



EGI Ph.D.-student meeting

2025-12-18



Topics for today – Thesis

- ITM upcoming Guideline for Thesis design
 - EESC guideline
 - Plagiarism and Self-plagiarism
 - AI use
 - Quality and Quantity
- Time line and deadlines (before defense)
- eISP in LADOK
- AOB

Plagiarism and Self-plagiarism

- Background
 - There has been a few cases for which Ph.D.-defenses has been postponed due to the occurrence of Plagiarism in the Ph.D.-thesis. These cases have been found before the actual defense, by either the Internal Quality Reviewer or by the appointed Opponent at the formal defense. These cases have been of mainly two cases:
 - Reuse of text from published articles of the Ph.D. -student
 - Re-use of charts/diagrams from published articles of the Ph.D. -student
- Statement at the FA/DA meetings:
 - Reformulate text from previous articles, even when from appended articles -"10 words in a row without quotation signs is not ok". Redo graphs and pictures, or use "with permission".
 - From the EESC-guideline:
 - “student’s own intellectual work and should not contain verbatim reproductions of parts of published or submitted manuscripts. All sources, including your own work, must be acknowledged. ”
 - “the kappa should function as a self-standing document. It should be comprehensible without reading the papers included in the thesis ”

Plagiarism and Self-plagiarism

- Students ask for guidance:
 - It's a discussion between Main supervisor and student when deviating from the view of FA
 - It is a risk since there are a few checkpoints to pass
 - The view of the Internal Quality Reviewer
 - (The view of the FA, DA will not have a different view than the FA)
 - The view of the Opponent
 - The view of the grading committee
- Questions Supervisors may have an opinion on:
 - Size of Kappa (self-contained, at the same time not re-using material or phrases)
 - Copyright of papers, charts, diagram, pictures (often copyright and ownership given away when publishing) => Use with permission + Adequate reference (usually not a problem if you publish via the "large" publisher, Elsevier, Springer etc. but do check), **if needed ask for permission to use for thesis at time of publication** .

Use of AI for thesis

- For reference, the EESC guideline:
 - “The kappa must be the student’s own intellectual work...”
- Thus, the obvious guide would be that there is no issue using AI for language check and text improvement, just as we used to do with sending thesis for external language check previously.

Quality and Quantity

- There are some examples recently where students have exaggerated number of publication:
 - Indek (?) student with eleven papers
 - ABE students
 - 6 papers claimed in the thesis, then additional 20 not included in thesis. Quality of the papers (and the kappa) seemed to have been suffering from the workload.
- It is the view of FA/DA to make sure quality is maintained, quantity is not a substitution.
 - The old guideline stating a scope corresponding to 4 peer reviewed journal papers (with good credits) is expected. Corresponding here does not directly translate to an actual number.
- It is important that the supervisors also communicate the importance of **quality** and focus less on the number(s).

Time line and deadlines (before defense)

- There has been several recent cases where supervisors and students do not seem to understand the importance of the stated deadline (the countdown to defense)
- Some of these are not KTH-rules but UKÄ-rules
- FA will no longer have any leniency for not keeping the deadlines
 - Failing to comply will mean defense has to be re -scheduled to a later time
- The timeline on ITM homepage will be updated with clearer deadlines, using words such as shall and not 5-6 weeks so it will be easier to comprehend.
- Thus, make sure you will have buffers between the deadlines in case of any hiccups along the way
 - It is understood the inconvenience of re -scheduling of defense with all the involved actors, so use buffers.



EESC guideline (template for ITM?)

The purpose of the kappa

At a high level, the kappa provides you with an opportunity to summarise the main arguments and results arising from the studies carried out during your doctoral research. It also provides an overview of the entire area of your thesis (which encompasses the union of papers it is based on) and may cover aspects not addressed by the individual papers. The kappa allows for a level of abstraction away from the details of the rest of the thesis, to show and argue for a consolidated contribution to your research domain. In practical terms, the kappa is a principal means of achieving the degree objectives for third-cycle education, as outlined in the Higher Education Ordinance. It also serves as an important source of evidence that the student has indeed met these objectives. The kappa also serves to introduce the research topic to a wider audience. For this reason, although not mandatory, we strongly recommend including a popular science summary.

Considerations when writing the kappa

- The kappa must be the student's own intellectual work and should not contain verbatim reproductions of parts of published or submitted manuscripts. All sources, including your own work, must be acknowledged.
- The kappa/monograph is a public document that is available physically and published electronically. It may contain unpublished results, but the public nature of the document must be kept in mind when doing so (e.g., it may prevent future patenting).
- For a compilation thesis, the kappa should function as a self-standing document. It should be comprehensible without reading the papers included in the thesis.

EESC guideline

High level structure of the kappa

The structure of the kappa may vary across research domains or even between topics. Below, we list the essential components of the kappa, which can be organized in a way that best suits the specific research field. Note that these components do not need to follow a fixed order and can be combined or arranged differently as needed:

1. **Popular Science Summary** – Provide a summary that communicates the research to a broader audience.
2. **Introduction and Motivation** – Introduce the problems addressed and discuss aspects such as sustainability.
3. **Research Questions** – Clearly state the research questions your thesis addresses.
4. **Thesis Contributions** – Detail the contributions your work makes with respect to the research questions.
5. **Literature Review** – Review the relevant literature for the overall area of the thesis.
6. **Research Gaps and Interrelationships between Papers** – Identify research gaps in the state of the art and explain how the included papers, research gaps, and research questions are connected. Illustrate how the papers interrelate and contribute to a broader understanding of the thesis topic.
7. **Statement of Own Contributions** – Clearly outline your contributions to the thesis results, distinguishing your work from that of co-authors. Use an established taxonomy, such as CRediT¹, or provide detailed statements about roles (e.g., XX was responsible for data collection, while YY did the analysis).
8. **Conclusions** – Summarize the findings and discuss their implications.
9. **Future Work** – Suggest potential directions for future research.

Consider the components outlined above as essential elements. These elements are closely aligned with the objectives of the doctoral degree. The table below provides an overview of how different parts of the thesis demonstrate the achievement of specific degree objectives.

Degree Objective (ISP Section 9)	Relevant Components of the Kappa
A1	2, 4, 5, 7, 8
A2	4, 5, 6, 7, 9
B1	5, 6, 8, 9
B2	3, 5
B3	4, 6, 8, 9
B4	The kappa as a whole and the defence.
B5	6, 9
B6	1, 8
C1	By writing the kappa independently with minimal use of co-authored papers. By discussing potential ethical issues in the kappa.
C2	1, 2, 8, 9
Sustainability	2, 8, 9



eISP in LADOK

- KTH is involved in a new generation of ISP, which is intended to be “inside” LADOK.
- What are your opinion? What should be included:
 - More/less info in
 - Minimum (KTH)-level with possibility for supervisors to expand
 - Much info should, if needed, be populated from other systems (at KTH).
 - Info that is not really used in the context of the research study should be removed (or elective)
 - Journal system, meeting documentation and such needs to be smooth
 - Keeping track of development and plan (agreements) must be tracked and stored



AOB?