

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): D stage: 2 room: _____
 reporter: HW

problem no.: 8 Juror's name & signature: Ostermann F. Johnson
 opponent: AUS reviewer: THT

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.75 + 2 - 0 = 6$$

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 — 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	fair	not well fitting <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some own input	average <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 — some scientific points cleared <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	many <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
3 — good	good	well performed, sufficient number <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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

$$1 + 0.5 + 2.25 + 2 - 0 = 6$$

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 — concise and correct or no questions asked — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 — 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 — main points <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 — partial <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	average <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some correct	good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	reasonable	
	3 — all relevant points	many	many correct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	efficient <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3 — good	most	many correct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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

$$1 + 2.25 + 1.25 + 1 - 0 = 6$$

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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 — some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	1 — partial	partially relevant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	too short/long <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 — too short/long	partially relevant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	too short/long <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
2 — many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	2 — good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	mostly adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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:

66657

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 5 stage: 2 room: K problem no.: 8 Juror's name & signature: Wei Liu
 reporter: Hungary opponent: Austria reviewer: Thailand

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 3.25 + 0.5 - 0 = 6
 1.25 5.75

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	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
6	deep and comprehensible, 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:

65567

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.25 + 1 + 1.25 - 0 = 5
 2.25 4.5

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:

67656

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.75 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7
 2.75 4.75 6.75

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: