



## Call for clinical research 2025

Spring call 2025

Panel/Name of reviewer:

Application number:

Name of applicant:

Title of proposed project:

**How to review applications of call for clinical research**

This funding scheme is designed to promote ambitious clinical research by consortia composed of two or more research teams. The objectives of the call are to strengthen clinical research and generate new research knowledge to support social welfare and healthcare, disease treatment, diagnostics, prevention or business activity. Also, an important objective is to increase collaboration between researchers in wellbeing services counties and other organisations. The research to be funded should be of a high quality, with a high scientific impact and wide impact beyond academia. For wide societal impact, there should be a clear plan for interaction with key actors in using research findings at different stages of the research project lifecycle. The focus of the review should be on the scientific quality, the implementation of the research plan, the potential for achieving societal impact and other specific objectives of the call. It is also important to pay attention to the expected added value of the consortium and the potential to increase collaboration between consortium partners. The funding is applied for to employ research teams and cover research costs.

Provide both a written review and numerical ratings in section 1 (Project's relevance to call), section 2 (Quality of research) and section 3 (Implementation), and give an overall rating in section 5. Write evaluative comments rather than descriptive ones. Section 4 (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
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 Project's relevance to call

### 1.1 Project's relevance to call

Subrating (1–6)

Contribution of the application to achieving the objectives of the call

Please review:

- how the project strengthens clinical research
  - potential to increase collaboration between wellbeing services counties and other organisations
  - effects, impact and interaction beyond academia, especially potential to generate new research knowledge to support social welfare and healthcare, disease treatment, diagnostics, prevention or business activity
  - relevance of planned interaction with key actors in using research findings at different stages of the research project lifecycle
- See call text for complete description of the objectives of this call.
  - See [research plan](#).

## 2 Quality of research

### 2.1 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](#).
  - **The consortium application** consists of two or more subprojects, each with nominated PIs and separate budgets but a common research plan. The consortium implements a joint research plan with a view to achieving more extensive added value than through normal cooperation.



### 3 Implementation

#### 3.1 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
  - 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 the project
- [See research plan.](#)

#### 3.2 Expertise, human resources and collaborations, including aspects of responsible science Subrating (1–6)

Please review:

- competence and scientific expertise of all applicants of consortium in terms of project implementation
- potential to increase collaboration between consortium partners
- complementary expertise of teams 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, engaged with their own funding, and impact of their environment on project's potential success
- implementation plans for interaction with end-users and beneficiaries at various stages of the project (key actors, means, channels and optimal timing)
- significance of planned mobility for implementation of research plan and researcher training (if adequate)
  - [See research plan.](#)
  - [See most relevant publications and other key outputs in the application form.](#)
  - [See CVs of the applicants in the application form.](#)
  - [See lists of publications.](#)
  - [See mobility plan in the application form.](#)
  - [See possible letter\(s\) of collaboration.](#)



#### 4 Review panel's summary assessment of proposal

##### 4.1 Main strengths and weaknesses of proposal and their justifications; possible other remarks

##### TO BE COMPLETED ONLY AT THE PANEL MEETING

Section 4 of the form is applicable only to the applications selected for discussion during the review panel meeting.

##### 4.1.1 Main strengths and their justifications (no numerical rating)

- Summary assessment of application's main strengths with justifications
  - Refer to the review criteria in sections 1, 2 and 3.
  - To be completed only at the panel meeting

##### 4.1.2 Main weaknesses and their justifications (no numerical rating)

- Summary assessment of application's main weaknesses with justifications
  - Refer to the review criteria in sections 1, 2 and 3.
  - To be completed only at the panel meeting

##### 4.1.3 Other remarks (if any):

- For example: possible contradictions in individual reviews, or other relevant remarks from the panel discussion.
  - To be completed only at the panel meeting

#### 5 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 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. Only applications with a final rating of 5 or 6 were ranked.