Participants sessions and insights

Session 1 — Sharif

attachment:3f468381-ae49-4c5b-9888-3485f365d2df:sharif.mp4

Participant Profile

Sharif has several years of experience in Web3 and DeFi, though his recent usage has been limited primarily to **staking and trading** rather than complex strategies. sharif

His decision criteria when selecting yield opportunities are:

- APY
- Reputation and security of the platform
- Background research on the team and protocol sharif

This profile places him in the **target audience segment: DeFi-familiar but not deeply technical strategy users.**

---

1. Yields Page — Initial Understanding

Interpretation of the page

Sharif immediately understood the page as a **platform for staking or earning yield across different tokens** based on the headline and layout.

> “I'm guessing it's a platform where I can stake in multiple tokens... and it's going to make it very easy for me to do that.”
> sharif

This indicates that the **core purpose of the page is understood without guidance.**

Positive signal

The page successfully communicates:

- yield opportunities
- multi-asset exploration
- action through row selection

---

2. Glow Points — Major Source of Uncertainty

The most repeated confusion during the session concerned **Glow Points**.

Sharif immediately questioned:

- What Glow Points are
- What they are worth
- What they can be used for

> “I'm then thinking what are the glow points and what are they worth? What do they get me?”
> sharif

Even after checking the documentation, the value remained unclear.

> “I can't tell what I'm going to do with the points, what it's going to get me yet.”
> sharif

Behavioral impact

Because of the uncertainty, he decided to **ignore Glow Points entirely when making decisions.**

> “I would toggle this off and make my decisions based on the APY... I would consider this a bonus.”
> sharif

Insight

Glow Points currently function as **non-actionable information** because their value and utility are unclear.

Users may:

- ignore them completely
- remove them from their decision process

---

3. Yield Selection Behavior

When evaluating opportunities, Sharif followed a realistic DeFi decision process:

1. Choose a token he already holds
2. Compare available opportunities
3. Evaluate APY
4. Consider platform reputation

> “I'll think about a coin that I have a lot of liquidity in... let's say USDC.”
> sharif

This confirms that the **Yields page mental model aligns with real user behavior**.

Users begin with assets they already hold rather than browsing abstract strategies.

---

4. Lending Pool Page

When entering the USDC market page, Sharif reported that the interface felt familiar.

> “This is like what I'd expect... it's quite clear to me.”
> sharif

He quickly understood:

- the information layout

- the deposit interaction
- the position panel

Insight

The **lending pool flow appears intuitive for DeFi users.**

---

5. Strategy Vault Page

Sharif perceived the strategy vault as **more complex** and requiring additional research.

> “I'd have to do my research in and hopefully this link would educate me a bit.”
> sharif

However, once explained, he felt the information available was sufficient.

> “That's all the information that I would need.”
> sharif

Insight

Strategy vaults are perceived as:

- more advanced
- requiring prior understanding
- acceptable if documentation exists

---

6. Vault (syrupUSDC) Flow

Sharif understood the vault concept quickly.

> “You deposit your syrup USDC into the vault and then you get yield back.”
> sharif

He correctly interpreted it as a **yield-generating deposit mechanism.**

Deposit flow

The deposit interaction felt simple and expected.

> “It looks really simple to do.”
> sharif

---

7. Position Visibility Issue

During the vault interaction, Sharif almost missed the **position panel appearing after deposit**.

> “I actually didn't notice that that popped up.”
> sharif

This suggests the position state change lacks sufficient visual emphasis.

He suggested adding:

- stronger highlighting
- possibly a link to transaction history

---

8. Withdrawal Flow

Sharif understood the **withdrawal queue mechanism** immediately.

> “If it's a queue I'm going to have to wait for my withdrawal... that makes sense.”
> sharif

He also appreciated the timer indicating when funds could be claimed.

Insight

Queue withdrawal mechanics were **clear and intuitive.**

---

9. UI Consistency Across Product Types

Sharif noticed layout inconsistencies between:

- vault pages
- strategy pages
- market pages

Specifically:

- position sections appearing in different locations
- queue information appearing in different parts of the screen

> “The UI might feel a little inconsistent with the way the pages are laid out for the different types.”
> sharif

This caused a moment where he **looked in the wrong location for information.**

---

10. Minor UI Observations

Sharif also noted several smaller interface issues:

Toast visibility

If the user is scrolled down, the success message might not be visible.

Withdrawal values

During a full withdrawal, numbers should clearly drop to zero to avoid confusion.

Key Takeaways from Sharif

Positive Signals

- Yields page purpose is immediately understood
- Navigation between pages feels natural
- Lending pool flow is intuitive
- Vault flow is easy to understand

- Withdrawal queue is clear

Usability Issues

- Glow Points lack clear value or explanation
- Position state after deposit is easy to miss
- UI layout differs between product types
- Some small visual inconsistencies

Behavioral Patterns

Sharif’s decision process followed a realistic sequence:

1. Start with tokens already owned
2. Compare APY opportunities
3. Evaluate trust in the protocol
4. Ignore unclear incentive systems

Session 2 — Harry

attachment:fbcef99b-033c-48ac-b8b7-83341117c94f:harry.mp4

Participant Profile

Harry has **limited but practical DeFi experience**, primarily focused on staking.

His exposure comes mostly from a **single platform recommended by a friend**, which he has continued using due to familiarity rather than exploration of alternatives.
harry

This places him closer to a **beginner/intermediate DeFi user**, compared to Sharif who had broader exposure.

---

1. Yields Page — Initial Understanding

Harry correctly interpreted the front page as a **dashboard for exploring yield opportunities**.

He identified:

- tokens
- APY values
- yield sources
- available opportunities

> “You could see deposit token and the yield source... and their corresponding APYs.”
> harry

Behavioral Pattern

His first instinct was to **read documentation before interacting with the interface.**

> “One of the first things I would do... I would read the documents.”
> harry

Insight

Users with lower DeFi confidence may:

- rely heavily on documentation
- hesitate to interact without reading first

---

2. Navigation Understanding

Harry quickly identified the main navigation areas:

- Yields

- Vaults
- Strategy Vaults
- Lending Pools

He also noticed the wallet indicator and audit badge in the header.

> “I assume that is probably the wallet address... and the audits.”
> harry

Insight

The **top navigation is understandable even for less experienced users.**

---

3. Filtering and Category Logic

Harry immediately understood the category filters.

Example:

> “You could see a filter option where you could click stables... and see the stable coins.”
> harry

This suggests the **product grouping model is intuitive.**

---

4. Product Type Mental Models

Harry attempted to define the difference between the three product types.

Lending Pools

He correctly interpreted lending pools as:

> “Lending your token in order to get profits.”
> harry

Vaults

He described vaults as similar to staking:

> “Where you keep your token for a period of time in order to get profit.”
> harry

Strategy Vaults

This was less clear.

> “I'm not too sure about strategy vaults.”
> harry

Insight

This confirms that **strategy vaults require additional explanation**, especially for users with lower DeFi sophistication.

---

5. Strategy Vault Page

After reading the description, Harry was able to correctly summarize the strategy vault mechanism:

- deposit SOL
- borrow leverage
- earn boosted yield

> “You deposit Solana and then borrow up to times three leverage to earn boosted yield.”
> harry

He also understood the **risk component of leverage**.

> “This leverage can go either way... you could earn more or expose yourself to more risk.”
> harry

Insight

The strategy vault page explanation appears **effective enough for intermediate users to understand the concept.**

---

6. “How It Works” Diagram

Harry responded positively to the step visualization.

> “This is nice... it’s quite user friendly.”
> harry

He correctly understood the steps:

1. Deposit
2. Choose leverage
3. Earn yield
4. Manage position

Insight

The **step visualization strongly improves comprehension.**

---

7. Strategy Vault Deposit Flow

Harry correctly interpreted all key values:

- leverage
- health level
- borrow amount
- APY
- converted token value

> “Based on my leverage and deposit... this would adjust based on each information.”
> harry

He also noticed hover tooltips explaining some metrics.

Insight

The **deposit panel appears understandable even with leverage mechanics.**

8. Withdrawal Flow

Harry correctly understood the withdrawal comparison UI.

He inferred that the numbers represent **before vs after withdrawal states**.

> “It's comparing the previous information and the information after withdrawal.”
> harry

This interpretation was confirmed during the session.

Insight

The **before/after comparison model is intuitive.**

9. Vault Page (syrupUSDC)

Harry immediately recognized the vault as a **yield deposit mechanism.**

> “You deposit syrup USDC in order to earn yield and points.”
> harry

The deposit flow was understood easily.

Curiosity About Points

However, he again questioned the meaning of **points incentives**.

> “Multiple points incentive sparks my curiosity.”
> harry

Insight

Just like Sharif, Harry wanted to understand:

- what the points represent
- how they benefit the user

10. Withdrawal Queue

Harry understood the withdrawal queue mechanism immediately.

> “You could see the withdrawal queue... and the timer.”
> harry

He also asked about **penalties for cancellation**, which indicates he was thinking about real usage scenarios.

---

11. Lending Pool Page

Harry correctly interpreted the lending pool flow:

- deposit collateral
- borrow assets
- earn yield or leverage

> “It's basically a deposit and borrow process.”
> harry

Key Takeaways from Harry

Positive Signals

- Yields page purpose understood
- Category filtering understood
- Strategy vault mechanics understood after explanation
- Deposit and withdrawal flows intuitive
- Step diagram improves comprehension
- Lending pool model understood

Usability Issues

- Strategy vault meaning unclear initially
- Points incentives unclear
- Some users may depend heavily on documentation before interacting

Behavioral Patterns

Harry showed a **learning-first behavior**:

1. Look for documentation
2. Read explanations
3. Then interact with the product

This is different from Sharif, who explored the interface more freely.

Session 3 — Cosmin

attachment:3a808bf7-e046-42af-b537-319019b06c62:cosmin.mp4

Participant Profile

Cosmin has **basic experience with staking**, primarily through wallet-based staking (Exodus), but **no experience with leveraged staking**.

> “I feel like I understand what it is, sort of, but I'm not too sure of the mechanics.” cosmin

This places him in the **DeFi-familiar but not advanced strategy user segment**, similar to Harry.

---

1. Yields Page — Initial Interpretation

Cosmin understood the page as a **hub for exploring yield opportunities** and quickly identified the main components.

He interpreted:

- Featured vaults as promoted opportunities
- Tokens and APY as the main comparison signals
- Glow Points as some form of rewards system.

> “I assume that's sort of a rewards program type of thing.”
> cosmin

Insight

The **overall page purpose is understandable immediately**, even for users unfamiliar with the platform.

---

2. Glow Points — Again a Major Source of Uncertainty

Cosmin immediately questioned the meaning of Glow Points and reward systems.

> “I would like to know what the rewards are... how is it higher?”
> cosmin

Later he asked again how rewards increase the APY when the toggle is enabled.

This reinforces a pattern already observed in the previous sessions.

Insight

Users consistently ask:

- What Glow Points are
- How they translate to value
- How they affect APY calculations

The incentive system remains unclear.

---

3. Strategy Vault — Initial Understanding

Cosmin initially struggled to differentiate **Vault vs Strategy Vault**.

> “I'm not too sure how that's different.”
> cosmin

He immediately looked for documentation or explanations.

> “I'd like to read the docs to understand how it works.”
> cosmin

Insight

Users expect:

- quick explanations
- accessible educational content

Documentation links are useful but **inline explanations would improve comprehension.**

---

4. Educational Content Expectations

Cosmin explicitly suggested that **video explanations** would improve understanding of complex mechanisms.

> “It would be nice to have a little video... showing how the process works.”
> cosmin

Insight

Some users prefer **visual explanations over written documentation** when learning complex strategies.

---

5. Strategy Vault Mechanics — Once Explained

After reviewing the infographic explaining the leverage process, Cosmin quickly understood the mechanics.

> “If I understood it perfectly... yes it makes sense to me.”
> cosmin

He correctly interpreted:

- deposit
- leverage multiplier
- borrowed amount
- resulting APY

Insight

The **step-by-step explanation works well**, but users need it before interacting with the deposit panel.

---

6. Deposit Panel Understanding

Cosmin correctly interpreted the interaction model of the right-side panel.

He understood:

- deposit amount
- leverage slider
- resulting APY changes

He also inferred how the maximum APY is reached.

> “That's how you can get the maximum restaking APY.”
> cosmin

Insight

The **interactive panel communicates leverage mechanics effectively once the concept is understood.**

---

7. Position Page — Missing Key Information

After creating a position, Cosmin noticed a major issue.

The interface showed the resulting position but **did not clearly show the original deposit amount.**

> “I want to know how much I put in first.”
> cosmin

He suggested displaying:

- original deposit
- resulting leveraged amount

Insight

Users want clear visibility of:

- initial investment
- leveraged exposure
- current position value

Without this, it becomes harder to track what happened in the transaction.

---

8. Monitoring Performance Over Time

Cosmin expected to see performance tracking features.

> “How can I monitor change over time?”
> cosmin

He specifically suggested:

- performance graphs
- larger growth indicators

> “A graph over time for sure is excellent.”
> cosmin

Insight

Users expect **visual performance tracking**, especially for longer-term positions.

9. Withdrawal Flow

Cosmin understood the withdrawal process immediately.

He correctly interpreted:

- withdrawal queue
- timer
- position closure

> “It's in a queue... that makes sense.”
> cosmin

Minor issue

He initially missed the toast notification and suggested making it more visible.

10. Vault Flow (syrupUSDC)

Cosmin understood the vault mechanism as a **simpler staking model compared to strategy vaults.**

> “There's no borrowing involved... it's just staking.”
> cosmin

This shows the conceptual difference between vault types is eventually understood.

11. Major UX Issue — Inconsistent Position Pages

Cosmin strongly noticed that **vault positions and strategy positions use different layouts.**

> “The inconsistency makes it kind of weird.”
> cosmin

He expected:

- all positions to share a similar interface
- a unified mental model for managing positions

> “If I browse all my positions, I expect them to look like this.”
> cosmin

Insight

This is a **significant UX consistency issue**.

---

12. Product Type Confusion

Cosmin also requested quick explanations for product types.

He suggested **tooltips for concepts like Lending Pools**.

> “Just hover over lending pool and it gives a one-line explanation.”
> cosmin

Insight

Users need **quick refresher explanations**, not only documentation links.

---

13. Filtering

Filtering and token selection were immediately understood.

> “The filters are fine.”
> cosmin

Insight

The filtering system appears intuitive.

Key Takeaways from Cosmin

Positive Signals

- Yields page purpose clear
- Strategy mechanics understandable after explanation
- Deposit panel intuitive
- Withdrawal queue clear
- Filters easy to use

Usability Issues

- Glow Points value unclear
- Difference between Vault and Strategy Vault unclear initially
- Position page missing original deposit information
- No visual performance tracking
- Inconsistent layout between vault and strategy flows
- Notifications easy to miss

Behavioral Pattern

Cosmin's interaction pattern was:

1. Compare APY opportunities
2. Look for documentation
3. Understand the mechanism
4. Evaluate position monitoring features

This behavior indicates **users care about understanding mechanics before committing capital.**

Session 4 — Jonathan

attachment:2baf159c-e1da-46e3-beb5-4cc0596499c5:jonathan.mp4

Participant Profile

Jonathan appears to have **practical experience with DeFi platforms and yield products**, showing familiarity with concepts such as:

- staking
- APY comparison
- borrowing mechanisms
- yield farming

Compared to previous participants, Jonathan demonstrated **higher confidence navigating financial interfaces**, focusing more on evaluating opportunities rather than learning basic mechanics.

---

1. Yields Page — Immediate Interpretation

Jonathan quickly understood the purpose of the page as a **yield exploration interface** where users can compare different opportunities.

He focused primarily on:

- APY
- token type
- yield source

This suggests the main signals used for evaluation are correctly prioritized.

Insight

For experienced users, the **Yields page works as intended as a discovery surface for yield opportunities.**

---

2. Product Categories

Jonathan understood the existence of different product types but still needed clarification about their differences.

As seen in previous sessions, the distinctions between:

- Vaults
- Strategy Vaults
- Lending Pools

were not immediately obvious.

Insight

Even experienced DeFi users benefit from **quick contextual explanations of product categories.**

---

3. Strategy Vault Concept

Jonathan demonstrated a relatively quick understanding of the leveraged staking concept.

He correctly interpreted:

- deposit
- leverage multiplier
- borrowing mechanism
- amplified yield

However, like previous participants, he needed to read explanations before feeling fully confident.

Insight

The **concept is understandable**, but the interface still requires **supporting educational cues**.

---

4. Deposit Panel

Jonathan was comfortable interpreting the deposit panel and the relationship between:

- deposit amount
- leverage
- resulting APY

The interactive elements helped communicate the mechanics clearly.

Insight

The **deposit panel design appears effective for users with DeFi familiarity.**

---

5. Position Management

Jonathan was able to interpret the position management interface and understand:

- current position
- leverage impact
- borrowing exposure
- APY

However, similar to Cosmin, position tracking information could be clearer.

Users often want to see:

- initial deposit
- current value
- growth over time

---

6. Withdrawal Flow

Jonathan understood the withdrawal process quickly and correctly interpreted:

- withdrawal queue
- processing delay
- position closure

This indicates the **withdrawal mechanism communicates its behavior effectively.**

---

7. Incentives (Glow Points)

As in previous sessions, Jonathan questioned the meaning and value of **Glow Points**.

Participants consistently struggle to understand:

- what points represent
- how they translate into value
- how they affect APY calculations

Insight

The incentive system remains one of the **least clear elements of the product.**

---

8. Filtering and Navigation

Jonathan had no difficulty using the filters and navigation elements.

The filtering system behaved as expected and did not introduce confusion.

Insight

The **filtering system appears intuitive and requires no major changes.**

Key Takeaways from Jonathan

Positive Signals

- Yields page easily understood
- Deposit panel intuitive
- Withdrawal process clear
- Filtering works well
- Strategy vault mechanics understandable after explanation

Usability Issues

- Product category differences unclear initially
- Glow Points meaning unclear
- Position tracking information could be clearer

Session 5 — Michał

attachment:8e4a7a2d-30c6-4977-a8c5-b9572edcba09:michal.mp4

Participant Profile

Michał has a **technical background (programmer)** and demonstrated strong analytical behavior during the session. He focused heavily on:

- interface logic
- UI consistency
- interaction clarity

He approached the product more like a **technical reviewer** than a typical DeFi user, often analyzing UI behavior and layout patterns.
michal

---

1. Yields Page — Initial Impression

Michał reacted positively to the **information density of the front page**.

He specifically liked seeing:

- earnings information
- positions overview
- the yield table

> “I like the information on the first page... I like to know what's my position, what I am earning.”
> michal

Insight

The **data-oriented layout resonates well with technically oriented users**.

---

2. Table Interaction Confusion

One of the first issues he identified was **inconsistent row behavior in the yield table**.

Some rows expanded while others opened new pages.

> “When I'm clicking SOL it extends the view, but when I'm clicking BTC it's opening a new page.”
> michal

He eventually deduced the reason:

Rows with an expand icon behave differently than rows without it.

Insight

The interaction model is **understandable but not immediately obvious**.

A clearer indicator of expandable rows could reduce the learning friction.

---

3. Filters and Search

Michał expected the search field to be interactive but quickly understood that the prototype was static.

Filtering logic itself appeared intuitive.

Insight

No major usability issues were identified in filtering behavior.

---

4. Vault Flow (syrupUSDC)

Michał understood the vault deposit process immediately.

> “Yeah, I understand what I'm doing here.”
> michal

However, he questioned the **reward toggle control**.

> “Why there's an option to turn on rewards?”
> michal

The toggle gave the impression that the user could **enable or disable rewards**, which created confusion.

Insight

The **reward toggle mental model is unclear**.

Users interpret it as:

- turning rewards on/off
- opting into rewards
- or selecting a reward mode

---

5. Deposit Input Preference

Michał expressed a strong preference for **direct numeric inputs rather than percentage sliders**.

> “I'm not the fan of percents when I want to provide the value.”
> michal

Although he acknowledged this might be a personal preference, it highlights a pattern seen in more technical users.

Insight

Advanced users may prefer **precise numeric input over percentage controls**.

---

6. Transaction Transparency

Michał reacted positively to the **“View Transaction” option**.

> “I like the view transaction option... I would click it.”
> michal

This feature appealed to his technical mindset, allowing verification of on-chain activity.

Insight

Providing access to **blockchain transaction details builds trust for advanced users**.

---

7. Withdrawal Flow

The withdrawal flow was understood easily.

However, he commented on the **length of the withdrawal notification message**.

> “This message is either too long or maybe divided into lines.”
> michal

He suggested making it shorter or easier to scan.

He also suggested displaying the **expected waiting time** more clearly.

> “Maybe add... wait 10 minutes or 5 minutes.”
> michal

Insight

Users appreciate **clearer and more concise status messaging**.

---

8. Strategy Vault Page

Michał had no major issues understanding the strategy vault interface.

He liked that key information such as:

- APY
- rewards
- leverage

were clearly visible.

> “I like the number very much... it's good that it's so visible.”
> michal

Insight

High visibility of **potential returns and rewards is effective** in attracting attention.

---

9. Layout Optimization Suggestion

When interacting with the strategy vault page, Michał suggested **restructuring the layout**.

He felt that users primarily interact with the **deposit/withdraw section**, while the informational content is secondary.

> “If I know what I'm doing... I'm more interested in this part.”
> michal

He suggested:

- collapsing informational sections
- prioritizing the interaction panel

Insight

Experienced users may prefer **faster access to transaction controls** rather than informational content.

---

10. Homepage Layout Feedback

Michał also commented on the **hero section size**.

> “This ‘Welcome to Glow’ is too big... the table is more important.”
> michal

He suggested that frequent users would likely return to the app to check data rather than read the headline again.

Insight

Frequent users prioritize **data visibility over marketing-style headers**.

Key Takeaways from Michał

Positive Signals

- Data-rich homepage appreciated
- Strategy vault metrics easy to read
- Transaction transparency valued
- Filters understandable
- Overall flow logical

Usability Issues

- Yield table interaction inconsistency
- Rewards toggle confusing
- Withdrawal message too long

- Percentage-based input not ideal for all users
- Hero section too prominent for returning users

Session 6 — Gasti

attachment:fbeb2c30-fe8c-45bb-958e-8efba2028e19:Gasti___Gianpiero_user_interview_-_2026_03_04_11_55_GMT-05_00_-_Recording.mp4

Participant Profile

Gasti is a **colleague from the Concrete team**, familiar with crypto products and financial interfaces. He approached the session with a **task-oriented mindset**, focusing primarily on verifying whether the main flows worked correctly.

Unlike earlier participants, Gasti did not spend much time interpreting concepts and instead focused on **testing the mechanics of the interface and confirming expected behaviors**.

---

1. Yields Page — Initial Navigation

Gasti quickly understood how to interact with the table and identified that **rows must be clicked to proceed into an opportunity**.

He explored several components including:

- Featured portfolio
- Vaults
- Strategy vaults
- Lending pools

This suggests that the **main exploration entry points are discoverable**.

Insight

The **table interaction model works for users with prior crypto experience**.

2. Opportunity Selection

Gasti correctly understood that selecting a row leads to the **investment flow for that opportunity**.

He was able to:

- select a vault
- proceed to the investment interface
- start configuring a position.

Insight

The **transition from exploration → action appears intuitive**.

---

3. APY and Rewards Display

During the session, Gasti verified that the interface clearly displays:

- APY
- Glow Points multiplier
- reward indicators

These signals were visible during the opportunity selection process.
Gasti _ Gianpiero user intervie...

Insight

The **reward indicators are noticeable**, although the session notes do not indicate whether the meaning of Glow Points was fully understood.

(This aligns with the confusion observed in earlier sessions.)

---

4. Deposit Flow

Gasti successfully completed the **deposit flow** and verified that:

- the deposit call-to-action was clear
- the investment position could be created
- the interface allowed configuration of the deposit amount.

Insight

The **deposit flow appears straightforward and easy to execute**.

---

5. Withdrawal Flow

Gasti also tested the **withdrawal process** and confirmed that:

- withdrawals can be initiated
- some withdrawals enter a queue
- users must return after the unstaking period to complete the process. Gasti _ Gianpiero user intervie...

Insight

The **queued withdrawal model is understandable**, though it requires clear messaging to ensure users know when to return.

---

6. Leverage Interaction

Gasti briefly explored the **leverage mechanics**, including:

- viewing leverage settings
- adjusting parameters
- checking account information related to leverage. Gasti _ Gianpiero user intervie...

Insight

The leverage controls appear **accessible and functional**, although this session did not deeply explore the conceptual understanding of leverage.

---

7. Portfolio and Earnings Overview

Gasti reviewed the **landing page overview elements**, particularly:

- the welcome screen
- earnings overview
- portfolio information.

These components were recognized as a **summary of the user's financial activity on the platform**.

Insight

The **dashboard-style overview provides useful context for users returning to the app**.

Key Takeaways from Gasti

Positive Signals

- Table navigation works
- Opportunity selection is intuitive
- Deposit flow is straightforward
- Withdrawal queue concept understandable
- Leverage interaction accessible
- APY and rewards visible

Observed Limitations

- Session focused mostly on **mechanics rather than conceptual understanding**
- Limited feedback on:
  - Glow Points meaning
  - strategy explanation

- yield comparison logic

Session 7 — Pierre

attachment:bf214456-fdf0-43c6-9e7b-9405830dde2e:pierre.mp4

Participant Profile

Pierre is a **crypto-native user and internal collaborator from the Concrete ecosystem**. He demonstrated strong familiarity with DeFi interfaces and focused primarily on:

- terminology consistency
- protocol conventions
- user expectations based on existing Solana platforms

His feedback was highly **product-strategy oriented**, often referencing conventions used by other major protocols.
Pierre

---

1. Asset Coverage Expectations

One of Pierre's first suggestions was expanding the set of available assets, specifically recommending the inclusion of **Wrapped Bitcoin (WBTC)**.

He noted that Bitcoin is widely considered a **"blue chip" asset**, and users may expect to see it as part of the available opportunities.

Insight

Advanced users may expect **recognizable assets** such as BTC to appear among yield opportunities, even if only a derivative version is available.

---

2. Vault Terminology Confusion

Pierre immediately questioned the difference between:

- **Vault**
- **Strategy Vault**

His assumption was that **all vaults already imply a strategy**.

After clarification that strategy vaults include **leverage**, he suggested simplifying the terminology.
Pierre

Insight

The term **“Strategy Vault” is not intuitive**.

Users may interpret every vault as having some strategy behind it.

---

3. Suggested Naming Change

Pierre recommended simplifying the naming convention across the interface.

Instead of separating:

- Vault
- Strategy Vault

He suggested using:

- **Vault (standard yield vault)**
- **Leverage / Multiplier within the vault**

This would allow all opportunities to remain under the **same conceptual category**.

Insight

Simplifying terminology could reduce conceptual overhead and improve discoverability.

---

4. Ecosystem Naming Conventions

Pierre also suggested renaming **“Lending Pool”** to **“Lend”**.

He pointed out that many Solana protocols use simpler naming patterns and that matching those conventions helps users navigate new products more easily.
Pierre

Examples he referenced include naming patterns used by major Solana protocols.

Insight

Aligning terminology with **ecosystem conventions** reduces learning friction.

---

5. Rewards Display (Glow Points)

Pierre raised concerns about including **Glow Points in APY calculations** when the value of those points is not clearly defined.

He questioned whether showing these rewards alongside yield metrics could potentially create confusion.

Insight

Displaying rewards with **uncertain value alongside APY metrics may create ambiguity for users evaluating returns**.

This reinforces the confusion around incentives seen in earlier sessions.

---

6. Withdrawal Timer Usability

Pierre suggested improving the withdrawal timer display.

Instead of showing only hours, he recommended displaying the waiting time in a clearer format such as:

- days
- hours
- minutes

This would make the waiting period easier to interpret.
Pierre

Insight

Time-based processes should be communicated in **human-readable formats** to improve usability.

---

7. Health Level Terminology

Pierre discussed the **“health level” indicator** used in the leveraged strategy.

The health level represents the safety margin of the user's leveraged position.

Pierre suggested verifying whether this terminology is commonly used across the Solana ecosystem.
Pierre

Insight

Financial terminology should ideally align with **industry conventions to avoid introducing new mental models.**

---

8. Leverage Adjustment Limitation

During the discussion, it was noted that changing leverage currently requires:

- closing the existing position
- reopening a new position with the desired leverage

This behavior may affect usability for users wanting to adjust their exposure dynamically.
Pierre

Insight

Users may expect the ability to **modify leverage without closing the entire position**.

Key Takeaways from Pierre

Positive Signals

- Core vault mechanics understandable
- Yield opportunities easy to interpret
- Interface navigation straightforward

Usability Issues

- “Strategy Vault” terminology confusing
- Lending Pool naming inconsistent with ecosystem standards
- Glow Points inclusion in APY unclear
- Withdrawal timer readability could improve
- Health level terminology may need validation

Session 8 — Conor

attachment:85631a49-9527-42f8-9a76-c7a93e4b9c87:Conor_-_user_testing_Glow_-_2026_03_11_10_00_GMT-05_00_-_Recording_2.mp4

Participant Profile

Conor is a **Senior Product Designer from the Concrete team** with strong experience in designing crypto products and financial interfaces. His feedback focused primarily on:

- clarity of information architecture
- interface hierarchy
- consistency across product types
- risk communication for leveraged products

Compared to other participants, Conor approached the interface with a **product design perspective**, identifying structural improvements and UX clarity issues.

Conor - user testing Glow - 202...

1. Landing Page Hierarchy

One of Conor's first observations was that the **introductory text at the top of the page felt too long and unnecessary for an application interface**.

He noted that sections such as:

- "Welcome to Glow"
- "Explore yield opportunities"
- instructions like "Click any row to set up a position"

take up too much vertical space and resemble **marketing copy rather than functional product UI**.

Insight

Returning users are primarily interested in **data and opportunities**, not onboarding explanations.

Reducing introductory text improves **information density and usability**.

2. Conditional Display of "Your Earnings"

Conor pointed out that the **"Your Earnings" section should only appear when a user has an active position**.

For first-time users, the section has no relevance and may create confusion.

Insight

Interface elements should adapt to **user state**:

- first-time users → exploration
- returning users → portfolio monitoring

3. Vault vs Strategy Vault Confusion

Similar to previous sessions, Conor questioned the distinction between:

- Vaults
- Strategy Vaults

He suggested **grouping them under the same conceptual category**, since strategy vaults are simply a type of vault with leverage.
Conor - user testing Glow - 202...

Insight

Separating these as completely different categories may introduce unnecessary conceptual complexity.

---

4. Leverage and Liquidation Clarity

Conor emphasized that **leverage introduces liquidation risk**, which should be communicated clearly.

He suggested improving the explanation of:

- how leverage works
- what triggers liquidation
- how the health level relates to liquidation risk

Insight

Users interacting with leveraged products need **clear risk communication**, especially when liquidation is possible.

---

5. Placement of the Leverage Slider

Conor suggested moving the **leverage slider closer to the APY display**, since leverage directly affects the resulting yield.

Currently, the relationship between these elements is not visually clear.

Insight

Controls that affect a metric should be **visually associated with that metric**.

This improves causal understanding.

---

6. APY and Rewards Calculation

Conor was highly attracted to the high APY values but immediately questioned **whether Glow Points rewards were included in the displayed APY**.

He noted that the **rewards toggle is confusing**, as it appears to turn rewards on or off rather than simply displaying APY including rewards.
Conor - user testing Glow - 202...

Insight

The reward toggle creates an **unclear mental model**, reinforcing confusion observed in earlier sessions.

---

7. Vault Page Consistency

Conor suggested that **vault pages grouped by deposit token should follow the same layout patterns** used elsewhere in the application.

Inconsistencies in layout may reduce usability and increase cognitive load.

Insight

Consistent layout structures improve predictability across the product.

---

8. APY Performance Over Time

Conor recommended adding **historical APY charts**.

This would allow users to understand:

- yield stability
- historical performance
- reliability of returns

Insight

Performance visualization can significantly increase **trust and decision confidence**.

---

9. Withdrawal Queue Visibility

Conor noticed that the **withdrawal queue time was difficult to see**.

For example, the queue duration (e.g., 57 hours) appeared small and hidden in the interface.

He suggested making the withdrawal timing more visible and integrating it directly into the main withdrawal information.
Conor - user testing Glow - 202...

Insight

Critical operational constraints such as **withdrawal delays must be highly visible before deposit decisions are made**.

---

10. Position Monitoring and Labels

Conor suggested renaming the **“My Account” section to “My Position”**, since the displayed information refers specifically to the user’s investment position rather than the broader account.

Insight

Accurate terminology improves user understanding of displayed data.

---

11. Interface Alignment

Conor also identified an issue with **content alignment and margins** across the interface.

He recommended applying consistent margins to create a more visually organized layout.

Insight

Consistent layout structure improves **visual clarity and perceived product quality**.

Key Takeaways from Conor

Positive Signals

- Yield opportunities are attractive
- Position monitoring concept is useful
- Strategy vault mechanics understandable
- Data presentation is strong

Usability Issues

- Introductory text too prominent
- Vault vs strategy vault distinction confusing
- Rewards toggle unclear
- Withdrawal queue information not visible enough
- Leverage risk explanation insufficient
- Interface alignment inconsistencies