Design Critique - Movies Critics Loved, But Audiences Really Didn't
By Vanya Arikutharam (PES1201800379)

The infographic is elegantly presented, although requires some effort to understand the graphic! The viewer's attention is drawn to the bright bubbles and then the title, which is concisely phrased in order to draw in the right audience. While the bubbles and their labels seem cluttered on mobile, it is fairly well spaced when viewing it on a laptop.

I like the contrasting colour palette chosen. The contrast between the dark background and brightly coloured bubbles works quite well in my opinion. The reverse chronological year scale is also an effective choice. It's also good to note the addition of the sources used, which increases the trustworthy factor of the infographic.

One of my favourite aspects of the chart is the method used to convey the movie budgets to the audience. The encoding label included in the top right corner is one of the most elegant and compact ways I've ever encountered to successfully show that the size of the circle directly corresponds to the movie budget. It also blends very well with the infographic as a whole and is pleasing to look at. The subtext uses the example of 'The Last Jedi' to clearly explain what the entire graphic is trying to convey.

Although at first glance the chart used seems appropriate, it becomes a little confusing/ takes a little effort, when trying to connect the bottom scale of percentages with the title of the infographic. Initially, one may think that it indicates the percentage of the audience who hated the movie but actually it is the delta between the audience and critiques scores. This confusion could've been avoided if the x axis was clearly labelled as the % gap between audience and critics ratings.

Another important thing to note is the presence of the top arrow which I believe is serving no clear purpose. It seems unnecessary as I'm not getting any additional information by it being there. In fact it's probably doing more harm than good. Initially one may think it's another scale that hasn't been labelled, which doesn't appear to be the case. The average viewer may also confuse it for the budget scale due to the placement of the budget encoding near the arrowhead.

A small yet important detail is the font size of the bubble labels and the text in the top right corner. Although it is readable on a laptop and a regular-sized tablet, it is unreadable on your phone, even in landscape mode. Hence it wouldn't be a very good addition to an online article since most of us read those on our phone. Additionally, although the contrast between the background and the elements is well chosen, the individual colour colour coding of the bubbles has shades that are very similar (for example, yellow and orange) which may make it hard to differentiate and reduces accessibility for those with colour blindness.

The interpretability of the infographic can be improved with different approaches. The simplest one would be to change the x axis labelling as mentioned before. Another approach involves dropping the year scale and replacing it with a '% of movie critics who loved the movie' scale, since there is not really much of a trend (although there being no trend could also be considered informative in a way). This will allow for a much better and intuitive interpretation of what information the infographic designer is trying to convey.

Overall, there's a lot of information packed in and the designer has maximised the amount of information each element of the visualisation conveys, which may have caused a cluttered look. On balance, it is a fairly good infographic and with certain minimal, but important changes could be very intuitively informative to the target audience.

->Positives - what I liked

->Negatives - what I didn't like
->How can it be improved
->Does it draw the right audience
->Overall conclusion

=>Could be written in stages based on how interested the audience

Overview
        Initial reactions
        Content
        Aesthetics
        Style
Analysis

Interpretation
Evaluation

The <insert interesting first sentence>.

<u>Positives</u>
->Elegant
->Eye-catching
->size of title-good for both phone and laptop
->Colour palette is nice (the contrast between the dark background and brightly coloured bubbles works well in my opinion)
->Trustworthy - sources are cited
->Reverse chronological scale works well
->Encoding for the budget is nicely done, it's intuitive
->Bubble colour encoding is also nicely done
->Scale and spacing is appropriately chosen

<u>Negatives</u>
->Label text and sub-text ->font size is too small on mobile
->On a broader aspect it's not the best way to represent the message it's trying convey (interpretability of the graph is not very intuitive apart from the budget aspect)
-> Top arrow seems unnecessary as its presence isn't giving me any additional info (placement of the budget encoding is bad because of the unnecessary arrow)

<u>How can it be improved</u>
->A threshold value indicating what percentage of the movie critics loved the movie
->Dropping the year scale for a %of movie critics who loved the movie scale since there isn't really any trend across the years (although that itself could be considered useful information)

<u>Accessibility</u>
->Red-Blind/Protanopia
        ->Orange, green and yellow all appear yellow
->Blue-Blind/Tritanopia
        ->