

Re-Exam
Pdf on file



Faculty of Science
Division of Postgraduate Academic Management

EXAMINER'S REPORT ON A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED FOR THE AWARD OF MASTER OF SCIENCE

Name of Candidate: Zoe Luhdo
 Person Number: 771435
 Title of Dissertation: Determining the role and relative importance of predator avoidance and nutrition as process influencing herbivore use of burnt areas in Satara, Kruger National Park, South Africa

Please read the information sheet before completing this form

Examiner's Recommendation/s - Please answer all questions by ticking the appropriate box		YES	NO
1	Does the Dissertation reveal an adequate acquaintance with the methods of research? (Refer 2.1 of guide)	X	
2	Is the literary presentation of the Dissertation satisfactory?	X	
3	Does the Dissertation constitute a contribution to the advancement of knowledge in the subject chosen?	X	
4	More than one category of b may be yes. Only ONE of c should be YES		
	a) Do you recommend award of the degree of MSc for the Dissertation as it stands?		X
	b) Do you recommend the award of the degree subject to:		
	i) correction of minor errors and/or	X	
	ii) revision involving, for example, rewriting of certain sections and/or	X	
	iii) extension, for example, additions of sections and/or provision of additional data?		
	c) If the answer to b) ii or b) iii is yes,		
	i) Are you satisfied to leave the checking of the revised Dissertation to the Head of School?	X	
	ii) Do you wish to re-examine the revised Dissertation?		X
	d) Do you recommend outright rejection?		X
5	Do you recommend the award of the degree with distinction? Please comment.		X
6	The names of examiners are confidential, but successful candidates may be told the names of their examiners with their consent. Would you agree to your name being divulged in this case?	X	

EXAMINERS DETAILED REPORT

Please frame your report in the light of the requirements for the degree referred to in the Information Sheet. Please expand your recommendations under item 4 of this form. If you have suggested correction, revision and/or extension, please be specific about what the candidate should be required to do to make the Dissertation acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION /COMMENTS:

This is my second review and I must congratulate the student and the supervisor for a hugely improved thesis. The thesis now shows that the candidate understands the nature and purpose of the investigations and is well acquainted with the methods of research.
 All the points I had asked to improve on have been dealt with. The only aspect that could still improve are the discussions of the results, with discussion sections still being for most part a repetition of the results. Hence I recommend the candidate makes a better effort to place the results in the context of the available literature in the discussion sections. In addition there are minor errors and comments which I have pointed out on the pdf.
 I also congratulate the candidate on having a section where the shortcomings of the study are critically analysed and were recommendations for future work are discussed, as it shows a good level of scientific maturity.

After re-examination the examiner reports recommend the award of the MSc subject to the correction of minor errors and revision being completed to the satisfaction of the HoS
 @Muyade
 13th Oct 2015