

# SCORESHEET

stage: 3 fight (round no.): 4 room: J problem no.: 1083 Juror's name: Kyran HARRINGTON  
 reporter: Iran opponent: Australia reviewer: Singapore Russel Yang signature: [Signature]  
Rojan Abdolhazade Raiden Lemon

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

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 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	poor	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <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	
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:

**OPPONENT** Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 2 + 1 + 2 - 0 = 6$

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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 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

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

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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 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**

stage: III  
 reporter: Rajan Abalabanda (IRAN)  
 opponent: Radein Lomon (AUSTRALIA)  
 fight (round no.): 4  
 room: J  
 reviewer: Kusal Loug (SINGAPORE)  
 problem no.: 3  
 rejected: 10.8  
 Juror's name: 347N  
 signature: Muly. Subhan

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.0 + 8.0 - 0.0 = 6

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	fair	not well fitting	average	partly
2	fair	fair	fair	deviations	interesting	only technical points cleared
3	good	good	well performed	qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some scientific points cleared
4	detailed	quite detailed, errors analysed	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	above average	interesting points convincingly supported
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, + reproducible, correct	convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	proved deep understanding
6	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	completely testable	convincing analysis	analysed, conclusive	and theoretical	brought in new physics

NOTES:

Final revision made  
 + some revision to fit the best comment to fitting the theory

relevant and using answer to base question  
 However it does not change the predictive power of their theory

OPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.0 + 0.5 + 1.5 = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED	understanding of relevant topics	own opinions presented	priority	time management	scientific relevance of topics presented	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	priority
0	almost no/irrelevant	no or irrelevant	very little	no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
0.5	some main points	few	some	reasonable	some	some	some aspects fine	some
1	main points	some correct	reasonable	fair	average	some correct	some aspects efficient	fair
2	all relevant points	many correct	many correct	efficient	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	very good
3	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement	all time used +	all relevant	+ improvement	overall efficient	
4					new crucial (points)	discussed		

NOTES:

almost no irrelevant  
 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report  
 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used  
 in relevant points (7 of them)  
 is not consistent  
 completely ok

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 8.0 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 8

Was not able to catch the main advantages of the problem  
 focused on general drawbacks rather than to this presentation  
 Was not able to report the purpose of the experiments

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

NOTES:

time managed efficiently  
 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized,  
 used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp  
 many unclear points resolved; most time contributed to clarify some unclear points  
 some relevant, sufficient number,  
 contributed to clarify some unclear points