

SCORESHEET

stage: 3
reporter:

fight (round no.): 2
opponent:

room:
reviewer:

problem no.:

Juror's name: PLESCH
signature: [Signature]

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 0.5 - 0.5 = 3.5$$

| 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 average |
| 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 | 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:

Uchi + concise CQ = strong opponent -0.5 -0.2

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 3 - \square = 7$$

| 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

$$1 + 0.5 + 1 + 1 - \square = 3$$

| 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:

Vazv naposia :)

SCORESHEET

stage: III

fight (round no.): 2

room: J

problem no.: 5

Juror's name: A. Qualova

reporter: Taiwan

opponent: Germany

reviewer: Tuney

signature: [Signature]

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3.5 + 2.5 - 0.5 = 7$$

| 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 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or 0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, -1 <input type="checkbox"/> 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 | 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 | 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:

somewhat

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0.5 = 7.5 \sim 7$$

| 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 0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, -1 <input type="checkbox"/> 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 | reasonable | 1 little | some | some | some aspects fine | 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:

some interesting questions raised

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 3$$

| 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 0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, -1 <input type="checkbox"/> inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> 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 | + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently | 3 detailed, complex | fully adequate | accurate, conclusive | + improvement suggestions | good | 3 condensed and accurate | fully adequate | accurate, conclusive | + improvement suggestions | good | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |

NOTES:

"relevant param" T, CO2 concentr. bubble formation important.