

SCORESHEET

stage: 3
reporter: Austria

fight (round no.): 4
opponent: Bulgaria

room: C
reviewer: USA

problem no.: 14

Juror's name: Bylund
signature:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4.2 + 1.5 - 0 = 6 \quad (5.7)$$

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 <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 type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -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	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	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	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
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	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

$$1 + 0.5 + 1 + 1.5 - 0 = 4 \quad (4.0)$$

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 type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -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 type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used		2 <input type="checkbox"/> main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	
		3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
		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

$$1 + 0.1 + 1.5 + 1.3 - 0 = 5 \quad (4.8)$$

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 4 fight (round no.): 3
 reporter: Austria opponent: Bulgaria

room: C problem no.: 14
 reviewer: USA

Juror's name: Gideon Choo
 signature: CSY

REPORTER 3

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + \cancel{2.5} + 2.5 - 0 = 7$

mind up

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 — almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 — almost no	too few	poor	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked 1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 — some	some	some	some	review of sources cited	partly	1 — only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	
2 — fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some of <u>2.5</u>	average	2 — some scientific points cleared	<u>2.5</u>	<u>2.5</u>	
3 — good	good <u>3</u>	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed <u>2.5</u>	+ some interesting results	interesting solution <u>2</u>	3 — interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4 — detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 — brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
5 — demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1 - 0 = 5$

mind up

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 — almost no, irrelevant	1 — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	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 —	1 —	0 — almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	0 — almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked 1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 —	2 —	1 — some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 — little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	
2 —	3 —	2 — main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 — partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	
3 —	4 —	3 — all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 — good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
4 —		4 — practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 — new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

3.00 mins

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 2 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 5$

need to go deeper in explaining why you agree/disagree

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant	1 — some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	
0 —	1 —	0 — poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 — poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked 1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 —	2 —	1 — partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 — too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	
2 —	3 —	2 — good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2 — informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	
3 —		3 — detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3 — condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES: