Winter call – how applications are reviewed

We start at 13.00
Some guidelines

1. First the presentation – then questions and discussion
   The presentation takes about 15 minutes and we have plenty of time for questions and discussion

2. The webinar presentation will be recorded and made available online for two weeks – Q&A and discussion will not be recorded

3. You can write questions during the presentation on Q&A
Ask & Apply webinars in 2023

1. What’s new about the winter call?: **Tuesday 31 October at 13-14**

2. Winter call – How applications are reviewed: **Thursday 2 November at 13-14**

3. Merits and increased competencies of Academy Research Fellows: **Tuesday 21 November at 13-14.30**

4. Academy Programme for Sport Science and Physical Activity: **Thursday 23 November at 13-14**

5. Ask Me Anything – our science advisers answer your questions: **Tuesday 12 December at 13-14**
Winter call – how applications are reviewed

Preparation of the review

Review process before the panel meeting

Reviewers’ work at the panel meeting

Decisions
Preparing the review

• The new panel structure was designed based on
  • analysis of previous years’ applications and their distribution across scientific disciplines and themes
  • aim to decrease the number of panels to adapt to the shorter timeline in winter call
  • feedback received in public consultation
  • benchmarking the panel structure in international research funding organizations

• Science advisers recruit reviewers mainly before the call closes

• Reviewers are esteemed international researchers in the field of the panel

• Secrecy, integrity and conflicts of interest are taken into account throughout the review process
Responsible researcher review

Reviewers are asked to:

• Consider the **content and quality of publications**, rather than their number or venue of publication, or the impact of the journals in which they were published
  • Applicants may not include citation metrics or journal-based metrics to their application

• Consider the **value and impact of all research outputs**, not only publications

• **Be sensitive to legitimate delays** in publication and personal factors or other types of leave, part-time work and disabilities that may have affected the applicant’s record of outputs

• Take into account the applicant’s career stage throughout the review

• Base the review mainly on a qualitative peer review of the research plan
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Call 15.11.2023 – 17.1.2024
Panel structure for winter 2024 call (aka.fi)

**RC24_05 Biotechnology, biomedical materials, developmental biology and stem cell technologies**

**Scope**
- The panel includes basic and applied research using all organisms on biotechnology and bioengineering, developmental biology and stem cell research (including organoids and tissue regeneration), biomedical materials and nanomedicine. Research on pharmacology related to drug targeting and delivery to tissues, and toxicology of the engineered materials and therapeutics are also included.

**Keywords**
- biomedical materials, biotechnology (microbial, industrial, medical and pharmaceutical), bioengineering and synthetic biology, biophysics, developmental biology, stem cells, pharmacology, toxicology
The applicant selects a review panel

1. Examine several panel descriptions in your field and carefully read both the scope and keywords before choosing the panel.

2. Choose one panel and one scientific council in your application. None of the panels are linked to a particular scientific council as such.

3. Submit your application to the most relevant panel. **Your panel selection is binding.** We may reallocate applications only if there has been an obvious typographical or other clear error in the selection. The applicant will be informed in such cases.

Please note:

- Any topic is welcome, regardless of whether it is explicitly stated in panel descriptions. Panels are typically multidisciplinary.

- The lists of keywords in panel descriptions are non-exhaustive; their aim is to guide applicants’ panel selection.

- The panel structure does not represent any scientific classification as such. The numbering, names or descriptors of panels do not reflect any priorities.

- The panel structure is revised regularly (for scientific and/or operational reasons).

- Note: panel RC24_42 will review applications for Clinical Researcher funding and will not be available for other applicants.
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An applicant has selected the panel for their application

The applications are assigned to reviewers (2 individual reviews/application)

A review may be requested from an expert outside the panel to provide additional knowledge

The applications that reach rating 5 or 6 in any of the individual reviews will proceed to panel

The applications rated 1 to 4 will proceed to the decision-making phase

Review process before the panel meeting
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates extremely high novelty and/or innovation; has potential to substantially advance science at global level; presents a high-gain plan that may include risks</td>
<td>6 (outstanding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is very good in international comparison – contains no significant elements to be improved</td>
<td>5 (excellent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is in general sound but contains some elements that should be improved</td>
<td>4 (very good)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is in general sound but contains important elements that should be improved</td>
<td>3 (good)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contains flaws and needs substantial modification or improvement</td>
<td>2 (fair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contains severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project or the application</td>
<td>1 (poor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Winter call – how applications are reviewed

Preparing the review

Review process before the panel meeting

Reviewers’ work at the panel meeting

Decisions
### Reviewers’ work at the panel meeting

- All panellists have access to all applications and reviews before the panel meeting.
- Panellists discuss the applications and decide the ratings.
- The panel writes a summary assessment section on each application based on the discussions and the individual reviews.
- Panels also rank the strongest applications (final overall rating 5–6).
**Review form at different stages of the review process**

### Individual reviews x 2 (including reviewer’s name)

1. **Quality of research**
   - 1.1 Scientific quality, novelty and innovativeness of research
     Sub-rating (1–6)

2. **Implementation (incl. responsible science)**
   - 2.1 Feasibility of research plan
     Sub-rating (1–6)
   - 2.2 Expertise, human resources, and collaborations
     Sub-rating (1–6)

3. **Review panel’s summary assessment**
   - 3.1 Main strengths and their justifications:
   - 3.2 Main weaknesses and their justifications:
   - 3.3 Other remarks (if any):

### Panel review (names of panellists’ and the individual reviewers)

1. **Quality of research**
   - 1.1 Scientific quality, novelty and innovativeness of research
     Sub-rating (1–6)

2. **Implementation (incl. responsible science)**
   - 2.1 Feasibility of research plan
     Sub-rating (1–6)
   - 2.2 Expertise, human resources, and collaborations
     Sub-rating (1–6)

3. **Review panel’s summary assessment**
   - 3.1 Main strengths and their justifications:
   - 3.2 Main weaknesses and their justifications:
   - 3.3 Other remarks (if any):

- Overall Rating (individual ratings and final panel rating)
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Calls open 15.11.2023 – 17.1.2024

READ THE CALL TEXT CAREFULLY
• Contact details according to your Scientific Council

Review panels - Research Council of Finland

Guides for reviewers

Helpdesk

Ask&Apply Webinars 2023

Funding statistics for September 2022 call

Panel feedback: SSH, BHE, NSE
Time for Questions and Answers

Please write your questions in Q&A