

# SCORESHEET

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3 + 1 - 1 = 4$$

fight (round no.): 3

stage: 2

room: 102

problem no.: 10

Juror's name & signature: Zuzana

reporter: Presov

opponent: GJH (Helen J.)

reviewer: Srobarova

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 incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 ..... some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 ..... deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	some	some aspects fine	
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	many	good	
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	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
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			

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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 ..... some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 ..... some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 ..... deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	few	some	some aspects fine	some	
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	some	some correct	good	reasonable	
3		all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
4		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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 ..... irrelevant 0 ..... none 1 ..... relevant, constructive -2 ..... deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	0 ..... concise and correct or no questions asked -1 ..... some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 ..... deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	partial	partially relevant	some	too short/long	partially relevant	some	too short/long	some		
2	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	relevant parts	many		
3	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		

NOTES:



## SCORESHEET

REPORTER <sup>3</sup> Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 1.5 - 1.5 = 1$$

fight (round no.): 3 stage: 1 room: 102 problem no.: 17 Juror's name & signature: *Testi Cugra*

reporter: *Stobanova (R-Lasch)*

opponent: *Pesic (Hale)*

reviewer: *6th (Lasevic)*

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				
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor		concise and correct or
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	some	some aspects fine	0	no questions asked
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	many	good	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	-1	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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	-2	
6											
7											

NOTES: *relevant parameters not gathered (pitch) theory is expensive (too little losses) do more statistics*

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 5$$

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 = 9$$

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

NOTES:



# SCORESHEET

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 1.5 - 1 = 4$$

fight (round no.): 3

stage: 3

room: 102

problem no.: 16

Juror's name & signature:

reporter:

GTH (Gipfel)

opponent:

Adrian (Cigleny)

reviewer:

Prasou (Kati)

## 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

$$1 + 0.7 + 0.5 + 1 = 3$$

## 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

$$1 + 0.5 + 1 + 1 + 0.5 = 4$$

## 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

- 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:



## SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 3 stage: 1 room: 102 problem no.: 15

Juror's name & signature: PLBSCA

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3.5 + 2 - 2 = 5$$

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	some	some aspects fine
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
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

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	understanding of presentation	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented
1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
	almost nothing	almost no	too few
	some main points	few	some
	main points	some	some correct
	all relevant points	many	many correct
	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions

NOTES:

### REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 + 1.5 - 1.5 = 8$$

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

NOTES:

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



# SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 2

stage: 3

room: 102

problem no.: 10

Juror's name & signature: PUKSCY

*[Signature]*

reporter: RLPRFL

GSH

opponent:

reviewer:

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 1.25 - \square = 4$$

## 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							
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:

! send to?

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 0.5 + 0.25 - \square = 3$$

## 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

$$1 + 0.25 + 0.75 + 0 + 0.5 - \square = 3$$

## 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

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 0.5 - 1 = 2$$

fight (round no.):

stage: 2

room: 102

problem no.: 7

Juror's name & signature:

reporter: PO 3

opponent: GSH

reviewer: SIOB

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											
4	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		
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	proved deep understanding	overall efficient		
7											

NOTES:

### OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 - 1 = 6$$

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										0	concise and correct or no questions asked	
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	almost no	too few	poor	no			
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	few	some	some aspects fine	some	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	
		main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	some	some correct	good	reasonable			
		all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair			
		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good			
NOTES:												-2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

### REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 0.5 - 1 = 5$$

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	irrelevant	0	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	none	-1	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	relevant, constructive	-2	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				

NOTES:

WRS: 5.0/10



## SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 3

stage: 3

room: 102

problem no.:

Juror's name & signature: HLUBINA

reporter: GJH

opponent: ŠROBÁŘOVÁ

reviewer: PREŠOV

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 6$$

#### 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	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

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

#### 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

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

#### 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.): 3 stage: 2 room: 102 problem no.:

Juror's name & signature: HLUBINA

reporter: PRESOV

opponent: GJH

reviewer: SROBAKOVA

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 0.5 - 1 = 2$$

## 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			well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	good	good	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable					
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	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

$$1 + 1 + 2.5 + 3 - 1 = 6$$

## 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

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

## 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.): 3 stage: 1 room: 102 problem no.:

Juror's name & signature: HLUBINA

reporter: ŠROBA'ROVA

opponent: PREŠOV

reviewer: GJH

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 2 - 1 = 6$$

## 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

$$1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1 - 1 = 3$$

## 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

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 - 0 = 8$$

## 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:

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



## SCORESHEET

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3.75 + 1.75 - 0.5 = 6$$

fight (round no.): 3 stage: 3

room: 102

problem no.: 16

Juror's name & signature:

Neel NEILINGER

reporter: GJH

opponent: SRABH/NOJ

reviewer: GJH PRG-S-V

### 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

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

### 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

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

### 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:



## SCORESHEET

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 1.5 - 1.5 = 3$$

fight (round no.): 3 stage: 2

room: 102

problem no.: 7

Juror's name & signature:

Me. Dg. NEILKEN

reporter: G3H PRAEVA

opponent: G3H

reviewer: SNABANUA

### 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:

PRAEVA - 11

### OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 7$$

### 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

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

### 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:



# SCORESHEET

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3 + 1.5 - 1 = 4$$

fight (round no.): 3 stage: 1

room: 102

problem no.:

Juror's name & signature:

Neel NEILINGA

reporter: SROBANOVA

opponent: GJAN PRASAD

reviewer: GJH

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	<p>0 concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	some	some aspects fine	
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	many	good	
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	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
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			

NOTES:

more about velocity

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 = 5$$

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	<p>0 concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	few	some	some aspects fine	some	
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	some	some correct	good	reasonable	
3		all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
4		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0 - 0 = 9$$

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	irrelevant	<p>0 concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions</p>
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	partial	partially relevant	some	too short/long	partially relevant	some	too short/long	some	none	
2	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	relevant parts	many	relevant, constructive	
3	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		
4											

NOTES:



# SCORESHEET

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 1 - 1 = 4

fight (round no.): 3 stage: 3 room: 102 problem no.: 16 Juror's name & signature: KAVICKY  
reporter: GJH opponent: ŠROBAREVA reviewer: GJAD PBEŠOV

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		
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		
6											
7											

NOTES: Why quadratic drag force?

30 → 1st graph 2  
larger container 2

26  
&  
proving experiment 2  
that was the conclusion

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 4

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
		all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair		
		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good		
NOTES:												

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.25 + 1 + 1 + 0.5 + 0 - 0 = 4

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	0	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	1	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	2	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		

NOTES: temperature 2



# SCORESHEET

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1 - 1 = 3

fight (round no.): 3 stage: 2

room: 102

problem no.: 7

Juror's name & signature: KAVICKY

reporter: GJAR PREČOV

opponent: GJH

reviewer: SROBROVA

## 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:

focus of some wave → what is the principle?  
→ no amplification, no change of frequency?  
unstable!

Dep. on material → ex. what are the quantitative values?  
What are the relevant parameters?  
What was the function of microphone  
enough focus?

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0.5 = 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:

change of f.  
shape!

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1 + 1 ± 0 - 0 = 6

## 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:



# SCORESHEET

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 1 - 1.5 = 3$$

fight (round no.): 3 stage: 1 room: 102 problem no.: 17  
reporter: IROBAROVA

Juror's name & signature: KAVICKY 16/2  
opponent: GJAP PDESOU reviewer: GJH

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	some	some aspects fine
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
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: bone → plastic energy → article

→ conduct curve bone?

dependence of velocity on parameters. (problems)

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 3$$

All energy transferred to E.D → no, roboton ...

height → increasing? → 0.5 like bone

smaller angle → quicker movement?

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	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	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	almost no	too few	poor	no	-1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	few	some	some aspects fine	some	-2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	some	some correct	good	reasonable		
		all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair		
		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good		
NOTES: Two boxes sticks												

NOTES: Two types sticks, Diff angle ✓

medical sticks? - irrelevant

2 too general

Q: Squ. distance in time of particle 2

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 2.5 + 1.5 + 0 - 0 = 8$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	-1 — irrelevant	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked
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										
	0 — poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 — poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 — almost no	too few	0 — none	1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
	1 — partial	partially relevant	some	1 — too short/long	partially relevant	some	1 — too short/long	some	2 — relevant parts	2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	2 — good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 — informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 — relevant parts	many	1 — relevant, constructive	
	3 — detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 — condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	3 — accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		

NOTES: