

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 1 stage: 3 room: 101 problem no.:

Juror's name & signature: FEILHAUER JH

reporter: GJH

opponent: PRESOV

reviewer:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 6 + 2 - 1 = 8$$

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
2	many	good
3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
4	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- 2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
- 2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
- 3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
1	too short/long	some
2	relevant parts	many
3	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 0 irrelevant
- 1 none
- 2 relevant, constructive

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:

Please, suitably adjust your grades taking into regard the [1,10] range.

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 1 stage: 3 room: 101 problem no.: 5

Juror's name & signature: *Yurivik*

reporter: G3H

opponent: PRESOV

reviewer: OSTRAVA

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 5.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 7$$

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few
1	some
2	many
3	+ data/theory convincingly supported
4	proved deep understanding
5	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 3.5 + 2 - 0 = 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- 2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no
1	some main points	few	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	efficient
4	+ practically all points	+ practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	no
1	few	some	some
2	some	some correct	good
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient

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

$$1 + 0 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 0 \pm 0 - 0 = 4$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
- 2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
- 3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant
1	partial	partially relevant
2	good	mostly adequate
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant
1	too short/long	partially relevant
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no
1	too short/long
2	relevant parts
3	accurate, conclusive

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 0 irrelevant
- 1 none
- 2 relevant, constructive

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:

Please, suitably adjust your grades taking into regard the [1,10] range.

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 1

stage: 3

room: 101

problem no.: 1

Juror's name & signature:

Ondrej Toth

reporter: G2H

opponent: Puc50r

reviewer: Ostrava

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 6 + 0.5 - 1.5 = 7$$

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects 'above average'	some parts well done
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
2	many	good
3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
4	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- 2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1 - 1 - 0 = 4$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
- 2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
- 3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
1	too short/long	some
2	relevant parts	many
3	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 irrelevant
- 0 none
- 1 relevant, constructive

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:

Please, suitably adjust your grades taking into regard the [1,10] range.

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 1 stage: 3 room: 101 problem no.:

Juror's name & signature:

reporter: GJH

opponent:

reviewer: OSTRAVA

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 1 - 0 = 6$$

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting deviations	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
2	many	good
3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
4	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.0 + 2.5 - 0 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- 2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0 + 1 + 1 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 4$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
- 2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
- 3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
1	too short/long	some
2	relevant parts	many
3	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 0 irrelevant
- 1 none
- 2 relevant, constructive

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:

Please, suitably adjust your grades taking into regard the [1,10] range.

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 1

stage: 3

room: 01

problem no.: 5

Juror's name & signature:

reporter: GJH

opponent: Moe

reviewer: Ophoe

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 7$$

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
2	many	good
3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
4	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 2 + 2.5 - 0 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- 2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0 + 1 + 1 + 1 \pm 0 - 0 = 4$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
- 2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
- 3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
1	too short/long	some
2	relevant parts	many
3	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 irrelevant
- 2 none
- 3 relevant, constructive

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:

Please, suitably adjust your grades taking into regard the [1,10] range.

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 1 stage: 2 room: 101 problem no.: 15 Juror's name & signature: Oudrej Toth
 reporter: Ostava opponent: CJH reviewer: Prešov

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 4$$

REPORT								DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion		
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	too few	poor	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	some	some aspects fine	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	many	good	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	3	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative				
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient		

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation		
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	almost no	too few	poor	no	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	few	some	some aspects fine	some	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	some	some correct	good	reasonable	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3		all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	3	
4		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	4	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	almost no	too few	-1	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	partial	partially relevant	some	too short/long	partially relevant	some	too short/long	some	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	relevant parts	many	1	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate	2	

NOTES:

Please, suitably adjust your grades taking into regard the [1,10] range.

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 18 stage: 2 room: 101 problem no.: 15 Juror's name & signature: Yurouik

reporter: OSTRAVA

opponent: G2H

reviewer: PREŠOV

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
2	many	good
3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
4	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	concise and correct or no questions asked
+1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
+2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	few	some	reasonable
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	main points	some	some correct	fair
3		+ all relevant points	many	many correct	efficient
4		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS:	
0	concise and correct or no questions asked
-1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
-2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 1 + 0.5 + 1 - 0 = 4$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	partial	partially relevant
2	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	good	mostly adequate
3	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	fully adequate

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
1	too short/long	some
2	relevant parts	many
3	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

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:

Please, suitably adjust your grades taking into regard the [1,10] range.

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 1 stage: 2 room: 101 problem no.: 15

Juror's name & signature: FELHAUER

reporter: OSTRAVA

opponent: GJH

reviewer: PREŠOV

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 4

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0 too few	poor
1 some	some aspects fine
2 many	good
3 + data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
4 proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED
0 too few, mostly irrelevant
1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0 almost no	too few	poor	no
1 few	some	some aspects fine	some
2 some	some correct	good	reasonable
3 good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4 new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	partial	partially relevant	some
2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
1	too short/long	some
2	relevant parts	many
3	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT
-1 irrelevant
0 none
1 relevant, constructive

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:

Please, suitably adjust your grades taking into regard the [1,10] range.

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 11 stage: 2 room: 101 problem no.: 15 Juror's name & signature: ROCH

reporter: OSTRAVA

opponent: GJH

reviewer: PREŠOV

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 5$$

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
2	many	good
3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
4	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- 2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 7 + 7 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 5$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
- 2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
- 3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
1	too short/long	some
2	relevant parts	many
3	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 irrelevant
- 0 none
- 1 relevant, constructive

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:

Please, suitably adjust your grades taking into regard the [1,10] range.

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 1 stage: 2 room: 101 problem no.: 15 Juror's name & signature: RONDREIE (signature)

reporter: Chirica

opponent: GJH

reviewer: Preson

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 5$$

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
2	many	good
3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
4	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 8$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- 2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 1 + 1.5 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 5$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
- 2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
- 3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
1	too short/long	some
2	relevant parts	many
3	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 irrelevant
- 0 none
- 1 relevant, constructive

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:

Please, suitably adjust your grades taking into regard the [1,10] range.

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 1

stage: 1

room: 101

problem no.: 8

Juror's name & signature:

Yurorik

reporter: PREŠOV

opponent: OSTRAVA

reviewer: G-JH

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 1 - 1 = 3$$

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
2	many	good
3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
4	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- 2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 3 + 2 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 9$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
- 2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
- 3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
1	too short/long	some
2	relevant parts	many
3	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 irrelevant
- 0 none
- 1 relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 1 stage: 1 room: 101 problem no.: 8 Juror's name & signature: Ondrej T544
reporter: Prešov opponent: Ostrava reviewer: G3H

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1 - 1 = 2$$

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
2	many	good
3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
4	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 8$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
1	too short/long	some
2	relevant parts	many
3	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 irrelevant
0 none
1 relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 1

stage: 1

room: 101

problem no.: 8

Juror's name & signature:

FEILHAUER *Edin*

reporter: PREŠOV

opponent: OSTRAVA

reviewer: 6JH

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 3

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0 too few	poor
1 some	some aspects fine
2 many	good
3 + data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
4 proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1 + 2 - 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- 2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0 almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1 some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2 main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3 all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4 practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0 almost no	too few	poor	no
1 few	some	some aspects fine	some
2 some	some correct	good	reasonable
3 good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4 new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
- 2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
- 3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0 poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1 partial	partially relevant	some
2 good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3 detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0 poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1 too short/long	partially relevant	some
2 informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3 condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0 almost no	too few
1 too short/long	some
2 relevant parts	many
3 accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 0 irrelevant
- 1 none
- 2 relevant, constructive

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:

Please, suitably adjust your grades taking into regard the [1,10] range.

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 1 stage: 1 room: 101 problem no.: 8 Juror's name & signature: ROCH

reporter: PRESOU opponent: OSTRAVA reviewer: GJH

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 15 + 0 - 05 = 2$$

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3			well performed, sufficient number	deviations	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	good	good	+ results explained	qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	detailed	quite detailed, correct	errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated
6	demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive			
7	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight						

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
2	many	good
3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
4	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- 2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 15 + 2 + 2 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
- 2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
- 3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
1	too short/long	some
2	relevant parts	many
3	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 irrelevant
- 2 none
- 3 relevant, constructive

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:

Please, suitably adjust your grades taking into regard the [1,10] range.

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 1 stage: 1

room: 101

problem no.: 8

Juror's name & signature:

KOADRACIK

reporter: Prusor

opponent: Bogdanova

reviewer: GSH

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 1 - 0.0 = 3$$

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3							
4	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated
7							

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
2	many	good
3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
4		
5	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
6		
7		

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

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- 2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
- 2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
- 3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
1	too short/long	some
2	relevant parts	many
3	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 irrelevant
- 0 none
- 1 relevant, constructive

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: