SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5.5 + 1 − 0.5 = 7

Stage: 1 Fight **2 B**, Problem:

GYPT: **Baier (Rep**   Slovenia: **Marolt (Opp)**   BG/BRG Villach 2: **Wang (Rev)**

sign *Martin Tazreiter*   Tazreiter, Martin

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							
7	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
	many	good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	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 + 3 + 2 − 0.5 = 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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 ± $+1$ − 0 = 7

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
1	too short/long	some
	relevant parts	many
2	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:

IYPT – March 2019

sign _[signature]_ Schweitzer, Susanne

GYPT: Reporter - Baier   Slovenia: Opponent - Darclt   BG/BRG Villach 2: Reviewer - Wang

REPORTER

1 + [3,5] + [1,75] − [0] = [6,25] 6 *(Start from 1 and add/subtract)*

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							
7	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental _and_ theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

1 + [1] + [1] + [0,75] − [0] = [3,75] 4 *(Start from 1 and add/subtract)*

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

1 + [1,25] + [2] + [2] + [1,25] ± [0] − [0] = [7,5] 8 *(Start from 1 and add/subtract)*

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
	+ 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
1	too short/long	some
	relevant parts	many
2	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

$1 + \boxed{4} + \boxed{1,8} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{7}$

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
5/6/7	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
	many	good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	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: ↑ explanation / argumentation
by simulation why small angle approx is suitable? just examined a small range frequencies seem not to match

↳ would be nice to have a rough estimation of how decay rate depends on ..... (linear, indirect/direct proportional, quadratic, not at all) relevant as conclusion / some parts not clear from presentation

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + \boxed{1} + \boxed{1,4} + \boxed{1,3} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{5} \quad (4,7)$

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:

overall impression of some parts of discussion: strong dep. on input of team

1,2
2,0
1,0
1,5
1,2
1,9 :5 = 1,3

1
2
1

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2,5} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{1,5} \pm \boxed{-0,3} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{9}$

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
2	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:
↑ more critical about comparison

REPORTER + ~~3~~ + 1,5 - 0 = **7**   Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + ~~3~~ + 1,5 - 0 = 7

GYPT: **Baier (Rep)**   Slovenia: **Marolt (Opp)**   BG/BRG Villach 2: **Wang (Rev)**

REPORT

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0		
	too few	poor
1	some ✗	some aspects fine
✗	many	good ✗
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	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: "rate of decay depends on ... √ ?"

OPPONENT   Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
	relevant, aimed at resolving
1 ✗	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 + 1,5 + 1 ± 0,5 - 0 = **7**

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
2	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:

SCORESHEET

Stage: 1 Fight 2 B, **Problem:** 15

sign ~~K~~   Klingenböck, Anna Maria

GYPT: Reporter (Markus B.)   **Slovenia:** Opp. Matija Vardt   **BG/BRG Villach 2:** Rev Alice W.

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 5 + 2.5 - 0 = 8$

REPORT

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: – missing: why not more parameters? Limits!
+ elaborate setup
+ well structured

~ Time management maybe shorter, but slower

– missing: different alignments
– simulation could be optimised

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 (X)
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 (X)
2	main points (X)	some (X)	some correct (X)	reasonable (X)	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some (X)	some correct (X)	good	reasonable (X)
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 (X)
-1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
-2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:
+ valid questions
+ noticed problem with Simulation vs. Experiment

– Time management better
(+ missing error)

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points; + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used (X)
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 (X)	mostly adequate (X)	reasonable (X)
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 (X)
2	informative, apt (X)	mostly adequate (X)	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

-1	irrelevant
	none (X)
1	relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: + good additional possibilities to vary material + alignment
+ good summary

GYPT: _Baier (Rep)_   Slovenia: _Marolt (Opp)_   BG/BRG Villach 2: _Wangl (Rev)_

REPORTER

$1 + \boxed{3} + \boxed{1.5} - \boxed{0.5} = \boxed{5}$

REPORT

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0		
	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
	many	good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	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: _explain used models more carefully; what do you conclude from them? What do they tell you about the system?_

OPPONENT

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

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:

focus on relevant points!

REVIEWER

$1 + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{1.5} + \boxed{1.5} \pm \boxed{0} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{8}$

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
	+ 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
1	too short/long	some
	relevant parts	many
2	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:

sign _Martin T_   Tazreiter, Martin

REPORTER   Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 5 + 2.5 - 0.5 = 8$

Slovenia: **Strah (Rep)**   BG/BRG Villach 2: **Smole (Opp)**   GYPT: **Westphal (Rev)**

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	X 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, X demonstrative
5							
6							
	deep and comprehensible, X 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
	some	some aspects fine
1		
	many	good
2		
	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	X proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT   Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

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	X reasonable
2	main points	X some	X 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	X few	some	✓ some aspects fine	X some
2	some	X 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

$1 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 1 \pm 1 - 0 = 9$

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
1	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
2 X	+ 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	X mostly adequate	X reasonable
3 X	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	X mostly adequate	X reasonable
	X condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good
3			

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

-1	irrelevant
0	none
1 X	relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: Assumption of pendulum model challenged

SCORESHEET
Stage: 2 Fight **2 B**, Problem: 3
Slovenia: ~~Reviewer~~ Reporter   BG/BRG Villach 2: Opponent   GYPT: Reviewer - Westphal

sign _[signature]_

Schweitzer, Susanne

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 3.75 + 2 - 0 = 6.75$ 7

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							
7	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

$1 + 7 + 1.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 5.75$ 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

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
	+ 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
1	too short/long	some
	relevant parts	many
2	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

$1 + 4.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 7$

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							
7	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental _and_ theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
	many ✗	good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient ✗
3	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: +errors ✓ →∅ discussion   + very good structured   + good comparison   + good reactions to critics   − angel/weak contact
+theory limits   + good explained + good graphics   →∅ not investigated

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:
− weak questions
− wrong physical theory used

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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 ✗
2	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: • relevant new points
• good reviews

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3,5 + 1,5 − 0 = 6

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	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							
7	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
	many ✗	good
2 ✗	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	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 am impressed! Thank you! (Good and creative exp./ nice presentation. I still don't get why the u GN?)

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,5 + 1 + 1 − 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

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 + 2 + 1 ± 0,2 − 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1 ✗	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points + 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
2	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 + 2 - 0 = 8

REPORT

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
	some	some aspects fine
1	many	good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	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: when change) estimation to different materials interest
from n ? (of any errors? compare to membrane)
happens ? why not relevant (small)

4,8
3
4,5
5
5,5
6
33,3 : 7 = 5

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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
1
1,2
3
1,4
7,6 : 5 = 1,5

+: Outlook to discussion
cardboard (paper
also length, mass, E-module
could make

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1,2 + 2 + 0,75 ± 0 - 0 = 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
2	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: lots of points

Slovenia: _Stroh - Rep_   BG/BRG Villach 2: _Smole - Opp_   GYPT: _Westphal - Rev_

REPORTER

1 + (4) + (2) - (0) = (7)

Start from 1 and add/subtract

REPORT

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
	some	some aspects fine
1	many	good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	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 qualitative ornumphons, go further on that! nice qualitative comparison between experiment & theory, but no explanation of deviations_

OPPONENT

1 + (10) + (15) + (15) - (0) = (5)

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

1 + (2) + (2) + (2) + (1) + (1) - (0) = (8)

Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
	+ 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
1	too short/long	some
	relevant parts	many
2	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:

SCORESHEET
Stage: 3 Fight **2 B**, Problem:

sign *Martin T.*   Tazreiter, Martin

BG/BRG Villach 2:   GYPT: Slovenia:

REPORTER

$1 + \boxed{2\frac{1}{2}} + \boxed{1.5} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{4}$ Start from 1 and add/subtract

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 (X)	no/ almost no (X)	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 (X)	some own input (X)	average	average (X)
3	good (X)	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 (X)	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6							
7	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

