

25.2.2020

Instructions for reviewing research applications – Academy professors, 2nd-stage proposals 2020

Contents

- 1 Academy professor funding instrument
- 2 Role of experts and the Academy of Finland
- 3 Expert panel meeting
- 4 Review
- 5 Confidentiality and ethics
- 6 Conflict of interest
- 7 Reviewer's declaration

Appendix: Review form for Academy professor, 2nd stage

1 Academy Professor funding instrument

The aim of a research post as Academy Professor is to facilitate full-time scientific research for internationally leading-edge researchers. Academy Professors are expected to greatly contribute to the progress of research and develop a creative research environment. Their duties include (without separate compensation) supervision of thesis and dissertation writers and teaching associated with the research, covering 5% of annual working hours. The applicant is a researcher. Posts as Academy Professor are intended for leading-edge researchers for fixed-term, full-time research and related tasks. They pursue their research plans, supervise their team and provide guidance to junior researchers.

The Academy Professor's term is five years. Successful applicants can – having received the decision on their salary funding – submit a separate application for a grant for research costs to the relevant research council. This grant can cover research costs, salary costs of a research team, national and international collaboration, and mobility.

The Academy Professor funding call follows a two-stage review process. Selection is based on thorough international peer review of the plans of intent and thereafter of the full applications. On the basis of your review, a subcommittee appointed by the Board of the Academy of Finland selects the Academy Professor candidates for the second stage.

A rebuttal process is applied in the second stage. After the panel has given its review report, the Academy will send it to the applicant for potential comments. This stage helps in correcting any factual mistakes or misunderstandings in the review report. The applicants have one week to correct any mistakes they identify (no more than two pages). Both the review reports and the applicants' comments are in use while the General Subcommittee appointed by the Academy Board makes the funding decisions. [Read more about Academy Professors here.](#)



2 Role of experts and the Academy of Finland

The Academy of Finland funds cutting-edge and innovative research aiming at significant scientific breakthroughs. Our funding is based on open competition and independent peer review. Experts are invited to review the scientific excellence of the submitted funding applications and rank the reviewed applications. The reviews are finalised in expert panel meetings.

After receiving the panel review reports, the decision-making body (General Subcommittee) makes the final funding decisions. The decisions are based on a peer review of scientific quality and panel ranking, but factors related to science policy may also influence the decisions. Examples of such factors are the promotion of equal opportunities for all genders, the advancement of junior researchers' careers, and impact beyond academia.

3 Expert panel meeting

Before the meeting takes place, each application is assigned to at least two panel members who then prepare draft reviews. All draft reviews will be made available to the panel members before the meeting. In some cases, an application may be sent to an expert outside the panel to provide additional knowledge pertaining to a particular field through an external draft review.

The panel of experts consists of esteemed, mostly international researchers in the field. At the meeting, the panel will review all applications assigned to it, prepare one joint review report for each application based on the discussions and the preliminary reviews, and rank the applications. Academy staff will assist the panel in preparing the panel review reports. The panel members have access to all applications assigned to the panel, barring conflicts of interest (see below).

4 Review

4.1 Reviewing research applications

Written reviews: Evaluative comments are particularly valuable to the decision-making body. The review also provides the applicant with important feedback. Before the funding decisions are made, the applicants are given access to the final panel review on their own application and may provide the Academy with their rebuttal. Reviewers should therefore:

- write evaluative rather than descriptive comments (avoid copying text directly from the application)
- write comments under each sub-item
- write coherent comments in the passive voice, which can be used, if agreed, as such in the panel review report.

Numerical evaluation: The consistency between the numerical rating and the written comments is particularly important. The numerical evaluation of the sub-items and final rating is made with a rating scale ranging from 1 (poor) to 6 (outstanding).



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.
5 (excellent)	Is extremely good in international comparison – contains 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.

4.2 Items to be reviewed

The five main items in the evaluation of the application are:

1. Scientific quality, ground-breaking nature and innovativeness of the research
2. Implementation of the research plan
3. Responsible science
4. Competence and expertise of the applicant
5. Overall assessment
6. Final rating.

The specific review criteria and review instructions are presented in Appendix 1. The same instructions can also be found in the Academy's online services.

4.3. How to review applications in the Academy's online services

Please use the [Academy of Finland's online services](#) to review applications. Review reports are completed in the online services. You can access the items of the research plan directly from the corresponding review form questions. However, we do expect you to read the full application. You can find the review instructions and all our review forms under [Guides for reviewers](#) on our website.

4.4. Ranking applications in a panel meeting

After the panel has completed the review of the applications within a funding instrument during the panel meeting, it is also asked to rank the applications (or some of the applications). The applications are ranked based on the review criteria used (Appendix 1).

5 Confidentiality and ethics

According to the Finnish Act on the Openness of Government Activities, research plans, abstracts, progress reports and reviews are confidential documents. Application documents should therefore be handled and stored with due care and confidentiality.

The Academy of Finland is committed to following the guidelines of the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity for responsible conduct of research. The guidelines also apply to reviewing funding applications, research programmes and scientific disciplines. All reviews must be handled confidentially, competently and impartially, based on the criteria set for the review process. Care must be taken to ensure that the review complies with general stipulations about conflicts of interest. Prior notice must be given if a reviewer has economic or other affiliations or significantly different schools of thought in relation to the applicant under review. This is a way to avoid conflicts of interest.



As a reviewer, you are not allowed to disclose any information concerning application documents or reviews to outsiders, nor are you allowed to use this confidential information to your own benefit or anyone else's benefit or disadvantage. You may not reveal to outsiders that you are assessing the research plan of a particular researcher. If you are contacted by anyone, including the applicant, who has questions about the application or reviews, please advise them to contact the Academy of Finland.

Reviewers are guilty of research misconduct if they misappropriate research ideas from applications. The quality of the review is not a research-ethical issue unless the review has been conducted carelessly, which may give an appearance of a review that deliberately either underrates or overrates the applicants under review.

Disclosing the contents of research plans to third parties or contacting applicants personally without explicit agreement to do so are also regarded as instances of inappropriate behaviour on the part of reviewers.

Once the review has been completed, you are required to destroy all application documents and any copies made of them, or to return them to the Academy. Confidentiality must also be maintained after the review process has been completed. Reviews are confidential documents, but applicants will have access to the panel review reports on their own application after the funding decisions have been made. The draft reviews and external draft reviews are also confidential documents unless otherwise stated in the applicable legislation or required by court order.

After the funding decisions have been made, the Academy will publish a list of names, current positions and institutions of all individual reviewers and panel members used in the call. In addition, the applicants will see the names of all panel members in the panel review report. If requested, the names of reviewers that have supplied the draft reviews will also be disclosed to the applicant (under the Finnish Act on the Openness of Government Activities).

6 Conflicts of interest

As a reviewer you are required to declare any personal interests according to the criteria below. You must disqualify yourself if you can in any way benefit from the approval or rejection of the application. You must also disqualify yourself in the following circumstances:

- You have collaborated with the applicant (e.g. you have co-authored and published an article or manuscript with the applicant in the past three years, been involved in the preparation of the application, or are involved in the publication or application of the results).
- You have been a superior, subordinate or instructor of the applicant in the past three years.
- You are applying for the same post as the applicant.
- You are applying for funding from the Academy from the same funding instrument.
- The applicant is a close person to you. A close person is:
 - a) your spouse (also de facto), child, grandchild, sibling, parent, grandparent or a person otherwise close to you (e.g. fiancé/e or a close friend), as well as their spouses (also de facto)
 - b) a sibling of your parent or his/her spouse (also de facto), a child of your sibling, or your previous spouse (also de facto)
 - c) a child, grandchild, sibling, parent or grandparent of your spouse as well as their spouses (also de facto), or a child of a sibling of your spouse
 - d) or a half-relative comparable to the above-mentioned persons.

You are also disqualified if your impartiality may be endangered in any other way, or if you feel that you have a conflict of interest and are therefore disqualified to review the application.

If you identify any conflicts of interest, please notify us as soon as possible.



7 Reviewer's declaration

Please acknowledge that by accepting the task of a reviewer you guarantee not to disclose the information you receive and not to use it for anybody's benefit or disadvantage as stated in section 4 above (Confidentiality and ethics). Further, you affirm that you will immediately notify the Academy if you have a conflict of interest in one or more applications.

Appendix 1.

Review form 2020 Academy Professor, 2nd stage