ACADEMY OF FINLAND

Application review form

Academy Research Fellowships 2022

September 2022 call

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

Application number:

How to review applications for Academy Research Fellowships

The aim of the Academy Research Fellowships is to support researchers so that they can increase their competencies and make significant career progress towards more demanding research positions and achieve an established position in the national and international research community. Academy Research Fellows produce high-quality, high-impact research that stimulates the renewal of science.

The academic competence and qualifications of applicants should be evaluated with special reference to their postdoctoral research and scientific collaborations in relation to their current career stage. The focus should be on reviewing the research plan and the applicant's competence, which is based on qualitative indicators.

The researcher's merits should be assessed through a wide range of outputs and research career roles, taking into account possible career breaks. The researcher's progress should also be reviewed in relation to their doctoral dissertation and any other earlier research work. In line with the broader science policy objectives of the funding scheme, applicants should be promising research talents who are on a rising career trajectory and who have the potential to advance to more demanding research positions. Special attention should be devoted to the applicant's potential for career development and ability to generate scientific renewal.

Applicants should provide proof of their independence and development of diverse skills and competencies. This evidence may vary between different situations and fields of research. Applicants can demonstrate their competence by describing, for example, their experience of different research environments, their ability to build up collaborative networks, previous national or international mobility, existing or planned joint projects or more independent publishing than in previous career stages, academic leadership, supervision, and teaching experience.

Throughout the review, the applicant's career stage should be taken into account.

ACADEMY OF FINLAND

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

Write evaluative rather than descriptive comments.

- Bullet text refers to technical instructions for the online services (SARA).

Below is the rating scale for the pre-review (before the panel meeting) and the final review (in the panel meeting). The consistency between the numerical rating and the written comments is particularly important.

Draft rating	Description	Final rating
6 (outstanding)	Demonstrates extremely high novelty and/or innovation; has potential to substantially advance science at global level; presents a high-gain plan that may include risks	6 (outstanding)
5 (excellent)	Is very good in international comparison – contains no significant elements to be improved	5 (excellent)
4 (good)	Is in general sound but contains some elements that should be improved	4 (good)
3 (fair)	Is in general sound but contains important elements that should be improved	1–3 (fair to insufficient)
2 (poor)	Contains flaws; is in need of substantial modification or improvement	
1 (insufficient)	Contains severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project or the application	

1. Competence of applicant

1.1 Competence and expertise of applicant **Sub-rating (1–6)**

Personal merits and scientific expertise of applicant; applicant's professional competence and independence; merits in supervising/mentoring students, PhD candidates and/or postdoctoral researchers; merits in existing or planned joint projects or more independent publishing than in previous career stages; experience of working in different research environments across international and/or sectoral borders; significance of the funding to the advancement of the applicant's professional competence; applicant's career development potential and ability to generate scientific renewal, etc.

- See **CV** of applicant in the application form including
    - o most relevant publications and other key outputs in CV (complete list of publications attached at the end of application)
- See **Merits and increased competencies** in the application form.

2 Quality of research

2.1 Scientific quality, novelty and innovativeness of research **Sub-rating (1–6)**

Significance of project; objectives and hypotheses; ambitiousness and state of the art of objectives (possible novel concepts and approaches or development across disciplines); scientific impact of research; potential for breakthroughs or exceptionally significant outcomes; etc.

- See item **1 Aim and objectives** in the research plan.

3 Implementation

3.1 Feasibility 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; 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.

3.2 Human resources, expertise and collaboration **Sub-rating (1–6)**

Scientific expertise of applicant in terms of project implementation; if relevant, complementary expertise of applicant's team (i.e., project personnel directly working/funded for the project), including appropriateness and sufficiency for the proposed project; adequateness of human resources in terms of project implementation; contribution of national and/or international research collaborators and their environment to the success of the project (i.e., collaborators engaged in the project with their own funding); significance of planned mobility for implementation of research plan and researcher training; etc.

- See item **3. Applicant, possible research team and collaborators** in the research plan.

ACADEMY OF FINLAND

- See **list of publications.**
- See **mobility plan** in the application form.
- See **letter(s) of collaboration**.

4 Responsible science, societal effects and impact

4.1 Responsible science **(no numerical rating)**

Consideration of different aspects of responsible science; please comment especially if there are shortcomings in any of the following aspects: research ethics; promotion of equality and nondiscrimination within project or in society at large; open access to research publications; data management and open access to data; sustainable development.

- See item **4 Responsible science** in the research plan.

4.2 Societal effects and impact of the project **(no numerical rating)**

Comments on aspects of societal effects and impact of the project, if relevant

- See item **5 Societal effects and impact** in the research plan.
- Comments on societal effects and impact should not affect the scientific review/rating or ranking of the application. Instead, they will be considered as an additional factor when the funding decisions are made.

5 Summary assessment of project

Main strengths and weaknesses of project **(no numerical rating)**

Summary assessment of application including main strengths and weaknesses with justifications; concluding remarks.

5.1 Main strengths and their justifications:

5.2 Main weaknesses and their justifications:

5.3 Concluding remarks:

ACADEMY OF FINLAND

6 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 based on the panel discussion (the ranking is made during the panel meeting)

Your application was ranked [ordinal number] of all [number] [Funding instrument name] applications reviewed in this panel. Only applications with a final rating of 5 or 6 were ranked. The [Funding instrument name] applications addressed to the Research Council for [Research Council name] were reviewed in a total of [number] panels.