High-Level Grading of our paper

Reviewer	Overall Rating	Expertise	Significance Relative to Length	Technical Quality	Clarity	Interest to OZCHI Community
1	3 (borderline)	Expert	Modest	Good	Poor	Interesting to a broad audience
2	2 (reject)	Passing	Slight	Poor	Fair	Interesting to a broad audience
3	1 (reject)	Passing	Slight	Poor	Poor	Not interesting to audience
4	2 (reject)	Passing	Slight	Poor	Fair	Small, committed audience

Common complaints from reviewers

- <u>Contributions to HCI literature are unclear / missing:</u> *(4/4 reviewers mention this)*
    a. Clearly define contributions of this work in relation to HCI literature.
    b. Related work section seems to be written like part of the method section.
        i. Problematic to the reviewer: Reviewer likes to rely on the related work section to provide an overview of the literature to date, and to illustrate what research is going on in this field. And why our research is important.
        ii. **Recommendation**: Rewrite this section to provide an overview of the literature of readers have a clearer idea of other related research. Create a separate section this is more methodological that details how design decisions were made. Could tabulate this information detailing design issue / design approach to address issue / relevant references for justification.
        iii. Include more references to justify our claims in the methods section.
    c. Related work section is "muddled" with several references that have low cohesion with the presented topic.
    d. Reviewer expected related work to include how other researchers were thinking on how to support astronauts during their travels and work.
        i. We should focus on work in the researched area (astronauts using AR)
    e. Overhaul the related work section to only include past literature how AR interfaces helped astronauts during space operations.
    f. Include more references to justify our claims in the methods section.
    g. Reviewer had difficulty understanding the contribution of the work relative to what has already been explored.

- <u>Paper Formatting issues:</u> *(3/4 reviewers mention this)*
    a. Every other paragraph has different font and spacing.
    b. Incorrect use of capitals: Learning, Astronaut
    c. Need to define EVA before mentioned in introduction
    d. Paper suffers from serious issues that demand major reworking
        i. "framing" and connecting to extant literature
    e. Recognizes work / references we used. Did not follow formatting guidelines. Makes it difficult to read the paper.
    f. Paper reads more like a technical report than a research project.
    g. Paper formatting is wrong.
    h. Literature review reads more like a checklist. Theoretical concepts need to be further explored.
    i. Introduction: Brief and without references. Makes it hard to gauge what our problem is or why we chose the AR HUD as a solution.

- <u>Research Question is unclear:</u> *(2/4 reviewers mention this)*
    a. We are missing a solid research question.
        i. Reviewer believes our paper to be more like a collection of different frontend implementations that are seemingly good for astronauts.
    b. Research question is unclear

- <u>Additional Concerns / Comments</u>
    o Paper can be shortened
        ▪ We shouldn't explain our functionality in detail and describe newly added functionalities.
        ▪ Use saved space to include a detailed table for a user study
    o Our implementations were not evaluated in study, instead we cited NASA interviewers.
    o Questions the validity our implementation – we need a user study
    o Augmented reality applications pertaining to repair and maintenance have been vastly explored.
    o Unclear if our implementation works, if so, to what extent.
        ▪ *Would have been helpful if we uploaded a video of a test that was recorded to see our implementation in action.*
    o Paper does not adequately engage with discourses in the related field.

- <u>Recommendations given by reviewers</u>
    - General recommendations:
        - Tighten up the narrative: Long and unwieldy
        - Substantiate contribution through a review of HCI literature. Not enough references in the paper or a clear this work relates to work in the HCI field.
    - Fix structure issues within the paper
    - Include a usability study
    - Provide clarity for how the design for lunar terrain and space environment exists
    - How the light conditions on the moon were handled / affected the usability of our implementation.
    - Reviewer provides a potential roadmap detailing how to fix our paper before its published:
        - Nailing research / technical contributions in introduction
        - Making technical details more concise and don't explain basic operations.
        - This will shorten the paper. With the saved space, include a user study.
    - Describe how we came up with our design and solution and why we're using the AR HUD.
    - Describe how our solution compares with other potential designs.
    - Describe other research in this area.
    - Methods section is very long. It is recommended that we summarize this section or provide a summary of what is to come to guide reading via creating a table.
    - Testing section: We should detail how many people were used in the testing phase. How was data collection and analyzed?
    - Demonstration and Review Panel: Provide more details on what form the panel took to provide feedback.
    - Conclusion: Authors should outline the core contribution to HCI. What gap are we filling?