

Assessment by external examiner

Assess the degree to which the candidate has achieved the specified objectives for the following criteria on the standard grading form.

Disciplinary grounding

Is the theoretical and scientific basis described well enough so that the work is in line with international academic research in this field?

Theoretical insight

Does the work, especially the introduction, document that the candidate has an advanced level of knowledge of the theory and methods in this field in general and specialization in a defined area that is particularly relevant to the issue addressed?

Description of objectives

Are the objectives and/or current hypotheses presented in a clear and understandable manner?

Level of skill

Does the candidate have command of the relevant methods and can use them in his/her work in a suitable and integrated manner?

Execution

Does the work demonstrate creativity and/or contribute to new knowledge/innovation? Does the work appear extensive? How do you assess the quality and importance of the new knowledge/new results generated in the work?

Analysis and discussion

Is the analysis, interpretation/synthesis and discussion scientifically grounded and justified and clearly linked to the issue addressed? Is the discussion at a high disciplinary level? Can candidate apply his/her knowledge and skills in new areas and place the results in a more extensive context?

Critical reflection

Does the candidate provide a reasonable assessment of the significance of the results? Is the candidate critical to various sources of information? Are uncertainties, methodological errors, measurement errors, and other sources of error considered and discussed? Is there an analysis of relevant ethical issues in scientific, professional and research contexts?

Own contribution/achievements

Does the candidate clearly distinguish his/her own contribution from those of others? To what degree does the conclusion present how far the objectives were reached? Is there a reasonable and substantiated recommendation for further work or potential follow-up?

Structure

Is there a logical and structural form in the written work (standard IMRaD: Introduction, Methods, Results and Discussion)? Is the work generally well-arranged?

Language

Does the candidate address the issue and results with the necessary scientific precision? Is the work readable and in high-quality language?

Form

Is there a uniform style for the references, figures and tables? Is the quality of figures and tables satisfactory? Does the candidate command the form of expression in this field?