

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4.5 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 7



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 D, Stage: 3, Problem No. 15

sign *Maria Anghel*

Anghel, Maria

Rep: Russia

Opp: Korea

Rev: Belarus

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

NOTES: Explained all relevant losses, and investigated most of them. Did not explain limitations of theory.

Made arguments for his solution, though not entirely convincing.

Simulation error's method.

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.75 + 3.5 - = 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"/>	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	
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"/>	good	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	fair	
3 <input type="checkbox"/>		3 <input type="checkbox"/>	all relevant points	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	many	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	many correct	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	some aspects efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	very good	
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"/>	overall efficient	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	all time used	

NOTES: Good questions

Clear understanding of presentation but could have used time to explain opinions instead of discussion points.

Excellent handling of discussion and good detail. ~~They~~ should have more time management & opinions.

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.75 + 2.5 + 3 + 1.75 + 0.5 - = 10

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"/>	almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	too few	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	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"/>	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"/>	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"/>	accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	fully adequate	
4 <input type="checkbox"/>		4 <input type="checkbox"/>		4 <input type="checkbox"/>		4 <input type="checkbox"/>		4 <input type="checkbox"/>		4 <input type="checkbox"/>		

NOTES: Great questions

Good overview, captured miss. points

Very good overview of both opponent's and speech.

A bit rushed but very good opinions & suggestions

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 D, Stage: 3, Problem No. 15

sign Maciej Kolwas

Kolwas, Maciej

Rep: Russia

Opp: Korea

Rev: Belarus

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 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 8

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2 + 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 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	-1 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	0 <input type="checkbox"/> none	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <input type="checkbox"/> + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive	2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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 + 5 + 1,5 - 0,25 = 7



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 D, Stage: 3, Problem No. 15

sign

Michaloudis, Apostolos

Rep: Russia

Opp: Korea

Rev: Belarus

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				
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				

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,5 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 9 (1,8,5)

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	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,5 + 2 + 1,75 + 1,25 ± 0 - 0 = 7 (7,5)

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 + 4.25 + 1.25 - 0.25 = 6



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 D, Stage: 3, Problem No. 15

sign *J. Jodi's*

Izadi, Dina

Rep: Russia

Opp: Korea

Rev: Belarus

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	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 ___ some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 ___ some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 ___ deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 few	some	some aspects fine	some	
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 some	some correct	good	reasonable	
	3 all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
	4 practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.75 + 1.5 + 1.25 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	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 ___ some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 ___ some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 ___ deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	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	2 accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5.5

1 + 3 + 1.5 - = 6



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 D, Stage: 3, Problem No. 15

sign *[Signature]*

Pussadee, Nirut

Rep: Russia

Opp: Korea

Rev: Belarus

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: definition of τ

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7.5

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2.5 - = 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"/>	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"/>	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"/>	good	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	fair	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"/>	some aspects efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	fair	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"/>	overall efficient	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	very good	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	very good		

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 1.5 + 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	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"/>	some	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	none	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	good	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	many	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	relevant, constructive	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		3 <input type="checkbox"/>	detailed, complex	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	good	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	fully adequate				

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 7.75 - = 7



SCORESHEET

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

sign *Maria Anghel*

Anghel, Maria

Rep: Korea

Opp: Belarus

Rev: Russia

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
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"/> no questions asked
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"/> some incorrect,
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	3 <input type="checkbox"/> inconclusive or too long
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 type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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: A lot of work, good theory and excellent setup. Should explain limits of theory and be more clear in communicating condition for phenomenon to happen.

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.25 + 2.75 + 1.75 - = 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"/>	poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	some main points	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	few	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	some	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	some	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	main points	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	some	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		3 <input type="checkbox"/>	all relevant points	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	many	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	many correct	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	fair	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	efficient		
		4 <input type="checkbox"/>	practically all points	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	practically all	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	+ improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	very good	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	+ all time used		

NOTES: Good points, but time management wasn't good. Should have prioritized more important topics.

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 7.5 + 2.5 + 7.75 + 0.75 - - = 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"/>	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"/>	some	1 <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	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	good	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"/>	detailed, complex	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	good	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	fully adequate				

NOTES: Great questions but some did not have follow up in presentation. Picked up on many important points! But time should be managed more efficiently in order to bring forward critical missing points (eg. initial angle, etc)

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7.5

1 + 4.5 + 2 - [] = 8



SCORESHEET

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

14

sign

Pussadee, Nirut

Rep: Korea

Opp: Belarus

Rev: Russia

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"/> 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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 - [] = 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	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"/> 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	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 type="checkbox"/> main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	some correct	good	reasonable	
	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"/> 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

7.5

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 + 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 <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 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	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 type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	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"/> detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good		fully adequate		

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5 + 1 - = 7



SCORESHEET

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

sign *Mary Kolwas*

Kolwas, Maciej

Rep: Korea

Opp: Belarus

Rev: Russia

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> not well fitting	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some own input	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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: *nice conclusions used at point what was done was done well*

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 3 + 3 - = 9

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 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	2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> efficient	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient	3 <input checked="" 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: *Very deep knowledge about phenomenon*

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 3 + 3 + 15 - - = 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	-1 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	0 <input type="checkbox"/> none	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive	2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> condensed & accurate	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fully adequate		

NOTES: *very good*

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5,5 + 1,5 - 0,25 = 8



SCORESHEET

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

sign

[Signature]

Michaloudis, Apostolos

Rep: Korea

Opp: Belarus

Rev: Russia

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	4 <input type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct	4 <input type="checkbox"/> results explained	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental or theoretical	4 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall clear, demonstrative	4 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> demonstrative	5 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex, completely testable	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 <input type="checkbox"/> well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental and theoretical	5 <input type="checkbox"/> greater extent than expected	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + complex concepts well communicated			
6 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight									

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,25 + 3,75 + 3 - 0,25 = 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 + 1,5 + 2 + 2 + 1 ± 0 - 0 = 8 (7,5)

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	-1 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> 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

$$1 + 0.75 + 1 - 0 = 2.75$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 D, Stage: 1, Problem No. _____

sign A. J. J.

Izadi, Dina

Rep: Korea

Opp: Belarus

Rev: Russia

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

$$1 + 0.75 + 1.25 + 1.5 - 0 = 4.5$$

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	X relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 some main points	few	X some	X some	reasonable	1 few	some	X some aspects fine	X some	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 main points	X some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 X some	X 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

$$1 + 0.75 + 1 + 0.5 + 0.5 - 0 = 3.75$$

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	X no	0 almost no	too few	-1 irrelevant	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1	X relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	1 partial	partially relevant	X some	1 X too short/long	X partially relevant	some	1 X too short/long	X some	0 none	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
	+ 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 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		3 detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	3 accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		

NOTES:

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2 + 0.5 - 2 = 2



SCORESHEET
 Fight 5 D, Stage: 2, Problem No. 4
 Rep: Belarus Opp: Russia

sign *Maria Anghel*

Anghel, Maria

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS		
								relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion			
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	0	too few	poor	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	1	some	some aspects fine	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	2	many	good	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	3	
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: Good explanation of phenomenon. However, it is very unclear to me what was simulated and what was experiment. Reporter could not defend solution well in discussion. Reported did not know what model they were using. I would rather have only experiments than a presentation with a simulation that the reporter doesn't understand.

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2.5 = 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	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	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	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2	some	some correct	good	reasonable	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	3	
		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	4	

NOTES: Great questions, just could have had more.

Touched upon very good points in their discussion constructive. would have liked more exp. discussion.

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2 + 1.5 + 0.25 = 9

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS			
	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions					
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0	almost no	too few	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	partial	partially relevant	some	1	too short/long	partially relevant	some	1	too short/long	some	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	2	relevant parts	many	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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	3	

NOTES: Excellent review, clearly knows problem: advanced fluid dynamics. too much time on flow separation.

didn't have time to explain

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.5 + 1 - = 6



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 D, Stage: 2, Problem No. 4

sign *[Signature]*

Pussadee, Nirut

Rep: Belarus

Opp: Russia

Rev: Korea

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

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - =



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 D, Stage: 2, Problem No. 4

sign *Maciej Kolwas*

Kolwas, Maciej

Rep: Belarus

Opp: Russia

Rev: Korea

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			
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:

missed picking-up part

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 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 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:

does not discussed picking-up?

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2 + 2 - - =

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:

OK

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.75 + 1.5 - 0.25 = 5



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 D, Stage: 2, Problem No. 4

sign *A. Jodis*

Izadi, Dina

Rep: Belarus

Opp: Russia

Rev: Korea

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 -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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some own input	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> average	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	good	
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			
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"/> 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	3 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	overall efficient	

NOTES: lack of discussion on comparison theory and experiment and also neglect of viscosity according to Re which was wrong

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.25 + 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 <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"/> 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some correct	reasonable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	some correct	good	reasonable	
	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many correct	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 + 1.25 + 2 + 2 + 1.25 - 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	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> none	
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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		

NOTES: lack of dis, lack of time to manage and talk about missed points

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

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3,5 + 1,25 - 0 = 6



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 D, Stage: 2, Problem No. 4

sign

Michaloudis, Apostolos

Rep: Belarus

Opp: Russia

Rev: Korea

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,25 + 2,25 + 2 - 0 = 7 (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 <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 + 1,25 + 1,75 + 1,25 + 1,25 ± 0 - 0 = 6 (6,7)

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: