

SCORESHEET

REPORTER: 2,2 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + ~~1~~ + ~~1~~ - 0 = ~~1~~ = 5

stage: 3
 reporter: Ivan Dimitrov

fight (round no.): 2
 opponent: Jakub Domes

room: B
 reviewer: William Kocalp
 problem no.: 9

Juror's name: FANG-YUH
 signature: Fang-Yuh Lo

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	efficiency
0	almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic
1	only technical	some	avoided some questions
2	some scientific points cleared	many	cooperated well
3	interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions
4	brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive

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: ~~results - 1 diagram~~ experiments inadequate; different liquid might influence; energy doesn't depend on frame
 experiment-theory discrepancy not discussed; resistant force increase

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + ~~2~~ - 0.5 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED	
0	almost no, irrelevant
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation
0	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no
1	very little	some main points	few	some	almost no
2	not all	main points	some	to important topics	some
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable
4	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no
1	little	some	some	to some extent	almost no
2	partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some
3	good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable
4	new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very 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: energy perspective cannot help to understand the phenomenon

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2 + ~~1~~ + 1.8 - 0.5 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED	
0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out
2	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.
3	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no
2	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some
3	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	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:

Ball on Tube

SCORESHEET

REPORTER
1 + $\frac{1}{2}$ + 0.5 = $\frac{5}{2}$

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 2 room: B problem no.: 9
reporter: Bulgaria opponent: Czech Rep reviewer: Sweden

Juror's name: T-S-Koh
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	efficiency	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	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	1 only technical	some	avoided some questions	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 some scientific	many	cooperated well	
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations - No qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	3 interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions	
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive	
6 deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting/deviations analysed, conclusive No.	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES: Various force & Coriolis force - \hookrightarrow assumption? Sample 5 doesn't match. Only (m) varied & α ? NOT shown. $\$W \checkmark$.

Opponent: 1 + 3 + 3 - 0.5 = 7
 Moment of viscosity η ? Sample 4 & 5 graph.

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 almost no, irrelevant	1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
0	some unclear points	0 almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0 almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	1 very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	1 little	some	some	to some extent	almost no	
2		2 not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	2 partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some	
3		3 almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	3 good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable	
4		4 all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4 new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	very good	

NOTES: Did not ask essential questions. Asked optional ones some like - vertical force. Missed friction normal force. Good pt raised re: sample 4.

REVIEWER
1 + $\frac{1}{2}$ + $\frac{1}{2}$ + $\frac{1}{2}$ = $\frac{3}{2}$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	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 partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	
2		2 good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	
3		3 detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	3 brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	

NOTES: Missed friction Normal force

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{3.5}$ + $\boxed{2.5}$ - $\boxed{}$ = $\boxed{7}$

stage: $\boxed{3}$ fight (round no.): $\boxed{2}$
 reporter: Bulgaria Ivan Dimitrov opponent: Czech Republic Jarub Domes

room: \boxed{B} problem no.: $\boxed{9}$
 reviewer: Sweden William Kecalp

Juror's name: *Zuansbert Tejelav*
 signature: *X. KICALP*

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	efficiency		
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	0	concise and correct or
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	only technical	some	avoided some questions	1	no questions asked
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	points cleared	many	cooperated well	2	some incorrect,
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	some scientific points cleared			3	inconclusive or too long
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions	4	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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	brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive		

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{4.5}$ + $\boxed{9.5}$ + $\boxed{1.5}$ - $\boxed{1.1}$ = $\boxed{5.4}$ $\times \boxed{1.5}$

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation		
0	almost no, irrelevant	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	some main points	few	some	almost no	little	some	some	to some extent	almost no	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	main points	some	to important topics	some	partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3		all-relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable	3	
4		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	very good	4	

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{2.5}$ + $\boxed{2.5}$ + $\boxed{2}$ - $\boxed{1}$ = $\boxed{7}$

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS		
	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation			
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0	concise and correct or no questions asked	
1	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	
2	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
3	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	3	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2.2 + 1.9 - 0.5 = 5

stage: 3
 reporter: BULGARIA

fight (round no.): PF2
 opponent: CZECH REPUBLIC

room: B
 reviewer: SWEDEN

problem no.: 9

Juror's name: URSZ GARDZIK
 signature: URSZ GARDZIK

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	efficiency	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 only technical	some	avoided some	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 points cleared	many	questions	
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	3 interesting points	+ data/theory	cooperated well	
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 dismissed	convincingly supported	answered directly	
6 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	4 brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	to most questions efficient, productive	

NOTES: To less experiments to justify the target theoretical assumptions. This it does not much experimental data as some some assumptions are not valid.
 Good understanding of theory. $\bar{z} = \dots$ - presentation was limited to no kinetic equation

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 0.5 + 1 + 2.5 - 0.5 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 almost no, irrelevant	1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	
0 almost no, irrelevant	1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	0 almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0 almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no
1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	2 very little	some main points	1 very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	1 little	some	some	to some extent	almost no
2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	2 not all	main points	2 not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	2 partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some
	3 almost all	all relevant points	3 almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	3 good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable
	4 all & efficiently	practically all points	4 all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4 new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	very good

NOTES: Questions - few questions (3)
 Discussion about equilibrium point ✓
 OPPOSITION (SPEECH): TOO LESS POINTS COVERED X

DIDN'T UNDERSTAND REPORTER'S RESPONSE X
 FOCUS ON 1 IMPORTANT ASPECT ✓
 Refers to the report ✓
 Energy is conserved?
 FRICTION! Contact with walls!

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2 + 2.5 + 2 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS			
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions		pros & cons	prioritisation	
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no		
1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	2 partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no
2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	2 good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some
3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	3 detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	3 detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	3 brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good

NOTES: 8-9 questions.
 Resistor forces, viscosity
 no survey of the speech to fort them the discussion.

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 2.5 = 6

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 2
 reporter: Bulgaria opponent: Czech

room: B problem no.: 9
 reviewer: Sweden

Juror's name: Nint
 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	efficiency	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 only technical	some	avoided some questions	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 some scientific	many	cooperated well	
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	3 interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions	
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive	
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				

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
0 almost no, irrelevant	some relevant, aimed at resolving	0 almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0 almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no	
1 some unclear points	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	1 very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	1 little	some	some	to some extent	almost no	
2		2 not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	2 partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some	
3		3 almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	3 good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable	
4		4 all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4 new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	
1 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.		1 partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	
2 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently		2 good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	
3		3 detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	3 brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	

NOTES:

Leidenfrost Stars.

REPORTER
1 + $3^{2.5}$ + 2 - 0 = 6

*Exp not fitted
Data not complete*

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 2
reporter: Czech Rep. opponent: Sweden

room: B problem no.: 5
reviewer: Bulgaria

Juror's name: T-S. Koh
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	efficiency	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 only technical	some	avoided some	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 some scientific	many	questions	
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	3 interesting points	+ data/theory	cooperated well	
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 discussed	convincingly supported	answered directly	
6 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	4 brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	to most questions efficient, productive	

NOTES:

Q: Concave shape - MV, cause of osc ↓
Temp of surface - n/m.

Assumpt = of dist betw drop & surface
How ext use temp inside droplet

odd-even Δ, endurance relevance clears expl of oscillance
Lack expl = qual & quant of phenomenon.
surface tension prevents/exceeds

OPPONENT
1 + $1.7^{1.5}$ + 1.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 almost no, irrelevant	1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used		0 almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0 almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no	
		1 very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	1 little	some	some	to some extent	almost no	
		2 not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	2 partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some	
		3 almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	3 good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable	
		4 all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4 new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	very good	

NOTES: Opp need to ask abt the physics, not just tech. details

Tried to get Rep to expl. "drag force"
freq indep of mode

REVIEWER
1 + 2.2 + 2.5 + 0.5 - 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.		0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	
3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently		1 partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	
		2 good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	
		3 detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	3 brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 1.4 - \square = 6.4 \quad (6)$$

stage: 1

reporter: Czech Rep.
Daniel Rychly

fight (round no.): 2

opponent: Sweden
Daniel Javadinjad

room: B

reviewer: Bulgaria
Simona Todorova

problem no.: 5

Juror's name: Juanher Tejeira

signature: X.X.X.X

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	efficiency	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 only technical	some	avoided some questions	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 some scientific points cleared	many	cooperated well	
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	some interesting results	interesting solution	3 interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions	
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive	
6 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.4 + 2 + 2 - \square = 6.4 \quad 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	1	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
0 almost no, irrelevant	some relevant, aimed at resolving	0 almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0 almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 some unclear points	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	1 very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	1 little	some	some	to some extent	almost no	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2		2 not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	2 partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3		3 almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	3 good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable	
4		4 all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4 new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.4 + 2.5 + 2.5 - \square = 8.4 \quad (8)$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	1	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.		1 partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently		2 good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3		3 detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	3 brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 1 = 3.5 = 4$$

4,5

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 2

room: B

problem no.: 5

Juror's name: Nimit

reporter: Czech

opponent: Sweden

reviewer: Bulgaria

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	efficiency	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 only technical	some	avoided some	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 some scientific	many	cooperated well	
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	3 interesting points	+ data/theory	answered directly	
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 discussed	convincingly supported	to most questions	
6 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	4 brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive	

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 = 5 = 4$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	1	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
0 almost no, irrelevant	some relevant, aimed at resolving	0 almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0 almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 some unclear points	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	1 very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	1 little	some	some	to some extent	almost no	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2		2 not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	2 partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3		3 almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	3 good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable	3
4		4 all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4 new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	very good	4

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.5 = 5 = 4$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	1	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.		1 partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently		2 good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3		3 detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	3 brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	3

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2 + 2 - = 5

stage: 1
 reporter: Czech Republic

fight (round no.): PF2
 opponent: Sweden

room: A B
 reviewer: Bulgaria

problem no.: 5

Juror's name: LUKASZ GLADZUN
 signature: Juha S. Pidik

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	efficiency	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no/ almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> others' data, incorrectly cited	0 <input type="checkbox"/> misunderstood	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no, chaotic	
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> review of sources, cited	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partly	1 <input type="checkbox"/> only technical	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> avoided some	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some own input	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some scientific	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> cooperated well	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	3 <input type="checkbox"/> not well fitting deviations	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some interesting results	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> points cleared	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory	3 <input type="checkbox"/> answered directly	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	4 <input type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + results explained errors analysed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> qualitatively analysed + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental or theoretical	4 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average	4 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points discussed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> convincingly supported	4 <input type="checkbox"/> to most questions	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex, completely testable	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 <input type="checkbox"/> well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental and theoretical	5 <input type="checkbox"/> greater extent than expected	5 <input type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics	5 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	5 <input type="checkbox"/> efficient, productive	

NOTES: $F = \text{const. } 26 \text{ Hz} - \text{NOT TRUE}$
 $NO F \text{ depends on relevant parameters.}$

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 - 0.5 = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no, irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost nothing	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no or irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> very little	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> very little	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some main points	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> almost no	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> little	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> to some extent	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/> not all	2 <input type="checkbox"/> main points	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> to important topics	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> leading or cooperative	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	
	3 <input type="checkbox"/> almost all	3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input type="checkbox"/> to most topics	3 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input type="checkbox"/> quite efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	
	4 <input type="checkbox"/> all & efficiently	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all points	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	4 <input type="checkbox"/> new crucial point(s)	4 <input type="checkbox"/> almost all	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very efficient	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	

NOTES: $GOOD \text{ POINTS, } NO \text{ NOT WELL ADRESSED BY OPP}$
 $NOT \text{ ALL GRAPHS REQUIRE ERROR BARS! IT IS IMPORTANT TO UNDERSTAND WHERE ARE NEEDED}$
 $I \text{ DO NOT FEEL CLOSER TO UNDERSTANDING THE NATURE.}$

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + 1.0 + 1.5 - 0 = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> almost no	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> brief but accurate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 3 + 1.5 - 0 = 6

stage: 1
 reporter: Daniel Rychly

fight (round no.): 2
 opponent: Daniel Savadinejad

room: B problem no.: 5
 reviewer: Simona Todorova

Juror's name: FANG-YUH LO
 signature: Fang-Yuh Lo

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

	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	efficiency
0	almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic
1	only technical	some	avoided some questions
2	points cleared	many	cooperated well
3	some scientific		
4	points cleared	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions
5	interesting points discussed	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive
6	brought in new physics		

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: capillary waves not explained, some good qualitative explanations

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1 - 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 — almost no, irrelevant
 1 — some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
 2 — short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation
0	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no
1	very little	some main points	few	some	almost no
2	not all	main points	some	to important topics	some
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable
4	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good

	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no
1	little	some	some	to some extent	almost no
2	partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some
3	good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable
4	new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very 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: questions & discussion did not help to understand the topic

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 1.8 + 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 — too few, mostly irrelevant
 1 — some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out
 2 — most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.
 3 — +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently

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

	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no
2	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some
3	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	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: Some good own opinions, clear answers from the to questions of the jurors

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{1.5}$ + $\boxed{4}$ - $\boxed{1}$ = $\boxed{3}$

stage: 2
 reporter: SWEDEN

fight (round no.): PF2
 opponent: BULGARIA

room: B
 reviewer: CZECH REPUBLIC
 problem no.: 2

Juror's name: EUKASZ CIEPICKI
 signature: *Eukasz Ciepicki*

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	efficiency	
0 --- almost no	0 --- almost no	0 --- too few	0 --- no/ almost no	0 --- others' data, incorrectly cited	0 --- misunderstood	0 --- almost no	0 --- too few	0 --- almost no, chaotic	
1 --- some	1 --- some	1 --- some	1 --- some	1 --- review of sources, cited	1 --- partly	1 --- only technical points cleared	1 --- some	1 --- avoided some questions	
2 --- fair	2 --- fair	2 --- fair	2 --- not well fitting deviations	2 --- some own input	2 --- average	2 --- some scientific points cleared	2 --- many	2 --- cooperated well	
3 --- good	3 --- good	3 --- well performed, sufficient number	3 --- qualitatively analysed	3 --- some interesting results	3 --- interesting solution	3 --- interesting points discussed	3 --- + data/theory convincingly supported	3 --- answered directly to most questions	
4 --- detailed demonstrative	4 --- quite detailed, correct	4 --- + results explained errors analysed	4 --- + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 --- considerable experimental or theoretical	4 --- some aspects above average	4 --- brought in new physics	4 --- proved deep understanding	4 --- efficient, productive	
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				

NOTES:

*No understanding of dB scale
 OPP ON ALL MODES*

~~Overall impression of report~~

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{0.5}$ + $\boxed{2}$ + $\boxed{1.5}$ - $\boxed{0.5}$ = $\boxed{5}$

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
0 --- almost no, irrelevant	0 --- almost no, irrelevant	0 --- almost no	0 --- almost nothing	0 --- no or irrelevant	0 --- almost no	0 --- no	0 --- almost no	0 --- irrelevant	0 --- very little	0 --- almost no	0 --- no	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked
1 --- some relevant, aimed at resolving	1 --- some relevant, aimed at resolving	1 --- very little	1 --- some main points	1 --- few	1 --- some	1 --- almost no	1 --- little	1 --- some	1 --- some	1 --- to some extent	1 --- almost no	1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 --- some unclear points	2 --- some unclear points	2 --- not all	2 --- main points	2 --- some	2 --- to important topics	2 --- some	2 --- partial	2 --- average	2 --- some correct	2 --- leading or cooperative	2 --- some	2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 --- short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	3 --- short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	3 --- almost all	3 --- all relevant points	3 --- many	3 --- to most topics	3 --- reasonable	3 --- good	3 --- many	3 --- many correct	3 --- quite efficient	3 --- reasonable	
		4 --- all & efficiently	4 --- practically all points	4 --- practically all	4 --- + improvement suggestions	4 --- very good	4 --- new crucial point(s)	4 --- almost all	4 --- + improvement suggestions	4 --- very efficient	4 --- very good	

NOTES: *3 questions asked*

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{1}$ + $\boxed{1.5}$ + $\boxed{1.5}$ - $\boxed{0.5}$ = $\boxed{5}$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	0 --- poor	0 --- almost no	0 --- too few	0 --- irrelevant	0 --- no	0 --- poor	0 --- almost no	0 --- too few	0 --- irrelevant	0 --- no	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked
1 --- some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	1 --- some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	1 --- partial	1 --- too short/long	1 --- some	1 --- partially relevant	1 --- almost no	1 --- too short/long	1 --- too short/long	1 --- some	1 --- partially relevant	1 --- almost no	1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 --- most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	2 --- most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	2 --- good	2 --- relevant parts	2 --- many	2 --- mostly adequate	2 --- some	2 --- informative, apt	2 --- relevant parts	2 --- many	2 --- mostly adequate	2 --- some	2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 --- +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	3 --- +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	3 --- detailed, complex	3 --- accurate, conclusive	3 --- + improvement suggestions	3 --- fully adequate	3 --- good	3 --- brief but accurate	3 --- accurate, conclusive	3 --- + improvement suggestions	3 --- fully adequate	3 --- good	

NOTES:

REPORTER

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

Start from 1 and add/subtract

SCORESHEET

stage: 2
reporter: Sweden

fight (round no.): 2 room: B
opponent: Bulgaria reviewer: Czech Rep

problem no.: 2

Juror's name: T-S-Koh
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	efficiency	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 only technical	some	avoided some	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 some scientific	many	questions	
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	some interesting results	interesting solution	3 interesting points	+ data/theory	cooperated well	
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 discussed	convincingly supported	answered directly	
6 deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	4 brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive	

NOTES: Man of pressure to explain end correct = 0.6v.
Standing wave from pressure - not quite accurate

Slide 9 - Math but no physical expl. How is air vel. measured?
Did not mention spectrum of sound
Slide 20 - no info not on da

OPPONENT

1 + $\boxed{1.8}$ + $\boxed{2.2}$ + $\boxed{3}$ - $\boxed{0}$ = $\boxed{8}$

Start from 1 and add/subtract

To ask where is stop wave?

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 almost no, irrelevant	1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
0 almost no, irrelevant	1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	0 almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0 almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no	
1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	1 very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	1 little	some	some	to some extent	almost no	
2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used		2 not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	2 partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some	
		3 almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	3 good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable	
		4 all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4 new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	very good	

NOTES: Good group of sharp questions

Knows his physics - sharp and insightful questions

REVIEWER

1 + $\boxed{2}$ + $\boxed{1.5}$ + $\boxed{1.5}$ - $\boxed{0}$ = $\boxed{6}$

Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	
1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	1 partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	
2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	2 good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	
3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently		3 detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	3 brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	

NOTES: No ~~own~~ opinion given - could have gone one step further.
scientific value add

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2.5 + 1.5 - = 5

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 2
 reporter: Sweden opponent: Bulgaria
Daniel Javorkajad

room: B problem no.: 2
 reviewer: Czech Republic
Tomas Wolf

Juror's name: Zuabsher Ejelova
 signature: X. X. X. X. X.

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

	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	efficiency
0	almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic
1	only technical points cleared	some	avoided some questions
2	some scientific points cleared	many	cooperated well
3	interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions
4	brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive

	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: Double

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 3 + 3 - 1 = 7.5 8

	QUESTIONS ASKED
0	almost no, irrelevant
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation
0	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no
1	very little	some main points	few	some	almost no
2	not all	main points	some	to important topics	some
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable
4	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good

	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no
1	little	some	some	to some extent	almost no
2	partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some
3	good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable
4	new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very 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 + 2.2 + 2.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 7

	QUESTIONS ASKED
0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out
2	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.
3	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently

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

	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no
2	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some
3	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	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

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 = 5

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 2
 reporter: Daniel Savadinjad opponent: Dimitar Tomov

room: B problem no.: 2
 reviewer: Tomás Wolf

Juror's name: FANG-YUH LO
 signature: Fang-Yuh Lo

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	efficiency	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 only technical	some	avoided some questions	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 some scientific	many	cooperated well	
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	3 interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions	
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive	
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				

NOTES: membrane vibration - sound frequency relation not demonstrated
 resonating air column model seems not fit with vibrating condition | end correction should be compared with tube radius

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + ~~1~~ + 2.3 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS											
0 almost no, irrelevant	1 some relevant aimed at resolving some unclear points	2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	0 almost no	1 little	2 partial	3 good		4 new crucial point(s)	0 almost no	1 irrelevant	2 some	3 many	4 almost all					
0 almost no, irrelevant	1 some relevant aimed at resolving some unclear points	2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	0 almost no	1 very little	2 not all	3 almost all	4 all & efficiently	0 almost nothing	1 some main points	2 many points	3 all relevant points	4 practically all points	0 almost no	1 irrelevant	2 some	3 many correct	4 + improvement suggestions	0 almost no	1 to some extent	2 leading or cooperative	3 quite efficient	4 very efficient	

NOTES: $\frac{1}{3} \sim \frac{1}{2}$ of the time related to irrelevant technical questions

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS														
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	0 poor	1 partial	2 good		3 detailed, complex	0 speech summary	1 poor	2 too short/long	3 brief but accurate	0 almost no	1 too few	2 some	3 many	4 + improvement suggestions	0 almost no	1 irrelevant	2 partially relevant	3 mostly adequate
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	0 poor	1 almost no	2 too short/long	3 some	4 many	0 almost no	1 too short/long	2 too short/long	3 informative, apt	0 speech summary	1 poor	2 too short/long	3 brief but accurate	0 almost no	1 too few	2 some	3 many	4 + improvement suggestions	0 almost no	1 irrelevant <td>2 partially relevant</td> <td>3 mostly adequate</td> <td>4 fully adequate</td>	2 partially relevant	3 mostly adequate	4 fully adequate

NOTES: question to both reporter & opponents
 own opinions concerning discussion expressed

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - = 4

stage: 2
 reporter: Sweden

fight (round no.): 2
 opponent: Bulgaria

room: B
 reviewer: Czech

problem no.: 2

Juror's name: Nirut
 signature: *Nirut*

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	efficiency	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no/ almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> others' data, incorrectly cited	0 <input type="checkbox"/> misunderstood	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no, chaotic	
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> review of sources, cited	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly	1 <input type="checkbox"/> only technical	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> avoided some questions	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> not well fitting	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some own input	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some scientific	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> cooperated well	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	3 <input type="checkbox"/> deviations	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some interesting results	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory	3 <input type="checkbox"/> answered directly	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + results explained	4 <input type="checkbox"/> qualitatively analysed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental or theoretical	4 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average	4 <input type="checkbox"/> discussed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> convincingly supported	4 <input type="checkbox"/> to most questions	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> demonstrative	5 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex, completely testable	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + theory limits explained, conclusive	5 <input type="checkbox"/> well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental and theoretical	5 <input type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics	5 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	5 <input type="checkbox"/> efficient, productive	
6 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight									

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + 1 + 2 - = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no, irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no, irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost nothing	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no or irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> very little	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some relevant, aimed at resolving	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some relevant, aimed at resolving	1 <input type="checkbox"/> very little	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some main points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/> little	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> to some extent	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> some unclear points	2 <input type="checkbox"/> short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/> not all	2 <input type="checkbox"/> main points	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> to important topics	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> leading or cooperative	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	
		3 <input type="checkbox"/> almost all	3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input type="checkbox"/> to most topics	3 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input type="checkbox"/> quite efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	
		4 <input type="checkbox"/> all & efficiently	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all points	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	4 <input type="checkbox"/> new crucial point(s)	4 <input type="checkbox"/> almost all	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very efficient	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 0.5 + 3.5 + 1.5 - = 5 4.5

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
1 <input type="checkbox"/> clear things out	1 <input type="checkbox"/> most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	2 <input type="checkbox"/> +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	
		3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> brief but accurate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	

NOTES:



Juror	Team	Stage 1			Stage 2			Stage 3			Stage 4				
		Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev		
Nirut Pusadee	Czech Republic	5	5	6	4	6	5	6	5	6					
Lukasz Gladczak	Sweden	5	4	4	3	5	5	5	5	7					
Juanher Tejelara	Bulgaria	6	6	8	5	8	7	7	5	7					
Toek Sung Koh	Sweden	6	6	5	2	8	6	5	7	7					
Fang-Yuh Lo	Bulgaria	6	5	6	5	6	7	5	7	6					
-	Czech Republic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-					
Acting Team Member	Daniel Rychlý		Daniel Javadinejad		Daniel Javadinejad		Dimitar Tomov		Tomáš Wolf		Ivan Dimitrov		Jakub Domes		William Kocaj
Rejected Problems	NIL	NIL			NIL			NIL							
Accepted Problem	5: Leidenfrost stars	2: Balloon Airhorn			9: Ball in a Tube										

Signature Fight Assistant: Double-checked with Scoring Guidelines by second Fight Assistant (signature):