CS2HCI: Human Computer Interaction
Knowledge Elicitation Report Feedback Form

Team: 2A

what²
why how

What *have you done well?*	The report presents the content in a logical order with balanced attention given to all expected areas.

Comprehensive rationale included for methodological choices related to the data collection methods used.

Figures have been used to good effect where applicable within the report.

Use of direct quotes is relevant and provides good evidence to help support the arguments made.

The use of thematic analysis and evidence of its application in Table 2 demonstrate good effort at approaching data analysis using a systematic method.

The discussion is insightful, demonstrating a high standard of analytical reflection on the findings and clear associations between the findings and the design challenge.

Reflection on the study limitations and how the team attempted to address some of them is thoughtful. |

What *could you have done better?*	Although you include some details about your knowledge elicitation plan, there was a need to include more so that someone reading your report may be able to replicate your study from your explanation. For example, how long was your survey live for? On average how long was a typical interview? Etc. It would have been desirable to start the analysis section with some demographic information describing your sample of participants and their key characteristics. Analysis is thoughtful, but one way it could be further improved is by including more inferential analyses that consider the relationships between different variables/factors. The discussion on limitations is insightful. One way it could be improved is by commenting on how the limitations may have affected the results. In what direction do you think these would have affected preferences for particular features? Which features do you think may have been most affected by these biases?
Why *is it important to implement improvements?*	The report is well-written and presents a balanced justification of the chosen elicitation methods. It includes some detail about the knowledge elicitation plan, but scope to have included more to allow a potential reader to replicate the study. Findings reported are interesting, but scope to dig deeper, for example, by discussing associations between factors. There are some excellent links between the findings and the design revealing deep thinking about design-related decisions.
How *can the improvements best be made?*	Please see the comments above.

Please see Blackboard for individual grades based on your contribution to the knowledge elicitation report. If you did not contribute to this report, then you will receive a mark of zero.