

## SCORESHEET

stage: 3

fight (round no.): 2

room: 2

problem no.: 2

Juror name: STANĚL LUBOMÍR

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

signature: *StaněL*

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

8

#### 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

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	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: 3

fight (round no.): 2

room: 102

problem no.:

Juror name: MARTIN GLEZ

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

signature:

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 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

## 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

4

### 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, 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: 3

fight (round no.): 2

room: 102

problem no.: 2

Juror name: JERGEN STRICKLA

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

signature: *Yunus*

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

REPORT						DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	cooperation	relevant arguments/responses	flexibility/reactions	
0 almost no	0 almost no	0 too few	0 no/ almost no	0 others data, incorrectly cited	0 misunderstood	0 almost no	0 too few	0 poor, slow reactions	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked 1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 some	1 some	1 some	1 some	1 reviewed sources, properly cited	1 partly	1 was trying	1 some	1 could answer some questions	
2 basic	2 basic	2 well performed	2 done, but not well fitting	2 some own	2 on average level	2 satisfying	2 most	2 gave reasonable explanations	
3 good but not so demonstrative	3 detailed, correct	3 quite a lot, errors analysed	3 + explained	3 relevant	3 convincing solution	3 productive	3 + data/theory convincingly supported	3 +helped clear things out quickly	
4 detailed, good, demonstrative	4 +good testable predictions	4 + results explained and analysed	4 well fitting, deviations analysed	4 considerable experimental or theoretical	4 some parts better than average	4 very efficient	4 proved deep understanding	4 +technical cooperation with team, very efficient	
5 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 detailed, complex, completely testable	5 + totally reliable, reproducible	5 perfect correlation, very conclusive	5 considerable experimental and theoretical	5 grater extent than expected				

NOTES:

2,5

2

-1

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

4

QUESTIONS ASKED						DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritization		leading	cooperation	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	prioritisation	
0 almost no, irrelevant	0 almost nothing	0 no or irrelevant	0 almost no	0 no	0 almost no	0 almost no	0 almost no	0 irrelevant	0 very little	0 no	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked 1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	1 some main points	1 few	1 some	1 almost no	1 little	1 was trying	1 few	1 some	1 almost no	1 almost no	
2 enough	2 main points	2 some	2 to most topics	2 some	2 partial	2 satisfying	2 most	2 mostly correct	2 some	2 some	
3 almost all	3 all relevant parts	3 almost all	3 to almost all topics	3 reasonable	3 efficient	3 good	3 almost all	3 almost all correct	3 reasonable	3 reasonable	
4 all & efficiently	4 almost all parts	4 all	4 + improvement suggestions	4 very good	4 very efficient	4 very efficient	4 all	4 + improvement suggestions	4 very good	4 very good	

NOTES:

2,5

1

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

4

QUESTIONS ASKED						REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
report summary	understanding of report	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation		speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	0 poor	0 too few	0 irrelevant	0 chaotic	0 poor	0 poor	0 almost no	0 too few	0 irrelevant	0 chaotic	0 poor	0 almost no	0 too few	0 irrelevant	0 chaotic	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked 1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out	1 partially	1 some	1 partially relevant	1 present	1 too short/long	1 too short/long	1 too short/long	1 some	1 partially relevant	1 present	1 too short/long	1 too short/long	1 some	1 partially relevant	1 present	
2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp.	2 informative, apt	2 many	2 adequate	2 visible	2 informative, apt	2 relevant parts	2 many	2 adequate	2 visible	2 visible	2 informative, apt	2 relevant parts	2 many	2 adequate	2 visible	
3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	3 brief but accurate	3 + improvement suggestions	3 fully adequate	3 clear, intuitive	3 brief but accurate	3 accurate, conclusive	3 + improvement suggestions	3 fully adequate	3 clear, intuitive	3 intuitive	3 brief but accurate	3 accurate, conclusive	3 + improvement suggestions	3 fully adequate	3 clear, intuitive	

NOTES:

1,5

1

## SCORESHEET

stage: 3

fight (round no.): 2

room: 102

problem no.: 2

Juror name: Milen Smolnik

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

signature: *Kare*

### REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

#### 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

4

#### 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: Oni tam fokt to natchnatie publi

### 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:



REPORTER  
Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

## SCORESHEET

stage: 3  
reporter: GJK

fight (round no.): 2  
opponent: PJS

room: 102  
reviewer: SRO

problem no.: 2

Juror name: DANIEL NABAJ  
signature: Nabaj

### 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	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: 3  
reporter:

fight (round no.): 2  
opponent:

room: 702  
reviewer:

problem no.: 8

Juror name: PLESCU  
signature:

## 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

### 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:

No error bars

$$1 + 3.5 + 1.25 = 6 - 1 = 5$$

## 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	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:

Japanese decibels

$$1 + 0.5 + 1.75 + 1.75 = 5 - 1 = 4$$

## 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:

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

# SCORESHEET

stage: 2

fight (round no.): 2

room: 102

problem no.: 10

Juror name: Milan Smolík

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

signature: *[Signature]*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

3

## 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 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

8

## 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

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:

# SCORESHEET

stage: 2

fight (round no.): 2

room: 2

problem no.: 10

Juror name: STAND LABOMIR

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

signature: 

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

2

## 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

## 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	
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

8

## 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

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

stage: 2

fight (round no.): 2

room: 102

problem no.: 10

Juror name: Plisck

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

signature:

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

2

### 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:

V → F, the line in

1+1+0-1

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

8

### 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:

Proco 0?

1+1.75+2+2-1=6

## 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+2+2.25+1.5-1=

Projuv?

# SCORESHEET

stage: 2

fight (round no.): 2

room: 102

problem no.: 10

Juror name: JERGUŠ STAVČKA

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

signature: *Yhuda*

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

2

### 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:

1,5

1

-2

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

8

### 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:

1

3

3

0

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

3

### 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:

1,5

other liquids - what's the point, lol?

1,5

-1

# SCORESHEET

stage: 2

fight (round no.): 2

room: 2

problem no.: 10

Juror name: DANIEL NAGAJ

reporter: SPO

opponent: GJH

reviewer: POS

signature: Nagaj

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

2

### 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:

padding heavily, less punch only  $v^{3/2}$ ? contact area quality 111-1

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

8

### 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:

mean  $\times$  h... viscosity setup 1, 1.75, 3, 3, -1 viscosity vs. 6

## 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, 2.5, 1.75, 0.75, -0.5 5.5 3.5 7.5 6

# SCORESHEET

stage: 2  
reporter:

fight (round no.): 2  
opponent:

room: 102  
reviewer:

problem no.: 16

Juror name: MARTIN GARO  
signature:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

3

## 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

8

## QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — almost no, irrelevant  
1 — some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points  
1.5 — 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	all	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

3

## QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0.25 — 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.): 2

room: 102

problem no.: 11

Juror name: MARTIN GARO

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

signature:

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	done, but not well fitting	reviewed sources, properly cited	partly
2	basic	basic	well performed	+ explained	some own relevant	on average level
3	good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	quite a lot, errors analysed			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:

temp  $\uparrow$  dep  $\rightarrow$  hysteresis  $\rightarrow$

2 Kennedy, temp, under control

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

4

## 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	all &	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	partial	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:

mass, how many more times, irrelevant things

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:

dynamite

# SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

stage: 1

reporter:

fight (round no.): 2

opponent:

room:

reviewer:

problem no.: 11

Juror name: JERGEN STEVKA

signature: *Yurica*

## 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 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:

3

2

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

4

### 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:

1,5

1

9

## 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:

3/2

1/2

2

# SCORESHEET

stage: 1  
reporter:

fight (round no.): 2  
opponent:

room: 2  
reviewer:

problem no.: 11

Juror name: STAND CARONIR  
signature: *[Signature]*

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6.25

### 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	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

5

### 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

7

stage:

1

fight (round no.):

2

room:

102

problem no.:

16

Juror name:

PLB Sci4

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

17

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

## 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	
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:

No continuous measurement!

$$1 + 5 + 3 = 9 - 2 = 7$$

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

4

### 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:

cas no increase, vadia in tie? g → preco? No conclusion,

$$4 + 0.75 \cdot 1.5 + 1.25 = 4.5$$

## 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:

Too much emphasis on accuracy

cas?

$$1 + 0.75 \cdot 2 + 1 = 2.5$$



# SCORESHEET

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 2

room: 102

problem no.: 11

Juror name: Milan Smolík

reporter: Pořtová

opponent:

reviewer: GJH

signature: *[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
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

4

## 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: Many deeper points not addressed

## 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

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

stage: 1  
reporter:

fight (round no.): 2  
opponent:

room:  
reviewer:

problem no.:

Juror name:  
signature:

DANIEL NAGA  
Naga

## 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	greater 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:

hydrogen bonds - hair core

1 0.35 2.5 -1.5 7 100% O<sub>2</sub> humidity? silica

calibration - 10% distilled dehydrated

hair length base ...

chemical attack

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

4

## 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	all relevant parts	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:

1 0.35 1 1 0 4

accuracy under tension

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 1.25 1.75 0 3

5