

UNIVERSITY OF DEBRECEN



QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN

**Gyula Petrányi Doctoral School of Allergy and
Clinical Immunology**

2020

Content

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. The doctoral school, leader of the school, doctoral school council | 2 |
| 2. The core members of the doctoral school | 3 |
| 3. Teachers and tutors of the doctoral school | 4 |
| 4. Announcement of doctoral dissertation topics | 5 |
| 5. Admission to the PhD education | 6 |
| 5.1. The admission scoring system | 7 |
| 6. PhD training | 7 |
| 7. Monitoring of the progress of PhD students | 10 |
| 8. Study and language requirements..... | 11 |
| 9. PhD degree obtaining requirements | 12 |
| 9.1. Ethical aspects | 13 |
| 9.2. Publication requirements | 15 |
| 9.3. Dissertation and its abstract..... | 17 |
| 9.4. Preliminary defence | 17 |
| 9.5. Application to a public defence | 22 |
| 9.6. Public defence, dissertation defence board..... | 23 |
| 10. Student's feedback | 26 |
| 11. Documentation | 26 |
| Appendix 1: Accreditation form for supervisors..... | 27 |
| Appendix 2: List of items for preliminary defence | 28 |
| Appendix 3: Application to a preliminary defence | 29 |
| Appendix 4: documents to be submitted when applying for the PhD qualification process.... | 31 |
| Appendix 5: Quality assurance questionnaire for students | 32 |

Quality Assurance Plan of the Gyula Petrányi Doctoral School of Allergy and Clinical Immunology

To provide a unified quality of the PhD trainings at the doctoral schools under the University of Debrecen Medical Science Doctoral Council's (henceforward: MSDC), the MSDC created the Operational Regulations of the Medical Science Doctoral Council, which contains the operational regulations of the individual schools. The rules of the operational regulations are valid for all doctoral schools. The regulations are available at the Doctoral School's webpage (<http://kiadi.unideb.hu>). The composition of this regulation was made by consideration of the principles in the Operational Regulations.

1. The doctoral school, leader of the school, doctoral school council

Leader of the DSACI: Andrea Szegedi M.D., PhD., D.Sc.
Department of Dermatology
University of Debrecen Faculty of Medicine
Department of Dermatological Allergology

Scientific area: medical science

Field of discipline: clinical medicine

Research field: immunology,
rheumatology,
allergology,
infectology,
primary immunodeficiencies

Council of Gyula Petrányi Doctoral School of Allergy and Clinical Immunology

The principles of the composition and tasks of the doctoral schools' council (henceforward: DSC) are contained in the MSDC Operational Regulations 1.§. 13.

Voting Members of the Doctoral School's Council:

Andrea Szegedi M.D., PhD., D.Sci. the leader of the school, signing authority in the school matters

Péter Antal – Szalmás M.D., PhD., D.Sci. core member, signing authority in the school matters in the absence of the leader

Edit Bodolay M.D., PhD., D.Sci. core member

Katalin Dankó M.D., PhD., D.Sci., core member

Attila Bácsi M.D., PhD, core member

Ádám Kemény-Beke M.D., PhD, core member

Tünde Tarr M.D., PhD, tutor

Antónia Szántó M.D., PhD, tutor

Beáta Tóth Lajszné Ph.D., core member, secretary of the doctoral school

Member of the doctoral school with consulting rights:

1 person who is a PhD student representative (between 1st of September 2018 and 31st of August: Orsolya Somogyi PhD student)

The MSDC holds a meeting twice in every semester, and in case of necessity, monthly. The MSDC can return a verdict electronically in the following topics: approval of the offered courses, starting tutorial accreditation process, starting prior dispute.

Simple majority is enough to the decisions.

The meetings are organised by the secretary of the doctoral school. The petitions requires the decision of the MSDC (for example: applying for pre-defence, before submission to the MSDC: changing supervisor, tutorial accreditation and entry application to the doctoral school etc.) the required documents must be given to the secretary of the doctoral school.

Tasks of the Medical Science Doctoral Council: see MSDC operational regulations 1.§. 13. Point

Tasks of the Doctoral School's leader: see MSDC operational regulations 1.§. 8. point

Tasks of the secretary of the Doctoral School: see MSDC operational regulations 1.§. 14. point

2. The core members of the doctoral school

Researchers with outstanding scientific achievements, who can establish the productive operation of the doctoral school. The research works of the core members are active, continuous and their success is documented. They regularly publish in international medical scientific journals and the effect of their publications can be measured by independent citations. The core members of the doctoral school have at least one PhD postdoctoral fellow in their team. The core members regularly announce research topics and mentoring the PhD students' research.

3. Teachers and tutors of the doctoral school

The tutor accreditation petition approved by the leadership of the Gyula Petrányi Doctoral School of Allergy and Clinical Immunology must be applied to the Medical Science Doctoral Council earliest 3 years after gaining the Ph.D. degree.

We consider with great importance the continuous (yearly) supervision of publication activity, the competition activity, and the Ph.D supervisor activity, as well as hosting theoretical and practical courses along with modern achievements related to the school's science fields. The teachers and tutors of the doctoral school are listed in the doctoral school's database (www.doktori.hu), and in case they are tutoring in more doctoral school, the tutor must declare in his/her own data sheet to which school how many percentages he/she belongs. The doctoral school reviews its tutors' list annually. Those who did not held at least one credit value course in the last 4 reviewed semesters (announcing the course/participant tutor) or who did not announce course and / or supervise one, he /she needs to be deleted from the tutors' list.

The current training plans, subjects and tutors' public informant can be found on the regularly renewed webpage of the doctoral school.

The quality assurance principles regarding the topic announcements and the supervisors are found in the next chapter.

4. Announcement of doctoral dissertation topics

The Council of the Doctoral School shall evaluate each topic and give its consent to the announcement of only those where the intellectual, infrastructural and material background of research is ensured and where it deems realistic that a high-quality dissertation could be submitted within 3 years following the complex examination.

Topic announcers are especially expected to perform an active researcher's activity, and that the indicators of their scientific publications published within 5 years before the announcement of the topic exceed the publication requirements of the Doctoral School regarding the obtaining of the PhD degree. The topic announcer is expected to confirm to have the material resources for the funding of the research.

Those topic announcers shall become supervisors in the case of whose announced topics students applying to the topic are admitted and enrol to the Doctoral School. Each PhD student shall be assigned to a supervisor who shall orientate and support the studies and research work of the PhD student working on the topic and preparation of the candidate for the PhD degree obtaining. By way of exception, a co-supervisor may also be named in addition to the supervisor in professionally justified cases as approved by the Doctoral and Habilitation Board of the University (DHBU) when supported by the DCMS (subject to the submission of a special request, see the DRs). Double supervision is possible only in the case of a training performed in the framework of international cooperation or of an interdisciplinary research topic.

The Doctoral School shall support the assignment of a maximum of 2 PhD students to one and the same supervisor in a single admission period. Deviation from this rule shall be possible in especially justified cases only. When approving the supervisor's assignment, the Doctoral Board of the scientific field shall take into consideration the efficiency of the former supervisory activity.

5. Admission to the PhD education

Our University provides two forms of organised PhD training: full-time (on state grant or self-financed) and correspondence (self-financed, besides working). The Scientific Directorate shall announce admission opportunities and admission conditions jointly, based on the data provision of Doctoral Boards of scientific fields, broken down by scientific field and Doctoral School in the national university application brochure and on the webpage of the university.

Those Hungarian and foreign citizens may apply to an organised PhD training who have a diploma testifying a degree and qualification obtained in the master level training of a Hungarian or foreign university or a diploma testifying an equivalent university-level degree and qualification or who are going to obtain it in the year of the admission. The applicant should have a state-recognised complex (confirming oral and verbal skills, formerly type “C”) language exam of medium level as a minimum (corresponding to level B2 of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages of the Council of Europe) or an equivalent state-recognised language exam in English. No admission scores may be granted for a language exam. As regards application to medical Doctoral Schools, a state-recognised complex (confirming oral and verbal skills, formerly type “C”) language exam in English of medium level as a minimum (corresponding to level B2 of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages of the Council of Europe) is expected since it is required for the participants of the medical doctoral training for obtaining the degree. No admission scores may be granted for a language exam.

Admission to the doctoral training is subject to application to PhD topics announced at www.doktori.hu on a national level, following a successful hearing by the admission board.

The application form (see Appendix 2 of the DCMS DRs) shall be available at the PhD Office. The deadline for the application is 15 May or, for a training starting in February, 15 November.

Admission requirements have been determined to ensure the proper educational background and a positive attitude to research work of the admitted students. Most important requirements are a degree of good quality, excellent language proficiency, outstanding achievements at Student’s Scientific Associations, other scientific work and a well-conceived research programme. The latter involves the professional competence of the supervisor, the research infrastructure and the funding ensuring its material background.

Admitted students should sign a statement upon enrolling to the effect that they have studied the doctoral rules and the requirements of the Doctoral Schools and that they understood their rights and obligations based on these (see Appendix 19 of MBD DRs).

5.1. The admission scoring system

Applicants to Doctoral Schools belonging to the DCMS shall undergo a uniform admission procedure. Only applications previously checked by the Secretary of the Doctoral School and bearing the supporting signature of the Head of the Doctoral School may be submitted.

6. PhD training

The full-time training shall consist of eight semesters (48 months). The training shall be organised by the Doctoral Board of the scientific field involving the Doctoral School boards. They shall provide for the announcement of courses, the management of study matters, the required completion of semesters and the payment of grants.

The studies and research of the candidate shall be orientated by the supervisor. By way of exception a co-supervisor may also be named in addition to the supervisor in professionally justified cases as approved by the Doctoral and Habilitation Board of the University. The supervisor shall make a proposal on the training and research plan of the PhD student and is responsible for its quality and implementation; shall ensure regular professional consultation opportunities; shall confirm the completion of research tasks in every semester; shall support the PhD student in writing scientific publications, and in the preparation of the doctoral dissertation; shall support him in being awarded scholarships abroad; shall confirm that the candidate played a determining role in achieving the results of the dissertation by their independent creative activity; and shall suggest the acceptance of the dissertation.

1st and 2nd year students are allowed to request the change of their supervisor (Appendix 24 to the DRs). If the research topic changes, the new research topic as approved by the Head of the Doctoral School shall be attached, too. In the case of applications submitted following a successful complex examination, the supervisor may be changed in especially justified cases only.

Courses to which the student registered shall be supervised by the supervisor. The student may register to any course as announced by the Doctoral Schools of the medical field if the latter fits their training orientation. The Doctoral School shall encourage the participation of its student in delivering independent topic reports based on the processing of the international literature. Requirements of the Doctoral School are detailed in the Educational Plan of the Doctoral School.

Study requirements are measured by study points (credit points). Credit points are the measurement units of the study, teaching and research work aiming at the completion of the obligations of PhD students in the doctoral training. Study credit points may be obtained by the PhD students by learning and reporting at the examination. PhD students shall obtain 30 ± 3 credit points by semester and 240 credit points altogether during the whole training programme. The mandatory number of credits to be obtained in the first four semesters of the medical doctoral training shall be 12.

- If the PhD student fails to obtain the required number of credit points due to his or her fault in a given semester, the DCMS shall decide on the suspension of the payment of the PhD grant. Should the PhD student fail to make up for his or her missing credits within a year, the DCMS may decide on the termination of the student relationship.

In the case of medical Doctoral Schools, 240 credit points shall be obtained by the students broken down as follows (for a detailed description of each credit points and the conditions of the completion, see the relevant points):

- *training credit points – at least 12 credit points to be obtained during the first four semesters of the training;*
- *research credit points – 27 credit points by semester, and 216 credit points altogether;*
- *dissertation credit points – 6 credit points altogether, in the research and dissertation stage;*
- *credit points to be obtained for other performance – 6 credit points as a maximum (teaching activity, conference presentation, supervisory work, or may be obtained as training credit points).*

The PhD student shall obtain the majority of the 240 credit points as required during the training (180-228 credit points) in the form of research credit points. 1 credit point: 30 working hours. The obtaining of the credit points shall be confirmed by the supervisor *based on the written report* submitted by the PhD student in every semester. This confirmation shall be a necessary condition to the successful closing of the semester. The PhD student shall submit his or her end-of-semester reports following the closing of the semester to the Head of the Doctoral School.

- *27 credit points per semester should be obtained by research activity in the first stage of the training (first four semesters, training and research stage) and in its second half (research and dissertation stage).*

The Doctoral School encourages and, in some cases, supports partial training and experience gaining of PhD students in Hungary and abroad, and their attendance at conferences in Hungary and abroad. The PhD student may participate in the partial training according to a work programme as approved by the supervisor which ensures the validity of the given study period in the doctoral training programme of the university. The partial training shall be subject to the consent of the DCMS based on the suggestion of the supervisor and the letter of acceptance of the foreign institution. For the whole duration of the training, a maximum of 6 credit points may be obtained by conference presentations or posters. The value of the conference credit points shall be determined by the Secretary of the doctoral committee, based on an application approved by the Head of the competent Doctoral School.

