A. Khella, B. B. Bederson, “Pocket photoMesa: A Zoomable image browser for PDA”, MUM 2004, Oct, 27-29.

In this paper, the author introduced a image browser with supporting techniques (ZUI and treemaps) for pocket devices and evaluated this design from the point of user’s satisfaction with comparison with other similar design.

I can feel strongly that in this paper, the author is mainly concentrate on users’ requirement. Even though, the former portion was about techniques, all of them are based on the consideration for users. For example, in their design, the reason leads designer discard scroll bars is it demands “firely tuned pointing skills on small devices” rather than technique weakness.

Techniques:

(1) screen resolution and size
    In the image browser application, this cause two issues: layout of the images and navigation between them.
    The author using ZUI for navigation and apply quantum strip treemaps technique to lay out the maps
(2) limited processing power
    As an aspect of overall pocket device bottleneck, this was not discussed here.
(3) stylus interaction
    actually it is integrated with issue (1) but concentrates on utility.

Usability study:

At the beginning, the author certificates the questions that he wants to get answers after experiments. The experiments were designed based on this: the software used to evaluate and do comparison belongs to the same filed-image browser, the differences are only lies at the wonders those author wants to know and just influences users’ satisfactory rather than techniques.

Another aspect that author concentrated on is participants and sample selection. As this view changes the conclusion dramatically, the author describe it in detail about how to select participants, what kind of pictures should be used to test user’s navigation etc. These considerations are explained explicitly to convince us the result based on author’s experiments.

In section 5.2.2, the author summarized some users’ experience. What I am concerned about this is how they are concluded. The data based on scientific experiment design is reliable, as it is quantity and can be compared easily. But the subjective statements here seem weak to convince me. I wonder how the author got these results? By asking the user to write their using experience or making them do some multi choices? Experiment design and analysis become crucial in this case.