

Application review form

Call to strengthen R&D activities and cooperation in wellbeing services counties 2027

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

Application number:

How to review applications in call to strengthen R&D activities and cooperation in wellbeing services counties

This funding scheme is aimed at strengthening cooperation between collaborative areas for healthcare and social welfare and other research actors in the areas. The funding promotes R&D in wellbeing services counties and strengthens cooperation within the health and social services system.

Review items:

- Objectives of the projects:
 - o Projects must increase collaboration between wellbeing services counties, as well as with universities, universities of applied sciences and government research institutes.
 - o Projects strengthen the quality of R&D activities and social and healthcare services.
 - o The R&D activities carried out in the projects improve productivity and effectiveness in the social and healthcare sector.
- Quality of R&D activities facilitated by the consortia
- Impact (for both social and healthcare services and R&D)
- Implementation of projects, including aspects of responsible science.

Provide both a written review and numerical ratings in section 1 (Project's relevance to call, background and significance), 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)	Has potential to substantially contribute to the objectives of the call; has potential to substantially support high quality R&D activities; presents a very high-quality plan
5 (excellent)	Has potential to contribute to the objectives of the call; has potential to support high quality R&D activities; presents a high-quality plan contains no significant elements to be improved
4 (good)	Has potential to contribute to the objectives of the call; has potential to support good quality R&D activities; presents a good-quality plan 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 Project's relevance to call

1. Relevance, background and significance

Subrating (1-6)

Please review:

- Alignment of proposed plan with objectives of the call and the project
 - o Projects must increase collaboration between wellbeing services counties, as well as with universities, universities of applied sciences and government research institutes.
 - o The project strengthens the quality of R&D activities and social and healthcare services
 - o The R&D activities carried out in the projects improve productivity and effectiveness in the social and healthcare sector.
 - Significance of project in relation to current knowledge, R&D-based starting points
 - o How the project and the methods used are linked to previous international or national R&D (state of the art)
 - o R&D premise, aims and objectives
 - R&D questions or hypotheses
 - Project's potential to generate new knowledge, new methods, new technology or new practices
- See **call text** for complete description of the objectives of this call.
- See **project plan section 1 Background and significance**.



2 Impact

2.1 Impact

Subrating (1-6)

Please review:

- Impact beyond academia (impact on social and healthcare services)
 - o Collaboration and its contribution to impact
 - o Expected impact and cost-effectiveness
 - o Impact assessment and metrics
 - o Demonstration, validation, and implementation of impact
 - o Possible additional societal impact
 - Impact within academia (R&D and scientific impact)
 - o Expected R&D results and their anticipated R&D impact
 - o Project's novelty or added value for R&D
 - o Potential for scientific breakthroughs and for promoting scientific renewal, **if applicable**
 - o Research impact within the scientific community, **if applicable**
- See [project plan section 2 Impact](#).
- Note that the projects in this call may include both research and development activities.

3 Implementation

3.1 Feasibility of plan, including aspects of responsible science

Subrating (1-6)

Please review:

- Project plan and schedule
 - o Feasibility of project, considering extent to which proposed research may include high risks
 - o Materials, R&D data and methods
 - o Detailed description of R&D to be performed, starting from objectives, scientific references and preliminary data (if available)
 - o Working arrangements and management of research tasks
 - o Research environment including research infrastructures
 - o Identified potential scientific or methodological problem areas and mitigation plan
 - o Consideration of good scientific practice, open access to research publications and data, data management, promotion of equality and nondiscrimination in society at large, and sustainable development within the project
- See [project plan section 3 Implementation and responsible science](#).



3.2 Expertise, human resources and collaboration, including aspects of responsible science

Subrating (1-6)

Please review:

- Collaborators
 - o Required consortium partners as stated in the call text, as well as their roles
 - o Justifications for selected partners and how the collaboration promotes and strengthens the R&D activities of the collaborative areas for healthcare and social welfare
 - o Other national and international collaborators of key significance to project implementation as well as their roles
 - Competence and expertise of all nominated PIs of consortium in terms of project implementation
 - Complementary expertise of teams directly working for/funded in the project, including appropriateness and sufficiency for proposed project
 - Adequateness of human resources for project implementation, with attention to promoting equality and nondiscrimination within project
 - Implementation plans for interaction with end-users and beneficiaries at various stages of project (key actors, means, channels and optimal timing)
 - Significance of planned mobility for implementation of research plan and researcher training
- See **project plan section 3 Implementation and responsible science**.
 - See **most relevant publications and other key outputs** in the application form.
 - See **CV(s)** of the PIs in the application form.
 - See possible **letter(s) of collaboration**.
 - The consortium application consists of three or more subprojects, each with nominated PIs and separate budgets but a common plan. The consortium implements a joint plan with a view to achieving more extensive added value than through normal cooperation. RCF officials have checked each consortium for eligibility.

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 is applicable only during the review panel meeting.

4.1.1 Main strengths and their justifications

(no numerical rating)

- Summary assessment of application's 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's main weaknesses with justifications
 - Refer to the review criteria in sections 1, 2 and 3.
 - To be completed only at the panel meeting

4.1.3 Other remarks (if any):

5 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 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.

