



POSTGRADUATE STUDIES  
**EXAMINER's REPORT**  
**EXAMPLE 2: MTech Dissertation**

**1. Positive remarks**

The candidate succeeded in compiling a logical research plan; formulate a problem and hypothesis, and investigate the problem according to scientific methods. The dissertation is technically well presented and neat, the literature study is reasonable. The language is acceptable; reporting and references are fairly consistent. The study is appropriate and relevant in its context.

**2. Negative remarks**

The report of the study is, in my opinion, on the thin side in all chapters. Avoid two headings following each other with an empty space. The most important criticism is that the relationship between the conclusions and recommendations is not very clear, because there seem to be contradictions as it is at present written Examples are:

**Title page:**

Change to the newly accepted shorter title 'Interface integrity of core material bonded to intra-radicular posts'.

**Page 7**

DTS should be written in full as on page 49. On page 49 only the abbreviation should be used

**Page 11**

Change 2 to two-year

**Page 17**

Reference used twice in same paragraph. Replace the second one with 'They'.

**Page 31**

Change polymerization with "polymerization".

**Page 77**

Rewrite the last paragraph. 'It is suggested that an *in vitro* study can be done using directly, as well as indirectly manufactured aesthetic intra-radicular posts and cores to determine whether any difference may exist in the success rate of the restorations. An *in vitro* study should also be done to determine the clinical success rate of direct and indirect aesthetic intra-radicular posts and cores.'

**3. General**

From a technical point of view, and from a possible clinical point of view, the study was executed well and seems to be relevant. There are, from an academic point of view, certain weaknesses in the report of the study. The report could have been more comprehensive.

**4. Conclusions**

In my opinion, the candidate has proven that he/she could identify a research problem, investigate it scientifically and report the study results appropriately. The candidate should pass with a mark of 60%.

Prof RR (Supervisor): \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

