Heuristic Evaluation Comparison

HEURISTIC PRINCIPLE	SWIGGY	ZOMATO	UBER EATS	BEST PERFORMANCE
ERROR PREVENTION	Confirms before order cancellation or address changes.	Shows confirmation pop-ups during payment edits.	Provides simple undo for order cancellation.	All perform well; Uber Eats' quick undo is most user-friendly.
RECOGNITION RATHER THAN RECALL	Displays recent orders and favorite restaurants on home screen.	Focuses on offers and promotions; users need to re-search past orders.	Highlights "Previously Ordered" section at top.	Uber Eats and Swiggy improve recall better than Zomato.
FLEXIBILITY AND EFFICIENCY OF USE	Offers "Repeat Order" and quick reorder buttons.	Provides easy filters but lacks reorder options.	Supports quick checkout and saved payment info.	Swiggy and Uber Eats excel in time efficiency.
AESTHETIC AND MINIMALIST DESIGN	Uses bright visuals and local themes; slightly crowded.	Bold, colorful, and clean layout with strong imagery.	Minimalistic black-and-white theme; clean and calm interface.	Uber Eats wins in minimalism and clarity.
HELP USERS RECOGNIZE, DIAGNOSE, AND RECOVER FROM ERRORS	Offers chat support during delivery; clear issue reporting.	Provides contact options, but feedback resolution is slower.	Includes built-in live help and instant refund updates.	Uber Eats provides fastest and most transparent error recovery.
HELP AND DOCUMENTATION	Includes FAQs and in-app order help.	Offers detailed support sections and	Combines FAQs with chatbot and	Uber Eats is strongest with multi-channel help.

HEURISTIC PRINCIPLE	SWIGGY	ZOMATO	UBER EATS	BEST PERFORMANCE
		feedback forms.	phone support.	

Key Findings

1. **Swiggy** provides a fast, region-focused experience emphasizing local offers and quick reordering, though the interface can feel cluttered.

2. **Zomato** excels in restaurant discovery, design visuals, and user-generated reviews but needs better personalization and recall features.

3. **Uber Eats** stands out for its minimal UI, consistent design, and effective support system, though it lacks local customization.

4. **Swiggy and Uber Eats** perform best in task efficiency and usability, while **Zomato** leads in visual appeal and brand engagement.

5. Combining **Zomato's discovery interface**, **Swiggy's operational speed**, and **Uber Eats' clean design** would result in an ideal, user-centered food delivery app.

Proposed UX Improvements

PLATFORM	IDENTIFIED ISSUE	SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENT
SWIGGY	Home screen overloaded with ads and banners.	Simplify the home layout with collapsible offers and focus on personalized restaurant recommendations.
SWIGGY	Delivery tracking map updates slowly.	Improve map refresh rate and provide clearer driver location indicators.
SWIGGY	Offers and coupons hidden under multiple clicks.	Display active offers directly on the checkout screen for easy selection.
ZOMATO	Filters not clearly visible; users must scroll to access.	Add a sticky top bar with visible filters and sorting tools.

PLATFORM	IDENTIFIED ISSUE	SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENT
ZOMATO	Too many pop-ups (e.g., feedback requests, app ratings).	Reduce interruptions by limiting pop-ups to one per session or move to notification panel.
ZOMATO	Restaurant page images load slowly on low networks.	Implement adaptive image loading and caching for smoother browsing.
UBER EATS	Limited restaurant information on the listing screen.	Display quick info (rating, delivery time, cuisine) directly on cards.
UBER EATS	Minimal visual hierarchy; text-heavy UI.	Use card-based layout, larger icons, and contrast colors to improve readability.
UBER EATS	Checkout lacks confirmation step before placing order.	Add a brief order summary and confirmation button before final payment.
BOTH (SWIGGY & ZOMATO)	Notification overload and duplication.	Use smart notifications — limit to 3/day based on user engagement history.
ALL THREE	Accessibility features not emphasized (e.g., font size, color contrast).	Add accessibility settings: adjustable text size, high-contrast mode, and voice navigation support.

Conclusion

From the heuristic evaluation, it's evident that **Swiggy, Zomato, and Uber Eats** deliver reliable services but differ in design and usability focus:

- **Swiggy** excels in **order tracking** and operational speed but needs **layout simplification**.

- **Zomato** offers rich **restaurant discovery** but can improve **filter visibility and navigation**.

- **Uber Eats** maintains **simplicity and global appeal** but requires **stronger visual cues and confirmation flow**.

Combining **Swiggy's operational strengths**, **Zomato's discovery features**, and **Uber Eats' clean design** could produce an ideal user-centric delivery platform.

Ongoing heuristic evaluations and UI refinements help maintain user satisfaction, engagement, and accessibility across devices.