

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): **F**

stage: **1**

room: **75**

problem no.: **9**

Juror's name & signature: **Platona**

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 5 + 2 - \square = 8$$

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	quite detailed	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	demonstrative	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

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

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

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

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
- 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.):

stage: 1

room:

problem no.: 9

Juror's name & signature: Pushkova

reporter: G.J.H. (Mekker) (Stavina)

opponent: KSG (Pushkova)

reviewer: Kstova

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4.5 + 1.5 - \square = 7$$

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

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

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

$$1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2.5 + 1.5 - \square - \square = 7$$

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:

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

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): FINAL stage: 1

room: SIEN

problem no.: 9

Juror's name & signature: Yurovick

reporter: GJH

opponent: 15G

reviewer: POSTOVA

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 5 + 2.5 - 0 = 9$$

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
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight						
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

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

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

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

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.): ^{FINAL}

stage: 1

room: ^{PRINCIPAL}

problem no.: PACAC 9

Juror's name & signature: *Murly Paulin*

reporter: JAWB STAVINA

604

opponent: ^{TERE 2} LUTUANA

106

reviewer: Lila Hahelova

POSTOVA

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 5.0 + 2.5 - \square = 9 \uparrow$$

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:

Thermal lens Q: Slide 28 fringes Q: Q1 VxI slope Q: Q1 absorption Q: Confocal parameter? Thermal optical slide properties of water Q: Q1 Q: Slide 24 Q: Q1 fitted values parameters for the input

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.0 + 3 + 2.5 - \square = 7 \downarrow$$

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

NOTES:

voltage vs time
refraction of length $\rightarrow f_1$

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2 + 1 \pm 0 - \square = 7 \downarrow$$

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:

microscopic device \rightarrow density ρ
suy/sauce difference
P 5mW
f

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): FINAL stage: 1 room:
reporter: GJH: ŠTAVINA

problem no.: 9 Juror's name & signature: ADAMUŠČIN
opponent: 1.56 reviewer: ROŠTOVÁ

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 demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ 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	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	too few	poor	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some aspects fine	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	many	good	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	

NOTES: AKO LÚC/VČNA PRECHÁDZA SÓJ. OMÁČKOU SNÍČOU ZIKON / INTERFERENCIA ?
ČASOVÁ ZÁVISLOSŤ OK
ZMENÁ HROBKY ÚRSTU OK

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0 - 0 = 7$$

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

NOTES:

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

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): *Final* stage: *1* room:

problem no.: *9*

Juror's name & signature:

KAVICKY K

reporter: *GJH (J. JAVINA)*

opponent: *156*

reviewer: *Postural*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4.25 + 1.75 - 0.5 = 7$$

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
too few	poor
some	some aspects fine
many	good
+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: - gradient of $\ln(T)$

→ works with anything?

slide 45

absorption coefficient → What would happen if the wedge thermal absorption coefficient 2x heat transfer coefficient

Can't be explained from structure

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.25 + 2.25 + 2 - 0 = 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
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
almost no	too few	poor	no
few	some	some aspects fine	some
some	some correct	good	reasonable
good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

→ time dependence → lower temp

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 2.5 + 1.5 + 1 + 0 - 0 = 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- irrelevant
- none
- relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

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

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): *final stage: 1*

room: *siem*

problem no.: *3*

Juror's name & signature: *Andrzej Toth*

reporter: *GJH*

opponent: *1.5G*

reviewer: *Pastor*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 5 + 2 - 0 = 8$$

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	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
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight						
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

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

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

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

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: *Juror came late*

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

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): F stage: 2 room: 75 problem no.: 7

reporter:

Juror's name & signature: PLASCH

opponent:

reviewer:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 6 + 25 - 05 = 9$$

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

$$1 + 7 + 25 + 25 - \square = 6$$

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:

OBCAS SUPER, OBCAS PRO-SELF vs L?

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 05 + 2 + 2 + 1 - \square = 6$$

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: other ma m/m2 3,2?

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5.75 + 0.75 - 0 = 8

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.):

stage: 2

room:

problem no.: 14

Juror's name & signature: Replicator

reporter: 186 (Flesch)

opponent: Postava

reviewer: 654

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 + 1.75 + 4.75 - 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 + 1.75 + 1.5 + 0.5 + 0.75 - 0.5 = 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.): FINAL stage: 2

room: PALAC

problem no.: 14

Juror's name & signature:

MATEJ BADI

reviewer: Zoltan GUDENC

reporter: DANIEL DAN PLESNICA

opponent: POSTOLU

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4.5 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 7$$

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	+ 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
too few	poor
some	some aspects fine
many	good
+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

Mass ratio
Range length
Release angle

Experiments - 10 → slipping
Is not taken
Collision?

Slide 15
Friction in equation of motion

Q: Comparing
friction
side by side

Q: Input parameters
for the simulation
Q: Did you measure
friction coefficient

Q: $\theta = \frac{\pi}{3}$?
 $k = y +$

$(1 + \frac{m_2}{m_1})^2$

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
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
almost no	too few	poor	no
few	some	some aspects fine	some
some	some correct	good	reasonable
good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

Conservation theory/exp
Inelastic collision

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 + 0.5 - 0 - 0 = 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- irrelevant
- none
- relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

Q: Does depend
Does not depend on R

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): FINAL stage: 2

room: 22KADLOVA

problem no.: 14

Juror's name & signature: Juror's name & signature

reporter: 156

opponent: POSTOVA

reviewer: GSH

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4.5 + 2 - 0 = 7$$

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	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, 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
too few	poor
some	some aspects fine
many	good
+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
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

$$1 + 0.5 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 7$$

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
almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
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
almost no	too few	poor	no
few	some	some aspects fine	some
some	some correct	good	reasonable
good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
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

$$1 + 0.49 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0 - 0 = 8$$

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
poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
partial	partially relevant	some
good	mostly adequate	reasonable
detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
almost no	too few
too short/long	some
relevant parts	many
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

$$1 + 5.5 + 2.5 - \boxed{} = 9$$

fight (round no.): FINAL stage: 2 room:

problem no.: 14 Juror's name & signature: ADAMUŠEVIČ

reporter: 1. SG RISPNIK

opponent: ROŠTOVA MFEJER

reviewer: GJIH

GILŠEVIČ

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	
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
some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	some	some aspects fine	
fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	many	good	1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	0 + data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	1 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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	2 —
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:

AKO MERALI TRŽNJE MFEJER SMIRKOVA TJELO? OK

ČUJDA ASPON TEORETIČKI PREDPOVED

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 3 + 2 - Bk = 6$$

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		almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	almost no	too few	poor	no	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked
0 — 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	0 some correct	6 good	reasonable	1 — 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:

NEOPYTAL SA NA MERALIE F

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 1.5 + Bk - \boxed{} = 8$$

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
1 — + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used		0 good	mostly adequate	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	relevant parts	many	1 — relevant, constructive	2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently		3 detailed, complex	0 fully adequate	good	condensed & accurate	0 fully adequate	good	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4.5 + 2 - 0 = 8$$

fight (round no.): *Final*

stage: *2*

room:

problem no.: *14*

Juror's name & signature: *Kavick*

reporter: *1.56 (S. Presnick)*

opponent: *POSTOVA' (M. Nestor)*

reviewer: *G3H*

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
too few	poor
some	some aspects fine
many	good
+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
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:

→ average equation
→ qualitative comparison
→ regressed
Whole band function
Whole function → how was it measured?

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.25 + 2 + 2.5 - 0 = 6$$

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
almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
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
almost no	too few	poor	no
few	some	some aspects fine	some
some	some correct	good	reasonable
good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
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:

biasedness?
1/3 as presentation
2nd B-L eq. → redundant function?
Technical details function +

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 3 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 9$$

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
poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
partial	partially relevant	some
good	mostly adequate	reasonable
detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
almost no	too few
too short/long	some
relevant parts	many
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:

Why other regressed

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): *final* stage: *2*

room: *Siet*

problem no.: *14*

Juror's name & signature: *Andrej Toth*

reporter: *1. SG*

opponent: *Postova*

reviewer: *GJH*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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	correct	errors analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated
6	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis				

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
too few	poor
some	some aspects fine
many	good
+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
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

$$1 + 0.5 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 7$$

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
almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
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
almost no	too few	poor	no
few	some	some aspects fine	some
some	some correct	good	reasonable
good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
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

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

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
poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
partial	partially relevant	some
good	mostly adequate	reasonable
detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
almost no	too few
too short/long	some
relevant parts	many
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.): **F**

stage: **3**

room:

problem no.: **SWW**

Juror's name & signature:

PRESCH

[Signature]

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0.5 = 5$$

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	<u>some</u>	some	<u>some</u>	review of sources, cited	<u>partly</u>	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	errors analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight		+ reproducible, convincing analysis				
7							

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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:

- CONTRA

upwards 32? disk vs R22

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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	<u>poor</u>
1	some main points	few	some	<u>some</u>	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	<u>many</u>	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	<u>some</u>	some aspects fine	<u>some</u>
2	some	some correct	good	<u>reasonable</u>
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	<u>new crucial point(s)</u>	+ 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

$$1 + 1 + 1.5 + 2 + 1.5 \pm \square - \square = 7$$

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	<u>good</u>	mostly adequate	<u>reasonable</u>
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	<u>informative, apt</u>	mostly adequate	<u>reasonable</u>
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
1	too short/long	<u>some</u>
2	relevant parts	<u>many</u>
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 *Final*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 - 5 = 15

fight (round no.):

stage: 3

room:

problem no.: 10

Juror's name & signature:

reporter:

Postora (Dobos)

opponent:

GJT (Rippel)

reviewer:

ASG (Hegebus)

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 + 15 + 25 + 95 - 7 = 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 + 175 + 2 + 3 + 175 ± 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.): **FINAL** stage: **3**

room: **SIEN** problem no.: **10**

Juror's name & signature:

reporter: **POŠTOVA**

opponent: **G3H**

reviewer: **1SG**

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 5.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 8$$

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	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	errors analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight		+ reproducible, convincing analysis				
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

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

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

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

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
- 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.): FINAL stage: 3

room: 4th PALMACHAT POLAC

problem no.: 14

Juror's name & signature: Matej Radin

reporter: RONALD DOUG POSTOVA

opponent: RISO RUPPEL GJH

reviewer: ADRIAN HEDRUS 156

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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	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:

Radius, weight & material



OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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:

LESS OF YOUR OPINION

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 3 + 3 + 1 + 0 - 0 = 8$$

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

- 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:

no slip 2

171222

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$\boxed{1} + \boxed{5} + \boxed{2} - \boxed{1} = \boxed{7}$$

problem no.: 10 Juror's name & signature: ADAMUSCIN

opponent: G24 RIPPET

reviewer: SGT HEGADUS

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		
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	too few	poor	concise and correct or no questions asked	
fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	some	some aspects fine		
good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	many	good		
detailed	quite detailed,	+ results explained	qualitatively analysed	+ theory limits	considerable experimental	interesting solution	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	
demonstrative	correct	errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	or theoretical	considerable experimental	greater extent than expected	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and theoretical						

- EXP. OVERENIE POVR. NAPÄTIA - ROŽNE MATERIÁLY GULE - 1

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$\boxed{1} + \boxed{1} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2} - \boxed{13} = \boxed{6}$$

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	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:

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$\boxed{1} + \boxed{1} + \boxed{4,5} + \boxed{2,5} + \boxed{1,5} \pm \boxed{13k} - \boxed{} = \boxed{8}$$

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): FINAL stage: 3 room: 10
reporter: POSTOVA (R. Dobos)

problem no.: 10 Juror's name & signature: KAUCKY B.
opponent: GIH (R. Rippl) reviewer: 1SG

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4.5 + 2.5 - 1 = 7

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	quite detailed	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
5	demonstrative	correct	errors analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis						

NOTES: disk 2 -> why both V
counter effect
theory -> problem with 0.15
slide 102 23 32 - drop

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 = 6

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	almost nothing	almost no	too few
2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	some main points	few	some
	main points	some	some correct
	all relevant points	good	many correct
	practically all points	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions

NOTES: det. of B

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	almost no	too few	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 — + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	partial	too short/long	too short/long	some	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	good	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	
	detailed, complex	condensed & accurate	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate	

NOTES: longer effect - why
-> cell 102

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

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): *final* stage: *1*

room: *2. kadlovna*

problem no.: *10*

Juror's name & signature: *Ondrej Toth*

reporter: *postova*

opponent: *GCH*

reviewer: *1. SG*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 1,5 - 0,5 = 6$$

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	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

$$1 + 0,5 + 3 + 2,5 - 0 = 7$$

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

$$1 + 0,5 + 2 + 2 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 7$$

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

- 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: