

Category	Criterion	Score for criterion				Category score
		Fail (< 5.0)	Pass (6.0 - 7.0)	Merit (7.0 - 8.0)	Distinction (8.0 - 10.0)	

General requirements	Length				Between 6,000 and 12,000 words (excluding footnotes/endnotes, title page and references).
	Time frame				Kept to deadlines / Finished final version within formal or agreed time frame for a 6 EC assignment.
	Rebuttal				Rebuttal to feedback on first version is included.
	Layout				Clear layout. Citations are in a correct and the same style throughout the review.
	Own work				All sources are named. The review article is written in own words and free from plagiarism.
Feedback:					

1. Title & abstract	Content and structure	The title and abstract cover mostly unimportant points / They do not try to entice the reader to read the review / The internal logic is missing.	The title and abstract cover most important points of the review / They try to entice the reader to read it and succeeds partly / The internal logic of the abstract could at places have been better.	The title and abstract cover almost all important points of the review / They entices the reader to read it / The internal logic of the abstract is sound.	The title and abstract cover all important points of the review / They entice the reader to read it / The internal internal logic of the abstract is sound and it is as concise as possible.
Feedback:					

	Background information	Background information is mostly off topic and essential background information is missing.	The background information is mostly on topic, but some essential information is missing and some off topic information is given.	The background information is mostly on topic and all essential information is given. Only small amounts of off topic information are given.	The background information is completely on topic.
--	------------------------	---	---	--	--

Category	Criterion	Score for criterion				Category score
		Fail (< 5.0)	Pass (6.0 - 7.0)	Merit (7.0 - 8.0)	Distinction (8.0 - 10.0)	
2. Introduction	Formulated main question and delineation of the subject	The main question is unambiguous, not inquirable and does not arise logically from the background information. Delineation of the subject is weak.	The main question is mostly unambiguous, but could have been defined more unambiguously at some points and the supervisor must be able to say how. The main question arises mostly from the background information. The delineation is mostly unambiguous.	The main question is unambiguous and inquirable and arises from the background information in a mostly logical way, though other main questions might also have been formulated. The delineation is unambiguous.	The main question is unambiguous and inquirable and arises from the background information in a completely logical way. No other main question is as such possible. The delineation is completely unambiguous.	
	Formulated aims/hypotheses/sub-questions	Most of the aims/hypotheses/sub-questions are unambiguous and will play almost no role in answering the main question.	Most of the aims/hypotheses/sub-questions are unambiguous and help to answer the main question, though not completely	The aims/hypotheses/sub-questions are unambiguous and have a unambiguous role in answering the main question.	The aims/hypotheses/sub-questions are unambiguous and have a unambiguous role in answering the main question. They also take into account other possible routes to answer the main question.	
	Explanation of methods to find sources (depends on specialisation)	The explanation of the methods is not sufficient to reach any of the same sources or understand the workflow of the student.	The explanation of the methods is sufficient to reach most of the sources and the workflow can be understood reasonably well.	The explanation of the methods is sufficient to reach all sources and the workflow can be understood almost completely. The reasoning behind the workflow and used keywords is also explained in some detail.	The explanation of the methods is sufficient to reach all sources and the workflow can be understood completely. The reasoning behind the workflow and used keywords is explained unambiguously.	
Feedback:						

3. Body	Use of articles	Only a couple of relevant articles have been used in the examination of articles. The articles are summarized in a crude manner.	A reasonable amount of relevant papers have been summarized unambiguously. The sources indicate that the student has thought about what information comes from reviews (hypotheses, trends, etc.) and what from research articles (basic data), but that (s)he does not understand the finer details thereof.	A good amount of relevant papers have been summarized unambiguously. The sources indicate that the student understands what information comes from reviews and what from research articles.	A good amount of relevant papers have been summarized unambiguously. Papers that are relevant, but less obvious ones have also been used. The sources indicate that the student understands what information comes from reviews and what from research articles.
	Critical evaluation of articles	The articles are almost never evaluated / If they are this is only done by looking at the impact factor of the journal it was published in.	The articles are critically evaluated most of the time / This is mostly by easy parameters, but sometimes the student has commented upon methods used or other internal factors from journals.	The articles are almost always critically evaluated / The student is able to combine different sources into a coherent section due to this evaluation most of the time.	The articles are always critically evaluated / The student is able to combine different sources into a coherent section due to this evaluation at all times.

