

Application review form

Academy Project 2027

2027 winter call

Panel/Name of reviewer:

Application number:

Name of applicant:

Title of proposed project:

How to review Academy Project applications

The aim of the funding scheme is to produce high-quality and high-impact research, facilitate groundbreaking research initiatives and strengthen high-level expertise. The review should focus on the scientific quality of the proposed research compared to international standards as well as on scientific impact and wider impact, if relevant in the project, and project implementation. The implementation shall be based on the most appropriate scientific methods and may include innovative and demanding approaches that are systematic and credible, identifying the uncertainties involved in the implementation and demonstrating the ability to manage the risks associated with the implementation of the research. In addition, the review will focus on the research team's competence and potential to conduct demanding and uncertain research. The review should also pay attention to the development of the research team's scientific, methodological and other competence, as well as to researcher training and mentoring at all career levels. The funding is applied for to employ 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 in section 1 (Quality of research), section 2 (Impact) 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
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 Quality of research

1.1 Excellence

Subrating (1-6)

Please review how well the project meets the following objectives:

- scientific quality compared to international cutting edge, level of ambition in the research plan and design
- novelty value, groundbreaking research initiatives
- clarity of research questions, utilisation of the most effective approaches
- creates conditions for scientific breakthroughs.

- See [research plan](#).

2 Impact

2.1 Impact

Subrating (1-6)

Please review project's potential to

- produce knowledge that drives the development of science and research
- generate scientific impact and, where relevant, broader impact, including contributions to sustainable development and responsibility
- strengthen internationally competitive and high-quality scientific, methodological and other expertise, and researcher training and mentoring.

- See [research plan](#).

3 Implementation

3.1 Implementation

Please review:

- methods, credibility of implementation and risk management
- innovative approaches



Research Council of Finland

- 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
 - expertise and suitability of research team for proposed research and potential of team to carry out demanding and uncertain research
 - quality of collaboration and relevance of collaborators.
- See **research plan**.
 - See **brief data management plan** in the application form.
 - 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.
 - See possible **letter(s) of collaboration**.
 - For more detailed instructions on assessing **responsible science**, please see the document "**Review principles**".

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 THE PANEL MEETING

Section 4 of the form applies 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 including 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 including main weaknesses with justifications
 - Refer to the review criteria in sections 1, 2 and 3.
 - To be completed only at the panel meeting.



Research Council of Finland

4.1.3 Other remarks (if any):

- For example: possible contradictions in individual reviews, or other relevant remarks from the panel
 - To be completed only at the panel meeting.

5 Overall rating	Rating (1-6)
------------------	--------------

- Please note that the final rating does not have to be a mathematical average of the subratings but should reflect the overall quality of the application.

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.

