

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5 + 1.5 - 0 = 7



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 E, Stage: 1, Problem No. 8

sign

Kew

Parker, Kerry

Rep: Slovakia *Henrich Hegedus*

Opp: Germany *F-briem*

Rev: Australia *P. Chugh*

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

NOTES: *difference between sound and wave in metal not clear. The lines on the spectrogram are all a bit convoluted. echoes not v. clear.*

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2.5 - 0 = 7

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

NOTES: *microphone modes (esp torsional) - amplifier - good point.*

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.25 + 1.25 + 1.25 + 1.25 + 0.25 - 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	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	almost no	too few	-1	irrelevant	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	partial	partially relevant	some	too short/long	partially relevant	some	too short/long	some	0	none	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	relevant parts	many	1	relevant, constructive	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate	2			

NOTES: *"not reproducible at all"* *"did not mention torsions"*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.5 + 1 - 0.5 = 6



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 E, Stage: 1, Problem No. 8

sign *[Signature]*
Fazio

Alorić, Aleksandra

Rep: Slovakia *Havríček*

Opp: Germany

Rev: Australia *Pranov*

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 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked	
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	some	some aspects fine	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	many	good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient		
4	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	proved deep understanding	overall efficient		
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative				
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated				
7											

NOTES:

* would expect here relevant exp/theory comparison, fitting here to single spectrum is fine for proof of concept

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.7 + 2.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	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 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked	
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	few	some	some aspects fine	some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 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	-1 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
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 + 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	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	almost no	too few	-1	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked	
1	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	partial	partially relevant	some	too short/long	partially relevant	some	too short/long	some	0	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	relevant parts	many	1	-1 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
3		detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate	2		

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 1.5 - 0 = 6.0



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 E, Stage: 1, Problem No. 8

sign

Eschenazi Elia

Eschenazi, Elia

Rep: Slovakia

Opp: Germany

Rev: Australia

REPORT							DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no/ almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> others' data, incorrectly cited	0 <input type="checkbox"/> misunderstood	0 <input type="checkbox"/> unclear, chaotic	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> review of sources, cited	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly clear	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> not well fitting	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some own input	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	3 <input type="checkbox"/> deviations qualitatively analysed	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + some interesting results	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some parts well done	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	4 <input type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + results explained errors analysed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental or theoretical	4 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall clear, demonstrative	4 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex, completely testable	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 <input type="checkbox"/> well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental and theoretical	5 <input type="checkbox"/> greater extent than expected	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + complex concepts well communicated			
6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>			
7 <input type="checkbox"/>	7 <input type="checkbox"/>	7 <input type="checkbox"/>	7 <input type="checkbox"/>	7 <input type="checkbox"/>	7 <input type="checkbox"/>	7 <input type="checkbox"/>			

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 8

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 1.5 - 0 = 6



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 E, Stage: 1, Problem No. 8

8

sign

Igor Timoshchenko

Timoshchenko, Igor

Rep: Slovakia

Opp: Germany

Rev: Australia

REPORT							DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no/ almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> others' data, incorrectly cited	0 <input type="checkbox"/> misunderstood	0 <input type="checkbox"/> unclear, chaotic	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 3 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> review of sources, cited	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly clear	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> not well fitting	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some own input	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	3 <input type="checkbox"/> deviations	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"/> qualitatively 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"/> 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 + 1 + 2.5 + 2 - 0 = 7

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 1.5 - 0 = 6.5 \approx 6$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 E, Stage: 1, Problem No. 8

sign hw

Wattanakasiwich, Pornrat

Rep: Slovakia

Opp: Germany

Rev: Australia

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 7.5 \approx 7$$

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 2 + 2 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 6.5 \approx 6$$

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

NOTES:

REPORTER ^{3.5}
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 4 + 1.5 - 0 = 6



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 E, Stage: 2, Problem No. 9

sign Kerry Parker

Parker, Kerry

Rep: Germany Frederick G. Opp: Australia Angad Singh. Rev: Slovakia Jakub Stavina

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	
0 --- almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked -1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 --- some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	
2 --- fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	
3 --- good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	
4 --- detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	
5 --- 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	
6 --- deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight							

NOTES: no mention of soya sauce.

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	almost no	too few	poor	no	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked -1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 --- relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	few	some	some aspects fine	some	
2 --- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	some	some correct	good	reasonable	
	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: no mention of soya sauce. opp points a bit picky.

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

NOTES: Vague mention of 'why soya sauce'

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2.5 - / = 8



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 E, Stage: 2, Problem No. 9

sign

Alexandra Aloric

Alorić, Aleksandra

Rep: Germany *FEDERIK*

Opp: Australia *ANGLAD*

Rev: Slovakia

JARUB

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

new physics insights/laws contributed to discussion, very well!

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 1.5 - / = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost nothing	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no or irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some main points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	1 <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input checked="" 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 + 0.5 + 2 + 1 + 0.5 - / = 5

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4.0 + 2.5 - 0 = 7.0



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 E, Stage: 2, Problem No. 9

sign

Eschenazi, Elia

Rep: Germany

Opp: Australia

Rev: Slovakia

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2.0 + 2.0 + 1 - 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 too few, mostly irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 almost no	too few	-1 irrelevant	0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	partial	partially relevant	some	1 too short/long	partially relevant	some	1 too short/long	some	0 none	
2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 relevant parts	many	1 relevant, constructive	
3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	3 accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2 - 0 = 7



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 E, Stage: 2, Problem No. 9

sign

[Handwritten Signature]

Timoshchenko, Igor

Rep: Germany

Opp: Australia

Rev: Slovakia

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 - 0 = 7

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 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 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	-1 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions -1 <input type="checkbox"/> -2 <input type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> none	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive	
	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> condensed & accurate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate		

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2 - 0 = 7



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 E, Stage: 2, Problem No. 9

sign

ks

Wattanakasiwich, Pornrat

Rep: Germany

Opp: Australia

Rev: Slovakia

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 2 + 1 + 1 ± 0 - 0 = 5.5 ≈ 5

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 4$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 E, Stage: 3, Problem No. 1

sign

Ken A.

Parker, Kerry

Rep: Australia

Opp: Slovakia

Rev: Germany

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

NOTES: *No tests for ω on final version.*

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 - 1 = 6$$

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

NOTES: *Did not point out lack of optimization.*

VanderGraaf voltage isn't constant!

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

NOTES: *Mentions ✓ from VanderGraaf.*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 1 - 1 = 5



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 E, Stage: 3, Problem No. 1

sign

dybd

Alorić, Aleksandra

Rep: Australia *FRANCO*

Opp: Slovakia *SMOER*

Rev: Germany *FREDERIK*

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 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions -2 —
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	1 — × many	× good	
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	
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			
6 —									

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 1 = 5

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 + 1 + 0.5 - 1 = 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 — too few, mostly irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 — poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 — almost no	too few	-1 — irrelevant	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions -2 —
1 — relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	partial	partially relevant	some	1 — too short/long	partially relevant	some	1 — too short/long	some	0 — none	
2 — + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	× good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 — informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 — × relevant parts	many	1 — × relevant, constructive	
3 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	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 + 1.0 - 0 = 4.5



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 E, Stage: 3, Problem No. 1

sign *[Signature]*

Eschenazi, Elia

Rep: Australia

Opp: Slovakia

Rev: Germany

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	1	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	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	0 almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	0 almost no	too few	poor	no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	1 some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 few	some	some aspects fine	some	
2		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 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 8.0

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT		ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	1	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0	1	
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	0 poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 almost no	too few	-1 irrelevant	0	0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -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	1	
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	2	
		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 E, Stage: 3, Problem No. 1

sign [Signature]

Timoshchenko, Igor

Rep: Australia

Opp: Slovakia

Rev: Germany

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			
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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> not well fitting <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some own input <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>			
4 <input type="checkbox"/> good	4 <input type="checkbox"/> good	4 <input type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	4 <input type="checkbox"/> deviations qualitatively analysed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + some interesting results	4 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average	4 <input type="checkbox"/> some parts well done <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>			
5 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>			
6 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	6 <input type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct	6 <input type="checkbox"/> + results explained errors analysed	6 <input type="checkbox"/> + theory limits explained, conclusive	6 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental or theoretical	6 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	6 <input type="checkbox"/> overall clear, demonstrative	6 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	6 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient			
7 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	7 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex, completely testable	7 <input type="checkbox"/> + reproducible, convincing analysis	7 <input type="checkbox"/> well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	7 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental and theoretical	7 <input type="checkbox"/> greater extent than expected	7 <input type="checkbox"/> + complex concepts well communicated	7 <input type="checkbox"/>	7 <input type="checkbox"/>			

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2 + 1 + 0.5 - 0 = 8$$

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"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	-1 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/>
1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + ~~2~~ - 0.5 = 5



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 E, Stage: 3, Problem No. 1

sign *hs*

Wattanakasiwich, Pornrat

Rep: Australia

Opp: Slovakia

Rev: Germany

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 6.5 ≈ 6

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 9

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

NOTES: