

SCORESHEET

stage: 3

fight (round no.): final

room:

problem no.: 11

Juror's name: (LAW)

reporter: Postera

opponent: ISG

reviewer: GJH

signature:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 5 + 3 - 0 = 9$$

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	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	almost no	too few	poor	
some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	
fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	some scientific points cleared	many	good	
good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
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				

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 3.5 + 3.0 - 0 = 9$$

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	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
almost no, irrelevant	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	
relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	
+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	
	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	
too few, mostly irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	
some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	
many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	
+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 6$$

stage: 5

fight (round no.): F

room:

problem no.:

Juror's name: P. Casey

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

signature: [Signature]

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	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	almost no	too few	poor	
some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	
fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	some scientific points cleared	many	good	
good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
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				

NOTES:

→ problem 3 I

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 3 + 3 - \square = 9$$

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	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
almost no, irrelevant	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	
relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	
short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	
	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 - \square = 8$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	
too few, mostly irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	
some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	
many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	
+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 33 + 25 - \square = 4$$

stage:

fight (round no.):

room:

problem no.: 11

Juror's name: T. O'PATRYK

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

signature: TO

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
some fair	some fair	some fair	some	review of sources, cited some own input	partly average
good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
almost no	too few	poor
only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine
some scientific points cleared	many	good
interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 3 - \square = 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- almost no, irrelevant
- relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor
some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
practically all points	practically all	+ Improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable
good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 15 + 2 + 25 - \square = 4$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- too few, mostly irrelevant
- some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points
- many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp
- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 5.0 + 2.0 - \quad = 8.0$$

stage: III

fight (round no.): FIVIAL ROUND

room:

problem no.: 4

RADIAL ARM MOUNTED PENDULUM

Juror's name: HATES BAD IN

signature: *Harley Padman*

reporter: DONALD DO BOY GAMES

opponent: SAMUEL PLESVICK 15C

reviewer: BOHDAN SLAVINE ESH

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
good	good	well performed, sufficient number of results explained, errors analysed	deviations qualitatively analysed, + theory limits explained, conclusive	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average greater extent than expected

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
almost no	too few	poor
only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine
some scientific interesting points discussed	many + data/theory convincingly supported	good some aspects efficient
brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

STIFFNESS: WHAT DOES THE HEIGHT AND ARM CHANGE? COUPLING IN. SHOWS ON THE SLIDE. COUPLING BETWEEN THE OSCILLATORS. Resonance of the coupled oscillators. HOW DID YOU NUMERICALLY ACHIEVE THE STABILITY OF THE UNKNOWN. Slide 28, Slide 30, Slide 31. Numerical values of theoretical predictions. CHCEW BT TO PAGES PROCEED. INITIAL CONDITION $\theta(0) = \dots$ HOW DOES THE OUTPUT OF THE SIMULATION.

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.0 + 3.0 + 3.0 - \quad = 9.0$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

almost no, irrelevant
 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable
good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

SIMULATION: BLINDING STIFFNESS. fps 60 → 30 fps. Frequency of oscillations. TIME MEASUREMENTS, ERROR BARS. CHANGE HEIGHT OF SPRING. AIR DAMPING FORCES.

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.0 + 2.0 + 2.0 - 0.0 = 6.0$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

too few, mostly irrelevant
 some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points
 many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp
 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

Amplitude of oscillations.

TEAM SUPPORT COMMENT

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4.5 + 2.25 - 0.5 = 7$$

stage: 5

fight (round no.): 3

room:

problem no.: 11

Juror's name: Milan Soudik

reporter: Postford

opponent: 156

reviewer: 63#

signature: *Yours*

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
almost no	too few	poor
only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine
some scientific points cleared	many	good
interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 3.5 + 2 = 8$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 almost no, 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
almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor
some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable
good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2.5 + 1.75 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

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: FINALS

fight (round no.): 3

room:

problem no.: 17

Juror's name: PAUL DAVIES

reporter: POSTOCKA

opponent: 156

reviewer: BOH

signature: [Signature]

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4.5 + 3 - 0 = 8$$

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution
detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	results explained errors analysed	theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
almost no	too few	poor
only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine
some scientific points cleared	many	good
interesting points discussed	data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 8.5$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 1 - almost no, irrelevant
- 2 - relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- 3 - + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable
good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 2.5 + 1.75 - 0 = 7.25$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 1 - too few, mostly irrelevant
- 2 - some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points
- 3 - many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp
- 4 - + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	improvement suggestions	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 5 + 3 - 0 = 9$$

stage: 3

fight (round no.): F

room: —

problem no.: 11.

Juror's name: Mrida Taha

reporter: GYMPS

opponent: DSG

reviewer: GJM

signature: MGT

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	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion		
almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	almost no	too few	poor		
some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine		
fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	some scientific points cleared	many	good		
good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient		
detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient		
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				1 concise and correct or no questions asked 2 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 3 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.75 + 2.5 + 3 - 0 = 8.8$$

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	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation		
almost no, irrelevant	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no		
relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some		
+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable		
	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair		
	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good		

Qualitative explanation of the phenomenon Quite good & clear opinion

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation		
too few, mostly irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no		
some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some		
many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable		
+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good		

NOTES:

↑ qualitative