Category	Criterion	Score for criterion				Category score
		Fail (< 5.0)	Pass (6.0 - 7.0)	Merit (7.0 - 8.0)	Distinction (8.0 - 10.0)	
	Level of detail in descriptions and argumentation	Level of detail varies widely.	Level of detail inappropriate at places.	In most places level of detail is appropriate.	Level of detail is appropriate at all places.	
	Connection of sections to the aims as formulated in the introduction	The different sections have almost no connection to the aims/hypotheses/sub-questions as formulated in the introduction.	The different sections have some connections to the aims/hypotheses/sub-questions as formulated in the introduction, but not always logically.	The different sections are unambiguously connected to the aims/hypotheses/sub-questions as formulated in the introduction, often in logical ways.	The different sections are unambiguously connected to the aims/hypotheses/sub-questions as formulated in the introduction, always in logical and sometimes even creative ways.	
	Integration: synthesis of the sections of the examination of articles	The different sections of the examination of articles are sometimes synthesized, but only in trivial ways.	The different sections of the examination of articles are often synthesized, but often in obvious ways.	The different sections of the examination of articles are all synthesized and some conflicts between sections are identified and explained.	The different sections of the examination of articles are all synthesized and all conflicts between sections are identified and explained.	
Feedback:						

4. Conclusion	Answering of main question	The conclusion answers the main question only partially and it repeats the examination of articles and not the discussion.	The conclusion is related to the main question, but not all sub-questions have been answered thoroughly. The conclusion is logical.	The conclusion is well related to the main question and all sub-questions have been answered thoroughly. The conclusion is exact and logical.	The conclusion is well related to the main question and all sub-questions have been answered thoroughly. The conclusion is original, exact and logical.	
	Implications of the conclusion and recommendations	Recommendations and implications are trivial and often not connected to the conclusion.	Recommendations and implications are well-connected to the conclusion, but are relatively simple.	Recommendations and implications are well-connected to the conclusion, to-the-point and original.	Recommendations and implications are well-connected to the conclusion, to-the-point and original. They are extensive enough to act as a project description for a new review.	
Feedback:						

5. Self-made figures & diagrams	Quality and relevance	The self-made figures/diagrams are only partly understandable after much difficulty or do not support the text of the review.	The self-made figures/diagrams are relatively unambiguous / They support the text of the review relatively well.	The self-made figures/diagrams are unambiguous and easy to read / They support the text of the review in appropriate places.	The self-made figures/diagrams are unambiguous and easy to read. They are a valuable addition to the text of the review.
---------------------------------	-----------------------	---	--	--	--

Category	Criterion	Score for criterion				Category score
		Fail (< 5.0)	Pass (6.0 - 7.0)	Merit (7.0 - 8.0)	Distinction (8.0 - 10.0)	
Feedback:						

6. Writing skills	Structure of the review	The main structure is incorrect in some places. Placement of material in different chapters is illogical in many sections.	Main structure is correct, but lower level hierarchy of sections is illogical in places. Some sections have overlapping functions leading to ambiguity in the review.	Main structure is correct and the lower level hierarchy is logical in most places. Ordering of the different sections is mostly logical.	Higher and lower level hierarchy is logical. Ordering of the sections is logical. All information occurs at the right place.
	Clarity of the arguments	Vagueness and/or inexactness in wording occur regularly and it affects the interpretation of the review.	Formulations in the review are predominantly unambiguous and exact. The review could have been written more concisely or more elaborate.	Formulations in the review are unambiguous and exact, as well as concise.	The textual quality of the review is such that it could be acceptable in a peer-reviewed journal.
	Readability	The sentences are full of spelling and grammar mistakes / Most sentences do not have a unambiguous function.	There are quite a few sentences with spelling and grammar mistakes, though they hardly bother while reading / There are quite some sentences without a unambiguous function / The writing style varies a lot.	There are no obvious spelling and grammar mistakes / Almost all sentences have a unambiguous function / The writing style is scientific and coherent.	There are no obvious spelling and grammar mistakes / All sentences have a unambiguous function / The writing style is scientific, coherent and pleasant to read.
Feedback:					

7. Independence	Interaction with supervisor	The student needs frequent instructions and help to grasp the topic from the supervisor. The supervisor needs careful checks to see if all tasks have been performed. The meetings with the supervisor were insufficiently prepared.	The supervisor is mainly responsible for explaining the topic to the student, but (s)he is able to fill in the details. The meetings with the supervisor were reasonably prepared.	The student plans and performs most writing independently and asks for help from the supervisor when needed. The meetings with the supervisor were well-prepared.	The student plans and performs writing independently. The meetings with the supervisor are very well-prepared.
Feedback:					

Category	Criterion	Score for criterion				Category score
		Fail (< 5.0)	Pass (6.0 - 7.0)	Merit (7.0 - 8.0)	Distinction (8.0 - 10.0)	
8. Optional extra category	As discussed with student beforehand	...	...	...	...	
Feedback:						

## FINAL GRADE:

Feedback:	
-----------	--

To allow for differences between scientific fields/disciplines, the relative weights of the categories are not specified. A supervisor has to decide and communicate to the student why and how sub-grades for the different categories will add up to the final grade.