Research Council of Finland

Application review form 2026

Strategic Research Programme Call: Full application
Review questions for societal relevance and impact

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

Application number:

Please provide written feedback in each of the following items and an overall numerical rating.

The numerical evaluation is made with the rating scale below. The written feedback should reflect the rating given using the wording in the rating descriptions. The final rating is made with a rating scale ranging from 6 (extremely significant) to 1 (poor).

Rating	Description
6 extremely significant	research of crucial relevance to users, i.e., such novelty or timeliness and promise that an extremely significant contribution to policy or practice is likely; demonstrates exceptional novelty and innovation to address a solution to an important problem or a critical barrier
5 very significant	research of very high relevance to users, i.e., such novelty or timeliness and promise that a very significant contribution to policy or practice is likely; high potential to address a solution to an important problem or a critical barrier
4 significant	research of high relevance to users, i.e., such novelty or timeliness and promise that a significant contribution to policy or practice is likely
3 moderate	research of relevance to users, i.e. such novelty or timeliness and promise that a moderate contribution to policy or practice is likely
2 limited	research that will add to understanding but that might not be of sufficient relevance or urgency to influence policy or practice
1 poor	research that is not considered relevant; proposal is in need of substantial modification or improvement

Research Council of Finland

1 Project's relevance to programme

1.1 Societal relevance of project and match with programme

How does the project contribute to achieving the solutions pursued by the programme?

Are the objectives and expected results societally important?

2 Project's interaction with society

2.1 Engaging stakeholders and networks, enabling social betterment

Is the implementation of research and interaction appropriate and effective from a societal perspective? Does it aim at concrete steps towards improving policy or practice? Is the reach and commitment of stakeholders sufficient to enable the intended change?

How does the research and interaction plan support co-creation, co-design, or co-production of knowledge, or other ways of engaging stakeholders beyond academia?

3 Competence and expertise

3.1 Competence and expertise of consortium, including external collaboration

What are the merits and expertise of the consortium (incl. expertise from multiple disciplines and beyond academia) in conducting socially relevant research that meets the expectations of the programme? Is the management and coordination of the consortium appropriate and high-quality? Does the consortium have appropriate competence to implement the interaction plans?

4 Responsible science

The Research Council of Finland is committed to promoting research integrity, responsible conduct of research and the principles and practices of equality and nondiscrimination and open science. See the '*Review process Code of Conduct*' document for further information. Has the applicant considered these aspects of responsible science in the application?

Research Council of Finland

Ethics

At the level of society's values and normative structures, does the proposed project enhance the freedom and capabilities of individuals? Does it contribute to their sense and real possibilities of belonging to a community? Does it help in creating a society where it is possible for people to act in a morally sustainable way?

Promotion of equality and nondiscrimination within society at large

Do you think that the proposed project promotes equality between genders and/or nondiscrimination within society at large? More broadly, do you think that the proposed project enhances an inclusive society, giving a voice also to those in vulnerable or marginalised positions?

Open science

Does the proposed project promote the use of knowledge in policymaking and society at large in such a way that it enhances the trustworthiness of science in the eyes of the public?

Sustainable development

Viewing the objectives of the programme in the broader context of the objectives of sustainable development (such as reduction of poverty, protection of the planet and improving the lives and prospects of everyone), do you think that the proposed project helps achieve balanced policies between different major social challenges, concerns and problems?

4.1. Implementation of responsible science

Consideration of the various aspects of responsible science; please comment especially if there are shortcomings in any of the aspects of responsible science listed above.

5 Summary assessment of project

5.1 Main strengths and weaknesses of project; additional comments and recommendations

Summary assessment of application including main strengths and weaknesses with justifications; concluding remarks.

6 Overall rating	Rating (1–6)