

Panel/Name of the reviewer:

Application number:

Name of the applicant:

Title of the proposed project:

*The Academy of Finland funds part-time research by physicians and other researchers engaged in clinical practice. The aim is to promote **clinical research** careers in cooperation with, for example, university hospitals, and to encourage medical doctors and other researchers working in clinical practice to engage in research alongside clinical practice. The funding is granted for part-time salary costs (20–50% of working hours) and for research costs. The funding is granted for four years.*

**Please provide both written feedback and numerical ratings to each of the following items.**

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. Potential to substantially advance science at global level. High-gain project that may include risks
<b>5 (excellent)</b>	Extremely good in international comparison – no significant elements to be improved
<b>4 (very good)</b>	In general sound but contains a few elements that could be improved
<b>3 (good)</b>	In general sound but contains important elements that should be improved
<b>2 (fair)</b>	Contains flaws. In need of substantial modification or improvement
<b>1 (poor)</b>	Severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project or the application

**1. Quality of research described in the plan**

**1.1 Scientific quality, novelty and innovativeness of the research**

**Sub-rating (1–6)**

*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.*

**1.2 Implementation of the research plan**

**Sub-rating (1–6)**

*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 the research tasks; the research environment including research infrastructures; identified potential scientific or methodological problem areas and mitigation plan; etc.*

**1.3 Responsible science**

**(no numerical rating)**

*Has the applicant considered the following aspects of responsible science:*

**1.3.1. Ethical issues**

- Yes
- No

*Further comments (if relevant)*





**1.3.2. Open access of the research publications**

- Yes
- No

Further comments (if relevant)

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

- Yes
- No

Further comments (if relevant)

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

- Yes
- No

Further comments (if relevant)

**2. Competence of the applicant, quality of research collaborations**

**2.1 Competence and expertise of the applicant**

**Sub-rating (1–6)**

*Personal merits and scientific expertise of the applicant, including the appropriateness and sufficiency for the proposed project; applicant's professional competence and independence; experience in supervising phd candidates and/or postdoctoral researchers; etc.*

**2.2 Research team and significance of research collaborations**

**Sub-rating (1–6)**

*Complementary expertise of the team (if relevant); contribution of national and/or international research collaboration to the success of the project; complementary expertise and research environment of the collaborators in terms of implementation of the project; etc.*

**2.3 Researcher mobility**

**Sub-rating (1–6)**

*Significance of the planned mobility for the implementation of the research plan and for researcher training; quality of the receiving organisation in the respective field of research; appropriateness of the length and timing of the mobility period/s; quality of the applicant's previous mobility across international and/or sectorial borders; etc.*

**3. Overall assessment and rating**

**3.1 Main strengths and weaknesses of project, additional comments and suggestions (no numerical rating)**

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

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Comments:

**4. Overall rating**

**Rating (1–6)**

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





ACADEMY OF FINLAND

### Ranking

Your application was ranked [ordinal number]<sup>th</sup> of all the [number] [Funding instrument name] applications reviewed in this panel. Only applications with the final rating of 4 to 6 were ranked. Altogether, [Funding instrument name] applications addressed to Research Council for [Research Council name] were reviewed in [number] panels.

