SCORESHEET Juror name: fight (round no.): room: problem no.: 10 stage: opponent: SROBAR reporter: VACUUM reviewer: REPORTER signature: Start from 1 and add/subtract REPORT DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT ANSWERS TO JURY. relevant comparison between relevant OPPONENT and phenomenon explanation theory/model experiments theory and experiment own contribution task fulfilment cooperation arguments/responses flexibility/reactions REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS almost no almost no too few no/ almost no others data, incorrectly cited misunderstood almost no too few poor, slow reactions reviewed sources, properly cited some some some some partly could answer some concise and correct or basic basic well performed done, but not well fitting some own on average level was trying some auestions no questions asked good but not so detailed, quite a lot, + explained relevant convincing gave reasonable errors analysed demonstrative correct solution satisfying most some incorrect, explanations detailed, good, +good testable results explained well fitting, deviations considerable experimental some parts better + data/theory +helped clear things out inconclusive or too long analysed predictions and analysed or theoretical than average demonstrative productive convincingly supported auickly deeply incorrect or show + totally reliable, perfect correlation, considerable experimental deep and comprehensible, detailed, complex, grater extent proved deep +technical cooperation deep misconceptions shows physical insight | completely testable reproducible very conclusive and theoretical than expected efficient understanding with team, very efficient NOTES: 2,5 1+ OPPONENT OPPOSITION (SPEECH) **DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER** ANSWERS TO JURY and Start from 1 and add/subtract leading cooperation time used understanding of relevant topics correct own prioritization relevance of own opinions REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS prioritisation presentation addressed opinions expressed topics presented **QUESTIONS ASKED** concise and correct or no almost no almost nothing no or irrelevant almost no almost no almost no irrelevant very little no almost no. irrelevant questions asked some main points few very little some almost no little was trying few some almost no some relevant, aimed at resolving some incorrect, enough main points some to most topics some partial satisfying most mostly correct some some unclear points inconclusive or too long almost all all relevant parts almost all to almost all topics reasonable efficient good almost all almost all correct reasonable short allowing short answers. deeply incorrect or show all & + improvement verv verv + improvement prioritized, all time used deep misconceptions efficiently almost all parts suggestions very good efficient efficient all suggestions very good 1 2-3 NOTES: 2.3 25 2,5 REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract **REVIEW OF OPPOSITION QUESTIONS ASKED** REVIEW OF REPORT ANSWERS TO JURY too few, mostly irrelevant understanding own opinions pros & cons prioritisation report speech discussion own opinions pros & cons prioritisation QUESTIONS summary of report some relevant, sufficient number, could summary analysis concise and correct or clear things out poor poor too few irrelevant chaotic poor almost no too few irrelevant no questions asked chaotic too short/long partially some partially relevant present too short/long too short/long most time used, many unclear points some partially relevant present some incorrect, resolved, aimed at both report and opp. informative, apt sufficient visible informative, apt relevant parts many adequate inconclusive or too long many adequate visible +short, apt and clear, well prioritized brief but detailed. + improvement fully clear. brief but deeply incorrect or show accurate. + improvement fully clear. time managed efficiently accurate complex suggestions adequate intuitive accurate conclusive suggestions adequate intuitive deep misconceptions NOTES: 1

1-8

		SCOKESHE	ELI		1			1			10		D.	Aur 11
_		stage: 4		fight (roun			room			problem no.:	10	Juror nan	ne: 📈	DHYL /
REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract		reporter: √a,	cury	opponent:	Stobarova		revie	wer: Pos	forci-			signature	: 0	
REPORT phenomenon explanation almost no some basic good but not so demonstrative detailed, good, demonstrative deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	theory/model almost no some basic detailed, correct +good testable predictions detailed, complex, completely testable		perfect cor very con	experiment lost no one rev t well fitting lained deviations deviation, of	own contribution of the co	ctly cited reperly cited o	task fulfi misunder parti on averag convinc soluti ome parts than ave grater ex	Iment stood 0 y e level 1 cing on 2 s better erage 3 ktent	almost no was trying satisfying	relevant arguments/res _i too few some	ponses flexibili poor, sl could a qu gave r expl pory +helped c ported q ep +technica	ity/reactions ow reactions inswer some reasonable lanations clear things out uickly al cooperation in, very efficient	OPPC REVIE	WERS TO JURY, DNENT and EWER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too lon deeply incorrect or sho
OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract QUESTIONS ASKED o almost no, irrelevant some relevant, aimed at res some unclear points short allowing short answer prioritized, all time used NOTES:	olving 0 alm ver 2 alm s, 3	present of almost no almost no almost no almost no main main most all all relevable.	ntation nothing ain points points ant parts	elevant topics addressed to or irrelevant few some almost all	correct own opinions expresse almost no some to most topics to almost all topic + improvement suggestions	almost r some	0 0 1 2 2 ble 3	almost n little partial efficien very efficien	almost no was trying satisfying good very	relevance of topics irrelevant few most	own opinions presented very little some mostly correct almost all correct + improvement suggestions	prioritisation no almost no some reasonable very good		VERS TO JURY and WER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or n questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract	0													
QUESTIONS ASKED o too few, mostly irrelevant some relevant, sufficient no		EVIEW OF REPO report summary		own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation		EW OF OF speech summary	PPOSITION discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	QUEST	/ERS TO JURY TIONS concise and correct or
clear things out most time used, many uncle resolved, aimed at both rep	1000 50	poor too short/long informative, apt	poor partially sufficient	some many	irrelevant partially relevant adequate	chaotic present visible	- 7		almost no ng too short/long apt relevant parts		irrelevant partially relevant adequate	chaotic present visible	-1=	no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
+short, apt and clear, well p	orioritized 3	brief but accurate	detailed, complex	+ improvement suggestions	t fully adequate	clear, intuitive	3	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	t fully adequate	clear, intuitive	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

SCORESHEET

Juror name: NAWASIOVA problem no.: 40 fight (round no.): 1 room: stage: 1 opponent: 5ROBAROVA reviewer: POS TOVA reporter: VACUUM signature: Navasiova REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT ANSWERS TO JURY. REPORT comparison between relevant relevant OPPONENT and task fulfilment own contribution phenomenon explanation theory/model experiments theory and experiment cooperation arguments/responses flexibility/reactions REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS no/almost no others data, incorrectly cited misunderstood too few almost no almost no too few almost no poor, slow reactions reviewed sources, properly cited partly could answer some some some some concise and correct or done, but not well fitting was trying some some own on average level questions 0) basic well performed basic no questions asked detailed, + explained relevant convincing gave reasonable good but not so quite a lot, satisfying some incorrect, most explanations errors analysed o solutiondemonstrative correct inconclusive or too long +good testable + results explained well fitting, deviations considerable experimental some parts better + data/theory +helped clear things out detailed, good, productive convincingly supported or theoretical than average predictions and analysed analysed quickly demonstrative deeply incorrect or show considerable experimental grater extent deep and comprehensible, detailed, complex, + totally reliable, perfect correlation, very proved deep +technical cooperation deep misconceptions efficient understanding reproducible very conclusive and theoretical than expected with team, very efficient shows physical insight completely testable NOTES: 1 +3,5 26,5 **OPPOSITION (SPEECH)** DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER ANSWERS TO JURY and **OPPONENT** Start from 1 and add/subtract cooperation relevance of REVIEWER'S OUESTIONS understanding of relevant topics correct own prioritization leading own opinions prioritisation time used opinions expressed topics presented presentation addressed concise and correct or no QUESTIONS ASKED almost no almost no almost no almost nothing no or irrelevant no almost no irrelevant very little no questions asked almost no, irrelevant some almost no very little some main points few little was trying few almost no some some incorrect, some relevant, aimed at resolving enough main points some to most topics some partial satisfying most mostly correct some inconclusive or too long some unclear points to almost all topics efficient almost all almost all correct almost all all relevant parts almost all reasonable good reasonable deeply incorrect or show short allowing short answers, + improvement all & verv verv + improvement deep misconceptions prioritized, all time used efficiently almost all parts suggestions very good efficient efficient all suggestions very good 1,5 = 3.5 NOTES: REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract **REVIEW OF OPPOSITION QUESTIONS ASKED** REVIEW OF REPORT ANSWERS TO JURY too few, mostly irrelevant prioritisation QUESTIONS report understanding own opinions pros & cons speech discussion own opinions pros & cons prioritisation analysis summary of report summary concise and correct or some relevant, sufficient number, could no questions asked clear things out too few irrelevant chaotic poor almost no too few irrelevant chaotic poor too short/long partially some partially relevant present too short/long too short/long some partially relevant present some incorrect. most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and oppsufficient many visible many inconclusive or too long adequate informative, apt relevant parts adequate visible informative, ap deeply incorrect or show +short, apt and clear, well prioritized fully clear, brief but brief but detailed. + improvement accurate, improvement fully clear, time managed efficiently accurate complex suggestions adequate intuitive accurate conclusive suggestions adequate intuitive deep misconceptions NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER Start from 1 and a	add/subtract 5		stage: 1 reporter: Van	fight (re	ound no.): 1 ent: 3rdiu		101 Post	ovel	problem no.: 10	Juror nam signature:	-100
REPORT	non explanation theo	ory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	100000000000000000000000000000000000000		ITH OPPONENT relevant arguments/responses	flexibility/reactions	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 alı	most no al	Imost no	too few some	no/ almost no some	others data, incorrectly cited reviewed sources, properly cited	misunderstood partly	0	almost no	too few	poor, slow reactions could answer some	concise and correct or
2 good	basic (but not so d	basic detailed, correct	The second secon	done, but not well fitting + explained		on average level convincing solution	1 -	was trying satisfying	some	questions gave reasonable explanations	no questions asked some incorrect,
4 deta	iled, good, +goo	od testable redictions	+ results explained and analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average	3 =	productive	+ data/theory convincingly supported	+helped clear things out quickly	inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show
deep and d	comprehensible, detail	led, complex, letely testable	+ totally reliable, reproducible	perfect correlation, very conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	grater extent than expected	4 =	very efficient	proved deep understanding	+technical cooperation with team, very efficient	deep misconceptions
NOTES:											

OPPONENT T	OPPOSITION (SF	PEECH)				DISC	CUSSION W	ITH REPOR	TER			ANSWERS TO JURY and
Start from 1 and add/subtract QUESTIONS ASKED	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritization		leading	cooperation	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	prioritisation	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or no
	0 almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0	almost no	almost no	irrelevant	very little	no	 questions asked
0almost no, irrelevant	1 very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	1	little	was trying	few	some	almost no	- some incorrect,
some relevant, aimed at resolving	enough	main points	some	to most topics	some	, E	partial	satisfying	most	mostly correct	(some)	inconclusive or too long
1 some unclear points	almost all	all relevant parts	almost all	to almost all topics	reasonable	4	efficient	good	almost all	almost all correct	reasonable	deeply incorrect or show
short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	3 all & efficiently	almost all parts	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4	very efficient	very efficient	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	-2 deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract									
QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REP	ORT			7	REVIEW OF OPP	OSITION		
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant	report summary	understanding of report	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros 8
	QUESTIONS ASKED	QUESTIONS ASKED O too few, mostly irrelevant O too few, mostly irrelevant	QUESTIONS ASKED O too few, mostly irrelevant O too few, mostly irrelevant	QUESTIONS ASKED 0 too few, mostly irrelevant REVIEW OF REPORT report understanding own opinions	Start from 1 and add/subtract QUESTIONS ASKED 0 too few, mostly irrelevant REVIEW OF REPORT report understanding own opinions pros & cons	Start from 1 and add/subtract QUESTIONS ASKED 0 too few, mostly irrelevant REVIEW OF REPORT report understanding own opinions pros & cons prioritisation	Start from 1 and add/subtract QUESTIONS ASKED 0 too few, mostly irrelevant report understanding own opinions pros & cons prioritisation speech summary	Start from 1 and add/subtract QUESTIONS ASKED 0 too few, mostly irrelevant report understanding own opinions pros & cons prioritisation speech discussion summary analysis	Start from 1 and add/subtract QUESTIONS ASKED 0 too few, mostly irrelevant report understanding own opinions pros & cons prioritisation speech discussion own opinions summany analysis

Start Hom I and day south as .							_							
QUESTIONS ASKED	REVI	EW OF REPO	RT				REV	IEW OF OPPO	OSITION			1		VERS TO JURY
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant		report	understanding	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	-	speech		own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	QUES	TIONS
some-relevant, sufficient number, could		summary	of report					summary	analysis				0	concise and correct or
1 clear things out	0	poor	poor	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	0	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	_	no questions asked
most time used, many unclear points	1	too short/long	partially	some	partially relevant	present	1	too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	present		some incorrect,
2 resolved, aimed at both report and opp.	/	nformative, apt	(sufficient)	many	adequate,	visible	6	informative, apt	elevant parts	many	adequate	visible		inconclusive or too long
+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	2	brief but	detailed,	+ improvement	fully	clear,	2	brief but	accurate,	improvement	fully	clear,		deeply incorrect or show
time managed efficiently	3	accurate	complex	suggestions	adequate	intuitive	3 —	accurate	conclusive	suggestions	adequate	intuitive	-2-	deep misconceptions

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract	SCORESHEET stage: A reporter: VACOV	fight (round no.):	room		org	problem no.	: 10	Juror nam signature:	e: KUNDRHEIR UUDLAS
REPORT phenomenon explanation almost no almost no some basic basic good but not so demonstrative detailed, good, demonstrative deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight heterory/mode detailed, detailed, correct detailed, good, demonstrative deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight NOTES:	too few no/ some well performed done, but quite a lot, errors analysed e tresults explained and analysed ex, totally reliable, reproducible too few no/ every no/ totally reliable, perfect very	xplained relevan	rrectly cited misunder properly cited par on avera convirus solutions perimental perimental grater e	filment erstood 0 tly ge level 1 cing tion ts better verage extent	cooperation almost no was trying satisfying	relevan arguments/res too few some + data/the convincingly su proved de understance	t sponses flexibil poor, si could a que gave experience poorted ep +technic	ity/reactions low reactions inswer some uestions reasonable lanations clear things out puickly al cooperation n, very efficient	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too lon deeply incorrect or she deep misconceptions
OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract QUESTIONS ASKED almost no, irrelevant some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points short allowing short answers,	DSITION (SPEECH) time used	relevant topics addressed no or irrelevant few some almost all all suggestion	n prioritization essed no 0 almost no 1 cs some 2 poics reasonable ant 3	ISCUSSION W leading almost no little partial efficient very efficient	1	relevance of topics irrelevant few most almost all	own opinions presented very little some mostly correct almost all correct + improvement suggestions	no almost no some reasonable very good	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or requestions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract QUESTIONS ASKED o too few, mostly irrelevant some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp. short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently NOTES: 2 + 1 5 + 2	REVIEW OF REPORT report understant summary of report poor poor too short/long partially informative, apt sufficient brief but detailed accurate complex	too few irrelevant y some partially relevant many adequate d, +improvement fully	chaotic ant present visible clear,	speech summary poor too short/long informative, apt brief but accurate	discussion analysis almost no too short/long		irrelevant partially relevant adequate	prioritisation chaotic present visible clear, intuitive	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

		stage:	2	fight (rour	nd no.):		room:	10	1	problem no.	: 3	Juror nam	e: ADAMUSETA
REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract	6	reporter: SR	OBÁROVÁ	opponent	POSTOVA		reviewer:	MC	JUM			signature	akushuly
phenomenon explanation almost no	theory/model	relevant experiments too few	comparison theory and en	xperiment	own contribution	-	task fulfilment	DISC		TH OPPONEN relevant arguments/res too few	ponses flexib	ility/reactions	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
some basic good but not so demonstrative	basic detailed, correct	some well performed quite a lot, errors analysed	som done, but not + explai	e rev well fitting ined	iewed sources, prop some own relevant	perly cited	partly on average level convincing solution	2 =	was trying satisfying	some × most	could gave ex	answer some questions e reasonable planations	concise and correct or no questions asked
	+good testable predictions detailed, complex, completely testable	+ results explained and analysed + totally reliable, reproducible	well fitting, d analys perfect corr very cond	relation,	considerable experir or theoretical considerable experir and theoretica	mental	than average grater extent than expected	3 = 4	productive very efficient	+ data/the convincingly sup proved de- understand	oported +techni	d clear things out quickly ical cooperation m, very efficient	inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
NOTES:	2-3	4-5	3.5/3	3	h-5		۷	CERTAIN	2,5	2	٦,	5	2-6
OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract QUESTIONS ASKED	time	preser	ntation	levant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritiza	ation le	eading	VITH REPOR	100	own opinions presented	prioritisation	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or no
almost no, irrelevant some relevant, aimed at res some unclear points short allowing short answer prioritized, all time used	olving 1 ver en 2 alm s, 3 a	y little some ma ough main ost all all releva	nothing no ain points points ant parts all parts	or irrelevant few some almost all	almost no some to most topics to almost all topics + improvement suggestions	no almost some reasona very go	e pable 3 × ef	nost no little partial ficient very ficient	almost no was trying satisfying good very efficient	few most almost all	very little in some mostly correct almost all correct + improvement suggestions		questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
NOTES: 1-2	4	7	7	3	2	3	7,)	7,5	1	1,5	2,5	
REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract	8			3						2			(3)
QUESTIONS ASKED 1 too few, mostly irrelevant some relevant, sufficient nu	ımber, could	VIEW OF REPO report summary	RT understanding of report	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisatio	sum	F OPPO eech mary	OSITION discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS a concise and correct or
clear things out most time used, many uncle resolved, aimed at both rep +short, apt and clear, well p time managed efficiently	ear points 1 port and opp. 2	poor too short/long informative, apt brief but accurate	poor partially sufficient detailed, complex	too few some many + improvemen suggestions	irrelevant partially relevant adequate t fully adequate	chaotic present visible clear, intuitive	1 too sho		almost no too short/long relevant parts accurate, conclusive		irrelevant partially relevar adequate t fully adequate	chaotic nt present visible clear, intuitive	no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
NOTES:		2	2	3	2	2							

