

# SCORESHEET

stage: 1  
reporter: Aani Atiq  
PAKISTAN

fight (round no.): 5  
opponent: Petar Petarovic  
SERBIA

room: 6  
reviewer: Pawan Singh  
INDIA

Juror's name: HATED BADIN  
signature: Mulya Pelin

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
1 + 1.5 + 2.0 - 0.5 = 4

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1.5	some	some	some	not well fitting	review of sources, cited	partly
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
6	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	almost no	too few	poor
1	only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine
2	some scientific points cleared	many	good
3	interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
4	brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 - concise and correct or no questions asked
-0.5 - some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
-1 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
-2 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES: observation, integration of the experiment, Euler-Lagrange equations, Q: Slide 17: damping, Q: Slide 18: FFT, Q: Phase portraits, Q: Experiment or simulation, Comparison

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract  
1 + 1.5 + 3.0 + 2.0 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED
0 - almost no, irrelevant
1 - relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
1.5 - + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
1	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
2	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 - concise and correct or no questions asked
-1 - some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
-2 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES: simulation elasticity, theory comparison, angular motion, very efficient

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
1 + (1.5-2) + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED
0 - too few, mostly irrelevant
1 - some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points
1.5 - many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp
3 - + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
1.5	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
1.5	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 - concise and correct or no questions asked
-1 - some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
-2 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES: some of the questions irrelevant

# SCORESHEET

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 5 room: G problem no.: 11 Juror's name: A. Bury  
 reporter: Pakistan opponent: Serbia reviewer: India signature: [Signature]

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 $1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 4$

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 <u>some</u>	<u>some</u>	<u>some</u>	<u>some</u>	review of sources, cited	<u>partly</u>	1 only technical points cleared	<u>some</u>	<u>some aspects fine</u>	
2 fair	<u>fair</u>	<u>fair</u>	not well fitting	<u>some own input</u>	average	2 <u>some scientific points cleared</u>	many	<u>good</u>	
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: Spont! el. material const. k? comparison? physical expl?

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 $1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7$

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	1	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	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 1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	1 some main points	few	some	<u>some</u>	<u>reasonable</u>	1 little	<u>some</u>	some	some aspects fine	<u>some</u>	
2		2 <u>main points</u>	<u>some</u>	<u>some correct</u>	reasonable	fair	2 <u>partial</u>	average	<u>some correct</u>	<u>good</u>	reasonable	
3		3 all relevant points	many	<u>many correct</u>	fair	efficient	3 good	most	<u>many correct</u>	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	

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 $1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1 - 0 = 5$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	1	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	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 1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	1 <u>partial</u>	partially relevant	<u>too short/long</u>	<u>some</u>	<u>some</u>	1 <u>too short/long</u>	<u>partially relevant</u>	<u>too short/long</u>	<u>some</u>	<u>some</u>	
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	2 good	<u>mostly adequate</u>	<u>relevant parts</u>	many	reasonable	2 informative, apt	<u>mostly adequate</u>	<u>relevant parts</u>	<u>many</u>	<u>reasonable</u>	
3		3 detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3 condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES: some of quest didn't take into account during rep and opp anal.