

## INFOMMOB 2022-2023

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

Comments (optional)			
<b>Discussion and Conclusion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weak or not supported by evidence.</li> <li>• Fails to answer research question.</li> <li>• Repetitive information.</li> <li>• Data inadequately discussed, sticking rigidly to existing concepts or using invalid arguments.</li> <li>• Discussion fails to address strengths and weaknesses of study.</li> <li>• Hypotheses, new models, or suggestions for additional research are missing/ illogical.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In line with presented evidence.</li> <li>• Answers research question.</li> <li>• Relation data and research question discussed adequately, using valid arguments.</li> <li>• Strengths and limitations, new insights are addressed in the light of the literature.</li> <li>• New insights, hypotheses or new models presented.</li> <li>• Suggestions for future research may be based on weak assumptions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concise, sensible and in depth discussion of data in relation to research question.</li> <li>• Complete, critical and balanced discussion of strengths, limitations, new insights and hypotheses.</li> <li>• Critical discussion of how the data relate to current knowledge of the subject.</li> <li>• New insights, new models and hypotheses are discussed in depth.</li> </ul>
Comments (optional)			
<b>Contributions &amp; relevance for multimodal interaction</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vague or unclear</li> <li>• Minor relevance for this scientific field</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearly and precisely formulated</li> <li>• Makes a scientific contribution to the field</li> <li>• Of relevance and interest for people working in this field</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong and precisely formulated</li> <li>• 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</li> </ul>
Comments (optional)			
<b>Structure and Style</b>			
<b>Structure and line of reasoning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The line of thought is unclear.</li> <li>• Text is badly structured.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Line of thought mostly clear.</li> <li>• Structure supports legibility of text.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The line of thought is easy to follow and supported by the structure.</li> </ul>
Comments (optional)			
<b>Referencing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Referral is insufficient, inconsistent, incomplete or incorrect.</li> <li>• References cannot be retrieved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Referral is complete and correct.</li> <li>• Correct application of a single referencing system.</li> <li>• References can be traced.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Key) references have been found independently.</li> </ul>
Comments (optional)			
<b>Writing skills</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Style too wordy or too concise.</li> <li>• Disturbing spelling or grammar mistakes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grammar and style enable understanding of the information.</li> <li>• No errors present detected by spellcheckers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grammar and style support legibility of the document.</li> <li>• Writing flows smoothly.</li> </ul>
Comments (optional)			
<b>General aspects</b>			
<b>Ethics</b>	<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	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.		
Additional comments			
(optional)			