

SCORESHEET

REPORTER: **R.S.** + **R.S.** - **0** = **6**
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

stage: **fight (round no.): 4**
 reporter: **Wz** opponent: **Sweke**

room: **B** problem no.: **12**
 reviewer: **Pamaria**

Juror's name: **STBACMBA**
 signature: **STB**

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

NOTES:

OPPOSITION
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + **1.5** + **2** + **2.5** - **0** = **7**

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

NOTES:

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

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 4 room: B problem no.:
 reporter: New Zealand opponent: Sweden reviewer: Romana Juror's name: Pablo Viktor
 signature: 

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 4,5 + 3,5 - 1 = 8

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + 2,5 + 2 - 1 = 6

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2 + 3 + 3 - 1 = 8

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER: **25** + **2** - **0.5** = **5**
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

stage: **A** fight (round no.): **1** room: **B** problem no.: **12** Juror's name: **QZANUSUN**
 reporter: **N2** opponent: **Sneider** reviewer: **Rom** signature: *[Signature]*

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

NOTES:

OPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract:
 1 + **1.5** + **3.0** + **2.0** - **0.5** = **7**

| QUESTIONS ASKED | time used | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | correct own opinions expressed | prioritisation | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER | efficiency | prioritisation | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |
|-----------------|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | no or irrelevant | almost no | no | scientific contribution almost no | almost no | no | conclude and correct or no questions asked |
| 1 | some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points | very little | few | some | some | little | some | to some extent | some incorrect, inconclusive or too long |
| 2 | short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used | not all | main points | to important topics | reasonable | partial | average | leading or cooperative | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| 3 | | almost all | all relevant points | to most topics | | good | many | quite efficient | |
| 4 | | all & efficiently | practically all points | + improvement suggestions | very good | new crucial point(s) | + improvement suggestions | very efficient | |

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract:
 1 + **2** + **1.5** + **1.5** - **1** = **5**

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 4 room: B problem no.: 12 Juror's name: Peter Barros
 reporter: New Zealand opponent: Sweden reviewer: Romania signature: Barros Rele

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.5 + 2.5 - 10 = 6

| 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 |
|--------|---|--|--|---|---|------------------------------|---|--|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | too few | no/ almost no | others' data, incorrectly cited | misunderstood | scientific contribution almost no | efficiency almost no, chaotic questions |
| 1 | some | some | some | some | review of sources, cited | partly | only technical points cleared | avoided some questions |
| 2 | fair | fair | fair | not well fitting | some interesting results | average | some scientific points cleared | cooperated well |
| 3 | good | good | well performed, sufficient number | deviations analysed | considerable experimental or theoretical | interesting | interesting points discussed | answered directly to most questions |
| 4 | deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | quite detailed, correct | + results explained errors analysed, convincing analysis | + theory limits explained, conclusive well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive | considerable experimental or theoretical | some aspects above average | interesting points discussed brought in new physics | convincingly supported, proved deep understanding |
| 5 | deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | detailed, complex, completely testable | | | considerable experimental and theoretical | greater extent than expected | | |
| 6 | | | | | | | | |

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.25 + 3 + 2.5 - 0.5 = 7

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0.5 = 6

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: *H* fight (round no.): *1*
 reporter: *N. Zec* opponent: *Streaken Boys* room: *B* problem no.: *14, 8, 12*
 reviewer: *Eric Coughlan* *Eric* Juror's name: *Yury Rashkevich*
 signature: *[Signature]*

REPORTER: *233* + *2* - *1* = *6*

Start from 1 and add/subtract

| REPORT | phenomenon explanation | theory/model | relevant experiments | comparison between theory and experiment | own contribution | task fulfilment | DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT | ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS | |
|--------|--|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|------------------------------|---|--|---|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | too few | no/ almost no | others' data, incorrectly cited | misunderstood | scientific contribution almost no | relevant arguments/responses: too few | efficiency 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 | 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 | many | answered directly to most questions |
| 4 | detailed | quite detailed, correct | + results explained | + theory limits explained, deviations analysed, conclusive | considerable experimental or theoretical | some aspects above average | + data/theory convincingly supported; proved deep understanding | many | answered directly to most questions efficiently, productive |
| 5 | demonstrative | correct | + reproducible, convincing analysis | | considerable experimental or theoretical | greater extent than expected | | | |
| 6 | deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight | completely testable | | | | | | | |

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + *1.5* + *2* + *3* - *0.5* = *7*

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + *2* + *1.5* + *1.5* - *0.5* = *6*

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 4 room: B problem no.: 9 Juror's name: Paula Wilton
 reporter: Sweden opponent: Romania reviewer: New Zealand signature: [Signature]

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

| 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 | |
|--------|--|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | too few | no/ almost no | others data, incorrectly cited | misunderstood | scientific contribution almost no | relevant arguments/responses too few | efficiency almost no, chaotic |
| 1 | some | some | some | some | review of sources, cited | partly average | only technical points cleared | 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 | many | answered directly to most questions |
| 4 | detailed | quite detailed, | + results explained | + theory limits explained, conclusive | considerable experimental or theoretical | some aspects above average | discussed | convincingly supported | efficient, productive |
| 5 | demonstrative | correct, | errors analysed | well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical | greater extent than expected | interesting points brought in new physics | proven deep understanding | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| 6 | deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight | detailed, complex, completely testable | + reproducible, convincing analysis | | | | | | |

NOTES:

OPPONENT 1 + 1 + 2 + 2,5 - 0 = 7
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

NOTES:

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

| QUESTIONS ASKED | REPORT SUMMARY & UNDERSTANDING | DISCUSSION ANALYSIS | OWN OPINIONS | PROS & CONS | PRIORITISATION | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION | OWN OPINIONS | PROS & CONS | PRIORITISATION | ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS |
|-----------------|---|---------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------|--|
| 0 | too few, mostly irrelevant | poor | almost no | irrelevant | no | speech summary poor | almost no | irrelevant | no | concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 1 | some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out | partial | some | partially relevant | almost no | too short/long | some | partially relevant | almost no | some incorrect, inconclusive or too long |
| 2 | most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp. | good | many | mostly adequate | some | informative, appropriate | many | mostly adequate | some | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| 3 | +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently | detailed, complex | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | good | brief but accurate | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | good | |

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 4 room: B problem no.: 9
 reporter: Sveden opponent: Rom reviewer: NZ Juror's name: Alan Sun
 signature: [Signature]

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

| REPORT | phenomenon explanation | theory/model | relevant experiments | comparison between theory and experiment | own contribution | task fulfillment | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER | DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT | ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |
|--------|--|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | too few | no/ almost no | others data, incorrectly cited | misunderstood | scientific contribution almost no | arguments/responses too few | 0 - concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 1 | some | some | some | some | review of sources, cited | partly | only technical points covered | some | 1 - some incorrect, inconclusive or too long |
| 2 | fair | fair | fair | not very fitting deviations | some own input | average | some scientific points covered | many | 2 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| 3 | good | good | well performed, sufficient number | qualitatively analysed + theory limits | some interesting results | interesting solution | interesting points discussed | + data/theory convincingly supported | |
| 4 | detailed | quite detailed, correct | + results explained | explained, conclusive | considerable experimental or theoretical | some aspects above average | more interesting points discussed | proved deep understanding | |
| 5 | demonstrative | detailed, complex, completely testable | + reproducible, convincing analysis | well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical | greater extent than expected | interesting points discussed | convincingly supported | |
| 6 | deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight | | | | | | | | |

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 20.18 + 3 - 1.15 = 6

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0.75 = 8

| QUESTIONS ASKED | REPORT SUMMARY & UNDERSTANDING | DISCUSSION ANALYSIS | OWN OPINIONS | PROS & CONS | PRIORITISATION | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION | OWN OPINIONS | PROS & CONS | PRIORITISATION | ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------|---|
| 0 - too few, mostly irrelevant | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | no | speech summary poor | too few | irrelevant | no | 0 - concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 1 - some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out | partial | too short/long | some | partially relevant | almost no | 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. | good | relevant parts | many | mostly adequate | some | informative, apt | many | mostly adequate | some | -1 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| 3 - short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently | detailed, complex | conclusive | + improvement suggestions | adequate | good | brief but accurate | + improvement suggestions | adequate | good | -2 - |

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: **2** fight (round no.): **4** room: **B** problem no.: **5** Juror's name: **Peter Boross**
 reporter: **Sweden** opponent: **Romania** reviewer: **New Zealand** signature: **Boross Ref**

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + **1.5** + **1** - **0** = **2.5**

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + **0.5** + **2.75** + **2.25** - **0** = **7**

| QUESTIONS ASKED | | time used | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | correct own opinions expressed | prioritisation | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER | | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS | | | |
|-----------------|--|-------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| 0 | almost no, irrelevant | almost no | almost nothing | no or irrelevant | almost no | no | scientific contribution almost no | relevance of topics irrelevant | own opinions presented very little | efficiency almost no | prioritisation almost no | concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 1 | some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points | very little | some main points | few | some | some | little | some | some correct | to some extent | almost no | some incorrect, |
| 2 | short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used | no/all | main points | many | to important topics | reasonable | partial | average | many correct | leading or cooperative | some | inconclusive or too long |
| | | almost all | all relevant points | many | to most topics | reasonable | good | many | many correct | quite efficient | reasonable | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| | | all & | 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 + **1.5** + **2** + **2** - **0** = **7**

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER: ES + 15 - 1 = 5 Start from 1 and add/subtract

stage: Sweden fight (round no.): 2 room: B problem no.: 9 Juror's name: Jury
 reporter: Victoria Lewis opponent: Romania reviewer: M. Zealand signature: Bashkakov

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

NOTES:

OPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 15 + 2 + 2 - 05 = 6

| QUESTIONS ASKED | | time used | | understanding of presentation | | relevant topics addressed | | correct own opinions expressed | | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER | | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS | | | |
|-----------------|--|-------------|-------------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|----|--|
| 0 | almost no, irrelevant | almost no | almost no | almost nothing | no or irrelevant | almost no | almost no | 0 | almost no | scientific contribution | relevance of topics | own opinions presented | efficiency | 0 | concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 1 | some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points | very little | very little | some main points | few | some | some | 1 | little | little | irrelevant | very little | almost no | -1 | some incorrect, |
| 2 | short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used | not all | not all | main points | some | to important topics | to most topics | 2 | partial | partial | average | some correct | to some extent leading or cooperative | -1 | inconclusive or too long |
| | | almost all | almost all | all relevant points | many | + improvement suggestions | reasonable | 3 | good | good | many | many correct | quite efficient | -2 | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| | | efficiently | efficiently | practically all points | practically all | | 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 - 05 = 7

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER: **15 + 15 - 0 = 4**
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

STAGE: **2** FIGHT (ROUND NO.): **4** ROOM: **B** PROBLEM NO.: **9** JUROR'S NAME: **T. Brown**
 REPORTER: **Jude** OPPONENT: **Bonnie** REVIEWER: **Naz Zelede** SIGNATURE: **[Signature]**

| REPORT | phenomenon explanation | theory/model | relevant experiments | comparison between theory and experiment | own contribution | task fulfillment | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER | DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT | ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |
|--------|--|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | too few | no/almost no | others' data, incorrectly cited | misunderstood | scientific contribution almost no | relevant arguments/responses too few | efficiency almost no, chaotic |
| 1 | some | some | some | some | review of sources, cited | average | only technical points cleared | some | conclude and correct or no questions asked |
| 2 | fair | fair | fair | not well fitting deviations | some interesting results | interesting solution | some scientific points cleared | many | some incorrect, inconclusive or too long |
| 3 | good | good | well performed, sufficient number | qualitatively analysed | considerable experimental or theoretical | some aspects above average | interesting points discussed | + data/theory convincingly supported | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| 4 | detailed | quite detailed, correct | + results explained | + theory limits explained, conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical | greater extent than expected | interesting points brought in new physics | convincingly supported proved deep understanding | |
| 5 | demonstrative | correct | + reproducible, convincing analysis | well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive | | | | | |
| 6 | deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight | detailed, complex, completely testable | | | | | | | |

NOTES: *Clash presentation with two versions of presentations and two projects/computers.*

OPPONENT: **1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 5**
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

| QUESTIONS ASKED | time used | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | correct own opinions expressed | prioritisation | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER | efficiency | prioritisation | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |
|-----------------|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|------------|-----------------|--|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | no or irrelevant | almost no | no | scientific contribution almost no | almost no | no | conclude and correct or no questions asked |
| 1 | some unclear points | very little | some main points | some | almost no | little | some | some | some incorrect, inconclusive or too long |
| 2 | short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used | not all | main points | to important topics | reasonable | partial | average | to some extent | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| 3 | | almost all | all relevant points | many | | good | many | quite efficient | |
| 4 | | efficiently | practically all points | practically all | very good | new crucial point(s) | almost all | very efficient | |

REVIEWER: **1 + 2 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 8**
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER: 2.5 + 1.25 - 0.25 = 4
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 4 room: 13 problem no.: 13 Juror's name: Peter Bovoss
 reporter: Romania opponent: New Zealand reviewer: Sweden signature: Barnes etc

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

NOTES:

OPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 0.5 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0.25 = 6

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

NOTES:

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

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

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

stage: 3
 reporter: *Amelia*
 fight (round no.): 4
 opponent: NZ

room: B
 reviewer: *Suelle*
 problem no.: 13

Juror's name: *J. B. McAlister*
 signature: *J. B. McAlister*

| REPORT | | DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT | | ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS | | | | | | |
|--------|--|--|---|---|--|--------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|---|
| 0 | phenomenon explanation almost no | theory/model almost no | relevant experiments <i>good/few</i> | comparison between theory and experiment <i>no/ almost no</i> | own contribution others' data, incorrectly cited | task fulfillment misunderstood | DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT | scientific contribution almost no | relevant arguments/responses <i>too few</i> | efficiency almost no, chaotic |
| 1 | some | some | some | some | some own input | average | 1 | only technical points cleared | many | avoided some questions |
| 2 | fair | fair | fair | not well fitting | some interesting results | interesting solution | 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 | convincingly supported, proved deep understanding | answered directly to most questions efficient, productive |
| 4 | detailed | quite detailed, correct | + results explained | + theory limits explained, conclusive | considerable experimental or theoretical | some aspects above average | 4 | interesting points brought in new physics | | |
| 5 | demonstrative | detailed, complex, completely testable | errors analysed + reproducible, convincing analysis | well fitting, deviations analysed | considerable experimental and theoretical | greater extent than expected | | | | |
| 6 | deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight | | | | | | | | | |

NOTES:

OPPONENT: 1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 = 0 = 7
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

| QUESTIONS ASKED | | OPPOSITION (SPEECH) | | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER | | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS | | |
|-----------------|--|---------------------|--|-------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| 0 | almost no, irrelevant | time used almost no | understanding of presentation almost nothing | relevant topics addressed few | correct own opinions expressed almost no | prioritisation no | 0 | concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 1 | some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points | very little | some main points | some | some | some | 1 | some incorrect, inconclusive or too long |
| 2 | short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used | not all | main points | many | to most topics + improvement suggestions | reasonable | 2 | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| | | almost all | all relevant points | practically all | practically all | very good | | |
| | | efficiently | | | | | | |

NOTES:

REVIEWER: 1 + 2.5 + 2 + 2 = 0 = 7
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 4 fight (round no.): 3 room: B problem no.: 10, 13 Juror's name: Bashkhetay
 reporter: Romania opponent: N. Zealand reviewer: Sweden signature: [Signature]
Rajha Rokas

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

| REPORT | | DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT | | 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 | ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |
| 0 almost no | 0 almost no | too few | no/ almost no | others' data, incorrectly cited | misunderstood | almost no | too few | almost no, chaotic | 0 concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some | 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some | some | some | review of sources, cited | partly | only technical | some | avoided some questions | 1 some incorrect, |
| 2 fair | 2 fair | fair | not well fitting, deviations | some own input | average | points cleared | many | cooperated well | 2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| 3 good | 3 good | well performed, sufficient number | qualitatively analysed | considerable experimental | interesting solution | points cleared | many | answered directly | |
| 4 detailed | 4 quite detailed, correct | + results explained | + theory limits | or theoretical | some aspects above average | discussed | + data/theory convincingly supported | answered directly to most questions | |
| 5 demonstrative | 5 correct | + reproducible, | well fitting, conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical | greater extent than expected | interesting points brought in new physics | convincingly supported | efficient, productive | |
| 6 deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight | 6 detailed, complex, completely testable | convincing analysis | analysed, conclusive | | | | | | |

NOTES:

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

| QUESTIONS ASKED | | OPPOSITION (SPEECH) | | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER | | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS | |
|--|---|------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| 0 almost no, irrelevant | 0 almost no | time used | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | correct own opinions expressed | prioritisation | 0 concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 1 some relevant, aimed at resolving | 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some unclear points | almost no | almost nothing | no or irrelevant | almost no | no | 1 some incorrect, |
| 2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used | 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> not all | very little | some main points | few | some | some | 2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| | 3 almost all | all relevant points | main points | many | to most topics | reasonable | |
| | 4 all & efficiently | practically all points | practically all | + improvement suggestions | very good | 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 | 0 report summary & understanding | discuss | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation | 0 concise and correct or no questions asked | |
| 1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out | 1 poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | no | 1 some incorrect, | |
| 2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp. | 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good | too short/long | some | partially relevant | almost no | 2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions | |
| 3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently | 3 detailed, complex | relevant parts | many | mostly adequate | some | | |

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 4 room: B problem no.: 10 Juror's name: Paulo Vitor
 reporter: Romania opponent: New Zealand reviewer: Sweden signature: [Signature]

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

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT
 1 + 1 + 2,5 + 2 - 0 = 7
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

| QUESTIONS ASKED | time used | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | correct own opinions expressed | prioritisation | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |
|-----------------|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| 0 | almost no, irrelevant | almost no | no or irrelevant | almost no | no | scientific contribution almost no | concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 1 | some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points | very little | few | some | some | little | some incorrect, inconclusive or too long |
| 2 | short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used | not all | some | to important topics | some | partial | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| | | almost all | many | to most topics | reasonable | good | |
| | | all & efficiently | practically all points | + improvement suggestions | very good | new crucial point(s) | |

NOTES:

REVIEWER
 1 + 2 + 1,5 + 1,5 - 0 = 6
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER: **2.0** + **1.5** - **1** = **4**

stage: **3**
reporter: **Ram**

fight (round no.): **4**
opponent: **WZ**

room: **B**
reviewer: **Sue Dean**

problem no.: **13**

Juror's name: **OTAN SWA**
signature: **OTAN SWA**

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT: **1** + **2.5** + **0.5** - **1** = **5**
Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER: **2** + **2.5** + **2.5** - **1** = **7**
Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

NOTES:

| Team | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | | | Stage 3 | | | Stage 4 | |
|--------------------|---|-----------|-------------------|----------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------|----------------|-----|
| | Rep | Opp | Rep | Opp | Rev | Rep | Opp | Rev | Opp | Rev |
| John Balcombe | 6 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 7 | |
| Yury Bakhtov | 6 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 7 | | |
| Peter Boross | 6 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 7 | | |
| Brian Sun | 5 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 7 | | |
| Pavlo Viktor | 8 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 7 | 6 | | |
| Acting Team Member | Eric Carlman | Eric Bojs | Andrei Mokut | William Focalp | Leonard-Peter Turica | Finnegan Messerli | Roxana Drogyna | Otis Rea | William Focalp | |
| Rejected Problems | 14. Gee-Haw Whammy Diddle 1. Invent Yourself | | - | | | 10 Pulling Glasses Apart | | | | |
| Accepted Problem | 12. Tor sion Gyroscope | | 9. Ball in a Tube | | | 18 Resonating Glass | | | | |

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