

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
1–2 marks	Problem is vague or unrelated to the real industry context. No evidence or examples provided to show that the issue actually exists.
3–4 marks	Problem has some relevance but is generic or over-simplified. Limited understanding of its importance in the industry. Minimal supporting context.
5–6 marks	Problem is relevant to the industry and somewhat validated. Presentation shows a basic understanding of its impact but lacks data or strong justification.
7–8 marks	Problem is clearly identified as a real and significant industry issue, supported by examples, cases, or observable trends. Shows understanding of its importance.
9–10 marks	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
1–2 marks	Problem description is confusing, inaccurate, or incomplete. Does not convey what the actual issue is.
3–4 marks	Problem is somewhat clear but overly broad or missing specific context. Lacks precision or depth in defining root causes.
5–6 marks	Description is mostly correct and clear. Some specific details provided but may overlook key aspects or assumptions.
7–8 marks	Problem is well-articulated, specific, and logically structured. The scope and causes are accurately explained. Audience can easily understand the problem's nature.
9–10 marks	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
1–2 marks	No mention or awareness of existing or competing solutions. Assumes the problem is unsolved.
3–4 marks	Mentions a few competing solutions without depth or analysis. Does not evaluate how they perform or differ.
5–6 marks	Identifies some existing solutions and provides basic comparison, but analysis is shallow or missing key points.
7–8 marks	Provides clear overview of major existing or competing solutions. Explains strengths and weaknesses logically and identifies potential improvement areas.
9–10 marks	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
1–2 marks	Solution is unrelated or fails to address the defined problem. No clear connection between problem and solution.
3–4 marks	Solution partially addresses the problem but misses core aspects or practical considerations.
5–6 marks	Solution aligns with the problem and provides a workable concept but lacks complete feasibility or depth.
7–8 marks	Solution effectively tackles the identified problem with clear, logical reasoning and relevant methods or technology.
9–10 marks	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
1–2 marks	Solution lacks originality; fully replicates existing ideas or standard methods.
3–4 marks	Solution shows minor novelty but mostly replicates known approaches. Innovation is limited to superficial changes.
5–6 marks	Solution introduces a moderately new concept or unique feature but within familiar territory.
7–8 marks	Solution demonstrates clear innovation or creative thinking. Combines existing ideas in a novel and practical way.
9–10 marks	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
1–2 marks	No discussion or awareness of risks, flaws, or side effects.
3–4 marks	Acknowledges some potential issues but lacks mitigation or reasoning.
5–6 marks	Identifies key flaws and risks with some basic mitigation strategies.
7–8 marks	Thoroughly evaluates possible risks, side effects, and challenges, with clear mitigation plans.
9–10 marks	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
1–2 marks	UI is disorganized, cluttered, or confusing. UX is unintuitive; navigation unclear.
3–4 marks	Basic layout exists but lacks flow, consistency, or usability focus.
5–6 marks	Functional UI with moderate clarity and logic. Some usability concerns remain.
7–8 marks	Clean and intuitive design; layout supports logical navigation and user tasks. Thought given to accessibility and aesthetics.
9–10 marks	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
1–2 marks	UI/UX has no clear relation to the proposed solution or user flow.
3–4 marks	UI/UX partially reflects solution logic but misses alignment with key functions.
5–6 marks	UI/UX generally supports the solution but could better reflect workflow or user needs.
7–8 marks	UI/UX strongly complements the proposed solution. Elements and interactions align with user tasks and problem context.
9–10 marks	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
1–2 marks	Tools/libraries not mentioned or irrelevant to the problem.
3–4 marks	Mentions tools superficially without explaining their role or suitability.
5–6 marks	Selects mostly appropriate tools but lacks detailed justification or technical reasoning.
7–8 marks	Clearly identifies relevant and effective tools/libraries, with logical explanation of how they fit the solution.
9–10 marks	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
1–2 marks	No plan or understanding of how the solution could be built or maintained.
3–4 marks	Basic or unrealistic development idea; lacks deployment or sustainability consideration.
5–6 marks	Feasibility considered but incomplete (e.g., missing deployment pipeline or maintenance plan).
7–8 marks	Clear understanding of development flow, deployment approach, and maintenance requirements. Reasonable plan in place.
9–10 marks	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 競品分析 ，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)