SCORESHEET

stage: 3 | fight (round no.): 2 | room: D | problem no.: | Juror's name: Vladimir Vesti c

reporter: Singapore | opponent: Czech | reviewer: Ukraine | signature:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 6 + 4 - 0 = 10

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
5						
6	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT 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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 — almost no, irrelevant

1 — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report

2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
1	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
2	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

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 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1 - 0 = 5

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

0 — concise and correct or no questions asked

-1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

-2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 3 | fight (round no.): 2 | room: D | problem no.: | Juror's name: Emi S.

reporter: SIN | opponent: Czech R. | reviewer: Ukr | signature: EGS.

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3+ + 2J - 0 = 7

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	0 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
4						
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
6	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT 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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 1,5 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

NOTES:

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
1	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
2	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7

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

NOTES:

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

SCORESHEET

stage: 3 | fight (round no.): 2 | room: D | problem no.: 5 | Juror's name: Zongqian Chen

reporter: Singapore | opponent: Czech | reviewer: Ukraine | signature: Zongqian Chen

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2 - 0 = 7

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
4	detailed	quite detailed,	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental	some aspects
5	demonstrative	correct	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	or theoretical	above average
6	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT 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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 almost no, irrelevant

1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report

2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
1	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
2	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

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 + 2 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 6

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

0 concise and correct or no questions asked

-1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 2 | fight (round no.): 3 | room: 2 | problem no.: 5 | Juror's name: Yu. Bashkatov

reporter: Singapore | opponent: Czech | reviewer: Ukraine | signature:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2,5 - [ ] = 8

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained, errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
5						
6	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT 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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,5 + 2 + 2 - [ ] = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 almost no, irrelevant

1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report

2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
1	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
2	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

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 + 2 + 1,5 + 1,5 - [ ] = 6

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

0 concise and correct or no questions asked

-1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 3 | fight (round no.): 2 | room: D | problem no.: 5 | Juror's name: Tomasz Gronkowski

reporter: Singapore | opponent: Czech | reviewer: Ukraine | signature: T. Gronkowski

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4,75 + 3 - [ ] = 9

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
4	detailed	quite detailed,	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental	some aspects
5	~~demonstrative~~	correct	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	or theoretical	~~above~~ average
6	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: 4,75

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

3,0

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT 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

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + ~~1,75~~ + ~~2,75~~ + 2 - [ ] = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

NOTES: 1,75

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	~~all~~ relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

2,75

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
1	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
2	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable
3	~~good~~	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

2

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + ~~1,75~~ + 1 - [ ] = 6

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

NOTES: 2

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

1,75

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

1,0

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

SCORESHEET

stage: 2 | fight (round no.): 2 | room: D | problem no.: 11 | Juror's name: Vladimir Velgic

reporter: Ukraine | opponent: Singapore | reviewer: Czech | signature:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2 - 0 = 7

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
5						
6	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT 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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 3 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 almost no, irrelevant

1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report

2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
1	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
2	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

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 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 7

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

0 concise and correct or no questions asked

-1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 2 | fight (round no.): 2 | room: D | problem no.: 11 | Juror's name: Eric S.

reporter: Uker | opponent: SIN | reviewer: Czech | signature: EGS

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 5

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
5						
6	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT 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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 3 + 2.5 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
1	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
2	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

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 + 1.5 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 6

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 2 | fight (round no.): 2 | room: D | problem no.: 11 | Juror's name: Zongqiang Chen

reporter: Ukraine | opponent: Singapore | reviewer: Czech | signature: Zong-Chen

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 2 - [ ] = 6

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
5						
6	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT 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: more equations

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 3 + 3 - 1 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
1	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
2	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

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: chose

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 2 | fight (round no.): 2 | room: 2 | problem no.: 11 | Juror's name: Yu. Bashkatov

reporter: Ukraine | opponent: Singapore | reviewer: Czech | signature:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3,5 + 2 - [ ] = 6

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good √	good √	well performed, √ sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results √	interesting solution √
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive √	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
5						
6	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT 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:

+ time.
present. −

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,5 + 2,5 + 2,5 - [ ] = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable √	fair
3	all relevant points √	many √	many correct √	fair √	efficient √
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
1	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
2	partial	average √	some correct √	good √	reasonable
3	good √	most √	many correct √	some aspects efficient	fair √
4	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

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 + 2,5 + 2 + 2 - [ ] = 7

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	good √	mostly adequate √	relevant parts √	many √	reasonable √
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some √	some
2	informative, apt √	mostly adequate √	relevant parts √	many √	reasonable √
3	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 2 | fight (round no.): 2 | room: D | problem no.: 11 | Juror's name: Tomasz Grenyko

reporter: Ukraine | opponent: Singapore | reviewer: Czech | signature: T. Grenyko

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 1,75 - [ ] = 6

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
4						
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
6	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: 3

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

1,75

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT 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

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1,75 + 2,75 - [ ] = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

NOTES: 1

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

2,75

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
1	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
2	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

2,80

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2,5 + 2 + 1,5 - [ ] = 7

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

NOTES: 2,5

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

2

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

1,25

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

SCORESHEET

stage: | fight (round no.): | room: D | problem no.: | Juror's name: Vladimir Vetić

reporter: Czech | opponent: Ukraine | reviewer: Singapore | signature:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2 - 0 = 7

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
4						
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
6	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT 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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
1	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
2	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

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 + 3 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 9

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 | fight (round no.): 2 | room: D | problem no.: 6 | Juror's name: Eric Scherfenberg

reporter: Czech Rep. | opponent: Ukr. | reviewer: Singapore | signature: EGS

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 5

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
5						
6	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT 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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
1	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
2	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

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 + 2 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 6

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 | fight (round no.): 2 | room: D | problem no.: 6 | Juror's name: zongqiang chen

reporter: Czech | opponent: Ukraine | reviewer: Singapor | signature: Zong-Chen

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 fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting ~~solution~~
4	detailed	quite detailed,	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental	some aspects
5	demonstrative	correct	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	or theoretical	above average
6	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT 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: friction. Boundary. param

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract: 1 + 1 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
1	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
2	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

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 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: time make noise, not well team work PPT

SCORESHEET

stage: 2 | fight (round no.): 1 | room: D | problem no.: 6 | Juror's name: Yu. Bashkatov

reporter: Czech | opponent: Ukraine | reviewer: Singapure | signature:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3,5 + 2 - [ ] = 7

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3 ✓	good ✓	good ✓	well performed, sufficient number ✓	deviations qualitatively analysed ✓	+ some interesting results ✓	interesting solution ✓
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
5						
6	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT 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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 + 2,5 - [ ] = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 almost no, irrelevant

1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report

2 ✓ + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points ✓	some ✓	some correct ✓	reasonable ✓	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient ✓
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
1	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
2	partial	average	some correct	good ✓	reasonable ✓
3	good ✓	most ✓	many correct ✓	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

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 + 3 + 2,5 + 3 - [ ] = 8

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	good	mostly adequate ✓	relevant parts ✓	many ✓	reasonable ✓
3	detailed, complex ✓	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	informative, apt ✓	mostly adequate ✓	relevant parts ✓	many ✓	reasonable ✓
3	condensed and accurate ✓	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

0 concise and correct or no questions asked

-1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 | fight (round no.): 2 | room: D | problem no.: 6 | Juror's name: Tomasz Grenyks

reporter: Czech | opponent: Ukraine | reviewer: Singapure | signature: T. Grenyks

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2 - [ ] = 7

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
4	detailed	quite detailed,	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental	some aspects
5	demonstrative	correct	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	or theoretical	above average
6	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: 4.

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

2

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT 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

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - [ ] = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 almost no, irrelevant

1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report

2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

NOTES: 1

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

2

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
1	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
2	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

2

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2,75 + 2 + 1,75 - [ ] = 7

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

NOTES: 2,75

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	good	mostly adequate, relevant parts		many	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

2

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

1,75

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

0 concise and correct or no questions asked

-1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

IYPTC 2018 . D Fight Assistants: Xingzuo Li , Yanran Lyu , Wei Li .

	Stage 1			Stage 2			Stage 3			Stage 4		
Team	Czech	Ukraine	Singapore	Ukraine	Singapore	Czech	Singapore	Czech	Ukraine			
Juror	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev
Tomasz Greczyło	7	6	7	6	8	7	9	8	6			
Yury Bashkatov	7	7	8	6	7	7	8	6	6			
Zongqiang Chen	6	7	6	6	8	7	7	7	6			
Eric Schertenleib	5	5	6	5	8	6	7	6	7			
Vladimir Vejjič	7	5	9	7	8	7	10	7	5			
Acting Team Member	Jakub Domes	Hryhorii Ovcharenko	Russell Yang	Hryhorii Ovcharenko	Xinghong Fu	Pavel Štěpánek	Liu Haixuan	Pavel Štěpánek	Svitlana Hrynchenko			
Chosen Problem	6 Ring Oiler			11 Azimuthal-Radial Pendulum			5 Drinking Straw					