

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 5.5 + 3 - 0 = 9

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 2
 reporter: Singapore opponent: Iran

room: K problem no.: 7
 reviewer: Romania

Juror's name: S. Bylund
 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 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	qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 brought-in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive	
5 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + 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, irrelevant		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	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	main points	some	to important topics	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	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 + 1.5 + 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 too few, mostly irrelevant		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		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	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:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{4.5} + \boxed{3} - \boxed{} = \boxed{8}$$

stage: 2

fight (round no.): 1

room: R

problem no.: 7

Juror's name: Lars Coris's

reporter: Sing Tu Xincheng

opponent: Iran Khan

reviewer: Zou

signature: Sg

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 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

$$1 + \boxed{0.75} + \boxed{3.0} + \boxed{2.25} - \boxed{} = \boxed{7}$$

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"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no, irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	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"/>	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"/> some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> very little	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	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"/> short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> not all	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> to important topics	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	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"/> many	3 <input type="checkbox"/> to most topics	3 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	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"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	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

$$1 + \boxed{1.75} + \boxed{1.5} + \boxed{1.5} - \boxed{} = \boxed{6}$$

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	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"/>	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"/> some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	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"/> most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	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"/> +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	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 + 4.3 + 2.1 - = 7.4

stage: 11 fight (round no.): 1 room: K
 reporter: SG Fu... opponent: Iran Emami reviewer: RO

problem no.: 7 Juror's name: A. V. K. J. J. 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 <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 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 + 2 + 2 - = 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"/> almost no, irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	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"/> short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	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"/> 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"/> all & efficiently	3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	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"/> 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 + 1.5 + 1.25 + 1.25 - = 5

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"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
1 <input type="checkbox"/> clear things out	1 <input type="checkbox"/> most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	2 <input type="checkbox"/> +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	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 + 2.5 - 0.5 = 7

stage: 1
 reporter: Singapore

fight (round no.): 2
 opponent: Iran

room: K
 reviewer: Romania

problem no.: 7

Juror's name: Songfan Liu
 signature: Songfan Liu

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 6

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

NOTES:

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	1 --- some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	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 --- <u>good</u>	<u>relevant parts</u>	<u>many</u>	<u>mostly adequate</u>	some	2 --- informative, apt	relevant parts	many	<u>mostly adequate</u>	some	
		3 --- detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	<u>good</u>	3 --- brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	<u>good</u>	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

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

stage: **1** fight (round no.): **II** room: **K** problem no.: **7**
 reporter: **Fy Kinghoug** opponent: **Emami** reviewer: **Romania**

Juror's name: **V. he bays Lev**
 signature: **[Signature]**

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + **8** + **2** + **3** - **0** = **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	1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	0 almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0 almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no	
1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	1 very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	1 little	some	some	to some extent	almost no	
2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used		2 not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	2 partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some	
		3 almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	3 good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable	
		4 all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4 new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	very good	

NOTES:

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 1 - 1 = 3$$

stage: 2

fight (round no.): 2

room: K

problem no.: 10

Juror's name: S Byland

reporter: Ivan

opponent: Rumania

reviewer: Singapore

signature: 

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.2 + 2.2 + 1.6 - 0 = 6$$

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 --- 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 --- 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 --- <u>not all</u>	main points	some	<u>to important topics</u>	some	2 --- partial	average	<u>some correct</u>	leading or cooperative	<u>some</u>	
		3 --- almost all	all relevant points	<u>many</u>	to most topics	<u>reasonable</u>	3 --- good	<u>many</u>	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

$$1 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 7$$

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	1 --- 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 --- <u>poor</u>	almost no	too few	<u>irrelevant</u>	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 --- <u>good</u>	relevant parts	<u>many</u>	mostly adequate	some	2 --- informative, apt	relevant parts	<u>many</u>	mostly adequate	<u>some</u>	
3 --- +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently		3 --- detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	<u>fully adequate</u>	<u>good</u>	3 --- brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.25 + 1.0 - \square = 3.0$$

stage: 2
reporter: iron
koshin

fight (round no.): 2
opponent: Komonika
Fudai M

room: K
reviewer: Sanyu
problem no.: 10

Juror's name: Lawson
signature: [Signature]

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

NOTES: 4.5 fine
hand 4/5 number

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 2.75 + 1.5 - 0 = 5.0$$

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	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	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 some unclear points	2 not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	2 partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	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: 5.0 back on same

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 9.0$$

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	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	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	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:

SCORESHEET

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

stage: 11-12 fight (round no.): 2 room: K problem no.: 10
 reporter: IRAN Rozhinu opponent: Ro Kudzei reviewer: SG

Juror's name: A. Kyrdoljiev
 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	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	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	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"/> to most questions	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	5 <input type="checkbox"/> efficient, productive	

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 0.8 + 1.8 + 2 - = 6.5

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	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 some unclear points	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 relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	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, inconclusive or too long
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 good	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"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		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 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 1.7 - = 8.7

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"/> 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"/> clear things out	1 <input type="checkbox"/> most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <input type="checkbox"/> most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	2 <input type="checkbox"/> +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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 + 2 - 0.5 = 5

stage: 2
 reporter: Iran

fight (round no.): 2
 opponent: Romania

room: K problem no.: 10
 reviewer: Singapore

Juror's name: Singfer Liu
 signature: Singfer Liu

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 --- <u>some</u>	1 --- <u>some</u>	1 --- <u>some</u>	1 --- <u>some</u>	1 --- review of sources, cited	1 --- <u>partly</u>	1 --- only technical	1 --- <u>some</u>	1 --- avoided some	
2 --- <u>fair</u>	2 --- <u>fair</u>	2 --- <u>fair</u>	2 --- <u>not well fitting</u>	2 --- <u>some own input</u>	2 --- <u>average</u>	2 --- points cleared	2 --- <u>many</u>	2 --- <u>questions</u>	
3 --- good	3 --- good	3 --- <u>well performed, sufficient number</u>	3 --- deviations	3 --- some interesting results	3 --- interesting solution	3 --- some scientific	3 --- <u>many</u>	3 --- <u>cooperated well</u>	
4 --- detailed demonstrative	4 --- quite detailed, correct	4 --- + results explained errors analysed	4 --- qualitatively analysed	4 --- considerable experimental or theoretical	4 --- some aspects above average	4 --- interesting points discussed	4 --- + data/theory	4 --- answered directly to most questions	
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 --- convincingly supported	5 --- efficient, productive	

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 --- almost no, irrelevant	1 --- some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	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 --- <u>some unclear points</u>	1 --- very little	1 --- <u>some main points</u>	1 --- few	1 --- <u>some</u>	1 --- almost no	1 --- little	1 --- <u>some</u>	1 --- <u>some</u>	1 --- to some extent	1 --- almost no	1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
		2 --- <u>not all</u>	2 --- <u>main points</u>	2 --- <u>some</u>	2 --- to important topics	2 --- <u>some</u>	2 --- <u>partial</u>	2 --- <u>average</u>	2 --- <u>some correct</u>	2 --- leading or cooperative	2 --- <u>some</u>	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 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 2 - 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	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 --- clear things out	1 --- most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	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 --- +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	2 --- <u>many unclear points</u>	2 --- <u>good</u>	2 --- <u>relevant parts</u>	2 --- <u>many</u>	2 --- mostly adequate	2 --- <u>some</u>	2 --- informative, apt	2 --- <u>relevant parts</u>	2 --- <u>many</u>	2 --- mostly adequate	2 --- <u>some</u>	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 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 4

stage: 2
 reporter: Rozhina

fight (round no.): II

room: K

problem no.: 10

Juror's name: V. Labyshev

opponent: Andrei Molot

reviewer: Li Kang

signature: Blau

signature: Blau

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 0 <input type="checkbox"/> no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, -1 <input type="checkbox"/> inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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	
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 + 0 + 2 + 2 - 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 <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	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no 0 <input type="checkbox"/> questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, -1 <input type="checkbox"/> inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some relevant, aimed at resolving	1 <input type="checkbox"/> very little	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some main points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/> little	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> to some extent	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> some unclear points	2 <input type="checkbox"/> 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"/> short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	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 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 1 = 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	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or 0 <input type="checkbox"/> no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, -1 <input type="checkbox"/> inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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

$$1 + 2.3 + 1.7 - 0.8 = 4$$

stage: 3

fight (round no.): 2

room: K


problem no.: 5

Juror's name: S. Bylund

reporter: Ramana

opponent: Singapore

reviewer: Ivan

signature: 

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 3.2 + 2.8 - 0 = 8$$

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	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost 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	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	2	partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some
3		3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	3	good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable
4		4	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	4	new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	very good

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 1.2 + 1.5 - \square = 6$$

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	almost no	too few	irrelevant	0	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no
1	clear things out	1	partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	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	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	3	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.0 + 1.75 - = 5.0

stage: 2
reporter: Roman
Andrei

fight (round no.): 3
opponent: Suvapor
Li Kuan Chen

room: K
reviewer: Iran
Ryda Kawan

problem no.: 5

Juror's name: D. J. G. G. G.
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: no error

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.75 + 2.5 = = 8.0

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	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	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	main points	some	to important topics	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	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 + 1.0 + 1.5 + 1.5 = = 5.0

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	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		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	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:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.6 + 0.6 - = 3 3.2

stage: IC
 reporter: Ro

fight (round no.): 3
 opponent: SG

room: K
 reviewer: ICAN

problem no.:

Juror's name: A. Kyulajies
 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	
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 + 1.5 + 3.3 + 3.3 - = 9.1

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"/> some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	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"/> short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	1 <input type="checkbox"/> very little	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some main points	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"/> not all	2 <input type="checkbox"/> main points	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"/> 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 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 + 1.2 + 1 + 1 - = 4.2

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"/> most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	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"/> 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"/> +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	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"/> 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"/> 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"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	
	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> 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 + $\boxed{3.5}$ + $\boxed{1.5}$ - $\boxed{0.5}$ = $\boxed{6}$

stage: $\boxed{3}$
 reporter: *Romania*

fight (round no.): $\boxed{2}$
 opponent: *Singapore*

room: *K*
 reviewer: *Iran*

problem no.: $\boxed{5}$

Juror's name: *Singfan Liu*
 signature: *Singfan Liu*

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 + $\boxed{1.5}$ + $\boxed{2.5}$ + $\boxed{2.5}$ - $\boxed{0.8}$ = $\boxed{7}$

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{1.5}$ + $\boxed{2}$ + $\boxed{2}$ - $\boxed{0.5}$ = $\boxed{6}$

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	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 clear things out	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		2 good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	
3		3 detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	3 brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + **3** + **2** - **0** = **6**

stage: **IC** fight (round no.): **3**
 reporter: **Mohut** opponent:

room: **K** problem no.: **5**
 reviewer:

Juror's name: **V. Lobyshev**
 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	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	
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 --- to most questions	
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 + **1** + **3** + **2** - **0** = **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 --- some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	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 --- 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 + **0** + **2** + **3** - **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	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 --- clear things out	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 --- most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	2 --- good	2 --- relevant parts	2 --- many	2 --- mostly adequate	2 --- some	2 --- informative, apt	2 --- relevant parts	2 --- many	2 --- mostly adequate	2 --- some	2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 --- +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	3 --- +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	3 --- detailed, complex	3 --- accurate, conclusive	3 --- + improvement suggestions	3 --- fully adequate	3 --- good	3 --- brief but accurate	3 --- accurate, conclusive	3 --- + improvement suggestions	3 --- fully adequate	3 --- good	

NOTES:



Juror	Team	Stage 1			Stage 2			Stage 3			Stage 4		
		Singapore	Iran	Romania	Iran	Romania	Singapore	Romania	Singapore	Iran	Rep	Opp	Rev
Samuel Byland		9	7	5	3	6	7	4	8	6			
Lars Grajdo		8	7	6	3	5	9	5	8	5			
Assen Kyaliev		7	6	5	3	6	8	3	9	4			
Songfen Liu		7	6	7	5	5	8	6	7	6			
Valentin Lohychev		8	7	6	4	5	6	6	7	6			
	Acting Team Member	#											
		MC Fu Xinghong	Nikarshat Emami	Danqin Rotarova	Rozhinu Sedigh	Andrei Mokht	Li Kang Chen	Andrei Mokht	Li Kang Chen	Aydin Rasouli			
	Rejected Problems				4, 5								
	Accepted Problem	7			10			5					

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