

You said:

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.

ChatGPT Plus

Reasoning on automatic evaluation process for two seconds

Understood! I am waiting for the teacher's question to start executing Phase 1 according to the algorithm.

You said:

Surprise Control – Marketing NovaAndes University developed CaryBloc, a drug that eliminates and prevents cavities in the primary state at a low cost. It already has a patent in

the United States and is awaiting authorization in Europe for clinical trials. According to the WHO, cavities affect 3,500 million people and their treatment consumes between 5% and 10% of health expenditure in developed countries. CaryBloc is for professional use, intercepts the advance of cavities and does not stain teeth. It does not require special equipment or complex techniques, which reduces your business cost. There are two types of toothpastes based on their fluoride concentration, measured in ppm (parts per million), which indicates how many units of fluoride there are per million units of toothpaste: ♣ Cosmetic: 1,000–1,500 ppm (daily use). ♣ Pharmaceuticals: more than 1,500 ppm (high risk of caries). Suppose a CaryBloc toothpaste, with the drug incorporated, is launched at a price similar to pharmaceutical brands such as Vitis, Sensodyne or PHB. Does the inclusion of the drug "CaryBloc" in the toothpaste formula represent a competitive advantage based on VRIO resources? Justify your answer by assessing whether you meet the criteria of Value, Rarity, Inimitation and Organization (12 Points)

ChatGPT Plus

Reasoned about competitive advantage and VRIO for 19 seconds

PHASE 1: CREATION OF THE EVALUATION CRITERIA

Step 1: Receiving the General Question

General question (professor):

"Does the inclusion of the drug 'CaryBloc' in the toothpaste formula represent a competitive advantage based on VRIO resources? Justify your answer by assessing whether it meets the criteria of Value, Rarity, Inimitation and Organization (12 Points)."

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

Based on the general question, the four main concepts associated with the VRIO model are identified. Each will be treated as an independent evaluation criterion. Therefore, the following **evaluation criteria are defined**:

1. Value (V)

Analyze whether the inclusion of "CaryBloc" in the toothpaste formula generates or adds value to the product, considering how it benefits the consumer's proposal or perception.

2. Rarity (R)

Evaluate whether this formula (toothpaste with the drug "CaryBloc") is a scarce or uncommon resource compared to the competition.

3. Inimitability (I)

Determine the degree of difficulty or ease that other companies would have to replicate or imitate the advantage granted by the presence of "CaryBloc" in toothpaste.

4. Organization (O)

Examine whether the company is organized and prepared to fully exploit the "CaryBloc" resource (launch capacity, productive capacity, alliances, patents, etc.), so that it becomes a source of sustained competitive advantage.

List of Evaluation Criteria:

1. Value
2. Rarity
3. Inimitation
4. Organization

We now have the clear list of evaluation criteria.

Confirm to proceed with Phase 2 (decision tables).

You said:

Not bad. I give you my guideline as a teacher in text format below so that you can create with the approach you want what comes in phase 2 of the algorithm, and validate the evaluation criteria that you have just created. Let's start by confirming the evaluation criteria. Valuable: According to the second paragraph of the text, "untreated cavities are the most frequent disorder among oral diseases, affecting almost 3,500 million people worldwide", therefore, the fact that "CaryBloc" toothpaste eliminates and preventively treats cavities is a feature that gives value to the market. (3 points) Rare: This formula is not currently available in other toothpastes, so competitors would not have this differentiating feature. Replicating it would take time, which reinforces its uncommon character in the market. (3 points) Inimitable: "CaryBloc" has a patent in the US and requires clinical trials in Europe, which means that, at least in the short and medium term, it is difficult to imitate.

However, this condition could change in the long term. (3 points) Organization: Given that the application of the treatment does not require special equipment or complex techniques, and considering that its low cost makes it commercially accessible, it can be inferred that the organization is in a position to implement and capture the value derived from this resource. (3 points)

ChatGPT Plus

He reasoned for 19 seconds

PHASE 2: CREATION OF DECISION TABLES FOR EVALUATION

The complete decision tables (one for each criterion) are presented below strictly following the structure described in the algorithm and taking the "Tablas_Decision_Ejemplo.docx" logic as a reference.

1) EVALUATION CRITERIA: VALUE

1.1 Formal definition

It is evaluated whether toothpaste with "CaryBloc" contributes or generates value for the market and/or the consumer. In this case, the value of caries prevention and elimination, accessibility, and any other advantages that make it relevant to the target audience are considered. The student is expected to identify why this innovation is valuable in the face of the need to slow down or prevent cavities, affecting 3,500 million people in the world.

1.2 Concepts evaluated

- **Contribution to the market and the consumer:** "CaryBloc's" ability to offer a functional caries prevention benefit.
- **Solution to a widespread health problem:** It provides a benefit related to a problem that affects a large proportion 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 (maximum 3).

1.4 Problem Concepts

Definition "Value Relevance" to the consumer: Refers to how toothpaste with "CaryBloc" is perceived as a meaningful solution. It implies that innovation responds to a real need and improves the consumer experience (e.g., 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 (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 Valor

Step	Evaluation question	Action	Result
1	Is it explicitly mentioned that "CaryBloc" (or its effects) brings a relevant benefit to the consumer or the market, in terms of caries prevention/treatment?	<p>No → Grant 0 points and stop the evaluation for Valor. <i>(No relationship is made between "CaryBloc" and an actual benefit or the problem of cavities)</i></p> <p>Yes → Continue to Step 2.</p>	<p>0 points OR Go to Step 2</p>
2	Is it explained (even briefly) why that benefit is valuable, considering the magnitude of the caries problem or other positive implications for the consumer?	<p>No → Award 1 point and stop the evaluation for Value. <i>(CaryBloc is recognized as a resource, but its relevance or the need to prevent cavities is not clearly justified)</i></p> <p>Yes → Continue to Step 3.</p>	<p>1 point OR Go to Step 3</p>
3	Is the answer coherent, without contradictions and does it explicitly allude to the importance of "CaryBloc" in the face of the high incidence of cavities (3,500 million people)?	<p>No → Award 2 points and stop the evaluation for Valor. <i>(The value of "CaryBloc" is mentioned, but there are partial ambiguities or contradictions)</i></p>	<p>2 points OR Go to Step 4</p>

Step	Evaluation question	Action	Result
		Yes → Continue to Step 4.	
		No → Award 2 points and stop the evaluation for Valor.	
4	Is it clearly concluded or inferred that the "CaryBloc" resource generates a valuable advantage (e.g., reducing treatment costs, providing a powerful solution, etc.)?	<i>(Mentions the value but does not make it clear what the specific advantage or benefit translates into)</i>	2 points OR 3 points
		Yes → Grant 3 points (Value fully demonstrated).	

2) EVALUATION CRITERIA: RARITY

2.1 Formal definition

It evaluates whether the innovation (toothpaste incorporating "CaryBloc") is unique or uncommon in the market, that is, if there are other similar alternatives or if the resource is so differentiated that it is rare to find in the competition.

2.2 Concepts evaluated

- **Availability of the formula on the market:** If the inclusion of a drug that slows the progression of cavities is rare.
- **Exclusivity:** If the student mentions that there are no similar products today or that replicating the formula would take time and research development.
- **Clear differentiation:** Whether the product is easily distinguishable from other pharmaceutical or cosmetic toothpastes.

2.3 Possible scores

0, 1, 2 or 3 points.

2.4 Problem Concepts

Definition "Market Rarity": Relates to the exclusivity or scarcity of the "CaryBloc" resource. It means that it is not easily found in the rest of the competitors and therefore it is a distinctive feature.

2.5 Note

To get the highest score, the answer must make it clear that "CaryBloc" is not only an uncommon attribute, but that the average competitor would not have the same technology anytime soon.

2.6 Rarity decision table

Step	Evaluation question	Action	Result
1	Is it mentioned that the "CaryBloc" formula is not present in conventional toothpastes or that it is a differentiated resource?	Do not → Grant 0 points and stop the evaluation for Rarity. <i>(No rarity of innovation is established)</i> Yes → Continue to Step 2.	0 points OR Go to Step 2
2	Is it argued or implied that replicating "CaryBloc" (or its effect) is not something that is quickly adopted by competitors (e.g., because of patents, development, costs, etc.)?	Do not → Grant 1 point and stop the evaluation for Rarity. <i>(Its differentiation is mentioned, but the difficulty of replicating it is not alluded to)</i> Yes → Continue with Step 3.	1 point OR Go to Step 3
3	Does the answer maintain coherence and suggest that the student understands that it is a scarce resource in the current market?	No → Grant 2 points and stop the evaluation for Rarity. <i>(The mention of rarity exists, but with ambiguities/contradictions)</i> Yes → Continue with Step 4.	2 points OR Go to Step 4
4	Is it clearly indicated that this rarity provides a real differentiating factor compared to other pharmaceutical pastes? (For example: "No one else offers 'CaryBloc' nowadays.")	No → Grant 2 points and stop the evaluation for Rarity. <i>(The strange factor is seen, but the idea that it is a great competitive advantage is not materialized)</i>	2 points OR 3 points

Step	Evaluation question	Action	Result
		Yes → Grant 3 points (Rarity fully demonstrated).	

3) EVALUATION CRITERION: INIMITABILITY

3.1 Formal definition

Check to see if the inclusion of "CaryBloc" is difficult for competitors to imitate. The existence of patents, investment in R+D, the complexity of development, clinical tests, etc., are analyzed. If these barriers are strong enough in the short/medium term, it is considered inimitable.

3.2 Concepts evaluated

- **Patent (U.S.) and Clinical Testing:** Indicates protection and complexity for others.
- **Time or cost barriers to replication:** Developing such a resource would require significant investment and scientific validations.
- **Possibility of the resource being copied in the long term:** Recognize the existence of a future horizon in which the patent expires or a substitute is found.

3.3 Possible scores

0, 1, 2 or 3 points.

3.4 Problem Concepts

"Difficulty to Imitate" Definition: Focuses on competitors' ability to reproduce the "CaryBloc" formula. It involves legal (patents), technical (clinical research) and temporal (how quickly it could be copied) aspects.

3.5 Note

It is sufficient for the student to identify that the patent and clinical tests hinder imitation in the short/medium term, even if he admits the possibility of future imitation.

3.6 Decision Table for Inimitation

Step	Evaluation question	Action	Result
1	Is there any mention of barriers (such as patents, clinical trials, or others) that make it difficult to imitate "CaryBloc"?	<p>No → Grant 0 points and stop the evaluation for Inimitabilidad. <i>(No factor limiting copying is alluded to)</i></p> <p>Yes → Continue to Step 2.</p>	<p>0 points OR Go to Step 2</p>
2	Is it explicitly stated that such barriers operate at least in the short or medium term, making it difficult for competitors to replicate "CaryBloc"?	<p>No → Award 1 point and stop the evaluation for Inimitability. <i>(The patent or barrier is mentioned, but its temporal effect is not explained)</i></p> <p>Yes → Continue to Step 3.</p>	<p>1 point OR Go to Step 3</p>
3	Is the answer coherent, without contradictions, recognizing that in the long run copies could emerge but there is still an important advantage in the meantime?	<p>No → Award 2 points and stop the evaluation for Inimitabilidad. <i>(There is mention of difficult imitation, but with inconsistencies or without clarifying the present advantage)</i></p> <p>Yes → Continue with Step 4.</p>	<p>2 points OR Go to Step 4</p>
4	Is it emphasized that the patent, added to the clinical validations, complicates copying and provides clear competitive protection?	<p>No → Award 2 points and stop the evaluation for Inimitabilidad. <i>(There is talk of difficulty in imitating, but the strength of the protection is not highlighted)</i></p> <p>Yes → Grant 3 points (Demonstrated inimitability).</p>	<p>2 points OR 3 points</p>

4) EVALUATION CRITERIA: ORGANIZATION

4.1 Formal definition

Analyze 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." It includes the capacity for production, distribution, marketing and any factor that allows "capturing" the value of this innovation.

4.2 Concepts evaluated

- **Ability to implement the resource:** That does not require expensive equipment or technical complications.
- **Low production cost and commercial feasibility:** It favors the massification of toothpaste and facilitates commercialization.
- **Alignment with the value chain:** The organization is ready to distribute and communicate the product to the market.

4.3 Possible scores

0, 1, 2 or 3 points.

4.4 Problem Concepts

Definition "Organizational Structure": Refers to the willingness of NovaAndes University or associated companies to develop, launch and sustain the production of "CaryBloc" pulp (patents, alliances, sales channels, etc.).

4.5 Note

For the highest score, the answer must clearly show that the company/entity is in a position to exploit the resource (e.g., "no complex techniques are required" and "the cost is low"), demonstrating an organization that sustains competitive advantage.

4.6 Decision Table for Organization

Step	Evaluation question	Action	Result
1	Is there any mention of an infrastructure or organization that allows "CaryBloc" to be leveraged (e.g., no complex equipment required, low business cost, etc.)?	No → Grant 0 points and stop the evaluation for Organization. <i>(Nothing is mentioned about the company's ability to exploit the resource)</i>	0 points OR Go to Step 2

Step	Evaluation question	Action	Result
		Yes → Continue to Step 2.	
		No → Award 1 point and stop the evaluation for Organization. <i>(Some infrastructure is mentioned, but the ease of getting to market is not clarified)</i>	1 point OR Go to Step 3
2	Is it recognized that this organizational capacity (ease of use/production) facilitates the arrival of toothpaste on the market?		
		Yes → Continue to Step 3.	
		Do not → Award 2 points and stop the evaluation for Organization. <i>(There are mentions of infrastructure, but with inconsistencies or contradictions)</i>	2 points OR Go to Step 4
3	Is the answer coherent and alludes to the coordination of resources and strategies necessary to market "CaryBloc" pasta without contradicting each other?		
		Yes → Continue with Step 4.	
		Do not → Award 2 points and stop the evaluation for Organization. <i>(Data is lacking to ensure that it is fully used)</i>	2 points OR 3 points
4	Is it emphasized that the organization (or university) is truly ready to extract and sustain competitive advantage (e.g., feasible large-scale launch, affordable cost, etc.)?	Yes → Award 3 points (Fully demonstrated organization).	

SUMMARY OF THE CRITERIA AND THEIR SCORES

- **Value:** 0–3 points
- **Rarity:** 0–3 points

- **Inimitation:** 0–3 points
- **Organization:** 0–3 points

Maximum total: 12 points

This concludes Phase 2 (decision tables) following the logic and format indicated.

Please **confirm if these criteria and tables are correct** to proceed to the next phase of the algorithm (Phase 3).

You said:

Bien. Continue to Phase 3

ChatGPT Plus

Reasoned for 8 seconds

PHASE 3: DEFINING THE OUTPUT FORMAT

Step 5: Standardized Response Structure

An output (dummy) document called "Ejemplo_Formato_Salida" is created that will contain uniform examples of correction of the general question, based on the Decision Tables (Phase 2). Each example includes:

1. **Criterion evaluated:** Name of the criterion (Value, Rarity, Inimitability, Organization).
2. **Score:** Score assigned to the criterion, e.g. "2/3 points".
3. **Observation:** Brief description of what the student mentioned.
4. **Justification:** Explanation based on the decision table, indicating why that score was awarded.

At the end of the evaluation of all criteria, it includes:

- **Final Score:** Sum of the partial scores.
 - **Final Comments:** Concluding feedback.
-

Step 6: Consolidation of the final evaluation

Two examples of real or simulated correction **are illustrated below** . Each example will show how the decision table for each criterion is applied to a hypothetical student response, and then the final score will be given with comments.

DOCUMENT: "Ejemplo_Formato_Salida"

Here are two uniform examples following the **standardized response structure**:

EXAMPLE 1

Student Response Assumption (abstract):

"The student highlights that 'CaryBloc' provides a benefit because it reduces the probability of cavities and considers that this is a resource with a patent in the US that will be difficult to replicate. It does not mention whether or not the company is ready to exploit it; it only states that the product is valuable and difficult to imitate. He says that there are other brands, but he does not clarify if they are the same.

1. Value (3 points)

Score: 2/3

Observation: The student describes how "CaryBloc" brings a benefit by reducing the incidence of cavities and mentions that the market is large (3,500 million people with untreated cavities). However, it does not delve into whether this reduces treatment costs or implies a forceful advantage beyond "it is valuable."

Justification:

According to the decision table, the student mentions a real benefit and recognizes that the product addresses a global health problem, which gives it value. However, the answer does not make it entirely clear why this translates into an economic advantage or comparative cost for consumers, which is why it does not reach the maximum score (3).

2. Rarity (3 points)

Score: 2/3

Note: Acknowledge that other pharmaceutical brands exist, but do not offer "CaryBloc." He mentions that the formula is not seen in the current competition, although he does not delve into the time or the specific difficulty to replicate it.

Rationale:

According to the decision table, the student identifies an uncommon resource ("CaryBloc"), but does not describe in detail whether it would take long for competitors to create an alternative. The lack of clarity on the exclusivity of the product means that it does not get 3/3.

3. Inimitability (3 points)

Score: 3/3

Note: Note that "CaryBloc" is patented in the United States and that its approval in Europe would require clinical testing, which would make imitation difficult in the short and medium term.

Justification:

According to the decision table, a clear barrier (patent + clinical evidence) is mentioned. The student clarifies that this barrier is strong in the short term, complying with all the steps to assign the maximum score in inimitation.

4. Organization (3 points)

Score: 0/3

Observation: The student does not mention the capacity of the company or university to exploit the resource, nor does it indicate whether it is prepared with distribution channels or commercial plans.

Justification:

Following the decision table, since there is no reference to any organizational factor (e.g., necessary equipment, ease of production, or commercial cost), 0 points are assigned.

Final Score: 2/3 (Value) + 2/3 (Rarity) + 3/3 (Inimitability) + 0/3 (Organization) = 7/12 points

Final Comments:

The answer satisfactorily covers the validity and inimitability of the inclusion of "CaryBloc." However, to improve the overall rating, it is recommended to explain more clearly how this resource differs from other pastes (Rarity) and, above all, to describe the organization necessary to take advantage of this innovation (Organization). Mentioning aspects such as ease of production, low commercial cost and the absence of technological complexities would have better supported the argument of a complete competitive advantage.

EXAMPLE 2**Student Answer Assumption (abstract):**

"The student indicates that 'CaryBloc' is an important product because it prevents cavities,

emphasizing that no one else offers a similar drug, and that the university is already ready to bring it to market thanks to its patent in the US and pending approval in Europe. He also explains that it is a low-cost formula that is easy to apply.

1. **Value (3 points)**

Score: 3/3

Observation: The answer describes a specific benefit for the consumer (reduces and prevents cavities, a widespread problem), relates this benefit to the magnitude of the market and mentions the possible reduction in treatment costs in the future.

Rationale:

According to the decision table, the student not only mentions the benefit of "CaryBloc," but relates it to the high number of people affected by cavities and the advantage of reducing dental expenses. This clearly demonstrates the relevance of the resource to the market, justifying the maximum score.

2. **Rarity (3 points)**

Score: 3/3

Note: It is explicitly stated that there are no similar products in common toothpastes, making formula a scarce resource that the competition does not have.

Justification:

According to the table, the answer details that "CaryBloc" is unique, acknowledging that other brands do not have the same feature. The idea of clear differentiation is fulfilled in the present, so the maximum score is awarded.

3. **Inimitation (3 points)**

Score: 2/3

Note: The student mentions the patent and approval in Europe, stating that "it could be copied in the future but it is expensive." It doesn't delve into the real difficulty of replicating the formula or how long it would take for the competition to reach the same level of effectiveness.

Rationale:

The decision table stipulates that, for 3 points, emphasis is required on the patent and clinical validations generating strong protection. The student alludes to the subject, but does not detail to what extent it prevents imitation in the short or medium term, remaining at 2/3.

4. **Organization (3 points)**

Score: 3/3

Observation: The student points out that it is a low-cost and easy-to-apply product, which indicates that the university has the means (or structure) to manufacture and distribute without the need for large investments in equipment.

Justification:

According to the table, the specific mention that complex techniques are not required is fulfilled. With this, the resource can be effectively exploited and marketed, achieving the highest score.

Final Score: 3/3 (Value) + 3/3 (Rarity) + 2/3 (Inimitability) + 3/3 (Organization) = 11/12 points

Final Comments:

The answer is very solid in explaining the value, rarity and organization to exploit competitive advantage. To achieve the perfect score, he could have delved a little deeper into the inimitation component, for example, describing in greater detail how patent and clinical testing discourage or significantly delay potential imitators for several years. Still, it's an outstanding job.

End of Phase 3 (Output Format and Examples).

If everything is correct, this document "Ejemplo_Formato_Salida" with the standardized structure and two complete examples is available.

Please confirm to proceed to Phase 4: Creation of the Evaluation Prompt.

You said:

Let's do phase 4 now

ChatGPT Plus

He reasoned for 12 seconds

PHASE 4: CREATION OF THE EVALUATION PROMPT

Below is the complete, **ready-to-use Evaluation Prompt**. It incorporates the 6 mandatory components (Evaluation Context, Primary Rules, Secondary Rules, Exclusion of Criteria, Evaluation Format and Adjustment of Hyperparameters).

1) EVALUATION CONTEXT

Evaluate the student's answer to the **question attached in the "Pregunta.docx" file:**

"Does the inclusion of the drug 'CaryBloc' in the toothpaste formula represent a competitive advantage based on VRIO resources? Justify your answer by assessing whether it meets the criteria of Value, Rarity, Inimitation and Organization (12 Points)."

There are four evaluation criteria to be applied:

1. **Value**
 2. **Rarity**
 3. **Inimitation**
 4. **Organization**
-

2) PRIMARY RULES OF CORRECTION

- You must **assign scores** only and strictly following the **binary logic (Yes/No)** of the decision tables found in the document:
"Tablas_Decision_Ejemplo.docx"
 - Each criterion (Value, Rarity, Inimitability, Organization) has steps and questions that define the final score from 0 to 3 points.
 - The score ranges or the questions contained in these tables must not be altered.
-

3) SECONDARY RULES OF CORRECTION

- Justify each score based **solely** on the **questions and actions** in the decision tables ("Tablas_Decision_Ejemplo.docx file").
 - If the student **does not mention** an evaluation criterion, **0 points** will be assigned in that section, with a **brief justification** alluding to its absence.
 - **Do not** add additional interpretations, non-established criteria, or extra weightings outside of what is indicated in these tables.
-

4) EXCLUSION OF UNWANTED EVALUATION CRITERIA

- **Ignore** aspects such as spelling, grammar, depth of analysis, writing style, or any other factor **not** contemplated in the decision tables.

- **Do not** create or consider new criteria or change the definitions of Value, Rarity, Inimitability, or Organization.
-

5) EVALUATION FORM

- For **each of the four criteria** (Value, Rarity, Imimitation, Organization), submit the assessment in the following **standardized format**, as shown in "Ejemplo_Formato_Salida.docx":
 1. **Criterion evaluated:** Name of the criterion.
 2. **Score:** Score obtained, e.g. "2/3 points".
 3. **Observation:** Brief summary of what the student mentioned related to that criterion.
 4. **Rationale:** Explanation based on the decision table (Yes/No actions) of why that score is assigned.
 - At the end of the four criteria, it includes:
 - **Final Score:** Sum of partial scores (maximum 12).
 - **Final Comments:** Concluding feedback, focused on how to improve in relation to the decision tables.
-

6) HYPERPARAMETER TUNNING

To maintain consistency of the assessment:

Wait for the student's response to apply the correction and always use these hyperparameters: {"temperature": 0.1, "frequency_penalty": 0.0, "presence_penalty": -1.0}

This Evaluation Prompt ensures that the AI applies only the established rules and tables, without adding external interpretations.