



## 1. General Impression / quality of scientific research (75%)

	<b>Excellent (6)</b>	<b>Very good (5.5)</b>	<b>Good (5)</b>	<b>Fair (4.5)</b>	<b>Acceptable (4)</b>	<b>Fail</b>
<b>Knowledge and skills</b>	Well-founded knowledge and eager to learn new concepts	Well-founded knowledge, shows interest beyond the work	Well-founded knowledge, shows interest in the work	Moderate knowledge, willing to learn only when necessary	Little knowledge, shows little interest to learn	No knowledge, no interest to learn
<b>Systematics and scientific standards</b>	Work was fully accomplished scientifically and systematically	Work was mostly accomplished systematically and scientifically	Work was to a large extent systematically accomplished	Work was partly systematically accomplished	The work was hardly accomplished systematically	The work was not accomplished systematically
<b>Initiative, commitment and independence</b>	Goals were exceeded by developing own ideas	All goals were achieved by own ideas	Work was accomplished independently, own ideas present	Some self initiative - goal partly reached	Shows very little self initiative	Shows no self initiative
<b>Quality of the results</b>	Particularly good and new results (incl. negative results) were obtained	All requested results were obtained with high quality	All requested results were obtained	The results were satisfying	Only a minimum of the possible results was obtained	No useful results were obtained
<b>Timeliness and efficiency</b>	The work proceeded quicker than usual; writing was very efficient		The work proceeded as usual; writing was at a normal pace		The work did not make any significant progress and writing took longer than normal	The work did not make any progress and writing took significantly longer than normal

Link to the [grading scheme](#)

## 2. Form /quality of written report (25%)

- Does the thesis have a clear structure?
  - Is there a comprehensive, informative *abstract*?
  - Does the introduction give a concise, yet comprehensive and meaningful review of the current state of knowledge regarding the thesis topic?
  - Are the discussion and conclusions building on and supported by the results, putting them into a broader context?
- Is the text scientifically correct, clearly understandable and grammatically sound ?
- Have the formal requirements for diagrams, tables, literary sources etc. been met?
  - Are all figures and tables accompanied by meaningful captions that are comprehensible?
  - Do all figures have proper scales, units and legends?
  - Are font sizes, line thicknesses, symbols sizes etc. in the figures chosen appropriately?
  - Do figures/graphs show the essentials or are they overloaded / have a meaningless scale?
  - If colors and/or grey- scales are used, have they been selected such that they are easily distinguishable?
  - Do tables contain all relevant information including e.g., units, columns with error estimates? Are only significant numbers of digits given?
  - Is the literature list complete and properly formatted? Are all references listed that are cited in the thesis (and only those)?



**Points to be judged in terms of Scientific Results and Interpretation**

- Are the methods adopted appropriate to the subject matter?
- Have the methods (e.g. analysis methods and protocols, instrument calibration, operating conditions for instruments, simulation methods and model setup, theoretical derivations ...) been carefully carried out and thoroughly, yet concisely, documented? Is the documentation sufficient for the reader to reproduce the approach?
- Has the collection of data and results or the derivations of formulae been carried out carefully and correctly?
- Is there a meaningful error analysis and discussion of uncertainties?
- Are observations and results thoroughly and systematically documented?
- Are key results presented in clear writing, in a logical sequence and supported by clear, graphical presentations?
- Are the observations clearly distinguishable from hypotheses and suppositions?
- Is the presentation of results in a meaningful relation to the methods?
- Do the discussion, interpretation and conclusions build on (and are they supported by) the results?