

SCORESHEET

REPORTER: POLAND
 opponent: RUSSIA
 fight (round no.): 3
 room: 9
 problem no.: 3
 signature: CHAN TAO KUEI

stage: 1
 reporter: POLAND
 opponent: RUSSIA
 fight (round no.): 3
 room: 9
 problem no.: 3
 signature: CHAN TAO KUEI

REPORT		DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT				DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER			
0	phenomenon explanation	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no
1	some	some	some	some	some	some	some	some	some
2	fair	fair	fair	fair	fair	fair	fair	fair	fair
3	good	good	good	good	good	good	good	good	good
4	detailed	quite detailed,	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental	considerable experimental	discussed	interesting points	interesting points
5	demonstrative	correct	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	well fitting, deviations	well fitting, deviations	convincingly supported	+ data/theory	convincingly supported
6	shows physical insight	detailed, complex,	+ reproducible,	convincing analysis	analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental	proved deep	understanding	proved deep

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)				DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER			
0	almost no, irrelevant	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving	some main points	some	some	some	some	some	some	some
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	all relevant points	many	many	many	many	many	many	many
3	almost all	all relevant points	to most topics	to most topics	to most topics	to most topics	to most topics	to most topics	to most topics
4	efficiently	practically all points	practically all	practically all	practically all	practically all	practically all	practically all	practically all

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

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT				REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	report summary & understanding	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no
1	clear things up	poor	poor	poor	poor	poor	poor	poor	poor
2	most time used, many unclear points	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.
3	time managed efficiently	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized

NOTES: Does not appear to be confident in which/what questions to ask a reporter and opponent.

SCORESHEET

REPORTER
Start from 1 and add/subtract
1 + 0.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 7

stage: reporter: Poland
fight (round no.): opponent: Russia
room: reviewer: Ukraine
problem no.:

Juror's name: KAYRA FARUK
signature: Kayra Faruk

REPORT		phenomenon		theory/model		relevant experiments		comparison between theory and experiment		own contribution		task fulfillment	
6	deep and comprehensive	shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	greater extent than expected	4	brought in new physics	discussed	convincingly supported	proved deep understanding	productive
5	detailed	demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	considerable experimental	some aspects above average	3	interesting points	+ data/theory	convincingly supported	answered directly	to most questions
4	good	good	detailed, correct	results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental	some aspects above average	2	points cleared	many	convincingly supported	cooperated well	no questions asked
3	fair	fair	well performed, sufficient number	well performed, deviations	qualitatively analysed	interesting results	average	1	only technical	some	convincingly supported	avoided some	no questions asked
2	some	some	fair	not well fitting	some	some own input	partly	0	almost no scientific contribution	many	convincingly supported	almost no, chaotic	no questions asked
1	almost no	almost no	fair	not well fitting	some	review of sources, cited	partly	0	almost no scientific contribution	many	convincingly supported	almost no, chaotic	no questions asked
0	almost no	almost no	fair	not well fitting	some	review of sources, cited	partly	0	almost no scientific contribution	many	convincingly supported	almost no, chaotic	no questions asked
0	almost no	almost no	fair	not well fitting	some	review of sources, cited	partly	0	almost no scientific contribution	many	convincingly supported	almost no, chaotic	no questions asked

NOTES:

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

NOTES:

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

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

NOTES:

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

ANSWERS TO JURY

0: concise and correct or no questions asked

1: some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

2: deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 reporter: Marcin Augustynowicz opponent: IRA Borzikhodzhen reviewer: Dmitri Kardovskiy
 fight (round no.): 3 room: G problem no.: 3
 Juror's name: PAK5-TUH 20 signature: Aug-Jak JB

REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + \boxed{10.5} + \boxed{11.5} - \boxed{0.5} = \boxed{21.5}$

REPORTER'S QUESTIONS

phenomenon	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment
0 almost no explanation	0 almost no theory/model	0 almost no relevant experiments	0 almost no comparison between theory and experiment	0 almost no own contribution	0 almost no task fulfillment
1 some	1 some	1 fair	1 not well fitting	1 some own input	1 average
2 fair	2 some	2 well performed, sufficient number of details	2 qualitatively analysed	2 some interesting results	2 interesting solution
3 good	3 fair	3 good	3 well performed, sufficient number of details	3 some interesting results	3 interesting solution
4 detailed	4 quite detailed, errors analysed	4 + results explained	4 + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 considerable experimental or theoretical	4 some aspects above average
5 demonstrative	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
6 deep and comprehensive, 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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

relevant arguments/responses	scientific contribution	efficiency
0 almost no, chaotic	0 almost no scientific contribution	0 almost no, chaotic
1 avoided some questions	1 only technical points cleared	1 avoided some questions
2 many	2 points cleared	2 cooperated well
3 many	3 points cleared	3 cooperated well
4 brought in new physics	4 discussed interesting points	4 convincingly supported
5 proved deep understanding	5 + data/theory	5 answered directly
6 productive	6 convincingly supported	6 answered directly

ANSWERS TO JURY

deep misconceptions	deeply incorrect or show	deeply incorrect or show
0 concise and correct or no questions asked	0 almost no, chaotic	0 almost no, chaotic
1 some incorrect, no questions asked	1 avoided some questions	1 avoided some questions
2 some incorrect, no questions asked	2 cooperated well	2 cooperated well
3 some incorrect, no questions asked	3 cooperated well	3 cooperated well
4 some incorrect, no questions asked	4 cooperated well	4 cooperated well
5 some incorrect, no questions asked	5 cooperated well	5 cooperated well
6 deep misconceptions	6 deep misconceptions	6 deep misconceptions

NOTES:

OPPONENT
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + \boxed{10.5} + \boxed{11.5} - \boxed{1} = \boxed{21}$

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

scientific contribution of topics	relevance of own opinions	efficiency	priority
0 almost no	0 almost no	0 almost no	0 almost no
1 very little	1 very little	1 almost no	1 almost no
2 partial	2 average	2 some	2 some
3 good	3 many	3 many correct	3 many correct
4 new crucial points(s)	4 almost all	4 improvement	4 improvement

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

deep misconceptions	deeply incorrect or show	deeply incorrect or show
0 concise and correct or no questions asked	0 almost no	0 almost no
1 some incorrect, no questions asked	1 almost no	1 almost no
2 some incorrect, no questions asked	2 some	2 some
3 some incorrect, no questions asked	3 some	3 some
4 some incorrect, no questions asked	4 some	4 some
5 some incorrect, no questions asked	5 some	5 some
6 deep misconceptions	6 deep misconceptions	6 deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIEWER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + \boxed{1} + \boxed{1.5} - \boxed{10.5} = \boxed{5}$

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REPORT

report summary & analysis	discussion own opinions	pros & cons	priority
0 almost no	0 almost no	0 irrelevant	0 no
1 poor	1 almost no	1 too short/long	1 almost no
2 good	2 relevant parts	2 many	2 many
3 detailed, accurate, + improvement	3 fully	3 adequate	3 adequate

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

fully	adequate	good
0 no	0 irrelevant	0 no
1 almost no	1 partially relevant	1 almost no
2 some	2 mostly adequate	2 some
3 good	3 fully	3 good

ANSWERS TO JURY

deep misconceptions	deeply incorrect or show	deeply incorrect or show
0 concise and correct or no questions asked	0 almost no	0 almost no
1 some incorrect, no questions asked	1 almost no	1 almost no
2 some incorrect, no questions asked	2 some	2 some
3 some incorrect, no questions asked	3 some	3 some
4 some incorrect, no questions asked	4 some	4 some
5 some incorrect, no questions asked	5 some	5 some
6 deep misconceptions	6 deep misconceptions	6 deep misconceptions

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 15 reporter: RUSIA opponent: UKRAINE room: 4 problem no.: 2 juror's name: VIOR signature: [Signature]

REPORT

NOTES:

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0	no	almost no	efficiency	priority
1	very little	to some extent	leading or cooperative	quite efficient
2	some	many correct	many correct	very efficient
3	good	many	many correct	reasonable
4	new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ suggestions	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 15 - 5 = 5

OPONENT

NOTES:

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0	no	almost no	efficiency	priority
1	irrelevant	very little	own options presented	scientific contribution of topics
2	some	to some extent	leading or cooperative	average
3	good	many	many correct	good
4	new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ suggestions	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1 - 1 = 4

REVIEWER

NOTES:

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 15 - 11 = 5

NOTES:

NOTES:

NOTES:

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER
 1 + 4 + 1.5 - 2 = 7
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

stage: 2
 reporter: Russia
 opponent: Ukraine
 fight (round no.): 3
 room: G
 reviewer: Roland
 problem no.: 2

Jury's name: Kanya Faran
 signature: Kanya Faran

REPORT

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

NOTES:

0	almost no, chaotic	avoided some questions	no questions asked
1	some	cooperated well	some incorrect,
2	some	answered directly	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

phenomenon	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment
0	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly presented	misunderstood
1	some	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
2	some	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed deviations	some interesting results	interesting
4	detailed	quite detailed, errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusions	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting points + data/theory
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	convincingly supported
6	deep and comprehensible	shows physical insight			convincingly supported

NOTES:

0	almost no, irrelevant	no questions asked	no questions asked
1	some unclear points	some incorrect,	some incorrect,
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

phenomenon	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment
0	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly presented	misunderstood
1	some	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
2	some	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed deviations	some interesting results	interesting
4	detailed	quite detailed, errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusions	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting points + data/theory
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	convincingly supported
6	deep and comprehensible	shows physical insight			convincingly supported

NOTES:

0	too few, mostly irrelevant	no questions asked	no questions asked
1	clear things out	some incorrect,	some incorrect,
2	most time used, many unclear points	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

ANSWERS TO JURY, REVIEWER and REPORTER'S QUESTIONS

REVIEW OF REPORT

phenomenon	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment
0	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly presented	misunderstood
1	some	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
2	some	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed deviations	some interesting results	interesting
4	detailed	quite detailed, errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusions	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting points + data/theory
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	convincingly supported
6	deep and comprehensible	shows physical insight			convincingly supported

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

0	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly presented	misunderstood
1	some	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
2	some	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed deviations	some interesting results	interesting
4	detailed	quite detailed, errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusions	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting points + data/theory
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	convincingly supported
6	deep and comprehensible	shows physical insight			convincingly supported

ANSWERS TO JURY

0	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly presented	misunderstood
1	some	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
2	some	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed deviations	some interesting results	interesting
4	detailed	quite detailed, errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusions	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting points + data/theory
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	convincingly supported
6	deep and comprehensible	shows physical insight			convincingly supported

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

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

SCORESHEET

stage: 3
 fight (round no.): 2
 room: G
 problem no.: 2
 reporter: Russia
 opponent: Ukraine
 reviewer: Poland
 Juror's name: Dawson
 signature: Dawson

REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1.5 = 2.5$
 $2.5 - 1.0 = 1.5$
 $1.5 - 1.0 = 0.5$
 $0.5 = 0.5$

REPORT

NOTES:

6	shows physical insight	deep and comprehensive	phenomenon explanation
5	detailed, demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	theory/model
4	quite detailed, errors analysed	correct	relevant experiments
3	fair	good	comparison between theory and experiment
2	fair	fair	own contribution
1	almost no	almost no	task fulfillment
0	some	some	

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

4	brought in new physics	relevant arguments/responses	efficiency
3	discussed interesting points	convincingly supported + data/theory	
2	points cleared	many	
1	some scientific points cleared	some	
0	almost no contribution	too few	

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

4	new crucial point(s)	almost all suggestions	very efficient
3	good	many correct	quite efficient
2	partial	average	leading or cooperative
1	little	some	to some extent
0	almost no contribution of topics	irrelevant	almost no

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPONENT
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1.5 = 2.5$
 $2.5 - 1.0 = 1.5$
 $1.5 = 1.5$

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

4	practically all points	practically all	efficiently
3	all relevant points	many	almost all
2	some main points	some	not all
1	almost no	some	very little
0	almost no	almost no	almost no

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

4	new crucial point(s)	almost all suggestions	very efficient
3	good	many correct	quite efficient
2	partial	average	leading or cooperative
1	little	some	to some extent
0	almost no contribution of topics	irrelevant	almost no

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

3	detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement	fully	good
2	relevant parts	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some
1	partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no
0	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

3	brief but accurate	conclusive, accurate, + improvement	many	mostly adequate	fully	good
2	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	fully	some
1	too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	no
0	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	no

ANSWERS TO JURY

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: JK reporter: JKRANE opponent: PLOND fight (round no.): 3 room: 5 reviewer: KRANE problem no.: 5

juror's name: vicbe signature: JKRANE

REPORT		DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT				ANSWERS TO JURY	
0	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	almost no	almost no, chaotic	efficiency	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost no	some	some	avoided some	relevant arguments/responses	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	only technical	cooperated well	many	2	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3	good	well performed, sufficient number	points cleared		many	3	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4	detailed	+ results explained	points cleared		many	4	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
5	demonstrative	errors analysed	interesting points	answered directly	+ data/theory convincingly supported	5	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
6	shows physical insight, deep and comprehensive	detailed, complex, completely testable	brought in new physics	efficient	proved deep understanding	6	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

1 + $\frac{1}{2}$ + $\frac{1}{2}$ - 0.5 = 5
 Start from -1 and add/subtract

REPORTER

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

OPPONENT

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	time used	understanding of relevant topics	correct own options expressed	almost no	almost no	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost no, irrelevant	presentation	relevant topics	some	very little	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some main points	some main points	few	some	to some extent	2	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3	all relevant points	all relevant points	many	good	many correct	3	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4	efficiently	practically all points	practically all	new crucial points	+ improvement	4	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

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

REVIEW OF REPORT		REVIEW OF OPPOSITION				ANSWERS TO JURY	
0	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	almost no	speech summary	discussion analysis	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor	almost no	poor	too short/long	almost no	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	good	partially relevant	informative, apt relevant parts	too short/long	many	2	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3	detailed, complex, accurate,	fully adequate	brief but accurate	conclusive, accurate, + improvement	many	3	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

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

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

REVIEWER

SCORESHEET

stage: 3
 fight (round no.): 3
 room: G
 problem no.: 5
 reporter: Maria Kowalewa
 opponent: Marcin Agrestnowicz
 reviewer: Polina Turishcheva
 Juror's name: Jay Markoff
 Signature: *Jay Markoff*

REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + [2,3] + [1,5,2] - [5] = 5$

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

NOTES: heading to # of nodes: relation not explained
 totally nervous

OPONENT
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + [0,1,5] + [2,3] + [1,8,2,3] - [5] = 6$

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	scientific contribution of topics	relevance of topics presented	own opinions	efficiency	prioritisation
0	almost no scientific contribution of topics	irrelevant topics presented	very little own opinions	almost no efficiency	no prioritisation
1	little scientific contribution of topics	some relevance of topics presented	some own opinions	some efficiency	almost no prioritisation
2	partial scientific contribution of topics	average relevance of topics presented	some own opinions	some efficiency	some prioritisation
3	good scientific contribution of topics	many relevance of topics presented	many own opinions	many efficiency	many prioritisation
4	new crucial scientific contribution of topics	almost all relevance of topics presented	almost all own opinions	almost all efficiency	almost all prioritisation

QUESTIONS ASKED
 0 almost no, irrelevant
 1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
 2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used
 3 negative point not summarized - i.e., discussion @ priority not

REVIEW OF REPORT	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	almost no report summary & understanding	almost no discussion analysis	too few own opinions	irrelevant pros & cons	no prioritisation
1	poor report summary & understanding	poor discussion analysis	poor own opinions	irrelevant pros & cons	no prioritisation
2	good report summary & understanding	relevant discussion analysis	relevant own opinions	mostly adequate pros & cons	some prioritisation
3	detailed, complex report summary & understanding	accurate, conclusive discussion analysis	accurate, conclusive own opinions	fully adequate pros & cons	good prioritisation

REVIEWER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + [1,3,3] + [1,5] + [1,4] - [5] = 5$

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

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

SCORESHEET

stage: 3
 reporter: Ukraine
 opponent: Poland
 fight (round no.): 3
 room: G
 reviewer: Russia
 problem no.: 5

Juror's name: Kayra Farain
 signature: Kayra Farain

NOTES:

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

OPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 2.5 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 9$

NOTES:

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

REVIEWER

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

NOTES:

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

ANSWERS TO JURY

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

SCORESHEET

stage: 3
 reporter: KRPAINE, MAHA, KOVARKKO
 opponent: POHND, MAHA
 reviewer: PUSIAH, JINSHYUN
 room: G
 problem no.: 5
 Juror's name: CHAN TAD KWEI
 signature: *[Signature]*

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

REPORTER

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

NOTES:

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

0 --- almost no, chaotic
 1 --- avoided some questions
 2 --- cooperated well
 3 --- answered directly
 4 --- to most questions

0 --- almost no, chaotic
 1 --- too few
 2 --- many
 3 --- + data/theory convincingly supported
 4 --- proved deep understanding

0 --- almost no, chaotic
 1 --- only technical
 2 --- some scientific
 3 --- interesting points
 4 --- brought in new physics

0 --- almost no, chaotic
 1 --- some
 2 --- many
 3 --- + improvements
 4 --- suggestions

0 --- almost no, chaotic
 1 --- irrelevant
 2 --- pros & cons
 3 --- prioritisation

OPPONENT

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

NOTES:

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

0 --- almost no
 1 --- very little
 2 --- some main points
 3 --- all relevant points
 4 --- all & efficiently

0 --- almost no
 1 --- some
 2 --- to important topics
 3 --- to most topics
 4 --- + improvement suggestions

0 --- almost no
 1 --- few
 2 --- some
 3 --- practically all

0 --- almost no
 1 --- no or irrelevant
 2 --- some
 3 --- practically all points

0 --- almost no
 1 --- some main points
 2 --- presentation

0 --- almost no
 1 --- relevant topics
 2 --- correct own
 3 --- prioritisation

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

0 --- almost no
 1 --- very little
 2 --- some
 3 --- to some extent
 4 --- almost no

0 --- almost no
 1 --- very little
 2 --- some
 3 --- many correct
 4 --- + improvements suggestions

0 --- almost no
 1 --- irrelevant
 2 --- scientific contribution of topics
 3 --- relevance
 4 --- own options

0 --- almost no
 1 --- some
 2 --- leading or cooperative
 3 --- to some extent
 4 --- almost no

0 --- almost no
 1 --- some
 2 --- quite efficient
 3 --- reasonable

0 --- almost no
 1 --- irrelevant
 2 --- pros & cons
 3 --- prioritisation

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

REVIEWER

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

0 --- almost no
 1 --- poor
 2 --- partial
 3 --- good
 4 --- detailed, complex

0 --- almost no
 1 --- too short/long
 2 --- relevant parts
 3 --- accurate, conclusive, + improvements suggestions

0 --- almost no
 1 --- too few
 2 --- some
 3 --- many
 4 --- + improvements suggestions

0 --- almost no
 1 --- irrelevant
 2 --- partially relevant
 3 --- mostly adequate
 4 --- fully

0 --- almost no
 1 --- no
 2 --- some
 3 --- good
 4 --- prioritisation

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

0 --- almost no
 1 --- poor
 2 --- too short/long
 3 --- brief but accurate

0 --- almost no
 1 --- too short/long
 2 --- relevant parts
 3 --- accurate, conclusive, + improvements suggestions

0 --- almost no
 1 --- too few
 2 --- some
 3 --- many
 4 --- + improvements suggestions

0 --- almost no
 1 --- irrelevant
 2 --- partially relevant
 3 --- mostly adequate
 4 --- fully

0 --- almost no
 1 --- no
 2 --- some
 3 --- good
 4 --- prioritisation

ANSWERS TO JURY

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 3 reporter: UKF
 fight (round no.): P&L 3 opponent: KUS
 room: G reviewer: KUS
 problem no.: 5
 juror's name: OZAN SUN signature: [Signature]

REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 3 + 2.5 - 0.5 = 4$

REPORT

NOTES:

6	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
5	demonstrative	correct	+ results explained, errors analysed	explained, conclusive	or theoretical	above average
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ theory limits	+ theory limits	considerable experimental	some aspects
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting points
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	points cleared
1	some	some	some	not well fitting	review of sources, cited	only technical
0	almost no explanation	almost no theory/model	almost no relevant experiments	no/almost no theory and experiment	others' data, incorrectly cited	almost no contribution

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

NOTES:

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

NOTES:

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

OPONENT
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 3 - 0.5 = 6$

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

NOTES:

4	efficiently	practically all points	practically all points	practically all points	+ improvement	very good
3	all & almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	reasonable
2	not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	some
1	very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	almost no
0	almost no time used	almost nothing presentation	addressed relevant topics	correct own opinions expressed	priority	priority

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

NOTES:

4	efficiently	practically all points	practically all points	practically all points	+ improvement	very good
3	all & almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	reasonable
2	not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	some
1	very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	almost no
0	almost no time used	almost nothing presentation	addressed relevant topics	correct own opinions expressed	priority	priority

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

NOTES:

4	efficiently	practically all points	practically all points	practically all points	+ improvement	very good
3	all & almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	reasonable
2	not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	some
1	very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	almost no
0	almost no time used	almost nothing presentation	addressed relevant topics	correct own opinions expressed	priority	priority

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

REVIEWER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 2 + 2.0 - 0.5 = 4.5$

REVIEW OF REPORT

NOTES:

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

ANSWERS TO JURY

NOTES:

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

ANSWERS TO JURY

NOTES:

Round: 3 Room: G Fight Assistants: Atker Kyran Angus



Juror	Team	Stage 1			Stage 2			Stage 3			Stage 4		
		Poland Rep	Russia Opp	Ukraine Rev	Russia Rep	Ukraine Opp	Poland Rev	Ukraine Rep	Poland Opp	Russia Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev
	Dean Sun	5	6	5	6	5	7	4	6	7			
	Tau Kwei Chan	6	6	6	5	5	6	5	6	7			
	Kara Farrahin	7	4	2	7	3	3	3	9	5			
	Fung-Yuk Ho	6	6	5	5	4	5	5	6	5			
	Victor Pannescu	5	6	4	5	4	5	5	5	5			
	Acting Team Member	Marcin Augustynowicz Ilia Parpikhodzhaev Dmytro Tvardovskyi			Budamtsev Alekei Dina Spinov Bartolo Bartłomiej Lewandawski			Mariia Kovalenko Marcin Augustynowicz Polina Turishcheva					
	Rejected Problems	10. Pulling Glasses Apart			10. Pulling Glasses Apart			6- Fast Chain					
	Accepted Problem	3. Single Lens Telescope			2. Balloon Airhorn			5. Leidenfrost Stars					

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