Application review form

Special funding for research into crisis preparedness and security of supply

Name of reviewer: Application number:
Name of applicant:
Title of proposed project:

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).

Rating	Science (Q2–4)	Relevance (Q1)
6 (outstanding)	Demonstrates exceptional novelty and innovation; has potential to substantially advance science at global level; is a high-gain project that may include risks	Research of crucial relevance to users, i.e., such novelty or timeliness and promise that an extremely significant contribution to policy or practice is likely; demonstrates exceptional novelty and innovation to address a solution to an important problem or a critical barrier
5 (excellent)	Is extremely good in international comparison – contains no significant elements to be improved	Research of very high relevance to users, i.e., such novelty or timeliness and promise that a very significant contribution to policy or practice is likely; high potential to address a solution to an important problem or a critical barrier
4 (very good)	Is in general sound but contains a few elements that could be improved	Research of high relevance to users, i.e., such novelty or timeliness and promise that a very significant contribution to policy or practice is likely
3 (good)	Is in general sound but contains important elements that should be improved	Research of relevance to users, i.e. such novelty or timeliness and promise that a moderate contribution to policy or practice is likely
2 (fair)	Contains flaws; is in need of substantial modification or improvement	Research will add to understanding but might not be of sufficient relevance or urgency to influence policy or practice

1 (poor)	Contains severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project or the application	Research not considered relevant; proposal in need of substantial modification or improvement

1 Project's relevance

1.1 Project's relevance to the call   Sub-rating (1–6)

Contribution of the application to achieving the objectives of the call

- See all items of the research plan, especially items **1.4 Special objective of call** and **5.2 Effects and impact beyond academia** in the research plan.

2 Quality of research described in the plan

2.1 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.

- 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.

2.2.1 If applicable: Research consortium   (no numerical rating)

Significance and added value of consortium for attainment of research objectives

ACADEMY OF FINLAND

- 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 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.

2.3 Responsible science   **(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.

- 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 practices of equality and non-discrimination and open science. See instructions for reviewers for further information.

2.3.1 Research ethics

☐ Yes

☐ No, please comment

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

☐ Yes

☐ No, please comment

2.3.3 Open access to research publications

☐ Yes

☐ No, please comment

2.3.4 Data management and open access to data

☐ Yes

☐ No, please comment

3 Competence of applicant(s), quality of 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 for the project); competence of applicant(s) in terms of supervising PhD candidates or postdoctoral researchers; etc.

- See item **3.1 Project personnel and their relevant merits** in the research plan.
- See **CV(s)** of the applicant(s) in the application form.
- See attached **list(s) of publications.**
- In the case of consortium applications, competence of all principal investigators should be reviewed.

3.2 Significance of collaboration

Sub-rating (1–6)

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

- See **item 3.2 Collaborators and their project-relevant key merits** in the research plan.
- See **Collaborators** section in the application form.
- See attached **Letters of commitment.**

4 Overall assessment and rating

4.1 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.

ACADEMY OF FINLAND

- 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.
- You are also encouraged to comment on principles of sustainable development (see item 5.1 in the research plan). However, this 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.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Comments:

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

Your application was ranked [ordinal number] of all [number] [Funding instrument name] applications reviewed in this panel. The [Funding instrument name] applications addressed to the call were reviewed in a total of [number] panels.