

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4.5 + 2 - [ ] = 7



**SCORESHEET**

Fight 6 L, Stage: 1, Problem No. 77

sign *[Signature]*

Plesch, Martin

Rep: China

Opp: Switzerland

Rev: Germany

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

NOTES:

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.75 + 1.25 + 2 - [ ] = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 - too few, mostly irrelevant	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	
1 - + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used		0 - almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	0 - almost no	too few	poor	no	0 - concise and correct or no questions asked
		1 - some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 - few	some	some aspects fine	some	1 - some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
		2 - 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	

1:45 review of literature

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 1.5 + 1.5 - [ ] - [ ] = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 - too few, mostly irrelevant	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
1 - + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used		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
2 - + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently		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 - 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:

+1.5

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 10 - 1 = 16



**SCORESHEET**

Fight 6 L, Stage: 1, Problem No. \_\_\_\_\_

sign \_\_\_\_\_

*Alan Allinson*

Allinson, Alan

Rep: China

Opp: Switzerland

Rev: Germany

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
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	some	some aspects fine	1
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	many	good	2
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	3
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	4
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			5

NOTES: Too fast!

in interactive!

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 6.8 + 2.8 + 2.5 - 0 = 8

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

NOTES: start with reports of literature

come back + compare?

no, why do if not used?

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 1.5 = 9

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	almost no	too few	-1	0
1	partial	partially relevant	some	too short/long	partially relevant	some	too short/long	some	0	1
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	informative apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	relevant parts	many	1	2
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate	2	3

NOTES: Respond! some language issues because too fast!

Good focus

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 1.25 -  = 6



**SCORESHEET**

Fight 6 L, Stage: 1, Problem No. 11

sign *Marin*

Anghel, Maria

Rep: China

Opp: Switzerland

Rev: Germany

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

NOTES: Advanced model, and a lot of work was done experimentally. However, phenomena was not explained well, some experiments not systematic. Discussion had satisfactory answers.

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.75 + 1.75 + 2.5 -  = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost nothing	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no or irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some main points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/> main points	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	
	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: Excellent questions! Just missed 100%. Opp speech could have been more detailed for pres & cons. Excellent topics, brought light to the report. However, not enough questions or justification of questions (eg. why is hysteresis important?).

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 1.25 + 1.25 + 0.25 -  = 8

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

NOTES: Good questions. Complex, but not enough prioritization or justification of points. Missed material properties. Average, touched on a few points. Covered some important parts but a lot missing. Left good.



**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.5 + 2 - 0 = 7



**SCORESHEET**

Fight 6 L, Stage: 1, Problem No. 11

sign *Al B*

Balcombe, John

Rep: China

Opp: Switzerland

Rev: Germany

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

NOTES:

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.8 + 3 + 3.0 - 0 = 8

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

NOTES:

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + ~~4~~ +  $3\frac{1}{4}$  - 0 = 7

(7 1/4 rounded down)



**SCORESHEET**

Fight 6 L, Stage: 1, Problem No. 11

sign *[Signature]*

Hogan, Kent

Rep: China

Opp: Switzerland

Rev: Germany

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient	
4 <input checked="" 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	
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		5 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	
6 <input type="checkbox"/>									

NOTES:

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 9

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

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

(8 1/2 rounded down)

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 type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none	
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> condensed & accurate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate		

NOTES:

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2 -  = 7



**SCORESHEET**

Fight 6 L, Stage: 1, Problem No. 11

sign *Maciej Kolwas*

Kolwas, Maciej

Rep: China *Zhebin Zhang* Opp: Switzerland

Rev: Germany

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 numbers	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: *no dynamics & influence of borders*

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 3 + 3 -  = 8

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

NOTES:

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 3 + 3 + 1 -  -  = 9

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

NOTES: *no involved acceleration & borders*

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



**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 7



**SCORESHEET**

Fight 6 L, Stage: 1, Problem No. 11

sign *[Signature]*

Martchenko, Ilya

Rep: China

Opp: Switzerland

Rev: Germany

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

NOTES:

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 9

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

NOTES:

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 1 + 1 ± 0 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	too few	-1 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input type="checkbox"/> 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 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	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	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	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 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 5



**SCORESHEET**

Fight 6 L, Stage: 1, Problem No. 11

sign *Poier*

Poier, Peter

Rep: China

Opp: Switzerland

Rev: Germany

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

NOTES:

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1.5 + 2 - 0 = 6

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

NOTES:

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 7

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

NOTES:



**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 1.5 -  = 6



**SCORESHEET**

Fight 6 L, Stage: 1, Problem No. 11

sign

Shchetnikov, Andrey

Rep: China

Opp: Switzerland

Rev: Germany

REPORT							DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no/ almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> others' data, incorrectly cited	0 <input type="checkbox"/> misunderstood	0 <input type="checkbox"/> unclear, chaotic	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> review of sources, cited	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly clear	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> not well fitting	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some own input	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	3 <input type="checkbox"/> deviations qualitatively analysed	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + some interesting results	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some parts well done	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed 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 + 1.5 + 2 -  = 6

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

NOTES:

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 + 0.5 -  -  = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	-1 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input 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, all 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	-1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
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		-2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 6$$



**SCORESHEET**

Fight 6 L, Stage: 1, Problem No. 11

sign hs

Wattanakasiwich, Pornrat

Rep: China

Opp: Switzerland

Rev: Germany

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

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
too few, mostly irrelevant	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input 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"/> some main points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input 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 type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input 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"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	3 <input type="checkbox"/> efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	
4 <input type="checkbox"/>	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> very good	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> all time used	4 <input type="checkbox"/> new crucial point(s)	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> very good	

NOTES:

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1.5 + 2 + 1 \pm 0 - 0 = 6.5 \approx 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
too few, mostly irrelevant	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	irrelevant	
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"/>	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input 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 type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> condensed & accurate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	

NOTES:

NOTES:

<p><b>QUESTIONS ASKED</b></p> <p>0 — too few, mostly irrelevant</p> <p>1 — relevant; meant to clarify unclear points</p> <p>2 — short, apt and clear, well prioritized,</p> <p>3 — time managed efficiently</p>	<p><b>REVIEW OF REPORT</b></p> <p>0 — poor/wrong</p> <p>1 — partial</p> <p>2 — good</p> <p>3 — detailed, complex</p>	<p><b>REVIEW OF OPPOSITION</b></p> <p>0 — poor/wrong</p> <p>1 — top short/long</p> <p>2 — informative, apt</p> <p>3 — condensed &amp; accurate</p>	<p><b>DISCUSSION ANALYSIS</b></p> <p>0 — almost no</p> <p>1 — too short/long</p> <p>2 — relevant parts</p> <p>3 — accurate, conclusive</p>	<p><b>MISSED POINTS</b></p> <p>0 — irrelevant</p> <p>1 — none</p> <p>2 — relevant, constructive</p>	<p><b>ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS</b></p> <p>0 — concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1 + 2 = 6

<p><b>QUESTIONS ASKED</b></p> <p>0 — too few, mostly irrelevant</p> <p>1 — relevant; aimed at resolving unclear points in the report</p> <p>2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used</p>	<p><b>OPPOSITION (SPEECH)</b></p> <p>0 — poor</p> <p>1 — reasonable</p> <p>2 — fair</p> <p>3 — many correct</p> <p>4 — practically all points</p>	<p><b>DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER</b></p> <p>0 — almost no</p> <p>1 — few</p> <p>2 — some</p> <p>3 — good</p> <p>4 — new crucial points</p>	<p><b>ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS</b></p> <p>0 — concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**OPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 2 = 6

<p><b>REPORT</b></p> <p>0 — almost no</p> <p>1 — some</p> <p>2 — fair</p> <p>3 — good</p> <p>4 — detailed</p> <p>5 — quite detailed, + results explained</p> <p>6 — detailed, complex, + reproducible,</p> <p>7 — deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight</p>	<p><b>relevant experiments</b></p> <p>0 — almost no</p> <p>1 — some</p> <p>2 — fair</p> <p>3 — well performed,</p> <p>4 — sufficient number</p> <p>5 — + results explained</p> <p>6 — errors analysed</p> <p>7 — well fitting, deviations</p>	<p><b>comparison between theory and experiment</b></p> <p>0 — no/almost no</p> <p>1 — some</p> <p>2 — not well fitting</p> <p>3 — + some interesting results</p> <p>4 — considerable experimental</p> <p>5 — + theory limits</p> <p>6 — explained, conclusive</p> <p>7 — well fitting, deviations</p>	<p><b>own contribution</b></p> <p>0 — review of sources, cited</p> <p>1 — partly clear</p> <p>2 — average</p> <p>3 — some aspects</p> <p>4 — above average</p> <p>5 — interesting</p> <p>6 — greater extent</p> <p>7 — considerable experimental</p>	<p><b>task fulfillment</b></p> <p>0 — unclear, chaotic</p> <p>1 — partly clear</p> <p>2 — average</p> <p>3 — some parts</p> <p>4 — well done</p> <p>5 — overall clear, demonstrative</p> <p>6 — + complex concepts well</p> <p>7 — + complex concepts well</p>	<p><b>relevant arguments/responses</b></p> <p>0 — too few</p> <p>1 — some</p> <p>2 — many</p> <p>3 — + data/theory</p> <p>4 — convincingly supported</p> <p>5 — proved deep understanding</p> <p>6 — overall efficient</p> <p>7 — overall efficient</p>	<p><b>reporter's conduct at the discussion</b></p> <p>0 — poor</p> <p>1 — some aspects fine</p> <p>2 — good</p> <p>3 — some aspects</p> <p>4 — efficient</p> <p>5 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2.5 = 7.5



**SCORESHEET**

Figth 6 L, Stage: 2, Problem No. \_\_\_\_\_

sign \_\_\_\_\_

Rep: Switzerland

Opp: Germany

Rev: Singapore

Blow n 6 ? deceleration Stokes??

bit aggressive

Plesch, Martin



SCORESHEET

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

Opp: Germany

Rev: Singapore



sign *[Handwritten Signature]*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 = 1.5

REPORT

ANSWERS TO JURY, Oponent, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS 0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	DISCUSSION WITH Oponent		DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER		REPORT	
	0 poor 1 some aspects fine 2 some aspects supported 3 proved deep understanding overall efficient	0 too few 1 some 2 convincingly supported 3 proved deep understanding	0 unclear, chaotic 1 partly clear 2 average 3 + complex concepts well	0 no/ almost no 1 some 2 + some interesting results 3 greater extent than expected	0 no/ almost no 1 some 2 + some interesting results 3 greater extent than expected	0 almost no 1 some 2 fair 3 + reproducible, well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive

NOTES:

phenomenon explanation  
 0 almost no  
 1 some  
 2 fair  
 3 good  
 4 detailed  
 5 demonstrative  
 6 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight

1 + 0.5 = 1.5

Oponent

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 = 1.5

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS 0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)		QUESTIONS ASKED	
	0 poor 1 some aspects fine 2 good 3 some aspects efficient 4 overall efficient very good	0 almost no 1 few 2 some 3 many correct 4 + improvement suggestions	0 almost no 1 few 2 some 3 good 4 new crucial points	0 poor 1 reasonable 2 fair 3 efficient 4 all time used	0 no 1 some 2 reasonable 3 fair 4 very good	0 almost nothing 1 no or irrelevant 2 too few 3 + improvement suggestions 4 practically all

NOTES:

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 = 2.5

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS 0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	MISSED POINTS		DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		REVIEW OF OPPOSITION		REVIEW OF REPORT		QUESTIONS ASKED	
	0 irrelevant 1 none 1 relevant, constructive	0 too few 1 almost no 2 some 3 fully	0 almost no 1 too short/long 2 accurate, relevant parts 3 accurate, fully	0 no 1 irrelevant 2 pros & cons 3 prioritisation	0 poor/wrong 1 too short/long 2 partially relevant 3 mostly adequate 4 fully adequate	0 no 1 some 2 reasonable 3 good	0 irrelevant 1 partially relevant 2 mostly adequate 3 fully	0 poor/wrong 1 partial 2 good 3 detailed, complex	0 irrelevant 1 pros & cons 2 understanding 3 report evaluation	0 too few, mostly irrelevant 1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points 2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used 3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

NOTES: nice, clear, detail

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

NOTES:

Good points but missed opp: discussion overall 5.5. Few missed points

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

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1.5 + 1.5 = 7

<p><b>QUESTIONS ASKED</b></p> <p>0 — too few, mostly irrelevant</p> <p>1 X — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report</p> <p>2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used</p> <p>3 — all relevant points</p> <p>4 — practically all points</p>	<p><b>OPPOSITION (SPEECH)</b></p> <p>0 — no</p> <p>1 — some</p> <p>2 — reasonable</p> <p>2 — fair</p> <p>3 — + improvement</p> <p>4 — all time used</p>	<p><b>DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER</b></p> <p>0 — almost no</p> <p>1 — few</p> <p>2 — some</p> <p>3 — good</p> <p>4 — new crucial (points)</p>	<p><b>DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER</b></p> <p>0 — no</p> <p>1 — some</p> <p>2 — reasonable</p> <p>3 — overall efficient</p> <p>4 — very good</p>	<p><b>ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS</b></p> <p>0 — concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**OPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.75 + 2.75 + 1.75 = 6

<p><b>REPORT</b></p> <p>0 — almost no</p> <p>1 — some</p> <p>2 — fair</p> <p>3 — good</p> <p>4 — detailed</p> <p>5 — demonstrative</p> <p>6 — deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight</p> <p>7 — explanation, theory/model</p>	<p><b>REPORT</b></p> <p>0 — almost no</p> <p>1 — some</p> <p>2 — fair</p> <p>3 — good</p> <p>4 — sufficient number</p> <p>5 — quite detailed, + results explained</p> <p>6 — detailed, complex, + reproducible, well fitting, deviations</p> <p>7 — deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight</p>	<p><b>REPORT</b></p> <p>0 — almost no</p> <p>1 — some</p> <p>2 — fair</p> <p>3 — good</p> <p>4 — + some interesting results</p> <p>5 — considerable experimental or theoretical</p> <p>6 — greater extent than expected</p> <p>7 — own contribution</p>	<p><b>REPORT</b></p> <p>0 — almost no</p> <p>1 — some</p> <p>2 — fair</p> <p>3 — good</p> <p>4 — + data/theory</p> <p>5 — + data/theory</p> <p>6 — proved deep understanding</p> <p>7 — explanation, theory/model</p>	<p><b>ANSWERS TO JURY, Oponent, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS</b></p> <p>0 — concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4.25 + 1.75 = 7

Good topics but inefficient conduct of discussion - more technique than constructive

focused upon some points but missed eg. pitch.

Good but not followed by water.

Had convincing arguments but should have been more assertive.

Good explanation, but a bit rushed. Very impressive own contribution! Did not investigate air jet or air velocity.

sign *Maria Anghel*

Problem No. 6



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





NOTES:

<p>QUESTIONS ASKED</p> <p>0 ___ too few, mostly irrelevant</p> <p>1 ___ relevant, meant to clarify unclear points</p> <p>1 ___ + suitably allotted to Rep &amp; Opp,</p> <p>2 ___ + short, apt and clear, well prioritized,</p> <p>2 ___ time managed efficiently</p>	<p>REVIEW OF REPORT</p> <p>report evaluation &amp; understanding</p> <p>0 ___ poor/wrong</p> <p>1 ___ partial</p> <p>2 ___ good</p> <p>3 ___ detailed, complex</p>	<p>REVIEW OF OPPOSITION</p> <p>speech evaluation</p> <p>0 ___ no</p> <p>1 ___ poor/wrong</p> <p>2 ___ too short/long</p> <p>2 ___ informative, apt</p> <p>3 ___ condensed &amp; accurate</p>	<p>DISCUSSION ANALYSIS</p> <p>discussion evaluation options</p> <p>0 ___ almost no</p> <p>1 ___ too short/long</p> <p>1 ___ relevant parts</p> <p>2 ___ accurate, conclusive</p> <p>2 ___ adequate</p>	<p>MISSSED POINTS</p> <p>0 ___ irrelevant</p> <p>0 ___ none</p> <p>1 ___ relevant,</p> <p>1 ___ constructive</p>	<p>ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS</p> <p>0 ___ concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>1 ___ some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>2 ___ deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 1/2 + 2 + 1 1/2 = 7

<p>QUESTIONS ASKED</p> <p>0 ___ too few, mostly irrelevant</p> <p>1 ___ relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report</p> <p>2 ___ + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used</p>	<p>OPPOSITION (SPEECH)</p> <p>understanding of relevant topics</p> <p>0 ___ almost nothing</p> <p>1 ___ some main points</p> <p>2 ___ all relevant points</p> <p>4 ___ practically all points</p>	<p>DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER</p> <p>relevant own opinions presented</p> <p>0 ___ almost no</p> <p>1 ___ few</p> <p>2 ___ some</p> <p>3 ___ new crucial points</p> <p>4 ___ all time used</p>	<p>ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS</p> <p>0 ___ concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>1 ___ some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>2 ___ deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

OPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 1/2 + 3 + 2 = 7 (7 1/2 rounded down)

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

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5 + 1 3/4 = 8 (7 3/4 rounded up)

SCORESHEET

Rep: Switzerland

Opp: Germany

Rev: Singapore

6

sign: *[Signature]*

Fight 6 L, Stage: 2, Problem No.

Hogan, Kent



SCORESHEET  
 Fight 6 L, Stage: 2, Problem No. 6  
 Rep: Switzerland 0 3  
 Opp: Germany Fabio B Rev: Singapore  
 sign  
 Kolwas, Maciej

REPORTER  
 Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 3.5 + 2 = 6

REPORT

REPORT	phenomenon explanation		relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment		own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	
	almost no	some		no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited			misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
7	shows physical insight	deep and comprehensible,	completely testable	convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	3
6	demonstrative	correct	correct	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	or theoretical	solution	demonstrative	2
5	detailed	quite detailed,	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental	interesting	overall clear,	above average	1
4	good	good	sufficient number	well performed, deviations	qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some parts well done	some aspects average	0
3	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	0
2	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	partly clear	0
1	almost no	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	unclear, chaotic	0
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	unclear, chaotic	0

NOTES:

lack of brevity and mass of conclusions

QUESTIONS ASKED	understanding of relevant topics		own opinions presented	relevant scientific topics presented		opponent's conduct of presentation	the discussion	priority
	too few, mostly irrelevant	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report		some main points	some			
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement	many correct	many correct	some aspects efficient	very good	4
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	some	good	3
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	reasonable	fair	2
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	some	some	1
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	no	poor	0

NOTES:

OPONENT  
 Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 1.5 + 3.5 + 2 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED	report evaluation & understanding		pros & cons	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion options	correct own
	too few, mostly irrelevant	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points						
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	conclusive	adequate
2	good	mostly adequate,	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate,	reasonable	accurate, fully	adequate
1	partial	partially relevant	some	too short/long	partially relevant	some	relevant parts	many
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	almost no	too few

NOTES:

very elegant

REVIEWER  
 Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 2 + 2 + 2 = 7

QUESTIONS TO JURY	ANSWERS TO JURY
conclude and correct or no questions asked	0
some incorrect,	-1
inconcise or too long	-1
deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	-2

MISSSED POINTS	POINTED OUT
irrelevant	-1
none	0
relevant,	1
constructive	2

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS
conclusive	2
relevant parts	1
too short/long	0
almost no	0
too few	0

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION
speech evaluation	3
informative, apt	2
too short/long	1
no	0
poor/wrong	0

REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF REPORT
report evaluation & understanding	3
mostly adequate,	2
partially relevant	1
no	0
irrelevant	0

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







NOTES:

<p><b>QUESTIONS ASKED</b></p> <p>0 — too few, mostly irrelevant</p> <p>1 — + suitably allotted to Rep &amp; Opp,</p> <p>2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized,</p> <p>3 — time managed efficiently</p>	<p><b>REVIEW OF REPORT</b></p> <p>0 — report evaluation &amp; understanding</p> <p>1 — poor/wrong</p> <p>2 — partial</p> <p>3 — good</p> <p>4 — detailed, complex</p>	<p><b>REVIEW OF OPPOSITION</b></p> <p>0 — pros &amp; cons</p> <p>1 — irrelevant</p> <p>2 — partially relevant</p> <p>3 — good</p>	<p><b>DISCUSSION ANALYSIS</b></p> <p>0 — almost no</p> <p>1 — too short/long</p> <p>2 — accurate, conclusive</p> <p>3 — adequate</p>	<p><b>MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT</b></p> <p>0 — irrelevant</p> <p>1 — relevant,</p> <p>2 — constructive</p>	<p><b>ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS</b></p> <p>0 — concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 = 6

6 - 0 = 6

<p><b>QUESTIONS ASKED</b></p> <p>0 — too few, mostly irrelevant</p> <p>1 — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report</p> <p>2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used</p> <p>3 — all relevant points</p> <p>4 — practically all points</p>	<p><b>OPPOSITION (SPEECH)</b></p> <p>0 — no</p> <p>1 — some</p> <p>2 — reasonable</p> <p>3 — fair</p> <p>4 — + improvement</p>	<p><b>DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER</b></p> <p>0 — almost no</p> <p>1 — few</p> <p>2 — some</p> <p>3 — many correct</p> <p>4 — + improvement</p>	<p><b>ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS</b></p> <p>0 — concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**OPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 3 = 7

7 - 0 = 7

<p><b>REPORT</b></p> <p>0 — almost no</p> <p>1 — some</p> <p>2 — fair</p> <p>3 — good</p> <p>4 — detailed</p> <p>5 — demonstrative</p> <p>6 — deep and comprehensible,</p> <p>7 — shows physical insight</p>	<p><b>relevant experiments</b></p> <p>0 — almost no</p> <p>1 — some</p> <p>2 — fair</p> <p>3 — well performed,</p> <p>4 — sufficient number</p> <p>5 — quite detailed,</p> <p>6 — detailed, complex,</p> <p>7 — shows physical insight</p>	<p><b>comparison between theory and experiment</b></p> <p>0 — no/almost no</p> <p>1 — some</p> <p>2 — fair</p> <p>3 — not well fitting</p> <p>4 — deviations</p> <p>5 — + results explained</p> <p>6 — errors analysed</p> <p>7 — well fitting, deviations</p>	<p><b>own contribution</b></p> <p>0 — review of sources, cited</p> <p>1 — partly</p> <p>2 — average</p> <p>3 — some interesting results</p> <p>4 — considerable experimental</p> <p>5 — greater extent</p> <p>6 — considerable experimental</p> <p>7 — and theoretical</p>	<p><b>task fulfillment</b></p> <p>0 — unclear, chaotic</p> <p>1 — partly clear</p> <p>2 — average</p> <p>3 — some aspects</p> <p>4 — well done</p> <p>5 — interesting</p> <p>6 — overall clear,</p> <p>7 — + complex concepts well</p>	<p><b>relevant arguments/responses</b></p> <p>0 — too few</p> <p>1 — some</p> <p>2 — many</p> <p>3 — provided deep understanding</p> <p>4 — convincingly supported</p> <p>5 — overall efficient</p>	<p><b>REPORTER'S CONDUCT AT THE DISCUSSION</b></p> <p>0 — poor</p> <p>1 — some aspects fine</p> <p>2 — good</p> <p>3 — some aspects</p> <p>4 — overall efficient</p> <p>5 — very good</p>	<p><b>ANSWERS TO JURY, Oponent, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS</b></p> <p>0 — concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2 - 0.5 = 6



SCORESHEET

Rep: Switzerland

Opp: Germany

Rev: Singapore

6

sign

*[Handwritten signature]*

Shchetnikov, Andrey





**REPORTER**  
Start from 1 and add/subtract  
1 + 5.5 + 1.5 = 7



**SCORESHEET**  
Fight 6 L, Stage: 3, Problem No. \_\_\_\_\_  
sign \_\_\_\_\_

Opp: Singapore

Rev: China

Plesch, Martin

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

NOTES:

Reas 2?  
Reas 3  
s-fit

**OPONENT**  
Start from 1 and add/subtract  
1 + 0.8 + 1.5 + 2.8 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED	0	too few, mostly irrelevant	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used
	4	practically all points	all relevant points	3	practically all
OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	0	poor
	4	understanding of relevant topics	addressed	4	all time used
DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	0	almost no	too few	0	poor
	4	new crucial points	+ improvement	4	all time used
ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	0	no	no	0	no
	4	very good	overall efficient	4	very good

NOTES:

**REVIEWER**  
Start from 1 and add/subtract  
1 + 1.75 + 2 + 2.7 + 1.2 = 9.25 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED	0	too few, mostly irrelevant	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	1	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp,
	3	detailed	good	2	time managed efficiently
REVIEW OF REPORT	0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	0	no
	3	adequate	fully	3	adequate
REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	0	no
	3	condensed & informative apt	mostly adequate	2	fully
DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	0	almost no	too short/long	0	too few
	2	conclusive, accurate, fully	adequate	2	conclusive
MISSED POINTS	0	irrelevant	no	0	no
	1	relevant,	construtive	1	relevant,
ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS					

NOTES:

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

sign 

Opp: Singapore

Rep: Germany

Rev: China



SCORESHEET

Fight 6 L, Stage: 3, Problem No. 1

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 = 5 - 2 = 3

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	fair	some	review of sources, cited	partly clear	partly clear
2	fair	fair	well performed, sufficient number	not well fitting	+ some interesting results	some parts average	some aspects fine
3	good	good	quite detailed, + results explained	deviations qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental	above average	some aspects good
4	detailed	detailed	demonstrative	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting overall clear, demonstrative	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	overall efficient
6							proved deep understanding
7							overall efficient

NOTES:

Optimisation not explained but impressive! or justified

OPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 = 2 + 2 = 4 - 2 = 2

QUESTIONS ASKED	understanding of relevant topics	own opinions	relevant presentation	scientific topics	relevant own opinions	opponent's conduct of discussion	priority
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	almost no	poor	no
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	some	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	main points	many correct	some correct	many correct	some aspects efficient	reasonable
3		all relevant points	many correct	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4		practically all points	+ improvement suggestions	new crucial points	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

NOTES:

None really address the critical eqn

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 = 2 + 2 = 4 - 2 = 2

QUESTIONS ASKED	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	irrelevant	poor/wrong	relevant	pros & cons	evaluation	discuss own options
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	irrelevant	no	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	irrelevant	too few
1	+ suitably allocated to Rep & Opp, most time used	partially relevant	some	too short/long	partially relevant	some	relevant	too short/long
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	good	mostly adequate	mostly adequate	mostly adequate	informative, apt	relevant parts	many
3		detailed, complex	fully	adequate	fully	condensed & accurate	adequate	adequate

NOTES:

Neither P + R addressed the critical model. other than conc

theory?









NOTES: Some irrelevant/peripheral points raised, WAAAY too fast - difficult to follow

<p>QUESTIONS ASKED</p> <p>0 = too few, mostly irrelevant</p> <p>1 = relevant, meant to clarify unclear points</p> <p>1 + suitably allotted to Rep &amp; Opp,</p> <p>most time used</p> <p>2 = + short, apt and clear, well prioritized,</p> <p>time managed efficiently</p>	<p>REVIEW OF REPORT</p> <p>0 = irrelevant</p> <p>1 = partially relevant</p> <p>2 = mostly adequate</p> <p>3 = fully adequate</p> <p>good</p>	<p>REVIEW OF OPPOSITION</p> <p>0 = poor/wrong evaluation</p> <p>1 = too short/long</p> <p>2 = informative, apt</p> <p>3 = condensed &amp; accurate</p> <p>speech</p> <p>pros &amp; cons</p> <p>priority</p>	<p>DISCUSSION ANALYSIS</p> <p>0 = almost no</p> <p>1 = too short/long</p> <p>2 = accurate, conclusive</p> <p>adequate</p> <p>many</p> <p>fully</p> <p>adequate</p>	<p>MISSED POINTS</p> <p>0 = irrelevant</p> <p>1 = none</p> <p>1 = relevant,</p> <p>constructive</p>	<p>ANSWERS TO JURY</p> <p>0 = concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>1 = some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>2 = deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 1 1/2 + 1 1/2 = 7

<p>QUESTIONS ASKED</p> <p>0 = too few, mostly irrelevant</p> <p>1 = relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report</p> <p>2 = + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used</p>	<p>OPPOSITION (SPEECH)</p> <p>0 = almost nothing</p> <p>1 = some main points</p> <p>2 = main points</p> <p>3 = all relevant points</p> <p>4 = practically all points</p>	<p>DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER</p> <p>0 = almost no</p> <p>1 = few</p> <p>2 = some</p> <p>3 = good</p> <p>4 = new crucial points</p> <p>relevant</p> <p>scientific topics</p> <p>presented</p>	<p>DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT</p> <p>0 = too few</p> <p>1 = some aspects fine</p> <p>2 = good</p> <p>3 = some aspects efficient</p> <p>4 = overall efficient</p> <p>very good</p>	<p>ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS</p> <p>0 = concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>1 = some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>2 = deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 1/2 + 3 + 2 1/2 = 8

NOTES: Many assumptions made

<p>REPORT</p> <p>0 = almost no</p> <p>1 = some</p> <p>2 = fair</p> <p>3 = good</p> <p>4 = detailed</p> <p>5 = demonstrative</p> <p>6 = deep and comprehensible,</p> <p>shows physical insight</p>	<p>REPORT</p> <p>0 = almost no</p> <p>1 = some</p> <p>2 = fair</p> <p>3 = well performed, sufficient number</p> <p>4 = quite detailed</p> <p>5 = errors analysed</p> <p>6 = detailed, complex, + reproducible,</p> <p>convincing analysis</p>	<p>REPORT</p> <p>0 = almost no</p> <p>1 = some</p> <p>2 = fair</p> <p>3 = not well fitting</p> <p>4 = + some interesting results</p> <p>5 = considerable experimental</p> <p>6 = greater extent</p> <p>than expected</p>	<p>REPORT</p> <p>0 = almost no</p> <p>1 = some</p> <p>2 = partly clear</p> <p>3 = average</p> <p>4 = some parts well done</p> <p>5 = overall clear, demonstrative</p> <p>6 = + complex concepts well communicated</p>	<p>DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT</p> <p>0 = almost no</p> <p>1 = some</p> <p>2 = many</p> <p>3 = + data/theory convincingly supported</p> <p>4 = proved deep understanding</p> <p>5 = overall efficient</p>	<p>ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS</p> <p>0 = concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>1 = some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>2 = deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5 + 2 = 8



SCORESHEET

Figth 6 L, Stage: 3, Problem No. 1

Opp: Singapore

Rep: Germany

Rev: China

sign

Hogan, Kent

NOTES:

<p><b>QUESTIONS ASKED</b></p> <p>0 — too few, mostly irrelevant</p> <p>1 — + suitably allotted to Rep &amp; Opp,</p> <p>2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized,</p> <p>3 — time managed efficiently</p>	<p><b>REVIEW OF REPORT</b></p> <p>0 — poor/wrong</p> <p>1 — partial</p> <p>2 — good</p> <p>3 — detailed, complex</p>	<p><b>REVIEW OF OPPOSITION</b></p> <p>0 — poor/wrong</p> <p>1 — too short/long</p> <p>2 — informative, apt</p> <p>3 — condensed &amp; accurate</p>	<p><b>DISCUSSION ANALYSIS</b></p> <p>0 — almost no</p> <p>1 — too short/long</p> <p>2 — accurate, conclusive</p> <p>3 — adequate</p>	<p><b>MISSED POINTS</b></p> <p>-1 — irrelevant</p> <p>0 — none</p> <p>1 — relevant,</p> <p>2 — constructive</p>	<p><b>ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS</b></p> <p>0 — concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>-1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>-2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 3 + 2 = 8

<p><b>QUESTIONS ASKED</b></p> <p>0 — too few, mostly irrelevant</p> <p>1 — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report</p> <p>2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used</p> <p>4 — practically all points</p>	<p><b>OPPOSITION (SPEECH)</b></p> <p>0 — almost nothing</p> <p>1 — no or irrelevant</p> <p>2 — few</p> <p>3 — some</p> <p>4 — practically all</p>	<p><b>DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER</b></p> <p>0 — almost no</p> <p>1 — few</p> <p>2 — some</p> <p>3 — good</p> <p>4 — new crucial points</p>	<p><b>ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS</b></p> <p>0 — concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>-1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>-2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2.5 = 7

<p><b>REPORT</b></p> <p>0 — almost no</p> <p>1 — some</p> <p>2 — fair</p> <p>3 — fair</p> <p>4 — good</p> <p>5 — detailed</p> <p>6 — demonstrative</p> <p>7 — deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight</p>	<p><b>DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT</b></p> <p>0 — too few</p> <p>1 — some</p> <p>2 — many</p> <p>3 — provided deep understanding</p> <p>4 — overall efficient</p>	<p><b>ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS</b></p> <p>0 — concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>-1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>-2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4.5 + 2.5 = 8



**SCORESHEET**

Flight 6 L, Stage: 3, Problem No. 01

Rep: Germany

Opp: Singapore

Rev: China

sign

01

Angela

Qualitative of Quantitative





NOTES:

<p><b>QUESTIONS ASKED</b></p> <p>0 — too few, mostly irrelevant                  1 — relevant, meant to clarify unclear points                  1 — suitably allotted to Rep &amp; Opp,                  most time used                  2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized,                  time managed efficiently</p>	<p><b>REVIEW OF REPORT</b></p> <p>0 — report evaluation &amp; understanding                  1 — poor/wrong                  1 — partially relevant                  2 — mostly adequate                  3 — detailed, complex, fully</p>	<p><b>REVIEW OF OPPOSITION</b></p> <p>0 — no                  1 — poor/wrong                  1 — partially relevant                  2 — too short/long                  2 — informative, apt                  3 — condensed &amp; accurate</p>	<p><b>DISCUSSION ANALYSIS</b></p> <p>0 — almost no                  1 — too short/long                  1 — relevant parts                  2 — accurate, conclusive, fully adequate</p>	<p><b>MISSED POINTS</b></p> <p>-1 — irrelevant                  0 — none                  1 — relevant, constructive</p>	<p><b>ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS</b></p> <p>0 — concise and correct or no questions asked                  -1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long                  -2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1 + 2 + 1 = 7

<p><b>QUESTIONS ASKED</b></p> <p>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</p>	<p><b>OPPOSITION (SPEECH)</b></p> <p>0 — almost nothing                  1 — no or irrelevant                  1 — some main points                  2 — some correct                  3 — many correct                  4 — practically all points</p>	<p><b>DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER</b></p> <p>0 — almost no                  1 — few                  1 — some                  2 — some correct                  3 — many correct                  4 — new crucial points</p>	<p><b>ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS</b></p> <p>0 — concise and correct or no questions asked                  -1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long                  -2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**OPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 1 = 5

<p><b>REPORT</b></p> <p>0 — almost no                  1 — some                  2 — fair                  3 — good                  4 — detailed                  5 — demonstrative                  6 — deep and comprehensible,                  shows physical insight</p>	<p><b>REPORTER'S CONDUCT AT THE DISCUSSION</b></p> <p>0 — almost no                  1 — some                  2 — fair                  3 — well performed, sufficient number, deviations</p>	<p><b>COMPARISON BETWEEN THEORY AND EXPERIMENT</b></p> <p>0 — no/almost no                  1 — some                  2 — not well fitting                  3 — deviations qualitatively analysed</p>	<p><b>OWN CONTRIBUTION</b></p> <p>0 — others' data, incorrectly cited                  1 — review of sources, cited                  2 — some own input                  3 — + some interesting results</p>	<p><b>SCIENCE COMMUNICATION</b></p> <p>0 — unclear, chaotic                  1 — partly clear                  2 — average                  3 — some parts well done</p>	<p><b>RELEVANT ARGUMENTS/RESPONSES</b></p> <p>0 — too few                  1 — some                  2 — + data/theory convincingly supported                  3 — proved deep understanding</p>	<p><b>ANSWERS TO JURY, Oponent, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS</b></p> <p>0 — concise and correct or no questions asked                  -1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long                  -2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5 + 2 = 8



SCORESHEET  
 Fight 6 L, Stage: 3, Problem No. \_\_\_\_\_

Opp: Singapore

Rev: China

sign \_\_\_\_\_







SCORESHEET

Rep: Germany  
Opp: Singapore  
Fight 6 L, Stage: 3, Problem No. 1

sign

1

Rev: China

Watanakasiwich, Porrat

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5.0 - 0.5 = 8.5 ≈ 9

REPORTER

REPORT

NOTES:

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 too few, mostly irrelevant

1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report

2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

NOTES:

<p>understanding of relevant topics</p> <p>presented</p> <p>too few</p> <p>own opinions</p> <p>relevant scientific topics</p> <p>time</p>	<p>presentation addressed</p> <p>no or irrelevant</p> <p>too few</p> <p>own opinions</p> <p>presented</p> <p>poor</p> <p>reasonable</p> <p>some</p> <p>fair</p> <p>efficient</p> <p>+ improvement</p> <p>practically all</p> <p>all time used</p>	<p>opponent's conduct of the discussion</p> <p>poor</p> <p>some aspects fine</p> <p>poor</p> <p>some</p> <p>good</p> <p>some aspects</p> <p>efficient</p> <p>overall efficient</p>	<p>discussion with reporter</p> <p>relevant scientific topics</p> <p>almost no</p> <p>some</p> <p>good</p> <p>many correct</p> <p>+ improvement</p> <p>new crucial points(s)</p>	<p>opponent's conduct of the discussion</p> <p>poor</p> <p>some aspects fine</p> <p>poor</p> <p>some</p> <p>good</p> <p>some aspects</p> <p>efficient</p> <p>overall efficient</p>	<p>ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS</p> <p>concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>some incorrect,</p> <p>inconclusive or too long</p> <p>deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 7

OPPONENT

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 too few, mostly irrelevant

1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points

1 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp,

most time used

2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized,

time managed efficiently

NOTES:

<p>report evaluation &amp; understanding</p> <p>poor/wrong</p> <p>partially relevant</p> <p>mostly adequate</p> <p>fully</p> <p>condensed &amp; accurate</p> <p>speech</p> <p>evaluation</p> <p>pros &amp; cons</p> <p>priority</p>	<p>report evaluation &amp; understanding</p> <p>poor/wrong</p> <p>partially relevant</p> <p>mostly adequate</p> <p>fully</p> <p>condensed &amp; accurate</p> <p>speech</p> <p>evaluation</p> <p>pros &amp; cons</p> <p>priority</p>	<p>discussion analysis</p> <p>almost no</p> <p>some</p> <p>many</p> <p>adequate</p> <p>correct options</p> <p>evaluation</p> <p>correct own</p>	<p>discussion analysis</p> <p>almost no</p> <p>some</p> <p>many</p> <p>adequate</p> <p>correct options</p> <p>evaluation</p> <p>correct own</p>	<p>ANSWERS TO JURY MISSED POINTS</p> <p>irrelevant</p> <p>none</p> <p>relevant,</p> <p>constructive</p>	<p>ANSWERS TO JURY</p> <p>concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>some incorrect,</p> <p>inconclusive or too long</p> <p>deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 1 + 1.5 ± 0.5 - 0 = 8

REVIEWER

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

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 6 + 25 - 0 = 9



**SCORESHEET**

Fight 6 L, Stage: 4, Problem No. 4

sign *Poier*

Poier, Peter

Rep: Singapore

Opp: China

Rev: Switzerland

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

NOTES:

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 25 + 25 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
too few, mostly irrelevant	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"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 3 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some main points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> main points	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> efficient	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	
4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all points	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + all time used	4 <input type="checkbox"/> new crucial point(s)	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	

NOTES:

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 25 + 2 + 2 + 0 - 0 = 9

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
too few, mostly irrelevant	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"/> none 1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive 2 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input 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 type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some		
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 type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many		
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> condensed & accurate	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fully adequate		
4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>		

NOTES:

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5.5 + 1.5 -  = 8



**SCORESHEET**

Fight 6 L, Stage: 4, Problem No. 4

sign

Shchetnikov, Andrey

Rep: Singapore

Opp: China

Rev: Switzerland

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

NOTES:

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1 + 2 -  = 6

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

NOTES:

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:



**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5.5 + 2 - 0 = 9



**SCORESHEET**

Fight 6 L, Stage: 4, Problem No. 4

sign DRB

Balcombe, John

Rep: Singapore

Opp: China

Rev: Switzerland

REPORT							DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 <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"/> -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> review of sources, cited	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly clear	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> not well fitting	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some own input	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	3 <input type="checkbox"/> deviations qualitatively analysed	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + some interesting results	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some parts well done	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	4 <input type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + results explained errors analysed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental or theoretical	4 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall clear, demonstrative			
5 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex, completely testable	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 <input type="checkbox"/> well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental and theoretical	5 <input type="checkbox"/> greater extent than expected	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + complex concepts well communicated			
6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	

NOTES:

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.4 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 8

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

NOTES:

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 1.3 + 0.2 - 0 = 9

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

NOTES:

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5 + 2 - 0 = 8



**SCORESHEET**

Fight 6 L, Stage: 4, Problem No. 4

sign *Kent*

Hogan, Kent

Rep: Singapore

Opp: China

Rev: Switzerland

REPORT							DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no/ almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> others' data, incorrectly cited	0 <input type="checkbox"/> misunderstood	0 <input type="checkbox"/> unclear, chaotic	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> review of sources, cited	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly clear	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> not well fitting	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some own input	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	
3 <input 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 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: "Pick up" the ball only partly addressed.

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1/2 + 3/4 + 2 - 1/4 = 7

(7 1/2 rounded down)

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 type="checkbox"/> relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some main points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/> main points	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input 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 checked="" 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:

Many discussion points not addressed.

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 + 2/4 + 3/4 + 0 - 1/4 = 8

(7 3/4 rounded up)

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"/> + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input 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 type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive	
	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> condensed & accurate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate		

NOTES:

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 3 - 0 = 8



**SCORESHEET**

Fight 6 L, Stage: 4, Problem No. 4

sign

Martchenko, Ilya

Rep: Singapore

Opp: China

Rev: Switzerland

REPORT							DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> deviations qualitatively analysed	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + some interesting results	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some parts well done	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	4 <input type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + results explained errors analysed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental or theoretical	4 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall clear, demonstrative	4 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex, completely testable	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 <input type="checkbox"/> well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental and theoretical	5 <input type="checkbox"/> greater extent than expected	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + complex concepts well communicated			
6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>			
7 <input type="checkbox"/>	7 <input type="checkbox"/>	7 <input type="checkbox"/>	7 <input type="checkbox"/>	7 <input type="checkbox"/>	7 <input type="checkbox"/>	7 <input type="checkbox"/>			

NOTES:

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 7

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

NOTES:

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 1 ± 0 - 0 = 8

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

NOTES:

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



**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 6 + 2 - 0 = 9



**SCORESHEET**

Fight 6 L, Stage: 4, Problem No. \_\_\_\_\_

sign *Maciej Kolwas*

Kolwas, Maciej

Rep: Singapore

Opp: China

Rev: Switzerland

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

NOTES:

*Best presentation today*

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 7

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

NOTES:

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

*stress on Betwulf??*

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5 + 1.25 - 0.5 = 7



**SCORESHEET**

Fight 6 L, Stage: 4, Problem No. \_\_\_\_\_ sign \_\_\_\_\_

Plesch, Martin

Rep: Singapore

Opp: China

Rev: Switzerland

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

NOTES:

TABLE TOP

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2.5 - = 7

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

NOTES:

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 2 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 9

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

NOTES:

TIME

Voices

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 5.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 9$$



**SCORESHEET**

Fight 6 L, Stage: 4, Problem No. 4

sign hw

Wattanawasiwich, Pornrat

Rep: Singapore

Opp: China

Rev: Switzerland

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

NOTES:

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 3 + 2.5 - 0 = 8$$

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

NOTES:

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 + 1 \pm 0.5 - 0 = 8.5 \approx 8$$

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

NOTES:

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



**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.8 + 2 - 0 = 7



**SCORESHEET**

Fight 6 L, Stage: 4, Problem No. 4

sign *Alan Allinson*

Allinson, Alan

Rep: Singapore

Opp: China

Rev: Switzerland

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

NOTES:

*Not enough data.*  
*What is cited final theoretical model?*  
*No force in x-direction*

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 = 7

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

NOTES:

*vortices - explain/expand*

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 + 1.5 + 1.5 = 8

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

NOTES:

*vortex shedding*

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5.25 + 2 - 0.25 = 8



**SCORESHEET**

Fight 6 L, Stage: 4, Problem No. 4

sign *Maria Anghel*

Anghel, Maria

Rep: Singapore

Opp: China

Rev: Switzerland

REPORT							DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 <input type="checkbox"/> -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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	4 <input type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + results explained errors analysed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental or theoretical	4 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall clear, demonstrative			
5 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex, completely testable	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 <input type="checkbox"/> well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental and theoretical	5 <input type="checkbox"/> greater extent than expected	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + complex concepts well communicated			
6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	

NOTES: Excellent experiments, but very basic qualitative explanation that doesn't adequately explain the phenomenon.  
Good choice of turbulence model

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 1.75 - 0.25 = 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"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 <input type="checkbox"/> -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some main points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	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 type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input 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	

Had some relevant points but wrong about K-E model. Should have used discussion time to focus on other topics. Points subtracted in discussion here for K-E model.

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.75 + 2 + 1.75 + 1 = 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"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 <input type="checkbox"/> -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> condensed & accurate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate		

NOTES: Overall good points but too empty. Should have motivated points more. Okay but too short. Didn't have time to explain.