Research Synthesis

Scope

This round focused on testing:

- Yields Front Page
- syrupUSDC Vault flow
- Strategy Vault flow
- Lending Asset Details

The goal was to validate whether the new architecture and flows improve usability, support clearer product understanding, and help users move confidently from exploration to action.

Participants

8 participants completed the study.

Participant profiles varied across:

- DeFi-familiar users with mostly staking experience
- More advanced crypto-native users
- Internal colleagues familiar with crypto products but not directly involved in the Glow product team

This mix was useful because it exposed both:

- beginner/intermediate comprehension issues
- terminology and product-architecture issues visible to more advanced users

---

Executive Summary

The redesigned Yields page is working well as an **exploration hub**. Most participants quickly understood that the page helps users compare opportunities, inspect products, and move into a specific investment flow. The front page

generally succeeded in communicating that Glow is a place to explore and deploy yield opportunities.
sharif
harry

The strongest issues were not around basic navigation, but around **mental model clarity**:

- users do not clearly understand the difference between **Vaults**, **Strategy Vaults**, and **Lending Pools**
- **Glow Points / rewards** remain highly unclear across nearly all sessions
- users want clearer visibility into **what they deposited, what they currently hold, and how their position has changed over time**
- the **vault and strategy vault flows feel inconsistent** in layout and position monitoring
- leveraged products still need better communication around **liquidation risk, leverage behavior, and health level**

In short:

The architecture is promising, but the product language, incentive system, and position clarity need refinement before implementation.

Key Findings

1. The Yields page is clearly useful as an exploration layer

This was one of the strongest positive signals across the study.

Participants generally understood the front page as a place to:

- compare yield opportunities
- inspect tokens and APYs
- choose a product and go deeper

Sharif immediately interpreted it as a platform where he could stake across multiple tokens.
sharif

Harry also understood it as a yield exploration interface with visible token and APY information.
harry

Cosmin identified it as a rewards and yield hub and immediately started comparing opportunities.
cosmin

Jonathan also read the page as a discovery surface for opportunities, though he commented on hierarchy issues in the hero area.
jonathan

What this means

The overall direction of a unified front page is validated. Users do see value in having:

- a central page for comparing opportunities
- one place to enter vaults, strategy vaults, and lending
- a more portfolio-like entry point into the product

Design implication

This page should continue to be developed as the main exploration hub. The main work now is less about whether the page is useful, and more about **how to make the information easier to interpret and compare**.

---

2. Glow Points / rewards are the biggest recurring source of confusion

This was the most repeated issue across the entire study.

Participants repeatedly asked:

- What are Glow Points?
- What are they worth?

- Why are they included in APY?
- Are rewards real yield or just speculative incentives?
- Does the rewards toggle turn rewards on/off or only change the display?

Sharif immediately asked what Glow Points are worth and what they get him, then decided to ignore them in his decision-making because the value was unclear.
sharif
sharif

Harry also became curious about “multiple points incentives” and wanted more explanation.
harry

Cosmin repeatedly questioned how rewards affect APY and asked what the rewards actually are.
cosmin

Jonathan flagged Glow Points very early and said the reward logic was hard to interpret.
jonathan
jonathan

Pierre explicitly questioned whether Glow Points should be included in reward calculations at all if their value is uncertain.
Pierre

Conor also called out that the APY/rewards relationship is vague and that the rewards toggle is confusing.
Conor - user testing Glow - 202...

What this means

Users do notice rewards, but they do not trust or understand them enough to use them in decision-making.

In several cases, the response was not “interesting, tell me more,” but rather:

“I’ll ignore this and decide based on core APY.”

Design implication

Glow Points need a much clearer treatment. At minimum, users need to understand:

- what Glow Points are
- whether they have present-day value or future utility
- whether APY includes speculative rewards or only base yield
- what the rewards toggle actually does

Recommendation

This is a priority UX/content problem, not a tooltip problem only.

The current system is creating uncertainty around one of the key incentive signals on the page.

---

3. The difference between Vaults, Strategy Vaults, and Lending Pools is not clear enough

This pattern appeared in almost every session.

Users could usually infer something after reading, but the distinctions were rarely obvious immediately.

Harry understood Lending Pools fairly well, described Vaults as more like staking, but admitted he was not sure what Strategy Vaults were.

Cosmin explicitly said he was not sure how Vaults and Strategy Vaults differ and wanted docs/tooltips to explain the distinction.

Jonathan formed a reasonable mental model on his own, but still needed to think through the difference between the categories.

Pierre questioned the distinction directly and suggested that “strategy vault” is not intuitive language, recommending simpler naming like “leverage vault” or treating all of them as vaults with different mechanics.

Conor made a similar point, arguing that strategy vaults are just a type of vault and should probably not be separated as a top-level concept.

What this means

Users do not naturally map the current category system to clear mental models.

The problem is not only education. It is also naming.

Design implication

The current product taxonomy may be more complex than needed.

There are two likely directions:

- add faster explanations
- simplify the taxonomy itself

Recommendation

This is worth addressing at the information architecture level, not only with supporting copy.

---

4. syrupUSDC Vault is understandable, but its post-deposit experience feels weak

Most users understood the syrupUSDC vault as a simpler, non-leveraged product once they reached it.

Sharif described it as depositing syrupUSDC and getting yield back.

Harry understood it as a deposit mechanism for earning yield and incentives. harry

Cosmin also understood that there was no borrowing involved and that it was a simpler staking-like flow.

However, several participants felt that after depositing, the vault experience lacked the richness and clarity of the strategy vault flow.

Cosmin found the resulting position view inconsistent with the strategy vault experience and said that the different layout broke his mental model.

Jonathan described the post-deposit state as underwhelming and said it felt more like staying on a marketing page than monitoring an actual investment.

Conor also noted layout inconsistencies and argued for more consistency across vault surfaces.

What this means

The problem is not the concept of the vault itself.

The problem is the **quality and consistency of the position-monitoring surface after deposit**.

Design implication

The syrupUSDC flow needs a stronger “position state” after deposit so users feel they are now managing an active investment, not still viewing a pre-deposit overview page.

---

5. Users want much better visibility into position state and performance

This was another strong repeated pattern.

Users repeatedly wanted clearer answers to:

- How much did I originally deposit?
- What do I hold now?
- How much has it grown?
- How is performance changing over time?

Cosmin explicitly asked to see the original deposit amount, not only the resulting leveraged token amount.

He also asked how he could monitor change over time and suggested a graph.

Jonathan also wanted a clearer sense of original input vs current output and profit when withdrawing.

Conor recommended APY-over-time charts to increase confidence.

Sharif almost missed the updated position state after deposit and suggested stronger highlighting and possibly transaction history.

What this means

Users need more than just “your position exists.”

They want **investment tracking**, not only transactional confirmation.

Design implication

Position pages should more clearly show:

- initial deposit
- current position value
- change since deposit
- growth or earnings over time
- historical or recent APY context where possible

Recommendation

This is a major opportunity area. Stronger position monitoring could meaningfully increase confidence and make the product feel more serious and trustworthy.

---

6. The leverage flow is promising, but risk communication still needs work

The strategy vault was one of the most interesting parts of the test.

Once users read the explanation or step-by-step graphic, many were able to understand the mechanics reasonably well.

Harry understood that the strategy uses deposited SOL plus leverage to earn boosted returns.
harry

Cosmin understood the flow after the infographic and correctly described deposit + leverage + active earning.
cosmin

Jonathan also worked through the model and reached the correct conclusion that the user is taking a leveraged position to amplify returns.
jonathan

But some critical risk concepts still felt underexplained:

- how leverage interacts with APY

- what “health level” means
- how liquidation risk works
- why some values move the way they do

Jonathan had never seen “health level” expressed that way and had to infer that it meant risk exposure.

Pierre and Conor both raised concerns about leverage and liquidation clarity.

What this means

The strategy vault is not fundamentally too complex, but it requires better communication of risk and mechanics.

Design implication

Users need clearer help around:

- what leverage changes
- what health level measures
- what could cause liquidation
- whether they can adjust leverage later

Recommendation

This is especially important because users may be attracted by the high APY before fully understanding the tradeoff.

---

7. The rewards toggle is creating the wrong mental model

This came up repeatedly and deserves its own callout separate from Glow Points generally.

Several users interpreted the toggle as something that **enables or disables rewards**, instead of simply changing the APY display to include rewards.

Michał explicitly said the control looks like he is “turning on rewards.”
michal

Conor also found the toggle confusing and suggested the control should make it clearer that it is a display mode, not an action.
Conor - user testing Glow - 202...

Jonathan similarly struggled to understand whether rewards were some additional mode or multiplier.
jonathan

What this means

This is not just vague copy. The control itself suggests the wrong behavior.

Design implication

Users should not be left wondering whether they are changing the product or just changing the display.

Recommendation

Rework the control so it clearly communicates comparison mode, not system state.

---

8. Withdrawal queue timing needs to be much more visible

This came up in multiple forms.

Most users understood the concept of queued withdrawals once they saw it.

That part is not the main issue.

Sharif understood the queue and timer quickly.
sharif

Harry also understood queued withdrawals and asked sensible follow-up questions about cancellation.
harry

But Conor and Pierre both argued that the timing information should be more visible and easier to interpret.
Pierre
Conor - user testing Glow - 202...

Michał suggested simpler, clearer messaging and making the wait time easier to read.
michal

What this means

Users can understand the queue, but the product is not surfacing it strongly enough at the right moments.

Design implication

Withdrawal timing is operationally critical information and should be visible:

- before deposit
- at withdrawal initiation
- during the queued state

---

9. There are still consistency issues across flows

This showed up in several sessions.

Users noticed when:

- some rows expanded and others navigated
- vault and strategy vault position states looked different
- queue information appeared in different places
- similar products used different layout structures

Cosmin made the strongest version of this point, saying the inconsistency broke his mental model.

Sharif also noticed inconsistency in position and queue placement across screens.

Conor and Michał each suggested layout and hierarchy refinements for consistency and alignment.

What this means

The system is close enough that users expect consistency, which is actually a good sign. But the remaining differences are noticeable and create friction.

Design implication

The more these flows are unified structurally, the easier the product will be to learn and reuse.

Hypothesis Review

H1 — Yields page usefulness

Validated

Users generally understood the Yields page as a useful exploration and comparison hub. The page is not perceived as decorative or passive. The main issues lie in interpretation of product types and rewards, not in the page’s overall purpose.
sharif
harry

H2 — Exploration → action flow

Mostly validated

Users were generally able to move from Yields into a chosen product. The path works. However, confidence drops when the selected opportunity depends on unclear taxonomy or unclear reward logic.

H3 — Strategy Vault flow clarity

Partially validated

Users can understand the strategy vault flow, especially with the step-by-step explanation. However, leverage, liquidation, health level, and APY/rewards relationships still need clearer communication.

H4 — syrupUSDC Vault flow simplicity & clarity

Validated conceptually, but weaker in post-deposit UX

Users generally understood syrupUSDC as the simpler, non-leveraged product. However, the position-monitoring experience after deposit feels weaker and less

satisfying than the strategy vault equivalent.