

Reviewer's Report for Milestone 3

Written Output and Oral Presentation

Higher Degree by Research Students

STUDENT ID

SURNAME

GIVEN NAME/S

ENROLLING SCHOOL

COURSE NAME

THESIS TITLE

Research Argument and Original Contribution

Please select one of the following:

- ☐ 1 - Very Weak
- ☐ 2 - Needs major improvement
- ☐ 3 - Adequate
- ☐ 4 - Strong
- ☐ 5 - Excellent

Reviewers should comment on the clarity and focus of the research questions, the coherence of the central argument, and how logically it is developed within the Milestone 3 written submission (approx. 3,000 words and distinct from the written output produced at Milestone 2). Feedback on the originality of the contribution and the significance of the research within its field is strongly encouraged.

Comments:

Structure, Coherence, and Thesis Readiness

Please select one of the following:

- ☐ 1 - Very poor structure/readiness
- ☐ 2 - Significant issues
- ☐ 3 - Mostly sound with some gaps
- ☐ 4 - Well-structured
- ☐ 5 - Submission-ready

Reviewers should comment on the logical flow of ideas within the Milestone 3 written submission, including clarity of writing, use of academic tone, and overall presentation. Feedback may also address how well the literature and analysis are integrated, and whether the thesis appears to be progressing toward submission readiness.

Comments:

Methodology and Interpretation of Findings

Please select one of the following:

- ☐ 1 - Inappropriate or unclear
- ☐ 2 - Major gaps/concerns
- ☐ 3 - Adequate
- ☐ 4 - Sound and well-documented
- ☐ 5 - Exemplary and rigorous

Reviewers should comment on the clarity and justification of the research design as outlined in the Milestone 3 written submission. Feedback may also include observations on the transparency of data collection and analysis, alignment between methods and research questions, interpretation of findings, and any discussion of limitations or ethical considerations.

Comments:

Oral Presentation and Communication

Please select one of the following:

- ☐ 1 - Very unclear or poorly delivered
- ☐ 2 - Needs improvement
- ☐ 3 - Adequate
- ☐ 4 - Clear and engaging
- ☐ 5 - Excellent and highly effective

Reviewers should comment on the clarity, structure, and delivery of the oral presentation. Feedback may include the students ability to communicate their research aims, methods, findings, and significance to an academic audience. Reviewers may also comment on the students engagement with questions and confidence in responding to feedback.

Comments:

Suggestions for Final Thesis Development

Reviewers are invited to provide any additional suggestions that may support the student in finalising their thesis for examination. This may include recommendations on content, structure, argument development, presentation, or other areas requiring refinement.

Comments:

Overall Reviewer Recommendation

- ☐ 1 - Not yet ready, significant work required
- ☐ 2 - Revisions to the Thesis Review Panel satisfaction. Second oral presentation required
- ☐ 3 - Revisions to the Thesis Review Panel satisfaction. No oral presentation required
- ☐ 4 - Approved with no revisions OR minor revisions

Final Comments:

**Signature of
Reviewer**

Date

(DD/MM/YY)

**Name of
Reviewer**

**The completed Milestone 3 reviewer's reports are to be submitted to the Thesis Chair. The Thesis Chair will coordinate the submission of the overall report via the online Milestone report form.*