

# EPIC Oxford report.pdf/45



Exported from Wikisource on August 7, 2024

- "References used are internet websites, no journals or books are used." (Reviewer 3 – student)

A similar point is made about the *Wikipedia* article on *Mutation*:

- "Many of the references are from websites, magazines, or other popular media, and not from primary source scientific articles." (Reviewer 2 – academic)

But the same reviewer pointed out, in discussing the fact that the *Britannica* article "mentions the mutation rate of HIV, but doesn't cite any HIV related material", that anyway, "much of the article is quite basic and does not necessarily need intensive citation." Thus the mere presence of references is not inevitably viewed as an advantage if (a) the references are of a generally low level and (b) the overall article appears to aspire to be simply a good basic introduction to a topic.

This reflects a more general feeling that a good article needs to balance its elements throughout:

- "All the references are published by recognized journals or are books written by academics that work in the topic. [...] The article [*Wikipedia*] is concise and focuses on its topic. All the information provided is relevant and necessary [...] provided in a well-structured form." (Reviewer 4 – academic – *Neurona*)

but

"The use of technical terms is not accompanied by an explanation [...] it would be necessary to add new information to complete the map. [...] I would probably eliminate the topic about artificial neural networks." (Reviewer 4 – academic – *Neurona*)

For most reviewers, though, lack of references was sometimes seen as a negative feature, regardless of other qualities, as the same reviewer makes clear with respect to the *Enciclonet* article on *Neurona*: "It is a great article, well-structured, clear, and easy to understand and read. The information provided is precise and complete. However, no references are provided and no topics are treated in depth." (Reviewer 4 – academic)

## **Redundancy and Repetition**

The following three comments on *Wikipedia* articles represent what was quite a common theme from many reviewers of *Wikipedia* in particular, which is to say up to date content with good coverage of issues, but at the same time a tendency to repetition and redundancy of content:

- "A lot of information, including a very thorough account of the events of Anselm's life. Mentions his most important ideas and works and discusses them

reasonably well. Cites respectable scholarly sources, for the most part. Doesn't read completely smoothly, a bit repetitive at times. There are some digressions and random sentences that harm the overall coherence."  
(Reviewer 1 – academic – *St Anselm*)

---

45



# About this digital edition

This e-book comes from the online library [Wikisource](#). This multilingual digital library, built by volunteers, is committed to developing a free accessible collection of publications of every kind: novels, poems, magazines, letters...

We distribute our books for free, starting from works not copyrighted or published under a free license. You are free to use our e-books for any purpose (including commercial exploitation), under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 Unported](#) license or, at your choice, those of the [GNU FDL](#).

Wikisource is constantly looking for new members. During the transcription and proofreading of this book, it's possible that we made some errors. You can report them at [this page](#).

The following users contributed to this book:

- AdamBMorgan
- Kathleen.wright5
- Wylve