvua ja edesauttoi uusien metodien ja teorioiden käyttöönottoa. Ohjelma on kasvattanut merkittävästi päihdetutkimuksen kapasiteettia Suomessa tohtori-koulutuksen muodossa sekä tarjoamalla mahdollisuuksia nuorille tutkijoille. Lisäksi päihdetutkimus ja päihdekysymykset ovat jossain määrin saaneet näkyvyyttä Suomessa.	
Asiasanat	Tutkimusohjelma, päihteet, addiktio, arviointi, tutkimusrahoitus	
Julkaisusarjan nimi ja numero	Suomen Akatemian julkaisuja 1/14	
ISSN	0358-9153	
ISBN	Painetulle kirjalle annettu tunnus	Pdf-versiolle annettu tunnus 978-951-715-877-0
Sivumäärä		
Julkaisun jakaja	Suomen Akatemia, PL 131, 00531 Helsinki	
Julkaisun kustantaja	Suomen Akatemia	
Painopaikka ja -aika		
Muut tiedot	www.aka.fi/julkaisut	

PRESENTATIONSBLAD

Utgivare	Finlands Akademi	Datum 5.12.2014
Författare	Utvärderingspanel	
Publikationens namn	Substance Use and Addictions. Evaluation Report 2007–2010 (Forskningsprogrammet för beroendefrågor. Utvärderingsrapport 2007–2010)	
Sammandrag	Finlands Akademis styrelse beslutade i november 2005 att starta ett fyraårigt forskningsprogram om beroendefrågor för åren 2007–2010. Programmet skulle undersöka användningen av alkohol och narkotika samt beroende på bred front. Föremål för forskningen var alkohol-, drog-, tobaks- och spelberoende samt beroendemekanismer. Programmets synvinklar och metoder sträckte sig från hälsovetenskap till biovetenskap och psykologi samt från samhällsvetenskaper till humaniora och juridik. Finansiering beviljades till totalt 13 projekt, varav sex var konsortier (ett finländskt, två finsk-kanadensiska, två finsk-ryska och ett finsk-kanadensisk-ryskt). Akademins finansiering uppgick till 5,5 miljoner euro. Övriga finansiärer var social- och hälsovårdsministeriet, INMHA från Kanada samt RFBR och RFH från Ryssland. År 2011 utsågs en internationell utvärderingspanel för att bedöma programmets genomförande och resultat. Panelen skulle fästa särskild uppmärksamhet vid följande faktorer: beredningen och planeringen; hur finansieringsbesluten och de finansierade projekten skapade förutsättningar för programmet; resultatens vetenskapliga kvalitet; samt programmets mervärde. Panelen fick också i uppgift att ge motiverade rekommendationer. Denna rapport presenterar resultaten av utvärderingspanelens arbete. Enligt panelen lyckades programmet uppnå de flesta av sina mål utmärkt. Programmet innehöll flera relevanta och framgångsrika forskningsprojekt inom olika områden och vissa av dessa projekt har avsevärt främjat forskningen kring beroende och alkohol och narkotika. Akademins satsning på programmet hjälpte forskningsområdet att växa och bidrog till att introducera nya metoder och teorier. Programmet stärkte betydligt forskningskapaciteten i Finland inom området alkohol och narkotika dels genom en ökning av doktorsutbildningen, dels genom ett bättre utbud av möjligheter för unga forskare. Dessutom ökade programmet synligheten av beroendefrågor i Finland.	
Nyckelord	forskningsprogram, alkohol och narkotika, beroende, utvärdering, forskningsfinansiering	
Seriens namn och nummer	Finlands Akademis publikationer 1/14	
ISSN	0358-9153	
ISBN	Tryck	Pdf 978-951-715-877-0
Sidantal		
Distribution	Finlands Akademi, PB 131, 00531 Helsingfors	
Förlag	Finlands Akademi	
Tryckeri/tryckningsort och -år		
Ytterligare information	www.aka.fi/publikationer	

ABSTRACT

In response to ever-increasing concerns about the burden of substance use and addiction in Finland, the Academy of Finland, in partnership with the Finnish Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, the Canadian Institute of Neurosciences, Mental Health and Addiction, the Russian Foundation for Basic Research and the Russian Foundation for Humanities launched a four-year funding programme to increase high-quality research on addiction to alcohol, drugs, tobacco and gambling, as well as to further understanding of the mechanisms behind these addictions. The Research Programme on Substance Use and Addictions, which run from 2007 through to 2010, sought to take full advantage of a broad perspective and to cross the traditional barriers between different disciplines by using methods and approaches applied, among others, by medical science, biosciences, psychology, the social sciences and humanities, and law. Indeed, one of the main motivations for the programme was to support and facilitate the formation of larger research groups, and therefore promote the continuity that is necessary for the development of research in this field and for the growth of a sufficient critical mass in the research community. The specific objectives of the programme were to: 1) support high-level multidisciplinary research on substance use and addictions in Finland, Canada and Russia; 2) strengthen national and international research cooperation and networking; 3) promote the application of new research methods in the field of substance use and addictions research; 4) support researcher training; and 5) improve communications and dissemination of information on research results among researchers and between researchers, end-users and other interest groups (e.g. politicians, the media, the general public).

In 2011, the Academy of Finland invited an international panel of experts to evaluate how the programme had succeeded in attaining its objectives. The panel consisted of the following scientists: Jennifer O'Loughlin, University of Montreal, Canada (chair); Astrid Skretting, Norwegian Institute for Alcohol and Drug Research, Norway; Betsy Thom, University of Middlesex, United Kingdom; Pekka Hakkarainen, National Institute for Health and Welfare, Finland; and Tuukka Tammi, A-Clinic Foundation, Finland (expert panel secretary).

According to the evaluation panel, the objectives of the programme were broad in scope, generally realistic, and most were achieved with excellence. Importantly, a wide range of highly relevant projects from basic biosciences to population health research were conducted successfully and some have already made significant contributions in terms of advancing addiction and substance use science. The programme has built considerable capacity in addictions research in Finland through training PhD students and providing opportunities for junior investigators. It also facilitated networking and collaboration with researchers in Canada and Russia. The objective related to

multidisciplinarity may not have attained the hoped-for outcome in part, because multidisciplinarity is not understood in a uniform manner across project leaders, Academy staff, and students. Overall, the evaluation panel concluded that the injection of dedicated funding into addiction and substance use research (for the first time by the Academy of Finland) has accelerated growth in knowledge in this domain. Recommendations for future similar endeavours are presented in this report.

PREFACE

In 2007, the Academy of Finland, in partnership with the Finnish Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, the Canadian Institute of Neurosciences, Mental Health and Addiction, the Russian Foundation for Basic Research and the Russian Foundation for Humanities launched a four-year funding programme with a view to increasing high-quality research on addiction to alcohol, drugs, tobacco and gambling, as well as to furthering understanding of the mechanisms behind these addictions. Programme objectives were to: 1) support high-level multidisciplinary research on substance use and addictions in Finland, Canada and Russia; 2) strengthen national and international research cooperation and networking; 3) promote the application of new research methods in the field of substance use and addictions research; 4) support researcher training; and 5) improve communications and dissemination of information on research results among researchers and between researchers, end-users and other interest groups (e.g. politicians, the media, the general public)

In 2011, the Academy of Finland invited an international panel of experts to evaluate how the programme had succeeded in attaining its objectives. The panel consisted of the following scientists:
Jennifer O'Loughlin, University of Montreal, Canada (chair); Astrid Skretting, Norwegian Institute for Alcohol and Drug Research, Norway; Betsy Thom, University of Middlesex, United Kingdom; Pekka Hakkarainen, National Institute for Health and Welfare, Finland; and Tuukka Tammi, A-Clinic Foundation, Finland (expert panel secretary). The panel met over two days in Helsinki in November 2011.

Methods used by the evaluation panel to assess the programme were primarily qualitative and included document review, a self-evaluation completed by project leaders, and in-person interviews with the two programme managers, project leaders, and members of the steering committee. Questions posed by the panel in the interviews covered the interviewees' perception of the following aspects of the programme: programme planning; programme implementation; training opportunities provided by the programme; collaboration and networking between research teams, nationally and internationally; whether or not the programme enhanced multidisciplinarity; the quality and innovativeness of scientific output; the applicability of findings; and recommendations. This report presents the results of the evaluation as well as the recommendations of the evaluation panel.

Jennifer O'Loughlin
Professor
Chair of the Evaluation Panel

1 RESEARCH PROGRAMME ON SUBSTANCE USE AND ADDICTIONS 2007–2010

1.1 Background

The Research Programme on Substance Use and Addictions was a four-year funding programme aimed at increasing high-quality research on addiction to alcohol, drugs, tobacco and gambling, as well as on the mechanisms behind these addictions. It was implemented from 2007 through to 2010 by the Academy of Finland, in partnership with the Finnish Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, the Canadian Institute of Neurosciences, Mental Health and Addiction (INMHA), the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (RFBR) and the Russian Foundation for Humanities (RFH). The programme was a response to ever-increasing concerns about the societal costs of substance use and addiction in Finland.

