BUCERIUS LAW SCHOOL
HOCHSCHULE FÜR RECHTSWISSENSCHAFT

Doctoral Degree Regulations of

Bucerius Law School
– Hochschule für Rechtswissenschaft –

from 15. Mai 2024
(last amended May 14, 2025)

The Senate of Bucerius Law School – Hochschule für Rechtswissenschaft – reissued the doctoral regulations (in the following: *PromO*) on May 15, 2024. The Ministry of Science, Research, Equality, and Districts approved them on June 19, 2024, under § 116 in conjunction with § 108(2) and (4) of the Hamburg Higher Education Act (*Hamburgisches Hochschulgesetz* – HmbHG).

Note: The German version of this document ist the only legally binding version. This English translation is dor your convenience only.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents 2
I. General Regulations (§§ 1 to 3) 4
§ 1 Doctoral Degree and Responsibilities 4
§ 2 Doctoral Committee 4
§ 3 Center for Academic Qualification (ZQ) 5
II. Promotion zur Doktor:in des Rechts (§§ 4 bis 29) 5
§ 4 Doctoral Achievements 5
§ 5 Evaluation 5
§ 6 Authorized Supervisors and Supervision Agreement 6
§ 7 Event “Fundamentals of Legal Research” 7
§ 8 Admission Requirements for Doctorate 8
§ 9 Application for Admission 9
§ 10 Decision on Admission; Admission Fee 10
§ 11 Doctoral Relationship 10
§ 12 Principles of Trustworthy Guidance 11
§ 13 Dissertation 12
§ 14 Admission to Examination 13
§ 15 Reporting on the Dissertation 14
§ 16 External Reviewers 15
§ 17 Review of the Dissertation 15
§ 18 Additional Reviewers 15
§ 19 Display of the Dissertation and Reviews 15
§ 20 Decision on Acceptance of the Dissertation 16
§ 21 Examination Committee and Lecture Topic 16
§ 22 Invitation to Oral Examination; Absence 17
§ 23 Subject and Content of Oral Examination 17
§ 23a Experimental Regulation for Disputation Model 17
§ 24 Decision on the Doctorate 18
§ 25 Mandatory Copies 19
§ 26 Doctoral Certificate 20
§ 27 Preliminary Use of the Doctoral Title 21
§ 28 [Currently Reserved] 21
§ 29 [Currently Reserved] 21
III. Honorary Doctorate in Law (§§ 30 to 31) 21
§ 30 Doctoral Achievements 21
§ 31 Award 22
IV. International Joint Doctorate (§§ 32 to 34) 22

§ 32 International Doctorate 22
§ 33 Admission Procedure 22
§ 34 Legal Basis 22
V. Final Provisions (§§ 35 to 38) 23
§ 35 Appeal 23
§ 36 Missing Doctoral Requirements 23
§ 37 Revocation of the Doctoral Degree 24
§ 38 Effective Date and Transitional Provisions 24

I. General Regulations (§§ 1 to 3)

§ 1 Doctoral Degree and Responsibilities

(1) [1]The university awards the degree "*Doktor des Rechts*" (Doctor of Law); abbreviated Dr. iur.) and the honorary degree "Doktor des Rechts ehrenhalber" (honorary Doctor of Law; abbreviated Dr. iur. h. c.). [2]The doctoral degree can also be awarded in conjunction with a foreign university or faculty based on a procedure conducted under §§ 32 ff. [3]The degree can optionally be awarded as "*Doktorin, Doktor oder Doktor:in*". [4]The abbreviated form remains unchanged.

(2) [1]Authorized examiners under these doctoral regulations are university lecturers according to § 10(1) No. 1 HmbHG, emeritus professors according to § 17(1) HmbHG, and retired professors. [2]The President and their deputies are equated with a university professor if they meet the requirements of § 15 HmbHG as legal scholars.

(3) [1]Decisions regarding the doctoral procedure are made by the Doctoral Committee (§ 2), unless these doctoral regulations specify another responsibility. [2]Appeals against decisions of the Doctoral Committee can be addressed to the Appeals Committee (§ 35). [3]Legal recourse remains unaffected.

(4) If tasks are assigned to a mediation office under these statutes, the Doctoral Committee establishes the mediation office in agreement with the President.

§ 2 Doctoral Committee

(1) [1]The Doctoral Committee is elected by the Senate for a term of 3 years. [2]If there is no validly constituted Doctoral Committee, the President appoints all or individual members who will perform the tasks until the next regular Senate meeting.

(2) [1]The Doctoral Committee decides on the admission to the doctorate (§ 10), the admission to the examination (§ 14), the acceptance of the dissertation (§ 20), the appointment of the examination committee (§ 21), and other matters assigned to it by these doctoral regulations. [2]It can issue guidelines for applying these regulations.

(3) [1]The Doctoral Committee consists of either three professors and a research associate of the university or two professors, a private lecturer, and a research associate of the university with a substitute member for each group. [2]Non-doctoral committee members have only an advisory role. [3]The Doctoral Committee elects a chairperson from its members. [4]The chairperson can only be a full-time university professor at the university as per § 18 university statute and § 15 HmbHG.

(4) [1]The Doctoral Committee decides in confidential deliberation and open voting without abstentions by majority. [2]In the event of a tie, the chairperson's vote decides. [3]The Doctoral Committee can decide by circulation procedure upon the chairperson's proposal, provided no member objects in text form immediately. [4]The chairperson handles the ongoing administration.

§ 3 Center for Academic Qualification (ZQ)

(1) [1]The Center for Academic Qualification (*Zentrum für wissenschaftliche Qualifikation*; ZQ) is responsible for the structured support of doctoral candidates. [2]This task is carried out jointly with the university lecturers. [3]The program of events of the Center for Academic Qualification (ZQ) requires the Senate's approval, which should be granted for three years.

(2) [1]The Center for Academic Qualification (ZQ) consists of a head and a board. [2]The head is subject to § 2(4) sentence 4. [3]The board consists of the head, three university lecturers, and two doctoral candidates, one of whom must be a research associate of the university. [4]The head and the board are elected by the Senate for three years, with re-election possible.

II. Promotion zur Doktor:in des Rechts (§§ 4 bis 29)

§ 4 Doctoral Achievements

(1) The doctorate serves to demonstrate the ability to conduct advanced legal research (§ 70(1) HmbHG).

(2) The doctorate is achieved based on a dissertation (§§ 13 to 20) and an oral examination (§§ 21 to 24).

§ 5 Evaluation

(1) [1]Doctoral achievements are evaluated with one of the following grades:

summa cum laude (excellent)

magna cum laude (very good)

cum laude (good)

satis bene (satisfactory)

rite (sufficient)

non rite (insufficient)

[2]The grade “summa cum laude” should only be awarded if the doctoral achievement is distinguished by special originality and academic maturity. [3]This must be thoroughly justified in the review according to § 17.

§ 6 Authorized Supervisors and Supervision Agreement

(1) [1]All university lecturers of the university are authorized to supervise a doctoral project (university professors as per § 18 university statute, junior professors, private lecturers, professors according to § 17 HmbHG). [2]Retired professors are authorized to supervise already admitted doctoral candidates. [3]Otherwise, taking over supervision requires the Doctoral Committee’s approval. [4]Supervision by a non-university professor (§ 10(1) No. 1 HmbHG) or private lecturer requires the Doctoral Committee’s approval.

(2) [1]An authorized supervisor can, without creating any binding effect vis-à-vis the Doctoral Committee, promise to supervise a person who meets the admission requirements according to § 8(1) No. 1 to 4 or (2) in writing or text form (supervision promise). [2]The promise obliges the supervisor to conclude a supervision agreement and undertake the duties of a supervisor under § 11(2). [3]The supervision promise must be reported to the Doctoral Committee. The Doctoral Committee must promptly inform the parties involved if, according to its preliminary assessment, the admission requirements of § 8(1) or (2) are not met.

(3) [1]The supervisor and the doctoral candidate conclude a supervision agreement. [2]The supervision agreement specifies the rights and obligations arising from the doctoral relationship between the university and the supervisor on one hand and the doctoral candidate on the other. [3]The supervision agreement must be in writing. [4]The supervision agreement particularly regulates:

- mutual expectations regarding the supervision of the doctoral project, including topic selection, type of dissertation, possibilities for presenting the project in a doctoral seminar, design of reporting obligations, and consultation meetings;
- the, in principle, mandatory attendance of the event „Grundlagen rechtswissenschaftlicher Forschung“ (Fundamentals of Legal Research) (§ 7) within the first six months of the supervision relationship;
- in the case of a cumulative dissertation, the number and criteria for the individual works to be submitted;
- the work and time plan for the dissertation project;
- involvement of additional supervisors according to § 11(3); and
- the framework conditions of the doctoral project, especially the compatibility of family and the doctoral project and the financial situation of the doctoral candidate.

[5]The supervision agreement should follow the template of a supervision agreement (appendix to the PromO), which can be adjusted to the specific requirements of the doctoral project. [6]The supervision agreement must be reported to the Doctoral Committee.

(4) [1]The supervision relationship can be terminated by the supervisor for an important reason. [2]An important reason exists particularly if, despite adequate supervision and sufficient time for completion, it becomes evident that successful completion of the doctoral project within a reasonable period is no longer expected, or if the basis of trust in the supervision relationship is destroyed, and cooperation is no longer possible. [3]It can in particular be terminated if the doctoral candidate fails to attend the event „*Grundlagen rechtswissenschaftlicher Forschung*" (Fundamentals of Legal Research) (§ 7(2)) within six months after signing the supervision agreement, despite being obliged to participate. [4]Before declaring termination, the supervisor must explain the reasons to the doctoral candidate and allow for a response. [5]If the doctoral candidate objects to the termination, the mediation office is involved; if no agreement is reached, the Doctoral Committee decides on the validity of the termination. [6]The doctoral candidate may terminate the supervision relationship at any time; withdrawal from the doctoral procedure (§ 11(6)) counts as termination. [7]With the termination, the supervision relationship ends, and the supervision agreement is considered nullified; the supervisor informs the Doctoral Committee about the termination.

§ 7 Event "Fundamentals of Legal Research"

(1) [1]The event „*Grundlagen rechtswissenschaftlicher Forschung*" (Fundamentals of Legal Research) provides a foundation for structured doctoral research at the university. [2]Participants engage deeply with the principles of good scientific practice and become familiar with the requirements for a doctoral project. [3]The event provides an overview of the potential of a legal research topic, the diversity of possible methodological approaches and their prerequisites, as well as the relevant disciplinary quality standards for a doctorate. [4]Additionally, information about the Center for Academic Qualification (§ 3) and its offerings is provided.

(2) [1]The Center for Academic Qualification (§ 3) is responsible for the design and implementation of the event. [2]The event should be offered twice annually and should span 10 to 15 hours. [3]Participation in the event is mandatory.

(3) [1]The Doctoral Committee may exempt an applicant from attending the Fundamentals of Legal Research event. [2]It must grant an exemption if attending the event is unreasonable for the applicant. [3]The time required to attend the event and the associated financial losses do not constitute grounds for exemption. [4]The advanced completion of the dissertation may constitute a reason. [5]The exemption may only be granted if it is ensured that the applicant knows and understands the principles of good scientific practice. [6]§ 8(3) and § 10(1) sentence 2 remain unaffected.

(4) [1]The fee for attending the event is 250 euros. [2]This fee is offset against the admission fee due under § 10(4) sentence 1 if admission has already been granted or if the admission to the doctorate is applied for within three months after attending the event "Fundamentals of Legal Research." [3]§ 10(4) sentences 3 to 5 apply accordingly.

§ 8 Admission Requirements for Doctorate

(1) Admission to the doctorate is granted to those who submit a supervision agreement (§ 6(3)) and who prove one of the following qualifications:

1. Passed the first or second examination within the meaning of § 5(1) of the German Judiciary Act (DRiG) with "fully satisfactory" or better.

2. Passed a comparable foreign legal examination with equivalent success and acquired two credits in German private law, criminal law, or public law at a state or state-recognized university.

3. Successfully completed the Master of Law and Business (MLB) examination at this university with particular success, and the Doctoral Committee, in agreement with the Dean of the MLB program, has determined that the master's thesis has a significant legal component and the applicant has successfully completed at least two lectures related to German law.

4. Acquired a comparable legal university degree in the Federal Republic of Germany with particular success.

5. Completed another university degree with particular success, qualifying them for a doctorate in that field, with the dissertation addressing an interdisciplinary area between that field and law, and the Doctoral Committee has granted consent.

(2) [1]If the examination according to paragraph 1, number 1 or 2 was graded "satisfactory" or equivalent, the Doctoral Committee should exempt the applicant from the requirement of paragraph 1, number 1 or 2, if

1. they present a seminar achievement graded at least "good" or equivalent or a legal bachelor's thesis graded at least "good" or equivalent from a scientific university, whether domestic or foreign, or

2. they have earned the Bachelor of Laws (LL.B.) at this university with a performance that places them in the top 15 percent of their examination cohort.

Additionally, the person who provides the supervision commitment (§ 6(2)) declares in a reasoned statement that the applicant's previous academic achievements suggest a successful doctorate. [2]Paragraph 1 applies correspondingly if the applicant did not pass the examination under paragraph 1 No. 1 with "fully satisfactory" or better but additionally passed a one-year Master of Laws (LL.M.) examination with particular success; if

taken abroad, it must be comparable to a German LL.M. examination, and paragraph 1 No. 2(b) applies additionally.

(3) [1]Deviating from paragraphs 1 and 2, the Doctoral Committee admits the applicant if

1. they were already admitted to a doctorate at another German legal faculty and
2. are supervised by a university lecturer who belongs to this university at the time of the application and previously belonged to the other legal faculty and supervised there.

[2]Admission within the meaning of number 1 also applies if the other German law faculty had informally promised admission in such a way as to create a legitimate expectation on the part of the applicant. [3]If the admission was made conditionally dependent on the fulfillment of further requirements, these requirements must be met at the time of the application to Bucerius Law School (§ 9).

(4) [1]The Doctoral Committee decides on the requirements of paragraph 1 Nos. 2 to 5 and paragraphs 2 and 3. [2]It may seek information from the Central Office for Foreign Education in case of doubt. [3]The Doctoral Committee may waive the requirement of two credits under paragraph 1 No. 2(b) in whole or in part.

(5) Admission must be denied if the applicant:

1. Has already been awarded a Dr. iur. in the Federal Republic of Germany.
2. Has been awarded a comparable Dr. iur. outside the Federal Republic of Germany, as determined by the Doctoral Committee.
3. Is still admitted to a Dr. iur. procedure at another university.
4. Has definitively failed the oral examination (§ 24(4)) in another doctoral procedure at this university.
5. The dissertation was rejected as unsuitable at another university.
6. Has failed the examination for Dr. iur. at another university.
7. Falls under § 36 No. 1.

§ 9 Application for Admission

(1) [1]The applicant submits the application for admission to the doctorate under § 8 in writing or text form to the Doctoral Committee. [2]They may simultaneously apply for permission to submit a foreign-language dissertation (§ 13(4)).

(2) [1]The applicant attaches to the application:

1. The supervision agreement according to § 6(3).
2. Proof that the requirements of § 8(1) to (3) are met.
3. A declaration that no grounds for denial of admission under § 8(5) exist.
4. A statement on whether and with what result they have already submitted a dissertation elsewhere or presented a dissertation draft.
5. A declaration that they have not and will not use commercial doctoral mediation and consulting.
6. A declaration to promptly inform the university of any subsequent loss of admission requirements.

(3) [1]The application under paragraph 1 may only be withdrawn from the Doctoral Committee under the provisions of § 11(6).

§ 10 Decision on Admission; Admission Fee

(1) [1]If the admission requirements (§§ 8, 9) are met, the Doctoral Committee admits the applicant to the doctorate and informs them of this decision in text form. [2]The admission may be conditional upon the applicant submitting a certificate of attendance for the event „*Grundlagen rechtswissenschaftlicher Forschung*" (Fundamentals of Legal Research) (§ 7) within six months after concluding the supervision agreement (§ 6(3)); the deadline is extended if the event is not offered within this period. [3]The deadline may be extended upon application for urgent personal reasons.

(2) [1]If the admission requirements (§§ 8, 9) are not met, the Doctoral Committee rejects the application. [2]The rejection must be justified.

(3) [1]Upon admission, an admission fee of 250 euros is due. [2]After paying this fee, the applicant is entered into the list of doctoral candidates of the university. [3]In justified exceptional cases, the President may make a different arrangement. [4]Employees and former employees with an average weekly working time of at least ten hours, if the employment relationship lasted at least 18 months, are exempt from the admission fee; an admission fee paid before the end of the period will be refunded. [5]In the case of § 8(3), the admission fee is waived.

§ 11 Doctoral Relationship

(1) [1]Upon admission, a doctoral relationship is established between the doctoral candidate and the university. [2]The university commits to supervising the doctoral project. [3]It enables self-determined research based on trustworthy guidance and promotes the doctoral project in a structured manner.

(2) [1]To ensure trustworthy guidance, the Doctoral Committee appoints an authorized supervisor. [2]The appointed supervisor is usually the one with whom the doctoral candidate concluded the supervision agreement (§ 6(3)). [3]The supervisor acts on behalf of the university. [4]The supervision must adhere to the principles of trustworthy guidance (§ 12).

(3) [1]The Doctoral Committee may appoint a second supervisor in agreement with the primary supervisor if necessary for scientific supervision. [2]It must appoint a second supervisor for intra- or interdisciplinary doctoral projects. [3]The doctoral candidate may apply to the Doctoral Committee for a second supervisor. [4]If there is no agreement among multiple supervisors on the supervision process, all parties may approach the mediation office. [5]If the mediation office cannot achieve consensus, the Doctoral Committee, after hearing all parties and in agreement with the President, determines the supervision arrangement. [6]The tasks of the second supervisor should be outlined in the supervision agreement (§ 6(3)) or an addendum.

(4) [1]The Doctoral Committee may relieve a supervisor from their duties and appoint a new one if the principles of trustworthy guidance are seriously violated. [2]This requires the President's consent. [3]The doctoral candidate may request the Doctoral Committee to relieve the supervisor from their duties. [4]The mediation office must be involved beforehand.

(5) [1]The Doctoral Committee may revoke admission (§ 10) if

- all supervisors have effectively resigned from their duties under § 6(5), and
- the university cannot ensure trustworthy guidance of the doctoral project, and
- the revocation is reasonable given the doctoral candidate's breaches of duty or obligation.

(6) [1]The doctoral candidate may terminate the doctoral relationship by withdrawing from the doctorate at any time before admission to the examination (§ 14). [2]If the candidate withdraws from the doctorate at a time when no negative decision has yet been made on the admission application according to § 14, the dissertation is considered not submitted. [3]If the candidate withdraws after receiving a negative decision on the dissertation or after beginning the oral examination, the withdrawal is invalid, and the doctoral examination procedure is considered unsuccessfully completed. [4]The Doctoral Committee issues a written decision to this effect, which must be justified. [5]The withdrawal from the doctorate according to sentences 1 to 3 is effected by a written application to withdraw the admission application (§ 9) to the Doctoral Committee.

§ 12 Principles of Trustworthy Guidance

(1) [1]The supervisor should assist the doctoral candidate in finding and developing the research question. [2]They may suggest a topic. [3]The supervision agreement (§ 6(3)) may stipulate mandatory attendance at events of the Center for Academic Qualification (ZQ).

(2) [1]The doctoral project should be designed so that its completion under normal circumstances, including preliminary review under paragraph 6, does not exceed three years. [2]If the project significantly deviates from the timeline, the supervision agreement must be adjusted. [3]The doctoral candidate must inform the supervisor if difficulties arise that are likely to jeopardize adherence to the agreed timeline.

(3) [1]The doctoral candidate commits to adhering to the principles of good scientific practice. [2]In particular, when conducting empirical research, candidates shall; commit to complying with applicable data protection regulations and research ethics principles as outlined in the supervision agreement; obtain consent from participants for surveys. [3]When conducting projects involving empirical research, the doctoral candidate shall prepare an overview of potentially relevant data protection and research ethics issues and outline their solution. [4]The university and all supervisors ensure adherence to the principles of good scientific practice, data protection regulations, and research ethics principles.

(4) [1]Regular discussions about the progress of the doctoral project are conducted between all parties to the supervision agreement. [2]These discussions should cover the current state of the project, the next steps, and the timeline. [3]The doctoral candidate should prepare short written reports for these discussions.

(5) [1]Supervisors give the doctoral candidate the opportunity to participate in doctoral seminars or suitable research colloquia. [2]The doctoral candidate should report on the progress of their project at least once.

(6) [1]Supervisors should read the dissertation in full before admission to the examination (§ 14) and provide the doctoral candidate with an assessment within a reasonable period, usually between three and six months, indicating whether the dissertation demonstrates the ability to conduct advanced legal research. [2]If not, the dissertation should be returned for revision. [3]The dissertation should not be returned for revision more than twice. [4]The goals of the revision should be explained. [5]Even if the dissertation meets the requirements for a doctoral achievement, suggestions for improvement and corrections should be made. [6]In this case, the dissertation should only be returned for revision once.

(7) [1]The parties involved in the supervision relationship may contact the mediation office if conflicts arise in the supervision relationship. [2]The mediation office should suggest ways to resolve the conflict amicably. [3]In doing so, the mediation office considers the particularities of a supervision relationship characterized by structural imbalances.

§ 13 Dissertation

(1) [1]The dissertation is a legal thesis based on independent research and must demonstrate the ability to conduct advanced legal work. [2]It must belong to a field represented by at least one authorized examiner of the university. [3]The independent scientific work may consist of a monographic dissertation or an equivalent cumulative dissertation.

(2) [1]In the monographic dissertation, the research question(s) are addressed in a single, coherent text of substantial length, which is independently marketable as a book (book format). [2]The doctoral candidate may, in accordance with paragraph 5, sentence 2, publish topics, research theses, interim results, or individual aspects or sections of the monographic dissertation until the examination procedure is completed. [3]The candidate must sufficiently clearly indicate these preliminary works and the extent of their incorporation into the dissertation, and adhere to the rules of good scientific practice in this regard. [4]The submitted dissertation must, even when utilizing preliminary works, be a relevant independent scientific work and contribute independently to solving scientific questions in its entirety.

(3) [1]A cumulative dissertation consists of a collection of individual works that have been published or are intended for publication, accompanied by an independent, substantial introduction and summary that integrates the individual contributions into a broader scientific context, it also identifies the connections between them, and interprets, evaluates, or discusses them comprehensively. [2]The cumulative dissertation must be submitted under a common title. [3]It must be indicated whether the contributions are submitted, accepted, or already published; the respective versions must be submitted. [4]If the individual contributions are co-authored, the doctoral candidate's contributions must be clearly identifiable and assessable; they must declare their independent contribution to each piece.

(4) [1]With the agreement of a supervisor (§ 11(2)), the Doctoral Committee should allow the dissertation to be submitted in English upon request. [2]If the dissertation is written in a third language, permission can only be granted if the reviewers have the necessary language skills. [3]In such cases, the dissertation must be accompanied by an extensive summary in German or English.

(5) [1]The dissertation must not have been submitted in another procedure to obtain an academic degree under §§ 67 and 70 HmbHG or an equivalent foreign degree, nor should it be submitted before the completion of the examination process. [2]The monographic dissertation must not be published in its entirety or substantial parts without the Doctoral Committee's approval before the completion of the examination process. [3]Paragraph 2, sentence 2 and paragraph 3, sentence 1 remain unaffected.

§ 14 Admission to Examination

(1) The doctoral candidate applies in writing or text form to the Doctoral Committee for admission to the examination.

(2) [1]The application must include:

1. The admission notice from the university (§ 10); if the application for admission is submitted simultaneously under § 9, this application suffices.

2. The latest version of the supervision agreement (§ 6(3)).

3. A certificate of participation in the Fundamentals of Legal Research event according to § 7, or a certificate of exemption from participation according to § 7(3).

4. Two printed, bound, or stapled and numbered copies with a table of contents and a searchable electronic version of the dissertation.

5. A summary of the dissertation coordinated with the supervisors, stored on a data carrier, including the problem, methodology, and results in German and English.

6. A curriculum vitae.

7. A list of published scientific works.

8. An official certificate of conduct not older than six months.

9. An affidavit that the dissertation was written independently and only the indicated sources and aids were used (§ 59(3) sentence 1 HmbHG).

10. A declaration that no grounds for denial of admission under § 8(5) exist.

11. A declaration that the conditions of §13(5) are met.

[2]If any documents are missing, the applicant must be given an appropriate deadline to submit the missing documents.

(3) The provisions of § 10(1) and (2) as well as (3) sentences 1, 3 to 5 apply accordingly to admission to the examination.

(4) [1]Admission must be denied if no admission to the doctorate (§ 10(1) sentence 1) has been granted or can be granted at the same time, or if the applicant is unworthy of holding a doctoral degree due to their conduct. [2]This is particularly the case if they have been convicted of an intentional crime with a final sentence of at least one year in prison.

(5) The application according to paragraph 1 can be revoked rom the Doctoral Committee in accordance with § 11(6).

§ 15 Reporting on the Dissertation

(1) [1]The dissertation is evaluated by two reporting university lecturers (§ 1(2)), one of whom must be a full-time university professor at the university according to § 18 university statute and § 15 HmbHG, or a junior professor within the meaning of § 18 university statute and § 18 HmbHG. [2]The Doctoral Committee may appoint additional reviewers in accordance with § 18.

(2) [1]The Doctoral Committee appoints the reviewers immediately after admission to the examination according to § 14. [2]The supervisor of the work (§ 11(2)) is usually appointed; this also applies if they have been appointed to another university.

§ 16 External Reviewers

Reviewers may also be authorized examiners from other scientific universities if they have comparable qualifications to those in § 1(2).

§ 17 Review of the Dissertation

(1) [1]The reviews are to be written independently. [2]The reviewers submit their written reviews to the Doctoral Committee within a reasonable period, usually within three months of appointment. [3]If the reviews are not submitted within six months, the Doctoral Committee decides on further action.

(2) Each reviewer proposes to the Doctoral Committee the acceptance, return for improvement (specifying the deficiencies to be corrected), or rejection of the dissertation and grades it with one of the grades mentioned in § 5.

(3) The dissertation is finally rejected, and the procedure is terminated if all reviewers propose rejection.

(4) A digital version of the reviews is provided to the doctoral candidate after the decision on the dissertation (§ 20); they may inspect the reviewed copies of the dissertation.

§ 18 Additional Reviewers

(1) [1]If only one reviewer grades the dissertation as "insufficient," the Doctoral Committee shall appoint another authorized examiner (§ 1(2)) as an additional reviewer. [2]If they also grade the dissertation as "insufficient," the examination is not passed, and the doctoral procedure ends without an oral examination, subject to § 20(2).

(2) [1]The Doctoral Committee, notwithstanding paragraph 1, may appoint an additional reviewer for important reasons. [2]The Doctoral Committee should replace one of the existing evaluations with the additional evaluation if this leads to or could still lead to a change in the overall result of the doctorate, or if based on the oral examination that it could still lead to a change in the overall result. [3]Before the replacement, the person whose evaluation is to be replaced must be heard. [4]If they object to the replacement, the replacement requires the approval of the President.

§ 19 Display of the Dissertation and Reviews

(1) The Doctoral Committee makes a digital copy of the dissertation and digital or digitized reviews available for two weeks for inspection by the persons named in paragraph 2 immediately after receiving the last review.

(2) [1]The Doctoral Committee notifies the doctoral candidate, all authorized supervisors of the university, all doctoral members of the Senate, and the Senate's representatives of the academic staff and doctoral candidates in text form about the display and the grades proposed in the reviews. [2]The period in paragraph 1 begins with the dispatch of

this notification. [3]The persons named, except the doctoral candidate, may submit written or text form comments to the Doctoral Committee within a week after the display period.

(3) In special cases, the Doctoral Committee may double the display period (paragraph 1) or the comment period (paragraph 2 sentence 2).

§ 20 Decision on Acceptance of the Dissertation

(1) [1]The Doctoral Committee decides on the acceptance of the dissertation in a non-public meeting or in a written procedure according to § 2(5) after the periods under § 19(2) and (3) have expired. [2]The Doctoral Committee may impose conditions for publication if proposed in a review.

(2) [1]The Doctoral Committee may return a rejected dissertation for revision once if one of the reviewers proposes it. [2]The committee sets an appropriate deadline for the revision. [3]If the revised dissertation is submitted on time, the reviewers appointed according to § 17 review and evaluate this version again. [4]If the deadline is missed and the doctoral candidate cannot prove that the delay was unavoidable, the dissertation is considered rejected.

(3) If the dissertation is not accepted, the examination is not passed, and the doctoral procedure is terminated without an oral examination, subject to paragraph 2.

§ 21 Examination Committee and Lecture Topic

(1) [1]The examination committee for the oral examination consists of three professors or two professors and one private lecturer, whether male or female. [2]The examination committee is appointed by the Doctoral Committee, which also designates the chair. [3]Two members of the examination committee must be members of the university. [4]At least one of the reviewers appointed under § 15 or § 18 should be a member of the examination committee. [5]Otherwise, the provisions of § 2(4) sentences 3 and 4 and § 2(5) apply accordingly.

(2) [1]Immediately after the examination committee is appointed, the Doctoral Committee informs the doctoral candidate about the appointed committee and requests them to propose a lecture topic in text form. [2]The proposal should be submitted within two weeks. [3]The lecture topic must not be derived from the dissertation nor be the core of a publication or term paper by the doctoral candidate at this or another university; the candidate must confirm the committee of this with the topic proposal. [4]The examination committee may deviate from the proposal after consultation.

(3) [1]The Doctoral Committee notifies the examination committee members immediately after receiving the topic proposal. [2]The proposal is considered accepted if none of the members objects in text form within one week.

§ 22 Invitation to Oral Examination; Absence

(1) [1]Immediately after the lecture topic is accepted, the Doctoral Committee invites the doctoral candidate to the oral examination in text form. [2]The invitation includes the lecture topic and the members of the examination committee. [3]The time, place, and topic of the oral examination are announced publicly within the university.

(2) [1]The notice period for the invitation is four weeks. [2]The doctoral candidate may waive the notice period in text form.

(3) [1]The oral examination is deemed not passed if the doctoral candidate misses the appointment without a valid reason. [2]The examination committee decides on this after giving the absentee an opportunity to comment.

§ 23 Subject and Content of Oral Examination

(1) [1]The oral examination consists of a legal lecture by the doctoral candidate and a subsequent discussion. [2]The oral examination serves to demonstrate the ability to present and discuss legal issues orally. [3]It usually lasts sixty minutes. [4]The examination is conducted in German; the examination committee may allow the examination to be conducted in another language upon the doctoral candidate's request, provided that all committee members can follow the examination.

(2) [1]The lecture initiates the oral examination. [2]It lasts between twenty and maximum thirty minutes.

(3) [1]The academic discussion following the lecture begins immediately after the lecture. [2]It may also cover topics related to the lecture topic.

(4) The lecture and academic discussion are open to the public within the university.

§ 23a Experimental Regulation for Disputation Model

(1) [1]The doctoral candidate can decide, with the consent of the first supervisor, whether the oral examination should follow the format described in §§ 21 to 23 (lecture model) or the format outlined in paragraph 3 of §§ 21 to 23 (disputation model). [2]The decision must be made at the time of the application under § 14(1). [3]The consent of the first supervisor must be present at the time the examination committee is appointed (§ 21(1) sentence 2). [4]If no declaration of the supervisor is available, consent is assumed.

(2) The Doctoral Committee evaluates the impact of paragraph 1 two years after its entry into force and reports to the Senate. [2]Paragraph 1 expires on December 31, 2026.

(3) [1]For the purposes of paragraph 1, §§ 21 to 23 are revised as follows:

1. § 21 Examination Committee **(Disputation Model)**
[1]The examination committee for the oral examination consists of three professors or two professors and one private lecturer. [2]The examination committee is appointed

by the Doctoral Committee, which also designates the chair. [3]Two members of the examination committee must be members of the university. [4]The reviewers appointed under § 15 or § 18 should be members of the examination committee. [5]Otherwise, the provisions of § 2(4) sentences 3 and 4 and § 2(5) apply accordingly. [6]The Doctoral Committee informs the doctoral candidate immediately about the composition of the examination committee.

2. § 22 Invitation to Oral Examination; Absence **(Disputation Model)**

(1) [1]Immediately after the examination committee is appointed, the Doctoral Committee invites the doctoral candidate to the oral examination in text form. [2]The invitation includes the members of the examination committee. [3]The time, place, and title of the dissertation are announced publicly within the university.

(2) [1]The notice period for the invitation is four weeks. [2]The doctoral candidate may waive the notice period in text form.

(3) [1]The oral examination is deemed not passed if the doctoral candidate misses the appointment without a valid reason. [2]The examination committee decides on this after giving the absentee an opportunity to comment.

3. § 23 Subject and Content of Oral Examination **(Disputation Model)**

(1) [1]The oral examination follows the format of a dissertation defense (disputation), consisting of a short lecture on the dissertation and a subsequent academic discussion. [2]The oral examination serves to demonstrate the ability to present and discuss legal issues orally. [3]It usually lasts sixty minutes. [4]The examination is conducted in German; the examination committee may allow the examination to be conducted in another language upon the doctoral candidate's request in text form, provided that all committee members can follow the examination.

(2) [1]The short lecture on the essential results of the dissertation or selected theses initiates the oral examination. [2]It lasts up to twenty minutes.

(3) [1]The academic discussion begins immediately after the short lecture. [2]It focuses on the dissertation itself and may include questions related to the dissertation's subject or methodology. [3]The doctoral candidate must be given the opportunity to address the main points of criticism expressed in the reviews during the academic discussion.

(4) The short lecture and academic discussion are open to the public within the university.

§ 24 Decision on the Doctorate

(1) The examination committee decides on the evaluation and overall result of the doctorate immediately after the oral examination, using the grading scale specified in § 5.

(2) [1]Each member gives an individual grade; the final grade of the oral examination is determined by the grades given by the majority of members; if three different grades are given, the middle grade applies. [2]If two members grade the performance as "non rite," the examination is not passed.

(3) [1]If the oral examination is passed, the overall result is calculated as follows:

1. [1]If the grades for the dissertation in the reviews are consistent, this grade constitutes the overall result. [2]The overall result is downgraded by one grade if the grade for the oral examination is two or more grades lower than the dissertation grade.

2. [1]If the dissertation is graded with no more than one grade difference by the reviewers, the better of the two grades constitutes the overall result if the oral examination is graded at least as good. [2]If the oral examination matches or is lower than the worse grade, this grade becomes the overall result.

3. [1]If **the** individual grades for the dissertation differ by two grades, the intermediate grade is considered, provided the grades for the oral examination support this calculation. [2]If the individual grades differ by three grades, the intermediate two grades are considered, and the better grade applies if the oral examination matches or exceeds this grade.

[2]If one of the three reviewers grades the dissertation as "non rite," this grade is disregarded for the overall result calculation.

(4) [1]The examination committee announces the result of the examination immediately after their deliberation. [2]The chair records the essential course and result of the examination.

(5) [1]If the oral examination is not passed, it can be repeated once. [2]The repetition should be done within a year. [3]If the second oral examination is missed without a valid reason or not passed, the entire examination is finally not passed.

§ 25 Mandatory Copies

(1) [1]After passing the oral examination, the doctoral candidate must submit the following copies to the Doctoral Committee within a year:

1. 10 book copies if the dissertation is published as an independent book or as a monograph in a series, including if it is digitally available under Open Access conditions, or

2. 5 printed or print-like reproduced copies if the dissertation is digitally accessible through the university library or another state university library in Germany, or

3. 30 printed or print-like reproduced copies in bound form if neither of the above applies.

[2]The Doctoral Committee can extend the submission deadline by up to one more year if the delay is not the candidate's fault.

(2) [1]The mandatory copies must indicate that the work was accepted as a dissertation by Bucerius Law School – Hochschule für Rechtswissenschaft. [2]They must also include the date of the oral examination and the names of the reviewers. [3]The external design of the dissertation must comply with the Doctoral Committee's guidelines. [4]Reviewers receive a copy each. [5]The Doctoral Committee ensures the necessary number of copies are delivered to the Carl von Ossietzky State and University Library.

(3) [1]The mandatory copies must match the dissertation evaluated; sentence 2 and 3 remain unaffected. [2]Conditions for publication made by the Doctoral Committee must be incorporated. [3]Other deviations, including abridgments, are only permissible if they do not change the scientific substance of the work or are justified by changes in the legal situation or the state of research achieved in the meantime. [4]Compliance with conditions and the permissibility of deviations are assessed by the Doctoral Committee, which may seek an opinion from the reviewers.

(4) [1]In the case of a cumulative dissertation, full bibliographic details must be provided for all accepted or published contributions. [2]If the necessary copyright acts for § 1 are not already legally allowed, the doctoral candidate should contractually ensure the required duplication, distribution, and/or public accessibility of the collected contributions. [3]If the rights holder does not permit or it is unreasonable for the candidate to wait for the decision, a detailed summary of the content of the contributions suffices. [4]In such a case, the combination of the requirements under § 13(3) and the summary must form an understandable and independently marketable text. [5]This is conclusively presumed if confirmed in writing by a supervisor.

§ 26 Doctoral Certificate

(1) [1]The university awards the degree specified in § 1(1) with the issuance of the doctoral certificate. [2]The issued certificate entitles the holder to use the doctoral title as described in § 1(1).

(2) The certificate contains:

1. The name of Bucerius Law School – Hochschule für Rechtswissenschaft –
2. The name of the doctoral graduate.
3. The doctoral degree (§ 1).
4. The title of the dissertation and the name of the supervising university lecturer.

5. The date of the doctoral degree, which is the date the mandatory copies were submitted.

6. The overall grade of the examination (§ 24) in Latin and German.

7. The functional title, name, and signature of the President and the chair of the Doctoral Committee.

8. The seal of the university.

(3) Upon request, the individual grades of the dissertation and the oral examination are listed on a separate document.

(4) Upon request, the certificate is also issued in English.

§ 27 Preliminary Use of the Doctoral Title

(1) [1]The Doctoral Committee may, upon written application, permit the doctoral candidate to use the doctoral title temporarily before the issuance of the certificate if they present a signed publishing contract ensuring that the conditions of § 25(1) sentence 1 No. 1 are met. [2]The permission expires if the mandatory copies are not submitted within two years.

(2) If the doctoral candidate has fulfilled the mandatory copy submission requirement under § 25, the Doctoral Committee may, upon written application, allow the use of the doctoral title temporarily until the certificate is issued (§ 26(1)), provided this permission has not already been granted under paragraph 1.

§ 28 [Currently Reserved]

§ 29 [Currently Reserved]

III. Honorary Doctorate in Law (§§ 30 to 31)

§ 30 Doctoral Achievements

(1) The university can award the honorary degree „*Doktor, Doktorin oder Doktor:in des Rechts ehrenhalber*“ (honorary Doctor of Law”) (abbreviated Dr. iur. h. c.) for outstanding scientific achievements that are significant for law or legal science (§ 1).

(2) The evaluation of the achievements of the honored person follows §§ 15, 16, 17(1) and (4) accordingly. [2]One review must be prepared by an external reviewer.

(3) The award of the degree and the recognition of the honored person’s achievements in the certificate (§ 31(3) No. 4) require the approval of two-thirds of the voting members of the Senate.

§ 31 Award

(1) The university awards the honorary doctorate (§ 1 § 30(1)) with the issuance of the honorary doctoral certificate.

(2) [1]The President presents the certificate to the honored person. [2]The issued certificate entitles the honored person to use the honorary doctoral title (§ 1 § 30(1)).

(3) The certificate contains:

1. The name of Bucerius Law School – Hochschule für Rechtswissenschaft
2. The name of the honored person
3. The doctoral degree (§ 1)
4. The recognition of the honored person's achievements.
5. The date of the award, which is the date the certificate is issued
6. The functional title, name, and signature of the President
7. The seal of the university.

IV. International Joint Doctorate (§§ 32 to 34)

§ 32 International Doctorate

[1]The university can award an international doctoral degree jointly with an authorized foreign university (partner universities) if the legal prerequisites are met both at the university and at the partner university, and the doctoral achievements required by these regulations, particularly § 13, are met. [2]The doctoral achievement entitles the award of an international doctoral degree, naming the participating universities. [3]The award is not permitted if any of the participating universities awards an additional international or national doctoral degree for the doctoral achievement.

§ 33 Admission Procedure

[1]Applicants for an international joint doctorate can be admitted on the recommendation of a full-time professor of the university. [2]The admission requirements must be equivalent to those required under § 8. [3]The Doctoral Committee decides on this.

§ 34 Legal Basis

(1) [1]The legal prerequisites for an international joint doctorate can be established by agreement, subject to special statutory regulations. [2]Such an agreement can be made for individual persons or generally with the partner university or a part of the partner

university (department, faculty, institute). [3]It must ensure compliance with the requirements of § 32 and the equivalent participation of Bucerius Law School in the doctoral procedure. [4]Otherwise, the provisions of these doctoral regulations apply accordingly.

(2) [1]Deviations from the provisions of the doctoral regulations are allowed in cooperation. [2]The deviations require the Senate's approval.

V. Final Provisions (§§ 35 to 38)

§ 35 Appeal

(1) The doctoral candidate can appeal decisions of the Doctoral Committee under § 10(2), § 14(4), § 20(3), § 33 sentence 3, § 36, and § 37(1) sentence 1, as well as decisions of the examination committee under § 22(3) and § 24.

(2) [1]The Appeal Committee decides on the appeal. [2]§ 66 HmbHG and § 42(2), § 68(1) sentence 1, and §§ 69 to 72 of the *Verwaltungsgerichtsordnung* (Administrative Court Procedure Act; VwGO) apply accordingly unless otherwise provided in the following paragraphs.

(3) [1]The Appeal Committee consists of one professor, whether male or female, a staff member of the university administration, and a representative of the doctoral candidates. [2]The staff member of the university administration chairs the committee. [3]Members of the Appeal Committee may not also be members of the Doctoral Committee. [4]Their term of office is three years.

(4) [1]The President appoints the staff member of the university administration and their deputy. [2]They must be qualified to hold judicial office. [3]If no one in the university administration meets this requirement, the positions are filled by members of the administration of another university.

(5) [1]The Senate elects the other members of the Appeal Committee and their deputies. [2]For members who are not professors and their deputies, the respective academic bodies have the right to make proposals; the Senate is not bound by these proposals. [3]The Senate appoints a deputy for each member of the examination committee; the sentences 1 and 2 apply accordingly.

(6) A person who acted as a reviewer or a member of the examination committee in the doctoral procedure is excluded from participating in the Appeal Committee.

§ 36 Missing Doctoral Requirements

If it is discovered before the issuance of the doctoral certificate that:

1. The doctoral graduate

a) is unworthy of holding an academic degree, particularly if they have been convicted of a scientific misconduct-related offense to a prison term of at least one year, or

b) The doctoral graduate has misled the university about essential requirements for the award of the doctoral degree, or

2. Essential requirements for the award of the doctoral degree were mistakenly assumed to be met without constituting a case under No. 1,

the doctoral certificate is not issued and in the case of the doctoral procedure under §§ 4 to 29, the overall examination is declared not passed by the Doctoral Committee, subject to a different decision by the Senate.

§ 37 Revocation of the Doctoral Degree

(1) [1]If the doctoral graduate has committed a significant act of deception in the doctoral procedure, the Doctoral Committee declares the examination not passed after hearing the individual. [2]If the doctoral degree has already been awarded, the Doctoral Committee revokes it.

(2) [1]§ 21 of the Statute for Ensuring Good Scientific Practice and Handling Suspected Cases of Scientific Misconduct at Bucerius Law School ("Satzungs zur Sicherung guter wissenschaftlicher Praxis und zum Umgang mit Verdachtsfällen wissenschaftlichen Fehlverhaltens") applies. [2]An act of deception particularly includes the unauthorized appropriation of another's ideas, formulations, and results without sufficient acknowledgment of their intellectual authorship.

§ 38 Effective Date and Transitional Provisions

[1]These doctoral regulations take effect upon their approval by the competent authority. [2]At the same time, the previous doctoral regulations of November 9, 2016, last amended by Senate resolution on November 30, 2022, are repealed.

VI. Appendix: Supervision Agreement Template pursuant to § 6 PromO of Bucerius Law School[1]

Between

1) _____
(hereinafter: the **doctoral candidate**)[2]

and

2) _____
(hereinafter: the **supervisor**)[3]

the following **supervision agreement** is concluded:

§ 1 Doctoral Project

(1) The doctoral candidate is preparing a monographic/cumulative[4] dissertation with the **working title**
……
……
……
in German/English[5].

(2) For a cumulative dissertation, the parties agree on the following individual works and applicable quantitative and qualitative criteria:

1 The template attempts to cover all situations. It can and should be adapted by the parties to meet the specific needs of the supervision relationship and appropriately shortened.
2 The parties are free to choose whether and which form of gender-neutral language they wish to use in the supervision agreement. The form used here is merely a suggestion.
3 Typically, there is only one supervisor. This is assumed in the form. If an additional supervisor has been appointed under § 11, para. 3 of the Doctoral Regulations, this person should be included as a party to the supervision agreement, and the supervision agreement should be adjusted accordingly.
4 Please specify what applies in each case.
5 Please specify what applies in each case; a third language is possible under the conditions of § 13, para. 4 of the Doctoral Regulations.

(3) For a project at the intersection of the doctoral candidate's field and law, the parties agree on the following interdisciplinary approach:[6]

§ 2 Timeline

(1) The completion of the doctoral project is aimed to be within ___ years.

(2) The parties agree on the following preliminary timeline:[7]

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Dissertation				
Travel				
Abroad				

§ 3 Duties of the Doctoral Candidate

(1) The doctoral candidate prepares a written outline of the doctoral project. The outline should describe the research question, the current research state, and discuss the scientific discourse. The outline should describe the methodological approach. The outline is a concrete summary of the project to which the supervisor commits in order to provide guidance. The supervisor-approved outline becomes part of this agreement.

(2) The doctoral candidate commits to completing the dissertation based on the approved outline within the timeframe specified in § 2(1) and submitting it to the Doctoral Committee. If it becomes clear that the timeline cannot be met, this must be discussed with the supervisor immediately.

(3) The doctoral candidate commits to participating in the Fundamentals of Legal Research event (§ 7 PromO) within the first six months. In addition, they commit to participating in suitable optional events of the Center for Academic Qualification (ZQ) at Bucerius Law School. They also commit to presenting their project at appropriate graduate events, seminars, workshops, or similar, as agreed with the supervisor. These events include but are not limited to:

[6] These details are only necessary if the doctoral candidate does not have a law degree and is only admitted because the work addresses an intersection between the candidate's field and law (§ 8, para. 1, no. 5 of the Doctoral Regulations). The details must be sufficiently specific for the Doctoral Committee to assess whether the special admission requirements are met.

[7] The timeline divides the doctoral phase into sections and includes intermediate goals of the doctoral project agreed upon by the parties. Additionally, this plan can document a potential research stay abroad, participation in conferences, or the planned publication of journal articles. The timeline is a prognostic decision and can therefore be modified at any time by mutual agreement.

(4) The doctoral candidate reports to the supervisor at least once per trimester/quarter/other specified period:

- ☐ per trimester
- ☐ per quarter
- ☐ other timeframe: _____

about the progress of the project, interim results, and adherence to the timeline and work plan. This report should include an updated outline. Additionally, they are obliged to promptly inform the supervisor of any significant changes in the topic, methodology, or focus. The full draft of the dissertation must be presented to the supervisor in good time before the end of the agreed period and before admission to the examination.

(5) The doctoral candidate will submit the dissertation and its drafts in a suitable format as a file created with a common word processing program to the supervisor on a data carrier. The doctoral candidate agrees that their submitted texts, drafts, and the dissertation version for review can be checked with appropriate software for proper citation and use of scientific literature and sources.

(6) Planned publications relevant to the doctoral project must be presented to the supervisor in good time before publication. Scientific projects not part of the (cumulative) dissertation should generally be reported to the supervisor to assess their impact on the agreed timeline (§ 2(1)).

§ 4 Duties of the Supervisor

(1) The supervisor commits to overseeing the doctoral thesis until the completion of the doctorate, regardless of the duration of any funding associated with the position.

(2) Supervision is carried out:

- ☐ within a structured doctoral program[8]
- ☐ as individual supervision with the following formats:

Content of the offer	Mandatory Participation	Optional Participation
Courses of Academic Writing/Work		
Doctoral Seminars		
Individual Consultation		
Submission of Interim Sections/Results		

[8] Please name the doctoral program. Should participation in the program prescribe regulations deviating from this supervision agreement, those regulations take precedence.

Other		

The parties have agreed on the following points:

- Frequency of exchanges: _____
- Frequency and format of progress reports:_____
- Type and number of presentations of the doctoral project:_____
- Integration into the scientific community:_____
- Stays abroad:_____
- Funding opportunities:_____
- Involvement of other discussion partners:_____

(3) The supervisor commits to regularly advising the doctoral candidate and discussing the progress and adherence to the timeline and work plan at least biannually. The performance and potential should be discussed, and the timeline and work plan further developed. The supervisor will provide at least one opportunity for the doctoral candidate to present the project at a doctoral seminar or another suitable format.

(4) The supervisor will read the dissertation in full before admission to the examination and provide the doctoral candidate with an assessment within

☐ two months ☐ three months ☐ six months

The supervisor will give an opinion as to whether the dissertation demonstrates the ability to conduct advanced legal research (§ 12(6) PromO). The dissertation should be discussed at least once, and written and oral suggestions should be provided. The supervisor will promptly point out errors and improvement options so that they can be considered within the planned period.

(5) The supervisor ensures that the doctoral candidate adheres to the timeline and work plan, points out potential difficulties in adhering to the timeline, and supports the doctoral candidate's scientific independence.

(6) If appointed as a reviewer for the dissertation, the supervisor commits to submitting the review within:

☐ two months ☐ three months ☐ six months

(7) After completing the doctoral project, the supervisor supports the doctoral candidate with advice and recommendations for publishing the dissertation.

§ 5 Compliance with the Rules of Good Scientific Practice

The parties commit to adhering to the rules of good scientific practice as formulated by Bucerius Law School[9]. It is primarily the doctoral candidate's task and duty to familiarize themselves with these standards. The supervisor shall support them in this. The parties agree to adhere to the rules of good scientific practice in the doctoral project. The doctoral candidate agrees that their work can be subject to plagiarism checks.

§ 6 Consideration of Specific Situations

The specific situation of the doctoral candidate, particularly the specific challenges faced by women, the compatibility of family and academic work, or the caring for relatives, will be considered in the supervision arrangement and the duties specified in § 3. The doctoral candidate is obliged to inform the supervisor of relevant changes in this area confidentially.

§ 7 Conflict Resolution

In case of conflicts, the parties may choose to approach the Doctoral Committee, the mediation office, or the President.

§ 8 Suspension and Termination of the Supervision Relationship

If the doctoral candidate is prevented from continuing their work on the doctoral project for a significant reason, the parties may agree to suspend the supervision relationship temporarily. If the doctoral candidate decides to discontinue the doctoral procedure, they must inform the supervisor immediately. The supervision relationship can be terminated by mutual agreement at any time. The doctoral candidate can terminate the supervision relationship in writing or text form to the supervisor before admission to the examination (§ 14 PromO). The termination of the supervisor is governed by § 6(4) PromO. The dissolution of the supervision relationship is otherwise governed by the rules of the doctoral regulations, particularly § 11(4) to (6).

Hamburg, _____

(doctoral candidate)

(supervisor)

[9] Refer to the Statute for Ensuring Good Scientific Practice and Handling Suspected Cases of Scientific Misconduct at Bucerius Law School.