

Instructions for a written critical review on degree projects at LTH

The critical review (a peer review) is to be both oral and written and both parts are to be assessed by the examiner of the student defending the project (the respondent). The reviewer is responsible for providing a written review of the degree project to both the respondent and the examiner, at the latest at the seminar at which the degree project is presented.

The role of the reviewer is to critically review the degree project and the presentation of it, and to contribute to a constructive discussion of the project. The reviewer's questions are to lead to a discussion that addresses, among other things, the practical and theoretical relevance of the degree project, the balance between the different parts of the project, methodological awareness and readability. The critical review is to conclude with an overall assessment mentioning the main strengths, weaknesses and areas for improvement in the project.

The critical review is not to be a page-by-page review of the project. If detailed comments have been made, these should be passed on to the respondents after the seminar. The following questions can serve as aids to the critical review:

- Are objectives, issues and limitations clear and relevant?
- Is the methodology well described and is the choice of method appropriate?
- Is it clear what parts are results of the degree project and what parts come from other sources?
- Are the arguments for claims, interpretations and conclusions well-founded, logical, convincing and credible?
- Are the conclusions reasonable in relation to the content, methods and results of the project?
- Do conclusions and results fulfil the aims and objectives of the project?
- How does the project take into account relevant societal and ethical aspects?
- Is the language used correct and adapted to the target audience?
- Is the project well laid out and are tables and diagrams illustrative and easily accessible?
- Are sources and references to related work relevant and well described? Are important references missing, or are unnecessary references included?
- Are there points that are unclear in the project?
- What could be improved and what could have been done differently?