Application review form

Special funding for international collaboration in high-performance computing 2023

Panel/Name of reviewer: Application number:

Name of applicant:

Title of proposed project:

How to review application in the Special funding for international collaboration in high-performance computing call 2023

The aim of the special funding is to support the development of a diverse future computing ecosystem and the expansion of computing expertise into new sectors on both national and international level. The funding is also targeted at promoting scientific renewal and diversity, the quality of research and scientific impact as well as impact beyond academia in the thematic areas of the Finnish Research Flagships. The focus of the evaluation should be on the scientific quality and implementation of the research plan, taking into consideration the specific objectives of the call. The aim is to reach internationally as high a scientific standard as possible and to support scientific breakthroughs and top-tier international research collaboration. The funding is applied for to hire a research team, and it may be applied for by individual research teams or consortia composed of two or more research teams.

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 draft 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 Project's relevance to the call

1.1 Project's relevance to the call   Sub-rating (1–6)
Contribution of the application to achieving the objectives of the call

- See all items of the research plan and specifically item **1.4 Special objective of call** in the research plan.
- See **5 Societal effects and impact** 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.

ACADEMY OF FINLAND

---

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 collaborations   Sub-rating (1–6)

Competence and scientific expertise of applicant (in case of consortium: applicants) in terms of project implementation; complementary expertise of the 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 Research team and collaborators** in the research plan.
- See **most relevant publications and other key outputs** in the application form.
- See **CV(s)** of the applicant(s) in the application form.
- See **list of publications**.
- See **mobility plan** in the application form.
- See **letter(s) of collaboration**.

3.2.1 If applicable: Research consortium   (no numerical rating)

Significance and added value of consortium for attainment of research objectives

- See item **2.4 Added value of consortium** in the research plan.
- A consortium is a fixed-term body of subprojects under a joint research plan that it implements together with a view to achieving more extensive added value than through normal cooperation. Each consortium subproject applies for funding to implement the plan as part of the joint consortium application, but a consortium application is reviewed as a single research plan.

ACADEMY OF FINLAND

---

4 Responsible science

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

Consideration of the different aspects of responsible science; please especially comment 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.

---

5 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.

5.1 Main strengths and their justifications:

5.2 Main weaknesses and their justifications:

5.3 Concluding remarks:

---

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)

ACADEMY OF FINLAND

Your application was ranked [ordinal number] of all [number] applications reviewed in this panel. Best applications were ranked. The applications addressed to the Academy of Finland's Flagship Programme sub-committee were reviewed in one panel.

ACADEMY OF FINLAND