

Insufficient (I) Mark ≤ 5.4	Sufficient (S) Mark 5.5-6.9	Good (G) Mark 7.0-7.9	Very Good (VG) Mark 8.0-8.9	Excellent (E) Mark ≥9.0
<b>9. Title and abstract</b>				
<p>The title and/or abstract is missing and completely fails to describe the reported study.</p> <p>*The title/abstract is missing and fails to describe of the reported research (research area, relevance, aim, method(s), results, conclusion).</p> <p>*Title/Abstract is difficult to understand and/or contains abbreviations and/or jargon.</p>	<p>*The title does not completely identify the reported research.</p> <p>*The abstract fails to offer all the information that should be presented (research area, relevance, aim, method(s), results, conclusion).</p> <p>*Title/Abstract is not that easy to understand because of the use of abbreviations and/or jargon.</p>	<p>*Title offers information on the topic and provides sufficient insight into the reported research.</p> <p>*The abstract is informative and offers almost all information that should be presented (research area, relevance, aim, method(s), results, conclusion).</p> <p>*Title and abstract are easy to understand and contain no abbreviations or jargon.</p>	<p>*The title clearly identifies the content of the research article.</p> <p>*The abstract offers all information that should be presented (research area, relevance, aim, method(s), results, conclusion), but is not yet a completely coherent story.</p> <p>*Title and abstract are easy to understand and contain no abbreviations or jargon.</p>	<p>*Title clearly identifies the reported research and is attractive to readers.</p> <p>*The abstract includes all required information (research area, relevance, aim, method(s), results, conclusion) and is a coherent story that can be understood on its own.</p> <p>*Title and abstract are easy to understand and contain no abbreviations or jargon.</p>
<b>10. Introduction, problem definition, research aim</b>				
<p>*Introduction contains insufficient scientific literature relevant for the research area.</p> <p>*Lacks a well defined research aim (question/hypothesis) corresponding to the used literature.</p> <p>*Structure of the introduction completely lacks coherence.</p>	<p>*Introduction contains sufficient scientific literature relevant for the research area.</p> <p>*Research aim (question/hypothesis) is defined, but the link to the described literature is poor.</p> <p>*Structure of the introduction lacks coherence and literature is not described in-depth.</p>	<p>*Introduction contains most scientific literature relevant for the research area and is well structured.</p> <p>*Research aim (question/hypothesis) is defined, and linked to the described literature and placed in a wider context.</p> <p>*Structure of the introduction is coherent, but interpretation of findings is superficial at some points.</p>	<p>*Introduction contains almost all scientific literature relevant for the research area and is well structured.</p> <p>*Research aim (question/hypothesis) is very well defined, and linked to the described literature.</p> <p>*Structure of the introduction is coherent and literature is well described.</p>	<p>*Introduction is a thorough literature review containing all scientific literature relevant for the research area and could be suitable for publication.</p> <p>*Research aim (question/hypothesis) is very well defined, linked to the described literature and clearly indicates the relevance/innovation.</p> <p>*Structure of the introduction is coherent, and literature is well described and appealing to read.</p>
<b>11. Materials and methods</b>				
<p>*Too many/too few details are used.</p> <p>*No clear order has been used.</p> <p>*Important information is missing, others are unable to repeat the research that is described in the article.</p>	<p>*Too many/too few details are used.</p> <p>*The order is not consistent.</p> <p>*Some important information is missing, others may struggle to repeat the research that is described in the article.</p>	<p>*All techniques have been described, but sometimes too many/too few details are used.</p> <p>*A clear order is used and the sections are mostly concise and well written.</p> <p>*At some points important information is missing, but it is possible for others to repeat the research that is described in the article.</p>	<p>*All techniques have been described with enough detail, but section should be adjusted before it can be used for publication.</p> <p>*A logical order is used and the sections are well described in a concise manner.</p> <p>*All necessary information is provided for others to repeat the research that is described in the article.</p>	<p>*Excellent description of the materials and methods used, can directly be used for scientific publication.</p> <p>*All sections are well described in a concise manner and logic order.</p> <p>*All necessary information is provided for others to repeat the research that is described in the article.</p>
<b>12. Results</b>				
<p>*Interpretation of the data is insufficient.</p> <p>*Results are poorly described and a coherent, understandable description of the data is missing.</p>	<p>*Interpretation of the data is marginal.</p> <p>*Results are poorly described, and the story does not provide insight into why the research has been performed/how the data are related to the research aim.</p>	<p>*The interpretation of the data and the quality of the figures and tables is generally good.</p> <p>*Results are described, but the story does not completely show why the research has been performed and how the data are related to the research aim.</p>	<p>*Data are interpreted correctly.</p> <p>*Results are well described so that the audience understands why the research has been performed and how the data are related to the research aim.</p>	<p>*Data are all interpreted perfectly.</p> <p>*Results are very well described and the story is appealing to the reader.</p> <p>*Overall this section can be of interest for publication in a scientific journal.</p>
<b>13. Figures and tables</b>				
<p>*Data are presented sloppily and figure numbers and titles are not sufficient or even missing.</p> <p>*Information in the legends or graph axes is missing or inaccurate.</p>	<p>*All data have been presented, but quality of the figures and tables is often poor and no clear titles are used for figures and titles.</p> <p>*Legends, or graph axes are incomplete or undefined.</p>	<p>*All data have been well presented in a coherent manner and/or some titles or graph axes are not defined well enough.</p> <p>*Legends are present and fairly well described, but may be more concise.</p>	<p>*The data is presented in a well structured manner and figures and tables all include a sharp and concise title, graph axes are complete and clear.</p> <p>*Legends are present and well described containing all information to understand the data that is presented.</p>	<p>*Data is presented in an excellent way. Figures and tables are of the highest quality.</p> <p>*Legends are all present and described in a concise, professional manner.</p>
<b>14. Discussion and conclusion</b>				
<p>*Important results are not summarised, but most results are repeated in too much detail.</p> <p>*Relation to the introduction, research aim or a broader scientific context is missing.</p> <p>*Relations between the own findings and earlier findings is missing, no/little referencing is used.</p> <p>*Conclusion is missing or does not derive logically from the presented information.</p> <p>*Implication of the research findings and/or ideas for future research are missing.</p>	<p>*Important results are not summarised, but most results are repeated in too much detail.</p> <p>*Relation to the introduction and research aim is unclear and relation to a broader scientific context is lacking.</p> <p>*Relations between the own findings and earlier findings is described poorly with little referencing.</p> <p>*Conclusion does not derive logically from the presented information.</p> <p>*Implication of the research findings is poorly described and ideas for future research are missing.</p>	<p>*Important results are summarised.</p> <p>*Relation to the introduction and research aim is clear, but relation to a broader scientific context could be improved.</p> <p>*Relations between the own findings and earlier findings are described superficial, referencing has been applied correctly.</p> <p>*Conclusion is derived logically from the presented information.</p> <p>*Implication of the research findings is described, but ideas for future research are missing.</p>	<p>*Interpretation of important results is of high scientific quality.</p> <p>*Relation to the introduction, research aim and a broader scientific context is clearly described.</p> <p>*In depth reasoning is used to describe the relation between the own findings and earlier findings, and referencing has been applied correctly.</p> <p>*Conclusion is strong and concise and derived logically from the presented information.</p> <p>*Implication of the research findings as well as ideas for future research are presented.</p>	<p>*Overall, the discussion is described in an excellent way, and meets all criteria of a scientific article.</p> <p>*Relation to the introduction, research aim and a broader scientific context is of high quality.</p> <p>*In-depth, critical reasoning is used to describe the relation between the own findings and earlier findings, and referencing has been applied correctly.</p> <p>*Conclusion is strong and concise and derived logically from the presented information.</p> <p>*Implication of the research findings as well as ideas for future research are strong.</p>
<b>15. Referencing</b>				
<p>*References to support statements are often missing in the list.</p> <p>*Lacks sources that are not peer-reviewed and/or scientifically reliable.</p>	<p>*References are occasionally cited, but are often unsubstantiated.</p> <p>*Most references are from a narrow selection of sources or sources that are not peer-reviewed and have uncertain reliability.</p>	<p>*References generally support statements presented in the text, but not always correctly written and cited.</p> <p>*Most references are scientific legitimate, few are questionable (e.g., trade books, internet sources, or popular magazines).</p>	<p>*References support almost all statements presented in the text and are all correctly written and cited.</p> <p>*All references are scientific legitimate.</p>	<p>*References support all statements presented in the text and are all correctly written and cited throughout the text.</p> <p>*A wide range of references from high standard scientific legitimate sources is used.</p>
<b>16. Professional writing (grammar, spelling and tone; sentence structure and word choice; lay-out; figures)</b>				
<p>*Poor use of professional language and too many grammar/spelling mistakes. Poor readability.</p> <p>*Sentences are incomprehensible and 'connection/signaling words' are missing.</p> <p>*Poor lay-out and information is not presented in the intended paragraphs/chapters.</p> <p>*No supporting figures and/or figures can not be understood independent of the text.</p>	<p>*Lack of professional language throughout the report and/or few grammar/spelling mistakes. Poor readability.</p> <p>*Some sentences are incomprehensible and 'connection/signaling words' are missing.</p> <p>*Appropriate lay-out and most information is presented in the intended paragraphs/chapters.</p> <p>*Supporting figures can not be understood independent of the text.</p>	<p>*Mostly professional language and no grammar/spelling mistakes. Good readability.</p> <p>*Few sentences are incomprehensible, but 'connection/signaling words' are missing.</p> <p>*Appropriate lay-out and all information is presented in the intended paragraphs/chapters.</p> <p>*Supporting figures can mostly be understood independent of the text.</p>	<p>*Professional language and no grammar/spelling mistakes. High readability.</p> <p>*Few sentences are incomprehensible and 'connection/signaling words' are missing.</p> <p>*Appropriate lay-out and all information is presented in the intended paragraphs/chapters.</p> <p>*Supporting figures can all be understood independent of the text.</p>	<p>*Professional language and no grammar/spelling mistakes. High readability.</p> <p>*All sentences are comprehensible and of high professional quality.</p> <p>*Above standard lay-out and all information is presented in the intended paragraphs/chapters.</p> <p>*Supporting figures are very clear and can all be understood independent of the text.</p>