Research Council of Finland

Application review form 2026

Strategic Research Programme Call: Full application
Review questions for scientific quality

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 description. The final rating is made with a rating scale ranging from 6 (outstanding) to 1 (insufficient).

Rating	Description
6 outstanding	demonstrates exceptional novelty and/or innovation; has potential to substantially advance science at a 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

Research Council of Finland

1 Quality of research described

1.1 Scientific quality and framing of phenomena

How does the project show high scientific quality and potential for innovative outcomes across disciplinary boundaries? How are the problem-framing and the choice of disciplinary perspectives and methodologies justified? Is there a unifying principle, frame or concept that provides coherence? Does the proposal indicate synergistic or innovative outcomes from the interaction between disciplines in a solution-oriented way?

1.2 Research plan

Are the objectives sound and well-presented and is the research plan realistic? Have relevant approaches, methods, materials and research partners been identified and appropriately incorporated into the research plan? Do you consider the application multidisciplinary, and are multiple organisations and research fields included in the work packages? Is the management plan appropriate and will it support leadership, coordination, interaction and exchange of information between work packages? Does the research environment support the project, such as with appropriate research and/or technology infrastructures?

2 Competence and expertise

2.1 Competence of applicants, quality of research collaboration

What are the merits and scientific expertise of the consortium in both discipline-based research and multidisciplinary research? Are they appropriate and sufficient for the proposed project? How does the collaboration (incl. international collaboration) contribute to the research activities and knowledge?

3 Impact

3.1 Scientific impact

What is the project's level of expected scientific impact? Is there potential for generating impact on multiple disciplines or for advancing further learning and collaboration across disciplinary divides?

Research Council of Finland

4 Responsible science

4.1. Responsible science

Consideration of the different aspects of responsible science; please especially comment if there are shortcomings in any of the following aspects: research ethics; promotion of equality and nondiscrimination within project or in society at large; open access to research publications; data management and open access to data; sustainable development. See '*Review process Code of Conduct*' document for further information.

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)