

# SCORESHEET

stage: 1

fight (round no.): final

room:

problem no.: 7

Juror's name: KUADRACIK

reporter: 1SG

opponent: GS4

reviewer: Postkova

signature:

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \square + \square - \square = \boxed{6}$$

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	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
almost no	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	almost no	too few	poor	
some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	
fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	some scientific points cleared	many	good	
good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = \boxed{7}$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
almost no, irrelevant	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	
relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	
+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	all relevant points	many	many correct	reasonable	fair	partial good	average most	some correct	good	reasonable	
	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 2 + 2 - \square = \boxed{7}$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	
too few, mostly irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	
some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	
many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	
+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 25 + 2 - 1 = 5$$

stage: 1

fight (round no.): F

room:

problem no.:

Juror's name: PLESC 4

reporter:

opponent:

reviewer:

signature:

## REPORT

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	review of sources, cited	partly
fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected
deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	convincing analysis	+ reproducible, well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive			

## DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
almost no	too few	poor
only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine
some scientific points cleared	many	good
interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall 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:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 7 + 28 + 7 - \square = 7$$

## QUESTIONS ASKED

- almost no, irrelevant
- relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

## OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor
some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	all time used

## DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable
good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

## ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3 + 25 + 22 - \square = 7$$

## QUESTIONS ASKED

- too few, mostly irrelevant
- some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points
- many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp
- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

## REVIEW OF REPORT

report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

## REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

## ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4.5 + 2.5 - \square = 8$$

stage:

fight (round no.):

room:

problem no.: 4

Juror's name: J. P. Ryan

reporter: 1.58

opponent: G. J. H. Brown

reviewer:

signature: J. P. Ryan

## REPORT

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	review of sources, cited	partly
fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected

## DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
almost no	too few	poor
only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine
some scientific points cleared	many	good
interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall 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:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 2.8 - \square = 7$$

## QUESTIONS ASKED

- almost no, irrelevant
- relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

## OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor
some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

## DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable
good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

## ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 2.5 + 2.5 - \square = 8$$

## QUESTIONS ASKED

- too few, mostly irrelevant
- some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points
- many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp
- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

## REVIEW OF REPORT

report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

## REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

## ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

**REPORTER** Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 4.0 + 2.0 - 1.0 = 6.0

stage: i  
 reporter: ALEXANDRA LEDKOVA ISG

fight (round no.): FINAL  
 opponent: RICHARD RIPPET GSH

room:  
 reviewer: GTHPOS

problem no.: 7  
 KROVICKA KATY

Juror's name: KATET BADIN  
 signature:

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	review of sources, cited	partly
fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected

scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
almost no	too few	poor
only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine
some scientific points cleared	many	good
interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall 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:**

non-adsorptive parameters? ...

Slide 14: ...

Slide 15: ...

Slide 35: ...

Q: ...

Q: ...

Q: ...

**OPPONENT** Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 1.0 + 2.5 + 2.05 - 0.75 = 6.0

QUESTIONS ASKED
almost no, irrelevant
relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor
some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used!

scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable
good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	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:**

Q: ...

Q: ...

Q: ...

Q: ...

Q: ...

Q: ...

**REVIEWER** Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 1 + 3.0 + 5.0 + 2.0 - 0.0 = 9.0

QUESTIONS ASKED
too few, mostly irrelevant
some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points
many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp
+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

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

**NOTES:**

Q: ...

Q: ...

Q: ...

Q: ...

Q: ...

# SCORESHEET

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 1 = 5$$

stage: 5

fight (round no.): 1

room:

problem no.: 7

Juror's name: Milan Sacklitz

reporter: 1.5g

opponent: GSH

reviewer: Postava

signature: Gai

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	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	almost no	too few	poor	
some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	
fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	some scientific points cleared	many	good	
good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average	brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2 - \square = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER					ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
almost no, irrelevant	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	
relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	
+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable	
	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

Dyn. sypania -> efekt

Pelena likovka

Rel parametre castic  
keteri castice ste mahl?

Matocenne licivka

Trenie na stiznizh plochich!

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 2 + 2.25 - \square = 8$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	
too few, mostly irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	
some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	
many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	
+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

stage: Final

fight (round no.): 1

room:

problem no.: 7

Juror's name: PAUL DRISH

reporter: 136

opponent: POSTOLAK

reviewer: POSTOLAK

signature: [Signature]

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 5$$

### REPORT

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	review of sources, cited	partly
fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected

### DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
almost no	too few	poor
only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine
some scientific points cleared	many	good
interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

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

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

NOTES:

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2.75 + 2.75 - 0 = 5$$

### QUESTIONS ASKED

- 1 - almost no, irrelevant
- 2 - relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- 3 - + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

### OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor
some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

### DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable
good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

### ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 2.75 - 0 = 9$$

### QUESTIONS ASKED

- 1 - too few, mostly irrelevant
- 2 - some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points
- 3 - many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp
- 4 - + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

### REVIEW OF REPORT

report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

### REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

### ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

# SCORESHEET

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0.5 = 6$$

stage: 1

fight (round no.): F

room: —

problem no.: 7

Juror's name: Xolunubim

reporter: ASG

opponent: GJH

reviewer: GYMPOS

signature: [Signature]

## REPORT

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	review of sources, cited	partly
fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average
good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution
detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	some aspects above average
demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected

## DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
almost no	too few	poor
only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine
some scientific points cleared	many	good
interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall 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: *Copy to law / who makes right? / je mika coheren?*

*Brazilian nuts effect / do vlatne bave vtip postbiti? / Bode to dokazni list / Brazil effect / Nacionalni kuro vplivo*

## OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 5$$

### QUESTIONS ASKED

- almost no, irrelevant
- relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

### OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor
some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

### DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable
good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	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: *Vihklost neznajca*

*Prilozi voden relevantni problem napomen / kognitivna - dobrograd - vsakaj ni zo?*

*Baveli so o vseh priten to isto priten - Ni konstruktivne*

## REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 8$$

### QUESTIONS ASKED

- too few, mostly irrelevant
- some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points
- many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp
- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

### REVIEW OF REPORT

report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

### REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

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

NOTES:

*moder lajca - vlatne resic*