Peer Review (11/5)

Alexandra Hurst

-PCA usage felt confusing for those not initiated. If the target audience is general lay people a PCA would not be conducive for this visualization. Multiple comments were made to choose another encoding for information to provide a general look at all dimensions of personality. The large portion of feedback was at this single point. It left most other sections feeling neglected as a result. This has been addressed by Jordan Pyper by reworking the section.

- Mentioned the table that had the empirical density plot in the prototype drawing, and asked about its purpose. They weren't sure what the histograms or empirical densities were supposed to describe. This will be addressed with more clear storytelling and descriptors.

-A general concern was to use not only numbers to represent data. This wasn't directed specifically at any component of our design but a warning of a trap we could fall into. This concern resonated with us are looking to use color and other visceral streams of information to connect with the user.

Ky Lamoureux

-The map was generally well accepted. Not much feedback other than the idea was sound and our concepts seem to work.

-The space utilization was greatly praised. This tenant will carry over to our final design and will maintain a priority.

- One theme in their concerns was understanding the purpose of a particular graphic. We might need to make sure it is apparent what the information is describing or add detail to clear up any confusion.

General Concerns

-This peer review was helpful to get to verbalize our concept to critics. Having a third party to tell you where you've gone wrong and where your strengths lie was very helpful. The main problem was that the feedback wasn't directed even though there is a document to guide the feedback. Our map was mostly neglected for feedback and the table view felt pushed aside for criticism on the PCA chart. Most of our feedback was on this chart which ultimately just resulted in scraping the PCA entirely.