Research Council of Finland

Application review form

SPECIAL FUNDING FOR INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION IN HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTING 2025

Spring call 2025

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

Application number:

How to review applications for SPECIAL FUNDING FOR INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION IN HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTING 2025

The aim of this funding is to support the development of a versatile future computing ecosystem and the expansion of computing expertise at both national and international level. The funding is designed to promote the quality and diversity of research, scientific impact and impact beyond academia as well as science self-renewal.

The funding will support international research collaboration focusing on using EuroHPC's high-performance computing resources in cooperation with partners from EuroHPC's European user states (including the United Kingdom), or on cooperation in using the LUMI supercomputer with researchers from the following states, organisations or countries: US state of Texas, US state of Colorado, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) of the US federal government, Japan or Canada. The funding is not intended for coordination or planning of collaborations.

The focus of the review should be on scientific quality and the implementation of the research plan together with the specific objectives of the call. The funding is applied for to hire a research team, and it may be applied for by individual research teams or consortia composed of two or more teams.

Provide both a written review and numerical ratings in section 1 (Project's relevance to call), 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

Research Council of Finland

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)

Please review the contribution of the application to achieving the objectives of the call, for instance:

- extent to which the use of EuroHPC or the LUMI supercomputer is justified and will benefit the project
- extent to which the project can contribute to the expansion of computing expertise at both national and international level.

- See **research plan.**
- The objectives of the call are described in more detail in the call text.

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
- (if applicable) 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 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 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 applicant (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, engaged with their own funding, and impact of their environment on project's potential success
- significance of planned mobility for implementation of research plan and researcher training

- See **research plan**.
- See **most relevant publications and other key outputs** in the application form.

Research Council of Finland

- See **CV(s)** of the applicant(s) in the application form.
- See **list of publications**.
- See **mobility plan** in the application form.
- See **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 top-tier 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):

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 the panel discussion (the ranking is made during the panel meeting)

Research Council of Finland

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.