

Advanced Literature Review Marking Criteria

Aspect	Fail	Pass	Merit	Distinction	Outstanding
Evidence of research from the literature and use of appropriate sources	Few references loosely connected to the review topic. Use of Wikipedia or other unverified sources.	References do not include the most important sources in the field of the review. Excessive use of web sources and textbooks, and/or not enough research papers.	The most important references are included but missing the latest advances and/or follow on work that discredits or develops previous results.	Report has most if not all the research work expected, including papers originating the field and up to date research connected to the project.	Comprehensive list of references that includes the latest developments, background topics and possible sources of research for the project.
Demonstrating an understanding of the scientific context and critical reading	Student does not connect the different parts of the research topic between themselves or within a broader research area.	Student places the research area in the right bibliographical context but fails to explain the physics behind the processes described or how the project may contribute.	Good connection between background physics and the field. Project somehow placed in the context of similar literature directly related to it. Some analysis or projections for potential contributions to the field.	The project is placed in the context of state of the art for the topic. Student connects undergraduate physics with the project and the field of research. Literature read critically rather than accepted blindly.	Report connects the project and the broader scientific literature beyond work directly related to it. Critical analysis of previous work and problems or mistakes found in the literature. Strict analysis of how the project may contribute to the field.
Written English, use of language, clarity of description, logical structure	Poor use of English makes it difficult to understand the meaning of some passages. Review is disorganized.	Grammatical and spelling mistakes obscure the meaning of parts of the report.	Occasional flaws in English or excessively technical/unexplained terms that hinder understanding in places. Mostly logical in structure.	English largely correct with only minor typographical errors that do not impede understanding. Review is logically organized, with section connected to each other.	The report is easy to read, well organized, highly informative and free from mistakes.
Correct length, appropriate, referencing and citation for the field	References do not include enough information to be retrieved or assigned to the text. Review not within 10% of requested length.	References not placed in text properly (e.g. nonconsecutive numbering). Sources not complete, missing or incorrectly citing journal, author etc.	References in the right format for the most part. List no comprehensive and missing the latest developments or critical papers. References to websites missing author or access date.	All references placed in the right context with appropriate style. Numerous research papers included. Websites include author and access date.	Referencing as expected from a respected journal in the field.