FEEDBACK FOR POPULAR SCIENCE ARTICLE (PGT)

MODULE NUMBER: BS937-7-SP

TITLE OF POPULAR SCIENCE ARTICLE: Write a scientific article that could be understood by an intelligent member of the general public about the application of **one** enzyme (obtained from a cultivated microbe) used in a biotechnological process.

Word Limit: 500 Words

LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSED: All

RELEVANT MODULE LEARNING OBJECTIVES: Mostly 2-6 and 9-26 and 46-48

Assessment Criteria: *These elements are not necessarily given equal weight in the overall assessment.*

Elements	Top distinction >80%	Distinction 70%-80%	Merit 60%-69%	Pass 50%-59%	Fail <50%	Low fail <40%
Quality of writing	Outstanding: great clarity. Very concise. Entirely logical in structure. Negligible errors in spelling & grammar	Excellent: clear and concise. Generally very logical. Minimal errors in spelling & grammar	Very good: usually clear and concise. Only minor weaknesses in logic. Few minor errors in spelling & grammar	Good: some lack of clarity and not concise. Some lapses in logic. Some errors in spelling & grammar	Poor: lacks clarity, and not concise. Many errors in spelling & grammar	Very poor: rambling, unclear. Difficult to understand. Very many errors in spelling & grammar
Quantity and relevance of information	Comprehensive, accurate information content. Entirely relevant to question	All important information. Minimal irrelevance/ inaccuracy	Considerable amount of information. Minor irrelevance/ inaccuracy	Reasonable amount of information. Some irrelevance/ inaccuracy	Limited amount of information. Much irrelevant or inaccurate	Negligible information. Mainly irrelevant/ inaccurate
Understand-ing	Excellent, critical understanding. Appreciation of all nuances / perspectives	Very good understanding. Some appreciation of nuances/ perspectives	Substantial understanding. Limited appreciation of nuances/ perspectives	Some understanding, but rather narrow	Limited and patchy. Somewhat misses the point	Little or none. Completely misses the point
Reading, research and referencing	Full, critical coverage of literature. Accurately cited and referenced	Broad, critical coverage. Only minor errors in citation / referencing	Good but lacks critical insight. Generally accurate citation / referencing	Adequate but uncritical. Some errors in citation / referencing	Narrow. Uncritical. Numerous errors in citation / referencing	Little or none. Uncritical. Citation / referencing absent or full of errors
Explained in a way that can be understood by an intelligent member of the public	Totally clear, avoided all jargon. Explained complex issues clearly and succinctly	Clear, mostly avoided jargon. Explained complex issues clearly and succinctly	Quite clear, mostly avoided jargon. Explained complex issues reasonably clearly and succinctly	Not very clear. Used a little too much jargon. Complex issues explained in a rather convoluted way	Unclear. Too much jargon. Complex issues poorly explained	Completely unclear. Full of jargon. Rambling, incomprehensible explanations

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS also SEE ANNOTATION ON YOUR WORK:

Several in-text citations are not in the reference list. Have those been copied and pasted from elsewhere? Two complicated figures, not referred to in the text and not discussed, do not help to understand the subject. Several terms are used which are not explained - this is not acceptable in a popular science article. The PDF file cannot be properly selected - the source Word file seems to be badly formatted.

MARK:…50%…….. NAME OF MARKER:… Dima Svistunenko ……