

Table 1

<b>Video stages</b>	S1 - video stages, saw no value in those. Only likely to see step 2, and showing the other ones made you feel the review was going to take more work than it actually does.	S5 - didn't think they made much sense: only ever gets to see the step 2.			
<b>Video player keyboard support</b>	S1 - wanted to use the video player with his keyboard, but the native video tag didn't allow it				
<b>Instructions vs user behaviour</b>	S1 - we should recommend people to watch the whole video, rather than just checking the beginning and the end of it	S5 - in the real situation would probably watch the whole video and also download it to keep a copy.			
<b>Audio channels information</b>	S1 - would have liked an explanation of each audio channel available: how are they generated / recorded?				
<b>Other brokenness section</b>	S2 - asked for a free text field to explain additional problems. Suggested having the "other brokenness" section as part of the second option ("problems with start time, end time and audio")	S3 - recalled some issue with the video last year, and would like a free text area to explain and submit the problem	S4 - wanted to report a problem with the video speaker feed (it's somehow staggered), and used the "other brokenness" option to do that.	S4 - When submitting the issue with the end time, didn't realise that both options were mutually exclusive, and observed that initial comment was missing from the thank you page.	S5 - missed a free text area for additional comments
<b>Download video link</b>	S1 - asked what does the "download video" link actually download: only the main video? Or the main video plus the 20 minutes before and after?				

<b>Publication of video</b>	S1 - mentioned we should not be linking to video files directly, but to a “video page” that could act as a hub for the community for the rest of the year	S3 - liked very much that the video is available in the context of the presentation page, where people can also access the abstract and the slides	S5 - would like the main video to be bigger in the review page, and also in the talk page in the FOSDEM website.	S5 - would like an option to share the video	
<b>User task flow</b>	S1 - sequence of events was: 1) Look at the beginning of main video 2) Report the problem with the starting time 3) Go back up to the main video and check the end of it 4) Report the problem with the end time	S3 - checked the start of the video, corrected the starting time with the form, then went back to the top of the page to check the end of the video, finishing by reporting on the end time.			
<b>Initial question structure</b>	S1 - suggested we separate the start / end time problems option from the audio and a/v sync. Doesn't think they belong together.				
<b>Thank you messages</b>	S3 - Thank you messages missing some visual element that would tell straight away that things were ok. Said they are “too grey” and asked for “some green”.	S3 - thank you messages should make clear that it can take a bit of time to process the changes requested through the review.	S4 - thank you pages were somehow a dead end. We should explain that you can now close the browser tab since you are done until a new email is sent to you.	S5 - Before fully reading the confirmation message, would like to double check the changes made to the video to make sure they were ok. Was somehow satisfied when finished reading and realised that there would be a chance to do that.	S5 - the email bit is the most important, so it should be at the beginning of the message, above the submitted review details, rather than at the end.

<b>Communicating review iterations</b>	S3 - The “second_review” bit in the URL might have provided an important hint as to how the process works. Maybe we should consider counting the number of reviews submitted and add the counter to the email subject. That would also stop the problem of Gmail (or other email clients) threading all review emails in a single conversation.				
<b>Impact of content realism (participants reviewing own talks vs others)</b>	S4 - was the first participant who was not a FOSDEM speaker: difficulties completing the task might be connected with that, and unfamiliarity with the talk (all previous participants reviewed their own talks)	S5 - would have liked a list of the slides in the talk to help determine whether the video was complete. Might have been because struggled to determine the right starting and end points (was not familiar with the talk).			
<b>Submit button</b>	S5 - about the submit button label, when the video is ok, the label of the button should not be “Send your video review to FOSDEM”, but more like “Confirm to FOSDEM the video is ok”.				
<b>Review page layout and design</b>	S5 - would like the main video to be bigger in the review page, and also in the talk page in the FOSDEM website.	S5 - important bits are the main video, and the question, but they get pushed very far down because of the information at the top (details about speaker, room and time). Thought that information is not really that important in this context, and should be “demoted” to a less prominent position.	S2 - found the font too small		