3D

Before leaving the room, please check that this Protocol is filled and signed. In case a Juror mistakenly holds up a Grade which differs from their Individual Protocol, announce this immediately to the Chairperson, make a clear correction in this Science Fight protocol, and ask the Juror to sign near the correction. No Juror can amend any Grade rectroactively (*IYNT Regs*, Ch. 1, IX, 1.)

Science Fight Protocol

Attendant's name Nini Rizhamadze Chairperson's name Marc Bitterli SF 3 Group D

Date 08.07.2018 Time SF started 10:28 Number of Jurors 9 Name of the winner of Captain's Contest, if any — Time SF ended 13:08

Grades cross-checked with Jurors' Protocols (Attendant's signature) [signature] The Protocol is complete and accepted (Chairperson's signature) [signature]

Captain's Contest, if any	Team: —	Points: —	Team: —	Points: —	Team: —	Points: —

	Stage I			Stage II			Stage III		
Problem in the Stage	Accepted: 16	Rejected, if any: X		Accepted: 14	Rejected, if any: X		Accepted: 15	Rejected, if any: 17,13	
	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer
Team →	Belarus-Pahonia	[illegible] Bulgaria-Awkward Turtles	Kazakhstan	Bulgaria-Awkward Turtles	Kazakhstan	Belarus-Pahonia	Kazakhstan	Belarus-Pahonia	Bulgaria-Awkward Turtles
Presenter's Name → (ask the Team to write the Name on the blackboard or pass you the name tag)	Maria Zhuiko	Samuil Mladenov	Nuray Begassilova	Nansi Todorova	Markhamed Gulam	Maryia Tomashuk	Zhan Utegaliyev	Kseniya Shymborskaya	Stoyan Germanov
Juror Yellow Cards: NR, NP, NT →	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	(NT)
Marc Bitterli	9	5	3	10	6	6	7	13	2
Aleksandr ~~Zubankov~~ Vadeev	16	9	6	16	8	7	13	15	5
Ilia Lomidze	21	12	8	12	7	9	12	16	9
Grigol Peradze.	21	9	5	10	6	9	9	16	4
Ivan Klimenko.	14	4	7	13	8	7	10	14	4
Ksenia Wang	12	4	5	13	8	6	10	14	6
~~Giorgi Tsereteli.~~	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Natalia Semenikhina	13	6	4	13	8	8	11	14	4
Giorgi Tsereteli	11	2	4	14	8	7	16	15	4
Anastasia Chervinskaia	13	3	3	13	6	7	9	10	4

Please fill clearly and sign before showing your Grades. In case of discrepancy, this Protocol is considered correct (*IYNT Regulations*, Ch. 2, I, 8). No Grade can be corrected retroactively (*IYNT Regulations*, Ch. 1, IX, 1). This Protocol will be scanned and published. Before leaving the Science Fight room, please cross-check your Grades with Attendant's Science Fight Protocol and pass this Protocol to Chairperson in your Group.

Individual Juror's Protocol

Juror's name Marc Bitterli Date 8.7.18 SF 4 3 Group D

	Overview of Science Fight		
	Stage I	**Stage II**	**Stage III**
Problem in the Stage	**Accepted:** 16 - Granular T	**Accepted:** 14 - Dendrochronol	**Accepted:** 15 - Laser Pointer
	Rejected, if any: —	Rejected, if any: _	Rejected, if any: 13, 17
	Fill below the names of Teams and Presenters, and any Yellow Cards announced by Chairperson (NR, NP, or NT)		
Reporter	Maria Zhuiko Belarus - Pahonia	Nansi Todoreva Bulgaria Akward T	Utegaliev Zhan Kazakhstan
Opponent	Samuil Mlasenov Bulgaria - Awkward T.	Gulan Makhammad Kazakhstan	Kseniya Shymborskaya Belarus - Pahonia
Reviewer	Nuray Begassilova Kazakhstan	Maryia Tamashuk Belarus - Pahonia	Stoyan Germanov (NT) Bulgaria Awkw. T

Criteria for Partial Grades

	for Reporter	Range	for Opponent	Range	for Reviewer	Range
α	Essence of the solution. Results. Validity. Scientific methods. Vision of scientific context. Justified conclusions. *Main tasks*: novel ideas, depth. *Inv Yourself*: problem statement. *Additional*: cooperation, resourcefulness	-6...+6	Objective critique. Skeptical inquiry. Relevant, nontrivial, challenging questions. Analysis of Report. Justified opinions. Understanding of scientific context. Valid conclusions, suggestions	-4...+4	Impartial, weighted, analytical Review. Relevant, nontrivial questions. Own, justified conclusions on Report, Opposition, and discussion. Understanding of scientific context	-2...+2
β	Defending own solution. Reaction to critique. Answers	-3...+3	Full focus on Report. Active, substantial argumentation	-2...+2	Critical summarization and wrap up of the Stage	-1...+1
γ	Structured and persuasive presentation. Speaking skills	-3...+3	Structured and persuasive Opposition. Speaking skills	-2...+2	Structured and persuasive Review. Speaking skills	-1...+1
δ	Technicalities, visual aids, demonstrations, team help	-2...+3	Technicalities, visual aids to the Opposition, team help	-1...+2	Technicalities, visual aids to the Review, team help	-0...+1

	Juror's Grades								
	Stage I			**Stage II**			**Stage III**		
	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer
Starting	**15**	**10**	**5**	**15**	**10**	**5**	**15**	**10**	**5**
α	-3	-3	-1	-5	-2	+1	-4	+1	-1
β	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	—	-2	+1	-1
γ	-1	-1	—	-1	-1	—	-1	—	-1
δ	-1	—	—	+2	—	—	-1	+1	—
Sum up the Starting Grade (15, 10, or 5) with all four Partial Grades, and write below your resulting Juror's Grade									
Juror's Grade	9	5	3	10	6	6	7	13	2
Juror's signature	M. Bitterli			M. Bitterli			M. Bitterli		

Please fill clearly and sign before showing your Grades. In case of discrepancy, this Protocol is considered correct (*IYNT Regulations*, Ch. 2, I, 8). No Grade can be corrected retroactively (*IYNT Regulations*, Ch. 1, IX, 1). This Protocol will be scanned and published. Before leaving the Science Fight room, please cross-check your Grades with Attendant's Science Fight Protocol and pass this Protocol to Chairperson in your Group.

Individual Juror's Protocol

Juror's name Alexander Nadaev Date 8 July SF 3 Group D

	Overview of Science Fight		
	Stage I	**Stage II**	**Stage III**
Problem in the Stage	**Accepted:** 16	**Accepted:** 14	**Accepted:** 15
	Rejected, if any: –	Rejected, if any: –	Rejected, if any: 17, 13
	Fill below the names of Teams and Presenters, and any Yellow Cards announced by Chairperson (NR, NP, or NT)		
Reporter	Belarus Pahonia M. Zhuiko	Bulgaria Aw. N. Todorova	Kazakhstan Z. Utegalieva [redacted]
Opponent	Bulgaria Aw. S. Markov	Kazakhstan G. Mokhammad	Belarus Pahonia Ksenia Shlyamporskaya
Reviewer	Kazakhstan M. Begazilova	Belarus Pahonia M. Tamashuk	Bulgaria Aw S. Germanov (NT)

Criteria for Partial Grades

	for Reporter	Range	for Opponent	Range	for Reviewer	Range
α	Essence of the solution. Results. Validity. Scientific methods. Vision of scientific context. Justified conclusions. *Main tasks*: novel ideas, depth. *Inv Yourself*: problem statement. *Additional*: cooperation, resourcefulness	-6...+6	Objective critique. Skeptical inquiry. Relevant, nontrivial, challenging questions. Analysis of Report. Justified opinions. Understanding of scientific context. Valid conclusions, suggestions	-4...+4	Impartial, weighted, analytical Review. Relevant, nontrivial questions. Own, justified conclusions on Report, Opposition, and discussion. Understanding of scientific context	-2...+2
β	Defending own solution. Reaction to critique. Answers	-3...+3	Full focus on Report. Active, substantial argumentation	-2...+2	Critical summarization and wrap up of the Stage	-1...+1
γ	Structured and persuasive presentation. Speaking skills	-3...+3	Structured and persuasive Opposition. Speaking skills	-2...+2	Structured and persuasive Review. Speaking skills	-1...+1
δ	Technicalities, visual aids, demonstrations, team help	-2...+3	Technicalities, visual aids to the Opposition, team help	-1...+2	Technicalities, visual aids to the Review, team help	-0...+1

	Juror's Grades								
	Stage I			**Stage II**			**Stage III**		
	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer
Starting	15	10	5	15	10	5	15	10	5
α	1+1	0+1	0	0	-1	1	1	1+1	0
β	-1	-1	1	0	-1	1	-1	1+1	0
γ	0	-1	0	1	0	0	-2	1	0
δ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sum up the Starting Grade (15, 10, or 5) with all four Partial Grades, and write below your resulting Juror's Grade									
Juror's Grade	16	9	6	16	8	7	13	15	5
Juror's signature	A Nadaev			A Nadaev			A Nadaev		

Please fill clearly and sign before showing your Grades. In case of discrepancy, this Protocol is considered correct (*IYNT Regulations*, Ch. 2, I, 8). No Grade can be corrected retroactively (*IYNT Regulations*, Ch. 1, IX, 1). This Protocol will be scanned and published. Before leaving the Science Fight room, please cross-check your Grades with Attendant's Science Fight Protocol and pass this Protocol to Chairperson in your Group.

Individual Juror's Protocol

Juror's name Ilia Lomidze Date 8 VI SF 3 Group 9

	Overview of Science Fight		
	Stage I	**Stage II**	**Stage III**
Problem in the Stage	**Accepted:** 16	**Accepted:** 14	**Accepted:** 15
	Rejected, if any: —	Rejected, if any: —	Rejected, if any: 17, 13
	Fill below the names of Teams and Presenters, and any Yellow Cards announced by Chairperson (NR, NP, or NT)		
Reporter	Belarus - Pahonia Masha Zhuĭko	Bulgaria - Awkward-T Nansi Todorova	Kazakhstan Zhan Ulegaliev
Opponent	Bulgaria - Awkward-T Samuil Mladenov	Kazakhstan Gulam Makhmood	Belarus - Pahonia Ksenija Shymborskaya
Reviewer	Kazakhstan Nuray Begassilova	Belarus - Pahonia Maryia Tamashuk	Bulgaria - Awkward-T Teyan Germanov

NT.

Criteria for Partial Grades

	for Reporter	Range	for Opponent	Range	for Reviewer	Range
α	Essence of the solution. Results. Validity. Scientific methods. Vision of scientific context. Justified conclusions. *Main tasks*: novel ideas, depth. *Inv Yourself*: problem statement. *Additional*: cooperation, resourcefulness	-6...+6	Objective critique. Skeptical inquiry. Relevant, nontrivial, challenging questions. Analysis of Report. Justified opinions. Understanding of scientific context. Valid conclusions, suggestions	-4...+4	Impartial, weighted, analytical Review. Relevant, nontrivial questions. Own, justified conclusions on Report, Opposition, and discussion. Understanding of scientific context	-2...+2
β	Defending own solution. Reaction to critique. Answers	-3...+3	Full focus on Report. Active, substantial argumentation	-2...+2	Critical summarization and wrap up of the Stage	-1...+1
γ	Structured and persuasive presentation. Speaking skills	-3...+3	Structured and persuasive Opposition. Speaking skills	-2...+2	Structured and persuasive Review. Speaking skills	-1...+1
δ	Technicalities, visual aids, demonstrations, team help	-2...+3	Technicalities, visual aids to the Opposition, team help	-1...+2	Technicalities, visual aids to the Review, team help	-0...+1

	Juror's Grades								
	Stage I			**Stage II**			**Stage III**		
	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer
Starting	**15**	**10**	**5**	**15**	**10**	**5**	**15**	**10**	**5**
α	1	0	2	-3	-1	+2	-1	+3	-1
β	1	1	1	1	-1	+1	-1	+2	0
γ	2	1	0	0	-1	1	0	+2	-1
δ	2	0	0	-1	0	0	-1	-1	0
Sum up the Starting Grade (15, 10, or 5) with all four Partial Grades, and write below your resulting Juror's Grade									
Juror's Grade	21	12	8	12	7	9	12	16	3
Juror's signature	I. Lomidze	I. Lomidze		I. Lomidze			I. Lomidze		

Please fill clearly and sign before showing your Grades. In case of discrepancy, this Protocol is considered correct (*IYNT Regulations*, Ch. 2, I, 8). No Grade can be corrected retroactively (*IYNT Regulations*, Ch. 1, IX, 1). This Protocol will be scanned and published. Before leaving the Science Fight room, please cross-check your Grades with Attendant's Science Fight Protocol and pass this Protocol to Chairperson in your Group.

Individual Juror's Protocol

Juror's name Gzigol Peradze Date 8 SF 3 Group D

	Overview of Science Fight		
	Stage I	**Stage II**	**Stage III**
Problem in the Stage	**Accepted:** 16	**Accepted:** 14	**Accepted:** 15
	Rejected, if any:	Rejected, if any:	Rejected, if any: 17, 13
	Fill below the names of Teams and Presenters, and any Yellow Cards announced by Chairperson (NR, NP, or NT)		
Reporter	Belarus – Pahonia Masia Zhuiko	Bulgaria AwKT Nansi Todorova	Kazakstan Utegaliev Zhan
Opponent	Bulgaria AwKwardT Samuil Mingenov	Kazakstan Gulam Makhmanmed	Belarus Pahonia Kseniya Shymborskaya
Reviewer	Kazakstan NurAY Begassilova	Belarus – Pahonia Maryia Tamashuk	Bulgaria Stoyan Germahov ~~YC~~ NT

Criteria for Partial Grades

	for Reporter	Range	for Opponent	Range	for Reviewer	Range
α	Essence of the solution. Results. Validity. Scientific methods. Vision of scientific context. Justified conclusions. *Main tasks*: novel ideas, depth. *Inv Yourself*: problem statement. *Additional*: cooperation, resourcefulness	-6...+6	Objective critique. Skeptical inquiry. Relevant, nontrivial, challenging questions. Analysis of Report. Justified opinions. Understanding of scientific context. Valid conclusions, suggestions	-4...+4	Impartial, weighted, analytical Review. Relevant, nontrivial questions. Own, justified conclusions on Report, Opposition, and discussion. Understanding of scientific context	-2...+2
β	Defending own solution. Reaction to critique. Answers	-3...+3	Full focus on Report. Active, substantial argumentation	-2...+2	Critical summarization and wrap up of the Stage	-1...+1
γ	Structured and persuasive presentation. Speaking skills	-3...+3	Structured and persuasive Opposition. Speaking skills	-2...+2	Structured and persuasive Review. Speaking skills	-1...+1
δ	Technicalities, visual aids, demonstrations, team help	-2...+3	Technicalities, visual aids to the Opposition, team help	-1...+2	Technicalities, visual aids to the Review, team help	-0...+1

Juror's Grades

	Stage I			Stage II			Stage III		
	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer
Starting	15	10	5	15	10	5	15	10	5
α	+2	0	0	-3	-1	+1	-2	+3	0
β	+1	0	0	-2	-1	+1	-3	+1	0
γ	+1	-1	0	-1	-1	+1	-1	+1	-1
δ	+2	0	0	+1	-1	+1	0	+1	0
Sum up the Starting Grade (15, 10, or 5) with all four Partial Grades, and write below your resulting Juror's Grade									
Juror's Grade	21	9	5	10	6	9	9	16	4
Juror's signature	[signature]			[signature]			[signature]		

Please fill clearly and sign before showing your Grades. In case of discrepancy, this Protocol is considered correct (*IYNT Regulations*, Ch. 2, I, 8). No Grade can be corrected retroactively (*IYNT Regulations*, Ch. 1, IX, 1). This Protocol will be scanned and published. Before leaving the Science Fight room, please cross-check your Grades with Attendant's Science Fight Protocol and pass this Protocol to Chairperson in your Group.

