

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 1 room: E problem no.: 17 Juror's name: L. C. Wright
 reporter: Switzerland opponent: Austria reviewer: Germany signature:

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 6$

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 — almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 — almost no	too few	poor	0 — <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or — <input type="checkbox"/> no questions asked — <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, — <input type="checkbox"/> inconclusive or too long -1 — <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show — <input type="checkbox"/> deep misconceptions
1 — some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 — only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	
2 — fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 — some scientific points cleared	many	good	
3 — good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	3 — interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4 — detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 — brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
5 — deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 1.5 + 2.0 + 2 - 0 = 7$

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 — almost no, irrelevant		0 — almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	0 — almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	0 — <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or — <input type="checkbox"/> no questions asked — <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, — <input type="checkbox"/> inconclusive or too long -1 — <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show — <input type="checkbox"/> deep misconceptions
1 — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report		1 — some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 — little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	
2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used		2 — main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 — partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	
		3 — all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 — good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
		4 — practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 — new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 - 0 = 7$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant		0 — poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 — poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 — <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or — <input type="checkbox"/> no questions asked — <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, — <input type="checkbox"/> inconclusive or too long -1 — <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show — <input type="checkbox"/> deep misconceptions
1 — contributed to clarify some unclear points		1 — partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 — too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	
2 — many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp		2 — good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2 — informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	
3 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently		3 — detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3 — condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 1
 reporter: Switzerland opponent: Austria

room: E problem no.: 17
 reviewer: Germany

Juror's name: Maizelis Z.
 signature: *[Signature]*

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 5

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	poor	0 <u>concise and correct</u> or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 some	<u>some</u>	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 only technical points cleared	<u>some</u>	some aspects fine	
2 <u>fair</u>	fair	fair	not well fitting	<u>some own input</u>	<u>average</u>	2 some scientific points cleared	many	good	
3 good	good	<u>well performed, sufficient number</u>	<u>deviations qualitatively analysed</u>	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	3 interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	<u>some aspects, efficient</u>	
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
5 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + 2 + 1.6 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0	almost no, irrelevant	0 almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	0 almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	0 <u>concise and correct</u> or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	<u>relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report</u>	1 some main points	few	some	<u>some</u>	reasonable	1 little	<u>some</u>	some	some aspects fine	<u>some</u>	
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 <u>main points</u>	<u>some</u>	<u>some correct</u>	reasonable	<u>fair</u>	2 <u>partial</u>	average	<u>some correct</u>	<u>good</u>	reasonable	
3		3 all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
4		4 practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	0 poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	1 partial	partially relevant	too short/long	<u>some</u>	some	1 too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	<u>some</u>	
2	<u>many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp</u>	2 <u>good</u>	<u>mostly adequate</u>	<u>relevant parts</u>	many	<u>reasonable</u>	2 <u>informative, apt</u>	<u>mostly adequate</u>	<u>relevant parts</u>	<u>many</u>	<u>reasonable</u>	
3	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3 detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3 condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 1
 reporter: Switzerland opponent: Austria

room: E problem no.: 17
 reviewer: Germany

Juror's name: Zuzana Coculova
 signature: 

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + 2 - 0 = 4

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	too few	poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 <input type="checkbox"/> only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some scientific points cleared	many	good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 <input type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 7 + 2 - 1 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS			
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation				
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	almost no, irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input type="checkbox"/>	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 <input type="checkbox"/>		3 <input type="checkbox"/>	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	
4 <input type="checkbox"/>		4 <input type="checkbox"/>	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 2 + 2 - 1 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS			
		report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation				
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input type="checkbox"/>	some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 1
 reporter: Switzerland opponent: Austria

room: E problem no.: 17
 reviewer: Germany

Juror's name: Nimit
 signature: *Nimit*

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 3 + 2 - =

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	too few	poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 <input type="checkbox"/> only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some scientific points cleared	many	good	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 <input type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - =

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS		
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation			
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	almost no, irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/>	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	
3 <input type="checkbox"/>		3 <input type="checkbox"/>	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
4 <input type="checkbox"/>		4 <input type="checkbox"/>	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - =

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS		
		report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation			
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/>	some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 1
 reporter: Switzerland opponent: Austria

room: E problem no.: 17
 reviewer: Germany

Juror's name: Tomasz Gwaryko
 signature: T. Gwaryko

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 4 + 2.5 - = 7

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	too few	poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 <input type="checkbox"/> only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some scientific points cleared	many	good	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 <input type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES: 4.00

2.5

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.25 + 2 + 2.5 - 0.5 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no, irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/> little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/> main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	
	3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 <input type="checkbox"/> new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES: 1.25

2

2.5

-0.5

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 2 - = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES: 2.5

2.25

2

SCORESHEET

stage: **2**
reporter: **Austria**

fight (round no.): **1**
opponent: **Germany**

room: **E** problem no.: **1**
reviewer: **Switzerland**

Juror's name: **Zuzana Coculova**
signature: 

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 6$$

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	too few	poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or <input type="checkbox"/> no questions asked
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 <input type="checkbox"/> only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	<input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, <input type="checkbox"/> inconclusive or too long
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some scientific points cleared	many	good	<input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 <input type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1 + 2 - 0 = 5$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS			
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation				
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	almost no, irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input type="checkbox"/>	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		3 <input type="checkbox"/>	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair		
		4 <input type="checkbox"/>	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good		

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 5$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS			
		report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation				
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input type="checkbox"/>	some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good		

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 2

room: E

problem no.: 1

Juror's name: Nint

reporter: Austria

opponent: Germany

reviewer: Switzerland

signature: *[Signature]*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.5 - \square = \square$$

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 — almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 — almost no	too few	poor	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 — <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	some	review of sources, cited	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partly	1 — only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	
2 — fair	fair	fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> not well fitting	some own input	average	2 — some scientific points cleared	many <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
3 — good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + some interesting results	interesting solution	3 — interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4 — detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 — brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
5 — deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - \square = \square$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 — almost no, irrelevant		0 — almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	0 — almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 — some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 — little	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	some aspects fine	some	
2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 — <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> main points	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some correct	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	fair	2 — partial	average	some correct	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	
		3 — all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 — good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
		4 — practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 — new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 2 + 1.5 - \square = \square$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant		0 — poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 — poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 — contributed to clarify some unclear points		1 — partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 — <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	
2 — many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 — <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2 — informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	
3 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3 — detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3 — condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 1 room: E problem no.: 1 Juror's name: Maizelis Z
 reporter: Austria opponent: Germany reviewer: Switzerland signature: [Signature]

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1.6 + 1.3 - 0 = 4$

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	poor	0 <u>con</u> <u>and correct</u> or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <u>some</u>	<u>some</u>	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 <u>only technical</u> points cleared	<u>some</u>	some aspects fine	
2 fair	fair	<u>fair</u>	<u>not well fitting</u>	<u>some own input</u>	<u>average</u>	2 some scientific points cleared	many	<u>good</u>	
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	3 interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
5 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 4$

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0	almost no, irrelevant	0 almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	0 almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	0 <u>con</u> <u>and correct</u> or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	<u>relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report</u>	1 <u>some main points</u>	<u>few</u>	<u>some</u>	<u>some</u>	<u>reasonable</u>	1 <u>little</u>	<u>some</u>	<u>some</u>	<u>some aspects fine</u>	<u>some</u>	
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	
3		3 all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
4		4 practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1.6 + 1.7 + 2 - 0 = 6$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	0 poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 <u>con</u> <u>and correct</u> or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	contributed to clarify some unclear points	1 partial	<u>partially relevant</u>	<u>too short/long</u>	some	some	1 <u>too short/long</u>	<u>partially relevant</u>	<u>too short/long</u>	some	some	
2	<u>many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp</u>	2 <u>good</u>	mostly adequate	<u>relevant parts</u>	<u>many</u>	<u>reasonable</u>	2 <u>informative, apt</u>	<u>mostly adequate</u>	<u>relevant parts</u>	<u>many</u>	<u>reasonable</u>	
3	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3 detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3 condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 2
reporter: Austria

fight (round no.): 1
opponent: Germany

room: E
reviewer: Switzerland

problem no.: 1

Juror's name: L. Grigis
signature: JG

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 1 - 0 = 5$$

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 — almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 — almost no	too few	poor	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 — some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 — only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	
2 — fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 — some scientific points cleared	many	good	
3 — good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	3 — interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4 — detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 — brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
5 — deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 — almost no, irrelevant		0 — almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	0 — almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report		1 — some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 — little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	
2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used		2 — main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 — partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	
		3 — all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 — good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
		4 — practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 — new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 - 0 = 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant		0 — poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 — poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 — contributed to clarify some unclear points		1 — partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 — too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	
2 — many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp		2 — good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2 — informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	
3 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently		3 — detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3 — condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 2

fight (round no.): 1

room: E

problem no.: 1

reporter: Austria

opponent: Germany

reviewer: Switzerland

Juror's name:

signature: T. Grejto

Tomon Grejto

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.25 + 1.75 - 0 = 5$$

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 some scientific points cleared	many	good	
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	3 interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
5 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

2.25

1.75

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1.75 + 1.75 - 0 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 almost no, irrelevant		0 almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	0 almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report		1 some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used		2 main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	
		3 all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
		4 practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

1

1.75

1.75

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	
0 too few, mostly irrelevant		0 poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 contributed to clarify some unclear points		1 partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	
2 many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp		2 good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2 informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	
3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently		3 detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3 condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES:

1

2.5

2.5

SCORESHEET

stage: 3
reporter: Germany

fight (round no.): 1
opponent: Switzerland

room: E
reviewer: Austria

problem no.: 8

Juror's name: Tomasz Grewko
signature: T. Grewko

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
1 + 5 + 3 - = 9

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	too few	poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 <input type="checkbox"/> only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some scientific points cleared	many	good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 <input type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> demonstrative		errors analysed							
6 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

5.0

3.0

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 3.25 + 4.0 - = 10

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
almost no, irrelevant	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 <input type="checkbox"/>		0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input type="checkbox"/>		1 <input type="checkbox"/> some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/> little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/> main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
		4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 <input type="checkbox"/> new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

1.5

3.25

4.0

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 2.5 - = 9

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
too few, mostly irrelevant	some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	
0 <input type="checkbox"/>		0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input type="checkbox"/>		1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES:

2.5


2.5

2.5

SCORESHEET

stage: 3
reporter: Germany

fight (round no.): 1 room: E problem no.: 8
opponent: Switzerland reviewer: Austria

Juror's name: Zuzana Coaulova
signature: 

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
1 + 5 + 2 - 1 = 7

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	too few	poor	
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some scientific points cleared	many	good	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 <input type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
1 + 1 + 3 + 4 - 0 = 9

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation		
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	almost no, irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable
		3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
		4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
1 + 3 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 9

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
		report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation		
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1 <input type="checkbox"/>	some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 1 room: E problem no.: 8 Juror's name: Maizelis Z.
 reporter: Germany opponent: Switzerland reviewer: Austria signature: *Pg*

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 7$$

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 some scientific points cleared	many	good	
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	3 interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
6 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS		
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation			
0	almost no, irrelevant	0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	
3		3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
4		4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS		
		report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation			
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	1	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	
2	many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	2	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	
3	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 3 room: E problem no.: 8 Juror's name: Nirut
 reporter: Germany opponent: Switzerland reviewer: Austria signature:

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 3.5 + 3 - = 8

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	poor	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 some scientific points cleared	many	good	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations quantitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	3 interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
5 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2.5 - = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 almost no, irrelevant		0 almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	0 almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report		1 some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used		2 main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		3 all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
		4 practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2 + 1.5 + 1.5 - = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	
0 too few, mostly irrelevant		0 poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points		1 partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp		2 good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2 informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently		3 detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3 condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 1 room: E problem no.: 8 Juror's name: L. Grassi
 reporter: Germany opponent: Switzerland reviewer: Austria signature: JG

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 4 + 2 - 0 = 7$

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	poor	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 some scientific points cleared	many	good	
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	3 interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
6 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 0,5 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 7$

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0	almost no, irrelevant	0 almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	0 almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	
3		3 all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
4		4 practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	all time used	4 new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 1,5 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	0 poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	contributed to clarify some unclear points	1 partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	
2	many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	2 good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2 informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	
3	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3 detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3 condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES:

Team	Stage 1			Stage 2			Stage 3			Stage 4		
	Switzerland	Austria	Germany	Austria	Germany	Switzerland	Germany	Switzerland	Austria	Rep	Opp	Rev
Juror	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev
Tomasz Grzylo	7	6	8	5	6	7	9	10	9			
Zuzana Coculova	4	5	7	6	5	5	7	9	9			
Lars Gräsjö	6	7	7	5	6	7	7	7	7			
Zakhar Marizelis	5	6	7	4	4	6	7	6	7			
Nirut Passadee	6	6	6	5	6	7	8	7	6			
Acting Team Member	David Immanuel Tsohan	Alexander Langreiter	Martin Link	Luca Entremont	Saskia Drechsel	Daniel Gotsmann	Frederik Garais	Jakob Storp	Jonathan Costa			
Chosen Problem	17			1			8					