

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 7$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 C, Stage: 1, Problem No. 14

sign Szechenyi

Széchenyi, Gábor

Rep: Slovakia

Opp: Thailand

Rev: Greece

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	some aspects fine	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	good	
3 <input checked="" 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			
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			
6 <input type="checkbox"/>									

NOTES: no word about friction in basic physics no error analysing lot of animation

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0.5 = 5.5 \Rightarrow 6$$

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	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 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 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	few	some	some	reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	some	some aspects fine	some	
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	some correct	good	reasonable	
3 <input type="checkbox"/>		3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
4 <input type="checkbox"/>		4 <input type="checkbox"/> 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

$$1 + 0.5 + 1 + 1.5 + 1 \pm 0 = 5$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	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 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	partially relevant	some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	partially relevant	some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	some	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none	
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	many	1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive	
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		
4 <input type="checkbox"/>											

NOTES: no verifying question check the knowledge time management

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 1.5 - 0 = 6.5$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 C, Stage: 1, Problem No. 14

sign SW

Napier, Susan

Rep: Slovakia

Opp: Thailand

Rev: Greece

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6.5$$

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

(2:30)

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 - 0.5 = 6.5$$

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4.7 + 2 - 0 = 8$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 C, Stage: 1, Problem No. 14

sign [Signature]

Maizelis, Zakhar

Rep: Slovakia

Opp: Thailand

Rev: Greece

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

NOTES: *A little unconfident. Full solution,*

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 6$$

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.7 + 1 + 1 + 0.5 - 0 - 0.2 = 4$$

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

9.5

$$1 + 6 + 2.5 - 0 = 9$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 C, Stage: 1, Problem No. 14

sign Paul Lee

Lee, Paul

Rep: Slovakia Samuel Tan

Opp: Thailand

Siniporn

Rev: Greece

Vasile

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 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"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	5 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex, completely testable	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 <input type="checkbox"/> well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental and theoretical	5 <input type="checkbox"/> greater extent than expected	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + complex concepts well communicated	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

6.5

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 - 0 = 7$$

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"/> 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

4.5

$$1 + 0.5 + 2.5 + 1 + 0.5 - 0 - 0 = 5$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 <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"/> none 1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive 2 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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		
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		
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

$$1 + 4.5 + 1.5 - \square = 7$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 C, Stage: 1, Problem No. 14

sign Tomasz Greczyło

Tomasz Greczyło

Greczyło, Tomasz

Rep: Slovakia

Opp: Thailand

Rev: Greece

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	3 <input type="checkbox"/> deviations qualitatively analysed	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + some interesting results	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some parts well done	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	3 <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	4 <input checked="" 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"/>									
7 <input type="checkbox"/>									

NOTES: detailed presentation of the phenomena, lack of conclusions

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.75 + 1.25 + 1.25 - \square = 5$$

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

NOTES: time management and prioritisation to be improved

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 1.25 + 0.5 + 0.25 - \square = 4$$

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

NOTES: wishing almost only the reporter

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5.75 + 2.25 - = 9



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 C, Stage: 2, Problem No. 5

sign Tomasz Greczylo

Greczylo, Tomasz

Rep: Thailand

Opp: Greece

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	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 incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	some aspects fine	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	good	
3 <input type="checkbox"/>							3 <input type="checkbox"/>		
4 <input type="checkbox"/> good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	4 <input type="checkbox"/>		
5 <input type="checkbox"/>							5 <input type="checkbox"/>		
6 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained, errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	6 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
7 <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	7 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	overall efficient	

NOTES: - advanced and complexed model, well presented and discussed

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.75 + 1 + 1.5 - 0.75 = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	some	some aspects fine	some	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	some correct	good	reasonable	
	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 <input checked="" 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: time management to be improved, good talk about theory

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.25 + 2 + 2 + 1 - - = 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	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 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, 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	
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	many	1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive	
3 <input 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	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	

NOTES: prioritisation to be improved

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 6.5 + 3 - 0.5 = 10



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 C, Stage: 2, Problem No. 5

sign Paul Lee

Lee, Paul

Rep: Thailand Chanat

Opp: Greece Vito

Rev: Slovakia Jakub

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 <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	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	4 proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
5 deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated			
6									

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 0.5 + 0.5 - 0 = 2.5

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 1 + 1 ± 0.5 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	0 poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 almost no	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	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	1 partial	partially relevant	some	1 too short/long	partially relevant	some	1 too short/long	some	0 none	
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	2 good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 relevant parts	many	1 relevant, constructive	
3		3 detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	3 accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		
4											

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3.5 + 2 - 0 = 7$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 C, Stage: 2, Problem No. 5

sign [Signature]

