	PORTER t from 1 and add/subtract	6	stage: 1		ound no.): 5 ent: Postover	room: 10	1 Pre	sor	problem no.: 17	Juror name signature:	e: KUNPALIK Uliltas
REF	PORT phenomenon-explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	DISC		TH OPPONENT relevant arguments/responses	flexibility/reactions	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and
	almost no some	almost no some	too few some	no/ almost no some	others data, incorrectly cited reviewed sources, properly cited	The second secon	0 =	almost no	too few	poor, slow reactions could answer some	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or
	good but not so demonstrative	detailed,	quite a lot, errors analysed	done, but not well fitting + explained	some own relevant	on average level convincing solution	2 -	was trying satisfying	most	questions gave reasonable explanations	no questions asked some incorrect,
	detailed, good, demonstrative	+good testable predictions	+ results explained and analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average	3 =	productive	+ data/theory convincingly supported	+helped clear things out	inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show
	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	4 =	very efficient	proved deep understanding	+technical cooperation with team, very efficient	deep misconceptions
NO	TES: 1+2 ₁ 5	+2 -	06								we.

OPPONENT [6]	OPP	OSITION (S	PEECH)				DIS	CUSSION V	VITH REPOR	TER			ANSWERS TO JURY and
Start from 1 and add/subtract QUESTIONS ASKED		time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritization		leading	cooperation	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	prioritisation	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or
almost no, irrelevant	0	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0	almost no	almost no	irrelevant	very little	no	questions asked
	1	very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	1	little	was trying	few	some	almost no	some incorrect,
some relevant, aimed at resolving	6	enough	main points	some	to most topics	(some	2	partial	satisfying	most	mostly correct	some	-1 inconclusive or too lon
some unclear points	*	almost all	all relevant parts	almost all	to almost all topics	reasonable	-	efficient	good	almost all	almost all correct	reasonable	
short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	3	all & efficiently	almost all parts	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	3_	very efficient	very efficient	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	-2— deeply incorrect or sho deep misconceptions

NOTES: 1+1(5+1(5-)6

REVIEWER
Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED	RE	VIEW OF REPO	ORT				REV	IEW OF OPPO	OSITION	40			ANSWERS TO JURY
o — too few, mostly irrelevant some relevant, sufficient number, could	L	report summary	understanding of report	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation		speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	QUESTIONS concise and correct or
clear things out	0	poor	poor	(too few	irrelevant	chaotic	0	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	no questions asked
most time used, many unclear points	1	too short/long	partially	some	partially relevant	present	1=	too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	present	some incorrect,
resolved, aimed at both report and opp.	2 =	informative, apt	sufficient	many	adequate	visible	25	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	adequate	visible	inconclusive or too long
+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	3	brief but accurate	detailed, complex	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	clear, intuitive	3	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	clear, intuitive	-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES: 1+1,5+1+1 -> 5

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract		SCORESHE stage: A reporter: SR	fight (r	round no.): 3 ent: POSNY	room: reviewer:	101 Bresi u	problem no.:	17 Juror nam signature:	
almost no alm asome sc basic b good but not so det demonstrative co detailed, good, demonstrative prec deep and comprehensible, detailed,	y/model nost no ome pasic tailed, prect d testable dictions d, complex, ely testable	quite a lot, errors analysed	comparison between theory and experiment no/ almost no some done, but not well fitting + explained well fitting, deviations analysed perfect correlation, very conclusive	others data, incorrectly cited reviewed sources, properly cited	task fulfilment misunderstood d partly on average level convincing solution some parts better X than average grater extent than expected	cooperation cooperation almost not was trying satisfying	g some	poor, slow reactions could answer some questions gave reasonable explanations Ahelped clear things out	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
NOTES:	5,5	4,5	9 29:6 = 5		4,5	7.5	2 - 3	7,5	12-8
OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract QUESTIONS ASKED almost no, irrelevant some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	0 almo 1 very ence 2 almo 3 almo al	on (SPEECH) understa presen almost r little some ma ough main p ost all all releva liently almost a	tation addressed nothing no or irrelevatin points few some on the parts almost all	opinions expressed almost no no some almost	ization le	SION WITH REPO ading cooperation nost no almost no ittle was trying artial Xsatisfying ficient good very very icient efficient	relevance of topics pro irrelevant ve few most almost all almost + imp	opinions esented ry little some almost no ly correct all correct rovement gestions prioritisation no almost no almost no verasonable very good	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS o concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
NOTES: REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract	7,5	2	2 - 11:5	ک ^۲ رڼ	Ĵ	،	2.3 13.5	(5 3	MA^6-7
QUESTIONS ASKED 1 too few, mostly irrelevant 2 some relevant, sufficient number, concluder things out 2 most time used, many unclear point resolved, aimed at both report and element time managed efficiently NOTES:	ould 0 1 1 opp. 2 7	report usummary poor too short/long (informative, apt value) brief but accurate	own opinion of report poor too few partially some	v irrelevant chaoti partially relevant presen X adequate visible ment fully clear,	tion spe sumi c 0 po it 1 too sho e 2 informa		too few ir ong some partic rts many a + improvement	os & cons prioritisation	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS O concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 3

reviewer: PRESOV

room: 101

problem no.: 17

Juror name: NANA SIOVA signature: Nanasiona

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

reporter: 5 ROBAROVA

opponent: POSTOVA

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

NOTES:

1+25+2

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

NOTES: 1+15+15+2

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED	REV	IEW OF REPO	ORT				RΕV	IEW OF OPPO	OSITION				ANS	WERS TO JURY
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant		report	understanding	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation		speech	discussion	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	QUE	STIONS
some relevant, sufficient number, could		summary	of report					summary	analysis				R)_	concise and correct or
Clear things out	0_	poor	poor	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	0	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	chaotic		no questions asked
most time used, many unclear points	1	too short/long	partially	some	partially relevant	present	1 _	too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	present	_	some incorrect,
resolved, aimed at both report and opp.	2=	informative, apt	sufficient	many	adequate	visible	2	informative apt	elevant parts	many	adequate	visible	-1_	inconclusive or too long
+short, apt and clear, well prioritized	=	brief but	detailed,	+ improvement	fully	clear,	_	brief but	accurate,	+ improvement	fully	clear,	_	deeply incorrect or show
time managed efficiently	3 -	accurate	complex	suggestions	adequate	intuitive	3 —	accurate	conclusive	suggestions	adequate	intuitive	-2	deep misconceptions

1	7) Broldro	W			Sabt (sauad	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			101			(AZ)		Plm	Tanin
	14		reporter:	old our	opponent:	Posto a				Eagma			Juror nan signature	ne:	Pin
_	Start from 1 and add/subtract														
	REPORT								DISC	CUSSION WI	ITH OPPONE	NT		ANSWER	RS TO JURY,
			relevant						CONT. 200	And the second second second second				OPPONE	NT and
0	1								-				770	REVIEW	R'S QUESTIONS
1									0 _	almost no	too few			4	
2	basic					some own	The second secon		evel 1	was trying	some			0.3	
R	good but not so	detailed,	quite a lot,	+ explained		relevant		1						T no	questions asked
ATI	demonstrative	correct	errors analysed							satisfying	most		and the second s	-1	
1	/ / /				itions co	1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -	CONTRACTOR			needlective					
5	The second secon	CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF THE	The second secon		ion, co										
6										efficient			8 N. A. B.	dee	ep misconceptions
		raction value pol	tool me ra > the elsae	a main	or or	Columb Horse		Cum		mp	me orale	Petie	? J	people for	me rele
	ODDONENT	CORPOCIT	ION (CDEECH)				-(VITU DEDOD	TED	710		T	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		3/	1			- Const. (1990)	l	525,885283		1 1	1		1	The state of the s	The second secon
	phenomenon explanation theory/model experiments to about no control to the complete of the com														
	erritario de rigido do moderno que artes e figuras e fig	0alm			_			0_	almest no	almost no		Annual Control of the	no	0	All the transmitted than I have been an expensed in
0	,_	yer			few)	some		0 1		The second second second second second				-	1
1		olvingy	ough main p	oints so	ome	to most topics	some	2	partial		most		1	1-1	
-			iost all all releva	nt parts alm	ost all t	o almost all topics	reasonab	le	efficient	good	almost all	almost all correct	reasonable	-	
2				II		100 850		3_		100 CONT.					
1	prioritized, air time used	4— етп	ciently almost a	ii parts	all	suggestions	very goo	d 4-	efficient	efficient	all	suggestions	very good	400	misconceptions
	REVIEWER	D Pa	zue		-		-		-						
(QUESTIONS ASKED	stage:													
			- 80		n opinions	pros & cons p	rioritisation			1 85 55	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation		
	some relevant, sufficient nu	ımber, could	200									pros a cons	prioritisation		
1	REPORT phenomenon registration theory/model performed some some septiments theory and experiments of their was incorrectly dark different some some some some some some some some														
	most time used, many uncle	ear points	too short/long	partially	some p	partially relevant	present	1 too	short/long	too short/long	g some	partially relevant	present	some	e incorrect,
6 12	resolved, aimed at both rep	ort and opp.) informative, apt	sufficient	many	adequate	visible	info	rmative, apt	relevant parts	many	adequate	visible	-1	25
3		prioritized				W 550		-		387 53500	(5)		500000000000000000000000000000000000000	-7	80
L	time managed efficiently	3	accurate	complex su	ggestions	adequate	intuitive	3	accurate	conclusive	suggestions	adequate	intuitive	- deep	misconceptions
	NOTES: Tactoud	SA It	obaroc		Pre 3	Tov Pa	yman	2							

problem no.: 17

Juror name: PETER MATAK signature: P. Marlak

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



stage: 1 fight (round no.): 3
reporter: ŠROBAROVA opponent: POŠTOVA

room: reviewer: 101 PREŠOV

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT 6	OPP	OSITION (SI	PEECH)				DISC	CUSSION W	VITH REPOR	RTER	71	,,,,	ANSWERS TO JURY and
Start from 1 and add/subtract QUESTIONS ASKED		time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritization		leading	cooperation	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	prioritisation	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or no
almost no, irrelevant	0	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0	almost no	almost no	irrelevant	very little	no	questions asked
0_	1 .	very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	1	little	was trying	few	some	almost no	***************************************
some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points	3)	enough	main points	some	to most topics	(some)	(3)	partial	satisfying	most	mostly correct	some	-1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
The best of the second	9	almost all	all relevant parts	almost all	to almost all topics	reasonable	ات	efficient	good	almost all	almost all correct	The same of the sa	
2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	3_ 4—	all & efficiently	almost all parts	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4	very efficient	very efficient	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	-2— deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



QUESTIONS ASKED	REV	IEW OF REPO	RT			uo	REV	IEW OF OPPO	OSITION	0)			ANSWERS TO JURY
too few, mostly irrelevant some relevant, sufficient number, could		report summary	understanding of report	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation		speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	QUESTIONS concise and correct or
1 clear things out	0_	poor	poor	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	0	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	no questions asked
most time used, many unclear points	1	too short/long	partially		partially relevant	present	1_	too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	present	some incorrect,
resolved, aimed at both report and opp.	37	informative, apt	sufficient	many	adequate	visible	311	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	adequate	visible	inconclusive or too long
3 — +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	3	brief but accurate	detailed, complex	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	clear, intuitive	3	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	clear, intuitive	-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

stage: /

fight (round no.): 3

room: 151

problem no.: 17

Juror name: FICKOVA

signature: Fickova

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



reporter: SROBAROVA

opponent: PasTOVA

reviewer: PRESOV

REP	ORT					
	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment
	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood
	some	some	some	some	reviewed sources, properly cited	partly
	basic	basic	well performed	done, but not well fitting	some own	on average level
	good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	quite a lot, errors analysed	+ explained	relevant	convincing solution
	detailed, good, demonstrative	+good testable predictions	+ results explained and analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average
	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

	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
s s	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	concise and correct or no questions asked
out	-1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
	deeply incorrect or show

deep misconceptions

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

QU	EST	ION	SA	١SK	ED

_almost no, irrelevant some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points

short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION	(SPEECH)
	1

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

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or no

questions asked some incorrect,

inconclusive or too long

deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



QUESTIONS ASKED

too few, mostly irrelevant some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out most time used, many unclear points

+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently

resolved, aimed at both report and opp.

RE	VIEW OF REPO	RT				ı
	report summary	understanding of report	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
0_	poor	poor	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	1
1	too short/long	partially	some	partially relevant	present	
2	informative, apt	sufficient	many	adequate	visible	6
3	brief but accurate	detailed, complex	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	clear, intuitive	

RE	VIEW OF OPPO	discussion	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	7.7.1
0	summary	analysis almost no	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	o concise and corre
1	too short/long	too short/long	15.5.5	partially relevant		some incorrect,
2	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	adequate	visible	inconclusive or to
3	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	clear, intuitive	-2 — deeply incorrect of deep misconcepti

QU	ESTIONS
0 -	concise and correct or
_	no questions asked
	some incorrect.

inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

phenomenon explanation almost no almost no some basic good but not so demonstrative detailed, good, demonstrative deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	completely testab	quite a lot, errors analysed + results explained and analysed + totally reliable, reproducible	comparison theory and e no/ alm som done, but not + expla well fitting, analy perfect cor very cone	experiment ost no ne rev well fitting ained deviations sed relation,	own contribution of the state o	perly cited perly cited mental so	misun pon ave com sol ome pa than grate	ulfilment derstood artly rage level vincing lution arts better average r extent expected	0 1 2 (3 4	cooperation almost no was trying satisfying	relevant arguments/res too few some most + data/the convincingly sup proved decunderstand	t sponses flexibi poor, s could gave expory +helped opported ep +technic	lity/reactions clow reactions answer some uestions reasonable planations clear things out quickly cal cooperation n, very efficient	OPPO REVIE	VERS TO JURY, DNENT and EWER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract QUESTIONS ASKED almost no, irrelevant some relevant, aimed at rese some unclear points short allowing short answers prioritized, all time used NOTES:	0 al 1 ve 2 al 3 al 4 ef	preser	nothing no nothing no nin points points ant parts	elevant topics addressed o or irrelevant few some almost all	correct own opinions expressed almost no some to most topics to almost all topics + improvement suggestions	almost some	no e ble	DISCUSSIC leadi almos littl parti price strict verificie efficie	ing st no le ial ent	cooperation almost no was trying satisfying good very efficient	relevance of topics irrelevant few most	own opinions presented very little some mostly correct almost all correct + improvement suggestions	no almost no some reasonable very good	REVIEV	ERS TO JURY and WER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
REVIEWER	imber, could of the part points ort and opp.	report summary poor too short/long informative, apt brief but		own opinions too few some many	irrelevant partially relevant adequate	prioritisation chaotic present visible clear,			h iry 'long t e, apt i	SITION discussion analysis almost no too short/long relevant parts accurate,	own opinions too few some many + improvement	irrelevant partially relevant adequate	prioritisation chaotic t present visible clear,	QUESTI	ERS TO JURY IONS concise and correct or to questions asked ome incorrect, nconclusive or too long leeply incorrect or show

intuitive

accurate

conclusive

suggestions

adequate

intuitive

deep misconceptions

room: 101 problem no.: 3 reviewer: inclarora

Juror name: KUW DACK signature: Ull Chi Ci S

SCORESHEET

accurate

complex

suggestions

adequate

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

time managed efficiently

NOTES:/+2 -1(5+1 -> 6

reporter: Postora

fight (round no.):

opponent: GJAR

	SCORESHE	ET				2		
	stage:	ر fight (re	ound no.):	room:	101	problem no.:	Juror nam	e: ADAUUSCTN
REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract	reporter: Po	STOVA oppone	ent: PRESOV	reviewer:	SPODIROLA		signature:	
REPORT phenomenon explanation almost no almost no almost no some some basic basic detailed, good but not so demonstrative detailed, good, demonstrative deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight NOTES: phenomenon explanation theory/model almost no almost no detailed, come detailed, correct detailed, complex, completely testable completely testable theory/model detailed, correct detailed, complex, completely testable	quite a lot, errors analysed results explained and analysed + totally reliable, reproducible	comparison between theory and experiment no/ almost no some done, but not well fitting + explained well fitting, deviations analysed perfect correlation, very conclusive	own contribution others data, incorrectly cited reviewed sources, properly cited some own relevant considerable experimental or theoretical considerable experimental and theoretical	task fulfilment misunderstood partly on average level convincing solution some parts better than average grater extent than expected	almost no was trying satisfying productive very efficient	relevant arguments/responses too few some most + data/theory convincingly supported proved deep understanding	flexibility/reactions poor, slow reactions could answer some questions gave reasonable explanations +helped clear things out quickly +technical cooperation with team, very efficient	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
NOTES: 4:5 2.7	4 6	18:6 ~ 9	4,5	WANT 17	2	1-2	1,5	(2) c
QUESTIONS ASKED almost no, irrelevant some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points short allowing short answers, stim	e used understa presen almost no some ma rough main prost all all relevance in the control of th	tation addressed nothing no or irrelevaring points few some almost all	opinions expressed	ation lead of the	ost no almost no ttle was trying	relevance of topics pres irrelevant ven few sc **most mostly almost all almost all + impres	prinions prioritisation prioritisation prioritisation no almost no almost no reasonable prioritisation no reasonable prioritisation	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
NOTES: REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract		~ 2			ÿ	-5		(3) - G
QUESTIONS ASKED 1 too few, mostly irrelevant 2 some relevant, sufficient number, could 3 clear things out 2 most time used, many unclear points 3 resolved, aimed at both report and opp. 3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	poor too short/long informative, apt	nderstanding own opinion of report poor too few partially some sufficient many detailed, complex suggestion	irrelevant chaotic partially relevant present adequate visible tent fully clear,	on spee summ 0 pool 1 too shor	nary analysis or almost no tt/long too short/long ive, apt relevant parts but accurate,	too few irre some partial many ade	& cons prioritisation	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS O concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
NOTES: 2,5		2,5			3	-AR 1	5	

stage: 2

experiments

too few

some

quite a lot,

errors analysed

and analysed

+ totally reliable,

reproducible

fight (round no.):

opponent: PRESOV

considerable experimental

and theoretical

correct own

opinions expressed

room: 101

problem no.: 3

Juror name: NA NA 310VA signature: Nanaziona

REPORTER

REPORT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

phenomenon explanation

almost no

some

basic

good but not so

demonstrative

detailed, good,

demonstrative

shows physical insight

theory/model

almost no

some

basic

detailed.

correct

+good testable

predictions

completely testable

reporter: POS TOVA comparison between relevant

theory and experiment

no/ almost no

some

+ explained

analysed

perfect correlation,

very conclusive

well performed done, but not well fitting

+ results explained well litting, deviations

reviewer: EROBARDVA own contribution task fulfilment others data, incorrectly cited misunderstood reviewed sources, properly cited partly on average level some-own relevant convincing solution considerable experimental some parts better or theoretical than average

grater extent

than expected

DISCUSSION WITH DEPORTED

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

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

> concise and correct or no questions asked

some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

141,5+2

deep and comprehensible, detailed, complex,

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED

almost no, irrelevant some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points

short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OP	POSITION (S	PEECH)	
	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed
0_	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant
1	very little	some main points	few

almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no
very little	some main points	few	some	almost no
enough	main points	some	to most topics	some
almost all	all relevant parts	almost all	to almost all topics	reasonable
all & efficiently	almost all parts	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good

	DIS	COSSION A	VIIH KEPOR	KIEK			P
prioritization		leading	cooperation	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	prioritisation	R
no	0_	almost no	almost no	irrelevant	very little	no	Ľ
almost no	1	little	was trying	few	some	almost no	
some	2	partial	atisfying	most	mostly correct	some	-1
reasonable	-	efficient	good	almost all	almost all correct	reasonable	ı
very good	4	very efficient	very efficient	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	-2

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

> concise and correct or no questions asked

some incorrect. inconclusive or too long

deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

1+0,5+1,5+1

REVIEWER



Sta	it ironi i anu aud/subtract
QI	JESTIONS ASKED
0 -	too few, mostly irrelev

some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out most time used, many unclear points

resolved, aimed at both report and opp.

+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently

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

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

ANSWERS TO JURY

QUESTIONS concise and correct or no questions asked

some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

1+2 + 25+1 =

		SCORESHE	ET	2			101			(2)		D.
		stage: 2	figh	nt (round no.): 5		room:	101	7	problem no.:	(2)	Juror nan	ne: / emoen
REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract	5	reporter:	opposition opposition	ponent: Rayne	2	reviewer:	SH	Live	-		signature	: 2m
REPORT							DISCI	ISSION WI	TH OPPONEN	IT		ANSWERS TO HIP
		relevant	comparison between	en			Disco) J J J J J J J J J J J J J J J J J J J	relevant			ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	experiments	theory and experime			ask fulfilment			arguments/resp	oonses flexibil	ity/reactions	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
almost no	almost no some	too few some	no/ almost no	others data, incorre reviewed sources, pro		nisunderstood partly	0	almost no	too few		ow reactions	
2 (basic)	(basic)	well performed	done, but not well fit			n average leve	TIV	was trying	some	and the same of th	inswer some lestions	o concise and correct or
good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	quite a lot, errors analysed	+ explained	relevant		convincing solution	12	satisfying			reasonable	no questions asked
4 detailed, good,	+good testable	+ results explained	well fitting, deviatio	ns considerable exper	rimental sor	me parts bette	er	satistyilig	most + data/theo		lanations clear things out	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
5 demonstrative	predictions	and analysed	analysed	or theoretic		than average	3 =		convincingly sup	ported o	uickly	-2 deeply incorrect or show
deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	completely testable	+ totally reliable, reproducible	perfect correlation very conclusive	, considerable exper and theoretic		grater extent han expected	4 —	very efficient	proved dee understandi		al cooperation , very efficient	deep misconceptions
NOTES:	-1.d	160 1	i dalis	>4	1, 1/2	2not		n	-/1-	1	- 1	
NOTES: Potrat	pray/	Cool 1	a valey	CV	aniji	1200	P	Wyn	ene	Vela,	4 stu	orn /
		1.		/ 1	1 / /	1 -	x /.	b		mile	PL	/
nostral	_	1 mm	a who	have who	25/01/	7 /	ipa	Cia		1		
OPPONENT	OPPOSIT	TION (SPEECH)				DISCUS	SION WI	TH REPOR	TER			ANSWERS TO JURY and
Start from 1 and add/subtract	tim	e used understa	nding of relevant	topics correct own	prioritizati	ion I	eading c	ooperation	relevance of	own opinions	prioritisation	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
QUESTIONS ASKED	0	presen							topics	presented		concise and correct or no
0 almost no, irrelevant	1 ver	nost no almost ry little some ma			almost no			almost no was trying	irrelevant few	very little some	no	questions asked
some relevant, aimed at resc	olving - /	nough main			some			satisfying	most	mostly correct	almost no some	some incorrect,
some unclear points	2	nost all all releva	int parts almost				fficient	good		Ilmost all correct	reasonable	inconclusive or too long
short allowing short answers prioritized, all time used		all & almost a	all parts all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	d 3	very fficient	very		+ improvement		deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	4	ciency dimeses	Jii parto uii	305653110113	very good	ч 4 е	mcient	efficient	all	suggestions	very good	
NOTES:												
	-											
REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract												
QUESTIONS ASKED	RE	EVIEW OF REPOR	RT			REVIEW C	OF OPPOS	SITION				ANSWERS TO JURY
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant	1	report	inderstanding own o	pinions pros & cons	prioritisation	sp	eech	discussion	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	QUESTIONS
some relevant, sufficient nui	mber, could	summary	of report	• 2000 •		0	nmary	analysis		A		0 concise and correct or
clear things out	ar asiata 1	too short/long		few irrelevant	chaotic		oor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	no questions asked
most time used, many uncle resolved, aimed at both repo		informative, apt	partially soi sufficient ma	7	visible (7 (1	oò short/long elevant parts		partially relevant		some incorrect,
+short, apt and clear, well pr	V 2 -	brief but		ovement fully	clear,	2	of but	accurate,	many + improvement	adequate fully	visible	deeply incorrect or show
time managed efficiently	3	accurate		stions adequate	intuitive	-	urate	conclusive	suggestions	adequate	clear, intuitive	-2 — deep misconceptions
NOTES:	Ray	le you	Ortiler	un pre	José	Lister	-0	asta	ur)			

relevant

experiments

too few

some

quite a lot,

errors analysed

and analysed

+ totally reliable,

reproducible

+ results explained

stage: 2
reporter: POSTOVA

task fulfilment

misunderstood

partly

convincing

solution

than average

grater extent

than expected

some parts bette

on average level

problem no.:

relevant

too few

some

most

+ data/theory

proved deep

understanding

quickly

+technical cooperation

with team, very efficient

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

almost no

was trying

satisfying

efficient

cooperation arguments/responses

productive convincingly supported

Juror name: PETER MATAK signature: P. Washik

REPORTER

REPORT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

phenomenon explanation

almost no

some

basic

good but not so

demonstrative

detailed, good,

demonstrative

deep and comprehensible, detailed, complex,

shows physical insight completely testable



theory/model

almost no

some

basic

detailed.

correct

+good testable

predictions

well performed done, but not well fitting

comparison between

theory and experiment

+ explained

well fitting, deviations

analysed

perfect correlation,

very conclusive

no/ almost no

some

fight (round no.): 3
opponent: PRESOV

own contribution

others data, incorrectly cited

reviewed sources, properly cited

some own

relevant

considerable experimental

or theoretical

considerable experimental

and theoretical

room: 101 reviewer: SROBAROVA

ANSWERS TO JURY. **OPPONENT** and flexibility/reactions **REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS** poor, slow reactions could answer some concise and correct or questions no questions asked gave reasonable some incorrect, explanations +helped clear things out inconclusive or too long

deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

OPPONENT 6	OPPO	OSITION (SI	PEECH)				DISC	CUSSION V	VITH REPOR	TER			ANSWERS TO JURY and
QUESTIONS ASKED		time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritization		leading	cooperation	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	prioritisation	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
almost no, irrelevant	0	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0	almost no	almost no	irrelevant	very little	no	questions asked
0_	1 _	very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	1	little	was trying	few	some	almost no	
some relevant, aimed at resolving	57 -	enough	main points	some	to most topics	some	5	partial	satisfying	most	mostly correct	some	-1 some incorrect,
some unclear points	9	almost all	all relevant parts	almost all	to almost all topics	reasonable	6	efficient	good	almost all	almost all correct	reasonable	inconclusive or too long
2 short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used	3	all & efficiently	almost all parts	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	4	very efficient	very efficient	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



QUESTIONS ASKED	RE۱	IEW OF REPO	RT				REV	IEW OF OPPO	OSITION				ANSWERS TO JURY
too few, mostly irrelevant some relevant, sufficient number, could		report summary	understanding of report	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation		speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	QUESTIONS concise and correct or
1 clear things out	0 _	poor	poor	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	0	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	no questions asked
most time used, many unclear points	1	too short/long	partially	some	partially relevant	present	1_	too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	present	some incorrect,
resolved, aimed at both report and opp.	57	informative, apt	sufficient	many	adequate	visible	50	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	(adequate)	visible	inconclusive or too long
3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	3	brief but accurate	detailed, complex	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	clear, intuitive	3	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	clear, intuitive	-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

stage:)

fight (round no.): 3

room: 40 1

problem no.: 3

Juror name: FICKOVA

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

reporter: POSTOVA

opponent: PRESOV

reviewer: SROBARDVA

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

very

efficient

verv

efficient

signature: Fickora

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED

almost no, irrelevant some relevant, aimed at resolving

some unclear points

short allowing short answers, prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION	(SPEECH)

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

1	DISC	CUSSION V	VITH REPOR	RTER			ANSWERS TO JURY and
n		leading	cooperation	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	prioritisation	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	0	almost no	almost no	irrelevant	very little	no	questions asked
1	1	little	was trying	few	some	almost no	some incorrect.
4	2	partial	satisfying	most	mostly correct	some	-1 inconclusive or too long
1	-	efficient	good	almost all	almost all correct	reasonable	— 1

all

+ improvement

suggestions

very good

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



QUESTIONS ASKED

too few, mostly irrelevant some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out

most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp.

+short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently

E١	IEW OF REPO	ORT			
	report summary	understanding of report	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation
	poor	poor	too few	irrelevant	chaotic
-	too short/long	partially	some	partially relevant	present
	informative, apt	sufficient	many	adequate	visible
	brief but accurate	detailed, complex	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	clear, intuitive

	RE	IEW OF OPPO	OSITION	W =	W		
1		speech summary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	
	0	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	'
ı	1=	too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	present	
ı	2-	informative, apt	relevant parts	many	adequate	visible	-
	3	brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	clear, intuitive	-7

ANSWERS TO JURY	
DUESTIONS	

concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES: nenechal

dehovorit

		SCC	RESHEET	_			4.0	- 1		0		KUNDR ACIC
		sta	ge: 🔇	fight (ro	ound no.): 🏅	r	oom: 10	7/	problem no	.: Z	Juror nan	ne:
REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract	7	rep	orter: GJ	P oppone	nt: Exclárora	ņ	eviewer:	Postoba			signature	: alledray
REPORT phenomenon explanation	theory/mod			omparison between eory and experiment	own contribution	task	fulfilment	2.2002.000.000.000	I WITH OPPONE relevan	nt	xibility/reactions	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and
almost no	almost no	t	oo few	no/ almost no	others data, incorrectly ci		ınderstood	0almost	no too fev	v poc	or, slow reactions	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
some	some basic		some performed do	some ne, but not well fitting	reviewed sources, properly some own	-	partly erage level)1 — was try	ring some		uld answer some questions	concise and correct or
good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	-	ite a lot, s analysed	+ explained	relevant		nvincing olution	2 satisfy	ing most		ave reasonable explanations	some incorrect,
detailed, good, demonstrative	+good testab predictions	Action to the second se	lts explained w analysed	rell fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experiment or theoretical		parts better n average	3 produc	+ data/the	and the same of	ped clear things out quickly	inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show
deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight			ally reliable, producible	perfect correlation, very conclusive	considerable experiment and theoretical		ter extent expected	4 very efficie			hnical cooperation eam, very efficient	deep misconceptions
NOTES: 1+2,5				->I						é		
OPPONENT	6 OPPO	OSITION (S	SPEECH)				DISCUSSI	ON WITH RE	PORTER			ANSWERS TO JURY and
Start from 1 and add/subtract QUESTIONS ASKED		time used	understandi presentati		s correct own propinions expressed	rioritization	lead	ding cooperat	relevance of topics	own opinion presented	5	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or no
almost no, irrelevant	0	almost no	almost noth	ning no or irrelevar	it almost no	no	0 almo	st no almost	no irrelevant	very little	no	questions asked
some relevant, aimed at res	olving 1	very little	some main p			almost no		tle was tryi	ng few	some	almost no	some incorrect,
some unclear points	2 -	enough	main poin	its some	to most topics	some	2 par	rtial satisfyii	ng most	mostly correc	ct some	-1 inconclusive or too long
Joine difficult politics	dia	-		A Commence of the Commence of	The second control of	and the state of t				333		

reasonable

very good

efficient

very

efficient

good

very

efficient

almost all

almost all correct

+ improvement

suggestions

reasonable

very good

deeply incorrect or show

deep misconceptions

NOTES:

1+1+1,5+2 > 6

almost all

all &

efficiently

all relevant parts

almost all parts

SCORESHEET

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

short allowing short answers,

prioritized, all time used

QUESTIONS ASKED	RE۱	VIEW OF REPO	RT				REVIEW (OF OPPO	DSITION	7		2	ANSWERS TO JURY
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant some relevant, sufficient number, could		report summary	understanding of report	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	- 25	peech mmary	discussion analysis	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	QUESTIONS concise and correct or
1 clear things out	0_	poor	poor	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	0	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	no questions asked
most time used, many unclear points	1	too short/long	partially	some	partially relevant	present	1 too sl	hort/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	present	some incorrect,
resolved, aimed at both report and opp.	2-	informative, apt	sufficient	many	(adequate)	visible	inform	native, apt	relevant parts	many	adequate	visible	inconclusive or too long
 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently 	3	brief but accurate	detailed, complex	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	clear, intuitive	-	ief but curate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	clear, intuitive	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

to almost all topics

+ improvement

suggestions

almost all

all

NOTES:

1+115+62+2-7

SCORESHEET fight (round no.): stage: Juror name: problem no.: PRESOV opponent: SROBAROVA reviewer: PO STOLA reporter: REPORTER signature: Start from 1 and add/subtract REPORT DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT ANSWERS TO JURY. comparison between relevant relevant OPPONENT and theory and experiment own contribution task fulfilment phenomenon explanation theory/model experiments cooperation arguments/responses flexibility/reactions REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS almost no too few no/ almost no others data, incorrectly cited misunderstood almost no too few poor, slow reactions some some some some reviewed sources, properly cited partly could answer some concise and correct or basic basic well performed done, but not well fitting some own on average level was trying some questions no questions asked good but not so detailed. quite a lot. + explained relevant convincing gave reasonable satisfying Y some incorrect. demonstrative correct errors analysed solution most explanations + results explained | well fitting, deviations considerable experimental some parts better inconclusive or too long detailed, good, +good testable + data/theory +helped clear things out Xthan average or theoretical demonstrative predictions and analysed analysed productive convincingly supported quickly deeply incorrect or show + totally reliable, deep and comprehensible, detailed, complex, perfect correlation, considerable experimental grater extent proved deep +technical cooperation deep misconceptions shows physical insight completely testable reproducible very conclusive and theoretical than expected efficient understanding with team, very efficient NOTES: 4,5 M 23:6 ~ **OPPONENT** OPPOSITION (SPEECH) DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER ANSWERS TO JURY and Start from 1 and add/subtract understanding of relevant topics prioritization leading cooperation relevance of time used correct own own opinions REVIEWER'S OUESTIONS prioritisation presentation addressed opinions expressed topics QUESTIONS ASKED presented concise and correct or no almost no almost nothing no or irrelevant almost no almost no almost no irrelevant very little almost no, irrelevant no questions asked very little some main points few some almost no little was trying few × some almost no some relevant, aimed at resolving some incorrect, main points enough some to most topics some partial satisfying most mostly correct × some > some unclear points inconclusive or too long all relevant parts almost all almost all to almost all topics reasonable efficient good almost all almost all correct reasonable deeply incorrect or show short allowing short answers, all & + improvement verv verv + improvement prioritized, all time used deep misconceptions efficiently almost all parts all suggestions very good efficient efficient suggestions very good 0-1 NOTES: 7-3 REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract REVIEW OF REPORT REVIEW OF OPPOSITION QUESTIONS ASKED ANSWERS TO JURY too few, mostly irrelevant understanding own opinions report pros & cons prioritisation speech discussion own opinions pros & cons prioritisation QUESTIONS of report summary summary analysis

some relevant, sufficient number, could concise and correct or clear things out poor too few irrelevant chaotic almost no poor poor too few irrelevant no questions asked chaotic most time used, many unclear points too short/long partially some partially relevant present too short/long too short/long some partially relevant present some incorrect. resolved, aimed at both report and opp. informative, apt √sufficient Xinformative, apt relevant parts inconclusive or too long many × adequate visible many adequate visible +short, apt and clear, well prioritized brief but detailed, * improvement fully clear, brief but accurate, + improvement fully deeply incorrect or show clear. time managed efficiently accurate complex suggestions adequate intuitive accurate conclusive suggestions deep misconceptions adequate intuitive

NOTES:

1

2

2

SCORESHEET stage: 3

fight (round no.): 3

room: 101

problem no.: Z

convincingly supported

cooperation arguments/responses

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

reporter: PRESOV

opponent: 3ROBAROVA

reviewer: POS TOVA

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

concise and correct or

flexibility/reactions

poor, slow reactions could answer some

questions

gave reasonable

explanations

+helped clear things out

quickly

+technical cooperation

with team, very efficient

no questions asked some incorrect. inconclusive or too long

deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

EPORT	P			Ý		DISCUSSION	WITH OPPONENT
phenomenon explanation	n theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	coopera	relevant tion arguments/respons
almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	n almost	
some	some	some	some	reviewed sources, properly cited	partly	_	
basic	basic	well performed	done, but not well fitting	some own	on average level	1 — was try	ng some
good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	quite a lot, errors analysed	+ explained	relevant	convincing	2 satisfyi	ng most
detailed, good, demonstrative	+good testable predictions	+ esults explained	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average	2	+ data/theory ve) convincingly support
deep and comprehensibl shows physical insight	e, detailed, complex, completely testable	+ totally reliable, reproducible	perfect correlation, very conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	grater extent than expected	4 very efficien	proved deep

