EVALUATION GUIDE

STIMULUS OF SCIENTIFIC EMPLOYMENT, INDIVIDUAL SUPPORT CALL (CEEC IND)
3rd EDITION

1. INTRODUCTION

Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT), the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology, is the public agency that supports Science and Technology in all areas of knowledge. FCT aims to promote research talent through sustainable advanced training and consolidation of scientific careers, to support the development of research centres that are international leaders in their field, to foster international competitiveness and visibility of Research and Innovation carried out in Portugal, to facilitate access of the scientific community to state-of-the-art Research Infrastructures, and to encourage knowledge transfer between Research and Development (R&D) Centres and the private sector, as well as Public Administration.

FCT funds people (by awarding studentships and scientific employment contracts), ideas (through R&D project grants), Research Centres and Infrastructures, as well as International Cooperation.

This call is aimed at funding scientific employment contracts for PhD holders and is based on peer review of applications submitted online. Each call entails a public announcement (in Portuguese) outlining the required features of the applications and the evaluation criteria to be applied, as well as the number of contracts to be funded.

The present call will be open between **January 30 and February 26, 2020.**

This document outlines the evaluation process and procedures adopted in the 3rd edition of the yearly call for the Stimulus of Scientific Employment – Individual Support (CEEC Ind), announced by FCT on December 30, 2019.

All applications will be evaluated by a panel of international experts according to the scientific area and subarea chosen by the applicants

2. STIMULUS OF SCIENTIFIC EMPLOYMENT – INDIVIDUAL SUPPORT

Strengthening scientific employment in Portugal is central to the Portuguese science-based innovation strategy for growth, and requires specific stimulus in the form of a financial support for hiring new researchers. At the same time, rejuvenation of scientific and academic institutions is promoted while assuring an appropriate professional context for scientists.

FCT issued in 2017 the Regulation of Scientific Employment (REC) by which two instruments were created to promote scientific employment:

- An **Individual Support** to hire PhD holders to work in R&D oriented Portuguese institutions. Applicants submit an **individual** application to a yearly call launched by FCT (CEEC Ind);
- An **Institutional Support** for the development of scientific employment of PhD holders by R&D oriented Portuguese institutions (CEEC Inst). In this FCT instrument, institutions apply with a scientific employment plan, and are awarded a number of positions. It is then the institutions' responsibility to choose the researchers to be hired.

The present call is aimed at providing **individual support for the hiring of 300 researchers holding a PhD degree in any scientific area**. The profile of the candidates should correspond to highly motivated scientists seeking to develop, carry out and coordinate research in Portuguese Institutions or Consortiums. Research contracts are awarded for a maximum of 6 years. **The funding is solely intended for the salary and its associated costs for the employer** in accordance with the selected level. **No other expenses are eligible**.

Host Institutions eligible for this call are:

Any institution integrated in the Portuguese System of Science and Technology, namely R&D institutions, such as research centres, national laboratories, associate laboratories, collaborative laboratories, technology interface centres, science and technology infrastructures, and science and technology consortia and networks.

For host institutions without legal personality, the institution with legal personality in which they are integrated will be the legal representative.

Four types of contracts can be funded under this call, corresponding to different career stages:

a) **Junior Researcher**: PhD holders for 5 or less years[1], with limited post-doctoral research experience in the scientific area of the application;

b) **Assistant Researcher**: PhD holders for over 5 years, with relevant *curriculum* in the scientific area of the application, but with limited scientific independence;

c) **Principal Researcher**: PhD holders for over 5 years, with relevant *curriculum* in the scientific area of the application, demonstrating scientific independence over the past 3 years;

d) **Coordinating Researcher**: PhD holders for over 5 years, holding the title of *habilitado* or *agregado* in Portugal, with a *curriculum* of high merit, and demonstrating scientific independence and leadership in the scientific area of the application.

Research independence is demonstrated through scientific competence, originality and international recognition, by experience in doctoral and/or post-doctoral supervision, or by competitive research funds attracted at national and/or international level.

Scientific leadership requires the demonstration of innovative research and technological development of recognized merit and quality, the contribution to the advancement of knowledge or its application, and the acknowledgement of her/his role as a national or international reference in the respective scientific area. Examples of scientific leadership include the coordination of Research groups or Centres, of international Research Projects, or the delivery of plenary talks in international conferences or other relevant events.

Each applicant can only submit one application. The applicant is responsible to choose the most suitable research contract level, to which s/he applies, as well as the most suitable scientific area and subarea in respect to the topic of the proposed research plan

[1] The 5 years are considered from the date of the PhD conclusion to the closing date of this call

3. COMPONENTS OF THE APPLICATION

Applications are submitted online *via* a dedicated FCT web application, MyFCT.

The application comprises the following parts for evaluation:

a) ***Curriculum vitae* (CV)**;

b) **Synopsis of the scientific and curricular path**, where the main activities and results obtained by the applicant in the last 5 years are highlighted;

c) **Motivation letter**, with up to two main identified contributions achieved by the applicant in the last 5 years and the expected main contributions for the next years;

d) **Research Plan**, including title, abstract, main activities to be developed, expected results and compliance with one or two (maximum) of the 17 UN sustainable development goals 2030 UN Agenda Goals;

e) **Synopsis of the host conditions** and description of the integration of the proposed research plan into the strategy of the associated host institution.

The application form includes the following sections:

Personal Data

Applicant´s personal data and PhD degree information

***Curriculum vitae*. The CV must be submitted/updated in English** on the **CIÊNCIA**VITAE platform and is an integral component of the application.

Application Data

Research contract level; title of the research plan; Abstract (3000 characters); Keywords (maximum 5); Current institution; Current institution country; main Scientific area; secondary Scientific Area; subarea; Evaluation Panel; opposed reviewers (optional, maximum 3).

Motivation letter (3000 characters)

The letter should include up to two of the main contributions in the last 5 years and the expected future main contributions.

CV Synopsis

Synopsis of the scientific and curricular path (3000 characters); interruption in scientific activity (If applicable); major activities and results in the last 5 years (3000 characters); the top five scientific achievements (350 characters each).

Research Plan

Background (3000 characters); Research plan and methods (5000 characters); Expected outcomes (2000 characters); Ethical issues (If applicable, 2000 characters); United Nations Sustainable Development Goals - 2030 Agenda (minimum 1, maximum 2); compliance with the goals of the 2030 Agenda (800 characters); references (3000 characters).

Host institution

Selection of the host institution; description of the host conditions (800 characters); integration of the research plan into the host institution's strategy (800 characters).

There is no pre-established structure to describe the Research Plan, the synopsis of the scientific and curricular path, the motivation letter, or the host conditions. **Besides character limitation for each section, only plain text is allowed**.

It is the **applicant's responsibility to identify the host institution; that institution will be** supporting the application and **must submit the mandatory agreement**[2] to carry out the proposed scientific research plan**.** The host institution must commit itself to provide all resources, including materials, support services, critical mass and institutional policies to ensure the implementation of the research plan.

The applicants identify the main and secondary scientific areas and corresponding subarea from the list provided (OECD´s revised Field of Science and Technology - FOS, adapted to the call), and should also indicate **5 keywords** that most accurately reflect the scientific content of the proposed research plan, as well as the **most relevant 2030 Agenda Goal(s)** addressed. **The main and secondary scientific areas, corresponding subareas and evaluation panels are listed in Appendix I**.

4. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation of the application will focus on the relevance, quality and up-to-datedness of the following two review criteria:

A. Merit of the candidate **(70%)**

B. Merit of the proposed Research Plan **(30%)**

CRITERION A

The assessment of the **merit of the candidate** is based on the three following items:

[2] The template for the agreement document will be available on the Science and Technology Portal, during the period for association of the host institution - February 27 until March 18, 2020.

i. ***Curriculum vitae*** **(CV);**

ii. **CV Synopsis*;***

iii. **Motivation letter**

with emphasis on the scientific, technological, cultural or artistic achievements and the applied research or research based in practice, that the applicant considers as most relevant or more impactful, as well as her/his internationalization degree. **This criterion also considers other activities** considered relevant by the applicant, such as management of science, technology and innovation programmes or projects, scientific supervision and outreach activities and dissemination of knowledge, namely for the promotion of culture and scientific practices.

The evaluation must take into account the career level selected by the applicant, namely regarding the evaluation of scientific independence (for principal and coordinating researchers) and of scientific leadership (for coordinating researchers). Although it will take into account the full professional path of the applicant, the **evaluation should be focused on the last 5 years**, with the following exceptions:

- Junior Research level, for whom less than 5 years may be considered for evaluation;
- Maternity / paternity leave or serious illness that impacted the scientific activity of the candidate (these situations must be referred to in the synopsis of the applicant´s CV). In these cases, the 5-year period should be extended considering the information provided by the applicant.

CRITERION B

The assessment of **the merit of the proposed Research Plan** should take into consideration the following aspects:

i. Relevance and innovative nature of the proposed research plan (based on the state-of-the-art in a given scientific area and previous work done by the applicant) and its progress beyond the current state-of-the-art;

ii. Adequacy of the methodology adopted, feasibility of the research plan and quality of the host conditions, as well as the fit into its R&D strategy;

iii. Clear identification of a mission and scientific challenges addressed by the research plan and its alignment with the framework of any of the 2030 Agenda Goals. The alignment with the Sustainable Development Goals of the UN 2030 Agenda is a requirement for the scientific employment contracts to be co-funded with European Structural and Investment Funds.

The assessment of the integration of the proposed research plan into the strategy of the host institution takes into account the description provided for the host conditions and research strategy, and how the proposed research plan, the expected results and the applicant's motivations contribute to it.

The proposed research plan **should be designed for a 6-year period, which is the maximum duration of the research work contracts**.

The aim of this instrument is to fund research careers and not the proposed research plans. Concerning the latter, FCT has other competitive calls such as R&D Projects and Research Units funding

5. SCORING SYSTEM

The scoring system uses a **10-point scale**, using 0.1 increments. The maximum score is 10 and the minimum is 1, as presented in Table I.

Table I – Qualitative descriptors associated to the 10-point scale

Impact	Score	Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses
Outstanding	**10**	Exceptionally strong with no weaknesses
Very high	**9**	Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses
	8	Very strong with minor weaknesses
High	**7**	Strong with minor weaknesses
	6	Strong with at least one moderate weakness
Medium	**5**	Some strengths with significant weaknesses
	4	Some strengths with several major weaknesses
Low	**3**	Few strengths and major weaknesses
	2	Very few strengths and serious weaknesses
Fail	**1**	Cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information **OR** if considered outside the scope of the evaluation panel

The final score (FS) is given by the following formula:

$$\mathbf{FS = 0.7A + 0.3B}$$

Each criterion is scored individually with **one decimal place.** The **final score (FS) is presented with two decimal places.** In cases of ties in the final score, the score awarded to **criterion B is considered for tie-breaking purposes**.

The minimum merit threshold for a proposal to be considered for funding is 8.00 (final score).

6. EVALUATION PROCESS

6.1 CONSTITUTION OF THE EVALUATION PANELS

- The evaluation panels are constituted **by international reviewers**, who are appointed by the Board of Directors of FCT. All reviewers are of recognized competence in the scientific areas of the applications under evaluation and cannot be affiliated with any Portuguese R&D institution;
- The constitution of the evaluation panels take into consideration the number and the scientific areas and subareas of the applications, as well as an adequate gender balance and a fair geographic and institutional distribution of evaluators;
- Each panel has a **Chair who is responsible for the following tasks**:

    1) To assist FCT with the constitution of the panel by suggesting possible reviewers to be invited;
    2) Assigning the applications to the Panel Members;
    3) Keeping the evaluation process within the defined timeframe and contacting Panel Members in case of any delays;
    4) Supporting the FCT team in the resolution of any Conflict of Interest (CoI) identified during the evaluation process;
    5) Suggesting external reviewers to be invited by FCT, to provide an assessment of the application(s) in consideration, whenever a particular expertise is not covered by the panel;
    6) To participate in a videoconference meeting with the Global Evaluation Coordinator, prior to the beginning of the remote reviewing period, to comply with the steps of the evaluation procedure;
    7) Assuring the quality of the reviewers' reports: comments should be in agreement with the scores taking into account descriptors of the scoring system (see section 5), providing substantive arguments and identifying both the strengths and weaknesses for each evaluation criterion;
    8) Leading the panel meeting discussion.

    The Chair may assess up to 10 applications in case s/he finds it appropriate, such as in situations of CoI or to cover a particular scientific expertise.

- The group of all Panel Chairs constitutes the **Coordinating Evaluation Panel**, which is headed by the Global Evaluation Coordinator appointed by FCT.

6.2 EVALUATION STAGES

The evaluation process of the applications comprises the following stages:

1) Applications eligibility and assignment to reviewers;
2) Remote evaluation;
   a) Individual phase
   b) Consensus phase
3) Panel Meeting;
4) Coordinating Evaluation Panel Meeting.

APPLICATIONS ELIGIBILITY AND ASSIGNMENT

- FCT performs the eligibility check of submitted applications according to the binding criteria described in the announcement. However, an application can be declared ineligible at any stage of evaluation. If during the evaluation any doubt arises, the Panel Chair and FCT should be informed;
- Each application is remotely and **individually assessed by two Panel Members**. One of the Panel Members is appointed as lead reviewer (1st reader/rapporteur) of the application;
- The Panel Chair is responsible for the assignment of the applications to the respective lead reviewer and 2nd reader;
- An external reviewer may be assigned by the Chair to a given application whenever a particular expertise is not covered by the panel;
- The distribution of the applications to Panel Members and external reviewers (if applicable) necessarily takes into consideration any declared CoI, as well as the matching of professional and scientific expertise within the topic of the application.

REMOTE EVALUATION

a) INDIVIDUAL PHASE

- Before the assessment, the reviewers have to declare whether or not a CoI is identified for that particular application;
- In case of a disqualifying CoI, the Panel Chair and FCT should be informed and the application reassigned by the Chair;
- In the case of a potential CoI, the Panel Member should notify FCT so that it is clarified, after a proper analysis, if s/he is able to perform unbiased evaluation or if the conflict should rather be considered as disqualifying;
- The Panel Members must submit an individual report with their assessment for each application assigned to them. This report includes:

  - ✓ Scores for each criterion and respective comments, including strengths and weaknesses;
  - ✓ A comment concerning ethical issues, if applicable;

- ✓ Identification of the research plan's alignment with the framework of any of the 2030 UN Agenda Goals;
- ✓ Confidential comments to the evaluation panel and/or FCT, if necessary.

- The reviewers should perform their **assessments considering different standards for each research level** (from junior to coordinating researcher) and **only the information provided by the applicant**. The final score (FS) of each application is calculated taking into account the weight given to each criterion (please see section 5), with two decimal places.
- Both readers must submit their individual evaluation prior the beginning of the consensus phase.
- An application **can be considered non-assessable when it strays considerably outside the scope of the panel.** The inadequacy of the application must be confirmed by the Panel Chair and **it cannot be moved to a different panel.** Being the case, the following procedure should be taken:

  - ✓ Score 1 for both criteria;
  - ✓ State in the report that the application was not submitted to the appropriate panel.

The evaluation panel must jointly validate this decision during the panel meeting.

b) CONSENSUS PHASE

- The Panel Member appointed as **1st reader prepares the consensus report for each application based on the two individual reviews** (and the external expert's assessment, if applicable) to be submitted to the panel;
- If the 1st reader is unable to reach a consensus report based on the two individual reviews, s/he shall inform the Chair, who should settle these differences (if necessary by obtaining a third opinion from another member of the panel);
- The consensus report, similar in structure to the individual reports, is the starting point for the discussion during the panel meeting. Comments must include the strengths and weaknesses for each evaluation criterion, and be in agreement with the scores.

PANEL MEETING

- Each evaluation panel meeting will be remotely coordinated by the Chair from FCT´s headquarters to proceed with the following activities:

  - ✓ Ensure that each application receives a fair judgment and is discussed appropriately;
  - ✓ Settle the final scores for each criterion, as well as the comments to be conveyed to the applicants, and **ensure that the scores are in agreement with the comments**. Final comments should be included in the panel evaluation report by the 1st reader (as specified in section 6.3);
  - ✓ Guarantee that adopted criteria are coherent within and across each research contract level (Junior, Assistant, Principal and Coordinator);
  - ✓ Prepare a provisional ranked list of all applications under evaluation for each of the four levels;

- ✓ **Prepare a panel meeting report** to be analysed by the Coordinating evaluation panel with a summary of the meeting that should address the following issues:

    - Working methodology adopted by the panel;
    - Identification of disqualifying Conflict of Interest;
    - The provisional ranked list of all applications for each of the four research contract levels.

    This report is signed by the Chair with the agreement of all Panel Members.

- ✓ Prepare an additional document with **recommendations to FCT** on the different aspects of the evaluation process that may help FCT to improve procedures in future calls.

COORDINATING EVALUATION PANEL MEETING

- The Coordinating Evaluation Panel brings together the Global Evaluation Coordinator and the Chairs of each panel in a final remote meeting. This meeting will be conducted from FCT headquarters by the Global Evaluation Coordinator, and the meeting activities include:

    - ✓ Approve the distribution of available positions by panel and contract levels, according to each panel ranked list;
    - ✓ Prepare the evaluation meeting report with a summary of the meeting, the provisional ranked lists of all panels by research contract level and comments regarding the evaluation process.

Only the applications with the **highest final scores, equal to or above 8.00, are selected for funding, up to the number of available positions**.

6.3 FEEDBACK TO BE TRANSMITTED TO APPLICANTS

All the reviewers should comply with the following additional guidelines in the elaboration of the evaluation reports.

Comments must:

- Be coherent with the scores taking into account the descriptors (section 5);
- Be clear and consistent, highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of the application for each criterion;
- Take into account the research level of the application (junior, assistant, principal and coordinator);
- Use dispassionate and analytical language. Avoid dismissive statements about the applicant, the proposed science, or the scientific field concerned;
- Be impeccably polite;
- Address the submitted work plan and not the work the reviewers consider should have been proposed.

Comments must not:

- Give a description or a summary of the application;

- Use the first person or equivalent (*e.g.*, "I think…", "This reviewer finds…"). Instead, expressions such as "The panel…" or "It is considered…" should be used;
- Ask questions, as the applicant will not be able to answer them;
- Provide recommendations or advice for improving the application;
- Have contradicting statements;
- Mention quantitative details that can easily originate factual mistakes.

The quality of the comments to be transmitted to the applicants is of paramount importance and part of the evaluation process, therefore being a crucial task of the evaluation panel

7. CONFIDENTIALITY AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST

7.1 CONFIDENTIALITY

The confidentiality of the applications must be protected. All reviewers involved in the evaluation are asked not to copy, quote or otherwise use material from the applications. All reviewers are also requested to sign a statement of confidentiality relative to the contents of the applications and to the results of the evaluation.

7.2 CONFLICT OF INTEREST (CoI)

Researchers that have submitted an application to the present call have to decline participating in the evaluation process. Those with first-degree relationships, domestic partnership or married to an applicant are also hindered from being a member of the panel to which the application was submitted**. Any CoI must be declared prior to the evaluation process.**

DISQUALIFYING CONFLICT OF INTEREST

In case a **disqualifying CoI** is identified for an application, the Panel Member **cannot evaluate it nor participate in its discussion**. Circumstances that should be interpreted as a disqualifying CoI are the following:

1. Personal or financial interest in the application's success;
2. Current or planned close scientific cooperation;
3. Research cooperation (*e.g.*, joint publications) within the last 3 years before the opening date of the call;
4. Dependent employment relationship or supervisory relationship (*e.g.*, teacher-student relationship up to and including the post-doctoral phase), within the last 3 years before the opening date of the call;
5. Affiliation, or pending transfer, to any Department, Institution or Research Centre involved in the application;

6. Be an active member in a council or similar supervisory board of the Department, Institution or Research Centre to which the applicant has been affiliated to within the last 3 years or will be connected to in the scope of the application.

POTENTIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST

In the case of a **potential CoI, the Panel Member should notify FCT** so that it is clarified, after a proper analysis, if s/he is able to perform an unbiased evaluation or if the conflict should rather be considered as disqualifying. A potential CoI exists in the following circumstances:

1. Relationships other than first-degree, marriage or domestic partnership; other personal ties or conflicts;
2. Professional relationships, other than those listed under no. 4;
3. Participation in University bodies other than those listed under no. 6, *e.g.*, scientific advisory committees in the research environment;
4. Involvement in a Project with a closely related research topic (competition issues);
5. Participating in an on-going scientific or inter-personal conflict with the applicant(s);
6. Any other circumstance the reviewer feels that may not be impartial.

In case of a disqualifying CoI, the reviewer will not be able to proceed with the evaluation. The reviewer should immediately inform the Panel Chair and the FCT team, so that the application may be reassigned. The Panel meeting report must mention disqualifying CoIs for all Panel Members.

8. PRELIMINARY HEARINGS

Once the provisional ranked lists of the evaluation results are communicated, applicants may use their right to dispute the proposed decision in the preliminary hearing phase, which takes place during the **10 working days following the communication of results**.

At this stage, Panel Members are asked to give support to FCT through the analysis of submitted complains that applicants may consider relevant to the appeal. The Chair should guarantee the quality of the comments to be transmitted to the applicants.

Comments of scientific nature are analysed by the evaluation panel that previously evaluated the application, which is also responsible for correcting possible misjudgements or clarifying alleged inaccuracies.

The analysis of these comments is **neither a second assessment** of the application **nor an additional opportunity for the applicant to present new information**. It should only serve to identify any error that may have occurred during the evaluation and that is now addressed by the applicant. Any identified error should be corrected and, depending on its nature, the score may be changed accordingly or remain the same.

The applicants must submit their comments in English and use appropriate language. Offensive comments will compromise the analysis of the preliminary hearing and will not be forwarded to the panel.

APPENDIX I – MAIN AND SECONDARY SCIENTIFIC AREAS, CORRESPONDING SUBAREAS AND EVALUATION PANELS

This appendix lists the main and secondary scientific areas and the corresponding subareas, adapted from the OECD´s revised Field of Science and Technology Classification - FOS, as well as the respective Evaluation Panels. Each evaluation Panel is responsible for the applications from a set of scientific subareas.

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel
Exact Sciences	**Mathematics**	Pure Mathematics	Mathematics and Computer and Information Sciences
		Applied Mathematics	
		Statistics and Probability	
		Other, please specify:	
	Computer and information sciences	Computer Sciences	
		Information Sciences	
		Bioinformatics	
		Informatics	
		Other, please specify:	
	Physical Sciences	Atomic, Molecular and Chemical Physics	Physical Sciences
		Condensed Matter Physics	
		Particles Physics	
		Nuclear Physics	
		Fluids and Plasma Physics	
		Optics	
		Acoustics	
		Astronomy	
		Other, please specify:	
	Chemical Sciences	Organic Chemistry	Chemical Sciences
		Inorganic Chemistry	
		Physical Chemistry	
		Polymer Science	
		Electrochemistry	
		Colloid Chemistry	
		Analytical Chemistry	
		Nuclear Chemistry	
		Medicinal Chemistry	
		Other, please specify:	

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel
Natural Sciences	**Earth and Related Environmental Sciences**	Geosciences, Multidisciplinary	Earth and Environmental Sciences
		Mineralogy	
		Paleontology	
		Geochemistry	
		Physical Geography	
		Geology	
		Volcanology	
		Meteorology and Atmospheric Sciences	
		Climatic Research	
		Oceanography, Hydrology and Water Resources	
		Geophysics	
		Environmental Sciences	
		Other, please specify:	
	Biological Sciences	Cell Biology	Experimental Biology and Biochemistry
		Biochemistry	
		Biochemical Research Methods	
		Microbiology	
		Molecular Biology	
		Biophysics	
		Genetics and Heredity	
		Reproductive Biology	
		Virology	
		Developmental Biology	
		Other subarea of Experimental Biology and Biochemistry, please specify:	
	Biological Sciences	Plant Sciences and Botany	Biological Sciences
		Zoology, Ornithology, Entomology	
		Marine Biology, Freshwater Biology and Limnology	
		Ecology	

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel
		Biodiversity Conservation	
		Biology (Theoretical, Mathematical)	
		Evolutionary Biology	
		Behavioural Sciences Biology	
		Mycology	
		Other subarea of Biological Sciences, please specify:	

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel
Engineering and Technology	**Civil Engineering**	Civil Engineering	Civil and Mechanical Engineering and Engineering Systems
		Architecture Engineering	
		Construction Engineering	
		Transport Engineering	
		Municipal and Structural Engineering	
		Other, please specify:	
	Electrical Engineering, Electronic Engineering, Information Engineering	Electrical and Electronic Engineering	Electrical, Electronic and Information Engineering
		Robotics	
		Automation and Control Systems	
		Communication Engineering and Systems	
		Telecommunications	
		Computer Hardware and Architecture	
		Other, please specify:	
	Mechanical Engineering	Mechanical Engineering	Civil and Mechanical Engineering and Engineering Systems
		Applied Mechanics	
		Thermodynamics	
		Aerospace Engineering	
		Nuclear Engineering	
		Audio Engineering and Reliability Analysis	
		Engineering Systems	
		Renewable Energies	
		Other, please specify:	
	Chemical Engineering	Chemical Engineering	Chemical Engineering
		Chemical Process Engineering	
		Other, please specify:	
	Materials Engineering	Materials Engineering	Materials Engineering and Nanotechnology
		Ceramics	
		Coating and Films	
		Composites	
		Paper and Wood	

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel
		Textiles	
		Other, please specify:	
	Medical Engineering	Medical Engineering and Biomedical Engineering	Medical Engineering and Biotechnology
		Laboratory Technology	
		Other, please specify:	
	Environmental Engineering	Environmental Engineering	Environmental Biotechnology and Engineering and Industrial Biotechnology
		Geotechnics	
		Petroleum Engineering, Energy and Fuels	
		Remote Sensing	
		Mining and Mineral Processing	
		Geological Engineering	
		Marine Engineering, Sea Vessels	
		Ocean Engineering	
		Other, please specify:	
	Environmental Biotechnology	Environmental Biotechnology	
		Bioremediation, Diagnostic Biotechnologies (DNA Chips and Biosensing Devices) in Environmental Management	
		Environmental Biotechnology related Ethics	
		Other, please specify:	
	Industrial Biotechnology	Industrial Biotechnology	
		Bioprocessing Technologies, Biocatalysis and Fermentation	

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel
		Bioproducts, Biomaterials, Bioplastics, Biofuels, Bio-derived Bulk and Fine Chemicals and Bio-derived Novel Materials	
		Other, please specify:	
	Nanotechnology	Nanomaterials	Materials Engineering and Nanotechnology
		Nanoprocesses	
		Nano-Optics and Nanophotonics	
		Modelling at Nanoscale	
		Other, please specify:	

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel
Medical and Health Sciences	**Basic Medicine**	Anatomy and Morphology	Basic and Clinical Medicine
		Human Genetics	
		Immunology	
		Neurosciences	
		Pharmacology	
		Toxicology	
		Physiology	
		Pathology	
		Oncobiology	
		Other, please specify:	
	Clinical Medicine	Andrology	
		Obstetrics and Gynecology	
		Paediatrics	
		Cardiac and Cardiovascular System	
		Peripheral Vascular Disease	
		Haematology	
		Respiratory Systems	
		Critical Care Medicine and Emergency Medicine	
		Anaesthesiology	
		Orthopaedics	
		Surgery	
		Radiology, Nuclear Medicine and Medical Imaging	
		Transplantation	
		Dentistry, Oral Surgery and Medicine	
		Dermatology	
		Infectious Diseases	
		Allergology	
		Rheumatology	
		Endocrinology and Metabolism	
		Gastroenterology and Hepatology	
		Urology and Nephrology	
		Oncology	

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel
		Ophthalmology	
		Otorhinolaryngology	
		Psychiatry	
		Clinical Neurology	
		Geriatrics and Gerontology	
		General and Family Medicine	
		Internal Medicine	
		Integrative and Complementary Medicine	
		Other, please specify:	
	Health Sciences	Health Care and Services	Health Sciences
		Health Services and Policies	
		Nursing	
		Nutrition, Dietetics	
		Public Health and Environmental Health	
		Epidemiology	
		Occupational Health	
		Sport and Fitness Sciences	
		Social Biomedical Sciences	
		Medical Ethics	
		Addiction	
		Other, please specify:	
		Tropical Medicine	Basic and Clinical Medicine
		Parasitology	
	Medical Biotechnology	Health-related Biotechnology	Medical Engineering and Biotechnology
		Technologies involving the Manipulation of Cells, Tissues, Organs or the Whole Organisms	
		Gene-based Diagnose and Therapies	
		Biomaterials	
		Medical Biotechnology related Ethics	
		Other, please specify:	

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel
Agricultural Sciences	**Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries**	Agriculture	Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
		Forestry	
		Fishery	
		Soil Science	
		Horticulture and Viticulture	
		Agronomy, Plant Breeding and Plant Protection	
		Other, please specify:	
	Animal and Dairy Science	Animal and Dairy Science	Animal and Veterinary Sciences and Agro-Food Biotechnology
		Husbandry	
		Pets	
		Other, please specify:	
	Veterinary Science	Veterinary Science	
		Other, please specify:	
	Agricultural Biotechnology	Agricultural Biotechnology and Food Biotechnology	
		GM Technology (crops and livestock) and Livestock Cloning	
		Marker Assisted Selection	
		Diagnostics	
		Biomass Feedstock Production Technologies, Biopharming	
		Agricultural Biotechnology related Ethics	
		Other, please specify:	

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel
Social Sciences	**Psychology**	Criminal Psychology	Psychology
		Social and Organizational Psychology	
		Cognitive Psychology and Neuropsychology	
		Clinical Psychology	
		Psychology of Development and Learning	
		Educational Psychology	
		Community and Health Psychology	
		Other, please specify:	
	Economics and Business	Economics	Economics and Business, Social and Economic Geography
		Business and Management	
		Other, please specify:	
	Educational Sciences	General Education (including Training, Pedagogy , Didactics)	Educational Sciences
		Special Education (to gifted persons, those with learning disabilities)	
		Other, please specify:	
	Sociology	Sociology	Sociology
		Demography	
		Anthropology	
		Ethnology	
		Social Topics (women´s and gender studies, social issues, family studies, social work)	
		Other, please specify:	
	Law	Public Law	Media and Communications, Law and Political Science
		Criminal Law	
		Private Law	
		European and International Law	
		Human Rights	

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel
		Other, please specify:	
	Political Sciences	Political Science	
		Military Sciences	
		Compared Politics	
		Political Theory	
		International Relations	
		Public Policy	
		European Studies	
		Other, please specify:	
	Social and Economic Geography	Environmental Sciences (social aspects)	Economics and Business, Social and Economic Geography
		Cultural and Economic Geography	
		Urban Studies (planning and development)	
		Transport Planning and Social Aspects of Transport	
		Other, please specify:	
	Media and Communications	Journalism and Media	Media and Communications, Law and Political Science
		Documental and Information Sciences	
		Other, please specify:	

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel
Humanities	**History and Archaeology**	Prehistory and Archaeology	History and Archaeology
		Ancient History	
		Medieval History	
		Modern History	
		Contemporary History	
		History of Science and Technology	
		Other, please specify:	
	Languages and Literature	Literature	Languages and Literature
		Portuguese Studies	
		Romanic Studies	
		Anglophone Studies	
		Classical Studies	
		Asian and African Studies	
		Germanic Studies	
		Linguistics	
		Other, please specify:	
	Philosophy, Ethics and Religion	Epistemology in Philosophy of Science	Philosophy, Ethics and Religion
		Methaphysics and Philosophical Anthropology	
		Philosophy of Art	
		Logic	
		History of Philosophy	
		Ethics and Political Philosophy	
		Theology and Religion Philosophy	
		Other, please specify:	
	Arts	Fine Arts	Arts
		Musicology	
		Visual Performative Arts (Cinema, Television, Drama, Dance, etc.)	
		Art History	
		Design	

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel
		Architecture and Urbanism	
		Other, please specify:	