

EVALUATION GUIDE

**STIMULUS OF SCIENTIFIC EMPLOYMENT,
INDIVIDUAL SUPPORT CALL (CEEC IND)**

4th Edition

1. INTRODUCTION

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

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

The aim of this call is to **fund scientific employment contracts** for PhD holders grounded on peer review of the applications submitted online. Each call entails a [public announcement](#) (in Portuguese) outlining the required features for application, the evaluation criteria and the number of contracts to be funded.

The present call will be open between **29th of January and 26th of February 2020**.

This document outlines the evaluation process and the procedures adopted for the 4th edition of the yearly call for the Stimulus of Scientific Employment – Individual Support (CEEC Ind), announced by FCT on 23rd of December 2020.

All applications will be evaluated by a panel of international experts covering the scientific areas and subareas chosen by the applicants

2. STIMULUS OF SCIENTIFIC EMPLOYMENT – INDIVIDUAL SUPPORT

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

FCT issued the [Regulation of Scientific Employment](#) (REC) in 2017, updated December 2019, by which two instruments were created to promote scientific employment:

- An **Individual Support** for hiring PhD holders by R&D Portuguese institutions. Applicants submit an **individual** application to a yearly call launched by FCT (CEEC Ind);
- An Institutional Support for development of scientific employment by PhD holders in R&D Portuguese institutions (CEEC Inst). For this FCT Call, institutions apply with a scientific employment

plan to be awarded with positions funding. It is then their responsibility to select researchers to be hired.

The present call is aimed at providing **individual support for hiring 400 researchers holding a PhD degree in any scientific area**. The profile of the applicants should correspond to highly motivated scientists seeking to develop, carry out and coordinate research in Portuguese Institutions or Consortiums. Research contracts will be awarded for a maximum of 6 years and **funding is solely intended for salary and its associated costs for the employer** in accordance with the selected level. **No other expenses are eligible**.

Host Institutions eligible for this call are:

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

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

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

- a) **Junior Researcher:** PhD holders for 5 or less years¹, with limited post-doctoral research experience in the scientific area of the application;
- b) **Assistant Researcher:** PhD holders for over 5 years, with relevant *curriculum* in the scientific area of the application, but with limited scientific independence;
- c) **Principal Researcher:** PhD holders for over 5 years, with relevant *curriculum* in the scientific area of the application, demonstrating scientific independence for the last 3 years;
- d) **Coordinating Researcher:** PhD holders for over 5 years, holding the title of *habilitado* or *agregado* in Portugal until the closing date of the call, with a *curriculum* of high merit, and demonstrating scientific independence and leadership in the scientific area of the application.

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

¹ The 5 years are considered from the date of the PhD conclusion to the closing date of this call, except for interruptions of scientific activity due to maternity/paternity leave and/or serious illness according to the Application Guide.

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

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

3. COMPONENTS OF THE APPLICATION

Applications are submitted online via a dedicated FCT web platform, [MyFCT](#).

The application comprises the following parts for evaluation:

- a) **Curriculum vitae (CV)**;
- b) **Motivation letter**, with up to two main identified contributions achieved by the applicant in the last 5 years and the expected main contributions for the next years;
- c) **Synopsis of the scientific and curricular path**, where the main activities and results obtained by the applicant in the last 5 years are highlighted;
- d) **Interruption of scientific activity** (If any);
- e) **Research Plan**, including title, abstract, main activities to be developed, expected results, ethical issues (if applicable) and compliance with one or two (maximum) of the 17 UN sustainable development goals [2030 UN Agenda Goals](#);
- f) **Synopsis of the host conditions** and description of the integration of the proposed research plan into the strategy of the associated host institution.

The application form includes the following sections:

Personal Data

Applicant's personal data and PhD degree information

Curriculum vitae. The CV must be updated and submitted in English via the [CIÊNCIAVITAE](#) platform and is an integral component of the application.

Application Data

Research contract level; title of the research plan; abstract (3000 characters); keywords (maximum 5); current institution; current institution country; main scientific area; secondary scientific area; subarea; evaluation panel; opposed reviewers (optional, maximum 3).

Motivation letter (3000 characters)

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

CV Synopsis

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

Interruption of scientific activity (If applicable)

Maternity leave (500 characters), Paternity leave (500 characters), Serious illness (500 characters) and/or other interruption(s) (500 characters).

Research Plan

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

Host institution

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

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

Applicants are responsible for identifying the host institution; the host institution must submit an agreement document² (mandatory) to carry out the proposed scientific research plan. The host institution must commit itself in providing all resources, including material, support services, critical mass and institutional policy to ensure research plan's implementation.

² The template for the agreement document will be available on the Science and Technology Portal, during the period for association of the host institution - From 1st of March to 19th of March 2021.

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

4. EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

- A. Merit of the candidate **(70%)**
- B. Merit of the proposed Research Plan **(30%)**

CRITERION A

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

- i. **Curriculum vitae (CV);**
- ii. **Motivation letter;**
- iii. **CV Synopsis;**
- iv. **Interruption of scientific activity (If any).**

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

The evaluation must consider the career level selected by the applicant, particularly in what concerns the evaluation of scientific independence (for principal and coordinating researchers) and scientific leadership (for coordinating researchers). An eventual **mismatch of an application in relation to the researcher contract level may be penalized** by the evaluation panel, *e.g.* an applicant applying for an Assistant researcher position but already having research seniority and scientific independence may be penalized.

Although taking into account the full professional path of the applicant, the **evaluation should be focused on the last 5 years**, with the following exceptions:

- Junior researchers with less than 5 years of scientific activity;
- Researchers who have interrupted their scientific activity due to maternity/paternity leave and/or serious illness, as well as other interruptions. In these situations, the evaluation should be focused in the **last 5 or less working years** of scientific activity, as described in the CV synopsis and explained by the applicant in the justification for the interruption of scientific activity.

Please note that for the **Junior Researcher level PhD holders for more than 5 years will be eligible** if they had interruptions in their scientific activity due to maternity/paternity leave and/or serious illness.

CRITERION B

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

- Relevance and innovative nature of the proposed research plan (based on the state-of-the-art in a given scientific area and previous work done by the applicant) and its progress beyond the current state-of-the-art;
- Adequacy of the methodology adopted, feasibility of the research plan and quality of the host conditions, as well as the fit into its R&D strategy.

The assessment of the proposed research plan should also take into account:

- Host conditions and its research strategy, and how the research plan, the expected results and applicant's motivations will contribute to the host institution activity and mission;
- If ethical issues (when applicable) are properly identified and addressed, according to the [Ethics Self-Assessment Guide](#);

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

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

5. SCORING SYSTEM

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

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

Impact	Score	Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses
Outstanding	10	Exceptionally strong with no weaknesses
Very high	9	Very strong with negligible weaknesses
	8	Very strong with minor weaknesses
High	7	Strong with minor weaknesses
	6	Strong with at least one moderate weakness
Medium	5	Some strengths with significant weaknesses
	4	Some strengths with several major weaknesses
Low	3	Few strengths and major weaknesses
	2	Very few strengths and serious weaknesses
Fail	1	Cannot be assessed

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

$$FS = 0.7A + 0.3B$$

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

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

6. EVALUATION PROCESS

6.1 CONSTITUTION OF THE EVALUATION PANELS

- Evaluation panels are formed **by international reviewers** appointed by the Board of Directors of FCT. All reviewers are of recognized competence in the scientific areas of the applications under evaluation and cannot be affiliated with any Portuguese R&D institution;
- The constitution of the evaluation panels takes into consideration the number of submitted applications and their scientific areas and subareas; the gender balance of its members; geographical and institutional distribution of reviewers' affiliations;
- Each panel has a **Chair responsible for**:
 - 1) Assisting FCT with panel constitution by suggesting possible reviewers;
 - 2) Assigning the applications to the Panel Members;
 - 3) Keeping the evaluation process within the defined timeframe and contacting Panel Members in case of any delays;
 - 4) Supporting the FCT team in solving Conflict of Interest (Col) identified during the evaluation process;
 - 5) Suggesting external reviewers whom may provide an additional assessment of specific applications, whenever a particular expertise is not covered by the panel;
 - 6) To participate in a videoconference meeting with the Evaluation Coordinator before the beginning of the remote evaluation, to comply with the evaluation procedures;
 - 7) Assuring the quality of the reports: comments should be consistent with the scores, respecting the scoring system (see section 5), provide substantive arguments and identifying both strengths and weaknesses, for each evaluation criterion;
 - 8) Leading the panel meeting discussion;
 - 9) Participating in the Coordinating Evaluation Panel meeting.

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

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

6.2 EVALUATION STAGES

The evaluation process of the applications comprises the following stages:

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

APPLICATIONS ELIGIBILITY AND ASSIGNMENT

- FCT is responsible for eligibility verification of submitted applications according to binding criteria described in the announcement. However, an application can be declared ineligible at any stage of the evaluation. If any doubts arise during the evaluation, the Panel Chair and FCT should be informed;
- Each application will be remotely and **individually assessed by two Panel Members**, one lead reviewer (1st reader/rapporteur) of the application and a second (2nd) reader;
- The Panel Chair is responsible for assigning the applications to lead reviewers and 2nd readers;
- An external reviewer may be assigned by the Chair to a given application whenever a particular expertise is not covered by the panel;
- The distribution of the applications to Panel Members and external reviewers (if applicable) will necessarily take into consideration the declaration of Col and the matching of professional and scientific expertise of the reviewers within the topic of the application.

REMOTE EVALUATION

a) INDIVIDUAL PHASE

- Before the assessment, the reviewers have to declare whether or not a Col is identified for each application;
- If a disqualifying Col with a particular application is identified, the Panel Chair and FCT must be informed and the application will be reassigned by the Chair to a different reviewer;
- If a potential Col with a particular application is identified, the Panel Member must notify FCT, whom will analyse and decide if s/he is able to perform unbiased evaluation or if the conflict should rather be considered as disqualifying;
- Panel Members must submit an individual report with their assessment for each application assigned to them. This report includes:

- ✓ Scores for each criterion and respective comments, including strengths and weaknesses;
 - ✓ A comment concerning ethical issues, if applicable;
 - ✓ Identification of the research plan's alignment with the framework of any of the [2030 UN Agenda Goals](#)³;
 - ✓ Confidential comments to the evaluation panel and/or FCT, if necessary.
- The reviewers should perform their **assessments considering different standards for each research level** (from junior to coordinating researcher) and **only based in the information provided by the applicant**. The final score (FS) of each application will consider the weight given to each criterion according to the formula in section 5, and will be presented with two decimal places.
 - Both readers must submit their individual evaluation prior the beginning of the consensus phase.
 - An application **can be considered non-assessable when it strays considerably outside the scope of the panel, is submitted in a language different from English, or has missing/incomplete information**. A non-assessable application must be confirmed by the Panel Chair and if considered out of the scope of the panel to which it was submitted, **it cannot be moved to a different evaluation panel**. In any of these situations, the following procedure should be taken:
 - ✓ Score both criteria 1;
 - ✓ State in the report that the panel could not assess the application and the reason for that.

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

b) CONSENSUS PHASE

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

PANEL MEETING

- Each evaluation panel meeting will be remotely coordinated by the Chair to proceed with the following activities:

³ The alignment with 1 or 2 the Sustainable Development Goals of the UN 2030 Agenda is a requirement for the scientific employment contracts to be co-funded with European Structural and Investment Funds.

- ✓ Ensure a fair judgment and an appropriate discussion of each application;
- ✓ Settle the final scores for each criterion, as well as the comments to be conveyed to the applicants, and **ensure that the scores are in agreement with the comments**. Final comments should be included in the panel evaluation report by the 1st reader (as specified in section 6.3);
- ✓ Guarantee that adopted criteria are coherent within and across each research contract level (Junior, Assistant, Principal and Coordinator);
- ✓ Prepare a provisional ranked list of all applications under evaluation for each of the four levels;
- ✓ **Prepare a panel meeting report** to be analysed by the Coordinating evaluation panel with a summary of the meeting that should address the following issues:
 - Working methodology adopted by the panel;
 - Identification of disqualifying Conflict of Interest;
 - The provisional ranked list of all applications for each of the four research contract levels.

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

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

COORDINATING EVALUATION PANEL MEETING

- The Coordinating Evaluation Panel brings together the Evaluation Coordinator and the Chairs of each panel in a final remote meeting. This meeting will be conducted by the Evaluation Coordinator, and the meeting activities include:
 - ✓ Approval the distribution of available positions by panel and contract levels, according to each panel ranked list. A proportional distribution will be taken as reference to allocate the number of positions to each research level within each panel. However, panels will have the flexibility to select the funding positions considering the quality of the applications evaluated in each research level;
 - ✓ Prepare the evaluation meeting report with a summary of the meeting, the provisional ranked lists of all panels by research contract level and comments regarding the evaluation process.

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

6.3 FEEDBACK TO BE TRANSMITTED TO APPLICANTS

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

Comments must:

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

Comments must not:

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

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

7. CONFIDENTIALITY AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST

7.1 CONFIDENTIALITY

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

7.2 CONFLICT OF INTEREST (CoI)

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

DISQUALIFYING CONFLICT OF INTEREST

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

1. Personal or financial interest in the application's success;
2. Current or planned close scientific cooperation;
3. Research cooperation (*e.g.*, joint publications) within the last 3 years before the opening date of the call;
4. Dependent employment relationship or supervisory relationship (*e.g.*, teacher-student relationship up to and including the post-doctoral phase), within the last 3 years before the opening date of the call;
5. Affiliation, or pending transfer, to any Department, Institution or Research Centre involved in the application;
6. Be an active member in a council or similar supervisory board of the Department, Institution or Research Centre to which the applicant has been affiliated to within the last 3 years or will be connected to in the scope of the application.

POTENTIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST

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

7. Relationships other than first-degree, marriage or domestic partnership; other personal ties or conflicts;
8. Professional relationships, other than those listed under no. 4;
9. Participation in University bodies other than those listed under no. 6, *e.g.*, scientific advisory committees in the research environment;
10. Involvement in a Project with a closely related research topic (competition issues);

11. Participating in an on-going scientific or inter-personal conflict with the applicant(s);
12. Any other circumstance the reviewer feels that may not be impartial.

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

8. PRELIMINARY HEARINGS

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

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

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

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

The applicants must submit their comments in English and use appropriate language.

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

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

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

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

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel
		Evolutionary Biology	
		Behavioural Sciences Biology	
		Mycology	
		<i>Other subarea of Biological Sciences, please specify:</i>	

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

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel
	Medical Engineering	Medical Engineering and Biomedical Engineering	Medical Engineering and Biotechnology
		Laboratory Technology	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	Environmental Engineering	Environmental Engineering	Environmental Biotechnology and Engineering and Industrial Biotechnology
		Geotechnics	
		Petroleum Engineering, Energy and Fuels	
		Remote Sensing	
		Mining and Mineral Processing	
		Geological Engineering	
		Marine Engineering, Sea Vessels	
		Ocean Engineering	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	Environmental Biotechnology	Environmental Biotechnology	Environmental Biotechnology and Engineering and Industrial Biotechnology
		Bioremediation, Diagnostic Biotechnologies (DNA Chips and Biosensing Devices) in Environmental Management	
		Environmental Biotechnology related Ethics	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	Industrial Biotechnology	Industrial Biotechnology	Environmental Biotechnology and Engineering and Industrial Biotechnology
		Bioprocessing Technologies, Biocatalysis and Fermentation	
		Bioproducts, Biomaterials, Bioplastics, Biofuels, Bio-derived Bulk and Fine Chemicals and Bio-derived Novel Materials	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
Nanotechnology	Nanomaterials	Materials Engineering and Nanotechnology	
	Nanoprocesses		
	Nano-Optics and Nanophotonics		
	Modelling at Nanoscale		
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		

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

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

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

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

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

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