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## Nielson’s Heuristics Evaluation:

Below is a documentation of everything noted by the evaluating team members when using Nielsen's Heuristics as a guide to the aspects of the system to be evaluated. Each numbered section is an article of evaluation in the Heuristics guide, and each lettered subsection is a summary of observations including flaws, defects, strengths, and neutral observations.

1. Visibility of system status:
   1. The system’s status is clear as we see that in each of the presented screens, there’s clear indications of the following:
      1. What feature are we on?
      2. Is the voice recognition listening to me?
      3. Should I have my volume up? (visual indication of sound playing)
   2. Due to the indetermination of process speeds in the prototypes, we weren’t able to test the response and feedback speeds.
2. Match between system and real world:
   1. Language of the system is very similar to the ‘mainstream’ world.
   2. Voice recognition is very often problematic with accent recognition and the designer’s prototype has not been able to address that.
   3. Information flow seems natural. No item of concern regarding information flow and order.
3. User control and freedom:
   1. No clear exit sign in many of the screens (*suggested edit: add exit buttons)*
   2. No undo buttons for actions
   3. No redo buttons for actions
   4. Very little consideration for navigation while using voice commands.
   5. No way to navigate to settings.
4. Consistency and standards:
   1. Navigation inconsistency, for example, some screens offer voice commands and some don’t. So, can we navigate the system through voice or can’t we?
   2. No multiple situations or words guide to the same thing. Standard of language consistency is fine.
5. Error prevention:
   1. No major error screens needed consideration in design, other than lack of connectivity and failure to recognize speech.
   2. Due to the inconsistency with the microphone logo positioning, it’s actually likely that people will habitually press in a location expecting a screen and trigger the microphone instead. (*suggested edits: increase consistency to avoid errors)*
6. Recognition, rather than recall:
   1. Recognizable symbols and metaphors (microphone logo, labels are clear and visible)
   2. Intuitive navigation (scrolling and pressing)
7. Flexibility and efficiency of use:
   1. No explanation of certain features (such as ASMR)
   2. No info screen displayed. No settings screen displayed.
   3. No functional algorithm is present yet, but the description of the system states that there will be personalization due to information storage and the algorithm’s ability to tailor and respond to inquiries based on the user.
8. Aesthetic and minimalistic design:
   1. Minimalistic design. Dialogues do not contain irrelevant bits of information.
   2. Aesthetics of the design were modern, and consistent throughout. The design language was clear in its attempts to stay away from sharp contrasts and sharp edges. Items blurred into each other beautifully.
9. Help users recognize, diagnose, and recover from errors:
   1. The system simulation (manned responses) seemed easy to navigate with voice. Going back, or undoing an action, can be made with a simple “I didn’t mean that”, “wait, not that”, or “go back” command.
   2. ASMR is a widely enough used abbreviation in its own community, but there should be some sort of ‘first-time’ introduction to the users who don’t already know.
   3. Users should be able to opt out of certain features.
10. Help and documentation:
    1. No screen to access user history.
    2. No action to delete entries a user doesn’t want suggested.
    3. No profile summary page included in prototype.