

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 5.5 + 1 - 0.5 = 7$$



**SCORESHEET**

Stage: 1 Fight 2 B, Problem:

GYPT: **Baier (Rep)**

sign *Martin Tazreiter*

Tazreiter, Martin

Slovenia: **Harolt (Opp)**

BG/BRG Villach 2: **Wang (Rev)**

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 fulfillment	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	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			
6 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> shows physical insight									

NOTES:

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 3 + 2 - 0.5 = 7$$

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 --- relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	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 --- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used		1 --- some main points	1 --- few	1 --- some	1 --- some	1 --- reasonable	1 --- few	1 --- some	1 --- some aspects fine	1 --- some	
		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:

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3,5 + 1,25 - 0 = 6,25 \quad 6$$



**SCORESHEET**

Stage: 1 Fight 2 B, Problem:

GYPT: *Reporter - Baier*

sign

Schweitzer, Susanne

Slovenia: *Opponent - Barot* BG/BRG Villach 2: *Reviewer - Wang*

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 incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 --- some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	1 --- some	some aspects fine	
2 --- fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	2 --- many	good	
3 --- good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	3 --- + data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4 --- detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative			
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			
6 ---									

NOTES:

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1 + 0,75 - 0 = 3,75 \quad 4$$

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

NOTES:

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1,25 + 2 + 2 + 1,25 - 0 - 0 = 7,75 \quad 8$$

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

1 + 4 + 1.8 - 0 = 7



**SCORESHEET**

Stage: 1 Fight 2 B, Problem: 15

GYPT: Reporter - *Baker*

Slovenia: Opponent - *Karol* BG/BRG Villach 2:

sign *Gerhard Dorn*

Dorn, Gerhard

Review - *Way*

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 fulfillment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 - almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	0 - too few	poor	0 - concise and correct or no questions asked 1 - some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 - some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	1 - some	some aspects fine	
2 - fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	2 - many	good	
3 - good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	3 - + data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4 - detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative			
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			
6 -									

NOTES: explanation by simulation

argumentation why small angle approx is suitable? just examined a small range frequencies seem not to match

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

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1.4 + 1.3 - 0 = 5 (4,7)

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	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	0 - almost no	too few	poor	no	0 - concise and correct or no questions asked 1 - some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 - relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report		1 - some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 - few	some	some aspects fine	some	
2 - + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used		2 - main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 - some	some correct	good	reasonable	
		3 - all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 - good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
		4 - practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 - new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

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

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2.5 + 2 + 1.5 - 0.3 - 0 = 9

1.2  
2.0  
2.0  
1.5  
1.5  
1.2  
9.9 : 5 = 1.98

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

NOTES:

more critical about comparison

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + ~~3~~ + 1.5 - 0 = 7



**SCORESHEET**

Stage: 1 Fight 2 B, Problem:

GYPT: **Baier (Rep)**

sign

*Jimosta*

Hömöstreit, Mihály

Slovenia: **Kardelj (Opp)** BG/BRG Villach 2: **Wang (Rev)**

REPORT							DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 --- almost no	0 --- almost no	0 --- too few	0 --- no/ almost no	0 --- others' data, incorrectly cited	0 --- misunderstood	0 --- unclear, chaotic	0 --- too few	0 --- poor	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 --- not well fitting	2 --- some own input	2 --- average	2 --- average	2 --- many <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 --- good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> --- good	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> --- good	3 --- well performed, sufficient number	3 --- deviations qualitatively analysed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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			
6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---			

NOTES: *rate of decay depends on ...*

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 2 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	0 --- relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	0 --- almost nothing	0 --- no or irrelevant	0 --- too few	0 --- no	0 --- poor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0 --- almost no	0 --- too few	0 --- poor	0 --- no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> --- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used		1 --- some main points	1 --- few <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 --- some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 --- some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 --- reasonable	1 --- few	1 --- some	1 --- some aspects fine	1 --- some	
		2 --- all relevant points	2 --- many	2 --- many correct	2 --- fair	2 --- efficient	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> --- some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 --- some correct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 --- good	2 --- reasonable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
		3 --- practically all points	3 --- practically all	3 --- + improvement suggestions	3 --- very good	3 --- + all time used	3 --- good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3 --- many correct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3 --- some aspects efficient <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3 --- fair	
							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 + 1.5 + 1 ± 0.5 - 0 = 7

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

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5 + 2,5 - 0 = 8



**SCORESHEET**

Stage: 1 Fight 2 B, Problem: 15

sign

*[Signature]*

Klingenböck, Anna Maria

GYPT: Reporter (Markus B.) Slovenia: Opp. Mahija Varolt BG/BRG Villach 2: Rev Alice W

REPORT							DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 --- almost no	0 --- almost no	0 --- too few	0 --- no/ almost no	0 --- others' data, incorrectly cited	0 --- misunderstood	0 --- unclear, chaotic	0 --- too few	0 --- poor	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked --- 1 --- some incorrect, --- inconclusive or too long -1 --- --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions -2 ---
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 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	4 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct	4 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> results explained errors analysed	4 --- + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental or theoretical	4 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	4 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> overall clear, demonstrative	4 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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			
6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---			

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

~ Timemanagement: 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		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 --- relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked --- 1 --- some incorrect, --- inconclusive or too long -1 --- --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions -2 ---
1 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used		1 --- some main points	1 --- few	1 --- some	1 --- some	1 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	1 --- few	1 --- some	1 --- some aspects fine	1 --- some	
		2 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> main points	2 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some many	2 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 --- fair	2 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	2 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	
		3 --- all relevant points	3 --- many	3 --- many correct	3 --- fair	3 --- efficient	3 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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: + valid questions  
 + noticed problem with Simulation vs. Experiment

- Time management better (A missing error)

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

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

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 15 - 0 = 5



**SCORESHEET**

Stage: 1 Fight 2 B, Problem: 15

GYPT: Baier (Rep)

sign

*[Handwritten signature]*

Werbach, Katharina

Slovenia: Harolt (Opp) BG/BRG Villach 2: Wamp (Rep)

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, -1 --- 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			
6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---			

NOTES: explain used models more carefully; what do you conclude from them? what do they tell you about the system?

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 4

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

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 + 15 + 15 - 0 - 0 = 8

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

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5 + 2.5 - 0.5 = 8



**SCORESHEET**

Stage: 2 Fight 2 B, Problem:

Slovenia: *Strah (Rep)*

sign *Reaktion*

Tazreiter, Martin

BG/BRG Villach 2: *Smode (Opp)* GYPT: *Westphal (Rev)*

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 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	4 --- overall efficient	
5 --- deep and comprehensible, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> shows physical insight	5 --- detailed, complex, completely testable	5 --- + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 --- well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental and theoretical	5 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> greater extent than expected	5 --- + complex concepts well communicated			
6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---			

NOTES:

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 7 + 1 - 0 = 4

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

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

NOTES: *Assumption of pendulum model challenged*

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.75 + 2 - 0 = 6.75 7



**SCORESHEET**

Stage: 2 Fight 2 B, Problem: 3  
Slovenia: *Janina Reporke*

sign *[Signature]*

Schweitzer, Susanne

BG/BRG Villach 2: *Smale Opponent* GYPT: *Reviewe - Wetzphal*

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 fulfillment	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 --- <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 --- <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 --- some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	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			
6 ---							3 --- proved deep understanding	overall efficient	

NOTES:

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 5.5 6

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	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 --- <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 --- <input type="checkbox"/> 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:

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 + 1.5 + 0.5 - 0 = 8.5 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	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 --- <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 --- <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 --- relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	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:



**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 7



**SCORESHEET**

Stage: 2 Fight 2 B, Problem: 3

Slovenia: Rep. Manca Strah

sign

*[Handwritten signature]*

Klingenberg, Anna Maria

BG/BRG Villach 2: *opulhas S.* GYPT: *Per Antonio Vasilphal*

REPORT							DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 --- almost no	0 --- almost no	0 --- too few	0 --- no/ almost no	0 --- others' data, incorrectly cited	0 --- misunderstood	0 --- unclear, chaotic	0 --- too few	0 --- poor	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 --- 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			
6 ---									

NOTES: *+ errors ✓ - discussion + very good structured + good explained + good graphics + good comparison + good reactions to critics - angel / weak contact -> not investigated*

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	0 --- relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 --- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some main points	1 --- few	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	
2 ---		2 --- main points	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 --- some correct	2 --- reasonable	2 --- fair	2 --- some	2 --- some correct	2 --- good	2 --- reasonable	
3 ---		3 --- all relevant points	3 --- many	3 --- many correct	3 --- fair	3 --- efficient	3 --- good	3 --- many correct	3 --- some aspects efficient	3 --- fair	
4 ---		4 --- practically all points	4 --- practically all	4 --- + improvement suggestions	4 --- very good	4 --- + all time used	4 --- new crucial point(s)	4 --- + improvement suggestions	4 --- overall efficient	4 --- very good	

NOTES: *- weak questions - wrong physical theory used*

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 + 1 ± 0.5 - 0 = 8

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

NOTES: *relevant new points good reviews*

**REPORTER** Start from 1 and add/subtract

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



**SCORESHEET**

Stage: 2 Fight 2 B, Problem: 3

Slovenia: *Mauca S-Rep* BG/BRG Villach 2: *Lila So* GYPT: *Antar = W-Rep*

sign *[Signature]*

Hömöstreij, Mihály

REPORT							DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 --- almost no	0 --- almost no	0 --- too few	0 --- no/ almost no	0 --- others' data, incorrectly cited	0 --- misunderstood	0 --- unclear, chaotic	0 --- too few	0 --- poor	0 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 --- some	1 --- some	1 --- some	1 --- some	1 --- review of sources, cited	1 --- partly	1 --- partly clear	1 --- some	1 --- some aspects fine	
2 --- 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			
6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---			

NOTES: *I am impressed! thank you! (good and creative exp.) nice presentation. I still don't get why the u = 11?*

**OPPONENT** Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	1 --- relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	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 ---	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 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 ---	1 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 --- some main points	1 --- few	1 --- some	1 --- some	1 --- reasonable	1 --- few	1 --- some	1 --- some aspects fine	1 --- some	
2 ---	2 ---	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:

**REVIEWER** Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,5 + 2 + 2 + 1 ± 0,2 - 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	1 --- relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 ---	0 ---	0 --- poor/wrong	0 --- irrelevant	0 --- no	0 --- poor/wrong	0 --- irrelevant	0 --- no	0 --- almost no	0 --- too few	-1 --- irrelevant	0 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 ---	1 --- + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	1 --- partial	1 --- partially relevant	1 --- some	1 --- too short/long	1 --- partially relevant	1 --- some	1 --- too short/long	1 --- some	0 --- none	
2 ---	2 --- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	2 --- good	2 --- mostly adequate	2 --- reasonable	2 --- informative, apt	2 --- mostly adequate	2 --- reasonable	2 --- relevant parts	2 --- many	1 --- 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:

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5 + 2 - 0 = 8



**SCORESHEET**

Stage: 2 Fight 2 B, Problem:

Slovenia: Reporter - Strah

BG/BRG Villach 2:

sign *Gerhard Dom*

Dom, Gerhard

Opponent - *Smole* GYPT: Reviewer - *Westphal*

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

NOTES:

*when change from n to n+1 estimation of any errors happens? why not relevant? (small) different materials interest compare to membrane*

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,3 + 1,5 + 1,6 - 0 = 5,4

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
							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 type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	relevant, 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:

*1, 1, 1, 2, 3, 3, 4, 7, 6 : 5 = 1,5*  
*+ Outlook to discussion*  
*↳ compare standard paper*  
*↳ also length of mass, E-module could matter*

