

Annex to the Notice of the Call

Evaluation Guide

Call for PhD Studentships in all Scientific Domains 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	1
ACRONYMS	2
1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. APPLICATION EVALUATION CRITERIA	3
2.1 Criterion A – Merit of the Applicant	4
2.1.1 Sub-criterion A1 – Academic Career	4
2.1.1.1 Documents of mandatory submission to apply Table 1 scores	5
2.1.1.2 Additional considerations for the application of the scores established in Table 1	5
2.1.2 Sub-criterion A2 – Personal Curriculum	7
2.1.3 Disability Bonuses	7
2.2 Criterion B – Merit of the Work Plan	8
2.3 Criterion C – Merit of the Hosting Conditions	8
3. EVALUATION PROCESS	10
3.1 Guiding principles for peer-review evaluation	10
3.2 Conflict of Interests (COI)	10
3.3 Terms of Reference and Confidentiality	11
3.4 Constitution of the Evaluation Panels	11
3.5 Role and Responsibilities of the Panel Coordination Team	12
3.6 Remote and Panel Meeting Evaluation	13
3.6.1 Remote evaluation	13
3.6.1.1 Individual Evaluation	14
3.6.1.2 Pre-consensus Evaluation	14
3.6.2 Panel Meeting	14
3.7 Comments to be transmitted to Applicants	15
3.8. Panel Meeting Report	16
Annex I – Scientific fields, adapted from the FOS Classification of the Frascati Manual ..	17

ACRONYMS

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*

DGES – Directorate General for Higher Education (*Direção Geral do Ensino Superior*)

1. INTRODUCTION

The Evaluation Guide is the document prepared to help evaluators and applicants understand the criteria and procedures associated to the evaluation of applications submitted to the Call for PhD Studentships in all Scientific Domains 2023.

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. APPLICATION EVALUATION CRITERIA

As indicated in the Notice of the Call, all applications considered admissible will be graded from zero (0.00, minimum) to five (5.00, maximum) in each of the three evaluation criteria:

- Criterion A – Merit of the Applicant;
- Criterion B – Merit of the Work Plan;
- Criterion C – Merit of the Hosting Conditions.

Applicants will be ranked according to the weighted average of the score obtained in the three criteria, following the relative weighting of: **30%** Merit of the Applicant (A); **40%** Merit of the Work Plan (B); **30%** Merit of the Hosting Conditions (C), converted into the following formula:

$$\textit{Final grade} = (0,3 \times A) + (0,4 \times B) + (0,3 \times C)$$

For **tie-breaking** purposes, the final ranking list will be based on the scores assigned to each of the evaluation criteria in the following order:

- (i) **Regular line of application:** criterion B (Merit of the Work Plan), criterion A (Merit of the Applicant) and criterion C (Merit of the Hosting Conditions);
- (ii) **Specific line of application in a non-academic environment:** criterion C (Merit of the Hosting Conditions), criterion B (Merit of the Work Plan) and criterion A (Merit of the Applicant).

The final score resulting from the application of formulas specified in this document shall be rounded to the third decimal digit using the following rule: when the fourth decimal digit is equal to or greater than 5 (five) it shall be rounded in excess; if less than 5 (five), the value of the third decimal digit shall be upheld.

Applicants whose **application is scored with a final grade lower than 3.000 are not eligible** for studentship granting.

2.1 Criterion A – Merit of the Applicant

The criterion A, Merit of the Applicant, which has a 30% relative weight to the final score, is evaluated based on two sub-criteria:

- A1. **Academic career** (reflecting the academic degree grades, for which the respective certificates have been submitted in the application), with a relative weight of **50%** in the Merit of the Applicant;
- A2. **Personal curriculum** (reflecting the scientific and professional career, and academic career, when applicable, and applicant’s motivation to pursue this study cycle), with a relative weight of **50%** in the Merit of the Applicant.

The score awarded to criterion A is calculated applying the following formula:

$$\text{Criterion A} = (0,5 \times A1) + (0,5 \times A2)$$

2.1.1 Sub-criterion A1 – Academic Career

The academic career sub-criterion is calculated according to the **final classification stated in the academic degree certificate, submitted in the application form**, according to Table 1.

Although the submission of degree certificates does not constitute an admissibility requirement, **documental evidence of the classifications obtained in the academic degrees is mandatory for the evaluation of sub-criterion A1.**

Table 1 – Reference table to score the sub-criterion A1 – Academic career

<u>Graduate + Master degrees</u> (pre- or post-Bologna) or <u>Integrated Master degree</u> (300-360 ECTS)		<u>Graduate degree (180 ECTS)</u> (pre- or post-Bologna)		<u>Master degree (90-120 ECTS)</u> (pre- or post-Bologna)	
Final Grade	A1 Score	Final Grade	A1 Score	Final Grade	A1 Score
≥ 18	5.0	≥ 17	3.5	≥ 17	3.0
17	4.5	16	3.0	16	2.5
16	4.0	15	2.5	15	2.0
15	3.5	14	2.0	14	1.5
14	3.0	<14	1.5	< 14	1.0
<14	2,5				

To calculate the score of sub-criterion A1, the prevailing grade is the one stated in the respective degree certificate(s) submitted in the application. Certificate **final grades presented with decimal digits** shall be rounded to the third decimal digit using the following rule: when the fourth decimal digit is equal to or greater than 5 (five) it shall be rounded in excess; if lesser, the value of the third decimal digit shall be upheld. To calculate the arithmetic average between the graduate and master degrees’ grades, the original grades indicated in the certificates (even if presented with decimal digits) shall be considered, rounding only the final grade average. If the degree certificate simultaneously shows, both the rounded and the decimal grades, the rounded grade shall be used.

In case no valid academic degree certificates are submitted, the sub-criterion A1 will be scored zero (A1 = 0).

2.1.1.1 Documents of mandatory submission to apply Table 1 scores

To apply the scoring system presented in Table 1 it is mandatory to submit the following documents in the application form:

- a) **Academic degree certificates, indicating the final grade.** Applicants with post-Bologna education shall present both 1st and 2nd study cycles academic degree certificates or an integrated master certificate, while applicants with pre-Bologna education should present the graduate and/or master degree certificates.
- b) In case of **foreign academic degrees it is mandatory to submit the recognition** of such degrees and **the conversion of the respective final grade to the Portuguese grading scale**, to guarantee the principle of equal treatment to applicants with national and foreign academic degrees.

Additionally, and whenever possible, the following documents should also be presented:

- c) The **Diploma Supplement** of the presented degree certificates;
- d) In the case of specific recognition, together with the original degree certificate and accompanied by the respective legal document of degree recognition and conversion of the final classification to the Portuguese grading scale, the corresponding **Jury Report** appointed for the act. It should be noted that this is a complementary document and its submission does not replace the submission of the degree recognition certificate issued by the Directorate General for Higher Education (*Direção Geral do Ensino Superior*, DGES) or by a Portuguese public higher education institution.

The recognition of foreign academic degrees and diplomas, and the conversion of the respective final grade to the Portuguese grading scale, can be issued by a Portuguese public higher education institution, or by DGES. FCT suggests visiting the DGES portal to obtain information about this procedure: <http://www.dges.gov.pt/en>.

2.1.1.2 Additional considerations for the application of the scores established in Table 1

In addition to the presentation of the documents indicated in the previous point, the following will be considered when scoring sub-criterion A1:

- a) The final grade average of “graduate + master” degrees, in a pre- or post-Bologna academic path, is the result of the simple arithmetic average of the final grade obtained in the 1st cycle (180 ECTS)/graduate degree and the final grade obtained in the 2nd cycle (90-120 ECTS)/master degree, by applying the following formula:

$$\text{Final score average (graduate + master degrees)} = \frac{\text{1st cycle final grade (graduate degree)} + \text{2nd cycle final grade (master)}}{2}$$

- b) In case of integrated master degrees whose institutions issue global certificates, the final grade indicated in the degree certificate should be considered (300-360 ECTS). In case of integrated masters in which the 1st and 2nd cycle certificates are issued separately, the final average will be calculated as indicated in paragraph a) or, when available, the diploma supplement will be consulted to verify the final classification of the degree and number of credits (ECTS) to which it refers to.
- c) When both integrated master degree certificate (300-360 ECTS) and a pre-Bologna or 2nd cycle degree certificate are presented, the final grade of **the integrated master degree is the one to be considered**.
- d) If only a graduate or master degree certificate is submitted, the corresponding scoring system should be

applied according to the respective columns in Table 1.

- e) When applicants submit **more than one equivalent graduate and/or master degree certificate** (with equivalent number of ECTS), the evaluation panel has to decide which of the equivalent academic degree is more adequate to the work plan and must thus be used to calculate the score of the academic career sub-criterion (A1). For instance, if an applicant submits a graduate degree certificate and more than one master certificate, the panel should consider the master's degree that is most suitable for the development of the work plan. However, if an applicant presents both an integrated master and a 2nd cycle degree certificates (without a graduate degree or a 1st cycle of studies), the panel must consider the integrated master's degree to calculate the academic career score, as previously indicated. The evaluation panel should consider the alternative submitted degree(s) in the assessment of sub-criterion A2, valuing applicant's personal curriculum. In any case, this must be explained in the respective evaluation reports.
- f) To calculate sub-criterion A1, in cases of certificates stating qualitative grades only (as pre-Bologna degree certificates, for example), the respective grade should be converted according to Table 2. The calculation of the final grade average (graduate + master) should then be used to determine A1 final score through the application of Table 1.
- g) Table 2 will not be used to convert qualitative scores of degrees obtained abroad that do not present the respective proof to the Portuguese grading scale.

Table 2 – Table for conversion of qualitative grades

Qualitative grade	Converted grade
Excellent Very Good with Distinction Praise and Distinction <i>Magna Cum Laude / Summa Cum Laude</i>	18
Very Good Approved with Distinction Good with Distinction <i>Cum Laude</i>	16
Good Approved / Approved by Unanimity	14
Sufficient	12

The **minimum grade of zero (A1 = 0)** will be scored to sub-criterion A1 in any case that is not included in Table 1. Some examples are described below:

- i. When **no certificate is submitted, in the application form**, neither graduate nor master's degree certificates (national or foreign);
- ii. When both national graduate and master certificates **do not state the respective final grade** (neither quantitative nor qualitative);
- iii. When both foreign graduate and master certificates **are not recognized, nor the final grades converted to the Portuguese grading scale**.

2.1.2 Sub-criterion A2 – Personal Curriculum

The assessment of sub-criterion A2 is performed by analysing and pondering the applicant's curriculum in an integrated way, considering the merit of their academic, scientific, professional and civic paths according to the submitted CV (information available in the **CIÊNCIAVITAE** and CV synopsis). In this analysis, the panel also considers the academic results that were not included in the calculation of the sub-criterion A1 – Academic career, and the various dimensions of the curriculum that may demonstrate a relevant personal, scientific and professional career.

In the evaluation of this sub-criterion the **motivation letter** is also considered, namely the clarity with which the candidate identifies the reasons underlying her/his application, including how the work plan fits into the applicant's career development objectives and personal ambitions, and the interest in the studies to be carried out. If applicable, a vision of the social return of the work should be envisaged, including the expected scientific progress, the potential for wealth creation and knowledge transfer. The justification for the choice of the submitted most representative document is also evaluated.

Although not constituting a requirement for the admissibility of the application to the call, **letters of recommendation** may be a relevant element for the evaluation of this sub-criterion. In order to be considered for evaluation purposes, a maximum of two distinct closed letters must be submitted, which must cumulatively meet the following characteristics: clearly identify the respective issuer, be signed, include the academic and/or professional context relationship of the candidate with the referee also specifying that are related with this specific call and work plan, highlighting not only the applicant's intellectual capabilities, but also relevant personal characteristics of the applicant. As indicated in the Notice of the Call, only "closed" letters of recommendation, submitted in the respective field of the form, will be evaluated, and letters of recommendation submitted in another field, such as, for example, in the Annexes section, will not be considered. Letters issued by members of the supervising team will also not be considered for evaluation purposes.

In the case of the **most representative document**, regarding which a justification for its choice must be included in the motivation letter, the panel will evaluate the document's scientific quality and its relevance within the scope of the submitted work plan.

The grade scored to this sub-criterion should translate a global and integrated view of applicant's personal curriculum.

2.1.3 Disability Bonuses

Applicants that state a degree of disability equal to or above 90% shall have a bonus of 20% on criterion A - Merit of the Applicant.

Applicants that state a degree of disability equal to or above 60% and under 90%, shall have a bonus of 10% in this criterion.

The degree of disability **must be duly proven** by submitting, in the application form, the document ***Atestado Médico de Incapacidade Multiuso (AMIM)***, issued according to the Decree-Law no. 202/96, of 23 of October, in its current version.

