Writing Standards

	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor
Abstract and Introduction	 Excellent overview of the background is given Motivation for studying the problem is credible and convincing Purpose of the paper is clearly explained and justified 	 Some overview of the background is given Motivation is valid, but incomplete and possibly not effective Purpose of the paper is stated 	 Background is incomplete Motivation is vague and not supported Purpose of the paper is obscure 	 No background given Motivation is unclear Purpose of the paper is vague or not explicitly stated
Overall organization	 Logically organized Sections and results are clearly marked Plenty of appropriate links and transitions 	 Paper is mostly well organized Most transitions are present 	 Some sections are too long/short or are not logically placed Incorrect or missing transitions 	 Section and result names and/or numbers are missing No transitions and no overall flow
Writing style	 Tone is professional Audience is addressed appropriately with uniform amount of detail 	 Tone is appropriate Most details are appropriate for the intended audience 	 Tone is mostly respectful Some details are skipped or redundant 	 Tone is patronizing, disrespectful Details are lacking or redundant
Modeling terminology and content	 All necessary variables, constraints, and objectives are given and explained All optimization problems correspond to the goals of the project Sources of data and any synthetic generation of data are explained and realistic Optimization algorithms and methods of analyzing the results are explained. Explanations are correct, clear, and easy to follow 	 Some notation and explanations are not given Most of the optimization problems are correctly formulated and consistent with the goals of the project The stated results in the article are mostly justified by the optimization problems solved. Most explanations are precise and can be followed 	 A number of explanations are not given Some terminology is not correctly used The optimization problems studied and the data correspond only weakly to the results claimed in the article Reasoning and explanation are lacking 	 Notation is not defined Terminology is misused Modeling is incorrect Results claimed aren't justified by the data and optimization problems solved
Spelling and grammar	 Excellent grammar, perfect spelling Strong sentences Math is well incorporated into the text 	 Mostly good grammar, perfect spelling Math is mostly well integrated into the text 	Few awkward sentencesSome spelling mistakesMath is separated from the text	Awkward phrasesMany spelling mistakesMath is not integrated or punctuated
Bibliography and citations	 Excellent use of citations Bibliography is complete with uniformly formatted entries 	 Most citations are present Some bibliography items are incorrectly formatted 	 Citations are missing Bibliography has errors, and some necessary sources are not listed 	 Few or no citations Bibliography entries are not clear or missing

Adapted from a rubric by S. van Willigenburg (Dept. Math, UBC), which was adapted from a rubric by K. Garaschuk.