

Application review form

Academy Research Fellowships 2027

2027 winter call

Panel/Name of reviewer:

Application number:

Name of applicant:

Title of proposed project:

How to review applications for Academy Research Fellowships

The objective of the Academy Research Fellowship funding is to support early-career researchers on fast career tracks and help them increase their competencies, make significant career progress towards the most demanding research positions and achieve an established position in the national and international research community.

The review should focus on the applicant's future potential to achieve these objectives and on the scientific quality, feasibility and impact of the research plan. When assessing the applicant, emphasis should be placed on future potential and planned development. Past achievements should be considered mainly as evidence supporting the feasibility of the applicant's plans. Assess merits qualitatively, taking into account the applicant's career stage and possible career breaks.

Provide both a written review and numerical ratings in section 1 (Applicant), section 2 (Quality, impact and implementation of research), and give an overall rating in section 4. Write evaluative comments rather than descriptive ones. Section 3 (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. Applicant

1.1 Career development

Subrating (1-6)

Please review:

- applicant's career development potential and ability gained during the project to transition to more demanding and leading research positions
- ambition, clarity and credibility of career plan
- applicant's ability to be responsible for the planning, management and development of the research and their capacity to further develop these
- research plan, career plan and previous experience as a whole.

The credibility and feasibility of the career plan are assessed based on how the applicant's achievements to date, current expertise and proposed plans collectively demonstrate the potential to become a leading researcher in the field, such as:

- quality, significance and development of research production
 - evidence of independent research work and the development of the research profile
 - experience in research management, supervision and teaching
 - versatile research cooperation, mobility and networking.
- See **Merits and increased competencies** in the application form, including
 - o most relevant publications and other key outputs (complete list of publications attached at the end of application).
 - See **CV** of applicant in the application form.

1.2 Qualifications and professional development

Subrating (1-6)

Please review:

- plan for the development of scientific and other expertise needed for research work
- ability to strengthen independent research and develop research
- development of supervision and management skills
- utilisation of internationalisation, cooperation and research environments in competence development.



Research Council of Finland

The credibility, consistency and feasibility of the competence development plan are assessed based on how the applicant's achievements to date demonstrate competence development and form a credible foundation for the development plan, such as:

- demonstrated scientific expertise and scope of knowledge
 - methodological competence and experience of different research approaches
 - diverse experience of research cooperation and mobility
 - other relevant scientific and expert merits.
- See **Merits and increased competencies** in the application form, including
 - o most relevant publications and other key outputs (complete list of publications attached at the end of application).
 - See **CV** of applicant in the application form.
 - See **research plan**.

2 Quality, impact and implementation of research

2.1 Quality and impact of research

Subrating (1-6)

Please review:

- how well the project meets the following objectives:
 - o scientific quality compared to international standards, level of ambition in the research plan
 - o novelty value and possible new or ambitious research initiatives
 - o clarity of research questions, utilisation of the most effective approaches
 - the project's potential to:
 - o produce knowledge that drives the development of science and research
 - o generate scientific impact, and where relevant, broader impact, including contributions to sustainable development and responsibility
 - o strengthen the applicant's research profile and international competitiveness.
- See **research plan**.

2.2 Implementation

Subrating (1-6)

Please review:

- methods, credibility of implementation and risk management
- innovativeness and suitability of 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
 - suitability of collaborators and possible research team
 - scope of research plan in relation to the objectives and the applicant's competence.
-
- See [research plan](#).
 - See [brief data management plan](#) in the application form.
 - See [mobility plan](#) in the application form.
 - See possible [letter\(s\) of collaboration](#).
 - See [list of publications](#).
 - See [Merits and increased competencies](#) in the application form.
 - See [CV](#) of applicant in the application form.
 - For more detailed instructions on assessing responsible science, please see the document "Review principles".

3 Review panel's summary assessment of proposal

3.1 Main strengths and weaknesses of proposal and their justifications; possible other remarks

TO BE COMPLETED ONLY AT THE PANEL MEETING

Section 3 of the form applies only to the applications selected for discussion during the review panel meeting.

3.1.1 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 and 2.
 - To be completed only at the panel meeting.

3.1.2 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 and 2.
 - To be completed only at the panel meeting.



Research Council of Finland

3.1.3 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.

4 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 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.

