

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.0 - 0.5 = 4$$

stage: 1

reporter: Aani Atiq
PAKISTAN

fight (round no.): 5

opponent: Petar Petarovic
SERBIA

room: 6

reviewer: Parv Singh
INDIA

problem no.: 11

Juror's name:

MATEJ BADIN

signature:

Matej Badin

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1.5	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
3	fair	fair	fair	fair	some own input	average
4	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
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

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 —

NOTES:

observation
- increasing of the exponent
- Euler-Lagrange equations
Q: Slide 17: damping
Q: Slide 18: FFT
Q: Phase portraits
Q: Experiment or simulation
Finally turned out no comparison between

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
2 —

NOTES:

- simulation elasticity
- theory explanation
- angular motion
- convergence time
- experimental

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + (1.5 \times 2) + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 6$$

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
2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently
3 —

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: 

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 → -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	errors analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected					
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight		+ reproducible, convincing analysis								

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 — almost no, irrelevant — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report 1 — 2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	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 — concise and correct or no questions asked — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions -1 — -2 —
	0 — almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	0 — almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	
	1 — some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 — little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	
	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:											

NOTES:

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

NOTES: some of quest offline didn't take into account q1 during rep and opp anal.

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 4$$

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 5

room: 9

problem no.:

Juror's name: ESCHENAZI

reporter: PAKISTAN

opponent: SERBIA

reviewer: INDIA

signature: *[Signature]*

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	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
5	demonstrative	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
- 1 ☐ some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- 2 ☐ deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 ☐ almost no, irrelevant
- 1 ☒ relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- 2 ☐ + 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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 ☐ too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 ☒ some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points
- 2 ☐ 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
2	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
2	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:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 5 stage: 1 room: 4 problem no.: 11 Juror's name & signature: YIN Guo *Yin Guo*
 reporter: Pakistan opponent: Serbia reviewer: India

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 — 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 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 + 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 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -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 + 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 5

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 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -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.): 5 stage: 1 room: G problem no.: 11
reporter: Pakistan opponent: Serbia

Azimuthal Radial Pendulum.

Sieweng Lim - Aw

Arif

Juror's name & signature:

reviewer: India

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 6$$

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	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
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
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

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
-1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
-2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — almost no, irrelevant
1 — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
2 — + 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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant
1 — some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points
2 — 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
2	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
2	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:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 5 stage: 2 room: G
reporter: Serbia

Invent Yourself

problem no.: 1

Juror's name & signature:

Sreng Lini - An

opponent: India

reviewer: Pakistan

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 7

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	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
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
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

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
-1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
-2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — almost no, irrelevant
1 — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
2 — + 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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant
1 — some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points
2 — 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
2	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
2	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:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 5 stage: 2 room: 4 problem no.: 1
reporter: Serbia opponent: India

Juror's name & signature: Yin Guo
reviewer: Pakistan

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 2 - 0 = 7$$

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 — concise and correct or no questions asked — 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 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				
6 —									

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1 + 1.5 - 0 = 4.5$$

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 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -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 — partly	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

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

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 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -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.): 5 stage: 2 room: G
reporter: SERBIA

problem no.: 1
opponent: INDIA

Juror's name & signature: ESCHENKHI

reviewer:

PAKISTAN

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 7$$

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	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
5	demonstrative	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
-1 ☐ some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
-2 ☐ deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2.0 + 2.0 - 0 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 ☐ almost no, irrelevant
1 ☒ relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
2 ☐ + 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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2.0 + 2.0 - 0 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 ☐ too few, mostly irrelevant
1 ☒ some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points
2 ☐ 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
2	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
2	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:

SCORESHEET

stage: 2
reporter: Serbia

fight (round no.): 5
opponent: India

room: G
problem no.: 1
reviewer: Pakistan

Juror's name: A. Bury
signature:

REPORTER
1 + 3 + 2.5 - 0 = 6.5

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
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	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1	only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2	some scientific points cleared	many	good	2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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		errors analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected					
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis								

NOTES: Why did you choose this setup?

OPPONENT
1 + 1.25 + 1 + 2.5 - 0 = 5.75

QUESTIONS ASKED	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 — almost no, irrelevant	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 — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
	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
1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1 - 0 = 4

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 5

room: 6

problem no.: 9

Juror's name: HATED BADIN

reporter: Parvinder Singh
INDIA

opponent: Anshu Arora
PAKISTAN

reviewer: Aleksandra Petrovic
SERBIA

signature: *Maly Arora*

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	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected
6	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight					

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
-1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
-2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

very simple model to count for the multiple measurement

Model used for what? not used for anything...

Then from the paper no novelty given...

but little

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 3.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 8$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

NOTES:

cooling effect of the

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	most	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

One of the best speeches during the tournament
Aimed all relevant points and weaknesses brought a lot of relevant physics, very accurate and no irrelevant point

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3.0 + 1.0 + 2.0 - 0 = 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant
1 — some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points
2 — 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
2	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
2	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:

very good questions
different
good
novelty ++

cannot really agree with points some different actually misunderstood

Lack of misconceptions about the