

# SCORESHEET

stage: 3

fight (round no.): 1

room: 102

problem no.: 17

Juror name: JERZYS STRZEKA

reporter: vjchod

opponent:

reviewer:

signature: Yurba

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

2

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	0 almost no	0 too few	0 no/ almost no	0 others data, incorrectly cited	0 misunderstood	0 almost no	0 too few	0 poor, slow reactions	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 some	1 some	1 some	1 some	1 reviewed sources, properly cited	1 partly	1 was trying	1 some	1 could answer some questions	
2 basic	2 basic	2 well performed	2 done, but not well fitting	2 some own	2 on average level	2 satisfying	2 most	2 gave reasonable explanations	
3 good but not so demonstrative	3 detailed, correct	3 quite a lot, errors analysed	3 + explained	3 relevant	3 convincing solution	3 productive	3 + data/theory convincingly supported	3 +helped clear things out quickly	
4 detailed, good, demonstrative	4 +good testable predictions	4 + results explained and analysed	4 well fitting, deviations analysed	4 considerable experimental or theoretical	4 some parts better than average	4 very efficient	4 proved deep understanding	4 +technical cooperation with team, very efficient	
5 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 detailed, complex, completely testable	5 + totally reliable, reproducible	5 perfect correlation, very conclusive	5 considerable experimental and theoretical	5 grater extent than expected				
6									

NOTES:

1

1/2

2/2

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

8

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	0 almost nothing	0 no or irrelevant	0 almost no	0 no	0 almost no	0 almost no	0 irrelevant	0 very little	0 no	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 very little	1 some main points	1 few	1 some	1 almost no	1 little	1 was trying	1 few	1 some	1 almost no	
2 enough	2 main points	2 some	2 to most topics	2 some	2 partial	2 satisfying	2 most	2 mostly correct	2 some	
3 almost all	3 all relevant parts	3 almost all	3 to almost all topics	3 reasonable	3 efficient	3 good	3 almost all	3 almost all correct	3 reasonable	
4 all & efficiently	4 almost all parts	4 all	4 + improvement suggestions	4 very good	4 very efficient	4 very efficient	4 all	4 + improvement suggestions	4 very good	

NOTES:

2

2

2,5

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

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 poor	0 poor	0 too few	0 irrelevant	0 chaotic	0 poor	0 almost no	0 too few	0 irrelevant	0 chaotic	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 too short/long	1 partially	1 some	1 partially relevant	1 present	1 too short/long	1 too short/long	1 some	1 partially relevant	1 present	
2 informative, apt	2 sufficient	2 many	2 adequate	2 visible	2 informative, apt	2 relevant parts	2 many	2 adequate	2 visible	
3 brief but accurate	3 detailed, complex	3 + improvement suggestions	3 fully adequate	3 clear, intuitive	3 brief but accurate	3 accurate, conclusive	3 + improvement suggestions	3 fully adequate	3 clear, intuitive	

NOTES:

2,5

2

1,5

-1/2

# SCORESHEET

stage: 3

fight (round no.): 1

room: 102

problem no.: 17

Juror name: Milen Smolič

reporter: Prašov

opponent: GJH

reviewer: 1.56

signature: *[Signature]*

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1

### REPORT

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

### DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

### ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

### NOTES:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

### QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — almost no, irrelevant
- some relevant, aimed at resolving
- 1 — 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
- some incorrect,
- 1 — inconclusive or too long
- 2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES: *Comprehensible explanation??*

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

### QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant
- some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out
- 1 — most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp.
- 2 — +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
- some incorrect,
- 1 — inconclusive or too long
- 2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

### NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

stage: 3

fight (round no.): 1

room: 102

problem no.: 17

Juror name: MARTIN GAZO

reporter: GJAR (arghah) opponent:

reviewer:

signature:

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

2

### REPORT

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

### DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	cooperation	relevant arguments/responses	flexibility/reactions
0	almost no	too few	poor, slow reactions
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:

5/4

7.5

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

8

### 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:

5.5

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

### REVIEW OF REPORT

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

### REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

### ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

### NOTES:

2

1.5

# SCORESHEET

stage: 3  
reporter:

fight (round no.): 1  
opponent:

room: 102  
reviewer:

problem no.: 17

Juror name: Plissey  
signature:

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

2

### 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, 1 errors analysed	+ explained	relevant	convincing solution
4	detailed, good, demonstrative	+good testable predictions	+ results explained and analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ totally reliable, reproducible	perfect correlation, very conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	grater extent than expected

### DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

### ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

### NOTES:

Vsco beam - teoria  
1+ 2(-) + 0.5 - 1 = 2

m<sup>2</sup> ⇒ v<sup>2</sup>  
↑ nonsense

1<sup>2</sup> ⇒ v<sup>2</sup>  
✓

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

8

### 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:

Relevant questions, Repeatability → long tube is fine

Polg - pres-

$$1+2+3+3-0.5=8$$

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

	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

	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:

Homotopy! Max. v<sub>g</sub> ideal → 22 m/s

Konze

$$1+2.5+1.75+1.25 \approx 7-1 \rightarrow 6$$

# SCORESHEET

stage: **3**  
reporter: **JAR**

fight (round no.): **1**  
opponent: **GJK**

room: **2**  
reviewer: **156**

problem no.:

Juror name: **DANIEL NACA**  
signature: *NACA*

REPORTER  
Start from 1 and add/subtract

**2**

## 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:

*the model is not too few 1 1.5 0.75 -1*

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

**7**

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

## DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

## ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

*1 1 2.7 2 0*

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

**9**

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## REVIEW OF REPORT

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

## REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

## ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

*delivered clearly 43-50*

# SCORESHEET

stage: 3

fight (round no.): 1

room: 102

problem no.: 17

Juror name: Naty Pisarcik

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

signature:

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

2

### 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:

7.5

0

-7

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

9

### QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — almost no, irrelevant
- 1 — some relevant, aimed at resolving
- 2 — some unclear points
- 3 — 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:

2

4

3

0

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

8

### QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 — some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out
- 2 — most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp.
- 3 — +short, apt and clear, well prioritized
- 4 — 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:

7.5

2.5

7.5

0

# SCORESHEET

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 1

room: 102

problem no.: 8

Juror name: Milan Samalik

reporter: 1SG

opponent: Prešov

reviewer: GJH

signature: Yon

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

### REPORT

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

### DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

### ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: Why is Prešov's system better? (výsledek v diskusi)

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

4

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

### OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

### DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

### ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

### REVIEW OF REPORT

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

### REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

### ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

stage: 2

fight (round no.): 1

room: 102

problem no.: 8

Juror name: Nats. Pisarcik

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

signature:

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

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 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 some	some	some	some	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				
6									

NOTES:

3,5

2,5

0

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

0,4

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	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 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 very little	some main points	few	some	almost no		1 little	was trying	few	some	almost no	
2 enough	main points	some	to most topics	some		2 partial	satisfying	most	mostly correct	some	
3 almost all	all relevant parts	almost all	to almost all topics	reasonable		3 efficient	good	almost all	almost all correct	reasonable	
4 all & efficiently	almost all parts	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good		4 very efficient	very efficient	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	

NOTES:

0,5

7

7,2

0

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

QUESTIONS ASKED						REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
						report summary	understanding of report	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
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 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -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	
2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp.						2 informative, apt	sufficient	many	adequate	visible	2 informative, apt	relevant parts	many	adequate	visible	
3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently						3 brief but accurate	detailed, complex	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	clear, intuitive	3 brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	clear, intuitive	

NOTES:

7

2

7,5

0

# SCORESHEET

stage: 2

fight (round no.): 1

room: 192

problem no.: 8

Juror name: JERGEN STRICKA

reporter: 156

opponent:

reviewer:

signature: *Yurka*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

## REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	reviewed sources, properly cited	partly
2	basic	basic	well performed	done, but not well fitting	some own	on average level
3	good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	quite a lot, errors analysed	explained	relevant	convincing
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:

3

2

-0.5

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

4

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

## DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

## ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

1/2

Krasne yovetlene?

2

2

-1.5

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:

2

2

1

0

+1 by feeling correction

# SCORESHEET

stage: 12

fight (round no.): 101

room: 102

problem no.: 8

Juror name: MARTIN GAZO

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer: Matej Badin

signature:

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

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	0 almost no	0 too few	0 no/ almost no	0 others data, incorrectly cited	0 misunderstood	0 almost no	0 too few	0 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	1 some	1 some	1 some	1 reviewed sources, properly cited	1 partly	1 was trying	1 some	1 questions	
2 basic	2 basic	2 well performed	2 done, but not well fitting	2 some own	2 on average level	2 satisfying	2 most	2 gave reasonable explanations	
3 good but not so demonstrative	3 detailed, correct	3 quite a lot, errors analysed	3 + explained	3 relevant	3 convincing solution	3 productive	3 + data/theory	3 + helped clear things out	
4 detailed, good, demonstrative	4 +good testable predictions	4 + results explained and analysed	4 well fitting, deviations analysed	4 considerable experimental or theoretical	4 some parts better, than average	4 convincingly supported	4 proved deep understanding	4 quickly	
5 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 detailed, complex, completely testable	5 + totally reliable, reproducible	5 perfect correlation, very conclusive	5 considerable experimental and theoretical	5 grater extent than expected	5 very efficient	5	5 + technical cooperation with team, very efficient	

NOTES:

3.5+3

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

4

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	0 almost nothing	0 no or irrelevant	0 almost no	0 no	0 almost no	0 almost no	0 irrelevant	0 very little	0 no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 very little	1 some main points	1 few	1 some	1 almost no	1 little	1 was trying	1 few	1 some	1 almost no	
2 enough	2 main points	2 some	2 to most topics	2 some	2 partial	2 satisfying	2 most	2 mostly correct	2 some	
3 almost all	3 all relevant parts	3 almost all	3 to almost all topics	3 reasonable	3 efficient	3 good	3 almost all	3 almost all correct	3 reasonable	
4 all & efficiently	4 almost all parts	4 all	4 + improvement suggestions	4 very good	4 very efficient	4 very efficient	4 all	4 + improvement suggestions	4 very good	

NOTES:

laser?

lead on the

-1.5

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

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	0 poor	0 poor	0 too few	0 irrelevant	0 chaotic	0 poor	0 almost no	0 too few	0 irrelevant	0 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	1 too short/long	1 partially	1 some	1 partially relevant	1 present	1 too short/long	1 too short/long	1 some	1 partially relevant	1 present	
2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp.	2	2 informative, apt	2 sufficient	2 many	2 adequate	2 visible	2 informative, apt	2 relevant parts	2 many	2 adequate	2 visible	
3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	3	3 brief but accurate	3 detailed, complex	3 + improvement suggestions	3 fully adequate	3 clear, intuitive	3 brief but accurate	3 accurate, conclusive	3 + improvement suggestions	3 fully adequate	3 clear, intuitive	

NOTES:

op: bad and wrong

# SCORESHEET

stage: 2

fight (round no.): 7

room: 102

problem no.: 8

Juror name: PL284

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

signature: [Signature]

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

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	0 almost no	0 too few	0 no/ almost no	0 others data, incorrectly cited	0 misunderstood	0 almost no	0 too few	0 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	1 some	1 some	1 some	1 reviewed sources, properly cited	1 partly	1 was trying	1 some	1 could answer some questions	
2 basic	2 basic	2 well performed	2 done, but not well fitting	2 some own	2 on average level	2 satisfying	2 most	2 gave reasonable explanations	
3 good but not so demonstrative	3 detailed, correct	3 quite a lot, errors analysed	3 + explained	3 relevant	3 convincing solution	3 productive	3 + data/theory convincingly supported	3 +helped clear things out quickly	
4 detailed, good, demonstrative	4 +good testable predictions	4 + results explained and analysed	4 well fitting, deviations analysed	4 considerable experimental or theoretical	4 some parts better than average	4 very efficient	4 proved deep understanding	4 +technical cooperation with team, very efficient	
5 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 detailed, complex, completely testable	5 + totally reliable, reproducible	5 perfect correlation, very conclusive	5 considerable experimental and theoretical	5 greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

$$\Delta T \approx 1K$$

$$1 + 4(-) + 2,5 - 1 = 6$$

$$3,5$$

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

4

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

NOTES:

2:invok? 2:let's see newie reagent? 7+0,5+2,5-1-1 = 6

roughly false

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

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

NOTES:

Proco 2:invok

$$1 + 3 + 1,5 + 2 - 1 \approx 6$$

# SCORESHEET

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

stage: 2

reporter: 156

fight (round no.): 7

opponent: JAR

room: 2

reviewer: GKH

problem no.: 8

Juror name: DANIEL NAGAI

signature: N. Nagai

## REPORT

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

## DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

## ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

## NOTES:

ine also stillen? 4.75 3 - .75 7.5

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

4

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

## DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

## ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

## NOTES:

1 1 1.5 1.5 - .75 4.75

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

## 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 + 2.75 + 2 + 1.5 = .75 6.5

# SCORESHEET

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 1

room: 102

problem no.: 12

Juror name: Maty. Pisarcik

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

signature:

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

2

### 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 could answer some questions
1	was trying	some	gave reasonable explanations
2	satisfying	most	+helped clear things out quickly
3	productive	convincingly supported	+technical cooperation with team, very efficient
4	very efficient	proved deep understanding	

### ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

15

1

-7

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

### OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

### DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

### ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

1

2

15

0

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

### REVIEW OF REPORT

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

### REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

### ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

15

2

1

0

# SCORESHEET

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 1

room: 2

problem no.:

Juror name: DANIEL NAGAI

reporter: GJH

opponent: 1SG

reviewer: JAR

signature: *Nagai*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

4

## 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:

some ideas — no explanation,  
 — lots of equations ... without solution ...  
 1.15 + 2.15 = 3.3

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

## DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

## ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

presentation: "building" "funding" data?  
 technical problem  
 not done?

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## REVIEW OF REPORT

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

## REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

## ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

1.175 + 1.511.75 \* 0 = 5

## SCORESHEET

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 1

room: 102

problem no.: 12

Juror name: Milan Smolik

reporter: 634

opponent: 156

reviewer: Prošov

signature: *Yes*

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

4

#### REPORT

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

#### DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

#### ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: So what did you do?

Too many pronouns => unclear

### OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

#### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

#### OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

#### DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

#### ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

### REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

#### 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:

*Prošov 156 and 102*

# SCORESHEET

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 1

room: 102

problem no.: 12

Juror name: Jergis Strucka

reporter: GJH

opponent: ISB

reviewer:

signature: Strucka

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

3

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	0 almost no	0 too few	0 no/ almost no	0 others data, incorrectly cited	0 misunderstood	0 almost no	0 too few	0 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	1 some	1 some	1 some	1 reviewed sources, properly cited	1 partly	1 was trying	1 some	1 could answer some questions	
2 basic	2 basic	2 well performed	2 done, but not well fitting	2 some own relevant	2 on average level	2 satisfying	2 most	2 gave reasonable explanations	
3 good but not so demonstrative	3 detailed, correct	3 quite a lot, errors analysed	3 + explained	3	3 convincing solution	3	3 + data/theory	3 +helped clear things out quickly	
4 detailed, good, demonstrative	4 +good testable predictions	4 + results explained and analysed	4 well fitting, deviations analysed	4 considerable experimental or theoretical	4 some parts better than average	4 productive	4 convincingly supported	4 +technical cooperation with team, very efficient	
5 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 detailed, complex, completely testable	5 + totally reliable, reproducible	5 perfect correlation, very conclusive	5 considerable experimental and theoretical	5 grater extent than expected	5 very efficient	5 proved deep understanding		

NOTES:

hard, unfinished

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

4

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	0 almost nothing	0 no or irrelevant	0 almost no	0 no		0 almost no	0 almost no	0 irrelevant	0 very little	0 no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 very little	1 some main points	1 few	1 some	1 almost no		1 little	1 was trying	1 few	1 some	1 almost no	
2 enough	2 main points	2 some	2 to most topics	2 some		2 partial	2 satisfying	2 most	2 mostly correct	2 some	
3 almost all	3 all relevant parts	3 almost all	3 to almost all topics	3 reasonable		3 efficient	3 good	3 almost all	3 almost all correct	3 reasonable	
4 all & efficiently	4 almost all parts	4 all	4 + improvement suggestions	4 very good		4 very efficient	4 very efficient	4 all	4 + improvement suggestions	4 very good	

NOTES:

emphasis on no qualitative explanation / not enough experiments? no analysis  
 discussion: question, answer not a decent discussion  
 no experimental discussion

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

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 poor	0 poor	0 too few	0 irrelevant	0 chaotic		0 poor	0 almost no	0 too few	0 irrelevant	0 chaotic	0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 too short/long	1 partially	1 some	1 partially relevant	1 present		1 too short/long	1 too short/long	1 some	1 partially relevant	1 present	
2 informative, apt	2 sufficient	2 many	2 adequate	2 visible		2 informative, apt	2 relevant parts	2 many	2 adequate	2 visible	
3 brief but accurate	3 detailed, complex	3 + improvement suggestions	3 fully adequate	3 clear, intuitive		3 brief but accurate	3 accurate, conclusive	3 + improvement suggestions	3 fully adequate	3 clear, intuitive	

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 1

room: 702

problem no.: 12

Juror name: PLESCU

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

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	0 almost no	0 too few	0 no/ almost no	0 others data, incorrectly cited	0 misunderstood	0 almost no	0 too few	0 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	1 some	1 some	1 some	1 reviewed sources, properly cited	1 partly	1 was trying	1 some	1 could answer some questions	
2 basic	2 basic	2 well performed	2 done, but not well fitting	2 some own	2 on average level	2 satisfying	2 most	2 gave reasonable explanations	
3 good but not so demonstrative	3 detailed, correct	3 quite a lot, errors analysed	3 + explained	3 relevant	3 convincing solution	3 productive	3 + data/theory convincingly supported	3 +helped clear things out quickly	
4 detailed, good, demonstrative	4 +good testable predictions	4 + results explained and analysed	4 well fitting, deviations analysed	4 considerable experimental or theoretical	4 some parts better than average	4 very efficient	4 proved deep understanding	4 +technical cooperation with team, very efficient	
5 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 detailed, complex, completely testable	5 + totally reliable, reproducible	5 perfect correlation, very conclusive	5 considerable experimental and theoretical	5 grater extent than expected				

NOTES:

Kvalitative vyznecenie u diskutii? Vpřu 12ty nity

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

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	0 almost nothing	0 no or irrelevant	0 almost no	0 no	0 almost no	0 almost no	0 irrelevant	0 very little	0 no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 very little	1 some main points	1 few	1 some	1 almost no	1 little	1 was trying	1 few	1 some	1 almost no	
2 enough	2 main points	2 some	2 to most topics	2 some	2 partial	2 satisfying	2 most	2 mostly correct	2 some	
3 almost all	3 all relevant parts	3 almost all	3 to almost all topics	3 reasonable	3 efficient	3 good	3 almost all	3 almost all correct	3 reasonable	
4 all & efficiently	4 almost all parts	4 all	4 + improvement suggestions	4 very good	4 very efficient	4 very efficient	4 all	4 + improvement suggestions	4 very good	

NOTES:

Naklonenie gyroskopu?

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

4

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 poor	0 poor	0 too few	0 irrelevant	0 chaotic	0 poor	0 almost no	0 too few	0 irrelevant	0 chaotic	0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 too short/long	1 partially	1 some	1 partially relevant	1 present	1 too short/long	1 too short/long	1 some	1 partially relevant	1 present	
2 informative, apt	2 sufficient	2 many	2 adequate	2 visible	2 informative, apt	2 relevant parts	2 many	2 adequate	2 visible	
3 brief but accurate	3 detailed, complex	3 + improvement suggestions	3 fully adequate	3 clear, intuitive	3 brief but accurate	3 accurate, conclusive	3 + improvement suggestions	3 fully adequate	3 clear, intuitive	

NOTES:

Roketa rakon? Zabořeno nity, koutky

624  
REPORTER  
Start from 1 and add/subtract

3

## SCORESHEET

stage: 1  
reporter:

fight (round no.): 1  
opponent:

room: 2102  
reviewer:

problem no.: 12

Juror name: MARTIN GAZO  
signature: 602

### REPORT

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

### DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	cooperation	relevant arguments/responses	flexibility/reactions
0	almost no	too few	poor, slow reactions
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:

unfinished

Exp?

didn't use the time

answered diff questions unclear explanations

### OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

15

#### 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:

valid = - explanation (no insight)  
invalid = - exp qual. exp: too hard?

?  
TOPIC

### REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

#### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

### REVIEW OF REPORT

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

### REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

### ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

3 + 2  
positive

cas