ACADEMY OF FINLAND

Application review form

Finnish Flagship Programme call 2020

Panel/Name of reviewer:
Name of applicant:
Title of proposed project:

Application number:

Application review form: Finnish Flagship Programme call 2020

The aim of the Academy of Finland's Flagship Programme is to pool together expertise from different fields in Finland to form high-level research and impact clusters that will further contribute to increasing the quality and impact of Finnish research. In this third call of the programme, funding is targeted towards competence clusters that operate in a strong innovation-oriented environment and have active collaborations with the business sector and possibly with other sectors of society.

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

- Blue text with bulleting refers to technical instructions for 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 (poor). Where relevant, please consider both scientific excellence and impact in support of economic growth and/or innovation ecosystem(s) and society.

6 (outstanding)	Demonstrates exceptional novelty, innovation as well as impact with crucial relevance; has potential to substantially advance science at global level; has such novelty or timeliness and promise that extremely significant support to economic growth and/or innovation ecosystem(s) and society is likely
5 (excellent)	Demonstrates novelty, innovation and impact with very high relevance – contains no significant elements to be improved; has such novelty or timeliness and promise that very significant support to economic growth and/or innovation ecosystem(s) and society is likely
4 (very good)	Is in general sound but contains a few elements that could be improved; has impact with high relevance, i.e. such novelty or timeliness and promise that

	significant support to economic growth and/or innovation ecosystem(s) and society is likely
3 (good)	Is in general sound but contains important elements that should be improved; has impact with relevance, i.e. such novelty or timeliness and promise that some support to economic growth and/or innovation ecosystem(s) and society is likely
2 (fair)	Contains flaws; is in need of substantial modification or improvement; has low potential for impact in support of economic growth and/or innovation ecosystem(s) and society
1 (poor)	Contains severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project or the application

1 Demonstrated scientific excellence and impact in support of economic growth and/or innovation ecosystem(s) and society

1.1 Demonstrated scientific excellence and impact **Sub-rating (1–6)**

Quality and significance of previous research and research outputs in the topic in international comparison; merits, scientific expertise and leadership skills of key persons; sufficiency of available expertise for a flagship project; etc.

- See item **1 Basic details** in the research and impact plan.
- See item **2 Central idea** in the research and impact plan.
- See item **3 Demonstrated scientific excellence and impact in support of economic growth and/or innovation ecosystem(s) and society** in the research and impact plan.
- See most relevant publications in the application document.

2 Plan for promoting scientific excellence and impact in support of economic growth and/or innovation ecosystem(s) and society

2.1 Scientific excellence and impact of proposed plan **Sub-rating (1–6)**

Ambitiousness and presentation of scientific and impact objectives; appropriateness of performance indicators; significance of expected scientific outcomes; advancement of state-of-the-art in the field(s); appropriateness/effectiveness of arrangements described for facilitating impact generation; etc.

- See item **4 Plan for promoting scientific excellence and impact in support of economic growth and/or innovation ecosystem(s) and society** in the research and impact plan.

2.2 Implementation of proposed plan for promoting scientific excellence and impact **Sub-rating (1–6)**

Clarity of plan; identification and incorporation of relevant approaches and methods; appropriateness of proposed schedule; identification of relevant problem areas and appropriateness of mitigation measures; etc.

- See item **4 Plan for promoting scientific excellence and impact in support of economic growth and/or innovation ecosystem(s) and society** in the research and impact 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 Plan for promoting scientific excellence and impact in support of economic growth and/or innovation ecosystem(s) and society** in the research and impact 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.

1.3.1 Research ethics

☐ Yes

☐ No, please comment

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

☐ Yes

☐ No, please comment

1.3.3 Open access of research publications

☐ Yes

☐ No, please comment

1.3.4 Data management and open access to data

☐ Yes

☐ No, please comment

3 Ecosystem and organisation of candidate flagship

3.1 Ecosystem and organisation **Sub-rating (1–6)**

Links of the proposed activities to host organisation's strategic choices and synergies; appropriateness of allocated resources and their evolution for implementation of proposed activities; coherency of management structures and procedures in supporting proposed activities; clarity of roles of different actors; identification of relevant collaborators including collaborations with business sector; active collaborations with business sector and possibly other sectors of society; appropriateness of planned actions for increasing appeal of research environment; innovation orientation of research environment; etc.

- See item **5 Ecosystem and organisation of candidate flagship** in the research and impact plan.

4 Overall assessment and rating

4.1 Added value of candidate flagship **(no numerical rating)**

Added value of candidate flagship for attainment of objectives

4.2 Expected significant scientific impact **(no numerical rating)**

Expected significant scientific impact of candidate flagship

4.3 Expected impact in support of economic growth and/or innovation ecosystem(s) and society **(no numerical rating)**

Expected impact in support of economic growth and/or innovation ecosystem(s) and society of candidate flagship

4.4 Main strengths and weaknesses **(no numerical rating)**

Please list major strengths and weaknesses of the application.

- Please give an overall assessment for the application including lists of strengths and weaknesses.

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).

ACADEMY OF FINLAND

Ranking

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.