

SCORESHEET

stage: 2
reporter: 156

fight (round no.): F
opponent: VACUUM

room: DH
reviewer: GJH

problem no.: 6

Juror name: ADAMUSCIN
signature: adu

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

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 | reviewed sources, properly cited | partly |
| 2 | basic | basic | well performed | done, but not well fitting | some own | on average level |
| 3 | good but not so demonstrative | detailed, correct | quite a lot, errors analysed | + explained | relevant | convincing solution |
| 4 | detailed, good, demonstrative | +good testable predictions | results explained and analysed | well fitting, deviations analysed | considerable experimental or theoretical | some parts better than average |
| 5 | deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | detailed, complex, completely testable | + totally reliable, reproducible | perfect correlation, very conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical | grater extent than expected |

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

| | cooperation | relevant arguments/responses | flexibility/reactions |
|---|----------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 0 | almost no | too few | poor, slow reactions could answer some questions |
| 1 | was trying | some | gave reasonable explanations |
| 2 | satisfying | most | +helped clear things out quickly |
| 3 | productive | + data/theory convincingly supported | +technical cooperation with team, very efficient |
| 4 | very efficient | proved deep understanding | |

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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

QUESTIONS ASKED

| | |
|---|--|
| 0 | almost no, irrelevant |
| 1 | some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points |
| 2 | short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used |

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

| | time used | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | correct own opinions expressed | prioritization |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost nothing | no or irrelevant | almost no | no |
| 1 | very little | some main points | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | enough | main points | some | to most topics | some |
| 3 | almost all | all relevant parts | almost all | to almost all topics | reasonable |
| 4 | all & efficiently | almost all parts | all | + improvement suggestions | very good |

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

| | leading | cooperation | relevance of topics | own opinions presented | prioritisation |
|---|----------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | irrelevant | very little | no |
| 1 | little | was trying | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | partial | satisfying | most | mostly correct | some |
| 3 | efficient | good | almost all | almost all correct | reasonable |
| 4 | very efficient | very efficient | all | + improvement suggestions | 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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

QUESTIONS ASKED

| | |
|---|---|
| 0 | too few, mostly irrelevant |
| 1 | some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out |
| 2 | most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp. |
| 3 | +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently |

REVIEW OF REPORT

| | report summary | understanding of report | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | poor | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | partially | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | sufficient | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | detailed, complex | +improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

| | speech summary | discussion analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | too short/long | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | relevant parts | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | accurate, conclusive | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

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

stage: 2

fight (round no.): F

room: D

problem no.: 6

Juror name: Milan Smolík

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

signature:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

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 | reviewed sources, properly cited | partly |
| 2 | basic | basic | well performed | done, but not well fitting | some own | on average level |
| 3 | good but not so demonstrative | detailed, correct | quite a lot, errors analysed | + explained | relevant | convincing solution |
| 4 | detailed, good, demonstrative | +good testable predictions | + results explained and analysed | well fitting, deviations analysed | considerable experimental or theoretical | some parts better than average |
| 5 | deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | detailed, complex, completely testable | + totally reliable, reproducible | perfect correlation, very conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical | grater extent than expected |

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

| | cooperation | relevant arguments/responses | flexibility/reactions |
|---|----------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 0 | almost no | too few | poor, slow reactions could answer some questions |
| 1 | was trying | some | gave reasonable explanations |
| 2 | satisfying | most | +helped clear things out quickly |
| 3 | productive | + data/theory convincingly supported | +technical cooperation with team, very efficient |
| 4 | very efficient | proved deep understanding | |

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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 almost no, irrelevant
- 1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
- 2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

| | time used | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | correct own opinions expressed | prioritization |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost nothing | no or irrelevant | almost no | no |
| 1 | very little | some main points | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | enough | main points | some | to most topics | some |
| 3 | almost all | all relevant parts | almost all | to almost all topics | reasonable |
| 4 | all & efficiently | almost all parts | all | + improvement suggestions | very good |

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

| | leading | cooperation | relevance of topics | own opinions presented | prioritisation |
|---|----------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | irrelevant | very little | no |
| 1 | little | was trying | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | partial | satisfying | most | mostly correct | some |
| 3 | efficient | good | almost all | almost all correct | reasonable |
| 4 | very efficient | very efficient | all | + improvement suggestions | 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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

4

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out
- 2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp.
- 3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

| | report summary | understanding of report | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | poor | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | partially | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | sufficient | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | detailed, complex | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

| | speech summary | discussion analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | too short/long | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | relevant parts | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | accurate, conclusive | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

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

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

stage: 2

reporter: 1. SG

fight (round no.): F

opponent: VACUMLABS

room: D

reviewer: GJH

problem no.: 6

Juror name: FICKOVA

signature: Fickova

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 | reviewed sources, properly cited | partly |
| 2 | basic | basic | well performed | done, but not well fitting | some own | on average level |
| 3 | good but not so demonstrative | detailed, correct | quite a lot, errors analysed | + explained | relevant | convincing solution |
| 4 | detailed, good, demonstrative | +good testable predictions | + results explained and analysed | well fitting, deviations analysed | considerable experimental or theoretical | some parts better than average |
| 5 | deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | detailed, complex, completely testable | + totally reliable, reproducible | perfect correlation, very conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical | grater extent than expected |

