# Potential Conflicts and Questions for Explore Feature Integration

## 1. Concepts System Integration

\*\*Potential Conflict\*\*: The refined Explore feature is deeply integrated with the Concepts System (Section 5.9), but the exact implementation details of the Concepts System may differ from what's assumed in the Explore feature.

\*\*Questions\*\*:

- Has the Concepts System (Section 5.9) been fully defined with the same concept structure (domains, concepts, relationships) as expected by the Explore feature?

- Are the color coding systems for concepts compatible between the two features?

- Is there a clear ownership boundary between Explore feature and Concepts System for shared functionality?

## 2. Database Schema Considerations

\*\*Potential Conflict\*\*: The refined Explore feature defines several concept-related tables that might overlap with tables defined in the Concepts System or other features.

\*\*Questions\*\*:

- Should concept-related tables (`concepts`, `concept\_relationships`, etc.) be defined in the Explore feature or in the Concepts System?

- How should we handle potential schema conflicts if similar tables are defined differently across features?

- Is there a need for a shared database schema section that defines common tables used across multiple features?

## 3. XP Balance and Gamification

\*\*Potential Conflict\*\*: The Explore feature introduces several new XP reward mechanisms that could potentially unbalance the overall XP economy.

\*\*Questions\*\*:

- Are the XP rewards for Explore activities (e.g., +15 XP for curiosity completion, +3 XP for concept discovery) balanced with XP rewards in other features?

- How should the concept mastery system in Explore integrate with the overall Wisdom XP system?

- Should there be daily or weekly caps on exploration-related XP to prevent exploitation?

## 4. Cross-Feature Integration Complexity

\*\*Potential Conflict\*\*: The Explore feature has deep integration points with multiple other features (Ask, Quest, Journal, Forum), which could create complex dependencies.

\*\*Questions\*\*:

- Are all the referenced features (Ask, Quest, Journal, Forum) ready to support the integration points described in the Explore feature?

- How should feature development be sequenced to manage these dependencies?

- Is there a need for a more detailed cross-feature integration specification?

## 5. Performance Considerations

\*\*Potential Conflict\*\*: The cosmic visualization with potentially hundreds of concepts and relationships could create performance issues, especially on mobile devices.

\*\*Questions\*\*:

- Have performance tests been conducted for the visualization with a realistic number of concepts?

- Is there a plan for progressive loading or level-of-detail rendering to ensure smooth performance?

- What are the minimum device specifications required for the full visualization experience?

## 6. Accessibility Concerns

\*\*Potential Conflict\*\*: The highly visual nature of the cosmic visualization might create accessibility challenges for users with visual impairments.

\*\*Questions\*\*:

- Is the alternative list view for concepts fully equivalent in functionality to the visualization?

- Have screen reader tests been conducted to ensure the feature is accessible?

- Are there additional accessibility considerations needed beyond what's specified?

## 7. Implementation Timeline

\*\*Potential Conflict\*\*: The implementation phases described might not align with the overall project timeline or dependencies.

\*\*Questions\*\*:

- Does the 12-week implementation timeline align with the master blueprint's timeline?

- Are there dependencies on other features that might affect this timeline?

- Should certain aspects of the feature be prioritized for earlier delivery?