

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 4 + 3 - 0 = 8

stage: 3 fight (round no.): SF2 room: C problem no.: 3
 reporter: Germany opponent: Slovakia reviewer: Switzerland

Juror's name: Jimoskcheako
 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 points cleared	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 + 0.5 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 8

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	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	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			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:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 2 + 1.5 - 0.2 = 6

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
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	+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				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 --- 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:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

stage: III

fight (round no.): SF2

room: C

problem no.: 3

Juror's name: Shashikanth Rana

reporter: Germany

opponent: Slovakia

reviewer: Switzerland

signature: Brandey

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	1 --- some	1 --- avoided some questions	
2 --- fair	2 --- fair	2 --- fair	2 --- not well fitting	2 --- some own input	2 --- average	2 --- some scientific	2 --- many	2 --- cooperated well	
3 --- good	3 --- good	3 --- well performed, sufficient number	3 --- deviations qualitatively analysed	3 --- some interesting results	3 --- interesting solution	3 --- interesting points	3 --- + data/theory	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 --- discussed	4 --- convincingly supported	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	5 --- brought in new physics	5 --- proved deep understanding	5 --- efficient, productive	

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{1.5} + \boxed{3} + \boxed{2.5} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{8}$$

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	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 some unclear points	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 --- short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	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 --- 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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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	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 --- 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 --- 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 --- 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:

SCORESHEET

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

stage: 3
 reporter: Germany

fight (round no.): 2
 opponent: Slovakia

room: C
 reviewer: Switzerland

problem no.: 3
 Juror's name: Huyck 30
 signature: [Signature]

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	some own input	average
3	<u>fair</u>	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight					

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	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 <u>0</u> concise and correct or no questions asked
-1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:
 ↳ Colloquial (en)!! → Problemst. → Not given to the problem
 ↳ Weak conclusion
 ↳ It's not single len.

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

QUESTIONS ASKED
0 almost no, irrelevant
1 <u>1</u> 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	<u>good</u>	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 <u>0</u> concise and correct or no questions asked
-1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:
 ↳ Good part. ↳ but short answers, nothing (p. 16-17)
 ↳ Setup Issue

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

QUESTIONS ASKED
0 too few, mostly irrelevant
1 <u>1</u> 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 <u>0</u> concise and correct or no questions asked
-1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:
 ↳ Doubt... ↳ Missing → the role of pinhole

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 4 + 3 - 0 = 8

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 2
 reporter: Germany opponent: Slovakia
Raymond Mason Martin Marek

room: C problem no.: 3 Juror's name: Chrisy Du
 reviewer: Switzerland Ivana Klasovita signature: JMS

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	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	0 --- <u>concise and correct or no questions asked</u> --- 1 --- some incorrect, --- inconclusive or too long -1 --- --- -2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	only technical	some	avoided some questions	
2	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	some interesting results	interesting solution	some scientific	many	cooperated well	
3	<u>detailed demonstrative</u>	<u>quite detailed, correct</u>	<u>+ results explained errors analysed</u>	<u>+ theory limits explained conclusive</u>	<u>considerable experimental or theoretical</u>	<u>some aspects above average</u>	<u>interesting points discussed</u>	<u>+ data/theory convincingly supported</u>	<u>answered directly to most questions</u>	
4	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	
5										

NOTES:

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

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 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	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 --- <u>concise and correct or no questions asked</u> --- 1 --- some incorrect, --- inconclusive or too long -1 --- --- -2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 --- some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	<u>partial</u>	<u>too short/long</u>	<u>some</u>	<u>partially relevant</u>	<u>almost no</u>	<u>too short/long</u>	<u>too short/long</u>	<u>some</u>	<u>partially relevant</u>	<u>almost no</u>	
2 --- <u>most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp</u>	good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	
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	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 7

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 2 room: C problem no.: 3 Juror's name: SUE NAPHER
 reporter: Germany Roman opponent: Shvankar Anshu reviewer: Sushant Suman signature: SRM

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 points cleared	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> avoided some questions	
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" 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 points cleared	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> cooperated well	
3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	3 <input type="checkbox"/> deviations qualitatively analysed	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some interesting results	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points discussed	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	3 <input type="checkbox"/> answered directly to most questions	
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"/> + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental or theoretical	4 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average	4 <input type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics	4 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	4 <input type="checkbox"/> efficient, productive	
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				

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 = 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	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 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 type="checkbox"/> almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/> little	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> partial	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input checked="" 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"/> 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 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 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"/> 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"/> some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	
2 <input checked="" 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 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"/> +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 + 3.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 6

stage: 21
 reporter: Slovakia

fight (round no.): 42
 opponent: Switzerland

room: C
 reviewer: $Reiner, Raymond$

problem no.: 9

Juror's name: $SUE NAPION$
 signature: $S. Napion$

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	some	some	some	some	review of sources	partly	almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	only technical points cleared	some	avoided some questions	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	some scientific points cleared	many	cooperated well	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> efficient, productive
4	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	brought in new physics	proved deep understanding		4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

NOTES:

NO references given at the end.

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2.5 - 0 = 7

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	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 correct	to some extent	almost no	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	not all main points	some	to important topics	some	partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3		almost all	many	to most topics	reasonable	good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4		all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	very good	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 3 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 8

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	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{3} + \boxed{2} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{6}$$

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 2

room: C

problem no.: 9

Juror's name: Chrisy Du

reporter: Slovakia
Katarina Samuova

opponent: Switzerland
Zara Vance

reviewer: Germany Raymond Mason

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	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	1 --- some	1 --- avoided some	
2 --- fair	2 --- fair	2 --- fair	2 --- not well fitting	2 --- some own input	2 --- average	2 --- points cleared	2 --- many	2 --- questions	
3 --- good	3 --- good	3 --- well performed, sufficient number + results explained	3 --- deviations qualitatively analysed + theory limits explained, conclusive	3 --- some interesting results	3 --- interesting solution	3 --- some scientific points cleared	3 --- + data/theory convincingly supported	3 --- cooperated well	
4 --- detailed	4 --- quite detailed, correct	4 --- errors analysed	4 --- well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	4 --- considerable experimental or theoretical	4 --- some aspects above average	4 --- interesting points discussed	4 --- proved deep understanding	4 --- answered directly to most questions	
5 --- demonstrative	5 --- detailed, complex, completely testable	5 --- + reproducible, convincing analysis		5 --- considerable experimental and theoretical	5 --- greater extent than expected	5 --- brought in new physics	5 --- efficient, productive	5 --- deep misconceptions	
6 --- deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight									

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{1} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{3} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{7}$$

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	0 --- some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	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 --- short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	1 --- not all	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 --- all relevant 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 --- all & efficiently	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:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{3} + \boxed{2.5} + \boxed{2.5} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{9}$$

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	0 --- some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	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 --- most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	1 --- short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	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 --- 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 --- 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:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{3.5} + \boxed{1.5} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{6}$$

stage: 1
reporter: Slovakia

fight (round no.): SF2
opponent: Switzerland

room: C
reviewer: Germany

problem no.: 9

Juror's name: Tymoshchenko
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 <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 points cleared	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> cooperated well	
3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> deviations	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some interesting results	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points discussed	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	3 <input type="checkbox"/> answered directly to most questions	
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"/> + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental or theoretical	4 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average	4 <input type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics	4 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	4 <input type="checkbox"/> efficient, productive	
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				

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{1} + \boxed{1.5} + \boxed{1.5} - \boxed{0.2} = \boxed{5}$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no, irrelevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	2 <input type="checkbox"/> 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	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"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	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"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> not all	2 <input checked="" 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"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	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"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	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

$$1 + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2.5} + \boxed{2.5} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{8}$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	2 <input type="checkbox"/> most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	3 <input type="checkbox"/> +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
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	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"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	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"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input checked="" 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"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	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

$$1 + \boxed{2.5} + \boxed{1.5} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{5}$$

stage: 1

fight (round no.): SF2

room: C

problem no.: 9

Juror's name: Shashikanth

reporter: Slovakia

opponent: Switzerland

reviewer: Germany

signature: Spondey

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	some own input ✓	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	some interesting results	interesting solution
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	greater extent than expected
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight		+ reproducible, convincing analysis			

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	points cleared	many	cooperated well
3	points cleared		
4	interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions
5	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
- 0 ___ no questions asked
- 1 ___ some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- 2 ___ deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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
- 0 ___ questions asked
- 1 ___ some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- 2 ___ deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{2.5} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2.5} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{8}$$

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
- 0 ___ 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

$$1 + \boxed{2} + \boxed{1.5} - \boxed{0.5} = \boxed{3.5} \quad 4$$

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 2

room: C

problem no.: 9

Juror's name: Humbert Z

reporter: Slovakia

opponent: Switzerland

reviewer: Germany

signature: *[Handwritten 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 points cleared	many	cooperated well	
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	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: *Problem.*

do not match the concepts and experiment.

No explanation for difference.

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{1.5} + \boxed{1.5} + \boxed{1.5} - \boxed{0.5} = \boxed{5.5} \quad 6$$

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	
0 almost no, irrelevant	1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	0 almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	0	0 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	2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	1 very little	some main points	few	some	1 almost no	1 little	some	some	to some extent	almost no	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used		2 not all	main points	some	to important topics	2 some	2 partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		3 almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	3 reasonable	3 good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable	
		4 all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	4 very good	4 new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	very good	

NOTES:

unclear.

Duoyang is connected to size

Size of Ball: Incomplete.

Stability: Not the most crucial.

too aggressive

This is not "integrated"

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{2.5} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2} - \boxed{0.5} = \boxed{7}$$

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

Raymond's /

Critical beginning part?

SCORESHEET

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

stage: fight (round no.): room: problem no.:
 reporter: opponent: reviewer:

Juror's name:
 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 <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 points cleared	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 points cleared	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 qualitatively analysed	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some interesting results	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points discussed	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	3 <input type="checkbox"/> answered directly to most questions	
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"/> + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental or theoretical	4 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average	4 <input type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics	4 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	4 <input type="checkbox"/> efficient, productive	
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				

NOTES:

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

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 type="checkbox"/> some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	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"/> 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 + + + - =

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 type="checkbox"/> some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	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"/> 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"/> +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 + 2.5 + 2.5 - = 5

stage: II fight (round no.): SF-2
 reporter: Switzerland opponent: Germany

room: C problem no.: 7
 reviewer: Slovakia

Juror's name: Shashikant Pandey
 signature: Shashikant Pandey

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2.5 - 0 = 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 <u> </u> almost no, irrelevant	0 <u> </u> almost no	0 <u> </u> almost nothing	0 <u> </u> no or irrelevant	0 <u> </u> almost no	0 <u> </u> no	0 <u> </u> almost no	0 <u> </u> irrelevant	0 <u> </u> very little	0 <u> </u> almost no	0 <u> </u> no	0 <u> </u> concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <u> </u> some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	1 <u> </u> very little	1 <u> </u> some main points	1 <u> </u> few	1 <u> </u> some	1 <u> </u> almost no	1 <u> </u> little	1 <u> </u> some	1 <u> </u> some	1 <u> </u> to some extent	1 <u> </u> almost no	1 <u> </u> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <u> </u> short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	2 <u> </u> not all	2 <u> </u> main points	2 <u> </u> some	2 <u> </u> to important topics	2 <u> </u> some	2 <u> </u> partial	2 <u> </u> average	2 <u> </u> some correct	2 <u> </u> leading or cooperative	2 <u> </u> some	2 <u> </u> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	3 <u> </u> almost all	3 <u> </u> all relevant points	3 <u> </u> many	3 <u> </u> to most topics	3 <u> </u> reasonable	3 <u> </u> good	3 <u> </u> many	3 <u> </u> many correct	3 <u> </u> quite efficient	3 <u> </u> reasonable	
	4 <u> </u> all & efficiently	4 <u> </u> practically all points	4 <u> </u> practically all	4 <u> </u> + improvement suggestions	4 <u> </u> very good	4 <u> </u> new crucial point(s)	4 <u> </u> almost all	4 <u> </u> + improvement suggestions	4 <u> </u> very efficient	4 <u> </u> very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 1.3 + 1.2 - 0 = 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 <u> </u> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <u> </u> poor	0 <u> </u> almost no	0 <u> </u> too few	0 <u> </u> irrelevant	0 <u> </u> no	0 <u> </u> poor	0 <u> </u> almost no	0 <u> </u> too few	0 <u> </u> irrelevant	0 <u> </u> no	0 <u> </u> concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <u> </u> some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	1 <u> </u> partial	1 <u> </u> too short/long	1 <u> </u> some	1 <u> </u> partially relevant	1 <u> </u> almost no	1 <u> </u> too short/long	1 <u> </u> too short/long	1 <u> </u> some	1 <u> </u> partially relevant	1 <u> </u> almost no	1 <u> </u> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <u> </u> most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	2 <u> </u> good	2 <u> </u> relevant parts	2 <u> </u> many	2 <u> </u> mostly adequate	2 <u> </u> some	2 <u> </u> informative, apt	2 <u> </u> relevant parts	2 <u> </u> many	2 <u> </u> mostly adequate	2 <u> </u> some	2 <u> </u> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 <u> </u> +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	3 <u> </u> detailed, complex	3 <u> </u> accurate, conclusive	3 <u> </u> + improvement suggestions	3 <u> </u> fully adequate	3 <u> </u> good	3 <u> </u> brief but accurate	3 <u> </u> accurate, conclusive	3 <u> </u> + improvement suggestions	3 <u> </u> fully adequate	3 <u> </u> good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 2
 reporter: Switzerland opponent: Germany

room: C problem no.: 17
 reviewer: Stankin

Juror's name: Hubert J.
 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 points cleared	some	avoided some questions	
2 --- <u>air</u>	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 --- some scientific points cleared	many	cooperated well	
3 --- good	<u>good</u>	well performed, sufficient number	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	+ 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:

Not sure slope? Rare expl. No error bar.

In depth but not dense Lack of Interaction

Q. from the initial frame. How the wave (spiral moves)? Dependent to the radius?

Boundary Conditions?

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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 --- almost no, irrelevant		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 relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points		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 --- short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used		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
		almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	3 --- good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable	
		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:

Truth = meaningful?

Concise free

Capitony

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{1} + \boxed{1.5} + \boxed{1.5} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{5}$$

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		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 relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out		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 --- most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.		good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 --- informative, apt	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	3 --- brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 3.5 + 2 - 0 = 7

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 2 room: C problem no.: 7
 reporter: Sutzed Zata opponent: Fernando Lopez reviewer: Slowela Kiri
 Juror's name: Joe Napier signature: SN

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	1 --- some	1 --- avoided some questions	
2 --- fair	2 --- fair	2 --- fair	2 --- not well fitting	2 --- some own input	2 --- average	2 --- some scientific	2 --- many	2 --- cooperated well	
3 --- good	3 --- good	3 --- well performed, sufficient number	3 --- deviations	3 --- some interesting results	3 --- interesting solution	3 --- interesting points	3 --- + data/theory	3 --- answered directly to most questions	
4 --- detailed	4 --- quite detailed, correct	4 --- + results explained	4 --- + theory limits	4 --- considerable experimental or theoretical	4 --- some aspects above average	4 --- discussed	4 --- convincingly supported	4 --- efficient, productive	
5 --- demonstrative	5 --- detailed, complex, completely testable	5 --- + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 --- well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 --- well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 --- considerable experimental and theoretical	5 --- brought in new physics	5 --- proved deep understanding		
6 --- deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight									

NOTES:

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

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	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	
1 --- some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	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	
2 --- short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	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	
	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:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 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	0 --- poor	0 --- almost no	0 --- too few	0 --- irrelevant	0 --- no	0 --- poor	0 --- almost no	0 --- too few	0 --- irrelevant	0 --- no	
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	
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	
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:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{2.5}$ + $\boxed{2.5}$ - $\boxed{0}$ = $\boxed{6}$

stage: $\boxed{2}$
 reporter: Switzerland
Zora Vance

fight (round no.): $\boxed{2}$
 opponent: Germany
Wateed El-Kishawi

room: \boxed{C}
 reviewer: Slovakia
Karin Demkova

problem no.: $\boxed{7}$
 Juror's name: Christy Du
 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 --- <u>fair</u>	<u>fair</u>	<u>fair</u>	not well fitting	some own input	<u>average</u>	2 --- some scientific	<u>many</u>	cooperated well	
3 --- <u>good</u>	<u>good</u>	<u>well performed, sufficient number</u>	<u>deviations qualitatively analysed</u>	<u>some interesting results</u>	<u>interesting solution</u>	3 --- <u>points cleared</u>	<u>data/theory</u>	<u>answered directly</u>	
4 --- detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 --- interesting points 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 + $\boxed{1}$ + $\boxed{2}$ + $\boxed{2}$ - $\boxed{0}$ = $\boxed{6}$

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 --- almost no, irrelevant	0 --- 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	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked
1 --- some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	1 --- very little	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 --- short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	2 --- not all	2 --- not all	<u>main points</u>	<u>some</u>	<u>to important topics</u>	<u>some</u>	2 --- <u>partial</u>	<u>average</u>	<u>some correct</u>	<u>leading or cooperative</u>	<u>some</u>	2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	3 --- almost all	3 --- almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	3 --- good	many	<u>many correct</u>	quite efficient	reasonable	
	4 --- all & efficiently	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 + $\boxed{2}$ + $\boxed{2}$ + $\boxed{2}$ - $\boxed{0}$ = $\boxed{7}$

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	0 --- 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 --- clear things out	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 --- most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp	2 --- good	2 --- good	<u>relevant parts</u>	<u>many</u>	<u>mostly adequate</u>	<u>some</u>	2 --- <u>informative, apt</u>	<u>relevant parts</u>	<u>many</u>	<u>mostly adequate</u>	<u>some</u>	2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 --- +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	3 --- detailed, complex	3 --- detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	3 --- brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	

NOTES:



Juror	Team	Stage 1			Stage 2			Stage 3			Stage 4					
		Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev			
SUSAN NAPIER		6	7	8	7	7	6	7	7	7	6	5				
CHRISY DU		6	7	9	6	6	7	8	5	5	5	5				
HUNKOOK JO		4	6	7	5	6	5	5	7	5	7	5				
SHASHIKANT PANDAY		5	6	8	5	6	5	8	8	6	8	6				
IGOR TIMOSHEENKO		6	5	8	4	7	6	8	8	6	8	6				
	Acting Team Member	KATRÍNA ŠAMUDVÁ	ZARA VANCE	RAYMOND MASON	ZARA VANCE	WALEED EL-KISHAWI	KARIN DEMKOVÁ	RAYMOND MASON	MARIZN MAREK	ZVANA KLASOVTA						
	Rejected Problems	Q7. SPIRAL WAVES			None			None								
	Accepted Problem	Q9. BALL IN A TUBE			Q7. SPIRAL WAVES			Q3. SPHERIC LENS TELESCOPE								

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