

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

round up

stage: 1
reporter: Canada

fight (round no.): 3
opponent: Hungary

room: H
reviewer: Pakistan

problem no.: 2

Juror's name: Kent Hogan
signature: *[Signature]*

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + $\frac{1}{2}$ + 3 + 3 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation			
0 - almost no, irrelevant	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	some main points	few	some	almost no	1 - little	some	some	to some extent	almost no			
2 - short all wing short answers, prioritized, all time used	many points	some	to important topics	some	2 - partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some			
	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	3 - good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable			
	efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	4 - new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	very good			

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

round up

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	0 - poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no			
1 - some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 - poor	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no			
2 - most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 - informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some			
3 - +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	+ 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 + 2.5 + 2 - = 5 X. Chen

stage: 1
 reporter: CANADA

fight (round no.): 3
 opponent: HUNGARY

room:
 reviewer: PAKISTAN

Juror's name: ALEXIA ALEXANDRA
 signature: *Alexia Alexandra*

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 discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	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 brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	answered directly to most questions	
6 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected			efficient, productive	

NOTES:
 good review of theory no calculations testable predictions made
 has few, looking unclear things
 apparently perfect fit but that doesn't fit reality of that effect

- tube is what produces the sand

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 2 - = 7 Timea Banioczi

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

understood and summarised theory
 - no specific function which theory fits experiments

- how come will rescale on the 1st mode?
 but an experiment shows that's not true?
 - tube would empty the V of dam?

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

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	
1	clear things out	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	
2	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	1 partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	
3	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	2 good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	
		3 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 + + - =

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

room: problem no.:
 reviewer:

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 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	<input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <input type="checkbox"/> -1 <input type="checkbox"/> -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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 discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions	
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ 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 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 + + + - =

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 almost no, irrelevant	1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
0	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	<input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <input type="checkbox"/> -1 <input type="checkbox"/> -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	1 very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	1 little	some	some	to some extent	almost no	
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:

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	<input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <input type="checkbox"/> -1 <input type="checkbox"/> -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	+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 + 2 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 4

stage: 1
 reporter: Canada

fight (round no.): DF3
 opponent: Hungary

room: H
 reviewer: Pakistan

problem no.: 2

Juror's name: LUKASZ GLADZUK
 signature: Lukas Gladzuk

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 some	some	some	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: Role of membrane not explained or investigated in depth WHY SOUND is generated, what induces oscillations of membrane?

Arguments about Open/Closed tube not convincing

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 4 + 2.8 + 2 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 almost no, irrelevant	1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
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 efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4 new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	very good	

NOTES: questions (6)

source of sound!

need fully correct answer, best supported by physical intuition.

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 4 + 1.5 - 0 = 5

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

NOTES: questions

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{2.5}$ + $\boxed{1.5}$ - $\boxed{0}$ = $\boxed{5}$

stage: 1
 reporter: Canada

fight (round no.): 3
 opponent: Hungary

room: H problem no.: 2
 reviewer: Pakistan

Juror's name: Chuan Yong Li
 signature: *Chuan Yong Li*

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 + $\boxed{1.5}$ + $\boxed{2.5}$ + $\boxed{2}$ - $\boxed{0}$ = $\boxed{7}$

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		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 + $\boxed{1.5}$ + $\boxed{2}$ + $\boxed{1.5}$ - $\boxed{0}$ = $\boxed{6}$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0 --- 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 + **4** + **2** - **0** = **7**

stage: **2** fight (round no.): **3** room: **H** problem no.:
 reporter: **Hungary** opponent: **Pakistan** reviewer: **Canada**

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

NOTES:

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 --- almost no, irrelevant	1 --- some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
0 --- almost no, irrelevant	1 --- some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	0 --- almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0 --- almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked 1 --- some incorrect, 2 --- inconclusive or too long 3 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 --- short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	1 --- very little	1 --- very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	1 --- little	some	some	to some extent	almost no	
	2 --- not all	2 --- not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	2 --- partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some	
	3 --- almost all	3 --- almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	3 --- good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable	
	4 --- all & efficiently	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** + **1** + **1** - **0** = **5**

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	1 --- some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	1 --- some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	0 --- poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 --- poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked 1 --- some incorrect, 2 --- inconclusive or too long 3 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 --- most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	1 --- clear	1 --- poor	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 --- too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	
2 --- +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	2 --- good	2 --- good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 --- informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	
	3 --- detailed, complex	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 + $\boxed{4.5}$ + $\boxed{2.5}$ - $\boxed{1}$ = $\boxed{8}$ Est or Varghahebrah

stage: $\boxed{2}$
reporter: Hungary

fight (round no.): $\boxed{3}$
opponent: Burstan

room: \boxed{I}
reviewer: Canada

problem no.: $\boxed{6}$

Juror's name: Alexandra
signature: day

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

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

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

NOTES: - very detailed explanation relevant checks ticked

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + $\boxed{0.5}$ + $\boxed{2.5}$ + $\boxed{1.5}$ - $\boxed{1}$ = $\boxed{6}$ Kaseeb Ejaz

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

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

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

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

NOTES: - not really relevant

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + $\boxed{0}$ + $\boxed{1.5}$ + $\boxed{1.5}$ - $\boxed{1}$ = $\boxed{5}$

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

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

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

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 4 + 25 - 0 = 8

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 3
 reporter: Exter opponent: Hascob

room: H problem no.: 6
 reviewer:

Juror's name: DARIO DVO
 signature: *Dario DVO*

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	efficiency	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 only technical	some	avoided some questions	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 some scientific points cleared	many	cooperated well	
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	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	
6 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 0.5 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 almost no, irrelevant	1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
0	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	0 almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0 almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no	
1	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:

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	
1	+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 + 4 + 2 - 0 = 7

stage: 2
 reporter: Hungary

fight (round no.): PF3
 opponent: Pakistan

room: H
 reviewer: Canada

problem no.: 6

Juror's name: LUKASZ GLADCOZ
 signature: John Greenbank

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> definitions qualitatively analysed	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some interesting results	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> points cleared	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data theory	3 <input type="checkbox"/> answered directly	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	4 <input type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + results explained errors analysed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental or theoretical	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average	4 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points discussed	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> convincingly supported	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> to most questions	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex, completely testable	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 <input type="checkbox"/> well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental and theoretical	5 <input type="checkbox"/> greater extent than expected	5 <input type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics	5 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	5 <input type="checkbox"/> efficient, productive	

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 2 - 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> almost no, irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost nothing	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no or irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> very little	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	1 <input type="checkbox"/> very little	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some main points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/> little	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> to some extent	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/> not all	2 <input type="checkbox"/> not all	2 <input type="checkbox"/> main points	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> to important topics	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partial	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> leading or cooperative	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> all & efficiently	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> all & efficiently	3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input type="checkbox"/> to most topics	3 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input type="checkbox"/> quite efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> all & efficiently	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all points	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all points	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	4 <input type="checkbox"/> new crucial point(s)	4 <input type="checkbox"/> almost all	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very efficient	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> all & efficiently	5 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all points	5 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all	5 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	5 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	5 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	5 <input type="checkbox"/> new crucial point(s)	5 <input type="checkbox"/> almost all	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	5 <input type="checkbox"/> very efficient	5 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	

NOTES:

DISCUSSION FOCUSES ON DETAILS BUT MISSES MAIN PHYSICS LACKING IN THE SOLUTION

Presents own opinion

ASKS ABOUT THINKS ALREADY PRESENTED BY OPP

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
0	1	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> clear things out	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	2 <input type="checkbox"/> +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	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	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	4 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	4 <input type="checkbox"/> good	4 <input type="checkbox"/> brief but accurate	4 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	4 <input type="checkbox"/> good	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	5 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	5 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	5 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	5 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	5 <input type="checkbox"/> good	5 <input type="checkbox"/> brief but accurate	5 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	5 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	5 <input type="checkbox"/> good	

NOTES: Physics & many questions

present point. relevance-

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{3.5}$ + $\boxed{2.5}$ - $\boxed{0}$ = $\boxed{7}$

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 3 room: H problem no.: 6
 reporter: Hungary opponent: Pakistan reviewer: Canada

Juror's name: Chuan Yongh
 signature: Chuang

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{1}$ + $\boxed{2.0}$ + $\boxed{2.5}$ - $\boxed{0}$ = $\boxed{7}$

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{1.5}$ + $\boxed{2.5}$ + $\boxed{2.5}$ - $\boxed{0}$ = $\boxed{8}$

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

NOTES:

round 3

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

SCORESHEET

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 3
 reporter: Pakistan opponent: Canada

room: H problem no.: 3
 reviewer: Hungary

Juror's name: Kent Hogan
 signature: [Signature]

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\frac{1}{2}$ + $2\frac{1}{2}$ + $2\frac{1}{2}$ - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	1	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
0 almost no, irrelevant	0 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	0 almost no	0 almost nothing	0 no or irrelevant	0 almost no	0 no	0 almost no	0 irrelevant	0 very little	0 almost no	0 no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	1 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	1 very little	1 some main points	1 few	1 some	1 almost no	1 little	1 some	1 some	1 to some extent	1 almost no	
2 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	2 no/all	2 main points	2 some	2 to important topics	2 some	2 partial	2 average	2 some correct	2 leading or cooperative	2 some	
3 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	3 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	3 almost all	3 all relevant points	3 many	3 to most topics	3 reasonable	3 many	3 many correct	3 quite efficient	3 reasonable	3 reasonable	
4 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	4 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	4 all & efficiently	4 practically all points	4 practically all	4 + improvement suggestions	4 very good	4 new crucial point(s)	4 almost all	4 + improvement suggestions	4 very efficient	4 very good	
6 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	6 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used											

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\frac{1}{2}$ + 2 + $2\frac{1}{2}$ - 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 too few, mostly irrelevant	0 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	0 poor	0 almost no	0 too few	0 irrelevant	0 no	0 poor	0 almost no	0 too few	0 irrelevant	0 no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	1 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	1 partial	1 too short/long	1 some	1 partially relevant	1 almost no	1 too short/long	1 too short/long	1 some	1 partially relevant	1 almost no	
2 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	2 good	2 relevant parts	2 many	2 mostly adequate	2 some	2 informative, apt	2 relevant parts	2 many	2 mostly adequate	2 some	
3 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	3 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	3 detailed, complex	3 accurate, conclusive	3 + improvement suggestions	3 fully adequate	3 good	3 brief but accurate	3 accurate, conclusive	3 + improvement suggestions	3 fully adequate	3 good	
6 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	6 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.											
6 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	6 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.											

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1 - 1 = 3 Aary Atiq

stage: 3
reporter: PAKISTAN

fight (round no.): 3
opponent: CANADA

room: H
reviewer: Hungary

problem no.: 3

Juror's name: Alexia
signature: [Signature]

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2.5 + 3 - 1 = 7 Xiaoyang Chen

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	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0 almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no			
1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	very little	few	some	almost no	1 little	some	some	to some extent	almost no			
2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	not all	some	to important topics	some	2 partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some			
	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	3 good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable			
	all & efficiently	practically all points	+ 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 + 2.5 + 2.7 - 1 = 8 Anon Submits

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER ^{0.5}
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\frac{1.5}{1}$ - $\frac{0.5}{0}$ = $\frac{1.5}{1}$

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 3
 reporter: Anon Atiq opponent: Xiaoyang

room: H problem no.: 3
 reviewer: Anon Suavits

Juror's name: Dario Dwi
 signature: Dmo Aw

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT ^{1.5}
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\frac{1.5}{1}$ + $\frac{3}{3}$ + $\frac{2}{2}$ - $\frac{0}{0}$ = $\frac{7}{7}$

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER ²
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\frac{1.5}{1}$ + $\frac{2}{2}$ + $\frac{2}{2}$ - $\frac{0}{0}$ = $\frac{7}{7}$

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

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

stage: 3
 reporter: Pakistan

fight (round no.): PFB
 opponent: Canada

room: H
 reviewer: Hungary

problem no.: 3

Juror's name: Julia Gudek
 signature: Julia Gudek

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 checked="" 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"/> points cleared	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> cooperated well	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	3 <input type="checkbox"/> deviations qualitatively analysed	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some interesting results	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> points cleared	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory	3 <input type="checkbox"/> answered directly	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	4 <input type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + results explained, errors analysed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental or theoretical	4 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average	4 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points discussed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> convincingly supported	4 <input type="checkbox"/> to most questions	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex, completely testable	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 <input type="checkbox"/> well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental and theoretical	5 <input type="checkbox"/> greater extent than expected	5 <input type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics	5 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	5 <input type="checkbox"/> efficient, productive	

NOTES: Identify important points. No theory flow more the magnitude, few points

LIGHT BOUNCES?

linear magnification (very)

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 0 + 2 - 0.5 = 4

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	
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost nothing	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no or irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> very little	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> very little	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some main points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/> little	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> to some extent	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> not all	2 <input type="checkbox"/> main points	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> to important topics	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> leading or cooperative	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/> almost all	3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input type="checkbox"/> to most topics	3 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input type="checkbox"/> quite efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	
4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/> 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	

Relates to the presentation, but not to the problem it self.

Focus on technical details, not the problem it self.

Showed more locks in the presentation that was already not good but didn't bring us closer to the understanding of the problem.

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

NOTES: THIS WAS AN OPPORTUNITY TO ADD SOMETHING TO THE SOLUTION NOT WELL TIME BALANCED 40%.

SCORESHEET

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

stage: 3
 reporter: Pakistan

fight (round no.): 3
 opponent: ~~Hungary~~ Canada

room: H
 problem no.: 3
 reviewer: Hungary

Juror's name: Chuan Yong
 signature: *Chuan Yong*

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 points cleared	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> avoided some questions	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> not well fitting	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some own input	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some scientific points cleared	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> cooperated well	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	3 <input type="checkbox"/> deviations	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some interesting results	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points discussed	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	3 <input type="checkbox"/> answered directly to most questions	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	4 <input type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + results explained errors analysed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental or theoretical	4 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average	4 <input type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics	4 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	4 <input type="checkbox"/> efficient, productive	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex, completely testable	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 <input type="checkbox"/> well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental and theoretical	5 <input type="checkbox"/> greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

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

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

NOTES:

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

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

Round: 3 Room: H Fight Assistants: He Shengmin Wen Dingyi



Team	Stage 1			Stage 2			Stage 3			Stage 4		
	Canada Rep	Hungary Opp	Pakistan Rev	Hungary Rep	Pakistan Opp	Canada Rev	Pakistan Rep	Canada Opp	Hungary Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev
Kent Hogan	6	8	6	7	5	5	2	7	7			
Aleksandra Moric	5	7	5	8	6	5	3	7	8			
Dennis Dvor	6	7	6	8	5	6	3	7	7			
Zukang Stadnyk	4	7	5	7	5	6	1	4	5			
Chuangyong Li	5	7	6	7	7	8	3	5	8			
Acting Team Member	Xiaoyang Chen			Eszter Varga-Umbriach			Arij Atig					
	Timea Banoczy			Haseeb Ejaz Chaudhry			Xiaoyang Chen					
	Haseeb Ejaz Chaudhry			Sujan He			Suzette Aron					
Rejected Problems												
Accepted Problem	2. Rakoon skinner.			6. Fast Chain.			3. Single Lens Telescope					

Signature Fight Assistant:
 Signature Fight Assistant (signature):