Vyry Quest 4.2 - Peer Insights

Ask your 2 peers about:

- What felt intuitive vs. confusing
- Whether the quest created a sense of togetherness / IRL collaboration
- Moments of delight
- Any slowdowns or unclear steps
- What would have improved their experience

What felt intuitive vs. confusing

Intuitive

- Recording signals felt action-oriented and easy to understand once users landed on the right surface.
- Creating an Xfiti felt like a meaningful output and gave the quest a tangible sense of creation.
- Starting quests was generally straightforward after the group understood where to enter the flow.
- Switching quests felt manageable, suggesting the navigation model is not fundamentally broken once mental models are formed.
- The core interactions themselves seem simpler than the surrounding onboarding, which suggests the product problem is more about framing than capability.

Confusing

- There is a lack of tooltips or a walkthrough to explain what to do first, which makes the initial experience feel under-instructed.
- Users did not realize that recorded signals may be public, creating ambiguity around privacy and sharing norms.
- The app does not explain core features in a timely sequence, so terminology appears before context.
- “Xfiti” is not self-explanatory for first-time users, and the product currently assumes vocabulary familiarity too early.
- Quests were not always easy to discover, which weakens entry into the core loop.
- Seeing a list of users without a clear next action created dead-end navigation and cognitive load.
- The motivation to complete a quest was not obvious upfront, reducing momentum in the early session.
- Starting a UT Austin specific quest was unclear, which is especially problematic for a campus-centered product.
- Completing a World quest felt difficult because cross-school coordination rules were not intuitive.
- Feature requests visible in the top-right created noise during the primary user journey and exposed internal/product-facing surfaces too early.
- Overall, the main failure point was not task execution but comprehension of what the product is, why it matters, and what step comes next.

Whether the quest created a sense of togetherness / IRL collaboration

- Yes, but only after the group collectively understood the mechanics and aligned on what to do.
- The collaboration payoff appears back-loaded: confusion dominates the beginning, while togetherness emerges later in the quest.

- Once the group started moving around campus and coordinating actions, the product felt more social and more differentiated from a solo mobile experience.
- This suggests the multiplayer value proposition is real, but the onboarding currently delays time-to-collaboration.
- A faster path to the first shared win would likely strengthen the emotional arc and improve retention.

Moments of delight

- Once the group understood the task, physically moving around and trying to find signals became fun and game-like.
- The transition from confusion to coordinated exploration created a noticeable sense of momentum.
- The product felt most delightful when it connected digital actions to real-world movement and peer interaction.
- The co-created nature of the experience made progress feel shared rather than individually transactional.
- Delight came less from UI polish and more from the feeling of discovery, participation, and collective creation.

Any slowdowns or unclear steps

- Early onboarding is the largest slowdown because users do not immediately understand the sequence: what a quest is, what an Xfiti is, and how signals fit into the loop.
- The app does not make the first required action sufficiently obvious, so users spend time interpreting the interface instead of progressing.
- Channel selection and quest discoverability appear to be friction points, especially for university-specific versus World quest paths.
- The presence of secondary surfaces, such as feature request visibility, interrupts the primary flow and competes for attention.
- There is insufficient in-context explanation for multiplayer coordination requirements, which creates uncertainty when trying to act as a 3-person party.
- The product currently depends too much on users self-teaching the system, which extends time-to-value and increases drop-off risk.

What would have improved their experience

- A guided first-run experience with 3-4 lightweight steps explaining quests, signals, Xfiti, and the end goal.
- Clearer labeling and microcopy around public versus private actions so users understand how their content is seen.
- A stronger quest entry point that answers three questions immediately: What do I do, who do I do it with, and why should I continue?
- Better surfacing of campus-relevant quests and simpler logic for when to use institute-specific versus World channels.
- A progress-oriented structure, such as step indicators or milestone confirmations, to reassure users that they are moving correctly through the loop.
- A clearer reward or payoff preview, so users understand that the experience leads to a shared creation and AR beaming moment.

- Removal or deprioritization of internal/product-facing elements from the consumer journey during active questing.
- More contextual nudges at dead ends, especially on user lists or quest screens where the next action is not self-evident.

PM synthesis from these peer insights

- The core loop has genuine experiential upside: once activated, it creates motion, coordination, and shared discovery.
- The primary product issue is activation clarity, not the underlying social mechanic.
- The highest-leverage improvement would be reducing time-to-understanding in the first 2–3 minutes.
- In PM terms, the product seems to have strong mid-loop delight but weak top-of-funnel comprehension.
- The best next-step experiments would likely center on onboarding, terminology simplification, and clearer quest-start affordances.