

The change is approved by  
the academic council meeting of the  
University Geomedi LLC protocol №02, 17.02.2025

Rector, Professor Marina Pirtskhalava

## **The Instruction for the Preparation, Submission, and Evaluation of the Master's Thesis**

### **I. General Part**

1.1. The Master's Thesis is a mandatory scientific-research component of the Master's educational program, aimed at developing the master's student's ability for critical analysis, innovative synthesis of information, and independent execution of research, using the latest methods and approaches.

1.2. The Master's Thesis reflects the alignment of the master's student's level of knowledge and research skills with the requirements defined by the Master's program. The thesis provides the opportunity to present one's own conclusions, arguments, and research results, adhering to the principles of academic integrity and ethical standards, both for the academic and professional community.

1.3. The master's student will be allowed to defend the thesis after obtaining the credits provided by the mandatory training courses of the speciality within the framework of the master's program.

1.4. The evaluation of the master's thesis is based on the rules for evaluating the knowledge and skills of students operating in the university and the components provided by the master's program.

1.5. The thesis supervisor is assigned from the academic staff designated by the faculty (invited staff with the relevant qualifications may also be permitted). The thesis supervisor may simultaneously supervise no more than 3 active-status master's students.

### **II. Master thesis topic**

2.1. The topic of the master's thesis is selected from the list of possible topics proposed by the supervisor or supervisors of the master's thesis based on the reconciliation of the opinions of the master's student and the topic supervisor.

2.2. The topic of the master's thesis shall be relevant, research-oriented, and correspond to the current scientific directions for the specialty of the master's educational program.

2.3. The list of topics for the master's thesis is approved by the faculty council upon submission by the supervisor of the relevant program.

2.4. The topic of the Master's Thesis and the scientific supervisor are approved by the Rector based on the decision of the Faculty Council through the relevant order.

### **III. Master's supervisor**

3.1. The supervisor of the master's thesis can be an academic or invited lecturer of the university with appropriate qualifications in the field. Taking into account the specificity of the research topic, priority can be given to the scientific and/or practical experience of the supervisor, as well as the relevance and fluency of topics previously performed under his guidance.

3.2. The supervisor of the master's thesis is approved by the rector of the university based on the decision of the faculty council.

3.3. The supervisor is obliged to:

1. help the master's student choose a topic, draw up a plan and process a bibliography;
2. periodically check the progress of work on the topic, express remarks, and provide appropriate consultations;
3. explain the master's student's rights and responsibilities and require their adherence;
4. advise the master's student to draw up an individual plan and to monitor its implementation.
5. prepare a written conclusion after the completion of the thesis, which will reflect the following:
  - title of the thesis;
  - Master student's identity;
  - A brief overview of the work and its strengths and weaknesses;
  - The master's student's skills;
  - general assessment of thesis (without a grade);
  - The relevance of the thesis content to the master's topic;
  - The conclusion regarding the admission or non-admission of the thesis to public defense.

3.4. The supervisor has the right to decline the supervision. In this case, they must submit a written request with appropriate justification to the Faculty Council, which will review the reasons for refusal and appoint a new supervisor.

### **IV. Submission of the master's thesis to the public defence**

4.1. The completed thesis shall be submitted to the supervisor of the master's program on the basis of the written conclusion, which shall be certified by the signature and seal of the faculty;

4.2. The supervisor of the master's program ensures that the work performed by the graduate is checked in the anti-plagiarism system in accordance with the plagiarism detection and response rule.

4.3. In the event of a positive request from the supervisor of the master's program, the graduate student will be admitted to the preliminary review of the thesis before the commission, which is approved by the faculty council.

4.4. The preliminary review of the master's thesis is a necessary condition for the public defense of the thesis;

## **V. Reviewer**

5.1. The supervisor of the master's program, together with the supervisor of the topic of the thesis, appoints a reviewer, who is formed by the resolution of the faculty council.

5.2. The reviewer can be both an employee of the university and an outside person;

5.3. The reviewer must be an individual with a doctoral academic degree in the relevant field;

5.4. The reviewer provides a review/assessment of the thesis.

5.5. The review should reflect:

- The title of the thesis
- Master student's identity;
- Review of the thesis (volume, structure, language, formatting, etc.);
- Strengths and weaknesses of the paper, with notes and recommendations;
- The alignment of the Master's Thesis with the Master's topic;
- The alignment of the Master's Thesis with the qualification to be awarded;

5.6. The reviewer is obliged to inform the master's student of his notes and conclusion about the paper no later than 3 days before the public defense;

5.7. The reviewer's attendance at the public defense is not mandatory, although the commission or the graduate student can invite him and attend the session.

## **VI. The Thesis Defense Procedure**

6.1. The master's student submits the completed thesis to the thesis supervisor, who returns it to the author with their comments (if any).

6.2. Taking into account the comments of the supervisor, the master's student completes the paper in a final form and again submits it to the supervisor of the topic for a written conclusion;

6.3. The thesis, along with the supervisor's conclusion, is submitted to the head of the Master's program, who, in case of a positive recommendation, will permit the master's student to proceed with the preliminary review of the thesis. It is not required for the thesis to be submitted in bound form for the preliminary review.

6.4. The head of the Master's program checks the completed Master's thesis (along with the electronic version) for plagiarism no later than one week before the public defense;

6.5. A properly formatted, bound, and covered copy of the reviewed thesis (along with the electronic version) is submitted to the relevant faculty for the public defense before the Master's Thesis Defense Commission.

6.6. The public defense of the Master's Thesis is conducted before the Master's Thesis Defense Commission, which is formed from the academic/invited staff of the relevant faculty specialty.

6.7. Specialists from the relevant field (employers) may be invited to the public defense of the Master's Thesis.

6.8. The commission must consist of 3 members, and a final protocol is drawn up regarding the proceedings and outcomes of the commission's meeting.

#### **6. 8. Public defence of the Thesis:**

6.8.1. The secretary of the master's thesis defence commission informs the public attending the public defence of the biography of the master's student, academic results, name of the master's thesis, supervisor, and reviewer;

6.8.2. The regulation for the Master's Thesis presentation is 15 minutes.

6.8.3. The master's student's presentation should briefly outline the thesis's objectives, tasks, existing viewpoints on the issues addressed, its analysis, conclusions, and the theoretical and practical value of the thesis;

6.8.4. After the master's report, with the permission of the chairman of the commission, the members of the commission and then the attending public can ask questions of the master's student. The graduate student is obliged to consistently answer each question;

6.8.5. Then, the floor is given to the reviewer (if they are present at the meeting), or the commission's secretary reads the review. The master's student responds to the reviewer's comments.

6.8.6. Next, the floor is given to the master's student's supervisor, who provides an evaluation of the master's student.

6.8.7. After the supervisor's speech, the members of the public defense commission, along with the invited specialists (if applicable), discuss the presented thesis.

6.8.8. The master's student is given the opportunity for a final word.

#### **VII. Evaluation of a master's thesis**

7.1. The master's thesis is evaluated using a 100-point system:

The grading system includes:

a) Five types of positive assessments:

a.1) (A) Excellent – 91-100 points;

a.2) (B) Very Good – 81-90 points;

a.3) (C) Good – 71-80 points;

- a.4) (D) Satisfactory – 61-70 points;
- a.5) (E) Sufficient – 51-60 points.

b) Two types of negative assessments:

- b.1) (FX) Failed – 41-50 points, which means that the student needs to put in more effort to pass and is given the opportunity to retake the exam once by working independently;
- b.2) (F) Failed – 40 points or less, which means that the student’s work is insufficient, and they must retake the course/subject.

**The public defense of the Master's thesis** (held in the 21st week) is evaluated based on the following components. Each component has an individual minimum competence threshold.

- Structure of the thesis – 5 points (minimum competence threshold – 2 points);
- Consistency between the stated objectives and research methods – 15 points (minimum competence threshold – 8 points);
- Diversity and validity of the sources used – 10 points (minimum competence threshold – 5 points);
- Citation technique – 5 points (minimum competence threshold – 3 points);
- Presentation technique and technology – 5 points (minimum competence threshold – 2 points);
- Relevance of the topic and its presentation – 15 points (minimum competence threshold – 8 points);
- Ability to reason and critically analyze – 15 points (minimum competence threshold – 8 points);
- Conclusions and recommendations – 10 points (minimum competence threshold – 5 points);
- Research planning and implementation – 15 points (minimum competence threshold – 8 points);
- Compliance with the regulations – 5 points (minimum competence threshold – 2 points).

<b>Evaluation of the Master's Thesis Defense Committee</b>					
<p><b>The structure of the Master's thesis is evaluated with a maximum of 5 points (minimum competence threshold – 2 points).</b></p> <p>Each member of the committee evaluates the thesis based on the following criteria:</p> <p><b>5 points</b> – The structure of the thesis fully complies with the standard, academic style is perfectly maintained, the headings, subheadings, and paragraph titles are entirely relevant to the content, and the citation of literature is relevant.</p> <p><b>4 points</b> – The structure of the thesis complies with the standard, academic style is maintained. The headings, subheadings, and paragraph titles are fully relevant to the content, and the citation of literature is relevant.</p> <p><b>3 points</b> – The language and style of formatting are mostly correct and academic. The alignment of headings, subheadings, and paragraph titles with the content is satisfactory, and the citation of literature is relevant.</p> <p><b>2 points</b> – The language and style of formatting are correct and academic. The headings, subheadings, and paragraph titles are mostly aligned with the content, and the citation of literature is mostly relevant.</p> <p><b>1 point</b> – The language and style of formatting contain numerous errors, the headings, subheadings, and paragraph titles do not match the content, and the citation of literature is irrelevant.</p> <p><b>0 points</b> – The formatting of the thesis does not meet the established requirements.</p>					
Commission member #1	Commission member #2	Commission member #3	Commission member #4	Commission member #5	Total

**The consistency between the stated objectives and research methods is evaluated with a maximum of 15 points (minimum competence threshold – 8 points).**

Each member of the committee evaluates the thesis based on the following criteria:

**15 points:** The relevance of the research topic is clearly and logically formulated, the stated objectives and conclusions are clearly linked to the research questions, the most appropriate and recent research methods and approaches are selected, and the rationale for their use is fully justified.

**13–14 points:** The stated objectives are clearly connected to the research questions. The most appropriate and recent research methods and approaches are selected, and the rationale for their use is fully justified.

**11–12 points:** A large part of the stated objectives is well connected to the research questions, the selected research methods and approaches ensure specific results, although they are partially outdated, and the rationale for their use is well justified.

**9–10 points:** The stated objectives are connected to the research questions, the selected research methods and approaches ensure specific results, but they are not up-to-date, and the rationale for their use is weakly justified.

**8 points:** The stated objectives are, to some extent, related to the research questions but contain minor errors. The objectives address the research questions posed in the thesis, the selected research methods and approaches are somewhat outdated but still relevant to the problem.

**7 points** – The stated objectives contain errors in their connection to the research questions. The objectives partially address the research questions posed in the thesis, the selected research methods and approaches are outdated and only partially ensure specific results.

**4–6 points** – The stated objectives contain significant errors in their connection to the research questions. The selected research methods and approaches are not relevant to the problem. The rationale for their use is not justified.

**0–3 points** – The objectives are unclear, the selected research methods and approaches are inadequate for the problem, and they do not ensure specific results.

Commission member #1	Commission member #2	Commission member #3	Commission member #4	Commission member #5	Total

**The diversity and validity of the sources used are evaluated with a maximum of 10 points (minimum competence threshold – 5 points)**

Each member of the committee evaluates the thesis based on the following criteria:

**10 points:** The sources are highly relevant to the research topic, up-to-date, and consist of high-level scientific original publications (including foreign-language sources) and specialized monographs. The ability to critically analyze and synthesize the sources is demonstrated.

**8–9 points:** The sources are relevant to the research topic, recent, and, with minor exceptions, consist of refereed scientific publications and specialized monographs. A critical approach and ability to synthesize the sources are evident.

**6–7 points:** The sources are mostly relevant to the research topic, recent, and consist of refereed scientific publications and specialized monographs. A critical approach and ability to synthesize the sources are evident.

**5 points** – The sources are partially relevant to the research topic, recent, and, with minor exceptions, consist of refereed scientific publications and specialized monographs. A critical approach and ability to synthesize the sources are evident.

**4 points** – The primary and secondary sources found are limited in number and include scientific publications, with weak relevance to the research issue. The literature analysis is weak, incomplete, and not critical.

**1–3 points:** The list of sources used is scarce, only partially relevant to the research topic, and almost lacks scientific publications. The ability to synthesize the sources is not demonstrated, and the analysis is vague or not presented at all.

**0 points:** No sources are used, or the sources do not match the research topic.

Commission member #1	Commission member #2	Commission member #3	Commission member #4	Commission member #5	Total
<p><b>Citation technique is evaluated with a maximum of 5 points</b> (minimum competence threshold – 3 points).</p> <p>Each member of the committee evaluates the thesis based on the following criteria:</p> <p><b>5 points:</b> The materials used (including foreign-language sources) are relevant and consist only of refereed publications and specialized monographs (no textbooks are used). The citation index is high..</p> <p><b>4 points:</b> The materials used are relevant, and the majority are refereed publications and specialized monographs (textbooks are used in some cases). The citation index is satisfactory.</p> <p><b>3 points:</b> A significant portion of the materials used are refereed publications and specialized monographs, but low-quality publications and textbooks are also used. In some cases, the relevance is moderate, and the citation index is low.</p> <p><b>2 points:</b> A very small part of the materials used are refereed publications, while a significant portion consists of low-quality publications and textbooks. In many cases, the relevance is low.</p> <p><b>1 point:</b> The materials used are primarily low-quality publications and textbooks, and the relevance is often low.</p> <p><b>0 points:</b> The materials used are not relevant to the research topic.</p>					
<p><b>Presentation technique and technology is evaluated with a maximum of 5 points</b> (minimum competence threshold – 2 points).</p> <p>Each member of the committee evaluates the thesis based on the following criteria:</p> <p><b>5 points:</b> The presentation is of a high standard, the technologies used meet the requirements, and the history of research on the topic is clearly formulated, thoroughly analyzed, and evaluated.</p> <p><b>4 points:</b> The presentation is well-executed, the technologies used meet the requirements, and the history of research on the topic is well formulated, but lacks depth in analysis and evaluation.</p> <p><b>3 points:</b> The presentation is well-done, the technologies used partially meet the requirements, and the history of research on the topic is satisfactorily formulated, mostly analyzed, and evaluated.</p> <p><b>2 points:</b> The presentation is done satisfactorily, but the history of research on the topic is only partially formulated, and it is partially analyzed and evaluated.</p> <p><b>1 point:</b> The presentation is poorly done, with errors, and the history of research on the topic is poorly formulated, not analyzed or evaluated.</p> <p><b>0 points:</b> The presentation is not done, and the history of research on the topic is not presented.</p>					
<p><b>Relevance and presentation of the topic is evaluated with a maximum of 15 points</b> (minimum competence threshold – 8 points);</p> <p>Each member of the committee evaluates the thesis based on the following criteria:</p> <p><b>15 points:</b> The topic is contemporary, innovative, the relevance of the research topic is clearly and logically formulated, it aligns with the research objectives, and the research results have both theoretical and practical significance.</p> <p><b>13–14 points:</b> The topic is contemporary, the relevance is clearly and logically formulated, the objectives of the thesis are clearly defined, and the research topic mainly stands out for its practical significance.</p> <p><b>11–12 points:</b> The topic is contemporary, the relevance of the research topic is logically formulated, but lacks clarity, it aligns with the research objectives, and the research results have some practical significance.</p> <p><b>9–10 points:</b> The topic is relevant, the relevance of the research topic is well-formulated, but contextual factors are not fully considered, and it aligns with the research objectives.</p>					

**8 points:** The topic is mostly relevant, presented in an argumentatively sound manner, and aligns with the research objectives.

**7 points** – The topic is less relevant, the problem presentation is vague, and the argumentation is partially aligned with the research objectives.

**6-4 points** – The relevance of the research topic is weakly formulated, the problem presentation is vague, and the argumentation is partially aligned with the research objectives.

