

Short paper (4 pages in ACM-format) Research project and academic publishing, DMD 15 ECTS - referee's comments

Course description:

https://mit.itu.dk/ucs/cb/course.sml?course_id=1232604&mode=search&goto=1351772138.000

Author(s) of article: Camilla Kjeldsmark, Charlotte Larsen, Heidar Al-Zaidi, Mathias Hornstrup, Tina Linné Olsen

Title of article: **Micro Participations Ability to Facilitate the Understanding of End Users Needs**

Referee's name:

	<i>Strong Yes</i>	<i>Weak Yes</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Weak No</i>	<i>Strong No</i>
Is the paper interesting, timely and thought provoking?	5	<u>4</u>	3	2	1
Is the subject matter relevant to the DMD area?	5	<u>4</u>	3	2	1
Is the intellectual level appropriate?	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Is the paper written and structured clearly?	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Are there adequate references to related work?	5	<u>4</u>	3	2	1
Are there sufficient graphics?	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1

Recommendation (select one only)

- Accept with no changes
- Accept with minor changes
- Request a major revision
- Reject

Comments for the editors only:

Comments which may be shown anonymously to the author(s):

I do not agree, fundamentally, that agile and UCD have different values - agile might be speedy, but the fundamental value (or focus) is still to create quality. Both UCD and agile entail practical compromises and shortcuts in practice.

My main question or problem, however, is about the validity of the project - do you actually answer your research question? Or, put in another way, is your research question stated wrongly?

In order to answer question as it stands in the paper, you need to look at the practitioners side, not the side of the users as they try to use the tool?

Or, alternatively, have some criteria of quality against which you judge the users responses.

So, in total, you seem to be studying the ability of the users to use the tool, not how the practitioners make sense of it? In your discussion you say that "it facilitates the participants well in expressing their needs in an understandable way" - how do you know?

Also, when you do the revision, you should consider coming up with a brief statement of

1. Contribution; what are you contributing with, and to which field are you contributing? Who else has contributed to that field, and how is your contribution different from theirs or how does it build on previous work.
2. You might consider coming up with some clearer suggestions or implications for changing the platform that you are looking at.
2. You clearly ran into some challenges for the platform, but how could these issues have been avoided?

Problems with the method or problems with the tool?

Referees are asked to complete this form electronically and return it to:
malmborg@itu.dk, jensp@itu.dk, annehvejsel@itu.dk, nmpe@itu.dk