# Editorial Marking Grid

**Rule #1:** There must be no plagiarism. Ever. No exceptions.

## 1. Communication

### 1.1 ABSTRACT

It should clearly and concisely **summarise** the article, communicating the problem/objective, method and conclusions. It should **grab the attention** of a potential reader and should **not ramble or include any abbreviations/undefined technical terms or references.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great flow, no longer than necessary</td>
<td>Good length and flow</td>
<td>Satisfactory length and flow</td>
<td>Very long/rambling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good balance between clarity and detail</td>
<td>Quite accessible to readership</td>
<td>Satisfactory accessibility</td>
<td>Very technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent statement of objective/problem</td>
<td>Good statement of objective/problem</td>
<td>Poor accessibility</td>
<td>No statement of objective/problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveys why it is interesting</td>
<td>Good statement of conclusions/results</td>
<td>Satisfactory statement of conclusions/results</td>
<td>No mention of conclusions/results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent communication of conclusions/results</td>
<td>Good, concise summary of project</td>
<td>Satisfactory summary of project</td>
<td>No summary of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good balance between clarity and length</td>
<td>Poor/inconclusive summary of project</td>
<td>Satisfactory balance between clarity and length</td>
<td>Long/rambling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good statement of conclusions/results</td>
<td>Overly technical</td>
<td>Poor/inconclusive summary of project</td>
<td>Very long/rambling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveys why it is interesting</td>
<td>Poor/inconclusive summary of project</td>
<td>Poor/inconclusive summary of project</td>
<td>Very long/rambling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## EDITOR’S COMMENTS

SCORE /10
1.2 READABILITY & STYLE

It should be readable by the target group i.e. ages 12 – 20. The concepts must be explained well and in a reader-engaging manner. Excessive jargon and terminology should be avoided and clearly explained if used. It should be concise, unambiguous and should exclude unnecessary words. The author must be coherent and avoid waffling. Numerical results should be represented using tables, graphs, charts etc. if appropriate.

Standard technical writing style also includes:

- Avoiding personal language (e.g. I, we)
- Avoiding emotive and colloquial language (e.g. brilliant, useless, cool)
- Using technical and formal terms (e.g. exceeds specification, statistically insignificant, adequate for the intended use)
- Not using contractions (e.g. don’t, won’t, can’t etc.)
- Defining all abbreviations and technical terms, erring on the side of caution
- Defining all symbols and including the relevant units where appropriate
- Using appropriate sections and headings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The article is not readable by teens</th>
<th>The article is readable but hard to follow by early teens</th>
<th>The article is readable by teens</th>
<th>The article is highly readable by target audience as well as scientists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excessive use of jargon</td>
<td>Somewhat coherent</td>
<td>Good coherence</td>
<td>Excellent coherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of coherence</td>
<td>The sections are somewhat cluttered</td>
<td>Good sectioning</td>
<td>Effective sectioning that helps in readability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sections and headings are not organised well</td>
<td>Tables/graphs are unclear</td>
<td>Good use of tables/graphs to show results</td>
<td>Excellent use of tables/graphs to summarise results and any trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No use of tables/graphs if appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tables and graphs are clearly presented with headers and a legend</td>
<td>Tables and graphs are very clearly presented with appropriate headers and an unambiguous legend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.3 GRAPHICAL PRESENTATION

- Neat, simple and uncluttered diagrams/figures showing important features
- In case of photographs, good lighting and clarity
- Figures, graphs and tables clearly labelled
- Appropriate use of scales, labels, symbols, lines and legends
- Clear and concise captions
- Where needed, relevant units shown

EDITOR’S COMMENTS

SCORE /5

1.4 REFERENCES

- Articles should follow the Chicago referencing style
- Check that there are sufficient references
- Check that they are ordered correctly
- Ensure there is a valid link to the original source page, as opposed to just the author
- All claims, sources of external information and key assumptions used should be supported by references

EDITOR’S COMMENTS

SCORE /5
2 Scientific/Technical Content

2.1 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND/LITERATURE REVIEW

The introduction should give the reader an effective and concise overview of the work and outline its aims and objectives. The background should explain clearly the work’s significance in a broader scientific context to an unfamiliar reader. It should explain the significance of the work both within the field and in general. The literature review should discuss other studies conducted in the field and how the other studies’ results relate to this work. Ensure all information included is relevant and is not just being used to pad out an article. Bear in mind that an author may structure this part of their article differently – this is ok as long as all of these points are covered.

- No reference to title
- Excessive rambling, waffling etc.
- Insufficient depth of background
- Excessive depth of background
- Excessively long background
- No reference to significance of the research
- No mention of other studies’ results
- Absence of literature review
- Somewhat rambling, waffling etc.
- Poor communication of introduction/background
- Overly long background
- Poor reference to significance of the research
- Little mention of other studies’ results
- Good coherence
- Good communication of introduction/background
- Good reference to significance of the research
- Some mention of other studies’ results
- Excellent coherence
- Context of work communicated excellently
- Significance of research is made very clear
- Highly effective conclusions and clearly presented results
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2.2 METHOD

The method section should outline in **sufficient detail how the research was conducted**. The **method should be appropriate** to the aims and objectives stated. Key decisions and **choices in methodology should be explained**, particularly regarding a **control or not**. Ensure that **sources of error are identified** and minimised as much as possible. If relevant, the adherence of the research to **applicable ethical standards** in the author’s jurisdiction should be outlined in good detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARKS: 0-5</th>
<th>MARKS: 5-10</th>
<th>MARKS: 10-15</th>
<th>MARKS 15-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism or references due not cited/missing (Plagiarism = 0)</td>
<td>Not all references are cited/missing</td>
<td>All references in place</td>
<td>Excellent references and in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaccurate science</td>
<td>Science somewhat inaccurate</td>
<td>Science accurate</td>
<td>Science accurate and presented effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No originality in research paper (if not presented as a review project)</td>
<td>Originality is there but must be presented better</td>
<td>Writing and science are original</td>
<td>Science is original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mere re-stating of old works (If not review project)</td>
<td>Results and conclusions need to be connected better</td>
<td>Good conclusions and results are presented</td>
<td>Highly effective conclusions and clearly presented results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS MISSING**

**EDITOR’S COMMENTS**
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### 2.3 CALCULATIONS/RESULTS

The calculations should all be correct (and checked) and numerical data given to an appropriate number of significant figures. All equations used should be presented algebraically with all terms explained before used to show results. Example calculations should also be included. Unnecessary, distracting or unclear data visualisations should be omitted. Appropriate data interpretation (trends etc.) should be presented. If statistics comprise part of the results, ensure they are appropriate and complete (e.g. error %, standard deviation). Check that the correct units are used and that any unexpected/anomalous results are pointed out.

**MARKS: 0-5**
- Plagiarism or references due not cited/missing (Plagiarism = 0)
- Inaccurate science
- No originality in research paper (if not presented as a review project)
- Mere re-stating of old works (If not review project)
- Results and conclusions missing

**MARKS: 5-10**
- Not all references are cited/missing
- Science somewhat inaccurate
- Originality is there but must be presented better
- Results and conclusions need to be connected better

**MARKS: 10-15**
- All references in place
- Science accurate
- Writing and science are original
- Good conclusions and results are presented

**MARKS 15-20**
- Excellent references and in place
- Science accurate and presented effectively
- Science is original
- Highly effective conclusions and clearly presented results

---
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2.4 DISCUSSION

It should include **logical interpretations** and discussion of results. It must also tell the readers how the study undertaken is a part of a **larger picture** and how it is **significant**. **Why should we care about these results?**

**Original Research**
- Are the results reasonable, and if not – why not?
- Do the results adequately address the stated aims and objectives?
- Is there a discussion on the level of agreement between theory and experiments,
- Is there a discussion on the applicability and limitations of relevant theories?
- Where applicable, is the relationship between variables stated?
- Are anomalous results present? If so, are they discussed?

**Magazine/Review Article**
- Has the author evaluated the science presented so as to make the article unique? (~50% of the article, at a minimum 20%, should be evaluation as opposed to restating facts)
- Has the author presented an alternative view, a counterargument or an opinion?
- Have recent developments and potential applications in the field been discussed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion/Conclusions are intermingled with results</th>
<th>Separate discussion section is present but not satisfactory</th>
<th>Good discussion with clear and concise main points</th>
<th>All discussion is coherent and effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no discussion/conclusion section at all</td>
<td>Interpretations follow in a semi-logical manner</td>
<td>Good interpretation and communication of results</td>
<td>Excellent interpretation that help reinforce the purpose of the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The interpretations are not logical and have no relation with the results</td>
<td>Interpretations are convoluted and incoherent</td>
<td>Significance of the study as part of the larger picture is mentioned</td>
<td>Significance of the study as part of the larger picture is discussed effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It simply restates the results in words without evaluating them</td>
<td>The significance of the study is not stated enough to the reader</td>
<td>Broad context of the work is communicated well</td>
<td>The section suggests where and how to do further study or research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of the study and further research suggestions are not present</td>
<td>Broad context of the work is poorly communicated</td>
<td>Some mention of potential future developments</td>
<td>The discussion predicts further hypothesis, study or applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad context of the work is not mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5 CONCLUSION(S)

- Is there a distinct, clear, concise conclusion section presenting a useful summary of the main findings and most important aspects of the discussion?

- Did the research fulfil the objective? If not, why not? (It is ok to be unsuccessful – but understanding why is the key to learning from mistakes)

- Why does this research matter?

Litmus test: If a person reads only the introduction, background and conclusion, will they have the essence of the article? If not, then something is not right.

| Conclusions are intermingled with another section | Distinct conclusions section but poorly presented | Conclusions well formatted |
| Poor summary of article’s results/findings | Verbose and unconcise conclusions | Conclusions are very clear and concise |
| Conclusions bear no relation to results or discussion | Link with results and discussion tenuous | Excellent logical connection with results and discussion |
| Inclusion of material not already presented | Ineffective communication of article’s findings | Effective and coherent communication of the article’s findings |
| Conclusions missing | |
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2.6 SCOPE & ORIGINALITY

Is the article original and innovative or is it just a repeat of something done before? All articles should add some new insight or evaluation, either new science or some new opinion.

EDITOR’S COMMENTS

NO SCORE
Overall Score. Does the aggregated score place the article in the correct overall category?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-40</td>
<td>A poor article. This article is not a standard acceptable for publication in a journal in both scientific content and communication. REJECTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>An average article. The article is acceptable containing some good elements but needs substantial work before it is publishable. BORDERLINE – Second review necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-80</td>
<td>A good article The article has good scientific integrity and concepts are generally well communicated. With some polishing the article can be published. ACCEPTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>An excellent article The article is to a near professional standard with few/no errors. Some additional polishing will make this a professional grade article. ACCEPTED -Accelerated Publication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score __/100