

School of Medical Sciences Honours Manuscript - Instructions to Authors

(Adapted from the Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals, the British Journal of Pharmacology, the Journal of Anatomy, the Journal of Pathology and the Journal of Physiology)

Manuscripts must include: 1. Title Page, 2. Abstract, 3. Introduction, 4. Methods, 5. Results, 6. Discussion, 7. Acknowledgements, 8. List of references, 9 Tables, 10. Figures and 11. Supplementary Data (optional).

Title Page

Title: The title should contain no more than 150 characters (including spaces) and clearly indicate the subject matter of the paper.

Authors: The author's name in full and the name and addresses of the department(s) and institution(s) to which the work should be attributed.

Running Title: A running title containing no more than 50 characters (including spaces) is required.

Key Words: Three to Five key words should be provided.

Word Count: The word count excluding abstract, acknowledgments, references and figure legends should be listed.

Abbreviations: list all abbreviations used

Abstract

An abstract of up to 250 words should follow the title page. The abstract should provide the background for the study, experimental approach, major findings and conclusions. It should be understandable without reference to the rest of the paper. References may not be cited.

Introduction

The introduction should give a clear account of the background for the study, and the research objective or hypothesis tested should be stated. The introduction should be understandable to a non-specialist.

Methods

The methods must be described in sufficient detail to allow the experiments to be interpreted and repeated by an experienced investigator. Give references to established methods, provide references and brief descriptions for methods that have been published but are not well known; describe new or substantially modified methods. Identify the apparatus, drugs and chemicals used, give the manufacturer's name and address in parentheses after each item. Describe the statistical methods used and define all statistical terms, abbreviations, and symbols. Specify the computer software used. Where appropriate, describe your selection of the subjects (patients or laboratory animals, including controls), identify the age, sex, strain, number used and other important characteristics of the subjects.

Results

Present your results in logical sequence in the text, tables, graphs and illustrations. The description of the experimental results should be succinct, but in sufficient detail to allow the experiments to be analysed and interpreted by the reader. Where data is presented the mean results with standard errors, the number of observations, and statistical significance, should be given where appropriate. The rationale for performing the experiments may be briefly mentioned in the Results section, but conclusions or interpretation of results should

not be presented. Do not repeat in the text all the data that is presented in the tables or graphs. Headed paragraphs maybe used to aid in the presentation of the results.

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, Results and/or Acknowledgments as appropriate.

Discussion

In the discussion explore possible mechanisms or explanations for the findings of your study, compare and contrast your results with those from other relevant studies, state the limitations of the study, and explore the implications of the findings for future research. Do not repeat in detail data or other material given in the Introduction or the Results sections. The main conclusions should be conveyed in the final paragraph.

Acknowledgements

The author should acknowledge those who have provided reagents, technical help and scientific advice.

References

In the text, references to other work should take the form: (Bolton and Kitamura, 1983) or 'Bolton and Kitamura (1983) showed that...' When a paper written by two authors is cited, both names are given; for three or more authors only the first name is given, followed by 'et al.' References to unpublished observations or personal communications should be mentioned in the text only, and not included in the list of references. Direct reference to original research sources should be used whenever possible.

The reference list at the end of the manuscript must be arranged alphabetically according to the surname of the first author. When the names of first authors are identical, the alphabetical order of the surnames of subsequent authors takes precedence over the year of publication. The authors' names are followed by the year of publication in brackets. If more than one paper by the same authors in one year is cited, a, b, c, etc. are placed after the year of publication, both in the text and in the list of references. All authors should be quoted for papers with up to seven authors; for papers with more than seven authors, the first six should be quoted followed by et al.

The format for references to papers and books, and to chapters in books, is as follows:

Lipp P, Egger M & Niggli E (2002). Spatial characteristics of sarcoplasmic reticulum Ca^{2+} release events triggered by L-type Ca^{2+} current and Na^+ current in guinea-pig cardiac myocytes. *J Physiol* **542**, 383-393.

Adrian ED (1932). *The Mechanism of Nervous Action*. Humphrey Milford, London.

Buchan AMJ, Bryant MG, Polak JM, Gregor M, Ghatei MA & Bloom SR (1981). Development of regulatory peptides in the human fetal intestine. In *Gut Hormones*, 2nd edn, ed. Bloom SR & Polak JM, pp. 119-124. Churchill Livingstone, Edinburgh.

For those articles published on online ahead of print, that have not been assigned full publication details the DOI (digital object identifier) should be used. See example below:

Lipp P, Egger M & Niggli E (2002). Spatial characteristics of sarcoplasmic reticulum Ca^{2+} release events triggered by L-type Ca^{2+} current and Na^{+} current in guinea-pig cardiac myocytes. *J Physiol*; DOI: 10.1113/jphysiol.2001.013382.

Tables

Each table should be given on a separate page. Tables are numbered consecutively according to the order in which they have been first cited in the text. Tables should be numbered with Arabic numerals and the number should be followed by a brief descriptive title at the head of the table. Tables should be self-explanatory, with necessary descriptions provided in footnotes underneath the table. Give each column a short or abbreviated heading.

Figures and Legends

Figures should be numbered consecutively according to the order in which they have been first cited in the text. Figure legends can appear below the figure and/or on a separate page. Each figure should be given a title and a legend that explains the figures in sufficient detail that, whenever possible, they can be understood without reference to the text. All symbols and abbreviations should be explained within the legend. If a figure has been published, acknowledge the original source.

Supplementary Data

Material needed for an in depth evaluation of the work, but which does not fit well in manuscript format, should be included as Supplementary Data. These data should only be included if they enhance the overall understanding of the research but should not be essential for the understanding of the manuscript.

Abbreviations, Units and Symbols

Use only standard abbreviations; the full term for which an abbreviation stands should precede its first use in the text. SI units and symbols should be used for physicochemical quantities. Gene names and loci should be in italics, and proteins should be in roman. Virus nomenclature (and acronyms) should follow the guidelines of the International Committee on the Taxonomy of Viruses (ICTV). Chemical nomenclature should follow the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC) definitive rules for nomenclature. Pharmacological units should follow the guidelines given in the British Journal of Pharmacology.

Formatting and Technical Instructions

Text should be times roman, 12 point font, with 1.5 line-spacing throughout the manuscript. Margins should be 3 cm on the left-hand side, 2 cm on the right-hand, 2 cm at the top and 2 cm at the bottom. The manuscript should be no more than 5000 words excluding; the abstract, acknowledgements and references, tables, figures, legends, and supplementary data.

Criteria	Literature Review (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	6.4-5.0	5-0
Background _____/10 x 2.5	Very comprehensive, detailed and focused introduction.	Highly detailed and focused introduction.	Detailed and focused introduction	Detailed introduction.	Some key basic information missing in introduction.	Major lack of key basic information in introduction.	Lack of significant detail in introduction.
Critical Analysis _____/10 x 2.5	Comprehensive critical analysis of strengths and limitations of the literature	Critical analysis of strengths and limitations of the literature	Some critical analysis of strengths and limitations of the literature.	Some critical analysis of strengths and limitations of the literature but mostly descriptive	Limited critical analysis of strengths and limitations of the literature, mostly descriptive	Very limited critical analysis of strengths and limitations of the literature.	No critical analysis of strengths and limitations of the literature presented
Hypotheses & Aims _____/10 x 1	Hypotheses and aims clearly outlined and comprehensively justified.	Hypotheses and aims clearly outlined and justified.	Hypotheses and aims outlined and justified.	No clear hypotheses. Aims outlined and justified.	No clear hypotheses. Aims outlined.	No clear hypotheses. Aims not clearly outlined.	No hypotheses or aims apparent.
Methods _____/10 x 0.5	Clear and detailed description of proposed experiments. Comprehensively planned and accurately outlined experiments.	Clear and detailed description of proposed experiments. Accurately outlined experiments.	Clear description of experiments, but minor detail lacking. Accurately outlined experiments.	Description of experiments mostly clear, but some detail lacking. Minor inconsistencies in experimental design.	Description of experiments lacked some major detail. Minor inconsistencies in experimental design.	Description of experiments lacks major details. Major inconsistencies in experimental design.	Experiments not described.
_____/10 x 0.5	Well developed and very clear links between hypotheses, aims and methods and literature.	Very clear links between hypotheses, aims and methods and literature.	Clear links between hypotheses, aims and methods and literature.	Some links between hypotheses, aims and methods and literature.	Poor links between hypotheses, aims and methods and literature.	No links between hypotheses, aims and methods and literature.	No hypotheses, aims or methods
References _____/10 x 1	Predominant and comprehensive use of primary articles. All articles presented from recent or seminal publications.	Predominant use of primary articles. All articles presented from recent or seminal publications.	Predominant use of primary articles. Most articles presented from recent or seminal publications.	Some over reliance on reviews. Most articles presented from recent or seminal publications	Some over reliance on reviews. Many articles not from recent or seminal publications.	Significant over reliance on reviews. Limited number of recent or seminal articles used.	Use of literature limited to a few articles and reviews. Poor attempt to explore literature.
_____/10 x 1	Citation style correct and consistent throughout. Reference list completely accurate with no errors.	Citation style correct and consistent. Reference list complete, but a few minor errors.	Citation style consistent. Reference list complete, but many minor errors.	Some references inconsistent between text and list with many minor errors. Citation style mostly consistent.	Many references inconsistent between text and list with many minor errors. Citation style incorrect / inconsistent.	Many inconsistencies between text and list. Some major errors. Inappropriate citation style used.	Many references inconsistent between text and list. Many major errors.
Presentation _____/10 x 1	No grammatical or spelling errors. Professional expression and style used consistently. All figures accurate and informative.	No grammatical or spelling errors. Professional expression and style used. All figures accurate and informative.	No grammatical errors and minor spelling errors. Professional expression and style used. All figures accurate and informative	Minor grammatical errors and minor spelling errors. Professional expression and style used. Most figures accurate and informative.	Minor grammatical errors and minor spelling errors. Professional expression used. Most figures accurate.	Major grammatical and spelling errors. Professional expression used Numerous errors in figures.	Major grammatical and spelling errors. Language used not professional. Numerous errors in figures.

COMPONENTS	INTRODUCTORY SEMINAR (Mark out of 10 for each marking criteria)						
	10 – 9	9 - 8.5	8.4 - 8	7.9 - 7.5	7.4 - 6.5	6.4 - 5	5 - 0
Background /10 x 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very focused introduction with sufficient detail and all concepts and terminology described to allow for understanding by a non-expert audience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focused introduction with sufficient detail and most concepts and terminology described to allow for understanding by a non-expert audience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Somewhat focused introduction with satisfactory detail and most concepts and terminology described to allow for understanding by a non-expert audience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction lacks some focus, has adequate detail and most concepts and terminology described to allow for understanding by a non-expert audience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction lacks focus and detail. Many concepts and terminology not described to allow for understanding by a non-expert audience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction lacks focus and has inadequate detail. Most concepts and terminology not described to allow for understanding by a non-expert audience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction lacks focus and has inadequate detail. Cannot be understood by a non-expert audience
Hypotheses & Aims /10 x 0.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very clear and well developed links between hypotheses, aims and methods and literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very clear links between hypotheses, aims and methods and literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear links between hypotheses, aims and methods and literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Links between hypotheses, aims and methods and literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some links between hypotheses, aims and methods and literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No clear links between hypotheses, aims and methods and literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No hypotheses, aims or methods
Methods /10 x 1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear and detailed description of proposed experiments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear description of proposed experiments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear description of experiments, but minor detail lacking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Descriptions of experiments mostly clear, but minor detail lacking. Minor inconsistencies in experimental design. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of experiments lacked some major detail. Minor inconsistencies in experimental design. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of experiments lacked some major detail. Major inconsistencies in experimental design. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experiments not described.
Presentation /10 x 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The font, colour, graphics and slide layout used greatly enhances the presentation. Figures used and clearly labelled. No errors. Clear and logical structure throughout Delivery clear, well paced, articulate and professional throughout. Confident stance and body language. Enthusiastic and interesting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The font, colour, graphics and slide layout used enhances the presentation. Figures used and clearly labelled. Minor errors. Clear and logical structure throughout Delivery clear, well paced, articulate and professional. Confident stance and body language. Enthusiastic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The font, colour, graphics and slide layout used enhances the presentation. Figures used and labelled. Minor errors. Mostly clear and logical structure throughout Delivery clear, well paced and articulate. Mostly confident stance and body language. Enthusiastic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The font, colour, graphics and slide layout used sometimes distracts from the presentation. Figures used and labelled with some errors. Mostly clear and logical structure throughout Delivery clear and well paced. Mostly confident stance and body language. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The font, colour, graphics and slide layout used sometimes distracts from the presentation. Not all figures used are labelled or have errors. Lacking clear and logical structure Delivery mostly clear. Some major lapses in body language observed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The font, colour, graphics and slide layout used distracts from the presentation. Poor use of figures those used are labelled or have errors. Lacking clear and logical structure Delivery unclear / inaudible. Some major lapses in body language observed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The font, colour, graphics and slide layout used distracts from the presentation. Figures used not labelled. No logical structure to presentation Delivery unclear / inaudible. Not confident with poor body language
Questions /10 x 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All responses demonstrated clear understanding of complex technical and contextual issues. Consistently strongly argued and accurate answers to questions drawing from related literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responses demonstrated clear understanding of complex technical and contextual issues. Strongly argued and accurate answers to questions drawing from related literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responses demonstrated understanding of technical and contextual issues. Accurate answers to questions drawing from related literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responses demonstrated some understanding of technical and contextual issues. Mostly accurate answers to questions drawing from literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responses demonstrated some understanding of technical or contextual issues but not both. A number of minor errors made in responses to questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responses demonstrated little understanding of technical and contextual issues. A number of major errors made in responses to questions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responses did not demonstrate any understanding of the project. Significant errors made in responses to questions.

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 _____/10 X 2.5	<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, with necessary descriptions provided in footnotes underneath the table. 	<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 footnotes underneath the table. A few minor errors in data presentation. 	<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. Most tables self-explanatory, with necessary descriptions provided in footnotes underneath the table. Some minor errors in data presentation. 	<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 without reference to the text. Most tables self-explanatory with necessary descriptions provided in footnotes. Some significant errors in data presentation. 	<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 detail that they can be understood without reference to the text. Most tables are self-explanatory. Some significant errors in data presentation 	<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-explanatory. Major errors in data presentation 	<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.

<p>DISCUSSION</p> <p>_____/10 X 2.5</p>	<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 placed 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.
<p>REFERENCES</p> <p>_____/10 X 1.5</p>	<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.
<p>PRESENTATION</p> <p>_____/10 X 1</p>	<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

COMPONENTS	FINAL SEMINAR (Mark out of 10 for each marking criteria)						
	10 - 9	9 - 8.5	8.4 - 8.0	7.9 - 7.5	7.4 - 6.5	6.4 - 5	5 - 0
Background, Hypotheses & Aims and Methods /10 x 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very clear & concise description of background. Can be understood by a non-expert audience. Well developed links between hypotheses, aims, methods and literature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear & concise description of background. Can be understood by a non-expert audience. Clear links between hypotheses, aims and methods and literature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear description of background. Can mostly be understood by a non-expert audience. Good links between hypotheses, aims and methods and literature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good description of background. Occasionally difficult for non-expert audience to understand. Links made between hypotheses, aims and methods and literature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear description of background. Occasionally difficult for non-expert audience to understand. Insufficient links between hypotheses, aims and methods and literature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor description of background. Difficult for non-expert audience to understand. Lacking links between hypotheses, aims and methods and literature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lacking description of background. Cannot be understood by a non-expert audience. No links between hypotheses, aims, methods and literature
Results /10 x 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All data presented clearly, accurately and with sufficient detail with direct links to aims 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All data presented clearly, accurately and with sufficient detail with links to aims 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most data presented clearly, accurately and with sufficient detail with links to aims 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most data presented clearly and accurately with some links to aims. Some errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some data presented clearly and accurately with limited links to aims. Some errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some data presented clearly with limited links to aims. Major errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data presentation confusing. Major errors / omissions. No links to aims
Discussion /10 x 2.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All data evaluated critically. Significance of findings placed within the broader context of the field. Conclusions appropriate. Clear demonstration of an understanding of the limitations of the data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All data evaluated critically. Most findings placed within the broader context of the field. Good demonstration of an understanding of the limitations of the data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most data evaluated critically. Most findings placed within the broader context of the field. Good demonstration of an understanding of the limitations of the data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most data evaluated critically. Most findings placed within the broader context of the field. Most conclusions appropriate. Some demonstration of an understanding of the limitations of the data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some critical evaluation of data. Some findings placed within the broader context of the field. Errors in conclusions. Some demonstration of an understanding of the limitations of the data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited critical evaluation of data. Most findings not placed within the broader context of the field. Some conclusions. Lack of demonstration of an understanding of the limitations of the data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No critical evaluation of data. Findings not placed within the broader context of the field. No conclusions. No demonstration of an understanding of the limitations of the data
Presentation /10 x 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The font, colour, graphics and slide layout used greatly enhances the presentation. Figures used and clearly labelled. No errors. Clear and logical structure throughout Delivery clear, well paced, articulate and professional throughout. Confident stance and body language. Enthusiastic and interesting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The font, colour, graphics and slide layout used enhances the presentation. Figures used and clearly labelled. Minor errors. Clear and logical structure throughout Delivery clear, well paced, articulate and professional. Confident stance and body language. Enthusiastic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The font, colour, graphics and slide layout used enhances the presentation. Figures used and labelled. Minor errors. Mostly clear and logical structure throughout Delivery clear, well paced and articulate. Mostly confident stance and body language. Enthusiastic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The font, colour, graphics and slide layout used sometimes detracts from the presentation. Figures used and labelled with some errors. Mostly clear and logical structure throughout Delivery clear and well paced. Mostly confident stance and body language. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The font, colour, graphics and slide layout used sometimes detracts from the presentation. Not all figures used are labelled or have errors. Lacking clear and logical structure Delivery mostly clear. Some major lapses in body language observed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The font, colour, graphics and slide layout used distracts from the presentation. Poor use of figures those used are not labelled or have errors. Lacking clear and logical structure Delivery unclear / inaudible. Some major lapses in body language observed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The font, colour, graphics and slide layout used distracts from the presentation. Figures used not labelled. No logical structure to presentation Delivery unclear / inaudible. Not confident with poor body language
Questions /10 x 2.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All responses demonstrated clear understanding of complex technical and contextual issues. Consistently strongly argued and accurate answers to questions drawing from related literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responses demonstrated clear understanding of complex technical and contextual issues. Strongly argued and accurate answers to questions drawing from related literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responses demonstrated understanding of technical and contextual issues. Accurate answers to questions drawing from related literature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responses demonstrated some understanding of technical and contextual issues. Mostly accurate answers to questions drawing from literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responses demonstrated some understanding of technical or contextual issues but not both. A number of minor errors made in responses to questions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responses demonstrated little understanding of technical and contextual issues. A number of major errors made in responses to most questions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responses did not demonstrate any understanding of the project. Significant errors made in responses to all questions.

Category	Interview (Mark out of 10 for each marking criteria)						
	10-9	9-8.5	8.4-8.0	7.9-7.5	7.4-6.5	6.4-5	5-0
_____/10 x 5	All responses demonstrated clear understanding of complex technical and contextual issues.	Responses demonstrated clear understanding of complex technical and contextual issues.	Responses demonstrated understanding of technical and contextual issues.	Responses demonstrated some understanding of technical and contextual issues.	Responses demonstrated some understanding of technical or contextual issues but not both.	Responses demonstrated little understanding of technical and contextual issues.	Responses did not demonstrate any understanding of the project.
_____/10 x 5	Consistently strongly argued and accurate answers to questions placing the findings of the project in the context of past studies.	Strongly argued and accurate answers to questions placing the findings of the project in the context of past studies.	Accurate answers to questions placing the findings of the project in the context of past studies.	Mostly accurate answers to questions placing the findings of the project in the context of past studies.	A number of minor errors made in responses to questions. Cannot placing the findings of the project in the context of past studies	A number of major errors made in responses to questions. Cannot placing the findings of the project in the context of past studies	Unable to answer most questions.

COMPONENTS	RESEARCH PERFORMANCE (Mark out of 10 for each marking criteria)					
	10 – 9.0	8.9 - 8.5	8.4 - 7.5	7.4 - 6.5	6.4 – 5.0	4.9 – 0
Motivation and Organisational Skills _____/10 X 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exceptionally planning and time-management skills Demonstrated appropriate initiative in all situations Demonstrated independent motivation and a deep understanding of when, or when not to, persist in relation to trouble-shooting and/or data collection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent planning and time-management with rare lapses Demonstrated appropriate initiative in most situations Demonstrated independent motivation and a good understanding of when or when not to, persist in relation to trouble-shooting and/or data collection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good planning and time-management with occasional lapses Demonstrated initiative in many but not all situations Demonstrated motivation and a understanding of when or when not to, persist in relation to trouble-shooting and/or data collection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned well but struggled to manage multiple activities or complex tasks Demonstrated initiative in many but not all situations, sometimes the initiative was inappropriate Motivated but lacked an understanding of when to persist in relation to trouble-shooting and/or data collection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inadequate planning lacks due regard of time limits Demonstrated little initiative, or initiative was largely inappropriate Moderate motivation but showed little or no persistence in relation to trouble-shooting and/or data collection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very poor time-management skills Demonstrated little or no initiative Lacked motivation and failed to persist in relation to trouble-shooting and/or data collection
Research Skills _____/10 X 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exceptionally high laboratory/research skills, required minimal teaching and supervision Appropriate attention to precision and accuracy Is able to trouble-shooting experimental problems without input from supervisor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent laboratory/ research skills, required minimal teaching and supervision Appropriate attention to precision and accuracy, with minor lapses Is able to trouble-shooting experimental problems with minimal input from supervisor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good laboratory/ research skills, required minimal teaching and supervision Appropriate attention to precision and accuracy with occasional lapses. Is able to trouble-shooting experimental problems with some input from supervisor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good laboratory/ research skills, required some on-going teaching and supervision Limited attention to precision and accuracy Can provided initial ideas on trouble-shooting but these are limited in their scope 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor laboratory/research skills, required constant teaching and supervision Limited attention to precision and accuracy Largely relied on the supervisor for trouble-shooting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extremely poor laboratory/ research skills, required constant teaching and supervision No attention to precision and accuracy Relied on supervisor for trouble-shooting
