

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 3.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 6

stage: 3
 reporter: Austria

fight (round no.): 3
 opponent: Serbia

room: I problem no.: 3
 reviewer: Brazil

Juror's name: Syfa Lia
 signature: Syfa Lia

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	efficiency	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 only technical	some	avoided some questions	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 some scientific points cleared	many	cooperated well	
3 <u>good</u>	<u>good</u>	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	3 interesting points discussed	+ data/theory	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	convincingly supported; 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 + 1 + 1.5 + 0.5 - 0 = 4

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

NOTES:

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

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{1.75}$ + $\boxed{2.25}$ - $\boxed{}$ = $\boxed{5}$

stage: $\boxed{3}$ fight (round no.): $\boxed{3}$ room: \boxed{I} problem no.: $\boxed{3}$
 reporter: *Austrie V. Weisger* opponent: *Sasie C. Leronovic* reviewer: *Brazil T. Flor*

Juror's name: *Tomislav Grcenjak*
 signature: *T. Grcenjak*

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 fulfillment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	efficiency	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no/ almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> others' data, incorrectly cited	0 <input type="checkbox"/> misunderstood	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no, chaotic	
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> review of sources, cited	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly	1 <input type="checkbox"/> only technical	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> avoided some questions	
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> not well fitting deviations	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some own input	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some scientific	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> cooperated well	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	3 <input type="checkbox"/> qualitatively analysed	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some interesting results	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	3 <input checked="" 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"/> discussed	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	5 <input type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics			

NOTES: - poor structure of the presentation
 - they do not investigate Siphtraes

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{0.5}$ + $\boxed{1.25}$ + $\boxed{0.75}$ - $\boxed{}$ = $\boxed{4}$

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> almost no, irrelevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used		0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost nothing	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no or irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> very little	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
		1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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"/> 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 checked="" 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: - only clarification questions
 - asked about limitations of the hole size
 - lack of understanding of the experiment

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{2}$ + $\boxed{1.75}$ + $\boxed{1.75}$ - $\boxed{}$ = $\boxed{7}$

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

SCORESHEET

REPORTER ^{3.3}
 1 + ~~2.08~~ + ^{1.96} - 0 = ~~3.96~~ ^{7.26} **(7)**

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 3
 reporter: AUSTRIA opponent: SERBIA

room: I problem no.: 3
 reviewer: BRAZIL

Juror's name: E. ESCHENAZI
 signature: *E. Eschenazi*

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	
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 deviations	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 --- 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	
5 --- deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 --- detailed, complex, completely testable	5 --- + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 --- well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 --- considerable experimental and theoretical	5 --- greater extent than expected				

NOTES: Conclusions explain well the results and interplay of magnification and brightness.
 (3.3) (3.8) (3.5) (3.5) (2.8) (2.5) (2.8) (2.0) (3.1)

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 0.7 + 1.3 + 1.16 - 0 = 4.16 **(4)**

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

NOTES: (0.7) (3) (0.8) (1) (0.8) (1) (0.8) (0.8) (2)

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2.5 + 2.24 + 2.32 - 0 = 8.06 **(8)** ~~8.06~~ Not too many relevant questions

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

NOTES: Aberration, Sue pinhole Diffraction (3.5) (2.5) (2.3) (1.8) (2.3) (2.5)

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 2 + 2 - 6.5 = 5$

stage: H1
 reporter: Valentin Wenzinger (AUSTRIA)

fight (round no.): 3
 opponent: Ayhan No. 10 (SERBIA)

room: I
 reviewer: (BRAZIL)

14 rejected

problem no.: 3

Juror's name: HATEJ BADJI

signature: *Hatej Badji*

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	efficiency	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	only technical points cleared	some	avoided some questions	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	1.5, 2 some scientific points cleared	many	cooperated well	
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	data entered into results	interesting solution	2 interesting points discussed	+ data/theory	answered directly to most questions	
4 detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	3 brought in new physics	convincingly supported	proved deep understanding	
5 demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	explained, conclusive	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	4	proven deep understanding	efficient, productive	
6 deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight									

NOTES:
 - observations → cause of the...
 - small aperture → eyepiece
 - diameter of the lens → very wide, brightness
 - sharpness → exp. blurring effort
 - magnification → magnification on end bars
 - distance between lenses
 - Conclusion? → about how wide placement of pinhole
 - Trade off? → trade-off between resolution and brightness
 - Pinhole diameter 0.28mm - 0.98mm (slide 6)
 - Brightness - Gray value - Is it linear? (18)
 - Where is it placed? The pinhole? into the lens?
 - Where to place the pinhole?
 - Distance from the lens is bigger than the focal length
 - Pickem

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

NOTES:
 - Question: Slide 5, Slide 11: Change pinhole was changed...
 - "Geometrical optics"
 - Disrupt the diffraction limit at size of pinhole
 - Q: Wave optics? should be considered
 - Discussion: Big pinhole - small pinhole under microscope
 - Distance from the lens is bigger than the focal length
 - Pickem

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.	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2		good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3		detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	

NOTES:
 - Question: observation - experimentally observed? which aberrations - chromatic vs. spherical
 - Ideal size of the pinhole?
 - Brightness - all the light which comes from the lens
 - Diffraction occur
 - How far from the pinhole?
 - Magnitude of the telescope
 - Ideal telescope

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + $\boxed{3}$ + $\boxed{2}$ - $\boxed{0}$ = $\boxed{6}$

stage: $\boxed{3}$ fight (round no.): $\boxed{3}$ room: \boxed{I} problem no.: $\boxed{3}$ Juror's name: *D. Keller*
 reporter: *Andrin* opponent: *Leibin* reviewer: *Bruce* signature: *D. Keller*

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 --- \uparrow fair	\uparrow fair	\uparrow fair	not well fitting	\uparrow some own input	\uparrow average	2 --- \uparrow some scientific points cleared	\uparrow many	\uparrow questions cooperated well	
3 --- good	good	well performed, sufficient number	\uparrow deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	3 --- interesting points discussed	\uparrow 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 + $\boxed{1}$ + $\boxed{2}$ + $\boxed{2}$ - $\boxed{0}$ = $\boxed{6}$

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 6

stage: 32

fight (round no.): 3

room: I

problem no.: 15

Juror's name: P. Keller

reporter: Austria

opponent: Jakarta

reviewer: David

signature: D. Keller

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> interesting solution
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,5 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no, irrelevant
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
2 <input type="checkbox"/> short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation
0	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no
1	very little	some main points	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> few	some	almost no
2	not all	main points	some	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> to important topics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some
3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable
4	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good

	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no
1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> little	some	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	to some extent	almost no
2	partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some
3	good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable
4	new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6

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

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

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

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + (2.5) - 0 = 6

stage: II

fight (round no.): 3

room: I

problem no.: 15

Boiling egg

Juror's name: MATEJ BADA

reporter: Thomas Bergamo (BRAZIL)

opponent: Philip Reindl (AUSTRIA)

reviewer: Aleksandra Stojimic (SERBIA)

signature: Maja Bada

REPORT

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

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 interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions
4 brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: METHODS SENSITIVITY 3 methods spinning absorption of light temperature of water to report position

more on choice of good - too few - choice of the... comparison between theory and experiment... own contribution... task fulfilment... My question: what about... Q4: SENSITIVITY OF LIGHT METHOD ALONE

METHODOLOGY: SETUP 1: TOOL... CRUISE OF EGGS (SIZE, QUANTITY, MASS)

DEGREE OF BOILING -> y-values I = max light intensity

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: Questions: most accurate choice of the eggs internal structure of the eggs

own opinion on these approaches... Discussion: average of three boiling 10 times each egg - statistics is obtained shell thickness using all the eggs - different ages of the values - measurement - note

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + (1.5) + 2 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: Questions: robot -> easy single egg degree of boiling the eggs most precise method -> find the relation... 400c boiling chemical reaction decomposition of the proteins

degree of boiling of gradient shell thickness at the egg... Term of boiling - reliable... could have elaborated on the advantages of the found

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{2.25} + \boxed{2.75} - \boxed{} = \boxed{6}$$

stage: 2

fight (round no.): 3

room: I

problem no.: 15

Juror's name: Tomasz Grczylo

reporter: Brazil T. Bergemeister

opponent: Austria P. Reinold

reviewer: Serbia A. Stajkovic

signature: T. Grczylo

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

NOTES: - 3 methods but not well presented, sensitivity only for one of them;

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{0.75} + \boxed{1.25} + \boxed{1.75} - \boxed{1.75} = \boxed{5}$$

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

NOTES: - the way the egg is cooked as an important factor
- tends to present own results

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{1.75} + \boxed{1.5} + \boxed{1.5} - \boxed{} = \boxed{6}$$

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

NOTES: - brought the problem of degree cooking, temperature
- the way of cooking

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{2.5}$ + $\boxed{2.0}$ - $\boxed{0.5}$ = $\boxed{5}$

stage: $\boxed{2}$ fight (round no.): $\boxed{3}$
 reporter: Brazil opponent: Austria

room: I problem no.: 15
 reviewer: Serbia

Juror's name: Syge Lu
 signature: Syge Lu

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{1.5}$ + $\boxed{2}$ + $\boxed{1.5}$ - $\boxed{}$ = $\boxed{6}$

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{2}$ + $\boxed{1.5}$ + $\boxed{2.0}$ - $\boxed{0.5}$ = $\boxed{6}$

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{3.25} + \boxed{2.7} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{6.95} \quad (7)$$

stage: 2

fight (round no.): 3

room: I

problem no.: 15

Juror's name: E. ESCHENAZ

reporter: BRAZIL

opponent: Austria

reviewer: SERBIA

signature: *E. Eschenaz*

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

NOTES: Method 2. NO Kinetic explanation.

(2) (2) (2)

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{1.2} + \boxed{2.04} + \boxed{2.4} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{6.64} \quad (7)$$

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

NOTES:

(3) (2) (3) (1) (1.2) (3) (3) (2) (2) (2)

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{1.2} + \boxed{1.96} + \boxed{1.92} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{6.08} \quad (6)$$

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

NOTES:

(1.8) 2 2 1.8 (2) 2 2 2 1.8 1.8 2

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.0 + 2.9 - 0 = 5.2 (5)

stage: 1
reporter: SERBIA

fight (round no.): 3
opponent: BRAZIL

room: I
reviewer: AUSTRIA

problem no.: 11
Juror's name: E. ESCHEUAZ1
signature: *E. Escueza*

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 (2)	too few (1.5)	no/ almost no (1.5)	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	
1 - some	some (1)	some (1)	some (1)	review of sources, cited	partly (2.0)	only technical points cleared	some (1)	avoided some questions	
2 - fair	fair (1)	fair (1)	not well fitting	some own input	average	some scientific points cleared	many (2)	cooperated well	
3 - good (2.0)	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	2.5 answered directly	
4 - detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive	
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: Error bars? Did not show any diffraction pattern. Response time does not depend on the length. No much comparison key and experiment. No model.

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2.1 + 1.86 - 0 = 5.96 (6)

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

NOTES: Temperature. Why is it lower.

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2.16 + 2.1 - 0 = 6.26 (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 - too few, mostly irrelevant	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	
1 - clear things out	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	
2 - most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	
3 - +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently		detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	

NOTES: 2.5 2.5 (1.3) 2.5 2 (2.5) 2.5 1.3 2.5 2

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 3

room: I

problem no.: 11 Hair regrowth

Juror's name: MATEJ BODIN

reporter: Milena Šimic (SERBIA)

opponent: (BRAZIL)

reviewer: (AUSTRIA)

signature: *Matej Bodin*

REPORT

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

→ accuracy
→ res. param. time relevant parameter

→ addition of humidity
→ ...
→ elongation
→ widening intensively

→ clarity
→ construction of the byproduct
→ comparing to digital

→ Q1: Going below 50% (Slide 11)
→ Q2: Hypothesis?!!

→ STOP on graph

→ Accuracy

→ Inconclusive
→ verification standard deviations

EXP: 2 types response time died normal
2 exp: 3 types of hair count
1 type of width

→ Conclusion: 0.05

Q4: Relevant parameters

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 2 + (2.5) - 0 = 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

Question: ...
parameters (length, temperature?)
Fitting paper...
chemical reaction
absorption?
HYSTERESIS - "not sure" +

Speech:
- temperature
- response time
- Accuracy

Discussion:
→ chemical interactions
→ Variation of parameters
→ length
→ diameter actual
→ Conclusion
→ I.I.I.I.I.I.I.I.

Lack of prioritisation in discussion, more important properties
Use of abstract importance of planning the ...

PRECISION OF THE TOPIC REPORTER
Use of the seal

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3 + (1.5) + 1 - 0 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

Question: ...
priority
non-uniform distribution of humidity
HYSTERESIS?
TEMPERATURE 30°C
Accuracy of the region of the limit

Reporter:
- prioritisation lack
- parameters
→ good rep
→ done on things while has been done can be done better

Opponent

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{1.5} + \boxed{1.75} - \boxed{} = \boxed{4}$$

stage: 1
reporter: Serbia
M. Simić

fight (round no.): 3
opponent: Brazil
V. Tamaç

room: I
reviewer: Austria
J. Hell

Juror's name: Tomaz Grealyto
signature: T. Grealyto

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

- just repeating the information already presented during first
- no relevant parameters stated

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{1.5} + \boxed{2.25} + \boxed{2} - \boxed{} = \boxed{7}$$

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

NOTES: - good and precise questions

- point important aspects of the phenomena

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{2} + \boxed{1.5} + \boxed{1.75} - \boxed{} = \boxed{6}$$

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

NOTES: - important questions

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 3

room: I

problem no.: 11

Juror's name: D. Keller

reporter: Serbia

opponent: Brazil

reviewer: Anthon

signature: D. Keller

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + $\boxed{1.5}$ + $\boxed{3}$ + $\boxed{2}$ - $\boxed{0}$ = $\boxed{7}$

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no, irrelevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used		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 type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
		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	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
		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 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 type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
		3 <input 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 type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input type="checkbox"/> quite efficient	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	3 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		4 <input checked="" 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 + $\boxed{2}$ + $\boxed{2}$ + $\boxed{2}$ - $\boxed{0}$ = $\boxed{7}$

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{3.5} + \boxed{1.5} - \boxed{0.5} = \boxed{5}$$

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 3

room: I

problem no.: 11

Juror's name: *Singha Lee*
signature: *Singha Lee*

reporter: *Serbia*

opponent: *Brazil*

reviewer: *Austria*

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	
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	2 --- many	2 --- cooperated well	
3 --- good	3 --- good	3 --- well performed, sufficient number	3 --- deviations	3 --- some interesting results	3 --- interesting solution	3 --- interesting points discussed	3 --- + data/theory convincingly supported	3 --- answered directly to most questions	
4 --- detailed 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	
5 --- deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 --- detailed, complex, completely testable	5 --- + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 --- well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 --- considerable experimental and theoretical	5 --- greater extent than expected				
6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---	6 ---				

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{1.5} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2.5} - \boxed{0.5} = \boxed{6}$$

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:



Juror	Team	Stage 1			Stage 2			Stage 3			Stage 4			
		Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev	
Daniel Keller	Serbia	5	7	7	6	7	6	6	6	7				
Matej Radin	Brazil	4	7	6	6	7	6	5	4	7				
Elija Eschenazi	Austria	5	6	6	7	7	6	7	4	8				
Tomasz Grczylo	Brazil	4	7	6	6	5	6	5	4	7				
Songfen Liu	Austria	5	6	7	5	6	6	6	4	7				
	Acting Team Member	Milena Simić			Jonathan Hell			Thomas Ross-White Bergamaschi			Valentin Wiesinger			
	Rejected Problems	1			1			* 14						
	Accepted Problem	11			15			* 3						

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