Individual Juror's Protocol

Juror's name Ivan Klimenko Date 08.07.2018 SF 3 Group D

	Overview of Science Fight		
	Stage I	**Stage II**	**Stage III**
Problem in the Stage	**Accepted:** 16	**Accepted:** 14	**Accepted:** 15
	Rejected, if any: X	Rejected, if any: X	Rejected, if any: 17, 13.
	Fill below the names of Teams and Presenters, and any Yellow Cards announced by Chairperson (NR, NP, or NT)		
Reporter	BP Maria Zhuiko	BAT Nansi Todorova	Kz Zhan Utegaliyev
Opponent	BAT Samuil Mladenov	Kz Gulam Makhammad	BP Kseniya Shymborskaya
Reviewer	Kz Nuray Begassilova	BP Maryia Tamashuk	BAT Stoyan Germanov

Criteria for Partial Grades

	for Reporter	Range	for Opponent	Range	for Reviewer	Range
α	Essence of the solution. Results. Validity. Scientific methods. Vision of scientific context. Justified conclusions. *Main tasks*: novel ideas, depth. *Inv Yourself*: problem statement. *Additional*: cooperation, resourcefulness	-6...+6	Objective critique. Skeptical inquiry. Relevant, nontrivial, challenging questions. Analysis of Report. Justified opinions. Understanding of scientific context. Valid conclusions, suggestions	-4...+4	Impartial, weighted, analytical Review. Relevant, nontrivial questions. Own, justified conclusions on Report, Opposition, and discussion. Understanding of scientific context	-2...+2
β	Defending own solution. Reaction to critique. Answers	-3...+3	Full focus on Report. Active, substantial argumentation	-2...+2	Critical summarization and wrap up of the Stage	-1...+1
γ	Structured and persuasive presentation. Speaking skills	-3...+3	Structured and persuasive Opposition. Speaking skills	-2...+2	Structured and persuasive Review. Speaking skills	-1...+1
δ	Technicalities, visual aids, demonstrations, team help	-2...+3	Technicalities, visual aids to the Opposition, team help	-1...+2	Technicalities, visual aids to the Review, team help	-0...+1

	Juror's Grades								
	Stage I			**Stage II**			**Stage III**		
	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer
Starting	**15**	**10**	**5**	**15**	**10**	**5**	**15**	**10**	**5**
α	-2+4	-3	+1	-4	-2	0	-1	+1+2	0
β	-1-1	-2	+1	-1	+2-1	+1	0-1	+1+1	0
γ	+2	-1	+1	+2	-1	0	-1-1	+1	-1
δ	-1	0	0	+1	0	+1	-1	0	0
Sum up the Starting Grade (15, 10, or 5) with all four Partial Grades, and write below your resulting Juror's Grade									
Juror's Grade	14	4	7	13	8	7	10	14	4
Juror's signature									

Please fill clearly and sign before showing your Grades. In case of discrepancy, this Protocol is considered correct (*IYNT Regulations*, Ch. 2, I, 8). No Grade can be corrected retroactively (*IYNT Regulations*, Ch. 1, IX, 1). This Protocol will be scanned and published. Before leaving the Science Fight room, please cross-check your Grades with Attendant's Science Fight Protocol and pass this Protocol to Chairperson in your Group.

Individual Juror's Protocol

Juror's name Ksenia Wang Date 8.07.2018 SF 3 Group D

	Overview of Science Fight		
	Stage I	**Stage II**	**Stage III**
Problem in the Stage	**Accepted:** 16	**Accepted:** 14	**Accepted:** 15
	Rejected, if any:	Rejected, if any:	Rejected, if any: 17, 13
	Fill below the names of Teams and Presenters, and any Yellow Cards announced by Chairperson (NR, NP, or NT)		
Reporter	Belarus – Pahonia Maria Zhuiko	Bulgaria Aukuard-T Nansi Todorova	Kazakhstan Zhan Utegaliyev
Opponent	Bulgaria Aukuard-T. Samuil Mladenov	Kazakhstan Gulam Makhammad	Belarus – Pahonia Kseniya Shymbovskaya
Reviewer	Kazakhstan Nuray Begassilova	Belarus – Pahonia Maryia Tamashuk	Bulgaria Aukuard-T Stoyan Germanov

(yellow card)

Criteria for Partial Grades

	for Reporter	Range	for Opponent	Range	for Reviewer	Range
α	Essence of the solution. Results. Validity. Scientific methods. Vision of scientific context. Justified conclusions. *Main tasks*: novel ideas, depth. *Inv Yourself*: problem statement. *Additional*: cooperation, resourcefulness	-6...+6	Objective critique. Skeptical inquiry. Relevant, nontrivial, challenging questions. Analysis of Report. Justified opinions. Understanding of scientific context. Valid conclusions, suggestions	-4...+4	Impartial, weighted, analytical Review. Relevant, nontrivial questions. Own, justified conclusions on Report, Opposition, and discussion. Understanding of scientific context	-2...+2
β	Defending own solution. Reaction to critique. Answers	-3...+3	Full focus on Report. Active, substantial argumentation	-2...+2	Critical summarization and wrap up of the Stage	-1...+1
γ	Structured and persuasive presentation. Speaking skills	-3...+3	Structured and persuasive Opposition. Speaking skills	-2...+2	Structured and persuasive Review. Speaking skills	-1...+1
δ	Technicalities, visual aids, demonstrations, team help	-2...+3	Technicalities, visual aids to the Opposition, team help	-1...+2	Technicalities, visual aids to the Review, team help	-0...+1

	Juror's Grades								
	Stage I			**Stage II**			**Stage III**		
	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer
Starting	**15**	**10**	**5**	**15**	**10**	**5**	**15**	**10**	**5**
α	0	-2	0	-1	0	0	-1	+2	+1
β	-2	-2	0	-1	-1	+1	-3	+2	0
γ	-1	-2	0	-1	-1	0	-1	0	0
δ	0	0	0	+1	0	0	0	0	0
Sum up the Starting Grade (15, 10, or 5) with all four Partial Grades, and write below your resulting Juror's Grade									
Juror's Grade	12	~~5~~ 4	5	13	8	6	10	14	6
Juror's signature									

Please fill clearly and sign before showing your Grades. In case of discrepancy, this Protocol is considered correct (*IYNT Regulations*, Ch. 2, I, 8). No Grade can be corrected retroactively (*IYNT Regulations*, Ch. 1, IX, 1). This Protocol will be scanned and published. Before leaving the Science Fight room, please cross-check your Grades with Attendant's Science Fight Protocol and pass this Protocol to Chairperson in your Group.

Individual Juror's Protocol

Juror's name Natalia Semenikhina Date 08.07.2018 SF 3 Group D

	Overview of Science Fight		
	Stage I	**Stage II**	**Stage III**
Problem in the Stage	**Accepted:** 16	**Accepted:** 14	**Accepted:** 15
	Rejected, if any: –	Rejected, if any: –	Rejected, if any: 17, 13
	Fill below the names of Teams and Presenters, and any Yellow Cards announced by Chairperson (NR, NP, or NT)		
Reporter	Maria Zhuiko Belarus	Nansi Todorova Bulgaria Awkward	Zhan Utegaliyev Kazakhstan
Opponent	Samuil Mladenov Bulgaria Awkward	Gulam Makhamad Kazakhstan	Kseniya Shymporskaya Belarus
Reviewer	Nuray Begassilova Kazkhstan	Mariya Timashuk Belarus	Stoyan Germanov Bulgaria Awkward (Yellow card)

Criteria for Partial Grades

	for Reporter	Range	for Opponent	Range	for Reviewer	Range
α	Essence of the solution. Results. Validity. Scientific methods. Vision of scientific context. Justified conclusions. *Main tasks*: novel ideas, depth. *Inv Yourself*: problem statement. *Additional*: cooperation, resourcefulness	-6...+6	Objective critique. Skeptical inquiry. Relevant, nontrivial, challenging questions. Analysis of Report. Justified opinions. Understanding of scientific context. Valid conclusions, suggestions	-4...+4	Impartial, weighted, analytical Review. Relevant, nontrivial questions. Own, justified conclusions on Report, Opposition, and discussion. Understanding of scientific context	-2...+2
β	Defending own solution. Reaction to critique. Answers	-3...+3	Full focus on Report. Active, substantial argumentation	-2...+2	Critical summarization and wrap up of the Stage	-1...+1
γ	Structured and persuasive presentation. Speaking skills	-3...+3	Structured and persuasive Opposition. Speaking skills	-2...+2	Structured and persuasive Review. Speaking skills	-1...+1
δ	Technicalities, visual aids, demonstrations, team help	-2...+3	Technicalities, visual aids to the Opposition, team help	-1...+2	Technicalities, visual aids to the Review, team help	-0...+1

	Juror's Grades								
	Stage I			**Stage II**			**Stage III**		
	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer
Starting	**15**	**10**	**5**	**15**	**10**	**5**	**15**	**10**	**5**
α	0	-1	0	0	-1	+1	-2	+1	0
β	-1	-1	0	-1	0	+1	-1	+1	0
γ	-1	-1	0	-2	0	0	-1	+2	-1
δ	0	-1	-1	0	-1	0	0	0	0
Sum up the Starting Grade (15, 10, or 5) with all four Partial Grades, and write below your resulting Juror's Grade									
Juror's Grade	13	6	4	13	8	8	11	14	4
Juror's signature									

Please fill clearly and sign before showing your Grades. In case of discrepancy, this Protocol is considered correct (*IYNT Regulations*, Ch. 2, I, 8). No Grade can be corrected retroactively (*IYNT Regulations*, Ch. 1, IX, 1). This Protocol will be scanned and published. Before leaving the Science Fight room, please cross-check your Grades with Attendant's Science Fight Protocol and pass this Protocol to Chairperson in your Group.

Individual Juror's Protocol

Juror's name Giorgi Tsereteli Date 07/08/2018 SF 3 Group D

	Overview of Science Fight		
	Stage I	**Stage II**	**Stage III**
Problem in the Stage	**Accepted:** 16	**Accepted:** 14	**Accepted:** ~~13~~ 15
	Rejected, if any: –	Rejected, if any: –	Rejected, if any: ~~13~~, 17
	Fill below the names of Teams and Presenters, and any Yellow Cards announced by Chairperson (NR, NP, or NT)		
Reporter	Maria Zhuika	Nansi Todorova	Utegaliev Zhan
Opponent	SAMUIL Minkenov	Gulam Makhomna	Kseniya shymborskaya
Reviewer	NURAY Begassilova	Maryia Tomashuk	Stayan Germanov (yellow card)

Criteria for Partial Grades

	for Reporter	Range	for Opponent	Range	for Reviewer	Range
α	Essence of the solution. Results. Validity. Scientific methods. Vision of scientific context. Justified conclusions. *Main tasks*: novel ideas, depth. *Inv Yourself*: problem statement. *Additional*: cooperation, resourcefulness	-6...+6	Objective critique. Skeptical inquiry. Relevant, nontrivial, challenging questions. Analysis of Report. Justified opinions. Understanding of scientific context. Valid conclusions, suggestions	-4...+4	Impartial, weighted, analytical Review. Relevant, nontrivial questions. Own, justified conclusions on Report, Opposition, and discussion. Understanding of scientific context	-2...+2
β	Defending own solution. Reaction to critique. Answers	-3...+3	Full focus on Report. Active, substantial argumentation	-2...+2	Critical summarization and wrap up of the Stage	-1...+1
γ	Structured and persuasive presentation. Speaking skills	-3...+3	Structured and persuasive Opposition. Speaking skills	-2...+2	Structured and persuasive Review. Speaking skills	-1...+1
δ	Technicalities, visual aids, demonstrations, team help	-2...+3	Technicalities, visual aids to the Opposition, team help	-1...+2	Technicalities, visual aids to the Review, team help	-0...+1

	Juror's Grades								
	Stage I			**Stage II**			**Stage III**		
	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer
Starting	15	10	5	15	10	5	15	10	5
α	~~-3~~ -3	-3	-2	-4	-2	0	~~5~~	2	0
β	-2	-2	-1.	-2	-1	0	-1	1	-1
γ	1	-2	1	1	0	1	-1	2	0
δ	0	-1.	1	+1	~~0~~	1	-1	0	0
Sum up the Starting Grade (15, 10, or 5) with all four Partial Grades, and write below your resulting Juror's Grade									
Juror's Grade	11	2	4.	14	8	7	~~16~~	15	4
Juror's signature									

Please fill clearly and sign before showing your Grades. In case of discrepancy, this Protocol is considered correct (*IYNT Regulations*, Ch. 2, I, 8). No Grade can be corrected retroactively (*IYNT Regulations*, Ch. 1, IX, 1). This Protocol will be scanned and published. Before leaving the Science Fight room, please cross-check your Grades with Attendant's Science Fight Protocol and pass this Protocol to Chairperson in your Group.

Individual Juror's Protocol

Juror's name Anastasiia Chervinskaia Date 08.07.18 SF 3 Group D

	Overview of Science Fight		
	Stage I	**Stage II**	**Stage III**
Problem in the Stage	**Accepted:** 16	**Accepted:** 14	**Accepted:** 15
	Rejected, if any: —	Rejected, if any: —	Rejected, if any: 17, 13
	Fill below the names of Teams and Presenters, and any Yellow Cards announced by Chairperson (NR, NP, or NT)		
Reporter	Belarus - Pahonya Maria Zhuiko	Bulgaria Nansi Todorova	Kazakhstan Zhan Utegaliev
Opponent	Bulgaria - Awkward T Samuil Minsenov	Kazakhstan Gulam Makhamadi	Belarus Ksenija Shimborskaya
Reviewer	Kazakhstan Nuray Begassilova	Belarus Maryia Tamashuk	Bulgaria Stoyan Germanov

Criteria for Partial Grades

	for Reporter	Range	for Opponent	Range	for Reviewer	Range
α	Essence of the solution. Results. Validity. Scientific methods. Vision of scientific context. Justified conclusions. *Main tasks*: novel ideas, depth. *Inv Yourself*: problem statement. *Additional*: cooperation, resourcefulness	-6...+6	Objective critique. Skeptical inquiry. Relevant, nontrivial, challenging questions. Analysis of Report. Justified opinions. Understanding of scientific context. Valid conclusions, suggestions	-4...+4	Impartial, weighted, analytical Review. Relevant, nontrivial questions. Own, justified conclusions on Report, Opposition, and discussion. Understanding of scientific context	-2...+2
β	Defending own solution. Reaction to critique. Answers	-3...+3	Full focus on Report. Active, substantial argumentation	-2...+2	Critical summarization and wrap up of the Stage	-1...+1
γ	Structured and persuasive presentation. Speaking skills	-3...+3	Structured and persuasive Opposition. Speaking skills	-2...+2	Structured and persuasive Review. Speaking skills	-1...+1
δ	Technicalities, visual aids, demonstrations, team help	-2...+3	Technicalities, visual aids to the Opposition, team help	-1...+2	Technicalities, visual aids to the Review, team help	-0...+1

	Juror's Grades								
	Stage I			**Stage II**			**Stage III**		
	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer	Reporter	Opponent	Reviewer
Starting	**15**	**10**	**5**	**15**	**10**	**5**	**15**	**10**	**5**
α	0	-3	-2	+1	-1	+1	-1	0	0
β	0	-2	0	-2	-2	+1	-3	-1	-1
γ	-2	-2	0	-1	-1	0	-2	+1	0
δ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sum up the Starting Grade (15, 10, or 5) with all four Partial Grades, and write below your resulting Juror's Grade									
Juror's Grade	13	3	3	13	6	7	9	10	4
Juror's signature									