



Synthetic Biology

based on standard parts

Judging_Feedback For GreatBay_China

Select a different team

Return to HQ_Manage_Awards iGEM 2018 Championship

Comments from the judges

Judge 1

- Wow! This is an amazing iGEM project. It would be a fantastic project even for a college-level team. Very challenging project, great results, outstanding presentation, lovely artwork, excellent modeling. Incredible! Congratulations on a fantastic job.
- The "Kitty Wonderland" is great, but not suitable for the hardware prize. That award is intended for hardware that can be used to do synthetic biology more successfully or efficiently.

Judge 2

- First off, I was blown away by the incredible output of your team! Your project would have amazed me from an undergraduate (or even overgraduate!) team, so it was especially inspiring to see it from a group of high school students. Your design sense was consistent & impressive. The art on your wiki, the video documentaries you presented, and the design and flow of your presentation were all really enjoyable. You demonstrated incredibly thorough knowledge of your project during your questions answers both at the presentation and poster. I was really impressed by your discussion and documentation of your safety work... Though in general your documentation is lovely. A commendable example that I want to show to future teams! Your design and testing was modular. Your model was really, really impressive! You clearly did a lot of research and developed it very thoughtfully.
- I couldn't give you hardware prize- your Kitty Wonderland makes sense in the product design category, but is not really hardware intended to be used by synthetic biologists. For product design, I thought you did good work with your stakeholders and answered questions well at your poster. I had to dock a few points on integrated human practices for documentation- what you learned from expert interviews was well-documented, but your public and government engagement was not clearly documented. I would love to see even stronger two-way dialogue with members of the public (as well as in consultation with domain experts) but that's a minor question. I wish other aspects of your public engagement were documented in more detail (e.g. future iGEM teams might want to know more about the process of making a documentary).

Judge 3

- Your team put SO MUCH WORK into this project! You have designed it with a lot of thought and clearly spent a lot of time with the literature to determine your best route to success. It is an elegant division of labor between the bacteria and the yeast, and you considered every aspect of the project from ensuring that the two organisms coexisted in harmony to ease of manufacturing at a production scale. I hope you continue to do your best work and move towards publishing this exciting process! In addition, your team presentation was very dynamic and it is clear that you work together well on a very complex project. I appreciated how thorough you were in answering our questions at the poster!
- It would be interesting to see the model expanded to include the role of the specific enzymes you've knocked out to see if you can predict the impact. And of course, putting the whole system together will be an exciting endeavor as well!

Judge 4

- I am very impressed by this project. You designed a very challenging and modular project based on very recent papers, and you managed to convincingly demonstrate that you made everything work. More importantly, you used your new techniques for a really local problem, the stray cats in your city. You used very advanced techniques, especially for high school students, very cool! The part library of TALEsp's you produced will definitely be used by many other future teams! Apart from the science, your human practices were really good. It was really nice to start helping a local lady and raise money for her. I think it's very impressive that you made a working prototype to trap cats in a very humane way. Lastly, your presentation and poster were very well presented, the artwork is beautiful and the design is clear. You did a good job answering questions too, you could explain all the questions we had, and we really came up with difficult questions!
- You had very impressive results, but try to always highlight that you have error bars for everything you do! There Also, I loved that you were helping cats, but if you're synthesizing such a valuable product, it is also good to look at the implications of that!

Judge 5

- Your presentation was really well put together. You succinctly summarized a lot of data in a short amount of time that was easy to understand. I loved all of your artwork! You had great engineering strategy that you broke down your problem into small pieces to test that clearly contributed to the big picture goal. I can clearly see how you are going to fit all of tested parts together to construct a working system. You did great troubleshooting. I liked that you included the results that didn't work in your presentation so we could see how problem solved to find a working system.
- You clearly had a complex project with a lot of different variables. I could not quite follow every aspect of your project directly from the wiki and found myself looking up and googling some of the terms you mentioned. A bit more description and images describing the non standard biology like TALE with incoherent feedforward loop would make your project easier to understand. This would make your work more accessible for other teams to pickup on and use. In addition, you used a lot of abbreviations on your wiki. To make it easier for people that are not familiar with your project to define these variable once on each wiki page for easier understanding.

Judge 6

- You did an exemplary job creating a very full-bodied iGEM project. You not only generated a lot of promising data, you also incorporated very recent literature and systems into your project, which is great to see.
- I wish there was more explanation on the model during the presentation.

Details of the votes

The tables below present the actual number of votes by the judges. They are provided to help you understand how the judges interpreted your project. Each row represents one aspect of your project. The boxes contain the number of votes. Higher votes are on the left.

Project – Standard Track

6						
3	3					
3	3					
6						
1	4	1				
6						
1	5					
1	5					
6						
3	2					

- How impressive is this project?
 How creative is the team's project?
 Did the project work?
 How much did the team accomplish (addressed a real world problem, produced functional BioBricks, carried out Human Practices, created a wiki, presentation, poster, etc.)?
 Is the project likely to have an impact?
 How well were engineering principles (for example: modularity, prototyping, debugging, standardized measurements, etc.) used?
 How thoughtful and thorough was the team's consideration of human practices?
 How much of the work did the team do themselves and how much was done by others?
 Did the team design a project based on synthetic biology and standard parts?
 Are the parts well documented in the Registry?

Project – Special Track

No votes cast for this category

Wiki

4	1					
3	2					
4	1					
3	2					
3	2					

- Do I understand what the team accomplished?
 Is the wiki attractive and easy to navigate?
 Does the team clearly document their project and support their results with convincing evidence?
 How well does the team describe what they did and what was done by others on the Attributions page?
 Will the wiki be a compelling record of the team's project for future teams?

Presentation

4	1					
4	1					
3	1	1				
3	1	1				

- Was the presentation thorough, clear, and easy to understand?
 How visually appealing was the presentation?
 Did you find the presentation engaging?
 How competent were the team members at answering questions?

Poster

3	2					
4	1					
3	2					
4	1					

- Does the poster flow well?
 How well is the project described on their poster?
 Did you find the poster visually appealing?
 How competent were the team members at answering questions?

Integrated Human Practices

4	1					
5						
1	3	1				
1	2	2				

- Was their Human Practices work integrated into their project?
 Does it serve as an inspiring example to others?
 Is it documented in a way that others can build upon?
 Was it thoughtfully implemented? (did they explain the context, rationale, prior work)

Education & Public Engagement

4	1					
3	2					
1	2	1	1			
1	4					

- How well did their work promote mutual learning and engagement?
 Does it serve as an inspiring example to others?
 Is it documented in a way that others can build upon?
 Was it thoughtfully implemented? (did they explain the context, rationale, prior work)

Model

2	3					
5						
1	4					
3	2					

- How impressive is the modeling?
 Did the model help the team understand a part, device, or system?
 Did the team use measurements of a part, device, or system to develop the model?
 Does the modeling approach provide a good example for others?

Measurement

No votes cast for this category

Entrepreneurship

No votes cast for this category

Product Design

	2	2	1			
	1	4				
	3	1	1			
2	2	1				
2	1	1	1			

- Does the team's synthetic biology product address a real-world need?
 Does their product successfully incorporate synthetic biology into its design?
 How impressive was the demonstration (at the Giant Jamboree or through video) and documentation of their product?
 How well did the team engage with potential users and/or experts and incorporate feedback into the product design?
 Has the team thoughtfully considered the positive and negative implications of their product?

Software Tool

No votes cast for this category

Hardware

		1	2	2		
	1	2	1	1		
	1	1	2	1		
1	1	2	1	1		

- Does the hardware address a need or problem in synthetic biology?
 Did the team conduct user testing and learn from user feedback?
 Did the team demonstrate utility and functionality in their hardware proof of concept?
 Is the documentation of the hardware system sufficient to enable reproduction by other teams?

Plant Synthetic Biology

No votes cast for this category

New Basic Part

	5					
1	2	2				
4	1					
	5					
3	1	1				

- How does the documentation compare to BBa_K863006 and BBa_K863001?
 How new/innovative is it?
 Did the team show the part works as expected?
 Is it useful to the community?
 How well characterized (experimentally measured) is this Basic Part when tested in a device?

New Composite Part

2	3					
1	3	1				
3	2					
1	4					
3	1	1				

- How does the documentation compare to BBa_K404122 and BBa_K863005?
 How new/innovative is it?
 Did the team show the part works as expected?
 Is it useful to the community?
 How well characterized (experimentally measured) is this Composite Part?

4	1				
1	3	1			
3	1	1			
3	2				
2	2	1			

- Is this collection a coherent group of parts meant to be used as a collection, or just a list of all the parts the team made?
- How does the documentation compare to the BBa_K747000–095 collection?
- Did the team submit a complete collection allowing it to be used without any further manipulation or parts from outside of the Registry?
- Did the team finish building a functional system using this collection?
- Is it useful to the community?