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**Name of candidate:**

**ID:**

**Working title of thesis:**

**Disciplinary area:**

**Main/principal joint supervisor:**

**Joint/Co-supervisor:**

**Please tick the boxes that apply:**

**1: Evidence of clear research question(s)**

**☐** There is evidence that the research project is shaped by [a] clear research question or questions.

**☐** There is evidence that [a] clear research question or questions will be forthcoming with some further consideration and assistance by thesis supervisors.

**☐** There is no clear evidence that [a] satisfactory question or questions will guide the research project.

**Comment:**

**2: Depth of understanding of relevant literature(s)**

**☐** It is clear that the project is informed by a strong, critical grasp of the relevant theoretical and/or applied literature(s).

**☐** The project is generally well informed by the relevant literature(s).

**☐** The project is not sufficiently informed by the relevant literature(s).

**Comment:**

**3: Conceptualisation and justification of methodology**

**☐** The justification of the approach to the research is exemplary. The method of inquiry is clearly appropriate to the research question(s). It is easy for the reader to follow the methodological logic at all times.

**☐** The approach to the research is generally well understood and justified, and consistent with the research question(s). The methodological logic is largely clear.

**☐** The approach to the research is largely taken for granted or poorly justified, or is quite unsuited to the research question(s). There is insufficient evidence of attention to clarifying the logic of the design.

**Comment:**

**4. Writing skills**

**Quality of writing for academic purposes:**

**☐**  Satisfactory

**☐**  Needs improvement

**Comment:**

**5: Overall quality of presentation of a scholarly project**

**☐** The project shows exceptional organisation and consistency throughout. The documentation and presentation of the research question(s), relevant literature(s), significant methodological issues, and research proposal indicate a very high quality research plan. The discussion consistently displays clarity and logic in argumentation, and makes excellent use of the work of other scholars. Technical flaws are very rare.

**☐** The project is well organised and consistent between most sections. The documentation and presentation of the research question(s), relevant literature(s), significant methodological issues, and research proposal indicate a good research plan. The author’s thinking is clear and is, in the main, well argued and justified, and linkages to the work of other scholars are evident.

**☐** The overall project is poorly organised and/or lacking in consistency. There are numerous technical flaws. The case for work in the proposed area is poorly argued and/or unconvincing. Little or no attempt has been made to connect the project with the relevant community of scholars.

**Comment:**

**Overall assessment:**

**Name of reviewer:**

I consent to my review being shared with the student: **☐** Yes  **☐** No.

**Signed: Date:**
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