Reviewer: Ng Chi Hui, Seat 19
DSAI2

1. **Strive for Consistency**
   The designer understands the details and intricacies that **show for a consistent UI**. He has implemented the design with a consistent visual layout in mind. This can be observed from the same layout, which includes the navigation bars, the map displays, and the set of symbols used for various purposes. There is also a consistent sequence of actions for similar situations. Overall, the UI remains consistent, and the interface does not change much as the users use different functionalities of the kiosk.

2. **Cater to Universal Usability**
   The designer has made **some effort to cater to users with different skill levels**. Upon the tapping of the question mark icon in the planning section of Screen 3, the user would be brought to a pop-up screen that **instructs the user on how to use the planning interface**. The tutorial feature is helpful for **novice users**. For the **more advanced user**, features such as the **filter button and the sorting** button in Screen 2.3 allow for better customization. The interface thus supports users from novice to more advanced users. The ease of use of this interface is further supported using navigation bars that require no memorization, little action to move from one page to another, and a simple structure. No jargon is being used in the interface, making it easy to pick up.

   The author has thoughtfully added helpful settings, such as the language selection feature, to **cater to guests of different nationalities**.

   The kiosk **catered to visually impaired and elderly users**. In Screen 2, the 'View by Map' feature allows the user to zoom in and out, which can support those with poorer vision. The evaluator believes that the designer can have **more options/settings page** that caters to visual disabilities by adding a voice dictation option, text-to-speech functionality, and text visibility control.

3. **Provide Informative Feedback**
   This rule was followed quite closely as every action taken by the user would yield some result or display. For example, when the user taps into a particular section (i.e., Screen 2.2, View by List then Shows), the **navigation bar will be highlighted**, indicating to the user which page he/she is on. It will also display the section the user has tapped on. This visual approach makes feedback clear and easy; users can **easily understand** what action has been done.

   However, the evaluator believes improvements can be made to the section where the profiles of the visitors are being recognised (Main interface page). Though some informative feedback has been provided whereby when a new user is detected, sound will be produced, and information of the new user will be shown. However, the evaluator believes that the **feedback provided is displayed in a tiny section** of the entire interface. It will not be immediately clear to the user if the kiosk has been updated to the information that he has inputted previously, or a new profile is created. A suggestion is to have forms of **visual cues (i.e., dialog boxes)** such as "Welcome back, your information and plans are currently being updated and loaded" or "You have successfully registered" etc.

4. **Design Dialogs to Yield Closure**
   This prototype did not describe any dialogs and functions involving a sequence of steps. There's not much indication of design dialogs that have yielded closure or similar actions that give notification to the user stating that the action has been completed. The evaluator believes this **UI lacks dialog**.

   The evaluator suggests that more design dialogs can be added, such as in the **login section** when the user has successfully registered/login. Alternatively, dialogs could be added in the **planning section,** such as when the user **deletes an activity/saves** the plan. One such sequence of action could be **Edit Plan, Save Plan, Viewing the Updated Plan**. This might provide the user with a better indication about the completion of the planning section.

   However, it should be noted that there isn't much scope to include this in the kiosk, as most of the actions are quite simple and, upon completion, there would be a change in the screen. There are very few functionalities that are long enough to have an entire sequence of beginning, middle, and end to provide closure.

5. **Permit Easy Reversal of Actions**

   Easy reversal of actions can be seen with various buttons such as the **cross button after adding activity into the plan, the favourites button in the featured screen** (tapping adds it to favorites and tapping again unfavorite it), the **undo button in the favourites and planning section** also allows the easy reversal of action. A **home button** common to all pages is a positive factor in this UI design, as the user could return to the first page easily. The designer has done a good job in implementing features that support the reversal of actions. The evaluator suggests that a redo button beside the undo button could also be helpful.

6. **Support Internal Locus of Control**

   There is **no acausality** seen in the interface currently, as all responses made by the interface are initiated by the user. A change in the interface is only triggered by a user clicking a button.

   Navigation and tasks activation has been clearly marked in the UI using navigation bars (i.e. View Destination Information, View/Edit My Plan) and Buttons (i.e., Home Button) that allow the users to access all the features on one page. This is a huge plus point as it helps the user **feel in control of the kiosk operating process**, as the actions are **easily reversible**, and **the user can quickly switch from one page to another**. Another good example of giving users the locus of control can be seen in Screen 2.1 Rides list, is by providing them with the **ability to filter and sort the rides by their features**. This tool can help facilitate their decision making.

7. **Reduce Short Term Memory Load**

   There is almost only one screen, where all the pages can be accessed from Screen 2. Thus, the **display is simple**. With the help of the navigation bar, it is easy for the user to move from one state to another. Actions/screens are always **1-2 clicks away, much lesser than the traditional short-term memory limit**. When the user is on a page, the button on the navigation bar is also highlighted to tell the user which page he is. This reduces the need for the user to remember where he is already on the display, as there are sufficient visual cues.

   The user also does not need to remember information from one display and then use it in another. One good example would be in the **Planning Interface**. The user **does not need to remember what rides/eateries/shows he or she has favorited in the other section of the UI**, as all the activities that the user has favorited before **will be shown in the Favorites section of the planning interface** allowing the user to easily access what they have added.

   This interface design thus **ensures low memory load** for the user, as they do not have to remember much information and cross-reference them between different pages.

8. **Prevent Errors**

   This prototype provides **very little indication of error prevention**. The evaluator suggests the following features to be added. For instance, in Screen 3, upon tapping the information button in the favorites section, it prompts the user to choose from various show timings. Error handling can be added here, such as the **greying out of timings** that have passed so that the user wouldn't be able to select them. Another feature that the author could consider implementing is in the planning interface. When the user taps on the cross button to remove the activity, the interface can **generate a confirmation message** before deleting, which helps prevent accidental removal of activities.

   This prototype is consistent with the layout and design in other interfaces, such as the **cross button on the top righ**t and other commonly used logos, such as **heart shape for favorites**. This allows the user to **quickly familiarize with the interface and thus would be less likely to make errors**.

9. **Additional Comments**

   The whole flow of the Lo-Fi design is generally good. The design shows very clearly the transitions for each screen and has included key features and functionalities required. However, the evaluator believes the prototype could improve through clearer annotations of user actions and consequences. For example, what exactly happens after the user taps cross on an activity in the planning section- does it return to the favourites section, or the activity is obliterated? Another example would be how login/registration is being handled by the interface.