

2018 Mount Sinai Health Hackathon

For each item identified below, circle the number to the right that best fits your judgment of its quality.
Use the rating scale to select the quality number from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent).

Judge Name
Team Name

Judging Criteria	Scale					
	N o - s c o r e	P o o r	Good			E x c e l l e n t
CONCEPT EVALUATION						
1. Clinical relevance & validity	x	1	2	3	4	5
2. Potential clinical impact	x	1	2	3	4	5
3. Commercial potential	x	1	2	3	4	5
4. Novelty	x	1	2	3	4	5
5. Design concept	x	1	2	3	4	5
EXECUTION EVALUATION						
6. Overall software/hardware demo progress	x	1	2	3	4	5
7. Functionality	x	1	2	3	4	5
8. User experience – usability and interface aesthetics	x	1	2	3	4	5
9. Integration of technology	x	1	2	3	4	5
10. Technical sophistication	x	1	2	3	4	5

DESIGN CRITERIA DESCRIPTIONS

Concept Evaluation

1. Clinical relevance and validity
 - Does the solution address an important clinical problem backed up by evidence in medical literature, patient testimonials and/or expert opinion?
2. Potential clinical impact
 - How substantial would the solution be in correcting the problem, in terms of both magnitude and scale of impact?
3. Commercial potential
 - How viable is the solution commercially in terms of both scalability and profitability/sustainability?
4. Novelty
 - How novel/unique is the solution in terms of difference from existing products/solutions/IP
5. Design concept
 - How does the design of the solution rate in terms of feasibility, ingenuity, elegance?

Prototype Execution Evaluation

6. Overall software/hardware demo progress
 - How substantial was progress completed in terms of actual prototype/demo of design?
 - 1 = no attempt to implement design, 3 = Demonstrable effort, 5. Outstanding effort
7. Functionality
 - How functional was the prototype/demo?
 - 1 = No functionality completed, 3= partial functionality, 5= completely functional
8. User experience – usability and interface aesthetics
 - How developed is the user interface for the prototype/demo in terms of both usability and appearance?
 - 1 = No user interface developed, 3 = acceptable usability/appearance , 5= outstanding usability/appearance
9. Integration of technology
 - How broad is the technology used and how well is it integrated overall in the prototype/demo?
 - 1 = little technology integration, 3 = partial integration of more than one technology, 5 = full integration of more than one technology
10. Technical sophistication
 - How much skill/complexity is demonstrated in at least one area of technology used in the prototype/demo?
 - 1 = no level of skill demonstrated, 3 = basic demonstration in several areas or good demonstration in 1 area, 5 = Advanced level of skill and/or complexity demonstrated