Universität Konstanz

Universität Konstanz · Fach XXX · 78457 Konstanz

Prof. Dr. Max Mustermann

FB Informatik & Informationswissenschaft

Raum XXX
Universitätsstraße 10
78464 Konstanz
+49 7531 / 88 - XXXX
Fax: +49 7531 / 88 - XXXX

max.mustermann@uni.kn
http://XXXX.uni.kn

Frau Karolin Wurster
Zentrales Prüfungsamt
Universität Konstanz

Im Hause

24. 8. 2023

Gutachten zur Bachelorarbeit

Seite: 1 / 4

Name:	**Candidate Name**
Thema:	**Title Row 1**
	Title Row 2
Note:	**sehr gut (1,3)** Unterschrift:

Der Evaluierungsbogen für die detaillierte Begründung der Note findet sich auf den folgenden Seiten.

Universität
Konstanz

Bachelor Thesis Evaluation Form

Student name: Candidate Name
Student ID number: 01 / xxxxxx

Title of the thesis: Title Row 1
                      Title Row 2

☒ First Reviewer: Name of first reviewer
☐ Second Reviewer: Name of second reviewer

Introduction

	Very good			Fail	n/a
	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Does the introduction motivate the goals of the thesis and explain the context of the work? Does it point to existing solutions and their limitations? Is the research question formulated clearly? Does the contribution become clear?

Comments for criterion A. Nunc sed pede. Praesent vitae lectus. Praesent neque justo, vehicula eget, interdum id, facilisis et, nibh. Phasellus at purus et libero lacinia dictum. Fusce aliquet. Nulla eu ante placerat leo semper dictum. Mauris metus. Curabitur lobortis. Curabitur sollicitudin hendrerit nunc. Donec ultrices lacus id ipsum.

Related Work / Background

	Very good			Fail	n/a
	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

Does the thesis describe relevant related work and relevant background information in appropriate number and detail?

Comments for criterion B. Nunc sed pede. Praesent vitae lectus. Praesent neque justo, vehicula eget, interdum id, facilisis et, nibh. Phasellus at purus et libero lacinia dictum. Fusce aliquet. Nulla eu ante placerat leo semper dictum. Mauris metus. Curabitur lobortis. Curabitur sollicitudin hendrerit nunc. Donec ultrices lacus id ipsum.

Theoretical Analysis and Practical Description

	Very good			Fail	n/a
	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Is the proposed solution to the problem (e.g. theoretical approach, experiment, implementation) well described? Are proofs and theoretical analysis carried out carefully?

Comments for part C. Nunc sed pede. Praesent vitae lectus. Praesent neque justo, vehicula eget, interdum id, facilisis et, nibh. Phasellus at purus et libero lacinia dictum. Fusce aliquet. Nulla eu ante placerat leo semper dictum. Mauris metus. Curabitur lobortis. Curabitur sollicitudin hendrerit nunc. Donec ultrices lacus id ipsum.

Evaluation and Discussion

Very good   Fail   n/a

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐   ☐

Have sensible, well-justified experiments been performed? Are the results compared to the results of similar approaches? Are the obtained results discussed with respect to the goal of the thesis?

Comments for part D. Nunc sed pede. Praesent vitae lectus. Praesent neque justo, vehicula eget, interdum id, facilisis et, nibh. Phasellus at purus et libero lacinia dictum. Fusce aliquet. Nulla eu ante placerat leo semper dictum. Mauris metus. Curabitur lobortis. Curabitur sollicitudin hendrerit nunc. Donec ultrices lacus id ipsum.

Conclusion

Very good   Fail   n/a

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒   ☐

Does the conclusion state the results concisely and does it explain their significance? Do the results justify the conclusions? Does it restate limitations and open questions?

Comments for part E. Nunc sed pede. Praesent vitae lectus. Praesent neque justo, vehicula eget, interdum id, facilisis et, nibh. Phasellus at purus et libero lacinia dictum. Fusce aliquet. Nulla eu ante placerat leo semper dictum. Mauris metus. Curabitur lobortis. Curabitur sollicitudin hendrerit nunc. Donec ultrices lacus id ipsum.

Formal Aspects and Writing Style

Very good   Fail   n/a

☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐   ☐

Is the thesis well written, easy to read and is appropriate wording used? Are graphs, tables, formulas etc. well displayed? Is the overall thesis and the single chapters and paragraphs well-structured? Are all references cited correctly and is the bibliography formatted properly?

Comments for part F. Nunc sed pede. Praesent vitae lectus. Praesent neque justo, vehicula eget, interdum id, facilisis et, nibh. Phasellus at purus et libero lacinia dictum. Fusce aliquet. Nulla eu ante placerat leo semper dictum. Mauris metus. Curabitur lobortis. Curabitur sollicitudin hendrerit nunc. Donec ultrices lacus id ipsum.

Practical Skills and Working Style

Very good   Fail   n/a

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐   ☒

Does the thesis reflect an independent working style? Does it reflect critical and original thinking? Was the developed code correct, documented and efficient?

Comments for part G. Nunc sed pede. Praesent vitae lectus. Praesent neque justo, vehicula eget, interdum id, facilisis et, nibh. Phasellus at purus et libero lacinia dictum. Fusce aliquet. Nulla eu ante placerat leo semper dictum. Mauris metus. Curabitur lobortis. Curabitur sollicitudin hendrerit nunc. Donec ultrices lacus id ipsum.

Universität
Konstanz

Final Comments

Final comments. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

Grade:

very good (sehr gut):	☐ 1,0	☒ **1,3**	
good (gut):	☐ 1,7	☐ 2,0	☐ 2,3
satisfactory (befriedigend):	☐ 2,7	☐ 3,0	☐ 3,3
sufficient (ausreichend):	☐ 3,7	☐ 4,0	
fail (nicht ausreichend):	☐ 5,0		

Date: 24. 8. 2023   Reviewer signature: