

Applicants for funding for a research post as **Academy Professor** must have demonstrated excellence in research and must contribute to the development of their field as a whole, both during and after their professorship. The Academy Professor posts are intended for leading-edge researchers for fixed-term, full-time research and related tasks. Academy Professors pursue their own research plan, supervise their team and provide guidance to junior researchers. The funding covers a maximum of five years at a time. In order to be granted funding for a second term as Academy Professor, applicants must demonstrate their successful activities during their previous term, and their research plans must show scientific ambition and renewal. Academy Professors may be granted funding to cover research costs during their term.

**Please provide both written feedback and numerical ratings to each of the following sub-criteria.**

The numerical evaluation of the sub-items and final rating is made with a rating scale ranging from 1 (poor) to 6 (outstanding).

<b>6 (outstanding)</b>	Demonstrates exceptional novelty and innovation. Has potential to substantially advance science at global level. Is a high-gain project that may include risks.
<b>5 (excellent)</b>	Is extremely good in international comparison – contains no significant elements to be improved.
<b>4 (very good)</b>	Is in general sound but contains a few elements that could be improved.
<b>3 (good)</b>	Is in general sound but contains important elements that should be improved.
<b>2 (fair)</b>	Contains flaws. Is in need of substantial modification or improvement.
<b>1 (poor)</b>	Contains severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project or the application.

## 1 Quality of research described in the plan

Rating (1-6)

### 1.1. Scientific quality, ground-breaking nature and innovativeness of the research

Significance of the project; objectives and hypothesis; ambitiousness and state of the art of the objectives (possible novel concepts and approaches or development across disciplines); scientific impact of the research; potential for breakthroughs or exceptionally significant outcomes; etc.

➤ See item 1 **Aim and objectives** in the research plan.

### 1.2. Implementation of the research plan

Feasibility of the project (bearing in mind the extent to which the proposed research may include high risks); materials, research data and methods; human resources and management of research tasks; research environment including research infrastructures; identified potential scientific or methodological problem areas and mitigation plan; etc.

➤ See item 2 **Implementation** in the research plan.

### 1.3. Responsible science (no numerical rating)

Has the applicant considered the following aspects of responsible science properly? Select Yes/No under each sub-question. Provide further comments if needed.



- See item **4 Responsible science** in the research plan.
- See attached data management plan.
  - Please note: The Academy of Finland is committed to research integrity for responsible conduct of research<sup>1</sup> and to promoting the principles and practices of open science<sup>2</sup>.

**1.3.1. Ethical issues**

- Yes
- No

**1.3.2. Open access of research publications**

- Yes
- No

**1.3.3. Data management plan and open access to data or metadata**

- Yes
- No

**1.3.4. Promotion of equality and non-discrimination within the project or in society at large**

- Yes
- No

**2 Competence of applicant**

**Rating (1-6)**

**2.1 Competence<sup>3</sup> and expertise of the applicant**

Scientific productivity, originality and researcher education displayed by the PI, especially during the last 5–10 years. PI's status and recognition within the international scientific community.

- See item **3 Applicant, possible research group and partners** in the research plan.
- See attached **CV(s)** and **list(s) of publications**.

**3 Overall assessment and rating**

<sup>1</sup> European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity; ALLEA, All European Academies, 2017

<sup>2</sup> The Academy of Finland is committed to promoting the principles and practices of open science to improve the quality, responsibility and social impact of science. The goal is to make all outputs produced and used in research (research publications, data, methods) and their metadata widely available for reuse. The principles of open science must be pursued with due attention to good scientific practice and law. The degrees of data openness may justifiably vary, ranging from fully open to strictly confidential.

<sup>3</sup> The Academy of Finland is committed to promoting the DORA recommendations and to not using journal-based metrics, such as Journal Impact Factors, as a surrogate measure of the quality of individual research articles, to assess an individual scientist's contributions.





### 3.1 Main strengths and weaknesses of the project, additional comments and suggestions

Please list major strengths and weaknesses of the application as well as any additional comments.

- Please give an overall assessment for the application including lists of strengths and weaknesses as well as any additional comments. It is important to comment on both the strengths and the weaknesses of the application.
- You are also encouraged to comment on the societal effects and impact, including principles of sustainable development, see item 5 in research plan. However, these should not affect the scientific review/rating or ranking of the application. Instead, they will be considered as an additional factor when the funding decisions are made.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Comments:

### Overall rating

### Rating (1–6)

Please note that the final rating should not be a mathematical average of the sub-ratings.

- The final rating should not be a mathematical average of the sub-ratings. 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

Your application was ranked [ordinal number]<sup>st/nd/rd/th</sup> of all [number] [Funding instrument name] applications reviewed in this panel. Only applications with a final rating of 5 or 6 were ranked

