



Academy Professorship 2025

2025 winter call

Panel/Name of reviewer:

Application number:

Name of applicant:

Title of proposed project:

How to review Academy Professorship applications

An Academy Professorship is aimed at internationally recognised high-quality researchers (with evidence in CV and publication list) whose research contributes to scientific renewal, aims for scientific breakthroughs and seeks solutions for the benefit of society. The focus of the review should be on the scientific quality of the research plan and the applicant's competence and suitability to the objectives of the funding scheme. The applicant's competence should be reviewed based on qualitative indicators. The researcher's merits should be assessed through a wide range of outputs and research career roles and an ability to reach the international forefront in their field. The applicant is expected to reach the international forefront in their field during the funding period and strengthen the quality of research within their disciplines in Finland. The applicant should be able to make wide and versatile impact during and after the funding period. The applicant must have concrete plans for active top-level research even after the funding period. The funding is applied for to cover the researcher's own salary, to employ a research team and to cover research costs.

Provide both a written review and numerical ratings for 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
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



Research Council of Finland

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
- 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](#).

1.2 Comments on aspects of societal effects and impact of the project

(no numerical rating)

Please review:

- How the project will be able to achieve wide and versatile societal impact.

- See [research plan](#)

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
- 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



Research Council of Finland

- 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**.
- See **brief data management plan** in the application form.

2.2 Applicant's competence, capabilities, expertise and expected achievements

Sub-rating (1-6)

Please review:

- applicant's internationally recognised personal achievements and scientific expertise
- applicant's competence and scientific expertise in terms of project implementation
- applicant's professional competence
- applicant's capabilities and potential to reach the international forefront in their field with this funding
- applicant's capabilities to strengthen the quality of research in their discipline in Finland
- applicant's ability to generate new scientific breakthroughs
- applicant's ability to advance scientific renewal
- See **CV** of the applicant(s) in the application form.
- See **merits and capabilities**
- See **list of publications**.
- See **research plan**.

2.3 Expertise, human resources, and collaborations of the team, including aspects of responsible science

Sub-rating (1-6)

Please review:

- complementary expertise of team members, 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 planned mobility for implementation of research plan and researcher training



Research Council of Finland

- See **research plan**.
- See **mobility plan** in the application form.
- 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 is applicable only to the top-tier applications selected for discussion during the review panel meeting.

3.1.1 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 and 2.
 - To be completed only at the panel meeting

3.1.2 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 and 2.
 - To be completed only at the panel meeting

3.1.3 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

4 Overall rating

Rating (1-6)

- Please note that the final rating should not be a mathematical average of the sub-ratings. For example, the application should not be penalised if it has a slight weakness in one evaluation item



Research Council of Finland

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. Only [number] of applications were ranked.

