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 directo 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: Eleonora Monti………

Degree: PhD TITLE OF THESIS/DISSERTATION:
CURRENT APPROACHES AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN THE MANAGEMENT,

DIAGNOSIS AND TREATMENT OF CANINE MAMMARY

TUMORS………………………………………………………………………………………

………

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

Category	Rating	Comments
Research Questions/Set-up	A	
Literature Review	A	
Methodology	A	
Analysis/Presentation of Results	A	
Discussion/Implications	A	
Quality of Writing	A	
Overall Rating	A	

Additional Comments: Taking into consideration the wide, controversial and mostly retrospective clinical publications in the subject, authors have analyzed very thoroughly existing literature, even though in some of the covered aspects it is limited to description of different results or opinions, since so many factors vary among literature.

From the practical application in daily practice, it is obvious the need of well-designed larger, prospective studies with clearly differentiated groups of patients and homogenizing variables to be investigated, a frequent problem in veterinary oncology.

Nevertheless, authors have performed a serious and detailed review, well organized and structured with a clear and concise writing. .

Signature:_____   Print name: Enrique Rodriguez Grau-Bassas,

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.