Report of the Preliminary Defence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the PhD researcher:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of the PhD:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the Supervisor:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of the preliminary defence:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The preliminary defence takes place behind closed doors. The PhD researcher is heard and questioned by the Examination Committee.

The discussion between the PhD researcher and the Examination Committee may include the following elements:

- Scientific value: originality, independence, depth
- Aim and relevance of the research
- Scientific methodology
- Interpretation of the data
- Validity of the conclusions
- Literature and references
- Form of the manuscript: use of language, form, style, structure and layout.

After having heard the candidate the Examination Committee draws up a report of the preliminary defence, which is signed by the members present, and formulates a recommendation:

☐ 1: **The manuscript is accepted**, possibly with some adjustments. This implies that the PhD researcher is permitted to publically defend and a date for this can be set. The PhD researcher submits the revised manuscript and a discussion sheet to the examination committee before the public defence (the examination committee does not need to re-evaluate the manuscript itself). In the discussion sheet, the PhD researcher gives a detailed summary of how the various questions and recommendations of the examination committee have been taken into account in the revised version of the manuscript.

☐ 2: **Revision: approval with reservation**. This implies that the PhD researcher needs to submit a revised manuscript and a discussion sheet and that (some members of) the examination committee will re-evaluate the manuscript. The examination committee decides on the details of the procedure (electronic procedure is possible). If some members of the examination committee do not agree with the improvements proposed by the candidate, a new meeting of the examination committee and the PhD researcher will be organised so that the examination committee can make a re-evaluation.

☐ 3: **The manuscript is rejected**. The chair of the examination committee contacts the chair of the Faculty Doctoral Committee to set up an appropriate procedure.
The Examination Committee adds the following information to its recommendation:

1. If the Examination Committee agrees to already set a date for the public defence:
   - Take into account that the public defence can only take place after all the members of the Examination Committee have fully approved the manuscript.
     - Date and time: ………………………………………………………………………………………
     - Location: ………………………………………………………………………………………

2. If a written follow-up procedure is necessary before the manuscript can be accepted:
   - Deadline for the PhD candidate to send the improved manuscript to the Committee:
     ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   - Which members of the Examination Committee need to receive the improved manuscript?
     ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………
     ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………
     ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………
     ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………
     ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   - By which date will the Faculty Administration receive news from the Examination Committee about their approval of the manuscript (this needs to be at least 3 weeks before the foreseen date of the public defence): …………………

3. If a second preliminary defence is necessary before the manuscript can be approved:
   - Date and time: ………………………………………………………………………………………
   - Location: ……………………………………………………………………………………………

4. Which remarks does the Examination Committee have (positive and/or negative elements):
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………
5. Which improvements -- if any- does the PhD candidate need to make to the PhD manuscript?

If necessary, add a document to this form. If the remarks of the Examination Committee will be communicated to the PhD candidate in a separate document or email, make sure to mention this below.

6. If the manuscript is rejected, explicitly state all the elements that have led up to this decision and include a solid motivation:
The members of the Examination Committee can approve by signing the signature sheet which the PhD researcher downloaded via KULoket or by signing the next page:

Names and signatures of the members of the Examination Committee who were present at the presentation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Secretary of the Examination Committee needs to hand in this form to the Faculty Administration. The Faculty Administration will upload this form into the personal PhD file of the PhD researcher, where it will be available for the PhD researcher and the members of the Examination Committee.