

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--|----------------|--|
| Student Name: | | Number: | |
| Title of Project: | | | |
| MSc Specialization: | | Date: | |

Please review the Research Topics outcome, addressing the most relevant of the following issues:

- **Mastery of the subject:** did the student embrace the subject of the Research Topic and make it his/her own?
- **Background and prior work:** did the student do a good literature research, identifying relevant prior work?
- **Research question:** did the student formulate clear and specific research question or problem statement?
- **Approach:** did the student define a viable approach to address the research questions?
- **Initial Results** (optional): if there are initial results, do they form a good basis for building upon in the Final Project?
- **Quality of writing:** is the Research Topics report of sufficient quality in structure and writing? Is it the student's own work?
- **Process:** was the student sufficiently independent and self-driven, setting the agenda and working with limited supervision?

Especially those of the above issues should be addressed that are above or below average (where the average should be equated to "satisfactory", or grade 7.0). Please provide enough feedback to (i) justify the grade and (ii) enable the student to improve his/her performance for the Final Project where necessary.

Final grade based on the above (half-point grades on scale 1.0-10.0 except 5.5, see below for meaning):

Examiner (ultimately responsible for the grade, appointed by the Examination Board)

| Name | Signature | Date | S ¹ |
|------|-----------|------|----------------|
| | | | |

Other supervisors, if any (need not sign, but may do so if they desire)

| Name | Signature | Date | S ¹ |
|------|-----------|------|----------------|
| | | | |
| | | | |

Final grade scale

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| 1.0: very poor | 2.0: poor | 3.0: very insufficient | 4.0: insufficient | 5.0: below sufficient |
| 6.0: sufficient | 7.0: satisfactory | 8.0: good | 9.0: very good | 10.0: excellent |

¹ Mark the column S with X for those staff members who actually co-supervised the thesis – this affects the assignment of ECs to research groups