Jeremiah Choi – 300474835

**Visibility of system status: 5/5**

* The status of which the screen is on is always displayed at the top of the screen.

**Match between system and the real world: 3/5**

* The terminologies used are common among gamers whilst simple can lead to a lot of newbie confusion.

**User control and freedom: 3/5**

* A return button is always clearly displayed, however the position of the button change on some screen and can lead to slip ups.

**Consistency and standards: 2/5**

* Words are once again used in a group of targeted users(gamers) and on the home screen one have to wonder the difference between “View Map” and “To Battle”. And for further confusion on manage military and front screen there are both a manage production button.
* This part is nitpicking, I don’t see the reason to add an extra “manage” in front of military and production buttons.

**Error prevention: 4/5**

* There is a clear 2nd indication for user before they made an important decision (to battle) that can lead to permanent effects.

**Recognition rather than recall: 2/5**

* While information are clearly displayed the uses of huge amount of numbers and information on “military” and how it is not clearly displayed or fit in 1 small window leads to the heavy case of recall rather than recognition.

**Flexibility and efficiency of use: 3.5/5**

* The location of buttons are a bit inconsistent but they are big and clear and well-spaced apart.

**Aesthetic and minimalist design: 4/5**

* The design is great, the tilted rectangular buttons give a good sense of sleek and aggressiveness for the game and there is a certain minimalism to it even if it is not much of.

**Help users recognize, diagnose, and recover from errors: 0/5**

* No clear and description of this.

**Help and documentation: 4/5**

* There are buttons to further show more information, though I do not see a documentation of any sort like a tutorial.

Lillian Hide-Tobin 300451675

**Visibility of system status: 3/5**

* The differences show what screen the users is using most of the time, but there are similar screens that hard to differentiate.

**Match between system and the real world: 5/5**

* Words are clear and easy to understand.

**User control and freedom: 5/5**

* Return buttons are always present and serve as an undo button as well.

**Consistency and standards: 4/5**

* Words used are clear and simple, buttons and icons are always where they were.

**Error prevention: 2/5**

* There are no preventions implemented in case of errors and mistakes, the only way to undo is through back/return.

**Recognition rather than recall: 2/5**

* Since there are no clear indications of which mode the systems is on, users need to rely on recall to know which is which.
* Other actions used icons and short words descriptions as well, no need to rely on memory for these actions.

**Flexibility and efficiency of use: 2.5/5**

* The efficiency of use changing between each screen/mode is simple but being unable to go through other modes in home screen lead to a lack of flexibility.

**Aesthetic and minimalist design: 4/5**

* The design is minimalistic and simple
* While it uses a striking and rare green color the design is slightly too simple that can leave a good lasting effects.

**Help users recognize, diagnose, and recover from errors: 0/5**

* No error or diagnose screens are implemented

**Help and documentation: 3/5**

* There are a help “i” button on most modes.

Andrija Djorovic - 300366056

**Visibility of system status: 1/5**

* Besides from the login screen there is no clear indication of which screen the user is on. And the designs mainly stay the same throughout most screens and it becomes quite confusing.

**Match between system and the real world: 4.5/5**

* The terminologies used are fairly simple and straight to the point. The only exception is the create group page where “public” and “private” words are used which can be slightly hard to understand for new users.

**User control and freedom: 5/5**

* The systems navigate using a sidebar eliminates the need for a return button however a return to previous screen button could also be integrated for more freedom of use.

**Consistency and standards: 5/5**

* Words and terms used are clear.

**Error prevention: 1/5**

* There are no visibly error prevention implemented though the systems also has no particular needs for errors prevention. It could still be implemented in logout button.

**Recognition rather than recall: 2/5**

* Informations are clearly delivered and the only instance of recall is login information which also served as security and protection.
* However the icon of the sidebar while is very common and should be to most users it is still too minimalistic and can and will create confusion to users who do not know the meaning of the icon.
* With no clear indication of the screen status, users are unable to determine which state they are on and have to rely on recall/memory.

**Flexibility and efficiency of use: 5/5**

* The sidebar allow the access to all function screens almost instantly at any moment.

**Aesthetic and minimalist design: 3/5**

* The design is aesthetically pleasing and minimal but subjectively I don’t prefer the choice of color. And the size of the bars and options are a bit too big to fit in 1 screen most of the time if the functions are heavily used.

**Help users recognize, diagnose, and recover from errors: 0/5**

* No clear and description of this.

**Help and documentation: 0/5**

* No tutorials or documentations are visible.

Jack Rodgers - 300446310

**Visibility of system status: 4/5**

* While it doesn’t say, the differences give each screen/mode give them a clear distinction.

**Match between system and the real world: 3.5/5**

* Some acronyms are used such as AR and some technical jargons are used.
* The technical jargons are quite common enough and I don’t think there are simpler words to replace them so I find it inconsequential.

**User control and freedom: 5/5**

* Very good uses of returns and sidebar as well. Not to mention a search bar for further interaction and freedom.

**Consistency and standards: 5/5**

* Words used are clear and simple.

**Error prevention: 5/5**

* There are important warning screen when making actions that could have permanent effects

**Recognition rather than recall: 4.5/5**

* Almost everything is clearly described and do not require form of memorization.

**Flexibility and efficiency of use: 4.5/5**

* All actions are short and easy to perform
* There is the inclusion of a search bar to shorten the searching process
* There are no personalized customization(though I find it unnecessary)

**Aesthetic and minimalist design: 4/5**

* The design is minimalistic and simple
* While it uses a striking and rare green color the design is slightly too simple that can leave a good lasting effects.

**Help users recognize, diagnose, and recover from errors: 5/5**

* Always give an error screen and explains a constructive solution.

**Help and documentation: 5/5**

* A tutorial and documentation is given at the beginning.
* Personally I would prefer and option to say don’t show this again rather than having it appear only once and have to manually look for it again.