

# SCORESHEET

stage: 2

fight (round no.): 1

room: D

problem no.: 15

Juror's name: VICTOR PAUNESCU  
signature: *[Signature]*

reporter: CHINESE TAPEI

opponent: SERBIA

reviewer: AUSTRALIA

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 2 - \square = 5$$

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	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	too few	poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 <input type="checkbox"/> only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some scientific points cleared	many	good	
3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 <input type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 2 - \square = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS		
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation			
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	almost no, irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	
		3 <input type="checkbox"/>	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
		4 <input type="checkbox"/>	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 1 + 1.5 - \square = 5$$

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

NOTES:

**SCORESHEET**

stage: 4  
 fight (round no.): 1  
 reporter: CHINESE TRAPTOPPONENT: SELBY  
 reviewer: MSTR2L24  
 problem no.: 45  
 juror's name: LUCIA MIGNANIKOVA  
 signature: [Signature]

**REPORTER**  
 Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 $1 + 2 + 1/5 - 0/5 = 4$

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT				REPORT							
	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
no	some aspects fine	some	many	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	almost no	some	fair	well performed, sufficient number	good	detailed	deep and comprehensive
no questions asked	poor	too few	many	convincingly supported	efficient	almost no	some	fair	well performed, sufficient number	good	detailed	shows physical insight
concise and correct or	poor	too few	many	convincingly supported	efficient	almost no	some	fair	well performed, sufficient number	good	detailed	demonstrative
no questions asked	poor	too few	many	convincingly supported	efficient	almost no	some	fair	well performed, sufficient number	good	detailed	errors analysed
some incorrect,	poor	too few	many	convincingly supported	efficient	almost no	some	fair	well performed, sufficient number	good	detailed	+ results explained
inconclusive or too long	poor	too few	many	convincingly supported	efficient	almost no	some	fair	well performed, sufficient number	good	detailed	+ reproducible,
deeply incorrect or show	poor	too few	many	convincingly supported	efficient	almost no	some	fair	well performed, sufficient number	good	detailed	convincing analysis
deep misconceptions	poor	too few	many	convincingly supported	efficient	almost no	some	fair	well performed, sufficient number	good	detailed	completely testable

NOTES:

**OPONENT**  
 Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 $1 + 1/5 + 3 + 2 = 4$

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				OPPOSITION (SPEECH)				QUESTIONS ASKED					
	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3
no	poor	some	average	many correct	some aspects efficient	poor	reasonable	fair	efficient	all relevant points	practically all points	almost no, irrelevant	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used
no questions asked	poor	some	average	many correct	some aspects efficient	poor	reasonable	fair	efficient	all relevant points	practically all points	almost no, irrelevant	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used
concise and correct or	poor	some	average	many correct	some aspects efficient	poor	reasonable	fair	efficient	all relevant points	practically all points	almost no, irrelevant	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used
no questions asked	poor	some	average	many correct	some aspects efficient	poor	reasonable	fair	efficient	all relevant points	practically all points	almost no, irrelevant	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used
some incorrect,	poor	some	average	many correct	some aspects efficient	poor	reasonable	fair	efficient	all relevant points	practically all points	almost no, irrelevant	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used
inconclusive or too long	poor	some	average	many correct	some aspects efficient	poor	reasonable	fair	efficient	all relevant points	practically all points	almost no, irrelevant	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used
deeply incorrect or show	poor	some	average	many correct	some aspects efficient	poor	reasonable	fair	efficient	all relevant points	practically all points	almost no, irrelevant	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used
deep misconceptions	poor	some	average	many correct	some aspects efficient	poor	reasonable	fair	efficient	all relevant points	practically all points	almost no, irrelevant	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

NOTES:

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

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION				REVIEW OF REPORT				QUESTIONS ASKED				
	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	
no questions asked	poor	irrelevant	almost no	discussion analysis	own opinions	priority	summary	pros & cons	poor	irrelevant	almost no	report summary & understanding	too few, mostly irrelevant
no questions asked	poor	irrelevant	almost no	discussion analysis	own opinions	priority	summary	pros & cons	poor	irrelevant	almost no	report summary & understanding	too few, mostly irrelevant
concise and correct or	poor	irrelevant	almost no	discussion analysis	own opinions	priority	summary	pros & cons	poor	irrelevant	almost no	report summary & understanding	too few, mostly irrelevant
no questions asked	poor	irrelevant	almost no	discussion analysis	own opinions	priority	summary	pros & cons	poor	irrelevant	almost no	report summary & understanding	too few, mostly irrelevant
some incorrect,	poor	irrelevant	almost no	discussion analysis	own opinions	priority	summary	pros & cons	poor	irrelevant	almost no	report summary & understanding	too few, mostly irrelevant
inconclusive or too long	poor	irrelevant	almost no	discussion analysis	own opinions	priority	summary	pros & cons	poor	irrelevant	almost no	report summary & understanding	too few, mostly irrelevant
deeply incorrect or show	poor	irrelevant	almost no	discussion analysis	own opinions	priority	summary	pros & cons	poor	irrelevant	almost no	report summary & understanding	too few, mostly irrelevant
deep misconceptions	poor	irrelevant	almost no	discussion analysis	own opinions	priority	summary	pros & cons	poor	irrelevant	almost no	report summary & understanding	too few, mostly irrelevant

NOTES: