

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 2.5 - 0.5 = 7$$



SCORESHEET

Stage: 1 Fight 1 A, Problem: 3

Germany Rosenheim:

GYPT:

sign

Thomas Lindner

Lindner, Thomas

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	1 some	1 some	1 some	1 review of sources, cited	1 partly	1 partly clear	1 some	1 some aspects fine	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 fair	2 fair	2 fair	2 not well fitting	2 some own input	2 average	2 average	2 many	2 good	2 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
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	3 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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 comprehensible, 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			

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

place mer

Theory



SCORESHEET

Stage: 1 Fight 1 A, Problem:

Germany Rosenheim:

GYPT:

Wien:

Lasserus, Max

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3 + 1.5 - 0 = 6$$

REPORT

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3/4 + 1 + 1 + 1.5 - 0.5 - 0 = 5$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 irrelevant
- 0 none
- 1 relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 5$$



SCORESHEET

Stage: 1 Fight 1 A, Problem:

Germany Rosenheim:

GYPT:

Wien:

Mnevets, Daniil

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
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	some	some aspects fine
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
6									
7									

NOTES: k value, chaotic patterns, number of undertone predictions

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	understanding of presentation	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented
1 --- relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	almost nothing	almost no	too few
2 --- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	some main points	few	some
	main points	some	some correct
	all relevant points	good	many correct
	practically all points	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions

NOTES: the size + the... What predictions should be done

F(1) non linear, Amplitude of paper

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 1 - 0 = 6$$



SCORESHEET

Stage: 1 Fight 1 A, Problem:

Germany Rosenheim:

GYPT:

Wien:

sign

Maurizio Musso

Musso, Maurizio

REPORT

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 irrelevant
- 0 ~~x~~ none
- 1 relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 7$$



SCORESHEET

Stage: 1 Fight 1A, Problem: 3

Germany Rosenheim:

GYPT:

sign

Siess, Josef

Wien:

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

NOTES: weak contact explained, paper parameters = ? / humidity

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	understanding of presentation	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented
1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
	prioritisation	prioritisation	
	time management		
	0 almost nothing	0 almost no	0 too few
	1 some main points	1 few	1 some
	2 main points	2 some	2 some correct
	3 all relevant points	3 good	3 many correct
	4 practically all points	4 new crucial point(s)	4 + improvement suggestions

NOTES:

more points expected

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

missed out !

missed

observer Innsbruck

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3,5 + 1 - 1 = 5$$



SCORESHEET

Stage: 2 Fight 1 A, Problem: 14

GYPT:

Wien:

sign

Siess, Josef

BRG APP Innsbruck:

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

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

applied angle thetor vs fall up ? ①

Microphone ?
hard to follow speech!

energy 2

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1,5 + 2 + 2 - \square = 7$$

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

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1,5 + 1,5 + 0,5 \pm \square - \square = 6$$

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

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

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

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT
-1 --- irrelevant
0 --- none
1 --- relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

Reviewer: Rosenheim

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 1 - 0 = 6$$



SCORESHEET

Stage: 2 Fight 1A, Problem:

GYPT:

Wien:

sign

Maurizio Musso

Musso, Maurizio

BRG APP Innsbruck:

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	too few	poor	0	concise and correct or
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	some	some aspects fine	1	no questions asked
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	many	good	2	some incorrect,
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	inconclusive or too long
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		deeply incorrect or show
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				deep misconceptions

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

$$1 + 4.0 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 6$$



SCORESHEET

Stage: 2 Fight 1A, Problem: 14

GYPT:

Wien:

BRG APP Innsbruck:

sign

Mnevets, Daniil

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	too few	poor	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some aspects fine	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	many	good	2 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	3 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	

NOTES: Two slips, comparison, boundaries of observation, angular momentum conservation,

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 0.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 4$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	few	some	poor
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	main points	some	reasonable	fair
3		all relevant points	many	many correct	efficient
4		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	too few	poor	no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.6 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 0 - 0 = 5$$

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

NOTES:

please explain and cite your theory

more!



SCORESHEET

Stage: 2 Fight 1 A, Problem: 143

GYPT:

Wien:

sign

[Signature]

Lasserus, Max

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 5 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 8$$

REPORT

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1 - 0.5 = 5$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 5.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 8$$



SCORESHEET

Stage: 2 Fight 1 A, Problem: 14

GYPT:

Wien:

sign

Thomas M

Lindner, Thomas

BRG APP Innsbruck:

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

$$1 + 1 + 1 + 1.5 + 0.5 - 1 - 0 = 4$$

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

NOTES: don't disregard centrifugal force ; good on uncertainty prediction

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$\boxed{1} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{0.5} - \boxed{-1} = \boxed{3}$$


Stage: 3 Fight 1A, Problem: 78

Wien:

BRG APP Innsbruck:

Germany Rosenheim:

Lindner, Thomas

sign *Thomas M. H.*

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	X almost no	X too few	X no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	X misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	X some	X some	X some	X some	review of sources, cited	X partly	partly clear	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	X some own input	average	average	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	X some parts well done	3	
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative		
5	demonstrative	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:

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$\boxed{1} + \boxed{1} + \boxed{2.5} + \boxed{1.5} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{6}$$

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

NOTES:

good to raise the relevance issue, be honest: there is no need to downplay your opinion, electromagnetic waves?

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$\boxed{1} + \boxed{1.5} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{1.5} + \boxed{1} - \boxed{1} = \boxed{8}$$

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

NOTES: good to bring in dispersion!

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 0.5 - 0 = 2$$



SCORESHEET

Stage: 3 Fight 1A, Problem: 8

Wien:

BRG APP Innsbruck:

Germany Rosenheim:

sign

Lasserus, Max

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

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0 + 2 + 2.5 - 0 = 6$$

Acoustic waves are not electro magnetic!

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 0.5 - 0.5 = 2$$



SCORESHEET

Stage: 3 Fight 1A, Problem: 9

Wien:

BRG APP Innsbruck:

Germany Rosenheim:

sign

[Signature]

Mnevets, Daniil

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	reporter's conduct at the discussion	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0.5-1	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	0	too few	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	1	some	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	2	many	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	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		
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		overall efficient		

NOTES: no theory or laser sound expl.

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1.5 + 2.5 - 0.5 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0.5-1	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	0	almost no	too few	poor	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1	few	some	some aspects fine	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2	some	some correct	good	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	3	
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	4	

NOTES: sound is e-m wave, material doesn't influence the speed of sound

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 \pm 1 - 0 = 8$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0.5-1	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	poor/wrong	irrelevant	0	0	almost no	too few	-1	irrelevant
1	partial	partially relevant	some	too short/long	partially relevant	1	1	too short/long	some	0	none
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	2	2	relevant parts	many	1	relevant, constructive
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	3	3	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 4$$



SCORESHEET

Stage: 3 Fight 1A, Problem:

Wien:

BRG APP Innsbruck:

Germany Rosenheim:

sign Maurizio Musso

Musso, Maurizio

REPORT

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 irrelevant
- 0 none
- 1 relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - \boxed{} = \boxed{4}$$



SCORESHEET

Stage: 3 Fight 1 A, Problem: 8

Wien:

BRG APP Innsbruck:

Germany Rosenheim:

sign

Siess, Josef

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	1 some	1 some	1 some	1 review of sources, cited	1 partly	1 partly clear	1 some	1 some aspects fine	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 fair	2 fair	2 fair	2 not well fitting	2 some own input	2 average	2 average	2 many	2 good	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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			
5 deep and comprehensible, 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	5 proved deep understanding	5 overall efficient	

NOTES:

ear drum, mechanical waves? dispersion? accuracy?

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 2.5 + 3 - \boxed{} = \boxed{8}$$

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	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 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1	1 some main points	1 few	1 some	1 some	1 reasonable	1 few	1 some	1 some aspects fine	1 some	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2	2 main points	2 some	2 some correct	2 reasonable	2 fair	2 some	2 some correct	2 good	2 reasonable	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	3	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	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:

focused on physics

tried to focus

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.25 + 1.25 + 1.25 + 1.25 \pm 1 - \boxed{} = \boxed{6}$$

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

NOTES:

(missed out?)

observer GYPT

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 5$$



SCORESHEET

Stage: 4 Fight 1A, Problem: 5

BRG APP Innsbruck:

Germany Rosenheim:

GYPT:

sign

[Signature]

Lindner, Thomas

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, 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	2 fair	2 not well fitting	2 some own input	2 average	2 average	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
4 good	4 good	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> deviations qualitatively analysed	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + some interesting results	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some parts well done	4 + data/theory convincingly supported	4 some aspects efficient	
5 detailed demonstrative	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	5	5	
6 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	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	6 proved deep understanding	6 overall efficient	
7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	

NOTES: reference material directly on slide, only comparison first - why not later,

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0	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	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some main points	1 few	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	1 few	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	1 some	
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2	2 main points	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 some correct	2 reasonable	2 fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 good	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	
	3	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	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:

only empirical points raised in questions,

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 2 + 1.5 + 1 + 0.5 - 0.5 = 6$$

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

NOTES: flow characteristics ~~not~~ not most important point

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4.5 + 2.5 = 8$$



SCORESHEET

Stage: 4 Fight 1A, Problem: 5

BRG APP Innsbruck:

Germany Rosenheim:

GYPT:

sign

Lasserus

Lasserus, Max

REPORT

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: + Live Experiment? Perfect.

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0 + 2 + 2.5 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 2.5 + 1.5 + 1 + 0.5 = 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 2 - 1.5 = 5$$



SCORESHEET

Stage: 4 Fight 1 A, Problem:

BRG APP Innsbruck:

Germany Rosenheim:

GYPT:

REPORT 2.5-3							DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT 1-2		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	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative			
5 — demonstrative		errors analysed							
6 — deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated			
7 —									

NOTES: fit of theory, bottle shape, data analysis

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH) 2-2.5					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER 1-2				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant		almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	0 — almost no	too few	poor	no	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked
1 — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report		some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 — few	some	some aspects fine	some	1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used		main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 — some	some correct	good	reasonable	2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 — good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 — new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 2 + 1.5 + 1.5 \pm 0.5 - 0.5 = 2$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT 1-2			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION 1-1.5			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS 1-1.5		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT 0.5	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant		poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 — poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 — almost no	too few	-1 — irrelevant	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked
1 — + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used		partial	partially relevant	some	1 — too short/long	partially relevant	some	1 — too short/long	some	0 — none	1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently		good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 — informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 — relevant parts	many	1 — relevant, constructive	2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 — condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	3 — accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		

NOTES:

Laminar and turbulence

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 2 - 0 = 7$$



SCORESHEET

Stage: 4 Fight 1 A, Problem:

BRG APP Innsbruck:

Germany Rosenheim:

GYPT:

sign *Maurizio Musso*

Musso, Maurizio

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	report evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	<p>1 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant</p> <p>0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none</p> <p>1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive</p>	<p>0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	pros & cons	pros & cons	correct own opinions		
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	prioritisation	prioritisation			

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 2 - \square = 7$$



SCORESHEET

Stage: 4 Fight 1A, Problem: 5

BRG APP Innsbruck:

sign

[Signature]

Siess, Josef

Germany Rosenheim:

GYPT:

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	too few	poor	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	some	some aspects fine	
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	many	good	
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4										
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative			
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
7										

NOTES:

life experiment!

real bottle / neck

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 - \square = 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	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	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	almost no	too few	poor	no	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	few	some	some aspects fine	some	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	some	some correct	good	reasonable		
		all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair		

NOTES:

*error analysis ✓
bottle neck ✓*

Keating/exp. fit ? Δ

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 1.5 + 1.25 - \square = 7$$

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

only 2 parameters changed, size, what other parameters?