Architectural Review 2 Reflection
Eric Elder Jacobsen and Flynn Michael Legg

We received a great deal of useful feedback, some of which we will consider as we move forward with our project. When we showed our initial display design, our audience voiced a desire for more readability, and suggested color coding to make the information more digestible. We plan to experiment with this and other options when decluttering our pygame display in the next stage of our project. Our audience also requested a few features that would make for interesting stretch goals, including a metronome, chords for each beat instead of each measure, and even a key to switch between major and minor. Other requests included click/button press interactions such as looping a subset of measures, and scrolling forward or back by one measure instead of simply returning to the top. We will possibly pursue these once we have achieved our mvp. Other suggestions were given, such as incorporating music generation or increasing the accessibility to beginners. However, while these might be interesting or useful features, they do not fit with the overall goal of our project and so we will look past them.

The questions we got more fleshed-out answers on were those about the code. We showed our chord generation function and asked for some input on it. The current system of storing middle C chords and modulating them to get other keys works pretty well, but some of the responses we got pointed out some potentially more effective ways to handle the chord generation. One thing we will try is a no-storage version, where the program generates its own middle C chords ahead of time. We would have a separate part of the program where it runs these chords and trains itself in preparation for the user-interaction portion. This would eliminate any package of data that the program would have to be downloaded with, but a potential downside is that it might take a lot of time to train the program, as SonicPi's chord generation is not fast.

The review process went much better this time, mostly because we had an actual review. We stuck pretty closely to our planned agenda, gave a comprehensible overview of our project, and got responses to questions that will definitely be helpful moving forward. We plan to act on a lot of the feedback we were given. The responses to the code-oriented questions were more helpful that the responses to the musically-oriented ones, which we should have expected since we are presenting to software design students. Next time we will focus on asking technical questions, and look elsewhere for musical theory suggestions, since these reviews are not the only way we can see feedback.