

PEER REVIEW - SPRINT 3

09/08/2024

1. Group information:

GROUP 14			
No.	Student ID	Full name	Email
1	21127234	Nguyễn Lê Anh Chi	nlachi21@clc.fitus.edu.vn
2	21127235	Nguyễn Xuân Quỳnh Chi	nxqchi21@clc.fitus.edu.vn
3	21127495	Lê Ngô Song Cát	lnscat21@clc.fitus.edu.vn
4	21127659	Bùi Ngọc Kiều Nhi	bnknhi21@clc.fitus.edu.vn

2. Review:

- **Teacher – Hồ Tuấn Thanh:**

- The group's proposed solution can solve the problems found, but the group is developing two different applications, which is not in accordance with the original requirements of the problem.
- Teacher gave some examples on how to improve the assignment:
 - Need to design an interface for the person who will manage and input the uploaded videos, maybe a website interface.
 - The buttons on the user interface of application 1 should be placed in a convenient position for users to operate by hand.
 - There should be a vocabulary search bar for users to search directly.
 - If the requirement for a flashcard is a short video, it is too difficult for the flashcard creator no? should we give image option?
 - Can the system automatically increase the level over time without user choosing? Will the theme be randomly selected by the system?
 - Merge 2 applications into 1.

- **Group#10:**

- **Pros:**

- Background running feature on Facebook: The idea of running in the background on Facebook is quite unique, similar to translating extensions on the web, helping users easily learn vocabulary without having to switch applications.
- Easy to understand system: The team has built a system that is easy to visualize, easy to understand, with clear context, helping users grasp how the application works.

- **Deficiencies/needs to improve:**

- **Prototype does not comply with requirements:** The team's prototype was done online, while the requirement was to do it on paper. This does not comply with the assignment and can cause difficulties in fair evaluation.

English Study – Flashcard	28/07/2024 – 10/08/2024	Peer Review
---------------------------	-------------------------	-------------

- **Missing feature icons in the prototype:** The prototype does not have icons for the secondary features as presented orally, reducing the intuitiveness and consistency in the design.
- **Demo using TikTok:** The team demoed using TikTok on the phone is fine, but many feature buttons are missing in the prototype.
- **Saving and reviewing vocabulary is not reasonable:** The group does not present how vocabulary is saved so that it can be reviewed by users. It would be better to clarify that users will review vocabulary according to certain categories (recent words, topics, favorites, summary, etc.)
- **Facebook does not support word selection:** Facebook does not allow selecting a word and does not support running in the background on other applications, making the group's solution unfeasible in practice.
- **Wrong topic:** The group is developing two different applications, which is not in accordance with the original requirements of the topic. As the teacher suggested, merge the two applications into one.

⇒ **Answer:**

Prototype does not comply with the requirements: The group has made a paper prototype, only made it digital so that it can be viewed more easily for the report.

3. Feedback for other groups:

- **Group#09:**

- The slide to capture the prototype is too blurry and hard to see.
- The group's suggestions are a bit impractical:
 - When users exercise, how does VR know how to exercise correctly?
 - On problem 1: How does AI recognize food?
 - How can mobile apps integrate with VR?

- **Group#10:**

- The group's presentation was quite impressive. The group made some good and convincing suggestions to solve the problems of mismatch level in finding badminton partners and last-minute cancellations disrupting badminton meetups.
- **Needs to improve:**
 - **Rating players after each match:** the group should make the interface simpler, maybe just rate each person on each page instead of showing all players on the same page.
 - **Badminton teammates:** the group is a bit rigid in not allowing players with low reputation to join the game, maybe their friends accept and want to play together but are rejected by the system.
 - **The group's urgent recruitment mechanism** feels a bit unfeasible because few people can meet such requirements immediately.

English Study – Flashcard	28/07/2024 – 10/08/2024	Peer Review
---------------------------	-------------------------	-------------

- The group said that if a player cancels at the last minute or is absent, that person's reputation will be deducted, other users can base on that to accept or decline this player, but if the score is so low that everyone declines and it stays low, what should we do?
- **Group#11:**
- The team raised the problem that users do not know where to start learning, but the proposed solution is that after completing a course, another course will be suggested, so what will the user base on to choose the first course?
- The option to personalize the learning path is also a bit vague because on the prototype, the team only asks users to enter the available study dates, so what criteria should the lesson content or courses be distributed based on?