

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

AS 5

stage: 1
reporter: VACUUM

fight (round no.): 1
opponent: GROBAR

room: 107
reviewer: POSTUL4

problem no.: 10

Juror name: IDJ MUSCIN
signature: [signature]

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	reviewed sources, properly cited	partly
2	basic	basic	well performed	done, but not well fitting	some own relevant	on average level
3	good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	quite a lot, errors analysed	+ explained		convincing solution
4	detailed, good, demonstrative	+good testable predictions	+ results explained and analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ totally reliable, reproducible	perfect correlation, very conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	grater extent than expected
6						

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	cooperation	relevant arguments/responses	flexibility/reactions
0	almost no	too few	poor, slow reactions
1	was trying	some	could answer some questions
2	satisfying	most	gave reasonable explanations
3	productive	+ data/theory convincingly supported	+helped clear things out quickly
4	very efficient	proved deep understanding	+technical cooperation with team, very efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: 3 2 5-4 2-3 1 3 2-8 2,5 1 2 -0,5
1+ 2-3 2

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

607

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: 1 4 2-3 2-3 2-3 2-3 2,5 2,5 2 2,5 2,5
12,5 2-3 2-3

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

8

	QUESTIONS 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 REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

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: 2-3 2-3 3 2-3 2 1,5 3 3 2-8

SCORESHEET

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 1

room: 1

problem no.: 10

Juror name: BAHYL

reporter: Vacuum

opponent: Stobanov

reviewer: Postger

signature:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	reviewed sources, properly cited	partly
2	basic	basic	well performed	done, but not well fitting	some own	on average level
3	good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	quite a lot, errors analysed	+ explained	relevant	convincing solution
4	detailed, good, demonstrative	+good testable predictions	+ results explained and analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ totally reliable, reproducible	perfect correlation, very conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	grater extent than expected

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	cooperation	relevant arguments/responses	flexibility/reactions
0	almost no	too few	poor, slow reactions
1	was trying	some	could answer some questions
2	satisfying	most	gave reasonable explanations
3	productive	+ data/theory convincingly supported	+helped clear things out quickly
4	very efficient	proved deep understanding	+technical cooperation with team, very efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: 0+2+2+2+1 = 6 or 5

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — almost no, irrelevant
 1 — some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
 2 — short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	leading	cooperation	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	prioritisation
0	almost no	almost no	irrelevant	very little	no
1	little	was trying	few	some	almost no
2	partial	satisfying	most	mostly correct	some
3	efficient	good	almost all	almost all correct	reasonable
4	very efficient	very efficient	all	+ improvement suggestions	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: 0+1+2+3 = 6 or 7

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

QUESTIONS 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 REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

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: 1+1+2+2 = 6

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

stage: 1

reporter: VACUUM

fight (round no.): 1

opponent: ŠROBA'KOVA'

room: 101

reviewer: POŠTOVA'

problem no.: 10

Juror name: NÁVAŠIOVA'

signature: NÁVAŠIOVA'

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	reviewed sources, properly cited	partly
2	basic	basic	well performed	done, but not well fitting	some own	on average level
3	good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	quite a lot, errors analysed	+ explained	relevant	convincing solution
4	detailed, good, demonstrative	+good testable predictions	+ results explained and analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ totally reliable, reproducible	perfect correlation, very conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	grater extent than expected
6						

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	cooperation	relevant arguments/responses	flexibility/reactions
0	almost no	too few	poor, slow reactions
1	was trying	some	could answer some questions
2	satisfying	most	gave reasonable explanations
3	productive	+ data/theory convincingly supported	+helped clear things out quickly
4	very efficient	proved deep understanding	+technical cooperation with team, very efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

1 + 3,5

+ 2

= 6,5

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

3

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — almost no, irrelevant
 1 — some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
 2 — short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

1 + 2

1

+ 1,5

= 3,5

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

QUESTIONS 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 REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

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:

1 + 1 + 2

+ 2

SCORESHEET

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 1

room: 101

problem no.: 10

Juror name: T. O. P. R. W. H.

