# Evaluation of the Research and Professional Activities of the Institutes of the Czech Academy of Sciences for 2015–2019

BIBLIOMETRIC PARAMETERS OF ALL OUTPUTS INCLUDING THOSE EVALUATED IN THE PHASE I.

Institute:	Institute of Philosophy of the CAS, v. v. i.
Team:	Department of Analytic Philosophy
Head:	prof. PhDr. Petr Koťátko, CSc.
Field:	Philosophy, Ethics and Religion
Total number of outputs: 48	**Evaluated outputs:** 23

QUALITY OF OUTPUTS BY JOURNAL RANKING

QUALITY OF OUTPUTS BY INTENSITY OF CITATIONS

TYPES OF COLLABORATION

Collaboration	Outputs (evaluated)	Outputs (not evaluated)
A1	4	10
B	2	1
B1	2	6
C	1	
C1	1	
D		
D1		
E		
n.a.	13	8
Without affiliation		
A1+B1+C1+D1	7	16
B+C+D+E	3	1

FIELD STRUCTURE OF OUTPUTS

Field structure of outputs	Outputs (evaluated)	Outputs (not evaluated)
n.a.	13	8
Philosophy	4	14
Ethics	2	10
History Philosophy Of Science	2	3
Logic	3	
Physics Multidisciplinary	2	
Psychology Multidisciplinary	2	
Classics		1
Mathematics	1	
Psychology Experimental	1	

Total number of outputs: outputs of the team published during the evaluated period 2015-2019.

Evaluated outputs: selected outputs submitted by the team to the Phase I of evaluation.

Outputs used for bibliometry: subset of all outputs registered in the Web of Science; document type: article, review or proceedings paper.

Quality of outputs by journal ranking: number of outputs in top decile (1*) and quartiles (1-4) by AIS of journals; n. a. - outputs in journals without AIS; orange: outputs from the Phase I, blue: the other outputs of the team.

Quality of outputs by intensity of citations: number of outputs in the top decile (1*) and in quartiles (1, 2, 3+4) determined from the list of outputs ordered by the number of citations (downloaded from the Web of Science at the beginning of evaluation) for each subject category, year, and type of output; n. a. – the data are not robust enough for relevant judgement; orange: outputs from the Phase I, blue: the other outputs of the team.

Types of collaboration: outputs created exclusively in a particular institute are marked by A1, outputs created within national cooperation by max. 5 organizations are marked by B, outputs created within international cooperation by max. 5 organizations are marked C, outputs created within large collaboration exceeding 5 organizations are marked D, outputs created within large international collaboration are marked E. It is distinguished by marking B1/B, C1/C and D1/D whether the output has/does not have a corresponding author from a particular team.

Field structure of outputs: number of outputs of the team in different subject categories (subfields); if the output is assigned to more than one field, the field where the publication performs best (assessed by Quality of outputs by journals ranking) is taken; the table shows up to 20 fields.

Detailed explanation of the indicators is provided in the Methodology of evaluation, Annex 2 – Bibliometrics.

NOTE: The significance of bibliometrics in humanities is very limited. Therefore, the results of bibliometric analysis were not provided to the Commission.

Evaluation of the Research and Professional Activities of the Institutes of the Czech Academy of Sciences for 2015–2019
BIBLIOMETRIC PARAMETERS OF ALL OUTPUTS INCLUDING THOSE EVALUATED IN THE PHASE I.

Institute: Institute of Philosophy of the CAS, v. v. i.
Team: Department of Contemporary Continental Philosophy
Head: doc. Mgr. Martin Nitsche, Ph.D.
Field: Philosophy, Ethics and Religion
Total number of outputs: 73   **Evaluated outputs:** 25

QUALITY OF OUTPUTS BY JOURNAL RANKING

QUALITY OF OUTPUTS BY INTENSITY OF CITATIONS

TYPES OF COLLABORATION

Collaboration	Outputs (evaluated)	Outputs (not evaluated)
A1	3	38
B		2
B1		2
C		
C1	2	1
D		
D1		
E		
n.a.	18	4
Without affiliation	2	1
A1+B1+C1+D1	5	41
B+C+D+E		2

FIELD STRUCTURE OF OUTPUTS

Field structure of outputs	Outputs (evaluated)	Outputs (not evaluated)
Philosophy	5	33
n.a.	18	4
Ethics		16
Psychology Multidisciplinary		4
Religion	1	1
Social Sciences Interdisciplinary	2	
Cultural Studies		1
History Philosophy Of Science	1	
International Relations		1
Literature		1
Logic	1	
Social Work		1
Sociology		1

Total number of outputs: outputs of the team published during the evaluated period 2015-2019.
Evaluated outputs: selected outputs submitted by the team to the Phase I of evaluation.
Outputs used for bibliometry: subset of all outputs registered in the Web of Science; document type: article, review or proceedings paper.
Quality of outputs by journal ranking: number of outputs in top decile (1*) and quartiles (1-4) by AIS of journals; n. a. - outputs in journals without AIS; orange: outputs from the Phase I, blue: the other outputs of the team.
Quality of outputs by intensity of citations: number of outputs in the top decile (1*) and in quartiles (1, 2, 3+4) determined from the list of outputs ordered by the number of citations (downloaded from the Web of Science at the beginning of evaluation) for each subject category, year, and type of output; n. a. – the data are not robust enough for relevant judgement; orange: outputs from the Phase I, blue: the other outputs of the team.
Types of collaboration: outputs created exclusively in a particular institute are marked by A1, outputs created within national cooperation by max. 5 organizations are marked by B, outputs created within international cooperation by max. 5 organizations are marked C, outputs created within large collaboration exceeding 5 organizations are marked D, outputs created within large international collaboration are marked E. It is distinguished by marking B1/B, C1/C and D1/D whether the output has/does not have a corresponding author from a particular team.
Field structure of outputs: number of outputs of the team in different subject categories (subfields); if the output is assigned to more than one field, the field where the publication performs best (assessed by Quality of outputs by journals ranking) is taken; the table shows up to 20 fields.
**Detailed explanation of the indicators is provided in the Methodology of evaluation, Annex 2 – Bibliometrics.**

NOTE: The significance of bibliometrics in humanities is very limited. Therefore, the results of bibliometric analysis were not provided to the Commission.

Evaluation of the Research and Professional Activities of the Institutes of the Czech Academy of Sciences for 2015–2019
BIBLIOMETRIC PARAMETERS OF ALL OUTPUTS INCLUDING THOSE EVALUATED IN THE PHASE I.

Institute:	Institute of Philosophy of the CAS, v. v. i.
Team:	Department of Logic
Head:	Mgr. Vít Punčochář, Ph.D.
Field:	Philosophy, Ethics and Religion
Total number of outputs: 62	**Evaluated outputs:** 16

QUALITY OF OUTPUTS BY JOURNAL RANKING

QUALITY OF OUTPUTS BY INTENSITY OF CITATIONS

TYPES OF COLLABORATION

Collaboration	Outputs (evaluated)	Outputs (not evaluated)
A1	13	26
B		3
B1		6
C		1
C1		
D		
D1		
E		
n.a.	3	7
Without affiliation		3
A1+B1+C1+D1	13	32
B+C+D+E		4

FIELD STRUCTURE OF OUTPUTS

Field structure of outputs	Outputs (evaluated)	Outputs (not evaluated)
Philosophy	11	33
Logic	7	8
Ethics		13
n.a.	3	7
Computer Science Theory Methods	3	3
History Philosophy Of Science	2	4
Language Linguistics	3	
Mathematics	2	1
Computer Science Artificial Intelligence	2	
Mathematics Applied	2	
Communication	1	
Economics		1
Linguistics	1	

Total number of outputs: outputs of the team published during the evaluated period 2015-2019.
Evaluated outputs: selected outputs submitted by the team to the Phase I of evaluation.
Outputs used for bibliometry: subset of all outputs registered in the Web of Science; document type: article, review or proceedings paper.
Quality of outputs by journal ranking: number of outputs in top decile (1*) and quartiles (1-4) by AIS of journals; n. a. - outputs in journals without AIS; orange: outputs from the Phase I, blue: the other outputs of the team.
Quality of outputs by intensity of citations: number of outputs in the top decile (1*) and in quartiles (1, 2, 3+4) determined from the list of outputs ordered by the number of citations (downloaded from the Web of Science at the beginning of evaluation) for each subject category, year, and type of output; n. a. – the data are not robust enough for relevant judgement; orange: outputs from the Phase I, blue: the other outputs of the team.
Types of collaboration: outputs created exclusively in a particular institute are marked by A1, outputs created within national cooperation by max. 5 organizations are marked by B, outputs created within international cooperation by max. 5 organizations are marked C, outputs created within large collaboration exceeding 5 organizations are marked D, outputs created within large international collaboration are marked E. It is distinguished by marking B1/B, C1/C and D1/D whether the output has/does not have a corresponding author from a particular team.
Field structure of outputs: number of outputs of the team in different subject categories (subfields); if the output is assigned to more than one field, the field where the publication performs best (assessed by Quality of outputs by journals ranking) is taken; the table shows up to 20 fields.
**Detailed explanation of the indicators is provided in the Methodology of evaluation, Annex 2 – Bibliometrics.**

NOTE: The significance of bibliometrics in humanities is very limited. Therefore, the results of bibliometric analysis were not provided to the Commission.

Evaluation of the Research and Professional Activities of the Institutes of the Czech Academy of Sciences for 2015–2019

BIBLIOMETRIC PARAMETERS OF ALL OUTPUTS INCLUDING THOSE EVALUATED IN THE PHASE I.

Institute:	Institute of Philosophy of the CAS, v. v. i.
Team:	Department for the Study of Ancient and Medieval Thought
Head:	doc. Mgr. Petr Dvořák, Ph.D.
Field:	Philosophy, Ethics and Religion
Total number of outputs: 41	**Evaluated outputs:** 22

QUALITY OF OUTPUTS BY JOURNAL RANKING

QUALITY OF OUTPUTS BY INTENSITY OF CITATIONS

TYPES OF COLLABORATION

Collaboration	Outputs (evaluated)	Outputs (not evaluated)
A1	5	13
B		1
B1		1
C		
C1		
D		
D1		
E		
n.a.	17	3
Without affiliation		1
A1+B1+C1+D1	5	14
B+C+D+E		1

FIELD STRUCTURE OF OUTPUTS

Field structure of outputs	Outputs (evaluated)	Outputs (not evaluated)
n.a.	17	3
Philosophy	3	13
Ethics	1	11
History Philosophy Of Science	1	2
Logic	1	1
Medieval Renaissance Studies	2	
Religion	1	1
Classics		1

Total number of outputs: outputs of the team published during the evaluated period 2015-2019.

Evaluated outputs: selected outputs submitted by the team to the Phase I of evaluation.

Outputs used for bibliometry: subset of all outputs registered in the Web of Science; document type: article, review or proceedings paper.

Quality of outputs by journal ranking: number of outputs in top decile (1*) and quartiles (1-4) by AIS of journals; n. a. - outputs in journals without AIS; orange: outputs from the Phase I, blue: the other outputs of the team.

Quality of outputs by intensity of citations: number of outputs in the top decile (1*) and in quartiles (1, 2, 3+4) determined from the list of outputs ordered by the number of citations (downloaded from the Web of Science at the beginning of evaluation) for each subject category, year, and type of output; n. a. – the data are not robust enough for relevant judgement; orange: outputs from the Phase I, blue: the other outputs of the team.

Types of collaboration: outputs created exclusively in a particular institute are marked by A1, outputs created within national cooperation by max. 5 organizations are marked by B, outputs created within international cooperation by max. 5 organizations are marked C, outputs created within large collaboration exceeding 5 organizations are marked D, outputs created within large international collaboration are marked E. It is distinguished by marking B1/B, C1/C and D1/D whether the output has/does not have a corresponding author from a particular team.

Field structure of outputs: number of outputs of the team in different subject categories (subfields); if the output is assigned to more than one field, the field where the publication performs best (assessed by Quality of outputs by journals ranking) is taken; the table shows up to 20 fields.

Detailed explanation of the indicators is provided in the Methodology of evaluation, Annex 2 – Bibliometrics.

NOTE: The significance of bibliometrics in humanities is very limited. Therefore, the results of bibliometric analysis were not provided to the Commission.

Evaluation of the Research and Professional Activities of the Institutes of the Czech Academy of Sciences for 2015–2019
BIBLIOMETRIC PARAMETERS OF ALL OUTPUTS INCLUDING THOSE EVALUATED IN THE PHASE I.

Institute:	Institute of Philosophy of the CAS, v. v. i.
Team:	Department of Comenius Studies and Early Modern Intellectual History
Head:	PhDr. Vladimír Urbánek, Ph.D.
Field:	History and Archaeology
Total number of outputs: 25	**Evaluated outputs:** 20

QUALITY OF OUTPUTS BY JOURNAL RANKING

QUALITY OF OUTPUTS BY INTENSITY OF CITATIONS

TYPES OF COLLABORATION

Collaboration	Outputs (evaluated)	Outputs (not evaluated)
A1	2	4
B		
B1		
C	1	
C1		
D		
D1		
E		
n.a.	17	1
Without affiliation		
A1+B1+C1+D1	2	4
B+C+D+E	1	

FIELD STRUCTURE OF OUTPUTS

Field structure of outputs	Outputs (evaluated)	Outputs (not evaluated)
n.a.	17	1
Literature Slavic		2
Medieval Renaissance Studies	1	1
Philosophy	1	1
Ethics		1
History Philosophy Of Science	1	

Total number of outputs: outputs of the team published during the evaluated period 2015-2019.

Evaluated outputs: selected outputs submitted by the team to the Phase I of evaluation.

Outputs used for bibliometry: subset of all outputs registered in the Web of Science; document type: article, review or proceedings paper.

Quality of outputs by journal ranking: number of outputs in top decile (1*) and quartiles (1-4) by AIS of journals; n. a. - outputs in journals without AIS; orange: outputs from the Phase I, blue: the other outputs of the team.

Quality of outputs by intensity of citations: number of outputs in the top decile (1*) and in quartiles (1, 2, 3+4) determined from the list of outputs ordered by the number of citations (downloaded from the Web of Science at the beginning of evaluation) for each subject category, year, and type of output; n. a. – the data are not robust enough for relevant judgement; orange: outputs from the Phase I, blue: the other outputs of the team.

Types of collaboration: outputs created exclusively in a particular institute are marked by A1, outputs created within national cooperation by max. 5 organizations are marked by B, outputs created within international cooperation by max. 5 organizations are marked C, outputs created within large collaboration exceeding 5 organizations are marked D, outputs created within large international collaboration are marked E. It is distinguished by marking B1/B, C1/C and D1/D whether the output has/does not have a corresponding author from a particular team.

Field structure of outputs: number of outputs of the team in different subject categories (subfields); if the output is assigned to more than one field, the field where the publication performs best (assessed by Quality of outputs by journals ranking) is taken; the table shows up to 20 fields.

Detailed explanation of the indicators is provided in the Methodology of evaluation, Annex 2 – Bibliometrics.

NOTE: The significance of bibliometrics in humanities is very limited. Therefore, the results of bibliometric analysis were not provided to the Commission.

Evaluation of the Research and Professional Activities of the Institutes of the Czech Academy of Sciences for 2015–2019
BIBLIOMETRIC PARAMETERS OF ALL OUTPUTS INCLUDING THOSE EVALUATED IN THE PHASE I.

Institute:	Institute of Philosophy of the CAS, v. v. i.
Team:	Department for the Study of Modern Rationality
Head:	PhDr. Ing. Jiří Chotaš, Ph.D.
Field:	Philosophy, Ethics and Religion
Total number of outputs: 19	**Evaluated outputs:** 12

QUALITY OF OUTPUTS BY JOURNAL RANKING

QUALITY OF OUTPUTS BY INTENSITY OF CITATIONS

TYPES OF COLLABORATION

Collaboration	Outputs (evaluated)	Outputs (not evaluated)
A1		6
B		
B1		
C		
C1		
D		
D1		
E		
n.a.	12	1
Without affiliation		
A1+B1+C1+D1		6
B+C+D+E		

FIELD STRUCTURE OF OUTPUTS

Field structure of outputs	Outputs (evaluated)	Outputs (not evaluated)
n.a.	12	1
Ethics		6
Philosophy		6

Total number of outputs: outputs of the team published during the evaluated period 2015-2019.
Evaluated outputs: selected outputs submitted by the team to the Phase I of evaluation.
Outputs used for bibliometry: subset of all outputs registered in the Web of Science; document type: article, review or proceedings paper.
Quality of outputs by journal ranking: number of outputs in top decile (1*) and quartiles (1-4) by AIS of journals; n. a. - outputs in journals without AIS; orange: outputs from the Phase I, blue: the other outputs of the team.
Quality of outputs by intensity of citations: number of outputs in the top decile (1*) and in quartiles (1, 2, 3+4) determined from the list of outputs ordered by the number of citations (downloaded from the Web of Science at the beginning of evaluation) for each subject category, year, and type of output; n. a. – the data are not robust enough for relevant judgement; orange: outputs from the Phase I, blue: the other outputs of the team.
Types of collaboration: outputs created exclusively in a particular institute are marked by A1, outputs created within national cooperation by max. 5 organizations are marked by B, outputs created within international cooperation by max. 5 organizations are marked C, outputs created within large collaboration exceeding 5 organizations are marked D, outputs created within large international collaboration are marked E. It is distinguished by marking B1/B, C1/C and D1/D whether the output has/does not have a corresponding author from a particular team.
Field structure of outputs: number of outputs of the team in different subject categories (subfields); if the output is assigned to more than one field, the field where the publication performs best (assessed by Quality of outputs by journals ranking) is taken; the table shows up to 20 fields.
**Detailed explanation of the indicators is provided in the Methodology of evaluation, Annex 2 – Bibliometrics.**

NOTE: The significance of bibliometrics in humanities is very limited. Therefore, the results of bibliometric analysis were not provided to the Commission.

Evaluation of the Research and Professional Activities of the Institutes of the Czech Academy of Sciences for 2015–2019

BIBLIOMETRIC PARAMETERS OF ALL OUTPUTS INCLUDING THOSE EVALUATED IN THE PHASE I.

Institute:	Institute of Philosophy of the CAS, v. v. i.
Team:	Department for the Study of Modern Czech Philosophy
Head:	Mgr. Ivan Landa, PhD.
Field:	Philosophy, Ethics and Religion
Total number of outputs: 21	**Evaluated outputs:** 14

QUALITY OF OUTPUTS BY JOURNAL RANKING

QUALITY OF OUTPUTS BY INTENSITY OF CITATIONS

TYPES OF COLLABORATION

Collaboration	Outputs (evaluated)	Outputs (not evaluated)
A1	2	3
B		
B1		1
C		1
C1		
D		
D1		
E		
n.a.	12	2
Without affiliation		
A1+B1+C1+D1	2	4
B+C+D+E		1

FIELD STRUCTURE OF OUTPUTS

Field structure of outputs	Outputs (evaluated)	Outputs (not evaluated)
n.a.	12	2
Ethics	1	3
Philosophy	1	3
Literature Slavic	1	
Sociology		1
Virology		1

Total number of outputs: outputs of the team published during the evaluated period 2015-2019.
Evaluated outputs: selected outputs submitted by the team to the Phase I of evaluation.
Outputs used for bibliometry: subset of all outputs registered in the Web of Science; document type: article, review or proceedings paper.
Quality of outputs by journal ranking: number of outputs in top decile (1*) and quartiles (1-4) by AIS of journals; n. a. - outputs in journals without AIS; orange: outputs from the Phase I, blue: the other outputs of the team.
Quality of outputs by intensity of citations: number of outputs in the top decile (1*) and in quartiles (1, 2, 3+4) determined from the list of outputs ordered by the number of citations (downloaded from the Web of Science at the beginning of evaluation) for each subject category, year, and type of output; n. a. – the data are not robust enough for relevant judgement; orange: outputs from the Phase I, blue: the other outputs of the team.
Types of collaboration: outputs created exclusively in a particular institute are marked by A1, outputs created within national cooperation by max. 5 organizations are marked by B, outputs created within international cooperation by max. 5 organizations are marked C, outputs created within large collaboration exceeding 5 organizations are marked D, outputs created within large international collaboration are marked E. It is distinguished by marking B1/B, C1/C and D1/D whether the output has/does not have a corresponding author from a particular team.
Field structure of outputs: number of outputs of the team in different subject categories (subfields); if the output is assigned to more than one field, the field where the publication performs best (assessed by Quality of outputs by journals ranking) is taken; the table shows up to 20 fields.
**Detailed explanation of the indicators is provided in the Methodology of evaluation, Annex 2 – Bibliometrics.**

NOTE: The significance of bibliometrics in humanities is very limited. Therefore, the results of bibliometric analysis were not provided to the Commission.

Evaluation of the Research and Professional Activities of the Institutes of the Czech Academy of Sciences for 2015–2019
BIBLIOMETRIC PARAMETERS OF ALL OUTPUTS INCLUDING THOSE EVALUATED IN THE PHASE I.

Institute:	Institute of Philosophy of the CAS, v. v. i.
Team:	Centre for Theoretical Study - The Jan Patočka Archive
Head:	Mgr. Jan Frei, Ph.D. et Ph.D.
Field:	Philosophy, Ethics and Religion
Total number of outputs: 15	**Evaluated outputs:** 8

QUALITY OF OUTPUTS BY JOURNAL RANKING

QUALITY OF OUTPUTS BY INTENSITY OF CITATIONS

TYPES OF COLLABORATION

Collaboration	Outputs (evaluated)	Outputs (not evaluated)
A1	1	1
B		
B1		
C		2
C1		
D		
D1		
E		
n.a.	7	3
Without affiliation		1
A1+B1+C1+D1	1	1
B+C+D+E		2

FIELD STRUCTURE OF OUTPUTS

Field structure of outputs	Outputs (evaluated)	Outputs (not evaluated)
n.a.	7	3
Philosophy	1	4
Ethics		1

