



Application review form

Antarctic Research 2024

Panel/Name of reviewer:

Application number:

Name of applicant:

Title of proposed project:

How to review applications in the Antarctic research call

The aim of the Antarctic research call is to generate internationally significant new breakthroughs in Antarctic research. The themes have not been confined to any particular thematic area, but the call is open for all projects relevant in terms of Antarctic research. The research may be global, or it may focus on both Polar Regions, but it must be research that cannot be conducted without material on or from the Antarctic. Projects are required to engage in international collaboration.

The focus of the review should be on scientific quality and implementation of the research plan, taking into consideration the specific objectives of the call. 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.

Provide both a written review and numerical ratings for section 1 (Project's relevance to programme), section 2 (Quality of research) and section 3 (Implementation) and give an overall rating in section 5. Write evaluative comments rather than descriptive ones.

Use a rating scale ranging from 6 (outstanding) to 1 (insufficient). The consistency between the numerical rating and the written comments is particularly important.

Section 4 (Review panel's summary assessment) is written by the panel during the panel meeting.



| Rating scale | Description |
|------------------|---|
| 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 |
| 5 (excellent) | Is very good in international comparison - contains no significant elements to be improved |
| 4 (good) | Is in general sound but contains some elements that should be improved |
| 3 (fair) | Is in general sound but contains important elements that should be improved |
| 2 (poor) | Contains flaws and needs substantial modification or improvement |
| 1 (insufficient) | Contains severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project or the application |

1 Project's relevance to Antarctic research

1.1 Project's relevance to call

Sub-rating (1-6)

Please review:

- contribution of application to achieving objectives of call.
 - See all items of the **research plan** and specifically item 1.4 (Special objective of call) in the research plan.
 - The objectives of the call are described in the call text.

2 Quality of research

2.1 Scientific quality, novelty and innovativeness of research

Sub-rating (1-6)

Please review:

- scientific quality and significance of project's objectives and hypotheses
- ambitiousness and state of the art of objectives, including possible novel concepts and approaches or development across disciplines
- (if applicable) scientific added value of consortium for attainment of research objectives
- impact of research within academia
- potential for breakthroughs or exceptionally significant outcomes including possible high-risk, high-gain research
- project's potential to generate new knowledge, new methods, new technology or new practices.
 - See **research plan**.



Research Council of Finland

- A consortium application consists of two or more subprojects each with nominated PIs and separate budgets but a common research plan. The consortium implements a joint research plan with a view to achieving more extensive added value than through normal cooperation.

3 Implementation

3.1 Feasibility of research plan, including aspects of responsible science

Sub-rating (1-6)

Please review:

- feasibility of project, taking into account extent to which proposed research may include high risks
 - materials, research data and methods
 - working arrangements and management of research tasks
 - research environment including research infrastructures
 - identified potential scientific or methodological problem areas and mitigation plan
 - consideration of research ethics, open access to research publications and data, data management, promotion of equality and nondiscrimination in society at large, and sustainable development within in the project.
- See **research plan**.

3.2 Expertise, human resources, including aspects of responsible science

Sub-rating (1-6)

Please review:

- competence and scientific expertise of applicant (and in case of consortium: all applicants) in terms of project implementation
 - complementary expertise of team, who are directly working for/funded in the project, including appropriateness and sufficiency for proposed project
 - adequateness of human resources for project implementation, with attention to promoting equality and nondiscrimination within project
 - competence of the applicant(s) in terms of supervising PhD candidates or postdoctoral researchers; support for researcher training within the project.
- See **research plan**.
 - See **most relevant publications and other key outputs** in the application form.
 - See **CV(s)** of the applicant(s).
 - See **list of publications**.

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

Please review:

- significance of main international research collaboration including competence of the international partner in terms of merits and scientific expertise; complementary expertise and research environment of the main collaborator in terms of project implementation
- contribution of other research collaborators, both national and international, and impact of their research environment on project's potential success
- significance of planned mobility for implementation of research plan and researcher training
 - See [research plan](#).
 - See attached [CV, list of publications and statement provided by the main collaborator](#).
 - See [mobility plan](#) in the application form.
 - See possible [letter\(s\) of collaboration](#).

4 Review panel's summary assessment of proposal**4.1 Main strengths and weaknesses of proposal and their justifications; possible other remarks****TO BE COMPLETED ONLY AT THE PANEL MEETING**

Section 4 of the form is applicable only to the top-tier applications selected for discussion during the review panel meeting.

4.1.1 Main strengths and their justifications**(no numerical rating)**

- Summary assessment of the application's main strengths with justifications
 - Refer to the review criteria in sections 1, 2 and 3.
 - To be completed only at the panel meeting

4.1.2 Main weaknesses and their justifications**(no numerical rating)**

- Summary assessment of the application's main weaknesses with justifications
 - Refer to the review criteria in sections 1, 2 and 3.
 - To be completed only at the panel meeting

4.1.3 Other remarks (if any):

**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. Applications with a final rating of 5 or 6 were ranked.

