

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3.5 + 1.75 - 0.25 = 6$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 I, Stage: 1, Problem No. 12

sign

Douglas, Alistair

Rep: Hungary

Opp: United Kingdom

Rev: Chinese Taipei

| 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported | 3 <input checked="" 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: Good presentation. Super model. Fit of experiment to data is lab out. Should have tried a quantitative explanation for poor fit.

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

| QUESTIONS ASKED | OPPOSITION (SPEECH) | | | | | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER | | | | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | own opinions presented | prioritisation | time management | relevant scientific topics | own opinions presented | opponent's conduct of the discussion | prioritisation | |
| 0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost nothing | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> no or irrelevant | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> no | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> no | 0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 1 <input 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 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: Good opposing. Relevant questions and physics discussion - maybe some more questions.

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2.25 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 8$$

| QUESTIONS ASKED | REVIEW OF REPORT | | | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION | | | DISCUSSION ANALYSIS | | MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT | ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| | report evaluation & understanding | pros & cons | prioritisation | speech evaluation | pros & cons | prioritisation | discussion evaluation | correct own opinions | | |
| 0 <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"/> 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 |
| 1 <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant parts | 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many | 1 <input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 - 0 = 6



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 I, Stage: 1, Problem No. 12

sign

Kulinskyi, Volodymyr

Rep: Hungary

Opp: United Kingdom

Rev: Chinese Taipei

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 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 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 + 2 + 1.5 + 1 + 0 ± 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 |
| 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 + 2 - 0 = 7



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 I, Stage: 1, Problem No. 12

sign *[Signature]*

Rep: Hungary *Daniel*

Opp: United Kingdom

Rev: Chinese Taipei

Krokovny, Pavel

KAREN

| 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 type="checkbox"/> some | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> review of sources, cited | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly clear | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine | |
| 2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> not well fitting | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> some own input | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> average | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> average | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> many | 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good | |
| 3 <input type="checkbox"/> good | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> good | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> deviations qualitatively analysed | 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + some interesting results | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> some parts well done | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient | |
| 4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative | 4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct | 4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + results explained errors analysed | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> + theory limits explained, conclusive | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental or theoretical | 4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> interesting solution | 4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> overall clear, demonstrative | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient | |
| 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | | | |
| 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | | | |
| 7 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex, completely testable | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> + reproducible, convincing analysis | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental and theoretical | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> greater extent than expected | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> + complex concepts well communicated | | | |

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"/> 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"/> -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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> some | 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> few | 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some | |
| 2 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used | 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> main points | 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> some | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct | 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good | 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable | |
| | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> many | 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many correct | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> fair | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> efficient | 3 <input checked="" 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 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0.5 - 0 = 7

| QUESTIONS ASKED | REVIEW OF REPORT | | | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION | | | DISCUSSION ANALYSIS | | MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT | ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| | report evaluation & understanding | pros & cons | prioritisation | speech evaluation | pros & cons | prioritisation | discussion evaluation | correct own opinions | | |
| 0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> no | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> no | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few | -1 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant | 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 type="checkbox"/> partial | 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partially relevant | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some | 0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none | |
| 2 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently | 2 <input 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"/> 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 + 1 - 0 = 5



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 I, Stage: 1, Problem No. 12

sign *Orsford*

Eschenazi, Elia

Rep: Hungary

Opp: United Kingdom

Rev: Chinese Taipei

| 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 + 1.0 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 5

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 7



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 I, Stage: 1, Problem No. 12

sign *Eric*

Schertenleib, Eric

Rep: Hungary

Opp: United Kingdom

Rev: Chinese Taipei

| 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: free axo case not discussed at all
good model

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 = 6

| QUESTIONS ASKED | OPPOSITION (SPEECH) | | | | | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER | | | | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------|---|
| | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | own opinions presented | prioritisation | time management | relevant scientific topics | own opinions presented | opponent's conduct of the discussion | prioritisation | |
| 0 too few, mostly irrelevant | 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 + 1.25 + 3.75 + 1.5 + 1 ± 0.5 - 0 = 7

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 I, Stage: 2, Problem No. 13

sign

Kulinskyi, Volodymyr

Rep: United Kingdom

Opp: Chinese Taipei

Rev: Hungary

| 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 average | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly clear average | 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"/> some aspects above average | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> some parts well done | 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"/> interesting solution | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> overall clear, demonstrative | 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"/> greater extent than expected | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> + complex concepts well communicated | | | |
| 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 | | | | | |

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2,5 + 2,5 + 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"/> 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 good | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct, many 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"/> new crucial point(s) | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions | 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"/> overall efficient | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good | |

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0,5 + 2 + 2 + 1 - - = 7

| QUESTIONS ASKED | REVIEW OF REPORT | | | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION | | | DISCUSSION ANALYSIS | | MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT | ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS |
|---|--|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| | report evaluation & understanding | pros & cons | prioritisation | speech evaluation | pros & cons | prioritisation | discussion evaluation | correct own opinions | | |
| 0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant | 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"/> + 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 type="checkbox"/> good | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> many | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive | -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 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 + 2 - 0 = 5



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 I, Stage: 2, Problem No. 13

sign

Signature

Krokovny, Pavel

Rep: United Kingdom *Adrian*

Opp: Chinese Taipei

Rev: Hungary *Victoria*

MARC

Rev: Hungary

Victoria

| 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 type="checkbox"/> some | 1 <input 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 type="checkbox"/> partly | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly clear | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine | |
| 2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair | 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair | 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair | 2 <input 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 type="checkbox"/> many | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> good | |
| 3 <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient | |
| 4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> + results explained errors analysed | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> + theory limits explained, conclusive | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental or theoretical | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting solution | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall clear, demonstrative | | | |
| 5 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex, completely testable | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> + reproducible, convincing analysis | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental and theoretical | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> greater extent than expected | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> + complex concepts well communicated | | | |
| 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | |

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2.5 - 0 = 7

| QUESTIONS ASKED | OPPOSITION (SPEECH) | | | | | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER | | | | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | own opinions presented | prioritisation | time management | relevant scientific topics | own opinions presented | opponent's conduct of the discussion | prioritisation | |
| 0 <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> poor | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no | 0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too few | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> no | 0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> -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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> some | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some | 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> few | 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some | |
| 2 <input checked="" 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"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> many | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> many correct | 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> efficient | 3 <input checked="" 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 + 1.7 + 1.7 - 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 | 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"/> -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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used | 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good | 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate | 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable | 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> informative, apt | 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate | 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> many | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive | |
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive | 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fully adequate | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

NOTES:

REPORTER ³

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + ~~1~~ + 1.5 - 0 = 6



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 I, Stage: 2, Problem No. 13

sign Ba

Douglas, Alistair

Rep: United Kingdom

Opp: Chinese Taipei

Rev: Hungary

| 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 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 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 comprehensive, shows physical insight | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex, completely testable | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> + reproducible, convincing analysis | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental and theoretical | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> greater extent than expected | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> + complex concepts well communicated | | | | |
| 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| 7 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |

NOTES: Varied Moire pitch and gave qualitative results. No indication of difference in pitch or results.

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 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 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 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"/> -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"/> | | 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"/> | | 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 | |
| 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | |

NOTES: Didn't cover enough of our topics - too much time on one

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1 ± 0.25 - 0 = 6

| QUESTIONS ASKED | | REVIEW OF REPORT | | | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION | | | DISCUSSION ANALYSIS | | MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT | ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| | | report evaluation & understanding | pros & cons | prioritisation | speech evaluation | pros & cons | prioritisation | discussion evaluation | correct own opinions | | |
| 0 <input checked="" 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"/> -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 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 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 | | |
| 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | |

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 0.5 - 0 = 4



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 I, Stage: 2, Problem No. 13

sign *Eschenazi, Elia*

Eschenazi, Elia

Rep: United Kingdom

Opp: Chinese Taipei

Rev: Hungary

| 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 + 6 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 7

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 + 1 ± 0 - 0 = 7

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 I, Stage: 2, Problem No. 13

sign [Signature]

Schertenleib, Eric

Rep: United Kingdom

Opp: Chinese Taipei

Rev: Hungary

| 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

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

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.25 + 1.5 + 2 + 1.25 - 0 = 7$$

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2 - 0 = 7



SCORESHEET

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

sign *Eric*

Schertenleib, Eric

Rep: Chinese Taipei

Opp: Hungary

Rev: United Kingdom

| 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 + 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 — 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 + 1.0 + 2 + 1.5 + 0.5 - 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 -1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| 1 — relevant, meant to clarify unclear points | 1 — partial | partially relevant | some | 1 — too short/long | partially relevant | some | 1 — too short/long | some | 0 — none | |
| 2 — + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used | 2 — good | mostly adequate | reasonable | 2 — informative, apt | mostly adequate | reasonable | 2 — relevant parts | many | 1 — relevant, constructive | |
| 3 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently | 3 — detailed, complex | fully adequate | good | 3 — condensed & accurate | fully adequate | good | 3 — accurate, conclusive | fully adequate | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

NOTES:

own opp. mss.

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3.5 + 1 - \square = 6$$



SCORESHEET

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

sign _____

Kulinskyi, Volodymyr

Rep: Chinese Taipei

Opp: Hungary

Rev: United Kingdom

| 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

$$1 + 1 + 2.5 + 1.0 - \square = 6$$

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - \square = 6$$

| QUESTIONS ASKED | | REVIEW OF REPORT | | | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION | | | DISCUSSION ANALYSIS | | MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT | ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--|
| 0 | 2 | report evaluation & understanding | pros & cons | prioritisation | speech evaluation | pros & cons | prioritisation | discussion evaluation | correct own opinions | | |
| 0 too few, mostly irrelevant | relevant, meant to clarify unclear points | 0 poor/wrong | irrelevant | no | 0 poor/wrong | irrelevant | no | 0 almost no | too few | -1 irrelevant | 0 concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 1 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used | | 1 partial | partially relevant | some | 1 too short/long | partially relevant | some | 1 too short/long | some | 0 none | 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long |
| 2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently | | 2 good | mostly adequate | reasonable | 2 informative, apt | mostly adequate | reasonable | 2 relevant parts | many | 1 relevant, constructive | 2 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 + 4 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 6



SCORESHEET

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

sign [Signature]

Krokovny, Pavel

Rep: Chinese Taipei

Yu-Cheng

Opp: Hungary

Boglarzka

Rev: United Kingdom

Adam

| 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative | 4 <input checked="" 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 + 1.7 - 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> main points | 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some | 2 <input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> many correct | 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair | 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> efficient | 3 <input checked="" 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 + 1.5 + 0.5 ± 0 - 0 = 6

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4.5 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 7



SCORESHEET

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

sign

Bmo

Douglas, Alistair

Rep: Chinese Taipei

Opp: Hungary

Rev: United Kingdom

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

NOTES: More results could be shown → lots of info coming out in discussion. Good discussion of characteristics of Sci. Sand - bss do frequency etc.

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1.75 + 2.5 - 0.5 = 6

| QUESTIONS ASKED | | OPPOSITION (SPEECH) | | | | | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER | | | | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|--|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| | | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | own opinions presented | prioritisation | time management | relevant scientific topics | own opinions presented | opponent's conduct of the discussion | prioritisation | |
| 0 <input 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> some | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> few | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some | 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> some correct | 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair | 2 <input 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"/> | | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> many | 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many correct | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> fair | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> efficient | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> good | 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many correct | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> fair | |
| 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all points | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> + all time used | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> new crucial point(s) | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good | |

NOTES: Not satisfied with explanation of dispersion of sound wave in spring...

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1.25 + 0.75 ± 0.5 - 0 = 6

| QUESTIONS ASKED | | REVIEW OF REPORT | | | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION | | | DISCUSSION ANALYSIS | | MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT | ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| | | report evaluation & understanding | pros & cons | prioritisation | speech evaluation | pros & cons | prioritisation | discussion evaluation | correct own opinions | | |
| 0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | too few, mostly irrelevant | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> no | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> no | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant | 0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant | 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long | 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partially relevant | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long | 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some | 1 <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> informative, apt | 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable | 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant parts | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> many | 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| 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"/> 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: Mentioned that reporter did not consider a rod instead of a spring but we did.

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 4 + 1.5 - 0 = 7$



SCORESHEET

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

sign OOB

Eschenazi, Elia

Rep: Chinese Taipei

Opp: Hungary

Rev: United Kingdom

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1 + 2.0 + 2.0 - 0 = 6$

| QUESTIONS ASKED | | OPPOSITION (SPEECH) | | | | | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER | | | | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|--|------------|----------------------------|--|
| | | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | own opinions presented | prioritisation | time management | relevant scientific topics | own opinions presented | opponent's conduct of the discussion | prioritisation | | | | |
| 0 <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | some main points | few | some | some | reasonable | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | few | some | some aspects fine | some | 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 | some | some correct | reasonable | fair | 2 <input 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
 $1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1.5 - 0 - 0 = 6$

| QUESTIONS ASKED | | REVIEW OF REPORT | | | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION | | | DISCUSSION ANALYSIS | | MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT | ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| | | report evaluation & understanding | pros & cons | prioritisation | speech evaluation | pros & cons | prioritisation | discussion evaluation | correct own opinions | | | | |
| 0 <input type="checkbox"/> | too few, mostly irrelevant | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> | poor/wrong | irrelevant | no | 0 <input type="checkbox"/> | poor/wrong | irrelevant | no | -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 | partially relevant | some | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | too short/long | partially relevant | some | 0 <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | good | mostly adequate | reasonable | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | informative, apt | mostly adequate | reasonable | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | relevant, constructive | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| | | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | detailed, complex | fully adequate | good | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | condensed & accurate | fully adequate | good | | | | |

NOTES: