stage: 4

fight (round no.): 4

own contribution

others data, incorrectly cited

reviewed sources, properly cited

some own

relevant

considerable experimental

or theoretical

considerable experimental

and theoretical

room: 102

problem no.: 6

Juror name: Milan Smokk

signature: Yull

### REPORTER

REPORT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

phenomenon explanation

almost no

some

basic

good but not so

demonstrative

detailed, good,

demonstrative

deep and comprehensible, detailed, complex,

shows physical insight completely testable



theory/model

almost no

some

basic

detailed.

correct

+good testable

predictions

reporter:

relevant

experiments

too few

some

quite a lot,

errors analysed

and analysed

+ totally reliable,

reproducible

opponent:

comparison between

theory and experiment

no/ almost no

some

+ explained

analysed

perfect correlation,

very conclusive

well performed done, but not well fitting

+ results explained | well fitting, deviations

reviewer:

convincing

solution

some parts better

than average

grater extent

than expected

	DIS	cuss
task fulfilment		cod
misunderstood	0 -	al
partly	-	
on average level	1 -	w

efficient

SION WITH OPPONENT relevant operation arguments/responses flexibility/reactions lmost no too few poor, slow reactions could answer some as trying some questions gave reasonable satisfying explanations most + data/theory +helped clear things out productive \*convincingly supported \* quickly proved deep +technical cooperation

with team, very efficient

understanding

# 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:

**OPPONENT** 

Start from 1 and add/subtract

# **QUESTIONS ASKED**

almost no, irrelevant

D	some relevant, aimed at resolving
1_	some unclear points
2-	short allowing short answers,
	prioritized, all time used

	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritization
-	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	* no
0	- very little	some main points	few	some	√ almost no
	enough	<ul> <li>main points</li> </ul>	* some	to most topics	some
	almost all	all relevant parts	almost all	to almost all topics	reasonable
Ξ	all & efficiently	almost all parts	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good

DISC	USSION V	VITH REPOF	RTER			ANSWERS TO JURY and
	leading	cooperation	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	prioritisation	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or
0_	almost no	almost no	irrelevant	0 concise and c	questions asked	
10	little	was trying	• few	, some	almost no	some incorrect.
20	partial satisfying most mostly correct some	-1 inconclusive or too lon				
-	efficient	good	almost all	almost all correct	reasonable	The second secon
4	very efficient	very efficient	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	-2 deeply incorrect or sho deep misconceptions

REV	<b>IEWER'S QUESTIONS</b>
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



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

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

	REV	IEW OF OPPO	OSITION				ANSWERS TO JURY
1		speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	QUESTIONS concise and corre
	0	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	no questions aske
	1	too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	• present	some incorrect,
	20	informative, apt	relevant parts	• many	adequate	visible	inconclusive or to
ı	3	brief but accurate	* accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	clear, intuitive	-2 — deeply incorrect of deep misconception

7142	WENSTOJONI
QUE	STIONS
0	_ concise and correct or
0	no questions asked
1_	some incorrect,
-1	inconclusive or too long
_	deeply incorrect or show
-2	deep misconceptions



REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

**SCORESHEET** 

reporter: TOSTOV A

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 4

opponent:

room: 102

reviewer:

problem no.:

Juror name: MARTIN CARD

signature:

85.00							
RE	PORT				,		DI
	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	0
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	1
3	good but not so demonstrative	detailed,	quite a lot, errors analysed	explained	relevant	convincing solution	2
4	detailed, good, demonstrative	+good testable predictions	+ results explained and analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average	3
6	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	4

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED almost no, irrelevant

some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points

short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPF	OSITION (S	PEECH)			ıv.
	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	Tew	some	almost no
_	enough	main points	some	to most topics	some
2_	almost all	all relevant parts	almost all	to almost all topics	reasonable
3_	all & efficiently	almost all parts	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good

leading	cooperation	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	prioritisation
almost no	almost no	irrelevant	(very little)	no.
little	was trying	(few)	some	almost no
partia	satisfying	most	mostly correct	some
efficient	good	almost all	almost all correct	reasonable
very efficient	very efficient	all	+ improvement suggestions	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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



# QUESTIONS ASKED

 too few, mostly irrelevant some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out

most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp.

+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently

RE	VIEW OF REPO	RT				
	report summary	understanding of report	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
) _	poor	poor	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	
	too short/long	partially	some	partially relevant	present	
	Informative, apt	Sufficient	many	adequate	visible	
3	brief but accurate	detailed, complex	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	clear, intuitive	

R	EVIEW OF OPPO	OSITION			
	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation
)	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	chaotic
	too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	present
	(informative, apt	elevant parts	many	adequate	<b>Justible</b>
3	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	clear, intuitive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

1 415+2+15= NOTES:

stage:

room:

problem no.:

Juror name: PETER MATAK
signature: P. Malak

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



fight (round no.): 4
opponent: SKOBAZOVA reporter: POSTOVA

reviewer: BAJKALSKA

PORT						DIS	CUSSION W	TH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY,
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment		cooperation	relevant arguments/responses	flexibility/reactions	OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 -	almost no	too few	poor, slow reactions	KEVIEWER S QUESTIONS
some	some	some	some	reviewed sources, properly cited	partly	-			could answer some	concise and correct or
basic	basic	well performed	done, but not well fitting	some own	on average level	1 -	was trying	some	questions	no questions asked
good but not so	detailed,	quite a lot,	+ explained	relevant	convincing	0			gave reasonable	
demonstrative	correct	(errors analysed)			\solution/	2	satisfying	most	explanations	some incorrect,
detailed, good,	+good testable	+ results explained	well fitting, deviations	considerable experimental	some parts better	\_ =		+ data/theory	+helped clear things out	inconclusive or too long
demonstrative )	predictions	and analysed	analysed	or theoretical	than average	/3 =	productive	convincingly supported	quickly	deeply incorrect or show
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	4 =	very efficient	proved deep understanding	+technical cooperation with team, very efficient	deep misconceptions

NOTES:

О	Ρ	Р	o	N	Ε	N	Т
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Start from 1 and add/subtract

#### QUESTIONS ASKED

almost no, irrelevant

some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points

short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SI	PEECH)
----------------	--------

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

# **DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER** leading cooperation relevance of own oninions prioritication

	leauling	cooperation	topics	presented	prioritisation
	almost no	almost no	irrelevant	very little	no
	little	was trying	few	some	almost no
	partial	satisfying	most	mostly correct	some
-	efficient	good	almost all	almost all correct	reasonable
	very efficient	very efficient	all	+ improvement suggestions	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:

#### REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



#### **QUESTIONS ASKED**

too few, mostly irrelevant some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out most time used, many unclear points

resolved, aimed at both report and opp. +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently

E١	IEW OF REPO	RT				
	report summary	understanding of report	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
	poor	poor	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	
-	too short/long	partially	some	partially relevant	present	
7	informative, apt	sufficient	many	adequate	visible	
)	brief but accurate	detailed, complex	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	clear, intuitive	

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

## NSWERS TO JURY UESTIONS

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

deep misconceptions

			SCORESHE stage: 1		ound no.): 4	room: 10	02		problem no.:	Juror nam	e: Martin Chudjoh
	PORTER t from 1 and add/subtract	6	reporter:	oppone	ent:	reviewer:			ν	signature:	Chy
REF	PORT phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	DIS		TH OPPONENT relevant arguments/responses	flexibility/reactions	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 -	almost no	too few	poor, slow reactions	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
1	some	some	some	some	reviewed sources, properly cited	partly				could answer some	concise and correct or
2	basic	basic	well performed	done, but not well fitting	some own	on average level	1 -	was trying	some	questions	no questions asked
3	good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	quite a lot, errors analysed	+ explained	relevant	convincing solution	2	satisfying	most	gave reasonable explanations	some incorrect,
4	detailed, good, demonstrative	+good testable predictions	+ results explained and analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average	3 =	productive	+ data/theory convincingly supported	+helped clear things out quickly	inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show
6	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	4 -	very efficient	proved deep understanding	+technical cooperation with team, very efficient	deep misconceptions
NO	TES:		7+4+	3 -7				¥ -			

OPPONENT 7	OPPOSITION	(SPEECH)				DIS	CUSSION V	VITH REPOF	RTER			ANSWERS TO JURY and
Start from 1 and add/subtract	time use		relevant topics	- C.	prioritization		leading	cooperation		own opinions	prioritisation	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
QUESTIONS ASKED		presentation	addressed	opinions expressed					topics	presented		concise and correct or no
almost no, irrelevant	0 almost n	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0_	almost no	almost no	irrelevant	very little	no	questions asked
0_	1 very littl	some main points	few	some	almost no	1	little	was trying	few	some	almost no	some incorrect,
some relevant, aimed at resolving	enough	main points	some	to most topics	some	2	partial	satisfying	most	mostly correct	some	inconclusive or too long
1 some unclear points	almost a	l all relevant parts	almost all	to almost all topics	reasonable	-	efficient 1	good /	almost all	almost all correct	reasonable	
short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	3 all & efficient	y almost all parts	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4	very efficient	very efficient	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIE	WER	
	66 90	

start from 1 and add/subtract

9

QUESTIONS ASKED	REV	IEW OF REPO	RT				REV	IEW OF OPPO	OSITION				ANSWERS TO JURY
too few, mostly irrelevant some relevant, sufficient number, could		report summary	understanding of report	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation		speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	QUESTIONS concise and correct or
clear things out	0	poor	poor	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	0	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	no questions asked
most time used, many unclear points	1	too short/long	partially	some /	partially relevant	present	1_	too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	present	some incorrect,
resolved, aimed at both report and opp.	2=	informative, apt	sufficient 🛔	many 4	adequate	visible	2=	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	adequate 💃	visible	inconclusive or too long
+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	-2 — deeply incorrect or sho deep misconceptions

		<b>SCORESHE</b>	ET	_		200					
		stage:	fight (r	ound no.):	room	: 102		problem no.:	102	Juror nam	ie: PURSCH
REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract		reporter: Ĉa	maon oppon	ent:	revie	wer:				signature:	49
REPORT					(	DISC	USSION WI	TH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY,
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfi	lment	cooperation	relevant arguments/respondents	nses flexibilit	ty/reactions	OPPONENT and
0 almost no	almost no	too few	po/ almost no	others data, incorrectly	cited misunder	rstood	almost no	too few		ow reactions	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
1 some	some	some	some	reviewed sources, proper		1000	wastadas			nswer some	concise and correct or
2 basic good but not so	basic detailed,	well performed guite/a lot,	done, but not well fitting + explained	some own	on averag conyim		was trying	some		estions easonable	no questions asked
good but not so demonstrative	correct	errors analysed			soluti	on 2	satisfying	(most)	expl	anations	some incorrect,
4 detailed, good;	+good testable	+ results explained		considerable experime			productive	+ data/theor		lear things out	inconclusive or too long
deep and comprehensible,	predictions detailed complex.	+ totally reliable,	perfect correlation,	or theoretical considerable experime	than ave		very	convincingly support		uickly Il cooperation	-2 deeply incorrect or show
	completely testable		very conclusive	and theoretical	than exp		efficient	understanding		very efficient	deep misconceptions
NOTES: T-E	rent.		14	2,75 + 2,1 2,1476	-6 -1	= 5					
ODDONENT	ODDOCIT	TON (SDEECH)		A THE	DI	SCUSSION W	ITH DEDOD	TED			ANSWERS TO JURY and
OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract	7	ION (SPEECH)				1	1	2 P			REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	tim	e used understa presen			prioritization	leading	cooperation	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	prioritisation	
QUESTIONS ASKED	0 alm	ost no almost i			no 0_	almost no	almost no	irrelevant	very little	no	o concise and correct or no questions asked
some relevant, aimed at reso	aluing -	y little some ma		some	almost no 1	little	was trying	feW	some	almostno	some incorrect,
some unclear points	2	ough main p		to most topics	some 2	partial	satisfying	most r	mostly correct	some	-1 inconclusive or too long
short allowing short answers		nost all all releva	int parts almost all	to almost all topics + improvement	reasonable 3	efficient very	good		most all correct improvement	reasonable	deeply incorrect or show
prioritized, all time used		ciently almost a	all parts all	suggestions	very good 4	efficient	efficient	all	suggestions	very good	-2 deep misconceptions
NOTES: Vp. m. 2 Int pavametre? Vadindend - typi ok sel											
QUESTIONS ASKED	RI	EVIEW OF REPOR	RT	T	REVI	EW OF OPPO	DSITION	1			ANSWERS TO JURY
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant	200		inderstanding own opin	ions pros & cons pri	rioritisation	speech	discussion	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	QUESTIONS
some relevant, sufficient nu	mber, could	summary	of report poor too fev	v irrelevant	chaotic	poor	analysis almost no	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	o concise and correct or no questions asked
clear things out	ar points	too short/long	poor too fev			too short/long			partially relevant	present	some incorrect,
most time used, many uncle resolved, aimed at both rep		informative, apt	sufficient many			nformative, apt			adequate	visible	inconclusive or too long
—	2	brief but	detailed, + improve		clear, 2	brief byt	accyrate,	+ improvement	fully	clear,	deeply incorrect or show
time managed efficiently	3	accurate	complex suggestion		intuitive 3	accurate	conclusive	suggestions	adequate	intuitive	-2 — deep misconceptions
NOTES:	_	0		2,5		0 5					
	1+	5 +	5 7	D	~_	813					

stage: 2

relevant

experiments

too few

some

quite a lot,

errors analysed

and analysed

+ totally reliable,

reproducible

fight (round no.): 4

own contribution

others data, incorrectly cited

reviewed sources, properly cited

some own

relevant

considerable experimental

or theoretical

considerable experimental

and theoretical

room: 102

problem no.: 🤌

proved deep

understanding

productive convincingly supported

very

efficient

Juror name: Milan Smallk

signature: Your

REPORTER

REPORT

0

Start from 1 and add/subtract

phenomenon explanation

almost no

some

basic

good but not so

demonstrative

detailed, good,

demonstrative

theory/model

almost no

some

basic

detailed,

correct

+good testable

predictions

reporter:

opponent:

comparison between

theory and experiment

no/ almost no

some

+ explained

analysed

perfect correlation,

very conclusive

well performed done, but not well fitting

+ results explained well fitting, deviations

reviewer:

than average

grater extent

than expected

		DI	SC	USSION WI	TH OPPONENT
	task fulfilment			cooperation	relevant arguments/responses
	misunderstood	0		+almost no	too few
d	partly	Ĭ			
	on average level	1	1	was trying	<ul><li>some</li></ul>
	convincing solution	2	Ĕ	satisfying	most
	some parts better				+ data/theory

ANSWERS TO JURY, **OPPONENT** and flexibility/reactions REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS poor, slow reactions could answer some questions gave reasonable explanations

+helped clear things out

quickly

+technical cooperation

with team, very efficient

concise and correct or no questions asked

some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

**QUESTIONS ASKED** 

deep and comprehensible, detailed, complex,

shows physical insight | completely testable

almost no, irrelevant some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points 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
	enough	main points	some	f to most topics	some
2	almost all	all relevant parts	almost all	to almost all topics	reasonable
30	all & efficiently	<ul> <li>almost all parts</li> </ul>	all	+ improvement suggestions	• very good

	leading	cooperation	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	prioritisation
Ŧ.	almost no	almost no	irrelevant	very little	no
-	little	• was trying	few	some	almost no
	partial	satisfying	<ul><li>most</li></ul>	<ul> <li>mostly correct</li> </ul>	some
$\mathcal{I}_{i}$	efficient	good	almost all	almost all correct	reasonable
	very efficient	very efficient	all	+ improvement	very good

REVIEWER'S OUESTIONS concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

ANSWERS TO JURY and

deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



OU	IESTIONS 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.	
6-	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	

time managed efficiently

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

RE∖	IEW OF OPPO	OSITION			
	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation
0_	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	chaotic
10	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

	ANSV	VERS TO JURY
on	QUES	TIONS
	0-	concise and correct or
	-	no questions asked
	1	some incorrect,
	-1	inconclusive or too long
	_	deeply incorrect or show
1	-2	deep misconceptions

reviewer: signature: opponent: reporter: REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT ANSWERS TO JURY. REPORT comparison between relevant OPPONENT and relevant theory and experiment own contribution task fulfilment cooperation arguments/responses flexibility/reactions theory/model experiments phenomenon explanation REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS misunderstood others data, incorrectly cited too few no/ almost no almost no too few poor, slow reactions almost no almost no reviewed sources, properly cited could answer some concise and correct or wed performed done, but not well fitting on average level was trying questions basie some own basic no questions asked relevant convincing gave reasonable + explained detailed, quite a lot, good but not so some incorrect. satisfying explanations solution most errors analysed demonstrative correct considerable experimental + data/theory +helped clear things out inconclusive or too long well fitting, deviations some parts better + results explained +good testable detailed, good, than average or theoretical productive convincingly supported quickly analysed predictions and analysed deeply incorrect or show demonstrative considerable experimental grater extent proved deep +technical cooperation + totally reliable, perfect correlation, deep and comprehensible, detailed, complex, deep misconceptions than expected efficient understanding with team, very efficient and theoretical reproducible very conclusive shows physical insight completely testable NOTES: DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER ANSWERS TO JURY and OPPOSITION (SPEECH) OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract leading cooperation relevance of own opinions prioritisation REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS understanding of relevant topics correct own prioritization time used topics presented addressed opinions expressed presentation concise and correct or no **OUESTIONS ASKED** almost no almost no almost no irrelevant very little almost no almost nothing no or irrelevant no no questions asked almost no, irrelevant almost no few some little was trying some almost no very little some main points few some incorrect. some relevant, aimed at resolving some to most topics some main points enough partia satisfying most mostly correct some inconclusive or too long some unclear points to almost all topics Pasonable almost all almost all efficient good almost all correct reasonable all relevant parts almost all deeply incorrect or show short allowing short answers, + improvement + improvement all & verv verv deep misconceptions all suggestions very good efficient prioritized, all time used efficiently almost all parts efficient all suggestions very good 1.5 NOTES: REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract REVIEW OF REPORT REVIEW OF OPPOSITION ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS ASKED QUESTIONS too few, mostly irrelevant understanding own opinions pros & cons prioritisation speech discussion own opinions pros & cons prioritisation report summary analysis of report summary concise and correct or some relevant, sufficient number, could poor almost no too few Cirrelevant chaotic no questions asked too few irrelevant chaotic poor clear things out poor some present too short/long too short/long partially relevan rtially relevan presen some incorrect, most time used, many unclear points inconclusive or too long informative, apt relevant parts many visible adequate visible resolved, aimed at both report and opp. informative, an sufficient adequate many deeply incorrect or show +short, apt and clear, well prioritized brief but detailed, + improvement fully clear, brief but accurate, + improvement fully clear, conclusive deep misconceptions adequate intuitive accurate suggestions adequate intuitive accurate complex suggestions time managed efficiently NOTES:

room: 10>

problem no.:

Juror name: MARTIN GAZO

**SCORESHEET** 

fight (round no.):

stage: 7

relevant

experiments

too few

some

quite a lot.

errors analysed

+ results explained

and analysed

+ totally reliable,

reproducible

fight (round no.):

own contribution

others data, incorrectly cited

reviewed sources, properly cited

some own

relevant

considerable experimental

or theoretical

considerable experimental

and theoretical

task fulfilment

misunderstood

partly

on average level

convincing

solution

some parts better

than average

grater extent

than expected

problem no.:

cooperation arguments/responses

productive convincingly supported

relevant

too few

some

most

proved deep

understanding

+ data/theory

questions

gave reasonable

explanations

+helped clear things out

quickly

+technical cooperation

with team, very efficient

REPORTER

REPORT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

phenomenon explanation

almost no

some

basic

good but not so

demonstrative

detailed, good,

demonstrative

deep and comprehensible, detailed, complex,

shows physical insight completely testable



theory/model

almost no

some

basic

detailed.

correct

+good testable

predictions

reporter: SROBAROVA

opponent:

comparison between

theory and experiment

no/ almost no

some

+ explained

well fitting, deviations

analysed

perfect correlation,

very conclusive

well performed done, but not well fitting

almost no

was trying

satisfying

very

efficient

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	2200
	ANSWERS TO JURY,
flexibility/reactions	OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
poor, slow reactions	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
could answer some	concise and correct or

concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

#### NOTES:

**OPPONENT** 

Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED

almost no, irrelevant some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points

,=	short allowing short answers,	
	prioritized, all time used	

time us	ed understandi presentati		opinions expressed	prioritization
almost	o almost noth	ing no or irrelevan	t almost no	no
very litt	e some main p	oints few	some	almost no
enoug	main poin	ts some	to most topics	some
almost	all relevant p	arts almost all	to almost all topics	reasonable
all & efficien	ly almost all pa	arts all	+ improvement suggestions	very good

ISCUSSION	WITH REPOI	RTER			ANSWERS TO JURY and
leading	cooperation	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	prioritisation	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or
almost no	almost no	(irrelevant)	very little	no	questions asked
little	was trying	few	some	almost no	some incorrect,
partial	satisfying	most	mostly correct	some (	inconclusive or too lon
efficient	good	almost all	almost all correct	reasonable	
very efficient	very efficient	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	-2 deeply incorrect or sho deep misconceptions

**REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS** concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect,

inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



QL	JESTIONS ASKED
0	too few, mostly irrelevant
_	some relevant, sufficient
1_	clear things out

some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	
most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp.	
+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	

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

REV	IEW OF OPPO	OSITION				ANSV	VERS TO JURY
	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	QUES	TIONS  concise and corre
0	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	0	no questions aske
1_	too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	present	(2)	some incorrect,
5	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	adequate	visible	-12	inconclusive or to
3	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	clear, intuitive	-2	deeply incorrect of deep misconception

7142	WENS TO JONT	
QUE	STIONS	
0	concise and correct or no questions asked	
1)	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	

deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

SCORESHEET stage: 2

fight (round no.):

102

problem no.:

signature:

REPORTER
Start from 1 and add/subtract

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT 4	OPPC	OSITION (SI	PEECH)				DIS	CUSSION V	VITH REPOR	TER			ANSWERS TO JURY and
Start from 1 and add/subtract U		time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritization		leading	cooperation	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	prioritisation	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS  concise and correct or no
almost no, irrelevant	0	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0	almost no	almost no	irrelevant	very little	no	0 \ questions asked
0_4	1	very little,	some main points /	few	some	almost no	1	little	was trying	few	some /	almost no	some incorrect,
some relevant, aimed at resolving	2	enough [	main points	some	to most topics	some	2	partial (	satisfying	most	mostly correct	some	-1 inconclusive or too long
1 — some unclear points	4	almost all	all relevant parts	almost all	to almost all topics	reasonable	-	efficient	good	almost all	almost all correct	reasonable	
2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	3 4—	all & efficiently	almost all parts	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4	very efficient	very efficient	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

**REVIEWER** 

Start from 1 and add/subtract



QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT							IEW OF OPPO	ANSWERS TO JURY				
o — too few, mostly irrelevant  some relevant, sufficient number, could		report summary	understanding of report	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation		speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	QUESTIONS  concise and correct or
1 clear things out	0	poor	poor	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	0	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	no questions asked
most time used, many unclear points	1	too short/long	partially	some	partially relevant	present	1	too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	present	some incorrect,
resolved, aimed at both report and opp.	2=	informative, apt	sufficient (	many	adequate	visible	2=	informative, ap	relevant parts	many	adequate *	visible	inconclusive or too long
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	-2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT relevant some septemation theory/model specimeness on explanation theory/model specimeness on specime	REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract	stage: 2 reporter:	fight (rou opponent		room: 10 reviewer:	2	problem no.:	Juror nam signature	3
OPPOSITION (SPECH) Start from 1 and add/subtract  OUESTIONS ASKED  O almost no presentation  o almost no, irrelevant  some relevant, almed at resolving  some unclear points  some unclear points  2 and all Reviewed parts  and all Reviewed parts  and all Reviewed parts  all Reviewed part	phenomenon explanation almost no almost no some basic good but not so demonstrative detailed, good, demonstrative deep and comprehensible, detailed, complex detailed, complex	relevant too few no/ come well performed done, but quite a lot, errors analysed + results explained and analysed , + totally reliable, perfect	almost no reit not well ritting explained align, deviations inalysed t correlation,	others data, incorrectly cited eviewed sources, properly cited some own relevant considerable experimental or theoretical considerable experimental	ed partly on average level convincing solution some parts better than average grater extent	cooperation almost no was trying satisfying productive very	relevant arguments/respons too few some most + data/theory convincingly support proved deep	poor, slow reactions could answer some questions gave reasonable explanations +helped clear things out quickly +technical cooperation	OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS  concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show
Start from 1 and add/subtract  ULSTIONS ASKED  almost no, irrelevant equipment and add/subtract  original most no irrelevant some relevant, aimed at resolving some mala points some mala points  almost no irrelevant very fittle some mala points few some almost no irrelevant some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points  short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used  NOTES:    Very Wery   Very	NOTES: 3 balls 141,5+2-1=3	Vindel	T-E	Compass	u_		Uzsvetle Uzsvetle	nie Jahleg.	Zapticz
QUESTIONS ASKED  too few, mostly irrelevant some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp. +short, apt and clear, well prioritized 3 accurate  REVIEW OF REPORT  report understanding own opinions pros & cons prioritisation summary of report to few irrelevant chaotic poor poor tog few irrelevant chaotic poor almost no tog few partially relevant present too short/long to	QUESTIONS ASKED  almost no, irrelevant  some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points  short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used  NOTES:	me used understanding of presentation most no almost nothing some main points main points most all all relevant parts all & almost all parts	addressed no or irrelevant few some almost all all	opinions expressed almost no some alm to most topics s to almost all topics reas + improvement suggestions ver	no 0 almo nost no 1 lit opne 2 pa sonable 3 ve y good 4 effici	cooperation ost no almost no ottle was trying ritial satisfying cient good ery very	relevance of topics irrelevant few most almost all almost all	very little no some almóst no sstly correct some sist all correct reasonable approvement	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS  concise and correct or no questions asked  some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show
	QUESTIONS ASKED  1 too few, mostly irrelevant  2 some relevant, sufficient number, could  1 clear things out  2 most time used, many unclear points  resolved, aimed at both report and opp.  +short, apt and clear, well prioritized  time managed efficiently	report understar summary of repor poor poor too short/long partial informative, apt suffice brief but detaile	tou few y some nt many d, +improveme	irrelevant chao partially relevant prese adequate visib	sation spee summ tic poo ant 1 too shor le 2 informati r, brief	discussion analysis or almost no t/long too short/lon five, apt relevant part but accurate,	to few  ng spane pai  s many  + improvement	irrelevant chaotic tially relevant present adequate visible fully clear, adequate intuitive	QUESTIONS  o concise and correct or no questions asked  -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long  deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

stage: 3

relevant

experiments

too few

some

well performed

quite a lot,

errors analysed

and analysed

+ totally reliable,

reproducible

+ results explained

fight (round no.): 4

own contribution

others data, incorrectly cited

some own

relevant

considerable experimental

or theoretical

considerable experimental

and theoretical

reviewed sources, properly cited \*

room: 102

problem no.: 16

Juror name: Milan Smallk

signature: Zull

REPORTER

REPORT

0

Start from 1 and add/subtract

phenomenon explanation

almost no

some

basic

good but not so

demonstrative

detailed, good,

demonstrative

deep and comprehensible, detailed, complex,

shows physical insight completely testable

theory/model

almost no

some

basic

detailed,

correct

+good testable

predictions

reporter:

opponent:

comparison between

theory and experiment

some

done, but not well fitting

+ explained

well fitting, deviations

analysed

perfect correlation,

very conclusive

no/ almost no

reviewer:

some parts better

than average

grater extent

than expected

	1	DISC	JSS
	task fulfilment		cod
Ī	• misunderstood	0 —	al
d	▼ partly	· -	
	on average level	1 -	w
	convincing solution	2 1	sa

SION WITH OPPONENT relevant operation arguments/responses flexibility/reactions too few poor, slow reactions could answer some as trying some questions gave reasonable satisfying most explanations Thelped clear things out + data/theory productive convincingly supported quickly proved deep +technical cooperation efficient understanding with team, very 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:

**OPPONENT** Start from 1 and add/subtract QUESTIONS ASKED almost no, irrelevant

some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points short allowing short answers,

prioritized, all time used

OPF	OSITION (S	SPEECH)			
	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritization
_	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no
	very little	some main points	few	some	• almost no
-	enough	main points	some	to most topics	some
0	almost all	all relevant parts	almost all	to almost all topics	reasonable
Ξ	all & efficiently	almost all parts	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



QL	JESTIONS ASKED
0 -	<ul> <li>too few, mostly irrelevant</li> </ul>
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

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

RI	EVIEW OF OPPO speech summary	OSITION discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	- W. C. D All	WERS TO JURY STIONS concise and corre
0	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	0	no questions aske
1	too short/long	too short/long	* some	partially relevant	present	1	some incorrect,
2	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	adequate	visible	-1	inconclusive or to
3	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	clear, intuitive	-2	deeply incorrect of deep misconcept

and correct or ions asked orrect, sive or too long

correct or show conceptions

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract	SCORESHEET stage: 3 reporter: 1.66	fight (round no.): 🗘 opponent:	room: 102 reviewer:	problem no.: 1/2	Juror nam	ie: HAR7/N GAZO
phenomenon explanation almost no almost no some basic basic good but not so demonstrative detailed, good, demonstrative deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight  theory/model almost no some basic basic correct betailed, correct detailed, correct detailed, complex, completely testable	reproducible very conclus	etiment own contribution others data, incorrectly cited reviewed sources, properly cited of relevant d relevant considerable experimental or theoretical ation, considerable experimental	task fulfilment	cooperation almost no too few  was trying satisfying most + data/theory convincingly supported proved deep understanding	poor, slow reactions could answer some questions gave reasonable explanations +helped clear things out	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
OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract  OUESTIONS ASKED  almost no, irrelevant some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used  OPPOSITIONS  tim  Veri	presentation ad almost no thing no or some main points main points all all relevant parts all & almost all parts	rant topics dressed opinions expressed irrelevant almost no not some to most topics most all topics reason to most all topics reason to most all suggestions very grant to almost opinions to almost all topics reason to most all topics reason to most all topics reason to most all topics reason to almost all topics reason to all topics rea	DISCUSSION leading  almost no little leading  almost no little leading  cond little leading  almost no little leading  alm	topics pre almost no irrelevant ver was trying few satisfying most mostl good almost all almost very + impr efficient all sugg	opinions sented y little no ome almost no y correct all correct reasonable overment sestions	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
REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract		pros & cons prioritisat  oo few irrelevant chaotic some partially relevant present many adequate visible mprovement fully clear, uggestions adequate intuitive	REVIEW OF OPF speech summary poor too short/long nformative ag brief but	discussion analysis almost no too Tew artia too short/long some nartia relevant parts many accurate, + improvement	ľ	ANSWERS TO JURY  QUESTIONS  concise and correct or no questions asked  some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

stage: 3 reporter: 1SA

fight (round no.): 4 room: 102 problem no.: 16 opponent: POSTOVA reviewer: SROBAROVA

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

NOTES:

**OPPONENT** 

Start from 1 and add/subtract

# **QUESTIONS ASKED**

almost no, irrelevant some relevant, aimed at resolving

some unclear points

short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

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

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



_ = 22		
QI	JESTIONS 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	

RE	VIEW OF REPO	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION							
	report summary	understanding of report	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation		speech summary	discus analy almos	
0	poor	poor	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	0	poor		
1	too short/long	partially	some	partially relevant	present	1	too short/long	too shor	
3	informative, apt	sufficient	many	adequate	visible	27	informative, apt	relevant	
3	brief but accurate	detailed, complex	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	clear, intuitive	3	brief but accurate	accura conclu	

	REV	IEW OF OPPO	OSITION				ANSWERS TO JURY
n		speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	QUESTIONS concise and corre
	0	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	no questions aske
	1_	too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	present	some incorrect,
4	27	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	adequate 0	visible	inconclusive or to
1	3	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	clear, intuitive	-2 deeply incorrect of deep misconcepti

and correct or stions asked correct, usive or too long

> incorrect or show isconceptions

# SCORESHEET stage: 9 fight (round no.): 4 room: 101 problem no.: 15 Juror name: Markin Chadyol. reporter: opponent: reviewer: signature: DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT ANSWERS TO JURY.

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

## NOTES:

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

OPPONENT 6	ОРРО	SITION (SF	PEECH)				DISC	CUSSION V	VITH REPOR	RTER			ANSWERS TO JURY and
Start from 1 and add/subtract  QUESTIONS ASKED	,	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritization		leading	cooperation	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	prioritisation	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS  concise and correct or no
almost no, irrelevant	0	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0	almost no	almost no	irrelevant	very little	no	questions asked
0_		very little	some main points /	few	some	almost no	1	little	was trying	few	some	almost no	some incorrect,
some relevant, aimed at resolving	2	enough	main points	some	to most topics 🕴	some	2	partial	satisfying a	most V	mostly correct [	some	inconclusive or too long
some unclear points	2_	almost all	all relevant parts	almost all	to almost all topics	reasonable		efficient	good	almost all	almost all correct	reasonable	
2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	3_ 4—	all & efficiently	almost all parts	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4	very efficient	very efficient	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIEWER
Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED	RE	VIEW OF REPO	RT				REV	IEW OF OPPO	OSITION				ANSWERS TO JURY
<ul> <li>too few, mostly irrelevant</li> <li>some relevant, sufficient number, could</li> </ul>	0200	report summary	understanding of report	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation		speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	QUESTIONS  concise and corr
1 clear things out	0	poor	poor	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	0_	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	no questions ask
most time used, many unclear points	1	too short/long	partially (	some (	partially relevant	present /	1 1	too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	present	some incorrect,
resolved, aimed at both report and opp.	2 -	informative, apt	sufficient	many	adequate	visible	2=	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	adequate	visible	inconclusive or t
+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	-2 — deeply incorrect deep misconcept

SCORESHEET PLESCH 102 room: problem no.: stage: fight (round no.): Juror name: reviewer: reporter: opponent: signature: REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT REPORT ANSWERS TO JURY. relevant comparison between relevant OPPONENT and own contribution task fulfilment phenomenon explanation theory/model experiments theory and experiment cooperation arguments/responses flexibility/reactions REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS almost no no/ almost no others data, incorrectly cited misunderstood almost no too few too few poor, slow reactions some some reviewed sources, properly cited artly some could answer some concise and correct or Some basio well performed done, but not well fitting some own\_ on average level was trying questions basic no questions asked good but not so + explained relevant convincing detailed. quite a lot, gave reasonable some incorrect, demonstrative errors analysed solution satisfying most explanations correct considerable experimental + data/theory inconclusive or too long + results explained well fitting, deviations some parts better +helped clear things out detailed, good, +good testable productive convincingly supported demonstrative predictions and analysed analysed or theoretical than average quickly deeply incorrect or show considerable experimental proved deep deep and comprehensible, detailed, complex, + totally reliable, perfect correlation, grater extent +technical cooperation deep misconceptions and theoretical than expected efficient understanding with team, very efficient shows physical insight completely testable reproducible very conclusive NOTES: 1+1 +1 = 2 **DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER** OPPONENT OPPOSITION (SPEECH) ANSWERS TO JURY and Start from 1 and add/subtract prioritization leading cooperation relevance of own opinions **REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS** understanding of relevant topics correct own prioritisation time used addressed opinions expressed topics presented QUESTIONS ASKED presentation concise and correct or no almost nothing no or irrelevant almost no almost no almost no irrelevant almost no no very little no questions asked almost no, irrelevant very little some main points few some almost no little was trying few some almost no some incorrect. some relevant, aimed at resolving Some some enbugh mair points to most topics partial satisfying most mostly correct some inconclusive or too long some unclear points efficient to almost all topics reasonable almost all all relevant parts almost all good almost all almost all correct reasonable deeply incorrect or show short allowing short answers, all & + improvement very very + improvement deep misconceptions prioritized, all time used almost all parts suggestions very good efficient efficiently efficient all suggestions very good ibase plade Nedishituje def. synchronizacie 1+1+1+25 = 6 companiso preco sa synchronitaju? REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract REVIEW OF OPPOSITION REVIEW OF REPORT QUESTIONS ASKED ANSWERS TO JURY too few, mostly irrelevant QUESTIONS report understanding own opinions pros & cons prioritisation speech discussion own opinions pros & cons prioritisation of report summary analysis summary some relevant, sufficient number, could concise and correct or chaotic clear things out too few irrelevant almost no too few irrelevant chaotic no questions asked poor poor poor some todshort/long tooshort/long too short/long partially some partially relevant present partially relevant present most time used, many unclear points some incorrect, resolved, aimed at both report and opp. sufficient inconclusive or too long informative, apt many adequate visible informative, apt relevant parts many adequate visible +short, apt and clear, well prioritized detailed, fully brief but deeply incorrect or show brief but + improvement clear, accurate, + improvement fully clear. time managed efficiently intuitive accurate conclusive deep misconceptions accurate complex suggestions adequate suggestions adequate intuitive nevyatil : 141+14 1,5 = E frekupicie > presnova ?