

# SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 3 stage: 3 room: 101 problem no.: 4 Juror's name & signature: Kwadwo Agye

reporter: Osirawa

opponent: ISG

reviewer: Postlewa

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

## REPORT

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

## DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

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

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 7$$

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

## DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

## ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## REVIEW OF REPORT

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

## REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

## DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

## MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- irrelevant
- none
- relevant, constructive

## ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:



## SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 3 stage: 3 room: 101 problem no.: 4 Juror's name & signature: *Sworik*

reporter: OSTRAVA

opponent: 1SG

reviewer: POŠTOVA'

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1 - 2 = 2$$

### REPORT

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

### DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

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

NOTES:

### OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 3.5 + 3 - 0 = 8$$

### 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

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

### 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

fight (round no.): 3 stage: 3 room: 101 problem no.:  
reporter: OSTRAVA opponent: 156

Juror's name & signature: FELHAUER Sin  
reviewer: POŠTOVA

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

## 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	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

## DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

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

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
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

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

## 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  
2 none  
3 relevant, constructive

## ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

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



## SCORESHEET

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 1.5 - \boxed{\phantom{00}} = \boxed{3}$$

fight (round no.): 3

stage: 3

room: 101

problem no.: 4

Juror's name & signature: *Matej Badw*

reporter: *EVA MICHALCOVA*  
*OSTRAVA*

opponent: *TEREZA*  
*BUSKUNOVA*  
*156*

reviewer: *MATEJKA*  
*BLAZKOVA*  
*POSTOVA*

### REPORT

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

### DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

- 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

$$1 + 2 + 3 + 2 - \boxed{\phantom{00}} = \boxed{8}$$

### 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
almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

### DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

### ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

### REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 1.5 + 0.5 - \boxed{\phantom{00}} = \boxed{8.5}$$

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

### REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

### DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

### MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 irrelevant
- 0 none
- 1 relevant, constructive

### ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

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



# SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 3 stage: 3 room: 101 problem no.: 4

Juror's name & signature: ROCH

reporter: 0 STRAVA

opponent: 1.56

reviewer: POŠTOVA KE

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 0.5 - 0 = 3$$

## 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 average	partly clear average
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	some aspects above average	some parts well done
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
4	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
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical		

## DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

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

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

## DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

## ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 2 + 1 + 0.5 - 0 = 5$$

## 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
- 2 ..... none
- 3 ..... relevant, constructive

## ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

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



# SCORESHEET

fight (round no.):

stage:

room:

problem no.:

Juror's name & signature:

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1 - \square = 3$$

## 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	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

## DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

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

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

## 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

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

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## REVIEW OF REPORT

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

## REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

## DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

## MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

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

## ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

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



# SCORESHEET

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 5.5 + 2 - 0 = 8.5$$

fight (round no.): 3

stage: 2

room: 101

problem no.:

Juror's name & signature:

reporter: Poslovai

opponent: Astraw

reviewer: 156

## 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 and theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

## DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

- 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

$$1 + 1.5 + 0.5 + 2 - 0 = 5$$

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

## DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

## ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 1.5 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 7.5$$

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## REVIEW OF REPORT

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

## REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

## DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

## MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- irrelevant
- none
- relevant, constructive

## ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

IYPT - March 2019



# SCORESHEET

fight (round no.):

stage:

room:

problem no.:

Juror's name & signature:

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 7 + 1 - \square = 9$$

## REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	+ 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	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

## DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

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

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 6$$

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

## DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

## ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	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.): 3 stage: 2 room: 101

problem no.: 10

Juror's name & signature:

MATEJ BADIĆ

reporter: RONALD DOBOS  
POŠTAVA

opponent: ALEŠJA OŠTRAVA

reviewer:

158

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 5.5 + 2 - 0 = 8$$

## REPORT

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

## DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

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

## NOTES:

Weight, radius, material & inclination

Coulomb effect qualitative & horizontal explanation

B ← centrifugal force & angular velocity

Q: 33 & ?

Stability diagram

External perturbations experimentally

B definition → slide graph

Q: 10 error bars

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 0.5 + 3 - 0 = 5$$

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## NOTES:

placement of object, dimensions, balls

## OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

## DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

## ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## REVIEW OF REPORT

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

## REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

## DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

## MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- irrelevant
- none
- relevant, constructive

## ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

## NOTES:

new crucial point, oscillations of the ball, external perturbations to stable perturbations, stability regions



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



# SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 3 stage: 2 room: 101 problem no.: 10

Juror's name & signature: FEILHAUER Erik

reporter: POŠTOVA'

opponent: OŠTRAVA

reviewer: 156

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 2 - 0 = 7$$

## REPORT

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

## DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

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

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

## 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

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

## 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:

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



# SCORESHEET

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 8$$

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

Juror's name & signature:

*Yurik*

reporter: POSTOVA

opponent: OSTRAVA

reviewer: 1SG

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

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 6$$

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

$$1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 1.5 \pm 0.5 - 0 = 9$$

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
		report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	almost no	too few	-1 ..... irrelevant	0 ..... concise and correct or no questions asked 1 ..... some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 ..... some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 ..... deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	partial	partially relevant	some	too short/long	partially relevant	some	too short/long	some	0 ..... none	
2	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	relevant parts	many	1 ..... relevant, constructive	
3	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		
4											

NOTES:



## SCORESHEET

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 6 + 2 - 0 = 9$$

fight (round no.): 3

stage: 2

room: 101

problem no.: 10

Juror's name & signature: ROCH

reporter: POSTOVA KE

opponent:

OSTRAVA

reviewer:

1.56

### REPORT

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

### DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

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

NOTES:

### OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

### OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

### DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

### ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

### REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.7 + 2 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 8$$

### 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
- 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:



# SCORESHEET

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

problem no.: 5

Juror's name & signature:

reporter: SAMUEL JAN PLESNIK

opponent: Lilla Malenova

reviewer: OSTRAVA

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 7$$

## REPORT

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

## DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

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

## NOTES:

Handwritten notes including diagrams of a beaker and a flask, and various annotations related to the experiment and the report.

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## NOTES:

Handwritten notes including a diagram of a beaker and a flask, and various annotations related to the experiment and the report.

## OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

## DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

## ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.0 + 1.0 + 0.5 + 0 + 0 - 0 = 4$$

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## NOTES:

Handwritten notes including a diagram of a beaker and a flask, and various annotations related to the experiment and the report.

## REVIEW OF REPORT

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

## REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

## DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

## MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

irrelevant
none
relevant, constructive

## ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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



# SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 3 stage: 1 room:

problem no.: Juror's name & signature:

reporter: 156

opponent: POŠTOVA'

reviewer: OSTRAVA

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 2 - 0 = 7$$

## REPORT

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

## DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

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

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

## 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
almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

## DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

## ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## REVIEW OF REPORT

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

## REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

## DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

## MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 irrelevant
- 2 none
- 3 relevant, constructive

## ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

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



## SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 3 stage: 1 room: 101 problem no.: 5 Juror's name & signature: Yurovik  
 reporter: 1. SG opponent: POŠTOVÁ reviewer: OSTRAVA

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 5 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 7$$

### REPORT

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

### DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

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

### NOTES:

### OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 3 + 2.5 - 0 = 8$$

### 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
almost no	too few	poor	no
few	some	some aspects fine	some
some	some correct	good	reasonable
good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

### ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

### NOTES:

### REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1 \pm 0 - 0 = 6$$

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

### REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
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
almost no	too few
too short/long	some
relevant parts	many
accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

### MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

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

### ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

### NOTES:



## SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 3 stage: 1 room: 101 problem no.: 5 Juror's name & signature: ROCH

reporter:

1.56

opponent:

POŠTOVA KE

reviewer:

OSTRAVA

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

#### REPORT

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

#### DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

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

NOTES:

### OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

#### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

#### OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

#### DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

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

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

NOTES:

### REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

#### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

#### REVIEW OF REPORT

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

#### REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

#### DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

#### MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 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.): 3

stage: 1

room: 101

problem no.:

Juror's name & signature:

reporter:

1.56

opponent:

POJTOVA KE

reviewer:

MARIAN KIREŠ  
OSTRAVA

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

## REPORT

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

## DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

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

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

## DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

## ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## REVIEW OF REPORT

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

## REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

## DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

## MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 irrelevant
- 0 none
- 1 relevant, constructive

## ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:



# SCORESHEET

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 3$$

fight (round no.): 3

stage: 1

room: 101

problem no.:

Juror's name & signature:

reporter: 156

opponent: Podlona

reviewer: Onbrava

## REPORT

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

## DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

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

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

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

## 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

$$1 + 1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1 - 0 = 6$$

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
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:

IYPT - March 2019