



## Instructions for reviewing funding applications - Academy programme for sport science and physical activity ACTIVE

### Content

1	
1. Objectives of the Research Council of Finland and the funding schemes	1
1.1. Academy programme for sport science and physical activity	2
2. Role of experts and the Research Council of Finland	2
2.1. Panel chair	3
2.2. Individual reviewers and panel members	3
2.3. Panels	3
2.4. Research Council of Finland officials	3
2.5. Decision-making bodies	4
3. Review and ranking	4
3.1. Review criteria and rating scale	4
3.2. Individual review	5
3.3. Review panel meeting (online)	6
3.4. How to review applications in the Research Council's online services	6
4. Expert fees	6

### 1. Objectives of the Research Council of Finland and the funding schemes

The Research Council of Finland's mission is to open up new avenues for excellent, responsible and high-impact research. Our objectives are to advance new scientific breakthroughs and solutions for the benefit of society; the capacity of research for renewal and reform; and better and higher-impact skills and competence. Our funding is based on open competition, independent peer review and responsible science. We grant funding to researchers and research teams as well as to the most promising early-career researchers through different funding instruments.



### **1.1. Academy programme for sport science and physical activity**

Academy Programmes are thematic, target-oriented and coordinated research programmes that cover a range of activities to support innovative, high-quality and high-impact research and promote international and national research cooperation. The Academy Programme for Sport Science and Physical Activity ACTIVE advances the quality, renewal and impact of research in sport science. The programme generates new knowledge to promote public health and physical activity by directing funding to high-quality, innovative sport science research within different research areas targeting different population groups and different forms of sport, both at amateur and competitive level. Research projects will be funded in the following thematic areas:

1. Physically active lifestyle and physical fitness as well as the effects and impact mechanisms of exercise and physical activity
2. Equitable access to sports, physical activity and exercise, inclusion, sense of community, accountability and environmental sustainability
3. Achieving results and ethics in competitive and performance sports

The research projects funded within the programme should in addition to a high scientific quality also display novelty and inventiveness as well as scientific and societal impact and align with the special objectives of the call. The aim is to fund applications with a high applicability value for planning, decision-making in and promotion of exercise, sports, and physical activity.

The focus of the review should be on scientific quality and impact, implementation of the research plan and societal impact, taking into consideration 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 research teams. Read more in the call text and the program memorandum.

## **2. Role of experts and the Research Council of Finland**

Experts are invited to review the scientific excellence of the applications. The experts are esteemed, mostly international researchers in the field of the applications concerned. The funding decisions are made by the Research Council of Finland's decision-making bodies based



## Research Council of Finland

on the scientific review and science policy factors of the Research Council and its scientific councils or subcommittees.

### **2.1. Panel chair**

Each panel is assigned a chair from among the panel members. The duties of the chair are to chair the panel meeting via an online platform (Teams), lead the discussion and ensure that all applications are reviewed in a responsible and fair manner. The chair also has duties as a panel member. After the panel meeting the chair is expected to deliver a brief memorandum including feedback on the evaluation process and the panel meeting.

### **2.2. Individual reviewers and panel members**

Experts may act as individual reviewers and panel members. The duties of individual reviewers are to review and write review reports of the applications allocated to them. As a rule, individual reviewers also participate in the panel as members. All panel members are expected to actively participate in the panel meeting.

Applications will be allocated to at least two individual reviewers and/or possibly a reader in the panel review phase. The reader is asked to form an opinion of the application without writing a review. One of the reviewers will be a summariser in the panel meeting and will write the final panel summary review for the application.

### **2.3. Panels**

All applications submitted to the call in the Academy programme for Sport Science and Physical Activity will be evaluated in the same panel. The Panel consists of a chair, a possible vice chair and panel members representing the scope of the panel.

### **2.4. Research Council of Finland officials**

The Research Council of Finland's officials invite the panel members and, if needed, additional external individual reviewers to support the panel, provide instructions on the review process and organise instructive webinars and pre-panel meetings when relevant. The officials also take care of the practical arrangements in the panel meeting and ensure that the review process follows the Research Council's established procedures.



## 2.5. Decision-making bodies

After the scientific review, the [steering group of the Academy Programme](#) will examine the applications and the results of the review and prepare a proposal on projects to be funded. The final funding decisions are made by the [Subcommittee for Academy programme for Sport Science and Physical Activity](#). The decisions are based on the peer review and the panel ranking taking into account the specific objectives of the call and striving to funding a collection of projects that together successfully may promote the achieving of the specific aims of the programme.

## 3. Review and ranking

### 3.1. Review criteria and rating scale

The main criteria in the review are:

- contribution of the application to achieving the objectives of the call, including societal impact.
- scientific quality, novelty and innovativeness of the research as well as its impact within the scientific community
- feasibility of the research plan and the quality of research environment, including responsible science (Research ethics, Equality and non-discrimination, Open science, Sustainable development)
- competence of applicant and the research team
- human resources, expertise and collaborations

**Written reviews: Please note that after the funding decisions have been made, the applicants will receive the individual reviews and the panel summary assessment including the names of the experts on their own applications.** Evaluative comments are particularly valuable to the decision-making bodies. Written reviews play a crucial role in aiding decision-making bodies. In addition, they provide important feedback to applicants. Reviewers should therefore:

- write evaluative comments and give justifications using full sentences,
- avoid descriptive comments and copying text directly from the application,



- write comments and give subratings under each review item, taking into consideration the specific guidelines for each item (however, item “Review panel’s summary assessment” will be developed and finalised during the panel meeting), and
- maintain coherence throughout their comments and give constructive feedback.

**Numerical rating:** The consistency between the numerical rating and the written comments is particularly important. The rating scale ranges from 6 (outstanding) to 1 (insufficient). At all levels of the review process, please pay close attention to the potential for breakthrough research.

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Description</b>
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

\* Below threshold for panel discussion if all individual overall ratings are below 4

### **3.2. Individual review**

Each application is assigned to at least two individual reviewers. Reviewers write individual reviews, using specified sections in the review forms, and give sub- and overall ratings to the applications. Applications given an overall rating of 4, 5 or 6 from at least one reviewer will continue to the panel review phase. The other applications will continue directly to the decision-making process. Therefore, the deadline for submitting the individual review reports is strict. It supports the preparation of the panel meeting following the individual review phase. The individual review reports will be given to the applicants as is, including the names of the



reviewers. It is important to note that these reports provide important material for the decision-making bodies and valuable feedback for the applicants.

### **3.3. Review panel meeting (online)**

The panel members have access to all applications submitted to the panel, excluding conflicts of interest (see Review principles, section 1.3). Also, individual reviews for applications continuing to the panel review phase will be made available to all panel members at the latest one week before the meeting. However, please note that these review reports will only be made available to panel members once all review reports have been submitted to the Research Council.

In the panel meeting, the panel discusses applications that reached the panel review phase. The individual reviewers appointed to the application will present their opinion on the application and, typically, a third panel member (read-only/reader) may be assigned to read the application to form an additional, more general view of it. The review panel's summary assessment will be written for each application during the panel meeting by a dedicated summariser (a panel member). The summary is based on the discussions and the individual reviews. The panel decides the final overall rating for each application. When the final overall rating is 4, 5 or 6, also subratings for specified review criteria will be decided by the panel. To complete the review, the panel is asked to rank the applications rated 4, 5 or 6 within each funding instrument. The applications are ranked based on the review criteria used and the instrument-specific objectives listed in the review forms – no additional criteria will be used.

### **3.4. How to review applications in the Research Council's online services**

Please use the [Research Council of Finland's online services](#) (link takes you to the online services via our website) to review applications. You can find the review instructions and offline versions of all our review forms under [Guides for reviewers](#) on our website. Both individual reviews and panel review reports are completed in the online services. You can access the research plan or other sections in the application form directly from the review form questions. However, we do expect you to read the whole application.

## **4. Expert fees**

There will be a modest compensation for participation, EUR 460 (EUR 600 for panel chair) per panel day (taxed as per your national taxation rules). This compensation also covers



## Research Council of Finland

participation in a short pre-meeting. Furthermore, EUR 75 (EUR 100 in the case of consortium applications) will be paid for each individual review.

To claim your fees, please enter your own personal banking details in the online services. The honorarium will be paid into your personal bank account. Please notice that IBAN is mandatory for bank accounts in Europe. Also fill in the BIC/SWIFT code/clearing code/routing number.

Make sure that you have entered your personal details correctly in the online services to avoid any unnecessary delays in the payment. The payslip will be sent to your home address.

