



APPROVED by
HSE University Law
Dissertation Committee
Minutes No. 1, dated May 22,
2018

**ADDITIONAL CRITERIA FOR THE STRUCTURE AND FORMAT OF DISSERTATIONS AND SUMMARIES
SUBMITTED TO THE HSE UNIVERSITY LAW DISSERTATION COMMITTEE BY ACADEMIC DEGREE
CANDIDATES**

CRITERIA FOR DISSERTATION WORKS

Manuscript page count:

For a Candidate of Sciences (PhD) degree –
150-220 pages (7-11 academic sheets);
For a Doctor of Sciences degree – at least 400
pages (20 academic sheets).

Manuscript structure:

- a) title page, formatted as per the set template (see sample);
- b) table of contents;
- c) text of the dissertation, including its introduction (a sufficiently extensive analysis of bibliography regarding the research topic), main body, conclusion and a reference list.

CRITERIA FOR SUMMARY

Summary page count (in Russian and English):

For a Candidate of Sciences (PhD) degree – up to 1.5
academic sheets (up to 60.000 printed characters);
For a Doctor of Sciences degree – up to three academic
sheets (up to 120.000 printed characters).

A dissertation summary should outline the core ideas and conclusion of the dissertation research, as well as highlight the author's academic contributions, the theoretical and applied significance of the research findings, information about the organization where the research has been conducted, the academic supervisor and research advisors of the candidate for the academic degree (if relevant), and a list of the author's publications, where the key academic results of dissertation work are published.

We strongly recommend setting aside time for writing a summary since it can provide an initial impression for experts and council members about the candidate's work. A concise, substantive and clear synopsis of your work will provide a compelling reason for an expert to continue reading and emphasize the strengths of the dissertation work. A sloppy summary, however, will instantly result in a negative attitude, which may affect the assessment of the entire work, as this means that the author does not understand and is unable to explain the value of their own research, or that they have a careless attitude towards their own work.