

Assessment of PhD thesis: MD/PhD program Molecular Medicine, MHH

Title of the dissertation:

Preliminary Remarks:

The assessment of individual sections should be used for orientation to arrive at an overall grade but not for actually “calculating” it.

You do not necessarily have to fill in all sections/ points. However, the overall assessment would be required.

After completing this document, please print, sign and stamp the hardcopy and send it to hbrs@mh-hannover.de

Name of doctoral candidate:

0	Assessment	Remarks section
0	Does the submitted dissertation, taking into account the doctoral candidate's own contribution, represent an overall merit that justifies a doctoral degree at the Medizinische Hochschule Hannover?	2100 characters

A	STRUCTURE AND FORM OF THE THESIS	Your assessment (0: excellent 4: insufficient)
1	How well is the thesis structured?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
2	How good is the linguistic level/expertise?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
3	How good is the graphical elaboration (texts, graphics, tables)?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4

Remarks section

510 characters

B	OBJECTIVES OF THE THESIS	
4	How well is the scientific objective introduced?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
5	How clearly is the research problem defined?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4

540 characters

C	METHODS	
6	How well are the methods described?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
7	How well are the criteria for evaluating variables defined?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
8	What is your assessment of the control groups in terms of quality and quantity?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
9	How well are the methods suited to answering the research problem?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
10	How accurate are the methods?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
11	What is your assessment of the selection of random examples (distorting factors)?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
12	How well does the sample size correspond to the scientific question?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4

1020 characters

D	RESULTS	
13	How well are the results described?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
14	What is your assessment of the statistical evaluation?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
16	How comprehensible are the results?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4

620 characters

E	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	
16	How well is the method discussed?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
17	How well are the results discussed?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
18	How well are the results compared with the literature?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
19	How clear are the conclusions?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
20	How well are the conclusions based on the results?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4

806 characters

F	LITERATURE	
21	How comprehensive is the literature cited?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
22	How relevant is the literature cited?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4

248 characters

G	ORIGINALITY / COMPLEXITY	
23	What is your assessment of the scientific originality of the thesis?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
24	What is your assessment of the complexity/level of the applied methods?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
25	What is your assessment of the work/costs involved?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4

527 characters

Notes for the revision of the dissertation, if applicable: Please list here only those points that need to be changed in the dissertation. Please enter your comments in the field below or in case of longer comments, enclose as an annex!

4750 characters

Overall assessment and justification:


Please enter your comments in the field below or in case of longer comments, enclose as an annex!

4750 characters

Your assessment (please tick):

- No grade awarded**, please revise and resubmit to me.
- Rating see below, however, revision required before printing, no resubmission to my hands.
- summa cum laude (excellent, 0):**
Independently developed paper with high scientific research value and excellent in terms of applied methods and form. Top 5-10% of all theses I have come across.
- magna cum laude (very good, 1):**
Carried out independently, the work is very good in terms of methodology and format and of considerable scientific research value.
- cum laude (good, 2):**
Carried out independently, the work is good in terms of methodology and format and of scientific research value.
- rite (passed, 3):**
Carried out independently, the work is satisfactory in terms of methodology and format and of scientific research value
- non sufficit (insufficient, 4):**
All work that does not at least meet the criteria of "rite".

Reviewer's stamp:



Reviewer's signature