RUBRIC FOR PAPER CRITIQUE

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Needs Improvement (1)
Title and Abstract	Title is clear, specific, and reflects the content; abstract is concise, comprehensive, and accurately summarizes the study.	Title and abstract are clear and relevant but may lack some detail or specificity.	Title or abstract is somewhat vague or lacks alignment with the content of the paper.	Title is unclear, and the abstract is incomplete or misleading.
Introduction	Provides a thorough background, clearly states the research question or hypothesis, and articulates the significance of the study.	Background is provided, with a clear research question, though the significance may not be fully articulated.	Some background is provided, but the research question or hypothesis is unclear or poorly defined.	Lacks sufficient background; research question or hypothesis is missing or unclear.
Literature	Comprehensive and relevant review of the literature, demonstrating a strong understanding of the field.	Review is relevant but may miss some key references or lack depth in analysis.	Literature review is basic, with some relevant references but lacks depth or relevance.	Inadequate review of the literature; missing key references or irrelevant citations.
Methods	Methods are clearly described, replicable, and appropriate for the research question.	Methods are described and appropriate but may lack some clarity or detail.	Methods are outlined, but there are gaps in description or appropriateness.	Methods are poorly described, lacking sufficient detail for replication or inappropriate for the study.
Results	Results are clearly presented, logically organized, and supported by appropriate statistical analyses.	Results are presented clearly but may lack some detail or clarity in organization.	Results are presented but may be confusing, incomplete, or lack appropriate analysis.	Results are unclear, disorganized, or lack appropriate analysis, making them difficult to interpret.
Figures & Tables	Figures and tables are well-designed, clearly labeled, and effectively support the text.	Figures and tables are clear and relevant but may lack some detail or clarity.	Figures and tables are present but may be poorly labeled or not fully integrated with the text.	Figures and tables are confusing, poorly labeled, or do not support the text effectively.
Discussion	Discussion is insightful, thoroughly interprets the results, and relates them to the hypothesis and existing literature.	Discussion is solid, interpreting results well but may lack depth or full integration with the literature.	Discussion interprets the results but may be superficial, lacking in-depth analysis or relevance to the literature.	Discussion is weak, with poor interpretation of results and little connection to the literature.
References	References are comprehensive, relevant, and correctly formatted according to the journal's guidelines.	References are relevant and mostly correctly formatted, with minor errors.	References are included but may be incomplete, irrelevant, or incorrectly formatted.	References are missing, incomplete, or poorly formatted.
Overall Clarity and Writing	he paper is well-written, clear, and free of grammatical or typographical errors.	The paper is clear with minor grammatical or typographical errors.	The paper is understandable but contains several grammatical or typographical errors.	The paper is poorly written, unclear, and contains numerous grammatical or typographical errors.
36-40: Outstanding paper with minor improvements needed.				
30-35: Good paper with some areas for improvement.				
20-29: Satisfactory paper with significant areas needing improvement.				
Below 20: Paper requires substantial revision.				