

SCORESHEET

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 2
 reporter: Belarus opponent: Russia

room: E problem no.: 17
 reviewer: Australia

Juror's name: JOHN BALCOMBE
 signature: [Signature]

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1 + 15 - 0 = 4$

	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	<u>some</u>	<u>some</u>	<u>some</u>	<u>some</u>	review of sources, cited	<u>partly</u>
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	<u>some own input</u>	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
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			

	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	almost no	too few	poor
1	only technical points cleared	<u>some</u>	some aspects fine
2	<u>some scientific points cleared</u>	many	<u>good</u>
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
 $1 + 1 + 15 + 2 - 0 = 6$

	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

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

	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	<u>some</u>	some aspects fine	some
2	<u>partial</u>	average	some correct	<u>good</u>	<u>reasonable</u>
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

	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	<u>some</u>	some
2	<u>good</u>	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	<u>reasonable</u>
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

	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	<u>many</u>	<u>reasonable</u>
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:

juror's name: L. Grotzow
 signature: [Signature]

SCORESHEET

stage: 3
 reporter: A. Kudrutsar
 opponent: P. Lumsden
 reviewer: H. Ghomtola
 room: E
 problem no.: 17

Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 2 + 2 - 1 = 4$

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment
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 deviations	some own input	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
4	detailed	quite detailed,	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, concise	considerable experimental	some aspects
5	demonstrative	correct	errors analysed	well fitting, deviations	or theoretical	above average
6	deep and comprehensive	detailed, complex,	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	analysed, conclusive	and theoretical	than expected
	shows physical insight	completely testable				

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

NOTES:

Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 2 + 2 - 1 = 4$

OPONENT
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 1 = 5$

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

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7$

QUESTIONS ASKED	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	priority
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	good	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	fully adequate	+ improvement suggestions	good

REVIEW OF REPORT	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	priority
0	no	too few	poor	irrelevant	no
1	some	too short/long	partially relevant	some	some
2	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	fully	reasonable
3	good	condensed and accurate	adequate	adequate	good

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

NOTES: