

## Academy of Finland Evaluation report

Please rate the applications using the scale below. You are encouraged to use the entire scale.

1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good, 4 = very good, 5 = excellent, 6 = outstanding

In addition to the numerical rating, please give a written evaluation of each of the specific questions.

### Reminder to the reviewer

#### Aim

The aim of the Academy of Finland's Centre of Excellence Programme is to strengthen Finnish research by raising its level, contributing to its regeneration and promoting its societal impact.

1. Scientific quality and innovativeness of the research plan	Rating
---	--------

#### 1.1 Assess the scientific quality and innovativeness of the research plan.

Subrating

Comments

**1.2 Assess the potential of this research to produce significant new outcomes and scientific breakthroughs and to contribute to the progress of science in the field. To what extent are the objectives ambitious and beyond the state of the art (e.g. novel concepts and approaches or development across disciplines)?**

Subrating

Comments

2. Feasibility of the research plan	Rating
-------------------------------------	--------

**2.1 Are the research methods sound and the research plan feasible? Do the applicants acknowledge potential scientific or methodological problem areas and how are alternative approaches being considered? Is the proposed schedule appropriate and well planned?**

Subrating

Comments

**2.2 Assess the structure and management of the CoE project. Is the division of labour between research teams of the consortia appropriate? Are the planned resources (personnel, financial and other material resources) adequate for the implementation of the planned CoE activities?**

Subrating

Comments

**2.3 Are there any ethical issues involved and, if so, how are they taken into account? What is the intended level of open access to research results? Is the data management plan worked out in a sufficient way.**

Comments (no numerical rating)

### 3. Competence of the applicant and research teams

Rating

**3.1 Assess the quality of the publication record, scientific expertise and other merits of the proposed CoE director, vice director and team leaders.**

Subrating

Comments

**3.2 Do the proposed director, vice director and team leaders bring complementary expertise to the CoE project?**

Subrating

Comments

**3.3 Assess the leadership skills of the proposed CoE director and vice director. Is it appropriate and sufficient for the proposed project? (To be considered in detail only after the interview)**

Subrating

Comments

### 4. Research environment, collaboration and training

**4.1 How does the research environment support this CoE, including use and development of the research infrastructures?**

Subrating

Comments

**4.2 Assess the national and the international research collaborations that can significantly contribute to the success of the CoE project.**

Subrating

Comments

**4.3 Does the research project support researcher training and mobility?**

Subrating

Comments

### 5. Impact beyond academia

**5.1 Comment on the expected societal impact of the CoE project (beyond scientific or scholarly impact).**

Comments (no numerical rating)

## 6. Added value

Rating

**6.1 Assess the scientific added value of working as a CoE compared to traditional research collaboration.**

Comments

## 7. International competitiveness

**7.1 Current situation: Assess how the CoE rates in relation to *top* or *close to top* international research in its field. The CoE as a whole belongs to the**

- *top*: best 1% (= rating 6)
- *top*: best 5% (= rating 5)
- *close to top*: best 10% (= rating 4)
- *close to top*: best 20% (= rating 3)
- (= rating 2 not applicable)
- neither *top* nor *close to top* (= rating 1)

Sub-rating

Comments

**7.2 Potential to raise the level of research with CoE funding: The CoE as a whole is likely to belong to the**

- *top*: best 1% (= rating 6)
- *top*: best 5% (= rating 5)
- *close to top*: best 10% (= rating 4)
- *close to top*: best 20% (= rating 3)
- (= rating 2 not applicable)
- neither *top* nor *close to top* (= rating 1)

Sub-rating

Comments

## 8. Overall assessment

List of main strengths and weaknesses of the CoE project. Additional comments and suggestions.

## 9. Final rating

