

Strengths and weaknesses in the evaluation reports - Academy of Finland September 2017 call

Summary of the often-mentioned weaknesses

Scientific quality and innovativeness

- Lack of ambition / originality / high-risk activity
- The proposed research lacks new science
- The objectives and hypotheses do not address issues proposed in the introduction / do not go beyond the state of the art
- The project lacks a comprehensive theoretical framework
- The social objectives outweigh the scientific objectives
- It is not clear how the project differs from previous studies / the proposed work is largely incremental, extending material already developed by the applicant and his advisor

Implementation and feasibility

- The PI has other projects running at the same time: how will she/he manage all of them?
- The schedule is unbalanced and overloaded with parallel tasks at certain times
- Planning of the work packages is unrealistic
- The risks and mitigation measures are not sufficiently elaborated
- There are possible bottlenecks which have not been taken into account
- The overall concept is nice, however more thought is required over the practicality
- Deliverables and milestones, and their timing are missing and do not allow proper project progress monitoring
- Use of methods/data not sufficiently justified or explained
- Illogical or non-innovative approaches and methods

Competence of the applicant(s) / team / collaborations

- The applicant has not yet built a strong track record / publications/not enough 1st authorships
- Lack of in-depth description of the project team.
- Missing competences in the project team / the PI and research team are not experts of the topic
- It is unclear if the collaborations bring added value to the project
- No publications in 2017
- Too many collaborators (role of the applicant unclear) / The applicant has to rely to a certain extent on the collaboration partners for the success of the project

Responsible science

- The ethical implications are not considered carefully enough

Mobility

- Lack of mobility
- The reasons for the varying lengths of the planned mobility is not justified
- There should be more details about how the international visits are going to help to advance the project

Summary of the often-mentioned positive comments:

Scientific excellence, innovativeness and impact

- Original, exciting and ambitious project
- Potential for scientific breakthroughs and important theoretical/empirical/ methodological outcomes
- The project addresses fundamental research on a scientifically and generally highly relevant topic.
- Innovative project that might be able to push the state of the art in the field forward
- The result will be of interest for peers as well as for policymakers
- Potentially many new and groundbreaking applications

Implementation and feasibility

- Well planned admirably multi-disciplinary project
- The schedule is realistic
- Interesting combination of different methods in new ways
- Broad data collection approach, innovative in its multidisciplinary approach
- Excellent patient/sample collections/cohorts
- The approach to data collection and analysis is likely to yield important results for academic leaders, for policy makers and for society more generally
- An excellent research environment

Competence of the applicant(s) / team / collaborations

- Outstanding PI /competent applicant / excellent research team
- Well planned collaboration with highly relevant, excellent researchers / collaborators that will help to keep the focus of the project
- There is ample consideration of the development of a range of researchers at different levels

Mobility

- The mobility plan supports the research plan, and the receiving organisations are of high scholarly quality and very relevant for the project/supports research training
- The length and timing of stays is well planned