2.2 Criterion B – Merit of the Work Plan

The Merit of the Work Plan criterion has a relative weight of 40%, and is evaluated in an integrated and transversal manner, assessing the quality, originality and relevance of the work plan in all of its dimensions, in the following three sub-criteria:

B1 – Justified relevance of the object of study;

B2 – Scientific quality of the state of the art and the methodology of the work plan;

B3 – Feasibility of the work plan.

For **sub-criterion B1**, the evaluation is based on the clear definition of aims and research questions, as well as the originality and the potential contribution of the research project to the knowledge and progress of science and technology. In the **specific line in a non-academic environment** will be valued the (i) potential socio-economic impacts of the research and benefits for the social network, and (ii) the impact of the work plan on the non-academic host institution(s) and on its interaction with academia.

The assessment of **sub-criterion B2** is based on the quality of the state of the art and the proposed research methodology, considering the clarity, consistency, and coherence, in accordance with internationally accepted standards, and the originality of the work plan to be developed.

For **sub-criterion B3**, evaluation is based on the adequacy of methodologies to the tasks and aims proposed in the work in terms of the number of months indicated for carrying them out, as well as the total period expected to complete the project. The period foreseen for the submission of the thesis, or of the scientific work leading to the doctoral degree, at the university, must also be indicated in the timeline. If applicable, the risk assessment presented is also analysed, by identifying the most critical points and the corresponding contingency measures to be adopted.

The presentation of a **timeline**, of **mandatory** submission, is also considered, the detail of which must be sufficient for the panel to assess the sequence of tasks within the allotted time, allowing the assessment of the feasibility of the proposed work plan. In the **specific line in a non-academic environment**, the timeline must clearly consider the minimum period of 12 months (consecutive or interpolated) in the non-academic host institution with activity in Portugal. Other additional elements related to the work plan, though optional, should also be valued, such as, for example, schemes, formulas, or figures illustrating preliminary data and declarations of institutional support.

If appropriate, applicants may also submit a **Declaration of Institutional Support**; although optional, this element is relevant to demonstrate the planned cooperation between all the entities/researchers besides the identified host institutions/supervisors, allowing the panel to better analyse the work plan feasibility, as well as the contribution of these intervenients in its execution.

Whenever the work plan's scientific area, methodology or results include **ethical questions**, these should be clearly identified and justified (in the respective field of the application form), explaining how they will be addressed. To help identifying these questions, the ethics self-assessment guide should be consulted (Ethics Guide).

2.3 Criterion C – Merit of the Hosting Conditions

The merit of the hosting conditions, which has relative weight of 30%, is evaluated taking into consideration

two sub-criteria:

C1 – The scientific merit and experience of the supervisor(s) in the scientific field of the application, and the respective adequacy to supervise the PhD candidate;

C2 – Applicant’s demonstration of her/his motives to choose the supervising team and host institution(s), as well as their adequacy for the work plan.

The evaluation of these sub-criteria is performed in an integrated way, considering the following:

- a) The supervisor(s) associated CV, based on the information submitted in the application (**CIÊNCIAVITAE curriculum** or PDF), which must explicitly indicate their connection to the host entities, namely to the non-academic entities, where applicable;
- b) The applicant’s demonstration, in the respective field of the form, on the adequacy and complementarity of the supervising team and the host institution(s) to guarantee the accomplishment of the proposed work plan;
- c) The means available at the host institution(s) mentioned throughout the application form.

For applications submitted in the **specific line in a non-academic environment**, a 3rd sub-criterion is also considered in the assessment of the merit of the hosting conditions, which must have a minimum relative weigh of 50% within the scope of this criterion C:

C3 – Framing of the non-academic entity(ies) in the context of the work plan.

This sub-criterion will evaluate:

- a) The framing of the non-academic entity(ies) in the context of the work plan, in order to assess the contribution of these entities in the work execution;
- b) The relevance of the work plan to the objectives and activity areas of the non-academic entity(ies).

Applications that present **more than one host institution** must clearly indicate the tasks and the means made available performed in each institution, as well as the period in which the applicant will remain in each entity.

When **two or more supervisors** are proposed, the role of each one should be clearly explained, highlighting the **relevance** of each one’s participation and **complementarity** of their skills for the development and feasibility of the work plan. In the **specific line in a non-academic environment**, since it is an admissibility requirement to include at least two supervisors, the role of each supervisor, relevance and complementarity must always be highlighted.

When applying to a **both in Portugal and abroad studentship** (in which the work plan is partially carried out in a foreign institution), it is **mandatory** to identify the foreign affiliation institution(s), and to **associate a supervisor/co-supervisor** affiliated to that/those institution(s). It is also necessary to justify the reasons for choosing to develop the work plan in the institution(s) abroad. If no foreign host institution(s) and supervisor/co-supervisor in this/these institution(s) is/are indicated, the application will be **automatically converted into an application to a PhD studentship in Portugal**, being evaluated and financed accordingly.

In case of a PhD **Studentship abroad** (only eligible in the regular line of application), only the applications

in which the **host institution(s) is/are abroad** will be considered, being also necessary to justify why the research activities should be exclusively performed abroad, without the participation of any national entity. The collaboration of supervisors not associated to the application, with the submission of their CV in the respective form field, **will not be considered in the evaluation**, even if they are referred in the application form and/or having presented in replacement a declaration in the annexes of the work plan.

3. EVALUATION PROCESS

3.1 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 object of peer review, which requires a global and integrated vision of all components of the applicant's academic, scientific, professional and civic paths, as well as 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 value the quality and originality of the applications, avoiding a merely quantitative assessment of the applicants and supervisors' CVs.

Evaluators impartiality, objectivity and the 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).

3.2 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 be mandatorily 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 unit¹ and/or the same R&D unit² 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 prior³** to the date of opening of the application period;
- e) Having integrated the same scientific project team with the applicant or supervisor(s) in the **five years prior** to the opening date of the application period;
- f) Having **on-going scientific collaboration with the applicant or her/his supervisor(s)**;
- g) Being related (**family relationship**) to the applicant or her/his supervisor(s);
- h) Having a **scientific or personal conflict** with the applicant or her/his supervisor(s);
- i) 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.

3.3 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.

3.4 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.

All the panel members, including the chair and co-chair, and external reviewers that may eventually

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.

² 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.

³ 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.

produce evaluation reports for 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 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 correspondence indicated in Annex I, and **it is not possible, in the regular line, to transfer the application to a different evaluation panel**.

Applications submitted in the **specific line in a non-academic environment** will be evaluated by one or more specific evaluation panels, the composition and organization of which will take into account the scientific fields selected by the applicants as well as the number of submitted applications.

The composition of the Evaluation Panels is made public in the FCT website before the beginning of the evaluation period.

3.5 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 1st and 2nd readers, considering their fields of expertise, the application's subfield and the declared COIs;
- 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.

3.6 Remote and Panel Meeting Evaluation

3.6.1 Remote evaluation

Before starting 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 1st and 2nd reader, and in the second stage, the 1st reader is responsible to produce the pre-consensus report that should reflect the harmonized analysis of both readers allocated to the application.

3.6.1.1 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) **In the regular line**, an application shall be considered **non-assessable** when it **strays considerably from the scientific field in which it was submitted**. 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 additional admissibility requirements indicated in point 4.3 of the Notice of the Call.
- 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 6. Notice of the Call) and prepare the respective comments to clearly justify the score awarded.

3.6.1.2 Pre-consensus Evaluation

At the end of the individual evaluation stage and before the panel meeting, the 1st reader is responsible for preparing a pre-consensus report within the pre-established deadline.

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.

3.6.2 Panel Meeting

The panel meeting consists in 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 1st 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 or witness 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 1st 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.

3.7 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 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.

3.8. 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 Frascati Manual

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
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				
				1.6 Biological Sciences	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	Experimental Biology and Biochemistry		
	Microbiology					
	Virology					
	Biochemistry					
	Molecular Biology					
	Biochemical Research Methods					
	Biophysics					
	Genetics and Heredity					
	Reproductive Biology					
	Developmental Biology					
	Experimental Biology and Biochemistry - Other					
		1.6 Biological Sciences	Botany	Biological Sciences		
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	
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 Basic Medicine – 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	Forensic Chemistry and Biochemistry	Clinical Medicine and Health Sciences	
	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 – 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
		Linguistics – Other	
	6.3 Philosophy, Ethics and Religion	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	
6.4 Arts	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		