

# SCORESHEET

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

stage: 3  
 reporter: USA

room: F problem no.: 1  
 reviewer: A Zambanjan

Juror's name: Nimit  
 signature:

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 fulfilment misunderstood	efficiency almost no, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	no questions asked
2	fair	fair	fair	not well-fitting	some own input	average	some incorrect,
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	inconclusive or too long
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
5	demonstrative	correct	errors analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	
6	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis				

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER		DISCUSSION WITH OPPOSITION		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	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	questions asked
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	not all	main points	some	to important topics	to some extent	some incorrect,
3		almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	leading or cooperative	inconclusive or too long
4		all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	quite efficient	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 4 + 1 + 0 - 4 = 3.5

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

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 4 room: F problem no.: 7 Juror's name: D. Keller  
 reporter: VIA opponent: Rob Rep. reviewer: Andrija signature: D. Keller

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

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

NOTES: *Page 16 to 17 not used by anyone role with ex.*

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER		DISCUSSION WITH OPPOSITION		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 of topics almost no	own opinions presented very little	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	very little	some main points	some to important topics	irrelevant	some	questions asked
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	not all	main points	to most topics	some	some	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3		almost all	all relevant points	+ improvement suggestions	average	many correct	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4		efficiently	practically all points		good	+ improvement suggestions	
					new crucial point(s)	very efficient	

NOTES:

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	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	partial	almost no	too short/long	too short/long	some	questions asked
2	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	good	relevant parts	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

**SCORESHEET**

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 4 room: F problem no.: 1 Juror's name: Hunkoob Jo  
 reporter: USA opponent: Czech Republic reviewer: Azerbayjan signature: [Signature]

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

REPORT		DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		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 experiments too few	relevance of topics irrelevant	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	no/ some	review of forces, cited	little	some	to some extent	some incorrect,
2	good	not well fitting	some own input	partial	some	average	inconclusive or too long
3	quite detailed, correct	qualitatively analysed + theory limits	some interesting results	good	some	many	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4	demonstrative	explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	new crucial point(s)	interesting points discussed	convincingly supported	
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	4	brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	
6							

NOTES:  $\rightarrow$  No specific standard to explain the mechanism at breaking eggs.  $\downarrow$  model used in this study. IF

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER		DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	almost no, irrelevant	time used almost no	scientific contribution almost no	relevant arguments/responses too few	efficiency almost no, chaotic	efficiency almost no, chaotic	no questions asked
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	very little	little	some	avoided some questions	avoided some questions	some incorrect,
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	not all	partial	some	cooperated well	cooperated well	inconclusive or too long
3		all relevant points	good	many	answered directly to most questions	answered directly to most questions	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4		efficiently	new crucial point(s)	almost all	efficient, productive	efficient, productive	

NOTES:

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

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

NOTES:

$\rightarrow$  What are they missing? No about that

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER

1 + 3 + 2 - 0.5 = 5

Start from 1 and add/subtract

stage: 3

fight (round no.): 4

room: F

problem no.: 1

Juror's name: Aloric

reporter: USA

opponent: Greek Republic

reviewer: Aredayan

signature: *Aredayan*

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 average	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	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	many	3
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	X considerable experimental or theoretical	X some aspects above average	+ data/theory convincingly supported	4
5	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	errors analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	proven deep understanding	5
6			+ reproducible, convincing analysis					6

NOTES:

OPPONENT

1 + 1 + 1.5 + 2 = 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	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	reasonable	good	3
4	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	new crucial point(s)	4

NOTES:

REVIEWER

1 + 0.5 + 1 + 6.5 = 9.5

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET  
 stage: F  
 reporter: USA  
 opponent: C. R. P. Stepanec  
 room: 4  
 problem no.: 1  
 juror's name: Tamerre Greyko  
 signature: T. Greyko

REPORTER  
 Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 $1 + 4.25 + 3.0 - \square = 8$

OPPONENT  
 Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 $1 + 1 + 1.75 + 1.25 - \square = 5$

REVIEWER  
 Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 $1 + 0.25 + 1 + 0.5 - \square = 3$

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	partly understood
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	average
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	interesting
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	solution
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected
6	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight					

NOTES: - very clear presentation of the ideas - use of modelling in the spreadsheet

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	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good

NOTES: - so jumping between slides; - ask about the set-up once again - not commented numerical solving of the problem

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 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: - mainly repeated questions of the opponent

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	some scientific points cleared	many	cooperated well
3	interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly most questions
4	brought in new physics	improved 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	reading 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	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

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 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

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

ANSWERS TO JURY 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

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 0 = 2

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 4

reporter: Azerbaijan opponent: USA

room: F

reviewer: Czech

problem no.: 14

Juror's name: Nirit

signature: *Nirit*

REPORT		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 misunderstanding	scientific contribution almost no	relevant arguments/responses too few	efficiency almost no, chaotic	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	only technical	some	avoided some	1	some incorrect,
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	points cleared	many	cooperated well	2	inconclusive or too long
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting	some scientific	+ data/theory	answered directly	3	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	points cleared	convincingly supported	to most questions	4	
5	demonstrative	deep and comprehensible, detailed, complex, completely testable	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	interesting points	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive		
6	shows physical insight		+ reproducible, + convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive			brought in new physics				

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 1 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED		DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER		ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS			
0	almost no, irrelevant	scientific contribution almost no	relevance of topics irrelevant	own opinions presented very little	efficiency almost no	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	time used almost no	understanding of presentation almost nothing	correct own opinions expressed almost no	priority almost no	1	some incorrect,
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	very little	some main points	some	no	2	inconclusive or too long
3		not all	main points	to important topics	some	3	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4		all & efficiently	all relevant points	+ improvement suggestions	reasonable	4	
			practically all points		very good		

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2 = 6

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

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER 1 + 1 + 0 - 0 = 2

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 4

room: F problem no.:  
 reporter: Prohijan opponent: USA reviewer: Gosh Republic

Juror's name: P. K. K. signature: A. K. K.

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 fulfilment misunderstanding	efficiency almost no, chaotic
1	some fair	some fair	some fair	some deviations	review of sources, cited	partly average	avoided some questions
2	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	some own input	interesting solution	cooperated well
3	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	some interesting results	some aspects above average	answered directly
4	demonstrative	deep and comprehensible, detailed, complex, shows physical insight	errors analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	greater extent than expected	to most questions efficient, productive
5			+ reproducible, convincing analysis				
6							

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	time used almost no	understanding of presentation almost nothing	scientific contribution of topics almost no	own opinions presented very little	efficiency almost no	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	very little	some main points	little	some	to some extent	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	not all	main points	partial	some correct	leading or cooperative	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3		almost all	all relevant points	good	many correct	quite efficient	
4		all & efficiently	practically all points	new crucial point(s)	many correct + improvement suggestions	very efficient	

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

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

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	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	partial	too short/long	too short/long	too short/long	some	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	good	relevant parts	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	
			fully adequate	adequate	adequate	fully adequate	
			adequate	adequate	adequate	adequate	
			good	good	good	good	

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

**REPORTER** 1 + 1 = 2      Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 stage: 2      fight (round no.): 4      room: F      problem no.: 14      Juror's name: *Hurkes Jo*  
 reporter: *Abehanjan*      opponent: USA      reviewer: *Czech Republic*      signature: *[Signature]*

REPORT		DISCUSSION WITH OPPOSITION		DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS		
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	efficiency
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no <i>scope</i>	almost no <i>scope</i>	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic
1 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	fair	some	some deviations	review of <i>sources</i> , cited	average	only <i>technical</i> points cleared	<i>scope</i>	avoided some questions
2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	some scientific points cleared	many	cooperated well
3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ 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 <input type="checkbox"/> demonstrative	detailed, complex, well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	errors analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	brought in new physics	proven deep understanding	efficient, productive
5 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensive		+ reproducible, convincing analysis						
6 <input type="checkbox"/> shows physical insight								

**NOTES:**  
 No of all:  $1 + 1.5 + 1 = 4$   
 Unclear conclusion: *Can't hear you!*

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

**NOTES:** *Camera ← measure next*  
*Vibration energy*  
*You should have focused on their experiment.*

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

**NOTES:**  
*Position of a hole, mechanism optimal, results*  
*→ Could not finish the summary.*  
*→ What is your opinion?*



# SCORESHEET

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 4 room: F problem no.: 14  
 reporter: Alexandra opponent: USA reviewer: Cher Debbie  
 Juror's name: Alexandra  
 signature: [Signature]

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 1 + 0.5 - 0 = 2 AYDIN IM RANOL

REPORT		comparison between theory and experiment		own contribution		task fulfilment	
0	phenomenon explanation almost no	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	0	scientific contribution almost no	0	relevant arguments/responses too few
1	some fair	some	some own input	1	only technical points cleared	1	some
2	good	not well fitting	some interesting results	2	some scientific points cleared	2	many
3	quite detailed, correct	qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	3	interesting points discussed	3	+ data/theory convincingly supported
4	demonstrative	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	4	brought in new physics	4	proved deep understanding
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive					efficiency almost no, chaotic avoided some questions cooperated well
6							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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 6 JARUWIDH THARAL

QUESTIONS ASKED		DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT					
0	almost no, irrelevant	0	scientific contribution of topics almost no	0	relevance of topics almost no	0	own opinions presented very little	0	efficiency almost no	0	relevance of topics almost no
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	1	little	1	some	1	some	1	to some extent	1	almost no
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	2	partial	2	average	2	some correct	2	leading or cooperative	2	some
3		3	good	3	many	3	many correct	3	quite efficient	3	reasonable
4		4	new crucial point(s)	4	almost all	4	+ improvement suggestions	4	very efficient	4	very good

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 2.5 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 8 PATEL STIPANE K

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

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

NOTES:

**SCORESHEET**

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 +  $\boxed{95}$  +  $\boxed{95}$  -  $\boxed{2}$  =  $\boxed{188}$

fight (round no.): 4

room: F

problem no.: 114

Juror's name: *Tomeu*

reporter: *A. Morrison*

reviewer: *C. Rep. P. Stophenok*

signature: *T. Tomeu*

REPORT		DISCUSSION WITH OPPOSITION		DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	phenomenon explanation almost no	theory/model almost no	comparison between theory and experiment no/ almost no	own contribution	scientific contribution almost no	relevant arguments/responses too few	efficiency almost no, chaotic questions avoided some cooperated well
1	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	only technical points cleared	some	some incorrect,
2	fair	fair	not well fitting deviations	some own input	points cleared	many	inconclusive or too long
3	good	good	qualitatively analysed + theory limits explained, conclusive	some interesting results	interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4	detailed, demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical and theoretical	brought in new physics	proven deep understanding	
5	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	completely testable, convincing analysis					
6							

NOTES: - long list of parameters (mostly qualitative)

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 +  $\boxed{075}$  +  $\boxed{225}$  +  $\boxed{2}$  -  $\boxed{0}$  =  $\boxed{6}$

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	scientific contribution almost no	relevance of topics irrelevant	own opinions presented very little	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	very little	some main points	little	some	some	some incorrect,
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	not all	main points	partial	average	many correct	inconclusive or too long
3		almost all	all relevant points	good	many	many correct	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4		efficiently	practically all points	new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	

NOTES: - good points for digestion - calm way of telling with reporter

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 +  $\boxed{2}$  +  $\boxed{145}$  +  $\boxed{117}$  -  $\boxed{0}$  =  $\boxed{6}$

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	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	partial	almost no	too short/long	almost no	some	some incorrect,
2	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	good	relevant parts	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	inconclusive or too long
3	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES: - presentation well done

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 +  $2.5$  +  $6$  =  $8.5$

stage: 1  
 fight (round no.): 4  
 reporter: Czech  
 opponent: Azerbaijan

room: F  
 reviewer: USA  
 problem no.: 8  
 visum: giving density

Juror's name: Nirut  
 signature: *Nirut*

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	1
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	only technical points cleared	2
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	some interesting results	interesting	some scientific points cleared	3
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	interesting points discussed	4
5	demonstrative	correct	errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ data/theory convincingly supported	5
6	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive			proved deep understanding	6

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

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

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 of topics almost no	0
1	very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	irrelevant	1
2	not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	little	2
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics + improvement suggestions	reasonable	partial	3
4	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all		very good	good	4

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 +  $1.5$  +  $2$  =  $4.5$

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	poor	1
2	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	too short/long	2
3	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	informative, apt	3

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER

1 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 6

stage: 7 fight (round no.): 4

room: F problem no.:

Juror's name: D. Keller

reporter: Coach Ryo. opponent: Rodriguez

reviewer: UVA

signature: [Signature]

REPORT		DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		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	task fulfillment misunderstood	efficiency almost no, chaotic
1	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	no questions asked
2	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	some incorrect,
3	good	qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting	inconclusive or too long
4	detailed	+ theory limits	considerable experimental	some aspects	deeply incorrect or show
5	demonstrative	explained, conclusive	or, theoretical	above average	deep misconceptions
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0 + 7 + 7 - 0 = 3

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 7 + 2 - 0 = 6

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

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER

1 + 1.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 4

stage: 1  
fight (round no.): 4  
reporter: Gael Republic  
opponent: Azerbaijan

room: F  
reviewer: USA

Juror's name: Huboob Jo  
signature: [Signature]

