

Application review form

Centre of Excellence Programme 2024 2nd-stage evaluation, full proposal

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

Application number:

How to review Centre of Excellence applications

A Centre of Excellence (CoE) is a research community that is already at or striving for the international cutting edge of research in its field. CoEs may consist of one or more research teams working closely together under a joint research plan. The units selected as CoEs are scientifically first-rate research communities that have capacity for renewal and high societal impact. The CoE programmes contribute to the renewal of science by supplying new research topics, new methods and approaches, and new research teams.

The review criteria for Centres of Excellence are scientific quality, novelty and innovativeness of the research as well as its impact within academia. In addition, the scientific added value of consortium is important. Other main review criteria are feasibility of plan of Intent/research plan and the quality of research environment, competence of applicants and research team(s), and quality of collaboration networks including researcher mobility, and researcher training.

The CoEs are selected based on a two-stage evaluation process. At the first stage of the evaluation, the plans of intent are reviewed by international individual reviewers. At the second stage, the full proposals are reviewed and CoE candidates interviewed by an international evaluation panel.

Provide both a written review and numerical ratings in section 1 (Quality of research) and section 2 (Implementation) and give an overall rating in section 4. Write evaluative comments rather than descriptive ones. Section 3 (Review panel's summary assessment) is written by the panel during the panel meeting.

Use a rating scale ranging from 6 (outstanding) to 1 (insufficient). The consistency between the numerical rating and the written comments is particularly important.

Rating scale	Description
6 (outstanding)	Demonstrates extremely high novelty and/or innovation; has potential to substantially advance science at global level; presents a high-gain plan that may include risks



Research Council of Finland

5 (excellent)	Is very good in international comparison - contains no significant elements to be improved
4 (good)	Is in general sound but contains some elements that should be improved
3 (fair)	Is in general sound but contains important elements that should be improved
2 (poor)	Contains flaws and needs substantial modification or improvement
1 (insufficient)	Contains severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project or the application

1 Quality of research

1.1 Scientific quality, novelty and innovativeness of research

Subrating (1-6)

Please review:

- scientific quality and significance of project's objectives and hypotheses
 - ambitiousness and state of the art of objectives, including possible novel concepts and approaches or development across disciplines
 - scientific added value of consortium for attainment of research objectives
 - impact of research within academia
 - potential for breakthroughs or exceptionally significant outcomes including possible high-risk, high-gain research
 - project's potential to generate new knowledge, new methods, new technology or new practices
- See **research plan**.
 - A consortium application consists of two or more subprojects each with nominated PIs and separate budgets but a joint research plan. The consortium implements the joint research plan together with a view to achieving more extensive added value than through normal cooperation.

1.2 Comments on aspects of societal effects and impact of project

(no numerical rating)

- Comments on societal effects and impact should not affect the scientific review/rating or ranking. Instead, they will be considered as an additional factor when the funding decisions are made.

2 Implementation

2.1 Feasibility of research plan, including aspects of responsible science

Subrating (1-6)

Please review:

- feasibility of project, taking into account extent to which proposed research may include high risks



Research Council of Finland

- materials, research data and methods
- working arrangements and management of research tasks
- research environment including research infrastructures
- identified potential scientific or methodological problem areas and mitigation plan
- consideration of research ethics, open access to research publications and data, data management, promotion of equality and nondiscrimination in society at large, and sustainable development within in the project

- See **research plan**.

2.2 Expertise, human resources, and collaborations, including aspects of responsible science

Subrating (1-6)

Please review:

- competence and scientific expertise of applicants (and in case of consortium: all applicants) in terms of project implementation
 - complementary expertise of team, who are directly working for/funded in the project, including appropriateness and sufficiency for proposed project
 - adequateness of human resources for project implementation, with attention to promoting equality and nondiscrimination within project
 - contribution of both national and international research collaborators, who are engaged with their own funding, and impact of their environment on project's potential success
 - significance of mobility for implementation of research plan and researcher training
- See **research plan**.
- See **most relevant publications and other key outputs** in the application form.
- See **CV(s)** of the applicant(s) in the application form.
- See **list of publications**.
- See possible **letter(s) of collaboration**.

**3 Review panel's summary assessment of proposal****3.1 Main strengths and weaknesses of proposal and their justifications; possible other remarks****TO BE COMPLETED ONLY AT THE PANEL MEETING**

Section 3 of the form will be written during the review panel meeting.

3.1.1 Main strengths and their justifications**(no numerical rating)**

- Summary assessment of the application's and interview's main strengths with justifications
 - Refer to the review criteria in sections 1 and 2.
 - To be completed only at the panel meeting

3.1.2 Main weaknesses and their justifications**(no numerical rating)**

- Summary assessment of the application's and interview's main weaknesses with justifications
 - Refer to the review criteria in sections 1 and 2.
 - To be completed only at the panel meeting

3.1.3 Other remarks (if any):**4 Overall rating****Rating (1-6)**

- Please note that the final rating should not be a mathematical average of the subratings. 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 based on the panel discussion (the ranking is made during the panel meeting)

Your application was ranked [ordinal number] of all [number] [Funding instrument name] applications reviewed in this panel.