

---

ISRHML – Family Larsson-Rosenquist Foundation

# **trainee expansion program**

---

## **Minute – Science Review Board**

<b>Meeting</b>		
<b>Date</b>	Monday, August 22, 2016	
<b>Members</b>	Nancy Krebs, Chair	Present
	Evette van Niekerk	Present
	Foteini Kakulas	Excused
	Kim Michaelsen	Present
	Teresa da Costa	Present
	Shannon Kelleher	Excused
	Nathan Nickel	Present
<b>Guests</b>	-	
<b>Secretary</b>	Kathrin Litwan	Present



**ISRHML**  
The International Society  
for Research in Human  
Milk and Lactation

FAMILY  
**LARSSON**  **ROSENQUIST**  
FOUNDATION  
dedicated to human milk

Agenda	
1.	Welcome
2.	Quorum
3.	Review of applications a) Trainee Bridge Fund (TBF) Applications b) Trainee Travel Fund (TTF) Applications
4.	Decisions a) Trainee Bridge Fund (TBF) Applications b) Trainee Travel Fund (TTF) Applications

Agenda topic		
N°	Topic	Status/Comment
1.	Welcome	Nancy Krebs, Chair of the Scientific Review Board (SRB), welcomes the members on the call and explains the procedure of the call. Kathrin Litwan as the Board's Secretary will write the minutes and will keep the time of the meeting.
2.	Quorum	As of Annex 4 in the Sponsorship Agreement for the Trainee Expansion Program (TEP) the SRB is quorate with 5 out of 7 members present. With 5 of the 7 SRB members present on the call (see above) the board is quorate.
3.	Decision taking	The members discuss the procedure to evaluate the eligible applications. It was unanimous voted that every board member will send his/her score to each applicant to Kathrin Litwan by mail latest by Tuesday, August 23, at 8am Swiss time. Kathrin Litwan will then calculate the average score for each application. The three TBF applications with the highest average scores will go to the Counsel Board. Further, the Board's member votes unanimously that all board member will send their scores for each TTF application per mail to Kathrin Litwan and that Kathrin Litwan will calculate the average score for each TTF application. It was voted unanimously by all Board members that members with conflict of interest will declare this and will not rate on the applications with conflict of interest.
4.	Review of applications	Hereinafter, every single application was presented: First by the primary reviewer followed by the secondary reviewer. In case the primary reviewer was not on the call, the secondary reviewer took over. Nancy Krebs reviewed the comments from missing reviewers. a) Trainee Bridge Fund <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alecia-Jane Twigger: As Shannon L. Kelleher is not on the call, secondary reviewer, Teresa da Costa, shortly present the project and strongly recommends to award Ms Twigger. The project was very well presented in the application and the reviewer could make themselves a good picture of the proposed project. Teresa da Costa pointed out the ambitious nature of the project but she points also out that in case only the first part is achieved that would be a great achievement for the field. The ambitious nature of the project was also commented by the primary reviewer in her comments to the evaluation. Teresa da Costa pointed out that the ambitious goal of the project will be mitigated by the high quality of the mentor and, therefore, Teresa da Costa is of the mind that the great ambition will not rise problems.</li> <li>Anne Williams: Primary reviewer, Nancy Krebs, presented the proposed project. Nancy Krebs sees Anne Williams as a strong applicant. Following concerns were risen by Nancy Krebs: it is not clear how that project will help the applicant to start an own career. Concerns about the bridging character of the proposed project were mentioned and budget concerns. The considerable amount of the total budget is planned to be spent on the salary of the applicant's mentor. As Foteini Kakulas as secondary reviewer is not on the phone Nancy Krebs mentioned the written comments. Teresa da Costa rose methodological concerns regarding the 24h recall.</li> <li>Bridget Young: Teresa da Costa as primary reviewer presents the project. Teresa da Costa is very enthusiastic about the project and thinks that it is a very promising project and scientifically sound. Nevertheless, Teresa da Costa rises concerns since the applicant will stay at the same institution Nevertheless, Teresa da Costa thinks that the funding would give the applicant the opportunity to start her career in the field of human milk and lactation.</li> <li>Chen Li: Kim F. Michaelsen as secondary reviewer gives a short review on the evaluation. Kim Michaelsen points out the interesting objectives of the proposed project The high quality of the mentor was pointed out as well. Following concerns were addressed: the applicant will not change institutions and does not possess a long publication list as he has only published one paper as first author. Further, Kim F. Michaelsen is concerned if the proposed study design will lead to a sufficient statistical power. Teresa da Costa raises the question if the fund would really boost the career of the applicant. Kim F. Michaelsen has the opinion that the proposed project does not have as high as a potential to start a really good career in the field of human milk and lactation as other projects do.</li> <li>John Varrone: Nathan Nickel as secondary reviewer presents the project in absence of the primary reviewer, Foteini Kakulas. Nathan Nickel states his concerns regarding the career path of the applicant as the applicant lays down</li> </ul>