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1,2 + 2 + 0,75 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS		
									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 type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	partial	partially relevant	some	1	too short/long	partially relevant	some	1	too short/long	some	0	none	
	+ 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	
	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good		accurate, conclusive	fully adequate	1	relevant, constructive	

NOTES:

*lots of points*

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2 - 0 = 7



**SCORESHEET**

Stage: 2 Fight 2 B, Problem: 3

Slovenia: *Strah-Rep*

sign *Ullrich*

Werbach, Katharina

BG/BRG Villach 2: *Smole-app* GYPT: *Westphal-Rew*

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

NOTES: *good qualitative comparisons, go further on that! nice qualitative comparison between experiment & theory, but no explanation of deviations*

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 10 + 15 + 15 - 0 = 5

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

NOTES:

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 20 + 20 + 20 + 10 + 10 - 0 = 9

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

NOTES:

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 = 4



**SCORESHEET**

Stage: 3 Fight 2 B, Problem:

BG/BRG Villach 2:

sign *Robin T.*

Tazreiter, Martin

GYPT:

Slovenia:

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	X --- too few	X --- no/ almost no	0 --- others' data, incorrectly cited	0 --- misunderstood	0 --- unclear, chaotic	0 --- too few	0 --- poor	0 X --- concise and correct or no questions asked --- 1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long --- 2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions --- 3 ---
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	X --- some own input	X --- average	2 --- average	2 --- + data/theory convincingly supported	2 --- some aspects efficient	
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 --- proved deep understanding	3 --- overall efficient	
4 X --- detailed demonstrative	4 X --- quite detailed, correct	4 --- + results explained errors analysed	4 --- + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 --- considerable experimental or theoretical	4 --- interesting solution	4 --- overall clear, demonstrative			
5 --- deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 --- detailed, complex, completely testable	5 --- + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 --- well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 --- considerable experimental and theoretical	5 --- greater extent than expected	5 --- + complex concepts well communicated			
6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---			

NOTES:

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 3 + 3 - 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	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 X --- concise and correct or no questions asked --- 1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long --- 2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions --- 3 ---
1 X --- 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 X --- many correct	3 --- fair	3 --- efficient	3 X --- good	3 --- many correct	3 --- some aspects efficient	3 --- fair	
	4 X --- practically all points	4 X --- 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 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0 - 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	-1 --- irrelevant	0 X --- concise and correct or no questions asked --- 1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long --- 2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions --- 3 ---
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	0 X --- none	
1 X --- + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	2 --- good	2 --- mostly adequate	2 --- reasonable	2 --- informative, apt	2 --- mostly adequate	2 --- reasonable	2 X --- relevant parts	2 X --- many	1 --- relevant, constructive	
2 --- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3 X --- detailed, complex	3 --- fully adequate	3 X --- good	3 X --- condensed & accurate	3 X --- fully adequate	3 --- good	3 --- accurate, conclusive	3 --- fully adequate		

NOTES:

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3<sup>3/5</sup> + 1.25 - 0 = 6.25 = 6



**SCORESHEET**

Stage: 3 Fight 2 B, Problem: 16

sign

*S. Fil*

Schweitzer, Susanne

BG/BRG Villach 2: *Reporter*

GYPT: *Opponent*

Slovenia: *Reviewer*

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

NOTES:

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3<sup>4/5</sup> + 2.75 + 2.5 - 0 = 7.75 = 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	almost no	too few	poor	no	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	few	some	some aspects fine	some	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	some	some correct	good	reasonable	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	3	
		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	all time used	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	4	

NOTES:

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 + 1.25 + 0.25 - 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	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	almost no	too few	-1	irrelevant	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	partial	partially relevant	some	too short/long	partially relevant	some	too short/long	some	0	none	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	relevant parts	many	1	relevant, constructive	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate				

NOTES:

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2 - 0 = 7



**SCORESHEET**

Stage: 3 Fight 2 B, Problem: 16

sign *A*

Klingenböck, Anna Maria

BG/BRG Villach 2: Rep. Alice W. GYPT: Opp. Thomas K.

Slovenia: Rev. Mitja S

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 fulfillment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 --- almost no	0 --- almost no	0 --- too few	0 --- no/ almost no	0 --- others' data, incorrectly cited	0 --- misunderstood	0 --- unclear, chaotic	0 --- too few	0 --- poor	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 --- -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			
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			
6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---			

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 + 7.5 + 2 + 2.5 - 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 --- -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: + good questions  
 + leading discussion

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES: + good summary  
 - no new points

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 5



**SCORESHEET**

Stage: 3 Fight 2 B, Problem: 16

BG/BRG Villach 2: Alice W.

sign *P. Mihály*

Hömöstreit, Mihály

GYPT: Thomas K.

Slovenia: *Mežica S.*

REPORT							DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 --- almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	0 --- too few	poor	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked 1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 --- some	some	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	1 --- some	some aspects fine	
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> --- fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	fair	not well fitting	some own input <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	average <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	average	2 --- many	good	
3 --- good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> above average	some parts <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> well done	3 --- + data/theory <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> convincingly supported	some aspects <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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			
6 ---									

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

NOTES:

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant		0 --- poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 --- poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 --- almost no	too few <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	-1 --- irrelevant	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked 1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> --- + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used		1 --- partial	partially relevant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> --- too short/long	partially relevant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> --- too short/long	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0 --- none	
2 --- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently		2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> --- good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	mostly adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	reasonable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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: *It was way to general for my taste.*



**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.7 + 2.7 - 0 = 7



**SCORESHEET**

Stage: 3 Fight 2 B, Problem: 16

BG/BRG Villach 2: Reporter

GYPT: Opponent

Slovenia: Reviewer

sign *C. Gerhard*

Dorn, Gerhard

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 fulfillment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 --- almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	0 --- too few	poor	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked
1 --- some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	1 --- some	some aspects fine	1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 --- fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	2 --- many	good	2 --- 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	3 --- + data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	3 --- 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			
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	

**NOTES:**

↳ nice logical pathway for the derivation of the theory

**OPPONENT**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.9 + 2.7 + 3 - 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		0 --- almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	0 --- almost no	too few	poor	no	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked
1 --- relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report		1 --- some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 --- few	some	some aspects fine	some	1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 --- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used		2 --- main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 --- some	some correct	good	reasonable	2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		3 --- all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 --- good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
		4 --- practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 --- new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

**NOTES:**

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

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4.6 + 2.2 + 2.0 + 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		0 --- poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 --- poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 --- almost no	too few	-1 --- irrelevant	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked
1 --- relevant, meant to clarify unclear points		1 --- partial	partially relevant	some	1 --- too short/long	partially relevant	some	1 --- too short/long	some	0 --- none	1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 --- + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used		2 --- good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 --- informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 --- relevant parts	many	1 --- relevant, constructive	2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 --- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently		3 --- detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 --- condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	3 --- accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		

**NOTES:**

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 6



**SCORESHEET**

Stage: 3 Fight 2 B, Problem:

BG/BRG Villach 2:

GYPT:

Slovenia:

sign *Urume*

Werbach, Katharina

REPORT							DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 --- almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	0 --- too few	poor	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked -1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 --- some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	1 --- some	some aspects fine	
2 --- fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	2 --- many	good	
3 --- good	good	well performed, sufficient number	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			
6 ---									

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 + 0.5 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	1 --- relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	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 ---	0 ---	0 --- almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	0 --- almost no	too few	poor	no	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked -1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 ---	1 ---	1 --- some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 --- few	some	some aspects fine	some	
2 ---	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 ---		3 --- all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 --- good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
4 ---		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:

*ideal gas assumption is not that relevant in this case; they need to make a Q&A act of it*

**REVIEWER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES: