

ITERATE

UX Recommendations

Eight recommendations — six copy changes, one business decision, one deliberate non-change

The issue list says what is broken. This says what to do about it, with the reasoning attached so it can be argued with rather than merely followed.

PROJECT	PHASE	VERSION	PREPARED BY
Organic Life	Phase 2 — Evaluation	1.0	Tauseef Abbas

What this document does

The issue list says what is broken. This says what to do about it — specific enough to build from, with the reasoning attached so the recommendation can be argued with rather than merely followed.

Eight recommendations. Six are copy or placement changes. One is a business decision. One is deliberately a recommendation to change nothing.

R1 • Make the handoff destination explicit CRITICAL

FIELD	DETAIL
Addresses	Issue 1 — 3 / 8 stalled at the order CTA
Change	Rewrite the CTA label to name both the action and the destination. Add a one-line note beneath stating what happens next and the expected reply window.
From	"Order via WhatsApp" with a glyph
To	"Order on WhatsApp" — with supporting line: "Opens WhatsApp. Someone usually replies within an hour."
Reasoning	Participants did not doubt the action, they doubted where it took them. Naming the destination and setting the reply expectation removes both uncertainties at once.
Effort	Low — copy only

SECONDARY BENEFIT

The reply-window line also mitigates the slow-vendor-response risk by setting an expectation rather than implying immediacy. One copy change addresses a usability finding and an operational risk together.

R2 · Resolve the price question as a business decision CRITICAL

FIELD	DETAIL
Addresses	Issue 2 — 5 / 8 asked about price aloud
Recommendation	Display an indicative price range on the product card, with a note that the exact figure is confirmed on WhatsApp.
Reasoning	The operational objection to a fixed price is real — batch and quantity variation would create disputes. A range does not carry that risk and removes the hesitation. Complete absence of price is worse for trust than an approximate one.
Owner	Business. Design cannot resolve this unilaterally.
If declined	Add "Ask about price on WhatsApp" as explicit micro-copy, so the absence reads as an invitation rather than an omission.

R3 · Surface credentials in the conversation CRITICAL

FIELD	DETAIL
Addresses	Issue 3 – 2 / 8 could not find who is behind the platform
Change	Add a single persistent trust line beneath the hero input naming the practitioner and specialisation. Keep full credentials on the practitioner card and /about.
Reasoning	Evaluative users never touched the header. Credibility information must exist on the path they actually take, which is the hero and the conversation – not behind navigation.
Constraint	One line only. This must not compete with the input for attention – the hero's primacy is the validated finding of the whole test.
Effort	Low

R4 · Reorder the escalation copy HIGH

FIELD	DETAIL
Addresses	Issue 4 – one participant read escalation as refusal
Change	Lead with acknowledgement and reason. State the boundary second, never first.
Pattern	Acknowledge the symptom → explain why it deserves expert attention → introduce the practitioner → boundary stated last, if at all.
Reasoning	Boundary-first copy reads as rejection regardless of warmth. Reason-first copy reads as care. The information is identical; only the order changes.
Sign-off	Practitioner approval required – this is clinical copy

R5 · Give chip taps a visible confirmation MEDIUM

FIELD	DETAIL
Addresses	Issue 5 – two participants surprised by auto-submit
Change	Retain auto-submit, but populate the input visibly for approximately 300ms before submitting so the user sees what was sent.
Reasoning	The two-tap alternative adds friction for exactly the users chips are meant to help. The problem was not the speed, it was the invisibility of what got submitted.

R6 · Clarify the chip row affordance MEDIUM

FIELD	DETAIL
Addresses	Issue 7 — three attempted horizontal scroll on a wrapping row
Change	Commit to wrapping on mobile. Remove any visual suggestion of horizontal overflow — no partial chip bleeding off the right edge.
Reasoning	The ambiguity came from a chip clipped at the viewport edge, which read as "there is more this way". Either fully wrap or fully scroll; the hybrid is what confused people.

R7 · Demote "Learn more" LOW

FIELD	DETAIL
Addresses	Issue 8 — one participant read it as the primary action
Change	Render as an inline text link rather than a bordered secondary button.
Reasoning	Two button-like elements in one card create a choice where the design intends a clear hierarchy. Principle 03 applies to controls as well as to content.

R8 · Change nothing about latency, sharing, or scroll depth

FIELD	DETAIL
Addresses	Issues 9, 10, 11 — the three non-defects
Recommendation	Protect the 2.4s latency budget as a constraint rather than a target for further optimisation. Do not restructure sections 4–6 to increase scroll depth. Do not alter the response or card region without re-testing share intent.
Reasoning	Four of eight spontaneously wanted to share this. That behaviour is the acquisition model of the entire product, it emerged from the current design, and it is the easiest thing in this report to destroy by accident during revision.

WHY A "DO NOTHING" RECOMMENDATION IS INCLUDED

Plenty of teams accidentally redesign the one part users loved. Naming what is working, and making protecting it an explicit recommendation with an owner, is the only reliable defence against that.

Recommendation summary

#	RECOMMENDATION	TYPE	EFFORT	OWNER
R1	Name the handoff destination	Copy	Low	Design
R2	Show an indicative price range	Business	High	Business
R3	Trust line beneath the hero input	Placement	Low	Design
R4	Reorder escalation copy	Copy	Low	Design + practitioner
R5	Visible chip confirmation	Interaction	Low	Design
R6	Commit to chip wrapping	Layout	Low	Design
R7	Demote "Learn more"	Hierarchy	Low	Design
R8	Protect what is working	Constraint	—	All

Expected impact

METRIC	CURRENT	EXPECTED	DRIVEN BY
Task completion (all five)	62%	85%	R1, R3 — the two failed tasks
Order path completion	5 / 8	7–8 / 8	R1, R2
Credentials findable	6 / 8	8 / 8	R3
Escalation understood as care	7 / 8	8 / 8	R4
Latency	2.4s	2.4s	R8 — protected, not improved

RE-TEST GATE

Tasks 2 and 3 are re-run with five fresh participants after revision 1. Build proceeds at 80% task completion or above. R2 must be decided before launch regardless of the re-test outcome, because no amount of copy work resolves a missing price.

Then we go again

Revision 1 addresses six issues in a single design pass. The re-test measures whether they landed. If task completion clears 80%, the build proceeds; if it does not, the failing area is revised again.

This loop is the whole difference between a product people tolerate and one they tell their coworkers about — and in this product, telling their family on WhatsApp is the growth model.

DOCUMENT OWNER Tauseef Abbas · **PROJECT** Organic Life — AI-First Naturopathy Platform

PHASE Phase 2 — Evaluation · **STATUS** For revision 1

NOTE Sample deliverable published as a portfolio artefact at tauseefabbas.com