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Problem and Solution:

When we go to a restaurant we are presented with a paper menu. We cannot visualize what is written and what type of dish it is( if we havnt tried or heard before). We have come up with a simple yet modern solution to present an app to users. User can open the app and view the menu of different restaurants. They can select the food, select the quantity and then finally select the table once their order is confirmed then they can wait for it to be served. Later when they are done they can pay using app and give reviews for other users.

Concept Sketch of different screens
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Order Food
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Deisgn 1

Design 1 focus on making order

A perosn when opens app will see a splash screen. Then he will go to the login screen. He will login then he can view the menu or choose an options to which are presented. If he sees the menu he can view it. He can also swipe right or left to view the next dish. He can order from there and select the quantity. Delivery time will also be shown to him.

From menu button he can view the menu, where several options will be displayed. He can check his account details. Also he can check the list of restraunts and choose their menu.
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Pros | Cons |
| - Simple, clean  - Easy to keep record  - Familiar and intuitive interface | - Might not be engaging enough - Harder to encourage users to get out of their comfort zone - Difficult to handle collisions on times |

Design 2

Design 1 focus on making order and selecting table and payment

A perosn when opens app will see a splash screen. Then he will go to the login screen. He will login then he can view the menu or choose an options to which are presented. If he sees the dish he can view it. He can also swipe right or left to view the next dish. He can order from there and select the quantity. In next screen he will select the table. Delivery time will also be shown to him. He can see the items he ordered.

He can also pay from the app by entering his credit card details.
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| *Desing 2 with flow* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Pros | Cons |
| * Easy to use * Simple * Not complex * Good flow of app | * Very basic functionality * Can’t handle security * No menu buttons |

Selected interface design is #2:

Our prototype started on the front page (the user’s home screen and profile page) and branched from there. They have option to select the deals at front or go to the search bar and search for restaurants or deals. Then they can easyily click to view and then swipe right or left to go to next and previous respectively, depecnding on their priority. If they found the thing to order by looking at reviews or the item looks good in picture they can then order it. They can also select quantity to order and finally order. In next screen they can select the table at which they are sitting. Then once the order received they can check their details and confirm it. Later they can also pay from credit card and give reviews.

It seems like a good simple predictive and interative design.

They can go to menu from anywhere by pressing menu icon. From their they can check their account details, go to settings, and contact information etc.

UI Storyboarding

For our second design, we considered a version of the app on an Android device. Users could navigate to different pages using buttons and hyperlinks on their main page. Other features of the android included swiping left or right to view the item and order food After he is done he can pay and using the text bar to leave reviews for other users. Part of the design was considering features of android such as the built-in back button to go back to previous screen, and how that can influences things like circular design.
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Methods

**Participants:**

**Participant #1:**

She was about 20 years old and she is from Lahore. She usually go out to eat with her friends or family. She says that don’t find difficulty cuz she has enormous experience about what to order and how. So we recruited her to test our new system. We gave her cut out cards for her to order food. And recorded her responses

**Participant #2:**

we recruited a man this time who ocassionally order food online. He is about 27 years old and works in an office. He says that during lunch time he looks for deals on website and facebook ads and order which he likes. He says that many people have started selling food online so it becomes different who to choose from. We presented him with our idea and gave him our cards. He used them and we recoreded the responses.

**Participant #3:**

This time we asked a student to participate. He is 19 years old and recently joined univeristy, he lives in a hostel. During lunch time he has to go out to economical places to look for to eat. He has a selected range of foods that he like to eat. We asked him to test our prototype and we recorded his responses.

We feel that the persons we recruited were a good choice for testing as they cover our range of audience. They somehow did not show any confusion in the design as it had a streamline flow and was easy and adaptable.

**Environment of interview**

We interviewd the participants at their places. So they can be comfortable. We firstly booked an appointment and approached them to test our prototype and talk to them. P1 was in her university, P2 was at his office and P3 was at his hostle.

**Tasks**

Our team gave the participants the task. We follwed them and jot down and difficulty they encounter. Our task was to check:

1. Simple: login and view restraunts
2. Moderate: gestures (right or left for previous and next)
3. Complex: select table and confirm order and make account

**Procedure**

We asked our participants well in advance about their availabilities and willingness to participate in our tests. Before the interview, we thanked them for their time and gave some context regarding the idea of the app. We gave them cards, and gave them a scenario to order food. We explained to them the basics of the app, but did not share any relevant clue that might have helped them solve the tasks. We let them explore and figure out the app on their own unless they got very stuck. Observing their mild frustration provided us with valuable feedback. We asked them to perform task 1 first, and then upon completion, task 2, and then task 3.

**Test measures**

We used different tests to measure the usability and readability of scheduler. Some of these measures include

• Time they spent in completing each task.

• The number of questions they asked. Our thinking was that the more questions they asked the less clear and intuitive our prototype was.

• The number of errors they made

**Results**

Two of our participants had major complaints with the search function. They claimed it was unintuitive and redundant. Therefore we will have to implement changes in the search system in order to streamline the searching process. Currently, confusion is created when searching for a deal to add to cart and order it. All of them tried to click on unlickable things or using only gestures where none was to be used.

At payment they querried that will it be safe to profive their credit card details. They also need other payment metods like easy paisa or sim sim. Particiapnt 2 was keen in using this app as he uses other apps and had a better idea how to use it in a better way. He gave us insights to make it better. Participant 3 had most problems. He couldn’t understandor didn’t want to come out of his comfort zone. He also wanted add different language options.

Overall, we received praise at the idea of the app from our users, and parts of the app were intuitive while others (namely the search function and table selection) could definitely be improved. Along with implementing the other features mentioned, we should be able to address our users’ most frequent concerns.
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