



September call 2020

Panel/ Name of the reviewer:

Name of the applicant:

Title of the proposed project:

Application review form

Centres of Excellence Programme 2020

Application number:

The aim of the Academy of Finland's **Centres of Excellence Programme** is to strengthen Finnish research by raising its level, contributing to its regeneration and promoting its societal impact.

Application review form: Centres of Excellence Programme 2020

Please provide both written feedback and numerical ratings to each of the following items.

- [Blue text with bulleting refers to technical instructions on online services \(SARA\).](#)

The numerical evaluation of the sub-items and final rating is made with a rating scale ranging from 6 (outstanding) to 1 (poor).

6 (outstanding)	Demonstrates exceptional novelty and innovation. Has potential to substantially advance science at global level. High-gain project that may include risks.
5 (excellent)	Is extremely good in international comparison – no significant elements to be improved.
4 (very good)	Is in general sound but contains a few elements that could be improved.
3 (good)	Is in general sound but contains important elements that should be improved.
2 (fair)	Contains flaws. Is in need of substantial modification or improvement.
1 (poor)	Contains severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project or the application.



1. Quality of research described in the plan

1.1. Scientific quality, novelty and innovativeness of the research

Sub-rating (1–6)

Significance of the project; objectives and hypotheses; ambitiousness and state of the art of objectives (possible novel concepts and approaches or development across disciplines); scientific impact of the research; potential for breakthroughs or exceptionally significant outcomes; etc.

1st stage (plan of intent)

- See item **1 Background, objectives and implementation** in the plan of intent.

2nd stage (full application)

- See item **1 Aim and objectives** in the research plan.

1.2. Implementation of the research plan

Sub-rating (1–6)

Feasibility of the project (bearing in mind the extent to which the proposed research may include high risks); materials, research data and methods; human resources and management of the research tasks; research environment including research infrastructures; identified potential scientific or methodological problem areas and mitigation plan; etc.

1st stage

- See item **1 Background, objectives and implementation** in the plan of intent.

2nd stage

- See item **2 Implementation** in the research plan.

1.2.1. Research consortium

(no numerical rating)

Significance and added value of the consortium for the attainment of the research objectives.

- A consortium is a fixed-term body of subprojects and a collaboration of research projects that work at different sites or institutions under a joint research plan that is implemented in systematic collaboration. A consortium application is reviewed as a single research plan.

**1st stage**

- See item **1 Background, objectives and implementation** in the plan of intent.

2nd stage

- See item **2.4. Added value of consortium** in the research plan.

1.3. Responsible science (to be reviewed in the call stage 2) (no numerical rating)

Has the applicant considered the following aspects of responsible science properly in the application? Please, provide further comments if responsible science aspects have not been properly considered.

2nd stage

- See item **4 Responsible science** in the research plan.
- Academy of Finland is committed to research integrity for responsible conduct of research and promoting the principles and practice of equality and non-discrimination and open science. See instructions for reviewing for further information.

1.3.1. Research ethics

- Yes
- No, please comment

1.3.2. Promotion of equality and non-discrimination within the project or in society at large

- Yes
- No, please comment

1.3.3. Open access of the research publications

- Yes
- No, please comment



1.3.4. Data management and open access to data

- Yes
- No, please comment

2. Competence of applicant(s), quality of research collaboration

2.1. Competence of applicant(s) and complementary expertise of the applicant's research team (project personnel) Sub-rating (1–6)

Merits and scientific expertise of the applicant (in case of consortium: applicants) in terms of implementation of the project; complementary expertise of the research team (i.e. project personnel directly working/funded for the project); competence of the applicant(s) in terms of supervising PhD candidates or postdoctoral researchers; support for researcher training within the project; etc.

- See **CVs of the applicants in the application form**
- See attached and **lists of publications**.
- When reviewing consortium applications, competence of all principal investigators should be reviewed.
- Academy of Finland is a signatory of the DORA declaration. See instructions for reviewing for further information.

1st stage

- See item **2 Competence of the applicant(s), quality of research collaboration** in the plan of intent.

2nd stage

- See **item 3.1. Project personnel and their relevant merits** in the research plan.



2.2. Significance of research collaboration

Sub-rating (1–6)

Significance of national and/or international research collaboration (i.e. collaborators engaged to the project via their own funding) including complementary expertise and research environment of the collaborators in terms of implementation of the project; etc.

1st stage

- See **item 2 Competence of the applicant(s), quality of research collaboration** in the plan of intent.

2nd stage

- See **item 3.2 Collaborators and their key merits in terms of the project** in the research plan.
- See attached **Letter(s) of commitment(s)**

3. Overall assessment and rating

3.1. Sustainable development and societal impacts of the project (to be reviewed in the call stage 2) (no numerical rating)

2nd stage

- See item **4.4. Sustainable development** in the research plan.
- See item **5 Societal effects and impact** in the research plan.
- Please comment on the societal effects and impact, including principles of sustainable development. However, these should not affect the scientific review/rating or ranking of the application. Instead, they will be considered as an additional factor when the funding decisions are made.

3.2. Main strengths and weaknesses of the project, additional comments and suggestions (no numerical rating)

Please list major strengths and weaknesses of the application as well as any additional comments.



- Please give an overall assessment for the application including lists of strengths and weaknesses as well as any additional comments. It is important to comment on both the strengths and the weaknesses of the application.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Comments:

4. Overall rating

Rating (1-6)

- Please note that the final rating should not be a mathematical average of the sub-ratings. For example, the application should not be penalised if it has a slight weakness in one evaluation item that is later strengthened in another item (e.g. lack of some expertise in a local team but compensated through international collaboration).

Ranking (2nd stage)

Your application was ranked [ordinal number]th of all the [number] [Funding instrument name] applications reviewed in this panel. Only applications with the final rating of 5 or 6 were ranked. Altogether, [Funding instrument name] applications addressed to Research Council for [Research Council name] were reviewed in [number] panels.