

Panel/Name of reviewer:
Name of applicant:
Title of proposed project:

Application number:

Please also write comments (not only numerical ratings) to each of the following sub-items.

The numerical evaluation of the sub-items and Item 1 (Research plan), Item 2 (Competence of applicant(s), quality of research collaborations) and Item 3 (Overall assessment) is made with ratings ranging from 1 (poor) to 6 (outstanding).

1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good, 4 = very good, 5 = excellent, 6 = outstanding

*The **Academy Project** funding scheme is designed to promote the quality and diversity of research, scientific impact and impact beyond academia as well as science self-renewal. The aim is to attain internationally as high a scientific standard of work as possible and to support scientific breakthroughs and top-tier international research collaboration. Academy funding can be used to cover both direct and indirect research costs of the research team. The funding is granted primarily to teams of researchers with doctoral degrees. The salary costs of the PI can be incorporated into the project costs to be funded, but these costs must not be significant in relation to the project's total costs. As a rule, the funding is granted for four years.*

1 Quality of research plan	Rating (1–6):
-----------------------------------	----------------------

1.1 Scientific quality and innovativeness of research plan

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: How significant is the project scientifically? How high is the potential for breakthroughs or exceptionally significant outcomes? To what extent are the objectives ambitious and beyond the state of the art (e.g. novel concepts and approaches or development across disciplines)?

1.2 Feasibility of research plan

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: Are the objectives and hypotheses appropriately presented and how feasible the research plan is (bearing in mind the extent that the proposed research may include high risks)? Are the research methods and materials appropriate? How well the applicant acknowledges potential scientific or methodological problem areas, and how are alternative approaches being considered? Is the management of the proposed plan appropriate and well planned? Does the research environment support this project, including appropriate research infrastructures?

1.3 Ethical aspects and open science

Guiding questions: Are there any ethical issues involved and, if so, how are they taken into account? What is the intended level of open access to research results? Is the data management plan worked out in a sufficient way?

2 Competence of applicant(s), quality of research collaborations	Rating (1–6):
---	----------------------

2.1 Competence and expertise of applicant(s)

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: What are the merits and scientific expertise of the applicant(s)? Are they appropriate and sufficient for the proposed project? What are the competences of the applicant(s) in terms of supervising PhD candidates / postdoctoral researchers?

2.2 Research team, significance of research collaborations

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: Does the research team bring complementary expertise to the project (if applicable)? How does the national and/or international research collaboration contribute to the success of the project? Does the research project support researcher training?

2.3. Researcher mobility

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: How does the mobility plan support the research plan? Does the receiving organisation stand out in the respective field of research? Is the length of the mobility period appropriate and is its timing right for the project?

Panel/Name of reviewer:
Name of applicant:
Title of proposed project:

Application number:

2.4 Research consortium (if applicable)

Guiding question: If a consortium is involved, what is the significance and added value of the consortium for the attainment of the research objectives?

3 Overall assessment	Final rating (1–6):
-----------------------------	----------------------------

3.1 Main strengths and weaknesses of project, additional comments and suggestions

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Comments:

Please note that the final rating should not be a mathematical average of the sub-ratings.