RESEARCH SUMMARY

The following critique is for the paper: "Scenario-Based Interactive UI Design" written by Koski, Momoko and Takehiko. In their paper, the authors have described how they are approaching towards re-defining tradional scenario-based UI designs through their tool. According to them Interactive design system is an ill-defined strategy. Main limitations of solution-first approach is that designers want to select a solution approach too quickly and they may attempt to simplify the problem and reuse familiar solutions. In this paper, authors highlight two weaknesses in tradional scenario-based UI. First is integrating several scenarios in one UI is difficult, even if there is every possible scenario. Second, maintaining relation between scenarios and UI is a huge task in iterative design. So, their tool is designed to solve the above problems through the hierarchical scenario structure and and visualized overview of scenarios. It supports the characterization of user behavior based on scenario and then using it to design the UI.

GOOD EVALUATION

In particular what I liked about the paper is that the authors have provided with the tool for designers according to their needs that were never catered before. Their tool supports scenario management and UI design based on scenarios, also offering traceability between scenarios and UI such that a designer can efficiently iterate UI design-evaluation process. I think their tool offers a simple and elegant way of organizing links between various scenarios and implementation o UI corresponding to different user behavior. The good thing is that their tool has the hierarchical structure of sentences in scenario that provides great way of visualizing requirements expected of each user. Moreover, the tags offer an easily tractable solution to keeping track of different UI elements.

Again, one things that I find efficient was the closeness of Scenario Editor and UI Editor provides a contrast effect for the user to smoothly switch between two editors

CRITICAL EVALUATION

What I find not appealing in this paper is how a tool could fit so many scenarios in their UI design. Analyzing and considering each of user behavior is a pretty hard thing to achieve. And covering every possible scenario with the tool is a difficult task. There may be so many scenarios that are more complex than the generic user. And managing such scenarios in their tool may be a difficult task especially when requirements change.

In real world case or professional environment, user has an ever-changing need regarding any software. Sometimes it is even difficult to generate the whole scenario-situation in just words that would define everything that a user would want. The tool would not prove efficient in that case.

Also, I am not sure how much efficient the tool would be when it links the tags in Scenario editor to UI stencils and then design a rough UI with those stencils. Since it is a computerized tool there might be chances that the tags mess up and end up giving a wrong visualization of the relationship of sentences by the tags. This might result in designer to overview wrong scenarios and create a messed-up UI.

Their tool also focuses on around tens of graph nodes for visualizing scenario-structure. They have set a threshold for up to ten scenarios and tens of nodes and user can add more nodes if

needed. That would just be effective for managing scenarios and designing UIs but users still would not be able to quickly and easily trace and revise related sentences and tags.

QUESTIONS

Following questions can be raised based on the paper about Scenario-based Interactive UI Design Tool:

- Is their tool efficient enough in covering each of the user scenario based on the conceptual theory that would be provided in Scenario-Editor?
- What happens if the tags maintain a wrong links between nodes to determine the relation?
- What if there are too many highlighted nodes and edges that instead of being an aid to user, confuses them more?
- Could they have tested their tool on more than 3 people, what would the results then be?

CONCLUSION

I think in their tool, they have provided a very efficient way of combining both scenario writing and creating user-interface elements. However, I am not sure how much effective the tool would be in a real-world scenario. Their experiment involved way too less number of people to determine how much efficient the tool would be for other users. Nonetheless, with this tool the users can combine their tasks of scenario-writing and eliciting requirements in a way that is not too much immense and that also maintains the relations between scenarios and UI.

It does provide an interactive design process as well as enables designers to concentrate on design tasks. The tool allows designers to focus more on their designs and interactive process rather than worrying about keeping track of different user-scenarios.