

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
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 <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"/>	2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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	
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

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

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	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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	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	
	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	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
1 — some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	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"/>	1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 — many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	mostly adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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:

66657

SCORESHEET

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

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 5 stage: 2 room: 12 problem no.: 8 Juror's name & signature: *Konradik Uadriy*
 reporter: HUNGARY opponent: AUSTRALIA reviewer: THAILAND

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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	
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 — <u>good</u>	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:

from paper

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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	
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

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

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	
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 — <u>good</u>	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: K problem no.: 8 Juror's name & signature: *Tobias Hedberg Danas*
 reporter: Hungary opponent: Australia reviewer: Thailand Hedberg

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 5$$

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

$$1 + 0.5 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 6$$

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
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	1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
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	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

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

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
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	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	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	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	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 2 stage: 5 room: K problem no.: 8 Juror's name & signature: Kemy Parker *Kemy Parker*
 reporter: Kungay (Vavrik) opponent: Australia (Ghantala) reviewer: Thailand (Kritpachan)

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	
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 <i>inides?</i>	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: *good coverage, clearly links theory to experiment - neglected adhesive forces? "tuning" fluids? Lack of legends. No physical explanations, better in diagram. NSTs - needs assumptions.*

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 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	
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: *Asks for the details of density & surface tension? why? ok. No condensation hysteresis. "No adhesive forces?" mentioned*

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.8 + 1.7 + 1.5 - 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	
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

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3 + 1.5 - 0 = 6$$

fight (round no.): 1 stage: 3 room:
reporter: fls

problem no.: 11 Juror's name & signature: Ostermayer F. Ostermayer
opponent: THA reviewer: flw

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 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	too few	poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 <input type="checkbox"/> only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some scientific points cleared	many	good	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 <input type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> 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 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no, irrelevant	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/> little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	
	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 <input type="checkbox"/> new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 6$$

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 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, not	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 5 stage: 3 room: K problem no.: 11 Juror's name & signature: *KONDRETTEK Ueada*
 reporter: AUSTRALIA opponent: THAILAND reviewer: HUNGARY

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	+ 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	qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	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

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 7$$

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 -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

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

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 -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:

66443

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 5 stage: 3 room: K problem no.: 11 Juror's name & signature: Wei Liu
 reporter: Australia opponent: Thailand reviewer: Hungary

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2.75 + 1.75 - 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	almost no	too few	poor	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	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	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	interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	3	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	4	
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:

75754

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	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	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	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	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	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3		all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	3	
4		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	4	

NOTES:

66755

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.75 + 1.75 + 1.75 - 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	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	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	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	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	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 5 stage: 3 room: K problem no.: 11, Juror's name & signature: *Tobias Hedberg*
 reporter: Australia opponent: Thailand reviewer: Hungary *Tobias Hedberg*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 1 = 4$$

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 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

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

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	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 -2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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	
2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 — partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	
	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	

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	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 -2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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	
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	
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

fight (round no.): 3 stage: 5 room: K problem no.: 11 Juror's name & signature: K. Parker Ken Dr.
 reporter: Lavien Premaj (Aus) opponent: Samy Kasin (Thailand) reviewer: Nurgay (Föder)

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 0.8 - 0 = 3

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 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> 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: Lacks experiments. No consideration for ideal radial, few variables tested, "W anlagen" ill defined. No explanation of reversal. No damping. Not quite optimal.

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.0 + 1.5 + 1.2 - 0.3 = 3.4

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 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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	
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: E of red?

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.0 + 1.0 - 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	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 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 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	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: ? mind time.

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): V stage: 1 room: K problem no.:
 reporter:

Juror's name & signature: Ostermeier F. Ostermeier
 opponent:
 reviewer:

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 4 + 1.5 - 0 = 7$

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 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	too few	poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 <input type="checkbox"/> only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some scientific points cleared	many	good	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	4 <input type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> 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
 $1 + 0.5 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 = 5$

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 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no, irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/> little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	
	3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 <input type="checkbox"/> new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 2 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 8$

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 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 5 stage: 1 room: K problem no.: 14 Juror's name & signature: *KUNDRAEK Ueeteei*
 reporter: THAILAND opponent: HUNGARY reviewer: AUSTRALIA

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		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 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

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

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	0 — no	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked -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	1 — 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	2 — reasonable	
	3 — all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 — good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	3 — 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	4 — very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 2.5 - 0 = 7$$

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 -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	1 — 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	2 — 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	3 — good	

NOTES:

+ good answers to questions of jury!

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 5 stage: 1 room: K problem no.: 14 Juror's name & signature: *Tobias Hedberg*
 reporter: Thailand opponent: Hungary reviewer: Australia

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 3 + 1 - 1 = 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 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 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 4

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 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 + 2 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7

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 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.): 1 stage: 5 room: K problem no.: 14 Juror's name & signature: Kerry Packer Ken Packer
 reporter: Thailand (Kritiracha) opponent: Hungary (Manton Gyukai) reviewer: Australia (Will Power)

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	
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: - comparison of detectors? no distance effects measured. Not much light - went straight to E field.

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 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	
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: disappointing that the discussion was spent a lot of time arguing about the definition of 'camera'!

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

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	
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: new points raised that weren't important (shutter speed came up twice) - does the length of the spires - this is an exposure issue. need more uncertainty - justified in July 95.

77747

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 5 stage: 1 room: K problem no.: 14 Juror's name & signature: Wei Liu
 reporter: Thailand opponent: Hungary reviewer: Australia

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 4.5 + 1.5 - 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	almost no	too few	poor	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	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	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	interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	3	
4	detailed	quite detailed	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	discussed	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	4	
5	demostrative	correct	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	brought in new physics				
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive							

NOTES:

57547

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.25 + 2.25 + 2.5 - 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	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	few	some	reasonable	fair	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

87777

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

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	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	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	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	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	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	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	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES:

IYPTC 2018

room: K round: 5 Fight Assistants: Shiliang Song Tianyu Zhang Qian Zhang

Team	Stage 1			Stage 2			Stage 3			Stage 4		
	Thailand Rep	Hungary Opp	Australia Rev	Hungary Rep	Australia Opp	Thailand Rev	Australia Rep	Thailand Opp	Hungary Rev	Rep	Opp	Rev
Juror												
Florian Ostermaier	7	5	8	6	6	6	6	7	6			
Wei Lin	7	7	7	6	5	7	6	5	6			
Frantisek Kundracik	7	5	7	6	5	6	4	7	7			
Tobias & Frans Viktor Hedberg	4	4	7	5	6	5	4	5	5			
Kerry Parker	7	7	7	7	7	6.	3	4	5.			
Acting Team Member	Chavit Kritpracha	Márton Gyulai	Willana Power	Márton Vavrik	Mukund Ghantala	Chavit Kritpracha	Laviensraj Premraj	Kirin Sorangkasiri	András Ottó Földes.			
Chosen Problem	14 Radiant Lantern			8 8 Cusps in a Cylinder			11. Azimuthal Radial Pendulum					
Rejected Problem(s):												