



September 2021 call

Panel/Name of reviewer:

Name of applicant:

Title of proposed project:

Application review form

Clinical Researcher 2021

Application number:

Application review form: Clinical Researcher 2021

The Academy of Finland funds part-time research by physicians and other researchers engaged in clinical practice. The aim is to promote clinical research careers in cooperation with, for example, university hospitals and to encourage medical doctors and other researchers working in clinical practice to engage in research alongside clinical practice. The funding is granted for part-time salary costs (20–50% of working hours) and research costs. The funding is granted for four years.

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

Write evaluative rather than descriptive comments.

- [Bullet text refers to technical instructions for the online services \(SARA\).](#)

Below is the rating scale for the pre-review (before the panel meeting) and the final review (in the panel meeting). The consistency between the numerical rating and the written comments is particularly important.

Draft rate	Description	Final rate
6 (outstanding)	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	6 (outstanding)
5 (excellent)	Is very good in international comparison – contains no significant elements to be improved	5 (excellent)
4 (good)	Is in general sound but contains some elements that should be improved	4 (good)



3 (fair)	Is in general sound but contains important elements that should be improved	1–3 (fair to insufficient)
2 (poor)	Contains flaws; is in need of substantial modification or improvement	
1 (insufficient)	Contains severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project or the application	

1 Quality of research described in plan

1.1 Scientific quality, novelty and innovativeness of research

Sub-rating (1–6)

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

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

1.2 Implementation of research plan

Sub-rating (1–6)

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

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



2 Competence of applicant, quality of research collaboration

2.1 Competence and expertise of applicant

Sub-rating (1–6)

Personal merits and scientific expertise of applicant, including appropriateness and sufficiency for the proposed project; applicant's professional competence and independence; experience in supervising PhD candidates and/or postdoctoral researchers; etc.

- See item **3.1 Applicant's project-relevant merits** in the research plan.
- See **most relevant publications and other key outputs** in the application form.
- See **CV** of the applicant in the application form.
- See complete **list of publications**.

2.2. Research team and significance of research collaboration

Sub-rating (1–6)

Complementary expertise of applicant's team, if relevant (i.e. project personnel directly working/funded for the project); contribution of national and/or international research collaboration (i.e. collaborators engaged in the project with their own funding) to the success of the project; complementary expertise and research environment of collaborators in terms of project implementation; etc.

- See item **3.2 Collaborators and their project-relevant key merits** in the research plan.
- See attached **letter(s) of collaboration**.

3 Responsible science

3.1 Has the applicant considered the following aspects of responsible science properly in the application?

- See item **4 Responsible science** in the research plan.
- The Academy of Finland is committed to promoting research integrity, responsible conduct of research and the principles and practice of equality and nondiscrimination and open science. See 'Instructions for reviewing' for further information.

**3.1.1 Research ethics**

- Yes (no comment needed)
- No, please comment in item 3.2.1

3.1.2 Promotion of equality and nondiscrimination within project or in society at large

- Yes (no comment needed)
- No, please comment in item 3.2.1

3.1.3 Open access to research publications

- Yes (no comment needed)
- No, please comment in item 3.2.1

3.1.4 Data management and open access to data

- Yes (no comment needed)
- No, please comment in item 3.2.1

3.2 Comment on responsible science, societal effects and impact**3.2.1 Provide further comments if responsible science (3.1–aspects above (3.1.1 – 3.1.4) has not been properly considered****3.2.2 Additional comments on societal effects and impact**

You are also encouraged to comment on societal effects and impact, including principles of sustainable development.

- See items **4.4 Sustainable development objectives** and **5.1 Effects and impact beyond academia** in the research plan.
- Please note, that comments on the societal effects and impact, including principles of sustainable development should not affect the scientific review/rating or ranking of the application. Please note that comments on societal effects and impact, including principles of sustainable development, 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.

4 Overall assessment and rating

4.1 Main strengths and weaknesses of project

(no numerical rating)

Please select the major strengths and weaknesses of the application.

Main strengths (select all relevant aspects):

- scientific quality
- innovativeness and novelty value
- impact within scientific community
- feasibility of research plan
- overall competence of applicant
- competence and expertise of applicant in terms of project implementation
- clinical work supporting and facilitating the research project
- expertise of research team in terms of project implementation
- significance of collaborative networks in terms of project implementation

Main weaknesses (select all relevant aspects):

- scientific quality
- innovativeness and novelty value
- impact within scientific community
- feasibility of research plan
- overall competence of applicant
- competence and expertise of applicant in terms of project implementation
- clinical work supporting and facilitating the research project
- expertise of research team in terms of project implementation



- significance of collaborative networks in terms of project implementation

4.2 Justifications and comments

Please justify the selections above by briefly describing the main strengths and weaknesses of the application.

5 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 based on the panel discussion (the ranking is made during the panel meeting)

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