

SCORESHEET

stage: 2
reporter: Balanus

fight (round no.): PF4
opponent: GERMANY

room: E
reviewer: KOREA

problem no.: 5

Juror's name: FUKUZO GAKAROUK
signature: Jakes Gieduk

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 3

REPORT		DISCUSSION WITH OPPOSITION		DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT 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	efficiency almost no, chaotic
1	some fair	some fair	some fair	some not well fitting	review of sources, cited	partly average	avoided some questions
2	fair	fair	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some of input	interesting solution	cooperated well
3	good	good	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	some interesting results	some aspects above average	answered directly to most questions
4	detailed, demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	errors analysed, + reproducible,	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	greater extent than expected	efficient, productive
5	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable, convincing analysis			considerable experimental and theoretical		
6							

NOTES: no proof of copy by us F is not based on M

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED		DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER		DISCUSSION WITH OPPOSITION		ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	almost no, irrelevant	understanding of presentation almost nothing	relevance of topics almost no	scientific contribution almost no	own opinions presented very little	efficiency almost no	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving	some main points	some irrelevant	little	some	to some extent	some incorrect,
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	main points	no or irrelevant	some	some correct	leading or cooperative	inconclusive or too long
3		all relevant points	some	average	many correct	quite efficient	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4		practically all points	practically all	good	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	

NOTES: 0 - tension
Talk about pointer we think but no other in dist no.
Solution was not properly challenged

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 5

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	speech summary poor	discussion analysis almost no	own opinions too few	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	clear things out	good	almost no	too short/long	too short/long	some	some incorrect,
2	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	detailed, complex	too short/long	relevant parts	relevant parts	many	inconclusive or too long
3	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently		relevant parts	accurate, conclusive	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES: To few relevant questions (3)
some question not relevant (2)

no opinion on slashes, not indenting, no new physics

SCORESHEET

stage: 4 fight (round no.): 2 room: E problem no.: 5
 reporter: Belarus opponent: Germany reviewer: Korea

Juror's name: Eidegn Choo
 signature: [Signature]

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment
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	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	errors analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected
6	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight		+ reproducible, convincing analysis			

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

scientific contribution: almost no / only technical points cleared / points cleared / interesting points discussed / brought in new physics

relevant arguments/responses: too few / some / many

efficiency: almost no, chaotic / avoided some questions / cooperated well / answered directly to most questions / 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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

scientific contribution: almost no / little / partial / good / new crucial point(s)

relevance of topics: almost no / some / average / many

own opinions presented: very little / some / some correct / many correct / + improvement suggestions

efficiency: almost no / to some extent / leading or cooperative / quite efficient / very efficient

prioritisation: no / almost no / some / reasonable / 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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

scientific contribution: almost no / only technical points cleared / points cleared / interesting points discussed / brought in new physics

relevant arguments/responses: too few / some / many

efficiency: almost no, chaotic / avoided some questions / cooperated well / answered directly to most questions / 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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

scientific contribution: almost no / little / partial / good / new crucial point(s)

relevance of topics: almost no / some / average / many

own opinions presented: very little / some / some correct / many correct / + improvement suggestions

efficiency: almost no / to some extent / leading or cooperative / quite efficient / very efficient

prioritisation: no / almost no / some / reasonable / 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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

scientific contribution: almost no / only technical points cleared / points cleared / interesting points discussed / brought in new physics

relevant arguments/responses: too few / some / many

efficiency: almost no, chaotic / avoided some questions / cooperated well / answered directly to most questions / 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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

scientific contribution: almost no / little / partial / good / new crucial point(s)

relevance of topics: almost no / some / average / many

own opinions presented: very little / some / some correct / many correct / + improvement suggestions

efficiency: almost no / to some extent / leading or cooperative / quite efficient / very efficient

prioritisation: no / almost no / some / reasonable / 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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

scientific contribution: almost no / only technical points cleared / points cleared / interesting points discussed / brought in new physics

relevant arguments/responses: too few / some / many

efficiency: almost no, chaotic / avoided some questions / cooperated well / answered directly to most questions / 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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

scientific contribution: almost no / little / partial / good / new crucial point(s)

relevance of topics: almost no / some / average / many

own opinions presented: very little / some / some correct / many correct / + improvement suggestions

efficiency: almost no / to some extent / leading or cooperative / quite efficient / very efficient

prioritisation: no / almost no / some / reasonable / 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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

scientific contribution: almost no / only technical points cleared / points cleared / interesting points discussed / brought in new physics

relevant arguments/responses: too few / some / many

efficiency: almost no, chaotic / avoided some questions / cooperated well / answered directly to most questions / 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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

scientific contribution: almost no / little / partial / good / new crucial point(s)

relevance of topics: almost no / some / average / many

own opinions presented: very little / some / some correct / many correct / + improvement suggestions

efficiency: almost no / to some extent / leading or cooperative / quite efficient / very efficient

prioritisation: no / almost no / some / reasonable / 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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

scientific contribution: almost no / only technical points cleared / points cleared / interesting points discussed / brought in new physics

relevant arguments/responses: too few / some / many

efficiency: almost no, chaotic / avoided some questions / cooperated well / answered directly to most questions / 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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

scientific contribution: almost no / little / partial / good / new crucial point(s)

relevance of topics: almost no / some / average / many

own opinions presented: very little / some / some correct / many correct / + improvement suggestions

efficiency: almost no / to some extent / leading or cooperative / quite efficient / very efficient

prioritisation: no / almost no / some / reasonable / 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

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 - 1 = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED

0: almost no, irrelevant

1: some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points

2: short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

NOTES: 1

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

time used: almost no / very little / not all / almost all / all & efficiently

understanding of presentation: almost nothing / some main points / all relevant points / practically all points

relevant topics addressed: no or irrelevant / few / some / many

correct own opinions expressed: almost no / some / to important topics / to most topics / + improvement suggestions

prioritisation: no / almost no / some / reasonable / very good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech summary: poor / too short/long / informative, apt

discussion analysis: almost no / too short/long / accurate, conclusive

own opinions: too few / some / many / + improvement suggestions

pros & cons: irrelevant / partially relevant / mostly adequate / fully adequate

prioritisation: no / almost no / some / good

REVIEW OF REPORT

report summary & understanding: poor / partial / good / detailed, complex

discussion analysis: almost no / too short/long / relevant parts / accurate, conclusive

own opinions: too few / some / many / + improvement suggestions

pros & cons: irrelevant / partially relevant / mostly adequate / fully adequate

prioritisation: no / almost no / some / good

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 5

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

NOTES: 1

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech summary: poor / too short/long / informative, apt

discussion analysis: almost no / too short/long / accurate, conclusive

own opinions: too few / some / many / + improvement suggestions

pros & cons: irrelevant / partially relevant / mostly adequate / fully adequate

prioritisation: no / almost no / some / good

REVIEW OF REPORT

report summary & understanding: poor / partial / good / detailed, complex

discussion analysis: almost no / too short/long / relevant parts / accurate, conclusive

own opinions: too few / some / many / + improvement suggestions

pros & cons: irrelevant / partially relevant / mostly adequate / fully adequate

prioritisation: no / almost no / some / good

NOTES:

2 - explanation for link with math made

2 - explanation for basic phenomena of stars not strong

NOTES:

2 - spotted issues but need to share own opinions a deeper physics.

NOTES:

2 / 1

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 2.5 = 7.25$$

stage: 2 Debevs
reporter: Timothy Krusk

fight (round no.): 4
opponent: Geeman Auguste Medet

room: E South Korea
reviewer: South Korea

problem no.: 5

Juror's name: Zuanherg
signature: [Signature]

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment
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	qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	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	detailed, complex	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected
6	shows physical insight	(completely testable)				

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 3 + 2 = 8$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

NOTES:

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation
0	almost no	no or irrelevant	almost no	no
1	very little	few	some	almost no
2	not all	some	to important topics	some
3	almost all	many	to most topics + improvement suggestions	reasonable
4	all & efficiently	practically all points		very good

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 1.5 + 1.5 = 6$$

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

NOTES:

REVIEW OF REPORT

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	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

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	many	cooperated well
3 points cleared	+ data/theory	answered directly
4 interesting points discussed	convincingly supported	to most questions
5 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

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract: $1 + 2.75 + 2.75 - 0.5 = 5$
 room: E problem no.: 5
 Juror's name: Dina Izadi
OPPONENT Belarus fight (round no.): PF4 reviewer: Korea signature: A Jading
OPPOSITION Germany

