Group Assignment
Panos Markopoulos, 2 May at18:59

I have really enjoyed the work you did and appreciate the results. Your paper is well written, presents interesting and novel findings, and I will try to tempt you to co-author a publication with some very little extra work . A possibility worth considering is to write a joint paper with the lit survey group. 2-study papers tend to have higher chances and impact. Below are some more detailed comments for improving the work or the write up.

The abstract does not justify the research question. Your intro/explanation of the method would be clearer if you had summarized the Wolfel and Mortel dimensions first.
The legends to the figures need to be revised – remember when you write papers to write them also for those who will look at the title and figures first.
Your data analysis is a bit vague: e.g., 'the commonality between criteria was analysed' : I would like to have some elaboration here.
"Some of the participants used the same kind of criteria…" : some specificity would help here too.
Clustering: You should give an example of distances for two different pairs of card sets. Then this notion becomes more understandable.
Seen from a distance your analysis emphasizes form design, which is something that becomes more salient because of the method you used (based on first impressions). This needs to be raised in the discussion section.
It is also not clear how you did the analysis: in a team of 4? One of you? How were ambiguities and difference resolved?
What were examples of different interpretations of 'familiarity'?
'We assume that their knowledge of the cards did not significantly influence the results'… probably it did so but you could argue that it did not introduce systematic differences between participants. You need to re-think and discuss this point more extensively in the discussion. Similarly, discuss more the statement: "The design activity and purpose…the likelihood of use'
Figures 3 and 4 are excellent! Remember to use your design skills in presenting work: many papers make it just because the results are visualised well.
The use of the term 'objective' is not correct. I would distinguish between the dimensions characterizing the design of the cards (as addressed in the lit. review), as opposed to those that are remarked by participants in an evaluative stance.
Awareness 8
RQ 9
Sampling 8
Method Cong 8
Execution 10
QDA10
Quality 8
Contrib 8
Ethics 6
Commic. 8,5

Weighted total 8,35

Individual Assignment

Panos Markopoulos, 3 May at 14:03

You present a study that is already very high quality and therefore it is difficult to propose sensible improvments. Your suggestions for extending the term and trying out different cases is very apprpropate. The introduction is poorly written: it is difficult to understand what the project is about if one does not know the Fireflies: you refer to a decision but it is not clear what this decision is about and how Fireflies helps make it. The duration of the study has not been justified. The method is described a bit too operationally, so it is difficult to relate the method to the goals of the study, and to justify some of the decisions made.

Awareness: 7,5

RQ: 7,5

Sampling: 8

Method Congr: 7

Descri: 8,5

Ethics: 9

Comm: 8

Weighted total 7,95