

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 0.5 - 0 = 2



SCORESHEET

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

sign Florian

Ho, I leng

Rep: India

Opp: Switzerland

Rev: Croatia

REPORT

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 5

present how to construct the theory

1. Use diagram to present the 5min. experiment result
2. $T_1 = T_2 e^{\mu \theta}$ physics. 7=35min

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

NOTES:

3 3 1.5 1.5 3

conclusion you suggest not reline on reporter experimental data.

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1 + 0.7 + 0.5 - 0.5 = 4

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

NOTES:

1. 53.

1. more of ratios
2. releasing method
3. mass ratio and the phenomenon pattern formation.

linear relationship.

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 4



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 H, Stage: 1, Problem No. _____ sign _____

Lin, Ryan Hsiao-Tzu

Rep: India

Opp: Switzerland

Rev: Croatia

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 - too few, mostly irrelevant	0 - poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 - poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 - almost no	too few	-1 - irrelevant	0 - concise and correct or no questions asked -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 - accurate, conclusive	fully adequate	1 - relevant, constructive	
	3 - detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 - condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good				

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 3.5 \approx 3$$



SCORESHEET

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

sign h5

Wattanakasiwich, Pornrat

Rep: India

Opp: Switzerland

Rev: Croatia

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no/ almost no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> others' data, incorrectly cited	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> misunderstood	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> unclear, chaotic	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> review of sources, cited	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partly	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partly clear	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	1 <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> not well fitting	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some own input	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input checked="" 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

$$1 + 1 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost nothing	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no or irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	1 <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> very good	4 <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 2.5 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 - 0.5 = 7$$

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"/> relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none	1 <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive	2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> condensed & accurate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate		

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 4



SCORESHEET

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

sign

Yoon

Yoon, Young-Gui

Rep: India

Opp: Switzerland

Rev: Croatia

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation		
0 <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	some main points	1 <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	main points	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some correct	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	reasonable	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	fair	
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"/>	fair	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	efficient	
4 <input type="checkbox"/>		4 <input type="checkbox"/>	practically all points	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	practically all	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	+ improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	very good	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	+ all time used	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
		report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions			
0 <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	partial	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	partially relevant	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	too short/long	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some	
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	relevant parts	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	many	
3 <input type="checkbox"/>		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:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 14 - / = 4



SCORESHEET

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

sign *Alyssa*
OSKARI

Alorić, Aleksandra

Rep: India *HARSH*

Opp: Switzerland

Rev: Croatia *G. Pravec*

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 12 + 25 + 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"/> relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some main points	few	some	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	some	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	<input checked="" 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	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	some correct	good	reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	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

1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1 + 1.5 ± / - / = 5

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 6.5 + 2.5 - / = 9



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 H, Stage: 2, Problem No. 1

Rep: Switzerland

MICHAEL

Opp: Croatia

sign

MARCO

Rev: India

ANANYA

Alorić, Aleksandra

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 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 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 + 0.5 + 2 + 1 + 0.5 ± / - / = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 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 + 5.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 8



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 H, Stage: 2, Problem No. 1

sign Ho I IBWn

Ho, I leng

Rep: Switzerland

Opp: Croatia

Rev: India

REPORT							DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 <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"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
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"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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	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: 6 5 5 5 6 6 6

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.6 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost nothing	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no or irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input type="checkbox"/> 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"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
	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	3 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	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: 2 2 2 2 2 2 2.5 2.5 2

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 1.6 + 0.5 - 1 - 0 = 5

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

NOTES:

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2 - 0 = 7



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 H, Stage: 2, Problem No. 1

sign *[Signature]*

Lin, Ryan Hsiao-Tzu

Rep: Switzerland *Michael*

Opp: Croatia

Rev: India

REPORT								DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion		
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	0 too few	poor	0 concise and correct or no questions asked	
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:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 7

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0 irrelevant	
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	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	partial	partially relevant	some	1 too short/long	partially relevant	some	1 too short/long	some	2 none	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 relevant parts	many	1 relevant, constructive	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 + 5 + 2 - 0 = 8



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 H, Stage: 2, Problem No. 1

sign h

Wattanakasiwich, Pornrat

Rep: Switzerland

Opp: Croatia

Rev: India

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 2 + 2 - 0.5 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 <input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some main points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/> main points	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> very good	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + all time used	4 <input type="checkbox"/> new crucial point(s)	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 0.5 - 1 = 4

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 1.5 - 0 = 6



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 H, Stage: 2, Problem No. 1

sign *Yoon*

Yoon, Young-Gui

Rep: Switzerland

Opp: Croatia

Rev: India

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1 + 1.5 - 0 = 4

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1 + 0.5 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 4

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 1.5 - 0 = 5



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 H, Stage: 3, Problem No. 8

sign *Yoon*

Yoon, Young-Gui

Rep: Croatia

Opp: India

Rev: Switzerland

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	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	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	some aspects fine	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	good	
3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	3 <input checked="" 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"/>									
7 <input type="checkbox"/>									

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 = 5

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

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 8

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 2 - 0 = 5.5 ≈ 5



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 H, Stage: 3, Problem No. 8

sign *hw*

Wattanakasiwich, Pornrat

Rep: Croatia

Opp: India

Rev: Switzerland

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 5

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1 - 0.5 - 0 = 6.5

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant	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	partial	partially relevant	some	1 — too short/long	partially relevant	some	1 — too short/long	some	0 — none	
2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 — informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	1 — relevant parts	many	1 — relevant, constructive	
	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 — condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	2 — accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		

NOTES:

limitation of Euler-Bernoulli

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.5 + 2 - 0 = 6.5



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 H, Stage: 3, Problem No. 8

sign *[Signature]*

Lin, Ryan Hsiao-Tzu

Rep: Croatia

Opp: India

Rev: Switzerland

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 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 - 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		
	3 - detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 - condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	3 - accurate, conclusive	fully adequate	1 - relevant, constructive	

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 4



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 H, Stage: 3, Problem No. 8

sign *Ho IIR 07*

777 70

Ho, I leng

Rep: Croatia

Opp: India

Rev: Switzerland

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	detailed 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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
2	many	good
3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
4	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

- 0 ___ concise and correct or no questions asked
- 1 ___ some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- 2 ___ deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.2 + 1.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 ___ too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 ___ relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- 2 ___ + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

- 0 ___ concise and correct or no questions asked
- 1 ___ some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- 2 ___ deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES: = shape of sinky

no. fix point → Assumptive of theory.

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 1.5 + 1 - 0.6 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 ___ irrelevant
- 0 ___ none
- 1 ___ relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

- 0 ___ concise and correct or no questions asked
- 1 ___ some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- 2 ___ deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES: velocity group - Damping

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 1 = 5



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 H, Stage: 3, Problem No. 8

Rep: Croatia *FHP*

Opp: India

sign *dyed*
MAYANKU

Rev: Switzerland

Alorić, Aleksandra
Daniel

REPORT							DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no/ almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> others' data, incorrectly cited	0 <input type="checkbox"/> misunderstood	0 <input type="checkbox"/> unclear, chaotic	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> review of sources, cited	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly clear	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	
2 <input 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 type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	3 <input type="checkbox"/> deviations qualitatively analysed	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + some interesting results	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some parts well done	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	4 <input type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + results explained errors analysed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental or theoretical	4 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall clear, demonstrative	4 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex, completely testable	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 <input type="checkbox"/> well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental and theoretical	5 <input type="checkbox"/> greater extent than expected	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + complex concepts well communicated			
6 <input type="checkbox"/>									

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 3 + 2.5 - 1 = 7

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

NOTES: