



[Settings](#)

[Entries](#)

[Paneling](#)

[Schemats](#)

[Tabbing](#)

[Results](#)

PF QUARTERS

Online Ballot Comments

Caty Gottschalk & Gabriela Clinton vs Audrey Nasser & Edan Lee



Kennedy, David

RFD

I vote pro because of terminalized impacts

Donowho, Joseph

RFD

I vote aff on the accessibility argument. Cleanest warrant in the round. Neg doesn't do a good enough job extending the warrants on innovation and on their counter plan.

Jackie Ku & Jacob Grant vs Bryan Pan & Michael Zhu



Goldin, Ben

RFD

I voted neg on innovation.

Comments for Ku & Grant

like the energy

Comments for Pan & Zhu

really liked your rebbuttle

great summary

Irfan, Hanaa

RFD

I negate because aff does not extend any links from case, so i can not evaluate those impacts. aff turn is not well warranted and not weighed. i give neg their innovation offense because links are extended clearly and impacts are extended and weighed.

Comments for Pan & Zhu

1st speaker- good extensions in summary

Siddhartha Rana & Leon Sakata vs Sharick Merchant & Caden Juang



Day, Caden

RFD

Quarters

[Return to Schematic](#)

[Return to Round Results](#)

Annette Navaretto & Kennedy Honors vs Eschaal Merchant & Eric Fan



Dowdall, Joseph

RFD

Oral.

Comments for Navaretto & Honors

Annette = first

Kennedy = second

Comments for Merchant & Fan

Merchant = first

Fan = second

Calvillo, Joaquin

RFD

Every speech I sort of flipped which side I thought was going to win because it was really close. At the end of the round the biggest issues were Innovation, people not taking their medicine and me too drugs.

Innovation while it was an argument used by both didn't have much good clash so its hard to vote off of that. I think ultimately the pro wins that argument though there were a lot of problems with it. Neither side really addresses the other sides position. They just say thats wrong our side is right. That makes it hard to judge it. The pro side should have explained their side more about how it inversely is related because they just accept it as fact without explanation as to why and the neg never clashes with it. The 4% of innovation is real innovation argument is the only thing I can really judge because the neg kind of responds to it but not adequately enough to stop it.

Me too drugs was another good argument but once again not much clash. Basically the pro says its what happens in squo and the con side never says otherwise, basically conceding to it, but they respond by saying it only happens in the con world.

The argument that probably tipped the debate was the Adherence argument. The one where 30% of people were not taking their medicine because they couldn't afford it. The con never lays down enough ground to argue against it and the pro said it in every speech so because of that I am giving my vote to the pro side.

Overall a good round, but both sides really need to clash more and not just say "their side isn't true because my side is true". You have to go into the actual argument and respond to the argument, not bring in your own.

Comments for Navaretto & Honors

You both did good but you need more clash. Coming out of Rebuttal you had a lot of ground covered already and you should've weighed the Adherence argument more and taken advantage of their unresponsiveness to it. Weighing in general is another thing both sides need to work on.

Comments for Merchant & Fan

You all did very good, but both sides need more clash. If you had argued against the Adherence argument more you probably would've won. My advice is to weigh more and to remember to clash.

Also I dont really see the point in your 3rd contention. It seems like a counterplan but you didn't really use it that way. It doesn't provide any offense for you so I dont see the point.