NOTES:

OPPONENT

QL	IESTIONS ASKED
) —	almost no, irrelevant
	some relevant, aimed at resolvi

_)	Joine relevant, aimed at resolving
J	some unclear points
_	short allowing short answers,
	prioritized, all time used

OPP	OSITION (S	PEECH)				DIS	CUSSION V	VITH REPOR	RTER
	time used	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expressed	prioritization		leading	cooperation	relev
0	almost no	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no	0_	almost no	almost no	irrel
1	very little	some main points	few	some	almost no	1	little	was trying	1
2	enough	main points	some	o most topics	some	2	partial	satisfying	C _m
	almost all	all relevant parts	(almost all	to almost all topics	(reasonable)	4_	efficient	good	alm
3	all & efficiently	almost all parts	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	3_	very efficient	very efficient	

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

	ANSWERS TO JURY and
n	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	concise and correct or no questions asked
	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
-	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

+ 2 + 2/5

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtra

()
	I
ct (
_	=

QU	ESTIONS ASKED
0 -	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out
\mathcal{Q}	most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp.
3 —	+short, apt and clear, well prioritized

EVIEW OF REPO	ORT		7	
report summary	understanding of report	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation
poor	poor	too few	irrelevant	chaotic
too short/long	partially	some	partially relevant	present
informative, apt	sufficient	many	adequate	visible
brief but accurate	detailed, complex	+ improvement suggestions	adequate	clear, intuitive

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

ı	ANSWERS TO JURY
ŀ	QUESTIONS
	concise and correct or no questions asked
	-1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
ı	deeply incorrect or show

		2COKE2HE	EI		7			11	01			121			> >
		stage:	'5	fight (rou	nd no.):		room:	110	UZ	-	problem no.	($/$ $/$	Juror nan	1е: 🖊	unha
REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract	F -	reporter:	2 your	opponent	596054	na	review	er:	to	House	2	0	signature	: >	200
REPORT			-0						DISCH	ISSION WI	TH OPPONE	MT.		ANG	VERS TO JURY,
KEPOKI		relevant	comparison	between				- 1	DISCO	331014 441	relevant				NENT and
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	experiments	theory and ex		own contributi	ion 1	task fulfilm	nent		cooperation	arguments/res		lity/reactions		EWER'S QUESTIONS
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almo		others data, incorrec		misunderst	bood	0	almost no	too few		slow reactions	KEVIE	WER 3 QUESTIONS
1 some	some	some	done, but not		viewed sources, pro some own		partly on average	lovel	1	was trying	somo		answer some	0	concise and correct or
2 basic good but not so	detaîled,	well performed quite a lot,	+ explai	eemonium eou an eou (274	relevant	- 0	convincir	SHELDON SHOULD	1 = -	was trying	some		reasonable	0	no questions asked
demonstrative	correct	errors analysed					solution	_	2	satisfying	most	ext	olanations	-1-	some incorrect,
detailed, good,	+good testable	+ results explained			considerable experi	Marie and the second se	me parts b		3	nadudina l	+ data/the		clear things out		inconclusive or too long
5 demonstrative deep and comprehensible,	predictions detailed, complex.	+ totally reliable,	analys perfect corr		or théoretica considerable experi		than avera		0	very	convincingly sur proved de		quickly cal cooperation	-2	_ deeply incorrect or show
	ompletely testable		very conc		and theoretical		than expec		4	efficient	understand	및 5 Hand Hand Hand Hand Hand	m, very efficient	Á	deep misconceptions
NOTES: Van	der Was	droe Tulne	- id	ely &	9n?	e nel	de	je la	20	doj:	nuen	? ha	us ve Se	male	r&? Zouis
OPPONENT	OPPOSIT	ION (SPEECH)					ĎISC	CUSSIC	ON WIT	TH REPOR	TER	, , , , ,	*	ANSW	ERS TO JURY and
Start from 1 and add/subtract		e used understa	nding of re	levant topics	correct own	prioritizat	tion	leadi	ing c	ooperation	relevance of	own opinions	prioritisation		WER'S QUESTIONS
QUESTIONS ASKED		presen		addressed	opinions expresse	d					topics	presented			concise and correct or no
0 — almost no, irrelevant	and the second s	ost no almost	1	or irrelevant	almost no	no	0	almost		almost no	irrelevant	very little	no	<u> </u>	questions asked
some relevant, aimed at reso	alving -	Vittle some ma ough main	-	(few)	to most topics	almost r	/	little	100	was trying	few	sóme	almost no		some incorrect,
1 some unclear points	2	ost all all releva		almost all	to almost all topic		2	parti		satisfying good	most almost all	mostly-correct almost all correct	reasonable	-1	inconclusive or too long
short allowing short answers	2	II &	int purts	dimost dii	+ improvement	J (Cusonius	3_	ver		very	annoscan	+ improvement	Teasonable	~	deeply incorrect or show
prioritized, all time used	4 effic	ciently almost a	all parts	all	suggestions	very goo	od 4	efficie	ent	efficient	all	suggestions	very good	-2	deep misconceptions
NOTES: REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract		fora				-									
QUESTIONS ASKED	RE	VIEW OF REPOR	RT				REVIEV	N OF C	OPPOS	SITION			ν.	ANSW	ERS TO JURY
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant	-	report u	ınderstanding	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	n	speech	h	discussion	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	QUEST	IONS
some relevant, sufficient nu	mber, could	summary	of report				0 -	summa	ry	analysis				U	concise and correct or
1 clear things out		poor	poor	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	-	poor		almost no	too few	irrelevant	chaotic		no questions asked
most time used, many uncle		too short/long	partially	some	partially relevant			1		oo short/long	///	partially relevan	- X	-1	some incorrect,
resolved, aimed at both repo	2 -	informative, apt	sufficient	many	adequate	visible	2info	500 200-2000 B		elevant parts	many	adequate	visible		inconclusive or too long
+short, apt and clear, well protection time managed efficiently	rioritized	brief but accurate	detailed, complex	 improvement suggestions 	nt fully adequate	clear, intuitive	3 =	brief bu accurat		accurate, conclusive	+ improvemen suggestions	t fully adequate	clear, intuitive	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
NOTES:	ny doj		f	blow	y me	1/	W=		ese a Million	And the second s	lile	,	K		

		stage: 3		fight (roun			roor	1: 16 1		problem no.:		Juror nan	ne: FICKOVA
REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract	6	reporter: PA	SEZON	opponent:	SROBARE	PVA	revie	wer: Pos	TOVA			signature	Federa"
REPORT phenomenon explanation almost no some basic good but not so demonstrative detailed, good, demonstrative deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	almost no some basic detailed, correct +good testable predictions detailed, comple completely testal	quite a lot, errors analysed + results explained and analysed xx, + totally reliable, reproducible	perfect con very con	experiment oost no oo ne revi t well fitting ained deviations seed rrelation, clusive	own contribut thers data, incorre lewed sources, pro some own relevant considerable exper or theoretic considerable exper	ctly cited operly cited imental solimental al	task fulf misunde part on avera convir solut ome part than av grater e than exp	Iment rstood 0 y te level cing on s better erage xtent	almost no was trying satisfying	relevant arguments/res too few some most + data/thec convincingly sup proved dee understand	ponses flexibil poor, s could a que gave exp ory +helped oported exp +technic	ity/reactions low reactions answer some uestions reasonable lanations clear things out quickly al cooperation n, very efficient	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect, inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
NOTES: X-6Va VZtah no tixorane trenie n	os grafu edzi f napnut a sten	regencion a Lie	Llasit	ost ouz?	1=100	de Zo		gett a	ekistatod	ne pop	isana fu	nkcio n	nembranj
OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract	OPPOS	SITION (SPEECH)		/4		r			WITH REPOR	1		1	ANSWERS TO JURY and
QUESTIONS ASKED			anding of rentation	elevant topics addressed	correct own opinions expresse	prioritiza ed	tion	leading	cooperation	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	prioritisation	REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS concise and correct or no
almost no, irrelevant	0a	lmost no almost	nothing n	o or irrelevant	almost no	no	0	almost no	o almost no	irrelevant	very little	no	questions asked
some relevant, aimed at res	olving -		in points	few	some	almost	-	little	was trying	few	some	almost no	some incorrect,
some unclear points	2		points	some	to most topics	some	2	partial	satisfying	most	mostly correct	some	inconclusive or too long
short allowing short answers		Ilmost all all releva	ant parts	almost all	to almost all topic	s reasona	ble 3	efficient		almost all	almost all correct	reasonable	deeply incorrect or show
prioritized, all time used		all & efficiently almost	all parts	all	+ improvement suggestions	very go		very efficient	very efficient	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	-2 deep misconceptions
NOTES: Weat ted		1	s obje	non	h, 644	lorina j	o do	ezita	< spyla	j sa			
QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPO	RT				REV	EW OF OPI	POSITION				ANSWERS TO JURY
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant	- 1	report	understanding	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisatio		speech	discussion	own opinions	pros & cons	prioritisation	QUESTIONS
some relevant, sufficient nu	ımber, could	summary	of report	- Fillians				summary	analysis	ziiii opiiiiolis	pros & cons	prioritisation	concise and correct or
1 clear things out		0 poor	poor	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	0	poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	chaotic	no questions asked
most time used, many uncle	ear points	1 too short/long	partially	some	partially relevant	present	1 -	too short/lon	g too short/long	g some	partially relevant		some incorrect,
2 resolved, aimed at both rep	ort and opp.	informative, apt	sufficient	many	adequate	visible	,=	nformative, a	pt relevant parts	many	adequate	visible	inconclusive or too long
+short, apt and clear, well p	rioritized	brief but	detailed,	+ improvement	fully	clear,		brief but	accurate,	+ improvement	fully	clear,	deeply incorrect or show

intuitive

adequate

NOTES:

time managed efficiently

SCORESHEET

accurate

suggestions

Prilis Všeobeché klady

adequate

intuitive

deep misconceptions

conclusive suggestions

relevant

experiments

too few

quite a lot.

errors analysed

and analysed

+ totally reliable.

reproducible

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

efficiently

problem no.:

Juror name: PETER MATAK signature: P. Mr. Cabb

REPORTER

REPORT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

phenomenon explanation

almost no

some

basic

good but not so

demonstrative

detailed, good,

demonstrative

eep and comprehensible, detailed, complex,

shows physical insight | completely testable

theory/model

almost no

some

basic

detailed.

correct

+good testable

predictions

fight (round no.): 3
opponent: SROBAROVA

own contribution

others data, incorrectly cited

reviewed sources, properly cited

some own

relevant

considerable experimental

or theoretical

considerable experimental

and theoretical

suggestions

		DISC	CUSSION WI	TH OPPONENT relevant		ANSWERS TO JURY,
	task fulfilment	ı	cooperation	arguments/responses	flexibility/reactions	OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	misunderstood	0 —	almost no	too few	poor, slow reactions	REVIEWER 3 QUESTIONS
d	partly on average level	1 =	was trying	some	could answer some questions	concise and correct or no questions asked
	convincing solution	2	satisfying	most	gave reasonable explanations	some incorrect,
	some parts better than average	3	productive	+ data/theory convincingly supported	+helped clear things out quickly	inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show
	grater extent than expected	4 =	very efficient	proved deep understanding	+technical cooperation with team, very efficient	deep misconceptions

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASK	ED
---------------	----

almost no, irrelevant some relevant, aimed at resolving some unclear points

short allowing short answers,

prioritized, all time used

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

all

comparison between

theory and experiment

no/ almost no

some

+ explained

analysed

perfect correlation,

very conclusive

well performed done, but not well fitting

results explained well fitting, deviations

almost all parts

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and **REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS** concise and correct or no questions asked some incorrect,

> inconclusive or too long deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract



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

very good