

# SCORESHEET

**REPORTER** Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 +  +  -  =

stage: fight (round no.): room: problem no.: Juror's name:

reporter: opponent: reviewer: signature:

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	efficiency	
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	almost no, chaotic	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -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	avoided some questions	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some scientific points cleared	many	cooperated well	
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	answered directly to most questions	
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	efficient, productive	
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 +  +  +  -  =

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritisation	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	efficiency	prioritisation	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no, irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	irrelevant	very little	almost no	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -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, aimed at resolving some unclear points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/> little	some	some	to some extent	almost no	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/> not all	main points	some	to important topics	some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	average	some correct	leading or cooperative	some	
	3 <input type="checkbox"/> almost all	all relevant points	many	to most topics	reasonable	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	many	many correct	quite efficient	reasonable	
	4 <input type="checkbox"/> all & efficiently	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4 <input type="checkbox"/> new crucial point(s)	almost all	+ improvement suggestions	very efficient	very good	

NOTES:

**REVIEWER** Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 +  +  +  -  =

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report summary & understanding	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -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, could clear things out	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	almost no	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both rep. and opp.	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	relevant parts	many	mostly adequate	some	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	good	

NOTES: