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Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Drawn up at the pre-defence in front of the guidance committee of the PhD thesis with the title ...................................................................................................................................................., written by the PhD student ………………....................…………………………., enrolled on .......................................... (date), domain .........................................................................................., PhD supervisor Prof./Assoc.Prof. ......................................…………………………………….., PhD, Eng.

At the pre-defence session were present the members of the guidance committee, the PhD supervisor, specialists from the department/Faculty ..................................................................... Before the pre-defence, the thesis was verified by the Doctoral School using the Turnitin software, and the anti-plagiarism report showed no elements to justify the plagiarism suspicion (D3............/........................). After the applicant presented the results of the thesis and the original contributions, there was a session of questions, discussions and comments. The main questions asked by the members of the committee and the other specialists referred to:

1. ..................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
2. ..................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
3. ..................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

The guidance committee made a note that, where appropriate, the following aspects have to be explained/corrected/added in the thesis which will be officially submitted:

1. ..................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
2. ..................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

Taking into consideration the results and original contributions in the thesis, the discussions which took place, the conclusions of the acceptance report drafted by the PhD supervisor and the favourable opinion of the guidance committee, the following decision was made: The PhD thesis can/cannot be officially submitted in the view of the public defence.

PhD. supervisor: Prof. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, Phd, Eng.I agree/don't agree \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Members: Prof. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, Phd, Eng.I agree/don't agree \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Prof. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, Phd, Eng.I agree/don't agree \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Prof. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, Phd, Eng.I agree/don't agree \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 (signature)