

Points	9-10	7-8	5-6	0-4
Organization x.5	Presentation is clearly organized and follows a clear trajectory to your conclusions.	Presentation is somewhat disorganized or the path leading to your conclusion is not completely clear.	Presentation is disorganized or intermediate steps on the path to your conclusion are confusing or unjustified.	Little or no organization.
Introduction x.5	Overview of theoretical concepts relevant to the project. Spells out hypothesis or scientific questions being addressed with the investigation.	Theoretical background is not clear, has omissions, or lacks depth.	One or more conceptual problems with discussion. Little or no basis for assessment provided.	A substantive discussion is entirely lacking.

<p>Method and Verification x2</p>	<p>Algorithms, and program overview provided in the form of concise summaries of the program, rather than simply listing source code. Programming procedures are described in sufficient detail to allow a reader to know where to look for more information. Some means of determining if the output is correct is developed. Is there sufficient detail to make the experiments reproducible?</p>	<p>Algorithms are superficially described and lack proper references to the literature. The means of establishing the correctness of the output is unconvincing. Detail is at a level that would make reproducibility difficult.</p>	<p>Little or no information about the program and algorithms used. Little assurance of correctness is provided. Reproducibility is impossible.</p>	<p>No basis for assessment is provided.</p>
<p>Analysis x2</p>	<p>Relationships between parameters, hyperparameters, inputs and outputs are investigated, sensitivity of output to input investigated, Sources of uncertainty related to analysis.</p>	<p>Some important relationships left unconsidered, no mention of uncertainty.</p>	<p>Analysis is crude and shallow. Many important outputs are neglected.</p>	<p>Little or no analysis.</p>
<p>Interpretation x2</p>	<p>Summary of results, insights into the system, and avenues for future exploration.</p>	<p>Summary isn't consistent with the methods or experiment, insights are trivial.</p>	<p>Little is said about future experiments. Summary is inconsistent with text.</p>	<p>Little or no summary, no basis for evaluation.</p>

Data Presentation x2	Graphics are thoughtfully and carefully prepared; free of unnecessary clutter, well annotated.	Graphics are cramped, hard to understand, attempt to display too much or too little data. Opportunities to display information graphically are not exploited.	Very few graphs, poorly annotated, and confusing graphics.	No or only a few graphs of low quality, no basis for evaluation.
Mechanics	Presentation is generally well written and formatted; free of typographical, grammatical, and spelling errors.	Some errors in grammar and spelling, but the meaning of the writing is clear.	Writing is so poor that it is difficult to understand the meaning of important passages.	Report is very incomplete and contains little written support.