

Hi Kris,

Thank you for submitting the revised draft and for your notes outlining how you've addressed the committee's feedback. This will be my final review before submission.

I see the significant effort you've invested in responding to Prof. Chang's suggestion to make the thesis more "designerly" and Prof. Yen's comments on translating macro-theories into micro-level features. You are on the right track, and the core of your work is strong. However, the current length and fragmented structure are actively working against these efforts. The very connections you're trying to build are getting lost across hundreds of pages, making it difficult for a reader to trace the logical path from theory to design.

The most critical task now is to bring your sharpest insights into focus. As we agreed, the goal is to produce a focused thesis of **under 250 pages**. This is not about cutting corners; it's about making your argument as powerful as possible. Radically condensing and restructuring the work is the most important step to achieving this and, crucially, to making your responses to the committee's feedback truly effective.

Here is a clear strategy for this final revision.

1. The Literature Review: Forge a Clear Argument

This chapter is the absolute priority. Prof. Chang's main criticism was the need to firmly ground your research problem. A literature review must build a clear, logical argument that identifies the specific knowledge gap your research fills. The current version buries this.

- **Start with the Research Gap (Addressing Prof. Chang):** Before you write, define your core contribution in a single sentence (e.g., *"While Taiwanese students show high environmental concern, they lack accessible digital tools to translate this attitude into financial action; this thesis addresses that gap by designing an AI companion..."*). This sentence is your new North Star. Every paragraph must justify it.
- **Build a Narrative Arc (Addressing Prof. Yen):** Abandon the current structure of dozens of micro-sections. To effectively show how macro-theories translate into micro-features, you must build a narrative that leads the reader from one to the other. I suggest this flow:
 - **The Big Picture (Briefly):** Start with the global context—the intersection of consumer finance and the climate crisis. (1-2 pages max)
 - **The Specific Context:** Narrow down to Taiwanese college students. Use the literature to establish their pro-environmental attitudes and the "attitude-behavior gap." This contextualizes your problem.
 - **The Emerging Tools:** Discuss how digital technologies offer potential solutions. Here, you will **synthesize**, not segregate. Explain how "Superapps" create new consumer contexts, "Digital Product Passports" enable transparency, and "AI Companions" can personalize information. This synthesis is key.
 - **The Knowledge Gap:** Conclude by explicitly stating the gap: *"Despite these advances, no research has focused on designing a tool that integrates these elements for the Taiwanese student demographic. This is the critical gap my research*

addresses."

- **Be Ruthless in Editing:** Cut any section that does not directly support this narrative arc. The extensive history of environmental thought or deep dives into specific EU legislation must be reduced to a sentence or two that makes your point, or removed entirely.

2. The Results: Tell a Story with Your Personas

Your data is strong, but its presentation is too fragmented. To make your design process clearer (addressing Prof. Chang), the entire chapter should be structured around your personas.

- **Lead with Personas:** Instead of separate sections for "Shopping Attitudes," "AI Use," etc., present a holistic analysis of each persona ("Eco-Friendly," "Moderate," "Frugal"). For each persona, integrate the relevant survey data to paint a rich picture of their attitudes, behaviors, and needs. This creates a powerful narrative.
- **Synthesize Expert Feedback:** Do not present each expert interview sequentially. Instead, weave their insights thematically into your analysis of the personas. Use key quotes to reinforce a point about a persona's needs or to validate one of your design principles.
- **Consolidate Visuals:** You have over 160 figures. Select only the most essential charts that summarize your key findings (e.g., the persona clustering heatmap). Move the vast majority of individual Likert scale charts and secondary tables to an appendix.

3. The Discussion: Connect the Dots from Insight to Design

This is where you fully deliver on making the thesis "designerly" and linking theory to features.

- **Focus on Key Design Decisions:** Cut the detailed chronology of every early idea. Instead, structure this chapter around 2-3 pivotal design decisions. For each one, create a clear narrative:
 1. **The Insight:** *"Our research showed that the 'Frugal' persona is highly price-sensitive but responds to cost-saving nudges."*
 2. **The Design Response:** *"Therefore, we designed the 'Cost-Eco Slider' feature to visualize the trade-offs between price and environmental impact."*
 3. **The Learning:** *"Testing revealed that users engaged with this feature when the financial benefit was immediately clear."*
- **Make the Theory Central:** Explicitly use the Theory of Planned Behavior as your analytical lens. When discussing a feature, explain precisely how it is designed to influence **Attitude** (e.g., by framing sustainability as a health benefit), **Subjective Norms** (e.g., by showing what other eco-conscious students are buying), or **Perceived Behavioral Control** (e.g., by making sustainable choices simple and actionable). This directly addresses Prof. Yen's feedback.

Focusing your efforts here will not only shorten the thesis but will allow you to fully address the committee's feedback by demonstrating a clear, literature-grounded rationale for your work. You have done excellent research; this final stage is about presenting it with the clarity and force it deserves.

###