

Evaluation of Related Work Chapters

■ Evaluation of First Draft

Comprehensiveness (7/10):

Covers 15 publications, but mostly descriptive and missing deeper methodological discussion.

Relevance (9/10):

Citations are directly tied to the research problem, minimal irrelevant references.

Organization & Structure (7/10):

Thematic organization present, but transitions are abrupt and links to broader themes are weak.

Critical Analysis (6/10):

Summarizes works rather than systematically comparing; lacks consistent evaluation of strengths/weaknesses.

Clarity & Readability (8/10):

Clear and concise writing, though somewhat plain and less engaging.

Citation Quality & Accuracy (8/10):

Credible and recent sources, but some claims lack explicit citations.

Average Score: 7.5

Summary: The first draft is clear and relevant but mostly descriptive, with weak critical analysis. Organization is functional but could be improved, and citations are good though not always complete.

■ Evaluation of Final Chapter

Comprehensiveness (9/10):

Expands coverage with detailed thematic, methodological, and research gap discussion.

Relevance (9/10):

Citations remain highly relevant, aligned with the research problem.

Organization & Structure (9/10):

Clear thematic structure, with logical flow and explicit connections to broader challenges.

Critical Analysis (8/10):

Improved analysis with trade-offs and gaps highlighted, though some areas remain descriptive.

Clarity & Readability (9/10):

Professional and accessible writing, though occasionally dense.

Citation Quality & Accuracy (9/10):

Well-curated, recent, and accurate references; minor gaps remain.

Average Score: 8.8

Summary: The final chapter is comprehensive, structured, and analytical. It identifies research gaps and trends, uses high-quality citations, and maintains clarity. It could still improve with deeper cross-category synthesis but is overall strong and academically rigorous.