Proposed Structure for the Project Report

1. **Abstract**
   Brief summary of the project including objectives, methods, and key findings.

2. **Introduction**
   Background on mobile user interfaces and the relevance of the chosen topic.
   Problem statement and objectives of the project.
   Hypothesis (if applicable).

3. **Related Work**
   Review of the related research papers or projects.
   Comparison with existing solutions and identification of gaps.

4. **Methodology**
   User Study Design: Participants, independent/dependent variables, tasks.
   Performance Study: Profiling tools, metrics (CPU, memory, energy, etc.).
   Data Collection: Objective (performance logs) and subjective (survey responses).
   Statistical Analysis: Hypothesis testing (t-tests, ANOVA, etc.).

5. **Implementation**
   Overview of the app architecture (front-end and back-end).
   Key features and interaction methods implemented.
   Tools and technologies used (Android Studio, profiling tools, etc.).

6. **Interpretation of the Results**
   Usability Results: Task completion time, error rates, survey responses.
   Performance Results: CPU, memory, battery consumption across different conditions.
   Comparative Analysis: Comparison of interaction methods (e.g., navigation styles, one-handed vs. two-handed use, etc.).
   Statistical Findings (if applicable): Significance of differences between conditions.

7. **Limitations & Future Work**
   Challenges faced during the study.
   Potential improvements or extensions.

8. **Conclusion**
   Summary of key insights and takeaways.
   Final remarks on the project's success in meeting objectives.

9. **References**
   Properly cited sources (APA/ACM/IEEE format).

   Appendices (Optional)
   Survey questions, raw data, screenshots, etc.

Rubric for Evaluation of Demo and Report

Demo Evaluation (20%)

Criteria	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Fair (3)	Weak (2-0)
Functionality (focus on UI)	• App works flawlessly • All features demonstrated	• Minor bugs	• Major bugs • Limited usability	• App crashes • Lacks key features
User Interaction	• Smooth • Intuitive • Responsive.	• Mostly smooth • Minor problems	• Noticeable lag • Usability issues	• Poor response • Confusing UI
Comparative Analysis	• Clear analysis of different interaction methods	• Some comparisons • Not exhaustive	• Limited • Unclear comparisons	• No meaningful comparisons
Demo Clarity	• Professional, • Well-designed • Engaging	• Clear • Lacks polish	• Unclear • Rushed	• Vague • Disorganized

2. Report Evaluation (80%)

Criteria	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Satisfactory (4)	Poor (0-2)
Complexity of Application & UI (15 %)	• Well-designed UI with multiple interaction methods	• Functional UI but lacks depth.	• Basic UI with minimal interaction methods	• Simplistic or incomplete UI
Technical Content (Related Work, Methodology, Implementation, Testing & Evaluation) **(60%)**	• Strong literature review • Well documented methodology • Detailed implementation • Thorough testing with analysis	• Good literature review and methodology, • Some gaps in testing or analysis	• Limited related work • weak methodology • insufficient evaluation	• Missing key sections
3. Technical Presentation (Clarity, English, Illustrations, References) **(25%)**	• Professionally written • Clear visuals • Clear formatting • Proper citations	• Minor issues but generally clear	• Unclear writing • Poor visuals • Inconsistent citations	• Disorganized • Poorly written • Missing elements