

## REVIEW FOR GROUP 4

Generally, we think that you have chosen an interesting and original case, which certainly has potential for a lot of interesting technical choices and discussions. Since your technical sections did not make it to the draft, we cannot comment on general technical aspects of your design, but instead we will present our immediate thoughts when reading the report. As such our feedback is structured section-wise. Please note that we have tried to keep our feedback brief and to the point. If a section, which was present in your draft, is not mentioned below, it is because we had no critical comments to make.

### Section 2.1

It is not clear **why** the audiobook case was chosen over some of the alternatives:

You mention a choice between books and music, but after a discussion you downvoted an idea where users created music online. We think the mentioning of the downvoting is justified only if you also mention why the idea was downvoted.

We were also confused about what happened to the book choice (not audio books) you mention. We assume that regular books were downvoted in favor of audio books, but if so, why?

#### Section 2.1.1

We do not think the concept is clear enough in this section. In particular, we were not sure what is meant by “community created audio books”.

We were thinking *“is it both the audio and text that is created by the user, or do the users make audio for existing books (or both)?”*

This is elaborated in later sections of the report, but we would like a clarification here.

#### Section 2.1.2

We see no reason to split section 2.1.1 and section 2.1.2 into two different sections.

Since 2.1.2 is an elaboration of 2.1.1, you can consider to merge these sections.

### Section 2.2

In your second bullet point, you mention that users contribute with “media”, which is a very broad term. Consider adding a little more detail to which kind of media e.g. “Users who upload audio recordings of themselves reading the published books”.

We also think that financing, e.g. the purchase of credits, is relevant for describing the business opportunity. You can consider moving it from section 2.1.2 to here.

#### Section 2.2.1

It is a great idea to argue for the community feel of your service. It is however very critical that the reader is convinced by this section. We do not agree with the claim that the features presented in this section provides a “community feel”.

Instead, they suggest a very competitive environment, but competing can also be discouraging rather than encouraging. Claiming that the competition about creating the most popular audio, will “generate a lot of discussions/word of mouth advertising for each title,

providing the publishers with valuable eyes-on-their-product time” needs more convincing. Is it possible to comment or rate the audio? This would help with creating the community. The last sentence in the section, about money, seems to be misplaced here. This would fit into section 2.2 instead.

### Section 2.2.2

We think that it is a great idea to include this section. Our group members asked the question in the title, so the section is definitely relevant.

However, we do think that this section is a bit heavy on claims.

“Each chapter being suffused with the community feel.” relies a lot on your argumentation in section 2.2.1. You mention that the product caters especially to blind people, but this does not seem inherent to the system as such. This should be elaborated. It should also be noted that you have not mentioned “free sponsor titles” previously.

You mention “a group of people that like literature and accepts everyone as they are”, but it is not explained how will ensure these friendly personalities in the group.

### Section 3.2

Consider to place the full list of use cases in an appendix and then discuss only a few examples in the report.

### Section 3.3

“The areas chosen for the discussion can be seen in appendix A, lower is more important” - remove “lower is more important”, as a reader there is no frame of reference for what “lower” is, and as such this is confusing.

“The course requirements are important for obvious reasons and was weighed somewhat higher.” - either just say that they are weighed “higher”, or explain why they’re more important. It is not obvious/you are missing an entire section of the argument.

“`\textbf{testing}`” (you meant `\textbf{testing}`, didn’t you?)

Page 8 is a bit of a wall of text and might benefit from splitting into smaller paragraphs.

You explain how everything adds to “automatic documentation” - but documentation is not prioritized very highly? This seems counter-intuitive.

A reference for and an explanation of **doxygen** would be nice here.

You claim that code quality is “important”, but do not qualify the claim with an explanation.

You have a ton of different themes and claims mixed together, this makes the paragraph almost unreadable. It would benefit from a restructuring.

Also most of the claims made in this section have no warrant (Toulmin).

“To benefit ourselves” - ends abruptly.

## Section 6

This is a nice introduction.

### Section 6.1

This is a lot of referencing and quoting from the books. It would be better to *very briefly* introduce the terms, provide references, and then focus on discussing your experiences (take the discussion from *your* perspective instead of a *general* perspective).

### Section 6.3

This section is good!

Explain what the *Singaporean usage of the word "can"* actually means.

It seems misplaced (you haven't done this before) to introduce the next section already in this one (the last paragraph can be removed).

### Section 6.4

A bit wall-of-text-y. Break it up a bit more, perhaps. Illustrations, tables, etc. would be welcome. The first bit, about the video conference, is about your experience (which is good), but it doesn't really concern technical tools.

"Of course..." - either qualify it by explaining **why** or just state that it happened and not that it was a given.

You say that you used several tools for "different purposes", but don't introduce these. Don't be a tease - save it for when you're actually talking about it.

You are **only** talking about Skype in the first 1½ page- mentioning that it was used "extensively" in the last week seems redundant.

You have some nice points in this section but it is very repetitive. You mention, several times, that you ended up moving from voice chat to text chat. This section could be boiled down to around one page without losing anything important.

### Section 6.5

Good section!

Qualify that it is often that communication leads to misunderstandings or simply state that "misunderstandings sometimes happen".

Include pictures (small versions), it breaks up the reading flow, making it more digestable. Additionally, you have several cases of "lag" where you actually mean "lack of".

### Section 6.6

Good section

Could use a better finish to the section.

### Section 6.7

Differs from previous projects? Exemplify or leave out.

You mention "similarities (that you have a lot of)" but don't mention any actual similarities.

6.8.1: Why is it obvious that you have "thick Danish accents"?

How are you "the leaders" if it did not shine through "decision-wise"?

Writing that you resorted to an excuse to move to Skype Chat, seems to imply that your previous Skype section is also just an excuse.

### Section 6.8.2

Good mix of referencing and examples!

“Avoiding a bit of ethnocentrism also proved unattainable.” - Why not “A bit of ethnocentrism proved unavoidable”?

Overall: You mention accent barriers, switch to Skype a **lot** of times in the report, repeating a lot of surrounding stuff.