

Guidelines for selecting PhD thesis reviewers / Full disclosure statement requirement

The rules that follow should be considered as guidelines in keeping with the PhD regulations of Faculty MI (*cf. PhD regulations of Faculty MI – [de](#) / [en](#)*), reducing the rules to simpler straightforward cases on one hand and more complex and therefore stricter cases on the other (e.g. “summa”).

To assist in the selection process, a *full disclosure statement from the primary advisor* shall now be required when proposing PhD thesis reviewers. Possible conflicts of interest* must be elaborated and requests for exceptions explained and justified.
(The COI statement form shall no longer be used.)

General requirements for appointing PhD thesis reviewers

For evaluating each PhD thesis, at least two (2) reviewers are needed. One of these needs to be independent of the candidate in all cases and preferably also have no conflict of interest at all with the primary advisor.

At least one reviewer must be a professor of the Faculty MI. As a rule, this is the primary advisor. Advisors with supervision rights but without professorial status shall write a review but will need to name an additional reviewer with the appropriate status in Faculty MI. This person will either be independent of the main advisor and the candidate, satisfying the requirement for a second reviewer, or not, if acting as co-advisor or if COI criteria come into play. In the latter cases, an additional independent reviewer must be named.

In the case that the first two (independent) reviewers are from the same research institute, a third independent reviewer external to the institute (not necessarily the location) shall be required.

For the grade of "*summa cum laude*", at least three (3) reviewers are needed, i.e., an *additional* review from an *external* reviewer who is independent of the candidate and the advisor(s) is required.

Overall, the selection of PhD reviewers is under the purview of the Faculty's PhD committee and its chairperson.

* **General conflict-of-interest criteria** to be taken into consideration in disclosure statement
(based on various community sources)

1. First-degree relationship, marriage, life partnership, domestic partnership
2. Former PhD student-advisor relationship
3. Current or planned close scientific cooperation
4. Joint funding or joint funding application
5. Recent joint authorship of a scientific publication
6. Current employment or financial dependency