

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{1.5} + \boxed{1} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{4}$$

stage:  $\frac{3}{}$

reporter: USA

fight (round no.): 1

opponent: slovakia

room: E

reviewer: Belarus

problem no.: 15

Juror's name: ZNchan

signature: *ZNchan*

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"/> <del>some</del>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> review of sources, cited	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly	1 <input type="checkbox"/> only technical points cleared	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> avoided some questions	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> <del>fair</del>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> <del>fair</del>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> not well fitting	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some own input	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some scientific points cleared	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> cooperated well	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	3 <input type="checkbox"/> deviations	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some interesting results	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points discussed	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	3 <input type="checkbox"/> answered directly to most questions	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	4 <input type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + results explained errors analysed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> qualitatively analysed	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				
6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>				

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	2 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/> +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	
4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

stage: 1  
reporter: USA

fight (round no.): 3  
opponent: Slovakia

room: E  
reviewer: Belarus

problem no.: 15

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
		report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation		
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/> +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 2.5 + 2 -    = 5

stage: I  
 reporter: USA  
McQuiston

fight (round no.): III  
 opponent: SLOVAKIA  
M. Marek

room: E problem no.: 15  
 reviewer: BELARUS  
I. Dotsenko

Juror's name: Kulinskyi  
 signature: [Signature]

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

NOTES:

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
0 almost no, irrelevant	0 almost no	0 almost nothing	0 no or irrelevant	0 almost no	0 no	0 almost no	0 irrelevant	0 very little	0 almost no	0 no	
1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	1 very little	1 some main points	1 few	1 some	1 almost no	1 little	1 some	1 some	1 <u>to some extent</u>	1 almost no	
2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	2 not all	2 main points	2 some	2 to important topics	2 some	2 partial	2 average	2 some correct	2 leading or cooperative	2 some	
	3 <u>almost all</u>	3 <u>all relevant points</u>	3 <u>many</u>	3 to most topics	3 <u>reasonable</u>	3 <u>good</u>	3 many	3 many correct	3 quite efficient	3 <u>reasonable</u>	
	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 + 4 + 2.8 + 2.4 -    = 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	0 almost no	0 too few	0 irrelevant	0 no	0 poor	0 almost no	0 too few	0 irrelevant	0 no	
1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	1 partial	1 <u>too short/long</u>	1 some	1 partially relevant	1 almost no	1 too short/long	1 <u>too short/long</u>	1 some	1 partially relevant	1 almost no	
2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	2 <u>good</u>	2 <u>relevant parts</u>	2 <u>many</u>	2 <u>mostly adequate</u>	2 some	2 <u>informative, apt</u>	2 <u>relevant parts</u>	2 <u>many</u>	2 <u>mostly adequate</u>	2 some	
3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	3 <u>detailed, complex</u>	3 accurate, conclusive	3 + improvement suggestions	3 fully adequate	3 good	3 brief but accurate	3 <u>accurate, conclusive</u>	3 + improvement suggestions	3 fully adequate	3 <u>good</u>	

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

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

stage: 1  
 reporter: USA

fight (round no.): 3  
 opponent: SLOVAKIA

room: E  
 reviewer: BELARUS

problem no.: 15  
 Juror's name: Young-Gui Yoon  
 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 qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	3 --- interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions	
4 --- detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 --- brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive	
5 --- deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

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

NOTES:

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

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

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 1.5 + 2 - 0 = 4

stage: 1  
 reporter: USA

fight (round no.): 3  
 opponent: SLOVAKIA

room: E  
 reviewer: BELARUS

problem no.: 15

Juror's name: UBALCOMBE  
 signature: [Signature]

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

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	concise and correct or no questions asked
-1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
-2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 1 + 3 + 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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation
0	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no
1	very little	some main points	few	some	almost no
2	not all	main points	some	to important topics	some
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable
4	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good

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

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

NOTES:

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

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

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

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

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

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 5 + 1.3 - 0.5 = 6

stage: I fight (round no.): III  
 reporter: SLVK M. Marek opponent: Belarus

room: B problem no.: 14  
 reviewer: USA Sejts July

Juror's name: Kyulinskyi  
 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	<u>some</u>	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 --- <u>only technical points cleared</u>	<u>some</u>	avoided some questions	
2 --- fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	<u>some own input</u>	average	2 --- some scientific points cleared	many	<u>cooperated well</u>	
3 --- good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	<u>some interesting results</u>	interesting solution	3 --- interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions	
4 --- detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	<u>some aspects above average</u>	4 --- brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive	
5 --- deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	<u>+ reproducible, convincing analysis</u>	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

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

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

NOTES:

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

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

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 4 + 2 - 0 = 7

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

room: E problem no.: 14  
 reviewer: USA

Juror's name: Zy Chan  
 signature: [Signature]

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

NOTES:

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
0 --- almost no, irrelevant	0 --- some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	0 --- almost no	0 --- almost nothing	0 --- no or irrelevant	0 --- almost no	0 --- no	0 --- almost no	0 --- irrelevant	0 --- very little	0 --- almost no	0 --- no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 --- short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	1 --- very little	1 --- some main points	1 --- few	1 --- some	1 --- almost no	1 --- almost no	1 --- little	1 --- some	1 --- some	1 --- to some extent	1 --- almost no	
	2 --- not all	2 --- main points	2 --- some	2 --- to important topics	2 --- some	2 --- some	2 --- partial	2 --- average	2 --- some correct	2 --- leading or cooperative	2 --- some	
	3 --- almost all	3 --- all relevant points	3 --- many	3 --- to most topics	3 --- reasonable	3 --- reasonable	3 --- good	3 --- many	3 --- many correct	3 --- quite efficient	3 --- reasonable	
	4 --- all & efficiently	4 --- practically all points	4 --- practically all	4 --- + improvement suggestions	4 --- very good	4 --- 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 + ~~1~~ - 0 = 6

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

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER **2** Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + **3** + ~~1~~ - **0** = **4**

stage: **2**  
reporter: **SLOVAKIA**

fight (round no.): **3**  
opponent: **BELARUS**

room: **E**  
reviewer: **USA**

problem no.: **14**

Juror's name: **J. BALCOMBE**  
signature: **JR R**

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 --- <b>good</b>	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: *Did not change parameters of original device e.g. notches*

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + **1** + **2** + **2** - **0** = **6**

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
0 --- almost no, irrelevant		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		very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	1 --- little	some	some	to some extent	almost no	
2 --- short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used		not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	2 --- partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some	
		almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	3 --- good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable	
		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** + **2** - **0** = **7**

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

NOTES:



# SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 5 + 2 - 0 = 8

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 3 room: E problem no.: 14  
 reporter: SLOVAKIA opponent: BELARUS reviewer: USA

Young Gair Yoon  
 Juror's name:  
 signature: Joon

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

NOTES:

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

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

NOTES:

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

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

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

stage: 2  
reporter: Slovakia

fight (round no.): 3  
opponent: Belarus

room: E  
reviewer:

problem no.:  
VSA

Juror's name: Lars G. van  
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 solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points discussed	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	3 <input type="checkbox"/> answered directly to most questions	
4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + results explained errors analysed	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + theory, limits explained, conclusive	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental or theoretical	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> efficient, productive	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex, completely testable	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 <input type="checkbox"/> well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental and theoretical	5 <input type="checkbox"/> greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{1} + \boxed{2.5} + \boxed{2.5} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{6}$$

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

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 2.5 + 2 - 0 = 6

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 3  
 reporter: BELARUS opponent: USA

room: E problem no.: 17  
 reviewer: SLOVAKIA

Juror's name: J. BALCOMBE  
 signature: *J. Balcombe*

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 <del>sources</del> , cited	partly	1 --- only technical points cleared	some	avoided some questions	
2 --- fair	fair	fair	not well fitting deviations	some own input	average	2 --- some scientific points cleared	many	cooperated well	
3 --- good	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	3 --- interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions	
4 --- detailed	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, completely testable	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 + 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 5

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

NOTES:

PROJECTOR PROBLEM! ←

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

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


NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

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

stage: **3** fight (round no.): **3**  
 reporter: **Belarus** opponent: **USA**

room: **E** problem no.: **17**  
 reviewer: **Slovakia**

Juror's name: **I N Chan**  
 signature: 

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

NOTES:

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

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

NOTES:

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

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

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

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

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 3  
 reporter: Belarus opponent: USA

room: E problem no.: 17  
 reviewer: Slovina

Juror's name: Lars Göttsche  
 signature: *[Signature]*

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

NOTES:

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	1	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
0 almost no, irrelevant	1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	0 almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0 almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1	2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	1 very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	1 little	some	some	to some extent	almost no	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 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	1	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1	2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	1 partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	2 good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		3 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 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 6

stage: I BELARUS fight (round no.):  
 reporter: Timofey KRAK opponent: USA  
A Cassidy

room: problem no.: 17  
 reviewer: SLVK  
M Turkevichova

Juror's name: Kulinskyi  
 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 <u>only technical points cleared</u>	some	avoided some questions	
2 <u>fair</u>	<u>fair</u>	fair	not well fitting	some own input	<u>average</u>	2 some scientific points cleared	many	<u>cooperated well</u>	
3 good	good	<u>well performed, sufficient number</u>	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	<u>qualitatively analysed</u>	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	<u>+ theory limits explained, conclusive</u>	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	1	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
0 almost no, irrelevant	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	<u>some main points</u>	few	some	almost no	1 <u>little</u>	<u>some</u>	some	<u>to some extent</u>	almost no	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2		2 not all	main points	<u>some</u>	to important topics	<u>some</u>	2 partial	average	<u>some correct</u>	leading or cooperative	some	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3		3 <u>almost all</u>	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	3 good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable	
4		4 all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4 new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 1.5 -      = 6.5 → 7

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	<u>some</u>	partially relevant	almost no	1 too short/long	too short/long	<u>some</u>	partially relevant	almost no	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	2 <u>good</u>	<u>relevant parts</u>	many	<u>mostly adequate</u>	<u>some</u>	2 informative, apt	relevant parts	many	<u>mostly adequate</u>	some	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3		3 detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	3 brief but accurate	<u>accurate</u>	+ improvement suggestions	<u>fully adequate</u>	good	

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + **3** + **1.5** - **0** = **6**

stage: **3** fight (round no.): **3**  
 reporter: **BELARUS** opponent: **USA**

room: **E** problem no.: **17**  
 reviewer: **SLOVAKIA**

Juror's name: **Young-Gui Yoon**  
 signature: *Yoon*

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

NOTES:

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no, irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost nothing	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no or irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> very little	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> very little	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some main points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/> little	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> to some extent	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/> no/all	2 <input type="checkbox"/> main points	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> to important topics	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> leading or cooperative	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	
	3 <input type="checkbox"/> almost all	3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input type="checkbox"/> to most topics	3 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input type="checkbox"/> quite efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	
	4 <input type="checkbox"/> all & efficiently	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all points	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	4 <input type="checkbox"/> new crucial point(s)	4 <input type="checkbox"/> almost all	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very efficient	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	

NOTES:

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

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

NOTES:



Juror	Team	Stage 1			Stage 2			Stage 3			Stage 4		
		USA Rep	Slovakia Opp	Belarus Rev	Slovakia Rep	Belarus Opp	USA Rev	Belarus Rep	USA Opp	Slovakia Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev
John Balcombe		4	7	6	6	6	7	6	5	7			
Lat Neng Chan		4	4	5	7	6	5	6	5	6			
Lara Gisten		5	6	6	8	7	6	4	6	6			
Volodymyr Kulinskiy		5	8	8	6	5	6	6	6	7			
Young-Gwi Yoon		6	6	6	8	7	7	6	6	7			
	Acting Team Member	Conor McQuiston	Martin Marek	Iliia Dotsenko	Martin Marek	Grigoriy Panyazkov	Seojin Jung	Timothy Kraik	Anna Cassidy	Michaela Jurekovicova			
	Rejected Problems												
	Accepted Problem	Q15			14			17					

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