

INFOMMMI 2023-2024

Group name			
Paper title			
Rubric Scientific Paper			
Criteria	Insufficient to sufficient: partly fails to meet academic requirements	Satisfactory to good: mostly meets academic requirements	Excellent: Belongs to the top 10%
Content			
Title	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not justify the content. Suggests incorrect/over interpretation of data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Represents the content well or very well 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attracts attention, creative and original Represents the content very well
Comments (optional)			
Abstract	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Misrepresents the content. Lacks components. Is hard to understand. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Represents most highlights. Contains all components. Can be understood without additional information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Represents main information and all highlights. Concise and correct.
Comments (optional)			
Introduction Relevance research question and scope of literature research (if applicable)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incomplete or inaccurate overview of literature (<i>note that a full literature review is not required for this project, but it is expected to back up major motivations or decisions with a few relevant sources</i>). Research question absent or lacks focus. Relevance research question unclear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate overview of relevant literature (<i>note that a full literature review is not required for this project</i>). Research question well defined and focussed. Relevance of research question clarified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete concise overview of relevant literature Substantiated research question with clear focus. Research question has the potential to contribute useful new knowledge to the field. Complete concise overview of relevant literature.
Comments (optional)			
Methods Section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fails to reveal how results were obtained. Decisions are badly or not motivated. Cannot be repeated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows understanding of how results were obtained. Decisions are generally well motivated and justified. Can be repeated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crucial steps are identified and highlighted. Excellent motivation and justification of design decisions.
Comments (optional)			
Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cannot be understood without information provided by figures and tables. Invalid description, analysis, interpretation of data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can be understood without information provided by figures and tables. Satisfactory description, analysis, interpretation of data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Valid data analyses. Complete and concise description of data. Convincing interpretation of data.
Comments (optional)			
Tables and figures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Absent/incorrect referral in written text Are irrelevant. Are ill-presented. Legends provide insufficient information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correctly referred to in written text Correct presentation of the relevant acquired data. Can be understood without additional information. Legends contain the necessary information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent presentation of acquired data. Presented in the best possible way. Legends are complete and concise.
Comments (optional)			

Discussion and Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak or not supported by evidence. • Fails to answer research question. • Repetitive information. • Data inadequately discussed, sticking rigidly to existing concepts or using invalid arguments. • Discussion fails to address strengths and weaknesses of study. • Hypotheses, new models, or suggestions for additional research are missing/ illogical. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In line with presented evidence. • Answers research question. • Relation data and research question discussed adequately, using valid arguments. • Strengths and limitations, new insights are addressed in the light of the literature. • New insights, hypotheses or new models presented. • Suggestions for future research may be based on weak assumptions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concise, sensible and in depth discussion of data in relation to research question. • Complete, critical and balanced discussion of strengths, limitations, new insights and hypotheses. • Critical discussion of how the data relate to current knowledge of the subject. • New insights, new models and hypotheses are discussed in depth.
Comments (optional)			
Contributions & relevance for multimodal interaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vague or unclear • Minor relevance for this scientific field 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly and precisely formulated • Makes a scientific contribution to the field • Of relevance and interest for people working in this field 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong and precisely formulated • A strong contribution extending the knowledge of the field, filling a gap in the state of the art, or providing an important re-confirmation or slight modification of existing knowledge
Comments (optional)			
Structure and Style			
Structure and line of reasoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The line of thought is unclear. • Text is badly structured. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Line of thought mostly clear. • Structure supports legibility of text. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The line of thought is easy to follow and supported by the structure.
Comments (optional)			
Referencing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Referral is insufficient, inconsistent, incomplete or incorrect. • References cannot be retrieved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Referral is complete and correct. • Correct application of a single referencing system. • References can be traced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Key) references have been found independently.
Comments (optional)			
Writing skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Style too wordy or too concise. • Disturbing spelling or grammar mistakes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grammar and style enable understanding of the information. • No errors present detected by spellcheckers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grammar and style support legibility of the document. • Writing flows smoothly.
Comments (optional)			
General aspects			
Ethics	<i>Ethical guidelines must be followed and violations cannot be tolerated when doing studies with human subjects. Note that ethics also includes aspects about integrity, manipulating or omitting data, etc.</i>		
Formalities	<i>Minor violations of the formalities are tolerated (esp. at the beginning of the course). Repeated violation or sloppiness may have a negative impact on the grade though, especially when it causes additional workload or problems for others.</i>		
Additional comments (optional)			