

Application review form

Academy Programme for Sport Science and Physical Activity ACTIVE 2027

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

Application number:

How to review applications in the Academy Programme for Sport Science and Physical Activity ACTIVE

The Academy Programme for Sport Science and Physical Activity ACTIVE advances the quality, renewal and impact of research in sport science. The programme generates new knowledge to promote public health and physical activity by directing funding to high-quality, innovative sport science research within different research areas.

The research projects funded within the programme should in addition to a high scientific quality also display novelty and inventiveness as well as scientific and societal impact. The aim is to fund applications with a high applicability value for planning, decision-making in and promotion of exercise, sports, and physical activity.

The focus of the review should be on scientific quality and impact, implementation of the research plan and societal impact, 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 the call) 2 (Quality of research) and section 3 (Implementation) and give the overall rating for 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 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, including societal impact.

Please review:

- alignment of the application with the call objectives.
- what new knowledge the project will generate to promote the theme/themes of the call.
- the appeal, utilisation potential and application areas of the research results beyond the scientific community, especially in relation to the objectives of the ACTIVE-programme to promote impact, accountability, and sustainability in sport science research.
- the applicability value of the research results for planning, decision-making in and promotion of exercise, sports, and physical activity in a short- and/or long-time perspective.
 - [See call text and program memorandum for complete description of the objectives of this call](#)
 - [See **research plan**.](#)

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



Research Council of Finland

- project's potential to generate new knowledge, new methods, new technology or new practices
 - See **research plan**.
 - A consortium application consists of two or more sub-projects each with nominated PIs and separate budgets but a common research plan. The consortium implements a joint research plan together 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
- responsible implementation: including consideration of research ethics and good scientific practice, open science and responsible data management, equality and nondiscrimination, and sustainable development within the project
 - See **research plan**.
 - See brief **data management plan** in the application form.

3.2 Expertise, human resources, and collaborations, 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
- adequacy of human resources for 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



Research Council of Finland

- description of the planned interaction with end-users and beneficiaries at various stages of the project (key actors, means, channels and optimal timing), including interaction with media.
- significance of planned mobility for implementation of research plan and researcher training (if adequate)
 - See **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 (if adequate).
 - 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 IN 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 the application's main strengths with justifications
 - Refer to the review criteria in sections 1, 2 and 3.
 - To be completed only in 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 in the panel meeting

4.1.3 Other remarks (if any):

- E.g. possible contradictions in individual reviews, or other relevant remarks from the panel discussion
 - To be completed only in 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 4, 5 or 6 were ranked.

