

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: 4 room: A problem no.:

Juror's name & signature: *Jing Chen*

reporter: *Slovakia*

opponent: *Serbia*

reviewer: *New Zealand*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 3 - \square = 6$$

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	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	too few	poor	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 <input type="checkbox"/> only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some scientific points cleared	many	good	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points discussed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	+ data/theory <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some aspects efficient <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 <input type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics	convincingly supported proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> 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

$$1 + 2 + 2 + 2 - \square = 7$$

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 2.5 + 2.5 - \square = 8$$

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: 9 room: A problem no.: 1 Juror's name & signature: Tomasz Grewko
 reporter: Slovehir opponent: Sense reviewer: New Zealand

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 2 - 1 = 6$$

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	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
6						

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
 0 ___ ~~some~~ incorrect, inconclusive or too long
 -1 ___ deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
 -2 ___

NOTES:

9.0

2.0

-1

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 2.25 + 2 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

NOTES:

0.5

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
 ___ some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
 -1 ___ deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
 -2 ___

2.25

2

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 2 + 2 = 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 ___ too few, mostly irrelevant
 ___ some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points
 1 ___ many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp
 2 ___
 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

2

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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