

NOTES:
 - physical or simple problem?
 - energy transfer - how/why?
 - 4 degrees of freedom
 - why lift?

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

1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED		DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					DISCUSSION WITH OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY	
4	practically all points	4	practically all	+ improvements	suggestions	very good	4	new crucial point(s)	all relevant	+ improvements	suggestions	overall efficient	very good
3	all relevant points	3	many	many correct	reasonable	fair	3	good	most	many correct	some aspects correct	some aspects efficient	fair
2	main points	2	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	reasonable
1	some main points	1	few	some	reasonable	reasonable	1	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	some incorrect, no questions asked
0	almost nothing	0	no or irrelevant	very little	poor	poor	0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	poor	no
			understanding of relevant topics	own options	presented	priority	time	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	presented	of the discussion	opponent's conduct	priority

1 + 1 + 2 + 2 = 6

REPORT		DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT					DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT					ANSWERS TO JURY	
6	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	6	theory/model	relevant experiments	theory and experiment	comparison between	own contribution	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct	at the discussion	poor	poor
5	detailed, demonstrative	5	quite detailed, correct	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	+ theory limits	considerable experimental	above average	discussed	convincingly supported	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	efficient
4	good	4	good	sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	average	only technical	some	some aspects fine	some aspects fine	some
3	fair	3	well performed, fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	partly	almost no	almost no	too few	too few	too few	too few
2	some	2	some	some	review of sources, cited	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	misunderstood	misunderstood	misunderstood	misunderstood	misunderstood	misunderstood
1	almost no	1	almost no	almost no	no/ almost no	no/ almost no	no/ almost no	no/ almost no	no/ almost no	no/ almost no	no/ almost no	no/ almost no	no/ almost no
0	almost no	0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no
	phenomenon explanation		theory/model	experiments	theory and experiment	comparison between	own contribution	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct	at the discussion	poor	poor

1 + 2 + 2 = 5

SCORESHEET

stage: 1
 reporter: VSA
 opponent: CHM
 fight (round no.): 1
 room: G
 problem no.: 11
 juror's name: Alexander Kovic
 signature: [Signature]
 reviewer: [Signature]

juror's name: Alexander Kovic

signature: [Signature]

problem no.: 11

room: G

fight (round no.): 1

opponent: CHM

reporter: VSA

stage: 1

1 + 2 + 2 = 5

SCORESHEET

stage: 1
reporter: USA

fight (round no.): 1
opponent: China

room: G problem no.: 11
reviewer: Thailand

Juror's name: PAVEL KROKOVNY
signature:

REPORTER 1.5 Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 4$$

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 no questions asked 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 <input type="checkbox"/> -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <u>1.5</u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> not well fitting	some own input	average	1 some scientific points cleared	many	good	
3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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	3 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

$$1 + 1.5 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 7$$

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 <input type="checkbox"/> -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + 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		3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many correct	fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> efficient	3 good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
4		4 practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

$$1 + 2 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 6$$

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 <input type="checkbox"/> -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	1 <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + 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: