**REVIEW**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title of the thesis:** |  |
|  |  |
| **Author:** |  |
|  |  |
| **Reviewer:** |  |

***Hint:*** *Please mark the assessments with ”X” in the corresponding box of each point. If desired, you can add more specific comments to the boxes below the assessments.*

**1. Research problem, aim of the graduation thesis, research questions, hypotheses**

**Research topic, the need/importance of research** – the definition of the research topic, its topicality and level of challenge; the justification of the need/importance of the research and its reliance on relevant source-based arguments.

**Research problem** – clarity of definition.

**Objective of the thesis** – concreteness, connection to the research problem and accordance with the thesis title.

**Research questions/tasks/hypotheses** – clarity of wording, logic, connection to the aim and research problem.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| Failed | Poor | Satisfactory | Good | Very good | Excellent |
| *Add a comment* |

**2.** **Theoretical/empirical background**

**A review of the scientific and field-specific literature** - the positioning of the research problem in a broader theoretical-conceptual context and the quality of explanation of the main concepts, approaches, processes, methods used in the work. Relevance to the research problem and research questions identified and the suitability of the approaches chosen to address and solve the research problem. Critical, comparative, synthesising treatment of sources to create a logical whole. If hypotheses are used, they should derive directly from a theory and/or previous research.

**References/sources** - relevance, suitability, adequacy and correctness of interpretation.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| Failed | Poor | Satisfactory | Good | Very good | Excellent |

|  |
| --- |
| *Add a comment* |

**3. Research methods and data**

**The empirical material/data/sample** - adequacy and sufficiency to address the research problem. Systematic and verifiable data collection.

**Methodology and research methods** – relevance, clarity of description, justification of the relevance and sufficiency for achieving the research objective and answering the research questions. Description of the relevant limitations and possible ethical concerns.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| Failed | Poor | Satisfactory | Good | Very good | Excellent |

|  |
| --- |
| *Add a comment* |

**4.** **Solving the research problem/analytical quality of the research**

**Presentation of results** – systematic, understandable, supported by illustrative tools.

**Analysis and discussion** - clarity, logic and argumentation based on the theoretical framework, previous empirical data and empirical data collected during the work. The extent to which the research questions have been answered and the objectives of the work have been met.

**Conclusions and proposals** – clarity, being based on the analysis carried out; addressing the strengths and weaknesses of the study; highlighting the scientific and practical value of the results; outlining future research opportunities.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| Failed | Poor | Satisfactory | Good | Very good | Excellent |

|  |
| --- |
| *Add a comment* |

**5. Formatting quality**

**Work structure**– balance and relevance.

**Language use and professional terminology** – fluency, consistency of writing style, compliance with scientific language requirements, terminological accuracy.

**Citing** - citation of all sources used, consistency of the list of references with parenthetical and int-text references, correctness of the formatting of references and of quotations.

**Other formatting requirements** – the extent of following other formatting requirements.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| Failed | Poor | Satisfactory | Good | Very good | Excellent |

|  |
| --- |
| *Add a comment* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strengths of the thesis:** |  |
|  |  |
| **Weaknesses of the thesis:** |  |
|  |  |
| **Questions:** | 1.2.3. |
| **Grade suggested by the reviewer:** |  |
|  |  |
| **Signature:** |  | **Date:** |  |

Assessment scale (see evaluation criteria):

5 (“A”) – “Excellent”

4 (“B”) – “Very good”

3 (“C”) – “Good”

2 (“D”) – “Satisfactory”

1 (“E”) – “Poor”

0 (“F”) – “Failed”