Maizelis, Zakhar

Rep: Thailand

Opp: Greece

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 7$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 C, Stage: 2, Problem No. 5

sign Sáčeky

Széchenyi, Gábor

Rep: Thailand

Opp: Greece

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"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> not well fitting	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some own input	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	
3 <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> + results explained errors analysed	4 <input 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 type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex, completely testable	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 <input type="checkbox"/> well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental and theoretical	5 <input type="checkbox"/> greater extent than expected	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + complex concepts well communicated			

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.25 + 0.5 + 0.5 - 0 = 2.25 \Rightarrow 2$$

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost nothing	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no or irrelevant	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> some main points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	1 <input checked="" 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:

few mostly irrelevant

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 0.5 - 0.5 = 5.5 \Rightarrow 6$$

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"/> relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none	
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive	
2 <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 + 2 + 0 = 8



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 C, Stage: 2, Problem No. _____

sign *J. O. N.*

Napier, Susan

Rep: Thailand

Opp: Greece

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	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	1 some	some aspects fine	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	2 + data/theory convincingly supported	good	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	3 proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative			
5 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated			

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1 + 0.5 = 3

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 0.5 = 6

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6.5

1 + 5 + 1 - 0.5 = 6



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 C, Stage: 3, Problem No. 13

sign Paul Lee

Lee, Paul

Rep: Greece

Christos

Opp: Slovakia

Baldan

Rev: Thailand

Charist

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	4 proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
5 deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated			
6									

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 3 + 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	too few, mostly irrelevant	0 almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	0 almost no	too few	poor	no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 few	some	some aspects fine	some	
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 some	some correct	good	reasonable	
		3 all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
		4 practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	all time used	4 new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

8.5

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 + 1.5 + 10.5 - 0.5 = 8

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - = 4



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 C, Stage: 3, Problem No. 13

sign Tomasz Greczyło

Greczyło, Tomasz

Rep: Greece

Opp: Slovakia

Rev: Thailand

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> almost no	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too few	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> unclear, chaotic	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	<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 -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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	<input type="checkbox"/> some	<input type="checkbox"/> some	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> review of sources, cited	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partly	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partly clear	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	<input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	<input type="checkbox"/> fair	<input type="checkbox"/> fair	<input type="checkbox"/> not well fitting	some own input	average	average	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	<input type="checkbox"/> good	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	<input type="checkbox"/> 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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			
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			
6 <input type="checkbox"/>									

NOTES: clarification on the measurements needed, task only partially done, points for discussion

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 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	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	too few	<input type="checkbox"/> poor	<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 -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	some	<input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> main points	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some correct	reasonable	fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some correct	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	<input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	
	3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	many	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many correct	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
	4 <input type="checkbox"/> 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: too long questions in the first phase, made important points, points for discussion needed

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.25 + 2 + 1.5 + 1.25 + 0.5 - = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	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"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	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	
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	mostly adequate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	mostly adequate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive	
	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.6 + 1 - 0 = 3.6 ⇒ 4



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 C, Stage: 3, Problem No. 13

sign *Szedeyi*

Széchenyi, Gábor

Rep: Greece

Opp: Slovakia

Rev: Thailand

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 too few	poor	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	2 many	some aspects fine	
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	good	
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	4 proved deep understanding	some aspects efficient	
5 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated		overall efficient	
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	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	0 almost no	too few	poor	no	0 ✗ concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 few	some	some aspects fine	some	
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 some	some correct	good	reasonable	
3		3 all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
4		4 practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2.5 + 1 + 0.5 - 1 - 0 = 9

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	0 poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 almost no	too few	-1 irrelevant	0 ✗ concise and correct or no questions asked -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	
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	2 good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 relevant parts	many	1 relevant, constructive	
3		3 detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	3 accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		

NOTES:

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 0 - \square = 4$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 C, Stage: 3, Problem No. _____

sign *S. Napier*

Napier, Susan

Rep: Greece

Opp: Slovakia

Rev: Thailand

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - \square = 6$$

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:

4 mins used

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 + 1.5 - \square = 9$$

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.2 + 2 - 0 = 5



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 C, Stage: 3, Problem No. _____ sign _____

Maizelis, Zakhar

Rep: Greece

Opp: Slovakia

Rev: Thailand

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1.7 - 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	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:

Very negative attitude, drawbacks first!

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 1.8 + 1.2 ± 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	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 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	partial	partially relevant	some	1 too short/long	partially relevant	some	1 too short/long	some	0 none	
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 relevant parts	many	1 relevant, constructive	
	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	2 accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		

NOTES: