

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 reporter: Romnia opponent: China room: A problem no.: 2 Juror's name: Nihat signature: *Nihat*

fight (round no.): 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
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	no/ almost no	almost no, chaotic	almost no
1	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	avoided some questions	only technical
2	some	some	some	others' data, incorrectly cited	operated well	points cleared
3	fair	fair	well performed, sufficient number	not well fitting deviations	many questions	some scientific
4	good	good	explained, + results explained	some own input	operated well	points cleared
5	detailed	detailed	quite detailed, correct	considerable experimental or theoretical	answered directly	interesting points
6	deep and comprehensive	detailed, complex	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	to most questions	brought in new physics
	shows physical insight	completely testable	convincing analysis	considerable experimental and theoretical	efficient, productive	proved deep understanding

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 = 4

Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS			
	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed		scientific relevance	own opinions presented	efficiency
0	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	no
1	very little	some main points	few	some	little	some	to some extent	some
2	not all	main points	some	to important topics	partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	good	many	many correct	quite efficient
4	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 = 7

Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT				REVIEW OF OPPOSITION				ANSWERS TO JURY
	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	
0	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	poor	almost no	irrelevant	no
1	partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no
2	good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	informative, apt	relevant parts	mostly adequate	some
3	detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully	good	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 = 9

Start from 1 and add/subtract

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: I
 reporter: ~~Romana~~ Romania
 opponent: china
 fight (round no.): 3
 room: A
 reviewer: chinez Toipei
 problem no.: 2
 juror's name: Shaohukant
 signature: *Spandey*

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

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

NOTES:

ANSWERS TO JUROR, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	efficiency	relevant arguments/responses	scientific contribution	physics brought in new	discussed	understanding
0	almost no, chaotic	too few	almost no	almost no	only technical	proved deep
1	avoided some questions	some	some	points cleared	only technical	convincingly supported
2	cooperated well	many	some scientific	points cleared	interesting points	+ data/theory answered directly
3	cooperated well	many	some scientific	points cleared	interesting points	+ data/theory answered directly
4	cooperated well	many	some scientific	points cleared	interesting points	+ data/theory answered directly
5	cooperated well	many	some scientific	points cleared	interesting points	+ data/theory answered directly
6	cooperated well	many	some scientific	points cleared	interesting points	+ data/theory answered directly

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1.5 + 3.5 + 3.0 - 0 = 8$

QUESTIONS ASKED	time used	understanding of relevant topics	correct own opinions expressed	priority	scientific relevance	own opinions presented	efficiency	priority
0	almost no	almost nothing	almost no	no	almost no	almost no	almost no	no
1	very little	some main points	few	some	little	some	to some extent	almost no
2	not all	main points	to important topics	some	partial	average	some correct	some
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	good	many	many correct	quite efficient
4	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement	new crucial points	almost all	suggestions	very efficient

NOTES:

ANSWERS TO JUROR and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	conscience and correct or no questions asked	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
0	conscience and correct or no questions asked <td>some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <td>deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions </td></td>	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <td>deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions </td>	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	conscience and correct or no questions asked <td>some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <td>deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions </td></td>	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <td>deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions </td>	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
2	conscience and correct or no questions asked <td>some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <td>deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions </td></td>	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <td>deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions </td>	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	conscience and correct or no questions asked <td>some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <td>deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions </td></td>	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <td>deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions </td>	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4	conscience and correct or no questions asked <td>some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <td>deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions </td></td>	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <td>deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions </td>	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 2.5 + 2 + 2.5 - 0 = 8$

QUESTIONS ASKED	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	priority
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	fully	adequate	good

NOTES:

ANSWERS TO JUROR QUESTIONS	conscience and correct or no questions asked	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
0	conscience and correct or no questions asked <td>some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <td>deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions </td></td>	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <td>deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions </td>	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	conscience and correct or no questions asked <td>some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <td>deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions </td></td>	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <td>deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions </td>	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
2	conscience and correct or no questions asked <td>some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <td>deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions </td></td>	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <td>deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions </td>	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	conscience and correct or no questions asked <td>some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <td>deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions </td></td>	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <td>deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions </td>	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

SCORESHEET

stage: *Ruwanika*
 reporter: *Pranitha Popen*
 opponent: *Harsha Luv*
 room: *A*
 reviewer: *Yu Wei Wang*
 problem no.: *Chinese Taipei*
 Juror's name: *Ikham Lim*
 signature: *[Signature]*

REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 3 = 0 - 1.5 + 5$

REPORT

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

NOTES:

ANSWERS TO JURY, Oponent 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

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

OPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1.5 = 3 + 3 - 0 = 8$

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics	correct own	priority
0 — almost no	0 — almost nothing	0 — no or irrelevant	0 — almost no	0 — no
1 — very little	1 — some main points	1 — few	1 — little	1 — some
2 — not all	2 — main points	2 — some	2 — average	2 — some correct
3 — almost all	3 — all relevant points	3 — many	3 — to most topics	3 — many correct
4 — all & efficiently	4 — practically all points	4 — practically all	4 — suggestions	4 — + improvement

NOTES:

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

efficiency	own opinions	scientific relevance	contribution of topics	priority
0 — almost no	0 — almost no	0 — almost no	0 — almost no	0 — no
1 — to some extent	1 — very little	1 — irrelevant	1 — irrelevant	1 — almost no
2 — leading or cooperative	2 — some	2 — some	2 — average	2 — some correct
3 — quite efficient	3 — many correct	3 — many	3 — many	3 — many correct
4 — very efficient	4 — suggestions	4 — almost all	4 — point(s)	4 — + improvement

REVIEWER

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 — too few, mostly irrelevant
 1 — some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out
 2 — resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.
 3 — time managed efficiently

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

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

stage: 1
 reporter: ERMINA
 opponent: LYU
 room: 3
 problem no.: 2
 reviewer: JIN HSI WANG
 Juror's name: PHIL O'NEIL
 signature: *PHIL O'NEIL*

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

REPORTER

NOTES:

0	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	almost no	some	some	theory and experiment	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0	almost no	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	efficiency	almost no, chaotic	avoided some questions	cooperated well	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	almost no	almost no	some	some	some	theory and experiment	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	1	partly	only technical	too few	some	avoided some questions	cooperated well	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
2	some	some	some	some	some	theory and experiment	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	2	partly	only technical	too few	some	avoided some questions	cooperated well	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
3	fair	good	well performed, sufficient number	explained, deviations	well fitting, deviations	comparison between	some	review of sources, cited	partly	3	interesting	some scientific points cleared	many	many	avoided some questions	cooperated well	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
4	detailed	quite detailed, errors analysed	+ results explained	+ theory limits	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	comparison between	some	review of sources, cited	partly	4	interesting	points cleared	many	many	avoided some questions	cooperated well	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
5	demonstrative	detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	comparison between	some	review of sources, cited	partly	5	interesting	points cleared	many	many	avoided some questions	cooperated well	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
6	shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	+ theory limits	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	comparison between	some	review of sources, cited	partly	6	interesting	points cleared	many	many	avoided some questions	cooperated well	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0	almost no, irrelevant	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	correct own	practically all	practically all points	efficiently	0	almost no	scientific relevance	own opinions	efficiency	almost no	questions asked	concise and correct or	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
1	some unclear points	very little	some main points	no or irrelevant	little	correct own	practically all	practically all points	efficiently	1	almost no	scientific relevance	own opinions	efficiency	almost no	questions asked	concise and correct or	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
2	some relevant, aimed at resolving	some	some main points	no or irrelevant	little	correct own	practically all	practically all points	efficiently	2	almost no	scientific relevance	own opinions	efficiency	almost no	questions asked	concise and correct or	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
3	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	almost all	all relevant points	practically all	partially	correct own	practically all	practically all points	efficiently	3	almost no	scientific relevance	own opinions	efficiency	almost no	questions asked	concise and correct or	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
4	some relevant, aimed at resolving	almost all	all relevant points	practically all	partially	correct own	practically all	practically all points	efficiently	4	almost no	scientific relevance	own opinions	efficiency	almost no	questions asked	concise and correct or	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

OPONENT

OPONENT
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1/2 + 1/2 - 0 = 2$

NOTES:

0	too few, mostly irrelevant	report summary & understanding	almost no	too few	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	priority	0	no	irrelevant	almost no	no	no	no questions asked	concise and correct or	ANSWERS TO JURY
1	clear things out	report summary & understanding	almost no	too few	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	priority	1	no	irrelevant	almost no	no	no questions asked	concise and correct or	ANSWERS TO JURY	
2	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	report summary & understanding	almost no	too few	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	priority	2	no	irrelevant	almost no	no	no questions asked	concise and correct or	ANSWERS TO JURY	
3	time managed efficiently	report summary & understanding	almost no	too few	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	priority	3	no	irrelevant	almost no	no	no questions asked	concise and correct or	ANSWERS TO JURY	

REVIEWER

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

NOTES:

0	too few, mostly irrelevant	report summary & understanding	almost no	too few	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	priority	0	no	irrelevant	almost no	no	no questions asked	concise and correct or	ANSWERS TO JURY
1	clear things out	report summary & understanding	almost no	too few	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	priority	1	no	irrelevant	almost no	no	no questions asked	concise and correct or	ANSWERS TO JURY
2	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	report summary & understanding	almost no	too few	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	priority	2	no	irrelevant	almost no	no	no questions asked	concise and correct or	ANSWERS TO JURY
3	time managed efficiently	report summary & understanding	almost no	too few	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	priority	3	no	irrelevant	almost no	no	no questions asked	concise and correct or	ANSWERS TO JURY

REVIEWER

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 reporter: Rowena opponent: ~~Ching~~ Ching
 room: A reviewer: Divese Taipei
 problem no.: 2
 juror's name: Chew Lark Yee signature: *Will*

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

REPORT

NOTES:

0	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment
1	almost no	almost no	some	no/almost no	review of sources, cited	misunderstood
2	some	some	fair	some	not well fitting	partly
3	good	good	well performed,	deviations	some own input	average
4	detailed	quite detailed,	+ results explained	+ theory limits	some interesting results	interesting
5	demonstrative	correct,	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	considerable experimental	some aspects
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex,	+ reproducible,	well fitting, deviations	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected

DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked
 1 --- avoided some questions
 2 --- cooperated well
 3 --- answered directly
 4 --- to most questions efficient, productive
 5 --- deep misconceptions

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	almost no, irrelevant	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics	correct own	priority
1	some unclear points	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	very little	some main points	few	line	almost no
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	good	new crucial point(s)
4	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement	very good	very good

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

0	priority	efficiency	own opinions	scientific relevance	contribution of topics	almost no
1	to some extent	almost no	some	irrelevant	very little	almost no
2	leading or cooperative	quite efficient	many correct	+ improvement	many	good
3	reasonable	very efficient	very efficient	almost all	almost all	new crucial point(s)
4	deep misconceptions	deeply incorrect or show	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions

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

REVIEWER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 2 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 6$

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	priority
1	clear things out	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no
2	some relevant, sufficient number, could	partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no
3	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some
4	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	detailed,	accurate,	+ improvement	fully	good

REVIEW OF REPORT

0	priority	pros & cons	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons
1	no	irrelevant	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant
2	informative, apt	relevant parts	conclusive,	+ improvement	adequate	fully
3	brief but accurate	conclusive,	accurate,	improvement	adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

ANSWERS TO JURY

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 2
 reporter: China
 opponent: China Taipei
 reviewer: Rowan's
 room: A
 problem no.: 7
 signature: Nint
 Juror's name: Nint
 signature: WJ

1 + 3 = 7

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6.5

REPORT

0	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0	almost no	contribution	scientific	almost no	only technical	some	avoided some	almost no, chaotic	efficiency			
1	relevant	experiments	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1	average	points cleared	some scientific	many	many	many	cooperated well	relevant	arguments/responses			
2	comparison between	theory and experiment	no or irrelevant	few	no or irrelevant	some own input	interesting	2	little	points cleared	points cleared	some cleared	points cleared	interesting points	discussed	brought in new	physics			
3	correct own	relevant topics	opinions expressed	contribution of topics	scientific	relevance	own opinions	4	new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvements	suggestions	very efficient	very good	practically all points	practically all	practically all	practically all		
4	time used	understanding of	presentation	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	no or irrelevant	almost no	0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	to some extent	almost no	no	contribution of topics	relevance	own opinions	efficiency		
5	detailed	demonstrative	quite detailed,	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	+ theory limits	some aspects	3	above average	considerable experimental	or theoretical	considerable experimental	and theoretical	greater extent	than expected	greater extent	above average	some aspects	some aspects	
6	deep and comprehensible	shows physical insight	convincing analysis	convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations	well fitting, deviations	analysed, conclusive	6	shows physical insight	detailed, complex,	completely testable	correct	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	explained, conclusive	convincing analysis	convincing analysis	convincingly supported	to most questions	efficient, productive

NOTES:

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

OPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 = 2.5

0	almost no	very little	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	some	almost no	0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	to some extent	almost no	no	practically all points	practically all	practically all	practically all
1	very little	some main points	some main points	few	some	some	1	little	irrelevant	some	some	some	some	to important topics	to most topics	to most topics	to most topics
2	not all	main points	main points	some	some	average	partial	2	partial	average	some correct	many correct	many correct	quite efficient	quite efficient	quite efficient	quite efficient
3	almost all	all relevant points	all relevant points	many	many	many	many	3	good	many	many	many	many	many correct	many correct	many correct	many correct
4	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all points	practically all	practically all	practically all	practically all	4	new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvements	suggestions	very efficient	very good	very good	very good	very good

QUESTIONS ASKED
 0 concise and correct or no questions asked
 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
 2 deep misconceptions

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 = 3

0	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	priority	0	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	report summary	speech	discussion	own opinions	pros & cons	priority
1	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	almost no	1	poor	poor	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	speech	summary	analysis	too few	irrelevant	almost no
2	good	relevant parts	relevant parts	many	many	many	many	2	informative, apt	relevant parts	conclusive,	+ improvements	suggestions	adequate	adequate	adequate	adequate	adequate	adequate
3	detailed, complex,	accurate, conclusive,	improvements	fully	good	3	brief but accurate,	accurate, conclusive,	+ improvements	suggestions	adequate	adequate	adequate	adequate	adequate	adequate	adequate	adequate	adequate

QUESTIONS ASKED
 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

QUESTIONS ASKED
 0 concise and correct or no questions asked
 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
 2 deep misconceptions

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: II reporter: Chune opponent: Chuneta reviewer: Romona
 fight (round no.): 3 room: A problem no.: 7
 Juror's name: Shahikant signature: Shahikant

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

REPORTER

REPORT

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

NOTES:

4	all & almost all	efficiently	practically all points	practically all	new crucial point(s)
3	almost all	all relevant points	main points	many	good
2	not all	some main points	to important topics	some	partial
1	very little	almost nothing	few	some	average
0	almost no	presentation	no or irrelevant	almost no	little
	time used	understanding of relevant topics	correct own opinions expressed	scientific relevance	contribution of topics
	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	correct own opinions expressed	relevant topics	own opinions presented	efficiency
	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	contribution of topics	own opinions	own opinions	efficiency

NOTES:

QUESTIONS ASKED
 0 almost no, irrelevant
 1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
 2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used
 3

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 - 3 = 8
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

OPONENT

3	time managed efficiently	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	short, apt and clear, well prioritized	time managed efficiently
2	most time used, many unclear points	clear things out	some relevant, sufficient number, could	report summary & understanding
1	most time used, many unclear points	clear things out	some relevant, sufficient number, could	discuss own opinions
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	too few, mostly irrelevant	too few, mostly irrelevant	pros & cons
	QUESTIONS ASKED	report summary & understanding	discuss own opinions	discuss own opinions
	REVIEW OF REPORT	discuss own opinions	discuss own opinions	discuss own opinions
	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	discuss own opinions	discuss own opinions	discuss own opinions

NOTES:

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

REVIEWER

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

3	brief but accurate, conclusive, suggestions	adequate	good
2	informative, apt relevant parts	mostly adequate	some
1	too short/long	partially relevant	almost no
0	poor	irrelevant	no
	speech summary	pros & cons	priority
	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	own opinions	own opinions
	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	own opinions	own opinions

3	detailed, complex	adequate	good
2	good	mostly adequate	some
1	partial	partially relevant	almost no
0	poor	irrelevant	no
	report summary & understanding	discuss own opinions	discuss own opinions
	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	own opinions	own opinions
	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	own opinions	own opinions

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

SCORESHEET

stage: 2 reporter: China
 fight (round no.): 3 opponent: China Tapie reviewer: Rowanica
 room: A problem no.: 7
 Juror's name: Chad Locke signature: [Signature]

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

REPORT

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

NOTES:

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0 concise and correct or no questions asked

1 avoided some questions

2 cooperated well

3 answered directly to most questions

4 efficient, productive

5 deep misconceptions

6 deeply incorrect or show inclusive or too long

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

OPPONENT

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 almost no, irrelevant
- 1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
- 2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used
- 3
- 4 all & efficiently

NOTES:

time used	understanding of relevant topics	correct own	scientific contribution of topics	relevance own opinions	efficiency	priority
0 almost no	0 almost nothing	0 no	0 almost no	0 irrelevant	0 almost no	0 no
1 very little	1 some main points	1 few	1 little	1 some	1 to some extent	1 almost no
2 not all	2 main points	2 some	2 average	2 some correct	2 leading & cooperative	2 almost no
3 almost all	3 all relevant points	3 to important topics	3 partial	3 many correct	3 quite efficient	3 reasonable
4 all & efficiently	4 practically all points	4 practically all	4 new crucial point(s)	4 almost all suggestions	4 very efficient	4 very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0 concise and correct or no questions asked

1 some incorrect, questions asked

2 some incorrect, inclusive or too long

3 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

REVIEWER

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

NOTES:

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

ANSWERS TO JURY

0 concise and correct or no questions asked

1 some incorrect, questions asked

2 some incorrect, inclusive or too long

3 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

REVIEW OF REPORT

SCORESHEET

stage: China
 reporter: Lynn Ding
 opponent: Chinese Taipei
 reviewer: Roxanna Douglas
 room: A
 fight (round no.): 3.2
 problem no.: 7
 Juror's name: Khan Lim
 signature:

REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 4 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 6$

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	fair	some	review of sources, cited	partly
2	fair	fair	well performed, sufficient number	not well fitting	some interesting results	average
3	good	good	quite detailed, errors analysed	explained, conclusive	considerable experimental	interesting
4	detailed	detailed	+ results explained	+ theory/limits	considerable experimental	points cleared
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, + reproducible,	convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	or theoretical	discussed
6	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	completely testable			considerable experimental and theoretical	brought in new physics

NOTES:

0 almost no, irrelevant
 1 some unclear points
 2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used
 3 almost all
 4 efficiently

QUESTIONS ASKED

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics	correct own opinions expressed	priority
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	little
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	partial
4	efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement	good

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

OPONENT
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1.5 + 3 - 0 = 7$

NOTES:

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

REVIEW OF REPORT	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	priority
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	fully	good

REVIEWER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 2 + 2.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 7$

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	priority
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	conclusive, accurate,	+ improvement	fully	good

SCORESHEET

REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 2.5 + 2 = 5.5$
 = 6

stage: 3
 fight (round no.): 3
 reporter: Chinwe Taiye! opponent: Romania
 reviewer: China

Jury's name: Nimit
 signature: *Nimit*

room: A
 problem no.: 3

REPORT

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

NOTES: not many images w/ different studied parameters shown

DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT

0	almost no, chaotic	avoided some	cooperated well	efficiency
1	too few	arguments/responses	relevant	relevant
2	some	points cleared	some scientific	scientific contribution
3	many	points cleared	interesting points	interesting points
4	many	points cleared	discussed	brought in new physics
	productive	proved deep understanding	convincingly supported	convincingly supported

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPONENT 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

OPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 = 7.5$
 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	almost no, irrelevant	almost no, irrelevant	almost nothing	addressed	opinions expressed	correct own	priority
1	very little	some main points	few	relevant topics	relevant topics	correct own	priority
2	not all	all relevant points	some	to important topics	to important topics	correct own	priority
3	almost all	all relevant points	practically all	+ improvement	+ improvement	correct own	priority
4	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	practically all	practically all	correct own	priority

0 --- almost no, irrelevant
 1 --- some relevant, aimed at resolving
 2 --- short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used
 3 --- most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.
 4 --- +short, apt and clear, well prioritized
 5 --- time managed efficiently

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2.5 = 7$
 = 9

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own options	pros & cons	priority
1	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	priority
2	good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	priority
3	detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement	fully	priority

0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant
 1 --- clear things out
 2 --- resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.
 3 --- +short, apt and clear, well prioritized
 4 --- most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.
 5 --- time managed efficiently

NOTES:

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

0	speech summary	discussion analysis	own options	pros & cons	priority
1	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	priority
2	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	priority
3	accurate	conclusive	+ improvement	fully	priority

ANSWERS TO JURY

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

SCORESHEET

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

stage: III
 fight (round no.): 3
 reporter: Chinese Tiger
 opponent: Romania

room: A
 reviewer: China
 problem no.: 3

Juror's name: Shaohua
 signature: Shaohua

REPORT

NOTES:

phenomenon	explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment
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,	deviations	some interesting results	interesting
4			sufficient number	quantitatively analysed	solution	points cleared
5	detailed	quite detailed,	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental	some aspects
6	demonstrative	correct	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	or theoretical	above average
	shows physical insight	completely testable,	convincing analysis,	well fitting, deviations	considerable experimental	greater extent
				analysed, conclusive	and theoretical	than expected

DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT

efficiency	relevant arguments/responses	scientific contribution
0	too few	almost no
1	some	only technical
2	many	points cleared
3	cooperated well	interesting points
4	productive	brought in new physics

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

OPONENT

1 + 1.3 + 2.5 + 2.2 - 7 = 7
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

time used	understanding of relevant topics	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation
0	almost no	almost no	no
1	very little	few	some
2	not all	some main points	some
3	almost all	all relevant points	many
4	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0 --- concise and correct or
 1 --- questions asked
 2 --- some incorrect,
 3 --- inconclusive or too long
 4 --- deeply incorrect or show
 5 --- deep misconceptions

REVIEWER

1 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 2 - 8 = 8
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED

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
 4 --- time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

ANSWERS TO JURY

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 3
 reporter: Chinese Taipei
 opponent: Romania
 fight (round no.): 3
 room: A
 reviewer: China
 problem no.: 3
 Juror's name: Chew Lok Yee
 signature: [Signature]

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

REPORTER

REPORT

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

NOTES:

0	efficiency	relevant arguments/responses	scientific contribution	almost no	only technical	points cleared	avoided some
	almost no, chaotic	too few	almost no	almost no	some scientific points cleared	many	avoided some
1	questions asked	some	irrelevant	very little	to some extent	cooperated well	questions
2	no questions asked	to some extent	irrelevant	little	some correct	many	no questions asked
3	some incorrect,	leading or cooperative	some correct	partial	average	many	some incorrect,
4	deeply incorrect or show	quite efficient	many correct	good	many	discussed	deeply incorrect or show
5	deep misconceptions	very efficient	+ improvement	new crucial point(s)	almost all	brought in new physics	deep misconceptions

DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

OPONENT

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	time used	understanding of relevant topics	correct own options expressed	practically all points	practically all	efficiently
	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	some	few	very little
1	some unclear points	some main points	some	to important topics	some	not all
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized/all time used	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	almost all
3	all &	reasonably	practically all points	+ improvement	very good	all &
4	efficiently	practically all points	practically all	suggestions	very good	efficiently

NOTES:

0	efficiency	relevant arguments/responses	scientific contribution	almost no	only technical	points cleared	avoided some
	almost no, chaotic	too few	almost no	almost no	some scientific points cleared	many	avoided some
1	questions asked	to some extent	irrelevant	little	some correct	many	no questions asked
2	some incorrect,	leading or cooperative	some correct	partial	average	many	some incorrect,
3	deeply incorrect or show	quite efficient	many correct	good	many	discussed	deeply incorrect or show
4	deep misconceptions	very efficient	+ improvement	new crucial point(s)	almost all	brought in new physics	deep misconceptions

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

REVIEWER

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prorisation
	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no
1	most time used, many unclear points	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no
2	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some
3	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	accurate, conclusive,	+ improvement	fully	good
3	time managed efficiently	detailed, complex,	conclusive,	accurate, conclusive,	good

REVIEW OF REPORT


REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

ANSWERS TO JURY

0	conclude and correct or	no questions asked	some incorrect,	inconcisive or too long	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions
	0	no	irrelevant	almost no	some	good
1	clear things out	too few	irrelevant	almost no	some	good
2	some relevant, sufficient number, could	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	good
3	most time used, many unclear points	too short/long	many	mostly adequate	some	good
3	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	accurate, conclusive,	+ improvement	fully	good	good
3	time managed efficiently	detailed, complex,	conclusive,	accurate, conclusive,	good	good

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: Chinese Taipei
 reporter: An Ting Wang
 opponent: Leonard Jovanna
 fight (round no.): 3.3
 room: A
 reviewer: China Buyi Ding
 problem no.: 3
 single lens telescope
 Juror's name: Klem Lim
 signature: 

REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 3 = 0.5 - 1.5 = 5$

REPORT		DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT				ANSWERS TO JURY, OPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	almost no	some	fair	some	almost no, chaotic
1	almost no	almost no	too few	some	fair	some	avoided some questions
2	fair	fair	some	not well fitting	well performed, sufficient number	fair	cooperated well
3	good	good	some	not well fitting deviations	qualitatively analysed	good	questions asked
4	detailed	quite detailed,	errors analysed	+ results explained	+ theory limits	explained	no questions asked, some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
5	demonstrative	correct	correct	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	detailed	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
6	shows physical insight	completely testable,	detailed, complex,	+ reproducible,	convincing analysis	deep and comprehensive	deep misconceptions

NOTES:

OPONENT
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1.5 + 3.5 + 3 = 9$

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	scientific contribution of topics	relevance	almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no
1	almost no	irrelevant	some	some	to some extent	almost no	questions asked
2	partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some	some	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3	good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable	reasonable	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4	new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvements	very efficient	very good	very good	deep misconceptions

NOTES:

QUESTIONS ASKED
 0 almost no, irrelevant
 1 some unclear, aimed at resolving
 2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used
 3 almost all
 4 all & efficiently

REVIEWER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 2 = 8$

REVIEW OF REPORT		REVIEW OF OPPOSITION				ANSWERS TO JURY	
0	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	almost no	irrelevant	no	no	no questions asked
1	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	no	concise and correct or
2	partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	almost no	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3	good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	some	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

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
 4 time managed efficiently

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 3 reporter: *guyula* opponent: *LEONARDO* reviewer: *ping* problem no.: 3 room: Juror's name: *PHIL OWELL* signature: *PHIL OWELL*

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

REPORTER

REPORT	phenomenon	explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
2	fair	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good	good	good	well performed, sufficient number of errors analysed	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	errors analysed + results explained	explained, conclusive	considerable experimental + theory limits	solution	points cleared
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, correct	convincing analysis + reproducible, well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	convincing analysis + reproducible, well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting points + data/theory	points cleared
6	deep and comprehensive	shows physical insight	completely testable	convincing analysis	and theoretical	proved deep understanding	brought in new physics

NOTES:

QUESTIONS ASKED	almost no, irrelevant	some relevant, aimed at resolving	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	NOTES:
0	almost no, irrelevant	almost no, irrelevant	almost no, irrelevant	
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving	some relevant, aimed at resolving	some relevant, aimed at resolving	
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	
3	almost all	almost all	almost all	
4	efficiently all &	efficiently all &	efficiently all &	
OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	time used	understanding of relevant topics	correct own opinion	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no
1	very little	some main points	few	little
2	not all	main points	some	partial
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	good
4	efficiently all &	practically all points	practically all	new crucial point(s)

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

OPONENT

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

1 + 3 + 2 + 2 - 1 = 7
Start from 1 and add/subtract

REVIEWER

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

Team	Stage 1			Stage 2			Stage 3			Stage 4	
	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Rev
Juror	ROMANIAN	CHINA	CHINESE THE	CHINA	GERMANY	ROMANIAN	Chinese Taipei	Romania	China		
Philip O'Neill	4	7	8	6	7	7	6	6	7		
Chew Lock Yee	5	6	6	6	7	8	7	8	6		
Lim Khan	5	8	7	6	7	7	5	9	8		
Sashikant Pandey	6	8	8	5	8	7	7	7	8		
Nirnt Paudyal	4	7	6	7	6	5	6	8	7		
Acting Team Member	Emminia Papa	Han bai Lyn	Yu-Hsi Wang	Ruyi Ding	An-Tung Huang	Rokana Pragya	An-Tung Huang	Leonard Turica	Ruyi Ding		
Rejected Problems	—			11- Hair Hygrometer 1- Inert yourself			—				
Accepted Problem	2- Balkan Airhorn			7- Spiral Waves			3- Single lens telescope				

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