

# HKU CSA X Long Bridge Hackathon

## Judging Criteria Sheet



### 1. PROBLEM — conveyed through the presentation

#### 1.1 The problem exists in the industry

Score	Description
<b>1–2 marks</b>	Problem is vague or unrelated to the real industry context. No evidence or examples provided to show that the issue actually exists.
<b>3–4 marks</b>	Problem has some relevance but is generic or over-simplified. Limited understanding of its importance in the industry. Minimal supporting context.
<b>5–6 marks</b>	Problem is relevant to the industry and somewhat validated. Presentation shows a basic understanding of its impact but lacks data or strong justification.
<b>7–8 marks</b>	Problem is clearly identified as a real and significant industry issue, supported by examples, cases, or observable trends. Shows understanding of its importance.
<b>9–10 marks</b>	Problem is highly relevant, timely, and critical within the industry. Presentation includes convincing evidence such as data, reports, or case studies that clearly validate its existence and significance.

#### 1.2 The description/characterization of the problem is correct, clear, and specific

Score	Description
<b>1–2 marks</b>	Problem description is confusing, inaccurate, or incomplete. Does not convey what the actual issue is.
<b>3–4 marks</b>	Problem is somewhat clear but overly broad or missing specific context. Lacks precision or depth in defining root causes.
<b>5–6 marks</b>	Description is mostly correct and clear. Some specific details provided but may overlook key aspects or assumptions.
<b>7–8 marks</b>	Problem is well-articulated, specific, and logically structured. The scope and causes are accurately explained. Audience can easily understand the problem's nature.
<b>9–10 marks</b>	Problem characterization is exceptionally clear, precise, and insightful. Demonstrates deep understanding of underlying causes, context, and implications. Includes supporting data or real examples.

### 1.3 Existing/competing solutions are adequately addressed

Score	Description
<b>1–2 marks</b>	No mention or awareness of existing or competing solutions. Assumes the problem is unsolved.
<b>3–4 marks</b>	Mentions a few competing solutions without depth or analysis. Does not evaluate how they perform or differ.
<b>5–6 marks</b>	Identifies some existing solutions and provides basic comparison, but analysis is shallow or missing key points.
<b>7–8 marks</b>	Provides clear overview of major existing or competing solutions. Explains strengths and weaknesses logically and identifies potential improvement areas.
<b>9–10 marks</b>	Thorough competitive landscape analysis with clear comparisons. Highlights unique gaps or opportunities the team’s solution addresses better. Shows strong market and technical awareness.

## 2. SOLUTION IDEA — conveyed through the presentation

### 2.1 The solution effectively solves the exact problem identified above

Score	Description
<b>1–2 marks</b>	Solution is unrelated or fails to address the defined problem. No clear connection between problem and solution.
<b>3–4 marks</b>	Solution partially addresses the problem but misses core aspects or practical considerations.
<b>5–6 marks</b>	Solution aligns with the problem and provides a workable concept but lacks complete feasibility or depth.
<b>7–8 marks</b>	Solution effectively tackles the identified problem with clear, logical reasoning and relevant methods or technology.
<b>9–10 marks</b>	Solution directly and comprehensively solves the problem with strong evidence or prototype validation. Clear, measurable impact demonstrated.

### 2.2 The solution is innovative and similar solutions have not been attempted before

Score	Description
<b>1–2 marks</b>	Solution lacks originality; fully replicates existing ideas or standard methods.
<b>3–4 marks</b>	Solution shows minor novelty but mostly replicates known approaches. Innovation is limited to superficial changes.
<b>5–6 marks</b>	Solution introduces a moderately new concept or unique feature but within familiar territory.
<b>7–8 marks</b>	Solution demonstrates clear innovation or creative thinking. Combines existing ideas in a novel and practical way.
<b>9–10 marks</b>	Solution is highly original, ground-breaking, or disruptively innovative. Demonstrates new thinking or unique value proposition not seen before.

## 2.3 Potential flaws or unintended side effects of the solution are adequately addressed

Score	Description
<b>1–2 marks</b>	No discussion or awareness of risks, flaws, or side effects.
<b>3–4 marks</b>	Acknowledges some potential issues but lacks mitigation or reasoning.
<b>5–6 marks</b>	Identifies key flaws and risks with some basic mitigation strategies.
<b>7–8 marks</b>	Thoroughly evaluates possible risks, side effects, and challenges, with clear mitigation plans.
<b>9–10 marks</b>	Demonstrates critical thinking by identifying multiple technical, ethical, or operational risks and providing realistic, data-backed mitigation strategies.



## 3. FRONTEND — Drawing / Figma / UI

### 3.1 The user interface and user experience are intuitive and well-designed

Score	Description
<b>1–2 marks</b>	UI is disorganized, cluttered, or confusing. UX is unintuitive; navigation unclear.
<b>3–4 marks</b>	Basic layout exists but lacks flow, consistency, or usability focus.
<b>5–6 marks</b>	Functional UI with moderate clarity and logic. Some usability concerns remain.
<b>7–8 marks</b>	Clean and intuitive design; layout supports logical navigation and user tasks. Thought given to accessibility and aesthetics.
<b>9–10 marks</b>	Professional, polished UI/UX design that feels natural and delightful to use. Strong coherence, responsiveness, and attention to detail. Demonstrates solid design principles.

### 3.2 The user interface and user experience are well-suited for the solution above

Score	Description
<b>1–2 marks</b>	UI/UX has no clear relation to the proposed solution or user flow.
<b>3–4 marks</b>	UI/UX partially reflects solution logic but misses alignment with key functions.
<b>5–6 marks</b>	UI/UX generally supports the solution but could better reflect workflow or user needs.
<b>7–8 marks</b>	UI/UX strongly complements the proposed solution. Elements and interactions align with user tasks and problem context.
<b>9–10 marks</b>	UI/UX is seamlessly integrated with the solution concept. Each interface element purposefully supports problem-solving and enhances user experience end-to-end.

## 4. BACKEND / LOGIC — Flowchart, Libraries, Tools

### 4.1 The appropriate tools to achieve the solution are correctly identified

Score	Description
<b>1–2 marks</b>	Tools/libraries not mentioned or irrelevant to the problem.
<b>3–4 marks</b>	Mentions tools superficially without explaining their role or suitability.
<b>5–6 marks</b>	Selects mostly appropriate tools but lacks detailed justification or technical reasoning.
<b>7–8 marks</b>	Clearly identifies relevant and effective tools/libraries, with logical explanation of how they fit the solution.
<b>9–10 marks</b>	Tools and frameworks are perfectly chosen and justified. Demonstrates deep understanding of technology stack and alignment with problem and scalability needs.

### 4.2 Development, deployment, and maintenance of the solution are feasible

Score	Description
<b>1–2 marks</b>	No plan or understanding of how the solution could be built or maintained.
<b>3–4 marks</b>	Basic or unrealistic development idea; lacks deployment or sustainability consideration.
<b>5–6 marks</b>	Feasibility considered but incomplete (e.g., missing deployment pipeline or maintenance plan).
<b>7–8 marks</b>	Clear understanding of development flow, deployment approach, and maintenance requirements. Reasonable plan in place.
<b>9–10 marks</b>	Comprehensive, realistic plan for development, deployment, and long-term maintenance. Includes scalability, cost, and performance considerations. Demonstrates professional project feasibility thinking.

### Total Maximum Score: 100

Each of the four criteria (Problem, Solution Idea, Frontend, Backend/Logic) receives a **1–10 mark score**. Judges' total scores across all criteria will be summed to determine the final team score.

# HKU CSA X Long Bridge Hackathon

## 評分準則

### 一、問題（Problem）—— 透過簡報呈現

#### 1.1 問題是否真實存在於產業中

分數區間	說明
1-2 分	問題模糊、與實際產業無關，未提供任何證據或例子證明其真實性。
3-4 分	問題略有相關但過於一般化，未能說明其在產業中的重要性，缺乏具體支持。
5-6 分	問題與產業有關並具一定合理性，展示出基本理解但欠缺數據或深入論證。
7-8 分	問題清楚界定且與產業高度相關，能提供例子、案例或趨勢作為佐證。
9-10 分	問題明確、具時效性且對產業有重大意義，以數據、報告或實際案例充分證實其存在與影響。

#### 1.2 問題的描述 / 界定是否正確、清晰且具體

分數區間	說明
1-2 分	問題描述混亂、不準確或不完整，無法理解其真正含義。
3-4 分	問題大致可理解但過於籠統，缺乏具體背景或原因分析。
5-6 分	描述基本正確且清楚，提供了一些細節但仍有遺漏或假設未釐清。
7-8 分	問題闡述明確、具體且邏輯清晰，能準確說明範圍與根本原因。
9-10 分	問題定義精確深入，展現對其成因、背景及影響的深刻理解，並以數據或實例支持。

### 1.3 是否充分分析現有 / 競爭解決方案

分數區間	說明
1-2 分	未提及任何現有或競爭方案，假設該問題尚無人解決。
3-4 分	有提到部分競爭方案但缺乏分析或比較。
5-6 分	能指出主要現有方案並略作比較，但分析層面不夠深入。
7-8 分	清楚列出主要競爭或現有解決方案，說明其優缺點並指出改進空間。
9-10 分	進行完整且深入的 <b>競品分析</b> ，清楚比較差異並指出團隊方案的獨特價值與市場機會。

## 二、解決方案構想（Solution Idea）—— 透過簡報呈現

### 2.1 解決方案是否能有效解決所界定的問題

分數區間	說明
1-2 分	解決方案與問題無明顯關聯，或無法實際解決問題。
3-4 分	解決方案僅部分對應問題，未能處理主要痛點。
5-6 分	解決方案能解決問題的部分層面，但缺乏完整可行性或細節。
7-8 分	解決方案能有效回應問題，具邏輯性與可行性，思路清晰。
9-10 分	解決方案能全面、明確且具體地解決問題，並以原型、數據或論證顯示實際成效。

### 2.2 解決方案是否具創新性，且未被他人嘗試過

分數區間	說明
1-2 分	無創新性，與現有方案完全相同或抄襲。
3-4 分	略有創意但多為既有方案的延伸，缺乏突破。
5-6 分	具一定創新元素或新組合，但整體思路仍屬常見。
7-8 分	創意明確，有新的思考方向或應用方式，具實用價值。
9-10 分	高度創新或具突破性，提出前所未有的概念或技術，展現強烈原創思維。

## 2.3 是否充分評估並處理潛在缺陷或副作用

分數區間	說明
1-2 分	完全未提及潛在風險或問題。
3-4 分	略有意識到部分風險，但未提出具體對策。
5-6 分	能識別主要缺陷並提出初步應對方式。
7-8 分	充分分析潛在風險與副作用，並提供具體可行的解決措施。
9-10 分	全面考慮技術、倫理及操作風險，提出有數據或實證支持的完善防範方案。



## 三、前端設計（Frontend）— 畫面 / Figma / UI

### 3.1 使用者介面與體驗是否直覺且設計良好

分數區間	說明
1-2 分	介面混亂、不清楚或難以操作。使用體驗不佳。
3-4 分	基本架構存在，但流程不順、設計不一致或缺乏邏輯。
5-6 分	介面可使用且理解度中等，仍有改進空間。
7-8 分	設計整潔直覺，操作流程順暢，兼顧美觀與易用性。
9-10 分	專業級設計，使用體驗流暢自然，細節到位且兼顧可及性與一致性。

### 3.2 使用者介面 / 體驗是否與解決方案契合

分數區間	說明
1-2 分	介面與解決方案毫無關聯，流程不符邏輯。
3-4 分	介面部分對應方案內容，但整體關聯性薄弱。
5-6 分	介面大致支持解決方案，但缺乏完整對應或互動設計。
7-8 分	介面設計能有效支援方案流程與使用情境，整體協調一致。
9-10 分	介面與方案高度整合，從互動到視覺設計皆精準反映解決流程與使用需求。

## 四、後端邏輯（Backend / Logic）— 流程圖、工具與函式庫

### 4.1 所選用的工具與技術是否合適

分數區間	說明
1-2 分	未提及任何技術或使用不相關工具。
3-4 分	提及部分工具但無說明用途或選擇理由。
5-6 分	工具大致適合，但缺乏技術面上的深入解釋。
7-8 分	清楚指出適合的工具 / 函式庫並合理說明其用途與優勢。
9-10 分	工具選擇精準且有理據，展現對技術架構與可擴充性的深刻理解。

### 4.2 開發、部署與維護的可行性

分數區間	說明
1-2 分	無任何開發或維護計畫，完全不具可行性。
3-4 分	有初步構想但缺乏實際操作性或可持續性。
5-6 分	有可行方向但細節不完整，如缺少部署流程或維護計畫。
7-8 分	展現明確的開發與部署流程，具備合理的技術與維護思考。
9-10 分	完整且具體的開發、部署與維護方案，考慮擴充性、成本與長期可持續性。展現專業級規劃能力。

 總分上限：100 分

（共 10 個子項，每項滿分 10 分）