

(please complete on the computer)

Reviewer proposals - supplement to the application for the opening of the doctoral examination procedure

**To the Vice Dean
Faculty of Biological Sciences
Bachstraße 18k
07743 Jena**

Based on the attached thesis (dissertation) entitled

I propose the reviewers listed overleaf.

.....

Acknowledgement
by the supervisor:

.....

As a general rule, reviewers must be professors, persons holding the “Habilitation” postdoctoral teaching qualification, or leaders of junior research groups accepted by the Faculty of Biological Sciences. If a reviewer from abroad does not meet these requirements, the Faculty Council shall decide on the qualification equivalence. In that case a scientific CV of the proposed reviewer has to be submitted together with this form.

→ Continue on pages 2 and 3

For the evaluation of my doctoral thesis, I propose the reviewers listed below, based on § 7 Para. 1 of the Doctoral examination regulations of the Faculty of Biological Sciences:

Reviewer 1

This reviewer must be a member of the Faculty of Biological Sciences.

Reviewer 1	has agreed	was requested	was not requested
------------	------------	---------------	-------------------

Reviewer 2

This reviewer is usually a member of the Faculty of Biological Sciences, a member of the University of Jena or a member of a scientific institution based in Jena. However, an independent person is also possible.

Full institutional address
reviewer 2:

E-Mail reviewer 2:

ORCID reviewer 2
(if available):

Reviewer 2	has agreed	was requested	was not requested
------------	------------	---------------	-------------------

Reviewer 3 (external review)

He/she shall neither be, or have been in the last five years a member or associate of the University, a member of any other scientific institution in Jena nor have produced any joint publications with the doctoral candidate or the supervisor(s) in the last three years (based on § 7 Para. 1 of the Doctoral examination regulations).

Full institutional address
reviewer 3:

E-Mail reviewer 3:

ORCID reviewer 3
(if available):

Reviewer 3	has agreed	was requested	was not requested
------------	------------	---------------	-------------------

Optional (but strongly recommended): Proposals for substitute reviewers

Substitute for reviewer 1

Reviewer 1 has agreed was requested was not requested

Substitute for reviewer 2

Full institutional address
reviewer 2:

E-Mail reviewer 2:

ORCID reviewer 2
(if available):

Reviewer 2 has agreed was requested was not requested

Substitute for reviewer 3 (auswärtiges Gutachten)

Full institutional address
reviewer 3:

E-Mail reviewer 3:

ORCID reviewer 3
(if available):

Reviewer 3 has agreed was requested was not requested