reporter: Vance Lih

opponent: Broden

reviewer: Ojurnal

signature: 10

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	reviewed sources, properly cited	partly
2	basic	basic	well performed	done, but not well fitting	some own	on average level
3	good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	quite a lot, errors analysed	+ explained	relevant	convincing solution
4	detailed, good, demonstrative	+good testable predictions	+ results explained and analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ totally reliable, reproducible	perfect correlation, very conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	grater extent than expected

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	cooperation	relevant arguments/responses	flexibility/reactions
0	almost no	too few	poor, slow reactions
1	was trying	some	could answer some questions
2	satisfying	most	gave reasonable explanations
3	productive	+ data/theory convincingly supported	+helped clear things out quickly
4	very efficient	proved deep understanding	+technical cooperation with team, very efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

- 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

5

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — almost no, irrelevant
 1 — some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
 2 — short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

5

QUESTIONS 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 REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

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

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 1

room: 1

problem no.: 10

Juror name: KUNDRETH

reporter: VACCUM

opponent: Erdemova

reviewer: Poolora

signature: Uudric

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	reviewed sources, properly cited	partly
2	basic	basic	well performed	done, but not well fitting	some own	on average level
3	good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	quite a lot, errors analysed	+ explained	relevant	convincing solution
4	detailed, good, demonstrative	+good-testable predictions	+ results explained and analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ totally reliable, reproducible	perfect correlation, very conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	grater extent than expected

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	cooperation	relevant arguments/responses	flexibility/reactions
0	almost no	too few	poor, slow reactions
1	was trying	some	could answer some questions
2	satisfying	most	gave reasonable explanations
3	productive	+ data/theory convincingly supported	+helped clear things out quickly
4	very efficient	proved deep understanding	+technical cooperation with team, very efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

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

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — almost no, irrelevant
- 1 — some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
- 2 — short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

$$1,5 + 1 + 2 = 5$$

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

QUESTIONS 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 REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

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:

$$2 + 1,5 + 2 = 6$$

SCORESHEET

stage: 2

fight (round no.): 1

room: 101

problem no.: 3

Juror name: ADAMUSZKA

reporter: SROBAROVA

opponent: POSTOVA

reviewer: VACUUM

signature: adamuska

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	reviewed sources, properly cited	partly
2	basic	basic	well performed	done, but not well fitting	some own	on average level
3	good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	quite a lot, errors analysed	+ explained	relevant	convincing solution
4	detailed, good, demonstrative	+good testable predictions	+ results explained and analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ totally reliable, reproducible	perfect correlation, very conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	grater extent than expected
6						

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	cooperation	relevant arguments/responses	flexibility/reactions
0	almost no	too few	poor, slow reactions
1	was trying	some	could answer some questions
2	satisfying	most	gave reasonable explanations
3	productive	+ data/theory convincingly supported	+helped clear things out quickly
4	very efficient	proved deep understanding	+technical cooperation with team, very efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

- 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

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — almost no, irrelevant
- 1 — some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
- 2 — short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

QUESTIONS 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 REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

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

3

stage: 1

reporter: JROB

fight (round no.): 1

opponent: POST

room: 1

reviewer: VACAM

problem no.: 3

Juror name: BAUM

signature: [Signature]

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	reviewed sources, properly cited	partly
2	basic	basic	well performed	done, but not well fitting	some own	on average level
3	good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	quite a lot, errors analysed	+ explained	relevant	convincing solution
4	detailed, good, demonstrative	+good testable predictions	+ results explained and analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ totally reliable, reproducible	perfect correlation, very conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	grater extent than expected
6						

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	cooperation	relevant arguments/responses	flexibility/reactions
0	almost no	too few	poor, slow reactions
1	was trying	some	could answer some questions
2	satisfying	most	gave reasonable explanations
3	productive	+ data/theory convincingly supported	+helped clear things out quickly
4	very efficient	proved deep understanding	+technical cooperation with team, very efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: 2+1+1+1 = 3

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

9

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 - almost no, irrelevant
- 1 - some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
- 2 - short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: 1+1+3+4 = 9

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

9

QUESTIONS 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 REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

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: 1+1+3+3 = 9

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

4

stage: 2

fight (round no.): 1

room: 101

problem no.: 3

Juror name: NANA'SIOVA'

reporter: ŠROBÁŘOVA

opponent: POŠTOVA'

reviewer: VACUUM

signature: Nana'siova'

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	reviewed sources, properly cited	partly
2	basic	basic	well performed	done, but not well fitting	some own	on average level
3	good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	quite a lot, errors analysed	+ explained	relevant	convincing solution
4	detailed, good, demonstrative	+good testable predictions	+ results explained and analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ totally reliable, reproducible	perfect correlation, very conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	grater extent than expected
6						

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	cooperation	relevant arguments/responses	flexibility/reactions
0	almost no	too few	poor, slow reactions
1	was trying	some	could answer some questions
2	satisfying	most	gave reasonable explanations
3	productive	+ data/theory convincingly supported	+helped clear things out quickly
4	very efficient	proved deep understanding	+technical cooperation with team, very efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

1 + 1,5

+ 1,5

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — almost no, irrelevant
- 1 — some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
- 2 — short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

1 + 1 +

2

+ 3

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

9

QUESTIONS 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 REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

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:

1 + 2,5 +

3 + 3

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

stage:

reporter: *Souren*

fight (round no.):

opponent: *Polina*

room: *101*

reviewer: *Vacuum*

problem no.:

Juror name: *T. DP4TJW*

signature:

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	reviewed sources, properly cited	partly
2	basic	basic	well performed	done, but not well fitting	some own	on average level
3	good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	quite a lot, errors analysed	+ explained	relevant	convincing solution
4	detailed, good, demonstrative	+good testable predictions	+ results explained and analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ totally reliable, reproducible	perfect correlation, very conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	grater extent than expected
6						

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	cooperation	relevant arguments/responses	flexibility/reactions
0	almost no	too few	poor, slow reactions
1	was trying	some	could answer some questions
2	satisfying	most	gave reasonable explanations
3	productive	+ data/theory convincingly supported	+helped clear things out quickly
4	very efficient	proved deep understanding	+technical cooperation with team, very efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

- 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

5

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — almost no, irrelevant
- 1 — some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
- 2 — short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

4

QUESTIONS 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 REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

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

4

stage: 2

fight (round no.): 1

room: 1

problem no.: 3

Juror name: Kowdrak

reporter: Szabona

opponent: Podonei

reviewer: Vaccinabals

signature: [Signature]

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	reviewed sources, properly cited	partly
2	basic	basic	well performed	done, but not well fitting	some own relevant	on average level
3	good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	quite a lot, errors analysed	+ explained		convincing solution
4	detailed, good, demonstrative	+good testable predictions	+ results explained and analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ totally reliable, reproducible	perfect correlation, very conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	grater extent than expected
6						

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	cooperation	relevant arguments/responses	flexibility/reactions
0	almost no	too few	poor, slow reactions
1	was trying	some	could answer some questions
2	satisfying	most	gave reasonable explanations
3	productive	+ data/theory convincingly supported	+helped clear things out quickly
4	very efficient	proved deep understanding	+technical cooperation with team, very efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

2 + 2.5 = 4.5

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

8

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

1 + 3 + 3.5 = 8

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

8

QUESTIONS 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 REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

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:

2.5 + 2.5 + 3 = 8

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

stage: 3

fight (round no.): 1

room: 101

problem no.: 15

Juror name: ADAMUS

reporter: POSTOLU

opponent: VACUUM

reviewer: SROBARIU

signature: Adamus

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	reviewed sources, properly cited	partly
2	basic	basic	well performed	done, but not well fitting	some own	on average level
3	good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	quite a lot, errors analysed	+ explained	relevant	convincing solution
4	detailed, good, demonstrative	+good testable predictions	+ results explained and analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ totally reliable, reproducible	perfect correlation, very conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	grater extent than expected
6						

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	cooperation	relevant arguments/responses	flexibility/reactions
0	almost no	too few	poor, slow reactions could answer some questions
1	was trying	some	gave reasonable explanations
2	satisfying	most	+helped clear things out quickly
3	productive	+ data/theory convincingly supported	+technical cooperation with team, very efficient
4	very efficient	proved deep understanding	

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

7

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — almost no, irrelevant
- 1 — some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
- 2 — short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

7

QUESTIONS 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 REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

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

8

stage: 3

reporter: PAST

fight (round no.): 1

opponent: Vacuum

room: 1

reviewer: SPOT

problem no.: 15

Juror name: BAHY

signature: R

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	reviewed sources, properly cited	partly
2	basic	basic	well performed	done, but not well fitting	some own	on average level
3	good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	quite a lot, errors analysed	+ explained	relevant	convincing solution
4	detailed, good, demonstrative	+good testable predictions	+ results explained and analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ totally reliable, reproducible	perfect correlation, very conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	grater extent than expected
6						

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	cooperation	relevant arguments/responses	flexibility/reactions
0	almost no	too few	poor, slow reactions
1	was trying	some	could answer some questions
2	satisfying	most	gave reasonable explanations
3	productive	+ data/theory convincingly supported	+helped clear things out quickly
4	very efficient	proved deep understanding	+technical cooperation with team, very efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: ① + 4 + 3 = 8

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — almost no, irrelevant
- 1 — some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
- 2 — short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: ① + 1 + 4 + 2 = 6

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

QUESTIONS 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 REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

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: ① + 1 + 3 = 5

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

stage: 3

reporter: POŠTOVA'

fight (round no.): 1

opponent: VACUUM

room: 101

reviewer: ŠROBAROVA'

problem no.: 15

Juror name: NA'NA'SIOVA'

signature: nanasiova'

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	reviewed sources, properly cited	partly
2	basic	basic	well performed	done, but not well fitting	some own	on average level
3	good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	quite a lot, errors analysed	+ explained	relevant	convincing solution
4	detailed, good, demonstrative	+ good testable predictions	+ results explained and analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ totally reliable, reproducible	perfect correlation, very conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	grater extent than expected
6						

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	cooperation	relevant arguments/responses	flexibility/reactions
0	almost no	too few	poor, slow reactions
1	was trying	some	could answer some questions
2	satisfying	most	gave reasonable explanations
3	productive	+ data/theory convincingly supported	+ helped clear things out quickly
4	very efficient	proved deep understanding	+ technical cooperation with team, very efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

$$1 + 3 + 1,5 = 5,5$$

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — almost no, irrelevant
 1 — some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
 2 — short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

$$1 + 1 + 2,5 + 2 = 6,5$$

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

4

QUESTIONS 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 REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

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:

$$1 + 1 + 1,5 + 0,5$$

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

stage:

fight (round no.):

room:

problem no.: 15

Juror name:

T. OPATRAJ

reporter: *Prashant*

opponent:

reviewer:

Navin Raj

signature:

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
1	some	some	some	some	reviewed sources, properly cited	partly
2	basic	basic	well performed	done, but not well fitting	some own	on average level
3	good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	quite a lot, errors analysed	+ explained	relevant	convincing solution
4	detailed, good, demonstrative	+good testable predictions	+ results explained and analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ totally reliable, reproducible	perfect correlation, very conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	grater extent than expected
6						

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	cooperation	relevant arguments/responses	flexibility/reactions
0	almost no	too few	poor, slow reactions
1	was trying	some	could answer some questions
2	satisfying	most	gave reasonable explanations
3	productive	+ data/theory convincingly supported	+helped clear things out quickly
4	very efficient	proved deep understanding	+technical cooperation with team, very efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

- 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

5

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	almost no, irrelevant
1	some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points
2	short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

5

QUESTIONS 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 REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

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: