**Fania Raczinski PhD report**

Prior to the viva voce, the internal examiner checked in detail the Turnitin originality reports which were reported fully to the External Examiner and were deemed perfectly consistent with normal academic practice. Some minor points of contribution (in matters of co-authorship and origination of ideas and tools) were raised briefly in the viva and answered to the satisfaction of the examiners. The examiners were in complete agreement as to the result of the submission. The thesis (and viva) demonstrated clearly that the candidate had, on the basis of an in depth knowledge of the field of pataphysics and on the basis of well devised research questions: (a) had developed original tools within a ‘pataphysical search engine’ (which she described as a form of ‘Algorithmic Meta Creativity’) (b) applied and evaluated these tools in an innovative manner. In fact the development of measurement and evaluation criteria was itself a major component of the thesis, involving a cross-disciplinary comparison of the many different discussions on creativity, machine intelligence, creative computing and computer creativity. This she presented in the form of an ‘argued’ literature review which sought to synthesise an evaluation procedure which she then applied to her own original work. There were some excellent creative touches to the thesis presentation including preamble short text poems clearly generated by her website programs. The minor amendments requested by the examiners are not at all extensive and centre on the need to give the reader a single focal point – better to grasp the overall picture from a relatively wide range of ideas presented.

1. At the end of each chapter: a short summary of where it fits into the whole PhD structure. This to be related to -

2. A diagram of the total PhD structure, showing how the chapters feed the overall PhD: the design, construction and evaluation of the website tools. This pulls everything together to increase the impact of the PhD and its original output. The candidate can decide how best to present this and whether in the Introduction or the Conclusion to the thesis.

3. Sound and music are hardly referred to. In the ‘to be developed in future’ section a paragraph stating this as a given for this thesis but pointing out the potential for its development (possible reference: Hugill).

4. The References should immediately follow the main text before appendices and other such material.

5. The ‘ReadMe’ from the accompanying disc (or other media storage – disc may not be needed in final Library copy – to be checked with the GSO and Library) to be available in the main thesis as an appendix ‘How to run the website software’ – check that it works exactly from the instructions given there.

6. The internal examiner’s copy of the PhD (returned to the candidate at the conclusion of the viva) has marked up some typos for correction. [The examiners commended the candidate for the small number found!]
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