	3 points	2.5 points	2 points	1.5 points	1 point	0.5 points	0 points
Introduction and Aim (max 1 point)					The scientific basis for the study is provided substantiated with references to relevant journal papers, appropriate models/equations and methodological stance. An argument is made for the significance of the study leading to the aim. The aim is clearly stated and contains measurable variables which are consistent with the analysis.	Certain aspects and connections are made, but a coherent and consistent argument is lacking.	The text is incoherent or absent.
Methods and Equipment (max 3 points)	All methods are fully and clearly explained, allow the aim to be answered. These include measured variables, equipment, sketch and photo of the experimental set-up, procedure and equations for measuring and/or calculating variables, methods to calculate uncertainties. The methods are detailed enough so that they can be followed by others to repeat the experiment.	Methods are very well described but some minor details are missing or incorrect	Methods are well described but there are missing or incorrect detail which would make it difficult for others to repeat the experiment.	Key steps are outlined, but detailed information is missing or incorrect.	Correct steps are mentioned, but methods overall do not provide clear steps for achieving the experiment's aim.	Some correct methods are mentioned but the overall description is incoherent or incorrect.	The text is incoherent or absent.
Results (max 3 points)	The data are very well presented, analysed, and described with final representations allowing the aim/question of the study to be answered. Appropriate visualisation of data is used including graphs and/or tables. Graphs and tables are clearly labelled, include captions, and are referenced	Results are very well described but there some minor inconsistencies.	Results are well presented but there are missing detail and/or mistakes in presentation or analysis.	Some key findings are demonstrated but many aspects data presentation and	Some correct ideas are mentioned and knowledge of experimental concepts is demonstrated but the overall presentation and analysis of the data are either incorrect, incoherent or missing.	Relevant keywords are mentioned and an attempt at data presentation and analysis is made but the overall	The text is incoherent or absent.

	in the text. Graphs include all required components, such as axis labels, units, and legends. Uncertainties are appropriately considered. Final results are quoted with correct number of significant figures. The writing and logic are clear and easy to follow.			analysis are missing or incorrect.		description doesn't answer the study aim and is unclear.	
Interpretation (max 2 points)			A very well-justified argument is made that the aim/question is addressed. Plausible scientific explanations connecting the aim/question supported by findings are articulated. The findings are discussed in the context of existing knowledge in the field with references to published materials. Inconsistencies and sources of error are identified, and reliability of the data are discussed. Study limitations are identified and future improvements or research are proposed. The text is well-structured.	A well-justified argument is made that the aim/question is addressed. Some detail of interpretation are missing.	Relevant concepts mentioned, but a coherent and consistent discussion is not provided.	Some relevant keywords are mentioned, but the overall discussion is incoherent.	The text is incoherent or absent.
Conclusion (max 1 point)					Main findings of the experiment are summarised in a concise way. Agreement/disagreement of results with relevant physical concepts is stated.	Some relevant conclusions are made but incomplete.	The text is incoherent or absent.