

SCORESHEET

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 4

room: 101

problem no.: 10

Juror name: Kowalek

reporter: GSTR

opponent: Vaccumoldy

reviewer: GSTR

signature: [Signature]

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

4

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	cooperation	relevant arguments/responses	flexibility/reactions	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	poor, slow reactions	
1 some	some	some	some	reviewed sources, properly cited	partly	1 was trying	some	could answer some questions	
2 basic	basic	well performed	done, but not well fitting	some own relevant	on average level	2 satisfying	most	gave reasonable explanations	
3 good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	quite a lot, errors analysed	+ explained		convincing solution	3 productive	+ data/theory convincingly supported	+helped clear things out quickly	
4 detailed, good, demonstrative	+good testable predictions	+ results explained and analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average	4 very efficient	proved deep understanding	+technical cooperation with team, very efficient	
5 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ totally reliable, reproducible	perfect correlation, very conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	grater extent than expected				

NOTES: $1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0.5 \rightarrow 4$

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritization	leading	cooperation	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	prioritisation			
0 almost no, irrelevant	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0 almost no	almost no	irrelevant	very little	no			
1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	very little	few	some	almost no	1 little	was trying	few	some	almost no			
2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	enough	main points	some	some	2 partial	satisfying	most	mostly correct	some			
	almost all	all relevant parts	to almost all topics	reasonable	3 efficient	good	almost all	almost all correct	reasonable			
	all & efficiently	all parts	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4 very efficient	very efficient	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good			

NOTES: $1 + 1 + 2 + 2.5 \rightarrow 7$

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

8

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

NOTES: $1 + 2 + 2.5 \rightarrow 8$

SCORESHEET

stage: 3

fight (round no.): 4

room: 101

problem no.: 17

Juror name: Kundrath

reporter: GJA

opponent: GAR

reviewer: Vaanlab

signature: [Signature]

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

8

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	reviewed sources, properly cited	partly
2	basic	basic	well performed	done, but not well fitting	some own	on average level
3	good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	quite a lot, errors analysed	+ explained	relevant	convincing solution
4	detailed, good, demonstrative	+good testable predictions	+ results explained and analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ totally reliable, reproducible	perfect correlation, very conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	grater extent than expected
6						

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: 1+4.5+2.5 → 8

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: 1+1+2.5 → 4.5

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: 1+2+1.5+2-0 → 7

SCORESHEET

stage: 2 fight (round no.): 4
 reporter: Vacuumlabs opponent: GJH

room: 101 problem no.: 3
 reviewer: GJH

Juror name: KUNDRAEK
 signature: [Signature]

REPORTER 8
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

NOTES: $1 + 4 + 3 + 0 \rightarrow 8$

OPPONENT 4
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

NOTES: $1 + 1.5 + 1 \rightarrow 4$

REVIEWER 5
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

NOTES: $1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 = 5$