

## SCORESHEET

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3 + 1.5 - 0 = 6$$

fight (round no.): 2 stage: 3 room: 101 problem no.: 1

Juror's name & signature: JAROSLAV TÓBIK

reporter: GYMSROBAROV

opponent: PAVEL GJH

reviewer: BOŠTOVA DOBOS

### REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

### DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

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

### NOTES:

Ke radania je bixovanie v, ale nie I. Pomôže kváčovať I? a prečo? A čo elektrický?  
 (čo by sa zmenila fyzika v inej atmosfére/vákuu?)

### OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.8 + 2.5 + 2.8 - 0 = 8$$

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

### OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

### DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

### ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

### NOTES:

### REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

### REVIEW OF REPORT

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

### REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

### DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

### MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 0 ..... irrelevant  
 1 ..... none  
 2 ..... relevant, constructive

### ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: Zmenila by atmosféra rýchlosť toku? Zmení sa pomer odporu obáčky?



# SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 2 stage: 3 room: 101 problem no.: 1 Juror's name & signature:

reporter: KE Štobátová opponent: BA GZH

reviewer: KE Poštolová

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 7

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	some	some aspects fine
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
6									
7									

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation		
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	0 almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	0 almost no	too few	poor	no	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 few	some	some aspects fine	some	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 some	some correct	good	reasonable	-1	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		3 all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	-2	
		4 practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good		
NOTES:												

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 3 + 2 + 2 - 1 = 9

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	report evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	concise and correct or no questions asked
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	almost no	too few	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
1	partial	too short/long	too short/long	some	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
2	good	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	
3	detailed, complex	condensed & accurate	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate	
0	pros & cons	pros & cons			
0	irrelevant	irrelevant			
1	partially relevant	partially relevant			
2	mostly adequate	mostly adequate			
3	fully adequate	fully adequate			

NOTES:



# SCORESHEET

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 1 = 5$$

fight (round no.):

stage:

room:

problem no.:

Juror's name & signature:

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

## REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3			well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	good	good					
5	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6	demonstrative		errors analysed				
7	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

## DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
2	many	good
3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
4		
5		
6		
7	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

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

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

## NOTES:

not qualit. expl. much

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2.5 + 1.5 = 6$$

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

## DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

## ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

## NOTES:

1. theory
2. parameters

Voltage?

connections to results missing

ions not c-

pick up top one

⊕ principle → wing

⊕ razor

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 + 1 = 7$$

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## REVIEW OF REPORT

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

## REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

## DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

## MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 irrelevant
- 0 none
- 1 relevant, constructive

## ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

## NOTES:

volt. / types/

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



## SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 2 stage: 3 room: 101 problem no.: 1

Juror's name & signature: PLBSCA

reporter: CIGLANSKY

opponent:

reviewer:

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 10 - \square = 5$$

### REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3							
4	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
5							
6	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
7	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

### DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
2	many	good
3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
4		
5		
6	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

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

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

NOTES:

OPTIMAL ANGLE!

### OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

### OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

### DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

### ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

### REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 0.75 \pm \square - \square = 5$$

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

### REVIEW OF REPORT

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

### REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

### DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

### MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 ..... irrelevant
- 0 ..... none
- 1 ..... relevant, constructive

### ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: Against electron?



## SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 2 stage: 3 room: 101 problem no.: 1  
reporter: PROBATOR opponent: G317

Juror's name & signature: KAVUKY K  
reviewer: POSTOVA

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 4.5 - \square = 5$$

### REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

### DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

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

### NOTES:

100% effort → theoretically why blob shape? ang. velocity explanation?  
What a the best measures → which way to optimize video

### OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2 - \square = 6$$

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

### OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	all time used

### DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

### ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

### NOTES:

source of rotation  
missed measurement before

### REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1.75 + 1 - \square = 6$$

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

### REVIEW OF REPORT

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

### REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

### DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

### MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 ..... irrelevant  
0 ..... none  
1 ..... relevant, constructive

### ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

### NOTES:

acceleration



## SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 2 stage: 2 room: 101

problem no.: 15

Juror's name & signature: JOZEF BRESTENSKÝ

reporter: KE POKORÁ

opponent: KE ŠTOKÁČOVÁ

reviewer: BA GJH

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 3 - 1 = 7$$

### REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3				deviations	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive			
7							

### DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

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

NOTES:

### OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

### OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

### DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

### ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

### REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

### REVIEW OF REPORT

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

### REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

### DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

### MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 0 irrelevant
- 1 none
- 2 relevant, constructive

### ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:



## SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 2 stage: 2 room: 101 problem no.: 15 Juror's name & signature: JAROSLAV TÓBIK Jób

reporter: O. URBÁN POŠTAVA opponent: ŠROBÁROVA

reviewer: GJ.H

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3.2 + 1 - 0 = 5$$

### REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ errors analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

### DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

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

NOTES: model vidyky relevantny. Učovanie T - dá sa porovnať  $\frac{x_2 - x_1}{x_1}$  a  $\frac{x_3 - x_2}{x_2}$  ? (slide 15)

### OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.2 + 2.5 + 1 - 0 = 6$$

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

### OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

### DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

### ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

Čo sa stane ak miesto guľičky použijete kocku?

### REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 2.5 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 - 0 = 9$$

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

### REVIEW OF REPORT

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

### REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

### DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

### MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 irrelevant
- 0 none
- 1 relevant, constructive

### ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

Where the energy go?



# SCORESHEET

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1 - 05 = 3$$

fight (round no.):

stage:

room:

problem no.:

Juror's name & signature:

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

## REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3			well performed, sufficient number	deviations	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	good	good		qualitatively analysed		interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical		
7							

## DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

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

## NOTES:

experiments contradicted theory? slide 23

material? no theory

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 1 + 1 - \square = 4$$

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

## DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

## ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

## NOTES:

1. diff sizes
2. delay hands
3. theory

up setup → is it relevant  
erroneous →

material  
steel energy parameters

2/3 → graphs  
not really  
started good → no but not conducted well

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## REVIEW OF REPORT

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

## REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

## DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

## MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 irrelevant
- 0 none
- 1 relevant, constructive

## ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

## NOTES:

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



## SCORESHEET

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

fight (round no.): 2 stage: 2 room: 101 problem no.: 15 Juror's name & signature: KAVIRAJ K

reporter: POSTAVA

opponent: JROBA'ROVA

reviewer: GSH

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

NOTES:

### OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 2 + 0.5 - 0 = 4$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	almost no	too few	poor	no	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	few	some	some aspects fine	some	2	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
		main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	some	some correct	good	reasonable	3	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
		all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	4	
		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good		

NOTES:

### REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 2 + 2 + 1 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	report evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	almost no	too few
1	partial	partially relevant	some	too short/long	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	relevant parts	many
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

NOTES:

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



## SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 2

stage: 2

room: 101

problem no.: 15

Juror's name & signature: PIESCH

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

#### REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3			well performed, sufficient number	deviations	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	good	good		qualitatively analysed			
5	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6	demonstrative		errors analysed				
7	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

#### DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
2	many	good
3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
4		
5		
6		
7	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

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

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

NOTES:

### OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

#### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

#### OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

#### DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

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

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

NOTES:

### REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

#### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

#### REVIEW OF REPORT

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

#### REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

#### DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

#### MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 ..... irrelevant
- 2 ..... none
- 3 ..... relevant, constructive

#### ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

POZPACITIE LOWIEC



# SCORESHEET

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 1 - 0.5 = 6$$

fight (round no.): 2 stage: 1 room: 101 problem no.:

Juror's name & signature:

MARTIN GAZO

reporter: 634

opponent: POSTOVA

reviewer: SIZORAPOVA

## REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight		+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive			
7							

## DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

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

## NOTES:

L not fully covered

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

## DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

## ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

## NOTES:

weak = "video", better comparison

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## REVIEW OF REPORT

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

## REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

## DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

## MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 0 irrelevant
- 1 none
- 2 relevant, constructive

## ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

## NOTES:

human factors, human load  
type of string

0 -

Logarithm

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



# SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 2 stage: 1 room: 101 problem no.:

Juror's name & signature: PLBSCAT

reporter: GSH

Stavir

opponent: Rony

reviewer:

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4.75 + 2.5 - \square = 8$$

## REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3				deviations		some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical		
7							

## DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

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

NOTES:

720 vs 220  
sinfy

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 3 + 2.5 - \square = 8$$

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

NOTES:

## OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

## DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

## ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

- Cap boum

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2.5 + 1 + 0 \pm \square - \square = 3$$

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## REVIEW OF REPORT

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

## REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

## DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

## MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 ..... irrelevant
- 0 ..... none
- 1 ..... relevant, constructive

## ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

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



## SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 2

stage: 1

room: 101

problem no.: 14

Juror's name & signature: KAVICKY Kz

reporter: G3H

opponent: POSTOVA

reviewer: SPOBROVA

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 5 + 45 - 0 = 8$$

### REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight		+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive			
7							

### DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

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

### NOTES:

Expectations: clear theory, analysed with parameters? basic exp. → not for this problem, dependence on function is clear

4.5m ✓

does it depend on mass of heavier load?

What's happening with time load

### OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 9$$

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

### OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

### DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

### ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

### NOTES:

### REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 0 \pm 0 - 0 = 4$$

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

### REVIEW OF REPORT

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

### REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

### DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

### MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 ..... irrelevant
- 2 ..... none
- 3 ..... relevant, constructive

### ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

### NOTES:

- General subtle bits



## SCORESHEET

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 5.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 8$$

fight (round no.): 2 stage: 1 room: 101

problem no.: 14

Juror's name & signature: JAROSLAV TÓBIK Jolíz

reporter: GJH J.ŠTAVINA

opponent: POŠTOVA' R. DOBOŠ

reviewer: ŠROBÁROVA VERONIKA?

### REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3				deviations	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive			
7							

### DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

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

### NOTES:

Prečo také rýchlo rázisi kracia sila od omdania. Objavili by sa kmity aj spontánne?

Zaberal brenie do kórona zachovania momentu hybnosti?

### OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.6 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 9$$

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

### OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

### DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

### ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

### NOTES:

### REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.8 + 2.2 + 1.8 + 1 \pm 0 - 0 = 8$$

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

### REVIEW OF REPORT

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

### REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

### DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

### MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 ..... irrelevant
- 0 ..... none
- 1 ..... relevant, constructive

### ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

### NOTES:

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



Jakub STAVINA

## SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 2 stage: 1 room: 101

problem no.: 14 Juror's name & signature: Jozef BRESTENSKÝ

reporter: BA GJH

opponent: KE Pöstová

reviewer: KE Štobárová

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 3 - 1 = 7 \quad 7$$

### REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

### DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

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

NOTES:

### OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 3 + 4 - 1 = 9 \quad 9$$

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

### OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

### DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

### ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

### REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 3 + 2 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 8 \quad 8$$

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

### REVIEW OF REPORT

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

### REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

### DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

### MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 0 ..... irrelevant  
 1 ..... none  
 2 ..... relevant, constructive

### ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

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