Call for PhD Studentships 2025

Evaluation Guide – Annex to the Notice of the Call

MARCH 14th, 2025

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 7
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 13
3.6.1.2 Consensus Evaluation 14
3.6.2 Panel Meeting 14
3.7 Comments to be transmitted to Applicants 15
3.8. Minutes of the panel plenary meeting 15
Annex I – Scientific fields adapted from the FOS Classification of the Frascati Manual 16

ACRONYMS

COI – Conflict of Interests[CP1]

CV – *Curriculum Vitae*

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

FCT – Foundation for Science and Technology (*Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, I.P.*)

myFCT – Information and Management System of FCT

1. INTRODUCTION

The Evaluation Guide provides the necessary guidelines to ensure that evaluators and applicants can fully understand the rationale behind the criteria and procedures associated to the evaluation of applications submitted to the Call for PhD Studentships 2025.

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:

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

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 will 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 up; if less than 5 (five), the value of the third decimal digit will remain unchanged.

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

2.1 Criterion A – Merit of the Applicant

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

A1. **Academic career** (academic degree grades proven by the respective certificates submitted in the application), with a relative weight of **50%** in the Merit of the Applicant.

A2. **Personal curriculum** (scientific, professional academic careers and applicant's motivation in pursuing doctoral studies), with a relative weight of **50%** in the Merit of the Applicant.

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

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

2.1.1 Sub-criterion A1 – Academic Career

Sub-criterion A1 - Academic Career is calculated based on the **final grade stated in the academic degree certificate submitted in the application form**, and according to Table 1.

Although the submission of degree certificates is not 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

Bachelor's + Master´s degrees (pre- or post-Bologna) or **Integrated Master degree (300-360 ECTS)**		**Bachelor's degree (180 ECTS)** (pre- or post-Bologna)		**Master's degree (90-120 ECTS)** (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**				

The classification to be considered in the calculation of sub-criterion A1 is the one indicated in the respective degree certificates submitted in the application or, when applicable, the respective certificates of degree recognition and conversion of the classification to the Portuguese scale. In the case of certificates whose **final classification** is presented in **decimals**, it will be rounded to the nearest unit using the following rule: when the decimal is equal to or greater than 5 (five), it will be rounded up; when the decimal is less than 5 (five), the value will be maintained. In the case of calculating the simple arithmetic average between the bachelor's grade and the master's grade, the grades appearing on the certificates will be considered (even if they have decimals), with rounding being carried out after obtaining the result of such average. If the qualification certificate presents, simultaneously, the rounded classification and with decimals, the rounded classification will be used.

If 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 the following documents must have been submitted in the application form:

a) **Academic degree certificates, indicating the final grade**. Applicants with post-Bologna courses must present the respective academic degree certificates of both the 1st (bachelor) and the 2nd (master) study cycles or an integrated master certificate; applicants with pre-Bologna courses must present the bachelor's and/or master's degree certificates.

b) To guarantee the principle of equal treatment to applicants with national and foreign academic degrees, 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**.

c) The recognition of foreign academic degrees and diplomas, as well as the conversion of the final grade to the Portuguese grading scale, can be requested at a higher education institution or to the Directorate General for Higher Education (*Direção Geral do Ensino Superior*, DGES). It is recommended to consult the DGES website, where you can find information about this process: http://www.dges.gov.pt.

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

d) The **Diploma Supplement** of the academic degree certificates presented, even if it is not used in the application of the scores established in Table 1, for calculation of the A1 score.

e) In the case of a specific recognition, **the report/minutes of the jury** appointed for that specific recognition, duly accompanied by the original degree certificate and corresponding legal document of degree recognition and conversion of the final grade to the Portuguese scale. It should be noted that this is a complementary document, which in no case replaces the submission of the degree recognition certificate issued by DGES or by a public higher education institution.

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

In addition to the documents included in 2.1.1.1, the following elements will be considered when scoring sub-criterion A1:

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

$$\textbf{Final score average (bachelor's + master's degrees)} = \frac{\textbf{1st cycle final grade (bachelor's)} + \textbf{2nd cycle final grade (master's)}}{2}$$

b) In case of integrated master's degrees, 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 score of the degree and number of credits (ECTS) to which it refers to.

c) If only a bachelor's or master's degree certificate is submitted, the scoring system will comply to the respective columns in Table 1 (column 2 and 3 respectively).

d) When applicants submit **more than one bachelor's and/or master's degree certificate** (with equivalent number of ECTS), the evaluation panel will decide which of the equivalent academic degree is more suitable to the work plan and will use it to calculate the score of the academic career sub-criterion (A1). For example, if a candidate presents a bachelor's certificate and more than one master's certificate, the panel must consider the master's degree that best suits the work plan. However, if integrated master's and master's certificates from the 2nd cycle of studies are presented (without a bachelor's or 1st cycle certificate), the panel must consider the integrated master's degree when calculating the classification of the academic career, as previously indicated. The evaluation panel must consider the other course(s) presented by the candidate in the evaluation of sub-criterion A2, valuing his/her personal CV. In any case, these choices must be explained in the respective evaluation reports.

e) If an integrated master's certificate [300-360 credits (ECTS)] and a pre-Bologna or 2nd cycle master's degree are presented, it is the final classification of the integrated master's degree that prevails. However, if separate certificates are presented for the 1st and 2nd cycles of an integrated master's course, and a pre-Bologna or 2nd cycle master's degree [90-120 credits (ECTS)] is also submitted, the panel may choose, for the purposes of calculating sub-criterion A1, the later and its final score, if it is more closely related to the work plan. In this case, the score of pre-Bologna or 2nd cycle master's degree [90-120 credits (ECTS)] may be combined with the final classification of the 1st cycle certificate [180 credits (ECTS)] of the integrated master's degree.

f) For the calculation of sub-criterion A1 relating to certificates that specify only a qualitative classification (for example, pre-Bologna master's degrees), the conversion terms expressed in Table 2 will be used for the purposes of calculating the final average (bachelor's+master's) and consequent determination of the classification of the academic career (by applying Table 1).

g) Table 2 will not be used to convert qualitative scores of degrees obtained abroad that do not present the respective proof of equivalence 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 *Magna Cum Laude* / *Summa Cum Laude*	**18**
Very Good Approved with Distinction Good with Distinction *Cum Laude*	**16**
Good Approved / Approved by Unanimity	**14**
Sufficient	**12**

Sub-criterion A1 will be assigned a score of zero (A1 = 0) in all cases not included in the situations outlined in Table 1. Some examples are described below:

i. When **no certificate (bachelor's or master's degrees) is submitted, in the application form.**

ii. When **none** of the certificates presented (bachelor's or master's degrees) **has an indication of final classification**, whether quantitative or qualitative.

iii. When **none** of the certificates obtained abroad (bachelor's and master's degrees), present the **certificates of recognition with the respective final classifications converted to the Portuguese classification scale**.

2.1.2 Sub-criterion A2 – Personal Curriculum

When assessing sub-criterion A2, the evaluators analyse and consider the candidate's CV in an integrated manner, considering the merit of their academic, scientific, professional, and civic career, in accordance with the candidate's CV (information available on 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 for their application, including how they frame the work plan in terms of career development goals and personal ambitions, as well as their interest in the studies to be conducted. If applicable, the social return of the candidate's work is also considered, including the expected scientific progress, potential for wealth creation, and knowledge transfer.

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. As a result of the changes introduced through Decree-Law no. 15/2024, of January 17, AMIMs subject to renewal or re-evaluation are considered valid as long as they are accompanied by proof of application for a medical board to assess incapacity, if it has been presented before the expiration date of the AMIM certificate.

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 – 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 values the clear definition of aims and research questions, as well as the originality and the potential contribution of the research project to knowledge and the advancement

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** values 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.

Sub-criterion B3 values the adequacy of the proposed methodologies to the tasks and aims of the work plan in terms of the number of months indicated for carrying them out, as well as the total period expected to complete the project. The expected period for the submission of the thesis or of the scientific work leading to the doctoral degree must also be indicated in the timeline. If applicable, the candidate should present a risk assessment identifying the most critical questions and the corresponding contingency measures to be adopted.

The submission of a **timeline** is mandatory and must have the sufficient detail so that the panel can assess the suitability of the time allocated to the various tasks and decide on the feasibility of the work plan within the proposed time. Consistency between the periods and duration of the tasks listed in the timeline, in the detailed description and in the periods of stay in the respective host institutions where the tasks will be carried out will be considered for evaluation purposes. The tasks listed in the application must also fit the dates and duration proposed for the work plan and the requested studentship.

In the **regular line**, the work plan may include a stay up to 6 months in non-academic institutions. If this request is not met when analysing the timeline and/or the detailed description of the work plan, there will be a penalty in the sub-criterion B3 mark.

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 operating in Portugal. If this request is not met when analysing the timeline and/or the detailed description of the work plan, there will be a penalty in the sub-criterion B3 mark.

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, when applicable, a **Declaration of Institutional Support**. Although optional, this element is relevant to substantiate the commitment between the various stakeholders, in case collaboration is envisaged with entities or researchers other than those identified as host institution/supervisors, allowing the panel to better assess the feasibility of the work program, as well as the contribution of these stakeholders in its implementation.

Whenever the work plan, the methodology or the 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, please refer to the ethics self-assessment guide (Ethics Guide).

2.3 Criterion C – Merit of the Hosting Conditions

The merit of the hosting conditions, a criterion weighing 30%, is evaluated based on two sub-criteria:

C1 – The scientific merit and experience of the supervisor(s) in the scientific area of the application, as well as its suitability for supervising the PhD's research work.

C2 – Justification given by the applicant of her/his motives to choose the supervisor(s) and host institution(s), as well as their adequacy for the work plan.

The evaluation of these sub-criteria is carried out in an integrated way, considering:

a) The supervisor(s)' associated CV, based on the information submitted in the application (**CIÊNCIA**VITAE *curriculum* or PDF), which must explicitly indicate their affiliation to the host institutions, namely and when applicable, to the non-academic institution.
b) The justification given by the applicant, in the respective field of the application form, concerning the suitability and complementarity of the supervisor(s) and the host institution(s) to guarantee the success of the proposed work plan.
c) The resources provided by the host institution(s) that mentioned throughout the application form.

For applications submitted in the **specific line in a non-academic environment**, a 3rd sub-criterion, which weights 50% of the total value of criterion C, is also considered when evaluating the merit of hosting conditions:

C3 – Framing of the non-academic institution(s) in the context of the work plan.

This sub-criterion will evaluate:

a) The framing of the non-academic institution(s) in the context of the work plan, in order to assess their contribution to the execution of the work plan.
b) The relevance of the work plan to the objectives and areas of activity of the non-academic institution(s).

Applications that present **more than one host institution** must clearly indicate the tasks and the resources made available by each institution, as well as the period in which the applicant will stay in each institution.

When **two or more supervisors** are proposed, their role should be clearly explained, highlighting the relevance of their participation and the complementarity of their skills for the development and feasibility of the work plan.

In the **specific line in a non-academic environment —** and since it is an admissibility requirement to include at least two supervisors (a supervisor from the academic host institution and a supervisor from the non-academic host institution) **—** it is mandatory to clearly highlight the role of each supervisor, their relevance and the complementarity of skills to the development and feasibility of the work plan.

In the case of applications which have indicated in the respective field of the form that they are within the scope of a **Non-Academic Chair under the FCT-Tenure Program**, it must be ensured that the hosting and supervision conditions indicated in the application correspond to those associated with the identified Chair. These elements are not evaluated under this criterion but are a condition for admissibility to the Call.

When applying for a **both in Portugal and abroad studentship** (a studentship where part of the work plan takes place in a foreign institution), it is mandatory to identify in the specific field of the application form, at least, one Portuguese host institution and one foreign host institution, as well as associating a supervisor/co-supervisor affiliated with each of these institution(s). Any inconsistencies will lead to a

penalty in scoring this criterion. The candidate must also justify his/her choice concerning the foreign host institution.

For **Studentships Abroad** (**only possible in the regular application line**), the host institution(s) is/are located outside Portugal. The applicant should clearly justify the reasons for choosing to carry on his/her research plan exclusively in an institution abroad, without the participation of national institutions, demonstrating the lack of the necessary expertise in Portugal.

The participation of supervisors who have not formally associated themselves with the application, even if they are mentioned in one of the fields of the form and/or a declaration has been submitted on their behalf in the annexes to the work plan, will not be considered for evaluation purposes.

3. EVALUATION PROCESS

3.1 Guiding principles for peer-review evaluation

FCT is responsible for ensuring the scientific quality of the peer review process of evaluation that supports the present call. The content of the application is evaluated by analysing in an integrated and global view all components of the candidate's academic, scientific, professional, and civic career, as well as the research work plan and the conditions for its successful accomplishment. The application must be evaluated taking into consideration its originality, consistency and coherence, and its contribution to the advancement of knowledge in all its components. Evaluators will value the quality and originality of the applications, avoiding a merely quantitative assessment of the applicants' and supervisors' CVs. The impartiality and objectivity of panel members, as well as the transparency of the evaluation process, are fundamental principles for assessing the merit of each application, regardless of the origin or identity of the candidates, supervisors, and host institutions. In addition, any situations of conflict of interest (COI) will be safeguarded.

3.2 Conflict of Interests (COI)

If the coordinating team — chair and co-chair(s) — or any other member of the evaluation panels has a conflict of interest (COI) regarding any of the applications submitted to the panel, they must declare it to FCT as soon as they have their first contact with the application data that allows them to assess the existence of such a conflict.

Panel members in COI situations cannot be assigned by the coordinating team as readers of the respective applications, being prevented from contacting both the applications or the evaluations produced on them throughout the entire evaluation process.

COI declarations must be mandatorily included in the panel meeting minutes. The chair of the evaluation panel, in collaboration with FCT, is responsible for ensuring the inclusion of the COI list in the minutes, including for each one the reference, the name of the candidate and the member of the panel in a COI situation.

COI situations concerning the chair, co-chair, panel members, and external experts include, but are not limited to:

a) Belonging to the **same academic or non-academic organizational unit[1] and/or the same R&D unit[2] 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[3]** 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) Having a **family relationship** with 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 the members of the panel, to third parties, to the candidate or to an external entity, regarding the ability of the member of the panel to evaluate the application impartially.

3.3 Terms of Reference and Confidentiality

All panel members (including evaluators, chair, and co-chair, as well as any external experts, who, although not part of the panel, may be consulted to support it), establish with FCT the commitment to respect a set of responsibilities essential to the evaluation process, such as the duties of **impartiality, declaration of any potential COI** and **confidentiality**. Confidentiality must be fully protected and ensured, at all times of the evaluation process to guarantee the independence of all opinions. All panel members, as well as external experts, are responsible for ensuring confidentiality over the entire evaluation process and the content of the applications, and are prevented from copying, quoting, or using any type of material contained therein.

3.4 Constitution of the Evaluation Panels

Evaluation panels are composed by experts with recognized experience and scientific merit. When establishing the evaluation panels, criteria covering scientific areas and subareas, gender balance and geographic and institutional diversity are followed.

Panel members, including the chair and co-chair, and external experts **cannot be supervisors of applications submitted to the evaluation panel** in which they participate. They may, however, be supervisors of applications submitted to other evaluation panels.

[1] Academic organizational unit refers to the department, if the structure of the faculty/school is organized by organizational units of a departmental, 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.

The evaluation carried out by each panel is coordinated by the panel chair, appointed by invitation from FCT. The panel chair has the responsibility to ensure that the evaluation is carried out with **transparency, independence, and equity**.