$1 + \boxed{1} + \boxed{3} + \boxed{3} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{8}$ Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report (X)
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 (X)	many correct (X)	fair	efficient
4	practically all points (X)	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 (X)	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

$1 + \boxed{1.5} + \boxed{2.5} + \boxed{2.5} + \boxed{1.5} \pm \boxed{0} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{9}$ Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used (X)
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 (X)	fully adequate (X)	good (X)

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 (X)	fully adequate (X)	good (X)

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

-1	irrelevant
0	none (X)
1	relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

IYPT – March 2019

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 3.5 + 1.75 - 0 = 6.25 \rightarrow 6$

(3.5 noted below)

REPORT

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

$1 + 3.5/1.75 + 2.75 + 3.5 - 0 = 7.75 \rightarrow 8$

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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 + 1.25 \pm 0.25 - 0 = 8$

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points; + 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
1	too short/long	some
	relevant parts	many
2	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:

SCORESHEET
Stage: 3 Fight **2 B**, Problem: *16*
BG/BRG Villach 2: Rep. *Alice W.* GYPT: Opp. *Thomas K.* Slovenia: Rev. *Mitja S*

sign

Klingenböck, Anna Maria

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: + simple but efficient setup
− exact comparison between theory + experiment
− show results (plots)
+ good knowledge of theory

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + \boxed{1,5} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2,5} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{7}$

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
2 X	+ 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 X	reasonable X	fair X
3	all relevant points X	many X	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 X	many correct X	some aspects efficient X	fair X
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:
+ good questions
+ leading discussion

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + \boxed{1,5} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{1} \pm \boxed{0} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{7}$

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
1 X	+ 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 X	mostly adequate X	reasonable X
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 X	mostly adequate X	reasonable X
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 X
	accurate, conclusive X	fully adequate
2		

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

-1	irrelevant
0 X	none
1	relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: + good summary
− no new points

sign [signature] Hömöstrei, Mihály

SCORESHEET
Stage: 3 Fight **2 B**, Problem: *16*
BG/BRG Villach 2: *Alice W.*   GYPT: *Thomas K.*   Slovenia: *M. Žin S.*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 5$

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							
7	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
	some	some aspects fine
1	many	good
2 ✗	+ data/theory ✗ convincingly supported	some aspects ✗ efficient
3	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: *Creative experimental setup, even if it is not perfect! You KNOW PHYSICS !*

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 1 + 2,1 + 2,6 - 0 = 7$

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

$1 + 1 + 1,5 + 1 + 0,5 ± 0 - 0 = 5$

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1 ✗	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points + 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
2	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: *It was way to general for my taste.*

REPORTER

1 + [3,7] + [2,7] − [0] = [7]   Start from 1 and add/subtract

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	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							
7	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
	many	good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	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 logical pathway for the derivation of the theory

(left margin handwritten: 4, 4,5, 2,5, 7, 5, 4, 3,2, 26 2:7=3,7, 5,2)

OPPONENT

1 + [0,9] + [2,7] + [3] − [0] = [8]   Start from 1 and add/subtract

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:
+: reproducible setup
−: ideal gas (real gas assumption has no influence)

REVIEWER

1 + [1,6] + [2,2] + [2,0] + [1] ± [0] − [0] = [8]   Start from 1 and add/subtract

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
2	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:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER   Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + \boxed{3} + \boxed{2} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{6}$

sign *Werbach* — Werbach, Katharina

Stage: 3 Fight **2 B**, Problem:

BG/BRG Villach 2:   GYPT: Slovenia:

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							
7	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
	some	some aspects fine
1	many	good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	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: Talk a bit slower, try to use more graphics to explain! Aim for a more concise comparison between theory & experiment; perform more experiments! Very good start!

OPPONENT   Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + \boxed{0.5} + \boxed{2.5} + \boxed{2.5} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{7}$

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: ideal gas assumption is not that relevant in her of it and try not to make a Q&A out

---

REVIEWER   Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points + 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
1	too short/long	some
	relevant parts	many
2	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: