	GOOD	SUFFICIENT	WEAK
General	Report contains all the sections and is delivered in time.		Report does not contain all the sections and/or it is not delivered in time.
Introduction	There is a good catchy introduction, where the urgency of the problem and the research question come forward. The introduction invites you to read on.	There is a clear introduction, and at the end the research question is clearly stated.	The introduction is too short and/or difficult to understand or does not respond to the research question.
Materials and Methods	The section is written in the correct style and contains all the information necessary to repeat the experiments/ computational analysis.	The section, for a large part, is written in the correct style and contains the most important information. There is occasionally some information is lacking and/or the style is sometimes not entirely correct.	The section is written in a wrong style and/or is missing a lot of information.
Results	The results represent a story that can be clearly followed by someone who has not done the experiments/ computational analysis. The results are clearly presented using figures and/or photographs and appropriate conclusions are drawn.	The results represent a story that can be clearly followed by someone who has not done the experiments/computational analysis. At places some information is missing or not quite the right conclusions are drawn, but the broad outlines are clear.	The results are inconsistently written, making it difficult to understand for someone who has not done the experiments/computational analysis.
Extra analysis	There is an extra analysis that is a logical follow up of the computer exercises. The analysis is correct.	There is an extra analysis done. It might contain some mistakes, or is not always a logical choice.	The report does not contain any extra analysis.
Discussion	The discussion goes back to the initial research problem and the results are critically examined. There is a link with the literature and suggestions for improvement.	The discussion goes back to the initial research problem and tie the loose ends.	The discussion is very short, missing and/or not in line with the rest of the report.
Scientific quality	The experiments/ computational analysis are well understood. Key arguments/assumptions are supported with references from the literature or other background information. The report contains little inaccuracies.	The experiments/ computational analysis have been understood in general. Majority of arguments/assumptions are supported scientifically and there are some minor inaccuracies.	The experiments/ computational analysis are not well understood, there is little scientific support for the arguments/assumptions and / or the report contains a lot of inaccuracies.

	GOOD	SUFFICIENT	WEAK
Layout	The layout is clear and throughout the report the same. The layout shows that sufficient attention is paid to the report.	The layout is clear and throughout the report the same.	The format of the report looks messy and/or it is not consistent throughout the report. It is not divided into sections and/or figures/tables are not or wrongly numbered.
Structure	The format and order of the parapgraphs in the different sections are logical. There are smooth transitions. It is a well-constructed story without repeating information.	The layout and the order of the sections are mostly logical. The transitions are mostly smooth. Sometimes there is some redundant information, but it is a clear story to follow.	The order of the sections is unlogical and/or there are hardly any transitions. The story is hard to follow.
Style	Writing style is scientific and pleasant to read. Sentences are not too long or too short, and word usage is varied. Good use of punctuation.	Writing style is not always scientific. Some pieces are well written, but there are also parts where the sentences are not well build, there is little variation in word use and/or some errors in punctuation.	The style is little scientific and/or sentences are too short or too long or incomplete and there is little variation in the vocabulary
Spelling and grammar	There are (almost) no errors in spelling and grammar.	Occasionally there is a mistake in spelling or grammar, but not in such a way that it affects the readability of the report.	There are many errors in spelling and grammar. This affects the readability of the thesis.
References	It refers to a large number of relevant scientific sources ($\geq$ 4 per person).	It refers to a number of relevant scientific sources ($\geq$ 2 per person).	There is no references to relevant resources and/or refered resources are not relevant or reliable.

Tips on writing a good report

A good report of your project is like a short scientific paper. It should therefore have a title, abstract, introduction, material & methods (or model) section, results, discussion, and list of references. There are courses and booklets on how to write a good paper, and we trust you all know the basic things like, number your pages, label your axis, use a spelling-checker, etcetera. Here we basically provide a short list of suggestions to turn your report into an exciting story.

- Most importantly, a good paper reads like a good story. Do not paste a large number of figures and tables together with a minimum number of connecting sentences in between, but tell a story from which you refer to a limited number of figures and tables. The reader should be able to enjoy the story without looking too much at the figures. From the text you may write sentences describing some interesting result, and just end that sentence with (see Fig. 3a).
- Figures and tables have legends that should be self-explanatory. Without reading the text one should be able to understand what the figure is about, and what its main message is. Combine related results as panels into one figure. Describe each panel in the figure legend after some general explanation about the figure.
- Do not write a sequential story of all the things you did. Make a selection of the results that are interesting for your story and make a plan for what is the most natural order to present these results. Tell your story with a vision, let it build up to its take-home message.
- Scientific writing means that your sentences should basically be true statements. If you are not sure about the general validity of a statement you should rewrite it into something less general, or prove your point with a reference to the literature. Things you don't know, you may pose as a question, or write ``it is tempting to speculate''.
- Divide up your pages in subsections and paragraphs. Subsections should have a subtitle such that the reader knows what to expect. Each paragraph typically has a single take-home message. Check whether all the sentences in a paragraph are truly contributing to that take-home message. If not, those sentences probably belong to another paragraph. Split your paragraph when it contains too many take-home messages. End your important paragraphs with a summarizing sentence telling the reader what you have just told him/her.
- Check your report for repeats. Do you have to describe the same things several times because you have a suboptimal order in which the results are described?
- Be concise, do not elaborate on what is not important. Dare to make choices on what is important.
- Plan on what you should write where. The introduction should make the reader interested and bring him/her up to the right level. The results section has paragraphs like: In order to test whether such and such, we did this and this. We found the following (see Fig 5), which means that... Therefore, we next tested whether ... The discussion gives more interpretation, relates your results to the results in the literature, gives possible caveats, and follow up work.
- Write in an active tense and let the most important subject of the sentence also be its subject. Don't write ``Fig 3 shows that T cell numbers oscillate due to'', but write ``T cell numbers oscillate due to ... (Fig. 3).'', because it is the oscillation of T cells that is important, and not Fig. 3.

References

In the text, references should be inserted as follows: (Pugsley, 1996; Matsunaga *et al.,*1997). Only articles that are published or "in press" may be included in the reference list. In the text, unpublished or submitted studies should be referred to as such (e.g. J.M. Smith, unpublished), or as a personal communication. It is the authors' responsibility to obtain permission for personal communications.

The reference list should be in alphabetical order according to the first author's last name. The title of the article must be included. For papers with up to seven authors, the names of all authors should be listed. For papers with eight or more authors, the first six names should be listed, followed by "*et al.*". Standard abbreviations of journal titles should be used, as in the *Index Medicus*. The following provide examples:

Pugsley, A.P. (1996) Multimers of the precursor of a type IV pilin like component of the general secretory pathway are unrelated to pili. *Mol Microbiol* 20: 1235–1245.

McGowan, S.J., Sebaihias, M., OLeary, S., Hardie, K.R., Williams, P., Stewart, G.S.A.B.,*et al.* (1997) Analysis of the carbapenem of Erwinia carotovora: definition of the antibiotic biosynthetic genes and evidence for a novel ß-lactam resistant mechanism. *Mol Microbiol* 26: 545–556.

Higgins, C.F., Causton, H.C., Dance, G.S.G., and Mudd, E.A. (1993) The role of the 3' end in mRNA stability and decay. In *Control of Messenger RNA Stability*. Belasco, J.G., and Brawerman, G. (eds). San Diego: Academic Press, pp. 13–30.

References to material on the World Wide Web can be given, but only if the information is available without charge to readers on an official site. The format for citations is as follows:

Beckleheimer, J. (1994). How do you cite URLs in a bibliography? [WWW document]. URL http://www.nrlssc.navy.mil/meta/bibliography.html.