

Appendix A.4

Translating scientific articles to the non-scientific public using the Wikipedia Encyclopedia

Julien Leuthold*, Adrian Gilli



*** Correspondence:**

Dr. Julien Leuthold: julien.leuthold@gmail.com, julien.leuthold@erdw.ethz.ch

The Wikipedia grading scheme (as on the 21st of December 2017).

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Content_assessment

WikiProject article quality grading scheme

Class	Criteria	Reader's experience	Editing suggestions
 FA	The article has attained featured article status by passing an official review. More detailed criteria [show]	Professional, outstanding, and thorough; a definitive source for encyclopedic information.	No further content additions should be necessary unless new information becomes available; further improvements to the prose quality are often possible.
 GA	The article has attained good article status by passing an official review. More detailed criteria [show]	Useful to nearly all readers, with no obvious problems; approaching (but not equalling) the quality of a professional encyclopedia.	Some editing by subject and style experts is helpful; comparison with an existing featured article on a similar topic may highlight areas where content is weak or missing.
B	The article is mostly complete and without major problems, but requires some further work to reach good article standards . More detailed criteria [show]	Readers are not left wanting, although the content may not be complete enough to satisfy a serious student or researcher.	A few aspects of content and style need to be addressed. Expert knowledge may be needed. The inclusion of supporting materials should be considered if practical, and the article checked for general compliance with the Manual of Style and related style guidelines .
C	The article is substantial, but is still missing important content or contains much irrelevant material. The article should have some references to reliable sources, but may still have significant problems or require substantial cleanup . More detailed criteria [show]	Useful to a casual reader, but would not provide a complete picture for even a moderately detailed study.	Considerable editing is needed to close gaps in content and solve cleanup problems.
Start	An article that is developing, but which is quite incomplete. It might or might not cite adequate reliable sources. More detailed criteria [show]	Provides some meaningful content, but most readers will need more.	Providing references to reliable sources should come first; the article also needs substantial improvement in content and organisation. Also improve the grammar, spelling, writing style and improve the jargon use.
Stub	A very basic description of the topic. However, all very-bad-quality articles will fall into this category. More detailed criteria [show]	Provides very little meaningful content; may be little more than a dictionary definition. Readers probably see insufficiently developed features of the topic and may not see how the features of the topic are significant.	Any editing or additional material can be helpful. The provision of meaningful content should be a priority. The best solution for a Stub-class Article to step up to a Start-class Article is to add in referenced reasons of why the topic is significant.