



An **Academy Programme** is a research programme funded by the Academy of Finland. It is a thematic, target-oriented and coordinated body of research projects designed to promote the renewal of scientific research and to produce cutting-edge research knowledge in a specific thematic area. A key goal is to generate scientific impact.

Health from Science (TERVA) is an Academy Programme aimed at encouraging Finnish researchers to seek bold, new research initiatives that can solve health issues related to major public health diseases. The programme invites high-risk research designs where the risks are motivated in terms of potentially significant effects on the promotion of public health.

Apart from promoting science renewal and long-term impact through the justifiable risks contained in the research projects, the TERVA programme also aims at fostering new kinds of collaborations between the Academy and foundations that support research into major public health diseases. Within the TERVA Academy Programme, the Academy and the foundations involved join forces with a view to funding the most promising new research projects that include justifiable risks and promote public health. The cooperation with foundations will add to the societal significance of the research by improving the visibility of the projects also outside the academic world.

Please provide both written feedback and numerical ratings to each of the following sub-criteria.

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.

1 Quality of research described in the plan

1.1 Progress of the “Health from Science” research project

Sub-rating (1–6)

Significance of the research results obtained during the first funding period. Addressing of identified risk factors. Quality of the evidence base for the approach chosen for continuing the project.

➤ See item 1 Aim and objectives in the research plan.

1.2 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.



1.3 Implementation of the research plan

Sub-rating (1–6)

Feasibility of the project (bearing in mind the 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.

1.3.1. Research consortium

(no numerical rating)

Significance and added value of the consortium for the attainment of the 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 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.

1.4 Responsible science

(no numerical rating)

Has the applicant considered the following aspects of responsible science properly? Select Yes/No under each sub-question. Provide further comments if needed.

- See item 4 Responsible science in the research plan.
- See attached data management plan.
 - Please note, the Academy of Finland is committed to research integrity for responsible conduct of research¹ and to promoting the principles and practices of open science².

1.4.1. Ethical issues

- Yes
- No

1.4.2. Open access of research publications

- Yes
- No

1.4.3. Data management plan and open access to data or metadata

- Yes
- No

¹ European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity; ALLEA, All European Academies, 2017

² The Academy of Finland is committed to promoting the principles and practices of open science to improve the quality, responsibility, and social impact of science. The goal is to make all outputs produced and used in research (research publications, data, methods) and their metadata widely available for reuse. The principles of open science must be pursued with due attention to good scientific practice and law. The degrees of data openness may justifiably vary, ranging from fully open to strictly confidential.





1.4.4. Promotion of equality and non-discrimination within the project or in society at large

- Yes
- No

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

2.1 Competence³ of applicant(s) and complementary expertise of research team **Sub-rating (1–6)**

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

- See item 3.1 Project personnel and their relevant merits in the research plan.
- See also attached CV(s) and list(s) of publications.
 - When reviewing consortium applications, the competence of all principal investigators should be reviewed.

2.2 Significance of research collaboration and researcher mobility **Sub-rating (1–6)**

Significance of national and/or international research collaboration including complementary expertise and research environment of the collaborators in terms of project implementation; significance of the planned mobility to the implementation of the research plan and researcher training; etc.

- See item 3.2 Collaborators and their key merits in terms of the project in the research plan.
- See Collaborators section in the application form.
- See Mobility section in the application form.

3 Project's relevance

3.1. Project's relevance to the programme

Sub-rating (1–6)

Contribution of the application to achieving the objectives of the programme

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

³ The Academy of Finland is committed to promoting the DORA recommendations and to not using journal-based metrics, such as Journal Impact Factors, as a surrogate measure of the quality of individual research articles, to assess an individual scientist's contributions.





4 Overall assessment and rating

4.1 Main strengths and weaknesses of the project, additional comments and suggestions

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:

Overall rating

Rating (1–6)

Please note that the final rating should not be a mathematical average of the sub-ratings.

- 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]^{st/nd/rd/th} of all [number] [Funding instrument name] applications reviewed in this panel. Only applications with a final rating of 5 or 6 were ranked. All applications addressed to the Health from Science programme call were evaluated in the same panel.

