

Answer to the Reviewer's Questions

Dr. Károly Hercegi

Question-1. The list of definitions in the subchapter 2.1 is useful, but I'm missing a few readable sentences about why this is necessary and how it fits before the following sub-chapters

Answer-1: Thank you for your concern. Placing the list of definitions in Chapter 2 was a recommendation by the other reviewer, Dr. Ádám B. Csapó. These definitions can help readers understand the differences between Hybrid Evaluation (Crowdsourcing Approach, Heuristic Approach) and Automated evaluation (Declarative Model, Ontological Model, and Algorithmic Evaluation), as some readers may find it difficult to understand the actual concept of the proposed approaches.

Question-2. The subsection 2.3.1.1 on Crowdsourcing has been improved compared to the previous version. However, some questions have remained open: Are e.g., blind users considered as experts in guidelines for web accessibility for blind users? If yes, who are the non-expert evaluators: were not they invited by mistake – or would it have been more useful to select better participants?

Answer-2: Thank you for your insightful feedback and concern. In my thesis, I didn't consider blind users as experts because I believe it's not a wise decision to consider blind users as experts, as they might not have a proper idea about web accessibility guidelines. Thus, I consider experts who have sufficient knowledge of web accessibility guidelines and web development process, have more than 5-7 years of research experience in this field, and have sufficient number of citations on their research profile.

Besides, non-experts can be end-users who have knowledge about the Internet platform and frequently engage themselves in the Internet platform. At this stage, due to the financial budget and limited time, I validated the proposed tool considering students' evaluation results as non-expert/end-user results. In the future, I will involve blind users as non-experts to participate in the evaluation process.

Question-3. Subsections 3.1.3.1 and 3.1.4.5: I have to mention that the methods would have been better applied not to general university students, but involving special users such as blind users, users with intellectual disabilities, etc.

Answer-3: Thank you for your suggestion. In this initial phase, I considered only university students and didn't consider special users such as blind users or users with intellectual disabilities due to the financial budget and limited time. Besides, the students were not just general students; rather, they finished the 'User Interface Design' course, where they learned accessible user interface design criteria and web content accessibility guidelines. Thus, they



have sufficient knowledge about accessible webpage criteria, which helped them to evaluate the tested webpages appropriately. However, I have a plan to involve people with different disabilities to determine their needs in future research.

Question-4. Subsection 3.1.4.5: It was not a perfect component of the experiment because involving a lot of inexperienced and non-special (non-blind, etc.) experts and users, but it is typical in a real world research – I’m just missing the state the consequent limitations, etc.!

Answer 4: Thank you for your opinion, and I agree with your opinion. Due to the financial budget and limited time, at this stage, I validated the proposed tool considering students’ evaluation results, although evaluating incorporating specialists would provide more suitable evaluation results. Thus, this is one of the major limitations of this study, which I have mentioned in the thesis as a limitation of the work.

At the end, I would like to thank you for all your effort, valuable suggestions, insightful opinions, feedback, and consideration that helped me improve my dissertation. Thank you.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Amal", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.