



31 January 2019

INFORMATION SHEET

Review of the dissertation to obtain a doctorate degree in agricultural sciences (Dr. sc. agr.)

(Last updated: February 2019)

The **review** should provide an evaluation of the dissertation, in particular in regard to the following questions:

- Is the topic suited for a doctoral dissertation, and are the objectives based on working hypotheses or research questions that were formed in a transparent and replicable way?
- Is the methodology applied to work on the question scientifically well-founded, and does it correspond to the current state of the art?
- Were the objectives achieved, and does the dissertation deliver original findings? Are the findings described correctly?
- Were the findings correctly interpreted and placed within the context of the current state of knowledge?
- Does the dissertation have a formally correct structure, is the language clear, and is it written in a scientifically correct way?

Finally, the review should include a recommendation of whether the dissertation should be accepted by the faculty, accepted with certain changes, or rejected.

To **grade** the dissertation and oral exam, according to Sec. 23 of the University of Hohenheim's Doctoral Regulations for the Faculties of Agricultural Sciences, Natural Sciences, and Business, Economics and Social Sciences (in effect as of 1 Feb 2019), the following grades are possible:

1.0 = very good	2.0 = good	3.0 = satisfactory
1.5 = between good and very good	2.5 = between satisfactory and good	4.0 = fail

The grade 3.5 may not be given.

For especially outstanding work in the dissertation, in **exceptional cases** the distinction "**0 = outstanding**" can be given. If both reviewers evaluate the dissertation as "0 = outstanding," a third review is obtained.

Only if the dissertation is evaluated with "0 = outstanding" by all reviewers and the oral defense is very good (0 = outstanding) will the doctorate be given the distinction "summa cum laude."

When evaluating the dissertation with "outstanding," the review should especially discuss whether important, unique, and new methodological knowledge was gained, whether the work has an outstanding concept and interpretation, whether the scientific findings provide prospects for the future, and whether the entire work is impressive in terms of argumentation and form.

signed

Chair of the Doctoral Committee