

Corrections on MSc Eng Dissertation _ 905290 _ Pascal Bohulu Mabelo _Nov 2016

Section	Correction or Improvement suggested	Correction made / Response
Overall Writing		
	Housekeeping issues, spelling mistakes: Addressed as recommended	Acceptance noted ...
	The researcher should put off his author's hat and put on the reader's or target audience's hat and re-read the report page by page. This will allow him to carefully listen to the flow and relevancy of the jargon and repetition of facts ... Addressed to an extent	Acceptance noted ...
Chapter 1		
1.4	Research Objectives: readability/style of sentence in Objective b)	Section redrafted for better readability ...
1.8	Scope not clearly explained in the particular relevant section ...	Section has been reworked to clarify what is in scope (i.e. processes) or out of scope (e.g., technology, human factors), including the intent to approach local investigations in view of global application ...
	Evidence of jargon, poetic writing – fancy phrases and lengthy sentences ...	Writing style and choice of words deemed appropriate for the discipline, which should reflect Soft Systems terminology, not just Engineering lexicon ...
	Formatting and grammatical issues evident in the introduction ...	Addressed, no further editing necessary ... (See Overall Writing section, as deemed acceptable)
1.10	New Comment: Revise Research Outline ...	Research outline was duly approved by the Examiner (refer to previous Examiner Report). Changing it at this point will not only disturb the flow of the dissertation, but might entail a re-visit of the whole research as well. For these reasons, the request was not accommodated

Chapter 2		
	New Comment: Suggested Research sections to be revised ... Despite the Examiner commenting previously that as follows: <i>"The literature reviewed presents good arguments/insights evident of careful thought process applied to this research and a reflection of the industry knowledge. The literature review is also structured appropriately ..."</i>	The structure, content of the Literature Survey (in line with 1.4, Objectives) informed the scope and flow of the remainder of this study, including the Questionnaire Any changes to the structure (which was previously accepted by the Examiner) might compromise the study For these reasons, the request was not accommodated
2.1	Rephrase sentence in Paragraph 1 for its "grammar is not good" ...	Particular sentence is a quotation, shall not be changed
Chapter 3		
	Content Acceptable	Acceptance noted; besides, stylistic and language are deemed appropriate for the discipline ...
Chapter 4		
	Addressed as recommended	Acceptance noted ...
Chapter 5		
	Content Acceptable	Acceptance noted
Chapter 6		
	No Comment	Acceptance noted
Chapter 7		
	Discussion to lack expected depth, but acceptable ...	Acceptance noted; section have met requirements ...
Chapter 8		
	No substantial changes effected but acceptable ...	Acceptance noted
Chapter 9		
	OK / Acceptable ...	Acceptance noted

Submitted by: Pascal Bohulu Mabelo

Capacity: Msc Student [905290]

Signature & Date: 21 Nov 2016

