

Guidelines for the Danish Diabetes and Endocrine Academy's fellowship programme

This document includes information about the Danish Diabetes and Endocrine Academy's (DDEA) fellowship programme:

- [DDEA fellowship programme](#)
- [Calls for applications](#)
- [Review process](#)

DDEA fellowship programme

The DDEA fellowship programme in diabetes and endocrinology covers three grant schemes: PhD scholarships; postdoctoral fellowships; and visiting researcher grants. **Table 1** below shows the different grant types within the fellowship programme; the total number of grants offered in 2024; and the total number of grants during 2023-2027.

Table 1. DDEA fellowships 2023-2027

Grant schemes	2024	Total (2023-2027)
PhD scholarships (2/3 financed) (DKK 1.1 million each) with no specific themes	7	29
PhD scholarships (2/3 financed) DKK 1.1 million each) with specific themes	4	10
PhD scholarships with co-financing from industry (1/3 co-financed) (DKK 550,000 each)	4	13
Cross-academy PhD scholarships (1/3 co-financed) (DKK 550,000 each)	8	11
Strategic partnership PhD scholarships (1/3 co-financed) (DKK 550,000 each)	3	7
Postdoctoral fellowships (two-year) (DKK 1.2 million each) with no specific themes	7	29
Postdoctoral fellowships (two-year) (DKK 1.2 million each) with specific themes	3	10
Postdoctoral fellowships (two-year) with co-funding from industry (1/2 co-financed) (DKK 600,000 each)	4	12
Strategic partnership postdoctoral fellowships (DKK 600,000 each)	3	7
Visiting researcher grants (max. DKK 400,000 each)	6	25
TOTAL	49	153

Calls for applications

For the DDEA fellowship programme, DDEA will have annual calls. All calls will be in open and free competition, and the majority will be without a specific theme or without being directed at a specific disease group.


The calls will be posted through the DDEA’s communication channels (in particular social media and newsletters), the websites of the Danish Endocrine Society and the Society for Young Endocrinologists, national and international job portals, including the Danish universities, direct mail to national and international collaborators and partners and direct communication at international conferences or DDEA activities.

Interested applicants can apply for the grants through the [DDEA website](#), where the application process and candidate eligibility are described in detail. Applicants must have a user login to the DDEA website in order to be able to submit an application.

Review process

All applications for PhD scholarships, postdoctoral fellowships and visiting researcher grants will be assessed according to the review process (**Figure 1**) and evaluation criteria, as set out by the Board of Directors (see **Appendix 1**). Grant calls and award allocations will be annual starting in June. The timeline for 2024 can be seen in **Appendix 2**.

Figure 1. Example of DDEA award and review process



Parties involved in the review process and their responsibilities

The review process is managed by the *DDEA Secretariat*.

Applications will undergo external international review by the *DDEA Grant Review Committee*. This committee constitutes a pool of reviewers and consists of a number of internationally renowned and dedicated scientific experts of the highest international calibre. A list of members and terms of references of the Grant Review Committee are available at the [DDEA website](#). The Grant Review Committee will perform an objective, professional and comprehensive peer review of applications for all three grant schemes.

A chair will be appointed for each type of grant. The *chairs of the Grant Review Committee* will make a final evaluation of all applications (for each grant type) and recommend eligible applications to the Board of Directors.

For the cross-academy PhD scholarships, the *co-financing academy* (Danish Cardiovascular Academy (DCA) or Danish Data Science Academy (DDSA)) will appoint *reviewers* or a *representative* to review and approve the recommended (top-ranked) applications. If the applications are at first reviewed by reviewers appointed by the co-financing academy (and not DDEA), DDEA will forward the applications recommended by the co-financing academy to the respective *chair of the Grant Review Committee* for approval and final recommendation to the Board of Directors.

Finally, the *DDEA Board of Directors* will make the final decision as to which applications will receive funding. The final decision of awardees made by the Board of Directors is final and cannot be appealed.

Review process

The DDEA review process is described below.

The review process is anonymous. Applicants will receive the reviewers' overall assessments of their application (excluding their scores). Also, reviewers will not see each other's scores. Reviewers are requested to treat all aspects of the review as strictly confidential.

Administrative check and selection of assessors

The Secretariat will conduct a pre-screening of all applications received for completeness and eligibility (administrative check). Incomplete applications or applications not meeting the DDEA requirements for grants (as stated in the call for applications) will be rejected without further review. All other applications will be assessed by the Grant Review Committee, as described below.

Review by the Grant Review Committee

For the review, the Secretariat will select appropriate reviewers among the members of the Grant Review Committee. The Secretariat will match reviewers and applications according to scientific topics and keywords related to the applicants' research fields, as described in their applications.

The reviewers will be asked to report any conflicts of interest (personal or professional (e.g. joint publications or close collaboration regarding the specific project of the applicant within the past 5 years)). In case of conflicts of interest, the reviewers will not review the application(s), and another reviewer will be assigned to the application in question.

Each application will be assessed by three individual reviewers. Each reviewer will assess a maximum of 10 applications.

The reviewers will use the DDEA web-based electronic system when submitting their reviews.

Each reviewer must provide a complete review of each application according to the evaluation criteria (see **Appendix 1**). This includes scoring each of the evaluation criteria, providing an overall impact score of the application and describing strengths and weaknesses for each criterion and overall.

When the reviewers have submitted their reviews, an average of the individual scores of each of the scores (of each review) will be calculated (*total score*). Subsequently, a *total average score* of the *total scores* of each review will be calculated for each application. All applications with a *total average score* below 3.0 will be discarded.

Recommendations to the Board of Directors by the chairs of the Grant Review Committee

Based on the *total* scores and the reviewers' comments, the chairs of the Grant Review Committee will make a final evaluation of all applications with a *total average score* of 3.0 or higher and recommend eligible applications to the Board of Directors.

The chairs will have access to the applications and the reviewers' reviews of the applications, ranked according to the calculated *total average score* of each application. In case of identical *total average scores* of two or more applications, the chairs will be asked to consider the *overall impact score* given by each of the three reviewers and rank the applications accordingly.

The chairs will include a summary of the assessments made by the reviewers and a prioritised list of the applications in their final recommendation.

The chairs must recommend twice as many candidates for each grant scheme than the number of grants available, according to **Table 2** below (example for 2023 2nd round).

Table 2. Example of recommendation of grant applications to the Board of Directors, 1st round 2023

Grant schemes	Number of grants available 2023 2 nd round	Number of applications to be recommended by the chairs to the Board of Directors – 2023 2 nd round
PhD scholarships (2/3 financed) (DKK 1.1 million each) with no specific themes	3	6
PhD scholarships with co-financing from industry (1/3 co-financed) (DKK 550,000 each)	2	4
Postdoctoral fellowships (two-year) (DKK 1.2 million each) with no specific themes	3	6
Postdoctoral fellowships with specific themes	5	10
Postdoctoral fellowships (two-year) with co-funding from industry (1/2 co-financed) (DKK 600,000 each)	2	4
Visiting researcher grants (max. DKK 400,000 each)	4	8

The chairs will be asked to report any conflicts of interest concerning the applications that they receive for final evaluation when returning their final recommendations to the Secretariat.

Cross-academy PhD scholarships

For the DDEA/DCA cross-academy PhD scholarships, the Secretariat will forward the final recommendation of the chairs to an appointed representative of DCA for approval or comments before final decision by the DDEA Board of Directors.

For the DDEA/DDSA cross-academy PhD scholarships, the Secretariat will forward the top-10 ranked applications (without ranking, reviewer comments or scores) to DDSA for review. DDSA will recommend five applications for receiving a grant. If no disagreement between DDSA and DDEA ranking, the DDEA Board of Directors will make the final decision based on the recommendations from DDSA. If disagreement between

DDSA and DDEA ranking, the respective chair of the DDEA Grant Review Committee will make a final review of the applications and make a final recommendation together with DDSA for final decision by the DDEA Board of Directors.

Decision of awardees by the Board of Directors

The Secretariat will forward the final recommendation (including any comments to the recommendation of the cross-academy PhD scholarships) to the Board of Directors, which will have access to all the applications and the reviewers' evaluations (scores and comments).

During a Board meeting, the Board of Directors will make the final decision as to which applications will receive funding based on the recommendations made by the Grant Review Committee.

A videoconference between each chair and the Board of Directors will be arranged in connection with the Board meeting to discuss the final recommendation. For the cross-academy PhD scholarships, a videoconference will also be arranged with the appointed representative of the co-financing academy, if the representative has made any comments to the final recommendation of the chairs.

In case of conflicts of interest by one of the members of the Board of Directors, the member in question will abstain from participating in the final decision-making. See the guidelines on conflicts of interest for the DDEA Board of Directors in respect to allocation of DDEA grants at the [DDEA website](#).

Award notification and rejection of applications

Based on the decision made by the Board of Directors, the Secretariat will finalise the process.

For all rejected applications, a rejection letter will be sent. The letter will include the reviewers' comments.

For all accepted applications, a grant notification letter containing relevant information about the grant will be sent. The letter will also include the reviewers' comments.

Evaluation criteria for the Danish Diabetes and Endocrine Academy's fellowship programme

This document includes evaluation criteria for the Danish Diabetes and Endocrine Academy's (DDEA) fellowship programme:

- [PhD scholarships](#)
- [Postdoctoral Fellowships](#)
- [Clinical Postdoctoral Fellowships](#)
- [Visiting Researcher Grants](#)

The evaluation criteria are applicable for all grant schemes within the DDEA fellowship programme.

Introduction

Each reviewer must provide a complete review of each application assigned to her/him according to the four evaluation criteria: 1) the applicant; 2) the project; 3) the research environment; and 4) the three DDEA funding focus areas (*not for clinical postdoctoral fellowships, [see below](#)*); and 5) overall.

The reviewers must give separate scores for each of the four evaluation criteria (applicant, project, research environment and the DDEA funding focus areas, see below) and an overall impact score on a scale from 1 to 5 (5 being highest), as shown in the table below. The reviewers must also describe strengths and weaknesses for each criterion and overall.

Score	Descriptor
5	Excellent
4	Very good
3	Good
2	Satisfactory
1	Unsatisfactory

Note: Applications are submitted by candidates from different fields of research (e.g. clinical research, basal research, epidemiology), and medical candidates may apply for part-time clinical positions allocating time to research and time to clinical work/specialisation simultaneously. The evaluation of the applications should therefore take into consideration the different backgrounds of the candidate (e.g. the applicant's prior research experience may vary for clinical researchers in particular), the position applied for and the nature of the project described in the application.

In particular, please note the specific evaluation criteria for [clinical postdoctoral fellowships](#) (2nd round 2023).

Evaluation criteria for PhD scholarships

The following evaluation criteria are applicable for the following DDEA PhD scholarships: 2/3-financed (with and without specific themes); PhD scholarships with co-financing from industry; cross-academy PhD scholarships; Strategic partnership PhD scholarships.

1: Applicant

The ideal candidate has relevant research experience from her/his master studies including the following:

- Publication (accepted or published) of research results in peer-reviewed journals (in relation to the candidate's research area and years of experience with diabetes or other endocrine research)
- Participation in national or international conferences and research meetings
- Exposure to an international research environment (locally and/or through a research stay abroad)
- Demonstrated technical or clinical skills with relevance to the PhD project.

Furthermore, the ideal candidate expresses high motivation and commitment, has received high grades during her/his Master's studies and has followed extracurricular activities or obtained other relevant qualifications improving her/his skills with relevance to the PhD project.

2: Project: PhD plan, scientific quality, approach and innovation

The ideal project plan includes a well-reasoned description of the overall strategy, methodology and analyses. The strategy should be appropriate for accomplishing the specific aims of the project and should ensure a robust and unbiased approach.

Furthermore, the project plan should challenge, seek to shift or improve current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilising up-to-date theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation or interventions.

Finally, the project plan should have sufficient scientific weight and research training for the PhD study and should describe any potential problems, alternative strategies and milestones for success.

3: Research environment: Investigator(s), supervisors and collaborators

The ideal research environment includes supervisors and collaborators that have demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s) (recent publications, international standing).

The supervisors and collaborators have complementary and integrated expertise (i.e. affiliation of collaborators from other research disciplines (e.g. basic science, clinical science, epidemiology, psychology), from abroad or from other sectors).

The supervisors and collaborators can sufficiently contribute to the completion of the PhD study (experience with supervision of PhD students) and offer a substantially international network for the applicant.

The leadership approach and governance and organisational structure of the involved PhD student, supervisors and collaborators are appropriate and transparent.

4: DDEA funding focus areas: Internationalisation, interdisciplinarity and collaboration across sectors

The DDEA grants must promote the three funding focus areas of the DDEA: 1) internationalisation; 2) interdisciplinarity; and 3) collaboration across sectors.

The ideal application includes at least one of the three funding focus areas, as described below.

1. **Internationalisation:** The application includes affiliation of collaborators from abroad and/or a planned research stay abroad during the PhD study (<six months) (accepted by the host).
2. **Interdisciplinarity:** The application includes affiliation of collaborators from other research disciplines (e.g. basic science, clinical science, epidemiology, psychology) (mandatory) with a clear description of how the synergy of research disciplines contributes to achieving the research goals of the project. The application describes a planned change of research/work environment (<six months) (accepted by the host).
3. **Collaboration across sectors:** The application includes affiliation of collaborators from other sectors e.g. industry, general practice, university hospitals or formalised agreements with collaborators from other sectors. The application describes a planned change of research/work environment (<six months) (accepted by the host).

Collaborations can be documented by collaboration agreements or an e-mail from the collaborators describing the nature of the collaboration, including e.g. joint publications based on affiliation and educational background of authors, joint and funded applications, patent applications or spin-off companies.

5: Overall impact

The overall impact score should reflect the reviewer's overall assessment of the application in consideration of the four scored evaluation criteria, including strengths and weakness of the application overall.

However, this score does not need to be an average score of the four other scores, as a total average score of all five scores will be calculated automatically (*total average score*).

An application does not need to be strong in all four evaluation criteria to be judged likely to have major scientific impact. For example, a project that by its nature is not innovative may be essential to advance a field.

Evaluation criteria for postdoctoral fellowships

The following evaluation criteria are applicable for the following DDEA Postdoctoral Fellowships: Two-year Postdoctoral Fellowships without specific themes; Postdoctoral Fellowships with co-financing from industry; Strategic partnership Postdoctoral Fellowships.

1: Applicant

The ideal candidate has relevant research experience from her/his PhD studies or from previous postdoc studies including:

- Publication (accepted or published) of research results in peer-reviewed journals, including publication in high impact journals and first authorships (in relation to the candidate's research area and years of experience with diabetes or other endocrine research)
- Oral and poster presentations at important and relevant national or international conferences
- Assessment and review activities
- External funding record and receipt of awards
- Demonstrated technical or clinical skills with relevance to the postdoc project
- Research stay abroad
- Research stay in another institution and/or demonstrated mobility from PhD study to postdoc studies, i.e. the applicant carries out her/his postdoc studies in another institution than the institution where the applicant carried out her/his PhD studies.

Furthermore, the ideal candidate has shown progress in her/his academic career path, expresses high motivation and commitment, has received high grades during her/his PhD studies and has followed extracurricular activities or obtained other relevant qualifications improving her/his skills with relevance to the postdoc project.

2: Project: Scientific quality, approach and innovation

The ideal project plan includes a well-reasoned description of the overall strategy, methodology and analyses. The strategy should be appropriate for accomplishing the specific aims of the project and should ensure a robust and unbiased approach.

Furthermore, the project plan should challenge, seek to shift or improve current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilising up-to-date theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation or interventions.

Finally, the project plan should describe any potential problems, alternative strategies and milestones for success.

3: Research environment: Investigator(s) and collaborators

The ideal research environment includes supervisors and collaborators that have demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s) (recent publications, international standing).

The supervisors and collaborators have complementary and integrated expertise (i.e. affiliation of collaborators from other research disciplines (e.g. basic science, clinical science, epidemiology, psychology), from abroad or from other sectors) and they offer a substantially international network for the applicant.

The leadership approach and governance and organisational structure of the involved postdoc fellow, supervisors and collaborators are appropriate and transparent.

Finally, the ideal research environment offers a clear plan for career development for the postdoc fellow.

4: DDEA funding focus areas: Internationalisation, interdisciplinarity and collaboration across sectors

The DDEA grants must promote the three funding focus areas of the DDEA: 1) internationalisation; 2) interdisciplinarity; and 3) collaboration across sectors.

The ideal application includes at least one of the three funding focus areas, as described below.

In particular, a planned research stay abroad or in another institution of <six months should be prioritised.

1. **Internationalisation:** The application includes affiliation of collaborators from abroad and/or a planned research stay abroad during the postdoc study (<six months) (accepted by the host).
2. **Interdisciplinarity:** The application includes affiliation of collaborators from other research disciplines (e.g. basic science, clinical science, epidemiology, psychology) with a clear description of how the synergy of research disciplines contributes to achieving the goals of the project. The application describes a planned change of research/work environment at another institution (<six months) (accepted by the host).
3. **Collaboration across sectors:** The application includes affiliation of collaborators from other sectors e.g. industry, general practice, university hospitals or formalised agreements with collaborators from other sectors. The application describes a planned change of research/work environment in other sectors (<six months) (accepted by the host).

Collaborations can be documented by collaboration agreements or an e-mail from the collaborators describing the nature of the collaboration, including e.g. joint publications based on affiliation and educational background of authors, joint and funded applications, patent applications or spin-off companies.

5: Overall impact

The overall impact score should reflect the reviewer's overall assessment of the application in consideration of the four scored evaluation criteria, including strengths and weakness of the application overall.

However, this score does not need to be an average score of the four other scores, as a total average score of all five scores will be calculated automatically (*total average score*).

An application does not need to be strong in all four evaluation criteria to be judged likely to have major scientific impact. For example, a project that by its nature is not innovative may be essential to advance a field.

Evaluation criteria for clinical postdoctoral fellowships

The following evaluation criteria are applicable for the DDEA Clinical Postdoctoral Fellowships.

The criteria are the same as for other postdoctoral fellowships (as described above), but criteria no 4 (DDEA funding focus areas) should not be considered for this grant scheme.

1: Applicant

The ideal candidate has relevant research experience from her/his PhD studies or from previous postdoc studies including:

- Publication (accepted or published) of research results in peer-reviewed journals, including publication in high impact journals and first authorships (in relation to the candidate's research area and years of experience with diabetes or other endocrine research)
- Oral and poster presentations at important and relevant national or international conferences
- Assessment and review activities
- External funding record and receipt of awards
- Demonstrated technical or clinical skills with relevance to the postdoc project
- Research stay abroad
- Research stay in another institution and/or demonstrated mobility from PhD study to postdoc studies, i.e. the applicant carries out her/his postdoc studies in another institution than the institution where the applicant carried out her/his PhD studies.

Furthermore, the ideal candidate has shown progress in her/his academic career path, expresses high motivation and commitment, has received high grades during her/his PhD studies and has followed extracurricular activities or obtained other relevant qualifications improving her/his skills with relevance to the postdoc project.

2: Project: Scientific quality, approach and innovation

The ideal project plan includes a well-reasoned description of the overall strategy, methodology and analyses. The strategy should be appropriate for accomplishing the specific aims of the project and should ensure a robust and unbiased approach.

Furthermore, the project plan should challenge, seek to shift or improve current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilising up-to-date theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation or interventions.

Finally, the project plan should describe any potential problems, alternative strategies and milestones for success.

The project plan and time schedule must take into account that the project time is only 20% for two years and that the project can be carried out within this timeframe.

3: Research environment: Investigator(s) and collaborators

The ideal research environment includes supervisors and collaborators that have demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s) (recent publications, international standing).

The supervisors and collaborators have complementary and integrated expertise (i.e. affiliation of collaborators from other research disciplines (e.g. basic science, clinical science, epidemiology, psychology), from abroad or from other sectors) and they offer a substantially international network for the applicant.

The leadership approach and governance and organisational structure of the involved postdoc fellow, supervisors and collaborators are appropriate and transparent.

Finally, the ideal research environment offers a clear plan for career development for the postdoc fellow.

4: *Not relevant for this grant scheme.*

5: Overall impact

The overall impact score should reflect the reviewer's overall assessment of the application in consideration of the three scored evaluation criteria (1-3), including strengths and weakness of the application overall.

However, this score does not need to be an average score of the three other scores, as a total average score of all four (1-3, 5) scores will be calculated automatically (*total average score*).

An application does not need to be strong in all three evaluation criteria to be judged likely to have major scientific impact. For example, a project that by its nature is not innovative may be essential to advance a field.

Evaluation criteria for Visiting Researcher Grants

The following evaluation criteria are applicable for all DDEA Visiting Researcher Grants.

1: Applicant

The ideal candidate has relevant research experience including:

- Publication (accepted or published) of research results in peer-reviewed journals, including publication in high impact journals and first/last authorships (in relation to the candidate's research area and years of experience with diabetes or other endocrine research)
- Oral and poster presentations at important and relevant conferences
- Assessment and review activities
- External funding record and receipt of large awards
- Demonstrated mobility including research stay abroad and/or other visiting researcher stays abroad with relevant outputs.

Furthermore, the ideal candidate has shown progress in her/his academic career path.

2: Project: Scientific quality, approach and innovation

The ideal project plan includes a well-reasoned description of the overall strategy, methodology and analyses. The strategy should be appropriate for accomplishing the specific aims of the project and should ensure a robust and unbiased approach.

Furthermore, the project plan should describe any potential problems, alternative strategies and milestones for success, and the project plan should challenge, seek to shift or improve current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilising up-to-date theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation or interventions.

Finally, the project plan includes a description of the extent to which the visit will strengthen the scientific research capacity in Denmark.

3: Research environment: Investigator(s), supervisors and collaborators

The ideal research environment at the host institution includes a principal investigator and collaborators that have demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s) (recent publications, international standing).

The host principal investigator and collaborators have complementary and integrated expertise (i.e. affiliation of collaborators from other research disciplines (e.g. basic science, clinical science, epidemiology, psychology), from abroad or from other sectors).

The leadership approach and governance and organisational structure of the involved visiting researcher, principal investigators and collaborators are appropriate and transparent.

4: DDEA funding focus areas: Internationalisation, interdisciplinarity and collaboration across sectors

The DDEA grants must promote the three funding focus areas of the DDEA: 1) internationalisation; 2) interdisciplinarity; and 3) collaboration across sectors.

The ideal application includes at least one of the three funding focus areas, as described below.

1. **Internationalisation:** The application contributes to knowledge exchange between the host institution and the applicant's home institution, i.e. agreements of change of research environment for PhD students or postdoctoral students, joint publications, joint applications for funding.
2. **Interdisciplinarity:** The application includes affiliation of collaborators from other research disciplines (e.g. basic science, clinical science, epidemiology, psychology) with a clear description of how the synergy of research disciplines contributes to achieving the goals of the project.
3. **Collaboration across sectors:** The application includes affiliation of collaborators from other sectors e.g. industry, general practice, university hospitals or formalised agreements with collaborators from other sectors.

Collaborations can be documented by collaboration agreements or an e-mail from the collaborators describing the nature of the collaboration, including e.g. joint publications based on affiliation and educational background of authors, joint and funded applications, patent applications or spin-off companies.

5: Overall impact

The overall impact score should reflect the reviewer's overall assessment of the application in consideration of the four scored evaluation criteria, including strengths and weakness of the application overall.

However, this score does not need to be an average score of the four other scores, as a total average score of all five scores will be calculated automatically (*total average score*).

An application does not need to be strong in all four evaluation criteria to be judged likely to have major scientific impact. For example, a project that by its nature is not innovative may be essential to advance a field.

The Danish Diabetes and Endocrine Academy review process and timeline 2024 for the DDEA fellowship programme

Call	Deadline for application	Review: Receipt of applications by selected reviewers	Review: Submission of review by reviewers	Final review: Receipt of applications for review by DDSA* reviewers	Final review: Submission of recommendation by DDSA* and DCA** reviewers	Final review: Receipt of applications by chairs	Final review: Submission of final review by chairs	Final decision Board of Directors	Replies to applicants
5 October 2023***	7 February 2024	22 February 2024	20 March 2024	5 April 2024	22 April 2024	23 April 2024	26 April 2024	3 June (receipt BoD 27 May)	7 June
End of June (week 26)	11 September	26 September	21 October	NR	NR	31 October	21 November	5 December (receipt BoD 28 November)	11 December

* DDSA = Danish Data Science Academy (only applicable for DDEA/DSAA Cross-Academy PhD Scholarships)

** DCA = Danish Cardiovascular Academy (only applicable for DDEA/DCA Cross-Academy PhD Scholarships)

*** Only Cross-Academy PhD scholarships