Participation in the supervision of the work of a student preparing his or her thesis or Student's Scientific Association paper shall be earn a maximum of 4 credit points (supervision alone – 2 credit points/student, supervision in cooperation – 1 credit point/student). Credit points shall be determined by the Secretary of the Doctoral Committee, based on the confirmation of the supervisor of the PhD student and granted by the Secretary of the Doctoral Committee or the PhD administrator. The completed thesis and/or confirmation of the Student's Scientific Association paper/presentation shall be attached to the application. (One supervised student may be taken into consideration only once, even if he prepared both a thesis and Student's Scientific Association paper.)

7. Monitoring of the progress of PhD students

Based on the MDS DRs, the Doctoral School shall evaluate the progress of the students at least once a year. In the Doctoral School , the following system shall be adhered to:

- During the doctoral training, the PhD student shall be compulsorily qualified. The Doctoral School shall evaluate the progress (training, research work) of the students at least once a year. The result of the evaluation shall be documented in writing, with a proposal to change the person of the supervisor or to re-assign the PhD student on state grant to the self-financed system, where necessary.
- The annual symposium of the students of Doctoral Schools is the compulsory qualification. The Doctoral School organises annual PhD symposiums which shall be attended by all students delivering a presentation. The student shall prepare an abstract for the symposium (**Appendix 8 to the Educational Plan**). In their presentation, the PhD student shall summarise the results of their research work.
- For the obtaining of research credit points, the PhD student shall prepare a written report in every semester, sending it to the head of the Doctoral School. Content and formal requirements of the report are laid down in **Appendix 4 to the Educational Plan**.
- The student shall prepare the written report required for the obtaining of the research credit points supplemented by the supervisor's assessment (**Appendix 5 to the Educational Plan**) and submit it to the Secretary of the Doctoral School every year. The Doctoral School Board shall assess the reports.
- During the doctoral training, a complex examination shall be taken closing the training and research stage of the training and as a precondition for starting the research and dissertation stage at the end of the fourth semester, measuring and evaluating the study and research progress.

The Doctoral School introduced the tutorial system for full-time PhD students on state grant as from the academic year 2018/2019. Its primary aim is to monitor the training and scientific activity of PhD students, the recognition of eventual problems and suggestion to solve them. Tutors do not have to orientate the professional work (which is exclusively a supervisory task) or to professionally evaluate the scientific results, either. However, tutors may provide advice and support. Tutors shall cooperate with the Council of the Doctoral School in performing their tasks. They shall check whether the student progresses properly in his or her research work, whether it is realistic that he would meet his or her publication requirement by the deadline, whether he complies with his or her training requirements, whether he performs teaching work, the number of classes he delivers in addition to the obligatory teaching task, the extent of its burden, whether there is a proper professional relationship between the PhD student and his or her supervisor, the future plans the PhD student (job opportunity etc.).

8. Study and language requirements

In medical Doctoral Schools, 240 credit points shall be obtained during the eight semesters of the training.

- The number of training (study) credit points to be compulsorily obtained shall be 12 as a minimum in the medical PhD training. The rules are detailed in the Educational Plan of the Doctoral School.

The obtaining of the PhD degree is subject to passing a complex (type “C”) state language exam of medium level and a university language exam qualified as excellent (5) or good (4) (in the case of a degree obtained after 1981) from another language or a state language exam type “C” of basic level as a minimum.

- In the case of Hungarian candidates from abroad, the language of the country of origin as a second language may be accepted.
- If the mother tongue of the candidate is not Hungarian, it shall be accepted as meeting the required level of the given language.
- When in doubt, the meeting of the language requirements shall be assessed by the Foreign Language Centre of the University of Debrecen.
- Documents confirming the language proficiency shall be submitted upon application to the preliminary defence at the latest.

Following the successful completion of the eight semesters, the PhD student shall obtain a pre-degree certificate stating that all course-units have been completed. The pre-degree certificate stating that all course-units have been completed documents that the PhD student fully complied with the study obligations of the PhD training. The Doctoral Board of the scientific field may issue a pre-degree certificate stating that all course-units have been completed only subject to the written approval of the Head of the competent Doctoral School (**Appendix 11 to the Educational Plan**). No pre-degree certificate stating that all course-units have been completed may be issued to PhD students who failed to obtain the required 240 credit points. The detailed order of the issue of the pre-degree certificate stating that all course-units have been completed shall be the following:

- the Doctoral School shall submit the list of the subjects in the absence of which the pre-degree certificate stating that all course-units have been completed may not be issued to the PhD administrator;
- if the student obtained the 240 credits but failed to comply with his or her obligations in accordance with the requirements of the school, the PhD administrator shall inform thereabout the Head of the Doctoral School who may refuse to issue the pre-degree certificate stating that all course-units have been completed.

9. PhD degree obtaining requirements

Obtaining of the PhD degree shall be subject to the meeting of study obligations (credit points), documented independent scientific work, confirmation of the meeting of the language requirements, the submission and defending of the dissertation at a public defence, and a successful complex examination.

- The PhD degree obtaining procedure shall be the second stage dedicated to research and dissertation preparation of the PhD training, following the complex examination.
- The PhD student has to apply to the PhD degree obtaining procedure simultaneously with applying to the complex examination (Appendix 4 to the DRs). The PhD degree obtaining procedure shall begin by enrolling to the semester following the successful complex examination.

- During the PhD degree obtaining procedure, the student relationship may be suspended for two semesters as a maximum. Upon the request of the student (**Appendix 10 to the Educational Plan**), the Doctoral Board may approve the suspension of the student relationship for a single duration exceeding the one as determined in the previous paragraph if the student may not comply with their obligations arising from their student relationship for reasons of birth-giving, accident, illness or another unexpected reason which cannot be attributed to him. The student's legal relationship may be suspended for a whole semester only.
- The PhD student shall submit the final version (following the preliminary defence) of the doctoral dissertation within three years following the complex examination. Subject to the decision of the DCMS, this deadline may be prolonged by one year as a maximum, upon a request, when justified.

9.1. Ethical aspects

Upon submitting the doctoral dissertation, the candidate would make a written statement (signed by the supervisor, too, in addition to the candidate) to the following effect (Appendix 23 to the Doctoral Regulations of the DCMS):

- his or her dissertation has not been submitted in another institution and it has not been refused;
- he is not subject to a procedure withdrawing the PhD degree and no formerly awarded PhD degree was withdrawn from him within 5 years;
- the dissertation is his or her independent work and literature references are clear and full;
- he indicated those results in the dissertation which were not his or her own (co-author's results) or only partly his or her own.

When assigning the evaluation board of the complex examination, and the preliminary and the public defence, special attention shall be paid to avoiding incompatibility. Close relatives or those whom cannot be expected to evaluate the matter without partiality may not participate in the PhD procedure.

During the PhD degree obtaining procedure, the Doctoral Board shall act with special care to deem whether the scientific activity of the candidate is his or her own and whether the scientific works and publications of the candidate to be used for the purposes of obtaining the PhD degree was not used by others to obtain a scientific degree in Hungary or abroad. During the procedure, statements related to the above shall be obtained from Hungarian and foreign co-authors (Appendix 14 to the Operation Rules of the DCMS).

The dissertation submitted to the preliminary defence shall be sent by the Secretary of the Doctoral School to the University and National Library for the purposes of plagiarism checking (for the detailed rules of the Doctoral School, see the part on preliminary defence) before the evaluation. The Library shall prepare the document containing the result of the checking within three working days to be forwarded by the Secretary of the Doctoral School to the reviewers. The reviewers shall state in their evaluations whether the dissertation complies with scientific ethical requirements of publishing according to the available data. The preliminary defence may be held even if the reviewer(s) raise an objection for reasons of scientific ethics and eventual faults may be corrected in the final dissertation without legal consequences. If the reviewer of the preliminary defence raised an objection for reasons of scientific ethics, he shall inform the Doctoral Board of the scientific area thereabout upon submitting the final dissertation. In this case, the final dissertation shall be submitted to a repeated plagiarism checking, the result of which shall be sent to the official reviewers. If the result of the plagiarism checking shows that the dissertation is not appropriate for reasons of scientific ethics, the Doctoral School shall decide whether it holds the preliminary defence despite this, or whether it delays the defence to be held following the revision of the dissertation only. (In the case of Doctoral Schools in the medical field the delay of the defence is the preferred procedure. If the preliminary defence is delayed, the revised dissertation shall be repeatedly sent for evaluation together with the result of the repeated plagiarism checking, to the same reviewers if possible. If no further objections based on scientific ethics arise with regard to the revised dissertation, the appropriate statement should be indicated on the written record of the preliminary defence. In this case, the Doctoral Board shall not submit the final dissertation to another plagiarism checking.

If the scientific publication or dissertation of the candidate raises founded suspicion of plagiarism, wilful manipulation of the data, wilful disinformation or any fraud, the Chairperson of the competent Doctoral Board of the scientific field shall initiate an ethical examination against the candidate during which the eventual responsibility of the supervisor shall also be assessed. For the duration of the ethical assessment, the PhD degree obtaining procedure shall be suspended. Knowing the result of the ethical assessment, the Doctoral Board of the scientific field shall decide on eventual sanctions.

9.2. Publication requirements

It is an important tool of quality assurance that the candidates should have publications in proper quantity and quality until the defending of the dissertation. It is expected from those wishing to obtain a PhD degree that they have an article published about the topic of the dissertation in English in an impact factor-measured international journal sent from the University of Debrecen and that the corresponding author is employed by the University of Debrecen. Submitting to defending of the dissertation shall be subject to at least 2 publications containing new scientific results *in extenso* related to the topic, published in a referred and impact factor-measured international journal. When determining the impact factor of journals, the Thomson Reuters list shall be taken as its basis. It is expected that the candidate should contribute to the results of the publications to a significant extent, and that he should be the first author in at least one publication, and that the orientation role of the supervisor be evident from the authors' lists of the publications, too. One copy of each publication (as an original or as a photocopy) should be submitted together with the dissertation and uploaded to the publication database of the University and National Library of the University of Debrecen. Based on publications uploaded into the database, the Library shall prepare and validate the list of publications of the candidate; and the candidate shall submit the validated list together with the dissertation to the Doctoral Board of the scientific field.

The list of publications may contain only peer-reviewed *in extenso* publications in English among the ones on which the dissertation is based. Among further publications, peer-reviewed Hungarian publications can also be included in addition to peer-reviewed *in extenso* publications in English if these are original publications, that is, their material has not been published elsewhere either in a foreign language or in Hungarian. The list may not include conference publications or supplements among publications on which the dissertation is based or among further publications.

We pay special attention to the quality of publications, and the board of the Doctoral School and the DCMS shall assess the appropriateness of the publications specifically in the case of each candidate as a condition of submitting the dissertation to defending. In issues of the appropriateness of the publications, the Doctoral School shall contact the Chairperson of the Doctoral Committee of Medical Sciences before submitting the dissertation to preliminary defence. The Chairperson shall assign an *ad hoc* board consisting of five members (including the Head of the competent Doctoral School and the library expert) against the decision of which no further appeal may be submitted.

Special care should be applied when deeming whether the scientific activity of the candidate is their own and whether the scientific works and publications of the candidate to be used for the purposes of obtaining the PhD degree was not used by others to obtain a scientific degree in Hungary or abroad. During the procedure, the candidate should obtain and submit the related statements of Hungarian and foreign co-authors to the DCMS. For this purpose, a specific sheet per publication should be used on which the name of the candidate, the title, authors and publication data (name of the journal, year of publishing, volume No., page No.) of the publication should be indicated, with the co-authors confirming by signing the sheet that they did not use the publication in question to obtain another scientific degree. In the case of foreign co-authors where the obtaining of the statement would be objectively hampered, a statement by the responsible researcher of the given foreign team(s)/institute(s) would be sufficient accurately indicating the co-authors on behalf of whom he issued the statement.

It should be avoided to use one and the same publication by two candidates. If nevertheless two candidates would like to use a publication, the Council of the Doctoral School shall profoundly assess whether the quantity and significance of results in the publication makes it possible or not, and the co-authors should make a statement confirming the proportion in which they participated in the work and the parts each candidate would use in their PhD dissertation. If a certain publication would be used by two candidates, it should be notified to the Head of the competent Doctoral School as early as before the first procedure. Joint use as approved by the Board of the competent Doctoral School(s) should be clearly documented (Appendix 14 to the DRs) and the documentation should be submitted to the Doctoral Committee of Medical Sciences. Publications used formerly may not be authorised for another procedure of defending the dissertation if this intent had not been indicated on the occasion of the first usage.

9.3. Dissertation and its abstract

The dissertation is a summarising work drawn up in Hungarian or English which presents the objectives, new scientific results, literature proficiency and research methods of the candidate. The PhD abstract is a shortened version of the dissertation in which the candidate presents the justification of their scientific work, their methodological preparedness and major results. The abstract presents the scientific results of the candidate based on which he proves during the PhD degree obtaining procedure that he is prepared to obtain the scientific degree. The abstract shall not contain graphs or tables. The abstract shall be drawn up in Hungarian and English (except for foreign citizens who may draw it up in English only).

Further formal requirements and length of the dissertation and of the abstract are determined in Appendix 15 to the DRs.

9.4. Preliminary defence

The dissertation shall be submitted to a preliminary defence before its being finalised. The preliminary defence shall be organised by the Council of the Doctoral School, drawing up written record about the defence. The procedural order of the preliminary defence in the Doctoral School shall be the following:

Application to the preliminary defence shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Doctoral School. Application is subject to meeting each and all of the following criteria.

