

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 6



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 F, Stage: 3, Problem No. 9

9

sign *A. C. Jennings*

Jennings, Gavin

Rep: Ukraine

Opp: Korea

Rev: Macao

Reject problem 2

REPORT	Volodymyr Mashchyt's							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	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion		
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	too few	poor	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	some	some aspects fine	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	many	good	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	3	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative				
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	+ complex concepts well communicated				

NOTES: Problem theory sound but only partially filled due to cigarette thickness not investigated and use of different laser λ.

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.2 + 2.0 + 2 - 0 = 6

Minsook Lee

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	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation		
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	almost no	too few	poor	no	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	few	some	some aspects fine	some	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	some	some correct	good	reasonable	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	3	
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	4	

NOTES: Starts discussion phase early. Initial time does not tell us much. Points out relative thickness of cigarette large.

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

Wen Ian Lou

1 + 1.2 + 1.2 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0.2 = 6 (Six)

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS		
	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions				
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	almost no	too few	-1	irrelevant	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	partial	partially relevant	some	too short/long	partially relevant	some	too short/long	some	0	none	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	relevant parts	many	1	relevant, constructive	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate	2		3	

NOTES: Initial range of Qs. Loses time on one point where discussion begins between reporter and opponent.

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 7



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 F, Stage: 3, Problem No. _____

sign *ADP*

Mnevets, Daniil

Rep: Ukraine

Opp: Korea

Rev: Macao

REPORT 4.5-6	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT 6.5-7	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	some	some aspects fine
3								many	good
4	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative		
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	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
7									

NOTES: Strong theoretical part, good comparison and detailed explanation, "rings" effect wasn't explained well enough

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED 0.5-1	OPPOSITION (SPEECH) 1.5-2	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER 1.5-2	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 - too few, mostly irrelevant	understanding of presentation	relevant scientific topics	relevant
1 - relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion
2 - + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	own opinions presented	prioritisation	prioritisation
	time management		
	0 - almost nothing	0 - almost no	0 - too few
	1 - some main points	1 - few	1 - some
	2 - main points	2 - some	2 - some correct
	3 - all relevant points	3 - good	3 - many correct
	4 - practically all points	4 - new crucial point(s)	4 - + improvement suggestions

NOTES: points were mostly irrelevant (correction, To), lack of opinion, time management

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 2 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED 0.5-1	REVIEW OF REPORT 1.5-2	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION 2	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS / MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 - too few, mostly irrelevant	report evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
1 - relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	pros & cons	pros & cons	correct own opinions	correct own opinions
2 - + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	prioritisation	prioritisation	correct own opinions	correct own opinions
1 - + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	0 - poor/wrong	0 - poor/wrong	0 - almost no	0 - too few
	1 - partial	1 - too short/long	1 - too short/long	1 - some
	2 - good	2 - informative, apt	2 - relevant parts	2 - many
	3 - detailed, complex	3 - condensed & accurate	3 - accurate, conclusive	3 - fully adequate

NOTES: Mostly the same problems as for opp, but well structured and presented analysis

Please, suitably adjust your grades taking into regard the [1,10] range.

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4.25 + 2 - 0.75 = 7



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 F, Stage: 3, Problem No. 9

sign MS

Steck, Michael

Rep: Ukraine

Opp: Korea

Rev: Macao

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	some	some aspects fine
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects 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	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

NOTES:

5 thermal couplings is questionable, but okay
calibration + soy source transmittance

as expected of this project

but ran out of time :(

conviction simulated

if you know this might be challenged, don't do it :(

could have gone more into errors

"thin layer", but well argued

again

of course thin/thick will change, but how?!

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2.5 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	understanding of presentation	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few
1	some main points	few	some
2	main points	some	some correct
3	all relevant points	many	many correct
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions

NOTES:

v.a. thin layer got

time cut-off, mostly due to

overly critical, but fairer

2:50 min presentation not okay according to jury meeting

conviction into thick samples did not find any but was hard

more points should be related to the reporter's solution/results

summary: no explanation of dir. layer
last point was perfectly related !!

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.75 + 1 + 1 + 0.5 + 0 - 0.5 = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	report evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	concise and correct or no questions asked
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	almost no	too few	no questions asked
1	partial	irrelevant	too short/long	some	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	good	partially relevant	informative, apt	many	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	detailed, complex	mostly adequate	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	

NOTES:

some not understandable? give better context please!

"shape of lens?"

not enough to deduce valid relationship

bad time management? why?

some points misinterpreted? are not misinterpreted?

very general

should do this

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

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



SCORESHEET
 Fight 1 F, Stage: 3, Problem No. 9
 Rep: Ukraine Opp: Korea

sign PaK

Panoš, Stanislav

Rev: Macao

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	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 — almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	0 — too few	poor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> — concise and correct or no questions asked <input type="checkbox"/> — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <input type="checkbox"/> -1 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions <input type="checkbox"/> -2 —
1 — some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partly <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> average	partly clear	1 — some	some aspects fine	
2 — fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	some aspects above average	average	2 — <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	
3 — good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> deviations qualitatively analysed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + some interesting results	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some parts well done	3 — proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
4 — detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	greater extent than expected	overall clear, demonstrative			
5 — deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical		+ complex concepts well communicated			
6 —									

↑ NOTES: +2,5 bad time management; no faith layer in experiment!

+1,5 0

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 2,5 + 2,5 - 0 = 8$$

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

NOTES: +2

↑ +2,5

+2,5

0

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0,5 + 2 + 1,5 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
1 — + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used		0 — poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 — poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 — almost no	too few	-1 — irrelevant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> — concise and correct or no questions asked <input type="checkbox"/> — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <input type="checkbox"/> -1 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions <input type="checkbox"/> -2 —
2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently		1 — partial	partially relevant	some	1 — too short/long	partially relevant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 — <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	0 — none	
		2 — <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 — <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	reasonable	2 — accurate, conclusive	fully adequate	1 — relevant, constructive	
		3 — detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 — condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good				

NOTES: +0,5

+2

+1,5

↑ 1 ↑ 0

0

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4.5 + 1 - 0.5 = 6



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 F, Stage: 3, Problem No. 9

sign

O'Neill, Philip

Rep: Ukraine

Opp: Korea

Rev: Macao

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	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion		
0 - almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	too few	poor	0 - concise and correct or no questions asked	
1 - some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	some	some aspects fine	1 - some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	
2 - fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	many	good	2 - + data/theory convincingly supported	
3 - good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done			3 - proved deep understanding	
4 - detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative				
5 - deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated				

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
0 - too few, mostly irrelevant	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
1 - + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used		0 - almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	0 - almost no	too few	poor	no	0 - concise and correct or no questions asked
		1 - some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 - few	some	some aspects fine	some	1 - some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
		2 - main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 - some	some correct	good	reasonable	2 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		3 - all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 - good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
		4 - practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 - new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 2 + 2 + 0.5 - 0 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 - too few, mostly irrelevant	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
1 - + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used		0 - poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 - poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 - almost no	too few	-1 - irrelevant	0 - concise and correct or no questions asked
2 - + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently		1 - partial	partially relevant	some	1 - too short/long	partially relevant	some	1 - too short/long	some	0 - none	1 - some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
		2 - good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 - informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 - relevant parts	many	1 - relevant, constructive	2 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		3 - detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 - condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	3 - accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		

NOTES:

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 2.8 + 0.8 - 0.5 = 4$



SCORESHEET
 Fight 1 F, Stage: 2, Problem No. 6
 Rep: Macao Opp: Ukraine

sign *[Signature]*
 Rev: Korea
 Jennings, Gavin
 Rejected 9,17

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS		
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	some	some aspects fine	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3								many	good		
4	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done				
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects 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	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient		
7											

NOTES: *Some parameters not investigated. Understanding limited.*

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1.2 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0.0 = 5$

Volodymyr Maschchys

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS				
0	understanding of presentation	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair		
	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient		
	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used		

NOTES: *Brings out several deficiencies of report but does not make his own views clear enough.*

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1.8 + 2.0 + 2.0 + 1 - 0.3 - 0 = 8$

Min Sol Kim

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
0	report evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	too few	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	partial	partially relevant	some	some	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	many		
4	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	fully adequate		

NOTES: *Review covers all main points - Initial questions used to point out deficiencies of report + obs.*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.5 + 1 - 0.5 = 5



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 F, Stage: 2, Problem No. 6

sign *[Signature]*

Mnevets, Daniil

Rep: Macao

Opp: Ukraine

Rev: Korea

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT /	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
2.5 - 4	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly average	partly clear	too few	poor
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	some	some aspects fine
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects 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	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

NOTES: Incorrect comparison of theory with exp (used exp velocity in theory, so they match anyway)
Had to verify his assumptions

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1 + 1.5 - 1 = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
1.5 - 2	understanding of presentation	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few
1	some main points	few	some
2	main points	some	some correct
3	all relevant points	many	many correct
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions

NOTES: Pushed a lot of the dynamic solution without explaining why the rep's sol. is wrong
Wasn't discussing the rep's solution, but his own questions from his own theoretical approach

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
1 - 1.5	report evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	conclude and correct or no questions asked
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	almost no	too few	no questions asked
1	partial	too short/long	too short/long	some	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	good	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	detailed, complex	condensed & accurate	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate	

NOTES: too many of irrelevant questions (have you done asked that, have you used the fer, etc...)
pushed dynamics as well as opp with no reason

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 1 - 1 = 4



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 F, Stage: 2, Problem No. 6

sign *Pgoll*

O'Neill, Philip

Rep: Macao

Opp: Ukraine

Rev: Korea

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 fulfillment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no/ almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> others' data, incorrectly cited	0 <input type="checkbox"/> misunderstood	0 <input type="checkbox"/> unclear, chaotic	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> review of sources, cited	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly clear	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> not well fitting	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some own input	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	3 <input type="checkbox"/> deviations qualitatively analysed	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + some interesting results	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some parts well done	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	4 <input type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + results explained errors analysed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental or theoretical	4 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall clear, demonstrative			
5 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex, completely testable	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 <input type="checkbox"/> well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental and theoretical	5 <input type="checkbox"/> greater extent than expected	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + complex concepts well communicated			

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 1 = 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	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost nothing	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no or irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> 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	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 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	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	3 <input type="checkbox"/> efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	
	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all points	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + all time used	4 <input type="checkbox"/> new crucial point(s)	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 + 3 + 1.0 + 0 - 0 = 9

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	-1 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input type="checkbox"/> + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	0 <input type="checkbox"/> none	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive	2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> condensed & accurate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate		

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2,5 + 1 - 0,5 = 4



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 F, Stage: 2, Problem No. 6

sign ZC

Panoš, Stanislav

Rep: Macao

Opp: Ukraine

Rev: Korea

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic		
0	some	some	some	some	X review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	0	too few
1	fair	fair	X fair	X not well fitting	X some own input	X average	X average	1	X some
2	X good	X good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	2	+ data/theory convincingly supported
3	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	3	proved deep understanding
4	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	+ complex concepts well communicated		

NOTES:

1

-0,5

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1	few	X some	some aspects fine	X some
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2	X some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

NOTES:

↑

+2

+1,5

~~0,5~~ 0

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,5 + 2,5 + 2 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0	irrelevant	0
1	partial	partially relevant	some	1	too short/long	partially relevant	some	1	too short/long	1
2	X good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2	X informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	2	X relevant parts	X many
3	detailed, complex	X fully adequate	good	3	condensed & accurate	X fully adequate	good	3	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

NOTES:

+1,5

+2,5

+2

↑ +1,0

↑ 0

0

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 1 - 0.5 = 4



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 F, Stage: 2, Problem No. 6

sign MS

Steck, Michael

Rep: Macao

Opp: Ukraine

Rev: Korea

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	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	0 too few	poor	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	1 some	some aspects fine	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	2 many	good	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	3 + 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	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative			
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	+ complex concepts well communicated			

NOTES: exp setup nice, but no limits shown. no warn without radius changed. air flow unclear, no different balls. limits of theory not reached. "high speed camera too slow" -> I do not think this is really limiting. less text, more logical steps would be nice. max angular velocity not discussed live at all!

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2.5 + 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	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	0 almost no	too few	poor	no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 few	some	some aspects fine	some	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 some	some correct	good	reasonable	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES: both better expressions would have been better. should find max w. most points gotten by oral expression. points in presentation not very specific. (1) maximum angular velocity -> sometimes hard to understand. hard to do in this case. could often not go into detail due to reports not having done it.

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 1 + 1.5 + 0 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 almost no	too few	-1 irrelevant	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	partial	partially relevant	some	1 too short/long	partially relevant	some	1 too short/long	some	0 none	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 relevant parts	many	1 relevant, constructive	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	3 accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		

NOTES: a bit too much preparation for the questions, 2min dynamics was handled by opponent? did ship over this very fast. slides were very good though. not perfectly done always. max points should have been... NYPT - March 2019

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 7$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 F, Stage: 1, Problem No. 10

sign *P90:11*

O'Neill, Philip

Rep: Korea

Opp: Macao

Rev: Ukraine

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	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion			
0 - almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	0 - too few	poor	0 - concise and correct or no questions asked		
1 - some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	1 - some	some aspects fine	1 - some incorrect, inconclusive or too long		
2 - fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	2 - many	good	2 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions		
3 - <u>good</u>	<u>good</u>	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	<u>some parts well done</u>	3 - + 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	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative					
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	+ complex concepts well communicated					

NOTES: *MOMENTUM CHANGE? OF WATER?*

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1 - 1 = 3$$

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 - 1 - 1 = 4$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT		ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 - too few, mostly irrelevant	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions			
1 - + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used		0 - poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 - poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 - almost no	too few	1 - irrelevant	0 - concise and correct or no questions asked	
2 - + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently		1 - <u>partial</u>	partially relevant	<u>some</u>	1 - <u>too short/long</u>	partially relevant	<u>some</u>	1 - <u>too short/long</u>	<u>some</u>	0 - none	1 - some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	
		2 - good	<u>mostly adequate</u>	reasonable	2 - <u>informative, apt</u>	<u>mostly adequate</u>	reasonable	2 - <u>relevant parts</u>	many	1 - relevant, constructive	2 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
		3 - detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 - condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	3 - accurate, conclusive	fully adequate			

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 7



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 F, Stage: 1, Problem No. 10

sign *RZ*

Panos, Stanislav

Rep: Korea

Opp: Macao

Rev: Ukraine

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS		
	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic				
0	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	0	too few	poor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <input type="checkbox"/> -1 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	1	some	some aspects fine	
2	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	2	many	good	
3	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4	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	+ complex concepts well communicated	3	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
5											
6											

↑ NOTES:

4.5 4.5

1.5-2

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 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	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	almost no	too few	poor	no	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <input type="checkbox"/> -1 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	few	some	some aspects fine	some	
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	some	some correct	good	reasonable	
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	
4										

↑ NOTES:

↑

1.5-2

1.5-1.5

-0.5

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1 + 0.5 - 0.5 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	almost no	too few	-1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <input type="checkbox"/> -1 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	partial	partially relevant	some	too short/long	partially relevant	some	too short/long	some	0	
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	relevant parts	many	1	
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate	2	
3										

↑ NOTES:

1.5

1

↑

0.5

↑

(+0.5)

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4.5 + 2 - 0.75 = 7$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 F, Stage: 1, Problem No. 10 water wheel

sign MS

Steck, Michael

Rep: Korea

Opp: Macao

Rev: Ukraine

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	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion		
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no/ almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> others' data, incorrectly cited	0 <input type="checkbox"/> misunderstood	0 <input type="checkbox"/> unclear, chaotic	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked	
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> review of sources, cited	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly clear	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> not well fitting	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some own input	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	3 <input type="checkbox"/> deviations qualitatively analysed	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + some interesting results	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some parts well done	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient		
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	4 <input type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct	4 <input type="checkbox"/> results explained errors analysed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental or theoretical	4 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall clear, demonstrative				
5 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex, completely testable	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 <input type="checkbox"/> well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental and theoretical	5 <input type="checkbox"/> greater extent than expected	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + complex concepts well communicated				

NOTES:

^ sry, too fast

at least give physical reactions / assumptions are proven
 → will be shown if asked 2-Axis stability was mentioned for ~10 seconds, is not perfectly okay

↑ because too fast :C

impressive without presentation

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 1.25 + 0.5 - 0 = 3$$

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

NOTES:

e.g. no goal/follow-up to "turbulent flow" apparent

rep. used "momentum" mostly empty words

rep. lacked definitions but did not provide any own insights

"success rate"

"should be included"

did/not lead the discussion

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> none	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many		2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> condensed & accurate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate		

NOTES:

mostly because report lacked in explaining details

could have been more critical

discussion did not have much content

nice answer, but can not give positive points