

## Application review form

### Flagship Programme call 5

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

Application number:

#### How to review Flagship Programme applications

The aim of the Finnish Flagship Programme is to support wide-ranging economic and other societal impact based on particularly high-level scientific research. The funding is targeted at competence clusters that are based on cooperation between organisations and that have convincing track records of results and impact. Finnish Flagships bring together expertise from different fields into competence clusters that strengthen the quality and impact of Finnish research.

The focus of the review should be on the Flagship Programme's objectives concerning internationally top-level research, impact in support of economic growth and/or society, and the role and participation of collaborators. Support provided by the Flagship for the building of internationally competitive competence clusters and ecosystems in Finland, together with the principles of responsible science, will also play a role in the review.

**Provide both a written review and numerical ratings for section 1 (Demonstrated scientific excellence and impact in support of economic growth and/or society), section 2 (Plan for promoting scientific excellence and impact in support of economic growth and/or society) and section 3 (Ecosystem and organisation of candidate Flagship). Provide a written review in section 4 (Summary assessment of proposal) and give an overall rating in section 6. Write evaluative comments rather than descriptive ones.**

**Please note: Section 5 (Review panel's summary assessment) is written by the panel during the panel meeting.**

The numerical evaluation of the sub-items and final rating is made with a rating scale ranging from 6 (outstanding) to 1 (poor). Where relevant, please consider both scientific excellence and impact in support of economic growth and/or society. The consistency between the numerical rating and the written comments is particularly important.

Rating scale	Description
6 (outstanding)	Demonstrates exceptional novelty, innovation as well as impact with crucial relevance; has potential to substantially advance science at global level; has such



	novelty or timeliness and promise that extremely significant support to economic growth and/or society is likely
5 (excellent)	Demonstrates novelty, innovation and impact with very high relevance – contains no significant elements to be improved; has such novelty or timeliness and promise that very significant support to economic growth and/or society is likely
4 (good)	Is in general sound but contains a few elements that could be improved; has impact with high relevance, i.e. such novelty or timeliness and promise that significant support to economic growth and/or society is likely
3 (fair)	Is in general sound but contains important elements that should be improved; has impact with relevance, i.e. such novelty or timeliness and promise that some support to economic growth and/or society is likely
2 (poor)	Contains flaws; is in need of substantial modification or improvement; has low potential for impact in support of economic growth and/or society
1 (insufficient)	Contains severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project or the application

**1 Demonstrated scientific excellence and impact in support of economic growth and/or society****1.1 Demonstrated scientific excellence and impact****Subrating (1-6)**

Quality and significance of previous research and research outputs in the topic in international comparison; merits, scientific expertise and leadership skills of key persons; sufficiency of available expertise for a Flagship project; etc.

- See item 1 Flagship details in the research and impact plan.
- See item 2 Central idea in the research and impact plan.
- See item 3 Demonstrated scientific excellence and impact in support of economic growth and/or society in the research and impact plan.
- See most relevant publications in the application document.

**2 Plan for promoting scientific excellence and impact in support of economic growth and/or society****2.1 Scientific excellence and impact of proposed plan****Subrating (1-6)**

Ambitiousness and presentation of scientific excellence and impact in support of economic growth and/or society objectives; appropriateness of performance indicators; significance of expected scientific outcomes; advancement of state-of-the-art in the field(s); appropriateness/effectiveness of arrangements described for facilitating impact generation; etc.

- See item 4.1 Description of plan for promoting scientific excellence and impact.



## 2.2 Implementation of proposed plan for promoting scientific excellence and impact including aspects of responsible science Subrating (1-6)

Clarity of plan; identification and incorporation of relevant approaches and methods; appropriateness of proposed schedule; identification of relevant problem areas and appropriateness of mitigation measures; consideration of gender equality and nondiscrimination, research ethics, open access to research publications and data, data management, and sustainable development; etc.

- See item 4.2 Implementation of proposed plan for promoting scientific excellence and impact including aspects of responsible science.

## 3 Ecosystem and organisation of candidate Flagship

### 3.1 Ecosystem and organisation Subrating (1-6)

Links of the proposed activities to host organisation's strategic choices and synergies; appropriateness of allocated resources and their evolution for implementation of proposed activities; coherence of management structures and procedures in supporting proposed activities; clarity of roles of different actors; identification of relevant collaborators including collaborations with business sector; active collaborations with business sector and possibly other sectors of society; appropriateness of planned actions for increasing appeal of research environment; innovation orientation of research environment; etc.

- See item 5 Ecosystem and organisation of candidate Flagship in the research and impact plan.

## 4 Summary assessment of proposal

### 4.1 Added value of candidate Flagship (no numerical rating)

Added value of candidate Flagship for attainment of objectives

### 4.2 Expected significant scientific impact (no numerical rating)

Expected significant scientific impact of candidate Flagship

### 4.3 Expected impact in support of economic growth and/or society (no numerical rating)

Expected impact in support of economic growth and/or society of candidate Flagship



## Research Council of Finland

### 5 Review panel's summary assessment of proposal

#### TO BE COMPLETED ONLY AT PANEL MEETING

Section 5 of the form is applicable only to the applications selected for discussion during the review panel meeting.

#### 5.1 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.

#### 5.2 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.

#### 5.3 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.

### 6 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 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.