POZNAN UNIVERSITY OF MEDICAL SCIENCES

DOCTORAL SCHOOL

RESULTS OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION CONDUCTED ON 15 SEPTEMBER 2026

NO.	STUDENT ID NUMBER	ASSESMENT RESULT	JUSTIFICATION
1.	80942	**POSITIVE**	The Committee very positively assessed the timeliness of the project's execution, the progress made in accordance with the planned research schedule, and the doctoral candidate's presentation of the research, as well as the subsequent discussion. The execution of the doctoral project was described as impressive. During the Q&A session, Committee members inquired about results contained in manuscripts currently under revision and expressed interest in the post-test methodology. The candidate was asked to explain Albert Bandura's Social Learning Theory and the statistical methodology employed. It was suggested that she deepen the analysis of psychological aspects related to the questionnaires used. She was also asked about the software used for statistical verification. Evaluation result: POSITIVE.

RESULTS OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION CONDUCTED ON 21 SEPTEMBER 2026

NO.	STUDENT ID NUMBER	ASSESMENT RESULT	JUSTIFICATION
1.	80991	**POSITIVE**	Based on the documentation submitted for the mid-term evaluation, the Committee concludes that the PhD Candidate is making satisfactory progress in accordance with the research schedule set out in her Individual Research Plan. The materials provided demonstrate systematic progress in the implementation of the planned research activities and the development of her research competencies. The PhD Candidate has collected and analysed data concerning the prices of medicines and pharmacy services in Portugal. She has also conducted an analysis of inflation trends and price dynamics, contributing to a better understanding of the economic factors influencing the pharmaceutical market and access to medicines. The research activities undertaken to date are consistent with the objectives of her doctoral project and provide a sound basis for further analyses.

			The Committee also positively assesses the PhD Candidate's publication activity. In addition to her previously published work, she is currently working on several new manuscripts related to her research. This demonstrates her continued involvement in disseminating research findings and developing her scientific output. The PhD Candidate has actively participated in national and international scientific conferences, providing opportunities to present and discuss her research findings and to exchange experience with researchers working in related fields. The Committee considers such activity an important element of her scientific development. The planned research internship in Lisbon is expected to further strengthen her methodological competencies and facilitate international scientific collaboration. During the mid-term evaluation, the PhD Candidate presented the progress of her research and the activities undertaken to date. She participated in the discussion with the Committee and responded to questions concerning her research methodology, the data collected, and the planned continuation of the project. The presentation and discussion demonstrated her familiarity with the research topic and her engagement in the doctoral project. Overall, the Committee positively assesses the PhD Candidate's progress, taking into account her research activities, publication plans, participation in national and international conferences, completed research placement, and plans for further international research experience. The activities undertaken provide evidence of consistent progress towards the objectives of the doctoral project. On the basis of the submitted documentation, the research progress, scientific activity, and the PhD Candidate's presentation and participation in the discussion, the Committee issues a positive mid-term evaluation.
2.	88595	**POSITIVE**	Based on the documentation submitted and the presentation delivered during the mid-term evaluation, the Committee concludes that the implementation of the research tasks during the first two years of doctoral education has been largely consistent with the schedule and objectives set out in the Individual Research Plan. The literature review conducted by the Doctoral Candidate covered both photosensitizer–drug conjugates, which constitute a central element of the research project, and the application of photodynamic therapy in cancer treatment. The analysis of the available literature provided a sound basis for initiating the planned synthetic studies aimed at obtaining macrocyclic precursor structures, followed by attempts to conjugate these structures with selected active pharmaceutical ingredients (APIs). During the course of the research, certain chemical challenges associated with the synthesis of the final covalent derivatives were encountered. As a consequence, the research plan concerning the synthesis of these compounds was partially modified. At the same time, the Doctoral Candidate continued work on alternative approaches involving liposomal formulations and polymeric nanocarriers for non-covalent mixtures of selected active agents. The Committee considers this modification to be a justified response to the experimental challenges encountered and notes that it has allowed the research to continue while remaining consistent with the overall objectives of the doctoral project. Based on the work completed to date and the modifications introduced, the Doctoral Candidate is approaching the stage at which the remaining planned research activities can be undertaken. The Committee recognizes his ability to adapt the research strategy to experimental findings while maintaining the project's scientific objectives. The Committee positively assesses the Doctoral Candidate's publication activity. During the first year of doctoral education, a review article co-authored by the Doctoral Candidate was published. At the transition between the first and second years of doctoral education, the first publication in the planned doctoral publication cycle was also published. This article is directly related to the subject of the doctoral dissertation and summarizes the Doctoral Candidate's literature review, constituting an important component of the project's scientific basis.

			The Doctoral Candidate is also actively involved in national and international scientific conferences, providing opportunities to present and discuss his research and to exchange scientific experience with researchers in the field. His scientific activity is further demonstrated by successful applications for research funding within the Doctoral School, including both a Small Research Grant and a Large Research Grant. The Committee considers these achievements as evidence of initiative and engagement in developing his research activity. An important element of the Doctoral Candidate's scientific development was also a nearly one-month research internship at Charles University in Hradec Králové, completed under the Erasmus+ Program. The placement provided an opportunity to gain experience in an international research environment and to further develop scientific and methodological competencies relevant to the doctoral project. During the mid-term evaluation, the Doctoral Candidate presented the progress of his research, the results obtained to date, and the planned next stages of the project. He participated in the discussion with the Committee and responded to questions concerning the research strategy, experimental challenges, and the proposed modifications to the research plan. The presentation and discussion demonstrated his knowledge of the research topic and her engagement in developing the doctoral project. Overall, the Committee positively assesses the Doctoral Candidate's progress during the first two years of doctoral education. Despite the experimental challenges encountered in the synthesis of the planned covalent derivatives, the research has progressed substantially, the necessary modifications have been introduced in a scientifically justified manner, and alternative research approaches have been pursued. The Doctoral Candidate has also demonstrated active scientific engagement through publications, conference participation, successful grant applications, and international research experience. Taking into account the progress of the research, scientific activity, publication record, international experience, and the Doctoral Candidate's presentation and participation in the discussion, the Committee issues a positive mid-term evaluation.
3.	80911	**POSITIVE**	Based on the documentation submitted for the mid-term evaluation, the Committee concludes that the doctoral research has been conducted in accordance with the objectives and the schedule outlined in the Individual Research Plan (IRP). During the evaluation period, the planned stages of the research were completed, and the designated milestones were achieved. In response to challenges encountered during the project, additional methodological improvements were implemented, further optimising research procedures and enhancing the quality of the study. The Committee considers these activities to demonstrate the proper and systematic implementation of the doctoral project, as well as the Doctoral Candidate's ability to respond appropriately to challenges that arise during the research process and to introduce justified methodological adjustments while maintaining the project's main objectives. The Committee positively assesses the Doctoral Candidate's scientific and publication activity. She is a co-author of a publication in the *European Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*, which contributes to her scientific output and demonstrates her involvement in research dissemination. At the same time, the Committee notes that, according to the IRP, a manuscript constituting a part of the doctoral dissertation was expected to have been published by this stage. No publication fulfilling this particular element of the planned publication schedule has yet been reported. The Committee therefore recommends intensifying work on the manuscript and ensuring its timely submission and further progression towards publication. The Doctoral Candidate has demonstrated substantial activity in the international scientific community, including participation in four international scientific conferences. Such involvement provides opportunities to present and discuss research findings, obtain feedback from other researchers, and develop international scientific contacts. An important element of the Doctoral Candidate's scientific development was a one-month research internship with her foreign supervisor. The internship provided an opportunity to work in an international research environment, broaden her methodological experience, and strengthen scientific collaboration relevant to the doctoral project.

			The Committee also positively notes the Doctoral Candidate's achievement of being awarded an NCN PRELUDIUM grant. Obtaining competitive research funding is an important indication of scientific initiative and demonstrates her ability to formulate and develop a research project and to seek external funding for scientific activities. During the mid-term evaluation, the Doctoral Candidate presented the progress of her research, the results obtained to date, and the planned continuation of the project. She participated in the discussion with the Committee and responded to questions concerning the methodology, research objectives, and interpretation of the results. The presentation and discussion demonstrated her familiarity with the research topic and her engagement in implementing the doctoral project. Overall, the Committee considers that the Doctoral Candidate has made satisfactory progress in implementing the doctoral project and has demonstrated substantial scientific activity, including publications, participation in international conferences, successful acquisition of competitive research funding, and international research experience. The Committee recognizes the achievement of the planned research milestones and the appropriate methodological adaptations introduced during the project. At the same time, the outstanding element of the publication schedule should be addressed as a priority in the subsequent stage of doctoral education. Taking into account the progress of the research, scientific achievements, international activity, grant success, and the Doctoral Candidate's presentation and participation in the discussion, while also noting the delay in the planned publication constituting part of the doctoral dissertation, the Committee issues a positive mid-term evaluation.
4.	94231	**POSITIVE**	The Committee, having reviewed the documentation submitted for the mid-term evaluation, the presentation delivered by the Doctoral Candidate, and the subsequent discussion, positively assesses the progress made in implementing the doctoral project and the Candidate's scientific activity. The doctoral dissertation is being carried out within a cotutelle PhD programme between Poznan University of Medical Sciences and Sapienza University of Rome. This international framework provides opportunities for joint supervision and scientific collaboration and creates favourable conditions for the successful completion of the planned publication-based doctoral dissertation. The implementation of the Individual Research Plan is progressing in accordance with the approved schedule. In particular, the recruitment process for the main case-control study, conducted as part of the ongoing research project, has been completed as planned. All baseline assessments specified in the study protocol have been performed in enrolled participants, with the exception of four participants from the Polish group who could not undergo DEXA due to body size limitations. The Committee considers this a justified technical limitation that does not indicate a significant deviation from the planned implementation of the study. The Committee places particular emphasis on the Doctoral Candidate's publication record. He is the author of two publications forming part of the publication cycle intended to constitute the doctoral dissertation. In addition, he is a co-author of five further publications, demonstrating his active involvement in other scientific projects and his ability to contribute effectively to collaborative research. The breadth of this publication activity reflects substantial scientific engagement extending beyond the core requirements of the doctoral project. The Doctoral Candidate has also demonstrated active involvement in the international scientific community, including participation in an international scientific conference. His scientific development has further been supported by obtaining a Large Research Grant from the Doctoral School, which constitutes evidence of scientific initiative and the ability to successfully seek competitive research funding. The Committee also positively assesses the Candidate's participation in the cotutelle programme and international scientific collaboration, which provide valuable opportunities for methodological development, exchange of expertise, and integration into an international research environment. During the mid-term evaluation, the Doctoral Candidate presented the progress of his research in a clear and structured manner, addressing the project's objectives, the methodology used, and the results obtained to date. His participation in the subsequent discussion was particularly

			noteworthy. He provided mature, well-considered and scientifically substantiated answers to the questions raised by the Committee, demonstrating an excellent understanding of the research topic, the methodological aspects of the project, and the broader scientific context of his work. His responses also reflected a high level of commitment to the doctoral project and strong personal engagement in the research. Overall, the Committee considers that the Doctoral Candidate is making very good progress in implementing the doctoral project. The completion of recruitment according to the planned schedule, the successful implementation of the study protocol, the substantial publication record—including two publications forming part of the doctoral dissertation cycle—and active involvement in additional scientific projects provide strong evidence of his scientific development. His success in securing competitive research funding, participation in international scientific activities, and, particularly, his mature contribution to the discussion further demonstrate a high level of scientific engagement. Taking into account the progress of the research, the publication record, involvement in scientific projects, international activity, successful acquisition of research funding, and the Doctoral Candidate's mature and substantive presentation and participation in the discussion, the Committee issues a positive mid-term evaluation.
5.	80339	**POSITIVE**	Based on the documentation submitted for the mid-term evaluation, the presentation delivered by the Doctoral Candidate, and her participation in the subsequent discussion, the Committee positively assesses the progress of the doctoral project and her scientific activity. The implementation of the Individual Research Plan (IRP) is proceeding very well and, in several aspects, ahead of the approved schedule. The overall timeliness of the research schedule is excellent. In particular, the study protocol was finalized in November 2024, slightly ahead of the planned February 2025 deadline. This achievement demonstrates effective planning and efficient organisation of the research activities. The sample collection is progressing smoothly and in accordance with the planned schedule, providing a solid foundation for the timely completion of the study's subsequent stages. The Committee particularly emphasizes the Doctoral Candidate's publication activity, which significantly exceeds expectations for this stage of doctoral education, both in terms of timeliness and quality. Her publication record demonstrates not only substantial involvement in scientific work but also the ability to disseminate research findings promptly and at an appropriate scientific level. The Committee considers the publication record to be an important indicator of the effective implementation of the doctoral project and the Candidate's strong scientific engagement. The Doctoral Candidate has also been actively involved in the international scientific community, including participation in an international scientific symposium, which provided an opportunity to present and discuss scientific work and to exchange experience with researchers from other institutions. Her scientific activity is further supported by a Large Research Grant from the Doctoral School, demonstrating initiative in developing her research and the ability to successfully secure competitive funding for scientific activities. During the mid-term evaluation, the Doctoral Candidate presented the progress of her research, the work completed to date, and the planned subsequent stages of the project in a clear and structured manner. During the discussion, she responded to the Committee's questions in a substantive and well-considered manner, demonstrating a good understanding of the research topic, the methodology used, and the objectives of the doctoral project. Her presentation and participation in the discussion confirmed her active involvement in the research and her readiness to undertake the subsequent stages of the project. Overall, the Committee considers that the Doctoral Candidate has made excellent progress in implementing the doctoral project. The completion of the study protocol ahead of schedule, the smooth progress of sample collection, and publication activity that exceeded expectations in both timeliness and quality provide strong evidence of highly effective implementation of the research plan. Her participation in an international scientific symposium and successful acquisition of a Large Research Grant further demonstrate her active scientific development.

			Taking into account the excellent progress of the research, the outstanding timeliness of the research schedule, strong publication activity, international scientific engagement, successful acquisition of research funding, and the Doctoral Candidate's presentation and substantive participation in the discussion, the Committee issues a positive mid-term evaluation.
6.	76750	**POSITIVE**	Based on the documentation submitted for the mid-term evaluation, the presentation delivered by the Doctoral Candidate, and the subsequent discussion, the Committee considers the progress of the doctoral project to be satisfactory and consistent with the main objectives of the Individual Research Plan. The implementation of the research plan has progressed appropriately, although certain activities have not been completed within the originally anticipated timeframe. In particular, there have been delays in the publication of manuscripts directly related to the doctoral dissertation and in the planned presentation of research findings at scientific conferences. The Committee considers these delays understandable and justified in light of the Doctoral Candidate's successful efforts to secure research funding and scholarships, as well as the modifications made to the research plan over the course of the project. Changes in the research strategy may require additional time to implement and validate new research approaches and may consequently affect the originally anticipated timeline for the publication and dissemination of results. The Committee considers such adjustments a natural and scientifically justified element of the research process and therefore finds the resulting delays understandable. The Committee positively assesses the Doctoral Candidate's scientific and publication activity. Although the publication of manuscripts directly related to the doctoral dissertation has been delayed, the Candidate has made productive use of this period by actively pursuing research funding and academic development opportunities. The successful acquisition of research grants and scholarships represents a significant scientific achievement and demonstrates initiative, independence, and the ability to obtain competitive support for further research. The Committee considers these activities to be an important contribution to the development of the doctoral project and the Candidate's scientific career. The Doctoral Candidate has also remained engaged in the broader scientific community through participation in scientific conferences and other academic activities. Where conference presentations have been postponed, the Committee considers this to be related to both the evolving research plan and the prioritization of activities associated with securing research funding and developing the project. These circumstances do not indicate a lack of scientific engagement; on the contrary, the Candidate has used the evaluation period productively to strengthen the scientific and financial foundations of the doctoral research. The Committee recognises that the delays in publishing the manuscripts are justified by the circumstances described above. At the same time, the publication of work directly related to the doctoral dissertation should remain a priority during the next stage of doctoral education to ensure the timely completion of the planned publication cycle. During the mid-term evaluation, the Doctoral Candidate presented the progress of the research, the work completed to date, and the planned continuation of the project. The presentation was clear and structured, and the Candidate actively participated in the subsequent discussion. The answers provided to the Committee's questions demonstrated a good understanding of the research topic, the objectives of the doctoral project, and the scientific context of the work. The discussion also confirmed the Candidate's engagement in the research and awareness of the remaining tasks. Overall, the Committee considers that the Doctoral Candidate has made satisfactory progress in implementing the doctoral project. The delays in publication and dissemination of research findings at conference are acknowledged; however, they are considered justified in light of the modifications introduced to the research plan, the evolving nature of the research activities, and the Candidate's successful efforts to secure research funding and scholarships. The Committee positively assesses the Candidate's scientific initiative and recognises the effective use of the evaluation period for activities supporting the continuation and further development of the doctoral research.

			Taking into account the progress of the research, scientific activity, successful acquisition of research funding and scholarships, participation in scientific activities, justified modifications to the research plan, as well as the Doctoral Candidate's presentation and substantive participation in the discussion, the Committee issues a positive mid-term evaluation.
7.	94269	**POSITIVE**	Based on the documentation submitted for the mid-term evaluation, the presentation delivered by the Doctoral Candidate, and the subsequent discussion, the Committee concludes that the Doctoral Candidate has made satisfactory progress in implementing the Individual Research Plan (IRP). The core objectives of the doctoral project, including the investigation of selected protein biosynthesis inhibitors, with particular emphasis on their effects on ribosome function, translation, ribosome biogenesis, and stress-granule formation, are being pursued consistently. The research activities undertaken to date remain aligned with the fundamental objectives of the IRP. During the project's implementation, several methodological modifications were introduced. These included replacing the planned FISH analysis with Oxford Nanopore sequencing and using toeprinting assays instead of puromycin-incorporation measurements. The Committee considers these modifications scientifically justified, as they broaden the scope of the investigation and may provide additional mechanistic insight into the processes under study, without altering the fundamental objectives of the doctoral project. Overall, the research remains aligned with the IRP, and the modifications are appropriately justified by the Doctoral Candidate. The Committee notes the Doctoral Candidate's publication activity and identifies areas requiring further development. Although the Candidate has contributed to published scientific work, he has not yet assumed a leading authorship position in the publications reported to date. Given the stage of the Candidate's doctoral education, the Committee recommends strengthening the Candidate's individual scientific contribution and increasing involvement in activities that demonstrate greater scientific independence, particularly by leading or co-leading publications directly related to the doctoral project. The Doctoral Candidate has participated in three international scientific conferences. However, participation was limited to attendance, without active contribution in the form of oral or poster presentations. The Committee considers participation in international conferences valuable for scientific development, but recommends a more active approach in the subsequent stage of doctoral education, including presenting research findings, engaging in scientific discussion, and establishing broader scientific collaborations. The Committee also notes that the Doctoral Candidate did not submit the Large Research Grant application planned within the research schedule. While this does not undermine the progress of the research itself, greater involvement in competitive research funding opportunities would be desirable and contribute to the development of the Candidate's scientific independence and project management skills. The Committee therefore recommends that opportunities to apply for research grants and other forms of competitive funding be actively pursued during the next stage of doctoral education. During the mid-term evaluation, the Doctoral Candidate presented the progress of the research, the methodological approaches applied, and the planned continuation of the project. The presentation demonstrated a good understanding of the research objectives and the methodological modifications introduced during the project's implementation. During the discussion, the Candidate responded to the Committee's questions and demonstrated knowledge of the subject matter and awareness of the scientific rationale underlying the research strategy. Overall, the Committee considers that the Doctoral Candidate has made satisfactory progress in implementing the doctoral project and that the research remains consistent with the IRP's fundamental objectives. The methodological modifications introduced to date are considered scientifically justified and potentially beneficial for the mechanistic scope of the research. At the same time, the Committee identifies the need to strengthen the Candidate's individual scientific profile, particularly through greater authorship responsibility, active presentation of research findings at scientific conferences, and increased engagement in competitive research funding.

			Taking into account the satisfactory progress of the research, the consistency of the research activities with the IRP, the scientifically justified methodological modifications, the Doctoral Candidate's publication and conference activity, as well as the presentation and participation in the discussion, while identifying the need for greater scientific independence and activity in the subsequent stage of doctoral education, the Committee issues a positive mid-term evaluation.

RESULTS OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION CONDUCTED ON 22 SEPTEMBER 2026

NO.	STUDENT ID NUMBER	ASSESMENT RESULT	JUSTIFICATION
1.	71335	**POSITIVE**	Based on the documentation submitted for the mid-term evaluation, the presentation delivered by the Doctoral Candidate, and her participation in the subsequent discussion, the Committee positively assesses the progress of the doctoral project and the implementation of the Individual Research Plan (IRP). The research schedule has been implemented appropriately, and the main research activities have progressed in accordance with the IRP's objectives. During the evaluation period, the Doctoral Candidate developed the study design, established a dedicated database for oncological and surgical variables, and conducted a structured review of the relevant literature. She also initiated patient recruitment and data management, thereby establishing the essential methodological and organizational foundations for the project's subsequent stages. The Committee notes that minor modifications to the sequence and timing of the planned activities have occurred. These were primarily associated with formal and administrative delays in implementing the Small Research Grant. In particular, delays in the delivery and registration of the cryosonde, as well as delays in transferring data from collaborating centers, affected the timing of selected research activities. The Committee considers these delays to be justified by external organizational and administrative factors and does not regard them as indicating insufficient progress in the doctoral project. The Committee positively assesses the Doctoral Candidate's publication activity, which is at a very satisfactory level for the current stage of education. Her publication record demonstrates consistent scientific activity and effective dissemination of research findings. The Candidate has also demonstrated a high level of conference activity, participating in scientific meetings and contributing to the exchange of scientific knowledge and experience. The Doctoral Candidate's scientific initiative is further demonstrated by the successful acquisition of funding through a Small Research Grant. She also submitted an application for an NCN PRELUDIUM grant, which demonstrates her willingness to seek competitive research funding and her commitment to developing the scientific aspects of the doctoral project. Although the outcome of such applications is not fully dependent on the

			Candidate, the preparation and submission of the proposal constitute valuable experience in developing research projects and competing for external funding. An additional element of the Candidate's scientific development was her participation in the Erasmus+ programme, which provided an opportunity to gain experience in an international academic and research environment, broaden her scientific competencies, and establish or strengthen international research contacts. During the mid-term evaluation, the Doctoral Candidate presented the progress of her research, including the study design, methodological foundations, activities undertaken to date, and planned subsequent stages of the project. The presentation was clear and structured. During the discussion, she responded to the Committee's questions and demonstrated a good understanding of the research objectives, methodology, and organizational aspects of the project. Her participation in the discussion confirmed her engagement in the research and awareness of the challenges and tasks associated with its further implementation.
2.	75206	**POSITIVE**	Based on the documentation submitted for the mid-term evaluation, the presentation delivered by the Doctoral Candidate, and the subsequent discussion, the Committee positively assesses the progress of the doctoral project and the Candidate's scientific activity. The implementation of the Individual Research Plan has progressed appropriately, and the main research activities are being carried out in accordance with the objectives of the doctoral project. The Committee notes, however, that a publication planned for the second year of doctoral education has not been completed within the originally anticipated timeframe. This constitutes a delay in the planned publication schedule and should be addressed during the subsequent stage of doctoral education. At the same time, the Committee recognizes the Candidate's continued involvement in research activities and considers the project's overall progress satisfactory. The Committee positively assesses the Doctoral Candidate's publication activity and involvement in dissemination of research findings. The Candidate has been actively engaged in scientific work and has participated in scientific conference, which have provided opportunities to present research findings, exchange scientific knowledge, and establish professional contacts. Continued active participation in scientific meetings is encouraged, particularly through oral or poster presentations directly related to the doctoral project. An important achievement during the evaluation period was securing funding through the Large Research Grant. The Committee considers this a significant element of the Candidate's scientific development, demonstrating initiative, the ability to develop a research proposal, and engagement in competitive research funding. The Candidate has also undertaken other scientific activities, including research-related training and internships, which have contributed to the development of methodological competencies and broader scientific experience. Such activities, together with participation in research projects and scientific meetings, demonstrate the Candidate's continued engagement in the academic and research environment and support the further development of the doctoral project. During the mid-term evaluation, the Doctoral Candidate presented the progress of the research, the activities completed to date, and the planned continuation of the project. The presentation was clear, well structured, and demonstrated a good understanding of the research objectives and methodology. During the discussion, the Candidate responded to the questions raised by the Committee and demonstrated appropriate knowledge of the research topic, understanding of the scientific rationale underlying the project, and awareness of the tasks that remain to be completed. The Candidate's participation in the discussion confirmed active engagement in the research and readiness to continue its implementation. Taking into account the progress of the research, the Candidate's publication and conference activity, participation in scientific projects, internships and other scientific activities, the successful acquisition of funding through the Large Research Grant, as well as the quality of the presentation and

			substantive participation in the discussion, while noting the delay concerning the publication planned for the second year of doctoral education, the Committee issues a positive mid-term evaluation.
3.	72019	**POSITIVE**	Based on the documentation submitted for the mid-term evaluation, the presentation delivered by the Doctoral Candidate, and the subsequent discussion, the Committee positively assesses the progress of the doctoral project and the implementation of the Individual Research Plan. The research activities are being carried out in accordance with the assumptions and schedule specified in the IRP. The main stages of the research have been implemented as planned, and the progress achieved to date provides a solid basis for the continued development and completion of the doctoral project. The Committee positively assesses the Doctoral Candidate's publication activity. To date, the Candidate has co-authored two scientific publications in which he is the first author. This constitutes a significant achievement and demonstrates an active and substantial individual contribution to the preparation and dissemination of research results. The Candidate's authorship position also indicates a developing degree of scientific independence and involvement in the research process. A further significant achievement is the successful acquisition of funding through a Large Research Grant. The Committee considers obtaining this competitive research funding to be an important element of the Candidate's scientific development, demonstrating initiative, the ability to formulate and develop a research project, and active engagement in the acquisition of external or competitive research support. The grant also provides an important foundation for the further implementation and development of the doctoral research. The Doctoral Candidate has also demonstrated active engagement in the international scientific community, participating actively in two international scientific conferences. Such involvement provides valuable opportunities for presenting and discussing research findings, exchanging scientific knowledge, receiving feedback from the international research community, and establishing scientific contacts. The Committee considers this conference activity an important component of the Candidate's professional and scientific development. During the mid-term evaluation, the Doctoral Candidate presented the progress of the research, the activities completed to date, and the planned subsequent stages of the project. The presentation was clear, well structured, and demonstrated a good understanding of the research objectives, methodology, and current state of the project. During the discussion, the Candidate responded substantively to the questions raised by the Committee and demonstrated a good command of the subject matter, understanding of the scientific rationale underlying the research, and awareness of the directions for further work. The discussion confirmed the Candidate's active engagement in the doctoral project and readiness to continue its implementation. Taking into account the appropriate implementation of the Individual Research Plan, the Candidate's strong publication activity, including two first-author publications, successful acquisition of a Large Research Grant, active participation in two international scientific conferences, involvement in other scientific activities, as well as the quality of the presentation and substantive participation in the discussion, the Committee issues a positive mid-term evaluation.
4.	81585	**POSITIVE**	Based on the documentation submitted for the mid-term evaluation, the presentation delivered by the Doctoral Candidate, and the subsequent discussion, the Committee positively assesses the progress of the doctoral project and the implementation of the Individual Research Plan. The research activities are being carried out in accordance with the objectives and schedule defined in the IRP. The progress achieved to date is consistent with the planned research pathway, and the Candidate has systematically implemented the activities expected for this stage of doctoral education. During the implementation of the IRP, several minor modifications were introduced, primarily to optimize the methodological procedures. These modifications were aimed at improving the methodological approach and adapting selected research methods to the practical requirements of the

			ongoing research. The Committee considers these adjustments to be scientifically justified and notes that they do not constitute significant deviations from the planned research objectives or alter the fundamental scope and direction of the doctoral project. The Committee positively assesses the Candidate's publication activity. The publications reported during the evaluation period are consistent with the research objectives and the publication-related plans included in the IRP. The Doctoral Candidate has also actively participated in the international scientific community, including participation in an international scientific conference. This provided an opportunity to present and discuss scientific work, exchange experience with researchers from other institutions, and broaden professional scientific contacts. An important element of the Candidate's scientific and professional development has been participation in numerous specialist courses and training programs. These activities have enabled the Candidate to broaden methodological and research competencies, acquire additional knowledge relevant to the doctoral project, and develop transferable academic skills. The Candidate has also been involved in organising a scientific conference. This activity demonstrates engagement in the broader academic community and provides valuable experience in the organisational and professional aspects of scientific work, including cooperation with other researchers and supporting the organisation of scientific events. During the mid-term evaluation, the Doctoral Candidate presented the progress of the research, the activities completed to date, and the plans for the subsequent stages of the doctoral project. The presentation was clear, well-structured, and appropriately focused on the research's main objectives and achievements. During the discussion, the Candidate responded to the Committee's questions and demonstrated a good understanding of the research topic, the applied methodology, and the project's scientific context. The discussion confirmed the Candidate's active engagement in the doctoral research and awareness of the planned directions for its further development.
5.	77733	**POSITIVE**	Based on the documentation submitted for the mid-term evaluation, the presentation delivered by the Doctoral Candidate, and the subsequent discussion, the Committee positively assesses the progress of the doctoral project and the implementation of the Individual Research Plan (IRP). The doctoral project is currently in the advanced experimental research stage, and the main research activities are progressing in accordance with the objectives of the IRP. The Committee notes a delay between the completion of selected research tasks and the timetable originally specified in the research plan. However, the Committee considers this delay scientifically justified and understandable in the context of the experimental work undertaken. In particular, the experimental period was extended to allow for the establishment of stable conditions for the mixed-cell culture, determination of the optimal number of cells and antibody concentrations, and refinement and validation of the flow cytometry panels. These steps are essential for ensuring the reproducibility and reliability of the experimental results and therefore constitute a scientifically justified extension of the experimental phase rather than a change in the fundamental objectives of the doctoral project. The Committee considers the additional time devoted to methodological optimization appropriate and beneficial for the quality of the research. Importantly, the delay is not expected to affect the timely completion of the doctoral thesis. The Committee positively assesses the Candidate's publication activity. The Doctoral Candidate is the first author of two scientific publications, which represent a significant achievement and demonstrate a substantial individual contribution to the research and dissemination of its results. The Candidate has also actively participated in a national scientific conference, contributing to the scientific exchange and dissemination of research findings. Such participation demonstrates engagement in the scientific community and provides an opportunity to discuss research results and receive feedback from other researchers.

			An important achievement during the evaluation period was the successful acquisition of funding through a Large Research Grant. The Committee considers this a significant indication of the Candidate's scientific initiative and ability to develop and pursue a research project within a competitive funding framework. The obtained funding constitutes valuable support for the continued implementation of the doctoral research. The Candidate has further demonstrated initiative by seeking competitive research funding through an application for an NCN PRELUDIUM grant. During the mid-term evaluation, the Doctoral Candidate presented the current stage of the experimental work, the methodological approaches applied, the results obtained to date, and the planned continuation of the project. The presentation was clear, well-structured, and demonstrated a good understanding of the research objectives, methodology, and experimental challenges. During the discussion, the Candidate responded substantively to the Committee's questions and demonstrated a strong command of the subject matter, as well as an understanding of the rationale behind the methodological decisions and experimental optimisation. The discussion confirmed the Candidate's active engagement in the research and readiness to continue the project towards its completion.