



# IYNT Reviewing Problem #13

Team Romania

# Reporter summary

Strengths	Weaknesses
The powerpoint was extremely well done, especially the animations, and was mostly clear.	First graph presented was extremely cluttered, which made following it harder.
Reporter drew clear conclusions and drew clear hypothesis-result ties.	Were the words presented in the original language or in English?
Extreme control of the external factors allowed the team to attain accurate results.	Theoretical part was weak and didn't go into enough detail.

# Opponent summary

Strengths	Weaknesses
The opponent noticed most of the errors and presented them, while also developing on them, providing additional insight.	The opponent did not realize the fact that the original task was not met.
Good questions and hypothetical scenarios were proposed, showing deep understanding of the material.	Asked questions about facts that we believe were sufficiently explained by the reporter.
Noticed the discrepancy within the language barrier.	

# Additional notes on the Reporter

- We believe that there could have been a conformation bias when it came to applying the third and second test, thus the results might not be reflecting the real-world conditions.
- It's not completely fair to compare visual symbols to heard words. Words and symbols are not equivalent. A possible better comparison could have been comparing written words to hearing words.
- No mention of correlation between words was mentioned. If the words were similar, or related they might remember them easier (such as if the words were pants, jeans, trousers)
- No mention of compression mechanics was done. The order in which the words appear also matters a lot.
- No possible causes of error were mentioned.
- Discarded the relevancy of the student's profile or specialization for both the experiments

## Additional notes on the Opponent

- We believe that the opponent did their job extremely well.
- Mentioned anxiety, and held their ground when told about the tests that the students might have issues with.

## Clashes during the fight.

- Clash: Age and occupation were not studied enough.
- Reviewer's opinion: We believe the efficiency of memory changes as age goes on, thus we have to agree with the opponent.
- Clash: Conclusion was not sufficient.
- Reviewer's opinion: The conclusions are extremely clear for the hypothesis posed. We have to agree with the reporter on this matter, since good conclusions were extrapolated.
- Clash: Error bars
- Reviewer's opinion: We fully agree with the opponent. No causes were mentioned.



Thank you!