

## **Annex I – Notice of the Call**

# **Evaluation Guide**

**Call for PhD Studentships – 2022**

---

**January 2022**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>ACRONYMS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. EVALUATION PROCESS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.1 Guiding principles for peer-review evaluation .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.2 Conflict of Interests (COI) .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.3 Terms of Reference and Confidentiality .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.4 Constitution of the Evaluation Panels.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.5 Role and Responsibilities of the Panel Coordination Team .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2.6 Remote and Panel Meeting Evaluation.....</b>	<b>7</b>
2.6.1 Remote evaluation .....	7
2.6.1.1 Individual Evaluation .....	8
2.6.1.2 Pre-consensus Evaluation .....	8
2.6.2 Panel Meeting.....	8
<b>2.7 Comments to be transmitted to Applicants .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2.8. Panel Meeting Report .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Annex I – Scientific fields, adapted from the FOS Classification of the Manual Frascati .</b>	<b>11</b>

## ACRONYMS

**BD** – PhD Studentship

**COI** – Conflict of Interests

**EBI** – Research Fellowship Holder Statute

**FCT** – Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, I.P.

**MyFCT** – FCT Information and Management System of FCT

**CV** – *Curriculum Vitae*

**RBI** – FCT Regulation for Studentships and Fellowships

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Evaluation Guide is the document prepared to help evaluators and applicants understand the procedure associated to applications evaluation of the PhD Studentships Call – 2022.

**No information included in this Guide replaces or overlaps with what is stated in the Research Fellowship Holder Statute (EBI), the FCT Regulation for Studentships and Fellowships (RBI) and the Notice of the Call.**

## 2. EVALUATION PROCESS

### 2.1 Guiding principles for peer-review evaluation

In this call FCT is responsible to ensure the scientific quality of the peer review process. The application content represents the essential core of peer review, which requires a global and integrated vision of all components of the applicant's academic, scientific, professional and civic paths, of the research work plan and of the conditions for its development. The application must be evaluated taking into consideration its originality, consistency and coherence, and its contribution to the progress of knowledge in all its components. Evaluators shall give precedence to quality and originality over quantity, when analysing applicants and supervisors' CVs. Evaluators impartiality, objectivity, and transparency of the evaluation process, are fundamental principles for the assessment of each application, regardless of origin or identity of the applicant, supervisors or affiliation institutions, safeguarding any situations of conflict of interests (COI).

### 2.2 Conflict of Interests (COI)

If the coordinating team (chair and co-chair(s)) or any other member of the evaluation panel is in a situation of conflict of interests (COI) regarding any of the applications submitted to the panel, it must be declared to FCT as early as the first contact with the application is made.

Panel members in any declared COI situation cannot be assigned by the coordinating team as readers of the respective applications and will be prevented from contacting in any way with the applications or their evaluation, throughout the evaluation process.

The COI declarations must mandatorily be included in the panel meeting report; the panel chair, in collaboration with FCT, is responsible for including the list of declared COI situations that should comprise the application reference, name of the applicant and the respective panel member who declared COI.

The situations of COI of the chair, co-chair, evaluators and external reviewers include, but are not limited to:

- a) Belonging to the **same academic or non-academic organizational unit<sup>1</sup> and/or the same R&D unit<sup>2</sup> of the host institution** of the work plan associated to the application;
- b) Belonging to the **same academic or non-academic organizational unit and/or the same R&D unit** of the **supervisor(s)** associated to the application;
- c) Belonging to the scientific committee of the Doctoral Programme indicated in the application;
- d) Having published scientific work with the applicant or with the applicant's supervisor(s) in the **three years prior<sup>3</sup>** to the date of opening of the application period;
- e) Having **on-going scientific collaboration with the applicant or her/his supervisor(s)**;
- f) Being related (**family relationship**) to the applicant or her/his supervisor(s);
- g) Having a **scientific or personal conflict** with the applicant or her/his supervisor(s);
- h) Being in **any other situation that may raise doubts** to her/himself, to third parties, namely the applicant or an external entity, about their capacity to assess the application impartially.

### 2.3 Terms of Reference and Confidentiality

All panel members, including evaluators, chair and co-chair, as well as potential external reviewers, who do not participate in the panel but who collaborate with it, establish with FCT the commitment to respect a set of responsibilities essential to the evaluation process, such as **impartiality, declaration of potential COI and confidentiality**. The confidentiality must be fully protected and ensured, during all the evaluation process, in order to guarantee the independence of all opinions produced. All panel members, as well as external reviewers, are responsible for ensuring confidentiality about the entire evaluation process and the content of the applications, being prevented from copying, citing or using any type of material contained therein.

### 2.4 Constitution of the Evaluation Panels

Evaluation panels are constituted by experts with acknowledged scientific merit and experience. Evaluation panels are established according to coverage of scientific fields and sub-fields, gender balance, geographical and institutional diversity (including higher education institutions, R&D units, state laboratories and associated laboratories, companies, among others).

All the panel members, including the chair and co-chair, and external reviewers that may eventually collaborate with the panel, **may never be part of the supervising team** of applicants with applications submitted under the evaluation panel where they participate, but may, nevertheless, be associated to

---

<sup>1</sup> Academic organizational unit refers to the department, if the structure of the faculty/school is organized by organizational units of a departmental nature, or to the faculty/school if not.

<sup>2</sup> In case there are more than one cluster/pole of the same R&D unit, the entire institution should be considered, regardless of the indicated cluster/pole

<sup>3</sup> It will be considered for this purpose the printing date or the publication date of the book, volume of the edition or of the journal issue.

applications submitted to alternative evaluation panels.

The assessment work developed by each panel is coordinated, by FCT's invitation, by one of its members, who has the responsibility for assuring that the evaluation exercise is carried out with **transparency, independence and equity**.

The chair may assess a reduced number of applications, namely in specific situations when there is a lack of scientific coverage in the panel or COI of the remaining panel members.

The chair shall appoint, among the members of the respective panel, one or two co-chairs (depending on panel dimension) to assist her/him in the coordination tasks, as the management of applicants with which has declared COI, for example. The evaluator nominated as co-chair accumulates the respective tasks of co-coordination with those of evaluator of the applications assigned to her/him.

Evaluation panels will be composed by scientific fields based on the adaptation of the FOS Classification of the Frascati Manual (**OECD's Revised Field of Science and Technology Classification in the Frascati Manual** – see Annex I).

Applications are assigned to the different panels according to the main scientific field, secondary scientific field and scientific subfield indicated by the applicant, in accordance with the table included in Annex I. The scientific fields and subfield identified by the applicant **cannot be altered by the evaluation panel and cannot be transferred to a different evaluation panel**.

In case of **applications in a non-academic environment**, the applicant chooses, similarly, the main, secondary and subfield scientific fields, being the application evaluated by a specific evaluation panel for this line of application. This multidisciplinary panel will be composed by experts from the different scientific fields and subfields indicated by the candidates. Applications submitted to this panel also **cannot be transferred to any other evaluation panel or application line**.

The constitution of the Evaluation Panels is made public in the FCT's webpage, in two distinct moments: the list of panel chairs will be disclosed during the application submission period and the list of evaluators that will participate in the evaluation process will be published before the beginning of the evaluation period.

## 2.5 Role and Responsibilities of the Panel Coordination Team

In collaboration with FCT, the chair is responsible for:

- a) Ensuring that the evaluation exercise is carried out with transparency, independence and equality;
- b) Appointing a co-chair to support her/him in the panel management activities and delegating the tasks considered necessary to the proper management of the panel work;
- c) Allocating to each application two evaluators, appointing them as 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> readers, considering their fields of expertise and the application's subfield;
- d) Identifying applications that may need to be evaluated by external reviewers;
- e) Managing the identified COIs;

- f) Ensuring that all panel members follow the guidelines and clarifications provided by FCT throughout the process, as well as the harmonization of evaluation parameters that the panel may establish;
- g) Verifying, in a joint action with the panel members, the suitability of the applications to the panel, identifying any applications outside the scope of the panel that may, eventually, be considered as “Non-assessable”;
- h) Ensuring that all panel members acknowledge and equitably apply the established criteria and sub-criteria, and the respective weighing of such criteria and sub-criteria, as harmonized by the panel;
- i) Assuring the compliance with the deadlines granted to evaluators in all the evaluation stages, namely to prepare the individual and pre-consensus evaluation reports;
- j) Ensuring that, when filling in the evaluation reports, evaluators justify their grading with clear and substantive arguments that allow understanding the correspondence between both;
- k) Moderating the panel meeting and ensuring a collegial process of decision;
- l) Assuring that the final evaluation report is prepared until the end of the plenary meeting;
- m) Guaranteeing that all the final evaluation reports produced by the panel, that will be communicated to applicants, are consistent and coherent with each other, that the comments demonstrate the relative merit of the applications and are in accordance with the provisions of this guide, in the Notice of the Call, in the applicable legislation and with the respective scores;
- n) Preparing the panel meeting report, together with all the panel members;
- o) Collaborating with FCT to solve any eventual unexpected event that may occur before, during and/or after the panel meeting;
- p) Coordinating the preliminary hearing process, assuring the compliance with the previous paragraphs.

## 2.6 Remote and Panel Meeting Evaluation

### 2.6.1 Remote evaluation

Before the beginning of the evaluation process, all panel members (including chair and co-chair) will have to indicate on the FCT's information system, MyFCT, the applications with which they are in a situation of conflict of interests, preventing access to its details. The list of COIs declared will be included in the panel meeting report, which will be made available to the applicants.

The remote evaluation is divided in two stages: i) individual evaluation and ii) pre-consensus evaluation. In the first stage, each evaluator completes their individual evaluation forms as 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> reader, and in the second stage, the 1<sup>st</sup> reader is responsible to produce the pre-consensus report that should reflect the harmonized analysis of both readers allocated to the application.

### 2.6.1.1 Individual Evaluation

- a) Each application is individually assessed by two panel members who are not in a situation of COI with the applicant and respective supervisor(s) and affiliation institution(s).
- b) If any of the evaluators identifies an additional situation of COI concerning any application(s) attributed to her/him, it must be immediately and formally declared to FCT and to the panel chair, who is responsible for the reallocation of the application(s).
- c) **Whenever justified**, the chair should **request to FCT the opinion of external reviewers**, during the individual remote evaluation period, considering the transdisciplinarity or specific aspects of the proposal and the institutional collaborations described in the application.
- d) An application shall be considered **non-assessable** when it **strays considerably from the scientific field in which it was submitted** or **when it does not comply with all the requirements** of the respective application line. Applications in such conditions should be immediately reported to FCT by the chair and/or the evaluators that identified the situation. Before considering an application as non-assessable because it substantially strays from the scientific field in which it was submitted, the evaluation panel should analyse the framing of the work plan main theme in the scientific subfield selected by the applicant and consult external reviewers, specialists in the application subject. This decision must be made explicit in the final evaluation report and justified in the panel meeting report.
- e) An application shall also be considered **non-assessable** when **a violation of at least one of the mandatory admissibility requirements of the applicant or application is identified**. In case of applications in a non-academic environment, submitted to the respective panel, these will be considered **non-assessable** if not complying with the specific admissibility requirements, namely, the indication of at least one non-academic entity, and the association of a supervisor affiliated to it.
- f) Each evaluator must fill in an individual evaluation report for each of the applications that they are assigned to, score the three evaluation criteria separately (see section 5. Notice of the Call) and prepare the respective comments to clearly justify the score awarded.

### 2.6.1.2 Pre-consensus Evaluation

At the end of the individual evaluation stage, the 1<sup>st</sup> reader is responsible for preparing a pre-consensus report within the pre-established deadline that takes place before the panel meeting.

The pre-consensus report should reflect the harmonization of the individual reports prepared by the two readers, also considering the external reviewers' assessment, whenever applicable.

### 2.6.2 Panel Meeting

The panel meeting consists on the reunion of all panel members, whose presence is mandatory, where the **collegial discussion of all applications submitted to the panel** is promoted and **moderated by the panel chair**. This meeting comprises the following:



- a) Analysis and joint discussion of all applications, taking into consideration the individual and pre-consensus evaluation reports previously produced which constitute the working documents for the panel;
- b) During the meeting, the 1<sup>st</sup> readers must be prepared to present a summary of strengths and eventual weaknesses of each application that has been assigned to them. The chair is responsible to promote the debate, encouraging the participation of all panel members;
- c) The final evaluation of each panel is performed by discussing the relative merit of all the applications, after which the final score for each application is established. If any panel member is in a situation of conflict of interests with any application, he/she will not be able to participate in the discussion. If this situation applies to the chair and the co-chair, another panel member without COI should be assigned to moderate the meeting and the discussion of these applications;
- d) The 1<sup>st</sup> reader is responsible for writing the final evaluation reports, taking into consideration the collegial decision of the panel;
- e) All the final evaluation reports produced must be consistent and coherent with each other, also exhibiting a correspondence between the scores and respective comments;
- f) All panel members are responsible for the discussion of the relative merit of all the applications. From the collegial discussion shall result a single provisional ranked list, per evaluation panel.

## 2.7 Comments to be transmitted to Applicants

Each panel should pay attention to present, in a clear, consistent and coherent manner, the arguments that led to the scores awarded **to each of the evaluation criteria and sub-criteria**; the eventual disability bonuses and respective degree of disability should also be mentioned. It is the responsibility of the chair and the co-chair to ensure that the panel justifies the scores with substantive arguments that allow the understanding of the meaning of the evaluation, identifying the strengths and weaknesses of each application for each evaluation criteria (see point 5. of the Notice of the Call).

In case the applicant presents more than one graduate and/or master degree, the panel should indicate which of the degrees has been selected for the calculation of sub-criterion A1 – Academic Career. In case of academic degrees obtained in a foreign country, the panel should mention if the applicant has submitted, or not, the respective recognition and/or conversion to the Portuguese grading scale.

The comments in the final evaluation reports should comply with the following recommendations:

- a) Do not use the 1<sup>st</sup> person; alternatively, as an example, use "The panel considers that (...)";
- b) Avoid descriptive comments or that are a mere summary of elements included in the application;
- c) Avoid generic and/or vague comments, such as "very weak work plan", "adequate CV", "excellent hosting conditions", etc.;
- d) Use analytic and impartial language, avoiding depreciative comments about the applicant, the work

plan proposed, the supervisors, etc.;

- e) Avoid asking questions since the applicant cannot reply.

## 2.8. Panel Meeting Report

The panel meeting report is a responsibility of all panel members; the chair is responsible for writing it down, being also responsible for representing the entire panel.

The panel meeting report must include:

- a) The name and affiliation of all panel members;
- b) The indication of applications considered as “non-assessable”;
- c) The panel adopted methodology used for particular cases;
- d) The provisional ranked list of all the applications evaluated by the panel, in descending order of the final score;
- e) The list of COI declared by all the panel members.

## Annex I – Scientific fields, adapted from the FOS Classification of the Manual

### Frascati

**NOTE:** The evaluation panel specific for applications in a non-academic environment will include all the scientific fields and subfields described below, and its constitution and organization will be determined according to the number of applications submitted.

Main Scientific Field	Secondary Scientific Field	Subfield	Evaluation Panel
<b>1a Exact Sciences</b>	<b>1.1 Mathematics</b>	Pure Mathematics	Mathematics
		Applied Mathematics	
		Statistics and Probability	
		Mathematics – Other	
	<b>1.2 Computer and Information Sciences</b>	Computation Sciences	Computer Sciences and Informatics
		Information Sciences	
		Bioinformatics	
		Computer Sciences and Informatics – Other	
	<b>1.3 Physical Sciences</b>	Atomic Physics	Physics
		Molecular Physics	
		Chemical Physics	
		Condensed Matter Physics	
		Particle Physics	
		Nuclear Physics	
		Fluids and Plasma Physics	
		Medical and Biological Physics	
Optics			
Acoustics			
Astronomy			
Gravitation and Cosmology			
Physical Sciences - Other			
<b>1.4 Chemical Sciences</b>	Organic Chemistry	Chemistry	
	Inorganic Chemistry		
	Nuclear Chemistry		
	Physical Chemistry		
	Polymer Science		
	Electrochemistry		
	Colloid Chemistry		
	Analytical Chemistry		
	Medicinal Chemistry		
	Chemistry – Other		

Main Scientific Field	Secondary Scientific Field	Subfield	Evaluation Panel
<b>1b Natural Sciences</b>	<b>1.5 Earth and related Environmental Sciences</b>	Geosciences and Multidisciplinary Studies	Earth Sciences
		Mineralogy	
		Palaeontology	
		Geochemistry	
		Geophysics	
		Physical Geography	
		Geology	
		Volcanology	
		Meteorology	
		Atmospheric Sciences	
		Climate Research	
		Oceanography	
		Hydrology	
		Water Resources	
		Earth Sciences - Other	
	Natural Resources and Sustainability	Environmental Sciences	Monitoring and Environmental Impact
			Environmental Management
			Ecotoxicology
			Waste Management and Recovery
			Climate Change
			Atmosphere and Pollution
			Water and Pollution
			Environmental Sciences – Other
	<b>1.6 Biological Sciences</b>	Experimental Biology and Biochemistry	Cellular Biology
			Microbiology
			Virology
			Biochemistry
			Molecular Biology
			Biochemical Research Methods
			Biophysics
			Genetics and Heredity
			Reproductive Biology
			Developmental Biology
Experimental Biology and Biochemistry - Other			
Biological Sciences		Botany	
		Zoology	
		Mammalogy	
		Herpetology	
		Ichthyology	
		Ornithology	
		Entomology	
		Mycology	
		Behavioural Biology	
		Marine Biology	
		Aquaculture	
		Freshwater Biology	
		Limnology	
		Ecology	
		Biodiversity Conservation	
		Evolutionary Biology	
Organism Biology			
Biological Sciences – Other			

Main Scientific Field	Secondary Scientific Field	Subfield	Evaluation Panel
<b>2 Engineering and Technology</b>	<b>2.1 Civil Engineering</b>	Civil Engineering	Civil Engineering
		Architecture Engineering	
		Construction Engineering	
		Municipal Engineering	
		Structural Engineering	
		Transport Engineering	
		Civil Engineering – Other	
	<b>2.2 Electrical, Electronic and Information Engineering</b>	Electrical and Electronic Engineering	Electrical and Electronic Engineering
		Robotics	
		Automation and Control Systems	
		Communication Engineering and Systems	
		Telecommunications	
		Computer Hardware and Architecture	
Electrical and Electronic Engineering – Other			
Informatics	Computer Sciences and Informatics		
<b>2.3 Mechanical Engineering</b>	Mechanical Engineering and Engineering Systems	Mechanical Engineering	
	Applied Mechanics		
	Thermodynamics		
	Aerospace Engineering		
	Nuclear Engineering		
	Manufacturing Processes		
	Audio Engineering and Reliability Analysis		
Mechanical Engineering – Other			
<b>2.4 Chemical Engineering</b>	Chemical Engineering	Chemical Engineering	
	Chemical Process Engineering		
	Chemical Engineering – Other		
<b>2.5 Materials Engineering</b>	Materials Engineering	Materials Engineering and Nanotechnologies	
	Ceramics		
	Coating and Films		
	Composites		
	Paper and Wood		
	Textiles		
	Nanomaterials		
Materials Engineering – Other			
<b>2.6 Medical Engineering</b>	Medical Engineering and Biomedical Engineering	Bioengineering and Biotechnology	
	Laboratory Technology		
	Medical Engineering – Other		
<b>2.7 Environmental Engineering</b>	Environmental Engineering	Environmental Engineering	
	Geological Engineering		
	Geotechnics		
	Petroleum engineering, Energy and Fuels		
	Remote Sensing		
	Mining and Mineral Processing		
	Marine Engineering		
	Sea Vessels		
	Ocean Engineering		
	Environmental Engineering – Other		

Main Scientific Field	Secondary Scientific Field	Subfield	Evaluation Panel
<b>2 Sciences of Engineering and Technology</b>	<b>2.8</b> Environmental Biotechnology	Bioremediation	Bioengineering and Biotechnology
		Diagnostic Biotechnologies in Environmental Management;	
		Environmental Biotechnology Related Ethics	
		Environmental Biotechnology – Other	
	<b>2.9</b> Industrial Biotechnology	Industrial Biotechnology	
		Bioprocessing Technologies	
		Biocatalysis	
		Fermentation	
		Bioproducts	
		Biomaterials	
		Bioplastics	
		Biofuels	
		New Bio-Derived Materials	
		Bio-Derived Chemicals	
	Industrial Biotechnology - Other		
<b>2.10</b> Nanotechnology	Nanodevices	Materials Engineering and Nanotechnologies	
	Nanoprocesses		
	Nanotechnologies – Other		
<b>2.11</b> Food Engineering and Technology	Food Engineering and Technology	Agricultural and Food Technologies	
	Food Engineering and Technology - Other		

Main Scientific Field	Secondary Scientific Field	Subfield	Evaluation Panel
<b>3 Medical and Health Sciences</b>	<b>3.1 Basic Medicine</b>	Biomedicine Anatomy and Histology Human Genetics Immunology Neurosciences Pharmacology Biopharmaceuticals Toxicology Physiology Pathology Basic Medicine – Other	Biomedicine
	<b>3.2 Clinical Medicine</b>	Andrology Obstetrics and Gynaecology Paediatrics Cardiac and Cardiovascular System Haematology Respiratory System Critical Care Medicine and Emergency Medicine Anaesthesiology Orthopaedics Surgery Radiology, Nuclear Medicine and Medical Imaging Transplants Stomatology Oral Surgery and Medicine Dermatology Infectious Diseases Allergology Rheumatology Endocrinology and Metabolism Gastroenterology and Hepatology Urology and Nephrology Oncology Ophthalmology Otorhinolaryngology Psychiatry Clinical Neurology Geriatrics and Gerontology General and Family Medicine Internal Medicine Integrative and Complementary Medicine Clinical Medicine – Other	Clinical Medicine and Health Sciences

Main Scientific Field	Secondary Scientific Field	Subfield	Evaluation Panel
<b>3 Medical and Health Sciences</b>	<b>3.3 Health Sciences</b>	Health Care and Services	Clinical Medicine and Health Sciences
		Health Services and Policies	
		Nursing	
		Nutrition, Dietetics	
		Public Health and Environmental Health	
		Tropical Medicine	
		Parasitology	
		Epidemiology	
		Occupational Medicine	
		Occupational Health	
		Sports and Fitness Sciences	
		Social Biomedical Sciences	
		Bioethics and History and Philosophy of Medicine	
	Addiction		
	Health Sciences - Other		
<b>3.4 Medical Biotechnology</b>	Health-related Biotechnology Technologies involving the manipulation of Cells, Tissues, Organs or the whole Body Gene-based Diagnose and Therapies Medical Biotechnology Related Ethics Medical Biotechnology – Other	Bioengineering and Biotechnology	
<b>3.5 Forensic Sciences</b>	Forensic Chemistry and Biochemistry Forensic Sciences – Other	Clinical Medicine and Health Sciences	



Main Scientific Field	Secondary Scientific Field	Subfield	Evaluation Panel
<b>4 Agricultural Sciences</b>	<b>4.1</b> Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Agriculture	Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
		Forestry	
		Fishery	
		Soil science	
		Horticulture	
		Viticulture	
		Agronomy	
		Plant Production	
		Plant Protection	
	Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries – Other		
	<b>4.2</b> Animal and Dairy Science	Animal and Dairy Science	Animal and Veterinary Sciences
		Livestock Breeding	
		Pets	
Animal and Dairy Science – Other			
<b>4.3</b> Veterinary Sciences	Veterinary Science	Animal and Veterinary Sciences	
	Veterinary Science – Other		
<b>4.4</b> Agricultural and Food Biotechnology	Agricultural and Food Biotechnology	Agricultural and Food Technologies	
	Food Security		
	Agricultural Biotechnology Related Ethics		
	Agricultural and Food Biotechnology – Other		
	Cloning of Domestic Animals	Animal and Veterinary Sciences	
Biomass Production Technologies	Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries		

Main Scientific Field	Secondary Scientific Field	Subfield	Evaluation Panel
<b>5 Social Sciences</b>	<b>5.1 Psychology</b>	Criminal Psychology	Psychology
		Social and Organizational Psychology	
		Cognitive Psychology and Neuropsychology	
		Clinical Psychology	
		Psychology of Development and Learning	
		Educational Psychology	
		Community and Health Psychology	
		Psychology – Other	
	<b>5.2 Economics and Management</b>	Economics	Economics and Management
		Management	
		Economics and Management – Other	
	<b>5.3 Educational Sciences</b>	General Education	Educational Sciences
		Educational Sciences	
	<b>5.4 Sociology</b>	Sociology	Sociology
		Sociologic Criminology	
		Social Service	
		Sociology – Other	
		Anthropology	Anthropology
		Anthropology – Other	
	<b>5.5 Law</b>	Public Law	Law
		Criminal Law	
		Private Law	
		European and International Law	
		Human Rights	
		Law, Social Sciences and Humanities	
		Law – Other	
	<b>5.6 Political Sciences</b>	Political Science	Political Sciences
		Military Science	
Compared Politics			
Political Theory			
International Relations			
Public Policy			
European Studies			
Political Sciences – Other			
<b>5.7 Social and Economic Geography</b>	Economic and Social Geography	Social and Economic Geography	
	Geographic Urbanism		
	Social and Economic Geography – Other		
<b>5.8 Media and Communications</b>	Documental and Information Sciences	Communication and Information Sciences	
	Journalism and Media		
	Communication and Science Management		
	Media and Communications – Other		

Main Scientific Field	Secondary Scientific Field	Subfield	Evaluation Panel
<b>6 Humanities</b>	<b>6.1 History and Archaeology</b>	Prehistory and Archaeology	History and Archaeology
		Ancient History	
		Medieval History	
		Modern History	
		Contemporary History	
		History of Science and Technology	
		History and Archaeology – Other	
	<b>6.2 Languages and Literature</b>	Literature	Literature Studies and Culture Studies
		Portuguese Studies	
		Romanic Studies	
		Anglophone Studies	
		Classical Studies	
		Asian and African Studies	
		Germanic Studies	
		Literature Studies and Culture Studies – Other	
	Linguistics	Linguistics	
	Linguistics – Other		
	<b>6.3 Philosophy, Ethics and Religion</b>	Philosophical Anthropology	Philosophy
		Epistemology	
		Aesthetics and Philosophy of Art	
Ethics and Political Philosophy			
Philosophy of Science			
Philosophy of Religion			
History of Philosophy			
Logic			
Metaphysics and Ontology			
Theology			
Philosophy– Other			
<b>6.4 Arts</b>	Fine Arts	Arts	
	Music		
	Visual Performing Arts – Cinema		
	Visual Performing Arts – Drama		
	Visual Performing Arts – Dance		
	Digital Arts		
	Arts – Other		
	History of Art	Museology and History of Art	
	Conservation and Restoration		
	Museology		
	Museology and Art History – Other		
	Architecture	Design, Architecture and Urbanism	
	Urbanism and Spatial Planning		
	Design		
	Design, Architecture and Urbanism – Other		