

Application review form

Academy Research Fellowships 2026

2026 winter call

Panel/Name of reviewer:

Application number:

Name of applicant:

Title of proposed project:

How to review applications for Academy Research Fellowships

The focus of the review 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 and the ability to generate scientific renewal. The applicant should be a promising research talent who is on a rising career trajectory and has potential to advance to more demanding research positions. Throughout the review, the applicant's career stage should be taken into account, including possible career breaks.

Provide both a written review and numerical ratings in section 1 (Competence and potential of applicant), section 2 (Quality of research) and section 3 (Implementation), and give an overall rating in section 5. Write evaluative comments rather than descriptive ones. Section 4 (Review panel's summary assessment) is written by the panel during the panel meeting.

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

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. Applicant****1.1 Competence, expected achievements and potential of applicant****Subrating (1-6)**

Please review:

- applicant's personal achievements and scientific expertise
- applicant's professional competence and independence, that is, merits in supervising and mentoring, merits in existing or planned joint projects, and more independent publishing
- experience of working in different research environments across international or sectoral borders
- significance of this funding to advancement of applicant's professional competence
- applicant's career development potential
- applicant's ability to generate scientific renewal during and after the project
 - 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.
 - Please note that the scientific expertise of the applicant in terms of project implementation is reviewed in subsection 3.2.

2 Quality of research**2.1 Scientific quality, novelty and innovativeness of research****Subrating (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
- 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**.



2.2 Additional comments on aspects of societal effects and impact of project, if relevant

(no numerical rating)

- Comments on societal effects and impact should not affect the scientific review/rating or ranking. Instead, they will be considered as an additional factor when the funding decisions are made.

3 Implementation

3.1 Feasibility of research plan, including aspects of responsible science

Subrating (1-6)

Please review:

- feasibility of project, taking into account extent to which 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
- consideration of gender equality and nondiscrimination, research ethics, open access to research publications and data, data management, and sustainable development
- See [research plan](#).
- See [brief data management plan](#) in the application form.

3.2 Expertise, human resources and collaboration, including aspects of responsible science

Subrating (1-6)

Please review:

- scientific expertise of applicant in terms of project implementation
- (if relevant) complementary expertise of applicant's team, who are directly working for/funded in the project, including appropriateness and sufficiency for the proposed project
- adequacy of human resources in terms of project implementation, with attention to promoting equality and nondiscrimination within project
- contribution of both national and international research collaborators, who are engaged with their own funding, and impact of their environment on project's potential success
- significance of planned mobility for implementation of research plan and researcher training
- See [research plan](#).
- See [list of publications](#).
- See [mobility plan](#) in the application form.
- See [letter\(s\) of collaboration](#).



Research Council of Finland

4 Review panel's summary assessment of proposal

4.1 Main strengths and weaknesses of proposal

TO BE COMPLETED ONLY AT THE PANEL MEETING

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

4.1.1 Main strengths and their justifications (no numerical rating)

- Summary assessment of application including 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 application including 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):

- For example: possible contradictions in individual reviews, or other relevant remarks from the panel discussion (incl. societal effects and impact)
 - To be completed only at the panel meeting.

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 a final rating of 5 or 6 were ranked.

