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

Please also write comments (not only numerical ratings) to each of the following sub-items.

The numerical evaluation of the sub-items and final rating is made with ratings ranging from 1 (poor) to 6 (outstanding).

1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good, 4 = very good, 5 = excellent, 6 = outstanding

Academy Programmes: Academy Programmes are thematic, target-oriented and coordinated body of collaborative research projects in a specified research theme. The specific theme can arise also from the use of the same methodology, research data or infrastructure. The general aim is to produce knowledge in the field or problems specified in the Academy Programme Memorandum, to raise the overall quality of research and to promote renewal of science for future research needs. A major emphasis in Academy Programmes is on multi- and interdisciplinarity approaches as well as international cooperation. Academy programmes aim at raising scientific and societal impact of research.

Targeted Academy Projects: A Targeted Academy Project is like a normal Academy Project but with predetermined targets for funding. The Academy Board or research councils may decide to direct funding to specific areas, considering objectives such as strengthening a particular discipline (e.g. as a result of a discipline or research field assessment) or promoting the internationalisation of research.

---

1 Quality of research plan

1.1 Scientific quality and innovativeness of research plan   **Sub-rating (1–6):**
Guiding questions: How significant is the project scientifically? Are the objectives and hypotheses appropriately presented? To what extent are the objectives ambitious and beyond the state of the art (e.g. novel concepts and approaches or development across disciplines)? How high is the potential for breakthroughs or exceptionally significant outcomes?

1.3. Implementation of research plan   **Sub-rating (1–6):**
Guiding questions: Is the research plan feasible (bearing in mind the extent to which the proposed research may include high risks)? Are the research methods and materials appropriate? Are the human resources and management of the proposed plan appropriate and well planned? Does the research environment support the project, including appropriate research infrastructures? How well does the applicant acknowledge potential scientific or methodological problem areas, and how does the applicant consider alternative approaches?

1.4 If applicable: research consortium   **(no numerical rating)**
Guiding question: What is the significance and added value of the consortium for the attainment of the research objectives?

1.5 Responsible science   **(no numerical rating)**
Guiding questions: Are there any ethical issues involved and, if so, how are they taken into account? What is the intended level of open access to research results? Does the data management plan responsibly support the reuse of research data? How does the project promote equality and non-discrimination within itself or in society at large?

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

2.1 Competence and expertise of applicant(s) and the research team, if applicable
Sub-rating (1–6):
Guiding questions: What are the merits and scientific expertise of the applicant(s)? Are they appropriate and sufficient for the proposed project? Does the research team bring complementary expertise to the project? What are the competences of the applicant(s) in terms of supervising PhD candidates or postdoctoral researchers? Does the project support researcher training?

2.2 Significance of research collaborations and researcher mobility **Sub-rating (1–6):**
Guiding questions: How does the national and/or international research collaboration contribute to the success of the project? What are the merits and scientific expertise of the collaborators? Are they appropriate and sufficient for the proposed project? How does the planned mobility support the research plan? Does the receiving organisation stand out in the respective field of research?

3 Project's relevance

3.1. Project's relevance to the programme/call **Sub-rating (1–6):**
Guiding question: How does the application contribute to achieving the objectives of the programme / call?

4 Overall assessment and final rating

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

(no numerical rating)
Please give an overall assessment of the application including lists of strengths and weaknesses as well as any additional comments.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Comments:

Final rating **Final rating (1–6):**
Please note that the final rating should not be a mathematical average of the sub-ratings.

Ranking (*to be modified, if needed*)

Your application was ranked [ordinal number] of [number] [funding instrument name] applications reviewed in this panel.