

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

Application number:

Please also write comments (not only numerical ratings) to each of the following sub-items.

The numerical evaluation of the sub-items and Item 1 (Research plan), Item 2 (Competence of applicant, quality of research collaborations) and Item 3 (Overall assessment) is made with ratings ranging from 1 (poor) to 6 (outstanding).

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

*An **Academy Research Fellow** funded by the Academy of Finland works on a research plan of a high scientific quality. Academy Research Fellows have built extensive research networks and the funding allows them to develop their skills of academic leadership and to establish themselves as independent researchers. The applicant is a researcher with 3–9 years of experience since PhD completion, or up to 13 years, provided that they have since completed medical specialist training. Those selected to the post will be requested to separately submit a detailed funding plan for research costs but a tentative funding plan for research costs is also appended to the application as part of the research plan. Research posts as Academy Research Fellow are filled for five years.*

1 Quality of research plan

Rating (1–6):

1.1 Scientific quality and innovativeness of research plan

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: How significant is the project scientifically? How high is the potential for breakthroughs or exceptionally significant outcomes? To what extent are the objectives ambitious and beyond the state of the art (e.g. novel concepts and approaches or development across disciplines)?

1.2 Feasibility of research plan

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: Are the objectives and hypotheses appropriately presented and is the research plan feasible (bearing in mind the extent to which the proposed research may include high risks)? Are the research methods and materials appropriate? How well does the applicant acknowledge potential scientific or methodological problem areas, and how does the applicant consider alternative approaches? Is the management of the proposed plan appropriate and well planned? Does the research environment support the project, including appropriate research infrastructures?

1.3 Good scientific practices

Guiding questions: Are there any ethical issues involved and, if so, how are they taken into account? Does the publication plan support open access? Does the data management plan responsibly support the reuse of research data after the project has been completed?

2 Competence of applicant, quality of research collaborations

Rating (1–6):

2.1 Competence and expertise of applicant

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: What are the personal merits and scientific expertise of the applicant? Are they appropriate and sufficient for the proposed project? What are the personal competences of the applicant in terms of supervising PhD candidates or postdoctoral researchers? Does the research plan advance the applicant's professional competence and independence?

2.2 Research team, significance of research collaborations

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: Does the research team bring complementary expertise to the project (if applicable)? How does the national and/or international research collaboration contribute to the success of the project?

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

Application number:

2.3. Researcher mobility

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding question: How does the mobility plan support the research plan? Does the receiving organisation stand out in the respective field of research? Is the length of the mobility period appropriate and is its timing right for the project? Does the mobility plan support researcher training? What has been the quality of the applicant's previous mobility across international and/or sectorial borders?

3 Overall assessment	Rating (1–6):
-----------------------------	----------------------

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

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Comments:

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