

# SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: 1 room: F problem no.: 4 Juror's name & signature: *Shashikant Pandey*  
 reporter: *Poland* opponent: *Georgia* reviewer: *Chinese Taipei*

**REPORTER** Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 6

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 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 -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 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 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 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 almost no, irrelevant	0 almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	0 almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	
	3 all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
	4 practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

**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
	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	0 poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	1 partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	
2 many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	2 good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2 informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	
3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3 detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3 condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: 1 room: F problem no.: 4  
 reporter: Poland

opponent: Georgia  
 Juror's name & signature: *Siu Eng Au - Ho*

reviewer: *Chunni Taipei*

REPORTER  
 Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 $1 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 7$

## REPORT

phenomenon explanation	almost no	theory/model	almost no	relevant experiments	too few	comparison between theory and experiment	no/almost no	own contribution	others' data, incorrectly cited	task fulfillment	misunderstood
good	fair	good	well performed, sufficient number, deviations	quite detailed, + results explained	+ some interesting results	well fitting	not well fitting	+ some interesting results	review of sources, cited	average	partly
detailed	demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	explained, errors analysed	qualitatively analysed	explained, conclusive	fair	considerable experimental	considerable experimental	interesting	some aspects
deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	correct	convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	+ theory limits	or theoretical	above average	greater extent	considerable experimental	and theoretical	discussed	than expected
6	5	4	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0

## NOTES:

scientific contribution	almost no	relevant arguments/responses	too few	reporter's conduct at the discussion	poor	scientific contribution of topics presented	very little	own opinions of the discussion	poor	opponent's conduct	some aspects fine	overall efficient	very good
only technical points cleared	some	some	some	some	some	average	some correct	some correct	some correct	many correct	some aspects efficient	overall efficient	very good
interesting points	discussed	convincingly supported	+ data/theory	many	good	discussed	interesting points	discussed	brought in new physics	discussed	convincingly supported	proved deep understanding	efficient
some scientific points cleared	some	some	some	some	some	average	some correct	some correct	many correct	many correct	some aspects efficient	overall efficient	very good
4	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

concise and correct or no questions asked  
 some incorrect, inclusive or too long  
 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 $1 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 7$

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 $1 + 2 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7$

## QUESTIONS ASKED

almost no, irrelevant	0	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1	presentation	no or irrelevant	very little	no	time management	poor
some main points	1	some main points	1	addressed	some	some	reasonable	own opinions	reasonable
main points	2	main points	2	relevant topics	some correct	some	fair	presentation	fair
all relevant points	3	all relevant points	3	practically all	many	many	efficient	practically all	efficient
practically all points	4	practically all points	4	all	+ improvements	very good	all time used	all	all time used

## NOTES:

relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report  
 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

## DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

speech summary	0	pros & cons	irrelevant	discussion analysis	almost no	scientific contribution of topics presented	very little	own opinions of the discussion	poor	opponent's conduct	some aspects fine	overall efficient	very good
partially relevant	1	partially relevant	1	partially relevant	some	average	some correct	some correct	some correct	many correct	some aspects efficient	overall efficient	very good
too short/long	2	too short/long	2	too short/long	partial	partial	reasonable	partial	reasonable	average	good	some aspects efficient	very good
informative, apt	3	informative, apt	3	informative, apt	good	good	efficient	good	efficient	many correct	some aspects efficient	overall efficient	very good
condensed and accurate	4	condensed and accurate	4	condensed and accurate	all relevant	all relevant	all time used	all relevant	all time used	discussed	discussed	discussed	discussed

## DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

concise and correct or no questions asked  
 some incorrect, inclusive or too long  
 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 $1 + 2 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 8$

## QUESTIONS ASKED

too few, mostly irrelevant	0	some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	1	report summary & understanding	poor	pros & cons	irrelevant	discussion analysis	almost no	own opinions	too few	own opinions	too few
many unclear points resolved, most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	2	many unclear points resolved, most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	2	good	partial	partial	reasonable	partial	reasonable	some	some	some	some
+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3	detailed, complex	mostly adequate	mostly adequate	reasonable	mostly adequate	reasonable	many	many	many	many
conclusive, accurate, + improvements	4	conclusive, accurate, + improvements	4	fully	adequate	adequate	reasonable	adequate	reasonable	conclusive, accurate, + improvements	conclusive, accurate, + improvements	conclusive, accurate, + improvements	conclusive, accurate, + improvements

## NOTES:

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

concise and correct or no questions asked  
 some incorrect, inclusive or too long  
 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions