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 - [ ] = 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 X	fair X	fair X	not well fitting ✓	some own input X	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution X
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
5						
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

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 X	+ data/theory convincingly supported X	some aspects efficient X
4	brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

- 0 X 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 + 2 + 2 + 2 - [ ] = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 almost no, irrelevant
- 1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- 2 X + 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 X	some	reasonable
2	main points X	some	some correct X	reasonable	fair X
3	all relevant points	many X	many correct	fair X	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 X	good X	reasonable
3	good X	most X	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair X
4	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

- 0 X 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 + 2 + 2,5 + 2,5 - [ ] = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points
- 2 X 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 X	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable X
3	detailed, complex X	fully adequate X	accurate, conclusive X	+ improvement suggestions X	good X

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 X	relevant parts X	many	reasonable X
3	condensed and accurate X	fully adequate X	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions X	good X

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: 4 room: A problem no.: 1 Juror's name & signature: Tomasz Gregyto

reporter: Slovakia opponent: Serbia 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						
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: 4.0

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

2.0

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

-1

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0,5 + 2,25 + 2 - [ ] = 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

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

2,25

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

2

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2,5 + 2 + 2 - [ ] = 7

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

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: 4 room: A problem no.: 1 Juror's name & signature: Zongqiang Chen

reporter: Slovakia opponent: serbia reviewer: New Zealand

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 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

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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 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 + 2 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 8

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:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: IV room: A problem no.: 1 Juror's name & signature: A. Churikova

reporter: Slovakia opponent: Serbia reviewer: New Zealand

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.5 + 2 - 0 = 6.5 ~ 7

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	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained, errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
5	demonstrative					
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

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: nice setup, a little more optimization would be nice

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2.5 - 0 = 6.5 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 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6.5 ~ 7

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:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: 4 room: A problem no.: 1 Juror's name & signature: MCWATTERS ZVARA

reporter: Slovakia opponent: Serbia reviewer: New Zealand

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 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 X	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						
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

10 vs 20

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 X	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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 3 + 2.5 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 almost no, irrelevant
1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
2 X + 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 X	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 X	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 + 3.5 + 2.5 + 2 - 0 = 9

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 X + 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 X	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

REVIEW OF OPPONENT

	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 X	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:

Nice control of Q/A's

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: 2 room: 14 problem no.: 13 Juror's name & signature: Zongdong - Chen

reporter: New Zealand opponent: Canada reviewer: Slovakia.

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2 - 0 = 7

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						
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

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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 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 + 2 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7

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:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: 2 room: A problem no.: 13 . Juror's name & signature: Jing Chen

reporter: New Zealand opponent: Canada reviewer: Slovakia

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 2 - [ ] = 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 X	fair	not well fitting X	some own input	average
3	good X	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results X	interesting solution X
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained, errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
5						
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

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 X	many X	good X
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 X 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 + 2 + 2 + 2 - [ ] = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 — almost no, irrelevant
1 — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
2 X + 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 X	some	some correct X	reasonable	fair X
3	all relevant points	many X	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 X	some	some aspects fine	some
2	partial X	average X	some correct	good X	reasonable
3	good	most	many correct X	some aspects efficient	fair X
4	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0 X 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 + 2.5 + 2.5 - [ ] = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 — too few, mostly irrelevant
1 X 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 X	too short/long	some	some
2	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts X	many X	reasonable X
3	detailed, complex X	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good X

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 X	some X	some X
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate X	relevant parts	many X	reasonable
3	condensed and accurate X	fully adequate X	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: 2 room: A problem no.: 13 Juror's name & signature: Tomasz Gregyro

reporter: New Zealand opponent: Canada reviewer: Slovakia

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4,25 + 2,75 - [ ] = 8

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						
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

4,25

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

2,75

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 + 1,25 + 2,75 + 2 - [ ] = 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

1,25

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

2,75

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

2

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 + 1,5 + 2 + 2,25 - [ ] = 7

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

1,5

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

2,25

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

SCORESHEET

weigh this

fight (round no.): 4 stage: 2 room: A problem no.: 13 Juror's name & signature: McWATTERS, WANA

reporter: NEW ZEALAND opponent: CANADA reviewer: SLOVAKIA

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3½ + 3 - 0 = 8

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 X	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						
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

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 X	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 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 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

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 + 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 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

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 X	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 X	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:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: II room: problem no.: Juror's name & signature: A. Chmelikova

reporter: New Zealand opponent: Canada reviewer: Slovakia

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2.5 - 0 = 5.5 ~ 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

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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 3 + 2.5 - 0 = 8.5 ~ 8

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 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7.5 ~ 7

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:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: I room: A problem no.: 7 Juror's name & signature: Zongqiang Chen

reporter: Serbia opponent: New Zealand reviewer: Canada

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 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

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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 + 1 - 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

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 + 2 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7

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:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: 1 room: A problem no.: 7 Juror's name & signature: Ting Chen

reporter: Serbia opponent: New Zealand reviewer: Canada

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 2 - [ ] = 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 X
3	good X	good X	well performed, sufficient number X	deviations qualitatively analysed X	+ some interesting results X	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						
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

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 X
2	some scientific points cleared X	many X	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 X 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 + 1,5 + 2,5 - [ ] = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 almost no, irrelevant
- 1 X 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 X	few X	some X	some X	reasonable X
2	main points X	some X	some correct X	reasonable	fair X
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 X	some correct	good	reasonable X
3	good X	most	many correct X	some aspects efficient X	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

- 0 X 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 + 2,5 + 2,5 - [ ] = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 X 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 X	relevant parts	many	reasonable X
3	detailed complex X	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive X	+ 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 X	relevant parts	many	reasonable X
3	condensed and accurate X	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive X	+ improvement suggestions X	good X

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: 1 room: A problem no.: 7 Juror's name & signature: Tomasz Grecki

reporter: Serbia opponent: New Zealand reviewer: ~~T. Grecki~~ Canada

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2 - [ ] = 7

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
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: 4.0

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

2.25

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

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2,5 + 2,5 - [ ] = 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

NOTES: 1.0

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

2,5

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

2,5

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2,5 + 2,25 + 2,5 - [ ] = 9

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: 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

2,25

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

2,5

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

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: 1 room: A problem no.: Juror's name & signature: MCWATTERS

reporter: Serbia opponent: New Zealand reviewer: Canada

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 - 0 = 5

	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 X	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						
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

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 X	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: I am still unsure why it should be @ the angle it is?

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 almost no, irrelevant

1 X 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 X	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient + all time used
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	

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 X	good	mostly	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

like moments to plan

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 too few, mostly irrelevant

1 some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points

2 X 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 X	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 X	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:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: I room: A problem no.: Juror's name & signature: A. Chernikova

reporter: Serbia. opponent: New Zealand reviewer: Canada

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 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
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: not much comparison between theory / experiment.

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 = 5.5 ~ 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

NOTES:

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 5.5 ~ 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

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:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: 3 room: A problem no.: 15. Juror's name & signature: Zongqiangchen

reporter: Canada opponent: Slovakia reviewer: Serbia

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 3 - 0 = 7

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						
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

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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 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 + 2 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7

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:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: 3 room: A problem no.: 15 Juror's name & signature: Jing Chen

reporter: Canada opponent: Slovakia reviewer: Serbia

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2,5 + 2,5 - [ ] = 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 X	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good X	good	well performed, sufficient number X	deviations qualitatively analysed X	+ some interesting results X	interesting solution X
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
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

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 X	many X	good X
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 X 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 + 3 + 3 - [ ] = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 — almost no, irrelevant
1 X 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 X	many X	many correct	fair X	efficient X
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions X	very good X	+ 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 X	most	many correct X	some aspects efficient X	fair X
4	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed X	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0 X 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 + 3 + 2,5 - [ ] = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 — too few, mostly irrelevant
1 X 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 X	fully adequate X	accurate, conclusive X	+ improvement suggestions X	good X

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 X	many X	reasonable
3	condensed and accurate X	fully adequate X	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good X

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: 3 room: A problem no.: 15 Juror's name & signature: Tomasz Gregyto

reporter: Canada opponent: Slovakia reviewer: Serbia

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3,75 + 2,25 - [ ] = 7

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

3,75

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

2,25

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

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,25 + 3 + 3,75 - [ ] = 9

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

NOTES: 1,25

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

3.0

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

3,25

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2,25 + 1,5 + 1,5 - [ ] = 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

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:

"Bubbles"

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: 3 room: A problem no.: 15 Juror's name & signature: W. McWalt

reporter: Canada opponent: Slovakia reviewer: Serbia

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.5 + 0.5 - 0 = 7

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						
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

Practicality

# of Param

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:

Nice opponent challenge to par vs. Rupe Anzwell

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 3 + 2.5 - [ ] = 8

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

NOTES:

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

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 0.5 + 0.5 - 0 = 8

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:

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

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: III room: A problem no.: 15 Juror's name & signature: A. Chmikova

reporter: Canada. opponent: Slovakia reviewer: Serbia

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 2.5 - 0.5 = 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 deviations~~	some own input	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	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						
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

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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2.5 - 0 = 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~~ all relevant points	some many	some correct many correct	reasonable fair	~~fair~~ efficient
3					
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 + 1.5 + 2.0 + 2 - 0 = 6.5 ~ 7

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:

IYPTC 2018 . A Fight Assistants: Xingzuo Lee, Yanran Lyu, Wei Li

	Stage 1			Stage 2			Stage 3			Stage 4		
Team	Serbia	New Zealand	Canada	New Zealand	Canada	Slovakia	Canada	Slovakia	Serbia	Slovakia	Serbia	New Zealand
Juror	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev
Tomasz Grecyto	7	7	8	8	7	7	7	8	6	6	6	7
Jing Chen	6	6	7	6	7	7	6	8	7	6	7	8
Zongqiang Chen	6	6	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	7	8
Alexandra Churikova	5	6	6	6	8	7	6	7	7	7	7	7
William McWatters	5	7	7	8	6	6	7	8	8	6	8	8
Acting Team Member	Emilija Đorđjecvić	Finnegan Clapcott Messerli	Zony Cao	Luke Roeven	Zony Cao	Katarína Šamuová	~~Zhi~~ Zhi Yang Chen	Veronika Rečková	Aleksandra Petković	Ronald Doboš	Petar Petrašinović	Ensai August
Chosen Problem	7 conical piles			13 Weighing Time			15 ~~Invent Yourself~~ Blowing Bubbles			1 Invent Yourself		
REJECTED:	No rejection			No rejection			No rejection			No rejection		