

SCORESHEET

stage: 4 fight (round no.): 4 room: H problem no.: 6 Juror's name: P. Wattanakasimich
 reporter: Hungary opponent: Switzerland reviewer: Chile signature: hw

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 4.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 7$

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 <input type="checkbox"/> -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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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

$1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2.5 - 0 = 7$

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

$1 + 1 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 4$

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	
2 <input 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: ~~1~~ 4 fight (round no.): 4 room: H problem no.:
 reporter: Hungary opponent: Switzerland reviewer: Chile

Juror's name: Shancai Wang
 signature: *[Signature]*

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + ~~3~~ + 1.5 - 0 = 5 S. Wang

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

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.2 + 2.5 + 2.8 - 0 = 7.5

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	0 almost no, irrelevant	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	0 almost no	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	
1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	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
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	1 some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
	2 main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	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: David

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 0.6 + 1.3 + 1.3 - 0 = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	0 too few, mostly irrelevant	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	0 poor <th>speech summary</th> <th>pros & cons</th> <th>discussion analysis</th> <th>own opinions</th> <th>prioritisation</th>	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	
1 contributed to clarify some unclear points	0 poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
2 many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	1 partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	1.2 some	1 too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	2 good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2 informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	3 detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3 condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES: Victor