|  |
| --- |
| What did you think of this application? |
| Intuitive, because I'm used to visualizations like this. |
| more informative, giving a better overview |
| It seemed familiar in its presentation. It reminded me of a public transit plan. |
| generally cool idea to use "subway map" style, took a bit to get used to but made sense after a while. some minor things: input and output was not 100% distingishable on the first look. |
| Classic view, familiar, a lot of information in a single figure |
| Übersichtlich, nice color theme |
| Straightforward and simple, but missing a lot of potentially important information. |
| It looks like the way workflows are described for expert users |
| I like topological maps and that the whole process was visible without scrolling on a single page. I think it was mostly intuitive to follow the flow of data. The naming of 'method' was not intuitive as I interpreted the methods as data. Minor issues for me: I'm red and green blind so I prefer lines to be additionally dotted for example. Because of the low amount of methods it was reasonable for me though. The separation of in- and output with the rounded edges was to sublte for me to notice, but I do not grasp the reason behind anywas. If it has outgoing lines it is output and vice versa. |
| Gives a first impression about workflows in the RNA-processing context. Shows the workflow itself, but it is rather difficult to understand what is happening exactly without further knowledge. |
| it was less informative, contained less detailed information, but at the same time presented 5 different choises. |
| The old classic application nothing wrong with it. Very conventional and orthodox. Easiest to learn and nothing to navigate so very fast, however feels way less intuitive and enganging. |
| It was a classical representation of a workflow, that helped me to understand the overall process and goal |
| sehr langweilig, schwerer zu verstehen, man muss ahnung haben, worum es geht, keine Lust mich damit zu beschäftigen |
| es war "übersichtlich"  sah aus wie ein ubahn-plan |
| it was interesting and looked well structured but I think for more complex workflows it could be overwhelming and confusing |
| It's good for giving a first impression of the workflow and allow for basic understanding of the structure if the user possesses enough knowledge about the topic. However since it is only an infographic and not interactive, it feels less immersive and does not seem to offer much in-depth information. It does look better than the AR-representation in some ways, yet looking better does not necessarily mean more effective in this case. |
| besser wenn man VR und AR nicht gewohnt ist |
| the system of different ways and paths |

|  |
| --- |
| Can you imagine any specific scenarios where this representation would be useful? |
| To get an overview about the workflow. |
| simply a nice overview of the workflow |
| Project planning, especially when working with other people. I can imagine using the different work stages as timed deadlines for example.   In order to visualize a program's flow chart, this kind of workflow could be very useful, due to its clear visualization of input/output, as well as different work procedures that are being applied to the files in question. The program flow could be generalized to any process that has specific requirements and different applications. |
| i think exatly the one presented. wehn you have severayl similar long wokflows to choose from that share a lot of steps, to visualize the differences |
| Getting an overview when working with a new workflow or understanding a specific part in order to adjust the workflow. |
| To quickly brief somone on a complex workflow or what stage is next |
| to get the simplest, most basic overveiw of your workflow. This format is the standard and should always be present to understand the entire process, but by non means is it ideal or enough. |
| It gives a clear overview of the workflow, thus if I want to look up a detail about it, e.g. which program is used in which step, I prefer this representation |
| I'm not sure as my data pipelines are usually straightforward. It would still help a little with visualizations of a single line. |
| To get a general understanding how a process works (without looking too much into details) |
| if you are alredy familiar with the workflow and just need a reminder or guide to the existing steps. |
|  |
| Every possible workflow |
| poster session, für menschen,die davon ahnung haben und sich täglich mit beschäftigen , kurze visualisierung |
| ja, wenn ich mich mit den Inhalten auskenne |
| To give an overview about some easy workflows or in Expert meetings where everyone is familiar with the topic |
| It would be useful as a way of presenting the basic concept of the scientific workflow to others who have a basic understanding of the work performed, yet I don't think it would benefit the layperson as much as for example the AR-representation did. |
| - |
| yes |

|  |
| --- |
| Was there anything that stood out to you? |
| All information is on one page, which is useful. A 2D image is not as exciting as the other AR/VR applications. Some information is missing on the legend and not intuitive. |
| nice illustration, clear diagram |
| I didn't quite understand the meaning of the different procedures named in the legend, because I don't specifically work within the context of this workflow. Other than that, I thought it was rather intuitive, and my initial understanding of the workflow was confirmed after a brief inquiry.  What I somewhat disliked was the lacking clarity in inputs/outputs, I thought that could have been made clearer. Also, the stages felt slightly cluttered, meaning that at the very first glance, the workflow seemed slightly overwhelming. |
| - output and inout to similar - confusing on first look + a known style helped with orientation + could probably be easily expanded with more simialr wokflows that use the same steps |
| It was very clear in this representation that the workflow supports multiple paths using different toolsets. This information was not visible in the AR application. |
| Would be cool if it was interactive, also a text to each node describing it would be helpful. Interactive: moving nodes around, etc. |
| LIKED: simple and useful for the intended purpose, if the purpose is getting an overall view. The colour coding was good, with the key in the corner. The ability to zoom in is also helpful. DISLIKED: I did not know which were inputs and which were outputs, there was no key to identify them. There was no possibility of getting more information or anything, and because everything was on this compact diagram, everything was abbreviated. I'm sure professionals would have a better idea of what the things are, but I'm sure they would also appreciate the option for more info. BUT like I said, it is the standard, and it is something that SHOULD be present. Other formats would be optimisations of this, but not replacements. |
| The given example is already quite advanced and clearly presented. |
| Single page overview |
| Without a bit of explanation of the interviewer about input and output as well as the different processes, I would have needed more time to figure it out myself. So this is just suitable as a short overview, best with some knowledge about the topic. |
|  |
| liked -- simplicity disliked -- All information displayed at once. Nothing to move around |
| - It was easy to understand the overall goal and structure of the workflow. - There was little detailed inormation about the application steps |
| nein, es war langweilig |
| die Faben, gute Strukturierung, |
| I liked how ist was structured but the steps could be explained in more detail |
| I liked that the basic structuring and the different parts of the workflow were clearly visible, yet because of the lack of descriptions, getting a deeper understanding of the work performed by the DAW was not possible for me. Since the workflow representation was not interactive it also does not draw the user in as much as the AR representation did, making it become boring faster. |
| - |
| many possibilities to consider |

|  |
| --- |
| Do you have any additional feedback or suggestions? |
| - |
| - |
| - |
| - |
| / |
| interactive |
| Key for inputs and outpus, more info through pop-ups. Perhaps an interactive instead of static system |
|  |
| - |
| An interactive view (e.g. clickable states and more info about the individual workflows) might be helpful |
|  |
|  |
|  |
| no |
|  |
| - |
| If the workflow was interactive or at least provided some more explanations for each subtask performed, it would be more helpful I suppose. |
| beste version wenn man mit der neuen Technik noch nicht so in Kontakt gekommen ist |
| I suppose here could be more possibilites. |