

SCORESHEET

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 4 room: W problem no.: 9/15 Juror's name: G. Exner
 reporter: Sethia opponent: Hungry reviewer: Iran signature: AS

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1 - 1 = 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	points cleared	many	cooperated well
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	qualitatively analysed	interesting solution	interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	discussed	convinced deep understanding	efficient, productive
5	demonstrative	correct	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	brought in new physics		
6	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable							

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 1 = 6

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 1 - 1 = 5

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 4 room: K problem no.: 15 Juror's name: Sam Claes
 reporter: Serbia opponent: Hungary reviewer: 1 team signature: chy

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 6

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	proving deep understanding	efficient, productive
5	demonstrative	correct	errors analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected			
6	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis						

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 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	almost no	no	scientific contribution almost no	almost no	no	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving	very little	some main points	some	some	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	reasonable	partial	average	some	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		almost all	all relevant points	to most topics		good	many	reasonable	
		all & efficiently	practically all points	+ improvement suggestions	very good	new crucial point(s)	almost all	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	pros & cons	prioritisation	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	poor	too few	irrelevant	no	speech summary poor	irrelevant	no	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	partial	some	partially relevant	some	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	mostly adequate	some	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	detailed, accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	adequate	good	brief but accurate	fully adequate	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: **3** fight (round no.): **4** room: **K** problem no.: **15** Juror's name: **DARIO DUBO**
 reporter: **Serbia** opponent: **Hungary** reviewer: **Iran** signature: *Dario Dubo*

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + **3** + **2** - **0** = **5**

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 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	answered well
3	good	good	well performed	deviations	some interesting results	interesting solution	interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	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	convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions
5	demonstrative	correct	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	brought in new physics	understanding	productive
6	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	completely testable							

NOTES: good model / ingenious

(not explained mathematical pendulum well)

could have made it more precise

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + **1.5** + **2** + **2** - **0** = **7**

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

good sources of error
 o mathematical pendulum
 o types of problem?
 o only 3 degrees

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

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

NOTES: Shine light?

SCORESHEET

stages: 3 fight (round no.): 4 room: K problem no.: 15 Juror's name: Kim Jong Ah
 reporter: Sethia opponent: Hungary reviewer: Iran signature: Chms.

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + ~~1~~ + 2 - 0 = 2 - 0 = 2

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	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,
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	some interesting results	interesting solution	interesting points discussed	inconclusive or too long
4	detailed	quite detailed,	+ results explained	+ theory/limits explained, deviations	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	discussed	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
5	demonstrative	correct	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	interesting points brought in new physics	
6	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable						

NOTES: No quantitative approach / didn't show the set-up

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2.3 - 0 = 7

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

NOTES: Good scale is too large

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 5

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	paper	too few	irrelevant	no	speech summary almost no	almost no	no	conclude and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	partial	some	partially relevant	almost no	report	to some extent	almost no	some incorrect,
2	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	too short/long	many	mostly adequate	some	too short/long	leading or cooperative	some	inconclusive or too long
3	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	good	many	fully adequate	some	informative, apt relevant parts	quite efficient	some	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		detailed, complex	+ improvement suggestions	adequate	good	brief but accurate	very efficient	good	
		conclusive				accurate			

NOTES: 4 different ways. ↓ x-axis error bar (didn't change)

SCORESHEET

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 4 room: 1c problem no.: 15 Juror's name: Sue Malek
 reporter: Sobha opponent: Huron reviewer: Sara signature: Sobha

Althea

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 average	only technical points cited	some	avoided some questions
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average solution	some scientific points cleared	many	cooperated well
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	points cleared	many	cooperated well
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported, proved deep understanding	answered directly to most questions
5	demonstrative	correct	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	discussed brought in new physics	proven deep understanding	to most questions efficient, productive
6	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	completely testable							

NOTES:

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	efficiency	prioritisation	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	scientific contribution almost no	almost no	no	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	very little	few	some	almost no	Irrelevant	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	some	partial	leading or cooperative	some	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3		almost all	practically all points	+ improvement suggestions	reasonable	good	quite efficient	reasonable	
4		all & efficiently	practically all points	+ improvement suggestions	very good	new crucial point(s)	very efficient	very good	

NOTES:

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	pros & cons	prioritisation	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	poor	too few	irrelevant	no	speech summary poor	Irrelevant	no	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	partial	some	partially relevant	almost no	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	fully adequate	good	informative, apt relevant parts	fully adequate	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 4 room: K problem no.: 14 Juror's name: Sigurd
 reporter: Sen opponent: Sobin reviewer: Hansen signature: Sigurd

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 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	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partial	only technical points cleared	some	1 some inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	some scientific points cleared	many	2 inconclusive or too long
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting	* points cleared	many	3 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4	detailed	quite detailed,	+ results explained	+ theory/limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	4 answered directly to most questions efficient, productive
5	demonstrative	correct	errors analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	discussed brought in new physics	proven deep understanding	
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	convincing analysis						

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1 - 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	opinions expressed	correct own	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	almost no	no	scientific contribution almost no	almost no	no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	little	some main points	some	some	some	some	little relevant	to some extent	some	1 some inconclusive or too long
2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	not all	main points	many	to important topics	reasonable	reasonable	average	leading or cooperative	some	2 inconclusive or too long
	almost all	all relevant points	practically all	to most topics	reasonable	reasonable	many	quite efficient	some	3 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	very good	many correct	very efficient	some	4 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 4 room: K problem no.: 14 Juror's name: Kim Jong Ah
 reporter: Iran opponent: Serbia reviewer: Hungary signature: Chris

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

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

NOTES: Avoid most questions, lack of relation between theory and experiment.

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + 2 + 166 - 0 = 7

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

NOTES: State out many problems in the ppt.

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

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

NOTES: Good time mag clear understanding, fair & review, having correct main opinions

SCORESHEET

REPORTER: 1 + + - = 2

stage: 2
reporter: *ITam*

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

room: *K*
reviewer: *Hungary*

problem no.: *14*

Juror's name: *B. Exner*
signature: *any*

REPORT		relevant experiments		comparison between theory and experiment		own contribution		task fulfillment		DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS		
0	phenomenon explanation	● almost no	● almost no	● almost no	● no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	review of sources, cited	misunderstood	0	scientific contribution	● almost no	● only technical points cleared	0	conclude and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	● some	some	not well fitting	some interesting results	average	partly	1	relevance of topics	● some	● some scientific points cleared	1	no questions asked
2	fair	fair	fair	fair	deviations	some own input	interesting solution	average	2	own opinions presented	● some	● many cleared	2	some incorrect
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	some interesting results	some aspects	above average	3	efficiency	● some	● many cleared	3	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ results explained	theory limits	considerable experimental or theoretical	greater extent	than expected	4	efficiency	● some	● many cleared	4	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent	than expected	4	efficiency	● some	● many cleared	4	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
6	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight								4	efficiency	● some	● many cleared	4	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

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

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	few	some	almost no	0	scientific contribution	● almost no	● little	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	very little	some main points	main points	some	many	to most topics	reasonable	1	relevance of topics	● some	● average	1	some incorrect
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	not all	all relevant points	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	reasonable	2	own opinions presented	● some	● to some extent leading or cooperative	2	inconclusive or too long
		almost all	practically all points	practically all points	practically all	practically all	practically all	practically all	3	efficiency	● some	● quite efficient	3	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all points	practically all	practically all	practically all	practically all	4	efficiency	● some	● very efficient	4	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
1 + 1 + 0.5 + 1.5 - = 4

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 4 room: K problem no.: 14 Juror's name: Gan Chae Kwan

reporter: Iran opponent: Sebin's reviewer: Hungary signature: [Signature]

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

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT
 1 + 1 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 = 5
Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

NOTES:

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

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER: 1 + 2 + 65/1 - 0 = 4

stage: 2
reporter: Yvon

fight (round no.): 4
opponent: Serbia

room: K
reviewer: Hungary

problem no.:

Juror's name: DARIG DUO
signature: Priscilla

REPORT		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	phenomenon explanation almost no	almost no	some	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	review of sources, cited	some own input	some interesting results	considerable experimental or theoretical	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	some aspects above average	some scientific contribution almost no	relevant arguments/responses too few	efficiency almost no, chaotic	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	fair	some	some	not well fitting	deviations	qualitatively analysed	+ theory limits explained, deviations well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed + reproducible, convincing analysis	average	interesting solution	some scientific points cleared	many	-1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	good	well performed, sufficient number	well explained errors analysed + reproducible, convincing analysis	quite detailed, correct	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	completely testable	practically all points	practically all	very good	scientific contribution of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency almost no	prioritisation no	-2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	

NOTES: Good maths → qualitative explanation? (focus motion)
Loads of variables → units and overs ~~comprehensible~~ ? with any theory (given the heavy maths?) or any predictions?

OPPONENT: 1 + 1 + 2 + 2.5 - 0 = 7

Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED		time used		understanding of presentation		relevant topics addressed		correct own opinions expressed		prioritisation		DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER		ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS		
0	almost no, irrelevant	almost no	very little	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	almost no	very little	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	-1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	almost no	very little	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	-2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES: asked explanation - shipping - no own input
- x axis oscillation - further parameter

REVIEWER: 1 + 2.5 + 2 + 2.5 - 0 = 8

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

NOTES: spoke about forces resonance
Second side of an angle
went through (opp no opinions)
all will
↳ weaknesses and strengths

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 3 room: K problem no.: 4/13 Juror's name: Gen Chae Kwan
 reporter: Hungary opponent: Iran reviewer: Serbia signature: [Signature]

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 4

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1 + 0.5 - 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 no	almost no	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	almost no	little	irrelevant	almost no	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	not all	main points	some	some	partial	average	some correct	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3		almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	good	many	many correct	
4		efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	new crucial points	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1 + 1 - 1 = 4

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 4 room: 16 problem no.: 13 Juror's name: G. Exner
 reporter: Hungary opponent: Tra reviewer: Sedra signature: ly

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1 - 1 = 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	convincingly supported proved deep understanding	efficient, productive
5	demonstrative	correct	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected			
6	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable							

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1 + 1 - 1 = 4

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	almost no	no	concise 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	quite efficient	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3		almost all	all relevant points	many	some	good	many	leading or cooperative	
4		all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	very good	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 + 1 - 1 = 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	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	some	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	good	many	mostly adequate	some	informative, apt relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	short, apt and clear, well prioritized	detailed, complex	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	brief but accurate	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	
4	time managed efficiently					accurate				

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 4 room: K problem no.: 13 Juror's name: Dario Dvo
 reporter: Hungary opponent: Iran reviewer: Scybia signature: Adone Dvo

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	some	some	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	some aspects above average, greater extent than expected	scientific contribution almost no	relevant arguments/responses too few	efficiency almost no, chaotic	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
1	some	some	fair	fair	some	review of sources, cited	some own input	some interesting results	some interesting results	some interesting results	some interesting results	some interesting results	only technical	some	avoided some questions	concise and correct or no questions asked	
2	fair	fair	good	good	not well fitting	some interesting results	some interesting results	some interesting results	some interesting results	some interesting results	some interesting results	some interesting results	points cleared	many	answered directly to most questions	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	deviations	deviations	deviations	deviations	deviations	deviations	deviations	points cleared	many	answered directly to most questions	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	
4	detailed	detailed	quite detailed, correct	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ results explained	+ results explained	+ results explained	+ results explained	+ results explained	+ results explained	+ results explained	interesting points	discussed	convincingly supported	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
5	demonstrative	demonstrative	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	discussed	brought in new physics	understanding	productive	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	discussed	brought in new physics	understanding	productive	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES: lots of theory. A few graphs without labels + not all parameters investigated. No proper conclusion. Video

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.8 + 2 + 1.8 - 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED		time used		understanding of presentation		relevant topics addressed		correct own opinions expressed		prioritisation		DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER		efficiency		ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	almost no, irrelevant	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	scientific contribution almost no	relevance of topics irrelevant	own opinions presented very little	efficiency almost no	prioritisation almost no
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	little	average	some correct	to some extent	almost no
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	partial	many	many correct	quite efficient	some
3	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	good	many	many correct	quite efficient	some
4	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	new crucial points	many	many correct	quite efficient	some
5	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	all & efficiently	many	many correct	quite efficient	some
6	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	practically all points	many	many correct	quite efficient	some

NOTES: Did not go back to presentation! Insisted only on new parameters + determination of resonating frequency (good)

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

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

NOTES: Short - did not add anything to the physics either

SCORESHEET

1 fight (round no.): 4

room: K

problem no.: 13

Juror's name: Susanna

reporter: Hanson

opponent: Arca

reviewer: Sabina

signature: Susanna

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 - 4 = 0

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1 - 1 - 1 = 0

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 0.5 + 0.5 = 3

QUESTIONS ASKED	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	speech summary poor	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	partial	some	partially relevant	almost no	discussion analysis 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	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	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 4 room: K problem no.: 13 Juror's name: Kin Long AB
 reporter: Hungary opponent: Iran reviewer: Serbia signature: Chaz

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 68 + 15 - 0 = 78

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 12 + 18 + 41 - 0 = 71

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	very little	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very few	some	almost no	some	scientific contribution almost no	relevance of topics irrelevant	own opinions very little	efficiency almost no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	very little	not all	some main points	some	some	some	some	some	little	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	-1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	not all	almost all	main points	many	many	many	to most topics	to most topics	partial	many	many correct	quite efficient	-1 inconclusive or too long
3		almost all	all & efficiently	all relevant points	practically all	practically all	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	+ improvement suggestions	good	many	many correct	very efficient	-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4		all & efficiently								new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 3

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

NOTES:

Team		Juror		Susan Napier		Kin Long Ao		Dario Duo		Ginka Exner		Chee Kwan Gan		Acting Team Member		Rejected Problems		Accepted Problem	
Hungary		Rep	5	5	6	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	Marcell Szakály			13 (Resonating glass)		
Iran		Opp	6	5	5	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	Ayda Rasouliastani					
Serbia		Rev	3	4	5	4	4	4	4	6	4	4	4	Miloš Rašić					
Iran		Rep	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	2	2	4	4	Rozhina Sedigh					
Serbia		Opp	5	5	6	7	6	7	7	7	7	5	5	Miloš Rašić					
Hungary		Rev	7	8	8	8	8	8	8	4	4	6	6	Tímea Báncsó			14. (Gel-Haw Whammy Diddle)		
Serbia		Rep	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	6	6	Aleksandra Stajković			15 (Boiled egg)		
Hungary		Opp	5	5	7	7	6	7	7	6	6	6	6	Balázs Norbert Nagy					
Iran		Rev	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	Rozhina Sedigh			9 (Ball in tube)		
		Rep																	
		Opp																	
		Rev																	

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