

# SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: 3 room: 101 problem no.: 6 Juror's name & signature: *Ewosik*

reporter: PGJTOVA

opponent: GJH

reviewer: OSTRAVA

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 5.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 8$$

## 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
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

$$1 + 0.5 + 3.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 7$$

## 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

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

## 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
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.):

stage: 3

room: 101

problem no.: 6

Juror's name & signature:

MARYAM KUREŠ

reporter:

POŠTOVÁ

opponent:

GJH

reviewer:

OSTRAVA

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 7 + \square - \square = 8$$

## 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 average	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	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained, errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6	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
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		
5	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
6		
7		

## 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

$$1 + 1 + 25 + 25 - \square = 7$$

## 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

$$1 + 1 + 15 + 25 + 1 \pm \square - \square = 7$$

## 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

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 2.25 - 1 = 6$$

fight (round no.): 4

stage: 3

room: 101

problem no.: 6

Juror's name & signature: Teeta George

reporter: Postova (Urban)

opponent: G. J. H. (Staviva)

reviewer: Ostrava (Ripal)

### 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	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	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
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight						
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

$$1 + 1 + 1.25 + 1.25 - 0 = 5$$

### 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

$$1 + 1.25 + 1 + 1 + 0.75 - 0 = 4$$

### QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 ..... too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 ..... + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
- 2 ..... + 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

fight (round no.): 4

stage: 3

room: 101

problem no.: 6

Juror's name & signature:

pubscl

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3.5 + 3 - 1 = 6$$

## 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:

RIESIL LEN PAVICH VLOHY - AKO VZACH ROZTACIA GUCOBY? KRATSE

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

## 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:

NECHYBA RU POKANIED

POJI DO NEKONSTITUTIVNE GOSTNOTI, PRECO???

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 0.5 + 0.5 + 0 = 3$$

## 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:

NEKONKRETN



# SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: 2 room: 101 problem no.: 12 Juror's name & signature: *Luravick*

reporter: OSTRAVA

opponent: POSTOVA

reviewer: GSH

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 1.0 - 1 = 3$$

## 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	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
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
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

$$1 + 1.5 + 3.5 + 4 - 0 = 10$$

## 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

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

## 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
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

figt (round no.): 4 stage: 2 room: 101 problem no.: 12 Juror's name & signature: P. K. S. C. H. reviewer:

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.75 + 1 - 0.5 = 3$$

## 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	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ 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:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.25 + 1.5 + 3.5 - \text{ } = 8$$

## QUESTIONS ASKED

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

## 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:

+ a bit of f

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 3 + 2 + 1.5 \pm \text{ } - \text{ } = 9$$

## 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:

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

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

## 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 average	partly clear
fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	average
good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	some parts well done
detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	overall clear, demonstrative
deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive			+ 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

$$1 + 1 + 3 + 3 - 1 = 9$$

## 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

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

## 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:

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



## SCORESHEET

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

fight (round no.): 4 stage: 2 room: 101

problem no.: 12

Juror's name & signature: Reizilwa

reporter: Astrav (Kopetia)

opponent: Tashara (Debas)

reviewer: Gita (Bipul)

### 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:

horizontal  
forbidden

### OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

### QUESTIONS ASKED

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

### 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

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

### 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:



# SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4

stage: 1

room: 109

problem no.: 11

Juror's name & signature: Reetha

reporter: GJH (Gleisner)

opponent: Ostrava (Michal)

reviewer: Postava (Hester)

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 25 - 1 = 4$$

## 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	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	errors analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated
deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight		+ reproducible, convincing analysis				

## 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

$$1 + 15 + 25 + 2 = 6$$

## 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

$$1 + 3 + 15 + 15 + 0 = 7$$

## 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:

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



## SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4

stage: 7

room: 201

problem no.: 11

Juror's name & signature:

PCBSCA

reporter: Glt Bosko

opponent:

reviewer:

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - \square = 4$$

### 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:

### OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

### 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

$$1 + 1 + 3 + 1 + 0 \pm \square - \square = 6$$

### 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:

POSKE PCBSCA



# SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: 1 room: 101 problem no.: 11 Juror's name & signature: Yurvik

reporter: GZH

opponent: OSTRAVA

reviewer: POŠTOVÁ

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4.5 + 2.5 - 1 = 6$$

## 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

- 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

$$1 + 0.5 + 2 + 2.5 - 0 = 6$$

## 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
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

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 + 0.5 - 0 - 0 = 7$$

## 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

- 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.): 4 stage: 1 room: 101 problem no.: 11 Juror's name & signature:

reporter: GJH

opponent: OSTRAVA

reviewer: G-PRTOVA KE

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 6 + 1 - 1 = 7$$

### 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			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	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6	demonstrative		errors analysed	explained, conclusive			
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
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

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

### 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
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

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

### 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
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.): 4 stage: 3 room: 101 problem no.:

Juror's name & signature:

reporter: KE

opponent: GJH

HLUBINA

reviewer: OSTRAVA

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
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	-1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
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	-2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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	proved deep understanding	overall efficient		
6											
7											

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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	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	-1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
		all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair		
		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	-2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
NOTES:												

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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				0			0		-1	0
	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no		poor/wrong	irrelevant		almost no	too few	
1	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	partial	partially relevant	some	1	too short/long	partially relevant	1	too short/long	some	
		good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	2	relevant parts	many	
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	3	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate	1
											-1
											0
											-1
											2
											-2

NOTES:

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



# SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4 stage: 2 room: 101

problem no.: Juror's name & signature:

reporter: OSTRAVA

opponent: KE

HLUBINA

reviewer: GJH

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 1 - 1 = 5$$

## 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 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

- 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

$$1 + 2 + 3 + 4 - \square = 10$$

## 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

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

## 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:

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



# SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 4

stage: 1

room: 701

problem no.:

Juror's name & signature:

HLUBINA

reporter: GJH

opponent: OSTRAVA

reviewer: KE

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3 + 2 - 1 = 5$$

## 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	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	errors analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated
deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight		+ reproducible, convincing analysis				

## 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

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

## 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
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

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

## 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
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.): 4 stage: 3 room: 101 problem no.: 6 Juror's name & signature: MEILING 12-11

reporter: POSTON

opponent: GJK

reviewer: O-STRAIA

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 6.5 + 2.5 - 0.5 = 9.5$$

### 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:

### OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 4.5$$

### 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

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

### 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
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.): 4 stage: 2 room: 101 problem no.: 12 Juror's name & signature: *HEILIGER HOF*

reporter: *OSTRAVA*

opponent: *POJOUŠ*

reviewer: *GJM*

### 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	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:

*175-181 26-36 14.8*

### OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 3 + 3.5 - 0 = 9$$

### 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:

*PANIC RIL*

### REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 - 0 = 8$$

### 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 accurate, conclusive	many 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

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 2 - 1 = 6$$

fight (round no.): 4 stage: 1 room: 101 problem no.: 11 Juror's name & signature:

reporter: GJH

opponent: OSTRAVA

PAVOL HLEBILKA Ref  
reviewer: G. POSTOL

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	
almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic		too few	poor	
some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear		some	some aspects fine	0
fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average		many	good	1
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	2
detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative		proved deep understanding	overall efficient	3
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				

NOTES:

### OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2 - 0 = 6.5$$

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	
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	1
		all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	2
		practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	3

NOTES:

### REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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	
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	partial	partially relevant	some	too short/long	partially relevant	some	too short/long	some	0	
	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	relevant parts	many	1	
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate	2	

NOTES: