**Thesis (PHD) Evaluation Form**

It is the coordinator/student’s responsibility to distribute this form along with their thesis to each member evaluator of the thesis. After the evaluation, the form should be submitted to the PhD director by email. (Prof. Beniamino Cenci Goga Dipartimento di Medicina Veterinaria, via San Costanzo 4, 06124 Perugia Italy. Tel + 39 075 5857929; email beniamino.cencigoga@unipg.it)

**Student's Name: VALERIA TOPPI**


**Degree: PhD TITLE OF THESIS/DISSERTATION:**

****

**Rating range A-D (ex.A = excellent B = good C = sufficient)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Category | Rating | Comments |
| |  | | --- | | Research Questions/Set-up: The research question is well-defined and relevanto.  The study is justified based on a lack of previous knowledge | | | | | A |  |
| |  | | --- | | Literature Review: The literature review provides a comprehensive and up-to-date overview of antimicrobial resistance and the use of hemp extracts in medical and veterinary fields | | | | | A |  |
| Methodology: The methodology is described in detail, with an adequate justification of the experimental protocols used. The statistical analysis techniques are appropriate. | | | | A |  |
| |  | | --- | | Analysis/Presentation of Results: The results are well-structured and supported. by quantitative data and clear images.  The statistical analyses are robust and clarify significant differences between the treated groups. | | | | | A |  |
| |  | | --- | | Discussion/Implications : The discussion is well-structured and effectively relates the results to the existing literature | | | | | A |  |
| |  | | --- | | Quality of Writing: The writing style is clear, and the scientific language is appropriate.  The document is well-organized and follows a coherent logical structure. | | | | | A |  |
| |  | | --- | | **Overall Rating :** **The thesis is well-structured and methodologically rigorous, with a robust analytical approach** | | | | | A |  |
|  | | | |  |  |

Additional Comments: The approach is methodologically rigorous and consistent with established microbiological research standards.

Signature:  Print name PATRIZIA NEBBIA

***Please review the attached evaluation guidelines and provide your assessment below.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Grade Descriptive Anchors** |
| **Research Question/Set-up** | |  |  | | --- | --- | | A | Includes clear description of the issue, identifies gaps in scientific knowledge and/or provides justification for the current research study. | | B | Research questions clearly articulated and sufficient background information included. | | C | Lacks a focused research question and importance is not completely justified. | |
| **Literature Review** | |  |  | | --- | --- | | A | Identifies relevant research and literature and accurately summarizes and integrates the information. | | B | Cites major works and places them in context. | | C | Fails to cite or assimilate previous works. | |
| **Methodology** | |  |  | | --- | --- | | A | Demonstrates clear understanding and proper use of methodology, identifies relevant strengths and weaknesses of methods used. | | B | Demonstrates proficient knowledge of methodology and gives justification for selection of methods. | | C | The methodology is not well appropriate for study and understanding is not clearly demonstrated. | |
| **Analysis/**  **Presentation of Results** | |  |  | | --- | --- | | A | Results interpreted in light of proposed research question and existing literature. Includes alternative explanations and instructional tables and graphs. | | B | Results clearly summarized, discussion of results focused and tied to research question. | | C | Presentation lacks focus, tables are unorganized, and results produce no insight into proposed question. | |
| **Discussion/ Implications** | |  |  | | --- | --- | | A | Clearly summarizes the key information gained from the study and describes advancement of knowledge or new insights on an issue. | | B | Discussion of results focused and connected to research questions. Implications for future research discussed. | | C | The new knowledge gained from the study and implications of the study are not clearly discussed. | |
| **Quality of Writing** | |  |  | | --- | --- | | A | Ideas expressed with very good clarity, logic, and conciseness. | | B | Coherent presentation with limited typos and grammatical errors. Logical progression of thought within overall thesis and within each section. | | C | Significant parts difficult to understand, numerous errors. Repetition, poor organization of ideas, and poor writing hinders reader understanding. | |