


SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 0.5 + 0.5 - 0 = 2

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 3 room: F problem no.: 11
 reporter: Azebijan opponent: Macao reviewer: George

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

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	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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> almost no	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input type="checkbox"/> short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used		1 <input type="checkbox"/> very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/> little	some	some	to some extent	almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
		2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> not all	main points	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	to important topics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partial	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> average	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some correct	leading or cooperative	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		3 <input type="checkbox"/> almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable	
		4 <input type="checkbox"/> all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4 <input type="checkbox"/> 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
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	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input type="checkbox"/> most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.		1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently		2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	relevant parts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	mostly adequate	some	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	relevant parts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	mostly adequate	some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

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

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

room: problem no.:
 reviewer:

Hair
 Juror's name:
 signature:

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

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no, irrelevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no, irrelevant	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"/> 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"/> 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"/> short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	3 <input type="checkbox"/> short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	3 <input type="checkbox"/> almost all	3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input type="checkbox"/> to most topics	3 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input type="checkbox"/> quite efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> all & efficiently	4 <input type="checkbox"/> all & efficiently	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: *1* *2* *3*

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

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

SCORESHEET

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

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 3 room: F problem no.: 11
 reporter: Aydin Imranov Azerbaijan opponent: 1 Cheong Hong Macao reviewer: Mariam Chilaia Georgia
 Juror's name: Luzana Cecile signature: Luzana Cecile

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 + 2 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
0 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	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 + 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	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	fully adequate	good	3 brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

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

stage: 3 fight (round no.): III
 reporter: Imraan opponent: Chau Hong
 rejected 5, 16, 15

room: F problem no.: 11
 reviewer: Meriam

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 4 = 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	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	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 + 3 + 2 - 1 = 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.	3 --- +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	0 --- poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 --- poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	
		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 + $\boxed{0.5}$ + $\boxed{0.5}$ - $\boxed{1}$ = $\boxed{1}$

stage: fight (round no.): 3
 reporter: Azerbaijan opponent: Russia

room: F problem no.: 11
 reviewer: George

Juror's name: Slavik
 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	
							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	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	only technical points cleared	some	avoided some questions	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	some scientific points cleared	many	cooperated well	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions	3	
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	4	
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected					

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{4}$ + $\boxed{2}$ + $\boxed{1}$ - $\boxed{}$ = $\boxed{5}$

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
0	almost no, irrelevant	almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	almost no	no	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	very little	some main points	few	some	some	some	almost no	to some extent	almost no	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	some correct	some	leading or cooperative	some	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable	reasonable	3	
		all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	very good	very good	4	

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{2}$ + $\boxed{3}$ + $\boxed{2}$ - $\boxed{}$ = $\boxed{8}$

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

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

stage: 2
 reporter: George

fight (round no.): 3
 opponent: Arbajan

room: F
 reviewer: Meera

problem no.: 14

Juror's name: RIGUER
 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	almost no	too few	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	some	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 <input type="checkbox"/> only technical	some	avoided some questions	
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some own input	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some scientific points cleared	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> cooperated well	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 <input type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensive, 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 NAO Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.0 + 2.2 + 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	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no	
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> very little	some main points	few	some	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> almost no	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> little	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	some	to some extent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> almost no	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> not all	main points	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	to important topics	some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some	
	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable	
	4 <input type="checkbox"/> all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4 <input type="checkbox"/> new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	very good	

NOTES:

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	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	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	some	partially relevant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	some	partially relevant	<input checked="" 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	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

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

stage: $\boxed{3}$ fight (round no.): $\boxed{2}$ room: \boxed{F} problem no.: $\boxed{14}$
 reporter: Georgia opponent: Azerbaijan reviewer: Macau

Diddle

Juror's name: Gideon Choo
 signature: *Choo*

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

NOTES:

~~Manage~~ Manage time better to establish more of maths model.

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{1}$ + $\boxed{0}$ + $\boxed{1}$ - $\boxed{0}$ = $\boxed{3}$

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

NOTES:

Need to establish reasons you are asking the questions. Deliver deeper physics

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
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	
1 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	+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		2 good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	
3		3 detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	3 brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

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

stage: Georgia fight (round no.): 3 room: F problem no.: 14
 reporter: Mariam Chilaia opponent: Aydin Samiriz reviewer: Weng Jia Hong
Georgina Overbaugh Macao

Juror's name: Luzana Pochon
 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	0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 only technical 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 + 0 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 3

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 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	few	some	some	almost no	1 little	some	some	to some extent	almost no	
	2 not all	2 main points	some	to important topics	some	2 partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some	2 good	
	3 almost all	3 all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	3 new crucial point(s)	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable	3 almost all	
	4 all & efficiently	4 practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good		almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	very good		

NOTES:

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

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 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	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 informative, apt	
2 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	2 good	2 relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	2 brief but accurate	
	3 detailed, complex	3 accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good						3	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

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

stage: 2
 reporter: Mariam

fight (round no.): III
 opponent:

room: F problem no.: 14
 reviewer: Weng Hei Kong

Juror's name: V. Lobyshev
 signature: [Signature]

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

NOTES:

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
0 --- 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 + 0 + 3 + 3 - 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		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	fully adequate	good	3 --- brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{2.5}$ + $\boxed{2}$ - $\boxed{}$ = $\boxed{6}$

stage: fight (round no.): $\boxed{3}$ room: \boxed{F} problem no.: $\boxed{14}$ Juror's name: \boxed{Slavik}
 reporter: \boxed{George} opponent: $\boxed{Azerbaijan}$ reviewer: \boxed{Macao} signature: $\boxed{\text{[Signature]}}$

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

NOTES:

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

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{2}$ + $\boxed{2}$ + $\boxed{2}$ - $\boxed{}$ = $\boxed{7}$

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{2} + \boxed{1} - \boxed{1} = \boxed{3}$$

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 3

room: F

problem no.: 9

Juror's name: *Luzana Pockova*

reporter: *Chong Ka Weng*
Macao

opponent: *Georgi Bulbaia*
Georgia

reviewer: *Hamran Gasimov*
Georgia

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

$$1 + \boxed{1} + \boxed{3} + \boxed{2} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{7}$$

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 --- 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 ✓	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

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

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 --- 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 ✓	1 --- partial ✓	too short/long	some ✓	partially relevant	almost no	1 --- too short/long	too short/long	some ✓	partially relevant	almost no	
2 --- most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	2 --- good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate ✓	some ✓	2 --- informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate ✓	some ✓	
3 --- +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	3 --- detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	3 --- brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

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

stage: 1
 reporter: Mecao

fight (round no.): 3
 opponent: Georgia

room: F problem no.: 9
 reviewer: Azerbaijan

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

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 1 + 0.5 - 0 = 4

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

NOTES:

REPORTER ² ^{A2}
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 3

SCORESHEET

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 1 room: F problem no.: 9 Ballin Take
 reporter: Macau opponent: Georgia reviewer: Azerbaijan Juror's name: Gideon Choo
 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	
	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	efficiency		
0	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	0	concise and correct or
1	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	only technical points cleared	some	avoided some questions	1	no questions asked
2	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	some scientific points cleared	many	cooperated well	2	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3	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	3	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4	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	4	

NOTES:
 need more depth in answers.
 answers are very brief and don't bring out physics understanding

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

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + 1 + 2 - 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	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	poor	some	partially relevant	almost no	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.	partial	many	mostly adequate	some	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	good	relevant parts	fully adequate	good	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	tully adequate	good	3	
4		detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	adequate						4	

NOTES:
 1. slides not clear at all. 2. 0

SCORESHEET

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

stage: 1 fight (round no.): III room: F problem no.: 9
 reporter: Ka Wang Chang opponent: Bjorgi But. reviewer: Kawan Gasimov

Juror's name: V. Lobyshev
 signature: Pha leaf

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 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	2 --- short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	
0 --- almost no, irrelevant	1 --- some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	2 --- short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	0 --- almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0 --- almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no
			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 + 0 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 5

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1 - 1 = 2

stage:

fight (round no.): 3

room: F

problem no.: 9

Juror's name: Stanik

reporter: Macao

opponent: Georgia

reviewer: Azerbaijan

signature: Stanik

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	efficiency	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no/almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> others' data, incorrectly cited	0 <input type="checkbox"/> misunderstood	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no, chaotic	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> review of sources, cited	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly	1 <input type="checkbox"/> only technical	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> avoided some questions	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
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	2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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	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 comprehensive, 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 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 7

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

NOTES:



Juror	Team	Stage 1			Stage 2			Stage 3			Stage 4		
		Macao Rep	Georgia Opp	Azerbaijan Rev	Georgia Rep	Azerbaijan Opp	Macao Rev	Azerbaijan Rep	Macao Opp	Georgia Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev
Jan Skalk		2	7	6	6	6	7	1	5	8			
Valentin Lobyshev		4	6	5	7	5	7	2	5	6			
Zuzana Coalova		3	7	5	7	3	4	2	7	7			
Gidon Oso		3	7	5	8	3	6	3	7	7			
Ulrike Requier		3	5	4	5	5	6	2	5	7			
	Acting Team Member												
			Ka Meng Quay Georgia Sofianos	Kanwar Azerbaijan Gosimov	Mariam Georgia Dilaliev	Aydin Azerbaijan Ismayilov	Keng Beng Macao Hei	Aydia Azerbaijan Ismayilov	1 Quany Macao Hong	Mariam Georgia Dilaliev			
	Rejected Problems	4			5			5, 16, 15					
	Accepted Problem	9			14			11					

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