Conditions of submitting the dissertation to the preliminary defence:

The list of items to be submitted is determined in **Appendix 2**.

- obtaining of the required credit points, obtaining of the **pre-degree certificate stating that all course-units have been completed** (application form for the pre-degree certificate stating that all course-units have been completed: **Appendix 11 to the Educational Plan**);
- presentation of **documents confirming the language proficiency** (DRs, § 16);

The existence of documents confirming the language proficiency shall be certified upon application to the preliminary defence at the latest. Documents confirming the language proficiency shall be submitted to the PhD Office where the PhD administrator issues a confirmation containing the data (type and number) of the language exam certificates. This certificate shall also indicate data of obtaining the pre-degree certificate stating that all course-units have been completed. **The certificate shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Doctoral School upon application to the preliminary defence.**

- **notification** addressed to the Head of the Doctoral School as signed by the supervisor and, where necessary, the Head of programme (**Appendix 3**) to be submitted to the Secretary of the DS **four** weeks preceding the planned date at the latest
- simultaneously with the notification, the printed unbound version of the **dissertation and the abstract** should be submitted to the Secretary of the Doctoral School including the list of publications prepared by the Kenézy Library of Life Sciences and the printed dissertation should include publications on which it is based. The printed dissertation should be submitted in 3 copies among which 2 copies should be placed in an unclosed postal envelope of proper size each. The electronic editable version (doc or docx) of the dissertation should be sent to beatoth@med.unideb.hu addressed to the Secretary of the Doctoral School. The dissertation submitted in an electronic version should not contain the publications on which it is based. The subject of the e-mail should be the name of the candidate, and the e-mail should contain the names of the candidate and the supervisor and the title of the dissertation.

- simultaneously with the notification, the candidate should submit the result of the plagiarism checking (pdf via e-mail or the library link) which was performed on the version of the dissertation to be submitted to the preliminary defence. The plagiarism checking application is available at: www.turnitin.com. Registration (only the teaching staff of the University of Debrecen may register) and plagiarism checking may be performed by the supervisor or, where possible, by the candidate (if he is allowed to register). Support may be requested from the staff of the University and National Library (but not from the Secretary of the Doctoral School). When uploading the dissertation, please ensure that the checked text (= the dissertation) be not left in the search application, and that the checked text do not contain the list of references. If the dissertation is drawn up in a language similar to that of the publications on which it is based, the candidate and the supervisor should check the conditions subject to which the text of the own publications may be used and then act accordingly. Where necessary, an authorisation should be obtained. The candidate and his or her supervisor shall attach the eventual authorisation, the usage conditions and a written statement to the effect that they adhered to these to the result of the plagiarism checking. If the plagiarism checking shows that there is significant similarity to materials formerly uploaded to the DEA, then the candidate and his or her supervisor shall make a written statement to the effect that the similar material uploaded to the DEA is exclusively a former work of the candidate and/or a student supervised by him.
- presentation of **statements of resigning by the co-authors or, where available, documents of the shared use of the publication** (Doctoral Regulations, §15(1) and Appendix 14) to the Secretary of the DS. The original copy of the co-authors' statements should be presented to the Secretary of the Doctoral School upon application to the preliminary defence, and 1 photocopy of each statement should be submitted;
- **presentation of the candidate's statement** (Doctoral Regulations, §12(5) and Appendix 23) to the Secretary of the DS; 1 photocopy of it should be submitted to the Secretary of the Doctoral School.

If any of the above conditions is not met, the preliminary defence may NOT be held.

If the conditions are met, the Council of the Doctoral School shall decide on the preliminary defence based on the result of the plagiarism checking, too. If the Council of the Doctoral School does not authorise the preliminary defence based on the result of the plagiarism checking, the dissertation should be revised. If the preliminary defence may be held, the Secretary of the Doctoral School shall notify the assigned reviewers and send the dissertation to the reviewers. The Secretary shall notify the candidate about the decision of the Council of the Doctoral School via e-mail. The following shall be performed according to the Rules: The Secretary of the Doctoral School shall send the electronic copy of the dissertation to the University and National Library for the purposes of plagiarism checking in accordance with the provisions of the Rules. Then she shall send the file containing the result to the reviewers.

Organisation and holding of the preliminary defence:

▪ **plagiarism checking:**

The dissertation submitted to preliminary defence shall be sent by the Secretary of the Doctoral School to the University and National Library for plagiarism checking prior to sending it for evaluation. The document containing the result of the checking shall be forwarded by the Secretary of the Doctoral School to the reviewers of the preliminary defence. The reviewers shall state in their evaluations whether the dissertation complies with scientific ethical requirements of publishing according to the available data.

If the result of the plagiarism checking shows that the dissertation is not appropriate for reasons of scientific ethics, the Council of the Doctoral School shall decide whether it holds the preliminary defence despite this, or whether it delays the defence to be held following the revision of the dissertation only. (The delay of the defence is the preferred procedure.)

Delayed preliminary defence: Plagiarism checking should be repeated on a revised dissertation. The revised dissertation shall be sent for evaluation together with the result of the checking, to the same reviewers if possible. If no further objections based on scientific ethics arise with regard to the revised dissertation, the appropriate statement should be indicated on the written record of the preliminary defence.

Performed preliminary defence: objections raised for reasons of scientific ethics should be corrected in the final dissertation without legal consequences following the defence. Nevertheless, objections raised for reasons of scientific ethics should be communicated to the Secretary of the Doctoral Committee of Medical Sciences upon submitting the final dissertation. (The appropriate statement should be indicated on the written record of the preliminary defence.)

- **Evaluation board of the preliminary defence:** to be assigned by the Council of the Doctoral School.

It consists of three members, one Chairperson and two reviewers. Each member of the board shall have a scientific degree. At least one-third of the members of the board are not members at the Doctoral School concerned.

Neither **reviewer** may be a co-worker of the candidate. Evaluators are preferred to be accredited teaching staff members of the University of Debrecen but a professional having a scientific degree who has no employment relationship with the university may also be requested. The **Chairperson** of the preliminary defence is preferred to be a Professor/Professor Emeritus core member of the board of the competent Doctoral School but he has to be the accredited Professor/Professor Emeritus core member of a medical Doctoral School of the University of Debrecen.

- **Announcement of the preliminary defence:** Preliminary defences are public and announced by the Secretary in the newsletter of the Faculty of General Medicine/DCMS of the University of Debrecen. The Secretary of the Doctoral School has to be notified about the precise time of the preliminary defence by Monday of the week preceding the event via e-mail. The e-mail should be sent to csoma.eszter@med.unideb.hu. The e-mail shall contain the following information in line with the format of the newsletter: name of the candidate, name of the supervisor, title of the dissertation, venue and date of the event. The Secretary of the Doctoral School shall send the data of the event to the newsletter of the Faculty of General Medicine/DCMS of the University of Debrecen in the format of the newsletter.

- **preliminary defence:** At the defence, the candidate shall present their results before the board as assigned by the Doctoral School in a free presentation of 20 minutes as a maximum and then the reviewers shall present their opinions to which the candidate should reply, together with any questions raised anew. The candidate shall receive the evaluation of the reviewers on paper or in an electronic format from the reviewers before the defence. At a closed session, the Board shall decide whether the dissertation can be submitted to the procedure before the Doctoral Board of the scientific field in an unchanged format or subject to the proposed changed or to a major revision of the dissertation. The written record contains 1 copy of the evaluations as signed by the reviewers each, to be sent by the reviewers to the Secretary of the Doctoral School.
- **Written record** should be drawn up on the preliminary defences (Appendix 20 to the DRs) to be sent to the Secretary of the Doctoral Board of the scientific field as an original or its photocopy (together with the related annexes). As regards the Doctoral School, these shall be submitted by the candidate to the Secretary of the DCMS.
- Following the preliminary defence, **corrections and changes** should be made to the dissertation and the abstract based on the suggestions of the Board as indicated in the written record. The supervisor shall make a written statement about the changes made to be submitted to the Secretary of the Doctoral Board of the scientific field.

As regards the Doctoral School or Pharmaceutical Sciences, 2 original copies of this statement shall be required. The Secretary shall provide the candidate with the written record when the latter submits 1 copy of the written statement of the supervisor to the effect that changes have been made to the Secretary of the Doctoral School. The other original copy of this statement, the written record provided and 1 copy of the evaluations each shall be presented by the candidate to the Secretary of the Doctoral Board and subsequently submitted at the PhD Office.

9.5. Application to a public defence

Following a successful preliminary defence, the following should be presented to the Secretary of the DCMS (for a detailed description, see the Doctoral Regulations, the list is attached hereto as **Appendix 4**):

- The list of publications issued by the Kenézy Library, the PhD dissertation including the printed versions of the publications on which it is based, and the abstract of the dissertation. The abstract should be submitted in Hungarian and English as well.

- Professional CV
- Co-authors' signed statements (Appendix 14 to the DRs)
- Statement of the supervisor on the performing of the requested changes of the written record of the preliminary defence
- Statement by the candidate (Appendix 23 to the DRs)
- Documents of the preliminary defence

The electronic material and the statements shall be checked by the Secretary of the Doctoral Committee.

The Secretary of the DCMS shall send the abstract containing the CV and the official list of publications issued by the library in electronic format to the members of the Doctoral Committee before the session discussing the submitting of the dissertation to the procedure (simultaneously with sending the invitation to it). The dissertation containing the publications on which it is based can be consulted at the PhD Office.

At the session of the DCMS, the Head of the competent Doctoral School or the representative of the latter shall submit a motion (based on expert opinion when needed) with regard to the submitting of the dissertation to the procedure and to the composition of the board of the defending of the dissertation (Chairperson, reviewers, members of the board). The dissertation shall be submitted to the procedure based on a secret voting by the DCMS (by simple majority); and the Secretary of the Doctoral Committee shall publish the fact of submitting the dissertation to the procedure in the next week's e-mail newsletter of the Faculty of General Medicine of the University of Debrecen.

Following the submitting of the dissertation, the members of the board of reviewers shall receive the dissertation and the abstract in a printed and electronic format, too. Upon announcing the public defence, the dissertation and the abstract shall be published at www.doktori.hu.

9. 6. Public defence, dissertation defence board

The PhD dissertation shall be defended before a board of reviewers in a public defence. The language of the defence shall be Hungarian or, when justified, English.

The Chairperson and the members (as well as the alternate members) of the board of reviewers shall be appointed by the Doctoral Board of the scientific field. The board of reviewers shall consist of five members: the Chairperson, two reviewers officially requested by the DCMS and two further members.

- Members not belonging to the Doctoral School of the candidate should be in majority in the board of reviewers.
- Each member of the board shall have a scientific degree, with the Chairperson of the board being a professionally competent Professor or Professor Emeritus of the University, and also a member of the DCMS where possible.
- At least one third (and in any case, one of the reviewers) of the members of the board should be an external professional not employed by the University. The DCMS shall make a suggestion as regards the alternate members of the board in every case.
- When appointing the board, special attention should be paid to avoiding conflicts of interest. Board membership may not be granted the candidate's supervisor, colleagues or co-authors of the publications on which the dissertation is based.

Upon the request of the Doctoral Board, the two reviewers shall prepare a written **evaluation** on the dissertation within two months from the submission of the dissertation within the study period of the semester, and state whether they suggests its being submitted to a public defence. The reviewers shall submit their opinions via electronic means and in 2 signed copies to the PhD Office and to the candidate. In the evaluation, questions may be put to the candidate. The candidate shall receive the evaluations beforehand, and reply to the questions included in them in writing before the public defence, which he shall submit to the PhD administrator. The dissertation sent to the reviewers may not be changed subsequently.

The date of the public defence shall be determined by the Secretary of the Doctoral School in accordance with the following: the candidate should preliminarily consult the members of the board and the PhD administrator as regards the date. The date agreed on according to the above shall be official when the Secretary of the Doctoral School receives the supporting written evaluations of both reviewers at least 15 days before the requested date.

- The candidate shall organise the technical circumstances of the public defence (requesting of a person to draw up the written record, ensuring a computer).

- Following the date becoming official, the candidate shall upload their doctoral dissertation, the abstract including the impressum (in Hungarian and English, too) and the invitation to the public defence to the electronic Archives of the University of Debrecen (DEA). The uploaded material shall be approved by the Secretary of the Doctoral Board. The abstract (the language of which shall be the same as that of the defence of the dissertation) and the invitation may be printed and posted following the approval only.
- The abstract shall be sent together with the invitation by the candidate.
- The PhD dissertation shall be defended according to the scenario as detailed in Appendix 17 of the DRs.

During the public defence, the candidate may present the abstract of their dissertation in a free lecture and then replies to the written questions of the reviewers and to the questions that may be raised by the board members, the reviewers and those present.

Following the closing of the defence, the board shall make a decision on the PhD dissertation, the independent scientific work of the candidate and their performance at the defending of the dissertation by secret voting, at a closed session. Each voting member of the board shall assess the dissertation, the independent scientific activity of the candidate and their performance at the defence of the dissertation each at a scale of four grades (summa cum laude, cum laude, rite, unacceptable). The board shall make separate decisions in all the three categories, and the result shall be determined based on the votes of the board members, in accordance with Appendix 13. The result of the public defence shall be publicly announced and justified by the Chairperson following the voting.

Written record should be drawn up about the public defence (Appendix 5/2 to the DRs). The written record shall be public and the Doctoral Board of the scientific field may issue a copy of it, upon a written request. Decisions of the board of reviewers and their justifications shall be entered on the registration sheet of the candidate.

As regards the granting of the PhD degree and its qualification, the Doctoral Board of the scientific field shall make a proposal to the DHBU based on the report of the board of reviewers and the qualifications granted, by sending the full documentation (copy of the university diploma, copies of documents confirming the language proficiency, official evaluations and replies of the candidate to these, written record of the defending of the dissertation, decision of the Doctoral Board of the scientific field). The PhD degree obtaining procedure shall be closed

by the decision of the DHBU and the DHBU shall make a decision on the granting of the PhD degree as entered on the registration sheet of the candidate.

10. Student's feedback

Students belonging to the DCMS shall complete an anonymous questionnaire in which they reply to questions related to their PhD training and make comments (**Appendix 5**).

11. Documentation

All decisions relating to the PhD training and degree obtaining within the competence of the Doctoral School shall be documented to be archived for 10 years.

Appendix 1: Accreditation form for supervisors

PERSONAL DATA SHEET OF THE PARTICIPATING FACULTY MEMBER AND RESEARCHER

Doctoral Committee of Medical Sciences, University of Debrecen

Doctoral school:

Programme:

Name:

- (1) University diploma (institution, major, year):
- (2) Highest academic degree (institution, degree, year):
- (3) Language knowledge: level: language certificate:
- (4) Title of the research topic (in Hungarian):
- (5) Title of the research topic (in English):
- (6) A short description of the topic (about half a page):
- (7) Research conditions:
- (8) Number of my academic publications: ..., the sum of impact factors:
- (9) Number of my publications published in the past 5 years: ..., the sum of impact factors... .
- (10) The bibliographical data of 10 of my most significant academic works (authors, title, journal):
- (11) I know about ... independent references (on the basis of the citation index) made to my works.
- (12) I have been supervisor of the following habilitation and university doctoral dissertations:
- (13) In the past 5 years I have obtained the support of the following tenders:

| | | | |
|-------|-----------|----------|--------|
| Year: | Resource: | Support: | Topic: |
|-------|-----------|----------|--------|
- (14) My major study programmes and cooperations done in Hungary and abroad:
- (15) Data on my teaching in Hungary and abroad (year, title of the topic, host university):

I wish to take part in the doctoral programme specified in the title.

Debrecen,, 20..

signature

Appendix 2: List of items for preliminary defence

Please bring a printed copy of this list with you.

Candidate:

Supervisor:

The following documents should be presented to the secretary of the Doctoral School

In electronic form to beatoth@med.unideb.hu:

- PhD dissertation containing the official publication list issued by the Kenezy Library (**file name: Name of the candidate_dissertation.docx**); the full version of the articles the thesis is based on must not be presented in the electronic version
- Short thesis containing the official publication list issued by the Kenezy Library (**file name: Name of the candidate _thesis.docx**);
- Application form (doc or docx without signature)
- The pdf (or the link of the library to it) of the similarity report

In printed form*:

- Co-author statements: the original statements should be presented, but hard copies are required for the Doctoral School (The signatures of the candidate and the supervisor have to be original on each document; Original signatures of the co-authors are required. If it is a hard copy, please write the following sentence: “True copy of the original document” , but the original signatures of the candidate and the supervisor are required also in that case.)
- Predoctoral declaration: the original statements should be presented, but a hard copy is required for the Doctoral School (Original signature of the candidate and the supervisor.);
- Certificate of absolutorium and language
- PhD thesis (=dissertation) containing the official publication list issued by the Kenezy Library in three copies

Appendix 3: Application to a preliminary defence

To the attention of the Head of the Doctoral School:

I, the undersigned name of the candidate, PhD student of the “programme name” programme of the Doctoral School of Pharmaceutical Sciences of the University of Debrecen who obtained the pre-degree certificate stating that all course-units have been completed, request the Doctoral School to consent to the submission to **preliminary defence** of my doctoral dissertation entitled “**dissertation title**”.

In the dissertation, there is/there is no* such a part that the candidate uses only partly (shared usage with another student).

*Please underline as appropriate. If there is such a part, please adhere to the Doctoral Regulations during the application.

I hereby attach the dissertation, the result of the plagiarism checking performed on the dissertation in line with the requirements of the Doctoral School, the Hungarian and the English abstracts and every required and necessary document to this letter.

We suggest that the preliminary defence be organised at the following venue on the following date:

Year, month, day, hour, minutes, venue

We suggest that the following persons evaluate the dissertation in advance:

Name of reviewer 1, scientific degree, position (workplace), phone, e-mail address, postal address

Name of reviewer 2, scientific degree, position (workplace), phone, e-mail address, postal address

Contact data of the candidate (workplace and its address, phone, e-mail)

Contact data of the supervisor (workplace and its address, phone, e-mail)

I, the undersigned name of the candidate, hereby state that the result of the attached plagiarism checking relates to the dissertation submitted to preliminary defence.

I, the undersigned name of the supervisor, hereby state that the result of the attached plagiarism checking relates to the dissertation submitted to preliminary defence.

Further statements (related to plagiarism checking) to be drafted individually when necessary.

Done in Debrecen,

name and signature of the candidate

name and signature of the supervisor

The Doctoral School of Pharmaceutical Sciences hereby consents / does not consent to the submission to preliminary defence of the dissertation.

Assigned opponents:

Chairperson of the preliminary defence:

Done in Debrecen,

Dr Árpád Tószaki

Head of the Doctoral School

Dr Eszter Csoma

Secretary of the Doctoral School

Appendix 4: documents to be submitted when applying for the PhD qualification process

Candidate:

Supervisor:

Doctoral School:

I. The following documents should be presented to the secretary of the Doctoral Committee of Medical Sciences, University of Debrecen (Eszter Csoma, PhD)

In electronic form to csoma.eszter@med.unideb.hu:

- PhD dissertation containing the official publication list issued by the Kenezy Library (file name: Name of the candidate_dissertation.docx); the full version of the articles the thesis is based on must not be presented in the electronic version
- Short thesis containing the official publication list issued by the Kenezy Library (file name: Name of the candidate_thesis.docx);
- Curriculum Vitae (Name of the candidate CV.docx).

In electronic form to phd@med.unideb.hu:

- The pdf (or the link of the library to it) of the similarity report

In printed form*:

- Co-author statements (The signatures of the candidate and the supervisor have to be original on each document; Original signatures of the co-authors are required. If it is a hard copy, please write the following sentence: "True copy of the original document", but the original signatures of the candidate and the supervisor are required also in that case.)
- Declaration of the supervisor that all the modifications prescribed by the pre-defense committee were performed in the thesis (Original signature of the supervisor.);
- Documentation of the preliminary defense (**signed, written record of the preliminary defense +opponents' reports + list of the corrections made by the PhD student in the dissertation**);
- Predoctoral declaration (Original signature of the candidate and the supervisor.);

Please bring a printed copy of this what-to-do list with you. Approval of the presented documents and comments regarding eventual problems/incompleteness of the presented material will be indicated here.

II. List of items to be submitted to the PhD office (Zsuzsanna Oláh)

After the secretary of the Doctoral Committee has checked and approved all the documents listed in part I, the following items should be submitted to the PhD office:

- Printed version of the short thesis in three copies;
- Curriculum Vitae in 3 printed copies;
- PhD thesis (=dissertation) containing the official publication list issued by the Kenezy Library in six bound copies (the full version of the articles the thesis is based on should be bound in the dissertation as well);
- Co-author statements;
- Declaration of the supervisor that all the modifications prescribed by the pre-defense committee were performed in the thesis;
- Documentation of preliminary debate;
- Predoctoral declaration.

Appendix 5: Quality assurance questionnaire for students

1. In which year did you start your PhD training? _____
2. Your present status:
full-time PhD student – correspondence PhD student – PhD candidate
3. Year of obtaining the pre-degree certificate stating that all course-units have been completed (or else, its planned year) _____
4. In which year do you plan to submit your dissertation? _____
5. Name of the Doctoral School:

6. Have you already completed such a questionnaire? If yes, in which year?

7. Where did you first hear about the Doctoral School (research venue) you chose? (You can choose more than one answers.)
 - in relation to the Student’s Scientific Association work, thesis work (or another professional link)
 - through an advertisement, way of the advertisement:

 - doctoral database
 - from my university trainers
 - from the university application brochure
 - through my friends
 - through my family or relatives
 - another way, please specify: _____
8. How much were you motivated by the following factors when applying to a PhD training? Please evaluate these from 1 to 5. (1 - not important; 5 – very important)

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| Professional orientation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Research opportunities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunity for a professional/scientific career | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Prolongation of student years | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Three years of guaranteed existence | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Student benefits to receive during the training | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities for scholarships abroad | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities for later employment abroad | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Later financial benefits of the PhD degree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Expectations at the workplace | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Family expectations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| No fixed working hours | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| Higher education employment is subject to the PhD degree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Other, please specify: _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

9. When deciding to go on to PhD studies, why did you choose your present Doctoral School? Please evaluate the importance of the listed factors. (1 – not important; 5 – very important)

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| Proximity of the institution (to the place of residence, to the workplace) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Recommendation of my university teachers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| For reasons of a previous professional relationship (Student's Scientific Association work, degree thesis) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I obtained my degree in this institution. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I had acquaintances among the trainers of the Doctoral School before. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I had acquaintances among the PhD students of the Doctoral School before. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Due to the research topic. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I thought I would be admitted here more easily. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I wanted to know what I am talented in. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Until I attend this training, I do not have to start to work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Other, please specify: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

If you already completed such a questionnaire, please specify any change you have experienced since the last completion.

10. Satisfaction with the requirements of the PhD training (1 - not at all; 5 - fully)

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Are you satisfied with the quality and the international renown of the research venue? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Are you satisfied with the infrastructure of the research venue (where you actually work)? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Do you consider yourself to be provided enough support and orientation by your supervisor? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Do you consider yourself to be provided enough support and orientation by your other trainers? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Are you satisfied with courses announced in the PhD training? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Are you satisfied with the operation of the administration of the Doctoral School? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Are you satisfied with information flow and awareness-raising within the Doctoral School? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Are you satisfied with the operation of the administration of the Doctoral Committee of Medical Sciences? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Are you satisfied with information flow and awareness-raising within the medical Doctoral School? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

If you already completed such a questionnaire, have your opinion changed for the period that elapsed ever since (did you experience improvement/deterioration, and if yes, at which areas)?

11. Please specify what are the causes of the three most significant problems in doctoral training according to you.

12. How much is your Doctoral School (or the current research venue/institute within it) persistent in demanding the performing of the following activities from you? (1 – I do not have to do them at all, 2 – there are no express expectations, 3 – it is expected, 4 – it is very much expected)

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| Research activity not related to the topic of the dissertation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Teaching activity | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Educational organising work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Scientific organising work, conference organising | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Conference attendance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Writing of tenders | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Other activities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

If you already completed such a questionnaire, have your opinion changed for the period that elapsed ever since (did you experience improvement/deterioration, and if yes, at which areas)?

13. How many hours do you spend on the following activities within the framework of the doctoral training during an average academic week?

| Activity | Hour/week |
|--|-----------|
| Participation at PhD courses as a student | |
| Teaching activity | |
| Research activity related to the own topic | |
| Other research activity not related to the topic of the dissertation | |
| Scientific organising work, conference organising | |
| Educational organising work | |
| Conference attendance | |
| Publication activity | |
| Writing of tenders | |
| Other activities | |

If you have already completed such a questionnaire, have any change occurred for the period that elapsed ever since (if yes, in what direction and at which areas)?

14. Please reconsider how your scientific activity could be summarised according to the below aspects.

| | yes/no | event/piece |
|---|---------------|--------------------|
| Have you published a paper in Hungarian during your PhD studies so far? If yes, how many? | | |
| Have you published a paper in a foreign language during your PhD studies so far? If yes, how many? | | |
| Do you have an impact factor-measured paper related to the topic of the dissertation among your papers published in a foreign language? | | |
| Have you delivered a presentation/poster at a professional conference in Hungarian since the beginning of the PhD training? If yes, how many? | | |
| Have you delivered a presentation/poster at an international professional conference since the beginning of the PhD training? If yes, how many? | | |
| Have you attended a Hungarian study trip since the beginning of the PhD training? Please specify the number of events and the duration per event. | | |
| Have you attended study trip/partial training abroad since the beginning of the PhD training? Please specify the number of events and the duration per event. | | |

If you have attended a study trip, who helped you in finding the host institution?

13. To what extent are you satisfied with your supervisor? Please evaluate the following from 1 to 5. 1 - not appropriate at all;
5 - perfectly appropriate

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| As regards my doctoral topic, I consider him professionally competent. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| He provides me with enough consultation opportunities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| He supports my progress in my doctoral topic with his or her professional advice to a significant extent. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| He contributes to my participation at conferences or study trips. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| He regularly assesses my professional progress. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| To what extent are you satisfied with your supervisor on the whole? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

If you already completed such a questionnaire, have your opinion changed about your supervisor for the period that elapsed ever since (if yes, how)?

14. If you could restart your PhD training, would you be willing to work under your present supervisor?

1. yes
2. no
3. I do not know

15. Have you changed your supervisor since the beginning of the PhD training? If yes, what were your reasons? Did you change your PhD topic or Doctoral School at the same time?

Thank you for answering.