

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 A, Stage: 1, Problem No. 10

sign

Werbach, Katharina

Rep: BG/BRG Villach 2

Opp: Iran

Rev: Hungary

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: excellent conduct at discussion!

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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:

good discourse

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1 + 1 + 0.5 - 0 = 6$$

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
- 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



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 A, Stage: 1, Problem No. 10

Handwritten signature

Eber, Alexander

Rep: BG/BRG Villach 2

Opp: Iran

Rev: Hungary

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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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	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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
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	irrelevant	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	prioritisation	prioritisation	correct own opinions	none	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 irrelevant	
	1 partial	1 too short/long	1 too short/long	0 none	
	2 good	2 informative, apt	2 relevant parts	1 relevant, constructive	
	3 detailed, complex	3 condensed & accurate	3 accurate, conclusive		

NOTES:

$$\boxed{1} + \boxed{3} + \boxed{1} - \boxed{1} = \boxed{4}$$


SCORESHEET

Fight 3 A, Stage: 1, Problem No.

Rep: BG/BRG Villach 2

Opp: Iran

sign

Rev: Hun

Rev: Hungary

Irgang, Klaus

REPORT


	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	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

$$\boxed{1} + \boxed{1} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{3} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{7}$$

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

$$\boxed{1} + \boxed{1} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{1} + \boxed{1} + \boxed{1} - \boxed{1} = \boxed{6}$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 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

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
	too short/long	some
1	relevant parts	many
	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate
2		

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

☐ irrelevant
☐ none
☒ relevant,
 constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

0 ——— concise and correct or
no questions asked

-1  some incorrect,
inconclusive or too long

——— deeply incorrect or show
-2 ——— deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 A, Stage: 1, Problem No. 10

sign

Korner

Korner, Marianne

Rep: BG/BRG Villach 2

Opp: Iran

Rev: Hungary

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	not well fitting	some own input	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> average	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

$$1 + 0.5 + 2.5 + 2 - 0 = 6$$

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

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 1 + 0.5 - 0 = 8$$

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	mostly adequate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable
3	detailed, complex	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	mostly adequate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

-1	irrelevant
0	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 A, Stage: 1, Problem No. 10

sign

Lasserus

Lasserus, Max

Rep: BG/BRG Villach 2 Zhang Opp: Iran

Rev: Hungary Csesi

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	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	good	good	+ results explained	qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	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:

good start, but there should be some theory of some sort; and more reproducible experiments

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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	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:

Sorry, but you presented your idea and did not discuss the report.

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 1.5 + 1 + 1.5 - \square = 8$$

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
- 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:

Very good presentation; Next time please include more physics

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 A, Stage: 1, Problem No. 10

sign

Daniel Stein

Steiner, Daniel

Rep: BG/BRG Villach 2

Opp: Iran

Rev: Hungary

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	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	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					
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:

Experimental setup, how controllable is water speed, pressure, etc. --- ?

no experiments to show stability

comparison theory \leftrightarrow observation

density not measured

error estimation qualitatively

error quantitatively missing

misunderstanding of torque

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1,5 + 3,25 + 2,75 - 0 = 8$$

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:

friction, pressure, density of flow asked

explains well torque on ball

establishes teacher - student interaction, gets better during discussion, though

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0,5 + 2 + 2,25 + 1,25 + 0,75 - 0,25 = 7$$

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

- 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:

answer to jury inconclusive

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 A, Stage: 2, Problem No. 14

sign

[Signature]

Werbach, Katharina

Rep: Iran

Opp: Hungary

Rev: Wien

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: *you had time left, but still talked very fast. Talk slower! explain parallel decisions*

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1 + 15 - 0 = 5$$

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

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:

→ prioritize

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

- 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: *make use of the time!*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 5 + 2,5 - 0 = 9$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 A, Stage: 2, Problem No. 14

