

SCORESHEET
 stage: 3 USA
 reporter: USA
 fight (round no.): 2
 opponent: Chile
 room: H
 problem no.: 4
 juror's name: MATEV
 reviewer: Romanq Herson's form: signature: Madu Madu

REPORT

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

4	shows physical insight	completely testable	convincing analysis	analysed, conclusive	and theoretical	than expected
3	detailed	detailed, complex, reproducible, errors analysed	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental	some aspects
2	good	good	sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
1	fair	fair	well performed, fair	deviations not well fitting	some own input	average
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

4	deep and comprehensive	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	scientific contribution	task fulfillment
3	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits	discussed or theoretical	considerable experimental
2	good	good	sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
1	fair	fair	well performed, fair	deviations not well fitting	some own input	average
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

4	deep and comprehensive	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	scientific contribution	task fulfillment
3	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits	discussed or theoretical	considerable experimental
2	good	good	sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
1	fair	fair	well performed, fair	deviations not well fitting	some own input	average
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

4	deep and comprehensive	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	scientific contribution	task fulfillment
3	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits	discussed or theoretical	considerable experimental
2	good	good	sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
1	fair	fair	well performed, fair	deviations not well fitting	some own input	average
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

4	deep and comprehensive	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	scientific contribution	task fulfillment
3	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits	discussed or theoretical	considerable experimental
2	good	good	sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
1	fair	fair	well performed, fair	deviations not well fitting	some own input	average
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

NOTES: 3-reject; 5-reject; Rep: Katherine Baker

OPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.4 + 1.8 = 4.6 (5)

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

4	practically all points	practically all	practically all	practically all	all time used +	new crucial points
3	all relevant points	many	many	many	efficient	good
2	main points	some correct	some correct	reasonable	fair	partial
1	some main points	few	some	reasonable	reasonable	little
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	almost no

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
 3 all relevant points
 4 practically all points

NOTES: opp: Victor Figueira

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.8 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0.2 = 4.6 (5)

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS


3	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	practically all points	practically all	practically all	all time used +	new crucial points
2	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	many	many	many	efficient	good
1	no questions asked	some main points	few	some	reasonable	little
0	concise and correct or no questions asked	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	poor	almost no

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: Rev: Tomica Djanaj

SCORESHEET

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 2 room: H problem no.: 354 Juror's name: Vera MARCHENKO
 reporter: USA opponent: Chile reviewer: Romana
Katherine Baker Victoria Fernandez Diana Iovica signature: 

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

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no/ almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> others' data, incorrectly cited	0 <input type="checkbox"/> misunderstood	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> review of sources, cited	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partly	1 <input type="checkbox"/> only technical points cleared	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> not well fitting	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some own input	2 <input type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some scientific points cleared	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> well performed, sufficient number	3 <input type="checkbox"/> deviations qualitatively analysed	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + some interesting results	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points discussed	3 <input type="checkbox"/> + data/theory convincingly supported	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	4 <input type="checkbox"/> quite detailed, correct	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + results explained errors analysed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental or theoretical	4 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects above average	4 <input type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics	4 <input type="checkbox"/> proved deep understanding	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	5 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex, completely testable	5 <input type="checkbox"/> + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 <input type="checkbox"/> well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 <input type="checkbox"/> considerable experimental and theoretical	5 <input type="checkbox"/> greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + 1 + 2 - 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 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no, irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost nothing	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no or irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> very little	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> very little	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some main points	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/> little	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/> main points	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partial	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	
	3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	3 <input type="checkbox"/> efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> most	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	
	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all points	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + all time used	4 <input type="checkbox"/> new crucial point(s)	4 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant discussed	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 4

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

NOTES: