

Annex I – Notice of the Call

Evaluation Guide

Call for PhD Studentships – 2020

February 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	4
ACRONYMS	5
1. INTRODUCTION	6
2. EVALUATION PROCESS.....	6
2.1 Guiding principles for peer-review evaluation	6
2.2 Conflict of Interests (COI).....	6
2.3 Terms of Reference and Confidentiality.....	7
2.4 Constitution of the Evaluation Panels.....	7
2.5 Role and responsibilities of the Panel Chair	8
2.6 Remote and Panel Meeting Evaluation.....	9
2.6.1 Remote evaluation	9
2.6.1.1 Individual Evaluation	9
2.6.1.2 Pre-consensus Evaluation	10
2.6.2 Panel Meeting.....	10
2.7 Comments to be transmitted to Applicants	11
2.8. Panel Meeting Report.....	11
3. STRATEGIC COORDINATION OF THE CALL.....	12
Annex I – Scientific fields, adapted from the FOS Classification of the Manual Frascati ..	13

ACRONYMS

BD – PhD Studentship

COI – Conflict of Interests

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 Research 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 – 2020.

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

2. EVALUATION PROCESS

2.1 Guiding principles for peer-review evaluation

The mission of FCT is to ensure the scientific quality of the peer review process. Therefore, evaluators shall give precedence to quality and originality over quantity, when analysing applicants and supervisors' CVs. The scientific content represents the essential core of peer review, which requires a global and integrated vision of all components of the applicant's scientific and professional career and the research work plan. The application must be evaluated taking into consideration its originality, consistency and coherence, and its contribution to the progress of knowledge in all of its components.

Impartiality and transparency are fundamental principles for evaluation decisions. All applications will be treated and assessed impartially, on the base of their merit, regardless of origin or identity of the applicant, supervisors or affiliation institution, safeguarding situations of conflict of interests (COI).

2.2 Conflict of Interests (COI)

If the chair, co-chair or any other member of the evaluation panel is in a situation of COI regarding any of the applications submitted to the panel, he/she must declare it 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 chair or co-chair 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 chair of the evaluation panel, in collaboration with FCT, is responsible for compiling the list of declared COI situations that include the application reference, name of the applicant and the respective panel member.

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 organizational unit¹ and/or the same R&D unit of the host institution** of the work plan associated to the application;
- b) Belonging to the **same academic organizational unit and/or the same R&D unit** of the higher education institution of the **supervisor and/or co-supervisor(s)** associated to the application;
- c) Having published scientific work with the applicant or with the applicant's supervisor or co-supervisor(s) in the **three years prior** to the date of opening of the application period;
- d) Having **on-going scientific collaboration with the applicant, their supervisor or co-supervisor(s)**;
- e) Being related (**family relationship**) to the applicant, supervisor or co-supervisor(s);
- f) Having a **scientific or personal conflict** with the applicant supervisor or co-supervisor(s);
- g) 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.

The members of the Scientific Coordination Group, referred in Chapter 5 of this Guide, cannot be in any situation of conflict of interests related to any of the submitted applications to this call.

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. During all the evaluation process, confidentiality must be fully protected and ensured 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, as well as the content of the applications, being prevented from copying, citing or using any type of material contained therein.

The members of the Scientific Coordination Group will also have to sign the respective Terms of Reference and Confidentiality.

2.4 Constitution of the Evaluation Panels

Evaluation panels are constituted by experts with acknowledged scientific merit and experience. Evaluation panels are also established according to coverage of scientific fields and sub-fields, gender balance, institutional and geographical diversity.

All the panel members, including the chair and co-chair, and external reviewers that may eventually collaborate with the panel, **may never be a supervisor or co-supervisor** of applicants with applications submitted under the evaluation panel where they participate, but may, nevertheless, be the supervisor

¹ 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.

or co-supervisor of candidates applying to alternative evaluation panels.

The assessment work developed by each panel is coordinated, under 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 should not assess any applications, but may exceptionally do so, under particular circumstances, namely 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, a co-chair to assist her/him in the coordination tasks, as the management of applicants with which has declared Col, for example. The evaluator nominated as co-chair accumulates the tasks of co-coordination with those of evaluator of the applications assigned to her/him.

Evaluation panels will be composed 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, therefore, applications cannot be transferred to a different evaluation panel.**

The constitution of the Evaluation Panels is made public in the FCT's webpage. 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 Chair

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 1st and 2nd readers, considering their fields of expertise and the application's subfield;
- d) Identifying applications that may need external reviewers;
- e) Managing the identified COIs;
- f) Ensuring that all panel members follow the guidelines and clarifications provided by FCT throughout the process;
- 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 be considered as "Non-assessable";

- h) Ensuring that all panel members know and apply the established criteria and sub-criteria, and the respective weighing of such criteria and sub-criteria, when filling in the individual evaluation reports;
- i) Assuring the compliance with the deadlines granted to evaluators 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 panel 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 and that the comments are in accordance with the provisions of this guide, 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 unexpected event that may occur before, during and/or after the panel meeting;
- p) Coordinating the preliminary hearing process.

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, thus preventing access to the details of these applications. The list of COIs declared by each panel member 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, both of which are carried out in myFCT portal. In the first stage, each evaluator must complete their individual evaluation forms as 1st and 2nd reader, and in the second stage, the 1st reader will be responsible to produce the pre-consensus report that should reflect the 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, as in the case of interdisciplinary applications, the chair may request to FCT the opinion of external reviewers, during the individual remote evaluation period.
- d) An application shall be considered non-assessable when it strays considerably from the scientific field in which it was submitted and if there is an alternative panel where it would better suit. The evaluation panel must jointly validate this decision during the panel meeting and that 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, whenever it has not been identified in the prior stage of administrative review of admissibility (as, for example, the case of submitting the same recommendation twice).
- 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 in order to clearly justify the score awarded.

2.6.1.2 Pre-consensus Evaluation

- a) At the end of the individual evaluation stage, the 1st reader is responsible for preparing a pre-consensus report within the pre-established deadline that takes place before the panel meeting.
- b) When preparing the pre-consensus report, the 1st reader must take into consideration the two individual evaluations (and external reviewers' assessment, if applicable).

2.6.2 Panel Meeting

The panel meeting consists on the reunion of all panel members where the **collegial discussion of all applications submitted to the panel** is promoted. This meeting comprises the following:

- g) 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;
- h) During the meeting, the 1st readers must be prepared to present a summary of strengths and eventual weaknesses of each application that has been assigned to them. During the discussion, the participation of all panel members should be encouraged;
- i) 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 and should leave the meeting. If this situation applies to the chair and the co-chair, another panel member should be assigned to moderate the meeting and the discussion of these applications;
- j) The 1st reader is responsible for preparing the final evaluation reports, taking into consideration the discussion and the collegial decision of the panel;

- k) All the final evaluation reports produced must be consistent and coherent with each other, also exhibiting a correspondence between the scores and respective comments;
- l) 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 1st 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 general 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 and must be signed by all, being the chair responsible for writing it down.

The panel meeting report must include:

- a) The name and affiliation of all panel members;
- b) The identification of all 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.

In addition, the panel meeting report must include the following annexes:

- e) The COI declarations of all the panel members;
- f) Eventual vote and competence delegations for justified absences.

3. STRATEGIC COORDINATION OF THE CALL

FCT will designate a Scientific Coordination Group to the Call, composed by three to five members of acknowledged international scientific merit, in distinct fields of knowledge. The work developed by this Group is coordinated by one of its members, by FCT invitation.

The constitution of the Scientific Coordination Group composition will be disclosed at FCT's webpage.

The Scientific Coordination Group will analyse the global results of all the evaluation panels, proposing to the FCT the number of studentships that shall be granted to each panel. In this process, the Group will consider the policy guidelines for Portugal in the European context («Higher Education, Research and Innovation in Portugal – Perspectives for 2030», available at: <https://www.portugal.gov.pt/download-ficheiros/ficheiro.aspx?v=6ac404ca-9f41-4d83-ae70-6ffff158803b>), as well as the need to guarantee a highly qualified human resources framework, recognizing the disciplinary, multidisciplinary and transdisciplinary nature of scientific knowledge.

The Scientific Coordination Group will meet after the evaluation process and ranking of all applications by the respective evaluation panels are completed, proposing to FCT the number of studentships that shall be granted to each panel and, consequently, the final provisional list of applications to be funded. A panel meeting report will be prepared, describing the methodology used for the decision-making.

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

Frascati

Main Scientific Field	Secondary Scientific Field	Subfield	Evaluation Panel
1a Exact Sciences	1.1 Mathematics	Pure Mathematics	Mathematics
		Applied Mathematics	
		Statistics and Probability	
		Mathematics – Other	
	1.2 Computer and Information Sciences	Computation Sciences	Computer Sciences and Informatics
		Information Sciences	
		Bioinformatics	
		Computer Sciences and Informatics – Other	
	1.3 Physical Sciences	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			
1.4 Chemical Sciences	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	
1b Natural Sciences	1.5 Earth and related Environmental Sciences	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			
	1.6 Biological Sciences	Cellular Biology	Microbiology	Experimental Biology and Biochemistry
			Virology	
			Biochemistry	
			Molecular Biology	
			Biochemical Research Methods	
			Biophysics	
			Genetics and Heredity	
			Reproductive Biology	
			Developmental Biology	
			Experimental Biology and Biochemistry - Other	
			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
2 Engineering and Technology	2.1 Civil Engineering	Civil Engineering	Civil Engineering
		Architecture Engineering	
		Construction Engineering	
		Municipal Engineering	
		Structural Engineering	
		Transport Engineering	
		Civil Engineering – Other	
	2.2 Electrical, Electronic and Information Engineering	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		
2.3 Mechanical Engineering	Mechanical Engineering and Engineering Systems	Mechanical Engineering	
	Applied Mechanics		
	Thermodynamics		
	Aerospace Engineering		
	Nuclear Engineering		
	Manufacturing Processes		
	Audio Engineering and Reliability Analysis		
Mechanical Engineering – Other			
2.4 Chemical Engineering	Chemical Engineering	Chemical Engineering	
	Chemical Process Engineering		
	Chemical Engineering – Other		
2.5 Materials Engineering	Materials Engineering	Materials Engineering and Nanotechnologies	
	Ceramics		
	Coating and Films		
	Composites		
	Paper and Wood		
	Textiles		
	Nanomaterials		
Materials Engineering – Other			
2.6 Medical Engineering	Medical Engineering and Biomedical Engineering	Bioengineering and Biotechnology	
	Laboratory Technology		
	Medical Engineering – Other		
2.7 Environmental Engineering	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
2 Sciences of Engineering and Technology	2.8 Environmental Biotechnology	Bioremediation	Bioengineering and Biotechnology
		Diagnostic Biotechnologies in Environmental Management;	
		Environmental Biotechnology Related Ethics	
		Environmental Biotechnology – Other	
	2.9 Industrial Biotechnology	Industrial Biotechnology	
		Bioprocessing Technologies	
		Biocatalysis	
		Fermentation	
		Bioproducts	
		Biomaterials	
		Bioplastics	
		Biofuels	
		New Bio-Derived Materials	
		Bio-Derived Chemicals	
	Industrial Biotechnology - Other		
2.10 Nanotechnology	Nanodevices	Materials Engineering and Nanotechnologies	
	Nanoprocesses		
	Nanotechnologies – Other		
2.11 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
3 Medical and Health Sciences	3.1 Basic Medicine	Biomedicine Anatomy and Histology Human Genetics Immunology Neurosciences Pharmacology Biopharmaceuticals Toxicology Physiology Pathology Biomedicine – Other	Biomedicine
	3.2 Clinical Medicine	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
3 Medical and Health Sciences	3.3 Health Sciences	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		
3.4 Medical Biotechnology	Health-related Biotechnology	Bioengineering and Biotechnology	
	Technologies involving the manipulation of Cells, Tissues, Organs or the whole Body		
	Gene-based Diagnose and Therapies		
	Medical Biotechnology Related Ethics		
3.5 Forensic Sciences	Medical Biotechnology – Other	Clinical Medicine and Health Sciences	
	Forensic Chemistry and Biochemistry		
	Forensic Sciences – Other		

Main Scientific Field	Secondary Scientific Field	Subfield	Evaluation Panel
4 Agricultural Sciences	4.1 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		
	4.2 Animal and Dairy Science	Animal and Dairy Science	Animal and Veterinary Sciences
		Livestock Breeding	
		Pets	
		Animal and Dairy Science – Other	
	4.3 Veterinary Sciences	Veterinary Science	Animal and Veterinary Sciences
		Veterinary Science – Other	
4.4 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
5 Social Sciences	5.1 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	
		Psychology – Other	
	5.2 Economics and Management	Economics	Economics and Management
		Management	
		Economics and Management – Other	
	5.3 Educational Sciences	General Education	Educational Sciences
		Educational Sciences	
	5.4 Sociology	Sociology	Sociology
		Sociologic Criminology	
		Social Service	
		Sociology – Other	
	Anthropology	Anthropology	Anthropology
		Anthropology – Other	
	5.5 Law	Public Law	Law
		Criminal Law	
		Private Law	
		European and International Law	
		Human Rights	
Law, Social Sciences and Humanities			
Law – Other			
5.6 Political Sciences	Political Science	Political Sciences	
	Military Science		
	Compared Politics		
	Political Theory		
	International Relations		
	Public Policy		
	European Studies		
	Political Sciences – Other		
5.7 Social and Economic Geography	Economic and Social Geography	Social and Economic Geography	
	Geographic Urbanism		
	Social and Economic Geography – Other		
5.8 Media and Communications	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
6 Humanities	6.1 History and Archaeology	Prehistory and Archaeology	History and Archaeology
		Ancient History	
		Medieval History	
		Modern History	
		Contemporary History	
		History of Science and Technology	
		History and Archaeology – Other	
	6.2 Languages and Literature	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		
	6.3 Philosophy, Ethics and Religion	Philosophical Anthropology	Philosophy, Ethics and Religion
		Epistemology	
		Philosophy of Science	
		Aesthetics and Philosophy of Art	
		Metaphysics and Ontology	
		Philosophy of Religion	
		Logic	
History of Philosophy			
Ethics and Political Philosophy			
Theology			
Philosophy, Ethics and Religion – Other			
6.4 Arts	Fine Arts	Arts	
	Musicology		
	Visual Performative Arts (Cinema, Television, Drama, Dance, etc.)		
	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		