

EVALUATION OF RESEARCH ESSAYS

Valid from 1 September 2024

Scientific research essays should be submitted to the Council of the Students' Research Society (SRS) via the Electronic Research Essay System (<http://tdk.lib.unideb.hu>). Two reviewers, appointed by the secretary of SRS, will evaluate the submitted essay independently of each other. The aim of evaluation is to decide whether the student submitting an essay has participated in the working process with the required initiative and prepared the research essay according to the relevant rules. To begin with, the reviewers will give a detailed evaluation and then a summary of the research essay. The minimum length of the first evaluation is 1000 characters. They will upload their evaluations to the Electronic Research Essay System.

In the Electronic Research Essay System, the reviewer must choose from the drop-down menu how to evaluate the research essay. The research essay can be accepted:

- **without any changes**, in its current form (**code:1**);
- **depending on the response** to the emerging questions **but without requesting changes in the research essay (code: 2A)**;
- **after modifications**, depending on how the questions were answered and after uploading the corrected research essay (**code: 2B**). Please, choose this code if you request either minor or major modifications regarding the description or presentation of the essay/work (e.g. incomplete or mistaken list of references; unclear presentation or explanation of the results; lack of thorough analysis in the discussion; incomplete presentation of the methods/patients; improper structure of the research essay; disproportion of chapters).
- after **substantial modification**, including changes in not only the presentation of the research essay but also depending on how the questions were answered and after the subsequent correction of the research essay has been made. Please, also choose this category if further experiments/observations are needed to complete the study (**code: 2C**).
- **The research essay is refused**. Referees should choose this option if they think students have devoted little energy to performing the experimental/clinical part of their work or editing their research essay. Also, the code below is recommended if a reviewer thinks another (corrected) version of the essay will not even resemble the original one (**code: 3**).

In case one referee refuses to accept the essay (code: 3) but the other one decides to accept it (code: 1 and/or codes: 2A/B/C), the Council of SRS commissions a third reviewer for the job. If - following the supervision of the previous two evaluations and of the research essay - the third referee also recommends refusal (code: 3), students can submit the research essay again only after it has been completely revised. Two different reviewers will evaluate the modified essay independently of the results of the first submission. If the aforementioned third reviewer accepts the essay with or without changes (codes: 2B/C and codes: 1/2A, respectively) the research essay should be submitted again after due consideration of the three reviewers' suggestions. The modified essay will be evaluated by the reviewers who proposed code 1 or code 2.

The author has to respond to each evaluation individually. The authors have to upload their responses to the Electronic Research Essay System. Acceptance or refusal of any research essay will be based on the evaluation and responses.

The evaluation of a research essay is an important component of educational activities at the university. Every reviewer must do this job in an ethical manner, free from subjectivity and the referee's activities should be pervaded by helping intentions. In the process of evaluating a research essay, it must be an important point for the student to learn about the methods and ways of communicating scientific results.

Suggestions of how to evaluate a research essay:

1. Logical structure, review of the literature: straightforward proposal of a topic, explanation of investigations, clear edition, response to demand based on the literature, accuracy/precision of conclusions and of comparisons with the data in the literature.
2. Methods: difficulty, versatility, accuracy of description and relevance of methods as well as the rate of personal contribution.
3. Results: how accurate, exact, detailed and clear the description/statement is; how relevant and illustrative the documentation is.
4. Format: esthetics and circumspection in preparing the essay, compilation of the references, appearance/edition of figures and tables, grammatical and printing mistakes

Special points in non-experimental research essays:

- Review articles: Is the summary critical, is its composition clear and accurate, is the literature relevant/up-to-date?
- Case reports: professional description of a specific case, analysis of its pathomechanism, well-based diagnostic and therapeutic conclusions.
- Audiovisual devices, films: quality of scenario and direction, technological manifestation of shooting and editing a film, execution of laboratory work.
- Method, model, preparation: usefulness, power of interpretation, durability, difficulty and care in the making.

The research essay will be refused if:

1. the author fails to keep the rules of preparation (format or other requirements).
2. the comparison of results and data in the literature is perfunctory and/or conclusions are unfounded.
3. the presentation of methods is not detailed or accurate enough; the description of principles is missing, or the method is inadequate.
4. it (the essay) fails to support the student's own contribution, or the level of contribution cannot clearly be established. The essay will also be refused if the Appendix contains no description of the following: own contribution and external contribution, documentation of permission and registration numbers (ethical, or of animal tests).

For further cases, see the relevant **Rules on Education and Examination** (<https://unideb.hu/szabalyzatok>).