

Algorithm - Copy.docx

Document

Ejemplo_Formato_Salida.docx

Document

Tablas_Decision_Ejemplo.docx

Document

Task: Strictly replicate the algorithm defined in the "Algorithm - Copy.docx" document to create: - Specific evaluation criteria - Complete decision tables - Standardized evaluation format file - Final auto-correction prompt Context: Next I will give you a specific question for you to run the algorithm from scratch, using exactly the examples of structure ("Ejemplo_Estructura.docx") and the decision table ("Tabla_Decision_Ejemplo.docx") as a guide strict to replicate format, logic and structure. To do this, you will wait for the question to give you, then we will execute the algorithm phase by phase to obtain it; 1) The evaluation criteria to be evaluated 2) A canvas/document with the decision tables and all its components (Formal Definition, Concepts Evaluated, Possible Scores, Concepts of the Problem and Note) for each defined evaluation criterion. 3) A canvas/document containing the output format (standardized response structure with at least 2 complete examples) 4) Evaluation prompt Mandatory rules: - Strictly follow the attached algorithm without external interpretations. - Use only the formats and logics of the "Ejemplo_Estructura.docx" and "Tabla_Decision_Ejemplo.docx" document as a clear and mandatory guide. Wait for the teacher's question to give you, and every time you deliver something, wait for the user's confirmation to move on to the next phase. Expected result: Delivery in an orderly manner: - Clear list of evaluation criteria. - Complete decision tables for each criterion. - File with the final evaluation structure. - Final prompt for automatic evaluation ready to use.

Reasoned about running the algorithm for a few seconds

Ready! I am waiting for the teacher's question to start the execution of the algorithm step by step, as indicated.

You said:

Question Control Surprise Marketing Context: Think of the product category "lottery scratches", which is a game that consists of a card with hidden areas and that the player must scratch to find out if he is a winner. Players can buy a scratch-off, either online or at a local lottery retailer, at different price points, think of one that costs CLP\$500. Question:

Briefly discuss the "value" of playing a lottery scratch card in terms of its benefits (functional and psychological) and costs (monetary and non-monetary).

He reasoned for 11 seconds

PHASE 1: CREATION OF ASSESSMENT CONCEPTS

Step 1: Receiving the General Question

The question to evaluate is:

"Briefly discuss the 'value' of playing a lottery scratch card in terms of its benefits (functional and psychological) and costs (monetary and non-monetary)."

Step 2: Break down into specific sub-questions and define criteria

1. **General concept: Value of the game for the player**
 - **Evaluation criteria:** Analyze the concept of value for the player.
 2. **General concept: Benefits for the player**
 - **Evaluation criteria:** Identify functional benefits for the player.
 - **Evaluation criteria:** Identify psychological benefits for the player.
 3. **General concept: Costs to the player**
 - **Evaluation criteria:** Identify monetary costs for the player.
 - **Evaluation criteria:** Identify non-monetary costs to the player.
-

List of Final Evaluation Criteria

1. Analyze the concept of value for the player.
 2. Identify functional benefits for the player.
 3. Identify psychological benefits for the player.
 4. Identify monetary costs to the player.
 5. Identify non-monetary costs to the player.
-

Note: Confirm if we can proceed to the next phase (Phase 2) for the creation of the Decision Tables.

You said:

Pauta_Docente.docx

Document

I confirm the evaluation criteria. Let's continue with phase 2. I also give you my guideline as a teacher in the "Pauta_Docente.docx" file so that you can create with the approach I want what comes in phase 2 of the algorithm

He reasoned for 26 seconds

PHASE 2: CREATION OF DECISION TABLES FOR THE EVALUATION (

Using the "Pauta_Docente.docx" as a basis and following the structure of the algorithm)

Step 3: Define the evaluation structure for each criterion

Below is the evaluation structure (six parts) for each of the five criteria identified in Phase 1.

1) Evaluation Criteria: Concept of Value for the Player

1. Evaluation Criteria

Concept of Value for the Player

2. Formal definitionAssesses whether the student explicitly defines the perceived value as "high" or "low" based on the relationship between the perceived benefits (functional and/or psychological) and the perceived costs (monetary and/or non-monetary).

3. Concepts evaluated

- **Positive (high) value:** The perceived benefits outweigh the perceived costs.
- **Negative or low value:** The perceived costs outweigh the perceived benefits.

4. Possible scores

0, 1 or 2 points.

5. Problem Concepts

- **"Benefit-Cost Ratio"** for Value: This refers to whether the student explicitly compares the benefits (functional and/or psychological) with the costs

(monetary and/or non-monetary), going so far as to qualify the value as "high", "low" or equivalent synonyms.

6. Note

- The definition of value should be focused on the **player's perspective**, not on the company.

2) Evaluation Criteria: Functional Benefits for the Player

1. Evaluation Criteria

Functional benefits for the player

2. Formal definition

These are those tangible or practical elements that add value to the player. According to the "Pauta_Docente," these include:

- **Accessibility** (availability of purchase, variety of points of sale, low cost that facilitates acquisition).
- **Instantaneity** (knowing the result immediately).
- **Variety of games** (scratches with different prices and themes).
- **Chance to win** (even if the probability is low, there is still a chance of getting a prize).

3. Concepts evaluated

- **Accessibility**
- **Instantaneity**
- **Variety of games**
- **Chance to Win**

4. Possible scores

0, 1 or 2 points.

5. Problem Concepts

- **"Player Context" for Functional Benefits:** Refers to how a functional benefit (accessibility, instantaneity, variety, chance to win) affects the player's actual experience (e.g., ease of purchase, speed of use, impact on their purchase decision).

6. Note

- They should focus on the experience and convenience for the player, **not** on advantages for the company or third parties.

3) Evaluation Criteria: Psychological Benefits for the Player

1. Evaluation criteria

Psychological benefits for the player

2. Formal definition

These are those emotional or mental aspects that generate value for the player. Following the "Pauta_Docente", they can manifest as:

- **Entertainment** (excitement, expectation, fun).
- **Sense of accomplishment or competition** (adrenaline, personal success).
- **Social inclusion** (sharing with others, feeling part of a group).

3. Concepts evaluated

- **Entertainment**
- **Sense of accomplishment or competence**
- **Social inclusion**

4. Possible scores

0, 1 or 2 points.

5. Problem Concepts

- **"Player Context" for Psychological Benefits:** Refers to how the psychological benefit impacts the player's emotional experience (motivation, satisfaction, sense of accomplishment, social connection, etc.).

6. Note

- It must be focused on the player's **psychological experience**; any other factor unrelated to the player's emotional experience is excluded.

4) Evaluation Criteria: Monetary Costs to the Player

1. Evaluation Criteria

Monetary Costs for the Player

2. **Formal definition** This refers to the price paid by the player to participate in the game (example: CLP\$500). It includes the perception of whether the cost is high or low, according to the "Pauta_Docente."

3. Concepts evaluated

- **Purchase price** (e.g., CLP\$500).
- **Perceived cost** (how justified the player sees that expense).

4. Possible scores 0 or 2 points.

(There is no score of 1 on this criterion, according to the logic shown in the examples.)

5. Problem Concepts

- A partial justification does not apply (there is no additional "concept of the problem" for an intermediate score).

6. Note

- If the monetary cost is described incorrectly (e.g. company production costs instead of what the player pays), 0 points are assumed.

5) Evaluation Criteria: Non-Monetary Costs to the Player

1. Evaluation Criteria

Non-Monetary Costs to the Player

2. **Formal definition** These are costs that the player assumes without paying money, but that affect his experience or purchase decision. According to the "Pauta_Docente", it can be:

- **Time** (in buying, scraping or searching for the product).
- **Risk of addiction** (ease of falling into compulsive gambling habits).
- **Emotional impact** (frustration at not winning, etc.).

3. Concepts evaluated

- **Time**

- **Risk of addiction**
 - **Emotional impact (frustration, disappointment, etc.)**
4. **Possible scores**
0, 1 or 2 points.
5. **Problem Concepts**
- **"Player Context" for Non-Monetary Costs:** Refers to how these costs (time, risk of addiction, emotional impact) affect the player's motivation, satisfaction, and continuity of play.
6. **Note**
- It should focus on the player (e.g., **their** time, **their** risk of addiction, **their** potential disappointment). It does not apply costs of the company or third parties.

Step 4: Create the decision table for each evaluation criterion

Next, the **Decision Tables** ("Hash" type) are presented where each criterion is broken down into steps (Yes/No binary questions). If the answer is negative at a key point, a score is assigned and/or the evaluation of the criterion is stopped. If it is affirmative, continue until the questions are exhausted.

Decision Table for the Concept of Value

Step	Evaluation question	Action	Result
1	Is the term "value" or synonyms (e.g., "perceived value," "valuable," "valued") explicitly mentioned?	<p>- Do not → Award 0 points and stop the evaluation for Valor. (Does not relate the scratch to the notion of value for the player)</p> <p>- Yes → Continue to Step 2.</p>	0 points / Go to Step 2
2	Is the idea of benefits (functional/psychological) explicitly	- Do not → Award 0 points and stop the evaluation for Valor. (Does not establish the benefit-cost ratio)	0 points / Go to Step 3

Step	Evaluation question	Action	Result
	connected to costs (monetary/non-monetary)?	- Yes → Continue to Step 3.	
3	Is the answer to the 'Value' evaluation criterion coherent, without significant contradictions or ambiguities?	- Do not → Assign 1 point and stop the evaluation for Value. (Value and the benefit-cost ratio are mentioned, but in a confusing/contradictory way)	1 point / Go to Step 4
		- Yes → Continue to Step 4.	
4	Is it indicated whether the value is "high" or "low" (or equivalent) when comparing benefits and costs?	- Do not → Award 1 point and stop the evaluation for Value. (It mentions value and its benefit-cost ratio, but does not rate it as high or low.)	1 stitch / 2 stitches
		- Yes → Award 2 points .	

Decision Table for Functional Benefits

Step	Evaluation question	Action	Result
1	Is at least one functional benefit (accessibility, instantaneity, variety of games, chance to win, or other equivalent) explicitly mentioned for the player?	- Do not → Assign 0 points and stop the evaluation for Functional Benefits. (No clear reference is made to any player-centered practical/tangible benefits.)	0 points / Go to Step 2
		- Yes → Continue to Step 2.	
2	Does the mentioned functional benefit really focus on the player experience (not on the company or other external factors)?	- Do not → Assign 0 points and stop the evaluation for Functional Benefits. (For example, if the focus is on the company's profit, it would not be a functional benefit for the player.)	0 points / Go to Step 3
		- Yes → Continue to Step 3.	

Step	Evaluation question	Action	Result
3	Is the answer to the evaluation criterion 'Functional Benefits' coherent, without significant contradictions or ambiguities?	<p>- Do not → Assign 1 point and stop the evaluation for Functional Benefits. (It mentions some benefit, but it is ambiguous or contradictory).</p> <p>- Yes → Continue to Step 4.</p>	1 point / Go to Step 4
4	Is it indicated or explained why the functional benefit is relevant in the player's context (ease of purchase, speed of use, impact on the purchase decision, etc.)?	<p>- Do not → Assign 1 point and stop the evaluation for Functional Benefits. (The benefit is mentioned, but its relevance to the player is not delved into.)</p> <p>- Yes → Assign 2 points.</p>	1 stitch / 2 stitches

Decision Table for Psychological Benefits

Step	Evaluation question	Action	Result
1	Is at least one psychological benefit explicitly mentioned (entertainment, sense of accomplishment, social inclusion, excitement, expectation, or other)?	<p>- Do not → Assign 0 points and stop the evaluation for Psychological Benefits. (No reference is made to any emotional or mental benefit to the player.)</p> <p>- Yes → Continue to Step 2.</p>	0 points / Go to Step 2
2	Does the psychological benefit mentioned focus on the player's emotional experience (not on the company or other external factors)?	<p>- Do not → Assign 0 points and stop the evaluation for Psychological Benefits. (If you're talking about brand benefits, it's not a psychological benefit for the player.)</p> <p>- Yes → Continue to Step 3.</p>	0 points / Go to Step 3

Step	Evaluation question	Action	Result
3	Is the answer to the 'Psychological Benefits' criterion coherent, without major contradictions or ambiguities?	<p>- Do not → Assign 1 point and stop the evaluation for Psychological Benefits. (There is mention of a psychological benefit, but the explanation is confusing or contradictory.)</p> <p>- Yes → Continue to Step 4.</p>	1 point / Go to Step 4
4	Is the reason why this psychological benefit is relevant in the player's context (how it influences their perception or experience of play, motivation, satisfaction, etc.) indicated or explained?	<p>- Do not → Assign 1 point and stop the evaluation for Psychological Benefits. (The benefit is mentioned, but its relevance to the player is not clarified.)</p> <p>- Yes → Assign 2 points.</p>	1 stitch / 2 stitches

Decision Table for Monetary Costs

Step	Evaluation question	Action	Result
1	Is the monetary cost paid by the player explicitly mentioned (e.g., CLP\$500, "low cost", "reduced price")?	<p>- No → Award 0 points and stop the evaluation for Monetary Costs. (Actual spend to the player is not recognized.)</p> <p>- Yes → Continue to Step 2.</p>	0 points / Go to Step 2
2	Are costs outside the player's control (e.g., company production costs, logistical costs) mentioned as if they were the player's monetary costs?	<p>- Yes → Award 0 points and stop the evaluation for Monetary Costs. (Confuses the costs of the company with those of the player)</p> <p>- Do not → Continue to Step 3.</p>	0 points / Go to Step 3

Step	Evaluation question	Action	Result
		- Do not → Assign 0 points and stop the evaluation for Monetary Costs.	
3	Is the answer about the monetary cost coherent, without contradictions (for example, it does not say at the beginning that it is "very high" and then "negligible" without explanation)?	(There is a mention, but it is contradictory and does not allow a clear interpretation). - Yes → Assign 2 points (correct mention without contradictions or major confusions).	0 points / 2 points

Note: The "Pauta_Docente" indicates that 2 points are awarded when the monetary cost is correctly described and relates to the player experience. The table here simplifies the binary logic for assigning 0 or 2.

Decision Table for Non-Cash Costs

Step	Evaluation question	Action	Result
1	Is at least one non-monetary cost (time, risk of addiction, emotional impact, etc.) explicitly mentioned that affects the player?	- Do not → Assign 0 points and stop the evaluation for Non-Monetary Costs. (No clear reference is made to any non-monetary costs.) - Yes → Continue to Step 2.	0 points / Go to Step 2
2	Is the non-monetary cost mentioned focused on the player's experience (their personal time, their frustration, their risk of addiction) and not on costs external to the company or other entities?	- Do not → Assign 1 point and stop the evaluation for Non-Monetary Costs. (It was confused with a cost external to the company or a factor that does not fall on the player). - Yes → Continue to Step 3.	1 point / Go to Step 3
3	Is the answer on 'Non-Monetary Costs' coherent, without major contradictions or ambiguities?	- Do not → Assign 1 point and stop the evaluation for Non-Monetary Costs. (The point is mentioned, but the explanation is confusing or	1 point / Go to Step 4

Step	Evaluation question	Action	Result
		contradictory.)	
		- Yes → Continue to Step 4.	
		- Do not → Assign 1 point and stop the evaluation for Non-Monetary Costs. (The non-monetary cost is mentioned, but its relevance to the player is not justified.)	1 stitch / 2 stitches
4	Is it indicated or explained why that non-monetary cost is relevant in the player's context (time, risk of addiction, frustration, etc.) and how it affects their experience or purchase decision?	- Yes → Assign 2 points (mention and clear explanation of its impact on the player).	

Ready! These are the evaluation structures and their complete decision tables (Phase 2, Step 3 and Step 4) for each of the defined criteria. Please confirm if we can advance to **Phase 3** for the development of the **standardized output format**.

You said:

I think it is good to move forward with Phase 3. Continues

He reasoned for 15 seconds

PHASE 3: DEFINING THE OUTPUT FORMAT

Below is the document called "**Ejemplo_Formato_Salida**", which contains the **standardized structure of response** and **two uniform examples** (Phase 3, steps 5 and 6).

Standardized response structure

For **each evaluation criterion** , the following are included:

1. **Criterion evaluated:** Name of the criterion.
2. **Score:** Score assigned to the criterion (based on the decision table).
3. **Observation:** Brief description of what the student mentioned about this criterion.
4. **Justification:** Explanation based on the decision table and the teacher's guideline.

Then, it ends with:

- **Final Score:** The sum of the partial scores of all the criteria.
 - **Final Comments:** Overall feedback for the student on their performance, indicating strengths and areas for improvement.
-

Example 1

1. Perceived Value (2 points)

- **Score:** 2/2
- **Note:** The student explicitly mentions that the benefits (entertainment, opportunity to earn) outweigh the costs (price and time), rating the value as "high."
- **Justification:**
 - According to the decision table, 2 points are awarded when the student mentions the notion of value, connects benefits and costs, and rates the value as high or low. The student clearly indicates that the player perceives a high value for the low cost and excitement of scratching, which coincides with the definition of "positive value".

2. Functional Benefits (2 points)

- **Score:** 1/2
- **Note:** Accessibility (lots of outlets and easy shopping) is mentioned as a functional benefit, but no elaboration is made on why this is relevant to the player.
- **Justification:**
 - To obtain 2 points, the decision table requires the student to explain the relevance in the context of the player. Accessibility is mentioned here but does not detail why it directly helps the player (e.g., if it facilitates the purchase or encourages the decision to participate). For this reason, only 1 point is awarded.

3. Psychological Benefits (2 points)

- **Score:** 2/2
- **Note:** Mention the "thrill of winning" and expectation, connecting it to entertainment and the player's sense of accomplishment.

- **Justification:**
 - According to the table, for 2 points the student must refer to the psychological benefit (e.g., entertainment) and explain why it is relevant. Here we detail how the illusion of winning brings motivation and excitement, positively affecting the player's experience.

4. Monetary Costs (2 points)

- **Score:** 2/2
- **Note:** The student mentions that the cost of CLP\$500 is "low" for the player and considers it a minimal investment in relation to the fun he gets.
- **Justification:**
 - According to the table, to obtain 2 points in monetary costs, the real price (CLP\$500) must be mentioned and not confused with production or logistics costs of the company. In addition, the answer is coherent and without contradictions, so you receive 2/2.

5. Non-Monetary Costs (2 points)

- **Score:** 0/2
- **Note:** The student does not mention either the time invested to buy the scratch or the possibility of frustration at not winning or the risk of addiction.
- **Justification:**
 - The decision table indicates 0 points if no non-monetary costs are referenced. In this case, there is no mention of time, frustration or any other factor, therefore 0 points are assigned.

Final Score: 2 (Value) + 1 (Functional) + 2 (Psychological) + 2 (Monetary) + 0 (Non-Monetary) = **7/10**

Final Comments: You have managed to clearly highlight the perception of (high) value and several benefits, both functional and psychological. However, non-monetary costs, such as time spent or the potential risk of addiction, were not addressed. In future responses, remember to explain how these costs can affect the player experience.

Example 2

1. Perceived Value (2 points)

- **Score:** 1/2
- **Note:** The student mentions the word "value" and partially relates some benefits and costs, but does not determine whether the value is high or low.
- **Justification:**
 - 2 points would be awarded if you clearly define value as "high" or "low". Here, the mention is ambiguous, without qualifying the final value. Therefore, they are left with 1 point.

2. Functional Benefits (2 points)

- **Score:** 2/2
- **Note:** Mention "instantaneity" (immediately knowing the outcome) and the "chance to win" a prize, explaining how that appeals to the player looking for quick gratification.
- **Justification:**
 - For 2 points, the table demands at least one functional benefit and the explanation of its relevance to the player experience. The student details the motivation to have an immediate outcome and the excitement of the potential gain.

3. Psychological Benefits (2 points)

- **Score:** 0/2
- **Observation:** The student does not describe any emotional aspect, such as entertainment or personal achievement, but limits himself to talking about functionalities and economic results.
- **Justification:**
 - The table indicates 0 points if no psychological benefit of the player is mentioned. There is no mention of fun, emotional expectation, or social connection, so no scoring is appropriate.

4. Monetary Costs (2 points)

- **Score:** 0/2

- **Note:** The student focuses on the production and logistics costs of the company, not to mention the actual price paid by the player (CLP\$500).
- **Justification:**
 - According to the table, if you confuse company costs with the monetary cost to the player, 0 points are awarded. Here, what the buyer pays was not properly addressed, so 0 points are assigned.

5. Non-Monetary Costs (2 points)

- **Score:** 2/2
- **Note:** The student explains that "the time of purchase" and "the possible frustration of not winning" can influence the player's decision.
- **Justification:**
 - For 2 points, you need to mention some non-monetary cost (e.g., time or frustration) and explain how it affects the experience. Here it is done correctly by detailing how the player may feel frustration and how to invest time in the purchase.

Final Score: 1 (Value) + 2 (Functional) + 0 (Psychological) + 0 (Monetary) + 2 (Non-Monetary) = **5/10**

Final Comments: You have identified some clear functional benefits and have adequately described the non-monetary costs to the player. However, it failed to mention and qualify the perceived value as "high" or "low," explain the psychological benefits, and describe the monetary cost borne by the player (rather than the costs of the enterprise). In future opportunities, relate these aspects in greater depth to show a complete analysis.

This concludes Phase 3! This Ejemplo_Formato_Salida document shows the standardized response structure and two complete application examples.

Please confirm if we can advance to **Phase 4**, where the **Evaluation Prompt will be created**.

You said:

Excellent. Let's do phase 4

He reasoned for a few seconds

PHASE 4: CREATION OF THE EVALUATION PROMPT

Below is the **Evaluation Prompt** that the AI must rigorously follow to correct student answers. It is composed of 6 mandatory components:

1) Evaluation Context

Evaluation Context:

Evaluate the student's answer to the following question:

"Briefly analyze the 'value' of playing a lottery scratch card in terms of its benefits (functional and psychological) and costs (monetary and non-monetary)."