The chair may evaluate a reduced number of applications, to overcome specific situations of lack of scientific coverage in the panel or COI situations of the remaining panel members.

The chair must articulate with one or two designated co-chairs the tasks of coordinating the panel, namely the management of applications with which COI situations have been declared. The panel member(s) designated as co-chair(s) will combine his/her/their respective tasks with those of evaluator of the applications assigned to him/her/them.

Evaluation panels will be composed according to the scientific areas 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).

In general, applications are assigned to one of the 33 (thirty-three) evaluation panels according to the combination of main scientific area, secondary scientific area and scientific sub-area selected by the candidate, and using the correspondence indicated in the Annex I. It is not possible to transfer the application between panels, nor between financing lines.

Applications submitted in the **specific line in a non-academic environment** are evaluated by 5 (five) evaluation panels, corresponding to the thematic areas of Engineering Sciences and Exact Sciences (2 panels), Natural and Agricultural Sciences, Health and Life Sciences, and Social Sciences and Humanities. These 5 (five) panels include the secondary scientific areas and subareas listed in Annex I.

The assignment to one of the 5 (five) evaluation panels is made according to the main and the secondary scientific areas selected by the candidate. It is not possible to transfer the application between panels, nor between financing lines.

The composition of the evaluation panels is made public on the FCT website before the evaluation of applications begins.

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) Coordinating with the designated co-chair(s) the management of the panel, delegating to her/him/them the tasks considered necessary for the good management of the panel.

c) Allocating to each application two evaluators, appointing them as 1st and 2nd readers, considering their fields of expertise, the application's subarea, and the declared COIs.

d) Identifying applications that may need to be evaluated by external experts.

e) Managing the identified COI situations.

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 may be established by the panel.

g) Verifying, together with the panel members, the suitability of the applications for the panel, identifying any applications outside the scope of the panel that may eventually be considered as “Non-evaluable”.

h) Ensuring that all panel members know and apply equitably the evaluation criteria and sub-criteria established and harmonized by the panel, as well as their respective weightings.

i) Ensuring compliance with the deadlines established for preparing reports in each of the stages of the remote assessment phase, namely, in the individual and consensus stages.

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 decision-making process.

l) Ensuring that the final evaluation report is prepared during the plenary meeting.

m) Ensuring that the final evaluation reports produced by the panel, and which will be transmitted to the applicants, are consistent and coherent with each other, demonstrate the relative merit of the applications and are in accordance with the norms established in this guide, in the Notice of the Call, in the applicable legislation and with the respective marks.

n) Preparing the panel meeting minutes, 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, ensuring compliance with the preceding 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 electronic evaluation platform, myFCT, the applications with which they are in a situation of conflict of interests, thereby ensuring that they will not have access to their details. The list of declared COIs will be included in the minutes of the panel plenary evaluation meeting, which will be made available to applicants.

The remote evaluation phase is divided into two stages: i) individual evaluation and ii) consensus evaluation. In the first stage, evaluators fill in their individual evaluation forms as 1st and 2nd reader; in the second stage, the 1st reader is responsible for producing the consensus report that must reflect the harmonized analysis of both readers allocated to the application.

3.6.1.1 Individual Evaluation

a) Each application is evaluated individually by two panel members who are not in a COI situation with either the applicant or the respective supervisor(s) and host institution(s).

b) If any of the evaluators identifies an additional COI situation in relation to any application(s) assigned to him/her, he/she must immediately and formally declare it to FCT and the panel chair, who is

responsible for the reallocation of the application(s).

c) Whenever justified, the chair, during the individual remote assessment period, may request FCT to provide **external experts**, considering the trans/interdisciplinarity or specific aspects of the proposal and the institutional collaborations described in the application.

d) An application will be considered "**Non-evaluable"** when it **deviates considerably from the scientific area in which it was submitted**. Applications in these circumstances must be reported immediately to FCT by the chair and/or evaluators who identify the situation. Before considering an application as non-evaluable because it deviates substantially from the scientific area in which it was submitted, the evaluation panel must analyse how the main theme of the work plan is framed in the scientific subarea selected by the applicant and may consult external experts on the topic of the application to support this analysis. The decision to consider an application as "Non-evaluable" must be duly substantiated in the final evaluation report, and must also be recorded in the minutes.