		<p>to be interested in a career in the formula industry. He further mentions his concerns about the support letter from his PhD supervisor which was not really supporting rather stating that the applicant was in his research group as a PhD candidate. Nathan Nickel summarizes the application as a worthwhile science but with major concerns about the applicant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Marta Napierala:</b> This application was primary reviewed from external reviewer Christina Chambers from University of California, San Diego, due to her expertise. Christina Chambers scored the application with a “Very Good” (4). In her evaluation, Christina Chambers mentioned concerns regarding the chosen methodology, statistics, and the presented timelines. Evette van Niekerk as secondary reviewer presents the project and evaluation. She describes the project as a project worthwhile and interesting from a scientific point of view. The applicant has a strong publication record. Evette van Niekerk mentions that the application is not very well written which could be due to the fact that the applicant is not an English native speaker. Furthermore, the timeline and working steps as well as the objectives are not clearly described. Additional concerns are raised to the fact that funding is also allocated to the mentor’s salary. Applicant seems not as a very strong candidate for a strong career in the field of human milk and lactation</li> <li>• <b>Sara Moukrazel:</b> Primary reviewer, Nathan Nickel, presents the project. The application strongly presents the bridge nature of the fund. It is further pointed out that this kind of research in the field of human milk and lactation is strongly needed. Nathan Nickel misses clear description of the methodologies and raises concerns to the ambitious nature of the application and if it is in fact doable. Furthermore, Nathan Nickel has questions if the applicant is able to bridge the lacking experience from her former work (bench work) to the proposed work (education). But Nathan Nickel thinks that the chosen mentors are of high quality who will help the applicant to bridge. Nancy Krebs as secondary reviewer misses a kind of reality check done by the applicant. Nancy Krebs underlines the difficulties to change behaviors of physicians. Furthermore, Nancy Krebs highlights that the applicant has no record in the field of education in medical schools which may explain the felt naivety of how to change medical education. Further concerns are mentioned regarding the size of the project which is rather large and possible additional funding. Nevertheless, both reviewer think of the applicant as a person with high capabilities to take of in the field of human milk and lactation.</li> <li>• <b>Veronique Demers-Mathieu:</b> Evette van Niekerk as primary reviewer presents the project and the evaluation. Evette van Niekerk highlights the bridging nature of the application as the applicant will start a new area of research with this project. This is also supported by secondary reviewer, Kim F. Michaelsen. Evette van Niekerk is critical about the proposed timeline since it is not concurrent with the submitted working steps. Furthermore, Evette van Niekerk highlights the limited publication record and is concerned about the ability of the applicant to rise any further funding. Kim F. Michaelsen adds concerns about the missing background in the field of human milk and lactation. Furthermore, the applicant stays at the same institution as for the applicant’s PhD study. Nevertheless, the mentor seems good. Furthermore, Kim F. Michaelsen raises question about the strength of the hypothesis.</li> </ul> <p>b) Trainee Travel Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Kamilla Eriksen</b> will not be reviewed and discussed. The reason for his is an ineligible start date in the submitted application.</li> <li>• <b>Chenx Cai:</b> Evette van Niekerk as secondary reviewer presents the project. Evette van Niekerk points out the very good track record of the applicant. Evette van Niekerk expresses her concerns about the very ambitious timeline that was submitted. It is believed that it very hard to achieve the submitted objective in the given time of three months. Nevertheless, the chose Host Institution is very renowned and the supporting letter is very strong and supporting. Thus, the applicant is seen as strong and the study as worthwhile.</li> <li>• <b>Kimberly Lackey:</b> Evette van Niekerk as primary reviewer presents the project and the evaluation. The candidate has a strong record and is a PhD candidate. The applicant has chosen very well established researchers as supervisors. The proposal was well described and written. Both reviewer think that it is a worthwhile project.</li> </ul>
--	--	--



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Klara Strydom: Teresa da Costa as a primary reviewer presents the application. The proposal is well prepared. Kim F. Michaelsen points out the great possibility for the applicant to go to the Bode Lab which he feels should be supported. Both reviewer think of the project as worthwhile to support and that the applicant will profit by the funding a lot.</li><li>• Melanie Wange Larsson: Nathan Nickel as primary reviewer presents the project. The application gave a detailed training plan. The technique which is objective to the proposal is unique to the applicant in terms that it cannot be learned at the Home Institution. But it is also not unique to the chosen Host Institution as it can be learned elsewhere around the world. Nevertheless, Donna Geddes is seen as a supportive supervisor and the applicant will profit a lot by the learned technique which fits well to the applicant's PhD study. Furthermore, the applicant is described as an accomplished student. Nathan Nickel raised his concerns whether the outcomes are clearly measurable or not since the metrics seemed not as clear. In all, the applicant and the submitted application is seen as worthwhile to fund.</li></ul>
--	--	---

For the TEP Science Review Board:

Zug, 24 August 2016  
Place and Date



Kathrin Litwan  
TEP Coordinator

25- Aug- 2016  
Place and Date



Nancy Krebs  
Chairperson of the Scientific Review Board

---

ISRHML – Family Larsson-Rosenquist Foundation

# **trainee expansion program**

---

## **Decision Note – Science Review Board**

<b>Meeting</b>		
<b>Date</b>	Monday, August 22, 2016	
<b>Members</b>	Nancy Krebs, Chair	Present
	Evette van Niekerk	Present
	Foteini Kakulas	Excused
	Kim Michaelsen	Present
	Teresa da Costa	Present
	Shannon Kelleher	Excused
	Nathan Nickel	Present
<b>Secretary</b>	Kathrin Litwan	Present

Decisions are taken by circular resolution. All needed material was sent out by email on Wednesday, August 24, 2016.

The TEP Science Review Board decides on Thursday, August 25, 2016 the following:

Decisions taken		
N°	Topic	Decision
1.	Following applications will be sent to the Counsel Board: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) For the TBF:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Alecia-Jane Twigger</li> <li>ii. Bridget Young</li> <li>iii. Chen Li</li> </ul> </li> <li>b) For the TTF:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Kimberly Lackey</li> <li>ii. Klara Strydom</li> <li>iii. Melanie Wange Larrison</li> <li>iv. Chenxi Cai</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	The decision was taken unanimous by circular resolution without any abstentions.

For the TEP Science Review Board:

---

Place and Date

---

Place and Date

---

Nancy Krebs  
Chairman of the TEP Science Review Board

---

Yz  
Member of the TEP Science Review Board

## Annex 1: Email Circular Resolution



### SRB Circular Resolution

**Kathrin Litwan** to: Nancy Krebs, Van Niekerk, E, Dr  
<evettev@sun.ac.za>, Foteini  
Kakulas, Kim F. Michaelsen, Nathan  
Cc: "Lars Bode"

24.08.2016 11:37

Dear SRB members

Thank you for sending your scores on time. I have calculated the average scores for each application and you find this in the attachment. The list is ranked by final scoring with the top scores listed first.

To properly complete the process, the Scientific Review Board need to formally vote on the final list to be sent to the Counsel Board. As we did not do this in the SRB meeting this Monday, we have to do it by circular resolution.

Please confirm your agreement that the attachment properly lists finalists and that the respective applications should be advanced to the CB accordingly.

Please send your answer (Yes, I agree. / No, I disagree.) by email to me until this evening (5pm Swiss time). Please ensure to send in your vote as for the circular resolution as it is mandatory to have a vote from each member of the SRB.

Many thanks in advance for sending in your vote.

Kind regards,  
Kathrin



Summary Evaluations TEP 2016.pdf



## Annex 2: Summary Evaluations TEP 2016

TBF-Applicant	Nancy Krebs	Evette van Niekerk	Foteini Kakulas	Kim F Michaelsen	Teresa da Costa	Shannon L Kelleher	Nathan Nickel	Total	# of scores	Average	Proposal
<b>Alecia-Jane Twigger</b>	2		2 Col		3	2	2	2,5	13,5	3	<b>2,7 Sent to CB</b>
<b>Bridget Young</b>	Col		3 -		3		6	2,5	17,5	5	<b>3,5 Sent to CB</b>
<b>Chen Li</b>	4		4	3	5	3 -		3,5	22,5	6	<b>3,8 Sent to CB</b>
Anne Williams	4		6	6	4	4 -		4	28	6	4,7 Decline
Sara Moukrazel	5		6 -		5	4 -		3,5	23,5	5	4,7 Decline
Veronique Demers-Mathieu	5		6 -		5	5 -		5	26	5	5,2 Decline
John JP Varrone	5		6	4	5	7 -		5	32	6	5,3 Decline
Marta Napierala	5		6 -		5	6 -		5	27	5	5,4 Decline

TTF-Applicant	Nancy Krebs	Evette van Niekerk	Foteini Kakulas	Kim F Michaelsen	Teresa da Costa	Shannon L Kelleher	Nathan Nickel	Total	# of scores	Average	Proposal
<b>Kimberly Lackey</b>	2		2	2	2	3 -		2	13	6	<b>2,2 Sent to CB</b>
<b>Klara Strydom</b>	3 Col		-		4	3		2	12	4	<b>3,0 Sent to CB</b>
<b>Melanie Wange Larsson</b>	4		3 Col	Col		3	5	3	18	3	<b>3,6 Sent to CB</b>
<b>Chenxi Cai</b>	5		5 -		4	4	5	4	27	6	<b>4,5 Sent to CB</b>

Col: Conflict of Interest as declared by the board member



**ISRHML**  
The International Society  
for Research in Human  
Milk and Lactation

FAMILY  
**LARSSON**  **ROSENQUIST**  
FOUNDATION  
dedicated to human milk

### Annex 3: Votes to Circular Resolution



**Re: SRB Circular Resolution**  
**Foteini Kakulas** to: Kathrin Litwan

24.08.2016 11:47

Yes I agree.  
Regards  
Foteini

On 24 Aug 2016, at 5:37 pm, Kathrin Litwan <[kathrin.litwan@larsson-rosenquist.org](mailto:kathrin.litwan@larsson-rosenquist.org)> wrote:

Dear SRB members

**Thank you for sending your scores on time. I have calculated the average scores for each application and you find this in the attachment. The list is ranked by final scoring with the top scores listed first.**

**To properly complete the process, the Scientific Review Board need to formally vote on the final list to be sent to the Counsel Board. As we did not do this in the SRB meeting this Monday, we have to do it by circular resolution.**

**Please confirm your agreement that the attachment properly lists finalists and that the respective applications should be advanced to the CB accordingly.**

