

SCORESHEET
 stage: 3
 reporter: SE
 fight (round no.): 1
 room: C
 reviewer: PL
 problem no.: 7
 Juror's name: Andrew Kishin
 signature: Kishin

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

REPORT

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT

reporter's conduct	relevant arguments/responses	scientific contribution	brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
0 poor	0 too few	0 almost no	0 only technical	0 too few	0 some aspects fine
1 some	1 some	1 points cleared	1 points cleared	1 some	1 some aspects fine
2 good	2 many	2 some scientific	2 interesting points	2 convincingly supported	2 good
3 some aspects	3 + data/theory	3 interesting points	3 discussed	3 convincingly supported	3 some aspects
4 overall efficient	4 overall efficient	4 brought in new physics	4 discussed	4 proved deep understanding	4 overall efficient

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

NOTES:

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

understanding of relevant topics	addressed presentation	own opinions	priority	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions	opponent's conduct	priority
0 almost no, irrelevant	0 almost nothing	0 very little	0 no	0 almost no	0 irrelevant	0 very little	0 poor	0 no
1 some main points	1 few	1 some	1 reasonable	1 little	1 average	1 some	1 some aspects fine	1 some
2 main points	2 some correct	2 reasonable	2 fair	2 partial	2 average	2 some correct	2 good	2 reasonable
3 all relevant points	3 many correct	3 many correct	3 fair	3 good	3 most	3 many correct	3 some aspects efficient	3 fair
4 practically all points	4 practically all	4 + improvement	4 very good	4 all relevant	4 all relevant	4 + improvement	4 overall efficient	4 very good

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

time management	priority	own opinions	analysis	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion	own opinions	priority
0 poor	0 no	0 very little	0 no	0 poor	0 irrelevant	0 almost no	0 poor	0 no
1 reasonable	1 some	1 some	1 some	1 poor	1 irrelevant	1 almost no	1 too few	1 no
2 fair	2 reasonable	2 some correct	2 fair	2 partial	2 average	2 some correct	2 good	2 reasonable
3 efficient	3 many correct	3 many correct	3 fair	3 good	3 most	3 many correct	3 some aspects efficient	3 fair
4 all time used	4 all time used	4 + improvement	4 very good	4 all relevant	4 all relevant	4 + improvement	4 overall efficient	4 very good

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 almost no, irrelevant
 1 unclear points in the report
 2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used
 3 all relevant points
 4 practically all points

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 15 + 15 - 1 = 30$

REVIEW OF REPORT

report summary	pros & cons	discussion	own opinions	priority
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	0 irrelevant	0 almost no	0 too few	0 no
1 some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	1 partially relevant	1 too short/long	1 some	1 some
2 many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	2 mostly adequate	2 informative, apt	2 many	2 reasonable
3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3 detailed, complex	3 fully	3 accurate, + improvements	3 good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech summary	pros & cons	discussion	own opinions	priority
0 poor	0 irrelevant	0 almost no	0 too few	0 no
1 poor	1 irrelevant	1 almost no	1 too few	1 no
2 informative, apt	2 mostly adequate	2 relevant parts	2 many	2 reasonable
3 condensed and accurate	3 fully	3 accurate, + improvements	3 good	3 good

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 too few, mostly irrelevant
 1 some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points
 2 many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp
 3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

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:

QUESTIONS ASKED	0	too few, mostly irrelevant	0	report summary & understanding	0	poor	0	irrelevant	0	almost no	0	too few	0	no questions asked	0	concise and correct or	0	no questions asked
	1	some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	1	pros & cons	1	poor	1	irrelevant	1	too short/long	1	poor	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	1	concise and correct or	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	2	good	2	mostly adequate	2	mostly adequate	2	mostly adequate	2	informative, apt	2	reasonable	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
3	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3	detailed, complex	3	fully	3	adequate	3	adequate	3	condensed and accurate	3	good	3	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	3	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	

REVIEWER
Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 = 4.5
4.5 + 4.2 = 8.7
8.7 - 3.7 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED	0	almost no, irrelevant	0	understanding of relevant topics	0	almost no	0	irrelevant	0	almost no	0	poor	0	no questions asked	0	concise and correct or	0	no questions asked
	1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1	presentation	1	very little	1	some	1	little	1	poor	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	1	concise and correct or	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2	main points	2	some	2	average	2	some correct	2	partial	2	reasonable	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
3		3	all relevant points	3	many	3	good	3	many correct	3	good	3	fair	3	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	3	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
4		4	practically all points	4	practically all	4	new crucial points	4	all relevant + suggestions	4	new crucial points	4	very good	4	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	4	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	

OPONENT
Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 = 5
5 + 2 = 7
7 - 0 = 7

REPORT	0	phenomenon explanation	0	almost no	0	some	0	almost no	0	almost no	0	poor	0	no questions asked	0	concise and correct or	0	no questions asked
	1	some	1	some	1	some	1	only technical	1	only technical	1	poor	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	1	concise and correct or	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	2	fair	2	fair	2	points cleared	2	points cleared	2	good	2	reasonable	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
3	good	3	good	3	good	3	some scientific	3	some scientific	3	good	3	some aspects	3	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	3	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
4	detailed	4	quite detailed	4	errors explained	4	interesting points	4	interesting points	4	some aspects	4	overall efficient	4	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	4	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
5	demonstrative	5	correct	5	convincing analysis	5	convincingly supported	5	convincingly supported	5	overall efficient	5	very good	5	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	5	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
6	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	6	detailed, complex, completely testable	6	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	6	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	6	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	6	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	6	very good	6	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	6	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	

REPORTER
Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2 = 7
7 - 0 = 7

SCORESHEET

stage: 3
reporter: Czech Republic
opponent: Sweden
fight (round no.): 1

room: Poland
reviewer: Igor Solisni

juror's name: T. J. J. J.
signature: X. X. X. X.

problem no.: 7

[Handwritten marks]