

SCORESHEET

stage: 5
 fight (round no.): 1
 reporter: Chinese Taipei
 opponent: Korea

room: E
 problem no.: 12
 reviewer: Mr Zealand

Juror's name: Nint
 signature: *Nint*

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

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

NOTES:

OPONENT
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + 3 + 3 - = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED	understanding of relevant topics	own opinions presented	priority	time management
	almost no, irrelevant	very little	no	poor
0	no or irrelevant	some	reasonable	fair
1	some main points	few	some	reasonable
2	main points	some correct	some correct	efficient
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement	+ all time used

NOTES:

REVIEWER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 - = 6.5

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

NOTES:

QUESTIONS ASKED	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	priority
	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
0	some	too short/long	partially relevant	some	no questions asked
1	reasonable	fair	average	some	conclude and correct or
2	good	many	many correct	many	no questions asked
3	and accurate	condensed	fully	adequate	conclude,

SCORESHEET

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 5

room: E

problem no.: 12

Juror's name: *Jeyhan Jatarov*

reporter: *Chinese Taipei*

opponent: *Korea*

reviewer: *New Zealand*

signature: *[Signature]*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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 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:

2

2

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.75 + 2.75 - 0 = 8$$

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 —	2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	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 —		1 — some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 — little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	
2 —		2 — main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 — partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	
3 —		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:

1.5

2.75-3

2.75-3

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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 — many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	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 —		1 — partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 — too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	
2 —		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:

1.75-2

2

1.75-2