

**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                                 | 0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked<br>-1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long<br>-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 --- 7 ---   |  |                                     |   |   |                              |                                      |  |                                      |   |

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             | 0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked<br>-1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long<br>-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

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

| 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            | 0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked<br>-1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long<br>-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:

**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 | misunderstood             | task fulfillment          | science communication        | relevant arguments/responses | conduct at the    | 0 | some                    | some                    | poor | some aspects fine | concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 1 | explanation            | almost no          | almost no           | too few             | relevant experiments                     | theory and experiment                    | own contribution           | others' data, incorrectly cited | misunderstood             | partly                    | unclear, chaotic             | relevant arguments/responses | conduct at the    | 1 | some                    | some                    | poor | some aspects fine | concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 2 | some                   | some               | some                | some                | well performed, fair                     | not well fitting deviations              | some own input             | review of sources, cited        | partly                    | partly clear              | partly clear                 | relevant arguments/responses | conduct at the    | 2 | some                    | some                    | poor | some aspects fine | concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 3 | fair                   | fair               | fair                | fair                | well performed, fair                     | not well fitting deviations              | some own input             | review of sources, cited        | partly                    | partly clear              | partly clear                 | relevant arguments/responses | conduct at the    | 3 | some                    | some                    | poor | some aspects fine | concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 4 | good                   | good               | good                | good                | well performed, sufficient number        | qualitatively analysed                   | + some interesting results | review of sources, cited        | some parts well done      | some parts well done      | some parts well done         | relevant arguments/responses | conduct at the    | 4 | good                    | good                    | poor | some aspects fine | concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 5 | detailed               | detailed           | quite detailed,     | + results explained | + theory limits explained, conclusive    | considerable experimental                | or theoretical             | considerable experimental       | interesting solution      | interesting solution      | overall clear, demonstrative | relevant arguments/responses | conduct at the    | 5 | some aspects            | some aspects            | poor | some aspects fine | concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 6 | demonstrative          | demonstrative      | quite detailed,     | + results explained | + theory limits explained, conclusive    | considerable experimental                | or theoretical             | considerable experimental       | interesting solution      | interesting solution      | overall clear, demonstrative | relevant arguments/responses | conduct at the    | 6 | some aspects            | some aspects            | poor | some aspects fine | concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 7 | shows physical insight | detailed, complex, | completely testable | convincing analysis | well fitting, deviations + reproducible, | convincing analysis                      | convincing analysis        | convincing analysis             | proved deep understanding | proved deep understanding | convincingly supported       | overall efficient            | overall efficient | 7 | deep and comprehensive, | deep and comprehensive, | poor | some aspects fine | concise and correct or no questions asked |

**NOTES:**

**OPONENT** 1 + 1.5 + 2.5 = 5

Start from 1 and add/subtract

|   |   |                                  |           |              |          |                   |           |         |      |      |                 |   |      |      |      |      |      |                    |
|---|---|----------------------------------|-----------|--------------|----------|-------------------|-----------|---------|------|------|-----------------|---|------|------|------|------|------|--------------------|
| 0 | too few, mostly irrelevant                                | understanding of relevant topics | presented | own opinions | relevant | scientific topics | presented | too few | poor | poor | time management | 0 | no   | no   | poor | no   | no   | no questions asked |
| 1 | unclear points in the report                              | understanding of relevant topics | presented | own opinions | relevant | scientific topics | presented | too few | poor | poor | time management | 1 | no   | no   | poor | no   | no   | no questions asked |
| 2 | + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used   | understanding of relevant topics | presented | own opinions | relevant | scientific topics | presented | too few | poor | poor | time management | 2 | some | some | poor | some | some | no questions asked |
| 3 | relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report | understanding of relevant topics | presented | own opinions | relevant | scientific topics | presented | too few | poor | poor | time management | 3 | some | some | poor | some | some | no questions asked |
| 4 | relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report | understanding of relevant topics | presented | own opinions | relevant | scientific topics | presented | too few | poor | poor | time management | 4 | some | some | poor | some | some | no questions asked |

**NOTES:**

**REVIEWER** 1 + 1 + 1 + 1.5 = 5

Start from 1 and add/subtract

|   |  |                                   |             |            |                   |             |            |   |      |      |            |   |      |      |            |   |      |      |                    |
|---|--|-----------------------------------|-------------|------------|-------------------|-------------|------------|---|------|------|------------|---|------|------|------------|---|------|------|--------------------|
| 0 | too few, mostly irrelevant   | report evaluation & understanding | pros & cons | evaluation | speech evaluation | pros & cons | evaluation | 0 | no   | no   | poor/wrong | 0 | no   | no   | poor/wrong | 0 | no   | no   | no questions asked |
| 1 | relevant, meant to clarify unclear points                          | report evaluation & understanding | pros & cons | evaluation | speech evaluation | pros & cons | evaluation | 1 | some | some | poor/wrong | 1 | some | some | poor/wrong | 1 | some | some | no questions asked |
| 2 | + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently | report evaluation & understanding | pros & cons | evaluation | speech evaluation | pros & cons | evaluation | 2 | some | some | poor/wrong | 2 | some | some | poor/wrong | 2 | some | some | no questions asked |
| 3 | relevant, meant to clarify unclear points                          | report evaluation & understanding | pros & cons | evaluation | speech evaluation | pros & cons | evaluation | 3 | some | some | poor/wrong | 3 | some | some | poor/wrong | 3 | some | some | no questions asked |

**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  
 Rep: New Zealand Amy Opp: Georgia Lazare sign [Signature] Rev: India Ishan Krokovny, Pavel

| 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<br>1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long<br>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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> good        |   |
| 3 <input type="checkbox"/> good  | 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good                        | 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number | 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> deviations qualitatively analysed  | 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + some interesting results     | 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average | 3 <input checked="" 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<br>1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long<br>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<br>0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none<br>1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive | 0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked<br>1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long<br>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 |   |   |
| 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            |   |   |
|   | 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 fulfilment              | 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 |
|                 |   | all relevant points       | many                   | many correct              | fair            | efficient                  | good                   | many correct                         | some aspects efficient | fair                                     |   |  |
|                 |   | 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 + 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                      |                           |            |   |   |
| 3               | + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently | detailed, complex | fully adequate     | good                 | condensed & accurate | fully adequate     | good                  | accurate, conclusive | fully adequate            |                           |            |   |   |

NOTES:

sign *F. Ostermaler*  
 Rev: India

Opp: Georgia

Problem No. 05

Rep: New Zealand

SCORESHEET



REPORTER  
 Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 $1 + 4 + 0.5 - 0.5 = 5$

| REPORT | phenomenon                                     | theory/model                           | relevant experiments                   | comparison between theory and experiment              | own contribution                                  | task fulfillment             | science communication                |
|--------|--|--|--|---|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 0      | almost no explanation                          | almost no theory/model                 | almost no relevant experiments         | no/almost no comparison between theory and experiment | others' data, incorrectly cited                   | misunderstood                | unclear, chaotic                     |
| 1      | some   | some                                   | some                                   | not well fitting                                      | review of sources, cited                          | partly                       | partly clear                         |
| 2      | some   | some                                   | fair                                   | fair  | some own input                                    | average                      | some aspects fine                    |
| 3      | fair   | fair                                   | well performed                         | deviations  | deviations  | above average                | some aspects fine                    |
| 4      | good   | good                                   | sufficient number of results explained | qualitatively analysed                                | + some interesting results                        | some average                 | some aspects fine                    |
| 5      | detailed                                       | quite detailed, correct                | + results explained                    | + theory limits explained, conclusive                 | considerable experimental or theoretical solution | interesting                  | overall clear, demonstrative         |
| 6      | demonstrative                                  | detailed, complex, completely testable | + reproducible, convincing analysis    | well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive         | considerable experimental and theoretical         | greater extent than expected | + complex concepts well communicated |
| 7      | deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight | detailed, complex, completely testable | convincing analysis                    | well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive         | considerable experimental and theoretical         | greater extent than expected | + complex concepts well communicated |

NOTES:

| QUESTIONS ASKED   | 0                | 1                | 2           | 3                   | 4                      |
|---|------------------|------------------|-------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| too few, mostly irrelevant                                | almost nothing   | some main points | main points | all relevant points | practically all points |
| relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report | no or irrelevant | few              | some        | many correct        | practically all        |
| + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used   | no               | reasonable       | reasonable  | fair                | very good              |
|   | poor             | reasonable       | reasonable  | efficient           | all time used          |
|   | poor             | reasonable       | reasonable  | efficient           | all time used          |

  

| DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER             | 0         | 1                 | 2            | 3                      | 4                         |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| relevant scientific topics           | almost no | few               | some         | good                   | new crucial points        |
| own opinions presented               | too few   | some              | some correct | many correct           | + improvement suggestions |
| opponent's conduct of the discussion | poor      | some aspects fine | good         | some aspects efficient | overall efficient         |
|                                      | poor      | some              | reasonable   | fair                   | very good                 |
|                                      | no        | some              | reasonable   | fair                   | very good                 |

NOTES:

OPONENT  
 Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 $1 + 1.25 + 1.75 - 0 = 6$

| QUESTIONS ASKED  | 0          | 1                  | 2          | 3                 |
|--|------------|--------------------|------------|-------------------|
| too few, mostly irrelevant   | poor/wrong | poor/wrong         | poor/wrong | poor/wrong        |
| relevant, meant to clarify unclear points                          | irrelevant | partially relevant | good       | detailed, complex |
| + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used                   | no         | some               | reasonable | good              |
| + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently | no         | some               | reasonable | good              |

  

| REVIEW OF REPORT                  | 0          | 1                  | 2               | 3          |
|-----------------------------------|------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------|
| report evaluation & understanding | poor/wrong | poor/wrong         | poor/wrong      | poor/wrong |
| pros & cons                       | irrelevant | partially relevant | mostly adequate | fully      |
|                                   | no         | some               | reasonable      | good       |

  

| REVIEW OF OPPOSITION | 0          | 1                  | 2               | 3          |
|----------------------|------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------|
| speech evaluation    | poor/wrong | poor/wrong         | poor/wrong      | poor/wrong |
| pros & cons          | irrelevant | partially relevant | mostly adequate | fully      |
|                      | no         | some               | reasonable      | good       |

  

| DISCUSSION ANALYSIS   | 0          | 1              | 2                      |
|-----------------------|------------|----------------|------------------------|
| discussion evaluation | almost no  | too short/long | accurate, conclusive   |
| own opinions          | too few    | some           | many                   |
|                       | irrelevant | none           | relevant, constructive |

  

| ANSWERS TO JURY                           | 0  | -1             | -2                       |
|---|----|----------------|--------------------------|
| concise and correct or no questions asked | no | some incorrect | deep misconceptions      |
|   | no | some incorrect | deeply incorrect or show |
|   | no | some incorrect | deeply incorrect or show |

REVIEWER  
 Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 $1 + 0.85 + 1 + 0 + 1.2 - 0 = 3$

NOTES:

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

**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<br>1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/><br>-1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long<br>-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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> some                      | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine      |   |
| 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        |   |
| 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 + 1.5 + 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<br>-1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long<br>-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 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                  |   |
| 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 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 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<br>-1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long<br>-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 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 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 |   |
|   | 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<br>-1 - some incorrect, inconclusive or too long<br>-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<br>-1 - some incorrect, inconclusive or too long<br>-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<br>-1 - some incorrect, inconclusive or too long<br>-2 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| 1 - + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used                   |  | 1 - partial                       | partially relevant | some           | 1 - too short/long       | partially relevant | some           | 1 - too short/long       | some                 | 0 - none                   |   |
| 2 - + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently |  | 2 - good                          | mostly adequate    | reasonable     | 2 - informative, apt     | mostly adequate    | reasonable     | 2 - relevant parts       | many                 | 1 - relevant, constructive |   |
|  |  | 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 + 25 - 1.5 + 1.5 = 6



**SCORESHEET**

Rep: India  
 Fight 1 J, Stage: 2, Problem No.

sign

Opp: New Zealand

Rev: Georgia

Kulinskyi, Volodymyr

| REPORT |  | DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT |  | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER |                    | ANSWERS TO JURY, OPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |                          |
|--------|--|-------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------|--|--------------------------|
| 7      | deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight | 3                       | proved deep understanding                          | 4                        | new crucial points | 2  | deep misconceptions      |
| 6      | demonstrative                                  | 2                       | + data/theory supported                            | 3                        | good               | 3  | deeply incorrect or show |
| 5      | detailed                                       | 1                       | convincing analysis                                | 2                        | some correct       | 2  | inconclusive or too long |
| 4      | good   | 0                       | quite detailed, errors analysed                    | 1                        | some               | 1  | some incorrect,          |
| 3      | fair   | 0                       | good   | 0                        | some               | 0  | no questions asked       |
| 2      | some   | 0                       | well performed, sufficient number                  | 0                        | almost no          | 0  | concise and correct or   |
| 1      | almost no explanation                          | 0                       | fair   | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
| 0      | phenomenon                                     | 0                       | not well fitting                                   | 0                        | poor               | 0  | concise and correct or   |
|        | theory/model                                   | 0                       | some   | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | relevant experiments                           | 0                       | almost no  | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | completely testable                            | 0                       | too few  | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | detailed, complex, + reproducible,             | 0                       | well fitting, deviations                           | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | convincing analysis                            | 0                       | well fitting, deviations analysed, + reproducible, | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | errors analysed                                | 0                       | explained  | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | theory limits                                  | 0                       | + theory limits                                    | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | considerable experimental                      | 0                       | qualitatively analysed                             | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | and theoretical                                | 0                       | devisations  | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | considerable experimental                      | 0                       | not well fitting                                   | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | or theoretical                                 | 0                       | some own input                                     | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | greater extent                                 | 0                       | review of sources, cited                           | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | + complex concepts well                        | 0                       | others' data, incorrectly cited                    | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | demonstrative                                  | 0                       | own contribution                                   | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | overall clear,                                 | 0                       | task fulfilment                                    | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | interesting solution                           | 0                       | science communication                              | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | overall clear,                                 | 0                       | unclear, chaotic                                   | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | some parts well done                           | 0                       | relevant arguments/responses                       | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | some aspects above average                     | 0                       | conduct at the                                     | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | average  | 0                       | reporter's   | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | partly clear                                   | 0                       | discuss  | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | partly clear                                   | 0                       | poor   | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | some aspects fine                              | 0                       | some aspects fine                                  | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | good   | 0                       | some   | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | many   | 0                       | many   | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | + data/theory supported                        | 0                       | convincing analysis                                | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | proved deep understanding                      | 0                       | overall efficient                                  | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | some aspects efficient                         | 0                       | some aspects                                       | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | efficient                                      | 0                       | overall efficient                                  | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |
|        | very good                                      | 0                       | very good  | 0                        | poor               | 0  | no questions asked       |

NOTES:

**OPONENT**  
 Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 0 + 2 + 1.5 = 5

| QUESTIONS ASKED |   | OPPOSITION (SPEECH) |  | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER |                            | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |                    |
|-----------------|---|---------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------------------|--|--------------------|
| 0               | too few, mostly irrelevant                                | 0                   | understanding of relevant topics addressed | 0                        | relevant scientific topics | 0  | no questions asked |
| 1               | relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report | 1                   | presentation                               | 1                        | own opinions presented     | 1  | no questions asked |
| 2               | + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used   | 2                   | almost nothing                             | 2                        | the discussion             | 2  | no questions asked |
| 3               | main points   | 3                   | no or irrelevant                           | 3                        | poor                       | 3  | no questions asked |
| 4               | all relevant points                                       | 4                   | some main points                           | 4                        | some aspects fine          | 4  | no questions asked |
| 5               | practically all points                                    | 5                   | some                                       | 5                        | some                       | 5  | no questions asked |
| 6               | many  | 6                   | some correct                               | 6                        | some correct               | 6  | no questions asked |
| 7               | practically all   | 7                   | many correct                               | 7                        | many correct               | 7  | no questions asked |
| 8               | + improvement suggestions                                 | 8                   | very good                                  | 8                        | + improvement suggestions  | 8  | no questions asked |
| 9               | all time used   | 9                   | efficient                                  | 9                        | new crucial points         | 9  | no questions asked |
| 10              | very good   | 10                  | fair                                       | 10                       | good                       | 10                                       | no questions asked |
| 11              | reasonable  | 11                  | reasonable                                 | 11                       | some                       | 11                                       | no questions asked |
| 12              | fair  | 12                  | fair                                       | 12                       | some                       | 12                                       | no questions asked |
| 13              | efficient   | 13                  | efficient                                  | 13                       | some correct               | 13                                       | no questions asked |
| 14              | all time used   | 14                  | all time used                              | 14                       | many correct               | 14                                       | no questions asked |
| 15              | very good   | 15                  | very good                                  | 15                       | + improvement suggestions  | 15                                       | no questions asked |
| 16              | all time used   | 16                  | all time used                              | 16                       | new crucial points         | 16                                       | no questions asked |
| 17              | very good   | 17                  | very good                                  | 17                       | good                       | 17                                       | no questions asked |
| 18              | reasonable  | 18                  | reasonable                                 | 18                       | some                       | 18                                       | no questions asked |
| 19              | fair  | 19                  | fair                                       | 19                       | some                       | 19                                       | no questions asked |
| 20              | efficient   | 20                  | efficient                                  | 20                       | some correct               | 20                                       | no questions asked |
| 21              | all time used   | 21                  | all time used                              | 21                       | many correct               | 21                                       | no questions asked |
| 22              | very good   | 22                  | very good                                  | 22                       | + improvement suggestions  | 22                                       | no questions asked |
| 23              | all time used   | 23                  | all time used                              | 23                       | new crucial points         | 23                                       | no questions asked |
| 24              | very good   | 24                  | very good                                  | 24                       | good                       | 24                                       | no questions asked |
| 25              | reasonable  | 25                  | reasonable                                 | 25                       | some                       | 25                                       | no questions asked |
| 26              | fair  | 26                  | fair                                       | 26                       | some                       | 26                                       | no questions asked |
| 27              | efficient   | 27                  | efficient                                  | 27                       | some correct               | 27                                       | no questions asked |
| 28              | all time used   | 28                  | all time used                              | 28                       | many correct               | 28                                       | no questions asked |
| 29              | very good   | 29                  | very good                                  | 29                       | + improvement suggestions  | 29                                       | no questions asked |
| 30              | all time used   | 30                  | all time used                              | 30                       | new crucial points         | 30                                       | no questions asked |

NOTES:

**REVIEWER**  
 Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 1 + 1.5 + 2 + 1.5 = 7

| QUESTIONS ASKED |   | REVIEW OF REPORT |                    | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION |                    | DISCUSSION ANALYSIS |                | MISSED POINTS |               | ANSWERS TO JURY |                    |
|-----------------|---|------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| 0               | too few, mostly irrelevant                | 0                | poor/wrong         | 0                    | poor/wrong         | 0                   | almost no      | 0             | irrelevant    | 0               | no questions asked |
| 1               | relevant, meant to clarify unclear points | 1                | & understanding    | 1                    | evaluation         | 1                   | too short/long | 1             | relevant      | 1               | no questions asked |
| 2               | + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp,         | 2                | report evaluation  | 2                    | speech evaluation  | 2                   | relevant parts | 2             | relevant,     | 2               | no questions asked |
| 3               | most time used                            | 3                | pros & cons        | 3                    | pros & cons        | 3                   | too short/long | 3             | constructive, | 3               | no questions asked |
| 4               | time managed efficiently                  | 4                | poor/wrong         | 4                    | poor/wrong         | 4                   | too few        | 4             | conclusive,   | 4               | no questions asked |
| 5               | short, apt and clear, well prioritized,   | 5                | irrelevant         | 5                    | irrelevant         | 5                   | too few        | 5             | adequate      | 5               | no questions asked |
| 6               | most time used                            | 6                | partially relevant | 6                    | partially relevant | 6                   | too few        | 6             | adequate      | 6               | no questions asked |
| 7               | + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, | 7                | mostly adequate    | 7                    | mostly adequate    | 7                   | too few        | 7             | adequate      | 7               | no questions asked |
| 8               | time managed efficiently                  | 8                | good               | 8                    | informative, apt   | 8                   | too few        | 8             | adequate      | 8               | no questions asked |
| 9               | most time used                            | 9                | complex,           | 9                    | condensed &        | 9                   | too few        | 9             | adequate      | 9               | no questions asked |
| 10              | short, apt and clear, well prioritized,   | 10               | detailed,          | 10                   | accurate &         | 10                  | too few        | 10            | adequate      | 10              | no questions asked |
| 11              | time managed efficiently                  | 11               | fully              | 11                   | fully              | 11                  | too few        | 11            | adequate      | 11              | no questions asked |
| 12              | most time used                            | 12               | mostly adequate    | 12                   | informative, apt   | 12                  | too few        | 12            | adequate      | 12              | no questions asked |
| 13              | + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, | 13               | reasonable         | 13                   | informative, apt   | 13                  | too few        | 13            | adequate      | 13              | no questions asked |
| 14              | time managed efficiently                  | 14               | good               | 14                   | informative, apt   | 14                  | too few        | 14            | adequate      | 14              | no questions asked |
| 15              | most time used                            | 15               | complex,           | 15                   | condensed &        | 15                  | too few        | 15            | adequate      | 15              | no questions asked |
| 16              | short, apt and clear, well prioritized,   | 16               | detailed,          | 16                   | accurate &         | 16                  | too few        | 16            | adequate      | 16              | no questions asked |
| 17              | time managed efficiently                  | 17               | fully              | 17                   | fully              | 17                  | too few        | 17            | adequate      | 17              | no questions asked |
| 18              | most time used                            | 18               | mostly adequate    | 18                   | informative, apt   | 18                  | too few        | 18            | adequate      | 18              | no questions asked |
| 19              | + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, | 19               | reasonable         | 19                   | informative, apt   | 19                  | too few        | 19            | adequate      | 19              | no questions asked |
| 20              | time managed efficiently                  | 20               | good               | 20                   | informative, apt   | 20                  | too few        | 20            | adequate      | 20              | no questions asked |
| 21              | most time used                            | 21               | complex,           | 21                   | condensed &        | 21                  | too few        | 21            | adequate      | 21              | no questions asked |
| 22              | short, apt and clear, well prioritized,   | 22               | detailed,          | 22                   | accurate &         | 22                  | too few        | 22            | adequate      | 22              | no questions asked |
| 23              | time managed efficiently                  | 23               | fully              | 23                   | fully              | 23                  | too few        | 23            | adequate      | 23              | no questions asked |
| 24              | most time used                            | 24               | mostly adequate    | 24                   | informative, apt   | 24                  | too few        | 24            | adequate      | 24              | no questions asked |
| 25              | + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, | 25               | reasonable         | 25                   | informative, apt   | 25                  | too few        | 25            | adequate      | 25              | no questions asked |
| 26              | time managed efficiently                  | 26               | good               | 26                   | informative, apt   | 26                  | too few        | 26            | adequate      | 26              | no questions asked |
| 27              | most time used                            | 27               | complex,           | 27                   | condensed &        | 27                  | too few        | 27            | adequate      | 27              | no questions asked |
| 28              | short, apt and clear, well prioritized,   | 28               | detailed,          | 28                   | accurate &         | 28                  | too few        | 28            | adequate      | 28              | no questions asked |
| 29              | time managed efficiently                  | 29               | fully              | 29                   | fully              | 29                  | too few        | 29            | adequate      | 29              | no questions asked |
| 30              | most time used                            | 30               | mostly adequate    | 30                   | informative, apt   | 30                  | too few        | 30            | adequate      | 30              | no questions asked |

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

NOTES:

IPPT - March 2019

NOTES:

|  |   |   |  |   |  |   |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| <p>QUESTIONS ASKED</p> <p>0 — too few, mostly irrelevant</p> <p>1 — + suitably allotted to Rep &amp; Opp,</p> <p>2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized,</p> <p>3 — time managed efficiently</p> | <p>REPORT</p> <p>0 — almost no explanation</p> <p>1 — some</p> <p>2 — fair</p> <p>3 — good</p> <p>4 — detailed</p> <p>5 — quite detailed,</p> <p>6 — demonstrative</p> <p>7 — deep and comprehensive, completely testable</p> | <p>REVIEW OF REPORT</p> <p>0 — poor/wrong</p> <p>1 — partial</p> <p>2 — good</p> <p>3 — detailed, complex</p> | <p>REVIEW OF OPPOSITION</p> <p>0 — no</p> <p>1 — poor/wrong</p> <p>2 — partially relevant</p> <p>3 — mostly adequate</p> | <p>DISCUSSION ANALYSIS</p> <p>0 — almost no</p> <p>1 — too short/long</p> <p>2 — accurate, conclusive</p> | <p>MISSED POINTS</p> <p>0 — irrelevant</p> <p>1 — none</p> <p>2 — relevant, constructive</p> | <p>ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS</p> <p>0 — concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p> |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|---|

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

OPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

|   |  |   |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| <p>REPORT</p> <p>0 — almost no explanation</p> <p>1 — some</p> <p>2 — fair</p> <p>3 — good</p> <p>4 — detailed</p> <p>5 — quite detailed,</p> <p>6 — demonstrative</p> <p>7 — deep and comprehensive, completely testable</p> | <p>DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT</p> <p>0 — almost no</p> <p>1 — some</p> <p>2 — fair</p> <p>3 — good</p> <p>4 — sufficient number</p> <p>5 — + results explained</p> <p>6 — errors analysed</p> <p>7 — well fitting, deviations</p> | <p>DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT</p> <p>0 — almost no</p> <p>1 — too few</p> <p>2 — some</p> <p>3 — not well fitting</p> <p>4 — some own input</p> <p>5 — average</p> <p>6 — some parts</p> <p>7 — overall clear, interesting</p> | <p>DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT</p> <p>0 — almost no</p> <p>1 — too few</p> <p>2 — some</p> <p>3 — some aspects fine</p> <p>4 — some aspects</p> <p>5 — good</p> <p>6 — some aspects</p> <p>7 — overall efficient</p> | <p>ANSWERS TO JURY, OPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS</p> <p>0 — concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p> |
|---|--|---|--|--|

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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



SCORESHEET

Rep: India

Opp: New Zealand

Rev: Georgia

sign

8

Krokovny, Pavel

Beqg

**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 - many                                 | good                                 | 2 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |   |
| 3 - good  | good                                   | well performed, sufficient number   | deviations qualitatively analysed             | + some interesting results                | some aspects above average   | some parts well done                 | 3 - + data/theory convincingly supported | some aspects efficient               |  |   |
| 4 - detailed demonstrative                          | quite detailed, correct                | + results explained errors analysed | + theory limits explained, conclusive         | considerable experimental or theoretical  | interesting solution         | overall clear, demonstrative         |  | 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 + 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:

**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                     | 0 too few                              | poor                                 | 0 concise and correct or no questions asked<br>-1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long<br>-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| 1 some 1.5  | some 1.5                               | some                                | some  | review of sources, cited                  | partly                       | partly clear                         | 1 some many                            | some aspects fine                    |   |
| 2 fair  | fair                                   | fair                                | not well fitting                              | some own input                            | average                      | average                              | 2 + data/theory convincingly supported | good                                 |   |
| 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 |  |                                      |   |
| 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                                | 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<br>-1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long<br>-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               |   | 3 all relevant points         | many                      | many correct              | fair           | efficient       | 3 good                     | many correct              | some aspects efficient               | fair           |   |
| 4               |   | 4 practically all points      | practically all           | + improvement suggestions | very good      | + all time used | 4 new crucial point(s)     | + 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   | 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<br>-1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long<br>-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |                           |
| 1               | + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used                   | 1 partial                         | partially relevant | some           | 1 too short/long       | partially relevant | some           | 1 too short/long       | some                 | 0 none                    |   |                           |
| 2               | + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently | 2 good                            | mostly adequate    | reasonable     | 2 informative, apt     | mostly adequate    | reasonable     | 2 relevant parts       | many                 | 1 relevant, constructive  |   |                           |
| 3               |  | 3 detailed, complex               | fully adequate     | good           | 3 condensed & accurate | fully adequate     | good           | 2 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<br>1 <input type="checkbox"/><br>-1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long<br>-2 <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<br>1 <input type="checkbox"/><br>-1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long<br>-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 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<br>1 <input type="checkbox"/><br>-1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long<br>-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 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  |  |   |
|  |  |   |                                       |   |   |  |  |  |  |   |

NOTES:

**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<br>-1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long<br>-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 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 + 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<br>-1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long<br>-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<br>-1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long<br>-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.