



Application review form

ICT 2023 targeted call

April 2022 call

Panel/Name of reviewer:

Application number:

Name of applicant:

Title of proposed project:

Application review form: ICT 2023 targeted call

The aim of the research, development and innovation programme ICT 2023 is to further improve Finland's scientific expertise in computer science and to promote the extensive application of ICT through thematic calls generating scientific impact.

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

- [Bullet text refers to technical instructions in the 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 (insufficient).

Rating	Description
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
5 (excellent)	Is very good in international comparison – contains no significant elements to be improved
4 (good)	Is in general sound but contains some elements that should be improved
3 (fair)	Is in general sound but contains important elements that should be improved
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 Project's relevance to programme/call

1.1 Project's relevance to programme/call

Sub-rating (1–6)

Contribution of the application to achieving the objectives of the programme/call

- See all items of the research plan and special item **1.4 Special objective of call** in the research plan.

2 Quality of research described in plan

2.1 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; generation of new knowledge, new methods, new technologies or new practices to end-users; potential for breakthroughs or exceptionally significant outcomes; etc.

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

2.2 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.

2.3 If applicable: Research consortium

(no numerical rating)

Significance and added value of consortium for attainment of research objectives

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



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

3 Competence of applicant(s), quality of research collaboration

3.1 Competence of applicant(s) and complementary expertise of applicant's research team (project personnel)

Sub-rating (1–6)

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

- See item **3.1 Project personnel and their project-relevant key merits** in the research plan.
- See **most relevant publications and other key outputs**.
 - See also **CV(s)** of the applicant(s) in the application form.
 - See also complete **list(s) of publications**.
- If you are reviewing consortium applications, competence of all principal investigators should be reviewed.

3.2 Significance of research and business collaboration and researcher mobility

Sub-rating (1–6)

Significance of national and/or international research, business and/or other non-academic collaboration (i.e. collaborators engaged in the project with their own funding) including complementary expertise and research environment of collaborators in terms of project implementation; significance of planned mobility for implementation of research plan and researcher training; etc.

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



- See [Mobility](#) in the application form.

4 Responsible science

4.1 Responsible science

(no numerical rating)

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 non-discrimination and open science. See [‘Instructions for reviewing’](#) for further information.

4.1.1 Research ethics

- Yes (no comment needed)
- No, please comment in sub-item 4.2.1

4.1.2 Promotion of equality and non-discrimination within project or in society at large

- Yes (no comment needed)
- No, please comment in sub-item 4.2.1

4.1.3 Open access to research publications

- Yes (no comment needed)
- No, please comment in sub-item 4.2.1

4.1.4 Data management and open access to data

- Yes (no comment needed)
- No, please comment in sub-item 4.2.1



4.2 Comment on responsible science, societal effects, and impact

4.2.1 Provide further comments if responsible science aspects (4.1.1–4.1.4) have not been properly considered

4.2.2 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.
- These should not affect the scientific review/rating or ranking of the application. Instead, it will be considered as an additional factor when the funding decisions are made.

5 Overall assessment and rating

5.1 Main strengths and weaknesses of 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:



**6 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.