Fachbereich 5 Geowissenschaften Bremen, 24.07.2019

Chair of the Doctoral Examination Board Tel. 218-65100

Prof. Dr. Thomas Pichler Fax 218-656105

 pichler@uni-bremen.de

****

**Dear Examiner,**

Thank you for your willingness to review this doctoral thesis. The aim of the assessment should be to determine, whether the thesis is of sufficient quality to fulfill the written requirement of the doctoral examination. Your recommendation should be either (1) to accept or (2) to reject the thesis. If your recommendation is to reject then the candidate has a one-time chance to withdraw, correct and resubmit. Should the dissertation have editorial inadequacies we would like you to point these out in your review and to request their correction. The examination committee will determine the final extent of corrections at the day of the defense. Corrections should not take longer than 4 weeks.

If in your opinion the dissertation is of excellent quality you can recommend accepting “With Distinction”. Should you choose to do so, we kindly ask to justify this recommendation separately and in detail. This distinction is generally reserved for truly outstanding doctoral theses, i.e., the top 5 to 10 %.

We would like to ask you to carry out the evaluation using the attached guideline. Please evaluate the individual criteria with “above average”, “as expected” or “below average” and justify your choice. We hope this will facilitate your evaluation and generate greater transparency.

To further simplify the process we would like to point out that you do not need to summarize the doctoral thesis.

Kind regards,

Prof. Dr. Thomas Pichler

Chair of the Doctoral Examination Board

**Candidate:**

**Title of dissertation:**

**Examiner:**

Please evaluate the dissertation considering the following criteria:
*(Please do not forget a meaningful justification of your choices)*

**Originality, timeliness and scientific progress**

☐ *above average* ☐ *as expected* ☐ below average

Meaningful justification:

**Clarity of hypotheses and line of argumentation**

☐ *above average* ☐ *as expected* ☐ below average

Meaningful justification:

**Description of methods (Can experiments be reproduced?)**

☐ *above average* ☐ *as expected* ☐ below average

Meaningful justification:

**Critical discussion of the results and citation of relevant literature**

☐ *above average* ☐ *as expected* ☐ below average

Meaningful justification:

**Organization of the dissertation, quality of figures, tables, language and style**

☐ *above average* ☐ *as expected* ☐ below average

Meaningful justification:

**For cumulative dissertations: was the relationship between individual manuscripts sufficiently clear? What was the candidate`s contribution to the dissertation if several authors were involved?**

☐ *above average* ☐ *as expected* ☐ below average

Meaningful justification:

**General impression**

☐ *above average* ☐ *as expected* ☐ below average

Meaningful justification:

**Recommendation**

* Accept
* Reject

Additional options:

* Editorial corrections are necessary
* Recommendation to accept “With Distinction”.

*(Please remember to justify this recommendation separately and in detail)*

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date: Signature: