

SCORESHEET

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 3

room: 101

problem no.: 17

Juror name: KUNDAR K

reporter: Grobdena

opponent: Postolova

reviewer: Prusor

signature: KUNDAR K

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
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+2.5+2 → 6

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: 1+1.5+1.5+1.5 → 6

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: 1+1.5+1+1 → 5

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 3

room: 101

problem no.: 17

Juror name: ADAMUSCIN

reporter: SRINIVASA

opponent: POSTUL

reviewer: PRESU

signature: Gush

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

6

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

fight (round no.): 3

room: 101

problem no.: 17

Juror name: NÁNAŠIOVA

reporter: ŠROBÁROVA

opponent: POŠTOVA

reviewer: PRGŠOV

signature: Nanašiová

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

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	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	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	some	some	some	reviewed sources, properly cited	partly	1 was trying	some	could answer some questions	
2 basic	basic	well performed	done, but not well fitting	some own	on average level	2 satisfying	most	gave reasonable explanations	
3 good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	quite a lot, errors analysed	+ explained	relevant	convincing solution	3 productive	+ data/theory convincingly supported	+ helped clear things out quickly	
4 detailed, good, demonstrative	+good testable predictions	results explained and analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average	4 very efficient	proved deep understanding	+technical cooperation with team, very efficient	
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				

NOTES:

1 + 2.5 + 2

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)						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	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	almost no	no		0 almost no	almost no	irrelevant	very little	no	0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 very little	some main points	few	some	almost no		1 little	was trying	few	some	almost no	
2 enough	main points	some	to most topics	some		2 partial	satisfying	most	mostly correct	some	
3 almost all	all relevant parts	almost all	to almost all topics	reasonable		3 efficient	good	almost all	almost all correct	reasonable	
4 all & efficiently	almost all parts	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good		4 very efficient	very efficient	all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	

NOTES:

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 2

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

4

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	
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	poor	too few	irrelevant	chaotic		0 poor	almost no	too few	irrelevant	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	partially	some	partially relevant	present		1 too short/long	too short/long	some	partially relevant	present	
2 most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp.	informative, apt	many	adequate	visible		2 informative, apt	relevant parts	many	adequate	visible	
3 +short, apt and clear, well prioritized time managed efficiently	brief but accurate	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	clear, intuitive		3 brief but accurate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	fully adequate	clear, intuitive	

NOTES:

1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1.5

17 Solahou
 REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract 6

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 3
 reporter: Solahou opponent: Poston

room: 101 problem no.: 17
 reviewer: Raymane

Juror name: Timonin
 signature: Timonin

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:

Traction, not measured or not calculated? Pressure measured? Low? ...
 Poston had advantage the main advantage ...
 ... value pump ...
 ... role ...

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract 5

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — almost no, irrelevant
 — some relevant, aimed at resolving
 1 — 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
 — some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out
 1 — most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp.
 2 — +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:

Poston ...
 ...
 ...

SCORESHEET

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 3

room: 101

problem no.: 17

Juror name: PETER MATÁK

reporter: ŠROBÁŘOVA

opponent: POŠTOVA

reviewer: PREŠOV

signature: P. Maták

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 relevant	on average level
3	good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	quite a lot, errors analysed	+ explained		convincing solution
4	detailed, good, demonstrative	+good testable predictions	+ results explained and analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ totally reliable, reproducible	perfect correlation, very conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	grater extent than expected
6						

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

stage: 1

fight (round no.): 3

room: 101

problem no.: 17

Juror name: FICKOVA

reporter: ŠROBÁŘOVA

opponent: POŠTOVA

reviewer: PREŠOV

signature: Fickova

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

6

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

4

stage:

reporter: *Postlona*

fight (round no.): 3

opponent: *GAIR*

room:

reviewer: *arobanova*

problem no.:

3

Juror name:

signature:

KONRADIK
Uedwig

REPORT

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	cooperation	relevant arguments/responses	flexibility/reactions
0	almost no	too few	poor, slow reactions 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:

$1 + 1.5 + 1 \rightarrow 4$

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	almost all	to most topics	some
3	all & efficiently			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 efficient	satisfying	most	mostly correct	some
3	very efficient	very efficient	almost all	almost all correct	reasonable
4			all	+ improvement suggestions	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

$1 + 1 + 1.5 \rightarrow 4$

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:

$1 + 2 + 1.5 + 1 \rightarrow 6$

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

stage: 2

fight (round no.): 3

room: 101

problem no.: 3

Juror name: ADAMUSCIN

reporter: POŠTOVAČ

opponent: PREŠOV

reviewer: ŠRODARSKA

signature: adu3h

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	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:

4,5

2,5

4,5

4,5

4,5

2,5

2

1,5

1,5

18:6 ~ 3

7-2

5-6

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:

1

~ 2

~ 2

5-6

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

8

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

2,5

2,5

~ 1,5

7-8

SCORESHEET

stage: 2

fight (round no.): 3

room: 101

problem no.: 3

Juror name: NA'NA'SIOVA'

reporter: POŠTOVA'

opponent: PREŠOV

reviewer: ŠROBA'ROVA

signature: Nana'siova'

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

4

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:

$$1 + 1,5 + 2$$

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 enough	some main points	few	some	almost no
2	almost all	all relevant parts	almost all	to most topics	some
3	all & efficiently	all relevant parts	almost all	to almost all topics	reasonable
4		all & efficiently	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:

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

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

SCORESHEET

stage: 2

fight (round no.): 3

room: 101

problem no.: 3

Juror name: Demian

reporter: Potter

opponent: Royle

reviewer: Irvine

signature: [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	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:

potter may have in doing quantification parameters (value shown) not sure 1 min a above statistical vibration

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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:

Royle ykro Schilder pre position (atok)

SCORESHEET

stage: 2

fight (round no.): 3

room: 101

problem no.: 3

Juror name: PETER MATAK

reporter: PRŠTOVA

opponent: PREŠOV

reviewer: ŠROBAROVA

signature: P. Matak

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 relevant	on average level
3	good but not so demonstrative	detailed, correct	quite a lot, errors analysed	+ explained		convincing solution
4	detailed, good, demonstrative	+good testable predictions	+ results explained and analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed	considerable experimental or theoretical	some parts better than average
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ totally reliable, reproducible	perfect correlation, very conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	grater extent than expected
6						

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

8

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 2

fight (round no.): 3

room: 101

problem no.: 3

Juror name: FICKOVA

reporter: POŠTOVA

opponent: PREŠOV

reviewer: ŠROBÁŘOVA

signature: Fickova

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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: nemchal dekovit

SCORESHEET

stage: 3

fight (round no.): 3

room: 101

problem no.: 2

Juror name: KIMDRACIK

reporter: GJR

opponent: Stobdrona

reviewer: Posilovci

signature: Uedra

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
6						

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

$$1 + 2,5 + 3,5 - 0,5 \rightarrow 7$$

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

$$1 + 1 + 1,5 + 2 \rightarrow 6$$

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

$$1 + 1,5 + 4,2 + 2 \rightarrow 7$$

SCORESHEET

stage: 3

fight (round no.): 3

room: 101

problem no.: 2

Juror name: ADAMUSZON

reporter: PRISOV

opponent: SROBAROVA

reviewer: POSTOLA

signature: adamuszon

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:

4 3,5 4 3 4,5 4 2 6-7

23:6 ~ 4

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

0-1 2-3 1-2 4-5

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:

2 2 2 2,5 2 2 2 7

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

stage: 3

reporter: PREŠOV

fight (round no.): 3

opponent: ŠROBAROVA

room: 101

reviewer: POŠTOVA

problem no.: 2

Juror name: NANAŠIOVA

signature: Nanašiova

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
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	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:

1 + 2,5 + 2,5
4

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

1 + 1 + 2 + 2,5

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

7 + 1,5 + 2 + 1,5
2

SCORESHEET

stage:

fight (round no.):

room:

problem no.:

Juror name:

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

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 could answer some questions
1	was trying	some	gave reasonable explanations
2	satisfying	+ most data/theory convincingly supported	+ helped clear things out quickly
3	productive	proved deep understanding	+ technical cooperation with team, very efficient
4	very efficient		

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

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

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

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

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

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

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

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

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 3

fight (round no.): 3

room: 16.7

problem no.:

Juror name: FICKOVA

reporter: PREŠOV

opponent: ŠROBÁŘOVA

reviewer: POŠTOVA

signature: Fickova

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

REPORT

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	cooperation	relevant arguments/responses	flexibility/reactions
0	almost no	too few	poor, slow reactions 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:

x-ova os grafu!
 vztah medzi frekvenciou a hlasitosťou??
 tixoranie napnutie
 tzenie na stene?

aktualizované popisane funkcia membrany

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

6

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:

aká teda bola zmena s objemom
 prilis tlacil na errorbary

membrana je dôležitá ← spytaj sa

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant
 — some relevant, sufficient number, could clear things out
 1 — most time used, many unclear points resolved, aimed at both report and opp.
 2 — +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:

prilis

Prilis v špecie he' lady

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

7

stage: 3

reporter: PREŠOV

fight (round no.): 3

opponent: ŠROBÁŘOVA

room: 101

reviewer: POŠTOVA'

problem no.: 2

Juror name: PETER MATAK

signature: P. Matak

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

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

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: