

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 1 room: E problem no.: 17 Juror's name: L. C. Wright
 reporter: Switzerland opponent: Austria reviewer: Germany signature:

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

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 — almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 — almost no	too few	poor	0 — <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or <input type="checkbox"/> no questions asked 1 — <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, <input type="checkbox"/> inconclusive or too long -1 — <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, <input type="checkbox"/> inconclusive or too long -2 — <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show <input type="checkbox"/> deep misconceptions
1 — some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 — only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	
2 — fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 — some scientific points cleared	many	good	
3 — good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	3 — interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
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	overall efficient	
5 — deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 1.5 + 2.0 + 2 - 0 = 7$

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 — almost no, irrelevant		0 — almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	0 — almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	0 — <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or <input type="checkbox"/> no questions asked 1 — <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, <input type="checkbox"/> inconclusive or too long -1 — <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, <input type="checkbox"/> inconclusive or too long -2 — <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show <input type="checkbox"/> deep misconceptions
1 — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report		1 — some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 — little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	
2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used		2 — main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 — partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	
		3 — all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 — good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
		4 — practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 — new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 - 0 = 7$

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 — too few, mostly irrelevant		0 — poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 — poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 — <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or <input type="checkbox"/> no questions asked 1 — <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, <input type="checkbox"/> inconclusive or too long -1 — <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, <input type="checkbox"/> inconclusive or too long -2 — <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show <input type="checkbox"/> deep misconceptions
1 — contributed to clarify some unclear points		1 — partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 — too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	
2 — many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp		2 — good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2 — informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	
3 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently		3 — detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3 — condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 1
 reporter: Switzerland opponent: Austria

room: E problem no.: 17
 reviewer: Germany

Juror's name: Maizelis Z.
 signature: *[Signature]*

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 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 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	poor	0 <u>concise and correct</u> or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 some	<u>some</u>	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 only technical points cleared	<u>some</u>	some aspects fine	
2 <u>fair</u>	fair	fair	not well fitting	<u>some own input</u>	<u>average</u>	2 some scientific points cleared	many	good	
3 good	good	<u>well performed, sufficient number</u>	<u>deviations qualitatively analysed</u>	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	3 interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	<u>some aspects, efficient</u>	
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	overall efficient	
5 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + 2 + 1.6 - 0 = 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	almost no, irrelevant	0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	0 <u>concise and correct</u> or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
1	<u>relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report</u>	1	some main points	few	some	reasonable	1	little	<u>some</u>	some	some aspects fine	<u>some</u>	1		<u>some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</u>
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2	<u>main points</u>	<u>some</u>	<u>some correct</u>	reasonable	<u>fair</u>	2	<u>partial</u>	average	<u>some correct</u>	<u>good</u>	2		<u>reasonable</u>
3		3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	3		<u>fair</u>
4		4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	4		<u>very good</u>

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

NOTES: