

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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



SCORESHEET

Stage: 1 Fight 2 E, Problem:

sign *Ber*

Poier, Peter

Belarus:

Wien:

Slovak YPT:

REPORT							DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 --- almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	0 --- too few	poor	0 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked --- some incorrect, -1 --- 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 --- + data/theory convincingly supported	good	
3 --- good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	3 --- proved deep understanding	overall 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

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

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked --- 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	partially relevant	some	1 --- too short/long	partially relevant	some	1 --- too short/long	some	0 --- none	
2 --- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	2 --- good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 --- informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 --- relevant parts	many	1 --- relevant, constructive	
	3 --- detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 --- condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	3 --- accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2 - 0.5 = 7



SCORESHEET

Stage: 1 Fight 2 E, Problem:

Belarus: *Mihaila Stsiapanau* Wien: *Sarah Rhomborg*

Slovak YPT: *Henrich Hegedus*

sign *[Handwritten Signature]*

Eber, Alexander

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

NOTES:

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	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	almost no	too few	poor	no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> -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	few	some	some aspects fine	some	
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	some	some correct	good	reasonable	
3		all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
4		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

+ materials

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2 + 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	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	almost no	too few	-1 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant 0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive -2 <input type="checkbox"/>
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	partial	partially relevant	some	too short/long	partially relevant	some	too short/long	some	
2	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	relevant parts	many	
3	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate	
4										

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 6



SCORESHEET

Stage: 1 Fight 2 E, Problem: 15

sign *[Signature]*

Lasserus, Max

Belarus: *Mikita et*

Wien:

Slovak YPT:

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

NOTES: *The should be more real videos / Fotos of Experim*

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 2 - 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	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: *You missed a little the whole the saying part*

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 1 - 0 = 6



SCORESHEET

Stage: 1 Fight 2 E, Problem:

Belarus: Reporter

Wien: Opponent

Slovak YPT: Reviewer

sign

Pfau, Hans-Linus

REPORT							DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 --- almost no	0 --- almost no	0 --- too few	0 --- no/ almost no	0 --- others' data, incorrectly cited	0 --- misunderstood	0 --- unclear, chaotic	0 --- too few	0 --- poor	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked -1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 --- some	1 --- some	1 --- some	1 --- some	1 --- review of sources, cited	1 --- partly	1 --- partly clear	1 --- some	1 --- some aspects fine	
2 --- fair	2 --- fair	2 --- fair	2 --- not well fitting	2 --- some own input	2 --- average	2 --- average	2 --- many	2 --- good X	
3 --- good	3 --- good X	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 X	3 --- some aspects efficient	
4 --- detailed demonstrative	4 --- quite detailed, correct	4 --- + results explained, errors analysed X	4 --- + theory limits explained, conclusive X	4 --- considerable experimental or theoretical X	4 --- interesting solution X	4 --- overall clear, demonstrative X			
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 ---	6 --- proved deep understanding	6 --- overall efficient	

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

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 X --- concise and correct or no questions asked -1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 X --- + 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 X	3 --- many X	3 --- many correct X	3 --- fair X	3 --- efficient X	3 --- good X	3 --- many correct X	3 --- some aspects efficient X	3 --- fair X	
		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: 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

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 1 - 0.5 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	0 --- 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 X --- relevant, constructive -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 X --- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently		2 --- good X	2 --- mostly adequate X	2 --- reasonable X	2 --- informative, apt X	2 --- mostly adequate X	2 --- reasonable X	2 --- relevant parts	2 --- many X		
		3 --- detailed, complex	3 --- fully adequate	3 --- good	3 --- condensed & accurate	3 --- fully adequate	3 --- good	3 --- accurate, conclusive X	3 --- fully adequate X		

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

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 6 + 2,75 - 1 = 9



SCORESHEET

Stage: 1 Fight 2 E, Problem: 15

sign *Daniel Steiner*

Steiner, Daniel

Belarus: [REP] *Albina Stepanov* Wien: [OPP] *Sarah Rhomberg* Slovak YPT: [REV] *Kurich Hegedus*

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	0	too few	poor	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	1	some	some aspects fine	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	2	many	good	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	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: *) different materials? *) different surface of balls? *) alignment? *) error estimator good → many

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,5 + 2,5 + 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	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	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	some main points	few	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	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	2	some	some correct	good	reasonable	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3		all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	3	
4		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	4	

NOTES: *) material question asked *) there are opinions, but *) discussion about clarifying about materials *) good questions *) no question about quantification of alignment, over

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2,5 + 2,5 + 2,75 + 0,5 - 0 = 10

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	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	partial	partially relevant	some	1	too short/long	partially relevant	some	1	too short/long	some	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	2	relevant parts	many	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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	3	

NOTES: *) good alternative approach of energy decay *) couldn't understand measurement of disalignment

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2 - 0 = 7



SCORESHEET

Stage: 1 Fight 2 E, Problem:

Belarus: Rep.

signature: *[Handwritten Signature]*

Widmann, Eberhard

Wien: Opp.

Slovak YPT:

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

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 3 + 3.5 - 0 = 8

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

NOTES: good analysis

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 3 + 2 + 1 - 1 - 0 = 10

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 --- concise and correct or no questions asked -1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 --- relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	1 --- partial	1 --- partially relevant	1 --- some	1 --- too short/long	1 --- partially relevant	1 --- some	1 --- too short/long	1 --- some	0 --- none	
2 --- + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	2 --- good	2 --- mostly adequate	2 --- reasonable	2 --- informative, apt	2 --- mostly adequate	2 --- reasonable	2 --- relevant parts	2 --- many	1 --- relevant, constructive	
3 --- + 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		

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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



SCORESHEET

Stage: 2 Fight 2 E, Problem:

sign Poi

Poier, Peter

Wien:

Slovak YPT:

Belarus:

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 --- 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 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 --- some	1 --- review of sources, cited	1 --- partly	1 --- partly clear	1 --- some	1 --- some aspects fine	
2 --- fair	2 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	2 --- fair	2 --- not well fitting	2 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some own input	2 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> average	2 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> average	2 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	2 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 --- 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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3 + 2 + 5 - 0 = 4$$

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 --- 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	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 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> main points	2 --- some	2 --- some correct	2 --- reasonable	2 --- fair	2 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 --- 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 --- 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

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	0 --- 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"/> none 1 --- relevant, constructive -2 ---	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 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 5



SCORESHEET

Stage: 2 Fight 2 E, Problem:

Wien: Sarah Tauber

sign

Eber, Alexander

Slovak YPT: Maros Mesler Belarus: Marina Shomber

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 X --- concise and correct or no questions asked --- 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 X --- 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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 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 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions -2 ---
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 X --- 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 X --- 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 - 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 X --- concise and correct or no questions asked --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions -2 ---
1 --- relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	1 --- partial	1 --- partially relevant	1 --- some	1 --- too short/long	1 --- partially relevant	1 --- some	1 X --- too short/long relevant parts	1 --- some	0 X --- none	
2 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 --- accurate, conclusive	2 --- fully adequate	1 --- relevant, constructive	
3 --- + 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				

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 4



SCORESHEET

Stage: 2 Fight 2 E, Problem: 14

Wien: Teuben

sign

[Handwritten signature]

Lasserus, Max

Slovak YPT: *Marija Mestel* Belarus: *[initials]*

Shan 500

REPORT							DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 --- almost no	0 --- almost no	0 --- too few	0 --- no/almost no	0 --- others' data, incorrectly cited	0 --- misunderstood	0 --- unclear, chaotic	0 --- too few	0 --- poor	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked 1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 --- some	1 --- some	1 --- some	1 --- some	1 --- review of sources, cited	1 --- partly	1 --- partly clear	1 --- some	1 --- some aspects fine	
2 --- fair	2 --- fair	2 --- fair	2 --- not well fitting	2 --- some own input	2 --- average	2 --- average	2 --- many	2 --- good	
3 --- good	3 --- good	3 --- well performed, sufficient number	3 --- deviations qualitatively analysed	3 --- + some interesting results	3 --- some aspects above average	3 --- some parts well done	3 --- + data/theory convincingly supported	3 --- some aspects efficient	
4 --- detailed demonstrative	4 --- quite detailed, correct	4 --- + results explained errors analysed	4 --- + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 --- considerable experimental or theoretical	4 --- interesting solution	4 --- overall clear, demonstrative			
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 ---			
7 ---	7 ---	7 ---	7 ---	7 ---	7 ---	7 ---			

NOTES: *good setup but too less Ex per ment.*

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 3 + 3 = 8

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 --- 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	1 --- few	1 --- some	1 --- some	1 --- reasonable	1 --- few	1 --- some	1 --- some aspects fine	1 --- some	
2 ---	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 ---		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: *Very good!*

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 2.5 + 2 + 2 ± 0 - 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 --- 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	1 --- partially relevant	1 --- some	1 --- too short/long	1 --- partially relevant	1 --- some	1 --- too short/long	1 --- some		
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		
		3 --- detailed, complex	3 --- fully adequate	3 --- good	3 --- condensed & accurate	3 --- fully adequate	3 --- good	3 --- accurate, conclusive	3 --- fully adequate		

NOTES: *I really like your short summary of the important points of the discussion.*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.5 + 1 - 0 = 6



SCORESHEET

Stage: 2 Fight 2 E, Problem:

Wien: Reporter

sign

Pfau, Hans-Linus

Slovak YPT: Opponent

Belarus: Reviewer

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	1 --- some	1 --- some	1 --- some	1 --- review of sources, cited	1 --- partly	1 --- partly clear	1 --- some	1 --- some aspects fine	1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 --- fair	2 --- fair	2 --- fair	2 --- not well fitting	2 --- some own input	2 --- average	2 --- average	2 --- many	2 --- good	2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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			

NOTES: You described the phenomenon very well and you showed possible Theoretical starting-Points. I missed the ~~part~~ the part where you ~~compare~~ 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		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 ---	too few, mostly irrelevant	0 --- almost nothing	0 --- no or irrelevant	0 --- too few	0 --- no	0 --- poor	0 --- almost no	0 --- too few	0 --- poor	0 --- no	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked
1 ---	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	1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
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	2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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: You brought some good Points, but you missed to challenge some Points from the reporter's presentation that should have been addressed

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1 - 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	0 --- irrelevant	0 --- no	0 --- poor/wrong	0 --- irrelevant	0 --- no	0 --- almost no	0 --- too few	-1 --- irrelevant	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked
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 --- none	1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 ---	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	2 --- good	2 --- mostly adequate	2 --- reasonable	2 --- informative, apt	2 --- mostly adequate	2 --- reasonable	2 --- relevant parts	2 --- many	1 --- relevant, constructive	2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 ---	+ 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		

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

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 0,75 - 0 = 25



SCORESHEET

Stage: 2 Fight 2 E, Problem: 14

Wien: [REP] Sarah Teuber Slovak YPT: [OPP] Marius Mink Belarus: [REV] Hanna Shember

sign *Daniel Steiner*

Steiner, Daniel

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 --- some incorrect, -1 --- inconclusive or too long -2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 --- some	some	some	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	1 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	some aspects fine	
2 --- fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	not well fitting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some own input	average	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> average	2 --- + data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
3 --- good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average	some parts well done	3 --- proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
4 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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:) friction explained) formulas "unnecessary") no comparison between model and experiment
) no measurements done) no plots of movement

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 3 + 3,25 - 0,5 = 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked --- some incorrect, -1 --- inconclusive or too long -2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	
	3 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many correct	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> efficient	3 --- good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many correct	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	
	4 --- practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + all time used	4 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> new crucial point(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

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

NOTES:) too detailed questions -> couldn't be answered short and clear) assessment superficial
) which stages specifically

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 1.5 - 0 = 6



SCORESHEET

Stage: 2 Fight 2 E, Problem:

Wien: Rep

sign

[Handwritten Signature]

Widmann, Eberhard

Slovak YPT: Opp-

Belarus: 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				
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 ---	6 --- proved deep understanding	6 --- overall efficient		

NOTES:

clear presentation, comparison th-exp (lacking, few parameters investigated in detail)
 only angle to release heavy weight
 make

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 3 + 2.5 - 0 = 8

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

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		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 --- 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	1 --- partially relevant	1 --- some	1 --- too short/long	1 --- partially relevant	1 --- some	1 --- too short/long	1 --- some		
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		
		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

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



SCORESHEET

Stage: 3 Fight 2 E, Problem:

Slovak YPT:

Belarus:

Wien:

sign *Tos*

Poier, Peter

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

NOTES:

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 6 + 2 - 0 = 9$$



SCORESHEET

Stage: 3 Fight 2 E, Problem:

Slovak YPT: *Michal Patić*

sign *Ar Ar*

Eber, Alexander

Belarus: *Arseniy Kholod*

Wien: *Sarah Rhomburg*

REPORT							DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 --- almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	0 --- too few	poor	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked --- 1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long --- -1 --- --- -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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	good	
3 ---			deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	3 ---	overall efficient	
4 --- good	good	well performed, sufficient number	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative			
5 --- detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated			
6 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis							

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	0 --- poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 --- poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 --- almost no	too few	-1 --- irrelevant	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked --- -1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long --- -2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	1 --- partial	partially relevant	some	1 --- too short/long	partially relevant	some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	some	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none	
2 --- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 --- informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 --- relevant parts	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 + 5 + 2.5 - 4 = 9



SCORESHEET

Stage: 3 Fight 2 E, Problem:

Slovak YPT: *Polici*

sign

Lasserus

Lasserus, Max

Belarus: *Kheled*

Wien: *Rhebenberg*

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	0	too few	poor	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	1	some	some aspects fine	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	2	many	good	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	3	
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	4	
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	5			5	

NOTES: *Very nice variation of the parameters*

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 2.5 + 2 - 1 = 5

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

NOTES: *too few*

Opponent's speech was quite good and well prioritized

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1 + 2 + 2 ± 0 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS								
						report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0	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	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	1	relevant, constructive	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	2		3	

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5.5 + 2.5 - 1 = 8



SCORESHEET

Stage: 3 Fight 2 E, Problem:

Slovak YPT: *Reporter*

sign _____

Pfau, Hans-Linus

Belarus: *Opponent*

Wien: *Reviewer*

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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>DIMENSIONS!</i> some incorrect, -1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3 --- some aspects efficient <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
4 --- detailed demonstrative	4 --- quite detailed, correct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 --- + results explained errors analysed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 --- + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 --- considerable experimental or theoretical <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 --- interesting solution <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 --- overall clear, demonstrative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 --- convincingly supported	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	5 --- proved deep understanding	5 --- overall efficient	
6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	

NOTES:

*You built a strong link between Theory and Experiment → very good Methodology
 Good Explanation why you focused on Helmholtz-Resonator? (Water Temperature-Dependency?)
 Explained when asked ✓
 Be aware of Dimensions!*

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
too few, mostly irrelevant	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 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 -2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 --- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	1 ---	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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 --- fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 --- some	2 --- some correct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 --- good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 --- reasonable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
		3 --- all relevant points <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3 --- many <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3 --- many correct	3 --- fair	3 --- efficient	3 --- good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3 --- many correct	3 --- some aspects efficient	3 --- fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
		4 --- practically all points	4 --- practically all	4 --- + improvement suggestions	4 --- very good	4 --- + all time used	4 --- new crucial point(s)	4 --- + improvement suggestions	4 --- overall efficient	4 --- very good	

NOTES:

*You 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

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
too few, mostly irrelevant	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	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 -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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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 --- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	2 ---	2 --- good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 --- mostly adequate	2 --- reasonable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 --- informative, apt	2 --- mostly adequate	2 --- reasonable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 --- relevant parts	2 --- many <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive	
		3 --- detailed, complex	3 --- fully adequate	3 --- good	3 --- condensed & accurate	3 --- fully adequate	3 --- good	3 --- accurate, conclusive	3 --- fully adequate	2 ---	

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 6 + 1,5 - 0 = 8

"good eight"



SCORESHEET

Stage: 3 Fight 2 E, Problem: 5

Slovak YPT: [REP] Michal Balic Belarus: [OPP] Ihorovij Kholod Wien: [REV] Sarah Rhomeberg

sign Daniel Steiner

Steiner, Daniel

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	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	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: *) error sources? *) other peaks in Γ ? *) temperature dependence?

↳ non-conclusion is a conclusion?

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,5 + 2,25 + 2,25 - 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 --- 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: *) other does not mention temp. dep.! *) brings up new point of water jet speed *) language barrier

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,75 + 2,75 + 2,25 + 1,75 + 0,25 - 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 --- 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 --- none	
2 --- + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	2 --- good	2 --- mostly adequate	2 --- reasonable	2 --- informative, apt	2 --- mostly adequate	2 --- reasonable	2 --- relevant parts	2 --- many	1 --- relevant, constructive	
3 --- + 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		

NOTES: *) jet temp. quest.

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5 + 3 - 0 = 9



SCORESHEET

Stage: 3 Fight 2 E, Problem:

Slovak YPT: *Rep*

Belarus: *OP*

Wien: *Rev*

Widmann, Eberhard

sign *[Signature]*

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	0	too few	poor	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	1	some	some aspects fine	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	2	many	good	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	3	
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	4	
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: *very good exp., data taking, analysis, treatment of error bars*

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 1 - 1 = 6

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES: