**Grading criteria for advanced project reports**

**Table 1.** Grading criteria Template.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description[[1]](#footnote-1)** | **Possible reduction** | **Point reduction** | **Comment to grading** |
| **Project deadline** |  |  |  |
| Missed the deadline | - |  |  |
| **URKUND** |  |  |  |
| The report has too much overlap with texts not produced by the author | - |  |  |
| **Layout** |  |  |  |
| Report not customarily outlined (see recourses) | X / 1 | 0 |  |
| Not used single column layout in the report | X / 1 | 0 |  |
| Report longer than 15 pages (Introduction - References) | X / 1 | 0 |  |
| Text below figures or text above tables missing | X / 1 |  |  |
| Relevant equations are not numbered and referred to in the text appropriately | X / 1 |  |  |
| Headlines are not appropriately named and numbered for different levels | X / 1 | 1 | See comments |
| Page numbering lacking | X / 1 | 1 | appendix |
| Reference list erroneous or incomplete (Used IEEE) | X / 1 |  |  |
| Abstract is lacking or incomplete | X / 1 | 1 |  |
| Appendices severely misused or containing irrelevant parts | X / 1 | 1 | See comments |
| **Language** |  |  |  |
| Extensive misspelling (can be found by word spell-check) | X / 1 |  |  |
| The text contains several grammatically incorrect sentences | X / 1 |  |  |
| The language is inappropriate or not scientific | X / 1 |  |  |
| **Introduction** |  |  |  |
| Project is not put into context by the introduction | X / 1 |  |  |
| No formulation of the project aims | X / 1 |  |  |
| Bonus points**:** Overall quality of introduction section | X / 1 |  |  |
| **Theory** |  |  |  |
| Theory section not put in any context | X / 1 |  |  |
| The basic equations (Navier-Stokes, RANS etc.) are not presented | X / 1 |  |  |
| Boussinesq approach is not described | X / 1 |  |  |
| The turbulent model is not described both with eq. and text | X / 1 |  |  |
| Boundary and initial conditions are not specified | X / 1 |  |  |
| No definition of used evaluation quantities (Pk+, U+, k+, etc.) | X / 1 |  |  |
| Bonus points**:** Overall quality of theory section | X / 1 |  |  |
| **Methods** |  |  |  |
| Not possible to reproduce the results using the description in methods | X / 1 |  |  |
| Insufficient presentation of geometries | X / 1 |  |  |
| Insufficient description of chosen mesh | X / 1 |  |  |
| Not specified approaches for solving poor convergence | X / 1 |  |  |
| Not specified how evaluation quantities are measured (cutlines, points, etc.) | X / 1 |  |  |
| Missing or lacking mesh convergence test (enough with geometry without sensors) | X / 3 |  |  |
| Bonus points**:** Overall quality of method section | X / 1 |  |  |
| **Results** |  |  |  |
| Irrelevant calculations and data are presented | X / 2 |  |  |
| Lacking presentation of results using text supported by figures | X / 6 |  |  |
| Missing/Lacking use of references and/or reference data | X / 4 |  |  |
| Missing/lacking simulation validation | X / 4 |  |  |
| Lacking quality or choice of presented results | X / 6 |  |  |
| Bonus points**:** Overall quality of result section | X / 1 |  |  |
| Bonus points: 3D injector | X / 5 |  |  |
| **Discussion** |  |  |  |
| Missing/lacking comparison between the project aims and the results | X / 2 |  |  |
| Missing/lacking discussion regarding mesh and mesh convergence | X / 4 |  |  |
| Missing/lacking comparison with reference data (experimental, numerical and/or theoretical) | X / 4 |  |  |
| Reference limitations not discussed (suitability and/or consequences of differences from your case) | X / 2 |  |  |
| Missing/lacking outlook or suggestion for future studies | X / 2 |  |  |
| Lacking discussion regarding simulation validation | X / 4 |  |  |
| Lacking general discussion regarding the presented results | X / 6 |  |  |
| Missing/lacking logical interpretation/implications of results | X / 2 |  |  |
| Bonus points: Overall quality of discussion | X / 1 |  |  |
| Bonus points: 3D injector | X / 5 |  |  |
| **Conclusion** |  |  |  |
| Missing conclusions | X / 2 |  |  |
| Ungrounded or erroneous conclusions | X / 1 |  |  |
| Bonus points**:** Overall quality of conclusions | X / 1 |  |  |

1. **MAX PROJECT POINTS: 80**
2. **TOTAL BONUS POINTS: /16**
3. **TOTAL POINT REDUCTION: /80**

**TOTAL PROJECT SCORE (A + B – C): - (U)**

**PROJECT GRADE: U: < 32 points (< 40 %)**

**3: 32 – 47.5 points (40­-59 %)**

**4: 48 – 63.5 points (60-79 %)**

**5: ≥ 64 points (≥ 80 %)**

**For resubmission:** see some recommendations in the report. But really what you need to do is finalize a result and discussion section, as well as formulate an aim in the introduction which you can reconnect to. I would skip abstract and the rest of introduction. Also, keep in mind that you can only get a low 3 in grad with a resubmission, so finalizing to something you would be happy with is more for you than me.

You can either correct according to the above suggestions with a maximum outcome of 32 point (40%), or you could opt not to resubmit ant instead redo the project with a new geometry, with a chance to get a higher grade (you could use much of the Comsol code and what you have written here in a new project).

1. The descriptions are either formulated to describe what would motivate a point reduction, or content that is expected to be included. If unclear, contact supervisor! [↑](#footnote-ref-1)