There are five evaluation criteria and are derived from the question:

1. Analyze the **Concept of Value** for the player.
 2. Identify **Functional Benefits** for the player.
 3. Identify **Psychological Benefits** for the player.
 4. Identify **Monetary Costs** to the player.
 5. Identify **Non-Monetary Costs** to the Player.
-

2) Primary Rules of Correction

Primary Correction Rules:

- Use **only** the **Decision Tables** defined in the "**Tablas_Decision_Ejemplo.docx**" document (or the file containing such tables) to assign scores on each evaluation criterion.
 - It follows **exactly** the binary logic "Yes/No" of each table to determine the corresponding score.
 - If the table indicates that 0 points are assigned to a certain answer, do not interpret or justify outside of what is indicated therein. In the same way, if the table indicates 2 points, assign them according to their structure.
-

3) Secondary Rules of Correction

Secondary Correction Rules:

- Justifications should be based exclusively on the **criteria** and **definitions** provided, without adding external interpretations or expanding criteria not included.
 - If the student **does not mention** a criterion, directly assign **0 points** in that section and briefly explain its absence.
 - Don't subdivide scores beyond what the table indicates. For example, for Monetary Costs, only 0 or 2 points are contemplated.
-

4) Exclusion of unwanted Evaluation Criteria

Exclusion of Criteria:

- **It ignores** aspects such as spelling, grammar, depth of analysis, relevance or style.
 - Do not consider information outside the 5 criteria indicated (e.g. do not correct if it talks about the company's marketing, legal aspects, etc.) unless that information relates to the criteria of the Decision Tables.
 - Do not interpret beyond what the tables and the Teacher's Guideline indicate.
-

5) Evaluation Format

Evaluation Format:

- When submitting the correction, use the **standardized format** shown in "**Ejemplo_Formato_Salida.docx**."
 1. **Criteria evaluated**
 2. **Score** (e.g. "1/2 points", "2/2 points", "0/2", as appropriate to the criterion)
 3. **Observation** (what the student mentioned)
 4. **Justification** (explanation aligned with the decision table)
 - After evaluating **all** the criteria, it presents:
 - **Final Score**: total sum.
 - **Final Comments**: brief global feedback.
-

6) Tuning Hyperparameters

Adjust Hyperparameters:

- Once the student provides their answer, they apply this same evaluation logic and these same tables to grade it.
- Set the hyperparameters for the fix as follows:

JSON

CopyEdit

```
{"temperature": 0.1, "frequency_penalty": 0.0, "presence_penalty": -1.0}
```

- **Wait for** the student's answers to evaluate and **do not** alter these hyperparameters.

This "Assessment Prompt" is ready to use: when the student's response is received, the AI must **strictly** follow these components to assign the score and deliver the feedback.

1) EVALUATION CRITERION: VALUE

1.1 Formal Definition

It is evaluated whether the toothpaste with “CaryBloc” provides or generates value for the market and/or the consumer. In this case, the value considered is related to the prevention and elimination of cavities, accessibility, and any other advantage that makes it relevant to the target audience. The student is expected to identify why this innovation is valuable in addressing the need to stop or avoid cavities, which affect 3.5 billion people worldwide.

1.2 Concepts Evaluated

- **Contribution to the market and the consumer:** The ability of “CaryBloc” to offer a functional benefit in cavity prevention.
- **Solution to a widespread health problem:** It provides a benefit related to an issue that affects a large portion of the population.
- **Perception of greater effectiveness:** Compared to other toothpastes, the incorporated medication may represent an advance in the prevention and treatment of cavities.

1.3 Possible Scores

0, 1, 2, or 3 points (a maximum of 3).

1.4 Problem Concepts

Definition of “Relevance of Value” for the consumer: Refers to how the toothpaste with “CaryBloc” is perceived as a significant solution. It implies that the innovation addresses a real need and improves the consumer experience (for example, reducing dental treatment costs, ensuring more effective prevention, etc.).

1.5 Note

To award the maximum score, it is necessary for the student to connect the need to prevent cavities (the magnitude of the problem) with the value provided by “CaryBloc” as a resource capable of reducing, intercepting, or eliminating cavities in an accessible way.

1.6 Decision Table for Value

Step	Evaluation Question	Action	Result
1	Does it explicitly mention that “CaryBloc” (or its effects) provides a relevant benefit to the consumer or the market, in terms of cavity prevention/treatment?	No → Award 0 points and stop the Value evaluation.(No relationship is established between “CaryBloc” and a real benefit or the cavity problem) Yes → Continue to Step 2.	0 points or Go to Step 2
2	Is it explained (even briefly) why this benefit is valuable, considering the magnitude of the cavity problem or other positive implications for the consumer?	No → Award 1 point and stop the Value evaluation.(“ CaryBloc” is recognized as a resource, but its relevance or the need for cavity prevention is not clearly justified) Yes → Continue to Step 3.	1 point or Go to Step 3
3	Is the answer coherent, with no contradictions, and does it explicitly allude to the importance of “CaryBloc” given the high incidence of cavities (3.5 billion people)?	No → Award 2 points and stop the Value evaluation.(The value of “CaryBloc” is mentioned, but there are ambiguities or partial	2 points or Go to Step 4

Step	Evaluation Question	Action	Result
		contradictions) Yes → Continue to Step 4.	
4	Is it clearly concluded or inferred that the “CaryBloc” resource provides a value advantage (for example, reducing treatment costs, offering a far-reaching solution, etc.)?	No → Award 2 points and stop the Value evaluation.(It mentions the value but does not clarify what the specific advantage or benefit is) Yes → Award 3 points (Value fully demonstrated).	2 points or 3 points

2) EVALUATION CRITERION: RARITY

2.1 Formal Definition

It evaluates whether the innovation (toothpaste that incorporates “CaryBloc”) is unique or uncommon in the market, i.e., if there are other similar alternatives or if the resource is so differentiated that it is rare to find among competitors.

2.2 Concepts Evaluated

- **Availability of the formula on the market:** Whether including a medication that halts the progression of cavities is uncommon.
- **Exclusivity:** Whether the student mentions that there are no similar products today or that replicating the formula would require time and research development.
- **Clear differentiation:** Whether the product can be easily distinguished from other pharmaceutical or cosmetic toothpastes.

2.3 Possible Scores

0, 1, 2, or 3 points.

2.4 Problem Concepts

Definition of “Market Rarity”: Related to the exclusivity or scarcity of the “CaryBloc” resource. It means that it is not easily found in other competitors, and therefore it is a distinctive feature.

2.5 Note

To obtain the highest score, the answer must clearly indicate that “CaryBloc” is not only an uncommon attribute but also that the average competitor would not have an identical technology in the short term.

2.6 Decision Table for Rarity

Step	Evaluation Question	Action	Result
1	Does it mention that the “CaryBloc” formula is not present in conventional toothpastes or that it is a differentiated resource?	No → Award 0 points and stop the Rarity evaluation.(The innovation’s rarity is not established) Yes → Continue to Step 2.	0 points or Go to Step 2
2	Is it argued or hinted that replicating “CaryBloc” (or its effect) is not something competitors can quickly adopt (for example, due to patents, development, costs, etc.)?	No → Award 1 point and stop the Rarity evaluation.(Its differentiation is mentioned, but there is no reference to the difficulty of replicating it) Yes → Continue to Step 3.	1 point or Go to Step 3
3	Does the answer remain coherent and imply that the student understands that this is a scarce resource in the current market?	No → Award 2 points and stop the Rarity evaluation.(Rarity is mentioned, but there are ambiguities/contradictions) Yes → Continue to Step 4.	2 points or Go to Step 4
4	Is it clearly stated that this rarity provides a real differentiating factor compared to other pharmaceutical toothpastes? (e.g., “No one else offers ‘CaryBloc’ these days.”)	No → Award 2 points and stop the Rarity evaluation.(The rare factor is acknowledged, but it is not stated that it constitutes a significant competitive advantage) Yes → Award 3 points (Rarity fully demonstrated).	2 points or 3 points

3) EVALUATION CRITERION: INIMITABILITY

3.1 Formal Definition

It verifies whether the inclusion of “CaryBloc” is difficult for competitors to imitate. It analyzes the existence of patents, R&D investment, development complexity, clinical trials, etc. If these barriers are sufficiently strong in the short/medium term, it is considered inimitable.

3.2 Concepts Evaluated

- **Patent (U.S.) and clinical trials:** Indicates protection and complexity for others.
- **Time or cost barriers to replication:** Developing a similar resource would require significant investment and scientific validation.
- **Possibility of the resource being copied in the long term:** Recognition that in the future, the patent may expire, or a substitute may be found.

3.3 Possible Scores

0, 1, 2, or 3 points.

3.4 Problem Concepts

Definition of “Difficulty of Imitation”: Focuses on competitors’ ability to reproduce the “CaryBloc” formula. It involves legal aspects (patents), technical aspects (clinical research), and time-related factors (how quickly it could be copied).

3.5 Note

It is sufficient for the student to identify that the patent and clinical trials make imitation difficult in the short/medium term, even if they acknowledge the possibility of future imitation.

3.6 Decision Table for Inimitability

Step	Evaluation Question	Action	Result
1	Does it mention the existence of barriers (such as patents, clinical trials, or others) that make “CaryBloc” difficult to imitate?	No → Award 0 points and stop the Inimitability evaluation.(No factor is mentioned to prevent copying) Yes → Continue to Step 2.	0 points or Go to Step 2
2	Is it explicitly stated that these barriers operate at least in the short	No → Award 1 point and stop the Inimitability evaluation.(The patent or	1 point or

Step	Evaluation Question	Action	Result
	or medium term, making it difficult for competitors to replicate “CaryBloc”?	barrier is mentioned, but its temporal effect is not explained) Yes → Continue to Step 3.	Go to Step 3
3	Is the answer coherent, with no contradictions, recognizing that in the long term copies could emerge but there is still a significant advantage in the meantime?	No → Award 2 points and stop the Inimitability evaluation.(There is a mention of difficult imitation, but with inconsistencies or without clarifying the current advantage) Yes → Continue to Step 4.	2 points or Go to Step 4
4	Is it emphasized that the patent, along with clinical validations, complicates copying and provides clear competitive protection?	No → Award 2 points and stop the Inimitability evaluation.(It is mentioned that imitation is difficult, but the strength of the protection is not highlighted) Yes → Award 3 points (Inimitability demonstrated).	2 points or 3 points

4) EVALUATION CRITERION: ORGANIZATION

4.1 Formal Definition

It analyzes whether the company (or NovaAndes University in collaboration with a partner) has the resources and organizational structure necessary to take advantage of the competitive advantage provided by “CaryBloc.” This includes production capacity, distribution, marketing, and any factor that enables the “capture” of value from this innovation.

4.2 Concepts Evaluated

- **Ability to implement the resource:** That it does not require expensive equipment or technical complications.
- **Low production cost and commercial feasibility:** Fosters the widespread availability of the toothpaste and facilitates marketing.
- **Alignment with the value chain:** The organization is prepared to distribute and promote the product in the market.

4.3 Possible Scores

0, 1, 2, or 3 points.

4.4 Problem Concepts

Definition of “Organizational Structure”: Refers to the arrangement of NovaAndes University or associated companies to develop, launch, and sustain production of the “CaryBloc” toothpaste (patents, partnerships, sales channels, etc.).

4.5 Note

For the maximum score, the answer must clearly show that the company/entity is positioned to exploit the resource (for example, “no complex techniques are required” and “the cost is low”), which demonstrates an organization that sustains the competitive advantage.

4.6 Decision Table for Organization

Step	Evaluation Question	Action	Result
1	Is there mention of infrastructure or an organization that allows leveraging “CaryBloc” (e.g., does not require complex equipment, commercial cost is low, etc.)?	No → Award 0 points and stop the Organization evaluation.(Nothing is mentioned about the company’s ability to exploit the resource) Yes → Continue to Step 2.	0 points or Go to Step 2
2	Is it recognized that this organizational capacity (ease of use/production) facilitates getting the toothpaste to the market?	No → Award 1 point and stop the Organization evaluation.(Something about the infrastructure is mentioned, but it does not clarify the ease of reaching the market) Yes → Continue to Step 3.	1 point or Go to Step 3
3	Is the answer coherent and does it refer to the coordination of resources and strategies necessary to market the “CaryBloc” toothpaste without contradicting itself?	No → Award 2 points and stop the Organization evaluation.(Infrastructure is mentioned, but with inconsistencies or contradictions) Yes → Continue to Step 4.	2 points or Go to Step 4

Step	Evaluation Question	Action	Result
4	Is it emphasized that the organization (or the university) is truly ready to extract and sustain the competitive advantage (e.g., feasible large-scale launch, affordable cost, etc.)?	No → Award 2 points and stop the Organization evaluation.(There is no sufficient data to ensure full exploitation) Yes → Award 3 points (Organization fully demonstrated).	2 points or 3 points

o1

You said:

Algoritmo_Ejemplo_1.docx

Document

Fantastic. I need you to replicate a faithful and consistent translation as you did now but with another document. You must be faithful to what it says without adding or removing elements. You must translate it into English as it is and be consistent in how the terms are named

ChatGPT Plus

Reasoned on faithful and consistent translation for 1m 15s

Below is a faithful, word-for-word translation of the provided document

“Algoritmo_Ejemplo_1.docx,” preserving its structure, headings, and terminology exactly as in the original Spanish text, now rendered in English. No elements have been added or removed.

Algorithm - Copy.docx

Document

Ejemplo_Formato_Salida.docx

Document

Tablas_Decision_Ejemplo.docx

Document

Task: Strictly replicate the algorithm defined in the document "Algoritmo - Copy.docx" to create:

- Specific evaluation criteria
- Complete decision tables
- A standardized evaluation format file
- A final automatic correction prompt

Context: Below I will give you a specific question so that you may execute the algorithm from scratch, using exactly the structural examples ("Ejemplo_Estructura.docx") and the decision table ("Tabla_Decision_Ejemplo.docx") as a strict guide to replicate format, logic, and structure. For this, you will wait for me to provide the question; then we will proceed phase by phase through the algorithm to obtain:

1. The evaluation criteria to be assessed
2. A template/document with the decision tables and all their components (Formal Definition, Concepts Evaluated, Possible Scores, Problem Concepts, and Note) for each defined evaluation criterion
3. A template/document containing the final output format (standardized response structure with at least two complete examples)
4. A final automatic correction prompt

Mandatory Rules:

- Strictly follow the attached algorithm without external interpretations.
- Use only the formats and logics from the document "Ejemplo_Estructura.docx" and "Tabla_Decision_Ejemplo.docx" as a clear and mandatory guide.
- Wait for the teacher's question, and each time you deliver something, wait for the user's confirmation before moving on to the next phase.

Expected Result: Deliver in an orderly manner:

- A clear list of evaluation criteria.
- Complete decision tables for each criterion.
- A file with the final evaluation structure.
- A final prompt for automatic evaluation, ready to use.

Thinking about the execution of the algorithm for a few seconds

Ready! I am awaiting the teacher's question to begin executing the algorithm step by step, just as indicated.

You said:

Surprise Control Question — Marketing Context Think about the product category “lottery scratch cards,” which is a game consisting of a card with hidden areas that the player must scratch off to find out if there is a prize. Players can purchase a “scratch card” either online or at a local lottery retailer; they come in different prices—imagine one that costs CLP\$500.

Question: Briefly analyze the “value” of playing a lottery scratch card in terms of its benefits (functional and psychological) and its costs (monetary and nonmonetary).

Thought process took 11 seconds

PHASE 1: CREATION OF EVALUATION CONCEPTS

Step 1: Receiving the general question

The question to be evaluated is:

“Briefly analyze the ‘value’ of playing a lottery scratch card in terms of its benefits (functional and psychological) and costs (monetary and nonmonetary).”

Step 2: Breaking it down into concrete subquestions and defining criteria

General concept: Value of the game for the player

Evaluation criterion: Analyze the concept of value for the player.

General concept: Benefits for the player

Evaluation criterion: Identify functional benefits for the player. Evaluation criterion: Identify psychological benefits for the player.

General concept: Costs for the player

Evaluation criterion: Identify monetary costs for the player. Evaluation criterion: Identify nonmonetary costs for the player.

Final List of Evaluation Criteria

- Analyze the concept of value for the player.
- Identify functional benefits for the player.
- Identify psychological benefits for the player.
- Identify monetary costs for the player.
- Identify nonmonetary costs for the player.

Note: Confirm if we can proceed to the next phase (Phase 2) to create the Decision Tables.

You said:

Pauta_Docente.docx

Document

I confirm the evaluation criteria. Let's continue with Phase 2. I am also giving you my teacher's guideline in the file "Pauta_Docente.docx" so that you can create what's coming in Phase 2 of the algorithm with the approach I want.

Thought process took 26 seconds

PHASE 2: CREATION OF DECISION TABLES FOR EVALUATION

(Using as a basis the "Pauta_Docente.docx" and following the structure of the algorithm)

Step 3: Define the evaluation structure for each criterion

Below is the evaluation structure (six parts) for each of the five criteria identified in Phase 1.

1. **Evaluation Criterion:** Concept of Value for the player

Evaluation Criterion Concept of Value for the player

Formal Definition Evaluates whether the student explicitly defines perceived value as "high" or "low" based on the relationship between perceived benefits (functional and/or psychological) and perceived costs (monetary and/or nonmonetary).

Concepts Evaluated

- Positive (high) value: Perceived benefits exceed perceived costs.

- Negative or low value: Perceived costs exceed perceived benefits.

Possible Scores0, 1, or 2 points.

Problem Concepts

“Benefit-Cost Relationship” for Value: This refers to whether the student explicitly compares the benefits (functional and/or psychological) with the costs (monetary and/or nonmonetary), arriving at a rating of “high,” “low,” or equivalent synonyms.

NoteThe definition of value must be centered on the player’s perspective, not on the company.

2. Evaluation Criterion: Functional Benefits for the player

Evaluation CriterionFunctional Benefits for the player

Formal DefinitionThese are the tangible or practical elements that bring value to the player. According to “Pauta_Docente,” these include:

- Accessibility (availability of purchase, variety of points of sale, low cost that facilitates acquisition).
- Instantaneity (finding out the result immediately).
- Variety of games (scratch cards with different prices and themes).
- Opportunity to win (even though the probability may be low, there is still a chance of getting a prize).

Concepts Evaluated

- Accessibility
- Instantaneity
- Variety of games
- Opportunity to win

Possible Scores0, 1, or 2 points.

Problem Concepts

“Player Context” for Functional Benefits: Refers to how a functional benefit (accessibility, instantaneity, variety, opportunity to win) influences the real experience of the player (for example, ease of purchase, speed of use, impact on the purchase decision).

Note They must focus on the player's experience and convenience, not on advantages for the company or third parties.

3. **Evaluation Criterion:** Psychological Benefits for the player

Evaluation Criterion Psychological Benefits for the player

Formal Definition These are the emotional or mental aspects that generate value for the player. According to "Pauta_Docente," they may be:

- Entertainment (excitement, anticipation, fun).
- Sense of achievement or competence (adrenaline, personal success).
- Social inclusion (sharing with others, feeling part of a group).

Concepts Evaluated

- Entertainment
- Sense of achievement or competence
- Social inclusion

Possible Scores 0, 1, or 2 points.

Problem Concepts

"Player Context" for Psychological Benefits: Refers to how the psychological benefit impacts the player's emotional experience (motivation, satisfaction, sense of achievement, social connection, etc.).

Note It must be centered on the player's psychological experience; any other factor not related to their emotional experience is excluded.

4. **Evaluation Criterion:** Monetary Costs for the player

Evaluation Criterion Monetary Costs for the player

Formal Definition Refers to the price the player pays to participate in the game (e.g., CLP\$500). It includes the perception of whether this cost is high or low, in accordance with "Pauta_Docente."

Concepts Evaluated

- Purchase price (for example, CLP\$500).
- Perceived cost (how justified the player sees this expense).

Possible Scores0 or 2 points.

(There is no score of 1 in this criterion, according to the logic shown in the examples.)

Problem ConceptsNo partial justification applies (no additional “problem concept” for an intermediate score).

NoteIf the monetary cost is described incorrectly (for example, production costs of the company instead of what the player pays), 0 points are assumed.

5. Evaluation Criterion: Nonmonetary Costs for the player

Evaluation CriterionNonmonetary Costs for the player

Formal DefinitionThese are costs the player incurs without spending money, but which affect their experience or purchase decision. According to “Pauta_Docente,” they may be:

- Time (in buying, scratching, or searching for the product).
- Risk of addiction (the ease of falling into compulsive gaming habits).
- Emotional impact (frustration upon not winning, etc.).

Concepts Evaluated

- Time
- Risk of addiction
- Emotional impact (frustration, disappointment, etc.)

Possible Scores0, 1, or 2 points.

Problem Concepts

“Player Context” for Nonmonetary Costs: Refers to how these costs (time, risk of addiction, emotional impact) influence the player’s motivation, satisfaction, and continued gameplay.

NoteIt must be centered on the player (for example, their time, their risk of addiction, their possible disappointment). It does not apply to company costs or third-party costs.

Step 4: Create the decision table for each evaluation criterion

Below are the Decision Tables (in “Hash” style) in which each criterion is broken down into steps (binary Yes/No questions). If the answer is negative at a key point, a score is assigned and/or evaluation of that criterion stops. If it is positive, one continues until all questions have been answered.

Decision Table for the Concept of Value

Step	Evaluation Question	Action	Result
1	Does it explicitly mention the term “value” or synonyms (e.g., “perceived value,” “valuable,” “valued”)?	No → Assign 0 points and stop the Value evaluation. (It does not link the scratch card to the notion of value for the player) Yes → Continue to Step 2.	0 points / Go to Step 2
2	Is the idea of benefits (functional/psychological) explicitly connected with costs (monetary/nonmonetary)?	No → Assign 0 points and stop the Value evaluation. (It does not establish the benefit-cost relationship) Yes → Continue to Step 3.	0 points / Go to Step 3
3	Is the answer for the ‘Value’ evaluation criterion coherent, without major contradictions or ambiguities?	No → Assign 1 point and stop the Value evaluation. (It mentions value and the benefit-cost relationship, but in a confusing/contradictory manner) Yes → Continue to Step 4.	1 point / Go to Step 4
4	Does it indicate whether the value is “high” or “low” (or an equivalent) when comparing benefits and costs?	No → Assign 1 point and stop the Value evaluation. (It mentions value and its benefit-cost relationship but does not rate it as high or low)	1 point / 2 points

Step Evaluation Question	Action	Result
	Yes → Assign 2 points.	

Decision Table for Functional Benefits

Step	Evaluation Question	Action	Result
1	Does it explicitly mention at least one functional benefit (accessibility, instantaneity, variety of games, chance to win, or an equivalent) for the player?	No → Assign 0 points and stop the Functional Benefits evaluation. (No clear reference is made to any practical/tangible benefit focused on the player). Yes → Continue to Step 2.	0 points / Go to Step 2
2	Is the mentioned functional benefit truly focused on the player's experience (not on the company or other external factors)?	No → Assign 0 points and stop the Functional Benefits evaluation. (For example, if the focus is on the company's profits, it is not a functional benefit for the player). Yes → Continue to Step 3.	0 points / Go to Step 3
3	Is the answer for the 'Functional Benefits' evaluation criterion coherent, without major contradictions or ambiguities?	No → Assign 1 point and stop the Functional Benefits evaluation. (It mentions a benefit, but it is ambiguous or contradictory). Yes → Continue to Step 4.	1 point / Go to Step 4
4	Does it indicate or explain why the functional benefit is relevant in the player's context (ease of purchase, speed of use, impact on the purchase decision, etc.)?	No → Assign 1 point and stop the Functional Benefits evaluation. (The benefit is mentioned, but its relevance to the player is not explored). Yes → Assign 2 points.	1 point / 2 points

Decision Table for Psychological Benefits

Step	Evaluation Question	Action	Result
1	Does it explicitly mention at least one psychological benefit (entertainment, sense of achievement, social inclusion, excitement, anticipation, or another)?	No → Assign 0 points and stop the Psychological Benefits evaluation. (No reference is made to any emotional or mental benefit for the player). Yes → Continue to Step 2.	0 points / Go to Step 2
2	Is the mentioned psychological benefit really focused on the player's emotional experience (not on the company or other external factors)?	No → Assign 0 points and stop the Psychological Benefits evaluation. (If it speaks of benefits for the brand, it is not a psychological benefit for the player). Yes → Continue to Step 3.	0 points / Go to Step 3
3	Is the answer for the 'Psychological Benefits' criterion coherent, without major contradictions or ambiguities?	No → Assign 1 point and stop the Psychological Benefits evaluation. (There is mention of a psychological benefit, but the explanation is confusing or contradictory). Yes → Continue to Step 4.	1 point / Go to Step 4
4	Does it indicate or explain why that psychological benefit is relevant in the context of the player (how it influences their perception or gaming experience, motivation, satisfaction, etc.)?	No → Assign 1 point and stop the Psychological Benefits evaluation. (The benefit is mentioned, but its relevance to the player is not clarified). Yes → Assign 2 points.	1 point / 2 points

Decision Table for Monetary Costs

Step	Evaluation Question	Action	Result
1	Does it explicitly mention the monetary cost the player pays (for example, CLP\$500, “low cost,” “reduced price”)?	No → Assign 0 points and stop the Monetary Costs evaluation. (It does not recognize the real expense for the player). Yes → Continue to Step 2.	0 points / Go to Step 2
2	Does it mention costs unrelated to the player (for example, the company’s production costs, logistical costs) as though they were the player’s monetary costs?	Yes → Assign 0 points and stop the Monetary Costs evaluation. (It confuses the company’s costs with those of the player) No → Continue to Step 3.	0 points / Go to Step 3
3	Is the response about the monetary cost coherent, without contradictions (for example, not saying at first that it is “very high” and then “insignificant” without explanation)?	No → Assign 0 points and stop the Monetary Costs evaluation. (It is mentioned, but is contradictory and prevents a clear interpretation). Yes → Assign 2 points (proper mention with no major contradictions or confusions).	0 points / 2 points

Note: In the “Pauta_Docente,” it is stated that 2 points are awarded when the monetary cost is correctly described and related to the player’s experience. The table here simplifies the binary logic for assigning 0 or 2.

Decision Table for Nonmonetary Costs

Step	Evaluation Question	Action	Result
1	Does it explicitly mention at least one nonmonetary cost (time, risk of	No → Assign 0 points and stop the Nonmonetary Costs evaluation. (No clear reference is made to any	0 points / Go to Step 2

Step	Evaluation Question	Action	Result
	addiction, emotional impact, etc.) that affects the player?	nonmonetary cost).	
		Yes → Continue to Step 2.	
2	Is the mentioned nonmonetary cost focused on the player's experience (their personal time, their frustration, their risk of addiction) and not on external costs of the company or other entities?	No → Assign 1 point and stop the Nonmonetary Costs evaluation. (It was confused with an external company cost or a factor that does not fall on the player).	1 point / Go to Step 3
		Yes → Continue to Step 3.	
3	Is the response about 'Nonmonetary Costs' coherent, without major contradictions or ambiguities?	No → Assign 1 point and stop the Nonmonetary Costs evaluation. (It is mentioned, but the explanation is confusing or contradictory).	1 point / Go to Step 4
		Yes → Continue to Step 4.	
4	Does it indicate or explain why this nonmonetary cost is relevant in the player's context (time, risk of addiction, frustration, etc.) and how it affects their experience or purchase decision?	No → Assign 1 point and stop the Nonmonetary Costs evaluation. (It mentions the nonmonetary cost but does not justify its relevance to the player). Yes → Assign 2 points (mention and clear explanation of its impact on the player).	1 point / 2 points

Ready! These are the evaluation structures and complete decision tables (Phase 2, Step 3 and Step 4) for each of the defined criteria. Please confirm if we can move on to Phase 3 for the creation of the standardized output format.

You said:

Great, let's move on to Phase 3. Proceed.

Thought process took 15 seconds

PHASE 3: DEFINITION OF THE OUTPUT FORMAT

Below is the document called “Ejemplo_Formato_Salida,” which contains the standardized response structure and two uniform examples (Phase 3, steps 5 and 6).

Standardized Response Structure

For each evaluation criterion, include:

- **Evaluated Criterion:** Name of the criterion.
- **Score:** The score assigned to the criterion (based on the decision table).
- **Observation:** A brief description of what the student mentioned about this criterion.
- **Justification:** An explanation based on the decision table and the teacher’s guideline.

Then conclude with:

Final Score: The sum of the partial scores for all criteria.

Final Comments: Overall feedback for the student on their performance, indicating strengths and areas for improvement.

Example 1

1. Perceived Value (2 points)

- **Score:** 2/2
- **Observation:** The student explicitly states that the benefits (entertainment, opportunity to win) outweigh the costs (price and time), calling the value “high.”
- **Justification:** According to the decision table, 2 points are awarded when the student mentions the notion of value, connects benefits and costs, and rates the value as high or low. The student clearly indicates that the player perceives high value due to the low cost and the excitement of scratching, which aligns with the definition of “positive value.”

2. Functional Benefits (2 points)

- **Score:** 1/2
- **Observation:** Accessibility (many points of sale and easy purchase) is mentioned as a functional benefit, but the student does not go into why this is relevant for the player.
- **Justification:** To get 2 points, the decision table requires the student to explain the relevance in the player's context. Here, accessibility is mentioned but not elaborated on how it directly helps the player (e.g., if it makes the purchase easier or encourages the decision to participate). Therefore, only 1 point is awarded.

3. Psychological Benefits (2 points)

- **Score:** 2/2
- **Observation:** The student mentions the "excitement of winning" and the sense of anticipation, tying it to entertainment and a sense of achievement for the player.
- **Justification:** According to the table, for 2 points the student must address a psychological benefit (e.g., entertainment) and explain why it is relevant. Here, it is detailed how the hope of winning provides motivation and excitement, positively affecting the player's experience.

4. Monetary Costs (2 points)

- **Score:** 2/2
- **Observation:** The student states that the CLP\$500 cost is "low" for the player and sees it as a minimal investment compared to the fun it provides.
- **Justification:** According to the table, to earn 2 points in monetary costs, the actual price (CLP\$500) must be mentioned without confusing it with production or logistics costs of the company. Moreover, the answer is coherent and without contradictions, so it receives 2/2.

5. Nonmonetary Costs (2 points)

- **Score:** 0/2
- **Observation:** The student does not mention the time spent buying the scratch card, any frustration at not winning, or the risk of addiction.
- **Justification:** The decision table indicates 0 points if no nonmonetary cost is mentioned. In this case, there is no mention of time, frustration, or any other factor, so 0 points are assigned.

Final Score: 2 (Value) + 1 (Functional) + 2 (Psychological) + 2 (Monetary) + 0 (Nonmonetary)
= 7/10

Final Comments:

You have clearly highlighted the perception of value (high) and several benefits, both functional and psychological. However, you missed discussing nonmonetary costs, such as the time spent or the potential risk of addiction. In future responses, remember to explain how these costs can affect the player's experience.

Example 2

1. Perceived Value (2 points)

- **Score:** 1/2
- **Observation:** The student mentions the word "value" and partially relates some benefits and costs, but does not determine whether the value is high or low.
- **Justification:** 2 points would be awarded if the student clearly defines value as "high" or "low." Here, the mention is ambiguous, without assigning a final rating to the value. Hence, only 1 point.

2. Functional Benefits (2 points)

- **Score:** 2/2
- **Observation:** The student mentions "instantaneity" (finding out the result immediately) and the "opportunity to win" a prize, explaining how this attracts a player seeking quick gratification.
- **Justification:** For 2 points, the table requires at least one functional benefit and an explanation of its relevance to the player's experience. The student details the motivation of having an immediate result and the excitement of a possible win.

3. Psychological Benefits (2 points)

- **Score:** 0/2
- **Observation:** The student does not describe any emotional aspect such as entertainment or personal achievement, limiting themselves to talking about functionalities and economic outcomes.

- **Justification:** The table indicates 0 points if no psychological benefit for the player is mentioned. There is no mention of fun, emotional anticipation, or social connection, so no score applies.

4. **Monetary Costs (2 points)**

- **Score:** 0/2
- **Observation:** The student focuses on the company's production and logistics costs, without mentioning the actual price the player pays (CLP\$500).
- **Justification:** According to the table, if the company's costs are confused with the player's monetary cost, 0 points are assigned. Here, the amount the buyer pays was not addressed correctly, so 0 points are given.

5. **Nonmonetary Costs (2 points)**

- **Score:** 2/2
- **Observation:** The student explains that "purchase time" and "possible frustration at not winning" can influence the player's decision.
- **Justification:** For 2 points, it is necessary to mention a nonmonetary cost (e.g., time or frustration) and explain how it affects the experience. This is done correctly here by detailing how the player may feel frustrated and how they invest time in buying.

Final Score: 1 (Value) + 2 (Functional) + 0 (Psychological) + 0 (Monetary) + 2 (Nonmonetary) = 5/10

Final Comments:

You have identified some clear functional benefits and adequately described the player's nonmonetary costs. However, you missed mentioning and rating the perceived value as "high" or "low," explaining psychological benefits, and describing the monetary cost the player assumes (instead of the company's costs). Next time, be sure to relate these aspects with more depth to show a complete analysis.

That concludes Phase 3! This "Ejemplo_Formato_Salida" document shows the standardized response structure and two fully applied examples.

Please confirm if we can move on to Phase 4, where we will create the Evaluation Prompt.

You said:

Excellent. Let's do Phase 4.

PHASE 4: CREATION OF THE EVALUATION PROMPT

Below is the Evaluation Prompt that the AI must rigorously follow to grade students' answers. It is made up of 6 mandatory components:

1. Evaluation Context

Evaluation Context:

Evaluate the student's answer to the following question: "Briefly analyze the 'value' of playing a lottery scratch card in terms of its benefits (functional and psychological) and its costs (monetary and nonmonetary)."

The evaluation criteria are five and derive from the question:

1. Analyze the Concept of Value for the player.
 2. Identify Functional Benefits for the player.
 3. Identify Psychological Benefits for the player.
 4. Identify Monetary Costs for the player.
 5. Identify Nonmonetary Costs for the player.
-

2. Primary Correction Rules

Primary Correction Rules:

Use only the Decision Tables defined in the document "Tablas_Decision_Ejemplo.docx" (or the file containing those tables) to assign scores for each evaluation criterion. Strictly follow the binary "Yes/No" logic of each table to determine the corresponding score. If the table indicates that 0 points must be assigned for a certain response, do not interpret or justify outside of what it indicates. Similarly, if the table indicates 2 points, assign them following its structure.

3. Secondary Correction Rules

Secondary Correction Rules:

The justifications must be based solely on the criteria and definitions provided, without adding external interpretations or expanding criteria not included. If the student does not mention a criterion, assign them 0 points in that section and briefly explain its absence. Do not subdivide scores beyond what the table indicates. For instance, for Monetary Costs, only 0 or 2 points are considered.

4. Exclusion of Undesired Evaluation Criteria

Exclusion of Criteria:

Ignore aspects such as spelling, grammar, depth of analysis, relevance, or style. Do not consider information outside the 5 indicated criteria (e.g., do not grade if they talk about the company's marketing, legal aspects, etc.) unless that information relates to the Decision Tables' criteria. Do not interpret beyond what the tables and the Teacher's Guideline indicate.

5. Evaluation Format

Evaluation Format:

When delivering the correction, use the standardized format shown in "Ejemplo_Formato_Salida.docx."

- **Evaluated Criterion**
- **Score** (e.g., "1/2 points," "2/2 points," "0/2," according to the criterion)
- **Observation** (what the student mentioned)
- **Justification** (explanation in line with the decision table)

After evaluating all criteria, present:

- **Final Score:** total sum.
 - **Final Comments:** brief overall feedback.
-

6. Adjust Hyperparameters

Adjust Hyperparameters:

Once the student provides their answer, apply the same evaluation logic and the same tables to grade it. Set the hyperparameters for the correction as follows:

json

CopyEdit

```
{"temperature": 0.1, "frequency_penalty": 0.0, "presence_penalty": -1.0}
```

Wait for the student's responses to evaluate, and do not alter these hyperparameters.

This "Evaluation Prompt" is ready to be used: when the student's answer is received, the AI must strictly follow these components to assign the score and deliver the feedback.