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

| | cooperation | relevant arguments/responses | flexibility/reactions |
|---|----------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 0 | almost no | too few | poor, slow reactions could answer some questions |
| 1 | was trying | some | gave reasonable explanations |
| 2 | satisfying | most | +helped clear things out quickly |
| 3 | productive | + data/theory convincingly supported | +technical cooperation with team, very efficient |
| 4 | very efficient | proved deep understanding | |

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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 almost no, irrelevant
- 1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
- 2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

| | time used | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | correct own opinions expressed | prioritization |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost nothing | no or irrelevant | almost no | no |
| 1 | very little | some main points | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | enough | main points | some | to most topics | some |
| 3 | almost all | all relevant parts | almost all | to almost all topics | reasonable |
| 4 | all & efficiently | almost all parts | all | + improvement suggestions | very good |

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

| | leading | cooperation | relevance of topics | own opinions presented | prioritisation |
|---|----------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | irrelevant | very little | no |
| 1 | little | was trying | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | partial | satisfying | most | mostly correct | some |
| 3 | efficient | good | almost all | almost all correct | reasonable |
| 4 | very efficient | very efficient | all | + improvement suggestions | 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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

3

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out
- 2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp.
- 3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

| | report summary | understanding of report | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | poor | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | partially | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | sufficient | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | detailed, complex | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

| | speech summary | discussion analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | too short/long | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | relevant parts | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | accurate, conclusive | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

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:

chaos

SCORESHEET

stage: 2

fight (round no.): F

room: D

problem no.: 6

Juror name: NANA'SIOVA

reporter: 1.56

opponent: VACUUM

reviewer: GJH

signature: Nana'siova

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

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 | reviewed sources, properly cited | partly |
| 2 | basic | basic | well performed | done, but not well fitting | some own | on average level |
| 3 | good but not so demonstrative | detailed, correct | quite a lot, errors analysed | + explained | relevant | convincing solution |
| 4 | detailed, good, demonstrative | +good testable predictions | + results explained and analysed | well fitting, deviations analysed | considerable experimental or theoretical | some parts better than average |
| 5 | deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | detailed, complex, completely testable | + totally reliable, reproducible | perfect correlation, very conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical | grater extent than expected |

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

| | cooperation | relevant arguments/responses | flexibility/reactions |
|---|----------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 0 | almost no | too few | poor, slow reactions could answer some questions |
| 1 | was trying | some | gave reasonable explanations |
| 2 | satisfying | most | +helped clear things out quickly |
| 3 | productive | + data/theory convincingly supported | +technical cooperation with team, very efficient |
| 4 | very efficient | proved deep understanding | |

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

- concise and correct or no questions asked
- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

1 + 2.5 + 2

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

QUESTIONS ASKED

| | |
|---|--|
| 0 | almost no, irrelevant |
| 1 | some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points |
| 2 | short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used |

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

| | time used | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | correct own opinions expressed | prioritization |
|---|-------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost nothing | no or irrelevant | almost no | no |
| 1 | very little | some main points | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | enough | main points | some | to most topics | some |
| 3 | almost all | all relevant parts | almost all | to almost all topics | reasonable |
| 4 | efficiently | almost all parts | all | + improvement suggestions | very good |

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

| | leading | cooperation | relevance of topics | own opinions presented | prioritisation |
|---|----------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | irrelevant | very little | no |
| 1 | little | was trying | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | partial | satisfying | most | mostly correct | some |
| 3 | efficient | good | almost all | almost all correct | reasonable |
| 4 | very efficient | very efficient | all | + improvement suggestions | very good |

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

- concise and correct or no questions asked
- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2.5

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

QUESTIONS ASKED

| | |
|---|---|
| 0 | too few, mostly irrelevant |
| 1 | some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out |
| 2 | most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp. |
| 3 | +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently |

REVIEW OF REPORT

| | report summary | understanding of report | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | poor | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | partially | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | sufficient | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | detailed, complex | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

| | speech summary | discussion analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | too short/long | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | relevant parts | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | accurate, conclusive | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

- concise and correct or no questions asked
- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

1 + 2 + 2 + 2.5

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

stage:

fight (round no.):

room:

problem no.:

Juror name:

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

signature:

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 | reviewed sources, properly cited | partly |
| 2 | basic | basic | well performed | done, but not well fitting | some own | on average level |
| 3 | good but not so demonstrative | detailed, correct | quite a lot, errors analysed | + explained | relevant | convincing solution |
| 4 | detailed, good, demonstrative | +good testable predictions | + results explained and analysed | well fitting, deviations analysed | considerable experimental or theoretical | some parts better than average |
| 5 | deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | detailed, complex, completely testable | + totally reliable, reproducible | perfect correlation, very conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical | grater extent than expected |

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

| | cooperation | relevant arguments/responses | flexibility/reactions |
|---|----------------|------------------------------|--|
| 0 | almost no | too few | poor, slow reactions could answer some questions |
| 1 | was trying | some | gave reasonable explanations |
| 2 | satisfying | + most | + helped clear things out quickly |
| 3 | productive | convincingly supported | +technical cooperation with team, very efficient |
| 4 | very efficient | proved deep understanding | |

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:

1+3+2 → 6

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

QUESTIONS ASKED

| | |
|---|--|
| 0 | almost no, irrelevant |
| 1 | some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points |
| 2 | short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used |

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

| | time used | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | correct own opinions expressed | prioritization |
|---|-------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost nothing | no or irrelevant | almost no | no |
| 1 | very little | some main points | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | enough | main points | some | to most topics | some |
| 3 | almost all | all relevant parts | almost all | to almost all topics | reasonable |
| 4 | efficiently | almost all parts | all | + improvement suggestions | very good |

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

| | leading | cooperation | relevance of topics | own opinions presented | prioritisation |
|---|----------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | irrelevant | very little | no |
| 1 | little | was trying | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | partial | satisfying | most | mostly correct | some |
| 3 | efficient | good | almost all | almost all correct | reasonable |
| 4 | very efficient | very efficient | all | + improvement suggestions | 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:

1+1+2.5+2

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

QUESTIONS ASKED

| | |
|---|---|
| 0 | too few, mostly irrelevant |
| 1 | some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out |
| 2 | most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp. |
| 3 | +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently |

REVIEW OF REPORT

| | report summary | understanding of report | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | poor | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | partially | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | sufficient | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | detailed, complex | +improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

| | speech summary | discussion analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | too short/long | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | relevant parts | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | accurate, conclusive | +improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

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:

1+1+1+1.5

SCORESHEET

stage: 2

fight (round no.): F

room: D

problem no.: 6

Juror name: PLESCH

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

signature: [Signature]

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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 | cooperation | relevant arguments/responses | flexibility/reactions | |
| almost no | almost no | too few | no/ almost no | others data, incorrectly cited | misunderstood | almost no | too few | poor, slow reactions | 0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| some | some | some | some | reviewed sources, properly cited | partly | | | | |
| basic | basic | well performed | done, but not well fitting | some own | on average level | 1 was trying | some | could answer some questions | |
| good but not so demonstrative | detailed, correct | quite a lot, errors analysed | + explained | relevant | convincing solution | 2 satisfying | most | gave reasonable explanations | |
| detailed, good, demonstrative | +good testable predictions | + results explained and analysed | well fitting, deviations analysed | considerable experimental or theoretical | some parts better than average | 3 productive | + data/theory convincingly supported | +helped clear things out quickly | |
| deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | detailed, complex, completely testable | + totally reliable, reproducible | perfect correlation, very conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical | grater extent than expected | 4 very efficient | proved deep understanding | +technical cooperation with team, very efficient | |

NOTES:

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

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

| QUESTIONS ASKED | | | | | | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER | | | | | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|--|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------|---|
| time used | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | correct own opinions expressed | prioritization | | leading | cooperation | relevance of topics | own opinions presented | prioritisation | |
| almost no, irrelevant | almost nothing | no or irrelevant | almost no | no | | almost no | almost no | irrelevant | very little | no | 0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points | some main points | few | some | almost no | | 1 little | was trying | few | some | almost no | |
| enough | main points | some | to most topics | some | | 2 partial | satisfying | most | mostly correct | some | |
| almost all | all relevant parts | almost all | to almost all topics | reasonable | | 3 efficient | good | almost all | almost all correct | reasonable | |
| all & | | | + improvement | | | 4 very efficient | very efficient | all | + improvement suggestions | very good | |
| efficiently | almost all parts | all | suggestions | very good | | | | | | | |

NOTES:

(no) positive zuhören \Rightarrow Zuhör-juice \otimes Zuhör-juice od. uhn

$$1 + 1 + 1,75 + 1,5 = 5$$

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

| QUESTIONS ASKED | | | | | | REVIEW OF REPORT | | | | | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION | | | | | ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS |
|---|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|--|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|---|
| report summary | understanding of report | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation | | speech summary | discussion analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation | speech summary | discussion analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation | |
| too few, mostly irrelevant | poor | too few | irrelevant | chaotic | | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | chaotic | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | chaotic | 0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out | too short/long | some | partially relevant | present | | 1 too short/long | too short/long | some | partially relevant | present | 1 too short/long | too short/long | some | partially relevant | present | |
| most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp. | informative, apt | many | adequate | visible | | 2 informative, apt | relevant parts | many | adequate | visible | 2 informative, apt | relevant parts | many | adequate | visible | |
| +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently | brief but accurate | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive | | 3 brief but accurate | accurate, conclusive | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive | 3 brief but accurate | accurate, conclusive | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

NOTES:

kein doppel pointen

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

SCORESHEET

stage: 1

fight (round no.): F

room: D11

problem no.:

Juror name: ADAMUSCIN

reporter: GJH

opponent: ISG

reviewer: VACUUM

signature: Adamuscin

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

4

REPORT

| phenomenon explanation | theory/model | relevant experiments | comparison between theory and experiment | own contribution | task fulfilment |
|---|--|----------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|
| almost no | almost no | too few | no/ almost no | others data, incorrectly cited | misunderstood |
| some | some | some | some | reviewed sources, properly cited | partly |
| basic | X basic | well performed | done, but not well fitting | some own | on average level |
| good but not so demonstrative | X detailed, correct | quite a lot, errors analysed | X + explained | relevant | convincing solution |
| detailed, good, demonstrative | X good testable predictions | + results explained and analysed | X well fitting, deviations analysed | considerable experimental or theoretical | some parts better than average |
| deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | detailed, complex, completely testable | + totally reliable, reproducible | perfect correlation, very conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical | grater extent than expected |

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

| cooperation | relevant arguments/responses | flexibility/reactions |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| almost no | too few | poor, slow reactions could answer some questions |
| 1 was trying | some | X gave reasonable explanations |
| 2 X satisfying | most | + helped clear things out quickly |
| 3 productive | + data/theory convincingly supported | + technical cooperation with team, very efficient |
| 4 very efficient | proved deep understanding | |

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:

~3
② 3

9-2

~5
④ 5

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

| time used | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | correct own opinions expressed | prioritization |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| almost no | almost nothing | no or irrelevant | almost no | no |
| 1 very little | some main points | few | some | almost no |
| 2 X enough | main points | X some | to most topics | some |
| 3 almost all | X all relevant parts | almost all | X to almost all topics | X reasonable |
| 4 all & efficiently | almost all parts | all | + improvement suggestions | very good |

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

| leading | cooperation | relevance of topics | own opinions presented | prioritisation |
|------------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| almost no | almost no | irrelevant | very little | no |
| 1 little | was trying | few | some | almost no |
| 2 partial | satisfying | most | mostly correct | some |
| 3 X efficient | good | almost all | almost all correct | X reasonable |
| 4 very efficient | very efficient | all | + improvement suggestions | 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:

~1

~2-3

2-3

⑥-8

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

| QUESTIONS ASKED |
|---|
| 0 too few, mostly irrelevant |
| 1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out |
| 2 X most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp. |
| 3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently |

REVIEW OF REPORT

| report summary | understanding of report | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 poor | poor | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 too short/long | partially | X some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 X informative, apt | X sufficient | many | X adequate | X visible |
| 3 brief but accurate | detailed, complex | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

| speech summary | discussion analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 too short/long | too short/long | X some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 X informative, apt | X relevant parts | many | X adequate | X visible |
| 3 brief but accurate | accurate, conclusive | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

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:

~2

7-2

⑥ 7

SCORESHEET

stage: 1

fight (round no.): F

room: D

problem no.: 15

Juror name: Milan Smolik

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

signature:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

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 | reviewed sources, properly cited | partly |
| 2 | basic | basic | well performed | done, but not well fitting | some own | on average level |
| 3 | good but not so demonstrative | detailed, correct | quite a lot, errors analysed | + explained | relevant | convincing solution |
| 4 | detailed, good, demonstrative | +good testable predictions | + results explained and analysed | well fitting, deviations analysed | considerable experimental or theoretical | some parts better than average |
| 5 | deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | detailed, complex, completely testable | + totally reliable, reproducible | perfect correlation, very conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical | grater extent than expected |

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

| | cooperation | relevant arguments/responses | flexibility/reactions |
|---|----------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 0 | almost no | too few | poor, slow reactions |
| 1 | was trying | some | could answer some questions |
| 2 | satisfying | most | gave reasonable explanations |
| 3 | productive | + data/theory convincingly supported | +helped clear things out quickly |
| 4 | very efficient | proved deep understanding | +technical cooperation with team, very 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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 almost no, irrelevant
- 1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
- 2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

| | time used | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | correct own opinions expressed | prioritization |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost nothing | no or irrelevant | almost no | no |
| 1 | very little | some main points | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | enough | main points | some | to most topics | some |
| 3 | almost all | all relevant parts | almost all | to almost all topics | reasonable |
| 4 | all & efficiently | almost all parts | all | + improvement suggestions | very good |

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

| | leading | cooperation | relevance of topics | own opinions presented | prioritisation |
|---|----------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | irrelevant | very little | no |
| 1 | little | was trying | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | partial | satisfying | most | mostly correct | some |
| 3 | efficient | good | almost all | almost all correct | reasonable |
| 4 | very efficient | very efficient | all | + improvement suggestions | 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: + mystery egg question

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

8

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out
- 2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp.
- 3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

| | report summary | understanding of report | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | poor | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | partially | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | sufficient | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | detailed, complex | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

| | speech summary | discussion analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | too short/long | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | relevant parts | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | accurate, conclusive | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

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

stage: 1

fight (round no.): F

room: D

problem no.: 15

Juror name: FICKOVA

reporter: GJH

opponent: 1. SG

reviewer: VACUMLABS

signature: Fickova

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

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 | reviewed sources, properly cited | partly |
| 2 | basic | basic | well performed | done, but not well fitting | some own | on average level |
| 3 | good but not so demonstrative | detailed, correct | quite a lot, errors analysed | + explained | relevant | convincing solution |
| 4 | detailed, good, demonstrative | +good testable predictions | + results explained and analysed | well fitting, deviations analysed | considerable experimental or theoretical | some parts better than average |
| 5 | deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | detailed, complex, completely testable | + totally reliable, reproducible | perfect correlation, very conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical | grater extent than expected |

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

| | cooperation | relevant arguments/responses | flexibility/reactions |
|---|----------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 0 | almost no | too few | poor, slow reactions |
| 1 | was trying | some | could answer some questions |
| 2 | satisfying | most | gave reasonable explanations |
| 3 | productive | + data/theory convincingly supported | +helped clear things out quickly |
| 4 | very efficient | proved deep understanding | +technical cooperation with team, very 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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

9

QUESTIONS ASKED

| | |
|---|--|
| 0 | almost no, irrelevant |
| 1 | some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points |
| 2 | short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used |

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

| | time used | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | correct own opinions expressed | prioritization |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost nothing | no or irrelevant | almost no | no |
| 1 | very little | some main points | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | enough | main points | some | to most topics | some |
| 3 | almost all | all relevant parts | almost all | to almost all topics | reasonable |
| 4 | all & efficiently | almost all parts | all | + improvement suggestions | very good |

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

| | leading | cooperation | relevance of topics | own opinions presented | prioritisation |
|---|----------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | irrelevant | very little | no |
| 1 | little | was trying | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | partial | satisfying | most | mostly correct | some |
| 3 | efficient | good | almost all | almost all correct | reasonable |
| 4 | very efficient | very efficient | all | + improvement suggestions | 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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

8

QUESTIONS ASKED

| | |
|---|---|
| 0 | too few, mostly irrelevant |
| 1 | some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out |
| 2 | most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp. |
| 3 | +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently |

REVIEW OF REPORT

| | report summary | understanding of report | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | poor | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | partially | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | sufficient | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | detailed, complex | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

| | speech summary | discussion analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | too short/long | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | relevant parts | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | accurate, conclusive | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

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

stage: 1

fight (round no.): F

room: D

problem no.: 15

Juror name: KANA'GIOVA

reporter: GJH

opponent: 1.56

reviewer: VACUUM

signature: Kana'giova

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

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 | reviewed sources, properly cited | partly |
| 2 | basic | basic | well performed | done, but not well fitting | some own | on average level |
| 3 | good but not so demonstrative | detailed, correct | quite a lot, errors analysed | explained | relevant | convincing solution |
| 4 | detailed, good, demonstrative | + good testable predictions | + results explained and analysed | well fitting, deviations analysed | considerable experimental or theoretical | some parts better than average |
| 5 | deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | detailed, complex, completely testable | + totally reliable, reproducible | perfect correlation, very conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical | grater extent than expected |

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

| | cooperation | relevant arguments/responses | flexibility/reactions |
|---|----------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| 0 | almost no | too few | poor, slow reactions |
| 1 | was trying | some | could answer some questions |
| 2 | satisfying | most | gave reasonable explanations |
| 3 | productive | + data/theory convincingly supported | + helped clear things out quickly |
| 4 | very efficient | proved deep understanding | + technical cooperation with team, very 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:

1 + 3,5 + 2

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 almost no, irrelevant
- 1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
- 2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

| | time used | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | correct own opinions expressed | prioritization |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost nothing | no or irrelevant | almost no | no |
| 1 | very little | some main points | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | enough | main points | some | most topics | some |
| 3 | almost all | all relevant parts | almost all | to almost all topics | reasonable |
| 4 | all & efficiently | almost all parts | all | improvement suggestions | very good |

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

| | leading | cooperation | relevance of topics | own opinions presented | prioritisation |
|---|----------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | irrelevant | very little | no |
| 1 | little | was trying | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | partial | satisfying | most | mostly correct | some |
| 3 | efficient | good | almost all | almost all correct | reasonable |
| 4 | very efficient | very efficient | all | + improvement suggestions | 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:

1 + 1 + 2,5 + 2,5

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

8

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out
- 2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp.
- 3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

| | report summary | understanding of report | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | poor | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | partially | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | sufficient | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | detailed, complex | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

| | speech summary | discussion analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | too short/long | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | relevant parts | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | accurate, conclusive | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

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:

1 + 1,5 + 2,5 + 2,5

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

stage: 1

reporter: GSH

fight (round no.): F

opponent: 156

room: D

reviewer: Vaanulabs

problem no.: 15

Juror name: KONDRAEL

signature: Uedra

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 | reviewed sources, properly cited | partly |
| 2 | basic | basic | well performed | done, but not well fitting | some own | on average level |
| 3 | good but not so demonstrative | detailed, correct | quite a lot, errors analysed | + explained | relevant | convincing solution |
| 4 | detailed, good, demonstrative | +good testable predictions | + results explained and analysed | well fitting, deviations analysed | considerable experimental or theoretical | some parts better than average |
| 5 | deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | detailed, complex, completely testable | + totally reliable, reproducible | perfect correlation, very conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical | grater extent than expected |

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

| | cooperation | relevant arguments/responses | flexibility/reactions |
|---|----------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 0 | almost no | too few | poor, slow reactions |
| 1 | was trying | some | could answer some questions |
| 2 | satisfying | most | gave reasonable explanations |
| 3 | productive | + data/theory convincingly supported | +helped clear things out quickly |
| 4 | very efficient | proved deep understanding | +technical cooperation with team, very 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:

$$1 + 2,5 + 2 \rightarrow 5$$

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 almost no, irrelevant
- 1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
- 2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

| | time used | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | correct own opinions expressed | prioritization |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost nothing | no or irrelevant | almost no | no |
| 1 | very little | some main points | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | enough | main points | some | to most topics | some |
| 3 | almost all | all relevant parts | almost all | to almost all topics | reasonable |
| 4 | all & efficiently | almost all parts | all | + improvement suggestions | very good |

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

| | leading | cooperation | relevance of topics | own opinions presented | prioritisation |
|---|----------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | irrelevant | very little | no |
| 1 | little | was trying | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | partial | satisfying | most | mostly correct | some |
| 3 | efficient | good | almost all | almost all correct | reasonable |
| 4 | very efficient | very efficient | all | + improvement suggestions | 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:

$$1 + 1 + 1,5 + 2,5 \rightarrow 6$$

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out
- 2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp.
- 3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

| | report summary | understanding of report | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | poor | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | partially | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | sufficient | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | detailed, complex | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

| | speech summary | discussion analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | too short/long | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | relevant parts | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | accurate, conclusive | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

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:

$$1 + 1,5 + 2 + 2,5 \rightarrow 7$$

SCORESHEET

stage: 1

fight (round no.): f

room: D

problem no.: VACB

Juror name: P. R. S. A. T.

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

signature:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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 | reviewed sources, properly cited | partly |
| 2 | basic | basic | well performed | done, but not well fitting | some own relevant | on average level |
| 3 | good but not so demonstrative | detailed, correct | quite a lot, errors analysed | + explained | | convincing solution |
| 4 | detailed, good, demonstrative | +good testable predictions | + results explained and analysed | well fitting, deviations analysed | considerable experimental or theoretical | some parts better than average |
| 5 | deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | detailed, complex, completely testable | + totally reliable, reproducible | perfect correlation, very conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical | grater extent than expected |
| 6 | | | | | | |

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

| | cooperation | relevant arguments/responses | flexibility/reactions |
|---|----------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 0 | almost no | too few | poor, slow reactions could answer some questions |
| 1 | was trying | some | gave reasonable explanations |
| 2 | satisfying | most | +helped clear things out quickly |
| 3 | productive | + data/theory convincingly supported | +technical cooperation with team, very efficient |
| 4 | very efficient | proved deep understanding | |

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:

$$1 + 2(4) + 2 = 5$$

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — almost no, irrelevant
- 1 — some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
- 2 — short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

| | time used | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | correct own opinions expressed | prioritization |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost nothing | no or irrelevant | almost no | no |
| 1 | very little | some main points | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | enough | main points | some | to most topics | some |
| 3 | almost all | all relevant parts | almost all | to almost all topics | reasonable |
| 4 | all & efficiently | almost all parts | all | + improvement suggestions | very good |

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

| | leading | cooperation | relevance of topics | own opinions presented | prioritisation |
|---|----------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | irrelevant | very little | no |
| 1 | little | was trying | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | partial | satisfying | most | mostly correct | some |
| 3 | efficient | good | almost all | almost all correct | reasonable |
| 4 | very efficient | very efficient | all | + improvement suggestions | 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:

$$1 + 2(5) + 3(6) = 6-7$$

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 — some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out
- 2 — most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp.
- 3 — +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

| | report summary | understanding of report | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | poor | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | partially | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | sufficient | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | detailed, complex | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

| | speech summary | discussion analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | too short/long | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | relevant parts | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | accurate, conclusive | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

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:

$$1 + 2(5) + 3 + 2(5) = 9$$

SCORESHEET

stage: 3

fight (round no.): final

room: D

problem no.:

Juror name: ROUNDELL

reporter: VACUUM LABS

opponent: GSH

reviewer: ASG

signature: [Signature]

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

8

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 | reviewed sources, properly cited | partly |
| 2 | basic | basic | well performed | done, but not well fitting | some own | on average level |
| 3 | good but not so demonstrative | detailed, correct | quite a lot, errors analysed | + explained | relevant | convincing solution |
| 4 | detailed, good, demonstrative | +good testable predictions | + results explained and analysed | well fitting, deviations analysed | considerable experimental or theoretical | some parts better than average |
| 5 | deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | detailed, complex, completely testable | + totally reliable, reproducible | perfect correlation, very conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical | grater extent than expected |

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

| | cooperation | relevant arguments/responses | flexibility/reactions |
|---|----------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 0 | almost no | too few | poor, slow reactions |
| 1 | was trying | some | could answer some questions |
| 2 | satisfying | most | gave reasonable explanations |
| 3 | productive | + data/theory convincingly supported | +helped clear things out quickly |
| 4 | very efficient | proved deep understanding | +technical cooperation with team, very 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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 almost no, irrelevant
- 1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
- 2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

| | time used | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | correct own opinions expressed | prioritization |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost nothing | no or irrelevant | almost no | no |
| 1 | very little | some main points | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | enough | main points | some | to most topics | some |
| 3 | almost all | all relevant parts | almost all | to almost all topics | reasonable |
| 4 | all & efficiently | almost all parts | all | + improvement suggestions | very good |

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

| | leading | cooperation | relevance of topics | own opinions presented | prioritisation |
|---|----------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | irrelevant | very little | no |
| 1 | little | was trying | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | partial | satisfying | most | mostly correct | some |
| 3 | efficient | good | almost all | almost all correct | reasonable |
| 4 | very efficient | very efficient | all | + improvement suggestions | 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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

9

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out
- 2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp.
- 3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

| | report summary | understanding of report | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | poor | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | partially | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | sufficient | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | detailed, complex | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

| | speech summary | discussion analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | too short/long | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | relevant parts | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | accurate, conclusive | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

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

stage: 3
reporter:

fight (round no.): F
opponent:

room: P
reviewer:

problem no.:

Juror name: PLRSCIT
signature:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

9

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 | reviewed sources, properly cited | partly |
| 2 | basic | basic | well performed | done, but not well fitting | some own | on average level |
| 3 | good but not so demonstrative | detailed, correct | quite a lot, errors analysed | + explained | relevant | convincing solution |
| 4 | detailed, good, demonstrative | +good, testable predictions | + results explained and analysed | well fitting, deviations analysed | considerable experimental or theoretical | some parts better than average |
| 5 | deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | detailed, complex, completely testable | + totally reliable, reproducible | perfect correlation, very conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical | grater extent than expected |

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

| | cooperation | relevant arguments/responses | flexibility/reactions |
|---|----------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 0 | almost no | too few | poor, slow reactions could answer some questions |
| 1 | was trying | some | gave reasonable explanations |
| 2 | satisfying | most | +helped clear things out quickly |
| 3 | productive | + data/theory convincingly supported | +technical cooperation with team, very efficient |
| 4 | very efficient | proved deep understanding | |

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:

$$1 + 5,5 + 3 = 9,5 - 0,5 = 9$$

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 almost no, irrelevant
1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

| | time used | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | correct own opinions expressed | prioritization |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost nothing | no or irrelevant | almost no | no |
| 1 | very little | some main points | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | enough | main points | some | to most topics | some |
| 3 | almost all | all relevant parts | almost all | to almost all topics | reasonable |
| 4 | all & efficiently | almost all parts | all | + improvement suggestions | very good |

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

| | leading | cooperation | relevance of topics | own opinions presented | prioritisation |
|---|----------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | irrelevant | very little | no |
| 1 | little | was trying | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | partial | satisfying | most | mostly correct | some |
| 3 | efficient | good | almost all | almost all correct | reasonable |
| 4 | very efficient | very efficient | all | + improvement suggestions | 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:

$$1 + 1,2 + 2 + 3 = 7$$

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

9

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out
2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp.
3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

| | report summary | understanding of report | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | poor | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | partially | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | sufficient | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | detailed, complex | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

| | speech summary | discussion analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | too short/long | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | relevant parts | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | accurate, conclusive | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

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:

$$1 + 3 + 2,5 + 2,5 = 9$$

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

9

stage: 3

reporter: VACUUM

fight (round no.): F

opponent: GJH

room: D

reviewer: 1.5G

problem no.: 14

Juror name:

MANA'SIOVA
Manasiova

signature:

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 | reviewed sources, properly cited | partly |
| 2 | basic | basic | well performed | done, but not well fitting | some own | on average level |
| 3 | good but not so demonstrative | detailed, correct | quite a lot, errors analysed | + explained | relevant | convincing solution |
| 4 | detailed, good, demonstrative | +good testable predictions | + results explained and analysed | well fitting, deviations analysed | considerable experimental or theoretical | some parts better than average |
| 5 | deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | detailed, complex, completely testable | + totally reliable, reproducible | perfect correlation, very conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical | greater extent than expected |

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

| | cooperation | relevant arguments/responses | flexibility/reactions |
|---|----------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 0 | almost no | too few | poor, slow reactions |
| 1 | was trying | some | could answer some questions |
| 2 | satisfying | most | gave reasonable explanations |
| 3 | productive | + data/theory convincingly supported | +helped clear things out quickly |
| 4 | very efficient | proved deep understanding | +technical cooperation with team, very 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:

1 + 5 + 3

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 almost no, irrelevant
- 1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
- 2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

| | time used | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | correct own opinions expressed | prioritization |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost nothing | no or irrelevant | almost no | no |
| 1 | very little | some main points | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | enough | main points | some | to most topics | some |
| 3 | almost all | all relevant parts | almost all | to almost all topics | reasonable |
| 4 | all & efficiently | almost all parts | all | + improvement suggestions | very good |

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

| | leading | cooperation | relevance of topics | own opinions presented | prioritisation |
|---|----------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | irrelevant | very little | no |
| 1 | little | was trying | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | partial | satisfying | most | mostly correct | some |
| 3 | efficient | good | almost all | almost all correct | reasonable |
| 4 | very efficient | very efficient | all | + improvement suggestions | 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:

1 + 0,5 + 2 + 2

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

9

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out
- 2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp.
- 3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

| | report summary | understanding of report | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | poor | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | partially | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | sufficient | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | detailed, complex | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

| | speech summary | discussion analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | too short/long | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | relevant parts | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | accurate, conclusive | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

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:

1 + 3 + 2 + 2,5

SCORESHEET

stage: 3 fight (round no.): F
reporter: VACUUM LABS opponent: GSH

room: D
reviewer: 1.5G

problem no.:

Juror name: FICKOVA
signature: Fickova

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

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 | reviewed sources, properly cited | partly |
| 2 | basic | basic | well performed | done, but not well fitting | some own | on average level |
| 3 | good but not so demonstrative | detailed, correct | quite a lot, errors analysed | + explained | relevant | convincing solution |
| 4 | detailed, good, demonstrative | +good testable predictions | + results explained and analysed | well fitting, deviations analysed | considerable experimental or theoretical | some parts better than average |
| 5 | deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | detailed, complex, completely testable | + totally reliable, reproducible | perfect correlation, very conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical | grater extent than expected |

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

| | cooperation | relevant arguments/responses | flexibility/reactions |
|---|----------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 0 | almost no | too few | poor, slow reactions could answer some questions |
| 1 | was trying | some | gave reasonable explanations |
| 2 | satisfying | most | +helped clear things out quickly |
| 3 | productive | + data/theory convincingly supported | +technical cooperation with team, very efficient |
| 4 | very efficient | proved deep understanding | |

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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

QUESTIONS ASKED

| | |
|---|--|
| 0 | almost no, irrelevant |
| 1 | some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points |
| 2 | short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used |

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

| | time used | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | correct own opinions expressed | prioritization |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost nothing | no or irrelevant | almost no | no |
| 1 | very little | some main points | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | enough | main points | some | to most topics | some |
| 3 | almost all | all relevant parts | almost all | to almost all topics | reasonable |
| 4 | all & efficiently | almost all parts | all | + improvement suggestions | very good |

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

| | leading | cooperation | relevance of topics | own opinions presented | prioritisation |
|---|----------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | irrelevant | very little | no |
| 1 | little | was trying | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | partial | satisfying | most | mostly correct | some |
| 3 | efficient | good | almost all | almost all correct | reasonable |
| 4 | very efficient | very efficient | all | + improvement suggestions | 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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

QUESTIONS ASKED

| | |
|---|---|
| 0 | too few, mostly irrelevant |
| 1 | some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out |
| 2 | most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp. |
| 3 | +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently |

REVIEW OF REPORT

| | report summary | understanding of report | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | poor | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | partially | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | sufficient | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | detailed, complex | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

| | speech summary | discussion analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | too short/long | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | relevant parts | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | accurate, conclusive | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

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

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

stage:

3

fight (round no.):

F

room:

DH

problem no.:

14

Juror name:

ADAMUSCIN

reporter: VACUUM

opponent:

GJH

reviewer:

156

signature:

adamuscin

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 | reviewed sources, properly cited | partly |
| 2 | basic | basic | well performed | done, but not well fitting | some own | on average level |
| 3 | good but not so demonstrative | detailed, correct | quite a lot, errors analysed | + explained | relevant | convincing solution |
| 4 | detailed, good, demonstrative | +good testable predictions | + results explained and analysed | well fitting, deviations analysed | considerable experimental or theoretical | some parts better than average |
| 5 | deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | detailed, complex, completely testable | + totally reliable, reproducible | perfect correlation, very conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical | grater extent than expected |

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

| | cooperation | relevant arguments/responses | flexibility/reactions |
|---|----------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 0 | almost no | too few | poor, slow reactions could answer some questions |
| 1 | was trying | some | gave reasonable explanations |
| 2 | satisfying | most | +helped clear things out quickly |
| 3 | productive | + data/theory convincingly supported | +technical cooperation with team, very efficient |
| 4 | very efficient | proved deep understanding | |

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:

2 2 3 4 4 3 1 1

2-3

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 almost no, irrelevant
- 1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
- 2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

| | time used | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | correct own opinions expressed | prioritization |
|---|-------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost nothing | no or irrelevant | almost no | no |
| 1 | very little | some main points | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | enough | main points | some | to most topics | some |
| 3 | almost all | all relevant parts | almost all | to almost all topics | reasonable |
| 4 | efficiently | almost all parts | all | + improvement suggestions | very good |

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

| | leading | cooperation | relevance of topics | own opinions presented | prioritisation |
|---|----------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | irrelevant | very little | no |
| 1 | little | was trying | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | partial | satisfying | most | mostly correct | some |
| 3 | efficient | good | almost all | almost all correct | reasonable |
| 4 | very efficient | very efficient | all | + improvement suggestions | 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:

1 3 3 2 1 3 1 2

2-3

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out
- 2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp.
- 3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

| | report summary | understanding of report | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | poor | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | partially | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | sufficient | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | detailed, complex | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

| | speech summary | discussion analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | too short/long | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | relevant parts | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | accurate, conclusive | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

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:

2 1-2 2 6-7

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

stage: 3
reporter:

fight (round no.): F
opponent:

room: D
reviewer:

problem no.: 14

Juror name: Milica Samolik
signature: ymu

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 | reviewed sources, properly cited | partly |
| 2 | basic | basic | well performed | done, but not well fitting | some own | on average level |
| 3 | good but not so demonstrative | detailed, correct | quite a lot, errors analysed | + explained | relevant | convincing solution |
| 4 | detailed, good, demonstrative | +good testable predictions | + results explained and analysed | well fitting, deviations analysed | considerable experimental or theoretical | some parts better than average |
| 5 | deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | detailed, complex, completely testable | + totally reliable, reproducible | perfect correlation, very conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical | grater extent than expected |

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

| | cooperation | relevant arguments/responses | flexibility/reactions |
|---|----------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 0 | almost no | too few | poor, slow reactions |
| 1 | was trying | some | could answer some questions |
| 2 | satisfying | most | gave reasonable explanations |
| 3 | productive | + data/theory convincingly supported | +helped clear things out quickly |
| 4 | very efficient | proved deep understanding | +technical cooperation with team, very 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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — almost no, irrelevant
1 — some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
2 — short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

| | time used | understanding of presentation | relevant topics addressed | correct own opinions expressed | prioritization |
|---|-------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost nothing | no or irrelevant | almost no | no |
| 1 | very little | some main points | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | enough | main points | some | to most topics | some |
| 3 | almost all | all relevant parts | almost all | to almost all topics | reasonable |
| 4 | efficiently | almost all parts | all | + improvement suggestions | very good |

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

| | leading | cooperation | relevance of topics | own opinions presented | prioritisation |
|---|----------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| 0 | almost no | almost no | irrelevant | very little | no |
| 1 | little | was trying | few | some | almost no |
| 2 | partial | satisfying | most | mostly correct | some |
| 3 | efficient | good | almost all | almost all correct | reasonable |
| 4 | very efficient | very efficient | all | + improvement suggestions | 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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

9

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant
1 — some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out
2 — most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp.
3 — +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

| | report summary | understanding of report | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | poor | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | partially | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | sufficient | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | detailed, complex | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

| | speech summary | discussion analysis | own opinions | pros & cons | prioritisation |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| 0 | poor | almost no | too few | irrelevant | chaotic |
| 1 | too short/long | too short/long | some | partially relevant | present |
| 2 | informative, apt | relevant parts | many | adequate | visible |
| 3 | brief but accurate | accurate, conclusive | + improvement suggestions | fully adequate | clear, intuitive |

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: