

Design Review I Reflection

Feedback and Decisions

We got a lot of positive feedback about the idea of our application. I think it showed that there was some sort of need for the project that we were moving forward with, which was pretty important to us. One of the major things that we learned from our design review was that we should use Flask as our way to integrate our python frameworks with web frameworks. Flask should prove a powerful way to get our interactive data visualization on our website easily. After we finished the actual review, Ian told us about pandas and their dataframes class, which we could use to store all of the data in an array and one that would keep all of the data together. This ended up proving to be extremely useful in our implementation of the code. Once we started using the data frames, it made our code much more readable. Instead of having multiple lists of data we had it all stored in one place, which also made it more efficient.

Some questions that we still have to address are how to implement flasks and pandas. We know that these two libraries will be useful in organizing and deploying our code, but we need to fully read through the documentation to get a better handle on the documentation of these libraries and how we can use them in our specific case. We're still not 100% sure how exactly we will show the data. So far we've been using plotly to show all of the data and it has been working so far. However, we're not sure that it will prove useful for more complex systems. We're still looking into other libraries, like seaborn and matplotlib to see if they might be better for what we are looking for in terms of data visualization. We're also looking at what information will be shown when the user will hover over the data and graphs. We're playing around with a lot of different information that could be presented to the user when they hover over certain parts of the visualization and we're working to figure out what exactly that information will be.

Review Process Reflection

Our actual review went well. We were able to convey our information clearly. We used drawings of what we wanted the final product to look like and presented them to the group around a table, which made everyone more involved and made the conversation more intimate. This was useful because everyone was focused on what our project was. When we gave them the larger context and showed them where in the process we were, we were able to already have students that understood our ultimate goal. We mostly stuck to what we were planning on presenting, except for the fact that we integrated the questions more as they seemed fit rather than just bringing them up all at once at the end. We got answers to most of our key questions in the end.

One of the major pitfalls of our design review was that we really weren't able to get a lot of information from the professors/ninjas during the course of the review. None of the other students knew about the libraries that we were working with, so that made it a lot harder for them to give us feedback or help like Ian did at the very end. It could maybe have been a little easier if we would have targeted the questions better to the people in the room towards things that they could help us with rather than open-ended questions.