# **FEEDBACK FOR SCIENTIFIC PAPER FORMAT (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)**

**MODULE NUMBER:** BS983-7-SP

**DEADLINE DATE: 4.00 p.m. Tuesday Week 26 (28th March 2023)**

# **LEARNING OUTCOME ASSESSED:**

Demonstrate competence in data presentation, analysis and interpretation, numeracy, information retrieval and written communication.

**RELEVANT MODULE LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**

8. Describe how detergents and mechanical methods may be employed to extract soluble and membrane proteins from eukaryotic and bacterial cells

9. Explain the underlying principles of commonly used chromatographic techniques for protein purification

10. Discuss the applications of gel electrophoresis & enzymatic activity assays in monitoring a purification protocol

11. Discuss the principles of techniques for determining the relative molecular mass & isoelectric point of a protein

12. Detail the methods available for obtaining information on the primary structure of a protein, including the elucidation of encoding genes

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

*(Marker: please circle relevant comments.)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Element | **Top distinction**  **>80%** | **Distinction**  **70%-79%** | **Merit**  **60%-69%** | **Pass**  **50%-59%** | **Fail**  **<50%** | **Low fail**  **<40%** |
| **Overall quality of writing.** | Excellent: great clarity. Very concise.  Minimal errors in spelling & grammar. | Very good: accurate, concise, unambiguous.  Minimal errors. | Good: usually accurate, concise, clear.  Few minor errors. | OK: some lack of clarity and not concise.  Few errors; mainly minor. | Poor: lacks clarity, major omissions, not concise.  Many errors. | Poor: rambling, unclear, many omissions.  Very many / major errors. |
| **Title** | Informative, elegantly expressed and concise. | Informative, clear and concise. | Moderately informative. Somewhat long/short. | Could be more informative.  Too long/short | Uninformative.  Poorly writtten.  Much too long/short. | Uninformative or missing. |
| **Abstract** | Excellent balance. Context and methodological approach clearly articulated.  Key results clearly reported. Appropriate conclusion. | Very good balance.  Context and methodological approach clearly articulated.  Key results clearly reported. Appropriate conclusion. | Good balance.  Context and methodological approach described.  Key results reported.  Conclusion included. | Balance OK.  Some coverage of context and methodological approach.  Results not well reported.  Conclusion poorly articulated . | Poor balance.  Context and methodological approach unclear or missing.  Inadequate reporting of results.  Conclusion inappropriate. | Very poor balance or no abstract included.  No context or methodology.  No mention of results.  No conclusion. |
| **Introduction.** | Comprehensive, highly relevant coverage of context and literature.  Seamlessly integrated and critically evaluated.  No factual errors.  Aims clear, explicit and logical. | Wide, highly relevant coverage of literature.  Very well integrated and critically evaluated.  Very minor errors.  Aims explicit and logical. | Good, relevant coverage of literature.  Well integrated and some critical evaluation.  Minor errors.  Aims stated and somewhat logical. | Reasonable coverage of literature (some irrelevant).  Some attempt at integration and critical evaluation.  Significant errors.  Aims somewhat unclear / illogical. | Poor coverage of literature.  Largely irrelevant.  Poor integration. No attempt to evaluate.  Numerous errors.  Aims poorly articulated. | No coverage of literature or entirely irrelevant.  Disintegrated!  Full of errors.  No explicit aims stated. |
| **Methods.** | Very clear, thorough & concise. Appropriate level of detail to replicate. | Clear, thorough & concise.  Appropriate level of detail to replicate | Mostly clear, thorough & concise.  Some necessary, unclear or missing detail. | Quite clear, but insufficient, or irrelevant detail.  Difficult to replicate. | Mostly unclear. Far too little or too much irrelevant detail.  Impossible to replicate. | V. unclear. Almost no relevant information.  Impossible to replicate. |
| **Results.** | Very clearly, selectively & concisely described.  Data correctly analysed & interpreted.  Tables and figures neat, accurate &, fully labeled.  Statistics correctly used, interpreted, & reported. | Clearly & concisely described.  Data correctly analysed & interpreted.  Tables and figures neat, accurate & fully labeled.  Statistics correctly used, interpreted & reported. | Mostly clearly & concisely described.  Data generally well analysed; few misinterpretations.  Some omissions / errors in presentation of tables and figures.  Statistics mainly correctly used, interpreted, & reported. | Generally clear, but difficult to identify key results.  Data analysis and interpretation satisfactory but some errors / omissions.  Significant errors in presentation of tables & figures.  Some errors in use, reporting & interpretation of statistics. | Unclear, key results not identified.  Many errors / omissions in data analysis & interpretation.  Many errors in presentation of tables & figures.  Major errors in use, reporting & interpretation of statistics. | No description of results.  Data not analysed; all key points missed or misinterpreted.  Tables and figures very poor or missing.  Statistics not used or totally inappropriate. |
| **Discussion** | Outstanding understanding.  Insightful, critical integration with literature.  Full evaluation of limitations. | Very good understanding. Critical integration with literature.  Full coverage of limitations. | Substantial understanding.  Good integration with literature but uncritical.  Good coverage of limitations. | Some understanding.  Incomplete integration, lacking insight.  Some coverage of limitations. | Limited and patchy.  Little integration with the literature. Minimal appreciation of limitations. | Little or no understanding.  No integration with the literature.  No recognition of limitations. |
| **References.** | Many. Always used effectively.  Cited & listed in approved format.  Mainly relevant peer reviewed papers and reviews. | Many. Nearly always used effectively.  Cited & listed in a standard way. Mainly relevant peer reviewed papers and reviews. | Reasonable number, but sometimes not used effectively.  Occasional deviations from uniform style.  Mainly peer reviewed, but some reliance on text books/www. | Rather few. Some missed or inappropriate.  Citations & listing deviate from uniform style.  Some peer reviewed, mainly texts/www. | Very few.  Many missed or inappropriate.  Largely non-uniform listing & citation.  Mostly non-peer reviewed texts/www. | Few, if any.  Most missed or inappropriate Citations & listing random and messy.  If any, then non-peer reviewed sources. |

**ANY ADDITIONAL MARKERS COMMENTS also SEE ANNOTATION ON YOUR WORK:**

Protein correctly identified and calibration curve included, although mw not calculated.

Introduction has no references, although many are listed in the references section. Discussion fails to discuss the results of the experiment, and the mw is not reported.

**MARK: 53 NAME OF MARKER: Metodi Metodiev**