

PROJECT MANUSCRIPT ASSESSMENT FORM

Examiners are to circle the relevant achievement level of the candidate on the accompanying criteria. Specific comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's Project Manuscript are to be made at the bottom of the criteria sheet. Additional sheets with feedback can be attached to the criteria sheet where the issue is not addressed in the criteria provided.

Examiners please note the general assessment criteria below when awarding final mark:

- >85 (Hons 1): Work of superior quality in all aspects of the Project Manuscript, demonstrating the ability to organise information in a clear and concise manner, the integration of information from a wide range of sources and containing clear examples of excellent critical evaluation experimental outcomes and placing these in context of the literature.
- 75-84 (Hons 2.1): Work of very good quality in all aspects of the Project Manuscript, but showing lesser ability to organise information in a clear and concise manner, integrate information from range of sources and critically evaluate experimental outcomes and integrating these in the context of the literature.
- 65-74 (Hons 2.2): Good quality in all aspects of the Project Manuscript but with inadequacies in understanding, critical skills, organisation and presentation.
- 50-64 (Hons 3): Adequate quality work with significant deficiencies in understanding, critical skills, organisation and presentation.
- <50 (Fail): No understanding of area or incomprehensible.

Student:

Mark (%):

Examiner:

Examiners Signature: _____

Date:

SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT MANUSCRIPT ASSESSMENT

The general format of the project manuscript is to comply with the guidelines set out in the “School of Medical Sciences Honours Manuscript - Instructions to Authors” and should contain an abstract, acknowledgments, brief introduction with aims and hypotheses, materials and methods, results, discussion and references sections. The word count should be not more than 5,000 words. This word limit excludes the abstract, acknowledgements and references sections, as well as supplementary data (if present), tables, figures and legends used in the text. Penalties will apply for an inability to observe the word limit. The abstract should succinctly and accurately summarise the aims and outcomes of the project. The acknowledgments are to be used to indicate how much of the research was performed independently or cooperatively. The brief introduction, aims and hypothesis section should define the problem being examined and place it in the context of published work in the area without being a complete review of the literature. It should identify the limitations of the literature and areas of controversy and give clear and valid aims and hypotheses. The format of the methods and results sections should fully comply with guidelines in the “School of Medical Sciences Honours Manuscript - Instructions to Authors”. The methods should be appropriate and valid for the stated aims and clearly described and fully referenced. The results should reflect a significant body of work including sufficient controls and replicates and analysis of data using appropriate statistical tests. Material needed for a complete understanding or evaluation of the work, but which does not fit well in the manuscript format, should be included as supplementary data. Presentation of the results should be clear and logical and should use figures, tables, etc. The discussion should be relevant to the introduction, methods, and results sections, logical in presentation and scientific content, show critical/creative analysis, place the findings of the study in the context of past studies and have suggestions for future studies. Please note that all work which is integral to the manuscript but was not performed by the honours student (i.e. was undertaken by another member of the supervisor's and/or co-supervisor's research group) is to be clearly disclosed in the Methods and/or Results sections of the Project Manuscript, where appropriate. This work may then be referred to in the Discussion and be assessed in the context of the methods and results attained by the honours student. The referencing style of the project manuscript should also comply with the guidelines set in the “School of Medical Sciences Honours Manuscript - Instructions to Authors”.

Due – 31st of October, 5pm (late penalties apply)

BSB Student Office (Room G27, Biological Sciences Building)

Length- Not more than 5,000 words

CATEGORY	Project Manuscript (Mark out of 10 for each marking criteria)						
	10-9.0	9.0-8.5	8.4-8.0	7.9-7.5	7.4-6.5	6.4-5	5-0
ABSTRACT, INTRODUCTION, HYPOTHESIS AND AIMS _____/10 X 1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concise and clear account of the scientific background and the rationale of the experiment. Very clear links between hypotheses / aims and literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concise and clear account of the scientific background and the rationale of the experiment. Clear links between hypotheses / aims and literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear account of the scientific background and the rationale of the experiment. Clear links between hypotheses / aims and literature. Minor errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear account of the scientific background and the rationale of the experiment. Minor omissions or errors. Links between hypotheses / aims and literature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A good introduction of the scientific background and the rationale of the experiment. Some factual error or omissions. Some links between hypotheses / aims and literature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some introduction to the scientific background and the rationale of the experiment. More detail needed. Some links between hypotheses / aims and literature. Factual errors or omissions in text. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lacking detail of the rationale of the experiment and scientific background. No links between hypotheses / aims and literature. Factual errors or omissions in text.
MATERIALS & METHODS _____/10 X 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear and detailed description of experiments and data analysis (including statistical analysis). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear description of experiments and data analysis (including statistical analysis). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good description of experiments and data analysis (including statistical analysis), with minor errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of experiments and data analysis (including statistical analysis) mostly clear but significant detail lacking. Minor errors present in methods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of experiments and data analysis (including statistical analysis) lacking major details. Minor errors present methods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of experiments and data analysis (including statistical analysis) lacking major details. Major errors in methods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of experiments and data analysis (including statistical analysis) absent or unclear.
RESULTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Logical and clear description of the experimental results with reference to tables and figures. No conclusions or interpretation of results presented. Sufficient controls and replicates with appropriate data analysis (including statistics) performed correctly. Represents an extensive body of work Graph axes labelled and units of measurement given in parentheses. Legends explain the figures in sufficient detail that they can be understood without reference to the text. Tables self-explanatory, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear description of the experimental results with reference to tables and figures. No conclusions or interpretation of results presented. Sufficient controls and replicates with minor errors in data analysis (including statistics). Represents an large body of work Graph axes labelled and units of measurement given in parentheses. Legends explain the figures in sufficient detail that they can be understood without reference to the text. Tables self-explanatory, with necessary descriptions provided in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear description of the experimental results with reference to tables and figures. No conclusions or interpretation of results presented. Sufficient controls and replicates with minor miscalculations in data analysis (including statistics) or inaccurate presentation of data. Represents an large body of work Graph axes labelled and units of measurement given in parentheses. Not all legends explain the figures in sufficient detail that they can be understood without reference to the text. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good description of the experimental results with reference to tables and figures in most instances. Generally no conclusions or interpretation of results presented. Sufficient controls and replicates with significant minor miscalculations in data analysis (including statistics) or inaccurate presentation of data. Represents an adequate body of work Most graph axes labelled and units of measurement given in parentheses. Not all legends explain the figures in sufficient detail to be understood 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of the experimental results lacks required detail and appropriate reference to figures and tables. Some conclusions or interpretation of results presented. Sufficient controls and replicates. Inappropriate data analysis, including statistics, used in some parts or inaccurate presentation of data. Represents an adequate body of work Results are poorly presented, most graph axes labelled and units of measurement given in parentheses. Not all legends explain the figures in sufficient 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of the experimental results lacks required detail. Some conclusions or interpretation of results presented. Insufficient controls and replicates used. Major errors or omissions in data analysis. Represents an inadequate body of work Results are poorly presented. Most graph axes not labelled or missing units of measurement. Most legends do not explain the figures in sufficient detail that they can be understood without reference to the text. Most tables are not self- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No description of the experimental results given. Lack of controls and replicates with appropriate data analysis (including statistics) performed. Represents an inadequate body of work Results poorly presented or missing. Graph axes not labelled and units of measurement absent. Legends do not explain the figures in sufficient detail that they can be understood without reference to the text. Tables are not self-explanatory.

_____ /10 X 2.5	with necessary descriptions provided in footnotes underneath the table.	footnotes underneath the table. A few minor errors in data presentation.	Most tables self-explanatory, with necessary descriptions provided in footnotes underneath the table. Some minor errors in data presentation.	without reference to the text. Most tables self-explanatory with necessary descriptions provided in footnotes. Some significant errors in data presentation.	detail that they can be understood without reference to the text. Most tables are self-explanatory. Some significant errors in data presentation	explanatory. Major errors in data presentation	
DISCUSSION _____ /10 X 2.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion is clear and logical. Extensive interpretation of the results with reference to previous scientific studies. Significance of findings place within the broader context of the field. • Comprehensive critical analysis of strengths and limitations of experiments. Future directions identified and clearly justified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion is clear. Appropriate interpretation of the results with reference to previous scientific studies. Significance of findings place within the broader context of the field. • Critical analysis of strengths and limitations of experiments. Future directions identified and justified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion is clear. Appropriate interpretation of the results with reference to previous scientific studies. Significance of findings place within the broader context of the field. • Critical analysis of strengths and limitations of experiments. Future directions identified and justified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion is clear. Appropriate interpretation of the results with a few minor errors. Reference to previous scientific studies. Significance of most findings place within the broader context of the field. • Some critical analysis of strengths and limitations of experiments. Future directions identified and mostly justified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion is unclear. Some inappropriate interpretation of the results. Lacking reference to previous scientific studies. Significance of findings not place within the broader context of the field. • Lacking some critical analysis of strengths and limitations of experiments. Future directions identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results are restated with little interpretation or reference to previous scientific studies. Findings not place within the broader context of the field. • No critical analysis of strengths and limitations of experiments. • Misunderstanding of some major concepts. No future directions identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results are restated with no interpretation or reference to previous scientific studies. Findings not place within the broader context of the field. • No critical analysis of strengths and limitations of experiments. • Misunderstanding of most major concepts. No future directions identified.
REFERENCES _____ /10 X 1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Predominant and comprehensive use of primary articles. All articles presented from recent or seminal publications. • Citation style correct and consistent throughout. Reference list completely accurate with no errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Predominant use of primary articles. All articles presented from recent or seminal publications. • Citation style correct and consistent. Reference list complete, but a few minor errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Predominant use of primary articles. Most articles presented from recent or seminal publications. • Citation style consistent. Reference list complete, but many minor errors. Citation style consistent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some over reliance on reviews. Most articles presented from recent or seminal publications • Some references inconsistent between text and list with many minor errors. Citation style mostly consistent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some over reliance on reviews. Many articles not from recent or seminal publications. • Many references inconsistent between text and list with many minor errors. Citation style incorrect / inconsistent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant over reliance on reviews. Limited number of recent or seminal articles used. • Many inconsistencies between text and list. Some major errors. Inappropriate citation style used. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of literature limited to a few articles and reviews. Poor attempt to explore literature. • Many references inconsistent between text and list. Many major errors.
PRESENTATION _____ /10 X 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No grammatical or spelling errors. Professional expression and style used consistently. All figures accurate and informative. • Word count 5000±500 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No grammatical or spelling errors. Professional expression and style used. All figures accurate and informative. • Word count <or>5000±500 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No grammatical errors and minor spelling errors. Professional expression and style used. All figures accurate and informative • Word count 5000±500 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor grammatical errors and minor spelling errors. Professional expression and style used. Most figures accurate and informative. • Word count 5000±500 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor grammatical errors and minor spelling errors. Professional expression used. Most figures accurate. • Word count: <or>5000±500 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major grammatical and spelling errors. Professional expression used. Numerous errors in figures. • Word count: 5000±500 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major grammatical and spelling errors. Language used not professional. Numerous errors in figures. • Word count: <or>5000

Specific Comments –

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Suggestions: