Rubric for the Rough Draft of the Project:

The rough draft is due Friday, November 7 by 11:59 pm. To facilitate the redistribution of drafts among the groups, please **e-mail the rough draft directly to me. One group member should send the e-mail, with all other group members CC’d to that submission e-mail.** On Saturday morning, I will send copies of the rough drafts between the groups that are reviewing one another’s draft.

Marks for the rough draft will mainly be based on the Introduction, Model Derivation, and References. Peer reviewers can use this rubric to evaluate the rough drafts as well.

For each item in the rubric, the draft will be marked on a scale of 0-3: 0 – the item was not included; 1 – the item was included but was not explained or described clearly; 2 – the item was included and was adequately explained or described; 3 – the item was included and was explained or described with great clarity and precision. Some of the items in the rubric are closely related to other items, in an effort to allow more careful parsing of what the paper is doing well.

Introduction

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The draft provides enough background information for me to understand the biological question. |  |
| The draft does a good job motivating the biological question so that I understand why it is interesting/important/fun to answer. |  |
| The authors seem to have a good understanding of the biology of the system they are investigating. |  |

Model Derivation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The variables being modeled are appropriate for the system and the biological question of interest. |  |
| All variables are defined and have appropriate units. |  |
| The model structure (for example, Susceptible-Exposed-Infected-Recovered) is a reasonable way to describe the biological system. |  |
| All of the biological processes needed to adequately model the system and answer the question of interest are included. |  |
| All of the parameters are defined and have appropriate units. |  |
| If parameter values are being taken from the literature, the sources of the values are clear and the parameter choices seem reasonable. |  |
| The terms in the equations have appropriate units (e.g., if your model is a differential equation model, then all of the terms of the dS/dt equation should have units of “number of individuals per time”). |  |
| The biological assumptions the authors are making in deriving the model are clearly stated. |  |
| The model assumptions are reasonable given the biological system and the question of interest, as stated in the Introduction. No key processes, mentioned in the Introduction, are excluded from the model without explanation. |  |
| I understand how the authors plan to analyze the model to answer the biological question. |  |
| The way the authors plan to analyze the model seems likely to provide an answer to the biological question. |  |

References:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The paper includes 8 references to primary or secondary literature papers. |  |

Other:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The paper is well written and easy to understand. |  |
| It is clear that the authors have put a lot of effort and thought into the paper. |  |

Comments:

What were some of the strengths of the paper?

What were some of the things the paper could have done better?

Other comments for the authors?