

SCORESHEET

Stage: 3
 fight (round no.): 5
 reporter: *KEE BAK TAN*
 opponent: *GERMANY*
 room: F
 problem no.: 6
 Juror's name: *Tatiana*
 signature: *TBS*

REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1.5 + 1.0 = 3$

REPORT

NOTES:

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT 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

OPPONENT
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 2.0 + 2.5 + 2.1 = 7$

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|------------|---------------------------|------------------------|------------|
| 4 | new crucial points | almost all | + improvement suggestions | very efficient | very good |
| 3 | good | many | many correct | quite efficient | reasonable |
| 2 | partial | average | some correct | leading or cooperative | some |
| 1 | little | some | some | to some extent | almost no |
| 0 | almost no | irrelevant | very little | almost no | no |

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked
 1 --- some unclear points
 2 --- short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

NOTES:

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

| | | | | |
|---|-----------|----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| 4 | time used | understanding of relevant topics | correct own | priority |
| 3 | almost no | presentation addressed | options expressed | priority |
| 2 | some | relevant topics | practically all | practically all |
| 1 | almost no | to most topics | many | to most topics |
| 0 | almost no | some | some | some |

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

REVIEWER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 3.0 + 2.5 + 2.0 = 9$

REVIEW OF REPORT

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|------------------|--------------|--------------------|-----------|
| 3 | report summary & understanding | discuss analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | priority |
| 2 | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | no |
| 1 | partial | too short/long | some | partially relevant | almost no |
| 0 | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | no |

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

| | | | | | |
|---|------------------|------------------|--------------|--------------------|-----------|
| 3 | speech summary | discuss analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | priority |
| 2 | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | no |
| 1 | informative, apt | too short/long | many | partially relevant | almost no |
| 0 | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | no |

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: III reporter: AZERBAIJAN opponent: GERMANY fight (round no.): 5

room: 7 reviewer: STIGKORBE

Juror's name: VICOR TAUBER signature: [Signature]

problem no.: _____

REPORT

NOTES:

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

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

REPORTER

DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT

NOTES:

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| 0 | efficiency | relevant | arguments/responses | scientific | contribution | relevant | correct own | prioritisation |
| 1 | ✓ almost no, chaotic | ✓ avoided some | ✓ some | ✓ almost no | ✓ only technical | ✓ some | ✓ almost no | ✓ almost no |
| 2 | cooperated well | questions | many | points cleared | points cleared | many | to most topics | reasonable |
| 3 | answered directly | + data/theory | convincingly supported | interesting points | discussed | brought in new | practically all | practically all |
| 4 | to most questions | efficient, productive | proved deep | understanding | understanding | proved deep | practically all points | practically all points |

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

OPONENT

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

NOTES:

| | | | | |
|---|-------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|
| 0 | efficiency | quite efficient | very efficient | very good |
| 1 | ✓ almost no | ✓ no some extent | ✓ almost no | ✓ almost no |
| 2 | ✓ some | ✓ some | ✓ some | ✓ some |
| 3 | ✓ average | ✓ some correct | ✓ many correct | ✓ many correct |
| 4 | ✓ good | ✓ many | ✓ many | ✓ many |

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

REVIEWER

QUESTIONS ASKED

NOTES:

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 0 | almost no, irrelevant | some relevant, aimed at resolving | some unclear points | short allowing short answers, | prioritized, all time used |
| 1 | ✓ almost no | ✓ almost nothing | ✓ some main points | ✓ very little | ✓ not all |
| 2 | ✓ almost no | ✓ no or irrelevant | ✓ some main points | ✓ some main points | ✓ all relevant points |
| 3 | ✓ almost no | ✓ almost all | ✓ all relevant points | ✓ almost all | ✓ all & efficiently |

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

REVIEWER

REVIEW OF REPORT

NOTES:

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------|----------------------|----------------|
| 0 | report summary | & understanding | discussion | analysis | pros & cons | prioritisation |
| 1 | ✓ poor | ✓ almost no | ✓ almost no | ✓ too few | ✓ irrelevant | ✓ almost no |
| 2 | ✓ too short/long | ✓ too short/long | ✓ some | ✓ some | ✓ partially relevant | ✓ almost no |
| 3 | ✓ informative, apt | ✓ relevant parts | ✓ many | ✓ many | ✓ mostly adequate | ✓ some |
| 4 | ✓ brief but accurate, | ✓ accurate, conclusive, | ✓ + improvements | ✓ fully | ✓ good | ✓ good |

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

REVIEWER

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

NOTES:

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| 0 | speech summary | discussion | analysis | pros & cons | prioritisation |
| 1 | ✓ poor | ✓ almost no | ✓ almost no | ✓ irrelevant | ✓ almost no |
| 2 | ✓ too short/long | ✓ too short/long | ✓ some | ✓ some | ✓ partially relevant |
| 3 | ✓ informative, apt | ✓ relevant parts | ✓ many | ✓ many | ✓ mostly adequate |
| 4 | ✓ brief but accurate, | ✓ accurate, conclusive, | ✓ + improvements | ✓ fully | ✓ good |

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

REVIEWER

QUESTIONS ASKED

NOTES:

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

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

REVIEWER

ANSWERS TO JURY

NOTES:

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

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

REVIEWER

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

NOTES:

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

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

REVIEWER

SCORESHEET

stage: 2
 reporter: Sophie
 opponent: Azerbaijan
 fight (round no.): 5
 room: F
 problem no.: 14
 juror's name: OZAN SUN
 signature: *[Signature]*

REPORTER
Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 5 = 2.5 - 0.5 = 8$

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

NOTES:

| ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS | efficiency | relevant arguments/responses | scientific contribution | physics |
|--|--|------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 0 | avoided some questions | some | almost no contribution | only technical points cleared |
| 1 | cooperated well | many | interesting points | some scientific points cleared |
| 2 | answered directly | + data/theory | convincingly supported | discussed |
| 3 | efficient, productive | proved deep understanding | brought in new physics | discussed |
| 4 | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions | to most questions | convincingly supported | discussed |

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

| QUESTIONS ASKED | time used | understanding of relevant topics | correct own options expressed | scientific relevance | own opinions presented | efficiency | priority |
|-----------------|--|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost nothing addressed | almost no options expressed | almost no scientific contribution of topics | almost no own opinions presented | almost no efficiency | almost no priority |
| 1 | some relevant, aimed at resolving | some main points | some | irrelevant | very little | to some extent | almost no |
| 2 | short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used | very little | some | irrelevant | some | leading or cooperative | almost no |
| 3 | almost all | all relevant points | many | good | many | quite efficient | reasonable |
| 4 | all & efficiently | practically all points | practically all | new crucial points | almost all suggestions | very efficient | very good |

NOTES:

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

REVIEWER
Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0.5 = 8$

| 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 | some relevant, sufficient number, could | partially relevant | almost no |
| 2 | resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp. | most time used, many unclear points | resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp. | mostly adequate | some |
| 3 | +short, apt and clear, well prioritized | time managed efficiently | time managed efficiently | fully | good |

NOTES:

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

SCORESHEET

stage: 2 reporter: _____ opponent: _____ reviewer: _____
 fight (round no.): 5 room: H problem no.: 14
 Juror's name: Hong Jun signature: [Signature]

1 + 4.5 + 0 - 0 = 5.5
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

REPORTER

| REPORT | | DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT | | | | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|--|--|------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 6 | shows physical insight | phenomenon | theory/model | relevant experiments | comparison between theory and experiment | own contribution | task fulfillment | scientific contribution | relevant arguments/responses | efficiency | almost no, chaotic | avoided some questions | cooperated well | answered directly | convincingly supported to most questions | efficient, productive | deep and comprehensible | detailed, complex, convincing analysis | well fitting, deviations analysed, reproducible | well fitting, deviations explained, conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical | greater extent than expected | | |
| 5 | detailed X | detailed X | quite detailed, correct | errors analysed | explained, conclusive | considerable experimental or theoretical | above average | discussed | convincingly supported | proved deep understanding | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| 4 | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation |
| 3 | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation |
| 2 | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation |
| 1 | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation |
| 0 | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation | explanation |

NOTES:

| QUESTIONS ASKED | | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER | | | | DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--|--------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|------------|---------------------|------|----------------|---------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|--|
| 0 | almost no, irrelevant | time used | understanding of relevant topics | correct own options expressed | no | practically all points | practically all | + improvement suggestions | very good | some relevant, aimed at resolving | short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used | some relevant, aimed at resolving | short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | some unclear points | almost no | almost nothing | no or irrelevant | almost no | some main points | some | to important topics | some | to most topics | reasonable | very good | new crucial points | almost all | all relevant points | many | to most topics | + improvement suggestions | very good | some relevant, aimed at resolving | short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used |
| 2 | some relevant, aimed at both rep. and opp. | very little | not all | some main points | some | to important topics | some | to important topics | some | to most topics | reasonable | very good | new crucial points | almost all | all relevant points | many | to most topics | + improvement suggestions | very good | some relevant, aimed at resolving | short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used |
| 3 | resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp. | almost all | almost all | some main points | some | to important topics | some | to important topics | some | to most topics | reasonable | very good | new crucial points | almost all | all relevant points | many | to most topics | + improvement suggestions | very good | some relevant, aimed at resolving | short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used |
| 4 | time managed efficiently | all & efficiently | all & efficiently | some main points | some | to important topics | some | to important topics | some | to most topics | reasonable | very good | new crucial points | almost all | all relevant points | many | to most topics | + improvement suggestions | very good | some relevant, aimed at resolving | short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used |

OPONENT

1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1 - 0 = 4
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

NOTES:

| QUESTIONS ASKED | | REVIEW OF REPORT | | | | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION | | | | ANSWERS TO JURY | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|--------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------|------------|-----------------|-----------|------------------|----------------|------|-----------------|------|------------------|----------------|------|-----------------|------|------------------|----------------|------|-----------------|
| 0 | too few, mostly irrelevant | report summary & understanding | discussion analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | |
| 1 | clear things out | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | no | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | |
| 2 | most time used, many unclear points | good | too short/long | some | partially relevant | almost no | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | almost no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | |
| 3 | +short, apt and clear, well prioritized | detailed, complex | relevant parts | many | mostly adequate | some | informative, apt | relevant parts | many | mostly adequate | some | informative, apt | relevant parts | many | mostly adequate | some | informative, apt | relevant parts | many | mostly adequate | some | informative, apt | relevant parts | many | mostly adequate |

REVIEWER

1 + 0.5 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 5.5
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 11
 reporter: SUGRORE
 opponent: AZERBAIJAN
 fight (round no.): 5
 room: F
 problem no.: 14
 reviewer: GERMAN
 juror's name: VICTOR PATRICKSON
 signature: [Signature]

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

REPORT

NOTES:

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT 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

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | almost no | almost no | almost no | almost no | almost no |
| 1 | very little | very little | very little | very little | very little | very little | very little |
| 2 | some | some | some | some | some | some | some |
| 3 | partial | average | some correct | many correct | many correct | many correct | many correct |
| 4 | good | good | many | many | many | many | many |

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------------|----------------|
| 0 | report summary & understanding | discussion analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
| 1 | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | no |
| 2 | partial | too short/long | some | partially relevant | almost no |
| 3 | good | relevant parts | many | mostly adequate | some |

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 0 | speech summary | discussion analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
| 1 | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | no |
| 2 | informative, apt | relevant parts | many | mostly adequate | some |
| 3 | brief but accurate | conclusive, accurate, + improvements | many | mostly adequate | some |

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

NOTES:

Juror's name: **SCHWEDLITZ**
 Signature: *Schweditz*

Stage: **2**
 reporter: **SINGAPORE**
 opponent: **GERBAIDAU**
 reviewer: **GERMANY**
 room: **F**
 fight (round no.): **5**
 problem no.: **14**

SCORESHEET

REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 5 + 3 - 0 = 9

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

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

NOTES: *Skater frequency is variable; - how noticeable?*
ventured off all cases: rolling, flicker, skipping, hand loss of contact

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

| QUESTIONS ASKED | almost no, irrelevant | some relevant, aimed at resolving | some unclear points | short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| 0 | almost no | almost nothing | very little | almost no |
| 1 | some main points | few | some | some |
| 2 | all relevant points | many | partial | average |
| 3 | almost all | to most topics | good | many |
| 4 | efficiently | practically all points | practically all | + improvement |

| DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER | efficiency | own opinions | relevance | scientific contribution of topics presented |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------|------------|---|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | almost no | almost no |
| 1 | to some extent | some | little | irrelevant |
| 2 | reading or cooperative | some correct | average | some |
| 3 | quite efficient | many correct | good | many |
| 4 | very efficient | + improvement | almost all | almost all |

NOTES: *no conclusions out the speed, however some interesting points extracted*

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

| QUESTIONS ASKED | 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. | +short, apt and clear, well prioritized | time managed efficiently |
|-----------------|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| 0 | too few, mostly irrelevant | almost no | poor | almost no | partial | poor | poor |
| 1 | some relevant, sufficient number, could | some relevant, sufficient number, could | clear things out | almost no | partially relevant | poor | poor |
| 2 | most time used, many unclear points | resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp. | most time used, many unclear points | some | partially relevant | too short/long | too short/long |
| 3 | +short, apt and clear, well prioritized | time managed efficiently | +short, apt and clear, well prioritized | good | mostly adequate | brief but accurate, apt | brief but accurate, apt |

| REVIEW OF REPORT | report summary & understanding | discussion analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | too few | irrelevant | no |
| 1 | poor | almost no | some | irrelevant | almost no |
| 2 | good | relevant parts | many | mostly adequate | some |
| 3 | detailed, complex | accurate, conclusive | + improvement | fully | good |

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

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 5 room: F problem no.: 02 attack juror's name: Tatyana G. S. signature: TGS

reporter: GERMANY (LAWYARD) reviewer: AZERBAIJAN (FIRED)

Start from 1 and add/subtract $1 + 4.8 + 3.0 - 0 = 8.8$

REPORT

NOTES: 4.3

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|-------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----|
| phenomenon | explanation | almost no | some | fair | good | detailed | demonstrative | shows physical insight | 4.3 |
| relevant | theory/model | almost no | some | fair | good | quite detailed, | correct | deep and comprehensible, | 4.3 |
| comparison between | theory and experiment | no/almost no | some | not well fitting | well performed, | + results explained | + errors analysed | detailed | 4.3 |
| own contribution | relevant | others' data, incorrectly cited | some | some own input | sufficient number, | + theory limits | explained, conclusive | deep and comprehensive, | 4.3 |
| task fulfillment | contribution | misunderstood | partly | interesting | debatable | qualitatively analysed | well fitting, deviations | completely testable | 4.3 |
| | scientific | contribution | almost no | only technical | points cleared | discussed | convincing analysis | convincing analysis | 4.3 |
| | relevance | own opinions | very little | some scientific | points cleared | interesting points | + reproducible, | convincing analysis | 4.3 |
| | efficiency | efficiency | almost no | some | many | + data/theory | proved deep | proved deep | 4.3 |
| | priority | priority | almost no | avoided some | questions | answered directly | productive | productive | 4.3 |

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

concise and correct or no questions asked

some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

4.2

4.0

3.5

2.5

3.0

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

NOTES: 2

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| time used | almost no | very little | almost no | no | almost no | some main points | some main points | some relevant, aimed at resolving | 0 |
| understanding of | almost no | very little | almost no | no | almost no | no or irrelevant | no or irrelevant | some unclear points | 1 |
| relevant topics | correct own | correct own | correct own | correct own | correct own | relevant topics | relevant topics | short allowing short answers, | 2 |
| options expressed | options expressed | options expressed | options expressed | options expressed | options expressed | addressed | addressed | prioritized, all time used | 2 |
| contribution of topics | contribution of topics | contribution of topics | contribution of topics | contribution of topics | contribution of topics | presented | presented | almost no, irrelevant | 0 |
| scientific | scientific | scientific | scientific | scientific | scientific | relevant | relevant | some relevant, aimed at resolving | 1 |
| relevance | relevance | relevance | relevance | relevance | relevance | own opinions | own opinions | some unclear points | 1 |
| own opinions | own opinions | own opinions | own opinions | own opinions | own opinions | presented | presented | short allowing short answers, | 2 |
| efficiency | efficiency | efficiency | efficiency | efficiency | efficiency | efficiency | efficiency | prioritized, all time used | 2 |
| priority | priority | priority | priority | priority | priority | priority | priority | almost no, irrelevant | 0 |

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

concise and correct or no questions asked

some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

4.0

3.2

3.0

3.2

4.0

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract $1 + 4.5 + 3.4 + 3.0 - 0 = 9.9$

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

NOTES: 1

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| time used | almost no | very little | almost no | no | almost no | some main points | some main points | some relevant, aimed at resolving | 0 |
| understanding of | almost no | very little | almost no | no | almost no | no or irrelevant | no or irrelevant | some unclear points | 1 |
| relevant topics | correct own | correct own | correct own | correct own | correct own | relevant topics | relevant topics | short allowing short answers, | 2 |
| options expressed | options expressed | options expressed | options expressed | options expressed | options expressed | addressed | addressed | prioritized, all time used | 2 |
| contribution of topics | contribution of topics | contribution of topics | contribution of topics | contribution of topics | contribution of topics | presented | presented | almost no, irrelevant | 0 |
| scientific | scientific | scientific | scientific | scientific | scientific | relevant | relevant | some relevant, aimed at resolving | 1 |
| relevance | relevance | relevance | relevance | relevance | relevance | own opinions | own opinions | some unclear points | 1 |
| own opinions | own opinions | own opinions | own opinions | own opinions | own opinions | presented | presented | short allowing short answers, | 2 |
| efficiency | efficiency | efficiency | efficiency | efficiency | efficiency | efficiency | efficiency | prioritized, all time used | 2 |
| priority | priority | priority | priority | priority | priority | priority | priority | almost no, irrelevant | 0 |

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

concise and correct or no questions asked

some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

4.0

3.2

3.0

3.2

4.0

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract $1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 3.0$

REVIEW OF REPORT

NOTES: 1

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| report summary & understanding | poor | poor | almost no | almost no | almost no | poor | poor | clear things out | 1 |
| discussion analysis | poor | poor | almost no | almost no | almost no | poor | poor | some relevant, sufficient number, could | 0 |
| own opinions | too few | too few | too few | too few | too few | too few | too few | too few, mostly irrelevant | 0 |
| pros & cons | irrelevant | irrelevant | irrelevant | irrelevant | irrelevant | irrelevant | irrelevant | most time used, many unclear points | 2 |
| priority | priority | priority | priority | priority | priority | priority | priority | resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp. | 2 |
| speech summary | summary | summary | summary | summary | summary | summary | summary | most time used, many unclear points | 2 |
| discussion analysis | discussion analysis | discussion analysis | discussion analysis | discussion analysis | discussion analysis | discussion analysis | discussion analysis | clear things out | 1 |
| own opinions | own opinions | own opinions | own opinions | own opinions | own opinions | own opinions | own opinions | some relevant, sufficient number, could | 0 |
| pros & cons | pros & cons | pros & cons | pros & cons | pros & cons | pros & cons | pros & cons | pros & cons | too few, mostly irrelevant | 0 |
| priority | priority | priority | priority | priority | priority | priority | priority | most time used, many unclear points | 2 |
| brief but accurate | brief but accurate | brief but accurate | brief but accurate | brief but accurate | brief but accurate | brief but accurate | brief but accurate | resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp. | 2 |
| conclusive, accurate, + improvements | conclusive, accurate, + improvements | conclusive, accurate, + improvements | conclusive, accurate, + improvements | conclusive, accurate, + improvements | conclusive, accurate, + improvements | conclusive, accurate, + improvements | conclusive, accurate, + improvements | most time used, many unclear points | 2 |
| fully | fully | fully | fully | fully | fully | fully | fully | clear things out | 1 |
| good | good | good | good | good | good | good | good | some relevant, sufficient number, could | 0 |

ANSWERS TO JURY

concise and correct or no questions asked

some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

4.0

3.2

3.0

3.2

4.0

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract $1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 3.0$

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER
Start from 1 and add/subtract
1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 6

stage: /
reporter: /
opponent: /
room: H
problem no.: 2
juror's name: Hong Jun
signature: [Signature]

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

| DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT | relevant arguments/responses | scientific contribution | proven deep understanding | productivity |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| 0 | too few | almost no | only technical | avoided some |
| 1 | some | some | many | cooperated well |
| 2 | many | many | many | cooperated well |
| 3 | + data/theory | interesting points | convincingly supported | answered directly |
| 4 | proved deep understanding | brought in new physics | productivity | efficient, productive |

NOTES:

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

| QUESTIONS ASKED | almost no, irrelevant | some relevant, aimed at resolving | short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | almost no |
| 1 | very little | some main points | some unclear points |
| 2 | not all | main points | some relevant, aimed at resolving |
| 3 | almost all | all relevant points | short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used |
| 4 | all & efficiently | practically all points | |

| DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER | scientific relevance | own opinions presented | efficiency | priority |
|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| 0 | almost no | irrelevant | very little | almost no |
| 1 | little | some | to some extent | almost no |
| 2 | partial | average | some correct | some |
| 3 | good | many | many correct | quite efficient |
| 4 | new crucial points | almost all | + suggestions | very efficient |

NOTES:

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

| QUESTIONS ASKED | 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. | +short, apt and clear, well prioritized | time managed efficiently |
|-----------------|--|---|------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| 0 | too few, mostly irrelevant <td>some relevant, sufficient number, could</td> <td>clear things out</td> <td>most time used, many unclear points</td> <td>resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.</td> <td>+short, apt and clear, well prioritized</td> <td>time managed efficiently</td> | some relevant, sufficient number, could | clear things out | most time used, many unclear points | resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp. | +short, apt and clear, well prioritized | time managed efficiently |
| 1 | poor | almost no | too few | partial | too short/long | poor | poor |
| 2 | good | relevant parts | many | mostly adequate | informative, apt | adequate | adequate |
| 3 | detailed, complex | accurate, conclusive, + improvements | fully | adequate | accurate, conclusive, + improvements | adequate | adequate |

| REVIEW OF REPORT | report summary & understanding | discussion analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | priority |
|------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|-----------|
| 0 | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | no |
| 1 | partial | too short/long | some | partially relevant | almost no |
| 2 | good | relevant parts | many | mostly adequate | some |
| 3 | detailed, complex | accurate, conclusive, + improvements | fully | adequate | good |

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

NOTES:

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

SCORESHEET

stage: I reporter: GERMANY opponent: STANISLAV reviewer: AZERBAIJAN room: ± fight (round no.): 5

juror's name: VICTOR STANISLAV signature: [Signature] problem no.: 2

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

| DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT | scientific contribution | relevant arguments/responses | efficiency |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| 0 | almost no contribution | almost no arguments/responses | almost no, chaotic |
| 1 | only technical | some | avoided some questions |
| 2 | some scientific points cleared | many | operated well |
| 3 | interesting points | + data/theory | answered directly |
| 4 | brought in new physics | proved deep understanding | productive |

NOTES:

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

REPORTER

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

| OPPOSITION (SPEECH) | correct own opinion | relevant topics addressed | understanding of presentation | time used |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| 0 | no | almost no | no or irrelevant | almost no |
| 1 | some | some | few | very little |
| 2 | to important topics | some | main points | not all |
| 3 | to most topics | many | all relevant points | almost all |
| 4 | + improvement | practically all | practically all points | efficiently |

NOTES:

1 + 1 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 7
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

OPONENT

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

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

NOTES:

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

REVIEWER

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 --- almost no, chaotic
 1 --- avoided some questions
 2 --- operated well
 3 --- answered directly
 4 --- to most questions

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0 --- almost no, chaotic
 1 --- avoided some questions
 2 --- operated well
 3 --- answered directly
 4 --- to most questions

SCORESHEET

reporter: Emma reviewer: Ashley
 stage: 1 opponent: Suzanne
 fight (round no.): 5 room: I
 problem no.: 2

Juror's name: DIAN SW signature: _____

REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 5.5 + 2.5 - 0.5 = 8$

NOTES:

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT

| efficiency | relevant arguments/responses | scientific contribution | physics |
|------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 0 | almost no, chaotic | almost no | only technical |
| 1 | avoided some questions | some | points cleared |
| 2 | cooperated well | many | some scientific points cleared |
| 3 | answered directly | + data/theory | interesting points |
| 4 | efficient, productive | convincingly supported | brought in new physics |

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPONENT 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

OPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

 $1 + 2 + 3.5 + 3.5 - 0.5 = 9$

NOTES:

| QUESTIONS ASKED | time used | understanding of relevant topics | correct own options expressed | priority |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost nothing | almost no | no |
| 1 | very little | some main points | some | little |
| 2 | not all | all relevant points | to important topics | average |
| 3 | almost all | practically all points | to most topics | many correct |
| 4 | efficiently | practically all points | practically all | many correct |

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

| efficiency | scientific contribution of topics | relevance of topics presented | own options | efficiency |
|------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------------|
| 0 | almost no | irrelevant | very little | almost no |
| 1 | little | some | to some extent | some |
| 2 | partial | average | some correct | reading or cooperative |
| 3 | good | many | many correct | quite efficient |
| 4 | new (qual) points | almost all | + improvements | very efficient |

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

 $1 + 2 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 5$

QUESTIONS ASKED

| QUESTIONS ASKED | report summary & understanding | discussion analysis | own options | pros & cons | priority |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------|-----------|
| 0 | too few, mostly irrelevant | almost no | too few | irrelevant | no |
| 1 | clear things out | some relevant, aimed at resolving | some main points | some | almost no |
| 2 | resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp. | most time used, many unclear points | all relevant points | practically all | some |
| 3 | time managed efficiently | +short, apt and clear, well prioritized | practically all points | practically all | fully |

REVIEW OF REPORT

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

NOTES:



| Team | Stage 1 | | | Stage 2 | | | Stage 3 | | | Stage 4 | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------|---------|-----|-----|
| | GERMANY | SINGAPORE | AZERBAIJAN | SINGAPORE | AZERBAIJAN | GERMANY | AZERBAIJAN | GERMANY | SINGAPORE | Rep | Opp | Rev |
| Juror | Rep | Opp | Rev | Rep | Opp | Rev | Rep | Opp | Rev | | | |
| Martin Smedlitze | 6 | 9 | 4 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 7 | 7 | | | |
| Victor Pavesou | 6 | 7 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 7 | 8 | | | |
| Hong Jung | 6 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 7 | 8 | | | |
| Tatyana Grigorieva | 8 | 9 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 7 | 9 | | | |
| Diion Sun | 8 | 9 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 9 | | | |
| Acting Team Member | Raymond Mason | Wang Junlin | Fuad Imanon | RACHEL GUE RIVERA | Ginsack Yusifor | Raymond Mason | Ginsack Yusifor | Waleed El-Kisrawi | Li Kang Qiang | | | |
| Rejected Problems | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accepted Problem | 2 | | | 14 | | | | | | | | |

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