

SCORESHEET

stage: 2

reporter: Sweden

fight (round no.): 1
opponent: Canada

room: C
reviewer: Korea

problem no.: 7

juror's name: Shanaei Wang
signature: Shanaei Wang

REPORTER
Start from 1 and add/subtract
1 + 4.2 + 2.6 - 0 = 8

7.8

REPORT

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

NOTES: 7.8

DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT

4	scientific contribution of relevance	own opinions presented	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	priority of time management
3	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	practically all + improvement suggestions	many correct	efficient
2	good	most	many correct	some correct	fair
1	partial	average	some correct	some correct	reasonable
0	almost no	irrelevant	no or irrelevant	very little	poor

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

4	overall efficient	some aspects efficient	very good
3	some aspects supported	some aspects efficient	fair
2	good	good	reasonable
1	some aspects fine	some aspects fine	some
0	poor	poor	no

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

OPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 - 3.8 = 8

208.1

NOTES: 7.8
0 almost no, irrelevant
1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

4	overall efficient	very good
3	some aspects supported	some aspects efficient
2	good	good
1	some aspects fine	some aspects fine
0	poor	poor

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.6 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 7

6.6

QUESTIONS ASKED

3	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good
2	used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
1	many unclear points resolved; most time contributed to clarify some unclear points	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
0	some relevant, sufficient number, too few, mostly irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no

REPORT summary & understanding

3	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discuss	analysis	own opinions	priority
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	conclusive	many	reasonable
1	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	irrelevant	almost no	no
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	no

speech summary

3	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	conclusive	suggestions	good	
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	conclusive	many	reasonable
1	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	irrelevant	almost no	no
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	no

discussion analysis

3	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	conclusive	suggestions	good	
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	conclusive	many	reasonable
1	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	irrelevant	almost no	no
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	no

own opinions

3	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	conclusive	suggestions	good	
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	conclusive	many	reasonable
1	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	irrelevant	almost no	no
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	no

priority

3	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	conclusive	suggestions	good	
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	conclusive	many	reasonable
1	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	irrelevant	almost no	no
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	no

QUESTIONS TO JURY

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

NOTES:

2.5

1.5

SCORESHEET

stage: 11
reporter: Sweden

fight (round no.): 1
opponent: Canada

room: C
reviewer: Korea

problem no.: 7
Piles

Juror's name: A. Kyuldjiev
signature: [Signature]

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
1 + 3 + 2 - = 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	
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	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
5 demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	errors analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				
6 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight		+ reproducible, convincing analysis							

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
1 + 1 + 22 + 22 - = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 almost no, irrelevant	1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	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	
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used		0 almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	0 almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	
		1 some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	
		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 + 23 + 25 + 22 - = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	1 some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	
2 many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp		0 poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	
3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently		1 partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	
		2 good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2 informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	
		3 detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3 condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES: