

# SCORESHEET

stage: 3  
reporter: Brazil

fight (round no.): 2  
opponent: Slovakia

room: 9  
reviewer: Pakistan

problem no.: 1

Juror's name: Jing Chen  
signature: Jing Chen

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
1 + 2.5 + 1.5 -  = 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 only technical points cleared <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some aspects fine <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
2 fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	not well fitting <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some own input	average <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 some scientific points cleared	many <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	good	
3 good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	+ some interesting results <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	interesting solution	3 interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4 detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	qualitatively analysed + theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
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:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract  
1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2.5 -  = 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"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	reasonable	1 little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 main points <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some correct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	reasonable	fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 partial <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	average <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some correct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	good	reasonable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
		3 all relevant points	many <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	many correct	fair	efficient	3 good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	most	many correct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some aspects efficient <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
		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 + 2 + 2.5 + 2.5 -  = 8

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"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	mostly adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	relevant parts <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	many <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	reasonable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 informative, apt <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	mostly adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	relevant parts <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	many <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	reasonable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
		3 detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	+ improvement suggestions <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3 condensed and accurate	fully adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	accurate, conclusive <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	+ improvement suggestions <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	good	

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

stage: 3  
reporter: Brazil

fight (round no.): 2  
opponent: Slovakia

room: 6  
reviewer: Pakistan

problem no.: 1

Juror's name: Tobias Repberg  
signature: Tobias Repberg

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
1 + 4 + 2 - 0 = 7

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 ___ concise and correct or no questions asked ___ -1 ___ some incorrect, inconclusive or too long ___ -2 ___ deeply incorrect or show 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 + 0.5 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 = 5

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 ___ concise and correct or no questions asked ___ -1 ___ some incorrect, inconclusive or too long ___ -2 ___ deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1	some main points	few	some	reasonable	1	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	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 + 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 ___ concise and correct 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	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	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES: