

Dear ZIHAO YOU (1907318),

Please find below comments and feedback from the examiners for your final-year project undertaken in 2021-2022.

Introduction:

Overall, an excellent motivation within the introduction.

The project's aims are not particularly clear, this is stated more as a series of outcomes. Nonetheless, the project is well motivated and its importance is underlined.

The report structure is delineated clearly.

Literature Review:

The coverage of related projects is a little briefer than it might be but generally captures the key areas. Perhaps too much background was given to general concepts such as usability, and design thinking rather than providing a more clearly argued synthesis of the key topics related to the research (AAC, accessibility, supporting speech and reading).

Specification and Design:

The specification of the initial prototype is well explained. The general idea is well presented, and the user and system requirements are clear.

Later on, these requirements are further refined through discussions with users, which generally shows a solid approach to the project.

Implementation/Technical achievement:

Overall, the final implemented system is conceptually interesting and novel implementation.

It is of medium sophistication - not much technical skill is required to build this, and there are a few minor flaws in the final prototype - both conceptual and technical.

The various user-centred design work in this project is good. Although a relatively small participant pool is used, these are of high quality as they are experts. The approach is not as robust as it might be, but nonetheless, captures very useful data.

The presentation of this is generally OK, but at points, the UCD work might be better explained as the Miro boards are not always clear (without going to the board itself).

The description of the implementation is very clear, but perhaps not written as objectively as it might be. This is a relatively basic implementation, which should

not really be described as 'tricky'. In general, this is a bit too narrative and personal.

#### Evaluation:

It was good to see an evaluation with users. The results might have been a little more detailed in the report. These are reasonably well compared to the requirements.

The report might have reflected on the results in the context of the wider literature better - comparing back to the papers discussed earlier.

#### General Scholarship:

Apart from some quite narrative parts, this was a well-written document. Good use of referencing, sectioning and good English overall.

At times, the arguments slightly break down, especially when discussing the needs of people with aphasia. However, a good effort was made considering the student was not able to engage with some end users.

Overall, a well-structured report, with only minor shortcomings in terms of grammar, etc.

There are lots of ideas for future work.

#### Legal, Social, Ethical and Professional...:

They key legal, ethical, social and professional issues related to the project are described, but not discussed. There are many ethically charged topics when designing for users with accessibility needs, and generally many ethical concerns around AAC, which might have been better described here.

You should have seen your project mark already, but if you haven't, please refer to Student Records.

Kind regards,  
NMES Postmaster