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Description automatically generatedWIAS PhD Literature survey**

1. **General information**

Project title:

Chair group (s):

Start date – End date:

Location of research/ Where will the project be carried out:

Composition of the project group and scheduled time for project

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Title | First name | Surname | Chair group | Institute / University | Role in project[[1]](#footnote-1) | hours/week |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Cooperation with organisations outside WIAS**

Wageningen UR Other Graduate Schools:

Research Institutes:

The Netherlands Universities:

Research Institutes:

Industry and organisations:

International Universities:

Research Institutes:

Industry and organisations:

**2. Summary of objectives**

Summary of objectives and hypotheses (as implemented in the already available research proposal)

**3. Content (5.000-10.000 words)**

3.1 Abstract (300 words)

3.2 Overview of the relevant literature

An option for literature searching: [Link to WUR My library](https://library.wur.nl/WebQuery/mylibrary)

The aim of the literature survey is to review existing scientific literature related to the main objectives/questions of the PhD research project. Overall, the scientific quality (completeness and relevance) should be appropriate for the PhD project. The method used in the literature search and selection should be described (e.g., search strategy, used database(s), search terms, inclusion/exclusion criteria).

The survey is:

- clear and concise, summarizing the current knowledge /theories / concepts /databases and methodologies/results using up-to-date peer reviewed scientific literature

- a stand-alone document with sufficient detail to inform a reader who may or may not have the relevant background on the topic.

- a systematic analysis of the relevant literature, containing logical and convincing arguments that are well-balanced and backed up by scientific literature

- able to identify gaps in knowledge and indicate the relevance of the PhD research project

- well laid out with every chapter having a clear function and put in the right place of the document.

- using functional figures and tables

- using writing a style that is attractive to excite / engage the reader

3.3 Consequences of the analysis of literature for the execution of the project (including a summary of the proposed adjustments of the original proposal)

Reflect with the obtained knowledge from the literature review on the existing research proposal. Describe adjustments you want to make based on the literature survey and what the consequences are of these adjustments on the PhD project?

**Data management**

*Do you follow the data management policy of the chair group?*

*If yes, are there any additional issues?*

**Statement using generative AI**

If you used AI for your literature survey, then provide a list of the ai tools used links to websites. List the purpose for each tool used.

If applicable, please take care yourself of appropriate submission to the relevant committees and other legal aspects (Nagoya protocol; ethical approvement; lab access, etc).

**Signatures for approval**

Daily supervisor Promotor

Name: Name:

Signature: Signature:

**Attachments:**

1. Peer reviewed proposal
2. Data management plan (if relevant)

Note: After submitting the literature survey, the PhD candidate will be invited for an interview with two WIAS Research Committee members to discuss the survey.

**Literature**

1. Promotor: Professor / or academic staff with “Ius Promovendi” who formally promotes a PhD candidate to doctor, and is (formally) the principal supervisor during the doctoral research.

   Co-promotor: a scientist (who has a PhD degree) with specific expertise in the field in which the PhD candidate does the research. Not uncommonly, the co-promotor is the one who actually guides the PhD research on a daily basis, while the promoter provides more formal guidance and keeps track of the theoretical aspects of the research.

   Daily supervisor: an academic member of the research group who carries out many of the daily supervising activities. In many cases, this person is also one of the co-promotors in the project.

   Advisor: a scientist who is involved in the project but not on a regular and formal basis [↑](#footnote-ref-1)