INFOMMOB 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	• Does not justify the content. • Suggests incorrect/over interpretation of data.	• Represents the content well or very well	• Attracts attention, creative and original • Represents the content very well
Comments (optional)			
Abstract	• Misrepresents the content. • Lacks components. • Is hard to understand.	• Represents most highlights. • Contains all components. • Can be understood without additional information.	• Represents main information and all highlights. • Concise and correct.
Comments (optional)			
Introduction *Relevance research question and scope of literature research (if applicable)*	• Incomplete or inaccurate overview of literature (*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*). • Research question absent or lacks focus. • Relevance research question unclear.	• Adequate overview of relevant literature (*note that a full literature review is not required for this project*). • Research question well defined and focussed. • Relevance of research question clarified.	• 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	• Fails to reveal how results were obtained. • Decisions are badly or not motivated. • Cannot be repeated.	• Allows understanding of how results were obtained. • Decisions are generally well motivated and justified. • Can be repeated.	• Crucial steps are identified and highlighted. • Excellent motivation and justification of design decisions.
Comments (optional)			
Results	• Cannot be understood without information provided by figures and tables. • Invalid description, analysis, interpretation of data.	• Can be understood without information provided by figures and tables. • Satisfactory description, analysis, interpretation of data.	• Valid data analyses. • Complete and concise description of data. • Convincing interpretation of data.
Comments (optional)			
Tables and figures	• Absent/incorrect referral in written text • Are irrelevant. • Are ill-presented. • Legends provide insufficient information.	• Correctly referred to in written text • Correct presentation of the relevant acquired data. • Can be understood without additional information. • Legends contain the necessary information.	• Excellent presentation of acquired data. • Presented in the best possible way. • Legends are complete and concise.

Comments (optional)			
Discussion and Conclusion	• 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.	• 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.	• 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	• Vague or unclear • Minor relevance for this scientific field	• Clearly and precisely formulated • Makes a scientific contribution to the field • Of relevance and interest for people working in this field	• 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	• The line of thought is unclear. • Text is badly structured.	• Line of thought mostly clear. • Structure supports legibility of text.	• The line of thought is easy to follow and supported by the structure.
Comments (optional)			
Referencing	• Referral is insufficient, inconsistent, incomplete or incorrect. • References cannot be retrieved.	• Referral is complete and correct. • Correct application of a single referencing system. • References can be traced.	• (Key) references have been found independently.
Comments (optional)			
Writing skills	• Style too wordy or too concise. • Disturbing spelling or grammar mistakes.	• Grammar and style enable understanding of the information. • No errors present detected by spellcheckers.	• Grammar and style support legibility of the document. • Writing flows smoothly.
Comments (optional)			
General aspects			
Ethics	*Ethicial 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.*		

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)			