

Olga Iushere

Juror's name:

signature: *[Signature]*

SCORESHEET

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 5

room: E

problem no.: 11

reviewer:

reporter: Bulgaria
opponent: Chang

REPORTER
Start from 1 and add/subtract
1 + 1 = 2 + 1.5 = 3.5 - 0 = 3.5

NOTES:

~2

1.5 ÷ 2

REPORT	phenomenon	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment
0	explanation almost no	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
2	fair	fair	good	well performed, sufficient number	some interesting results	interesting solution
3	good	good	quite detailed, demonstrative	+ results explained, errors analysed	qualitatively analysed	points cleared
4	detailed	detailed, complex, comprehensible	deep and comprehensive	shows physical insight	convincingly supported	discussed
5	demonstrative	correct	reproducible, + errors analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting points
6	deep and comprehensive	completely testable	convincing analysis	concluding analysis	considerable experimental and theoretical	brought in new physics

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

efficiency

relevant arguments/responses

scientific contribution

almost no

only technical

points cleared

some scientific

points cleared

many

cooperated well

avoided some

almost no, chaotic

questions

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincedly supported

+ data/theory

discussed

brought in new physics

proven deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

efficient, productive

proved deep understanding

convincingly supported

answered directly

to most questions

SCORESHEET

stage: 1
 fight (round no.): 5
 room: F
 problem no.: 11
 reporter: Bongers
 opponent: Chin
 reviewer: Balm
 juror's name: Delle
 signature: Delle

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

NOTES:

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT

scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	efficiency
0	almost no	almost no, chaotic
1	only technical	avoided some questions
2	points cleared	cooperated well
3	interesting points	answered directly
4	brought in new physics	productive

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

OPONENT

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

NOTES:

QUESTIONS ASKED	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics	correct own opinion	priority
0	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no
1	very little	some main points	few	little	almost no
2	not all	main points	some	partial	some
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	good	many
4	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	new crucial point(s)	almost all

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

own opinions	relevance of topics presented	efficiency	priority
0	irrelevant	almost no	no
1	very little	to some extent	almost no
2	some correct	leading or cooperative	some
3	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable
4	+ improvement	very efficient	very good

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

REVIEWER

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

NOTES:

QUESTIONS ASKED	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	priority
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no
1	clear things out	some relevant, sufficient number, could	poor	irrelevant	no
2	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	most time used, many unclear points	too short/long	partially relevant	almost no
3	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	time managed efficiently	relevant parts	mostly adequate	some

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

own opinions	discussion analysis	pros & cons	priority
0	almost no	irrelevant	no
1	too few	partially relevant	almost no
2	many	mostly adequate	some
3	+ improvements	fully	good

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

SCORESHEET

stage: 5
 reporter: BUNDIRA
 opponent: ZEHRA SHENOI
 fight (round no.): 10
 room: E
 reviewer: M. and S. Kunturich
 problem no.:
 Juror's name: Ryan H. Lee
 signature: *[Signature]*

REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 4 = 5 - 0 = 5

REPORT

NOTES:

0	almost no	almost no	theory/model	theory and experiment	phenomenon	0	explanation	almost no	1
1	some	some	fair	fair	some	1	fair	some	2
2	some	some	well performed	well fitting	good	2	good	some	3
3	fair	fair	sufficient number	deviations	quite detailed	3	detailed	some	4
4	convincing analysis	convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations	explained, conclusive	errors analysed	4	deep and comprehensive	some	5
5	convincing analysis	convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations	considerable experimental	errors analysed	5	shows physical insight	some	6
6	convincing analysis	convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations	considerable experimental	errors analysed	6	deep and comprehensive	some	

DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0	almost no	almost no	contribution	scientific	relevant	efficiency	0	conclude and correct or	0
1	almost no	almost no	only technical	points cleared	some	avoided some	1	no questions asked	1
2	some	some	points cleared	some scientific	many	cooperated well	2	some incorrect,	2
3	some	some	interesting points	points cleared	many	answered directly	3	some incorrect,	3
4	some	some	brought in new	discussed	convincingly supported	to most questions	4	deeply incorrect or show	4
5	some	some	brought in new	discussed	convincingly supported	to most questions	5	deeply incorrect or show	5
6	some	some	brought in new	discussed	convincingly supported	to most questions	6	deeply incorrect or show	6

OPONENT
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 3 = 4.5 - 0 = 4.5

QUESTIONS ASKED

NOTES:

0	almost no, irrelevant	almost no, irrelevant	time used	understanding of	relevant topics	correct own	0	no	0
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving	some relevant, aimed at resolving	very little	presentation	no or irrelevant	almost no	1	almost no	1
2	short allowing short answers,	short allowing short answers,	some main points	almost nothing	some	some	2	some	2
3	prioritized, all time used	prioritized, all time used	all relevant points	all relevant points	many	to most topics	3	reasonable	3
4	all & efficiently	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all points	improvement	suggestions	4	very good	4

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0	conclude and correct or	conclude and correct or	no	almost no	irrelevant	very little	0	no	0
1	questions asked	questions asked	to some extent	some	some	own opinions	1	almost no	1
2	some incorrect,	some incorrect,	leading or cooperative	some correct	average	some correct	2	some	2
3	inconclusive or too long	inconclusive or too long	quite efficient	many correct	many	many correct	3	reasonable	3
4	deeply incorrect or show	deeply incorrect or show	very efficient	improvement	suggestions	suggestions	4	very good	4

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

NOTES:

0	too few, mostly irrelevant	too few, mostly irrelevant	report summary & understanding	discussion	own opinions	pros & cons	0	no	0
1	some relevant, sufficient number, could	some relevant, sufficient number, could	clear things out	almost no	too few	irrelevant	1	no	1
2	most time used, many unclear points	most time used, many unclear points	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	partial	too short/long	partially relevant	2	almost no	2
3	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	time managed efficiently	good	relevant parts	mostly adequate	3	some	3

REVIEW OF REPORT

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

ANSWERS TO JURY

0	conclude and correct or	conclude and correct or	no	no	irrelevant	no	0	no	0
1	no questions asked	no questions asked	almost no	almost no	too few	irrelevant	1	almost no	1
2	some incorrect,	some incorrect,	inconclusive or too long	inconclusive or too long	some	partially relevant	2	almost no	2
3	deeply incorrect or show	deeply incorrect or show	deep misconceptions	deep misconceptions	improvement	fully	3	some	3

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 reporter: Bulgar opponent: Reza fight (round no.): 5 room: E reviewer: Chunee Balon problem no.: 11

Juror's name: Gan Chee Kwan signature: chy

REPORT		DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
6	shows deep and comprehensive physical insight	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	efficiency	0
5	demonstrative	phenomenon explanation	relevant	efficiency	1
4	detailed	theory/model	relevant	efficiency	2
3	good	theory/model	relevant	efficiency	3
2	fair	theory/model	relevant	efficiency	4
1	some	theory/model	relevant	efficiency	5
0	almost no	theory/model	relevant	efficiency	6
6	deep and comprehensive	comparison between theory and experiment	relevant	efficiency	0
5	detailed	comparison between theory and experiment	relevant	efficiency	1
4	quite detailed, errors analysed	comparison between theory and experiment	relevant	efficiency	2
3	good	comparison between theory and experiment	relevant	efficiency	3
2	fair	comparison between theory and experiment	relevant	efficiency	4
1	some	comparison between theory and experiment	relevant	efficiency	5
0	almost no	comparison between theory and experiment	relevant	efficiency	6
6	shows deep and comprehensive physical insight	own contribution	relevant	efficiency	0
5	demonstrative	own contribution	relevant	efficiency	1
4	detailed	own contribution	relevant	efficiency	2
3	good	own contribution	relevant	efficiency	3
2	fair	own contribution	relevant	efficiency	4
1	some	own contribution	relevant	efficiency	5
0	almost no	own contribution	relevant	efficiency	6

REPORTER $1 + \frac{2}{2} + \frac{3}{3} + \frac{4}{4} + \frac{5}{5} + \frac{6}{6} = 5$
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

NOTES:

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)		ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
4	new crucial points	practically all points	practically all points	efficiently	0
3	good	all relevant points	all relevant points	all & almost all	1
2	partial	to most topics	to important points	not all	2
1	average	to important topics	some main points	very little	3
0	almost no	some	some main points	almost no	4
4	almost all	practically all	practically all	efficiently	0
3	many	many	many	all & almost all	1
2	many correct	to most topics	to important points	not all	2
1	some correct	to important topics	some	very little	3
0	almost no	some	some	almost no	4
4	almost all	practically all	practically all	efficiently	0
3	many	many	many	all & almost all	1
2	many correct	to most topics	to important points	not all	2
1	some correct	to important topics	some	very little	3
0	almost no	some	some	almost no	4

OPONENT $1 + 1 + 2 + 2 = 6$
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

NOTES:

REVIEW OF REPORT		REVIEW OF OPPOSITION		ANSWERS TO JURY	
3	report summary & understanding	speech summary	brief but accurate	conclude, accurate, + improvements	0
2	discussion analysis	discussion analysis	informative, apt, relevant parts	relevant parts, many suggestions	1
1	own opinions	own opinions	too short/long	too short/long	2
0	pros & cons	pros & cons	poor	almost no	3
3	report summary & understanding	speech summary	brief but accurate	conclude, accurate, + improvements	0
2	discussion analysis	discussion analysis	informative, apt, relevant parts	relevant parts, many suggestions	1
1	own opinions	own opinions	too short/long	too short/long	2
0	pros & cons	pros & cons	poor	almost no	3

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

NOTES:

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF OPPOSITION		ANSWERS TO JURY	
3	time managed efficiently	speech summary	brief but accurate	conclude, accurate, + improvements	0
2	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	discussion analysis	informative, apt, relevant parts	relevant parts, many suggestions	1
1	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	own opinions	too short/long	too short/long	2
0	clear things out	pros & cons	poor	almost no	3

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 --- 100 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
 4 --- time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

0 --- almost no
 1 --- poor
 2 --- informative, apt, relevant parts
 3 --- brief but accurate

REVIEW OF REPORT

0 --- almost no
 1 --- irrelevant
 2 --- mostly adequate
 3 --- fully

ANSWERS TO JURY

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

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 4$$

stage: 1
reporter: Bulgaria

fight (round no.): 5
opponent: China

room: E
reviewer: Belarus

problem no.:

Juror's name: Ojan Khatis-Dzhaman
signature: Ojan Khatis-Dzhaman

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	X almost no	too few	X 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	X 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	X some interesting results	interesting solution	3 interesting points	+ data/theory	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 discussed	convincingly supported	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	5 brought in new physics	proved deep understanding		

NOTES: No attempt at justification, calibration and metering not clear, base order reaction part not convincing

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 7$$

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	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 X concise and correct or no questions asked
1 X 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	X 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	X 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

$$1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1 - 0 = 5$$

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 X concise and correct or no questions asked
1	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	1 partial	too short/long	X some	partially relevant	almost no	1 too short/long	too short/long	X some	partially relevant	X almost no	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
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	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 + $\boxed{4}$ + $\boxed{3}$ - $\boxed{0}$ = $\boxed{8}$

stage: $\boxed{2}$

fight (round no.): $\boxed{5}$

room: \boxed{E}

problem no.: $\boxed{9}$

reporter: $\boxed{\text{China}}$

opponent: $\boxed{\text{Belarus}}$

reviewer: $\boxed{\text{Bulgaria}}$

Juror's name:

signature: *Olga Inisheva*

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 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	
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: $2.5 \div 4$ $7 \div 8$ $\sim 2.5 \sim 3$ $\boxed{+} \rightarrow 8$

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + $\boxed{1}$ + $\boxed{2.5}$ + $\boxed{2.5}$ - $\boxed{0}$ = $\boxed{7}$

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	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 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: ~ 2.5 ~ 2.5

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + $\boxed{0.5}$ + $\boxed{1.5}$ + $\boxed{1.75}$ - $\boxed{0}$ = $\boxed{5}$

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	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 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: ~ 0.5 ~ 1.5 $\sim 1.75 \div 1.75$

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 4 + 3 - 0 = 8

stage: 5 fight (round no.): 2 room: G problem no.: 9 Juror's name: Ryan H. Lin
 reporter: CHINA Hanbai, Lynn opponent: BEARUS Caleb Penyzkov reviewer: BALWARTA 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 fulfillment	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	some interesting results	interesting solution	3 --- interesting points	data/theory	answered directly	
4 --- detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 --- discussed	convincingly supported	to most questions	
5 --- deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	5 --- brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive	

NOTES:

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 --- almost no, irrelevant	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	
1 --- some unclear points	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	0 --- almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0 --- almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no	
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	
3 --- almost all		2 --- not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	2 --- partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some	
4 --- all & efficiently		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:

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	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	
1 --- clear things out	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	0 --- poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 --- poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	
2 --- +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently		1 --- partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 --- too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	
		2 --- 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:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 5 + 2 - 0 = 8

stage: 2
 reporter: Chon

fight (round no.):
 opponent: Belann

room:
 reviewer: Bulgan

problem no.: Pan

Juror's name: Gran CK
 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 --- points cleared	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 demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 --- discussed	convincingly supported	to most questions	
5 --- deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	explained, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	4 --- brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive	

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + 3 + 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 --- almost no, irrelevant	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	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			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:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + 3 + 1 - 0 = 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	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	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	3 --- +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	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:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{4} + \boxed{3} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{8}$$

stage: **2**
reporter: **China**

fight (round no.): **5**
opponent: **Belarus**

room: **E**
reviewer: **Bulgaria**

problem no.: **9**

Juror's name: **Ojan Khatri-Demantzi**
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> qualitatively analysed	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some interesting results	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + data/theory	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> answered directly	
4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	4 <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average	4 <input type="checkbox"/> discussed	4 <input checked="" 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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{1} + \boxed{2.5} + \boxed{2.5} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{7}$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	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"/>	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"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> leading or cooperative	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	
3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> almost all	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> to most topics	3 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input checked="" 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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	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 checked="" 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"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> almost no	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> almost no	
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	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"/>	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 + 4 + 2 - 0 = 7

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 5 room: E problem no.: 9 Juror's name: D. Keller
 reporter: China opponent: Bolawi reviewer: Bulgaria signature: D. Keller

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	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 some scientific	many	questions	
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	some interesting results	interesting solution	3 interesting points	+ data/theory	cooperated well	
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 discussed	convincingly supported	answered directly	
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	4 brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	efficient, productive	

NOTES:

*friction force
ball in contact
with table*

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

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		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 relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points		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 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 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		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:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + 7 + 7 - 0 = 4

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		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 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	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
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	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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

stage: 3 reporter: *Wclara* opponent: *Bhigira* room: E problem no.: 15 reviewer: *Chin*

Juror's name: *John Khatir-Damawrah* signature: *John Khatir-Damawrah*

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

REPORT

NOTES:

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

NOTES:

4	brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	productivity
3	discussed	convincingly supported	answered directly
2	points cleared	+ data/theory	cooperated well
1	only technical	many	avoided some questions
0	almost no contribution	too few arguments/responses	almost no, chaotic

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

NOTES:

4	new crucial point(s)	almost all suggestions	very efficient	very good
3	good	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable
2	partial	average	leading or cooperative	some
1	little	some	to some extent	almost no
0	almost no contribution	irrelevant	very little	no

DISCUSSION WITH JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

NOTES:

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

OPPONENT

NOTES:

4	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement	very good
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	reasonable
2	not all	* main points	* some	to important topics	some	some
1	very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	almost no
0	almost no time used	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	no

DISCUSSION WITH JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

NOTES:

4	time used	understanding of relevant topics	correct own	practically all	practically all points	efficiently
3	presentation	relevant topics	correct own	practically all	practically all points	efficiently
2	understanding of relevant topics	correct own	practically all	practically all	practically all points	efficiently
1	presentation	relevant topics	correct own	practically all	practically all points	efficiently
0	almost no, irrelevant	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	almost no	almost no

DISCUSSION WITH JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

NOTES:

4	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement	very good
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	reasonable
2	not all	* main points	* some	to important topics	some	some
1	very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	almost no
0	almost no time used	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	no

DISCUSSION WITH JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

NOTES:

4	all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement	very good
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	reasonable
2	not all	* main points	* some	to important topics	some	some
1	very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	almost no
0	almost no time used	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	no

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

NOTES:

3	report summary & understanding	discuss	own opinions	pros & cons	practically all points	efficiently
2	clear things out	some relevant, sufficient number, could	some relevant, aimed at both rep. and opp.	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used
1	most time used, many unclear points	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	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
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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

NOTES:

3	speech	discussion	own opinions	pros & cons	practically all points	efficiently
2	summary	analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	practically all points	efficiently
1	too short/long	too short/long	some	to important topics	some	some
0	almost no	almost no	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	no

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

NOTES:

3	brief but accurate	conclusive	+ improvement	adequate	good	good
2	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	to most topics	reasonable	reasonable
1	too short/long	too short/long	some	to important topics	some	some
0	almost no	almost no	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	no

ANSWERS TO JURY

NOTES:

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

ANSWERS TO JURY

NOTES:

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

SCORESHEET

stage: 5
 fight (round no.): 3
 opponent: *Besnik Bajrami*
 reporter: *Ilir Daxenko*
 reviewer: *CHINA*
 room: 6
 problem no.: 15
 juror's name: *Ryan H. Lead*
 signature: *[Signature]*

REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 3 = 0 - 1.25 = 5

REPORT	phenomenon	theory/model	experiments	relevant	comparison between	own contribution	task fulfillment
0	almost no explanation	almost no theory/model	almost no experiments	almost no relevant	no/almost no theory and experiment	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
2	fair	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good	well performed	well performed	good	quite detailed	some interesting results	interesting
4	detailed	sufficient number	quite detailed	well explained	quite detailed	quite detailed	points cleared
5	demonstrative	errors analysed	+ results explained	+ theory limits	explained, conclusive	discussed	interesting points
6	deep and comprehensive	convincing analysis	convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations	well fitting, deviations	discussed	brought in new
	shows physical insight	completely testable	completely testable	reproducible	reproducible	convincingly supported	proved deep
							understanding
							productive

QUESTIONS ASKED	time used	understanding of	relevant topics	correct own	priority	scientific	relevance	own opinions	efficiency	priority
0	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no
1	very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	little	some	to some extent	almost no	no
2	not all	many points	some	to important topics	some	partial	average	leading or cooperative	some	some
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable	very good
4	efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement	suggestions	new crucial	almost all	+ improvement	very efficient	very good

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	report summary	discussion	own opinions	pros & cons	priority	report summary	discussion	own opinions	pros & cons	priority
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	almost no	irrelevant	too few	irrelevant	no
1	clear things out	some relevant, sufficient number, could	most time used, many unclear points	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no
2	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	time managed efficiently	most time used, many unclear points	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	good	too short/long	many	mostly adequate	some
3										good

REVIEWER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2 = 2.25 + 2.25 = 0 = 8

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

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

SCORESHEET

stage: reporter: *Balraj*
 fight (round no.): *5* opponent: *Rajans* reviewer: *Chaitan*
 room: *B-101* problem no.: *18* Juror's name: *Gan Chae Kwan*
 signature: *cy*

REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1 + 2 = 4$

REPORT

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

4	scientific contribution	brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	productive
3	discussed	convincingly supported	+ data/theory	answered directly
2	points cleared	some scientific	many	cooperated well
1	only technical	some	avoided some	questions
0	almost no	too few	almost no, chaotic	no questions asked

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

4	new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement	very efficient
3	good	many	many correct	quite efficient
2	partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative
1	little	some	some	to some extent
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no

ANSWERS TO JURY

6	deep and comprehensible	deep misconceptions
5	demonstrative	deeply incorrect or show
4	detailed	incomplete or too long
3	good	some incorrect,
2	fair	no questions asked
1	some	concise and correct or
0	almost no	no questions asked

NOTES:

OPPONENT
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1 + 2 = 4$

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

4	new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement	very efficient
3	good	many	many correct	quite efficient
2	partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative
1	little	some	some	to some extent
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

4	new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement	very efficient
3	good	many	many correct	quite efficient
2	partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative
1	little	some	some	to some extent
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

4	efficiently	all &	practically all points	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement	very good
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	reasonable	reasonable
2	not all	some main points	some	to important topics	some	some	some
1	very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	almost no	almost no
0	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	no	no

ANSWERS TO JURY

4	deep misconceptions	deeply incorrect or show
3	incomplete or too long	some incorrect,
2	no questions asked	concise and correct or
1	no	no
0	almost no	almost no

NOTES:

REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1 + 2 = 4$

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

4	new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement	very efficient
3	good	many	many correct	quite efficient
2	partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative
1	little	some	some	to some extent
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

4	new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement	very efficient
3	good	many	many correct	quite efficient
2	partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative
1	little	some	some	to some extent
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no

ANSWERS TO JURY

4	efficiently	all &	practically all points	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement	very good
3	almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	reasonable	reasonable
2	not all	some main points	some	to important topics	some	some	some
1	very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	almost no	almost no
0	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	no	no

ANSWERS TO JURY

6	deep and comprehensible	deep misconceptions
5	demonstrative	deeply incorrect or show
4	detailed	incomplete or too long
3	good	some incorrect,
2	fair	no questions asked
1	some	concise and correct or
0	almost no	no questions asked

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 5 room: E problem no.: 15

reporter: *Balam* opponent: *Balpatra* reviewer: *Chm+*

juror's name: *D. Kalle* signature: *D. Kalle*

1 + 3 = 0 - 2 + 6 = 6

Start from 1 and add/subtract

REPORTER

ANSWERS TO JURY	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT				REPORT											
	efficiency	relevant arguments/responses	scientific contribution	almost no points cleared	only technical	some scientific points cleared	many questions avoided some	almost no, chaotic	phenomenon explanation	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
										almost no, chaotic	some	fair	good	quite detailed, correct	detailed, complex, completely testable	shows physical insight
	efficiency	relevant arguments/responses	scientific contribution	almost no points cleared	only technical	some scientific points cleared	many questions avoided some	almost no, chaotic	phenomenon explanation	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
										almost no, chaotic	some	fair	good	quite detailed, correct	detailed, complex, completely testable	shows physical insight
	efficiency	relevant arguments/responses	scientific contribution	almost no points cleared	only technical	some scientific points cleared	many questions avoided some	almost no, chaotic	phenomenon explanation	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
almost no, chaotic										some	fair	good	quite detailed, correct	detailed, complex, completely testable	shows physical insight	
efficiency	relevant arguments/responses	scientific contribution	almost no points cleared	only technical	some scientific points cleared	many questions avoided some	almost no, chaotic	phenomenon explanation	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
									almost no, chaotic	some	fair	good	quite detailed, correct	detailed, complex, completely testable	shows physical insight	
efficiency	relevant arguments/responses	scientific contribution	almost no points cleared	only technical	some scientific points cleared	many questions avoided some	almost no, chaotic	phenomenon explanation	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
									almost no, chaotic	some	fair	good	quite detailed, correct	detailed, complex, completely testable	shows physical insight	

NOTES:

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				OPPOSITION (SPEECH)				QUESTIONS ASKED						
	efficiency	own opinions	relevance of topics presented	irrelevant	very little	almost no	some	almost no		time used	0	1	2	3	4
											almost no	some	almost no	some	almost no
	efficiency	own opinions	relevance of topics presented	irrelevant	very little	almost no	some	almost no		time used	0	1	2	3	4
almost no									some		almost no	some	almost no	some	almost no
efficiency	own opinions	relevance of topics presented	irrelevant	very little	almost no	some	almost no	time used	0	1	2	3	4		
									almost no	some	almost no	some	almost no	some	almost no

OPPONENT

1 + 1 = 0 - 2 + 5 = 5

Start from 1 and add/subtract

NOTES:

ANSWERS TO JURY	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION				REVIEW OF REPORT				QUESTIONS ASKED																		
	prioritisation	pros & cons	own opinions	discussion analysis	speech summary	almost no	too few	irrelevant		no	report summary & understanding analysis	poor	almost no	partial	too short/long	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	fully	adequate	good	time managed efficiently	clear things out	most time used, many unclear points	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	3
	prioritisation	pros & cons	own opinions	discussion analysis	speech summary	almost no	too few	irrelevant		no	report summary & understanding analysis	poor	almost no	partial	too short/long	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	fully	adequate	good	time managed efficiently	clear things out	most time used, many unclear points	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	3
almost no									too few																		
prioritisation	pros & cons	own opinions	discussion analysis	speech summary	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	report summary & understanding analysis	poor	almost no	partial	too short/long	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	fully	adequate	good	time managed efficiently	clear things out	most time used, many unclear points	resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	3		
																										almost no	too few

REVIEWER

1 + 3 = 0 - 1 + 7 = 7

Start from 1 and add/subtract

Spent 10 min on accuracy

NOTES:



Team	Stage 1			Stage 2			Stage 3			Stage 4		
	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev
Ryan Hsiao - Tan Lin	7	9	8	8	8	7	5	6	8			
Daniel Kellar	6	7	6	7	5	4	6	5	7			
Gan Chee Kuan	5	6	6	8	7	5	4	5	6			
Olga inisheva	5	7	6	8	7	5	5	5	7			
Ojankhatib Dumandadi	4	7	5	8	7	5	5	6	7			
Acting Team Member	Zehra Shemol	Wang Chun bing	Michael skuravovich	Hambai Lyu	Gleb penyazkov	Franses Rakhat Turqan bok	Ilia porsenko	Rakhat Turqanbek	Haotian zhu			
Rejected Problems	-			-			-					
Accepted Problem	Q11			Q9			15					

Signature Fight Assistant: *han kang* Double-checked with Scoring Guidelines by second Fight Assistant (signature): *Ng Wei Man*