Total number of outputs: outputs of the team published during the evaluated period 2015-2019.
Evaluated outputs: selected outputs submitted by the team to the Phase I of evaluation.
Outputs used for bibliometry: subset of all outputs registered in the Web of Science; document type: article, review or proceedings paper.
Quality of outputs by journal ranking: number of outputs in top decile (1*) and quartiles (1-4) by AIS of journals; n. a. - outputs in journals without AIS; orange: outputs from the Phase I, blue: the other outputs of the team.
Quality of outputs by intensity of citations: number of outputs in the top decile (1*) and in quartiles (1, 2, 3+4) determined from the list of outputs ordered by the number of citations (downloaded from the Web of Science at the beginning of evaluation) for each subject category, year, and type of output; n. a. – the data are not robust enough for relevant judgement; orange: outputs from the Phase I, blue: the other outputs of the team.
Types of collaboration: outputs created exclusively in a particular institute are marked by A1, outputs created within national cooperation by max. 5 organizations are marked by B, outputs created within international cooperation by max. 5 organizations are marked C, outputs created within large collaboration exceeding 5 organizations are marked D, outputs created within large international collaboration are marked E. It is distinguished by marking B1/B, C1/C and D1/D whether the output has/does not have a corresponding author from a particular team.
Field structure of outputs: number of outputs of the team in different subject categories (subfields); if the output is assigned to more than one field, the field where the publication performs best (assessed by Quality of outputs by journals ranking) is taken; the table shows up to 20 fields.
**Detailed explanation of the indicators is provided in the Methodology of evaluation, Annex 2 – Bibliometrics.**

NOTE: The significance of bibliometrics in humanities is very limited. Therefore, the results of bibliometric analysis were not provided to the Commission.

Evaluation of the Research and Professional Activities of the Institutes of the Czech Academy of Sciences for 2015–2019
BIBLIOMETRIC PARAMETERS OF ALL OUTPUTS INCLUDING THOSE EVALUATED IN THE PHASE I.

Institute:	Institute of Philosophy of the CAS, v. v. i.
Team:	Centre of Global Studies
Head:	doc. PhDr. Marek Hrubec, Ph.D.
Field:	Philosophy, Ethics and Religion
Total number of outputs: 35	**Evaluated outputs:** 15

QUALITY OF OUTPUTS BY JOURNAL RANKING

QUALITY OF OUTPUTS BY INTENSITY OF CITATIONS

TYPES OF COLLABORATION

Collaboration	Outputs (evaluated)	Outputs (not evaluated)
A1	6	11
B		
B1		1
C		
C1		
D		
D1		
E		
n.a.	9	8
Without affiliation		
A1+B1+C1+D1	6	12
B+C+D+E		

FIELD STRUCTURE OF OUTPUTS

Field structure of outputs	Outputs (evaluated)	Outputs (not evaluated)
n.a.	9	8
Philosophy		7
Ethics		6
Development Studies	3	
Political Science		2
Social Sciences Interdisciplinary	1	1
Sociology	1	1
Cultural Studies	1	
Religion		1

Total number of outputs: outputs of the team published during the evaluated period 2015-2019.
Evaluated outputs: selected outputs submitted by the team to the Phase I of evaluation.
Outputs used for bibliometry: subset of all outputs registered in the Web of Science; document type: article, review or proceedings paper.
Quality of outputs by journal ranking: number of outputs in top decile (1*) and quartiles (1-4) by AIS of journals; n. a. - outputs in journals without AIS; orange: outputs from the Phase I, blue: the other outputs of the team.
Quality of outputs by intensity of citations: number of outputs in the top decile (1*) and in quartiles (1, 2, 3+4) determined from the list of outputs ordered by the number of citations (downloaded from the Web of Science at the beginning of evaluation) for each subject category, year, and type of output; n. a. – the data are not robust enough for relevant judgement; orange: outputs from the Phase I, blue: the other outputs of the team.
Types of collaboration: outputs created exclusively in a particular institute are marked by A1, outputs created within national cooperation by max. 5 organizations are marked by B, outputs created within international cooperation by max. 5 organizations are marked C, outputs created within large collaboration exceeding 5 organizations are marked D, outputs created within large international collaboration are marked E. It is distinguished by marking B1/B, C1/C and D1/D whether the output has/does not have a corresponding author from a particular team.
Field structure of outputs: number of outputs of the team in different subject categories (subfields); if the output is assigned to more than one field, the field where the publication performs best (assessed by Quality of outputs by journals ranking) is taken; the table shows up to 20 fields.
**Detailed explanation of the indicators is provided in the Methodology of evaluation, Annex 2 – Bibliometrics.**

NOTE: The significance of bibliometrics in humanities is very limited. Therefore, the results of bibliometric analysis were not provided to the Commission.

Evaluation of the Research and Professional Activities of the Institutes of the Czech Academy of Sciences for 2015–2019

BIBLIOMETRIC PARAMETERS OF ALL OUTPUTS INCLUDING THOSE EVALUATED IN THE PHASE I.

Institute: Institute of Philosophy of the CAS, v. v. i.
Team: Centre for Science, Technology, and Society Studies
Head: PhDr. Jan Balon, PhD.
Field: Other Humanities and the Arts
Total number of outputs: 26   **Evaluated outputs:** 19

QUALITY OF OUTPUTS BY JOURNAL RANKING

QUALITY OF OUTPUTS BY INTENSITY OF CITATIONS

TYPES OF COLLABORATION

Collaboration	Outputs (evaluated)	Outputs (not evaluated)
A1	6	4
B		
B1	2	
C		
C1	1	
D		
D1		
E		
n.a.	10	3
Without affiliation		
A1+B1+C1+D1	9	4
B+C+D+E		

FIELD STRUCTURE OF OUTPUTS

Field structure of outputs	Outputs (evaluated)	Outputs (not evaluated)
n.a.	10	3
Social Sciences Interdisciplinary	4	1
Ethics		2
Philosophy	1	1
Computer Science Information System	1	
Education Educational Research		1
Information Science Library Science	1	
Mathematics	1	
Psychology Social	1	
Social Issues	1	

Total number of outputs: outputs of the team published during the evaluated period 2015-2019.
Evaluated outputs: selected outputs submitted by the team to the Phase I of evaluation.
Outputs used for bibliometry: subset of all outputs registered in the Web of Science; document type: article, review or proceedings paper.
Quality of outputs by journal ranking: number of outputs in top decile (1*) and quartiles (1-4) by AIS of journals; n. a. - outputs in journals without AIS; orange: outputs from the Phase I, blue: the other outputs of the team.
Quality of outputs by intensity of citations: number of outputs in the top decile (1*) and in quartiles (1, 2, 3+4) determined from the list of outputs ordered by the number of citations (downloaded from the Web of Science at the beginning of evaluation) for each subject category, year, and type of output; n. a. – the data are not robust enough for relevant judgement; orange: outputs from the Phase I, blue: the other outputs of the team.
Types of collaboration: outputs created exclusively in a particular institute are marked by A1, outputs created within national cooperation by max. 5 organizations are marked by B, outputs created within international cooperation by max. 5 organizations are marked C, outputs created within large collaboration exceeding 5 organizations are marked D, outputs created within large international collaboration are marked E. It is distinguished by marking B1/B, C1/C and D1/D whether the output has/does not have a corresponding author from a particular team.
Field structure of outputs: number of outputs of the team in different subject categories (subfields); if the output is assigned to more than one field, the field where the publication performs best (assessed by Quality of outputs by journals ranking) is taken; the table shows up to 20 fields.
**Detailed explanation of the indicators is provided in the Methodology of evaluation, Annex 2 – Bibliometrics.**

NOTE: The significance of bibliometrics in humanities is very limited. Therefore, the results of bibliometric analysis were not provided to the Commission.

Evaluation of the Research and Professional Activities of the Institutes of the Czech Academy of Sciences for 2015–2019
BIBLIOMETRIC PARAMETERS OF ALL OUTPUTS INCLUDING THOSE EVALUATED IN THE PHASE I.

Institute:	Institute of Philosophy of the CAS, v. v. i.
Team:	Centre for Classical Studies
Head:	PhDr. Petr Kitzler, Ph.D., DSc.
Field:	Languages and Literature
Total number of outputs: 81	**Evaluated outputs:** 36

QUALITY OF OUTPUTS BY JOURNAL RANKING

QUALITY OF OUTPUTS BY INTENSITY OF CITATIONS

TYPES OF COLLABORATION

Collaboration	Outputs (evaluated)	Outputs (not evaluated)
A1	7	18
B		1
B1		2
C		
C1		
D		
D1		
E		
n.a.	29	23
Without affiliation		1
A1+B1+C1+D1	7	20
B+C+D+E		1

FIELD STRUCTURE OF OUTPUTS

Field structure of outputs	Outputs (evaluated)	Outputs (not evaluated)
n.a.	29	23
Humanities Multidisciplinary	4	14
Classics	1	3
Religion	1	2
Ethics		1
Fisheries		1
History Philosophy Of Science	1	
Marine Freshwater Biology		1
Music		1
Philosophy		1

Total number of outputs: outputs of the team published during the evaluated period 2015-2019.

Evaluated outputs: selected outputs submitted by the team to the Phase I of evaluation.

Outputs used for bibliometry: subset of all outputs registered in the Web of Science; document type: article, review or proceedings paper.

Quality of outputs by journal ranking: number of outputs in top decile (1*) and quartiles (1-4) by AIS of journals; n. a. - outputs in journals without AIS; orange: outputs from the Phase I, blue: the other outputs of the team.

Quality of outputs by intensity of citations: number of outputs in the top decile (1*) and in quartiles (1, 2, 3+4) determined from the list of outputs ordered by the number of citations (downloaded from the Web of Science at the beginning of evaluation) for each subject category, year, and type of output; n. a. – the data are not robust enough for relevant judgement; orange: outputs from the Phase I, blue: the other outputs of the team.

Types of collaboration: outputs created exclusively in a particular institute are marked by A1, outputs created within national cooperation by max. 5 organizations are marked by B, outputs created within international cooperation by max. 5 organizations are marked C, outputs created within large collaboration exceeding 5 organizations are marked D, outputs created within large international collaboration are marked E. It is distinguished by marking B1/B, C1/C and D1/D whether the output has/does not have a corresponding author from a particular team.

Field structure of outputs: number of outputs of the team in different subject categories (subfields); if the output is assigned to more than one field, the field where the publication performs best (assessed by Quality of outputs by journals ranking) is taken; the table shows up to 20 fields.

Detailed explanation of the indicators is provided in the Methodology of evaluation, Annex 2 – Bibliometrics.

NOTE: The significance of bibliometrics in humanities is very limited. Therefore, the results of bibliometric analysis were not provided to the Commission.

Evaluation of the Research and Professional Activities of the Institutes of the Czech Academy of Sciences for 2015–2019

BIBLIOMETRIC PARAMETERS OF ALL OUTPUTS INCLUDING THOSE EVALUATED IN THE PHASE I.

Institute:	Institute of Philosophy of the CAS, v. v. i.
Team:	Centre for Medieval Studies
Head:	Mgr. Pavel Soukup, Ph.D.
Field:	History and Archaeology
Total number of outputs: 31	**Evaluated outputs:** 29

QUALITY OF OUTPUTS BY JOURNAL RANKING

QUALITY OF OUTPUTS BY INTENSITY OF CITATIONS

TYPES OF COLLABORATION

Collaboration	Outputs (evaluated)	Outputs (not evaluated)
A1	1	2
B		
B1		
C		
C1		
D		
D1		
E		
n.a.	28	
Without affiliation		
A1+B1+C1+D1	1	2
B+C+D+E		

FIELD STRUCTURE OF OUTPUTS

Field structure of outputs	Outputs (evaluated)	Outputs (not evaluated)
n.a.	28	
Humanities Multidisciplinary	1	1
Medieval Renaissance Studies		1

Total number of outputs: outputs of the team published during the evaluated period 2015-2019.
Evaluated outputs: selected outputs submitted by the team to the Phase I of evaluation.
Outputs used for bibliometry: subset of all outputs registered in the Web of Science; document type: article, review or proceedings paper.
Quality of outputs by journal ranking: number of outputs in top decile (1*) and quartiles (1-4) by AIS of journals; n. a. - outputs in journals without AIS; orange: outputs from the Phase I, blue: the other outputs of the team.
Quality of outputs by intensity of citations: number of outputs in the top decile (1*) and in quartiles (1, 2, 3+4) determined from the list of outputs ordered by the number of citations (downloaded from the Web of Science at the beginning of evaluation) for each subject category, year, and type of output; n. a. – the data are not robust enough for relevant judgement; orange: outputs from the Phase I, blue: the other outputs of the team.
Types of collaboration: outputs created exclusively in a particular institute are marked by A1, outputs created within national cooperation by max. 5 organizations are marked by B, outputs created within international cooperation by max. 5 organizations are marked C, outputs created within large collaboration exceeding 5 organizations are marked D, outputs created within large international collaboration are marked E. It is distinguished by marking B1/B, C1/C and D1/D whether the output has/does not have a corresponding author from a particular team.
Field structure of outputs: number of outputs of the team in different subject categories (subfields); if the output is assigned to more than one field, the field where the publication performs best (assessed by Quality of outputs by journals ranking) is taken; the table shows up to 20 fields.
Detailed explanation of the indicators is provided in the Methodology of evaluation, Annex 2 – Bibliometrics.

NOTE: The significance of bibliometrics in humanities is very limited. Therefore, the results of bibliometric analysis were not provided to the Commission.