SCORESHEET
Stage: 1 Fight **2 E**, Problem:

Belarus;   Wien: Slovak YPT:

REPORTER

$1 + \boxed{3{,}5} + \boxed{1} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{6}$ 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							
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
	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

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

NOTES:

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

REVIEWER

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

NOTES:

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
1	too short/long	some
	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

$1 + 4 + 2 - 0.5 = 7$

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
	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

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

NOTES:
+ materials

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 1 + 2 + 2 + 1 \pm 0.5 - 0 = 7$

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
	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

$1 + 4 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 6$

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	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
	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: There should be more real videos/fotos of Experimet

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 2 - \boxed{} = 5$

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: You missed a little the whole "decaying" Part

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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:

REPORTER

`1` + `4` + `1` - `0` = `6`   Start from 1 and add/subtract

Belarus: *Reporter*   Wien: *Opponent*   Slovak YPT: *Reviewer*

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: Very detailed Presentation; You almost had too much Information for the given Time; You obviously put a lot of Thought and Energy in your Experiments!

OPPONENT

`1` + `1` + `2` + `2.5` - `0` = `6`   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: Very structured Questions; Clearing the Questions directly with the Presentation of the Reporter was very efficient Your Precise Questions helped clearing up unclear parts of the Presentation

REVIEWER

`1` + `2` + `2` + `2` + `1` ± `0.5` - `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
	relevant, constructive ✗

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: Very sharp and direct Questions right after the Discussion   You challenged both parties and formed your own opinion

sign *Daniel Stein*   Steiner, Daniel

SCORESHEET
Stage: 1 Fight 2 E, Problem: 15
Belarus: [REP] Nikita Stepanov   Wien: [OPP] Sarah Rhomberg   Slovak YPT: [REV] Henrich Hegedus

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 6 + 2,75 − 1 = 9

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: ·) different materials?   ·) different surface of balls?   ·) alignment?   ·) error estimates good → messy

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,5 + 2,5 + 3 − 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: ·) material question asked ✓   ·) there are opinions, but   ·) discussion about clarifying about materials
·) good questions
·) no question about quantification of alignment issues ✝

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2,5 + 2,5 + 3,75 ± 0,5 − 0 = 10

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
	none
	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: ·) good alternative approach of energy decay   ·) couldn't understand measurement of disalignment

SCORESHEET

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

sig. _(signature)_ Widmann, Eberhard

Belarus: Rep. **Wien:** Opp. **Slovak YPT:** Rev.

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	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: very good theory, exp. explanation, but missing parameters to be investigated

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + \boxed{0.5} + \boxed{3} + \boxed{3.5} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{8}$

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: good analysis

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + \boxed{2} + \boxed{3} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{1} \pm \boxed{1} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{10}$

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:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + \boxed{5.5} + \boxed{1} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{6}$

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
	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

$1 + \boxed{0.5} + \boxed{2.5} + \boxed{1.5} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{4}$

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
	✗ relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
1	
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

$1 + \boxed{1} + \boxed{1.5} + \boxed{1.5} + \boxed{1} \pm \boxed{0} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{6}$

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
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: 2 Fight **2 E**, Problem:

sign _____

Eber, Alexander

Wien: Sarah Tauber   Slovak YPT: Maros Mesko   Belarus: Marina Shomben

REPORTER

1 + [2.8] + [2] - [0] = [65] *(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							
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
2	many	good
	✗ + 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] + [2.5] + [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:

REVIEWER

1 + [1.5] + [2] + [2] + [1] ± [0] - [0] = [7] *(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
Stage: 2 Fight **2** E, Problem: 14
Wien: Tauber   Slovak YPT: Maroš Mésk Belarus: 🅰 Sham 50?

sign _[signature]_   Lasserus, Max

REPORTER

1 + [1,5] + [2] − [0,5] = [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	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			well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	good	good					
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6							
7	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
	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 setup but to less Experiment.

OPPONENT

1 + [1] + [3] + [3] − [ ] = [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: Very good!

REVIEWER

1 + [0,5] + [2,5] + [2] + [2] ± [0] − [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
	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: I really like your short summary of the important points of the discussion.

sign _____

Pfau, Hans-Linus

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.5 + 1 - 0 = 6

Wien: Reporter   Slovak YPT: Opponent   Belarus: Reviewer

REPORT

0	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
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

0	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
1	too few	poor
	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: You described the phenomenon very well and you showed possible Theoretical Starting-Points. I missed the ~~part~~ the part where you ~~compared~~ compare the prediction of the theoretical Model with your experimental findings.

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 3 + 1.5 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

You brought some good Points but you missed to challenge some Points from the reporter's presentation that should have been adressed

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1 ± 0 - 0 = 5

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: The questions you brought up didn't really clear up ... relevant questions

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 0.75 − 0 = ≈ 5

Stage: 2 Fight **2 E**, Problem: **14**

sign *Daniel Steiner* — Steiner, Daniel

Wien: [REP] Sarah Tauber Slovak YPT: [OPP] Moós Máté Belarus: [REV] Hanna Shember

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	good ✗						
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6							
7	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
	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: °) friction explained, no measurements done °) formulas "innen" °) no comparison between model and experiment °) no plots of movement

---

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 3 + 3.25 − 0.5 = 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: °) not really a debate, but a Q&A °) prioritization not optimal → angular momentum and angular velocity increase

---

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.75 + 2 + 2 + 1.25 ± 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
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 ✗
	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: °) two detailed questions → couldn't be answered short and clear °) which stages specifically °) Assessment unoptimal

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 4 + 1.5 - 0 = 6$

Wien: Rep　　Slovak YPT: Opp-　　Belarus: Rev

REPORT

0–7	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	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated
7							

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

0–3	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	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: clear presentation, comparison th-exp lacking, few parameters investigated in detail (only angle to release heavy weight) m/m

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 2 + 3 + 2.5 - 0 = 8$

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

0–4	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

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: good understanding of report, pointed out missing studies, questions not all relevant

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 1 + 2 + 1 + 1 ± 0 - 0 = 6$

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

0–3	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

0–3	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

0–2	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
1	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: 3 Fight **2 E**, Problem:

Slovak YPT: Belarus: Wien:

REPORTER

R Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3,5 + [crossed out] − 1 = 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	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	X fair	X fair	fair	not well fitting	X some own input	average	average
3			well performed, sufficient number	X deviations qualitatively analysed		X some aspects above average	X some parts well done
4	good	good			+ some interesting results		
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	[crossed] too few	[crossed] poor
	some	some aspects fine
1	many	good
2	X + data/theory convincingly supported	X 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	X some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
-2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2 − 0 = 6

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	reasonable
2	X 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	X some
2	X some	X some correct	X 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	X 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 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 ± 0,5 − 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	X 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	X partial	partially relevant	X 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	X 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	X some
1	relevant parts	many
2	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

-1	irrelevant
0	X none
	X
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:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 6 + 2 - 0 = 9$

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

$1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2↑ - 0 = 7$

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

NOTES:

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1 ± 0 - 0 = 6$

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

NOTES:

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
1 ✗	too short/long relevant parts	some 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 E, Problem:

sign _Lasserus_   Lasserus, Max

Slovak YPT: Palić   **Belarus:** Khaled   **Wien:** Rhomberg

REPORTER

1 + 5 + ~~~~ - ☐ = ~~8~~ 9

Start from 1 and add/subtract

2,5
4

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
	some	some aspects fine
1	many	good
	+ 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
-1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
-2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES: Very nice variation of the parameters

OPPONENT

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

Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
1	
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 + 1 + 2 + 2 ± 0 - 0 = 7

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
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 E**, Problem: _____

sign _____

Pfau, Hans-Linus

Slovak YPT: _Reporter_   Belarus: OPPONENT   Wien: _Review_

REPORTER

$1 + \boxed{5,5} + \boxed{2,5} - \boxed{1} = \boxed{8}$

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 **X**	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 **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, ← DIMENSIONS ! **X** inconclusive or too long
-2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES: You built a strong Link between Theory and Experiment → very good Methodology! Good Explaination why you focused on Helmholtz-Resonator? (_____: Water Temperature-Dependency?! Explained when asked ✓

[Be aware of Dimensions ▽]

OPPONENT

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

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES: You brought up some valid Points that were left out in the presentation of the Reporter

A bit confusing - Take your Time to formulate Questions in a more organized way

REVIEWER

$1 + \boxed{1} + \boxed{~~X~~} + \boxed{2,5} + \boxed{1,5} \pm \boxed{0} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{8}$

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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:

SCORESHEET
Stage: 3 Fight **2 E**, Problem: 5
Slovak YPT: [REP] Michael Pelec Belarus: [OPP] Arseniy Kholod Wien: [REV] Sarah Rhomberg

sign *Daniel St___*   Steiner, Daniel

REPORTER

$1 + 6 + 1{,}5 - 0 = 8$ ("good eight")

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
2	many	good
	+ 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: *) error sources?   *) other peaks/sources in F-T?   *) temperature dependence?
↳ non-conclusion is a conclusion?

OPPONENT

$1 + 1{,}5 + 2{,}25 + 2{,}25 - 0 = 7$

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: *) other does not mention temp. dep.!   *) brings up new point of water jet speed   *) language barrier

REVIEWER

$1 + 1{,}75 + 2{,}75 + 2{,}25 + 1{,}75 \pm 0{,}25 - 0 = 9$

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
2	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used + 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: *) get temp. quest. ✓

SCORESHEET

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

sign _[signature]_   Widmann, Eberhard

Slovak YPT: Rep   Belarus: Op   Wien: Rev

REPORTER

1 + 5 + 3 − 0 = 9   *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
	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: very good exp., data taking, analysis, treatment of error bars

OPPONENT

1 + 1 + 2 + 1 − 1 = 6   *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 + 2 + 5 + 1 ± 0 − 0 = 7   *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: