

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 6



**SCORESHEET**

Fight 1 J, Stage: 3, Problem No. 5

sign *ES*

Schertenleib, Eric

Rep: New Zealand

Opp: Georgia

Rev: India

REPORT							DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 --- almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	0 --- too few	poor	
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, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	3 --- + data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
5 --- detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative			
6 --- deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated			

NOTES: *3 more freq?*

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2.5 + 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 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	0 --- almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	0 --- almost no	too few	poor	no	
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 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 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 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	0 --- poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 --- poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 --- almost no	too few	-1 --- irrelevant	
1 --- relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	1 --- partial	partially relevant	some	1 --- too short/long	partially relevant	some	1 --- too short/long	some	0 --- none	
2 --- + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	2 --- good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 --- informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 --- relevant parts	many	1 --- relevant, constructive	
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	-2 ---	

NOTES:

**REPORTER** 1 + 3 = 6

Start from 1 and add/subtract



**SCORESHEET**  
 Fight 1 J, Stage: 3, Problem No. \_\_\_\_\_

Opp: Georgia  
 Rep: New Zealand  
 Sign \_\_\_\_\_

Kulinskyi, Volodymyr

Rev: India

**REPORT**

0	phenomenon	almost no	almost no	too few	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	others' data, incorrectly cited	task fulfillment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	conduct at the	0	conclude and correct or	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions
	1	almost no	almost no	too few	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	others' data, incorrectly cited	task fulfillment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	conduct at the		0	conclude and correct or	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show
2	some	some	some	some	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	others' data, incorrectly cited	partly	misunderstood	relevant arguments/responses	conduct at the	1	conclude and correct or	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions
3	fair	fair	fair	fair	well performed, fair	deviations not well fitting	some own input	some own input	average	partly clear	too few	poor	0	conclude and correct or	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions
4	good	good	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	+ some interesting results	some aspects well done	partly clear	some aspects fine	poor	1	conclude and correct or	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions
5	detailed	detailed	quite detailed,	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental	or theoretical	considerable experimental	interesting overall clear,	overall clear,	convincingly supported	proved deep	2	conclude and correct or	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions
6	demonstrative	correct	correct	errors analysed	well fitting, deviations + reproducible,	convincing analysis	convincing analysis	convincing analysis	+ complex concepts well	+ complex concepts well	overall efficient	provided deep	3	conclude and correct or	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions
7	shows physical insight	completely testable,	detailed, complex,	+ reproducible,	convincing analysis	convincing analysis	convincing analysis	convincing analysis	greater extent than expected	and theoretical	proved deep	3	conclude and correct or	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions	

**NOTES:**

**OPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 = 5.5

**QUESTIONS ASKED**  
 0 too few, mostly irrelevant  
 1 unclear points in the report  
 2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

**NOTES:**

0	understanding of relevant topics	addressed	no or irrelevant	too few	own opinions presented	relevant scientific topics	almost no	few	some	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	overall efficient	very good	0	conclude and correct or	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions
	1	understanding of relevant topics	addressed	no or irrelevant	too few	own opinions presented	relevant scientific topics	almost no	few	some	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	overall efficient		very good	conclude and correct or	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show
2	presentation	presented	too few	some	own opinions presented	relevant scientific topics	almost no	few	some	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	overall efficient	very good	conclude and correct or	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions	
3	presentation	presented	too few	some	own opinions presented	relevant scientific topics	almost no	few	some	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	overall efficient	very good	conclude and correct or	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions	
4	presentation	presented	too few	some	own opinions presented	relevant scientific topics	almost no	few	some	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	overall efficient	very good	conclude and correct or	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions	
5	presentation	presented	too few	some	own opinions presented	relevant scientific topics	almost no	few	some	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	overall efficient	very good	conclude and correct or	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions	
6	presentation	presented	too few	some	own opinions presented	relevant scientific topics	almost no	few	some	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	overall efficient	very good	conclude and correct or	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions	
7	presentation	presented	too few	some	own opinions presented	relevant scientific topics	almost no	few	some	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	overall efficient	very good	conclude and correct or	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions	

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1.5 = 3.5

**QUESTIONS ASKED**

0 too few, mostly irrelevant  
 1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points  
 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp,  
 most time used  
 2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized,  
 time managed efficiently

**REVIEW OF REPORT**

0	report evaluation & understanding	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	pros & cons	pros & cons	0	poor/wrong	evaluation	speech	0	poor/wrong	evaluation	speech
1	report evaluation & understanding	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	pros & cons	pros & cons	0	poor/wrong	evaluation	speech	0	poor/wrong	evaluation	speech
2	report evaluation & understanding	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	pros & cons	pros & cons	0	poor/wrong	evaluation	speech	0	poor/wrong	evaluation	speech
3	report evaluation & understanding	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	pros & cons	pros & cons	0	poor/wrong	evaluation	speech	0	poor/wrong	evaluation	speech

**REVIEW OF OPPOSITION**

0	pros & cons	irrelevant	no	no	pros & cons	pros & cons	0	poor/wrong	evaluation	speech	0	poor/wrong	evaluation	speech
1	pros & cons	irrelevant	no	no	pros & cons	pros & cons	0	poor/wrong	evaluation	speech	0	poor/wrong	evaluation	speech
2	pros & cons	irrelevant	no	no	pros & cons	pros & cons	0	poor/wrong	evaluation	speech	0	poor/wrong	evaluation	speech
3	pros & cons	irrelevant	no	no	pros & cons	pros & cons	0	poor/wrong	evaluation	speech	0	poor/wrong	evaluation	speech

**DISCUSSION ANALYSIS**

0	discussion	evaluation	correct own	opinions	evaluation	correct own	opinions	0	almost no	too few	some	too short/long	relevant parts	many	adequate
1	discussion	evaluation	correct own	opinions	evaluation	correct own	opinions	0	almost no	too few	some	too short/long	relevant parts	many	adequate
2	discussion	evaluation	correct own	opinions	evaluation	correct own	opinions	0	almost no	too few	some	too short/long	relevant parts	many	adequate
3	discussion	evaluation	correct own	opinions	evaluation	correct own	opinions	0	almost no	too few	some	too short/long	relevant parts	many	adequate

**MISSED POINTS**

0	conclude and correct or	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions
1	conclude and correct or	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions
2	conclude and correct or	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions
3	conclude and correct or	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions

**ANSWERS TO JURY**

0	conclude and correct or	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions
1	conclude and correct or	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions
2	conclude and correct or	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions
3	conclude and correct or	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions

**NOTES:**

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

5 - rejected

**REPORTER** Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 5$$



**SCORESHEET**  
Fight 1 J, Stage: 3, Problem No. 5

sign [Signature]

Krokovny, Pavel

Rep: New Zealand Amy

Opp: Georgia KAZARE

Rev: India Ishan

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 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

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 5$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 <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 checked="" 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"/> + 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input checked="" 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 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"/> 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

$$1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1 + 0.7 - 0.5 - 0 = 5$$

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 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"/> + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input checked="" 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:

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

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 6



**SCORESHEET**

Fight 1 J, Stage: 3, Problem No. 5

sign *L. Cvetkovic*

Gladczuk, Leszek

Rep: New Zealand *Any Cui* Opp: Georgia *Lorane Oquani*

Rev: India *Ishean Pankh*

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

NOTES:

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

NOTES:

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 0.5 - 0 - 0 = 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	too few, mostly irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	almost no	too few	-1	irrelevant	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	partial	partially relevant	some	too short/long	partially relevant	some	too short/long	some	0	none	1	relevant, constructive
2	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	relevant parts	many	1	relevant, constructive	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate	2			

NOTES:



**REPORTER**  
1 + 4 + 0.5 - 0.5 = 5

Start from 1 and add/subtract



**SCORESHEET**

Rep: New Zealand  
Opp: Georgia  
Rev: India

sign *F. Ostermaler*

Ostermaler, Florian

**REPORT**

phenomenon explanation	almost no	almost no	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14

**NOTES:**

relevant arguments/responses	relevant	convinced deep	proved deep	overall efficient
0	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	5
2	3	4	5	6
3	4	5	6	7
4	5	6	7	8
5	6	7	8	9
6	7	8	9	10
7	8	9	10	11
8	9	10	11	12
9	10	11	12	13
10	11	12	13	14
11	12	13	14	15
12	13	14	15	16
13	14	15	16	17
14	15	16	17	18
15	16	17	18	19
16	17	18	19	20
17	18	19	20	21
18	19	20	21	22
19	20	21	22	23
20	21	22	23	24
21	22	23	24	25
22	23	24	25	26
23	24	25	26	27
24	25	26	27	28
25	26	27	28	29
26	27	28	29	30
27	28	29	30	31
28	29	30	31	32
29	30	31	32	33
30	31	32	33	34
31	32	33	34	35
32	33	34	35	36
33	34	35	36	37
34	35	36	37	38
35	36	37	38	39
36	37	38	39	40
37	38	39	40	41
38	39	40	41	42
39	40	41	42	43
40	41	42	43	44
41	42	43	44	45
42	43	44	45	46
43	44	45	46	47
44	45	46	47	48
45	46	47	48	49
46	47	48	49	50
47	48	49	50	51
48	49	50	51	52
49	50	51	52	53
50	51	52	53	54
51	52	53	54	55
52	53	54	55	56
53	54	55	56	57
54	55	56	57	58
55	56	57	58	59
56	57	58	59	60
57	58	59	60	61
58	59	60	61	62
59	60	61	62	63
60	61	62	63	64
61	62	63	64	65
62	63	64	65	66
63	64	65	66	67
64	65	66	67	68
65	66	67	68	69
66	67	68	69	70
67	68	69	70	71
68	69	70	71	72
69	70	71	72	73
70	71	72	73	74
71	72	73	74	75
72	73	74	75	76
73	74	75	76	77
74	75	76	77	78
75	76	77	78	79
76	77	78	79	80
77	78	79	80	81
78	79	80	81	82
79	80	81	82	83
80	81	82	83	84
81	82	83	84	85
82	83	84	85	86
83	84	85	86	87
84	85	86	87	88
85	86	87	88	89
86	87	88	89	90
87	88	89	90	91
88	89	90	91	92
89	90	91	92	93
90	91	92	93	94
91	92	93	94	95
92	93	94	95	96
93	94	95	96	97
94	95	96	97	98
95	96	97	98	99
96	97	98	99	100

**OPONENT**

1 + 1.25 + 1.75 - 0 = 6

Start from 1 and add/subtract

**QUESTIONS ASKED**

0 — too few, mostly irrelevant

1 — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report

2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

3 — all relevant points

4 — practically all points

**OPPOSITION (SPEECH)**

understanding of relevant topics	addressed	relevant topics	own opinions presented	presentation	almost nothing	some main points	main points	many	practically all
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32
24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33
25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34
26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35
27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36
28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37
29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38
30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39
31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40
32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41
33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42
34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43
35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44
36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45
37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46
38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47
39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48
40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49
41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50
42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51
43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52
44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53
45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54
46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55
47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56
48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57
49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58
50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59
51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60
52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61
53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62
54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63
55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64
56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65
57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66
58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68
60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69
61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70
62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71
63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72
64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73
65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74
66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75
67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76
68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77
69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78
70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79
71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80
72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81
73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80		

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 0.75 - 0.5 = 3$$



**SCORESHEET**

Fight 1 J, Stage: 2, Problem No. 8

sign F. Ostermaier

Ostermaier, Florian

Rep: India

Opp: New Zealand

Rev: Georgia

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input 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 type="checkbox"/> some own input	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input checked="" 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

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

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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input 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 type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	3 <input type="checkbox"/> efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input checked="" 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

$$1 + 0.75 + 2 + 1.5 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	0 <input checked="" 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 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 type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive	2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> condensed & accurate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate		

NOTES:

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 4



**SCORESHEET**

Fight 1 J, Stage: 2, Problem No. 8

sign EGJ

Schertenleib, Eric

Rep: India

Opp: New Zealand

Rev: Georgia

REPORT								DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion		
0 - almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	0 - too few	poor	0 - concise and correct or no questions asked -1 - some 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, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	3 - + data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient		
4 - detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative				
5 - deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated				
6 -										

NOTES:

*justification?*

*spect. on ans not analysed*

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 4.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	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 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 0.5 - 0 = 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 - too few, mostly irrelevant		0 - poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 - poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 - almost no	too few	-1 - irrelevant	0 - concise and correct or no questions asked -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	0 - none		
2 - + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used		2 - good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 - informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 - relevant parts	many	1 - relevant, constructive		
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:





NOTES:

<p><b>QUESTIONS ASKED</b></p> <p>0 — too few, mostly irrelevant                  1 — relevant, meant to clarify unclear points                  2 — + suitably allotted to Rep &amp; Opp,                  + short, apt and clear, well prioritized,                  time managed efficiently</p>	<p><b>REVIEW OF REPORT</b></p> <p>0 — poor/wrong                  1 — partial                  2 — good                  3 — detailed, complex</p>	<p><b>REVIEW OF OPPOSITION</b></p> <p>0 — no                  1 — partially relevant                  2 — mostly adequate                  3 — good</p>	<p><b>DISCUSSION ANALYSIS</b></p> <p>0 — almost no                  1 — too short/long                  2 — accurate, conclusive                  3 — fully adequate</p>	<p><b>MISSED POINTS</b></p> <p>-1 — irrelevant                  0 — none                  1 — relevant, constructive</p>	<p><b>ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS</b></p> <p>0 — concise and correct or no questions asked                  -1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long                  -2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1 + 1.6 + 0.7 - 0 = 6$$

<p><b>QUESTIONS ASKED</b></p> <p>0 — too few, mostly irrelevant                  1 — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report                  2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used</p>	<p><b>OPPOSITION (SPEECH)</b></p> <p>0 — almost nothing                  1 — some main points                  2 — all relevant points                  4 — practically all points</p>	<p><b>DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER</b></p> <p>0 — almost no                  1 — few                  2 — some                  3 — good                  4 — new crucial points</p>	<p><b>ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS</b></p> <p>0 — concise and correct or no questions asked                  -1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long                  -2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>
---	--	--	---

**OPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 5$$

<p><b>REPORT</b></p> <p>0 — almost no explanation                  1 — almost no                  2 — some                  3 — fair                  4 — good                  5 — detailed                  6 — demonstrative                  7 — deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight</p>	<p><b>DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT</b></p> <p>0 — almost no                  1 — some                  2 — fair                  3 — well performed, sufficient number                  4 — good                  5 — quite detailed, errors analysed                  6 — detailed, complex, + reproducible, convincing analysis                  7 — deep and comprehensive, + reproducible, convincing analysis</p>	<p><b>DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS</b></p> <p>0 — almost no                  1 — some                  2 — fair                  3 — well performed, sufficient number                  4 — good                  5 — quite detailed, errors analysed                  6 — detailed, complex, + reproducible, convincing analysis                  7 — deep and comprehensive, + reproducible, convincing analysis</p>
---	---	---

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 5$$



SCORESHEET  
 Fight 1 J, Stage: 2, Problem No. 8

Opp: New Zealand  
 sign

Rev: Georgia Beggs

Krokovny, Pavel

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 4



**SCORESHEET**

Fight 1 J, Stage: 2, Problem No. 8

8

sign

*L. Gladczuk*

Gladczuk, Leszek

Rep: India

Opp: New Zealand

Rev: Georgia

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

NOTES:

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 8

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

NOTES:

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 4



**SCORESHEET**

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

sign

*[Handwritten signature]*

Schertenleib, Eric

Rep: Georgia

Opp: India

Rev: New Zealand

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

NOTES:

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1 - 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	1 --- 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	
2 --- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used		0 --- almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	0 --- almost no	too few	poor	no	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked
		1 --- some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 --- few	some	some aspects fine	some	1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
		2 --- main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 --- some	some correct	good	reasonable	2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		3 --- all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 --- good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
		4 --- practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 --- new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

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

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 5



**SCORESHEET**

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

sign

Kulinskyi, Volodymyr

Rep: Georgia

Opp: India

Rev: New Zealand

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	too few	poor	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 some 1.5	some 1.5	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	some	some aspects fine	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	many	good	
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
5 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated			
6									

NOTES:

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 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	too few, mostly irrelevant	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	almost no	too few	poor	no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	few	some	some aspects fine	some	
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	some	some correct	good	reasonable	
3		all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
4		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2.5 + 2 + 1 + 1 - 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	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	almost no	too few	-1 irrelevant	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	partial	partially relevant	some	too short/long	partially relevant	some	too short/long	some	0 none	
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	relevant parts	many	1 relevant, constructive	
3		detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		
4											

NOTES:



(2 rejected)

**REPORTER** Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 5$$



**SCORESHEET**  
 Fight 1 J, Stage: 1, Problem No. 10  
 Rep: Georgia Keti Opp: India

sign [Signature]  
 Rev: New Zealand

Krokovny, Pavel  
Amy

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"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 3 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> review of sources, cited	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partly	1 <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> not well fitting	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some own input	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input checked="" 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"/>										

NOTES:

**OPPONENT** Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.7 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 = 5$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	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"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 3 <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 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 checked="" 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

$$1 + 1.5 + 1.9 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 0.5 - 0 = 8$$

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 3 <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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	1 <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	

NOTES:

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

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 3



**SCORESHEET**

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

sign *F. Ostermaier*

Ostermaier, Florian

Rep: Georgia

Opp: India

Rev: New Zealand

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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no/ almost no <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	review of sources, cited	partly <input checked="" 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	some own input <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	average	average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	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	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	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	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated			

NOTES:

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some main points <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1 + 0.5 - 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	
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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/> none	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	1 <input checked="" 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	2 <input type="checkbox"/> deep misconceptions	

NOTES:

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.0 + 1.5 - 0 = 6 = 5.5



**SCORESHEET**

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

2 rejected

sign

*J. Kuslowski*

Rep: Georgia *K. Kekkhava*

Opp: India *M. Shenoy*

Rev: New Zealand

Gladczuk, Leszek  
*V. Cui*

REPORT							DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	too few	poor	0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	some	some aspects fine	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	many	good	
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	+ 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	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
5 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated			
6									
7									

**NOTES:**

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

**NOTES:**

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

**NOTES:**

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