

# SCORESHEET

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 4 room: G. Spivak's problem no.: 10 Juror's name: Yung-Yuan Hsu  
 reporter: Dorian J. Hauer opponent: Hauer reviewer: Spivak's signature: Yung-Yuan Hsu  
 host: Karl-Lukas I Chang Hong host's score: Heather's score

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 21 + 15 - 0 = 24

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

NOTES: *Graph of F vs t. is not clear enough for purpose.*

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 1 + 15 + 15 - 0 = 16

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

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

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

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 4 room: G problem no.: 10 Juror's name: S. Byland  
 reporter: Ukraine opponent: Macao reviewer: Slavets signature: [Signature]

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 2.2 + 1.6 - 0.2 = 5

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 of topics presented	relevant arguments/responses too few
1	some	some	some	not well fitting	review of sources, cited	partly	own opinions	some
2	<u>fair</u>	<u>fair</u>	<u>fair</u>	deviations	some own input	average	some correct	many
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting	many correct	<u>many</u>
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory/limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	+ improvement suggestions	+ data/theory convincingly supported
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	very good	answered directly to most questions efficient, productive
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight							

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 1.2 + 1.6 + 1.3 - 0 = 5

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

NOTES:

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

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

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER: **3** + **2** - **0** = **6**

stage: **2**  
 reporter: **Ukraine** opponent: **Macao**

fight (round no.): **4**  
 room: **G** reviewer: **Slovakia**

problem no.: **60**  
 Juror's name: **Olgga Ivinskaya**  
 signature: *[Signature]*

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

NOTES:

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

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

NOTES:

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

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

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER: 2,0 + 2,0 - 0 = 5

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 4 room: 6 problem no.: 10 Juror's name: Tatyana G.S  
 reporter: UKLAINE opponent: MACKAO reviewer: SLOVAKIA signature: TGS

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

NOTES: 2,5

2,0

2,0

2,0

2,5 - 3,0

2,0

2,0

2,0

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

2,5

1,5

1,5

2,0

1,5

1,5

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

Kellie's class report

**SCORESHEET**

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 4 room: 10 Juror's name: Michael Peters  
 reporter: Ukraine opponent: Malta reviewer: Slouakia signature: [Signature]

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 2 + 1.3 - 1 = 3.3

3

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

NOTES: Error Bars own & RST

Nice apparatus Assume a spherical meniscus for pin in pool  
 Just low mark to Experimental

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1 - 0 = 3

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

Starts fix volume  
 I am unclear why this is important

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 2.5 + 1 + 1.5 - 0 = 7

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

NOTES:  
 1) Mass. in Air (Excellent @)  
 2) How is relevant to P&V  
 3) What are all P&V

# SCORESHEET

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 4 room: G problem no.: 1 Juror's name: Jung Wandy  
 reporter: Sherakia opponent: Ukraine reviewer: Maaco 1 Chang Hong signature: Jung Wandy  
 kata: Sherakia Duy Tin Tai do kyo kyo

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 13/4 + 1/3 - 0 = 14

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	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	relevance of topics irrelevant	relevant arguments/responses too few	efficiency almost no, chaotic avoided some questions
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	only technical points cleared	some scientific points cleared	some	cooperated well
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	interesting solution	average	many	cooperated well
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	some interesting results	above average	interesting points discussed	many correct	many	cooperated well
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects	interesting points discussed	some correct	many	cooperated well
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	errors analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	interesting points discussed	many correct	many	cooperated well
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight		+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	interesting points discussed	many correct	many	cooperated well

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1.6 + 2 - 0 = 6

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

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.7 + 1.5 + 1 - 0 = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	DISCUSSION WITH OPPOSITION	efficiency	prioritisation	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	speech summary poor	almost no	no	concise and correct or no questions asked
1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	very little	some main points	few	some	some	poor	almost no	no	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	too short/long	average	reasonable	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	informative, apt relevant parts	many	reasonable	
	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	brief but accurate	+ improvement suggestions	very good	

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 4 room: G problem no.: 1 Juror's name: S. Byland  
 reporter: Scarolan opponent: Ukraine reviewer: Kacoo signature: [Signature]

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 1.2 + 1.5 - 0 = 4

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

NOTES:

OPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 0.5 + 2.2 + 1.7 - 0 = 5

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 1.7 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 6

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

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 4 room: 6 problem no.: 1 Juror's name: Tatyana G.S.  
 reporter: SUVAYKA opponent: UKLAINE reviewer: MACAO signature: TGS

REPORTER 1 + 1.7 + 2.1 - 0.5 = 4.0 (4.0)

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

NOTES: 2.0 0.5 4.0 1.0 2.0 2.5

OPONENT 1 + 0.0 + 1.8 + 1.8 - 0 = 5

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

NOTES: 3 2 2 4.5 0.5 1.5 1.5 2.0 1.0 1.5

REVIEWER 1 + 2.5 + 1.5 + 0.5 - 0 = 6.0

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

NOTES: 2.5



# SCORESHEET

REPORTER: 1 + 25 + 2 - 0 = 45

STAGES: 1

FIGHT (ROUND NO.): 4

OPPONENT: UKRAINE

ROOM: 9

PROBLEM NO.: 1

REPORTER: Slovackia

REVIEWER: Malaco

JURY'S NAME: N. WATERS

SIGNATURE: [Signature]

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

NOTES: Approx 55M → How was this achieved? Dan 300fps

OPPONENT: 1 + 0 + 2 + 1.5 = 4.5

Start from 1 and add/subtract

How was this achieved? Dan 300fps

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	almost no
1	some unclear points	very little	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	almost all	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

2 Discussion of differences has been 80%

REVIEWER: 1 + 2 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 5

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	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	discussion analysis	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	own opinions	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	pros & cons	

NOTES: Nice Q or fair

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER: 1 + 1 + 15<sup>2</sup> - 0 = 24

stage: 1  
reporter: Slovakia

fight (round no.): 4  
opponent: Ukraine

room: G  
reviewer: Macca

problem no.: 1

Juror's name: Inishevc  
signature: *Inishevc*

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

NOTES:

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

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

NOTES:

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

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

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

stages: 3  
 reporter: Macab.  
 opponent: Shorshava.  
 room: 9  
 reviewer: Ukrainian  
 problem no.: X13  
 Juror's name: Yang-Yuan  
 signature: Yang-Yuan

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

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

**OPPONENT** Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 1 + 22 + 27 - 0 = 6

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

NOTES:

**REVIEWER** Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 1 + 18 + 14 - 0 = 5

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

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 4 room: 6 problem no.: 13  
 reporter: MACAO opponent: SLOVAKIA reviewer: UKRAINE  
 Juror's name: Tatyana  
 signature: TBS

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2,0 + 1,7 - 0,5 = 4,0 (4,0)

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

NOTES: 2,5 1,8 1,5 1,8 2,0 2,0 2,0 1,2 2,0

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES: 1,0 2,5 2,0 1,6 2,4 1,8 2,1 4,1 2,1 1,7 4,4

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:



# SCORESHEET

stages: 3 fight (round no.): 4 room: G problem no.: 13 Juror's name: Stgo Inisheba  
 reporter: Macao opponent: Slovakia reviewer: Ukraine signature: [Signature]

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

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

NOTES: 1

2

-1

OPONENT: 1 + 1 + 25 + 2 - 0 = 28 Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

25+28

2

REVIEWER: 1 + 15 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 5 Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	report summary & understanding poor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	speech summary poor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	conce and correct or no questions asked <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1	clear things out <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	discussion analysis almost no <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	no questions asked <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	own opinions too few <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	pros & cons irrelevant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

NOTES: 15

1

1

# SCORESHEET

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 4 room: UKRAINE problem no.: 13 Juror's name: M. Walters  
 reporter: Macao opponent: Slovakia reviewer: UKRAINE signature: [Signature]

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

NOTES:

Leading Slides  
 nice to check output of speaker  
 for I3 taking v. fast now  
 Now!!!

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 no	almost nothing	almost no	no	scientific contribution of topics irrelevant	conclude and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	very little	some main points	some	some	some relevant	some incorrect, some inconclusive or too long
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	not all	main points	to important topics	some	many correct	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3		almost all	all relevant points	to most topics	good	many correct	
4		all & efficiently	practically all points	improvements suggestions	very good	improvement suggestions	

NOTES:  
 1) Summarize slides  
 2) Resummarize

Excellent point 1000 fps used to measure 750 fps.

Very Nice observation data measurement sound wave Resonance

QUESTIONS ASKED	REPORT OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	report summary & understanding	condense and correct or no questions asked
1	clear things out	poor	some incorrect, some inconclusive or too long
2	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	partial	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	good	

NOTES:  
 1) Diameter of speaker  
 2) Bring up diameter  
 3) 1 type of Q factor

Q factor?



Round: 4 Room: 49 Fight Assistants: Cory Koh-Pouber

Team		Stage 1			Stage 2			Stage 3			Stage 4	
Juror		Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev		
Yung-Yuan Hsu	4	6	4	4	4	6	5	4	6	5		
Samuel Byland	4	5	6	5	5	8	4	5	6			
Tatyana Goungoules Stankovicij	4	5	6	5	5	5	4	5	5			
Alga Iuvilova	4	5	6	5	6	5	6	5	5			
William McWhorter	4	5	5	3	5	7	5	7	5			
Acting Team Member		Kapariina Jannova										
		Dmytro Tardovskiy										
		1 Cheong Hong										
Rejected Problems		10: Pulling glasses Apart 13: Resonating glass			NIL			11: Hair hygrometer				
Accepted Problem		1: Invent yourself			10: Pulling glasses Apart			13: Resonating glass				

*[Signature]*

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