

SCORESHEET

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

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 5
 reporter: ROMANIA opponent: BRAZIL

room: C problem no.: 4
 reviewer: SWITZERLAND

KONDRAEHL
 Juror's name:
 signature:

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 0.5 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 7

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

NOTES:

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

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1,6 + 1,6 - 0,2 = 4$$

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 5

room: C

problem no.: 4

reporter: ROMANIA

opponent: BRASIL

reviewer: SWITZERLAND

Juror's name: HOKÖSTREI, MIHAI
signature: Romis

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	
	almost no	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	efficiency		
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	0	concise and correct or
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	only technical points cleared	some	avoided some questions	1	no questions asked
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	some scientific points cleared	many	cooperated well	2	some incorrect,
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions	3	inconclusive or too long
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive	4	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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

$$1 + 2 + 3 + 1,5 - 0 = 8$$

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2,7 + 2,5 + 2 - 0 = 9$$

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 0.7 + 1 - = 3

stage: V fight (round no.): 1 room: C problem no.: 4
 reporter: Romania opponent: Brazil reviewer: ~~Paul~~ CH

Juror's name: A. Kopyldjiev
 signature:

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

NOTES: 1 + 0.7 + 1 = 2.7

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2.7 - = 7

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

NOTES: 1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2.7 = 7.2

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

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

NOTES: 1 + 2 + 2 + 2

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{2-5}$ + $\boxed{1-5}$ - $\boxed{1}$ = $\boxed{4}$

stage: $\boxed{1}$ fight (round no.): $\boxed{5}$
 reporter: Romania opponent: Brazil

room: C problem no.: $\boxed{4}$
 reviewer: Switzerland magnetic fields

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

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

NOTES: Did not vary relevant parameters other than magnetic induction.

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{2-2}$ + $\boxed{2}$ + $\boxed{2-2}$ - $\boxed{0}$ = $\boxed{7}$

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

NOTES: used 2.5 min

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{2}$ + $\boxed{2}$ + $\boxed{2}$ - $\boxed{0}$ = $\boxed{7}$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> brief but accurate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

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

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 5
 reporter: Romania opponent: Brazil

room: C problem no.: 4
 reviewer: Switzerland

Juror's name: Wee Wee Hsing
 signature: *Hy*

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

NOTES: Distinction between Nano and macro for analytical of fluid - relevant? *not on the formation of hills*
 N. and Non-N. behaviour
 Rosenzweig Instability is Brattical for H₂ system to form.
 Measured magnetic fields
 varied distance of d.
 Hysteresis observed?
 optical measurement of the transmission of the film fluid.
 How does the properties of the structure depend on the relevant parameters?
 Did not measure threshold magnetic fields.

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.8 + 2.8 + 2 - 0.2 = 8

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

NOTES: variables
 magnetic field lines
 Homogeneity of fields
 measured - geometry of hills
 Fluid density
 surface tension
 On of the inhomogeneity of the field is good point but don't measure threshold magnetic field!
 Braggian motion? (particles are large!)
 Surface tension is important (How to measure?)
 Consistent after horizontal lines
 Don't agree about the relevance of B. motion.

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.8 + 2.2 + 0.8 - 0.2 = 6

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

NOTES: Validity of Rosenzweig Instability
 can observe 2 spikes
 app - homogeneous field
 Good view of the report
 Not so good for opp. party
 Don't agree about relevance of B. motion.

SCORESHEET

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

stage: 2
 reporter: BRAZIL

fight (round no.): 5 room: C problem no.: 5
 opponent: SWITZERLAND reviewer: ROMANA

Juror's name: RUNDALEK
 signature: Uudal

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.2 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 8

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 8

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 5$$

stage: 2
reporter: BRASIC

fight (round no.): 5
opponent: SWITZERLAND

room: C
reviewer: POLSKA

problem no.: 5

Juror's name: HÖKÖSTREI, Mikael
signature: *[Signature]*

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

NOTES: Where does the eqn. slide #9(?) come from? Why does it look like this? Boris explanation of the what?

OPPONENT 3,0 Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 12 + 3 - 0 = 8$$

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 1,5 + 1,5 - 0 = 6$$

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

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

stage: V fight (round no.): 2
 reporter: Brazil opponent: Ut

room: C problem no.: 5
 reviewer: Ro

Juror's name: R. Kuyldjiev
 signature: [Signature]

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

NOTES: 1 + 2 + 1 = 4

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

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

NOTES: 1 + 0.5 + 2 + 1 = 4.5

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

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

NOTES: 1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 = 5

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $2.5 - 3$ + 1.5 - 1 = $4.5 - 5$

stage: 2
 reporter: Brazil

fight (round no.): 5
 opponent: Switzerland

room: C
 reviewer: Romania

problem no.: 5
 Leidenfirst Stars

Juror's name: Teo Kien Boon
 signature:

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	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	efficiency	
0 --- almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 --- almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	
1 --- some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 --- only technical	some	avoided some questions	
2 --- fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 --- some scientific points cleared	many	cooperated well	
3 --- good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	3 --- interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions	
4 --- detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 --- brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive	
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 + $2.5 - 3$ + 2.5 - 0 = 8

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2.5 + $2 - 2.5$ - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 --- poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	
1 --- some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 --- too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	
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	some	
3 --- +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	3 --- brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 1.7 - 0 = 5$$

stage: 2
reporter: Brazil

fight (round no.): 5
opponent: Switzerland

room: C
reviewer: Romania

problem no.: 5

Juror's name: Wee Wei Hsiung
signature: *HW*

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	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	efficiency	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 only technical points cleared	some	avoided some questions	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 some scientific points cleared	many	cooperated well	
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	3 interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions	
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive	
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: Rayleigh number. In water? Band number. Depend on frequency f & spherical. Forced oscillation (differs from experiment).
 A measure of conductivity correction. So much if determines optimally vs. drop. Only this radius of droplet & surface tension - determines flow.

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2 - 0 = 7$$

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

NOTES: Argument is dropped? Forced vs. natural oscillation. Is it possible to induce oscillations artificially? Good reply on differences of forced and natural freq. Literature and change in radius.

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 - 0.2 = 7$$

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

NOTES: Band number. Maximum temperature of plate. Emissivity from literature. Diffraction of light? Increase in f & radius. Note that of droplet may affect freq. Good point on the '240 ps' not followed up.

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0.2 = 5$$

stage: 2

fight (round no.): 5

room: C

problem no.: 2

reporter: SWITZERLAND

opponent: ROMANIA

reviewer: BRAZIL

Juror's name: Kowalski

signature: Uddia

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6$$

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 6$$

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 5

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 5
 reporter: SCUTTERBOARD opponent: ROMANA

room: C problem no.: 8
 reviewer: BRAZIL

Juror's name: HEMÖSTREI, MICHAEL
 signature: *[Signature]*

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	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	efficiency	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 only technical	some	avoided some questions	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 some scientific	many	cooperated well	
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	3 interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions	
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive	
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: ! Again = ?

Was the most relevant moments. Mostly about Sthor & Jves. It is important, but not enough for the task!

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + 2 + 20 - 0 = 6

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

NOTES: Again = ? missed!
 - at least not enough!

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

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{2.6} + \boxed{1} - \boxed{} = \boxed{5} \quad 4.6$$

stage: V
reporter: CH

fight (round no.): 3
opponent: ROM

room: C
reviewer: Brazil

problem no.: 8

Juror's name: A. Kuyal'siev
signature: [Signature]

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	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	efficiency	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 only technical points cleared	some	avoided some questions	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting deviations	some own input	average	2 some scientific points cleared	many	cooperated well	
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	interesting solution	3 interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	answered directly to most questions	
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive	
6 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: $1 + 2.6 + 1 = 4.6 \rightarrow 5$

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{4} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2} - \boxed{} = \boxed{6}$$

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

NOTES: $1 + 1 + 2 + 2 = 6$

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{1.4} + \boxed{1} + \boxed{1} - \boxed{} = \boxed{4.4}$$

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

NOTES: $1 + 1.4 + 1 + 1 = 4.4 \rightarrow 4$

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{2.5}$ + $\boxed{1.5}$ - $\boxed{0}$ = $\boxed{5}$

stage: $\boxed{3}$ fight (round no.): $\boxed{5}$
 reporter: *Switzerland* opponent: *Romania*

room: \boxed{C} problem no.: $\boxed{8}$
 reviewer: *Brazil* *Visudius* *Density*

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

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	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	efficiency	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no/almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> others' data, incorrectly cited	0 <input type="checkbox"/> misunderstood	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no, chaotic	
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> review of sources, cited	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly	1 <input type="checkbox"/> only technical	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> avoided some	
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> not well fitting	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some own input	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some scientific	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> questions	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	3 <input type="checkbox"/> deviations	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some interesting results	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory	3 <input type="checkbox"/> cooperated well	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	4 <input type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + results explained errors analysed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental or theoretical	4 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average	4 <input type="checkbox"/> discussed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> convincingly supported	4 <input type="checkbox"/> answered directly	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex, completely testable	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 <input type="checkbox"/> well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental and theoretical	5 <input type="checkbox"/> greater extent than expected	5 <input type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics	5 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	5 <input type="checkbox"/> to most questions efficient, productive	

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{1.2}$ + $\boxed{2}$ + $\boxed{2}$ - $\boxed{0}$ = $\boxed{6}$

QUESTIONS ASKED		POSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no, irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> some relevant, aimed at resolving	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some unclear points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost nothing	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no or irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> very little	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> very little	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some main points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/> little	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> to some extent	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> not all	2 <input type="checkbox"/> main points	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> to important topics	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> leading or cooperative	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	
4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/> almost all	3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input type="checkbox"/> to most topics	3 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input type="checkbox"/> quite efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	
5 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/> all & efficiently	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all points	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	4 <input type="checkbox"/> new crucial point(s)	4 <input type="checkbox"/> almost all	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very efficient	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + $\boxed{2}$ + $\boxed{2}$ + $\boxed{2}$ - $\boxed{0}$ = $\boxed{7}$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> some relevant, sufficient number, could	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
1 <input type="checkbox"/> clear things out	1 <input type="checkbox"/> most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	
4 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> brief but accurate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{2.5} + \boxed{0.8} - \boxed{0.2} = \boxed{4}$$

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 5
reporter: Switzerland opponent: Romania

room: C problem no.: 8
reviewer: Brazil

Juror's name: Wee Weibing
signature:

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

NOTES: $T_p \rightarrow T_a$ [production or conversion?] $T_p \rightarrow h$ what is the Rayleigh no? $T_p \rightarrow h$ Δ in how to determine? Δ - how to vary this showing shape of the focal point is important? Δ - large exposure to increase SNR Δ - how to account for ambient light? Δ - positioning of the plates don't affect sensitivity (if not too close)

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{1} + \boxed{1} + \boxed{1} - \boxed{0.2} = \boxed{4}$$

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

NOTES: Δ great valid part on the finiteness of the plate.

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{1.5} + \boxed{1.5} + \boxed{1.5} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{5}$$

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

NOTES: Δ knife blockage at spot size Δ Imagery correct? Δ Agree that it is not schlieren imaging



Team	Stage 1			Stage 2			Stage 3			Stage 4		
	ROMANIA	BRAZIL	SWITZERLAND	BRAZIL	SWITZERLAND	ROMANIA	SWITZERLAND	ROMANIA	BRAZIL	Rep	Opp	Rev
Juror												
FRANTIŠEK KUDRACK	4	7	7	7	8	8	5	6	6			
MILÁLY HÖMÖSTREI	4	8	9	5	8	6	5	6	8			
ASSEN KIVDJEV	3	7	7	5	5	5	5	6	4			
KIEN BOON TEO	4	7	7	5	8	8	5	6	7			
WEI HSUNG WEE	3	8	6	5	7	7	4	4	6			
Acting Team Member	ANDREI MOHUT	ROBERTO SAITO	FLORIAN WIRTH	THOMAS BERGAMASCHI	ZARA VANCE	LEONARD TURICA	IVANA KLASOVITA	LEONARD TURICA	ROBERTO SAITO			
Rejected Problems												
Accepted Problem	Qn 4. Magnetic Hills			Qn 5 LEIDENFROST STARS			Q8. VISUALISING DENSITY					

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