



September 2022 call

Panel/Name of reviewer:

Name of applicant:

Title of proposed project:

Application review form

Clinical Researcher 2022

Application number:

How to review applications for Clinical Researcher funding

The Academy of Finland funds part-time research by physicians and other researchers engaged in clinical practice. The focus of the evaluation should be on the scientific quality of the research plan. Additionally, attention should be paid to the applicant's suitability to the objectives of the Clinical Researcher funding instrument.

The aim is to promote clinical research careers in cooperation with, for example, university hospitals and to encourage medical doctors and other researchers working in clinical practice to engage in research alongside clinical practice. The funding is granted for part-time salary costs (20–50% of working hours) and research costs. The funding is granted for four years.

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 Quality of research

1.1 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.

2 Implementation

2.1 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.

2.2 Competence and expertise of applicant

Sub-rating (1–6)

Personal merits and scientific expertise of applicant; applicant's professional competence and independence; experience of supervising students, PhD candidates and/or postdoctoral researchers, 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; etc.

- See **CV** of applicant in the application form.



- See **most relevant publications and other key outputs** (complete list of publications attached at the end of application)
- See **list of publications**.

2.3 Human resources, expertise, and collaboration

Sub-rating (1–6)

Scientific expertise of applicant 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.
- See **mobility plan** in the application form.
- See **letter(s) of collaboration**.

3 Responsible science, societal effects, and impact

3.1 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.

3.2 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.



4 Summary assessment of project

Main strengths and weaknesses of project

(no numerical rating)

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

4.1 Main strengths and their justifications:

4.2 Main weaknesses and their justifications:

4.3 Concluding remarks:

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).

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 the 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.