Rep: Iran

Opp: Hungary

Rev: Wien

Eber, Alexander

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 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	2 many	good	
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	3 + data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	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

$$1 + 1 + 1,5 + 1,5 - 0,5 = 4$$

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 6 + 1 - 0 = 8$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 A, Stage: 2, Problem No. 14

Rep: Iran

Opp: Hungary

sign

[Signature]

Rev: Wien

Irgang, Klaus

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	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:

time too fast! => bad time management

g2a ~

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:

time ~

too much not relevant parameters, g2a +

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 3 + 2 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 9$$

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

$$1 + 5 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 7$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 A, Stage: 2, Problem No. 14

sign

Korner

Korner, Marianne

Rep: Iran

Opp: Hungary

Rev: Wien

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

$$1 + 1 + 1.2 + 2 - 0.5 = 6$$

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

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 + 0.5 + 0.5 - 0 = 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 — relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
- 2 — + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
- 3 — ✗ most time used
- 4 — + 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:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 A, Stage: 2, Problem No. 14

sign

Lasserus, Max

Rep: Iran

Roha Mohsen

Opp: Hungary

Cséc

Rev: Wien

Tob

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:

To less experiments to support the data

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 2 + 1.5 = 5$$

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:

The discussion was very just Q & A.

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2.5 + 1 = 8$$

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



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 A, Stage: 2, Problem No.

sign *Daniel Stein*

Steiner, Daniel

Rep: Iran

Opp: Hungary

Rev: Wien

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:

1) Capstan equation

2) different friction parameters

3) rod diameter

4) string length

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0,75 + 2 + 1,5 - 0 = 5$$

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

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:

1) focus on clarity
↳ too much

2) temperature, drag force?

3) Euler-Lagrange question unconvincing

4) also didn't ask about friction variance

5) unreasonable priorization

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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:

1) question about angles unnecessary

2) other questions ok

3) good summary

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 A, Stage: 3, Problem No. 4

sign *Handwritten signature*

Eber, Alexander

Rep: Hungary

Opp: Wien

Rev: BG/BRG Villach 2

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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

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

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

MISSSED 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: make sure get important points first followed by less important points

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 9 + 2 - 0 = 7$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 A, Stage: 3, Problem No. 4

Rep: Hungary

Opp: Wien

sign *[Signature]*

Werbach, Katharina

Rev: BG/BRG Villach 2

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 no questions asked
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	-1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	+ 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			-2 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	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	

NOTES:

good experimental work; comparison between exp & theory excellent; Spend the time & to explain your model if you have it

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 too few, mostly irrelevant		almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	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	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	
		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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 0.5 + 0.5 + 0.5 - 0 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 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	
2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used		good	mostly adequate	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	relevant parts	many	1 relevant, constructive	-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		-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

too short

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 A, Stage: 3, Problem No. 4

Rep: Hungary

Opp: Wien

sign

Irgang, Klaus

Rev. BG/BRG Villach 2

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	some	some aspects fine	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	1 many	0 good	
3 good	0 good	well performed, sufficient number	0 deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	2 + data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4 0 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	0 considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting 0 solution	0 overall clear, demonstrative	3 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			-1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
									-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

time! ☹

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0	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	
2	0 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	2 good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 relevant parts	many	1 relevant, constructive	
		3 detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	2 accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		

NOTES:

goes hard in hand...

$$1 + 2,5 + \cancel{1,2} - 0,5 = 5$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 A, Stage: 3, Problem No. 4

Rep: Hungary

Opp: Wien

sign

Korner, Marianne

Rev: BG/BRG Villach 2

REPORT							DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	0 too few	poor	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	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	1 many	good	
4 detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	2 + data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
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	3 proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
6 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight									

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$\boxed{1} + \boxed{1,5} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2} - \boxed{1} = \boxed{5}$$

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

$$\boxed{1} + \boxed{4} + \boxed{2} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{7}$$


Fight 3 A, Stage: 3, Problem No. _____

Rep: Hungary

Opp: Wien

Rev: BG/BRG Villach 2

Steiner, Daniel

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		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
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
		0 ✗ concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions 3

NOTES: *) Bernoulli equation ✓

#10: What are the errors?

- different fluids/gases moving ∇

•) asymmetry not under consideration! •) formula for ρ_{ch}

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1,25 + \cancel{2,25} + 1 - 0 = 4$$

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTION
relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> few	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some
2	some	some correct	good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

0 ☒ concise and correct or no questions asked

1 ☐ some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

2 ☐ deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

•) good question about different gases

- 100 less time spent on report/speech
- Q&A x

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1,5 + 1,25 + 2,75 + 1 \pm 0,75 - 0 = 7,25$$

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

NOTES:

7) Reynolds number question

*) criticism of opponents back
of own opinion

•) pressure under the ball?

•) error estimation criticism?

•) no presentation

a) mentioned rotation ✓

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 A, Stage: 3, Problem No. 4

sign

Lasserus, Max

Rep: Hungary

Opp: Wien

Rev: BG/BRG Villach 2

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

$$1 + 1 + 1,5 + 1,5 - 1 = 4$$

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

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

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:

blue presentation

+ E more discussion
+ relation of ball

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 A, Stage: 4, Problem No. 6

sign *Daniel Stein*

Steiner, Daniel

Rep: Wien

Opp: BG/BRG Villach 2

Rev: Iran

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	0 too few	poor	0 concise and correct or
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partly clear	1 some	some aspects fine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no questions asked
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	not well fitting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some own input	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> average	average	2 many	good	1 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	-1 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	3 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:

*) angular speed measurement?
↳ dimension

*) experiment with different surfaces?
*) theory ↔ experiment?

*) discussion part

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	<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 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used		1 some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 few	some	some aspects fine	some	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
		2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> main points	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some correct	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	2 some	some correct	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	-1 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		3 all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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:

*) speech time not used
*) no visual presentation
*) theory ↔ results missing noted ✓
*) weight of balls noted × ↔ was noted

*) prioritisation on errors
*) good discussion conduct ✓

*) edge case discussion

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1,25 + 2,5 + 2,5 + 1,5 + 0,5 - 0 = 9$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently		2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 relevant parts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	1 relevant, constructive	-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		3 detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	3 accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		

NOTES:

*) good clear questions

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 A, Stage: 4, Problem No. 6

sign

Lasserus, Max

Rep: Wien

Rheinberg

Opp: BG/BRG Villach 2

Rev: Iran

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	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:

Angular velocity? in m/s (?) :

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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:

Ask all parameters at the Experiment

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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	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



$$1 + 2 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 4$$

SCORESHEET

Fight 3 A, Stage: 4, Problem No. _____

sign *Uorues*

Korner, Marianne

Rep: Wien

Opp: BG/BRG Villach 2

Rev: Iran

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

$$1 + 1 + 2.5 - 1 = 6$$

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 A, Stage: 4, Problem No. 6

sign

Irgang, Klaus

Rep: Wien

Opp: BG/BRG Villach 2

Rev: Iran

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	0 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	some	some aspects fine	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 fair	0 fair	0 fair	not well fitting	0 some own input	average	0 average	1 many	good	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 0 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	3 proved deep understanding	overall efficient	

NOTES:

smile? still very fair

good discussion

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 2 + 2.5 - 0 = 6$$

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

NOTES:

If you use no slides make sure the the background doesn't blink...

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 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 0 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:

↑
messed up here

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 A, Stage: 4, Problem No.

6

Alireza Or

Eber, Alexander

Rep: Wien

Opp: BG/BRG Villach 2

Rev: Iran

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 4$$

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 A, Stage: 4, Problem No. 6

sign

[Signature]

Werbach, Katharina

Rep: Wien

Opp: BG/BRG Villach 2

Rev: Iran

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 no questions asked
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	some	some aspects fine	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	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	+ 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	

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 2 - 0 = 5$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 too few, mostly irrelevant		almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	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	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	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	
		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

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

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		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: