



Statement from the Director on the Final Report of the Evaluation of research and professional activity of the Institute of Physiology CAS for the period 2015–2019

We were encouraged by the way the Commissions No. 08 – *Medical and Health Sciences* and No. 05.2 – *Biological Sciences* assessed the Institute of Physiology as a whole, because the outcome was highly positive. We especially welcome the opinion of the Commissions that: *“A strength of the Institute of Physiology is its research program, which clearly addresses topics that are relevant for healthcare, e.g. in cardiovascular medicine, neurophysiology, and metabolic diseases. Most importantly, the institute has started to interact with medical disciplines and clinical research, and it is in an ideal position to enhance these interactions. In that regard, the commission appreciates the particular effort of the institute to attract medical students, which will be helpful to strengthen ties with the medical faculty.”* This statement represents a great support of our systematic efforts in the field of biomedical research. We are also satisfied with the evaluation of most of the 21 research teams of the Institute. We agree with most of the evaluation’s comments. We appreciate that a majority of the conflicting issues was solved based on our explanatory remarks following the evaluation.

Within the limited time available, and especially without a possibility of an onsite visitation due to the covid-19 pandemic, it was difficult to get in-depth knowledge of the local conditions. This probably explains why the evaluation of some teams was in part superficial. We will not comment on several minor disagreements and errors, except for the conflicting issue regarding the Team #21, the Laboratory of Developmental Cardiology. Its criticism concerned: 1) the continuation of conventional line of research by the new leadership and the absence of future research plan; and 2) the lack of human research. We found this two statements problematic, based on ad 1) the initiation of new directions of research by the new leader (J. Neckar), documented by his publications; and ad 2) the fact that the group is engaged primarily in basic research should not be considered a major weakness regarding the overall strategy of the institute, and existing new collaborations with the clinicians that were mentioned in the team's presentation. Therefore, we do not agree with the overall assessment and recommendation to reduce support of the team.

I would like to thank sincerely all the members of both Commissions for their demanding work and all their efforts. We are convinced that the evaluation will provide an important new impetus for the team leaders and help them to further improve their research efforts. It is valuable indeed for the leadership of the whole institute. I hereby declare that the course of Phase II of the Evaluation was consistent with the Methodology of the Evaluation.

Prague, 29 June 2021

Jan Kopecký, MD., DSc.
Director of the Institute of Physiology CAS