



MSIAM2 internship evaluation form (reviewer)

Student Name:

Reviewer Name:

Internship subject title:

We ask the MSc thesis reviewer to provide a written evaluation of the report based on the following items. For each item, a scoring range [0 max] is provided. Please see the detailed signification of possible scores on the back side of the page.

1/ Originality of the results [0 2]

2/ Mathematical level and skills [0 4]

3/ Clarity and structure [0 4]

4/ Form and style, spelling [0 4]

5/ Scientific contents [0 6]

For engineer-oriented works / industry-like (I)

1/ is replaced by 1 I/ Is the goal achieved ?

5/ is replaced by 5 I/ Scientific approach, quality of tests, analysis, software developments (in particular the software reliability and reusability)

The global score is between between 0 and 20.

Grade (Research work)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
1/ Originality of results							
2/ Mathematical level and skills							
3/ Clarity and structure							
4/ Form and style, spelling							
5/ Scientific contents							

Grade (Industry-oriented work)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
1/ Fulfilment of objectives							
2/ Mathematical level and skills							
3/ Clarity and structure							
4/ Form and style, spelling							
5/ Scientific approach & analysis							

Free Comments:

Signature:

Please send this evaluation form to msiam2@ensimag.fr the day before the oral defence or sooner.

item	Grade
Novelty of results [0 to 2]	2: Results of sufficient novelty and quality to deserve publication. 1: Original use of complex pre-existing concepts. 0: Use of somewhat basic pre-existing concepts.
(I) Fulfilment of objectives [0 to 2]	2: Objectives of the internship are perfectly reached, or exceeded. 1: Objectives of the internship are mostly achieved. 0: Objectives of the internship are achieved quite partially.
Skills in applied math [0 to 4]	4: Outstanding level in applied math, as rarely seen. 3: Very good level in applied math 2: Good level in applied math 1: Passable level in applied math 0: M2 level most reached. High number of significant errors.
Clarity, structure [0 to 4]	4: Report clarity and structure are excellent. 3: Clear, well structured, well highlighting most important points, reads well. Good global structure, which helps understanding the work done. 2: Correct global organization, but some details lack of clarity. 1: Navigating within the report requires some effort from the reader. Lack of structure and clarity; some parts are confusing. 0: Students does not seem to know exactly themselves the meaning of what they wrote.
Writing form, spelling [0 to 4]	4: Written as a (good) novel truly, well illustrated. Ref. section is as good as in journals. 3: Nicely written, reads well, no syntactic, stylistic nor grammatical error. Correct presentation of refs. 2: Some errors remain. "References" section is somewhat odd or imprecise. 1: Should have read their own report. Severe formatting flaws in references. 0: Numerous errors and typos, writing needs to be thoroughly revisited - some lack of work. No refs.
Scientific contents [0 to 6]	6: Denotes some fully mastered scientific approach, from theory to original examples, including state of the art. Outstanding depth of analysis. If applicable: production of directly reusable software. 5: Denotes a very sound scientific approach - from theory to treatment of classical examples. Very good depth of analysis. Exhaustive state of the art. If applicable: production of directly reusable software. 4: In-depth analysis, but some points remain to be investigated with more care. Satisfying state of the art. If applicable: production of reusable software. 3: Satisfying analysis, somehow simple but illustrative examples were addressed, some potential mistake on a complex point or some significant missing reference. If applicable: some software prototype. 2: Weaknesses in analysis, with some lack of depth. Basic examples only or multiple errors in the approach. Several significant missing references. Software seemingly running (cannot be sure). 1: Document highlighting some poor understanding of the topic. Principle of a scientific approach not really acquired. Software would require more work to be reusable. State of the art quite unsatisfactory. 0: Document highlighting really poor understanding of the topic - does not present any example, no usable software. No state of the art.
(I) Scientific approach, quality of tests, analyses and codes [0 to 6]	6: Denotes some fully mastered scientific approach: theory, state of the art, etc. Outstanding depth of analysis and validation process. In particular, several alternative approaches were compared. Production of directly reusable software. 5: Denotes a very sound scientific approach. Very good depth in analysis, relevant choices, well justified. Exhaustive state of the art. Nice validation of the approach, compared with another one. Production of reusable software of good quality. 4: In-depth analysis, but some points remain to be investigated with more care. Choices are not fully justified and validation is partial. Satisfying state of the art. If applicable: production of software requiring some more work for reusability. 3: Satisfying analysis, some potential mistakes or methodological errors in application, validation or interpretation. Some significant missing reference. Some software prototype usable by the author only. 2: Weaknesses in analysis, with some lack of depth. Cannot justify choices, interpret results or validate the approach. Software with significant bugs that are a real nuisance. 1: Document highlighting some poor understanding of the topic. Principle of a scientific approach not really acquired. Software in a quite preliminary state. State of the art quite unsatisfactory. 0: Document highlighting really poor understanding of the topic - does not present any application, no usable software. No state of the art.