Laboratory Notebook _____/10 X 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The protocols for all experiments are described with enough detail to allow another researcher to follow with ease All data collected are presented or location of stored recorded. The data are clearly labelled. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The protocols for all experiments are described with enough detail to allow another researcher to follow All data collected are presented or location of stored recorded. The data are clearly labelled, with minor omissions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The protocols for most experiments are described with enough detail to allow another researcher to follow Most of the data collected are presented or location stored recorded. Most of the data are clearly labelled 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The protocols for some but not all experiments are described with enough detail to allow another researcher to follow Not all of the data collected are presented or location stored recorded. Most data is clearly labelled 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some experimental protocols recorded, but without enough detail to allow another researcher to follow Poor record of data collected or location where it is stored. The data are not labelled. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No detail of experimental protocols recorded No record of data collected or location where it is stored.
Critical Analysis Skills _____/10 X 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent knowledge of relevant literature and the ability to relate the relevant literature to interpretation of results Thorough awareness of limitations of the study and appreciation of future directions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Able to discuss, interpret and apply the relevant literature to own data with minimal supervisory guidance Good appreciation of the limitations of the data and can suggest future directions for the study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Able to discuss, interpret and apply the relevant literature to own data with some supervisory guidance Understands the limitations of the data and can suggest future directions for the study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Able to discuss, interpret and apply the relevant literature to own data but needed significant supervisory guidance Has some appreciation of the limitations of the data and future directions of the study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited ability to discuss, interpret the relevant literature. Relied on heavily on supervisor for critical analysis and interpretation of the data Has limited understanding of the limitations and future directions of the study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has no knowledge of the relevant literature Unable to critically analyse and interpret own data Little or no appreciation of the limitations of the study. Unable to suggest future directions.

<p>Written Communication Skills</p> <p>_____ /10 X 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No supervisor contribution needed to complete assessment tasks • Written work is excellent in every way. No correction necessary. • Results presented suitable for publication, including appropriate graphical presentation and consistency in treatment of data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal supervisor contribution needed to complete assessment tasks • Written work is coherent well-structured and very easy to follow and read. Few corrections required. • Results presented in a manner that is largely suitable for publication, including appropriate graphical presentation and consistency in treatment of data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some supervisor contribution needed to complete assessment tasks • Written work easy to read and follow. Few structure, grammatical or typographical errors present • Presented results in a manner that is satisfactory but not necessarily ideal minor inconsistent in the presentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some supervisor contribution needed to complete assessment tasks • Written work has many structure, grammatical or typographical errors. • Results presented in manner that is mostly satisfactory with some errors in the presentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant supervisor contribution needed to complete assessment tasks • Written work lacked structure and required significant correction of spelling and grammar. • Results presented in a manner that is unsatisfactory with many errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large amount of supervisor contribution needed to complete assessment tasks • Written work lacked structure. Very poor written English skills. • Presentation of results inappropriate with many errors. Not all results presented.
---	---	--	---	---	--	---