

SUPPLEMENT 4
TO THE CALL FOR PAPERS
38TH OTDK
Physics, Earth Sciences and Mathematics Section

To emphasize the presentation of original results and facilitate professional discourse, the Physics, Earth Sciences and Mathematics Section Committee assigns equal weight to the evaluation of the TDK paper, the oral presentation, and the discussion.

Therefore, at the OTDK, the time allocated for presenting the TDK paper consists of **15 minutes for the presentation and 15 minutes for professional discussion**. The presentation must prominently incorporate the work completed by the student and highlight their original results. All aspects of the use of artificial intelligence must be addressed, as this forms an important part of the evaluation. These elements also play a significant role in the discussion following the presentation.

Evaluation of the TDK paper

1. Evaluation criteria for the TDK papers

- The quality and novelty of the original results, as well as the accuracy of their justification and evaluation.
- The quality, description, and originality of independently conducted methods, as well as the correctness of their application.
- The clear definition of the individual task (problem statement), as well as the detailed positioning and distinction of the independent work within the broader scientific research conducted by the research group.
- Style and structure of the paper, and knowledge of the literature.
- Use of AI in the process of ethical scientific work.

2. Evaluation criteria for the presentation and discussion at the conference

- Did the presentation meet the presentation requirements (structure, precision, clear reasoning, use of technical terms, etc.)?
- Did the presenter clearly define their own task, their scientific activity, and distinguish it from the broader research of the research group?
- At what scientific level was the presenter able to present their own research findings?
- Did the author present the research methods used in detail – including the use of artificial intelligence – and were they appropriate to the research objectives?
- How did the presenter justify their results, and how accurate were their conclusions?
- To what extent did the author demonstrate an understanding of the coherence of the paper and the scientific soundness of the results?
- To what extent was the presenter able to respond substantively to the Section Panel's comments, questions, and critiques; and how professionally confident are they in the subject?