

SCORESHEET

stage: 1
reporter: Romania

fight (round no.): SF4
opponent: Turkey

room: D
reviewer: China

problem no.: 7

Juror's name: Igor Timashechenko
signature: *[Signature]*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 1 - 0.5 = 3$$

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

$$1 + 1 + 1.6 + 1.2 - 0 = 5$$

| 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 0 almost nothing | no or irrelevant | very little | no | poor | 0 almost no | irrelevant | very little | poor | no | 0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> 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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 8$$

| 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 | 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 0 poor | irrelevant | almost no | too few | no | 0 poor | irrelevant | almost no | too few | no | 0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| 1 | 3 | 1 partial | partially relevant | too short/long | some | some | 1 too short/long | partially relevant | too short/long | some | some | |
| 2 | 4 | 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:

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 4
 reporter: ROMANIA opponent: TURKEY

room: D problem no.: 7
 reviewer: China

STANISLAU PALOS
 Juror's name:
 signature: RZ

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

| 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 | |
| 1 — some | some | some | some | review of sources, cited | partly | 1 — only technical points cleared | some | some aspects fine | |
| 2 — fair | fair | fair | not well fitting | some own input | average | 2 — some scientific points cleared | many | good | |
| 3 — good | good | well performed, sufficient number | deviations qualitatively analysed | + some interesting results | interesting solution | 3 — interesting points discussed | + data/theory convincingly supported | some aspects efficient | |
| 4 — detailed | quite detailed, correct | + results explained | + 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: No theoretical predictions!

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

| QUESTIONS ASKED | | OPPOSITION (SPEECH) | | | | | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER | | | | | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------------|
| | | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | own opinions presented | prioritisation | time management | scientific contribution | relevance of topics | own opinions presented | opponent's conduct of the discussion | prioritisation | |
| 0 — almost no, irrelevant | | almost nothing | no or irrelevant | very little | no | poor | 0 — almost no | irrelevant | very little | poor | no | |
| 1 — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report | | some main points | few | some | some | reasonable | 1 — little | some | some | some aspects fine | some | |
| 2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used | | main points | some | some correct | reasonable | fair | 2 — partial | average | some correct | good | reasonable | |
| | | all relevant points | many | many correct | fair | efficient | 3 — good | most | many correct | some aspects efficient | fair | |
| | | 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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 8$$

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

NOTES:

2.5

2.5