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A grade level < 3 in any of the categories is a fail. For calculating a final grade from average grade $X$, this formula will be used:

- If any category grade is a 1, the paper is graded Fail (U).
- If $X \leq 3.67$, the final grade will be 3.
- If $3.67 < X \leq 4.33$, the final grade will be 4.
- If $4.33 < X \leq 5$, the final grade will be 5.

When assigning grades to a paper, the most fitting level description in each category will be used to assign a numerical grade according to that level.

Introduction

The paper should include a question at the beginning on the form how does the implementation of X in Y affect Z as measured by W?!

1. The paper is vague on why a given design pattern (or set of design patterns) would be affected by, or affect, a certain software quality in a given context. There is no clear hypothesis presented.

2. The paper describes a concrete design pattern in a concrete context, proposes a clear hypothesis and justifies this hypothesis with respect to properties of the design pattern.

3. The paper describes a design pattern that seems well-adapted to the concrete context, proposes a clear hypothesis that can be answered and includes a concrete definition of how effects can be measured.

4. The paper clearly describes how to implement the design pattern in the given context, and justifies why this would affect the software quality as measured by the instrument chosen. The topic is advanced (A). The context is justified by relating to the design pattern and the software quality. The topic is of general interest, and the connections between X, Y, Z and W are well presented.

\textsuperscript{1}X is a Design Pattern, Y is, depending on the main topic, one or two applications, languages, paradigms or frameworks, Z is a software quality, and W is a concrete instrument that may be used to assess Z.
Information quality/evidence

1. Claims are to a large extent not justified by appropriate sources. Sources used are predominantly blogs, corporate web sites or Wikipedia entries. Their reliability is not discussed. The list of references is not formatted according to standards, and prevents readers from retrieving the original sources and verify claims.

3. Claims are justified by relevant sources. The author demonstrates an ability to independently find information on a topic, and uses sources in support for the hypothesis presented as well as sources that do not directly support the initial hypothesis.

4. Claims are justified by the correct use of relevant and reliable sources. Sources are specific to the claims made, and are primarily peer-reviewed scientific publications. The argumentation demonstrates an ability to independently find and use relevant evidence, arguments and counter-arguments from literature in a consistent manner.

5. Claims are justified by the correct use of relevant and reliable sources. Sources are specific, peer-reviewed papers, used correctly, and are well-cited. The argumentation demonstrates a thorough, critical review of sources, provides a consistent, and very clear argumentation where points and counter-points from previous research are included and the hypothesis is critically reviewed using evidence from previous research.

Organization

1. The report lacks a clear and logical development of ideas and lacks clear transitions between concepts or sections of the report.

3. The report has a mostly logical development of ideas, the hypothesis is presented adequately and there are supporting subsections.

4. The report structure resembles a research paper, the hypothesis is well justified and presented, and sections are logically ordered. Supporting subsections are justified in the text and counter-arguments are presented logically.

5. The report reads fluently as a research paper, with a lucid, thorough development of the hypothesis, topics and sub-topics, arguments and counter-arguments throughout.

Language and form

1. The text contains spelling, incoherent text or grammatical errors that makes it difficult to understand the content of the paper. There are figures, tables or code examples that are difficult to read, that are not referenced or illegally copied verbatim from other sources.

3. The text is for the most part without errors related to spelling, grammar, formatting or structure. Some parts of the text may be hard to read, contain long sentences, unclear references or unexplained terms. The text is coherent.
4. The text contains almost no errors related to spelling, grammar or form, has clear references and is easy to read. Some terms may be introduced without explanation, or there may be informal language in the text. The structure of the report is such that it is easy to follow the paper. Terms and concepts are described using crisp and clear language.

5. The text contains no errors related to spelling, grammar or form, has clear references and is easy to read. The style of the text is similar to that of a research paper, and all terms are sufficiently explained.

Analysis

1. The analysis uses vague reasoning, analogies or otherwise ill-founded claims about the properties of the chosen application. The analysis does not provide clear answers to that which was the initial question of the paper. The distinction between the application of a design pattern (X), that which can be measured (W), and the quality we may be interested in (Z) is unclear, or missing.

3. The evaluation is clearly related to the main subject, but may be limited in scope or validity. The analysis is based on the literature, and contains motivating examples to justify claims. The analysis is coherent and provides a reasonable answer to the question. The analysis uses peer-reviewed references to some extent.

4. The evaluation is clearly related to the main subject, and is of some general interest. The analysis is based on a comparison, and clearly links W to Z, and describes how that which is measured (W) gives indications of the quality that we are interested in (Z). The analysis mostly uses peer-reviewed references to support claims.

5. The evaluation is clearly related to the main subject, and is of general interest. It clearly links W to Z, and provides a mature description of how that which is measured (W) gives indications of the quality that we are interested in (Z). The analysis combines a thorough literature overview with a small empirical comparison of implementations of design patterns. The analysis mostly uses well-cited, peer-reviewed scientific references to support claims that are made.