e) An application shall also be considered **non-evaluable if at least one of the mandatory admissibility requirements** of the applicant or application is not met. In case of applications in a non-academic environment, submitted to the respective panel, those that do not meet the additional admissibility requirements indicated in section 4.3 of the Notice of the Call will be considered as "Non-evaluable".

f) Each evaluator must fill in an individual evaluation report for each of the applications assigned to him/her (i) scoring separately the three evaluation criteria and respective evaluation sub-criteria, in accordance with the weights determined in this Guide and in section 5 of the Notice of the Call: and (ii) preparing the corresponding comments, in order to clearly justify the scores awarded.

3.6.1.2 Consensus Evaluation

Once the individual evaluation stage has ended and before the panel meeting, the 1st reader is responsible for preparing the consensus report within the pre-established deadline.

Consensus reports must reflect the harmonization of individual reports prepared by the two readers, also considering, if applicable, the external experts' assessment.

3.6.2 Panel Meeting

The plenary evaluation phase consists of a meeting with the mandatory presence of all panel members and moderated by the chair, where a collegial discussion of all applications submitted to the panel is promoted. This meeting comprises the following moments:

a) Analysis and collective discussion of all applications, taking into consideration the individual evaluation and consensus reports previously written which constitute the working documents for the panel.

b) Presentation by the 1st readers of a summary of strengths and weaknesses of each application assigned to them. It is up to the chair to promote the debate and encourage the participation of all panel members in the discussion of the applications.

c) The final evaluation of the applications of each panel is the result of the discussion of their relative

merit, thus establishing the final classification of each one. Panel members in a COI situation with any application will not be able to participate in, or witness its discussion. In the case of applications in which the chair and co-chair declared COI situations, one member of the panel without COI will be appointed to replace them and moderate the discussion of these applications.

d) The 1st reader of each application is responsible for writing the respective final evaluation reports that must reflect the panel's collegial decision.

e) All final evaluation reports must be consistent and coherent with each other, and there must be a correspondence between the scores and the comments that support them.

f) All panel members are responsible for discussing the relative merit of all applications. The collegial discussion will result in a single provisional ranking list of candidates, per panel.

3.7 Comments to be transmitted to Applicants

Each panel must 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 explanation of any disability bonus, according to its respective degree, must also be mentioned. It is the chair's and the co-chair's responsibility to ensure that in the final evaluation reports the panel justifies the scores with substantive arguments that allow understanding the scores resulting from the evaluation, identifying the strengths and weaknesses of each application for each evaluation criteria (see section 5. of the Notice of the Call).

In cases where the applicant has more than one bachelor's and/or master's degrees, the panel must indicate which they selected to calculate the score of sub-criterion A1 – Academic Career. In the case of academic degrees obtained in a foreign institution, the panel must mention whether the respective recognition and/or conversion of the final classification to the Portuguese scale is presented.

3.8. Minutes of the panel plenary meeting

Although written by the chair of the panel, who is delegated the role of representing the entire panel, the minutes of the evaluation panel plenary meeting are the responsibility of all panel members.

The minutes of the panel plenary meeting must include:

a) Name and affiliation of all panel members.

b) Indication of the existence of applications considered "non-evaluable".

c) Methodology adopted by the panel for cases considered as particular ones.

d) Provisional list of classification and ranking of applications evaluated by the panel, in descending order of the final score.

e) List of COIs declared by all the panel members.

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

NOTE: Applications submitted in the **regular line** are evaluated by the 33 evaluation panels listed in the 4th column of the following table. Applications submitted in the **specific line in a non-academic environment** are evaluated by the following five evaluation panels, including all scientific areas and subareas listed in the table below, grouped as follows:

Engineering Sciences and Exact Sciences P1

– Main area 1a Exact Sciences including all secondary subareas 1.1 Mathematics, 1.2 Computer and Information Sciences, and 1.3 Physical Sciences.
– Main area 2 Engineering and Technology Sciences including all secondary subareas 2.1 Civil Engineering, 2.2 Electrical, Electronic and Information Engineering, 2.3 Mechanical Engineering, 2.5 Materials Engineering, 2.6 Medical Engineering, and 2.10 Nanotechnology.

Engineering Sciences and Exact Sciences P2

– Main area 1a Exact Sciences including all secondary subareas 1.4 Chemical Sciences.
– Main area 2 Engineering and Technology Sciences, it includes all subareas of the secondary areas 2.4 Chemical Engineering, 2.7 Environmental Engineering, 2.8 Environmental Biotechnology, 2.9 Industrial Biotechnology, and 2.11 Food Engineering and Technology.

Natural and Agricultural Sciences - includes all areas and subareas of the main area 1b Natural Sciences and 4 Agricultural Sciences.

Health and Life Sciences – includes all areas and subareas of the main area 3 Medical and Health Sciences.

Social Sciences and Humanities - includes all areas and subareas of the main area 5 Social Sciences and 6 Humanities.

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel Regular Line
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 and Chemical Engineering
		Inorganic Chemistry	
		Nuclear Chemistry	
		Physical Chemistry	
		Polymer Science	
		Electrochemistry	
		Colloid Chemistry	
		Analytical Chemistry	
		Medicinal Chemistry	
		Chemistry – Other	

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel Regular Line
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 and Engineering
		Monitoring and Environmental Impact	
		Environmental Management	
		Ecotoxicology	
		Waste Management and Recovery	
		Climate Change	
		Atmosphere and Pollution	
		Water and Pollution	
		Environmental Sciences – Other	

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel Regular Line
1b Natural Sciences	**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	
		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 Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel Regular Line
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	Industrial Management	Mechanical Engineering
		Applied Mechanics	
		Energy	
		Automation and Robotics	
		Nuclear Engineering	
		Manufacturing Processes	
		Audio Engineering and Reliability Analysis	
		Mechanical Engineering – Other	
	2.4 Chemical Engineering	Chemical Engineering	Chemistry and 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	

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel Regular Line
2 Engineering and Technology	**2.6** Medical Engineering	Medical Engineering and Biomedical Engineering	Bioengineering and Biotechnology
		Laboratory Technology	
		Medical Engineering – Other	
	2.7 Environmental Engineering	Environmental Engineering	Environmental Sciences and Engineering
		Geological Engineering	
		Geotechnics	
		Petroleum engineering, Energy and Fuels	
		Remote Sensing	
		Mining and Mineral Processing	
		Marine Engineering	
		Sea Vessels	
		Ocean Engineering	
		Environmental Engineering – Other	
	2.8 Environmental Biotechnology	Bioremediation	Bioengineering and Biotechnology
		Diagnostic Biotechnologies in	
		Environmental Management;	
		Environmental Biotechnology Related Ethics	
	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 Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel Regular Line
3 Medical and Health Sciences	**3.1** Basic Medicine	Biomedicine	Biomedicine
		Anatomy and Histology	
		Human Genetics	
		Immunology	
		Neurosciences	
		Pharmacology	
		Biopharmaceuticals	
		Toxicology	
		Physiology	
		Pathology	
		Basic Medicine – Other	
	3.2 Clinical Medicine	Andrology	Clinical Medicine and Health Sciences
		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	

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel Regular Line
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	
		Medical Biotechnology – Other	
	3.5 Forensic Sciences	Forensic Chemistry and Biochemistry	Clinical Medicine and Health Sciences
		Forensic Sciences – Other	

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel Regular Line
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	
		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 Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel Regular Line
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 Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel Regular Line
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	Linguistics and Literature 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 – 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	

REPÚBLICA PORTUGUESA
fct Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia
PESSOAS 2030
PORTUGAL 2030
Cofinanciado pela União Europeia