SCORESHEET

reviewer: VACCUM Start from 1 and add/subtract REPORT DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT ANSWERS TO JURY. relevant comparison between relevant OPPONENT and / theory/model experiments theory and experiment own contribution task fulfilment phenomenon explanation cooperation arguments/responses flexibility/reactions REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS no/ almost no others data, incorrectly cited almost no almost no too few misunderstood almost no too few poor, slow reactions reviewed sources, properly cited some some some partly could answer some concise and correct or basic basic well performed done, but not well fitting some own on average level was trying some questions no questions asked good but not so detailed, quite a lot, + explained relevant convincing gave reasonable correct errors analysed some incorrect, demonstrative solution satisfying most explanations detailed, good. +good testable + results explained | well fitting, deviations considerable experimental some parts better + data/theory +helped clear things out inconclusive or too long analysed predictions and analysed or theoretical than average productive convincingly supported demonstrative quickly deeply incorrect or show + totally reliable, perfect correlation, considerable experimental deep and comprehensible, detailed, complex, grater extent very proved deep +technical cooperation deep misconceptions very conclusive shows physical insight completely testable reproducible and theoretical than expected efficient understanding with team, very efficient NOTES: (1+1+1) # OPPONENT OPPOSITION (SPEECH) DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER ANSWERS TO JURY and Start from 1 and add/subtract understanding of time used relevant topics correct own prioritization leading cooperation relevance of own opinions prioritisation REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS presentation addressed opinions expressed topics presented **QUESTIONS ASKED** concise and correct or no no or irrelevant almost no almost nothing almost no no almost no almost no irrelevant very little no questions asked almost no. irrelevant very little some main points few almost no some little was trying few some almost no some relevant, aimed at resolving some incorrect, enough main points some to most topics some partial satisfying most mostly correct some inconclusive or too long some unclear points almost all all relevant parts almost all to almost all topics reasonable efficient good almost all almost all correct reasonable short allowing short answers, deeply incorrect or show + improvement verv very + improvement deep misconceptions prioritized, all time used almost all parts all suggestions very good efficient efficient all suggestions very good REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract REVIEW OF REPORT **QUESTIONS ASKED REVIEW OF OPPOSITION** ANSWERS TO JURY too few, mostly irrelevant understanding own opinions pros & cons prioritisation report speech discussion own opinions QUESTIONS pros & cons prioritisation of report some relevant, sufficient number, could summary summary analysis concise and correct or clear things out poor poor too few irrelevant chaotic poor almost no too few irrelevant no questions asked chaotic most time used, many unclear points too short/long partially some partially relevant present too short/long too short/long some partially relevant present some incorrect, resolved, aimed at both report and opp. informative, apt sufficient inconclusive or too long many adequate visible (informative, apt relevant parts many adequate visible +short, apt and clear, well prioritized brief but detailed, + improvement fully clear, brief but accurate, deeply incorrect or show improvement fully clear, time managed efficiently accurate complex suggestions adequate intuitive accurate conclusive suggestions deep misconceptions adequate intuitive NOTES: (1+45 + 3 + 3 = 9

room:

problem no.: 3

Juror name:

signature:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.):

opponent:

stage:

reporter:

REPORTER

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract	4	reporter:	20BAROV	opponent:	POS (0)	VA	reviev	ver: V	ACUUM			signature	Ka	masiova
	almost no some basic detailed, correct +good testable predictions	quite a lot, errors analysed + results explained and analysed + totally reliable,	comparison b theory and exp no/ almost some done, but not w + explaine well fitting, dec analysed perfect corre very conclu	t no ot revi ell fitting ed viations od lation, co	own contribute thers data, incorre ewed sources, pro some own relevant considerable experor or theoretic considerable experor and theoretic	rimental simental	task fulfili misunders partly on average convinci solutio some parts than averagrater ext	ment stood 0 / 2 level 1 ing on 2 better rage 3 tent	cooperation almost no was trying satisfying productive very efficient	relevant relevant relevant relevant relevant relevant relevant relevant too few some most + data/thec convincingly sup proved dec understand	ponses flexibi poor, s could gave exp ory +helped ported ep +technic	lity/reactions low reactions answer some uestions reasonable olanations clear things out quickly cal cooperation n, very efficient	OPPO REVIE	WERS TO JURY, DNENT and EWER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract QUESTIONS ASKED almost no, irrelevant some relevant, aimed at refine the some unclear points short allowing short answer prioritized, all time used	OPPOSITION tim 0 aln 1 ver 2 aln ers, 3 eff	FION (SPEECH) The used understal present almost in almost in main prost all all relevations almost all all & almost all almost all all & almost all almost all all almost all almost all all almost almost all almost a	tation according no or in points points at parts	evant topics ddressed or irrelevant few some Ilmost all	correct own opinions express almost no some to most topics to almost all topic + improvement suggestions	no almosi som cs reason	DIS of the desired able able able able able able able able	almost little partia efficier very efficier	no almost no was trying satisfying nt good very	relevance of topics irrelevant few most	own opinions presented very little some mostly correct almost all correct + improvement suggestions	prioritisation no almost no come reasonable very good	REVIEV	/ERS TO JURY and WER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or requestions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract QUESTIONS ASKED too few, mostly irrelevant some relevant, sufficient relevant, and time used, many und resolved, aimed at both relevant, apt and clear, well time managed efficiently	R number, could 0 clear points eport and opp. prioritized 3	report summary poor too short/long informative, apt brief but accurate	of report poor partially sufficient detailed,	too few some many improvement suggestions	pros & cons irrelevant partially relevant adequate fully adequate	chaotic t present visible clear, intuitive	0 1 to 2 in	speech summary poor oo short/lo	almost no ong too short/lon apt relevant part	too few some	pros & cons irrelevant partially relevan adequate t fully adequate	prioritisation chaotic t present visible clear, intuitive	QUEST	VERS TO JURY FIONS concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
NOTES: 1 + 7 St		3 13												

101

room:

problem no.: 3

Juror name: NANASIOVA

SCORESHEET stage: 2

fight (round no.):

SCORESHEET

stage: fight (round no.): room: 10 1 problem no.: Juror name: T- DP4TDVV

reporter: Scales opponent: October reviewer: Vacan signature:

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

relevant experiments comparison between theory and experiment own contribution task fulfilment cooperation arguments/responses flexibility/reactions

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

relevant cooperation arguments/responses flexibility/reactions

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

OPPONENT E	OPP	OSITION (SF	PEECH)				DIS	CUSSION V	VITH REPOR	TER			ANSWERS TO JURY and
Start from 1 and add/subtract QUESTIONS ASKED		time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritization		leading	cooperation	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	prioritisation	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or
almost no, irrelevant	00	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0_	almost no	almost no	irrelevant	very little	no	questions asked
	1	very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	1	little	was trying	few	some	almost no	<u> </u>
some relevant, aimed at resolving	-	enough	main points	some	to most topics	some	2	partial	satisfying	(most)	mostly correct	some	some incorrect, inconclusive or too lor
some unclear points	2_	almost all	all relevant parts	almost all	to almost all topics	reasonable	2_	efficient	good		almost all correct	reasonable)	
short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	4-	all & efficiently	almost all parts	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4	very efficient	very efficient	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	-2 deeply incorrect or shi deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract **REVIEW OF OPPOSITION** REVIEW OF REPORT QUESTIONS ASKED **ANSWERS TO JURY** too few, mostly irrelevant understanding own opinions pros & cons prioritisation QUESTIONS report speech discussion own opinions pros & cons prioritisation of report summary analysis summary some relevant, sufficient number, could concise and correct or too few irrelevant clear things out poor poor chaotic poor almost no too few irrelevant chaotic no questions asked present too short/long partially some partially relevant too short/long too short/long some most time used, many unclear points partially relevant present some incorrect, resolved, aimed at both report and opp. many informative, apt sufficient adequate visible informative, apt relevant parts inconclusive or too long many adequate visible +short, apt and clear, well prioritized + improvement fully brief but detailed, clear, brief but accurate, fully deeply incorrect or show + improvement clear. time managed efficiently accurate complex suggestions adequate intuitive accurate conclusive suggestions adequate intuitive deep misconceptions

		SCORESHE	ET	,	,				MARINA AARI
		stage: 2	fight (r	ound no.):	room:		problem no.: 🤇	S Juror nam	ne: KUWBALK
REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract	4	reporter:	deerora oppon	ent: Postora	reviewer:	Vacennela	els	signature:	
phenomenon explanation almost no some basic good but not so demonstrative detailed, good, demonstrative deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	theory/model almost no some basic detailed, correct +good testable predictions detailed, complex, completely testable	quite a lot, errors analysed + results explained and analysed + totally reliable,	comparison between theory and experiment no/ almost no some done, but not well fitting + explained well fitting, deviations analysed perfect correlation, very conclusive	own contribution others data, incorrectly cited reviewed sources, properly cite some own relevant considerable experimental or theoretical considerable experimental and theoretical	task fulfilment	DISCUSSION W cooperation almost no was trying satisfying	relevant arguments/respons too few some most + data/theory convincingly support proved deep understanding	poor, slow reactions could answer some questions gave reasonable explanations +helped clear things out	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract QUESTIONS ASKED almost no, irrelevant some relevant, aimed at reso some unclear points short allowing short answers prioritized, all time used	olving 0 alm ver 2 alm	rION (SPEECH) e used understa presen ost no almost i y little some ma ough main p ost all all releva ill & ciently almost a	tation addressed nothing no or irrelevatin points few points some almost all	opinions expressed almost no some alm to most topics to almost all topics + improvement	no 0 alrost no 1 pome ponable 3	SSION WITH REPO eading cooperation most no almost no little was trying partial satisfying fficient good very efficient efficient	relevance of topics irrelevant few most most almost all + im	vn opinions presented very little no some almost no ostly correct some ost all correct reasonable inprovement uggestions 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+	3,50	8	-		-			
QUESTIONS ASKED too few, mostly irrelevant some relevant, sufficient nu clear things out most time used, many uncle resolved, aimed at both report short, apt and clear, well p time managed efficiently	ear points ort and opp.	poor too short/long informative, apt brief but accurate	poor too fev partially some sufficient many detailed, complex own opinion	v irrelevant chaot partially relevant prese adequate visible ment fully clear	spint 1 too shee 2 information brief	OF OPPOSITION eech discussion analysis oor almost no ort/long too short/lor ative, apt relevant part ef but accurate, urate conclusive	too few ng some par is many improvement	pros & cons prioritisation irrelevant chaotic tially relevant present adequate visible fully clear, adequate intuitive	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
NOTES:	+ 2,5	C- 2,5+	8						

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract	7	•	, fi	ight (round no	o.): 1 VACUUM		room: reviewer:	101 SROBAROW	problem no.	15	Juror nam	ne: ADAMUSSY Garanty
REPORT phenomenon explanation almost no some basic good but not so demonstrative detailed, good, demonstrative deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight			perfect correlati very conclusiv	iment o others reviewe fitting consi	own contribution s data, incorrectly ed sources, proper some own relevant iderable experime or theoretical iderable experime and theoretical	cited mi rly cited on ental som thental gr	sk fulfilment isunderstood partly average level convincing solution ne parts better han average rater extent an expected	almost nowas tryingsatisfying	relevant n arguments/res too few some most + data/thec convincingly sup proved dec understand	ponses flexibil poor, s could q gave exp ory ported pp +technic with team	lity/reactions low reactions answer some uestions reasonable planations clear things out quickly cal cooperation n, very efficient	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract QUESTIONS ASKED almost no, irrelevant some relevant, aimed at reso some unclear points short allowing short answers prioritized, all time used NOTES:	time 0 alm 1 ver 2 alm 3 alm 4 effic	ION (SPEECH) e used understa presen ost no almost of plittle some ma ough main post all all releva II & ciently almost a	nothing no or in in points for interest sounts sount parts almost all parts a	nt topics ressed opin rrelevant ew one to a to a	correct own nions expressed almost no some o most topics almost all topics improvement suggestions	prioritizatio no almost no some reasonable very good	on lead on almo lit par par graph grap	cient good	RTER relevance of topics irrelevant few most	own opinions presented very little some mostly correct almost all correct + improvement suggestions	prioritisation no almost no some reasonable very good	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS o 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	7		17.	2	2-3				7-3			~ 7
QUESTIONS ASKED too few, mostly irrelevant some relevant, sufficient nu clear things out most time used, many uncle resolved, aimed at both repr +short, apt and clear, well p time managed efficiently	ear points ort and opp.	report summary poor too short/long informative, apt brief but accurate	poor t partially sufficient detailed, + im	some par many (irrelevant tially relevant adequate fully	oritisation	speed summ 0 poo 1 too short	ary analysis r almost no t/long too short/lor ve, apt elevant part out accurate,	too few ng some ts many + improvement	700 100 1	visible clear,	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS 0 concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show
NOTES:			1 306		1		accare	- Conclusive	suggestions	adequate	intuitive	deep misconceptions

5 Juror name: BAHYL
signature:
ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and
ses flexibility/reactions REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
poor, slow reactions
could answer some concise and correct or
questions no questions asked
gave reasonable explanations some incorrect,
+helped clear things out inconclusive or too long quickly deeply incorrect or show
+technical cooperation with team, very efficient deep misconceptions
•



NOTES: 0 + 1 + 1 + 2 = 6

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

too few, mostly irrelevant

time managed efficiently

QUESTIONS ASKED

clear things out

5

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

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

-11 ___

	ANSWERS TO JURY
on	QUESTIONS
	concise and correct or no questions asked
	some incorrect,

	some incorrect,
_	inconclusive or too long
	deeply incorrect or show
_	deep misconceptions



some relevant, sufficient number, could

most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp. +short, apt and clear, well prioritized



	COKESHE	EI	100					/ /
	stage: 3		ound no.): 🥠	room: 1	01	problem no.: 15	Juror nam	1e: NAWA'S 10 VA
REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract	reporter: po	3 TOVA oppone	ent: VACUUM	reviewer: (S RUBAROV	'A'		nanasiona
REPORT phenomenon explanation almost no almost no some basic good but not so demonstrative detailed, good, demonstrative deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight NOTES: theory/model almost no almost no almost no detailed, come detailed, correct theory/model detailed, correct theory/model almost no almost no detailed, correct theory/model almost no almost no detailed, correct theory/model theory/model detailed, correct theory/model t	quite a lot, errors analysed + results explained and analysed + totally reliable,	done, but not well fitting + explained	own contribution others data, incorrectly cireviewed sources, properly some own relevant considerable experiment or theoretical considerable experiment and theoretical	cited partly on average level convincing solution tal some parts betten than average	cooperation almost no was trying attisfying	relevant arguments/responses too few some + data/theory convincingly supported proved deep understanding	poor, slow reactions could answer some questions gave reasonable explanations +helped clear things out	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
QUESTIONS ASKED o almost no, irrelevant some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points alm short allowing short answers, time o alm ver en alm a		in points few points some almost all	opinions expressed nt almost no some to-most topics to almost all topics + improvement		tial satisfying good ry very	relevance of topics process irrelevant verse few most all most all most + imp	opinions esented ry little no almost no ly correct reasonable rovement gestions prioritisation prioritisation no almost no ly correct reasonable response 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								
too few, mostly irrelevant some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp. +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	poor too short/long informative, apt brief but accurate	own opinion of report poor too few partially some	irrelevant ch partially relevant pro adequate vi nent fully cl	speed summination of the speed summination of	analysis almost no almost	too few parties s many au + improvement	prioritisation relevant chaotic ally relevant present dequate visible fully clear, intuitive	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
NOTES: $1+1+1$	70,5							

SCORESHEET

SCORESHEET

stage:

fight (round no.):

room:

Juror name:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

reporter: Poll

opponent:

reviewer:

problem no.: 15

signature:

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT 5	OPP	POSITION (SI	PEECH)				DIS	CUSSION V	VITH REPOR	RTER			ANSWERS TO JURY and
Start from 1 and add/subtract QUESTIONS ASKED		time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritization		leading	cooperation	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	prioritisation	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or no
almost no, irrelevant	0	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0_	almost no	almost no	irrelevant	very little	no	questions asked
some relevant, aimed at resolving	1	very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	1	little	was trying	few	some	almost no	- Additional Control of the Control
some unclear points	2	enough	main points	Some	to most topics	some	2	partial	satisfying	most	mostly correct	some	- some incorrect,
	-	almost all	all relevant parts	almost all	to almost all topics	reasonable	-	efficient	good	almost all	almost all correct	reasonable	inconclusive or too long
short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	3_ 4	all & efficiently	almost all parts	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4	very efficient	very efficient	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

DEVIEWED

KEVIEWEK		l
Start from 1 and add/subtract)	
OUESTIONS ASKED		

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

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

E۷	IEW OF OPPO	DSITION			
	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation
	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	chaotic
	too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	present
	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	adequate	visible
	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	clear, intuitive

NSWERS TO JURY UESTIONS concise and correct or no questions asked

some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show

deep misconceptions