Evaluation criteria

1. Originality
– is the article sufficiently novel and interesting to warrant publication?
– does it add to the canon of knowledge?
– does the article adhere to the journal's standards?
– is the research question an important one?

2. Structure
– is the article clearly laid out? Are all the key elements (where relevant) present: abstract, introduction, methodology, results, conclusions?
   a) Title: does it clearly describe the article?
   b) Abstract: does it reflect the content of the article?
   c) Introduction: does it describe what the author hoped to achieve accurately, and clearly state the problem being investigated? (normally, the introduction should summarize relevant research to provide context, describe the experiment, the hypothesis(es) and the general experimental design or method).
   d) Research methods: does the author accurately explain how the data was collected?, if the methods are new, are they explained in detail?, have the equipment and materials been adequately described?, has the author been precise in describing measurements?
   e) Results: does the author explain in words what he/she discovered in the research?, if the appropriate analysis has been conducted?
   f) Conclusion/Discussion: are the claims in this section supported by the results? Have the authors indicated how the results relate to expectations and to earlier research?, does the conclusion explain how the research has moved the body of scientific knowledge forward?, does the article support or contradict previous theories?
   g) Figures and tables: do the figures and tables clearly illustrate the research results and are they clear to the reader? are they an important part of the story?

3. Previous Research
– if the article builds upon previous research does it reference that work appropriately?

4. Ethical Issues
– plagiarism: is the article a copy of another work?