**Please send your answer (Yes, I agree. / No, I disagree.) by email to me until this evening (5pm Swiss time). Please ensure to send in your vote as for the circular resolution as it is mandatory to have a vote from each member of the SRB.**

**Many thanks in advance for sending in your vote.**

Kind regards,  
Kathrin

<Summary Evaluations TEP 2016.pdf>



**ISRHML**  
The International Society  
for Research in Human  
Milk and Lactation

FAMILY  
**LARSSON**  **ROSENQUIST**  
FOUNDATION  
dedicated to human milk



**Re: SRB Circular Resolution**  
**Krebs, Nancy** to: Kathrin Litwan

24.08.2016 13:47

Yes, I agree with the rankings as you have them.

Thanks.

Nancy

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone on the Verizon Wireless 4G LTE network.

**From:** Kathrin Litwan

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 24, 2016 4:37 AM

**To:** Krebs, Nancy; Van Niekerk, E, Dr <evettev@sun.ac.za>; Foteini Kakulas; Kim F. Michaelsen; Nathan Nickel; shannon kelleher; Teresa HM Da Costa

**Cc:** Lars Bode

**Subject:** SRB Circular Resolution

**Dear SRB members**

**Thank you for sending your scores on time. I have calculated the average scores for each application and you find this in the attachment. The list is ranked by final scoring with the top scores listed first.**

**To properly complete the process, the Scientific Review Board need to formally vote on the final list to be sent to the Counsel Board. As we did not do this in the SRB meeting this Monday, we have to do it by circular resolution.**

**Please confirm your agreement that the attachment properly lists finalists and that the respective applications should be advanced to the CB accordingly.**

**Please send your answer (Yes, I agree. / No, I disagree.) by email to me until this evening (5pm Swiss time). Please ensure to send in your vote as for the circular resolution as it is mandatory to have a vote from each member of the SRB.**

**Many thanks in advance for sending in your vote.**

Kind regards,  
Kathrin



**ISRHML**  
The International Society  
for Research in Human  
Milk and Lactation

FAMILY  
**LARSSON**  **ROSENQUIST**  
FOUNDATION  
dedicated to human milk



**Re: SRB Circular Resolution**

**Kim F. Michaelsen** to: Kathrin Litwan  
Nancy Krebs, Van Niekerk, E, Dr <evettev@sun.ac.za>,  
Cc: Fotini Kakulas, Nathan Nickel, shannon kelleher,  
Teresa HM Da Costa, Lars Bode

24.08.2016 14:04

Dear Kathrin and all  
Looks good. I hereby approve the list  
My only comment is that the conflicts of interest are not included. I had one with Melanie for the travel funding.  
Best regards  
Kim

Sendt fra min iPhone

Den 24. aug. 2016 kl. 11.37 skrev Kathrin Litwan <[kathrin.litwan@larsson-rosenquist.org](mailto:kathrin.litwan@larsson-rosenquist.org)>:

Dear SRB members

Thank you for sending your scores on time. I have calculated the average scores for each application and you find this in the attachment. The list is ranked by final scoring with the top scores listed first.

To properly complete the process, the Scientific Review Board need to formally vote on the final list to be sent to the Counsel Board. As we did not do this in the SRB meeting this Monday, we have to do it by circular resolution.

Please confirm your agreement that the attachment properly lists finalists and that the respective applications should be advanced to the CB accordingly.

Please send your answer (Yes, I agree. / No, I disagree.) by email to me until this evening (5pm Swiss time). Please ensure to send in your vote as for the circular resolution as it is mandatory to have a vote from each member of the SRB.

Many thanks in advance for sending in your vote.

Kind regards,  
Kathrin

<Summary Evaluations TEP 2016.pdf>



**RE: SRB Circular Resolution**

**Van Niekerk, E, Dr** to: Kim F. Michaelsen, Kathrin Litwan  
Cc: Nancy Krebs, Foteini Kakulas, Nathan Nickel, shannon kelleher, Teresa HM Da Costa, Lars Bode

24.08.2016 14:33

Dear Kathrin

Thank you for all your efforts. I agree with the proposed list and with Kim that the disclosures should be included.

I have a conflict of interest with Klara Strydom and did not score her.

Kind regards  
EveAe

**Evette van Niekerk, PhD**

*Lektor / Lecturer*



UNIVERSITEIT  
STELLENBOSCH  
UNIVERSITY

Afdeling Menslike Voeding / Division of Human Nutrition  
Fakulteit Geneeskunde en Gesondheidswetenskappe /  
Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences  
Universiteit Stellenbosch University  
Francie van Zijl Rykman / Drive, Tygerberg, Kaapstad / Cape Town  
Postbus / PO Box 241, Kaapstad / Cape Town; 8000  
Suid-Afrika / South Africa  
Tel: +27 21 938 9474; Faks / fax: +27 21 933 2991  
e-pos / e-mail: evettev@sun.ac.za

**From:** Kim F. Michaelsen [mailto:kfm@nss.ku.dk]

**Sent:** Wednesday, 24 August 2016 14:04

**To:** Kathrin Litwan

**Cc:** Nancy Krebs; Van Niekerk, E, Dr <evettev@sun.ac.za>; Foteini Kakulas; Nathan Nickel; shannon kelleher; Teresa HM Da Costa; Lars Bode

**Subject:** Re: SRB Circular Resolution

Dear Kathrin and all

Looks good. I hereby approve the list

My only comment is that the conflicts of interest are not included. I had one with Melanie for the travel finding.

Best regards

Kim

Sendt fra min iPhone

Den 24. aug. 2016 kl. 11.37 skrev Kathrin Litwan <[kathrin.litwan@larsson-rosenquist.org](mailto:kathrin.litwan@larsson-rosenquist.org)>:

Dear SRB members

Thank you for sending your scores on time. I have calculated the average scores for each application and you find this in the attachment. The list is ranked by final scoring with the top scores listed first.



**Re: SRB Circular Resolution**

**SHANNON L KELLEHER** to: Van Niekerk, E, Dr\ <evettev@sun.ac.za> 24.08.2016 15:14  
Cc: "Kim F. Michaelsen", Kathrin Litwan, Nancy Krebs, Foteini Kakulas, Nathan Nickel, Teresa HM Da Costa, Lars Bode

Dear Kathrin,  
Apologies for not being able to attend the meeting. I agree with the proposed list.  
Sincerely,  
Shannon

**From:** "Van Niekerk, E, Dr <evettev@sun.ac.za>" <evettev@sun.ac.za>  
**To:** "Kim F. Michaelsen" <kfm@nexs.ku.dk>, "Kathrin Litwan" <kathrin.litwan@larsson-rosenquist.org>  
**Cc:** "Nancy Krebs" <Nancy.Krebs@ucdenver.edu>, "Foteini Kakulas" <foteini.kakulas@uwa.edu.au>, "Nathan Nickel" <Nathan\_Nickel@cpe.umanitoba.ca>, "slk39" <slk39@psu.edu>, "Teresa HM Da Costa" <thmdacosta@gmail.com>, "Lars Bode" <lbode@ucsd.edu>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 24, 2016 8:33:14 AM  
**Subject:** RE: SRB Circular Resolution

Dear Kathrin

Thank you for all your efforts. I agree with the proposed list and with Kim that the disclosures should be included.

I have a conflict of interest with Klara Strydom and did not score her.

Kind regards  
EveAe

**Evette van Niekerk, PhD**

*Lektor/ Lecturer*



**UNIVERSITEIT  
STELLENBOSCH  
UNIVERSITY**

Afdeling Menslike Voeding/ Division of Human Nutrition  
Fakulteit Geneeskunde en Gesondheidswetenskappe /  
Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences  
Universiteit Stellenbosch University  
Franse van Zijl Rylaan / Drive, Tygerberg, Kaapstad / Cape Town  
Postbus / PO Box 291, Kaapstad / Cape Town; 8000  
Suid-Afrika / South Africa  
Tel: +27 21 938 9474; Faks / fax: +27 21 933-2991  
e-pos / e-mail: [evettev@sun.ac.za](mailto:evettev@sun.ac.za)

**From:** Kim F. Michaelsen [mailto:kfm@nexs.ku.dk]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 24 August 2016 14:04  
**To:** Kathrin Litwan  
**Cc:** Nancy Krebs; Van Niekerk, E, Dr <evettev@sun.ac.za>; Foteini Kakulas; Nathan Nickel; shannon kelleher; Teresa HM Da Costa; Lars Bode  
**Subject:** Re: SRB Circular Resolution



**ISRHML**  
The International Society  
for Research in Human  
Milk and Lactation

FAMILY  
**LARSSON**  **ROSENQUIST**  
FOUNDATION  
dedicated to human milk



**Re: SRB Circular Resolution**

**Teresa HM Da Costa** to: SHANNON L KELLEHER  
"Van Niekerk, E, Dr <[evettev@sun.ac.za](mailto:evettev@sun.ac.za)>", "Kim F.  
Michaelsen", Kathrin Litwan, Nancy Krebs, Foteini Kakulas,  
Nathan Nickel, Lars Bode

24.08.2016 18:01

Dear Kathrin and colleagues

Yes I agree with the final list prepared. As mentioned by Kim it should be identified the conflict of interest for each case

Regards

Teresa da Costa

*Prof Teresa H. M. da Costa, DPhil*

*Professor*

*University of Brasilia*

*Faculty of Health Sciences*

*Department of Nutrition*

*CEP: 70.910-900*

*Brasilia - DF*

*Brazil*

*Tel: +55-61-3107-0092/3107-1740*

*E-mail: [thmdacosta@gmail.com](mailto:thmdacosta@gmail.com), [hdacosta@umb.br](mailto:hdacosta@umb.br)*

2016-08-24 10:14 GMT-03:00 SHANNON L KELLEHER <[slk39@psu.edu](mailto:slk39@psu.edu)>:

Dear Kathrin,

Apologies for not being able to attend the meeting. I agree with the proposed list.

Sincerely,

Shannon

---

**From:** "Van Niekerk, E, Dr <[evettev@sun.ac.za](mailto:evettev@sun.ac.za)>" <[evettev@sun.ac.za](mailto:evettev@sun.ac.za)>

**To:** "Kim F. Michaelsen" <[kfm@nexs.ku.dk](mailto:kfm@nexs.ku.dk)>, "Kathrin Litwan" <[kathrin.litwan@larsson-rosenquist.org](mailto:kathrin.litwan@larsson-rosenquist.org)>

**Cc:** "Nancy Krebs" <[Nancy.Krebs@ucdenver.edu](mailto:Nancy.Krebs@ucdenver.edu)>, "Foteini Kakulas" <[foteini.kakulas@uwa.edu.au](mailto:foteini.kakulas@uwa.edu.au)>, "Nathan Nickel" <[Nathan\\_Nickel@cpe.umanitoba.ca](mailto:Nathan_Nickel@cpe.umanitoba.ca)>, "slk39" <[slk39@psu.edu](mailto:slk39@psu.edu)>, "Teresa HM Da Costa" <[thmdacosta@gmail.com](mailto:thmdacosta@gmail.com)>, "Lars Bode" <[lbode@ucsd.edu](mailto:lbode@ucsd.edu)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 24, 2016 8:33:14 AM

**Subject:** RE: SRB Circular Resolution

Dear Kathrin

Thank you for all your efforts. I agree with the proposed list and with Kim that the disclosures



**ISRHML**  
The International Society  
for Research in Human  
Milk and Lactation

FAMILY  
**LARSSON**  **ROSENQUIST**  
FOUNDATION  
dedicated to human milk



**Re: SRB Circular Resolution**

**Foteini Kakulas** to: Kathrin Litwan  
Nancy Krebs, "Van Niekerk, E, Dr <evettev@sun.ac.za>",  
Cc: "Kim F. Michaelsen" , Nathan Nickel, shannon kelleher,  
Teresa HM Da Costa, Lars Bode

24.08.2016 19:05

Dear Kathrin,  
I agree with the list.  
My conflicts of interest were Alecia Jane Twigger and Melanie Larsson.  
Kind regards,  
Foteini

On 24 Aug 2016, at 5:37 pm, Kathrin Litwan <[kathrin.litwan@larsson-rosenquist.org](mailto:kathrin.litwan@larsson-rosenquist.org)> wrote:

Dear SRB members

Thank you for sending your scores on time. I have calculated the average scores for each application and you find this in the attachment. The list is ranked by final scoring with the top scores listed first.

To properly complete the process, the Scientific Review Board need to formally vote on the final list to be sent to the Counsel Board. As we did not do this in the SRB meeting this Monday, we have to do it by circular resolution.

Please confirm your agreement that the attachment properly lists finalists and that the respective applications should be advanced to the CB accordingly.

Please send your answer (Yes, I agree. / No, I disagree.) by email to me until this evening (5pm Swiss time). Please ensure to send in your vote as for the circular resolution as it is mandatory to have a vote from each member of the SRB.

Many thanks in advance for sending in your vote.

Kind regards,  
Kathrin

<Summary Evaluations TEP 2016.pdf>



**ISRHML**  
The International Society  
for Research in Human  
Milk and Lactation

FAMILY  
**LARSSON**  **ROSENQUIST**  
FOUNDATION  
dedicated to human milk



**Re: URGENT Fw: SRB Circular Resolution**  
**Nathan Nickel** to: Kathrin Litwan

25.08.2016 16:19

Yes. I agree

**Nathan C. Nickel, MPH, PhD**  
Research Scientist, MCHP  
Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 25, 2016, at 2:55 PM, Kathrin Litwan <[kathrin.litwan@larsson-rosenquist.org](mailto:kathrin.litwan@larsson-rosenquist.org)> wrote:

Dear Nathan

Could you please send as soon as somehow possible your vote regarding the TEP applications?

Thank you in advance  
Kathrin

----- Forwarded by Kathrin Litwan/OLH on 25.08.2016 15:53 -----

From: Kathrin Litwan/OLH  
To: "Nancy Krebs" <[Nancy.Krebs@ucdenver.edu](mailto:Nancy.Krebs@ucdenver.edu)>, "Van Niekerk, E, Dr" <[evettev@sun.ac.za](mailto:evettev@sun.ac.za)>, "Foteini Kakulas" <[foteini.kakulas@rwa.edu.au](mailto:foteini.kakulas@rwa.edu.au)>, "Kim F. Michaelsen" <[kfm@nexs.ku.dk](mailto:kfm@nexs.ku.dk)>, "Nathan Nickel" <[Nathan.Nickel@rpe.umanitoba.ca](mailto:Nathan.Nickel@rpe.umanitoba.ca)>, "shannon kelleher" <[sk39@psu.edu](mailto:sk39@psu.edu)>, "Teresa HM Da Costa" <[thmdacosta@gmail.com](mailto:thmdacosta@gmail.com)>  
Cc: "Lars Bode" <[lbode@ucsd.edu](mailto:lbode@ucsd.edu)>  
Date: 24.08.2016 11:37  
Subject: SRB Circular Resolution

Dear SRB members

Thank you for sending your scores on time. I have calculated the average scores for each application and you find this in the attachment. The list is ranked by final scoring with the top scores listed first.

To properly complete the process, the Scientific Review Board need to formally vote on the final list to be sent to the Counsel Board. As we did not do this in the SRB meeting this Monday, we have to do it by circular resolution.

Please confirm your agreement that the attachment properly lists finalists and that the respective applications should be advanced to the CB accordingly.