Primary Goal:

We wanted to assess the basic usability of a tiled layout along with strategies for layering complex information. We also wanted to evaluate what kind and how much instruction might be needed to help visitors use several, less common, interaction tools.

High-level Findings:

Need more instruction to help visitors understand and use exotic site features (side-by-side comparison tool, ranking widget, and option weighting based on rankings)

Photos of post-operative results are important.

Information layering is very affective and was well liked.

Side by side comparison tool is very useful.

Proficiency:
Computers and mobile devices (self scored)

	p1	p2	p3	p4	p5	p6	p7	avg.
Computer	3	3	4	5	4	5	4	| 4
Table and phone	1	3	5	5	5	5	4	| 4

First impressions (as reported by the reviewers):

- **Most noticeable/important**
  Shows options +6 easy to read +2 visually appealing +1, categories +3
- **Least noticeable/important**
  What is no change? +4, what does BRIDA mean? +1, boring +1
- **Confusing:**
  Technique names +4, how to use +2

Tasks:

- **Get info on a technique:**

Completed	p1	p2	p3	p4	p5	p6	p7	7/7
Didn't complete	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	
Confused	–	p2	–	–	–	–	–	1/7

- **Rank pros, cons, risks:**

Completed	–	–	–	p4	p5	p6	p7	4/7
Didn't complete	p1	p2	p3	–	–	–	–	3/7
Confused	p1	p2	p3	–	–	–	–	3/7

- **Go back to home** (button originally titled Close, changed after second interview to Back to home):

Completed	–	–	p3	p4	p5	p6	–	4/7
Didn't complete	p1	p2	–	–	–	–	p7	3/7
Confused	p1	p2	–	–	p5	–	p7	3/7

- **Technique weighting:**

Understood	–	p2	–	p4	–	–	–	2/7
Sort of got it	–	–	–	–	p5	p6	p7	3/7
Confused	p1	–	p3	–	–	–	–	2/7

- **Compare techniques:**

Completed	–	–	–	p4	–	–	p7	2/7
Didn't complete	p1	p2	p3	–	p5	p6	–	5/7
Confused	p1	p2	p3	–	p5	p6	–	5/7

- **Information seek:**

Completed	p1	p2	p3	p4	p5	p6	p7	7/7
Didn't complete	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	
Confused	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	

Overall:

- **Likes:**
Logical layout +5, information chunking/layering +5, side-by-side compare +6, by the numbers +1, voting +2
- **Dislikes/Missing:**
Not enough instruction +6, readability issues +2, other back/close option +4, confusing names +2, Long-term outcomes +1, photos +6, illustrations +3, external resource links +3, additional procedures (nipple sparing, tattooing, nipple recon) +2, U of M Branding (credibility)

General Questions:

- **Pre-consult research**
Did research +6, knew what technique +3, previous experience (family or friend) +2
- **Value of illustrations**
Didn't view +2
Useful +5
- **Doctor's influence on decision**
influenced decision +6

General observations and comments:

Single-stage…does that refer to cancer?

Would have been great to have a site like this when I was going through reconstruction.

Links to support and survivorship groups would be great.

Describe the difference between breast augmentation and reconstruction.

More realistic data on recovery, pain, post surgical outcomes (square implants that become natural looking over time).

Nerve deadness around harvest sites (dead spots).

Frustrated that post-operative photos are not available to view. Internet only shows "scary" photos of surgeries gone wrong.

More info on additive options such as nipple sparing, reconstruction and tattooing

Website Reviewed:

http://shamorca.com/projects/brida/