REPORT		DISCUSSION WITH OPPOSITION		DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	phenomenon explanation almost no	comparison between theory and experiment no/ almost no	own contribution others' data, incorrectly cited	scientific contribution almost no	relevant arguments/responses too few	efficiency almost no, chaotic	0
1	some	no/ some	review of sources, cited	only technical	some	avoided some questions	1
2	fair	not well fitting	some own input	points cleared	many	cooperated well	2
3	good	qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	points cleared	+ data/theory	answered directly	3
4	detailed	+ theory limits	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting points	convincingly supported	to most questions	4
5	correct	explained, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	discussed	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive	5
6	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive		brought in new physics			6

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract: $1 + 1 + 2 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 5$

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	scientific contribution of topics almost no	own opinions presented very little	efficiency almost no	0
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	very little	no or irrelevant	irrelevant	some	to some extent	1
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	not all	few	some	some correct	leading or cooperative	2
3		all relevant points	some	average	many correct	quite efficient	3
4		practically all points	many	good	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	4

NOTES: stands on one question more
-0.5

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract: $1 + 2 + 2.25 + 2.25 - 0.5 = 7$

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

NOTES: Time management to tell conclusion and missed points which are too important
-0.5

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 7.5 - 0 = 6

stage: 4 fight (round no.): 22

reporter: Belarus opponent: Germany

room: E problem no.: 5

reviewer: Korea

Juror's name: CAO XUEWEI

signature: X.S Cao

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	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	relevant arguments/responses too few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect,
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> inconclusive or too long
3	well prepared, sufficient number	quite detailed, correct	well prepared, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	many	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	+ data/theory convincingly supported	4 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected		

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 = 6

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	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	scientific contribution almost no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1	very little	some main points	some	some	almost no	little	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect,
2	not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	partial	2 <input type="checkbox"/> inconclusive or too long
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4	efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	new crucial point(s)	4 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 6

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET
 stage: 4
 reporter: Korea
 opponent: Germany
 reviewer: Belarus
 room: E
 problem no.: 10
 juror's name: Eileen Chen
 signature: *Chen*

REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 6

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

NOTES:
 3

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER		ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	almost no, irrelevant	scientific contribution almost no	relevance of topics irrelevant	efficiency almost no	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	little	some	to some extent	some incorrect,
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	partial	average	leading or cooperative	inconclusive or too long
		good	many	quite efficient	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		new crucial point(s)	almost all	very efficient	

NOTES:
 1

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

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

NOTES:
 1

SCORESHEET

stage: **3**
 reporter: **GERMANY**
 opponent: **KOREA**

fight (round no.): **PF3**
 room: **E**
 reviewer: **BELANDS**

problem no.: **10**

Juror's name: **LUKAS GOTTSCHALK**
 signature: *Lukas Gottschalk*

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 2 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 4$

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment
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	some interesting results	interesting solution
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected
6	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight		+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive		

NOTES: *Neuroed corner angle + Did not use to separate not interesting*
Too less experiments to justify the theory

Now the hypothesis is correct but difficult to see that the data are

no criticism on literature

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	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	some	some	almost no
2	not all	main points	some	to important topics	some
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics + improvement suggestions	reasonable
4	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all		very good

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1.0 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6$

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

NOTES:

Good concl justified points highlighted

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	efficiency
0	almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic
1	only technical points cleared	some	avoided some questions
2	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

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

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

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

stage: 3
 fight (round no.): 4
 reporter: Germany Medert
 opponent: South Korea
 referee: Sebastian Young Kim

room: E
 reviewer: Belarus
 problem no.: 10
 reviewer: Julia Potenko

Juror's name: Zvonimir Jelec
 signature: [Signature]

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	0
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	relevant arguments/responses too few	1
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	some	2
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	many	3
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	interesting points + data/theory	4
5	demonstrative	correct	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	discussed convincingly supported	5
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical		brought in new physics	6

NOTES:

OPPONENT
 1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6
 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	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	scientific contribution almost no	0
1	very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	little	1
2	not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	partial	2
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics + improvement	reasonable	good	3
4	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	suggestions	very good	new crucial point(s)	4

NOTES:

REVIEWER
 1 + 2 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7
 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	0
1	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	too short/long	1
2	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	informative, apt	2
3	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	brief but accurate	3

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

Juror's name: *Dina Hadji*
signature: *A. Zeddie*

room: *E* problem no.: *10*
reviewer: *Belarus*

stage: *3* fight (round no.): *FF4*
reporter: *Germany* opponent: *Korea*

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 3.25 + 2.25 - 0.5 = 6$

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment
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	some interesting results	interesting solution
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	errors analysed + reproducible, convincing analysis	+ theory limits explained, conclusive, well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected

NOTES: *Some cell parameters should be considered in but 7-0.5*

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	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	few	some	almost no
2	not all	main points	some	to important topics	some
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics + improvement suggestions	reasonable
4	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all		very good

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER
scientific contribution: almost no
relevance of topics: irrelevant
own opinions presented: very little
efficiency: almost no

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT
scientific contribution: almost no
relevant arguments/responses: too few
efficiency: almost no, chaotic

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

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1.75 + 1.75 + 1.75 - 0 = 6$

QUESTIONS ASKED	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no
1	partial	top 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 REPORT
speech summary: poor
discussion analysis: almost no
own opinions: too few
pros & cons: irrelevant
prioritisation: no

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION
speech summary: poor
discussion analysis: almost no
own opinions: too few
pros & cons: irrelevant
prioritisation: no

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

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

stage: 4
 reporter: Germany
 opponent: Korea

room: E
 reviewer: Belarus
 problem no.: 10

Juror's name: CAO XUFEI
 signature: X.S. Cao

REPORT		DISCUSSION WITH OPPOSITION		DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS		
0	phenomenon explanation 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
1	some fair	some fair	some deviations	review of sources, cited some own input	average	only technical points cleared	some	avoided some questions
2	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	some scientific points cleared	may	cooperated well
3	detailed, demonstrative	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions
4	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	+ 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
 1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 = 5
 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	correct own opinions expressed almost no	scientific contribution almost no	relevance of topics irrelevant	own opinions presented very little	efficiency almost no
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	very little	some main points	some to important topics	little	some	some	to some extent
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	not all	many points	many to most topics	partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative
3		almost all	all relevant points	+ improvement suggestions	good	many	many correct	quite efficient
4		efficiently	practically all points	practically all	new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	reasonable

NOTES:

REVIEWER
 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 = 3
 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	pros & cons irrelevant	speech summary poor	discussion analysis almost no	own opinions too few	efficiency almost no
1	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	partial	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	too short/long	some	to some extent
2	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	good	relevant parts	mostly adequate	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: **4** fight (round no.): **1** room: **E** problem no.: **12** Juror's name: **CAO XUEWEI**
 reporter: **Korea** opponent: **Belarus** reviewer: **Germany** signature: **X 3 Cao**

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

REPORT		DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	phenomenon explanation almost no	scientific contribution almost no	relevant arguments/responses too few	efficiency almost no, chaotic questions avoided some cooperated well	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some		-1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect,
2	fair	not well fitting deviations	many		-2 <input type="checkbox"/> inconclusive or too long
3	good	qualitatively analysed + theory limits explained, conclusive	+ data/theory convincingly supported		
4	detailed demonstrative	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	proved deep understanding		
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	(completely restable) convincing analysis			
6					

NOTES:

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER		ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	almost no, irrelevant	scientific contribution almost no	own opinions presented very little	efficiency almost no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	little	some	to some extent	-1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect,
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	partial	some correct	leading or cooperative	-2 <input type="checkbox"/> inconclusive or too long
		good	many correct	quite efficient	
		new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	

NOTES:

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	scientific contribution almost no	own opinions presented very little	efficiency almost no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	some	some	to some extent	-1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect,
2	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	partial	some correct	leading or cooperative	-2 <input type="checkbox"/> inconclusive or too long
3	short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	good	many correct	quite efficient	
		new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 4 fight (round no.): 1 room: E problem no.: 12 Juror's name: Grigory Ozerov
 reporter: S. Korea opponent: Belarus reviewer: Gerny signature: [Signature]

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract 6
 1 + 4 + 2 - 0 = 7

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment
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	qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
5	demonstrative	deep and comprehensible, detailed, complex	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected
6	shows physical insight	(completely testable)	convincing analysis	analysed, conclusive		

NOTES:

2 0

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	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	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	efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good

NOTES:

2 0

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	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	many	mostly adequate	some
3	detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good

NOTES:

2 explain what G modulus is to reporter. 2

SCORESHEET

stage: **1**

reporter: **KARLA**

fight (round no.): **PF4**

opponent: **Bolovus**

room: **F**

reviewer: **GERMANY**

problem no.: **12**

Juror's name: **LUKAS GLADZIK**

signature: *Lukas Gladzik*

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + **3** + **1.5** - **0** = **6**

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment
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	well performed	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good	good	sufficient number	qualitative analysis	some interesting results	interesting
4	deep and comprehensive	quite detailed, complex	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
5	shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	convincing analysis	explained, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected

NOTES:

Distinction of energy significant not included

- Is this former - no understanding.

- No projecting comparison

- Too less experiments to fully justify the model.

Self analysis missing

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + **4** + **2** + **2** - **0** = **6**

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 almost no, irrelevant
- 1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
- 2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used
- 3
- 4

NOTES:

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation
0	almost no	no or irrelevant	almost no	no
1	very little	few	some	almost no
2	no all	some	to important topics	some
3	almost all	many	to most topics + improvement suggestions	reasonable
4	efficiently	practically all		very good

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + **1** + **9.9** + **1.5** - **0** = **5**

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

NOTES: *few questions (9)*

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

Thood -

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5 + 2 - 0.6 = 7

stage: 4 fight (round no.): 4

reporter: Yoon Jae Ching opponent: Gleb Penazov

room: E problem no.: 12

reviewer: Reginald Mason

Juror's name: Mansher Tejela

signature: [Signature]

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	relevant arguments/responses	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	too few	1 some incorrect,
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	some	2 inconclusive or too long
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	many	3 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained, errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	+ data/theory convincingly supported, proved deep understanding	4 answered directly to most questions efficiently, productive
5	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected		

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 3 + 2.8 - 1 = 6.8 (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	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	scientific contribution	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1	very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	little	1 some incorrect,
2	not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	partial	2 inconclusive or too long
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	good	3 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	new crucial point(s)	4

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 2 + 3 - 1 = 8

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER
 1 + 3.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 7
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

stage: 1
 reporter: *Korea*
 fight (round no.): *PF4*
 opponent: *Belarus*

room: *E*
 reviewer: *Germany*
 problem no.: *12*

Juror's name: *Dina Ikedi*
 signature: *A. Gochij...*

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	0
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	relevant arguments/responses too few	concise and correct or no questions asked
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	some	no questions asked
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	some interesting results	interesting	many	some incorrect,
4	detailed demonstrative	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	qualitatively analysed + theory limits	considerable experimental or theoretical	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> solution	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions
5	deep and comprehensive	deep and comprehensive	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	explained, conclusive, well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	above average	proved deep understanding	efficiently
6	shows physical insight	completely testable				greater extent than expected		productive

NOTES:

OPPONENT
 1 + 1 + 2.5 + 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	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	scientific contribution almost no	0
1	very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	irrelevant	concise and correct or no questions asked
2	not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	some	some incorrect,
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics + improvement	reasonable	average	inconclusive or too long
4	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	suggestions	very good	good	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIEWER
 1 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 2.75 - 0 = 9
 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	0
1	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	poor	concise and correct or no questions asked
2	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	too short/long	some incorrect,
3	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	informative, apt relevant parts	inconclusive or too long
		accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	brief but accurate	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

Round: 4 Room: E Fight Assistants: CLARENCE LILU, ATHENA LONG



Team	Stage 1			Stage 2			Stage 3			Stage 4		
	SOUTH KOREA	BELARUS	GERMANY	BELARUS	GERMANY	SOUTH KOREA	GERMANY	SOUTH KOREA	BELARUS	Rep	Opp	Rev
Juror	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev
Xuwei Cao	6	6	7	6	6	6	4	5	5			
Gideon Choo	7	6	7 7	4	5	5	6	6	6			
tukasz Bkadozuk	6	6	5	3	6	5	4	5	6			
Dina Izadi	7	7	9	5	5	7	6	6	6			
Juanher Jejelava	7	7	8	7	8	6	8	6	7			
Acting Team Member	Yoon Jae Chung	Gleb Panyuzkov	Raymond Mason	Timofey Kunt	August Medeste	Jun Hyoung Jo	Timofey Kunt	Seo Young kim				
Rejected Problems	-			-								
Accepted Problem	12			5			10					

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