

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 1/4 - 0 = 6



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 L, Stage: 3, Problem No. 12

sign *Ker R*

Parker, Kerry

Rep: Czech Republic Tomas Opp: Poland Hubot

Rev: Ukraine Khozoshko

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> deviations qualitatively analysed	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + some interesting results	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some parts well done	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	4 <input type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + results explained errors analysed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental or theoretical	4 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall clear, demonstrative	4 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex, completely testable	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 <input type="checkbox"/> well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental and theoretical	5 <input type="checkbox"/> greater extent than expected	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + complex concepts well communicated			

NOTES: Use of time to stop seems a big weakness in the use of the Cu disc as a thermometer. Did allow for frictional torque, but exptl decay??

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1/4 + 1/4 - 0 = 6

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

NOTES:

✓ Like the ques about shape of field. X spadi a long time on indicator the case of the decay force? change of reference frame?

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1/2 + 2 + 2 + 0 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	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"/>	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	0 <input type="checkbox"/> none	
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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 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:

set zero charges?

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.8 + 1.2 - 0.3 = 6



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 L, Stage: 3, Problem No. 12

sign

Fang-Yuh Lo

Lo, Fang-Yuh

Rep: Czech Republic

Tomás Wolf

Opp: Poland

Hubert Szepel

Rev: Ukraine

Khoroshko Iliia

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

NOTES: *informative report* | *however not clear about torque / force direction* | *uniform B assumption not correct* | *use time as meter*

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.3 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 5

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

NOTES: *some Q irrelevant (e.g. distance between magnet & disc)* | *very good point to point at meter chord* | *discussion on some topic strange: reference frame?*

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.6 + 2 + 2 + 1 - 0.3 = 7

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

GYROSCOPE TESLA METER

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3.0 + 2.25 - 1 = 5.25 \quad (5)$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 L, Stage: 3, Problem No. 12

sign FERMINAMAROTTE

Marche, Fermina

Rep: Czech Republic

Opp: Poland

Rev: Ukraine

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

NOTES: Theoretical prediction of the accelerating force well done for... of your work. Discussion + answers. NOT as good as your report. There were some good as just you did not address. Incorrect answers to some questions. Why are there eddy currents? why in that direction? & permanent - not many magnets chosen. Your graphs were strangely presented. It was unclear what was being proved. Better than what?

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.75 + 2.25 + 2.0 - 0.5 = 6.5 \quad (7)$$

QUESTIONS ASKED					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS		
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	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			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			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 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: Some good ones, esp. the one about using a field example, and another of the field. I agree with your pros and cons and I felt they were prioritised correctly. You asked a great Q about the direction of the eddy currents. Rep'r couldn't answer, but I would have liked you to answer, rather than just saying 'Time-dependent field leads to induction and the relationship effect'. Some correct answers but not well polished or developed.

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.0 + 3.0 + 2.25 + 2.0 + 0.25 - 1.0 = 8.5 \quad (8)$$

QUESTIONS ASKED			REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0			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			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			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: Some really relevant questions were - well prioritised + efficient. eg the use of perm. magnets. Excellent summary I almost fully agree with your critique here + concise. I agree with your opinion and you seemed to understand things with your... you picked some but not the most crucial ones. Incorrect testmate's answer to the odd question.

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

0.5

$$1 + 3.5 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 6$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 L, Stage: 3, Problem No. 12

sign *Eugen Rožić*

Rožić, Eugen

Rep: Czech Republic

Opp: Poland

Rev: Ukraine

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,	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> inconclusive or too long	
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	3 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
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				
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: *friction function has linear part? why does theory fit less for copper? No test of unknown magnet...*

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

0.75

$$1 + 0.75 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6$$

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

NOTES: *used for discussion*

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

0.25

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.25 + 2 + 1.25 - 0.25 = 8$$

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

NOTES: *Reynolds number ??*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 5$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 L, Stage: 3, Problem No. 12

sign GA

Timoshchenko, Igor

Rep: Czech Republic

Opp: Poland

Rev: Ukraine

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> not well fitting	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some own input	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good		
3 <input 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				
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

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6$$

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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> some	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> main points	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	
	3 <input 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 type="checkbox"/> efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	
	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all points	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + all time used	4 <input type="checkbox"/> new crucial point(s)	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5 + 1/2 - 0 = 8



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 L, Stage: 2, Problem No. 6

sign

Kerry Parker

Parker, Kerry

Rep: Ukraine

Opp: Czech Republic

Rev: Poland

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

NOTES: *Very thorough, lacking transparency of assumptions, some confusing presentation.*

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3/4 + 1 + 2 - 0 = 5

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1/2 + 1 1/2 + 1 1/2 + 1/2 - 0 - 0 = 5

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

NOTES: *Unnecessary introduction of Coanda etc. new points ??*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.8 + 1 - 0.3 = 6



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 L, Stage: 2, Problem No. 6

sign

Fang-Yuh Le

Lo, Fang-Yuh

Rep: Ukraine

Khoroshko Illia

Opp: Czech Republic

Karel Chvitzek

Rev: Poland

Pawel Mierha

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

NOTES: good report | but discussion and answer too long a sentence

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.3 + 1 + 1.5 - 0.3 = 5

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

NOTES: QA too short, should stop rep occasionally | rep understanding not really showing | time management bad | lack of priority made it fuzzy

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 0.8 + 0.7 ± 0 - 0.3 = 5

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

NOTES: QA good | though good understanding of rep, no priority made it too long a review | no time for other review

HURRICANE BALLS

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 6.5 + 2 - 9.25 = 9.25 \quad (9)$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 L, Stage: 2, Problem No. 6

sign FERMINA MARCHE

Marche, Fermina

Rep: Ukraine

Opp: Czech Republic

Rev: Poland

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
								relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	too few	poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	some	some aspects fine	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	many	good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4	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: Theoretical discussion - this was excellent. You went into lots of deep concepts. Experimentally very thorough. See simulated air flow, which is above expectation. Nice comparison of experiment with attempt to account for demerol. Really impressive tracking method of balls.

Discussion - your justification that it's poss. to predict which ball will lift was unconvincing. You didn't answer the question well either.

Finished answer to the perfectly smooth. Finished later. Answered as were sometimes slightly inconclusive.

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.25 + 3.0 + 3.5 - 1.0 = 6.75$$

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

NOTES: Some good points but others not less relevant, eg fine pt. He was a good challenger. Good - it's hard to oppose an excellent report. But you drew out aspects that could have been developed eg air flow. Well done for gauged to discussion. I think your point about Magnus was dubious and not well justified. Poor time management in the review.

Uplift conditions - good choice, such an exciting discussion - but I didn't see enough of your input. Nice question about direction of air flow. Nice about reproducibility.

Incorrect answer to the perfectly smooth & Answer too brief with justification.

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 2 + 1 + 0.75 + 0 - 0 = 6.75$$

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

NOTES: Nice about asymmetry. Really good about the perfectly smooth.

Too long. Took 3 min out.

I think your point about Magnus was dubious and not well justified.

Me on work to the smooth surface.

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5.75 + 2.25 - 0 = 9



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 L, Stage: 2, Problem No. 6

sign *[Signature]*

Rožić, Eugen

Rep: Ukraine

Opp: Czech Republic

Rev: Poland

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

NOTES: *I calculated or measured? How are the balls connected? Force? what is drag, what slows it down - just rolling friction? Air drag?*

slide 11 - explain?

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1.25 + 2 - 1 = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some main points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	
	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 checked="" 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:

prediction of which ball uses??

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1.75 + 1.25 + 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 type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none	
2 <input checked="" 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 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:

Bad colors

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5 + 2 - 0 = 8



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 L, Stage: 2, Problem No. 6

sign *[Signature]*

Timoshchenko, Igor

Rep: Ukraine

Opp: Czech Republic

Rev: Poland

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 5

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2\frac{3}{4} + 1\frac{1}{4} - 0 = 5$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 L, Stage: 1, Problem No. 17

sign

Ker R.

Parker, Kerry

Rep: Poland *Szymon*

Opp: Ukraine *Volodymyr*

Rev: Czech Republic

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 1\frac{1}{2} - 0 = 5$$

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 1\frac{1}{4} + 1 + \frac{3}{4} + 1\frac{1}{2} - 0 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	-1 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	0 <input type="checkbox"/> none	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input 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 + 3 + 1.3 - 0.5 = 5



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 L, Stage: 1, Problem No. 17

sign *Fang-Yuh Lo*

Lo, Fang-Yuh

Rep: Poland *Szymon Petyniak*

Opp: Ukraine *Volodymyr Mashchuk*

Rev: Czech Republic

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

NOTES: *disordered/ordered explanation, ejection rate must have difference in model, has to be clarified* | *angle dependence still in doubt* | *phases not explained*

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1 - 0.3 = 5

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

NOTES: *QA quite good* | *disappointed in opposition @ no priority @ some raised questions not detailed discussed* | *some ambiguity in rep not raised.*

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.3 + 1 + 0.8 - 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	-1 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none	
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input 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	1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	1 <input type="checkbox"/> many	1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> condensed & accurate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate		

NOTES: *QA quite good* | *review of rep/opp somehow not to the point* | *review of discussion too short*

4.5/2 = 2.5 → because only half of the problem presented

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 1 - 0 = 5



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 L, Stage: 1, Problem No. 17

sign *[Signature]*

Rožić, Eugen

Rep: Poland

Opp: Ukraine

Rev: Czech Republic

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

NOTES: How did you quantify kinetic (& potential) energy? Angle to speed/height → theoretical? Speed of the wave?

↳ he led the conversation, took the role of the opponent...

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.25 + 3.25 + 2.25 - 0.5 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant		0 — almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	0 — almost no	too few	poor	no	
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: ↳ used for discussion, not clarification

↳ most energy dissipated on dry friction? Not kin, & not energy after ejection??

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1.25 + 1 ± 0 - 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant		0 — poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 — poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 — almost no	too few	-1 — irrelevant	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked
1 — 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 + 3 + 1.5 - 0 = 6



SCORESHEET

Fight 5 L, Stage: 1, Problem No. 17

sign

Timoshchenko, Igor

Rep: Poland

Opp: Ukraine

Rev: Czech Republic

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost nothing	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no or irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/> main points	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many correct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/> efficient <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many correct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	
	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 + 1 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 5

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

NOTES: