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Reviewer’s opinion

on Ph.D. dissertation authored by

*First name Family name*

entitled:

*title*

1. Problem and its impact

What is, in your opinion, the most important problem discussed in the dissertation?

Is it a scientific one?

Does it have a practical meaning?

1. Contribution

What is the main, original contribution of the dissertation?

If appropriate, you can make a distinction between what the Ph.D. candidate claims to be the main contribution and what you consider as the main contribution. If this is the case, indicate the reason for which you do not agree (e.g. it could be that somebody else has already proposed a given idea or it can be original but not correct due to some flaws described in Sec. 3 of the reviewer’s opinion). You can also comment on practicality of the proposed solutions (it could be that the problem is highly practical, but the proposed solution is not). If applicable, you can refer to other quality indicators you know about (e.g. quality of publications by the candidate, patents authored by the candidate, citations, existing applications of the proposed solutions etc.).

1. Correctness

Can we trust what is claimed in the dissertation? Are the arguments correct? Indicate the flaws you have noticed, if any. Also point out those aspects concerning correctness that you value most (elegance of proofs, design of experiments, analysis of empirical data, quality of prototype software/hardware etc.).

1. Knowledge of the candidate

What are the chapters of the dissertation (or sections in chapters) that resemble a tutorial and thus confirm a general knowledge of the candidate in the discipline of **Computing**. What areas of that discipline are covered by those chapters/sections? What do you think about quality of those chapters/sections? What is your opinion on the list of references? What is the degree of its completeness? Provide any other arguments in favour or against the claim that the candidate has general knowledge and understanding of the **Computing** discipline.

1. Other remarks[[1]](#footnote-1)
2. Conclusion

Taking into account what I have presented above and the requirements imposed by Article 13 of *the Act of 14 March 2003 of the Polish Parliament on the Academic Degrees and the Academic Title* (with amendments)[[2]](#footnote-2), my evaluation of the dissertation according to the three basic criteria is the following:

**A.** Does the dissertation present an original solution to a scientific problem? (the selected option is marked with **X**)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Definitely YES* | *Rather yes* | *Hard to say* | *Rather no* | *Definitely NO* |

**B.** After reading the dissertation, would you agree that the candidate has general theoretical knowledge and understanding of the discipline of **Computing**, and particularly the area of **Software Engineering**?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Definitely YES* | *Rather yes* | *Hard to say* | *Rather no* | *Definitely NO* |

**C.** Does the dissertation support the claim that the candidate is able to conduct scientific work?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Definitely YES* | *Rather yes* | *Hard to say* | *Rather no* | *Definitely NO* |

Moreover, taking into account ... I **recommend to distinguish** the dissertation for its quality[[3]](#footnote-3).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  | *Signature* |  |

1. Optional [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://www.nauka.gov.pl/g2/oryginal/2013_05/b26ba540a5785d48bee41aec63403b2c.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Obviously, this sentence is optional. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)