Guided review: Quasi-Qwerty Soft Keyboard Optimization (Bi et al., CHI 2010)

High-level understanding: Summarizing your understanding about the contribution and benefits of the paper. The final summary is usually put into 3–4 sentences in the actual review.

A. Problem	
Between the two keyboard layouts (, and),
there is a trade-off between	and
B. Method	
This paper proposed	that
This paper argue that	
To support this argument, regarding the motor performance, the authors derived theoretical movement efficiency of five keyboard layouts.	
A(n) comparing	g and
in three cond	itions:,, and
·	
C. Results	
Both theoretical motor performance and initial visual search time from the experiment	
reveals that pro	vide a balance between
and	
D. Implications	

The results of this paper can lead to a future keyboard layout design that strikes a balance between the motor performance and visual search time.

B1. Research method: B2. Variables: What are they? Operational definition? Were the definitions described unambiguously? If no, what are other interpretations? How much does the definitions serves the purpose to answer the research question? B3. Procedure: Was the procedure described in detail such that you can replicate this experiment? What are still ambiguous? B4. Validity: How much does the study achieved internal and external validity? What are potential threats to the validity?

Writing a review for Evaluation sections: This part of the review focuses on the validity,

generalizability, and replicability of the methods used in the evaluation.