

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 B, Stage: 1, Problem No. 8

Rep: BRG APP Innsbruck

Opp: GYPT

sign

[Signature]

Widmann, Eberhard

Rev: BG/BRG Villach 1

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
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
3 X good	X good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	X some interesting results	some aspects above average	X some parts well done	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	-1
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	-2
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

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	almost no	too few	poor	no	0
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
		all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	-2
		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

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	almost no	too few	-1 irrelevant	0
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
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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3.5 + 2 - 0 = 7$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 B, Stage: 1, Problem No. _____

sign

Scherbela, Michael

Rep: BRG APP Innsbruck J. Costa Opp: GYPT

Rev: BG/BRG Villach 1

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 B, Stage: 1, Problem No. 8

sign

Pfau, Hans-Linus

Rep: BRG APP Innsbruck

Opp: GYPT

Rev: BG/BRG Villach 1

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:

I liked your Experiments. It was ok to focus on the Slurkey -> But if you do that you should give a more detailed look how sound is actually formed. you got lost (a bit) in Formulas and Formalism, missing to explain the Phenomenon.

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

You pointed out very relevant Points but your own opinions came a bit short

The discussion should have been more structured. Fokus on some points you want to make and discuss them - show your own point of view.

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

	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

$$1 + 5 + 1.5 - 0 = 8$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 B, Stage: 1, Problem No. 8

sign

Kundracik

Kundracik, Frantisek

Rep: BRG APP Innsbruck

Opp: GYPT

Rev: BG/BRG Villach 1

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:

+ nice explanation, experiments
- not clear how the certain relations were found (literature?)

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

NOTES:

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

- : some points (e.g. what mass the sci-fi sound) were in the presentation clearly explained

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 7.5$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

0	irrelevant
1	none
2	relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 B, Stage: 1, Problem No. _____

sign *Andreas P.*

Beck, Anatol

Rep: BRG APP Innsbruck

Opp: GYPT

Rev: BG/BRG Villach 1

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

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

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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

- 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:

when talking about the spectrogram, tell why you want the reporter to talk more about it! (amplitudes, unclear exponential behaviour...)

more own opinion

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 B, Stage: 1, Problem No. 8

sign *[Signature]*

Hömöstreit, Mihály

Rep: BRG APP Innsbruck

Opp: GYPT

Rev: BG/BRG Villach 1

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

NOTES: *Nice experiment, basic physics to general used, def of. to be unclear in the experiments. (even if it is not a chemical later. to carry it all...)*

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 25 - 0 = 67$$

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

$$1 + 3 + 15 - 0 = 6$$

Start from 1 and add/subtract



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 B, Stage: 2, Problem No. 12

Rep: GYPT

Opp: BG/BRG Villach 1

Rev: BRG APP Innsbruck

Widmann, Eberhard

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	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	2 many	good	
3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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			-1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
									-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

OPPONENT

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

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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		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

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

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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	
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 B, Stage: 2, Problem No. 12

sign

Scherbela, Michael

Rep: GYPT *Unlabeled* Opp: BG/BRG Villach 1 S. *Ghauri* Rev: BRG APP Innsbruck *Andrey Pichler*

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	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:

Overall expl.: Every but well explained
 Theory: Simple model, relatively well explained; should have included fiction and qual. consider variations of geometry
 Exp.: well done, not so well visualised

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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:

Focus on m

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 6 + 1.5 - 0 = 9$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 B, Stage: 2, Problem No. 12

sign

Pfau, Hans-Linus

Rep: GYPT

Opp: BG/BRG Villach 1

Rev: BRG APP Innsbruck

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

NOTES: Very well structured and clear Theoretical Basis. You made it clear which assumption were made. Very good Experimental - Part.

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

You pointed out some reasonable points - Not all were good on but it was a overall good discussion

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 1 + 0.5 - 0 = 9$$

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

NOTES: You pointed out the Difference Between measurements and Theory and that the offset is similar. ✓

Very good Reviews which covered Both sides well. Very structured Review.

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 7$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 B, Stage: 2, Problem No. 12

sign

[Signature]

Kundracik, Frantisek

Rep: GYPT

Opp: BG/BRG Villach 1

Rev: BRG APP Innsbruck

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
								relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	too few	poor
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	some	some aspects fine
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	many	good
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
4	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:

+ good experiments + basic explanation of the effect
- no quantitative comparison TIE ($\sim B^2$, $\sim (\frac{R}{L})^2$, $\sim \frac{1}{\mu_0 g}$), not well fitting

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

+ many relevant points (no good fitting)
- some parameter claiming incorrect (e.g. μ_0) without supporting arguments.

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT		ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS			
		report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation				discussion evaluation	correct own opinions						
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0	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	1	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	2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	1	relevant parts	many	1	relevant, constructive	-2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	2	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate				

NOTES:

REPORTER $4,5$ Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + ~~1~~ + 2 - 0 = 8



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 B, Stage: 2, Problem No. 12

Rep: GYPT

Opp: BG/BRG Villach 1

Rev: BRG APP Innsbruck

sign

Anatol Beck

Beck, Anatol

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~~ + 2 + ~~1~~ - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

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:

IYPT - March 2019

REPORTER ⁴

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 7



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 B, Stage: 2, Problem No. 12.

sign *Mihály*

Hömöstre, Mihály

Rep: GYPT

Opp: BG/BRG Villach 1

Rev: BRG APP Innsbruck

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant		almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	almost no	too few	poor	no	0 — <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked — some incorrect, — inconclusive or too long —2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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	
		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 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 0.8 - 0 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant		poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	almost no	too few	-1 — irrelevant	0 — <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked — some incorrect, — inconclusive or too long —2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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	
3 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently		detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 B, Stage: 3, Problem No. 15

sign

[Signature]

Widmann, Eberhard

Rep: BG/BRG Villach 1

Opp: BRG APP Innsbruck

Rev: GYPT

REPORT

	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		OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
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	too few	poor	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
2	0 fair	0 fair	0 fair	0 not well fitting	0 some own input	0 average	average	0 some	some aspects fine	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	many	good	2	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	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	3	
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

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

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 B, Stage: 3, Problem No. 15

sign

[Signature]

Scherbela, Michael

Rep: BG/BRG Villach 1

Gfreiner

Opp: BRG APP Innsbruck

Rev: GYPT

T. *Kornalik*

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3				deviations	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed			
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

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

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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 3 + 2 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 8$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 irrelevant
- 2 none
- 3 relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3,5 + 1,5 - 0 = 6$$



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 B, Stage: 3, Problem No. 15

sign

Pfau, Hans-Linus

Rep: BG/BRG Villach 1

Opp: BRG APP Innsbruck

Rev: GYPT

REPORT							DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 — almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	0 — too few	poor	0 — <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
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	-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	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	-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			

NOTES:

You did a very detailed Overview of the Theory but you ran out of time to show all of your Experimental Findings in enough Detail → Prioritize Better

Better Def. of Decay is needed
 DL: Use your definition of Decay consistently (you cut your Measurements at the last collision)

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

→ You need Dimensions on your graphs? (x, y-Axes?)
 (Units)

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 — <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1 — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 — few	some	some aspects fine	some	
2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used		main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 — some	some correct	good	reasonable	-1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
		all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 — good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 — new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	-2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

Very well structured and constructive Discussion. A lot of valid Points

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

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



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 B, Stage: 3, Problem No. 15

sign

Uledia

Kundracik, Frantisek

Rep: BG/BRG Villach 1

Opp: BRG APP Innsbruck

Rev: GYPT

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

NOTES:

+ detailed explanation of various sources of dumping + many experiments
- no data analysis (comparison to theory) - what is the main source of dumping?

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 3 + 5 - 0 = 8$$

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

NOTES:

+ question about graphs (energy) at $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$
+ influence of COR at material change, COR determining
- how the heat is included into theory

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant		poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 — poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 — almost no	too few	-1 — irrelevant	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked -1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 — relevant, meant to clarify unclear points		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		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		detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 — condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	3 — accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		

NOTES:

first measure if the frictional forces you included are necessary at all to make it work
 you at all to make it work
 the experiment came late: 2 min. before end!
 maybe you did sufficient measurements but could not find the in your quick presentation
 Beck, Anatol the wood-balls would have been interesting concerning your theory and experimental proof of it

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

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



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 B, Stage: 3, Problem No. 15

Rep: BG/BRG Villach 1

Opp: BRG APP Innsbruck

Rev: GYPT

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

NOTES:

please talk slower
 estimation should be practical
 please give more experimental information / considerations (why this theoretical approach?)
 in between your theoretical part so the viewer can follow better.
 please explain why you include so many frictional terms!

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

NOTES:

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

you contradicted yourself: theory was complex and many parameters were included
 Did not show a sophisticated theory
 what does the energy transfer

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



SCORESHEET

Fight 3 B, Stage: 3, Problem No. 15.

sign *Pimöster*

Hömöstre, Mihály

Rep: BG/BRG Villach 1

Opp: BRG APP Innsbruck

Rev: GYPT

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: Nice and detailed model of the phenomenon, unfortunately have not used later...

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4.5 + 2.5 + 2 - 0 = 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.8 + 2 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 0.25 - 0 = 8$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 irrelevant
- 0 none
- 1 relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: