

## Full-Paper Review Rubric

### Criteria:

	3	2	1	0
Relevance	The work is in fields of either data analysis, STEM, or humanities. All the data are relevant to current society.	The work is in fields of either data analysis, STEM, or humanities. Some data are relevant to current society.	The work is in fields of either data analysis, STEM, or humanities. Few data are relevant to current society.	The work is in fields of either data analysis, STEM, or humanities. The data are irrelevant to current society.
Significance of contribution	The paper leads to future research which will significantly contribute to the field of research. The work suggests a new pathway in the field.	The paper has a strong potential for future research to others which will significantly contribute to the field of research.	The paper has a potential for future research to others which may contribute to the field of research.	The paper is not fully innovative in that it does not contribute to the development of the field of research.
Technical quality	The results are applicable to real life, formally presented and properly justified by data.	The results are somewhat applicable to real life, formally/casually presented and mostly justified by data.	The results are rarely applicable to real life, not so formally presented and rarely justified by data.	The results are not applicable to real life, informally presented and not justified by data.
Scholarship	The paper consistently demonstrates appreciation of scientific heritage throughout the whole paper. All the resources are relevantly cited.	The paper mostly demonstrates appreciation of scientific heritage. Most resources are relevantly cited.	The paper somewhat demonstrates appreciation of scientific heritage. Some resources are relevantly cited.	The paper does not demonstrate appreciation of scientific heritage. Resources are rarely cited.
Quality of presentation	The paper is clearly written and structured very well, in a guided format. It is readily comprehensible to others working in the same field.	The paper is somewhat clearly written and structured within the guided format and has standard and clean structure. It is somewhat comprehensible to others working in the same area.	The paper's structure is weak, and it diverges from the guideline to a great degree. It is not clearly written, and it is not very comprehensible.	The paper has very weak structure and clarity, and it does not follow the guided format. It is not readily comprehensible to others working in the same field.
Originality	The paper is creative. It consists of new and/or innovative	The paper repeats some of the ideas that were already	The paper repeats previously issued ideas to a large	The paper fails to construct original arguments. It

	ideas. The paper might contain some ideas that have been already issued by other researchers, but it develops those ideas to a significant degree with a unique perspective.	issued by other researchers or authors. However, the paper includes some degree of new and innovative ideas.	degree. It does not contain many original and innovative ideas from the researcher.	contains conventional ideas and doesn't show much development within the original perspective.
Adherence to purpose	The author's statement is consistent throughout the paper and strongly confident in their thesis.	The author's statement is somewhat consistent throughout the paper and confident in their thesis.	The author's statement is weakly consistent throughout the paper and somewhat confident in their thesis.	The author fails to assert their hypothesis throughout the paper. The author's statement is not consistent throughout the paper and changes.
Objectivity	The paper is objective. Conclusion presents factual results.	The paper is mostly objective. Conclusion is factual but partly subjective.	The paper is partially objective. Conclusion is somewhat biased.	The paper is not objective. Conclusion is biased.
Research ethics	The paper respects the privacy and confidentiality of its sources. It also follows scientific morality and did not commit any plagiarism.	The paper mostly respects the privacy and confidentiality of participants and data. The procedure is mostly moral. The full research does not contain any plagiarized work.	The paper does not secure privacy and confidentiality of the participants and data. The procedure includes somewhat immoral practices. The full research might contain some clue of plagiarism or did not clearly cite the sources.	The source of the paper is very unclear, and the researcher did not secure the confidentiality and privacy of their sources and included immoral practices. The work might contain plagiarized portions.

**Scoring:**

Relevance	4	3	2	1
Significance of contribution	4	3	2	1
Technological quality	4	3	2	1
Scholarship	4	3	2	1
Quality of presentation	4	3	2	1
Originality	4	3	2	1
Adherence to purpose	4	3	2	1
Objectivity	4	3	2	1
Research ethics	4	3	2	1

**Summary of the paper:****Confidential remarks for the programme committee**

If you wish to add any remarks intended only for PC members please write them below. These remarks will only be seen by the PC members having access to reviews for this submission. They will not be sent to the authors. This field is optional.

**CIRCH**  
CONCORDIA INTERNATIONAL  
RESEARCH CONFERENCE HANOI