



Collaboration with SME's from Academia point of view

Matti Nykter, Professor of Bioinformatics

Prostate Cancer Research Center

Faculty of Medicine and Health Technology, Tampere University

Academy of Finland Center of Excellence in Tumor Genetics research

matti.nykter@tuni.fi

Collaboration with SME's

- Access to specific pre-existing expertise – SMEs typically with narrow focus
- Understanding practical, real-world problems (from different fields)
- Opportunities for students for working on industry challenges and developing practical skills
- Dissemination of new information and innovation
- New perspectives and ways of working

Successful collaboration

- Should be based on small focused projects addressing specific problems
- Clear roles and responsibilities for respective members involved in the projects
 - Clear resource (funding) allocations
- Regular meetings and consistent communication
 - Dedicated contact persons
- The collaboration must be structured to provide clear value to both parties
 - e.g. new solutions, research insights, training opportunities.

Challenges

- Universities and SMEs have different organizational cultures
 - Agile vs institutional, legislation regarding public institutions, etc
- Resource Limitations
 - Universities work based on external funding
- Incompatible Perspectives
 - Differences in viewpoints and objectives.

(Own) Success stories

- Solutions for future of diagnostics
 - Predictions how the emerging measurement methods can be adapted to clinical use and their implications to data representation – PoC
 - Incorporation of AI
- Testing new drug molecules using patient derived models developed in house
- Application of in house developed assays for characterization of samples from clinical trials
- Gaining expertise for real world data processing
- Development of validated data analysis pipelines

Good practices

- The Marie Skłodowska-Curie Doctoral networks
 - Provides 3 year of funding for doctoral student (+ overhead), companies in high demand
 - Can be implemented collaboratively, e.g. company joins network, student enrolls to TAU doctoral program
- EU consortium projects more bureaucratic but equally beneficial
- Sharing of expertise (and personel / manpower) between university and companies
- Succesfull collaborations are based on decades long joint history -> development of trust and identification of joint interest are a necessity
 - Long term collboration pays off more than individual project development
 - e.g. single BF project most often mutually useless; but can be beneficial long term (“good will building”)
 - Regulations and lawyers will very likely stall all collaboration with out trust and good will.

Acknowledgements



Computational Biology group, TAU

Sinja Taavitsainen
Ebrahim Afyounian
Francesco Tabaro
Tuomo Virtanen
Tomi Häkkinen
Alessandro Lussana
Joonas Uusi-Mäkelä
Mikael Marttinen
Heini Kallio
Antti Kiviaho

Matti Annala
Reko Salonen
Anni Perämäki
Heini Kallio
Moriah Echlin
Vidal Fey
Sini Hakkola
Sara Hamis
Ismail Hermelo
Serafiina Jaatinen
Joonatan Sipola

Anssi Nurminen
Elaheh Moradi
Paula Mosallaei
Tuomas Mäenpää
Reetta Nätkin
Karoliina Salenius
Jenni Tolppanen
Henna Urhonen
Juuso Vuorinen
Hanna Selin

Tampere University (PIs)

Kirsi Granberg
Alfonso Urbanucci
Teemu Murtola
Teuvo Tammela
Tapio Visakorpi
Steve Bova
Pekka Ruusuvuori
Teemu Tolonen (Fimlab)

Vancouver Prostate Centre

Alexander Wyatt
Kim Chi

University of Eastern Finland

Leena Latonen
Kirsi Ketola

University of Helsinki

Lauri Aaltonen
Jussi Taipale
Tuomas Mirtti
Andrew Erickson

MD Anderson Cancer Center

Wenyi Wang
Peter Van Loo

University College London

Gerhardt Attard

University of Oxford

Ian Mills
David Wedge

KU Leuven

Frank Claessens
Wout Devlies
Steven Joniau

