Karsten's rubric for Proteopedia article

Criteria	3pts: Is above and beyond	2 pts: Does the job well	1 pt: Would benefit from editing (pet peeve alert)
Audience	Consistently caters to level of intended audience; explicit mentions intended audience	Goes from general to specific, catering to a general audience	1) Jargon and abbreviations 2) Wide swings in level of difficulty 3) Appeals to very small audience
Length and balance	Defined scope, with links to other pages	Revised with a view to length and balance	1) Ideas stated but not developed 2) Too much detail about minor aspects 3) Balance between text and 3D scenes is off
Organization	Structure with headings, includes navigation aids (TOC). Lead with ~3 sentences summarizing the page.	Structured into paragraphs with clear headings.	1) All text without breaks 2) Green links when Jmol window is not in view 3) Order does not make sense to reader
Correctness	Article is as well-researched and written as a review paper.	Article is based on at least one trustworthy reference and has been proof-read.	1) Glaring factual errors and misconceptions 2) Plagiarism 3) Grammatical errors
References	References in consistent format and of high quality supporting the main points	Includes primary citations of all structures shown	1) No references 2) Dead links 3) Reference to website, review or textbook where directly referencing primary research would make more sense

Karsten's rubric for Proteopedia 3D scenes

Criteria	3pts: Is above and beyond	2 pts: Does the job well	1 pt: Would benefit from editing (pet peeve alert)
Content	Rich content without overwhelming the viewer	Does what it says; supports the article's main points	1) Does not open 2) Wrong figure 3) Lacks essential item*: _____
Clarity	Beautiful or striking visuals	You can see the main point at a glance	1) View of focal item is blocked 2) Insufficient contrast between for- and background 3) Not clear what is what
Figure flow	Common visual language throughout, smooth transition between figures	Easy to recognize structural elements from figure to figure.	1) Switching color scheme too often 2) Easy to lose your bearings 3) Loading and orienting take too long
Support	1) Juxtaposed static figures (chemistry, sequences, related structures etc.) 2) Animations 3) Detailed figure legend	It is easy to understand the figure without leaving the page or going into jmol to research it.	1) No caption 2) Labels needed 3) Colors not explained
Interactivity	1) Kinemage-style switches 2) Prompts to id atoms or measure dimensions 3) Jmol buttons (slab on, rotate to common view etc.)	It is fun to explore the structure by rotating the scene and zooming into the details	1) Not centered 2) Confusing when you rotate view (e.g. labels not anchored) 3) Best view is lost because spinning is on

*choice of: PDB ID/hypothetical model designation, structural feature mentioned in the caption, …