

## Judging Criteria

The first round has 6 sections, for a total of 70 marks. The top 6 teams will be selected to present in the second round, which has 2 sections, for a total of 30 marks. In total 100 marks.

For each row, the table gives a description of work for each category: needs improvement; good; excellent. Each category will have a maximum of 10 marks, except Prediction and Presentation.

### First Round

	Needs Improvement (0 – 3)	Good (4 – 7)	Excellent (8 – 10)
<b>Brief write-up &amp; Slide deck</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The brief write-up should be no more than 500 words. It should relate to the slides and is aimed to provide judges with a full picture of what the team has accomplished. Students are welcome to insert plots in the write-up.</li> <li>- The slide deck should be no more than 10 pages. It should include insights and recommendations based on data analysis and modeling. The presentation can also address any challenges and innovative approaches. Please focus on the application of the model/theory instead of explaining them.</li> </ul>			
Analysis	Analysis is inadequate for making informed decisions or providing effective solutions.	Analysis is robust and appropriate.	Analysis is complete, advanced, and informative with external data.
Insights & recommendations	Recommendations are missing or not based on data analysis. Recommendations demonstrate limited understanding of business trade-offs from adoption.	Recommendations are relevant, but not fully supported by analysis. Recommendations demonstrate some understanding of business trade-offs from adoption.	Recommendations are feasible, specific, and can be fully supported by analysis. Recommendations demonstrate strong understanding of business trade-offs from adoption.
Creativity	Analysis and recommendations are not original or unique, and may not provide new insights to the problem.	The analysis and recommendations provided show some originality and creativity, but may not be as innovative as they could be.	The analysis and recommendations provided are highly creative (e.g., external data or innovative modelling method are being used) and original, offering unique perspectives and

			innovative solutions to the problem.
Slides	Slides do not have logical order, with misleading information presented.	Slides are well organized and include decent number of visualizations that can support the analysis and recommendations.	Slides are very well organized. No irrelevant information. Content is complete, correct, and convincing. Visuals are appealing and informative.
<b>Code &amp; Prediction Results</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Teams are expected to submit all codes (in any format) used to generate plots and predictions</li> <li>- The predictions should be submitted in csv format with two columns: TRANSACTION_ID and PREDICTION (value of 0 indicating not fraud, or 1 indicating fraud).</li> </ul>			
Readability	Code is not readable with no comments. There is unused or irrelevant code. Variable and function names are not self-explanatory.	Code is organized. There is little unused or irrelevant code. Variable and function names are easy to understand.	Code is very well structured. There is no unused or irrelevant code. Variable and function names are clear and match the purpose of the code.
Predictions	Needs Improvement (0 – 7)	Good (8 – 15)	Excellent (16 – 20)
	<p>All teams with correct submissions will be ranked based on their F1 score (other metrics, e.g., area under the ROC curve might also be considered) and divided into 10 buckets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-- 20 points: top 10% of the teams</li> <li>-- 18 points: next 10%</li> <li>-- 16 points: next 10%</li> <li>-- 14 points: next 10%</li> <li>-- 12 points: next 10%</li> <li>-- 10 points: next 10%</li> <li>-- 8 points: next 10%</li> <li>-- 6 points: next 10%</li> <li>-- 4 points: next 10%</li> <li>-- 2 point: bottom 10%</li> <li>-- 0 points: No submission or irreconcilable formatting issue</li> </ul> <p>Team with the highest score will receive 5 bonus points. If there are ties, both teams will receive the bonus.</p>		

## Second Round

<b>Presentation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This is for teams who enter the second round</li> <li>- The final presentation includes 6 minutes presentation + 4 minutes Q&amp;A</li> <li>- Final ranking of the team will be based on both first and second round evaluation</li> </ul>			
Presentation	Needs Improvement (0 – 7)	Good (8 – 15)	Excellent (16 – 20)
	Verbal presentation lacks in logic, accuracy, and coherence. Visual presentation is cluttered and does not align with the content of the presentation. Lack of cohesiveness and alignment between verbal and visual presentation.	Verbal presentation follows good logical order, is mostly correct, but incomplete or unconvincing. Visual presentation is readable and self-explanatory. Verbal and visual presentation are connected.	Presentation shows clarity and organization of thought, with all key points presented in logical order. Team shows ability to tell a compelling and engaging story with the help of visualizations backed by data analysis. Verbal and visual presentation are clearly connected.
Q&A	Needs Improvement (0 – 3)	Good (4 – 7)	Excellent (8 – 10)
	Basic understanding of the question. Illogical and incorrect responses.	Good understanding of the question. Responses are accurate and logical.	Good understanding of the question in technical/business context. Responses are accurate and logical with business acumen and relevant evidence.

### Important Notes

- Use MS Teams public channel to drop your questions or attend the mentorship session on Saturday
- Formal Kick-off Friday (Jan 20th), please join to check-in and ask questions!
- Please submit your team result with required format on time & prepare presentation ahead of time
- Final presentations on Sunday (Jan 22nd), team must attend in person to qualify for Top 6 winning teams