

Resteiction (X.2.d lifted after two objections, adding options 1281)

Juror's name: IGN MARTCHEVIC

signature: [Signature]

**SCORESHEET**

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 4 room: H problem no.: 64 12

reporter: Poland opponent: Georgia reviewer: Poliston

**REPORTER** Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 3 - 0 = 8

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 review of sources, cited	scientific contribution almost no	relevance of topics irrelevant	efficiency almost no, chaotic avoided some questions	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no questions asked
1	some	some	some own input	only technical points cleared	irrelevant	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	-1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	not well fitting deviations	some interesting results	some scientific points cleared	to some extent leading or cooperative	answered directly to most questions	-2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	good	qualitatively analysed + theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting points discussed	quite efficient	efficient, productive	
4	detailed demonstrative correct	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	brought in new physics	very efficient		
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	completely testable/convincing analysis					
6							

NOTES:

**OPPONENT** Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 9

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 of topics almost no	own opinions presented very little	efficiency almost no	no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	very little	irrelevant	some	to some extent leading or cooperative	almost no	-1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	not all	average	some correct	quite efficient	some	-2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3		almost all	many	many correct	very efficient	reasonable	
4		efficiently	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions		very good	

NOTES:

**REVIEWER** Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 3 + 2 - 1 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED		DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER		DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		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	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	partial	too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	-1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	good	relevant parts	informative, apt/ relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	-2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

stage: 3  
 reporter: Poland  
 opponent: Georgia

room: H  
 reviewer: Pakistan

fight (round no.): 4  
 problem no.: 12

Juror's name: Saffan Liu  
 signature: Saffan Liu

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

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

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 $1 + 1.5 + 3 + 1.5 = 7$

QUESTIONS ASKED		DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER		ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	task fulfilment
0 almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	no
1 very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	no
2 not all	major points	some	to important topics	some	almost no
3 almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	some
4 all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	very good

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 $1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 - 0.5 = 6$

QUESTIONS ASKED		DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	task fulfilment
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	poor	almost no	almost no	no	no
1 some relevant, sufficient number, could be clear things out	poor	almost no	almost no	no	no
2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	poor	almost no	almost no	no	no
3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	adequate	good

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER **PL** stage: **3** fight (round no.): **4** room: **H** problem no.: **12** Juror's name: **D. HAZAR**  
 reporter: **POLAND** opponent: **GEORGIA** reviewer: **PAKISTAN** signature: **S. HAZAR**

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	scientific contribution almost no	efficiency almost no, chaotic	0
1	some	some	only technical points cleared	avoided some questions	no questions asked
2	fair	not well fitting deviations	some scientific points cleared	cooperated well	some incorrect,
3	well performed, efficient number of results explained	qualitatively analyzed	interesting points discussed	answered directly to most questions	inconclusive or too long
4	+ errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	some aspects above average	efficiently, productive	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
5	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	greater extent than expected		
6	shows physical insight	completely testable			

NOTES:

OPPONENT **GE** Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + **2** + **2.5** + **1.5** - **0.7** = **6**

QUESTIONS ASKED		DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	almost no, irrelevant	scientific contribution almost no	relevance of topics irrelevant	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	relevant topics addressed no or irrelevant	correct own opinions expressed almost no	some	to some extent	-1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	few	some	to important topics	leading or cooperative	-1	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		many	to most topics	improvement suggestions	quite efficient	-2	
		practically all	improvement suggestions	very good	very efficient		

NOTES: drag missing? no...  
 (1) **pressure/aggraving** → caused by bad prioritization  
**pressure speed** - why is equilibrium definition important?

REVIEWER **PK** Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + **2** + **1.7** + **1.7** - **0.7** = **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	own opinions too few	pros & cons irrelevant	discussion analysis almost no	own opinions too few	pros & cons irrelevant	discussion analysis almost no	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	partial	top short/long	some	partially relevant	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	partially relevant	-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	improvement suggestions	many	fully adequate	mostly adequate	-1	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	improvement suggestions	many	adequate	adequate	-2	

NOTES: **avoid effect**

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER

1 +  $4.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 8$

stage: 3  
reporter: POL

room: 14  
opponent: GEORG.

problem no.: 12  
reviewer: PAK  
Juror's name: SCHEBELA  
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	avoided some questions
2	fair	not well fitting deviations	some own input	average	cooperated well
3	good	qualitative analysis	some interesting results	interesting solution	answered directly to most questions
4	detailed, quite defined, correct	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	efficient, productive
5	detailed, quite defined, correct	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	
6	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight				

NOTES:  
no full dynamics  
no other mols, Charlie Robinson, etc.

OPPONENT

1 +  $0.5 + 3.5 + 1 - 1 = 4$

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

NOTES:

## OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

## DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

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

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

NOTES:

## REVIEW OF REPORT

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

## REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

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

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

# SCORESHEET

stage: 3      fight (round no.): 4      room: H      problem no.: 12

reporter: Poland      opponent: Georgia      reviewer: Pakistan      juror's name: Teo Kien Boom

signature: *[Signature]*

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

NOTES: Reject 6, 4, accept 12.

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.9 + 2 - 0 = 6.4

QUESTIONS ASKED	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	very little	some	some	to some extent	some incorrect,
2	not all	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	Inconclusive or too long
3	almost all	many	many correct	quite efficient	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4	efficiently	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 4.5

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION				ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	
0	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	some incorrect,
2	partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	Inconclusive or too long
3	good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 +  $\boxed{2}$  +  $\boxed{2}$  -  $\boxed{1}$  =  $\boxed{4}$

stage:  $\boxed{2}$  fight (round no.):  $\boxed{4}$

reporter: Pakistan opponent: Poland

room:  $\boxed{H}$  problem no.:  $\boxed{11}$

reviewer: Georgia

Juror's name: Ryn MARTCHEK

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 fulfillment misunderstood	efficiency almost no, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	avoided some questions
2	fair	fair	well performed, sufficient number	not well fitting deviations	some own input	average	cooperated well
3	good	good	+ results explained	qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting	answered directly
4	detailed, demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	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	efficient, productive
6							

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 +  $\boxed{2}$  +  $\boxed{3}$  +  $\boxed{2}$  -  $\boxed{0}$  =  $\boxed{8}$

QUESTIONS ASKED		DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT				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	scientific contribution almost no	relevance of topics irrelevant	own opinions presented very little	efficiency 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	little	some	some	to some extent	almost no	some incorrect,
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all-time used	not all	main points	some	to important topics	partial	average	some correct	leading & cooperative	almost no	inconclusive or too long
3		almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	good	many	many correct	quite efficient	some	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4		efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	reasonable	

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER: 23 + 1.5 - 5 = 8.5  
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 4  
 reporter: Pakistan opponent: Poland

room: H problem no.: 11  
 reviewer: Georgia

Juror's name: Syfan Iiu  
 signature: Syfan Iiu

REPORT		DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER		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	avoided some questions
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting deviations	some own input	average	cooperated well
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	answered directly to most questions
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental of theoretical	some aspects above average	efficient, productive
5	demonstrative	correct	errors analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable, convincing analysis	+ reproducible, + reproducible, convincing analysis				

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

1 + 1.5 + 3 + 2 - 0.5 = 7  
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

1 + 2 + 2 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 6  
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

NOTES:

REPORTER *FK* *Hasnet Fjar-Claudry*

Start from 1 and add/substract

1 +  $\boxed{1.7} + \boxed{1.5} - \boxed{1} = \boxed{3}$

stage: **2**  
 fight (round no.): **4**  
 reporter: **PAKISTAN** opponent: **POLAND**

room: **#** problem no.: **11**  
 reviewer: **GEORGIA**

Juror's name: **R. MUR**  
 signature: *J. Harvat*

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	efficiency	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	almost no, chaotic	0
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	arguments/responses too few	avoided some questions	1
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	many	cooperated well	2
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	some interesting results	interesting solution	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions	3
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	proven deep understanding	efficient, productive	4
5	demonstrative	deep and comprehensible, detailed, complex, (completely testable)	errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	greater extent than expected			
6	shows physical insight		convincing analysis						

NOTES: *where is the device? where are graphs supporting the vertical claims? where is the accuracy? where is the derivation? where is the relation between really - alcohol?*

OPPONENT *PL* Start from 1 and add/substract

1 +  $\boxed{1.7} + \boxed{3.1} + \boxed{3} - \boxed{0.75} = \boxed{8}$

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	0
1	very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	little	to some extent	almost no	1
2	not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	partial	leading or cooperative	some	2
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	good	quite efficient	reasonable	3
4	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	new crucial point(s)	very efficient	very good	4

NOTES:

REVIEWER *GB* Start from 1 and add/substract

1 +  $\boxed{2.5} + \boxed{2.4} + \boxed{2.2} - \boxed{1} = \boxed{7}$

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

NOTES:

*Response time... give more time to others to answer, agreed to withdraw*



# SCORESHEET

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 4 room: H problem no.: MM Juror's name: SHERIFF A  
 reporter: PAK opponent: POL reviewer: GEORG G. signature: [Signature]

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

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	relevance of topics irrelevant	efficiency almost no, chaotic	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	no/ some	review of sources, cited	only technical points cleared	some	avoided some questions	some incorrect,
2	fair	not well fitting deviations	some own input	some scientific points cleared	to some extent leading or cooperative	cooperated well	inconclusive or too long
3	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed + theory limits	some interesting results	interesting points discussed	quite sufficient	answered directly to most questions	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4	+ results explained	explained, conclusive well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	brought in new physics	very efficient	efficient, productive	
5	errors analysed		considerable experimental and theoretical				
6	+ reproducible, convincing analysis						

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

1 + 2 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 9  
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

1 + 1 + 25 + 25 - 0 = 8  
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

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	prioritisation no	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	some incorrect,
2	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	inconclusive or too long
3	*short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	defined, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 4  
 reporter: Pakistan opponent: Poland

room: H problem no.: 11  
 reviewer: Georgia

Juror's name: Teo Kien Bom  
 signature: *[Signature]*

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 4.5 → 4

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 - 0 = 7.0

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:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7

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

NOTES:

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

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

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and OPPONENT'S QUESTIONS	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

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 7

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 4  
 reporter: Georgina opponent: Pakistan

room: H problem no.: 15  
 reviewer: Poland

Juror's name: Byron MARIKOVIC  
 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	scientific contribution almost no	relevant arguments/responses too few	efficiency almost no, chaotic
1	some	some	only technical	some	avoided some questions
2	fair	not well fitting	points cleared	many	cooperated well
3	good	qualitatively analysed	some scientific	+ delay/theory	answered directly
4	detailed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	interesting points discussed	convincingly supported	to most questions
5	demonstrative	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	completely testable, conclusive			

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

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

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

NOTES:

## OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

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

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

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 2 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 8

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

NOTES:

## REVIEW OF REPORT

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

## REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

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

# SCORESHEET

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 4 room: H problem no.: 15  
 reporter: Georgia opponent: Pakistan reviewer: Poland juror's name: Sofya Liu signature: Sofya Liu

REPORTER  
 1 + 2.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 5

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

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

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

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

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 2 + 2 + 2 - 0.5 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED		DISCUSSION WITH OPPOSITION		ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	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	1 too short/long	too short/long	some	some incorrect,
2	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	2 good	relevant parts accurate, conclusive	many	inconclusive or too long
3	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	3 detailed, complex	brief but accurate	+ improvement suggestions	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REPORTER **Dimple Dandze**  
 1 +  $2.3 + 1.6 - 0.15 = 3$

SCORESHEET  
 stage: **4** fight (round no.): **4** room: **H** problem no.: **15**  
 reporter: **GEORGINA OPPONENT: PAKISTAN** reviewer: **TOLAND** Juror's name: **DMAZUR**  
 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	avoided some questions
2	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	cooperated well
3	good	deviations	some interesting results	interesting solution	
4	detailed	qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	answered directly to most questions
5	demonstrative	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	greater extent than expected	efficient, productive
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	completely testable			

NOTES: *Final structure of egg, age of egg, modeling of boiling process, only up to 6 min for egg etc. slipping of egg yolk in water, no difference btw galle & white, solidification, alignment of rot. axis and egg axis*

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)		DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER		ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	time used almost no	scientific contribution almost no	relevance of topics irrelevant	efficiency almost no	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	very little	little	some	to some extent	some incorrect,
2	not all	partial	average	reading or cooperative	inconclusive or too long
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	quite efficient	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4	efficiently	practically all points	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	

NOTES: *If not understanding degree of boiling, time of cooking is useful but not part of task too much focus on the air bubble, not precise enough questions*

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

NOTES:

**SCORESHEET**

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 4 room: H problem no.: 15 Juror's name: SCHERBELA  
 reporter: GEORGIA opponent: PAKISTAN reviewer: POLANO signature: [Signature]

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 25 + 1 - 0 = 4

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

NOTES: presentation way too fast

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 15 + 1 - 05 = 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	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1	very little	some main points	some	some	almost no	almost no	-1 some incorrect,
2	not all	all relevant points	many	to most topics + improvement suggestions	almost no	to some extent leading or cooperative	-2 inconclusive or too long
3	almost all	practically all points	practically all		almost no	quite efficient	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4	efficiently				almost no	very efficient	

focused only on moral of within method, no scientific stuff

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 25 + 2 - 0 = 8

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

NOTES: 4 book of model 4 dim error

**SCORESHEET**

stage: 1      fight (round no.): 4      room: H      problem no.: 15      Juror's name: Teo Kien Boon  
 reporter: Georgia      opponent: Pakistan      reviewer: Poland      signature: [Signature]

REPORTER      Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 2 + 1 - 0.5 = 3.5 → 4

REPORT		DISCUSSION WITH OPPOSITION		DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	phenomenon explanation almost no	theory/model almost no	relevant experiments too few	comparison between theory and experiment no/ almost no	own contribution others' data, incorrectly cited	task fulfillment misunderstood	efficiency almost no, chaotic avoided <del>some</del> questions cooperated well 0 _____ concise and correct or no questions asked 1 _____ some incorrect, 2 _____ inconclusive or too long 3 _____ deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions 4 _____
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	
2	fair	fair	fair	not very fitting deviations	some own input	average	
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed + theory limits	some interesting results	interesting solution	
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	explained, conclusive well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	
5	demonstrative	correct	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	
6	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, (completely testable) convincing analysis					

NOTES: 1, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16 left to challenge.

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

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER      Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6.5 → 7.0

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	prioritisation no pros & cons irrelevant partially relevant almost no mostly adequate some fully adequate good
1	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	partial	too short/long	too short/long	too short/long	some	
2	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	detailed, complex	relevant parts	informatve, apt	relevant parts	ritarily	
3	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently		accurate, conclusive	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	

NOTES:

Round: 4 Room: H Fight Assistants: Ho Shermine, Howe Ying Yi



Team	Stage 1			Stage 2			Stage 3			Stage 4		
	Georgia Rep	Pakistan Opp	Poland Rev	Pakistan Rep	Poland Opp	Georgia Rev	Poland Rep	Georgia Opp	Pakistan Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev
Hya Martchenko	7	5	8	4	8	7	8	9	7			
Songben Liu	5	6	7	5	7	6	6	7	6			
Daniel Mazur	3	5	8	3	8	7	7	6	6			
Michael Scherbela	4	5	8	2	9	8	8	4	4			
Kien Boon Teo	4	5	7	4	7	7	7	6	5			
Acting Team Member	Dimitre Deridge	Haseeb Ejaz Chaudhry	Marcin Augustynowicz	Haseeb Ejaz Chaudhry	Barthomiej Lewandowski	Mariam Chibain	Filip Kubacki	George Butbain	Harj Atag			
Rejected Problems							6. Fast Chain 4. Magnetic Hills  Ban 9.2.d was lifted after 2 rejections, adding options 12 and 17					
Accepted Problem	15. Boiled Egg.			11. Hair Hygrometer.			12. Torsion Gyroscope					

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