



Call for clinical research 2026

Spring call 2026

Panel/Name of reviewer:

Application number:

Name of applicant:

Title of proposed project:

How to review applications of call for clinical research

This funding scheme is designed to strengthen clinical research and to promote clinical research careers. The clinical research project should be ambitious and of high scientific quality and implemented by consortia composed of three or more research teams. To reach these objectives the funding should increase collaboration between researchers in wellbeing services counties and other organisations; generate new research knowledge to support social welfare and healthcare, disease treatment, diagnostics, prevention or business activity; and encourage part-time research of physicians or other healthcare professionals engaged in clinical practice to enable broad coverage of speciality expertise within clinical research. The research to be funded should be of a high quality, with a high scientific impact and wide impact beyond academia. For wide societal impact, there should be a clear plan for interaction with key actors in using research findings at different stages of the research project lifecycle. The review should focus on scientific quality, research plan implementation and alignment with the call objectives, including the potential for achieving societal impact. It is equally important to pay attention to the significance of this funding to promote the clinical career development of physicians or other healthcare professionals engaged part-time in clinical practice (incl. early-career clinical researchers). Also, consider the expected added value of the consortium and the potential to increase collaboration between consortium partners. The funding is applied for to employ research teams, cover research costs and for part-time salary costs (20-50% of working hours) of physicians or other healthcare professionals engaged in clinical practice. The funding is granted for four years.

Provide both a written review and numerical ratings in section 1 (Project's relevance to call), 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
--------------	-------------



Research Council of Finland

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 call

1.1 Project's relevance to call

Subrating (1-6)

Contribution of the application to achieving the objectives of the call

Please review:

- potential of the project to strengthen clinical research
- significance for part-time clinical researcher career development of physicians or other healthcare professionals engaged part-time in clinical practice (incl. early-career clinical researchers) to enable broad coverage of speciality expertise in clinical research
- potential to increase collaboration between wellbeing services counties and other organisations
- effects, impact and interaction beyond academia, especially potential to generate new research knowledge to support social welfare and healthcare, disease treatment, diagnostics, prevention or business activity
- relevance of planned interaction with key actors in using research findings at different stages of the research project lifecycle
 - See call text 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

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



Research Council of Finland

- 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**.
 - **The consortium application** consists of three 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

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
 - working arrangements and 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 Part-time clinical researcher's career development potential, competence and expected achievements

Subrating (1-6)

Please review:

- significance of this funding for part-time clinical researcher's career development potential to enable broad coverage of speciality expertise within clinical research
- significance of this funding to advancement of professional competence and independence
- personal achievements and scientific and/or clinical expertise
- possible merits in supervising and mentoring
- merits in existing or planned joint projects
- experience of working in different research environments across international and/or sectoral borders



Research Council of Finland

- ability to generate scientific and/or clinical renewal during and after the project
- significance for development of networks and quality of already established networks
 - See part-time clinical researcher's **CV** in the application form
 - See part-time clinical researcher's **most relevant publications and other key outputs** in the application form.
 - See part-time clinical researcher's **list of publications**
 - See **research plan**.
 - Please note that the scientific expertise of all applicants in terms of project implementation is reviewed in section 3.3.

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

Subrating (1-6)

Please review:

- competence and scientific expertise of all applicants of consortium in terms of project implementation
- potential to increase collaboration between consortium partners, especially between wellbeing services counties and other organisations
- complementary expertise of teams 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, engaged with their own funding, and impact of their environment on project's potential success
- implementation plans for interaction with end-users and beneficiaries at various stages of the project (key actors, means, channels and optimal timing)
- 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** of all consortium partners in the application form.
 - See **CVs** of the applicants in the application form.
 - See **lists of publications**.
 - 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 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'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 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):

- For example: possible contradictions in individual reviews, or other relevant remarks from the panel discussion.
 - 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 subratings. 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 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.