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PhD Supervisors – a necessary????

Your supervisor is likely to be the single most significant individual in influencing the success of your PhD. Choosing your supervisor, understanding their roles – including those that are nothing to do with supervising you – and understanding their advice will be crucial to a smooth, successful PhD experience.
PhD Supervisors – a necessary ????

- I had 2 supervisors so far!
- Spent 12 months looking for 2\textsuperscript{nd} one!
- Spent 6 months looking for 3\textsuperscript{rd} one!
- More new Work
Why me –I volunteered! Why?

- Supervisor relationship –critical to PhD research
- My first one –did not work out –my research —was too different from their expertise –Master in LAW
- Some students get there –largely without or despite their supervisor –but much easier if “on side”!
- Relationship with new supervisor –going OK – although he was on leave for 9 months 2nd year –and alternative supervisor (new academic) –too soft!
How long have you been working on your PhD?

- Started June /2006?
- 2006 –when I started!
- 2007
- 2008
- 2009
- 2010, 2011?
PhD journey
One view of a PhD student/supervisor relationship

How do you rate out of 10 - your relationship with your PhD supervisor?
First Lesson Learned

What problems/issues have you had with your supervisor?

I didn't sleep all week, but I finished the paper for that conference in Italy...

Huh? What conference?
Second Lesson Learned

- Time fly fast
- Plan it wisely
Third Lesson Learned

- Don’t waste your first year
- Get a life
During my 5 year

Frustration is escalating
Still more to come

ADDRESSING REVIEWER COMMENTS
BAD REVIEWS ON YOUR PAPER? FOLLOW THESE GUIDELINES AND YOU MAY YET GET IT PAST THE EDITOR:

Reviewer comment:
“The method/device/paradigm the authors propose is clearly wrong.”

How NOT to respond:
× “Yes, we know. We thought we could still get a paper out of it. Sorry.”

Correct response:
✓ “The reviewer raises an interesting concern. However, as the focus of this work is exploratory and not performance-based, validation was not found to be of critical importance to the contribution of the paper.”

Reviewer comment:
“The authors fail to reference the work of Smith et al., who solved the same problem 20 years ago.”

How NOT to respond:
× “Huh. We didn’t think anybody had read that. Actually, their solution is better than ours.”

Correct response:
✓ “The reviewer raises an interesting concern. However, our work is based on completely different first principles (we use different variable names), and has a much more attractive graphical user interface.

Reviewer comment:
“This paper is poorly written and scientifically unsound. I do not recommend it for publication.”

How NOT to respond:
× “You #&@@% reviewer! I know who you are! I’m gonna get you when it’s my turn to review!”

Correct response:
✓ “The reviewer raises an interesting concern. However, we feel the reviewer did not fully comprehend the scope of the work, and misjudged the results based on incorrect assumptions.”
Hope your PhD goes well!
A good relationship with your supervisor will help!