

SCORESHEET
 fight (round no.): 5 stage: 1 room: 1
 juror's name & signature: *Shamoua Wong* reviewer: *Iran*
 problem no.: 6 opponent: *Brazil*

REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 3 + 1.5 - 1.5 = 4$

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	task fulfillment
		almost no	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited
0	poor	some	some	some	some	misunderstood
		fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	review of sources, cited partly
1	some aspects fine	fair	fair	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	interesting
		good	good	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	points cleared
2	some aspects	detailed	detailed, complex, completely testable	errors analysed	+ theory limits	some scientific points cleared
		demonstrative	shows physical insight	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	considerable experimental	points cleared
3	good	good	quite detailed, correct	explained, conclusive	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
		good	quite detailed, correct	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental	points cleared
4	some aspects efficient	detailed	detailed, complex, completely testable	convincing analysis	and theoretical	discussed
		demonstrative	shows physical insight	errors analysed	considerable experimental	discussed
5	overall efficient	deep and comprehensive	shows physical insight	convincing analysis	and theoretical	discussed
		deep and comprehensive	shows physical insight	convincing analysis	and theoretical	discussed
6	very good	deep and comprehensive	shows physical insight	convincing analysis	and theoretical	discussed
		deep and comprehensive	shows physical insight	convincing analysis	and theoretical	discussed

NOTES:

OPONENT
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1 + 2 + 2.5 - 0.5 = 5$

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	priority of time management
		almost no, irrelevant	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little
0	poor	unclear points in the report	unclear points in the report	no or irrelevant	very little
		relevant, aimed at resolving	relevant, aimed at resolving	no or irrelevant	very little
1	some main points	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	no or irrelevant	very little
		+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	no or irrelevant	very little
2	some aspects fine	some main points	some main points	no or irrelevant	very little
		some main points	some main points	no or irrelevant	very little
3	good	all relevant points	all relevant points	no or irrelevant	very little
		all relevant points	all relevant points	no or irrelevant	very little
4	overall efficient	practically all points	practically all points	no or irrelevant	very little
		practically all points	practically all points	no or irrelevant	very little

NOTES:

REVIEWER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 2 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 7$

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	priority
		too few, mostly irrelevant	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	
0	poor	too few, mostly irrelevant	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	
		too few, mostly irrelevant	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	too few	too few, mostly irrelevant	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	
		too few, mostly irrelevant	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	
2	some	too few, mostly irrelevant	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	
		too few, mostly irrelevant	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	
3	reasonable	too few, mostly irrelevant	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	
		too few, mostly irrelevant	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	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 5 stage: 1 room: J
 reporter: Georgia

problem no.: 6 Juror's name & signature: Maitelis Z. P.
 opponent: Brazil reviewer: Iran

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 1.6 - 0 = 5$$

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	
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

$$1 + 1 + 2.3 + 2 - 0 = 6$$

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	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 — + 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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.1 - 0 = 5$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant	some relevant, sufficient number, 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 — many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp		1 — 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 — + 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: