

CS3040 Mobile Design & Development

Synopsis & Critical Reviews

Student ID: 160108204

Student Name: Bhaven Patel

Report #1: Ontrack

Please include the full paper reference (not just the title) in the box at the top: this can be easily copied and pasted in from the BB page where you selected your paper. Comment applies to all reports.

Whilst there are some good points in your opening intro to the work, you could usefully have more fully articulated the problem that the authors were trying to solve and given a more concise and clear explanation of the concept itself (i.e., how it works). I would have expected to see explicit mention of the fact Ontrack represents a minimal attention, ambient interface.

You provide a strong outline of the study set-up and protocol: most of the expected information is there but there is scope for a few gaps to be plugged such as the fact that the users' speed was constrained and the guidance did not auto-reroute if the user went the wrong way. Similarly, how were target locations indicated in the 3D simulated environment?

When discussing the results, it is not helpful to your reader (whom you should assume has not read the original paper) to mention tables of content (s)he cannot see. Your overview of the results could, therefore, be clearer and more specific so that your reader can fully appreciate the findings of the study.

Good outline of the other potential uses to which Ontrack could be put.

Overall, quite a strong first synopsis. Most of the expected content was there but scope for a bit more detail in places and a little more precision at times.

Be careful not to over claim – do you really think that “everyone” would use this on a daily basis? Whilst I appreciate what you are trying to say, technical/scientific writing needs to be very precise. I, for one, would never use this system as I don't listen to music via headphones when out and about! ☺ In what way do you believe that Ontrack “maintains the clarity of what the directions are”? Don't just make statements like this, expand on your thinking to argue your point. Again, on what basis do you make that claim that more people would rather navigate discretely than having their mobile on show? You must not make claims you cannot support with evidence: just temper the language you are using. Ultimately, you get to the point that the fact that the user is being navigated to a destination is more hidden using Ontrack and this could be

66%

<p>beneficial...but you could elaborate further on why this would be a benefit.</p> <p>Good point that the lack of familiarity of the evaluation location placed everyone in the same boat and returned true raw navigational results. Good that you appreciate the benefit of task order randomisation. What else, however, was flawed in the study set-up? Did the lack of speed variation have any impact in your opinion? What about the lack of auto re-routing? You talk about the potential real-world impact of ambient noise on the use of Ontrack itself, but what about its absence from the study?</p> <p>Good point about the ambient noise occluding the navigational instructions. Good point about the potential directional limitations of the system. Good point about occlusion by other phone alerts.</p> <p>You touch on the potential issues with pauses between (or within) songs: are there any other features of the music itself that could render some music more suitable than others? Genre? Natural variation in volume and panning? What about the inability to repeat a direction cue? What happens when the user stands still? Impact of walking? Occlusion of real world sounds – safety? Antisocial? Annoyance? Familiarity of music – i.e., does it matter if the user knows the track well? What about users' concentration on the music – would that be sustained? There are lots of elements you could tease out in terms of critiquing the concept.</p> <p>Good point about the different group sizes. Also, good point about using something like Google maps as the comparison but your discussion on this could have made the point more clearly – i.e., why this would have been a fairer comparison. You could also have better elaborated on your criticism of the use of paper maps.</p> <p>You touch on the impact of real world sounds but don't reflect on how this could have been incorporated in the study set-up. What about the use of a workload rating that is based on NASA TLX? Why not use the validated rating scale itself? What does their decision mean in terms of the reliability of the data collected?</p> <p>What might you take away from this work to use in your coursework?</p> <p>Overall, a good critical review but there was scope to extract more from the paper and to have better discussed the points you are raising.</p>	
---	--

Report #2: Dynamic Visualisation of Ski Data

<p>You could have better articulated the problem space the authors were trying to tackle – not just their goals, but the situation they were trying to fix. What is currently wrong with using paper maps, for instance?</p> <p>You provide a reasonable outline of the visualisation and its basis on preference settings but it would be good to have read about the investigation the authors did in terms of what visualisation of suitability they should use (resulting in the choice to vary line thickness).</p> <p>You touch on many of the key elements of the study protocol/set-up but there are some elements that need further explanation. For example, was this a within- or between-groups study? The explanation of the tasks was OK but could be a little clearer for the benefit of someone who has not read the original article.</p>	<p>66%</p>
--	-------------------

<p>Your outline of the results is OK; again, scope for a little more clarity. You also outline the authors' stated limitations quite nicely.</p> <p>Overall, a reasonably strong synopsis but scope for more detail and clarity in places.</p> <p>Your opening critical review paragraph content, minus the opinion statement, is really what you should have woven into the start of your synopsis: it is not really critiquing the work so adds nothing new and is more of a fact/context setting paragraph.</p> <p>Good point about the fact that it is supporting a difficult task: can you elaborate on why you feel it has done this well though? You clearly appreciate that this is solving a problem but has it solved it effectively? Same goes for the fact that preferences have been added to the route planning mix – again, is this done well? What do you think of the chosen visualisation for this?</p> <p>You touch on some interesting points about the experimental design: how do you think lighting would impact the use of the system and why? Same for ambient sound (given there is no audio feedback in the system)? Again, can you elaborate on the issue with familiarity as it relates to both of the tested route planning systems?</p> <p>Some good points about the actual prospect of using the system in the real world. Are there other obstacles to its use you can think of? What about having to take off gloves? Fishing it out of internal pockets in the ski wear? Compare this to paper map?</p> <p>Relating the above to the experimental set-up, what could have been done differently? Perhaps replicating some of the practical elements? What about running the study somewhere more realistic but cost effective such as an indoor snow dome?</p> <p>Any comment on the task completion time measure given that for the mobile device it included the swapping in and out of quadrants? How could this have been handled better?</p> <p>Some nice thinking regarding the prospect of a dedicated device for skiers.</p> <p>What can you take from this work and apply to your coursework?</p> <p>Overall, a good critical review: scope to better structure it to explore the concept/system and then the study rather than jumping about as much and to have teased more out of both aspects of the work. Scope for deeper elaboration on your points.</p>	
--	--

Aggregate Mark:

66

%



The detailed feedback provided above is intended to help you improve on your synopsis and critical reviewing and associated report writing skills. The lessons you should learn from the above feedback are briefly summarised as follows:

What <i>have you done well?</i>	Synopses are on the right lines. Critical reviews pick upon some good points.
What <i>could you have done better?</i>	<p>Your synopses could have included a little more detail/clarity in places. Your critical reviews could have teased more out of the papers, and elaborated more fully on some of the points you are making.</p> <p>Your writing is not bad, but scope for more precision such that you are always entirely accurate in what you are saying.</p>
Why <i>is it important to implement improvements?</i>	<p>You need to develop synopses that can stand alone as complete and accurate summaries of the reported work for someone who has not read the original paper: yours are not quite there yet but are close.</p> <p>Your critical reviews need to dig deeper to show us more insight and critical reflective skills which are well articulated in your report.</p>
How <i>can the improvements best be made?</i>	See detailed feedback above.