

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

*The aim of the Academy of Finland's funding for research posts as **Postdoctoral Researcher** is to support the most promising researchers who have recently earned their doctorate (PhD completion 0–4 years ago, or no more than eight years ago, provided that the doctoral degree has been obtained simultaneously with medical specialist training) in gaining competence for demanding researcher or expert positions. Postdoctoral Researchers have established effective national or international collaborative networks. In the review of applications, particular attention will be paid to the international dimension of the research plan. Postdoctoral Researchers are encouraged to engage in international mobility and collaboration. The funding period is 36 months.*

**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? 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 questions:* 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?

<b>3 Overall assessment</b>	<b>Final rating (1–6):</b>
-----------------------------	----------------------------

**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.