**3-0 points** – The relevance of the research topic is not formulated, the problem is not presented, and consequently, the research results have neither theoretical nor practical significance.

Commission member #1	Commission member #2	Commission member #3	Commission member #4	Commission member #5	Total

**Ability to reason and critically analyze – evaluated with a maximum of 15 points**

(minimum competence threshold – 8 points).

Each member of the committee evaluates the thesis based on the following criteria:

**15 points:** Fully masters professional terminology, participation in the discussion is effective, reasoning is distinguished by high objectivity and critical analysis skills. The information on the topic is conveyed comprehensively.

**13-14 points:** Fully masters professional terminology, participation in the discussion and reasoning is objective and coherent, the information on the topic is presented in full, and critical analysis skills are evident.

**11-12 points** Well masters professional terminology, participation in the discussion and reasoning is mostly coherent, distinguished by critical analysis skills, and the content of the topic is adequately conveyed.

**9-10 points:** Mostly well masters professional terminology, participation in the discussion and reasoning is characterized by objectivity and critical analysis skills.

**8 points:** Adequately masters professional terminology, participation in the discussion and reasoning is objective and demonstrates critical analysis skills.

**7 points** – Insufficiently masters professional terminology, participation in the discussion and reasoning lacks critical analysis skills. The content of the topic is inadequately conveyed.

**6-4 points** – Does not master professional terminology. Reasoning is incomplete and unconvincing, lacking critical analysis skills. The content of the topic is inadequately conveyed.

**3-0 points** – Does not master professional terminology. Does not demonstrate critical analysis skills. Reasoning related to the topic is inadequate.

Commission member #1	Commission member #2	Commission member #3	Commission member #4	Commission member #5	Total

The sum of all the components

--	--	--	--	--	--

**Conclusions and Recommendations – evaluated with a maximum of 10 points**

(minimum competence threshold – 5 points).

Each member of the committee evaluates the thesis based on the following criteria:

**10 points:** Original and relevant conclusions and recommendations are drawn, the research goals are fully achieved, an innovative synthesis of knowledge and research results is implemented, conclusions are professionally formulated based on critical analysis of the research, and ethical standards of the research are upheld.

**8-9 points:** New and original conclusions and recommendations are drawn, their interpretation responds to the research goals, they are coherently described and analyzed. The research is validated with appropriate valid data. The research is conducted through relevant methods and ethical standards of research are upheld.

**6-7 points:** Good conclusions and recommendations are drawn, their interpretation responds to the research goals, they are coherently described and analyzed. The research is validated with appropriate valid data. The research is mostly conducted using relevant methods, and ethical standards of research are upheld.

**5 points** – The research goals are mostly achieved through the conclusions and recommendations, the synthesis of knowledge and research results is carried out adequately, and ethical standards of research are upheld.

**4 points** – The results achieved only cover a small part of the research goals, the synthesis of knowledge and research results is fragmented and includes unfinished parts, and the conclusions are superficial.

**1-3 points:** The research goals are not achieved, the conclusions are weak and superficial, and there is no synthesis of knowledge and research results.

**0 points:** The research goals are not achieved, and the conclusions are irrelevant to the results of the research topic.

Commission member #1	Commission member #2	Commission member #3	Commission member #4	Commission member #5	Total
----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	-------

The sum of all the components

**Research Planning and Implementation – evaluated with a maximum of 15 points**

(minimum competence threshold – 8 points)

Each member of the committee evaluates the thesis based on the following criteria:

**15 points:** The research was independently planned and implemented fully in accordance with the established research deadlines. A high level of responsibility is demonstrated, and all stages around the research topic were fully coordinated and completed on time with the supervisor.

**13–14 points:** The research was independently planned and implemented in accordance with the established research deadlines, demonstrating responsibility. The stages around the research topic were coordinated with the supervisor.

**11–12 points:** The research was independently planned and implemented in accordance with the established research deadlines, demonstrating responsibility. The stages around the research topic were coordinated with the supervisor, although there were minor delays in some cases.

**9-10 points:** The research was independently planned and implemented mostly in accordance with the established research deadlines, demonstrating responsibility. The stages around the research topic were coordinated with the supervisor, with minor delays.

**8 points:** The research was independently planned and implemented partially in accordance with the established research deadlines, demonstrating responsibility. The stages around the research topic were coordinated with the supervisor, with some delays, but the research topic largely corresponds to the set requirements for independent planning and implementation.

**7 points –** The research was independently planned and implemented not in accordance with the established research plan, demonstrating irresponsibility. The stages around the research topic were carried out with delays and not coordinated with the supervisor. Therefore, the research topic partially meets the set requirements for independent planning and implementation.

**4-6 points –** The research was independently planned and implemented with discrepancies to the established research deadlines, not coordinated with the supervisor, and irresponsibility was demonstrated. Therefore, the research topic does not meet the set requirements for independent planning and implementation.

**0-3 points –** The research was not independently planned and implemented according to the established deadlines, not coordinated with the supervisor, and extreme irresponsibility was demonstrated. Therefore, the research topic does not meet the set requirements for independent planning and implementation.

Commission member #1	Commission member #2	Commission member #3	Commission member #4	Commission member #5	Total
----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	-------

The sum of all the components

**Adherence to Regulations – evaluated with a maximum of 5 points**

(minimum competence threshold – 2 points).

Each member of the committee evaluates the thesis based on the following criteria:

**5 points:** Fully adheres to the time regulations set for the presentation.

**4 points:** Adheres to the time limit set for the presentation, with minor violations of the regulations.

**3 points:** Adheres to the time limit set for the presentation, with partial violations of the regulations.

**2 points:** Does not fit within the time limit for the presentation, mostly violates the regulations

**1 point:** Does not fit within the time limit for the presentation, significantly violates the regulations

**0 points:** Does not adhere to the time regulations set for the presentation at all.

Commission member #1	Commission member #2	Commission member #3	Commission member #4	Commission member #5	Total
Total Sum of All Components (Minimum competence threshold – 51 points)					

7.2. The master's thesis will be considered completed if it scores 51 or more points during the evaluation.

7.3. If the master's thesis is evaluated at 41–50 points, the master's student is allowed to submit a revised master's thesis during the next semester.

7.4. If the master's thesis is evaluated with a score between 0 and 40 points, the master's student loses the right to resubmit the same thesis.

7.5. Members of the master's thesis defense committee are obligated to attend the thesis defenses, actively participate in the discussions, and, after the defense concludes, summarize the discussions in a closed session and evaluate each master's thesis through an open vote.

7.6. The committee prepares the assessment report of the master's thesis and makes the final decision regarding the conferral of the academic degree of master. The report must be accompanied by the reviews and the final evaluation statement written by the committee, which is signed by the committee members.

7.7. If the master's student is unable to attend the defense of the master's thesis within the specified period due to a valid reason, the head of the master's program is obliged to review the situation and submit a corresponding request to the faculty council for consideration;

## VIII. Designing a master's thesis

8.1. The master's thesis has a structure that is compiled with the help of a scientific supervisor and includes the following parts:

8.1.1. **The title page** is formed according to certain rules (the name of the higher education institution is indicated at the top of the page: University Geomedi LLC). The postgraduate's name and last name are inscribed two to three centimeters below. The topic of the master's thesis is written in the middle of the page in 16 font sizes. Then the master's speciality name and the research degree of which a thesis for defense is submitted. The supervisor's name, last name, and academic status are then shown near the bottom of the page, on the right side. The work's performance, location (i.e., city), and year of submission are outlined below (see Annexes 1a and 1b).

8.1.2. **Annotation** of not more than half a page and not less than 150 words, which briefly describes the relevance, purpose, and main news of the topic. Annotation is required. be written in the Georgian language. Annotations will be placed on one page and bound on the next title page.

8.1.3. **Table of contents:** in which the exact names of all chapters and paragraphs of the text of the work are listed.

8.1.4. The **introduction** is the general part of the paper, where the relevance of the topic, the purpose, and the tasks of the research are substantiated in no more than 2–3 pages. The subject and object of the research, the methods used for the research and the material-technical base are defined.

8.1.5. **The main text** is broken up into paragraphs inside chapters. Paragraphs and chapters are titled, with the topic supervisor considering the material.

8.1.6. **The conclusion** represents a part of the main research results of the paper, which briefly and concretely answers all the tasks.

8.1.7. **Used literature:** a list of literature that is formed in compliance with the specified rules.

8.1.8. All parts of the finished master's thesis must be bound in the cover in the following order: title page annotation, table of contents, introduction, chapters (main content), conclusion, references, and appendices.

8.2. The master's thesis submitted for defence before the attestation commission must meet the following formal requirements:

8.2.1. The volume of the master's thesis should be no less than 50 pages, which means all linked pages;

8.2.2. The work is printed on A4 size paper in Silfaen with a 12-point font; the size of headings and sub-headings is 16–14; Spacing between lines: 1.5 spaces; text alignment: full width; indentation of the first line of the paragraph: 1.27 (5 spaces). Page margins: 3.0 cm; from left, 1.60 cm. - From above, below, and from the right.

8.3. The master's thesis is completed in Georgian, following orthographic and stylistic norms.

8.4. All pages of the paper must be numbered sequentially. It is not allowed to leave a free space or page; repeat pages. Each page is numbered in the lower right margin with Arabic numerals, size 10. The page number should be spaced 1.3 cm from the bottom edge of the page and 2.0 cm from the right edge. The title page is not numbered but will count towards the total number of papers.

8.5. The titles of all chapters and sub-chapters of the paper should be included in the table of contents. All chapters should start on a new page and sub-chapters should continue on the same page.

8.6. The structural elements of the paper ("Table of Contents," "Introduction," "Conclusion," "References," "Appendices," and others) and the titles of individual chapters are written (size 14) in the middle part of the line without a period or underline. The distance between the title and the text, between the main title and the sub-heading, is determined by 1.5 spaces.

8.7. Chapters, paragraphs, and subsections of the work are numbered with Arabic numerals. In the main part of the work, the chapters are numbered sequentially, with Arabic numerals and a period. Paragraphs and subsections are numbered with a combination of Arabic numerals (e.g., 1.2 means the first paragraph of the second paragraph, etc.); if necessary, the next digit with a dot determines the number of the subsection.

8.8. If abbreviations of words or sentences are used in the text of the work, then the accepted list of abbreviations should be used, or they should be deciphered directly after the first use in the text and written in parentheses.

8.9. It is necessary to indicate the literary sources used in the master's thesis. The used literature should be cited in the main text (at the end of the citation) in square brackets with Arabic numerals (e.g., [7.13–14] means the source of name 7 in the list of used literature, pages 13–14).

8.10. An alphabetical list of the used books will be included at the bottom of the paper. The sources are written in Georgian initially, and afterwards, they are published in other languages. Their listing should be done according to the rules:

8.10.1. When referring to a book or monograph, it is necessary to name:

- Surname and initials of the author(s);
- Name of the book;
- City of publication;
- year of publication;
- Total number of pages;

8.10.2. When referring to a scientific article, the author(s).

- Surname and initials;
- title of the article;
- Journal abbreviation;
- year of publication;
- volume;
- number;
- The first and last pages of the article.

8.10.3. In the case of using Internet materials:

- author of the material;
- Website author;
- name of the material with a link marking
- Website address;
- a retrieval date for an online source

8.10.4. In the case of the use of governmental and statutory documents:

- Name of the country;
- Name of the agency to which the document belongs;
- year when the requested material was looked for.
- Type of document (order, instruction, law)
- Name of the document concerning the appropriate identification number and year;
- Location of the publication where the requested material was looked for.
- The title of the publication where the requested material was looked for.

## **IX. Deadlines for the selection, execution, preliminary review, and defence of the master's thesis**

9.1. The list of master's thesis topics is approved by the faculty council before the start of the 4th semester, while the thesis topic and supervisor for the master's student are confirmed by the end of the 4th week of the 4th semester.

9.2. Completing work on the master's thesis and checking the thesis in the anti-plagiarism system—17th week of the IV semester;

9.3. Preliminary examination of the master's thesis, 18th week of the IV semester;

9.4. Presentation of the review, 20th week of the IV semester;

9.5. Public defence of master's thesis, 21st week of IV semester.