

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 1 + 2 - 0 = 4

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 2 room: H problem no.: 5  
 reporter: serbia opponent: New Zealand reviewer: Patricia

Juror's name: KONDRAK  
 signature: Uladislav

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 1 + 25 + 25 - 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	almost no, irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	almost no	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	very little	few	some	almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	little	some	some	to some extent	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	not all	main points	to important topics	some	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 <input type="checkbox"/>		3 <input type="checkbox"/>	almost all	all relevant points	to most topics	reasonable	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	good	many	many correct	quite efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	
4 <input type="checkbox"/>		4 <input type="checkbox"/>	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 0.5 + 1 + 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	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

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

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	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or
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	1 <input type="checkbox"/> no questions asked
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	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect,
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	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory	3 <input type="checkbox"/> answered directly to most questions	3 <input type="checkbox"/> inconclusive or too long
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"/> discussed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> convincingly supported	4 <input type="checkbox"/> efficient, productive	4 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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		

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 +  +  +  -  =  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"/> some relevant, aimed at resolving	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	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some unclear points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 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	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect,
2 <input type="checkbox"/> short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	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	2 <input type="checkbox"/> inconclusive or too long
		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	3 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		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	4 <input type="checkbox"/> deep misconceptions

NOTES:

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

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	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input type="checkbox"/> most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 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	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect,
2 <input type="checkbox"/> +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	2 <input type="checkbox"/> 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	2 <input type="checkbox"/> inconclusive or too long
		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	3 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 1 + 1.5 - 0 = 2.5 → 4

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

room: H problem no.: 5  
 reviewer:

Juror's name: Hong Jung  
 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	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	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory	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"/> 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:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 1 + 2.5 + 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 <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 + 2 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 = 6.5 → 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 <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"/> 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

$$1 + \boxed{1,5} + \boxed{1,5} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{4}$$

stage: 3

fight (round no.): 2

room: H

problem no.: 5

Juror's name: STALISE AV PANOS

reporter: SERBIA

opponent: LEW ZEAL.

reviewer: PAKISTAN

signature: *Pa - C*

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 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: 1,5 1 2,5 1 1 1,5 1,5 1,5

7 min ~~to~~ presentation

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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	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	0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions				
1 very little		some main points	few	some	almost no	1 little	some	some	to some extent	almost no	some					
2 not all		main points	some	to important topics	some	2 partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some	3 good		many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable
3 almost all		all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	3 new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	very good	4					
4 all & efficiently		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good											

NOTES: 3 3 3 2 4

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	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	0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 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: 1,5 1,5

# SCORESHEET

stage: 3  
reporter: SER

fight (round no.): 2  
opponent: NZ

room: H  
reviewer: PAK

problem no.:

Juror's name: SCHERBELLA  
signature: *Scherbella*

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

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 --- <del>some</del>	<del>some</del>	<del>some</del>	<del>some</del>	review of sources, cited	<del>partly</del>	1 --- only technical points cleared	<del>some</del>	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: 7 min

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract  
1 + 1 + 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	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:

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

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 + 1 + 1 -    = 3

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 2  
 reporter: Patishan opponent: Serbia

room: H problem no.: 2  
 reviewer: New Zealand

Juror's name: KADRACIK  
 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"/> <del>poorly</del>	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 demonstrative	4 <input type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + results explained errors analysed	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"/> 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:

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

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	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"/>	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"/> 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"/> 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"/>	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"/> 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 + 2 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 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	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
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"/> 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"/> 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"/> 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 + 1 - 0 = 4

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 2  
 reporter: Pakistan opponent: Serbia

room: H problem no.: 2  
 reviewer: NZ

Juror's name: Gian Chee Kim  
 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	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 + 2 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 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	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 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 --- 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:

**REVIEWER** Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 2 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 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	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 --- 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.	2 --- +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 +  +  -  =  → 3

stage:   
 reporter:

fight (round no.):   
 opponent:

room:   
 reviewer:

problem no.:

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 --- 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 --- points cleared	many	cooperated well	
3 --- good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	some interesting results	interesting solution	3 --- some scientific points cleared			
4 --- detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 --- interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions	
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	4 --- brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive	

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 --- 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:

**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 --- 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 + 1 + 13 - 0.5 = 2

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 2  
 reporter: PAKISTAN opponent: SERBIA

room: H problem no.: 2  
 reviewer: NEW ZEALAND

Juror's name: STANISLAV  
PAKOS  
 signature: PK

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	<u>too few</u>	<u>no/almost no</u>	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 --- almost no	<u>too few</u>	almost no, chaotic	
1 --- some	some	some	some	<u>review of sources, cited</u>	<u>partly</u>	1 --- <u>only technical points cleared</u>	some	avoided some questions	
2 --- <u>fair</u>	<u>fair</u>	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 --- points cleared	many	<u>cooperated well</u>	
3 --- good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	some interesting results	interesting solution	3 --- interesting points discussed	+ data/theory	answered directly to most questions	
4 --- detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	qualitatively analysed + theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 --- brought in new physics	convincingly supported	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		proved deep understanding		
NOTES:	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0.5</u>	<u>0.5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0.5</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>-0.5</u>

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 1 + 18 + 19 - 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	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 --- short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	2 --- <u>not all</u>	1 --- very little	some main points	<u>few</u>	<u>some</u>	almost no	1 --- little	some	some	<u>to some extent</u>	<u>almost no</u>	
2 ---	3 --- almost all	2 --- <u>all relevant points</u>	main points	some	to important topics	<u>some</u>	2 --- <u>partial</u>	<u>average</u>	<u>some correct</u>	leading or cooperative	some	
3 ---	4 --- all & efficiently	3 --- <u>all relevant points</u>	practically all 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:		<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2.25</u>	<u>2.25</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>-0.5</u>

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 2 + 25 + 25 - 0 = 8

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 ---	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 ---	3 --- +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	2 --- good	<u>relevant parts</u>	many	mostly adequate	<u>some</u>	2 --- <u>informative, apt</u>	<u>relevant parts</u>	many	mostly adequate	<u>some</u>	
3 ---		3 --- <u>detailed, complex</u>	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	<u>fully adequate</u>	good	3 --- brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	<u>fully adequate</u>	good	
NOTES:		<u>2.5</u>					<u>2.5</u>					

# SCORESHEET

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

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 2  
 reporter: PAK opponent: SER

room: H problem no.: 2  
 reviewer: NZ

Juror's name: SCHERBELA  
 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"/> 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	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory	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"/> discussed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> convincingly supported	4 <input type="checkbox"/> to most questions 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	5 <input type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics	5 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	5 <input type="checkbox"/> efficient, productive	

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 +  $\boxed{1}$  +  $\boxed{1.5}$  +  $\boxed{1}$  -  $\boxed{0.2}$  =  $\boxed{4}$

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no, irrelevant	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> very little	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some main points	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> almost no	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> little	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> to some extent	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> almost no	
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	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"/>	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"/> 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 +  $\boxed{2}$  +  $\boxed{2.5}$  +  $\boxed{2}$  -  $\boxed{0}$  =  $\boxed{8}$

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	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> almost no	
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	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"/>	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

$$1 + 1.5 + 2 - 0 = 5$$

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 2

room: 64

problem no.: 7

Juror's name:

reporter: New Zealand

opponent: Pakistan

reviewer: Serbia

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 2 - 0 = 5$$

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1.5 + 2 - 0 = 6$$

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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.		1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently		2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	
		3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	

NOTES:

-1 to 11

### SCORESHEET

*Spind Wave*

*Gea. Anthon*

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 4 *1/6*

stage: 1  
 reporter: NZ

fight (round no.): 2  
 opponent: Pakistan

room: H.  
 reviewer: Serbia

problem no.: 7

Juror's name:  
 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	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

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	some scientific points cleared	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions
4	interesting points discussed	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:

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

-1 to 11

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:

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

-1 to 10

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:

# SCORESHEET

**REPORTER** Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 +  $\boxed{1.5}$  +  $\boxed{2}$  -  $\boxed{0}$  =  $\boxed{4.5} \rightarrow 5$

stage:  $\boxed{1}$  fight (round no.):  $\boxed{2}$  room:  $\boxed{H}$  problem no.:  $\boxed{7}$  Juror's name: *Hong Jung*  
 reporter: opponent: reviewer: signature: *[Signature]*

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	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 qualitatively analysed	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 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"/> discussed	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	5 <input type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics			

NOTES:

**OPPONENT** Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 +  $\boxed{1.5}$  +  $\boxed{1.5}$  +  $\boxed{1.5}$  -  $\boxed{0}$  =  $\boxed{4.5} \rightarrow 6$

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	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"/>	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"/> 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"/> 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 of cooperative	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	
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"/> 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 +  $\boxed{2}$  +  $\boxed{1.5}$  +  $\boxed{1}$  -  $\boxed{0}$  =  $\boxed{5.5} \rightarrow 6$

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	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
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"/> 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"/> 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"/> 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 - 0 = 6

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 2 room: H problem no.: 7  
 reporter: NEW ZEALAND opponent: PAKISTAN reviewer: SERBIA

Juror's name: STANISAV PAVLOS  
 signature: P-C

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 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: 2 2 3 1 4 3 2,5 2,5 1

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 2 + 1,7 + 2 - 1 = 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	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		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	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: 3 1 2 0,5 2 2 2 2 2 2 2

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 2 + 1 + 1,5 - 0 = 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	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
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		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.	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	detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	3 brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	

NOTES: 1 2 1 1 2 1

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 3,0 + 1,5 - 0,3 = 5

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 2 room: H problem no.: 7  
 reporter: N2 opponent: PAK reviewer: SERBIA

Juror's name: SCHERBELA  
 signature: *E. Scherbel*

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	almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	only technical	some	avoided some questions	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	some scientific	many	cooperated well	
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	points cleared			
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	
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	brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive	

NOTES: *qualitative*

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 1 + 1,5 + 2,5 - 0 = 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	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	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 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 + 2,5 - 0 = 6

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	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	2 most time used, many unclear points	1 partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	
2	3 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:

Juror	Team	Stage 1			Stage 2			Stage 3			Stage 4		
		Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev
<i>Frankie Kumbhak</i>	<i>New Zealand</i>	5	5	6	3	4	8	4	7	4			
<i>Chae Kwon Jan</i>	<i>Pakistan</i>	6	5	5	4	5	6	4	6	3			
<i>Hong Jung</i>	<i>Serbia</i>	5	6	6	3	5	7	4	7	7			
<i>Atanidhar Raut</i>	<i>New Zealand</i>	6	6	6	2	5	8	4	8	6			
<i>Michael Schabala</i>	<i>Pakistan</i>	5	6	6	2	4	8	3	8	4			
	Acting Team Member	<i>Otis Rea</i>			<i>Edvin Maid</i>			<i>Edvin Maid</i>					
		<i>Harj Atig</i>			<i>Jonathan Chan .</i>			<i>Jonathan Chan .</i>					
		<i>Aleksandra Stojković</i>			<i>Jonathan Chan .</i>			<i>Abdullah Salman .</i>					
	Rejected Problems							<i>8. Visualizing Density</i>					
	Accepted Problem	<i>7. Spiral Waves</i>			<i>2. Rainbow Strikdown</i>			<i>5. Leidenfrost Stars</i>					

Signature Fight Assistant: *[Signature]* ..... Double-checked with Scoring Guidelines by second Fight Assistant (signature): *[Signature]* .....