

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 7$$



## SCORESHEET

Stage: 1 Fight 1 Z, Problem:

Slovak YPT: Jaron Nerken

14

sign

Scherbela, Michael

BG/BRG Villach 2:

Alice Wang

Slovenia:

Mitja

Savojac

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	<del>some</del>	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	some	some aspects fine	
2	<del>fair</del>	fair	<del>fair</del>	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	<del>many</del>	<del>good</del>	-1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	-2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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

$$1 + 0.5 + 0.5 + 1 - 0 = 3$$

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

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 5 + 2 - 0 = 8$$



## SCORESHEET

Stage: 1 Fight 1 Z, Problem: 14

Slovak YPT: Maros Mastko

sign Grillenbeck

Grillenbeck, Thomas

BG/BRG Villach 2: Alice Wang Slovenia: Midja Surajac

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 X	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 X	some aspects efficient X	
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct X	+ results explained errors analysed X	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical X	interesting solution X	overall clear, demonstrative X			
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: no analytic approach only simulation, missing references! error analysis not convincing analytic missing

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

no slides

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:



## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3 + 7 - 0 = 5$$



## SCORESHEET

Stage: 1 Fight 1 Z, Problem:

Slovak YPT: *Nešter*

BG/BRG Villach 2:

sign

*Robert Scheiber*  
*Wang*

Scheiber, Robert

Slovenia:

*Savajac*

## REPORT

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

## DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

## ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

## NOTES:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1,5 + 2,5 - 0 = 6$$

## 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

$$1 + 0,5 + 2 + 2 + 1,5 + 1 - 0 = 8$$

## 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

$$1 + 3.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 8$$



## SCORESHEET

Stage: 1 Fight 1 Z, Problem: 74

Slovak YPT: M. Mestrovac BG/BRG Villach 2: A. Wap Slovenia: M. Suvarjok

sign

Worm, Paul

## 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: Assumptions shown

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

## 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:

No presentation

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 0.5 - 0 = 8$$

## 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

- 0 — irrelevant
- 1 — none
- 2 — 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

$$1 + 5 + 1.5 - 0 = 7$$



# SCORESHEET

Stage: 1 Fight 1 Z, Problem: 10

Slovak YPT: Marcos Medner

BG/BRG Villach 2: Alice Wang

Slovenia: Maja Savagac

Zajki-Zechmeister, Krisztina

shape question

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

NOTES: wheel the repine graph a lot also theory exp. good comparison

Q. how would you implement diff. opes in simulation? how does the shape of object change anything

changing material like elastic is not the same as changing only friction! stretching question not answered

# OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 9.5 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	few	some	some	reasonable
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	some main points	some correct	reasonable	fair
3		all relevant points	many correct	fair	efficient
4		practically all points	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ 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	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable	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: rope type question good, clarify parameters, log scale ~

good point bringing up the back loop more own input would have been nice

# REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2 + 1.5 + 1 + 9.5 - 0 = 7$$

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

NOTES: single question good! friction zero question also very good

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 3$$



## SCORESHEET

Stage: 2 Fight 1 Z, Problem: 4

BG/BRG Villach 2: Luko's Smoke Slovenia:

sign

Scherbela, Michael

Slovak

Belarus:

Hanna Shumilova

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		
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic			0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	<del>some</del>	<del>some</del>	<del>some</del>	<del>some</del>	<del>review of sources, cited</del>	<del>partly</del>	<del>partly clear</del>	too few	poor	
2	<del>fair</del>	<del>fair</del>	<del>fair</del>	<del>not well fitting</del>	<del>some own input</del>	<del>average</del>	<del>average</del>	some	some aspects fine	
3								many	<del>good</del>	
4	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done			
5	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	
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:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	understanding of presentation	relevant 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	<del>no</del>	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	<del>few</del>	some	some aspects fine	some	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		main points	some	some correct	reasonable	<del>fair</del>	some	some correct	<del>good</del>	reasonable	3	
		all relevant points	<del>many</del>	<del>many correct</del>	<del>fair</del>	<del>efficient</del>	good	<del>many correct</del>	some aspects efficient	fair	4	
		<del>practically</del> all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good		
NOTES:												

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 2 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 8$$

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

NOTES:



## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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



## SCORESHEET

Stage: 2 Fight 1 Z, Problem: 4

BG/BRG Villach 2: Lukas Smole

Slovenia: Manca Shah

Belarus: Hanna Shamber

sign GulleSeck

Grillenbeck, 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	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic			0	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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	review of sources, cited	partly <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	partly clear <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	too few <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	poor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	average	average	some	some aspects fine	2	
3								many	good	3	
4	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done				
5	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		
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: no slide numbers! well structured but lacked substance

## 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	
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

$$1 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 8$$

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	too few, mostly irrelevant										
	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:

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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



## SCORESHEET

Stage: 2 Fight 1 Z, Problem: 4

BG/BRG Villach 2: Smole

Slovenia: Strah

Belarus: Shamber

Scheiber, Robert

## 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

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

## 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

## NOTES:

## 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

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 3 + 2 + 1,5 + 0,5 - 0 = 10$$

## 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

$$1 + 1.25 + 1 - 0.5 = 3$$



## SCORESHEET

Stage: 2 Fight 1 Z, Problem: 4

BG/BRG Villach 2: L. Smole

sign

Worm, Paul

Slovenia: M. Strah Belarus: H. Shamber

## 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							
4	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
5	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6	demonstrative		errors analysed				
7	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		
4	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
5		
6		
7	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:

Poor experimental setup

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

## 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					
5	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				
5	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:

Spend too much time in discussion on irrelevant aspects

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 1 + 1 + 0.5 - 0 = 6$$

## 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
- 2 — none
- 3 — 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: Too short analysis of discussion

# REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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



# SCORESHEET

Stage: 2 Fight 1 Z, Problem: 4

BG/BRG Villach 2: Lukas Stroh

Slovenia: Mones Stroh

Belarus: Hone

Zajki-Zechmeister, Krisztina

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	concise and correct or
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor	1	no questions asked
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	some	some aspects fine	2	some incorrect,
3								many	good	3	inconclusive or too long
4	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient		
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative				
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: Hypo: acceleration → velocity how precise

how was speed of air measured → error 2, error 1, 5, 10%

Error analysis: how much of every stated error source

# OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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		
		all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair		
		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good		

NOTES: how was paid now

NOTES: how wind speed measured  
what was goal

- too much focus on asymmetric problem  
- do ——— density (problem states air)

Q: Parameters ✓  
fluidity ✓  
balance ✓

# REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0	too few, mostly irrelevant								0	concise and correct or no questions asked
	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points								-1	irrelevant
1	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used								0	none
									1	relevant parts
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently								1	relevant, constructive
		</								

NOTES: good summary  
comprehensive analysis of both parties, own opinion given



# REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3 + 1 - 0 = 5$$



# SCORESHEET

Stage: 3 Fight 1 Z, Problem: 15

Slovenia: Jakša Karol

Belarus: Nikita Skripov

Slovak YPT: Michal Pali

Scherbela, Michael

sign

*[Signature]*

## 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

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

## 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

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

## 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

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



## SCORESHEET

Stage: 3 Fight 1 Z, Problem: 15

Slovenia: Matija Marolt

Belarus: Mikita Stsiapanau

Slovak YPT: Michal Polie

sign

Grillenbeck

Grillenbeck, Thomas

## REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	too few	no/ almost no <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some	review of sources, cited	partly <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	average	average <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some aspects fine <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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: no theory at all! unphysical assumption of exponential decay

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 6 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 12$$

## 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	many correct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	efficient <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some
2	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some correct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 2 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 8$$

## 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	mostly adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	reasonable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	reasonable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

## DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
1	too short/long	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	relevant parts <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	many
3	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

## MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 ☐ irrelevant
- 2 ☐ none
- 3 ☒ 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

$$1 + 3,5 + 1 - (-7) = 65 \text{ (4,5)}$$



## SCORESHEET

Stage: 3 Fight 1 Z, Problem:

Slovenia:

Narolt

Belarus:

Shriapana

Slovak YPT:

Scheiber, Robert

Palič

## 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

$$1 + 2 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 8 \text{ (8,5)}$$

## 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

$$1 + 1 + 2,5 + 2,5 + 1 + 0,5 - 0 = 8 \text{ (8,5)}$$

## 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

$$1 + 1.75 + 1 - 0 = 4$$



## SCORESHEET

Stage: 3 Fight 1 Z, Problem: 15

Slovenia: M. Kavolt

Belarus: M. Stigapavay

Slovak YPT: M. Polic

sign

Worm, Paul

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

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2.75 + 1.5 - 0.25 = 6$$

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	0	
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	few	some	some aspects fine	some	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
		main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	some	some correct	good	reasonable	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	3	
		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	all time used	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	4	
NOTES:												

NOTES:

Rude discussion manners; started the point

However already too much monologue

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 2.5 + 1.5 + 0.25 + 0.5 - 0.25 = 7$$

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

NOTES:



## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 1 - 0.5 = 4$$

ball hog's  
high  
-> dis take steps  
+ theory  
+ theory  
be nice



## SCORESHEET

Stage: 3 Fight 1 Z, Problem: 15

Slovenia: Melija

Belarus: Misha

Slovak YPT:

Zajki-Zechmeister, Krisztina

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								many	good
4	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained, errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated		
7									

## NOTES:

1 number  
method  
described  
efficiently

friction  
drag

model  
friction  
alignment

has less is already related to really foot showing of graphs  
why is the energy lost if alignment is different? -> couldn't follow properly  
celluloid, not plastic -> would you expect different results  
e.g. horizontal contribution  
better?

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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		
		all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair		
		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good		
NOTES:												

## NOTES:

Alignment questioned  
Loudly question -> important

ball material point good!  
many points

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	report evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	almost no	too few	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	partial	too short/long	too short/long	some	2 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:

couldn't  
say about other things  
conclusion

# REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 4$$



# SCORESHEET

Stage: 4 Fight 1 Z, Problem: 10

Belarus: Hoshan Shamber

sign

*[Signature]*

Scherbela, Michael

Slovak YPT: Kamil Hegedus BG/BRG Villach 2: Udoei

## 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, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	good	good					
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6							
7	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

$$1 + 2 + 3 + 3.5 - 0 = 10$$

## 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	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
3					
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

$$1 + 1 + 1.0 + 1 + 0.5 + -0.5 - 0 = 4$$

## 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

$$1 + 3 + 1 - 0 = 5$$



## SCORESHEET

Stage: 4 Fight 1 Z, Problem: 10

Belarus: Hanna Shamber

Slovak YPT: Henrich Hegerdus

BG/BRG Villach 2:

Hadei Zhang

Grillenbeck, Thomas

sign

Gille

## 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	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
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
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive			
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: theoretical description is partly from literature: citation & application to experiment & error analysis

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

## 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

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 1 + 0 + 0 - 0 = 5$$

## 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

- 0 ☒ irrelevant
- 1 ☐ none
- 2 ☐ 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:

no slides

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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



## SCORESHEET

Stage: 4 Fight 1 Z, Problem:

Belarus: *Shamber*Slovak YPT: *Nejedus*BG/BRG Villach 2: *Zhang*sign *[Signature]*

Scheiber, Robert

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	concise and correct or
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor		no questions asked
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	some	some aspects fine	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3				deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	many	good	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4	good	good	well performed, sufficient number					+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient		
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative				
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	3	
7											

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 2,5 + 2,5 - 0,5 = 8$$

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	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	prioritisation	prioritisation	
	time management		
	0 almost nothing	0 almost no	
	1 some main points	1 too few	
	2 main points	2 some	
	3 all relevant points	3 good	
	4 practically all points	4 new crucial point(s)	

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:



## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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



## SCORESHEET

Stage: 4 Fight 1 Z, Problem: 10

Belarus: H. Shamber

Slovak YPT: H. Hepetus BG/BRG Villach 2: H. Zhang

sign

Worm, Paul

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

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.75 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 8$$

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			
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	0	concise and correct or no questions asked	
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	few	some	some aspects fine	some	-1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	
		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			
		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	-2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
NOTES:													

NOTES:

poor time management

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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	irrelevant	no	too few	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	partial	partially relevant	some	some	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	many	
	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	fully adequate	

NOTES:

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$\boxed{1} + \boxed{15} + \boxed{05} - \boxed{05} = \boxed{3}$$


## SCORESHEET

Stage: 4 Fight 1 Z, Problem: 10

Belarus: *Anna Monchar*

sign 

Zajki-Zechmeister, Krisztina

Slovak YPT: *Henril Heger* BG/BRG Villach 2: *Heidi Zhong*

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	
almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	too few	poor	
some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	some	some aspects fine	
fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	many	good	
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	
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	
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:

no perturbations?!

how was velocity measured  $\rightarrow$  error?  
13. what are the real points? (good!)  
how was angle measured

very good  $\rightarrow$  use max time!  
set up unclear

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$\boxed{1} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{25} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{7}$$
[illegible]

NOTES:

≠ error discarding  
≠ plot?!

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$\boxed{1} + \boxed{1} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{0.5} + \boxed{0.5} \pm \boxed{0} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{5}$$

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

NOTES:

4. leads money  
many important  
things "

not  $\downarrow$  recall  
presented