



## Assessment of PhD thesis

*All three members of the assessment committee participate in the evaluation of the thesis. The committee shall present a recommendation with explanatory statement to the faculty. The committee normally prepares a joint statement but may attach any dissenting opinions as individual statements.*

**Name of candidate:**

**Title of thesis:**

**Assessment Committee: *(name, academic title and institution)***

**1<sup>st</sup> opponent:**

**2<sup>nd</sup> opponent:**

**UiB member &  
chair:**

## Assessment of the thesis

*The assessment of the thesis should include a description of what forms the basis for the thesis. Normally, this will be previously published/accepted/submitted material for a scientific journal. Where these articles have more than one author, the role of the candidate should be addressed.*

*The assessment should also provide an evaluation of the following elements (please refer to guidelines): Clearly and concisely formulated questions, the use of methods that are adequate and can be repeated, precise presentation of results, critical evaluation of results, use of terms and language within the academic field, adequate introduction.*

### The synopsis

#### General Overview:

*Give a general description of the candidate's synopsis; the themes listed below should be addressed.*

#### Hypothesis:

#### Methodology:

#### Results:

#### Discussion:

#### Impact:

#### Conclusion:

#### Evaluation:

### Evaluation of individual papers

#### Paper I

<Title>

<Author(s) in correct order>

<Published - Year>

<Publisher>

#### Aim of the study:

#### Methods:

#### Results:

#### Candidate's contribution:

*Consider to which degree the candidate's contribution is identifiable and in accordance with the statement of co-authorship.*

**Discussion and final evaluation paper I:**

**Paper II**

<Title>

<Author(s) in correct order>

<Published - Year>

<Publisher>

**Aim of the study:**

**Methods:**

**Results:**

**Candidate's contribution:**

*Consider to which degree the candidate's contribution is identifiable and in accordance with the statement of co-authorship.*

**Discussion and final evaluation paper II:**

**Paper III**

<Title>

<Author(s) in correct order>

<Published - Year>

<Publisher>

**Aim of the study:**

**Methods:**

**Results:**

**Candidate's contribution:**

*Consider to which degree the candidate's contribution is identifiable and in accordance with the statement of co-authorship.*

**Discussion and final evaluation paper III:**

## The assessment committee's recommendation:

### Final overall remarks:

Klikk her for å skrive inn tekst.

<input type="checkbox"/>	The thesis is worthy of public defence
<input type="checkbox"/>	The committee recommends that the candidate makes minor revisions to the thesis within three months after the candidate receives the evaluation report. The committee will submit a final report on the basis of a revised version of the thesis. A list of the specific items that the candidate should revise is included in the "suggested revision" box below
<input type="checkbox"/>	The thesis is not worthy of public defence, but may be resubmitted for assessment in revised form

### Suggested revisions (*c.f. section 11-5 in the PhD Regulations*):

Klikk her for å skrive inn tekst.

## Signatures

\_\_\_\_\_

Place and date

\_\_\_\_\_

Place and date

\_\_\_\_\_

Place and date

\_\_\_\_\_

First opponent

\_\_\_\_\_

Second opponent

\_\_\_\_\_

Committee chair