

**BIOM6401 Effective Scientific Writing Assessment Task: *Writing a Critical Literature Review of Research Papers* (25% of this course)**

Writing serves multiple purposes for professional scientists. This task focuses on writing to technical audiences. The Critical Review presages most of the key assessable components of the Honours program. Students will source three recent, research-based publications related to their Honours research project. They are required to write a review which critically appraises the three articles. The Reviews are to be submitted electronically with the connected EndNote libraries. Word length: 1400-1600; A4, double spacing, Times New Roman, margins 2.5 cm. No diagrams. The ABSTRACT (max 100 words) is NOT included in the word length.

**Criteria Sheet**

	25-21 %	20-16 %	15-11 %	10-1%
CONTENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>content is appropriate, accurate, recent, relevant &amp; detailed</li> <li>Review is synthesised and includes specific comparisons and evaluations</li> <li>Extent and use of describing, explaining &amp; arguing are appropriately balanced</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>content is recent, relevant &amp; detailed</li> <li>key points are articulated but synthesis, comparisons and evaluations are not sustained</li> <li>more describing &amp; explaining than arguing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>content is recent, but relevance, accuracy or detail are uneven or not sustained</li> <li>the Review is mainly a descriptive summary</li> <li>arguing is brief and/or not sustained</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review does not meet the minimum requirements for relevance or accuracy or detail</li> <li>Review comprises a descriptive list without any links between cited studies</li> </ul>
FORMAT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>submission conforms to the structural conventions of a Critical Review, and</li> <li>logical &amp; coherent argument is sustained throughout</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>submission mostly conforms to the structural conventions of a Critical Review, and</li> <li>logical &amp; coherent argument is mostly evident</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>limited adherence to the structural conventions of a Critical Review, and</li> <li>logical &amp; coherent argument is limited</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review does not adhere to the structural conventions of a Critical Review</li> </ul>
WRITING STYLE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and sentence structures are to a professional standard</li> <li>review is both informative and persuasive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and sentence structures are coherent</li> <li>review is mostly informative and persuasive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and sentence structures contain significant inconsistencies</li> <li>review is descriptive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and sentence structures do not meet minimum standards expected of Honours students</li> </ul>
ENDNOTE LIBRARY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>active and accurate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>not active</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>not active</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>not active</li> </ul>

Marker's overall grade: