



## Assessment of Dissertation

Title of the dissertation:

**Preliminary Remarks:**

This document is not suitable for all types of doctoral degree programmes. Its use is entirely optional.

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

After completing this document, please print, sign and stamp the hardcopy and then fax it to (+49-30) 450-576910.

Name of doctoral candidate:

<b>0</b>	<b>FOR DOCTORATES BY PUBLICATION</b>	Remarks section
0	Does the submitted dissertation, taking into account the doctoral candidate's own contribution, represent an overall merit that justifies of a doctoral degree at the Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin?	

<b>A</b>	<b>STRUCTURE AND FORM OF THE PAPER</b>	<b>Your assessment</b> (0: excellent 4: insufficient)	Remarks section
1	How well is the paper 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	

<b>B</b>	<b>OBJECTIVES OF THE PAPER</b>	
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

<b>C METHODS</b>			
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	

<b>D RESULTS</b>			
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	

<b>E DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS</b>			
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	

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

<b>G ORIGINALITY / COMPLEXITY</b>			
23	What is your assessment of the scientific originality of the paper?	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	

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!

**Overall assessment and justification, especially if this one differs from your individual evaluations - see sheets 1-3 - considerably of the assessment:  
Please enter your comments in the field below or in case of longer comments, enclose as an annex!**

**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.
  
- 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