REPORT		DISCUSSION WITH OPPOSITION		DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		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	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	review of sources, cited	only technical points cleared	some	avoided some questions	some incorrect,
2	good	not well fitting	some own input	some specific points cleared	very	cooperated well	inconclusive or too long
3	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	some interesting results	interesting points discussed	very	answered directly to most questions	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4	+ results explained	qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	discussed convincingly supported	very	efficient, productive	
5	errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	brought in new physics	very		
6	+ reproducible, completely testable, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive					

NOTES:

No fitting at all  
Unclear conclusion  
TF

OPPOSITION

1 + 1 + 1 + 1 - 1 = 4

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

NOTES:

(F) I had to see you back when you presented...  
Camera / focal length. ↓

REVIEWER

1 + 1.5 + 1 + 1 - 0.5 = 4

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

NOTES:

Three tasks lens, one-sided.  
Theory & system  
TF

# SCORESHEET

Juror's name: Marie Alexandra  
signature: [Signature]

problem no.: 8

room: F  
reporter: Creech Replic  
opponent: Azerbayjan  
reviewer: USA

stage: 1  
fight (round no.): 4

reporter: David Rydby

Start from 1 and add/subtract  
1 + 4.5 + 2.5 - 1 = 6

REPORT		DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		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	task fulfillment misunderstood	scientific contribution almost no	relevant arguments/responses too few	efficiency almost no, chaotic
1	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	only technical	some	avoided some questions
2	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	points cleared	many	cooperated well
3	good	deviations	some interesting results	interesting solution	points cleared		answered directly
4	detailed	qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	interesting points: discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	to most questions efficient,
5	demonstrative	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	greater extent than expected	brought in new physics		deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight						

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0 + 1 + 0 - 1 = 0

reporter: Grasimov  
opponent: Kamran

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 almost no	relevance of topics irrelevant	own opinions very little	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving	very little	some main points	1	some	some	some incorrect,
2	some unclear points	not all	main points	2	to important topics	to some extent	inconclusive or too long
3	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	almost all	all relevant points	3	many	leading or cooperative	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		all & efficiently	practically all points	4	almost all	quite efficient	
						very efficient	

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 - 1 = 6

reporter: Cover  
opponent: McGivison

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

NOTES:

**SCORESHEET**

Juror's name: Tomer Greenfeld  
 signature: T. Greenfeld

stage: 1 room: F problem no.: 8

reporter: Cz. Rep. D. Rychly opponent: Azerbaijan reviewer: USA C. Ar. Quistrom

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 3 + 35 - 0 = 38

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

NOTES: - nice presentation of the premises - not to detailed with description of the setup - uncertainty of the value needed

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 0 + 07 + 07 - 0 = 2

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

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 15 + 2 + 17 - 0 = 6

REVIEW OF REPORT				REVIEW OF OPPOSITION				ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS			
QUESTIONS ASKED	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	concise and correct or no questions asked
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0
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
2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	good	relevant points	many	mostly adequate	some	informative, apt relevant parts	accurate, conclusive	many	mostly adequate	some	1
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	2

NOTES: - did not address questions to the opponent



Round: 4 Room: F Fight Assistants: Tan Yee Ping, Yeong Zhan Kang

Team		Juror			Tomasz Greczylo			Aleksandra Alaric			Hunkok Jo			Daniel Keller			Nint Passadee		
Stage 1	Czech Republic	Rep	7	6	4	6	2	8	5	6	2	4	6	2	6	6	6	6	
	Azerbaijan	Opp	2	6	3	6	2	2	6	3	2	3	6	2	3	6	3	3	
	USA	Rev	6	2	4	6	2	6	4	2	6	2	6	2	6	2	6	2	
Stage 2	Azerbaijan	Rep	2	6	4	6	2	8	5	6	2	4	6	2	6	2	6	6	
	USA	Opp	6	2	4	6	2	6	5	6	2	6	2	6	2	6	2	6	
	Czech Republic	Rev	6	2	4	6	2	8	5	6	2	6	2	6	2	6	2	6	
Stage 3	Czech Republic	Opp	5	8	6	5	5	5	6	5	5	6	5	6	5	6	5	6	
	Azerbaijan	Rev	3	6	5	6	5	5	6	5	5	6	5	6	5	6	5	6	
	USA	Rep	8	2	4	6	2	6	5	6	2	6	5	6	5	6	5	6	
Stage 4		Rep																	
		Opp																	
		Rev																	

Acting Team Member

Accepted Problem

Rejected Problems

Q8

Q14

Q1

Signature Fight Assistant:

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