

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 1 - 0.5 = 4$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 G, Stage: 3, Problem No. 10

sign

Tobias Hedberg

Hedberg, Tobias

Rep: United Kingdom

Opp: Brazil

Rev: Austria

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 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	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	
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	
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	4 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	
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			
6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>			
7 <input type="checkbox"/>	7 <input type="checkbox"/>	7 <input type="checkbox"/>	7 <input type="checkbox"/>	7 <input type="checkbox"/>	7 <input type="checkbox"/>	7 <input type="checkbox"/>			

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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"/> 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	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	
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	
	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

$$1 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 0.5 - 0 - 0.5 = 7$$

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"/> 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"/> + 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	
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	
	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 + 3 - 2 = 4



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 G, Stage: 3, Problem No. 10

sign

mt

Pussadee, Nirut

Rep: United Kingdom

Opp: Brazil

Rev: Austria

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 incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions -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	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		
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		
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	4 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient		
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				
6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>				

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 - 2 = 2.5

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 <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"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions -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	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	
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	
	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 + 1 + 1.5 + 1 - 1 = 3.5

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 <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"/> none 1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive -2 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	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 incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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		
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		
	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

$$1 + 1.5 + 2 - \square = 4$$



SCORESHEET
 Fight 1 G, Stage: 3, Problem No. 10
 Rep: United Kingdom Opp: Brazil

sign [Signature]
 Rev: Austria

Jejelava, Juansher

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	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	0	too few	poor
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	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	2	many	good
3	detailed	quite detailed	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
4	demonstrative	correct	errors analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated		proved deep understanding	overall efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis							
6										
7										

NOTES: *qualitative on mostly*

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 3 + 3 - \square = 8$$

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
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	few	some	some aspects fine	some	1
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	some	some correct	good	reasonable	2
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:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2 + 0.5 - \square = 7$$

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	0
1	partial	partially relevant	some	too short/long	partially relevant	some	too short/long	some	0	1
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	relevant parts	many	1	2
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate	2	3

NOTES: *3 main parameters?*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1 - 0 = 3



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 G, Stage: 3, Problem No. 10

10

sign *[Signature]*

Veljić, Vladimir

Rep: United Kingdom

Opp: Brazil

Rev: Austria

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	4 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	
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 + 1.5 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 8

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 + 1.5 + 2 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 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 <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"/> relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	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"/> + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	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"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	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 + 0.5 - 0.5 = 3



SCORESHEET
 Fight 1 G, Stage: 3, Problem No. 10
 Rep: United Kingdom Opp: Brazil

sign *Flo I zone*

Ho, I leng

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> review of sources, cited	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partly clear	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> not well fitting	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some own input	2 <input checked="" 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	4 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	
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 + 1.3 + 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 <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> main points	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> efficient	3 <input checked="" 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	

3 2 2 2

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.2 + 2.5 + 2.2 + 1.5 + 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 <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"/> relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	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"/> + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input checked="" 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"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	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		

2 1.5 1.5

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 2 - 1 = 5



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 G, Stage: 1, Problem No. 15

15

sign *[Signature]*

Veljić, Vladimir

Rep: Brazil

Opp: Austria

Rev: United Kingdom

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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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"/> relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	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"/> + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	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"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	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 + 3 + 1 - 0 = 5



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 G, Stage: 1, Problem No. 15

sign

Tobias Hedberg

Hedberg, Tobias

Rep: Brazil

Opp: Austria

Rev: United Kingdom

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 incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions -1 <input type="checkbox"/> -2 <input type="checkbox"/>
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	
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	
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	4 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	
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			
6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>			

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 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 <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"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions -1 <input type="checkbox"/> -2 <input type="checkbox"/>
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	
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	
	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 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 7

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"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions -1 <input type="checkbox"/> -2 <input type="checkbox"/>
1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	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	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	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	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	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 + 3 + 7 - 0 = 6



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 G, Stage: 1, Problem No. 15

sign

J. I. Jones

Ho, I leng

Rep: Brazil

Opp: Austria

Rev: United Kingdom

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 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 incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	1 some	some aspects fine	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	2 many	good	
3 good	good	well performed	deviations	+ 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			
6									

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 2 - 0 = 6

f. material.

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	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 incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 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 few	some	some aspects fine	some	
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 3 + 7 + 1 - 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 too few, mostly irrelevant	0 poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 almost no	too few	-1 irrelevant 0 none 1 relevant, constructive 2	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	1 partial	partially relevant	some	1 too short/long	partially relevant	some	1 too short/long	some		
2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	2 good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 relevant parts	many		
3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	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 + 3 + 1 - 0 = 5



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 G, Stage: 1, Problem No. 15

sign

[Handwritten signature]

Jejelava, Juansher

Rep: Brazil

Opp: Austria

Rev: United Kingdom

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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	
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	
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	4 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	
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			
6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>			

NOTES: slide 40? // Was the ~~disipation~~ disipation in striking and stand? Why is it not relevant? // 200 classical // Could you suggest the quicker test. // do I understand it correctly? error bars are smaller than dots? // probably

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
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	
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	
4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	

NOTES: hard to distinguish some of questions // classical model. // soft spheres models. // heavy spheres drags // almost no ~~idea~~ idea on theory, perhaps points probably don't understand it. // was nervous, obviously, but on manageable level.

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
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	irrelevant	concise and correct or no questions asked
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	
4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	

NOTES: clearly formulated. // line Reporters Review much I missed than points with ideas than Oponents one. // the suggestions to avoid the critique on theory

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5.5

1 + 3 + 1.5 - = 6



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 G, Stage: 1, Problem No. 15

sign

Nt

Pussadee, Nirut

Rep: Brazil

Opp: Austria

Rev: United Kingdom

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 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 <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		
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		
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	3 <input type="checkbox"/> deviations qualitatively analysed	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + some interesting results	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some parts well done	3 <input checked="" 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	4 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient		
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				
6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>				

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5.5

1 + 1 + 4.5 + 2 - = 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 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 <input checked="" 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	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> main points	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	
	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

6.2

1 + 1 + 2 + 1.8 + 1 + 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 <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 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 <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive	
	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 + 3 + 1.5 - 1.5 = 4



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 G, Stage: 2, Problem No. 14

sign *peout*

Veljić, Vladimir

Rep: Austria

Opp: United Kingdom

Rev: Brazil

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:

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
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
1 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used		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	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
		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	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
		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	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	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	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	
		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					

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2.8 + 1.5 - 1 = 7

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 type="checkbox"/> relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	0 <input type="checkbox"/> speech evaluation	0 <input type="checkbox"/> pros & cons	0 <input type="checkbox"/> prioritisation	0 <input type="checkbox"/> discussion evaluation	0 <input type="checkbox"/> correct own opinions		
1 <input type="checkbox"/> + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used		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
2 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently		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"/> 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	1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	1 <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	2 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate		

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.6 + 2 - 0 = 7



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 G, Stage: 2, Problem No. 14

sign JWILSON

Ho, I leng

Rep: Austria

Opp: United Kingdom

Rev: Brazil

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 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	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	
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	
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"/> well done	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + results explained error 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	4 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> demonstrative	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			
6 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight									

NOTES:

3 3 missing fixing wefficient 2.5 -
5 4 4 4

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.2 + 1.8 + 1.5 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	1 <input 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"/> 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"/>	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> main points	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	
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 checked="" 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:

2 2 1.5 1.5 2.5 2 1 1.5 1.5

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.2 + 1.6 + 1.6 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 7

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 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"/>	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	-1 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	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"/>	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	0 <input type="checkbox"/> none	
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	1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive	
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		
4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>		

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 6$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 G, Stage: 2, Problem No. 14

sign *Tobias Hedberg*

Hedberg, Tobias

Rep: Austria

Opp: United Kingdom

Rev: Brazil

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 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	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	
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	
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	4 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensive, 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			
6 <input type="checkbox"/>									

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + [6.2] + 2 - 0 = 6$$

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	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"/> 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	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	
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	
	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

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

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 + 4 + 1.5 - 0.1 = 6



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 G, Stage: 2, Problem No. 44

sign

[Handwritten signature]

Jejelava, Juansher

Rep: Austria

Opp: United Kingdom

Rev: Brazil

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	4 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	
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:

Is solution 2D or 3D ; What is the error bars on 18 and 17 ; System Chaotic? 21 Right Low graph? How do you know that theory correlates with the experiment where are errors? How can source of chaos is only air? // to much pauses during the discussions, slide 15 the averaging of 5 experiment?

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 1.5 - 0.1 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS			
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>		4 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>
1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>
4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>

NOTES: do not let reporter to finish answer...

printitazig is somehow spkange... // Do not quite get the questions about the matrix equation? mass and friction?

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 + 1 + 0.1 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>		
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>
1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>

NOTES:

it is the rounding is not strictly mathematical.

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5.5

1 + 3 + 1.5 - [] = 6



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 G, Stage: 2, Problem No. 14

sign

Handwritten signature

Pussadee, Nirut

Rep: Austria

Opp: United Kingdom

Rev: Brazil

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

5.5

1 + 1 + 2 + 1.5 - [] = 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	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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> main points	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input checked="" 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 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 + 1.5 - [] - [] = 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 <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"/> relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> none	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive	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	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: