

Criteria	Ratings				
<i>Content & concepts</i>	Excellent 4	Good 3	Acceptable 2	Needs improvement 1	Missing 0
A sound understanding of the content of the primary paper has been demonstrated	★				
Any criticisms or perspectives offered are well developed, conceptually nuanced and/or original		★			
Evidence has been marshalled to provide support for the context or arguments in the critique (e.g., relevant additional sources identified)		★			
<i>Communication</i>	Completely 3	Mostly 2	Not enough 1	Not at all 0	
The critique is organized in a way that clearly and concisely communicates the results, context and/or implications	★				
Language is accessible and understandable, but still scientifically accurate, as appropriate for a general, scientific audience (e.g., key terms explained, minimal use of jargon)	★				
<i>Scientific literacy</i>	Yes		No 0		
References are consistently formatted	★		★		
Length is appropriate			★		
TOTAL GRADE	17 /20				