

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.0 + 2.5 - 2.0 = 6$$

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 3
 reporter: Thailand (Pamekitti) opponent: Singapore (Fu)

room: B problem no.:
 reviewer: Sweden (William)

Juror's name: G. Jennings
 signature:

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.0 + 3.0 + 3.0 - 0 = 9$$

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

$$1 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 2.0 - 0 = 8$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	
1 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 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 6

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 3
 reporter: Thailand opponent: Singapore
Pimrakitti Puktatae Fu Xinghong

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

Juror's name: Chrisy Du
 signature: [Signature]

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2 + 3.5 + 1.5 - 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	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 --- <u>short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used</u>		2 --- not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	2 --- partial	<u>average</u>	some correct	<u>leading or cooperative</u>	<u>some</u>	2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		3 --- almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics + improvement suggestions	reasonable	3 --- <u>good</u>	many	<u>many correct</u>	quite efficient	reasonable	
		4 --- <u>all & efficiently</u>	<u>practically all points</u>	practically all		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 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant		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 --- <u>good</u>	<u>relevant parts</u>	many	<u>mostly adequate</u>	<u>some</u>	2 --- <u>informative, apt</u>	<u>relevant parts</u>	many	<u>mostly adequate</u>	<u>some</u>	2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 --- <u>short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently</u>		3 --- detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	3 --- brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	improvement suggestions	adequate	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

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

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 3 room: B problem no.: 9
 reporter: THAILAND opponent: SINGAPORE reviewer: SWEDEN

Juror's name: L. Blanderuk
 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	no/ almost no	review of sources, cited	partly	1 --- only technical points cleared	some	avoided some questions	
2 --- <u>fair</u>	fair	<u>fair</u>	not well fitting	<u>some own input</u>	<u>average</u>	2 --- <u>some scientific points cleared</u>	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	<u>quite detailed, correct</u>	+ 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 + 3 + 2.5 - - = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 --- almost no, irrelevant	1 --- some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
2 --- short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used		0 --- almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0 --- almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no	
		1 --- very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	1 --- little	some	some	to some extent	almost no	
		2 --- not all	<u>main points</u>	<u>some</u>	<u>to important topics</u>	some	2 --- partial	<u>average</u>	some correct	leading or cooperative	<u>some</u>	
		3 --- almost all	all relevant points	many	<u>to most topics</u>	<u>reasonable</u>	3 --- <u>good</u>	many	<u>many correct</u>	<u>quite efficient</u>	reasonable	
		4 --- <u>all & efficiently</u>	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 + 2.5 - - = 8

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

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

stage: 1
 reporter: Thailand

fight (round no.): PF3
 opponent: Singapore

room: B
 reviewer: Sweden

problem no.: 9

Juror's name: Dina Itad
 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 deviations	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some own input	2 <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> qualitatively analysed	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some interesting results	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> interesting points discussed	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> answered directly to most questions	
4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	4 <input type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct	4 <input checked="" 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 + $\boxed{2}$ + $\boxed{3.5}$ + $\boxed{3.5}$ - $\boxed{}$ = $\boxed{10}$

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{2.5}$ + $\boxed{2}$ + $\boxed{2.5}$ - $\boxed{}$ = $\boxed{8}$

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

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

stage: 3 THAILAND fight (round no.): 1
 reporter: ~~THAILAND~~ PAWEKITT PARATALAE opponent: SINGAPORE
XINXIAHONG FU

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

Juror's name: RYAN H. LIN
 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	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> not well fitting	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some own input	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some scientific	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> cooperated well	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	3 <input type="checkbox"/> deviations	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some interesting results	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory	3 <input type="checkbox"/> answered directly	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	4 <input type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + results explained errors analysed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + 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:

3

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	1	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
0 <input 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 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"/> main points	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> to important topics	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	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"/> all relevant points	3 <input type="checkbox"/> to most topics	3 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	3 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	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"/> short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	4 <input type="checkbox"/> efficiently	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all points	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	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:

1

3.25

3

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 9

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	1	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0 <input 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"/> clear things out	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"/> clear things out	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:

2.5

2.5

2.5

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4.5 + 3.5 - 0 = 9$$

stage: 2

fight (round no.): 3

room: B

problem no.:

Juror's name: G. Jennings

reporter: Singapore (Usang)

opponent: Sweden (Eric)

reviewer: Thailand (Phum)

signature: [Signature]

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	efficiency	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 only technical points cleared	some	avoided some questions	
2 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	+ theory limits	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	explained, conclusive	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical				

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 3.0 + 2.5 - 0 = 8$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		POSITION (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	
1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points		1 very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	1 little	some	some	to some extent	almost no	
2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used		2 not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	2 partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some	
		3 almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	3 good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable	
		4 all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4 new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 2.0 - 0 = 8$$

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{4} + \boxed{3} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{8}$$

stage: 2

fight (round no.): 3

room: C

problem no.: 8

Juror's name: Chrisy Du

reporter: Singapore

opponent: Sweden

reviewer: Thailand / Phum Siviriboon

signature:

Wang Hwai Lin Eric Bojs

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	some interesting results	interesting solution	3 interesting points discussed	+ data/theory	answered directly	
4 detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 brought in new physics	convincingly supported	to most questions	
5 demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected		proved deep understanding	efficient, productive	
6 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight		+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive						

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{1} + \boxed{2.5} + \boxed{2} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{7}$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	1	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
0 almost no, irrelevant	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	0 almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0 almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used		1 very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	1 little	some	some	to some extent	almost no	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
		2 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

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	1	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.		1 partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently		2 good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		3 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 + 5 + 3 - 6 = 9

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 2 room: B problem no.: 8
 reporter: SINGAPORE opponent: SWEDEN reviewer: THILAND

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 3 + 3.5 - 0 = 9

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	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked -1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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	<u>main points</u>	some	to important topics	some	2 --- partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	<u>some</u>	
		3 --- <u>almost all</u>	all relevant points	<u>many</u>	<u>to most topics</u>	reasonable	3 --- <u>good</u>	many	many correct	quite efficient	<u>reasonable</u>	
		4 --- all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4 --- new crucial point(s)	<u>almost all</u>	+ improvement suggestions	<u>very efficient</u>	very good	

NOTES:

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	1 --- clear things out	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	1 --- clear things out	0 --- poor	almost no	<u>too few</u>	irrelevant	no	0 --- poor	almost no	<u>too few</u>	irrelevant	no	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked -1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 --- clear things out	2 --- most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	1 --- <u>partial</u>	too short/long	<u>some</u>	partially relevant	almost no	1 --- <u>too short/long</u>	<u>too short/long</u>	<u>some</u>	<u>partially relevant</u>	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	<u>relevant parts</u>	many	mostly adequate	<u>some</u>	2 --- <u>informative, apt</u>	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 + 4 + 3 - 0 = 8

stage: 2 fight (round no.): PF3
 reporter: Singapore opponent: Sweden

room: B problem no.: 8
 reviewer: Thailand

Juror's name: Dina Ixadi
 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	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some interesting results	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting	3 <input type="checkbox"/> points cleared	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	3 <input type="checkbox"/> answered directly	
4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X detailed demonstrative	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X quite detailed, correct	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X results explained	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X + theory limits	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X considerable experimental or theoretical	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X solution	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X interesting points discussed	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X + data/theory convincingly supported	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X answered directly 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: Time management @ at the end of presentation

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.75 + 2.75 + 2.5 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no, irrelevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost nothing	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no or irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> very little	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> very little	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some main points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/> little	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> to some extent	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	2 <input type="checkbox"/> not all	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> X almost all	3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X many	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X to most topics	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X reasonable	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X many correct	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X quite efficient	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X 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 + 1.75 + 1.75 - 0 = 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"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X good	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X mostly adequate	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X some	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X informative, apt	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X relevant parts	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X many	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X mostly adequate	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X some	
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> brief but accurate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 5 + 3 - 0 = 9

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 2
 reporter: SINGAPORE opponent: SWEDEN
Hua Jjin Wang ERIC Bojs

room: B problem no.: 8
 reviewer: THAILAND
Phumi Siriviboon

Juror's name: RYAN H. LIN
 signature: [Signature]

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	0 --- almost no	0 --- almost no	0 --- too few	0 --- no/ almost no	0 --- others' data, incorrectly cited	0 --- misunderstood	0 --- scientific contribution	0 --- relevant arguments/responses	0 --- efficiency	
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 --- only technical points cleared	1 --- some	1 --- avoided some questions	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 --- some scientific points cleared	2 --- many	2 --- cooperated well	-1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	some interesting results	interesting solution	3 --- interesting points discussed	3 --- + data/theory convincingly supported	3 --- answered directly to most questions	-2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 --- brought in new physics	4 --- proved deep understanding	4 --- efficient, productive	
5	demonstrative	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				
6	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	completely testable	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 + 4.25 + 3.25 - 0 = 9

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	0 --- almost no, irrelevant	0 --- time used	0 --- understanding of presentation	0 --- relevant topics addressed	0 --- correct own opinions expressed	0 --- prioritisation	0 --- scientific contribution	0 --- relevance of topics	0 --- own opinions presented	0 --- efficiency	
1 --- some relevant, aimed at resolving	1 --- very little	1 --- some main points	1 --- no or irrelevant	1 --- almost no	1 --- no	1 --- little	1 --- some	1 --- some	1 --- to some extent	1 --- almost no	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked
2 --- some unclear points	2 --- not all	2 --- main points	2 --- some	2 --- to important topics	2 --- some	2 --- partial	2 --- average	2 --- some correct	2 --- leading or cooperative	2 --- some	-1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3 --- short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	3 --- almost all	3 --- all relevant points	3 --- many	3 --- to most topics	3 --- reasonable	3 --- good	3 --- many	3 --- many correct	3 --- quite efficient	3 --- reasonable	-2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	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 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	0 --- report summary & understanding	0 --- discussion analysis	0 --- own opinions	0 --- pros & cons	0 --- prioritisation	0 --- speech summary	0 --- discussion analysis	0 --- own opinions	0 --- pros & cons	
1 --- some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	1 --- partial	1 --- too short/long	1 --- some	1 --- partially relevant	1 --- almost no	1 --- too short/long	1 --- too short/long	1 --- some	1 --- partially relevant	1 --- almost no	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked
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	-1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
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	-2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 5

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 3
 reporter: Sweden (William) opponent: Thailand (Phum)

room: B problem no.: 13
 reviewer: Singapore (Markus)

Juror's name: G. Jennings
 signature: [Signature]

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	efficiency	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 only technical points cleared	some	avoided some questions	
2 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	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	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical				

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 2.0 + 2.5 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 almost no, irrelevant	1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
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 + 2 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	
1 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

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

stage: 3
reporter: Sweden
William Kocalp

fight (round no.): 3
opponent: Thailand
Phum Sirirakorn

room: B
reviewer: Singapore / Markus Lendermann

problem no.: 13

Juror's name: Chrisy Du
signature:

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS						
				time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution
0 --- almost no, irrelevant	0 --- almost no	0 --- almost no	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked						
1 --- some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	1 --- very little	1 --- little	--- some incorrect,						
2 --- short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	2 --- not all	2 --- partial	--- inconclusive or too long						
	3 --- almost all	3 --- good	--- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions						
	4 --- all & efficiently	4 --- new crucial point(s)							

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 4$$

stage: 3

fight (round no.): 3

room: B

problem no.: 13

Juror's name: L. Stedman

reporter: SWEDEN

opponent: THAILAND

reviewer: SINGAPORE

signature: L. Stedman

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	efficiency	
0 - almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	
1 - some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	only technical points cleared	some	avoided some questions	
2 - fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	some scientific points cleared	many	cooperated well	
3 - good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	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	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

$$1 + 0 + 1.2 + 1.5 - 0 = 5$$

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 - too few, mostly irrelevant	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	
1 - most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	
2 -		partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	
3 -		good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	
4 -		detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

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

stage: 3
 reporter: Sweden

fight (round no.): PF3
 opponent: Thailand

room: B
 reviewer: Singapore

problem no.: 13

Juror's name: Dina Ikadi
 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 --- only technical points cleared	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	avoided some questions	
2 --- fair	fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	not well fitting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some own input	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> average	2 --- some scientific points cleared	many	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> cooperated well	
3 --- good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 + 1.25 + 1.75 + 2 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 --- almost no, irrelevant	1 --- some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some main points	few	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	almost no	1 --- little	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> to some extent	almost no	
2 --- short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used		2 --- not all	main points	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	to important topics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	
		3 --- almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	3 --- good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable	
		4 --- all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4 --- new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2.75 + 2.75 + 2.5 - 0 = 9

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	1 --- some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	mostly adequate	some	2 --- informative, apt	relevant parts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	some	
3 --- +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently		3 --- detailed, complex	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	3 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + ~~2.5~~ - 0 = 2.5

stage: 3

fight (round no.): 3

room: B

problem no.:

Juror's name: RYAN H. LIN

reporter: SWEDEN
William Kocarp

opponent: THAILAND
Phum Sraviboon

reviewer: SINGAPORE
Markus Lendermann

signature: *[Signature]*

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

2.25

2.5

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1.25 + 1 - 0 = 2.75

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

NOTES:

0.75

1.25

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 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	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked -1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 --- some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	
2 --- most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	
3 --- +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	

NOTES:

2.0

2.5

2.5

Round: 3 Room: B Fight Assistants: Carol Koh, Reuben, Le Quang, Anh, Bairy Salvtya



Juror	Team	Stage 1			Stage 2			Stage 3			Stage 4		
		Thailand Rep	Singapore Opp	Sweden Rev	Singapore Rep	Sweden Opp	Thailand Rev	Sweden Rep	Thailand Opp	Singapore Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev
Gavin Jennings		6	9	8	9	8	8	5	6	8			
Chrisy Du		6	8	8	8	7	8	4	6	9			
Ieszek Gladczuk		6	8	8	9	9	7	4	5	7			
Dina Izadi		7	10	8	8	8	7	5	6	9			
Ryan Hsiao-Tzu Lin		6	8	9	9	9	7	5	4	8			
Acting Team Member		Pamekitti Puhtalae			Wang Huaijin			William Kocalp					
		Xinghong Fu			Eric Bojs			Phum Sriviboon					
		William Kocalp			Sriviboon Phum Sriviboon			Phum Sriviboon			Markus Lendermann		
Rejected Problems		-											
Accepted Problem		9. Ball in a Tube			8. Visualising Density.			13. Resonating Glass					

14.7

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