The programme sought to take full advantage of a broad perspective and to cross the traditional barriers between different disciplines, methods and sources. It aimed at fostering the use of methods and approaches applied, among others, by medical science, biosciences, psychology, the social sciences and humanities, and law. Indeed, one of the main motivations for the programme was to support and facilitate the formation of larger research groups, and therefore promote the continuity that is necessary for the progress of research in this field and for the growth of a sufficient critical mass in the research community. The programme provided opportunities to work with research themes that take into account the distinctive features and themes of the substance use situation in the participating countries which are not sufficiently covered in international research. The core themes of the programme were:

- macro-level changes in alcohol policy and consumption, differences in drinking habits between various population groups, and harms
- substance use, harms and drug policy
- research into prevention, treatment and recovery processes
- research into addiction behaviour and addiction mechanisms.

1.2 Objectives

According to the Research Programme Strategy (2003–2008) of the Academy of Finland, a research programme is composed of a number of research projects that are focused on a defined subject area or set of problems scheduled to run for a set period of time with coordinated management. A programme is to be sufficiently broad with a well-defined focus and adequate duration, and it should provide added value when compared to traditional funding of individual projects. The specific objectives of the Research Programme on Substance Use and Addictions were to

- support high-level multidisciplinary research on substance use and addictions in Finland, Canada and Russia
- strengthen national and international research cooperation and networking
- promote the application of new research methods in the field of substance use and addictions research
- support researcher training
- improve communications and dissemination of information on research results among researchers and between researchers, end-users and other interest groups (e.g. politicians, the media, the general public).

1.3 Funding partners

Many European countries as well as the United States and Canada have a strong tradition of addiction research. Important synergies can be achieved in research on substance and gambling addictions among other things through comparative social research. Finland, Russia and Canada are all northern countries where cultures of alcohol and substance use share many similarities, although they also have many differences. International research collaboration will help to open up new perspectives on the cultures of substance use and alcohol policy in the participating countries.

In preparing the programme, the Academy of Finland looked to the possibility of joint funding with other countries, and developed collaborations with the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (specifically the Institute of Neurosciences, Mental health, and Addiction, INMHA) as well as with two of the largest Russian governmental funding organisations (Russian Foundation for Basic Research (RFBR) and Russian Foundation for Humanities (RFH). While other countries were approached, the programme managers mentioned that different priorities, needs and timetables were barriers to establishing collaboration. The Academy of Finland allocated EUR 5.5 million for the programme. The Finnish Ministry of Social Affairs and Health contributed EUR 340,000. The INMHA allocated CAD 360,000 and the RFH and the RFBR together approximately EUR 90,000. The seeming imbalance in the Russian allocation was related to a different funding approach in Russia. Each funding organisation funded only teams based in their own country.

1.4 Planning and coordination

Programme planning and coordination were undertaken by the Academy of Finland in cooperation with the other funding organisations except those in Russia (whose regulations did not allow it). A planning group (later a steering committee) was nominated in 2005, and somewhat later included five representatives from the Academy of Finland, one representative from the INMHA and one from the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health. The committee was chaired by (the late) Professor Matti Heikkilä (Academy of Finland) and vice-chaired by Astrid Eberhart (INMHA). Professor Karl Mann from Heidelberg University and Professor Robin Room from the Centre for Social Research on Alcohol and Drugs (SoRAD) in Stockholm were invited as external experts to strengthen the scientific expertise, especially in the initial phase of the programme when the objectives were set and the funding decisions made. The tasks of the steering committee were: to make a proposal to the Academy of Finland in regard to which projects should be funded (after consideration of the peer-review committee recommendations), to manage and monitor the activities of the programme, to plan and organise the final evaluation, and to promote the application of the research results. Members of the early planning and steering committees are listed in Appendix 7. It is of particular note that Matti Heikkilä was a very active "driving force" in the planning phase of the programme and that his death was regarded as a tremendous loss to the programme.

At the Academy, Dr Mika Tirronen and Dr Mikko Ylikangas managed the programme. Their responsibility was to report on the

scientific progress of the projects and the use of funds in accordance with the instructions of the programme coordination and funding organisations; see to that the researchers funded through the programme participated in the meetings, seminars, and workshops arranged by the steering committee; when needed, take part in producing articles, brochures, reviews and information material on the programme and its results; and actively disseminate information about the programme and its results at public and scientific forums.

1.5 Peer review of project proposals

The call for proposals for the Research Programme on Substance Use and Addictions, which had both a national (Finnish) and an international component, was announced in January 2006. The national component had a two-stage process. At the first stage, a total of 59 letters of intent (LoI, 47 individual proposals and 12 consortia) were reviewed by the steering committee. The 59 LoIs represented 66 research teams of investigators and the total collective budgets submitted was EUR 20.75 million. On 3 March 2006, the steering committee selected 40 proposals from among the 59 to proceed to the second stage of the call which comprised submission of full proposals with peer review. The international component involved one stage only (full proposals with peer review). A total of 15 proposals were submitted: five Finnish-Canadian proposals, seven Finnish-Russian proposals, and three trilateral (Finnish-Canadian-Russian) proposals.

Project submissions were peer-reviewed by an international panel of ten experts. Selection of the experts was based on recommendations made by the steering committee, review of the specific expertise of researchers listed in an Expert Database maintained at the Academy of Finland, and PubMed searches completed by the programme managers. Appendix 8 lists the panel members. The panel met in Helsinki in October 2006 and was chaired by Professor Mats Berglund from Lund University, Sweden. Each proposal was reviewed by 2–3 researchers using a standard set of questions, with relatively more emphasis on scientific quality than on other aspects of the protocol. The process and procedures followed by the peer review committee were standard.

The steering committee discussed the rating made by the peer review panel in November 2006 and made a proposal for the funding decisions. A total of 13 projects were approved for funding (17.6% of the 74 proposals that were submitted). Seven were submitted by individual Finnish teams, one was a national consortium, two were Finnish-Canadian, two were Finnish-Russian and one was a Finnish-Canadian-Russian project. The projects were funded for up to four years and the funds became available for spending in 2007. Table 1 summarises the results of the call for proposals, and Table 2 summarises the topic areas covered by the funded projects. The 13 funded projects had requested a total of EUR 6.3 million, so that the level of funding over requested funding was 87%.

Table 1. Results of the Call for Proposals.

	Number of projects submitted n	Number of projects funded n %	
Total	**74**	**13**	**17.6**
National component	**59**	**8**	**13.6**
Individual	47	7	14.9
Consortia	12	1	8.3
International component	**15**	**5**	**33.3**
Finnish-Canadian	5	2	40.0
Finnish-Russian	7	2	28.6
Finnish-Canadian-Russian	3	1	33.3

Table 2. Addiction topic areas covered by number of funded proposals.*

	Causes and consequences	Treatment
Total	**10**	**5**
Alcohol	6	
Drugs, including cannabis	1	
Smoking	2	2
General	1	3

*Several protocols fell into more than one category.

2 METHODS OF EVALUATION

The methods used by the evaluation panel to assess the programme were primarily qualitative. These included a review of documents provided by the Academy of Finland before (Appendix 4) and during the panel meeting, review of two PowerPoint presentations by the programme managers, and in-person interactive interviews during the panel meeting with the two programme managers (Mika Tirronen and Mikko Ylikangas); with project leaders Jaakko Kaprio (University of Helsinki), Raimo Tuominen (University of Helsinki), Kalervo Kiianmaa (National Institute for Health and Welfare), Anja Koski-Jännes (University of Tampere); with students Katja Kuusisto (University of Tampere), Jenni Vanhanen (University of Helsinki), Antti Latvala (University of Helsinki); and with Kari Haavisto (member of steering committee, Ministry of Social Affairs and Health), Arja Kallio (Director of the Programme Unit, Academy of Finland). This roster of interviewees, proposed by the programme managers, was thought to represent the range and diversity of the programme activities and targets. Questions asked by the panel generally covered the interviewee's perception of the following aspects of the programme: programme planning; programme implementation; training opportunities provided by the programme; collaboration and networking between teams, nationally and internationally; whether or not the programme enhanced multidisciplinarity; the quality and innovativeness of scientific output; the applicability of findings; and recommendations. The chair (Jennifer O'Loughlin) and expert panel secretary (Tuukka Tammi) kept detailed notes during the interviews. The notes were summarised, and the chair wrote a first draft of the report using the notes based on the interviews as well as the written materials provided by the Academy of Finland. The draft was reviewed by all panel members, and their suggestions were integrated into a final version. The final version of the report was approved by all panel members.

3 EVALUATION RESULTS

Section 3.1 presents the findings of the evaluation panel with respect to each of the five primary programme objectives. Section 3.2 describes the findings for other aspects of the programme (not necessarily embedded within the five primary objectives) and Section 3.3 describes results pertaining to the programme outcomes.

3.1 Attaining programme objectives

3.1.1 Support high-level multidisciplinary research on substance use and addictions in Finland, Canada and Russia

A primary objective of the programme was to support multidisciplinary research on substance use and addiction. The Academy advocated that multidisciplinarity should be part of each project but that this was not "forced" on the project. Terms such as "multidisciplinarity", "interdisciplinarity" or "transdisciplinarity" (i.e. concepts that revolve around the degree of collaboration and crossfertilisation between disciplines) are often used interchangeably, likely contributing to a general lack of clarity about what multidisciplinary research actually is. While generally thought to enrich the research undertaken and provide more in-depth understanding of the results, difference in objectives and methods between more fundamental and applied research can present considerable challenges in the application of a multidisciplinary paradigm.

In general, the evaluation panel felt that there was a considerable variability in how investigators, students, and staff defined and/or viewed multidisciplinary research. Several investigators thought that multidisciplinarity was not relevant to their specific project. Others felt that the multidisciplinary approach was built into their projects (i.e. the project incorporated researchers with expertise in a set of related disciplines such as the social sciences), so that there was little need to seek it elsewhere. Some investigators suggested that multidisciplinarity might work, but only within narrow domains, and some suggested that multidisciplinary training for students is too much to expect from students who need to master their own discipline, and in addition, presents a danger in terms of trainees losing in-depth knowledge in a specific domain.

While joint events between basic researchers and social scientists were reported to be interesting, at least one basic scientist thought the social scientists had more to learn and benefited more from the interaction. The programme managers at the Academy reported that interaction between disciplines did not happen unless it was "forced" and that, in the end, there could have been more interaction between disciplines. One investigator told the evaluation panel that "it was nice to be forced to learn from other fields" and that without the programme, "the researchers would go only to their own conferences and read only their own publications".

In the investigators' self-evaluations, the mean score for the item "Did the programme enhance multidisciplinarity in your research area?" was 4 of a possible 5, indicating that in fact most investigators believed that this objective had been

achieved. However, when asked to estimate the multidisciplinarity of their project, the score was 3.2 of a possible 5 (one of the lowest scores obtained in terms of project outcomes).

The evaluation panel concluded that the programme was not optimal in terms of fostering multidisciplinarity. Issues included that multidisciplinarity was not well-defined or consistently understood, its value was not clear to investigators or students and, from a practical perspective, multidisciplinarity was not a requirement for funding.

3.1.2 Strengthen national and international research cooperation and networking

An important goal of the programme was to promote collaborative research and effective networking between funded projects, nationally with researchers working in the same or similar domains, and internationally. The following paragraphs discuss each of these.

Links between projects

While attempts were made to promote links between funded projects through seminars, for example, and several project leaders mentioned some collaboration with other funded projects (i.e. Kuusisto cited collaboration with Koski-Jännes' project), the panel observed that, in general, the links between the projects seemed minimal. The programme managers mentioned that linking projects in this programme was very challenging and cited the example that the mechanisms underpinning addiction were debated from the very beginning of the programme in the opening seminar. The evaluation panel concluded that the research undertaken within the programme was based primarily on established networks, and recommended that more directed planning may be helpful in terms of developing explicit and realistic specific objectives for linking projects. For example, a realistic objective might entail assuring that students trained within the programme are able to clearly articulate the contribution of other disciplines to their projects. The panel suggested that setting specific objectives might facilitate development of activities and events that promote functional and useful links. In addition, specification of objectives that can be measured empirically will facilitate evaluation.

National links

Similarly, while there was general recognition that collaboration between, and networking with other thematic research programmes within Finland is good practice, the evaluation panel did not note many examples of national links fostered by the programme, although one investigator noted a joint event organised with the Power and Society in Finland Research Programme (VALTA).

One investigator thought that the programme has contributed to more regional equality as projects housed at the University of Tampere had also been funded so that addiction and substance use research was no longer completely centred in Helsinki. In the self-evaluation completed by project leaders, the mean score for the item that measured whether or not the researcher had benefitted from the programme in terms of national collaboration was 3.7 of a possible 5, indicating that there was room for improvement.

International links

The programme preferentially funded projects with international links to Russia and Canada over national (Finnish) projects (Table 1). The selection of Russia

and Canada as the countries with which Finland would partner in this programme was based on the interest of the steering committee to link with these countries, and on the interest, willingness and ability of these countries to contribute financially. While other international partners were approached, these collaborations could not be initiated within the timeframe of the programme. It is of note that one programme manager worked specifically to facilitate links with Russia.

Overall, the individuals interviewed reported mixed feelings about international collaboration. Several felt that while the projects had not yet benefited extensively from international collaboration, there were new international links facilitated by the programme and other links, such as the European Union ERA-NETs, that will be useful in the future. Some felt that internationalisation could have been more active and aggressive. Others noted that the programme had facilitated or helped consolidate already existing links internationally in countries other than Canada and Russia. More specifically, nine projects listed 25 collaborative partners from nine countries (USA, Russia, Sweden, United Kingdom, Italy, the Netherlands, France, New Zealand, Australia). In the self-evaluation completed by project leaders, the mean score for the item that measured whether or not the researcher had benefitted from the programme in terms of international collaboration was 4.2 of a possible 5, indicating that they were very satisfied with this aspect of the programme (notable more so than with national collaboration). Thirteen of the 15 respondents responded 'yes' to "Did the programme enable cooperation with researchers from Finland, Canada Russia or other countries that you would not have had without this funding?"

In regard to specific links with Canada and Russia, investigators that worked with Canada were very satisfied with these links and expressed that the programme had facilitated networks and collaboration with Canadian scientists. On the other hand, there was a general sense of disappointment with the links with Russia. There was some consternation that the imbalance in funding between Finland and Russia may have been detrimental in terms of attaining expected results. It was pointed out that cooperation in funding is different from cooperation in research, and that these need to be distinguished in terms of planning. One investigator felt that "cooperation with Russia could have been better prepared by the Academy". However, the programme managers pointed out that: "The Russian funding organisations function within the limits of their rules, which are strict and inflexible. International funding cooperation was a new thing in Russia in 2006. They have the same rules for national and international calls. It has not been possible to change these rules by bilateral negotiations. The problem was that that the Russian project leaders could have applied for additional funding from these funding organisations for internationalisation. This is the normal procedure. In Finland the projects apply funds for internationalisation in the main call. However, the Russian project leaders did not apply for additional funding, although we asked the Finnish project leaders to inform the Russians about this option…"

The evaluation panel noted that the Canadian collaboration was highly satisfactory. Collaboration with Russia could perhaps have benefited from more groundwork that identified possible pitfalls, with planning and leadership aimed at overcoming the pitfalls. However, not all barriers are identifiable until actual

implementation of the programme, and planning for all contingencies is time-consuming and may not be necessary. The panel commented that monitoring the impact of funding imbalances between partners in a research funding programme may be helpful.

Table 3. Indicators of international collaboration.*

	n
Publications by five international collaborative teams	51
Joint conferences, seminars, workshops*	9
Visits from Finland	3
Visits to Finland	28

* These were organised by the coordination team at the Academy of Finland and included Brussels 2006; Helsinki 2007, 2009, 2011; Moscow 2008; Washington 2008; Lake Como 2009; Prague 2010; Stockholm 2011.

3.1.3 Promote application of new research methods in the field of substance use and addictions research

Eleven of 15 project leaders reported in the self-evaluations that "new research methods" was a result of the funded research; 8 of 15 reported a "new theory"; and one reported new "software/database". The evaluation panel commented that dedicated funding likely facilitated the application of a variety of methods and theories to addiction research but it may yet be too soon to assess the impact of the methods used and data generated in terms of fostering new research methods.

3.1.4 Support researcher training

Project leaders reported that a total of 145 persons were supported by the funding at least in part, including 49 doctoral and 22 postdoctoral students. Overall 905.6 person-months (75.5 person-years) were supported by the programme, and the programme supported an important amount of training particularly at the doctoral level. In the self-evaluation reports completed by 15 investigators, the score for "benefiting from the programme in terms of research training" was 4.2 of a possible 5, indicating that investigators were very satisfied with the training enabled by the programme.

In order to promote interdisciplinary learning among trainees, the programme organised a total of nine seminars during the four-year period of funding. Attendance ranged between 20 and 300 at each seminar, and most attendees were PhD students. While some students and researchers appreciated the interactions between social sciences and biological fields made possible through the seminars, the seminars were criticised for the lack of themes of sufficient interest to all projects, which were quite distinct one from the other. In the self-evaluation reports completed by 15 investigators, the score for "Was the amount of events organised by coordination appropriate?" was 3.8 of a possible 5, indicating that investigators were satisfied with this component of the programme, but that there was room for improvement. One investigator suggested in the self-evaluation that the seminars should have had more support in terms of organisation, and should perhaps have been organised conjointly across projects to assure common ground. Overall, the diversity of the funded projects, as well as in the training and expertise of the investigators and students, may have required substantially more time and effort in terms of planning the seminars to allow more useful interaction and sharing.

Finally, a common concern was that, while the programme allowed more young

researchers to train in research on addictions and substance use, it was not clear that there would, in fact, be academic positions available for them in the near future. Several investigators suggested that a funding period longer than four years may have helped more trainees become better established. However, others (including several members of the evaluation panel) suggested that, rather than producing narrow addiction specialists, the training may have provided transferable skills that would allow trainees to be flexible and to change topics or fields in the future, if necessary. The evaluation panel concluded that although there may be issues in terms of placement of trainees in the future, the persons trained in the programme will be valuable to the addiction field more generally, perhaps as civil servants or public health practitioners.

3.1.5 Improve communications and dissemination of information on research results among researchers and between researchers, end-users and other interest groups (e.g. politicians, the media, the general public)

The Academy of Finland deemed it important to involve stakeholders and end-users in the programme to assure that the programme produced "science for society" and that outreach encompassed the broad public, not just academia. Indeed, a driving principle of the programme noted by Academy Vice President Anneli Pauli, was that it should increase visibility of the addiction issue in part, through profiling specific projects and researchers, and disseminating research findings among stakeholders. Both programme managers expressed their perception that addiction research attained visibility locally, nationally and also abroad. However, data from the self-evaluation completed by 15 project investigators suggest that, relative to other outcomes, visibility was an objective with which they were not as satisfied. The mean score was 3 of a possible 5 for the item measuring, whether or not their project was more visible because of the programme. In addition, the score was 2.2 of a possible 5 for the item measuring the extent to which media was involved in their research.

Table 4. Communication aimed at general public.

Type of communication	N
Newspaper and magazine articles	58
Articles in electronic media	7
Radio	9
Television	7

Overall, it was difficult for the evaluation panel to assess whether or not objectives related to visibility had been attained. The panel commented that it may be helpful to collect data systematically to track specific indicators of visibility and knowledge sharing.

3.2 Other aspects of the programme

3.2.1 Coordination

Ongoing coordination was viewed by the Academy as adding value to the programme (i.e. 2 + 2 = 5). It was undertaken by the steering committee, two programme managers and a project officer. The budget for coordination was 170,000 euros for 2006–2011 (approx. 30,000 euros per year), and the aims of coordination were to advance national and international networking and collaboration, advance researcher training, monitor the projects and distribute information. On 31 December 2010, approximately 73% of the planned coordination budget had been

spent (29% on events (seminars and workshops); 26% on protocol evaluation; 25% on travel and the reminder on distribution of information, steering committee meetings and other).

Without exception, project leaders, students, and other stakeholders interviewed during the panel meeting expressed satisfaction with the programme managers. All project leaders interviewed were "very happy" with programme coordination. Another interviewee reported that "The programme managers did a great job, and had innovative ideas for events and bringing different people together." One of the interviewed project leaders added that coordination worked well, was helpful and was fluent."

The evaluation panel concluded that this aspect of the programme was very positive. The budget for coordination was appropriate and well spent. Having two programme managers was needed, particularly since the international aspects of the programme required specific skills and was time-consuming. In particular, the panel felt that the programme managers, Mika Tirronen and Mikko Ylikangas, did an impressive job to successfully establish international connections and coordinate the programme nationally and locally. There were no specific suggestions on how to improve this aspect of the programme.

3.2.2 Funding decisions

The programme managers had foreseen, based on the funding resources, that a total of 15–20 funded projects or consortia would have been optimal for the programme. As illustrated in Table 1, a total of 13 projects were funded and projects with an international orientation were more likely to be funded than individual Finnish projects or consortia. This, in fact, reflected a specific objective of the programme and may be regarded as a success. Table 2 shows that ten projects related to etiology, and five assessed treatment. Six projects investigated issues related to alcohol, by far the most "popular" topic area among funded projects.

Table 5. Proportion of projects reviewed that were funded according to final panel rating.

Final panel rating (/5)	Total number of projects with rating	Funded	
		n	%
Total	**52**	**13**	**25**
5	3	3	100
4.5	5	5	100
4	7	3	43
3.5	6	2	33
<3.5	31	0	0

Both programme managers reported that the procedures and processes to select the projects to be funded were standard and ran smoothly for the most part. However, they did mention that there was some tension between the more biomedical researchers and the social scientists of the peer review committee in terms of project ratings. The social scientists seemed to score on a different scale tending to give lower scores. In addition, they noted some divergence between "steering committee" members in terms of whether funding "higher-risk" projects and those submitted by more junior investigators should be facilitated over projects submitted by well-established researchers who would be certain to attain their project objectives. Overall, however, the programme managers felt that scientific quality had driven the selection process and the most scientifically valid projects

had been selected for funding. Although the programme managers expressed general satisfaction with the distribution of funded projects in terms of topic area, they did note that there may have been some imbalance in that more social science projects could have received funding and importantly, that projects related to illicit drugs and gambling, as well as those which assessed policy related to addiction and substance use, were underrepresented among the funded projects.

The evaluation panel noted that the selection process was rigorously planned and executed, and given the wide scope of the proposals received, the tensions between researchers working in widely different domains may be expected. Given limited funding and the focus on scientific validity, the panel was assured that the "right" projects had been funded. However, in the future, the Academy could consider:

- Encouraging the steering committee to be "braver" in approving projects that address the priorities of the call for proposals or the gaps in thematic areas, while, of course, always respecting that scientific quality must be of the highest standard.
- Developing a separate funding mechanism for "higher-risk" projects.
- Setting up peer review committees that include scientists with widely different training and expertise for working cohesively together using the same standards.
- Adopting a framework for calls for proposals that prioritises thematic priorities (i.e. planning for additional calls if gaps in thematic priorities are noted either in the proposal received or those that are funded). While this strategy had been discussed during programme planning, no additional calls were made during the programme in spite of the funding gaps noted.
- Provide training for researchers working in areas where there are gaps, to develop more convincing proposals.

3.2.3 Amount of funding

In planning the programme, one recommendation was that the budget should be sufficient to permit all researchers, including PhD students to work full time on the project, and in addition to allow international networking. The Academy of Finland allocated a total of 5.5 million euros to the programme. Funding by the partner organisations, and in particular by Russia, was substantially lower as indicated earlier. Funding ranged between 142,000–548,000 euros per project (an average of 305,000 euros per project) and covered salaries and fees, equipment costs, costs for seminars, inviting foreign researchers and other direct costs.

There were few complaints about the level of funding. In the self-evaluations completed by 15 project leaders, the mean score for "How important was the funding for your research?" was 4.7 of a possible 5. When asked if the level of funding was sufficient with respect to their research plan, the mean score was 3.8. Nine of the 15 respondents indicated that the addiction funding comprised more than half of the funding for their addiction research, and the mean score for "other sources of funding" enabling their research was 3.0. Further ten of 14 project leaders reported that the programme had helped them obtain additional funding for their projects, while two of 14 indicated that they felt that funding in the future was facilitated by the programme.

However, several project leaders indicated that the four-year timeline was not sufficient to accomplish goals beyond those related to the science, such as multidisciplinarity, training, and collaboration between projects. Overall, the evaluation panel thought that the level of funding per project was satisfactory. The panel was told by the programme managers that the length of the funding (four years) was in essence immutable. Beyond the general reflection that research takes time, and that a longer programme may have resulted in more scientific output and sustained training opportunities for young researchers, the panel did not make further comment or provide any specific recommendations beyond several general suggestions, such as funding a professorship in the addictions field and/or setting up a multidisciplinary Centre of Excellence.

3.2.4 Evaluation

Implementation of a new funding programme that incorporates international links within a well-established national funding institution is a very complex endeavour entailing vision, coordination, cooperation and effective communication between numerous stakeholders, detailed planning and execution, adequate financial support, sufficient time, as well as evaluation processes to enable detection of issues and improvement of the programme. The evaluation panel felt that the Academy's planning and support of the panel's work was excellent and it greatly appreciated the quantity and quality of support. The panel did note that it was somewhat difficult to navigate through the material provided prior to the meeting in Helsinki, that some of the material was not clearly presented in terms of how it would be useful to the panel, and that the specific tasks of the panel might have been more precisely articulated so that the work accomplished during the meeting was completely on-task. In order to facilitate such work in the future, it may be helpful to build evaluation into the programme from the get-go to assure that specific measureable objectives are articulated for each aspect of the programme; that data collected for evaluation purposes (i.e. the self-evaluation completed by project leaders) align with the specific objectives so that empirical evaluation data are available for each aspect of the programme; and that materials provided to the panel prior to the panel meeting are well-delineated in terms of purpose. The evaluation panel noted that it may be helpful to consult relevant references, as well as evaluation experts who specialise in the evaluation of large-scale funding programmes, to facilitate the evaluation process in the future.

3.3 Programme outcomes

3.3.1 Scientific results

While still early to judge, several indicators suggest that the projects funded have yielded innovative results that address gaps in the literature. The final reports submitted by project leaders indicate that the project funded yielded a total of 127 original scientific articles, of which 51 resulted from international collaborations. One patent has been filed. Finally, ten of 15 project leaders who completed the self-evaluation reported that they have secured additional funding for their projects and the mean score for the item that measured how innovative the research was compared to other research in the field was 4.1, indicating that project leaders felt the programme has contributed to

innovativeness. The mean score for added value of the programme was 4.2 of a possible 5, and project leaders indicated that the programme had enhanced the development of their research (mean score = 4.1). A summary of selected outcomes is presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Programme outcomes.

Type of outcome	N
Original scientific articles	127
by international collaborative teams (5)	51
Review articles	6
Other articles in scientific journals	4
In professional journals	6
Edited books	3
Contributions to books/other compilations	33
Doctoral dissertations	9
Patents	1

While it is difficult to assess the overall scientific quality of the programme outputs given the information provided, the evaluation panel felt that the quantity of publications and other output suggest a relatively high productivity by the programme.

3.3.2 Societal impact

The programme managers expressed that, while the programme has produced many excellent (measureable) results in terms of scientific output, its societal impact remains to be demonstrated. In fact, in the self-evaluations completed by the project leaders, the score for short-term (1–3 years) applicability of the results was 3.2 (of a possible 5), while the score for long-term impact (more than 3 years) was 4.1, indicating that the project leaders recognised that the impact of the results of the projects take time to percolate and influence research, programmes and policy. Overall, 12 of the 15 project leaders who completed the self-evaluations indicated that their projects will eventually have societal impact, listing the following as possible impacts: improved treatment strategies, including those that address multiple addiction simultaneously (since alcohol, smoking and mental health problems, for example, often co-occur); improved public education; improved training of practitioners; validation of the Tobacco Act 2010 goal of achieving a smoke-free Finland; need for cohesive traffic, health and social policy to address the addiction and substance use issue; development of new drugs; novel approaches to smoking reduction, including strategies that are personalised; and information of drinking patterns in Finland will inform programmes and policy.

Overall, the evaluation panel noted that "societal impact" needs to be defined and operationalised in terms of empirical indicators. Data should be collected on these indicators throughout the programme as well as for several years after the completion of the programme (when the programme's societal impact may actually manifest) in order to be better positioned to evaluate this aspect of the programme.

4 CONCLUSIONS

1. The objectives of the programme were broad in scope, generally realistic, and most of them were achieved with excellence.
2. Importantly, a wide range of highly relevant projects from basic biosciences to population health research were conducted successfully and some have already made significant contributions in terms of advancing addiction and substance use science.
3. The injection of dedicated funding into addiction and substance use research (for the first time by the Academy of Finland) has accelerated growth in knowledge in this domain.
4. The programme managers were universally appreciated. Their dedicated work, as well as their enthusiasm, were critical to all aspects of the programme's success.
5. The programme has built considerable capacity in Finnish addictions research through training PhD students and providing opportunities for junior investigators.
6. The programme has facilitated more equity in funding across Finland so that addiction research is now not so Helsinki-centred.
7. Multidisciplinarity is not understood in a uniform manner among the project leaders, Academy staff, and students. In particular, the purpose or added value of a multidisciplinary approach was not well understood. Without specific objectives pertaining to each project, this programme objective was likely not achieved to the extent hoped for.
8. Linking funded projects was challenging so that meaningful interaction between funded projects was less than hoped for.
9. The programme facilitated networking and collaboration with researchers in Canada and Russia. There was concern that the inequity in funding with Russian partners may have resulted in some unnecessary tension.
10. Dedicated funding likely facilitated the application of a variety of methods and theories to addiction research, but it may yet be too soon to appreciate the impact of the methods used and data generated in terms of fostering new research methods.
11. While the evaluation panel was not able to quantify visibility of the programme, its very existence accentuated that the addiction issue is a serious social and public health problem.

5 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Because several gaps in specific substantive (i.e. gambling, policy, multiple substance use, prevention, treatment systems) and mechanistic (i.e. natural history; mechanistic underpinnings; mental health and addiction) areas were noted in terms of the projects funded by the programme, the Academy could consider:
2. Encouraging the steering committee to be "braver" in approving projects that address the priorities of the call for proposals or the gaps in the thematic areas while, of course, always respecting that scientific quality must be of the highest standard
3. Developing a separate funding mechanism for "higher-risk" projects
4. Setting up peer review committees that include scientists with widely different training and expertise for working cohesively together by using the same standards
5. Adopting a framework for calls for proposals that respects thematic priorities (i.e. planning for additional calls if gaps in thematic priorities are noted either in the proposals received or those that are funded). While this strategy had been discussed during the programme planning, no additional calls were launched during the programme in spite of the funding gaps noted
6. Providing focused training for researchers working in areas where there are gaps with a view to developing more solid proposals
7. Funding a professorship in the addictions and/or setting up a multidisciplinary Centre of Excellence.
8. The research programme was wide in scope. The Academy of Finland (with other funding agencies in Finland) could consider implementing a second, possibly more focused addiction and substance use research programme to maintain accelerated contributions to the field, to assure coverage of areas that were not funded, and to maintain newly developed research capacity in the area.
9. The programme funded projects for a maximum of four years, which was generally viewed as a relatively short time period for a project. Offering the possibility of longer-term funding, perhaps through interim review with the possibility of extended funding, may be beneficial for certain types of projects. Further, projects should be encouraged to carefully consider renewal strategies (if needed) well before the end of the funding period.
10. Specific objectives should be identified in terms of linking funded projects. What specifically does the Academy hope to achieve in linking funded projects? Setting specific objectives may facilitate development of activities and events that promote functional, useful, and meaningful links. In addition, specification of objectives that can be measured empirically will facilitate evaluation.

11. While the international component of the programme generally worked very well and was broadly appreciated, the funding responsibilities of each party should be clearly delineated prior to spending. In addition, the Academy (rather than the individual projects) could take more leadership in organising more international events to facilitate networking and collaboration across countries. Joint funding internationally should not necessarily be restricted to 1–2 countries.
12. The evaluation model and tools for evaluation should be planned in conjunction with Programme planning from the get-go. The evaluation model should be clearly defined and the tools (i.e. self-evaluation questionnaires, structured final reports, interview guidelines) to gather information for the evaluation panels should align very closely with the model and the programme objectives. Review of these materials with the evaluation panel before data collection could be very helpful to assure that the panel will obtain all the data needed to complete their task.
13. Multidisciplinarity will need to be defined clearly and understood in a similar way across Academy staff, researchers, and students. Achievable and precise objectives with respect to multidisciplinarity will need to be developed and these objectives should be understood by all involved in the programme.
14. The Academy may need to take a stronger leadership role to encourage (without "forcing") collaboration and networking between the funded projects. However, realistic and achievable specific objectives in regard to project collaboration need to be developed with each project individually, so that meaningful and helpful collaboration ensues.
15. Specific objectives for visibility need to be defined, and indicators that enable tracking of visibility throughout programme implementation need to be developed. Systematic data collection on indicators related to programme objectives will permit interim reviews so that adjustment can be made to the programme to assure that its specific objectives are attained.
16. Specific objectives for attaining societal impact need to be defined, and indicators that enable tracking of societal impact throughout programme implementation will need to be developed. Societal impact needs to be tracked beyond the life of the programme to provide a full picture.

Appendix 1. Assignment

Request for expert evaluation of the Academy of Finland Substance Use and Addictions Research Programme

Dear Professor O'Loughlin,

I am writing on behalf of the Steering Committee of the Substance Use and Addictions Research Programme (2007–2010) of the Academy of Finland. Substance Use and Addictions was a four-year research programme between Finland, Canada and Russia researching addictions to alcohol, drugs, tobacco and gambling as well as the mechanisms behind the emergence of these addictions. The programme involved eight Finnish, two Finnish-Canadian, two Finnish-Russian and one Finnish-Canadian-Russian research projects. The programme was funded by the Academy of Finland, the Finnish Ministry for Social Affairs and Health, the Canadian Institute of Neurosciences, Mental Health and Addiction (INMHA), the Russian Fund for Basic Research (RFBR) and the Russian Foundation for Humanities (RFH). The research programme was coordinated by the Academy of Finland.

The programme seeks to take full advantage of its broad perspectives and to overstep the traditional barriers between different disciplines, methods and sources.

Objectives of the research programme were:

- To support high-level multidisciplinary research on substance abuse and addictions in Finland, Canada and Russia
- To strengthen national and international research cooperation and networking
- To promote the application of new research methods in the field of substance use and addictions research
- To support researcher training
- To improve communications and dissemination of information on research results among researchers and between researchers, end-users and other interest groups (e.g. politicians, the media, the general public).

The key themes of the programme were:

- Macro-level changes in alcohol policy and consumption, differences in drinking habits between various population groups, and harms
- Substance use, harms, and drug policy
- Research into prevention, treatments and recovery processes
- Research into addiction behaviour and addiction mechanisms

The Academy of Finland will carry out the evaluation of the research programme in November 2011. The external evaluation will be conducted by a panel, which consists of a Chairman and three internationally distinguished experts. You were recommended by the Steering Committee. Therefore I wish to kindly inquire, whether you would be willing to act as the Chairperson of the evaluation panel.

The Academy of Finland will pay for your travel (in economy class) and accommodation costs. A fee of ____ Euros (minus taxes 35% and pension premium 4.7 or 6.0%) is paid for the evaluation

work to cover expenses not otherwise paid by the Academy of Finland, for instance additional meals during the visit. However, the Academy will provide lunches and coffee/tea during the meeting. The Academy of Finland will also host a get-together dinner the night before the panel meeting.

The panel is expected to assess the programme as a whole and reflect the following issues:

1. Planning of the research programme
2. Scientific quality of the research programme
3. Success of the implementation of the programme goals and objectives
4. Contribution to researcher and expert training
5. Collaboration and networking
6. Applicability of research and importance to the users
7. Recommendations for the future.

The work will include examination of research reports, self-evaluation assessments, products of the programme; meeting with the Programme Steering Committee as well as discussion with researchers and the coordinator of the research programme. There will be time reserved for the panel's own discussion and drafting of a short Evaluation Report. Technical assistance will be provided during the visit. The reports, assessments etc. will be sent to you in good time before the panel meeting.

The panel work will take place in Helsinki at the Academy of Finland (Hakaniemenranta 6, 00530 Helsinki). If you accept our invitation we would like to know which date would suit you best in November. We need two days for the panel work, and depending on the travel arrangements the whole task would require probably staying 2–3 nights in Helsinki (preferably not during 11–17 November). The preliminary schedule for the panel is as follows:

- xx November Arrival in Helsinki; get-together dinner
- xx November, 9 AM – 6 PM Panel meeting at the Academy of Finland
- xx November, 9 AM – 3 PM Panel meeting; departure from Helsinki

Your contribution in the matter would be of great value to the Academy of Finland. Please kindly confirm the receipt of this message, and in your earliest convenience also let us know if you accept this invitation. We will be happy to provide further information upon your request. More information about the Substance Use and Addictions Research Programme is available at www.aka.fi/addiktio > in English.

The Academy of Finland is a governmental expert organisation on research funding and science policy (www.aka.fi). The Academy's object is to promote high-level scientific research through long-term quality-based research funding, science and science policy expertise and efforts to strengthen the position of science and scientific research. The Academy's operation covers all scientific disciplines. Research programmes are an important funding instrument and a platform for international cooperation. A total of 12 research programmes were ongoing in 2010.

Appendix 2. Members of Evaluation Panel

Chair

Jennifer O'Loughlin, PhD, CRC, Fellow CAHS
Professor
Department of Social and Preventive Medicine
University of Montreal
Canada

Members

Astrid Skretting
Research Director
Norwegian Institute for Alcohol and Drug Research
Norway

Betsy Thom
Professor
University of Middlesex
United Kingdom

Pekka Hakkarainen
Docent
Department Director
National Institute for Health and Welfare
Finland

Expert panel secretary

Tuukka Tammi
Research Manager
A-Clinic Foundation
Finland

Appendix 3. List of funded projects

Finnish projects

1. Predictors, Neuropsychological Correlates, and Consequences of Cannabis and Alcohol Use among Finnish Young Adults. A Twin and Population Approach. Kaprio Jaakko, National Public Health Institute
2. FinDrink Study: Epidemiology of Alcohol Drinking Patterns, Consumption Changes and Health Implications in Contemporary Finnish Population. Kauhanen Jussi, University of Kuopio
3. Process and Outcome of Initial Motivational Interviews with Substance Abusers. Koski-Jännes Anja, University of Tampere
4. The Life Course of DUI* Offenders (*Driving under influence of alcohol and/or drugs). Lillsunde Pirjo, National Public Health Institute
5. Tuberomamillary Neurons, Histamine and H3 Receptor in Hypothalamic Regulation of Alcohol Addiction. Panula Pertti, University of Helsinki
6. Effectiveness of Substance Abuse Treatment in Light of Common Factors. Saarnio Pekka, University of Tampere
7. Effectiveness of Pharmacological Treatments of Drug Dependence. Tiihonen Jari (consortium coordinator), University of Kuopio, Kauhanen Jussi, University of Kuopio
8. Changes in the Cultural Position of Drinking. Törrönen Jukka, National Research and Development Centre for Welfare and Health, Stakes

International projects

1. Role of Genetic Factors in Individuals' Ability to Quit Smoking. Hirvonen Ari, Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, Imyanitov Evgeny, N.N. Petrov Research Institute of Oncology
2. Brain Opioidergic Systems and Neurobehavioral Sensitization in Addiction to Alcohol

1. Kiianmaa Kalervo (consortium coordinator), National Public Health Institute, Ahtee Liisa, University of Helsinki, Castrén Eero, University of Helsinki, Gianoulakis Christina, McGill University
3. Development of Nicotine Metabolism Inhibitors as Anti-smoking Drugs. Raunio Hannu, University of Kuopio, Tyndale Rachel, University of Toronto
4. Theories of Addiction and Images of Addictive Behaviours. Sulkunen Pekka (consortium coordinator), University of Helsinki, Koski-Jännes Anja, University of Tampere, Poikolainen Kari, Finnish Foundation for Alcohol Studies, Cunningham John, Center for Addiction and Mental Health, Pervova Irina, St. Petersburg State University
5. Behavioral and Molecular Mechanisms of Nicotine Addiction. Tuominen Raimo, University of Helsinki, Zvartau Edwin, Pavlov Medical University

Appendix 4. Material provided for evaluation

1. Appointment letter
2. Guidelines for evaluation
3. Evaluation meeting schedule
4. Programme memorandum
5. Programme summary
6. Table of the funding decisions
7. Final reports of the projects
8. Summary of the final reports
9. Self-evaluation questionnaire sent to project leaders
10. Summary of the project leaders' self-evaluation reports
11. Composition of the Programme Steering Committees
12. Coordination budget 2006–2012
13. Research plans and abstracts
14. List of the Evaluation Panel members in 2006
15. Academy of Finland in Brief, brochure
16. Academy of Finland Research Programmes, brochure
17. Brochure of the Addiction research programme
18. Annual report 2010 of the Academy of Finland
19. Media coverage

Appendix 5. Self-evaluation questionnaire of projects

Research Programme on Substance Use and Addictions (ADDICTION) - Self-evaluation questionnaire

The data collected through this questionnaire will be used in the final evaluation of the research programme on Substance Use and Addictions (ADDICTION).

For the backround and objectives of the programme, please refer to the Programme memorandum: www.aka.fi/addiktio > In English > Materials > Programme memorandum.

More information about the questionnaire:

Mika Tirronen
Programme Manager
Academy of Finland
mika.tirronen@aka.fi
+358 40 702 7462

Mikko Ylikangas
Programme Manager
Academy of Finland
mikko.ylikangas@aka.fi
+358 40 586 4729

Melisa Huhtakangas
Project Officer
Academy of Finland
melisa.huhtakangas@aka.fi
+358 40 154 5423

Some questions in this questionnaire are closed questions with rating scale from 1 to 5;

1 = not at all
5 = very much
NR = not relevant

QUESTION 1 IS GENERAL TO THE PROGRAMME AS A WHOLE.

1. Please estimate: *

	NR	1	2	3	4	5
Were the objectives of the programme relevant and achievable? *	○	○	○	○	○	○
Did the research field gain any added value for having a programme compared to normal research grants? *	○	○	○	○	○	○
Did ADDICTION programme enhance multidisciplinarity in your research area? *	○	○	○	○	○	○
Did ADDICTION programme enhance the development of your research area? *	○	○	○	○	○	○

QUESTIONS 2 - 12 ARE SPECIFIC TO YOUR TEAM/PROJECT.

2. Please estimate: *

	NR	1	2	3	4	5
How important ADDICTION funding was for your research? *	○	○	○	○	○	○
Did the amount of funding you received in the programme match with the funding you applied for? *	○	○	○	○	○	○
Was the funding sufficient compared to the research plan? *	○	○	○	○	○	○

3. How big of a portion was ADDICTION funding of your overall research funding for addiction research in 2007-2010? *

- ☐ 5 - 25%
- ☐ 26 - 50%
- ☐ 51 - 75%
- ☐ 76 - 100%

4. Have you benefited from engaging with ADDICTION programme regarding: *

	NR	1	2	3	4	5
scientific results *	○	○	○	○	○	○
national collaboration *	○	○	○	○	○	○
international collaboration *	○	○	○	○	○	○
researcher training *	○	○	○	○	○	○
mobility of researchers *	○	○	○	○	○	○
visibility in the public media *	○	○	○	○	○	○

5. Please estimate: *

	NR	1	2	3	4	5
to what extent did you reach your objectives *	○	○	○	○	○	○
to what extent did your project contribute to the objectives of the programme *	○	○	○	○	○	○
multidisciplinarity of the project *	○	○	○	○	○	○
how well were you able to follow the original research plan *	○	○	○	○	○	○
the applicability of the results in short-term (1-3 years) *	○	○	○	○	○	○
the applicability of the results in long-term (more than 3 years) *	○	○	○	○	○	○
how innovative is your research compared to other research in your field *	○	○	○	○	○	○

6. Please estimate how much the following factors enabled your research: *

	NR	1	2	3	4	5
CIHR/AF/RFBR/RFH funding *	○	○	○	○	○	○
other sources of funding *	○	○	○	○	○	○
institutional/university support *	○	○	○	○	○	○
national collaborations *	○	○	○	○	○	○
international collaborations *	○	○	○	○	○	○
availability of qualified research personnel *	○	○	○	○	○	○

7. Please indicate how the stakeholders listed below, were/are involved in your research: *

	NR	1	2	3	4	5
study stakeholders (who are formally listed in the grant application) *	○	○	○	○	○	○
other researchers/academics *	○	○	○	○	○	○
health system/care practioners/managers *	○	○	○	○	○	○
patients/consumer of health care system *	○	○	○	○	○	○
consumer groups *	○	○	○	○	○	○
charitable organizations *	○	○	○	○	○	○
industry *	○	○	○	○	○	○
media *	○	○	○	○	○	○

8. Did the programme enable the cooperation with researchers from Finland/Canada/Russia/other countries that you would not have had without this funding? *

○ Yes
○ No

9. Which of the following outcomes have or will result from your ADDICTION-funded project? *

	Yes	No	May in the future
research finding/new knowledge *	○	○	○
new research method *	○	○	○
new theory *	○	○	○
new practice (clinical tool/instrument procedure/technique) *	○	○	○
new drugs *	○	○	○
software/database *	○	○	○
new patent (pending or obtained) *	○	○	○
new product license *	○	○	○
spin-off company *	○	○	○
research funding from other sources *	○	○	○
other (please specify below) *	○	○	○

10. other

11. Did your project (or will it) have any societal impact? *

- Yes
- No

12. If yes, please specify

QUESTION 13 CONCERNS THE FUNCTION OF THE PROGRAMME COORDINATION.

13. Please estimate: *

	NR	1	2	3	4	5
Did you benefit from the coordination? *						
Did you find the arranged events useful? *						
Was the amount of events organised by coordination appropriate? *						

QUESTIONS 14 - 21 ARE GENERAL QUESTIONS ABOUT THE ADDICTION PROGRAMME AND THE PROGRAMME CONCEPT IN GENERAL.
(IN OPEN COMMENTS MAX 1000 CHARACTERS/QUESTION)

14. What were the strengths of the ADDICTION programme? *

15. What were the weaknesses of the ADDICTION programme? *

16. How could the ADDICTION programme have been improved? *

17. What are your recommendations for the future research programmes? *

18. Would your field of research benefit from a new research programme? *

- Yes
- No

19. If yes, please specify

20. What are the greatest shortcomings, problem areas, and needs in your field of research? *

21. How would you raise the level of research in your field? *

QUESTIONS 22 - 30 NEED TO BE ANSWERED ONLY BY THE INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATIVE TEAMS.
(AF-INMHA, AF-RFBR and AF-RFH funded projects)

22. Was the cooperation with your international partner already in existence before applying for the ADDICTION funding?

- Yes
- No

23. Will the cooperation with your international partner continue after the ADDICTION funding comes to its end?

- Yes
- No

24. How many visits did you have from your team to your foreign partner?

25. How many visits were there from your foreign partner to your team?

26. How many joint publications did your international collaborative project publish?

27. How did your project benefit from this international collaboration, or did it?

28. Did you have any obstacles in conducting the collaborative project? If yes, please describe.

29. How could the international part of the ADDICTION programme have been improved?

30. What are your recommendations for the future research programmes in terms of international collaboration?

Contact data are optional.

31. Contact form

Name	
Email	
Country	
Company / Organization	
Department	

Appendix 6. Agenda of Evaluation Panel meeting

24–25 November, 2011

Place:	Academy of Finland, Helsinki (Hakaniemenranta 6, Helsinki)
Hosts:	Programme Manager, Dr Mika Tirronen Programme Manager, Dr Mikko Ylikangas Project Officer, Ms Melisa Huhtakangas

Wednesday 23 November, 2011

18:45	Meeting at the hotel lobby with Programme Managers Mika Tirronen and Mikko Ylikangas
19:00	Get-together dinner

Thursday 24 November, 2011

08:30	Meeting at the hotel lobby
09:00–10:00	Kick-off of the panel meeting Introductions of the panel members and the Academy of Finland staff Brief presentation of the Academy of Finland – Dr Mikko Ylikangas Presentation of the research programme ADDICTION and the evaluation process – Dr Mika Tirronen Organization of the panel work – Professor Jennifer O'Loughlin, Chair of the Evaluation Panel Dr Tuukka Tammi, Expert secretary of the panel
10:00–11:00	Interview: Programme Managers Dr Mika Tirronen and Dr Mikko Ylikangas
11:00–12:00	Interviews: Project Leaders
12:00–13:00	Lunch
13:00–14:30	Interviews: Project Leaders
15:00	Coffee
15:00–17:00	Interviews: ADDICTION Steering Group representatives, Academy of Finland staff and other stakeholders
17:00–18:00	Panel work, writing of the Evaluation Report

Friday 25 November, 2011

9:00–12:00	Panel work, writing of the evaluation report
12:00–13:00	Lunch
13:00–15:00	Panel work, writing of the evaluation report
15:00–16:00	Summary of the discussions; next steps on the delivery of the evaluation report

Appendix 7. Members of Planning and Steering Committee

Planning group

March 2005 – 26 January 2006

Chair: Professor Matti Heikkilä, Research Council for Culture and Society
Members:
Professor Eila Helander, Research Council for Culture and Society
Professor Hilkka Soininen, Research Council for Health
Professor Kalervo Väänänen Research Council for Health
Experts:
Special researcher Pekka Hakkarainen, Stakes
Professor Jouko Lönnqvist, National Public Health Institute

Planning group

26 January, 2006 – 12 January, 2007

Chair: Professor Matti Heikkilä, Research Council for Culture and Society,
Vice Chair: Professor Hilkka Soininen, Research Council for Health
Members:
Professor Anssi Auvinen, Research Council for Health,
Assistant Director Astrid Eberhart, Institute of Neuroscience, Mental Health and Addiction, Canadian Institutes of Health Research,
Advisor Kari Haavisto, Ministry of Social Affairs and Health,
Professor Päivi Hovi-Wasastejrna, Research Council for Culture and Society,
Professor Pertti Mattila, Research Council for Natural Sciences and Engineering,
Professor Pirkko Nuolijärvi, Board of the Academy of Finland,
Professor Karl Åkerman, Research Council for Biosciences and Environment
Expert members:
Professor Karl Mann, Central Institute of Mental Health, University of Heidelberg,
Professor Robin Room, Centre for Social Research on Alcohol and Drugs, Stockholm University

Steering group

January 12, 2007 – January 2010

Chair: Deputy Director General Matti Heikkilä, Research Council for Culture and Society,
First Vice-Chair: Assistant Director Astrid Eberhart, Institute of Neuroscience, Mental Health and Addiction, Canadian Institutes of Health Research,
Second Vice-Chair: Professor Anssi Auvinen, Research Council for Health,
Members:
Professor Katariina Salmela-Aro, Research Council for Culture and Society,
Advisor Kari Haavisto, Ministry of Social Affairs and Health,
Professor Pirkko Nuolijärvi, Board of the Academy of Finland,
Professor Karl Åkerman, Research Council for Biosciences and Environment

Expert members:
Professor Karl Mann, Central Institute of Mental Health, University of Heidelberg,
Professor Robin Room, Centre for Social Research on Alcohol and Drugs,
Stockholm University

January 2010 – 9 June 2010

Chair: Professor Anssi Auvinen, Research Council for Health
Vice-Chair: Assistant Director Astrid Eberhart, Institute of Neuroscience,
Mental Health and Addiction, Canadian Institutes of Health Research
Members:
Professor Pirkko Nuolijärvi, Board of the Academy of Finland
Professor Katariina Salmela-Aro, Research Council for Culture and Society
Professor Karl Åkerman, Research Council for Biosciences and Environment
Advisor Kari Haavisto, Ministry of Social Affairs and Health
Expert members:
Professor Karl Mann, Central Institute of Mental Health, University of Heidelberg
Professor Robin Room, Centre for Social Research on Alcohol and Drugs,
Stockholm University

9 June, 2010 – 31 December, 2011

Chair: Professor Matti Sintonen, Research Council for Culture and Society
Vice-Chair: Assistant Director Elisabeth Theriault, Institute of Neuroscience,
Mental Health and Addiction, Canadian Institutes of Health Research
Members:
Professor Jaakko Kaprio, Research Council for Health
Professor Jaana Bamford, Research Council for Biosciences and Environment
Advisor Kari Haavisto, Ministry of Social Affairs and Health
Expert members:
Professor Karl Mann, Central Institute of Mental Health, University of Heidelberg
Professor Robin Room, Centre for Social Research on Alcohol and Drugs,
Stockholm University

Appendix 8. Members of peer-review panel

Substance Use and Addictions Research Programme panel meeting, October 17–18, 2006

Chair

Professor Mats Berglund
Department of Drug and Alcohol Diseases
University Hospital MAS, Malmö, Sweden

Members

Professor Anders Bergmark
University of Stockholm

Nick Heather PhD
Emeritus Professor of Alcohol & Other Drug Studies

Professor Margaretha Järvinen
Department of Sociology, University of Copenhagen

Dr Hilary J. Little
Department of Addictive Behavior
Saint George's Hospital Medical School, London

Professor Börje Olsson
Centre for Social Research on Alcohol and Drugs, University of Stockholm

Professor Janice Froehlich
Scientific Co-Director of the Indiana Alcohol Research Center
Chancellor's Professor of Medicine
Indiana University School of Medicine
Interim Vice Chancellor for Research
Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis

Professor John Strang
National Addiction Centre, Institute of Psychiatry, King's College London

External experts

Professor Scott J. Leischow, Department of Family and Community Medicine
Deputy Director, Arizona Cancer Center, University of Arizona

Dr Sylvain Baillet
CNRS France

Appendix 9: Addiction Foresight report

The Addiction research programme organized an event at the Katajanokka Casino on 11 October 2011 to discuss the future of addiction research in Finland. The event was targeted for leading researchers, preventatives of research funding bodies, civil servants and policy makers. The event was attended by 37 participants and the keynote speech was given by the Minister of Health and Social Services MS. Maria Guzenina-Richardson. The starting point of the event and the main concern of the discussion was the future of addiction research when the fragmentation of the research continues and the competition for research grants gets harder in the same time when substance use is and its harms are increasing and when there is constantly more need and request for addiction research. Other topics of the event were the links between society and research, the link between research and the alcohol/drug/tobacco policy, the priority areas of research now and in the near future, the need for international cooperation and interdisciplinarity, and the perspectives of research funding. The event was moderated by the Addiction Programme Managers who drafted a written summary of the discussion. The following summary contains the main points of the discussion and it can be used for the final evaluation of the Addiction programme as well as when making decisions on addiction research and its funding in near future.

Report/Academy of Finland

Addiction Foresight – the future of addiction research in Finland

October 10, 2011, Katajanokka Casino, Helsinki

General discussion on the following topics

1. Research needs
2. International collaboration
3. The link between research and the alcohol/drug/tobacco policy
4. Prospects and needs of funding

1. Research needs:

a. Use of alcohol is usually linked to the use of other substances as well, yet this is practically a non-researched area. Tobacco, alcohol, and drugs should be considered more as an entity. Many users are multiple substance users and the use of one substance with its effects and mechanisms is difficult to distinguish from the other. New research in this area could significantly change our understanding of substance use.

b. Substance use among youth is a not well understood phenomenon. However, we know even less well the reasons behind sobriety. When sobriety of young people increased during the 90s this phenomenon was not tackled. No-one asked for its reasons and it did not generate any discussions, although the development was clearly visible and radical. Even today we do not know what the young people are doing when they do not drink or when they drink.

c. Research on the mechanisms of addictions needs more focus. We are still far from being able to predict addictions and to help patients prior to the outburst of the addiction. How can addictions be abolished when they have already developed? We must avoid the duplication of research and focus on research, which creates genuinely knew knowledge.
d. We need deeper understanding on the social mechanisms and representations of drinking.
e. The prevalence of fetal alcohol syndrome (FAS) in Finland is 500-600 cases a year. By improving the early diagnosis it could be possible to prevent the birth of children with mental retardation.
f. The road traffic mortality among the youth is high and it is often linked with substance use. It is important to research and discuss the means to decrease the injuries and mortality.
g. Addictive gambling should be researched in a broader context to understand the mechanisms generating the problem. We should aim at abolishing the border between basic research and applied research as well as the borders between different scientific disciplines.
h. Substance use must be examined together with the mental problems. The general databases should integrate these different and possibly interlinked aspects to same data sets.
i. In accidental deaths and injuries substances play an important role. Therefore we need a horizontal approach in resesarch.
j. Funding from ALKO and the Academy of Finland research programme have raised the visibility of the research into treatment. There are many young researchers in the field who are in the early stage of their career. This field would benefit from programmatic infrastructure.
k. Research into treatment and various forms of therapy generate a new, important topic of research. We need more client research and research of treatment systems.
l. There has been a good balance in Finland between societal and medical research.
m. Many areas such as the development of pharmaceutical treatments are very much depending on interdisciplinary approach. Finland could contribute here by combining behavioral sciences with social medicine.
n. The action plan of the Finnish government emphasizes an integrated approach into drug problem. Research should follow this line, for instance when it comes to the age limitations.
o. The perspective in the study of substance use should be broadened into cultural phenomena. The services are offered by the basic healthcare system. When mental health care work and substance use treatment are integrated it raises questions: how can it work when the cultures are so far from each other?

2. International collaboration:

a. The Nordic countries are natural partners for addiction research. There are strong networks, which should be utilized and supported.
b. Cooperation with Russian researchers should be maintained and developed. There have been difficulties but also good results have been achieved. High quality research is done for instance in St. Petersburg.
c. International cooperation should be an option in future research programmes but it should not be an absolute value.

d. International cooperation in research funding and international collaboration in research itself are two different things. International collaborative research should be supported. International funding cooperation demands a lot of administrative work, and there may be only few applications, which "have" to be funded then.
e. The impact of the international collaboration requested in the Academy's funding measures should be assessed. Is it truly beneficial? What is the objective of the international collaboration?
f. Many countries, like the USA, are mainly interested about such kind of top research and research areas, where they can learn from us, where we have strong expertise.
g. National collaboration is a challenge as such and it should be considered and developed, too. Coordination of research within a single university may be a challenge as such.
h. International collaboration is needed. Research and training programmes could arrange and support international collaboration schemes.

3. The link between research and the alcohol/drug/tobacco policy.

a. It would be worth studying, how research on substance use and addictions has been translated to socio-political and medical practices. Cohort studies should be developed to enable analyses recovering the relation between poverty and health problems, or poverty and substance use.
b. The alcohol act and the act on temperance work will be amended in the near future. It would be interesting to study, how lobbying by various interest groups will be conducted and perceived during the preparation process, and what kind of effects, if any, it might have on the final outcome. We will also need studies on the impact of these acts after their enforcement.

4. Funding prospects and needs

a. The funding scheme has been changing and reshaping recently. The biomedical alcohol research unit of ALKO (which is the state owned national monopoly) was moved to Stakes and KTL a couple of years ago. When the merging of Stakes and KTL took place in 2008 and THL was established, the biomedical alcohol research was transferred into universities. Part of the researchers could not find funding opportunities in the new landscape. Some became unemployed, and as the result of this, the research landscape has narrowed considerably.
b. Funding is not distributed equally or appropriately. In gambling research, for instance, the funding is more abundant than the research capacity is. In other areas, especially in those not directly linked to problem based gambling, funding is considerably more limited.
c. The ADDICTION Programme has been a unique endeavour, e.g. by enabling the training of young researchers into this specific research field. The big question is, how to ensure the research and career opportunities to these young researchers. Many young researchers have been forced to move to other areas of research or even to completely other types of jobs.
d. Due to poor funding prospects in Finland it has been easier to recruit foreign PhD students (than Finns) to the projects. The foreign researchers have better prospects to continue their work after returning to their home country or institute.

e. Academy could have an important role in designing the forthcoming EU funding schemes. There is an ERA-Net initiative on illicit drugs coordinated by Netherlands. The issue of substance use is becoming more and more topical at the European level as well.

f. It is desirable to have an active interaction and dialogue between the scientists and funders. We should aim at maintaining the existing, strong research networks and structures and identifying new, important topics of research.