**Qualitative Evaluation - Iteration 3**

To assess the LoFi Web App developed in the previous step, a qualitative evaluation was conducted. For this purpose, interviews were conducted with three different test persons in the context of different test cases. The test person were a 27-year-old male, a 55-year-old female, and a 60-year-old male. Since the target group of our app was adapted during iteration 2 and only the interface for those seeking help, i.e. those making a request, is now being created as part of the project work, the personas and scenarios developed in iteration 1 were only usable in part for the current task. This resulted in the following three test cases: in test case 1, the person opened the app for the first time and was then to explore it in its entirety. In test case 2, the person was to make a request and complete all the necessary steps to do so, while in test case 3, the test person was to find information and inspiration about garden projects on the "Explore" page.

Evaluation criteria included checking the presence of an acceptable user flow, the extent to which all icons used in the web app were understandable, and whether functions were generally missing or unnecessary. During the interview, this allowed some problems to be identified, but also suggestions to be generated.

For example, buttons that allow an action to be performed, were not recognized as buttons in all cases (example: keyword selection on the "Add-Request" page or the "Latest reviews" filter option on the "Review" page). Here, the next step should be to work on the design again.

When selecting the keyword and defining the time span on the "Add-Request" page, the test subjects wished to have an additional "Submit" button and not just the currently existing "Close" button. The group felt this criticism was absolutely justified and will therefore follow up on the implementation.

The pop-up notifications that the user receives when some functions are executed, were rated as very helpful by the users, but some would have liked to have them placed more centrally on the screen and the display duration extended.

One test person would also like to have access to a person's profile from all interfaces where the profile picture and name can be seen, and not only from certain interfaces. However, this limitation is mainly due to the "low fidelity" of the web app prototype and will be overcome in the next iteration step.

For the oldest of the test persons, the "location" icon (when entering the zip code when creating a request) was incomprehensible. However, since this is actually a fairly common icon for the use case, it is probably not necessary to change the icon, since there is also the additional option of entering the postcode normally via the input field and the icon is therefore not mandatory to use, but redundant.

One test person suggested that the user already specifies a price when creating the request, so that the step of "asking for a price" is omitted. This could further increase user flow. After discussion within the group, however, they came to the conclusion that a price specification at the beginning would limit the flexibility and advantages of the users of the “Craftive” App too much. In addition, another test person had attached that the reduction to two main functions in the request area ("Ask price" and "See offer") is a good, logical and sufficient reduction and the "user flow" becomes clear quickly at the latest through a little trial and error.

Overall, the user flow can therefore be judged as sufficient, the icons as mostly understandable and the scope of the functions as appropriate.