## Systematic literature reviews





Ana Isabel Martins, PhD anaisabelmartins@ua.pt



### SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEWS

- Systematic reviews are syntheses of existing literature on a particular topic, carried out according to a specific protocol in order to:
  - Limit bias errors,
  - Gather all existing information on the subject in question;
  - Critically assess the information collected,
  - Synthesize relevant information that addresses the topic of interest.



### SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEWS

 What are the differences between narrative reviews and systematic literature reviews?

- The quality of a literature review depends on the quality of the method used and its ability to minimize errors and bias.
- The main difference lies in the fact that systematic literature reviews are carried out according to a scientific method that can be reproduced while narrative reviews do not employ any method.

- Failure to locate important studies can significantly affect results
- To summarize the existing evidence concerning a subject
- To identify any gaps in current research in order to suggest areas for further investigation
- To provide a framework background in order to appropriately position new research activities .

### WHAT ARE THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN NARRATIVE REVIEWS AND SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEWS?

Feature	Narrative reviews	Systematic reviews
Question	comprehensive	specific
Sources and Research	Not specified, subject to bias.	Sources are generally representative and research methods are referenced.
Selection of articles	Selection methods are not specified, subject to bias.	Based on predefined criteria that are applied to all articles
Evaluation	Variable	Rigorous
Synthesis	Generally qualitative	Generally quantitative
Inferences	Occasionally based on evidence	Generally based on evidence

### SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEWS

It usually involves 6 main steps

- 1. Formulate the problem
- 2. Locate and select studies
- 3. Evaluate the selected studies
- 4. Collect the data
- 5. Analyze and present the results
- 6. Interpret the results



### 1. FORMULATE THE PROBLEM

Development of a review protocol

- Background
- research questions
- search strategy (search terms and resources to be searched)
- study selection (inclusion and exclusion criteria )
- Study quality assessment checklists and procedures
- data extraction strategy
- project timetable

### 1. FORMULATE THE PROBLEM

- A specific problem (P) is tackled using some specific constraints, methods and or approaches (C) to develop a system application ou algorithm (S).
- GOAL: What existing solutions are available, how do they compare, what the strengths of the evidence is and what implication these solutions have.
- RQ1: what are the existing solutions to (P)?
- RQ2: how does the different solutions found by addressing RQ1 compare to each other with respect to (C)?
- RQ3: what is the strength of the evidence in support of the different solutions ?
- ----RQ4: what implications will these findings have when creating (S)?



Review

#### Methodological Quality of User-Centered Usability Evaluation of Ambient Assisted Living Solutions: A Systematic Literature Review

Rute Bastardo<sup>1</sup>, Ana Isabel Martins<sup>2</sup>, João Pavão<sup>3</sup>, Anabela Gonçalves Silva<sup>2</sup> and Nelson Pacheco Rocha<sup>4,\*</sup>

- <sup>1</sup> UNIDCOM, Science and Technology School, University of Trás-os-Montes and Alto Douro, Quinta de Prado, 5001-801 Vila Real, Portugal; rutebastardo@gmail.com
- <sup>2</sup> Center for Health Technology and Services Research, Health Sciences School, University of Aveiro, 3810-193 Aveiro, Portugal; anaisabelmartins@ua.pt (A.I.M.); asilva@ua.pt (A.G.S.)
- <sup>3</sup> INESC-TEC, Science and Technology School, University of Trás-os-Montes and Alto Douro, Quinta de Prado, 5001-801 Vila Real, Portugal; jpavao@utad.pt
- <sup>4</sup> Department of Medical Sciences, IEETA-Institute of Electronics and Informatics Engineering of Aveiro, University of Aveiro, 3810-193 Aveiro, Portugal
- \* Correspondence: npr@ua.pt

Abstract: This study aimed to determine the methodological quality of user-centered usability evaluation of Ambient Assisted Living (AAL) solutions by (i) identifying the characteristics of the AAL studies reporting on user-centered usability evaluation, (ii) systematizing the methods, procedures and instruments being used, and (iii) verifying if there is evidence of a common understanding on methods, procedures, and instruments for user-centered usability evaluation. An electronic search was conducted on Web of Science, Scopus, and IEEE Xplore databases, combining relevant keywords. Then, titles and abstracts were screened against inclusion and exclusion criteria, and the full texts of the eligible studies were retrieved and screened for inclusion. A total of 44 studies were included. The results show a great heterogeneity of methods, procedures, and instruments to evaluate the usability of AAL solutions and, in general, the researchers fail to consider and report relevant methodological aspects. Guidelines and instruments to assess the quality of the studies might help improving the experimental design and reporting of studies on user-centered usability evaluation of AAL solutions.



Academic Editor: Paul B. Tchounwou

Received: 9 September 2021 Accepted: 28 October 2021 Published: 1 November 2021

. \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ .

#### 1. Introduction

The worldwide population is ageing and the related longer life-expectancy represents an extraordinary challenge in terms of public healthcare policies, due to the changing



Citation: Bastardo, R.; Martins, A.I.; Pavão, J.; Silva, A.G.; Rocha, N.P. Methodological Quality of User-Centered Usability Evaluation of Ambient Assisted Living Solutions: A Systematic Literature Review. Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2021, 18, 11507. https://doi.org/10.3390/ ijerph182111507



\_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_

#### 2. Materials and Methods

This systematic review followed the guidelines of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) [28]. To perform the systematic literature review, the authors defined a review protocol with explicit descriptions of the methods to be used and the steps to be taken [29]: (i) the research questions; (ii) the search strategies; (iii) the inclusion and exclusion criteria; (iv) the screening procedures; (v) data extraction; (vi) methodological quality assessment; and (vii) synthesis and reporting.

#### 2.1. Research Questions

\_\_\_\_\_

Based on the analysis of the literature in the field of usability evaluation of digital solutions and previous work of the research team, a lack of consensus in the academic literature regarding the methods, procedures, and instruments being used for evaluating usability of AAL solutions was identified. To have a more in-depth knowledge of the practices on user-centered usability evaluation of AAL solutions, the following research question was formulated:

• RQ1: What is the methodological quality of user-centered usability evaluation of AAL solutions?

This broad question was subdivided into three additional secondary research questions:

- RQ2: What are the characteristics of the AAL studies reporting on user-centered usability evaluation in terms of study demographics, publication date, country of publication, purpose of the AAL reported solution and interaction modalities?
- RQ3: What are the methods (e.g., test methods, inquiry methods or both), procedures (e.g., environment where the usability evaluation is conducted), and instruments being used (e.g., validated instruments or purposively developed instruments)?
- RQ4: Do existing studies on user-centered usability evaluation of AAL solutions follow quality recommendations when assessed against the Critical Assessment of Usability Studies Scale (CAUSS) [30]?

### Chapter 13 Usability Evaluation Methods: A Systematic Review

Ana Isabel Martins University of Aveiro, Portugal

Alexandra Queirós University of Aveiro, Portugal Anabela G. Silva University of Aveiro, Portugal

Nelson Pacheco Rocha University of Aveiro, Portugal

#### ABSTRACT

This chapter aims to identify, analyze, and classify the methodologies and methods described in the literature for the usability evaluation of systems and services based on information and communication technologies. The methodology used was a systematic review of the literature. The studies included in the analysis were classified into empirical and analytical methodologies (test, inquiry, controlled experiment, or inspection). A total of 2116 studies were included, of which 1308 were classified. In terms of results, the inquiry methodology was the most frequent in this review, followed by test, inspection, and finally, the controlled experiment methodology. A combination of methodologies is relatively common, especially the combination of test and inquiry methodologies, probably because they assess different but complementary aspects of usability contributing to a more comprehensive assessment.

### 2. LOCATE AND SELECT STUDIES

Main information sources in computer science

- Scopus,
- ACM digital library
- IEEE xplore
- ISI web of knowledge
- ScienceDirect
- CiteSeer

Scopus ACM DIGITAL LIBRARY



**IEEE** Xplore<sup>®</sup>



Other: Pubmed, MEDLINE





### 2. LOCATE AND SELECT STUDIES

Criteria to consider:

- Data range
- Language
- Study type
- Location of research
- Type of publication

#### Keywords

- Create a comprehensive list of keywords with alternative spellings
- Sophisticated search strings can be constructed using Boolean string AND's and OR's
- It is important to correctly select the search terms

#### https://www.scopus.com/search/form.uri?display=basic#basic

. Û	Scopus	Search Sources Lists SciVal a	0 Ļ <u>m</u>
		Start exploring Discover the most reliable, relevant, up-to-date research. All in one place.	
		C Documents Authors Affiliations	Search tips 🕐
		Search within Search documents * Search documents *	
		+ Add search field 🗄 Add date range Advanced document search >	Search Q
		Search History Saved Searches	
		Start searching and your history will appear here. If you need help to start searching check out our search tips.	

### 2. LOCATE AND SELECT STUDIES

Publish or Perish

👭 Harzing's Publish	or Perish (	Windows G	JI Editio	on) 7.33.338	8.7819	)																		- 0	×
File Edit Search	View H	elp																							
🕑 🖻 📩 🖬 🔡	<b>)</b> 🚽	16 🕞 🛨	ŭΧ																						
🕘 My searches	S	earch terms				Source	Papers	Cites	Cites/y	h	q	hl,no	hl,ann	hA a	acc	Search date	Cache date	Las							
🕑 Trash		usability A	ND "me	edical devic	ces (	Google Sc	112	1623	64.92	14	38	11	0.44	7	4	02/12/2021	02/12/2021	0							
		Ana Isabel	Martins	5	(	Google Sc	71	611	61.10	13	23	7	0.70	4	1	02/12/2021	02/12/2021	0							
	·					,,																			
	anch														ow to o	wards with Case	ala Echalar								
Authore:	arcii													10	ow to s	earch with 600	gie Scholai						Vears: 0 - 0	Conre	ch
Additions.																								Searc	
Publication name:																							155N:	Search D	lirect
Title words:	usability AN	ID "medical d	evices"																					Clear	All
Keywords:																								Reve	rt
Maximum number of r	esults:	.000 ~		Include citat	tions	Include patent	ts																	New	•
Results	Hel		Citer	Dervear	Rank	Authors					Title										Vear	Publication	Dublisher	Tune	^
Publication years:	1996-202		661	26.17	2	17hana TR la	haven VI D				Unio						معاديه المعالم				2002	laureal of his medical	Flamin	UTM	
Citation years: 25	(1996-2021		200	200.00	2	OV Bitkina Hk	(Kim   Dark	atel, DL Pa	iige		Usin	ility and	y neuristics	to evalua	ne pau	Idenices: An o	ventiew of the	s current c	rtate a	analysis methodologies, and future challenges	2005	International Journal of In	Elsevier	HTML	
Papers:	112		137	22.83	1	Kendler AV	Strochlic				lical	ility tecti	ng of medic	al device	reulear	acvices. All o	verview of the	current s	state, a	analysis methodologies, and ruture chanenges	2015	international Journal of Int	books google com	BOOK	
Cites/year:	64.93		67	8 38	4	AR Lang IL M	lartin S Shar	nles IA Cr	OWE		The	iffect of	design on th	e usahili	ty and	real world effe	ectiveness of m	aedical de	evices	s: a case study with adolescent users	2013	Applied ergonomics	Flowier	HTMI	
Cites/paper:	14.49	Mh	44	7.33	64	IFC IFC	arcin, o onar	pics, six ci	one		6236	6-1: 2015	Medical De	vices—P	art 1: A	Application of	usability engin	eering to	o medi	dical devices	2015	International Electrotechn	ciscvici	CITATION	
Authors/paper:	2.14	† 🗹 h	40	10.00	66	US Food and D	Drug Admini	istration			App	vina hur	nan factors	and usab	ility en	naineerina to r	medical device	s: quidan	nce for	r industry and Food and Drug Administration staff. 2016	2017			CITATION	
h-index:	14	Mh	36	7.20	67	WF Moroney					App	vina hur	nan factors	and usab	ility en	naineerina to r	medical device	s: quidan	nce for	r industry and Food and Drug Administration staff	2016		SAGE PUBLICATIONS INC	CITATION	
g-index: bi. norm:	38	⊠h	34	8.50	6	M Schmettow	, R Schnittke	er, JM Schr	raagen		An e	xtended	protocol for	usability	valida	ation of medic	al devices: Res	earch des	sign ar	and reference model	2017	Journal of biomedical	Elsevier	HTML	
hI,annual:	0.4	⊧⊠h	26	1.86	65	International E	Electrotechni	ical Comn	nission		Med	ical devi	ces: Applica	ion of us	ability	engineering t	o medical devi	ices	-		2007		International Electrotechn	CITATION	
hA-index:		⁄ ⊠ h	23	3.29	7	S Borsci, RD M	lacredie, JL N	Martin			How	many te	sters are ne	eded to a	issure t	the usability of	f medical devic	es?			2014	review of medical devic	Taylor & Francis		
Papers with ACC >=	1,2,5,10,20	: 🗹 h	20	3.33	14	CH Fung, U lg	odan, C Ales	ssi, JL Mar	tin		Hun	ian facto	rs/usability	barriers t	o hom	e medical dev	ices among inc	dividuals	with c	disabling conditions: in-depth interviews with positive air.	2015	Disability and health	Elsevier	HTML	
29,13,9,4	,3	🗹 h	20	4.00	68	Food and Drug	g Administra	ation			Арр	ying hur	nan factors	and usab	ility en	ngineering to r	medical device	s			2016	Food and Drug Administr		CITATION	
Conv Results	• •	🗹 h	19	0.76	11	RL Klatzky, N H	Kober, A Ma	vor			Safe	comfor	able, attract	ive, and	easy to	o use: improvir	ng the usability	of home	e med	dical devices	1996		pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov		
		⊠ h	16	1.23	69	EN IEC					6236	6, Medic	al Devices-A	pplicatio	on of U	Jsability Engin	eering To Medi	cal Devic	ces		2008	Bristol: British Standards I		CITATION	
Save Results			14	2.80	8	L Heinemann,	D Drossel				Usat	ility of n	nedical devi	es for pa	tients	with diabetes	who are visual	ly impaire	red or b	blind	2016	Journal of diabetes	journals.sagepub.com		
Frequently Asked (	Questions		12	0.80	17	JP Turley, TR Jo	ohnson, DP S	Smith, J ZI	hang		Ope	ating m	anual-based	usability	evalua	ation of medio	al devices: an	effective	patien	nt safety screening method	2006	The Joint Commission	Elsevier		
Training Recourses (	in ultiling unl		11	0.73	70	BS EN					6236	6: 2008 N	fedical devi	ces-Appl	ication	n of usability e	ngineering to r	medical d	devices	25	2006	Buckle, P., Clarkson, PJ, C		CITATION	
maining Resources (	, nurun iguai)		9	0.90	9	U Matern, D B	üchel				Usat	ulity of n	nedical devi	:es							2011	Springer handbook of me	Springer	205	
YouTube Cha	innei		9	1.50	12	B North		15 Charles			The	growing	role of num	an factor	s and u	usability engin	leering for med	lical devi	ices		2015	what's required in the ne	bsigroup.com	PDF	
			9	0.00	18	Jivi winters, Di	M Kempel, N	VIF Story			Ine	nobile u	sability lab t	ooi tor a	ccessib	hing analysis o	of medical devi	ces: Desig	ign stra	rategy and use experiences	2000	Medical	taylorrancis.com	CITATION	
			9	0.67	15	I O Riased I A	ndersson	ical Comn	nission		lice	2500: 20	d ucability p	roblomc	ipplicat ip relat	tion or usabilit	ty engineering	to medical d	device	or contract of the second seco	2007	SAI Global, Geneva, Switz	receptobate net	DDE	
			7	0.07	10	S Braun	anuersson				Ucał	ility for a	nedical devi	cer	intelat	tion to autom	ation levels of i	medicard	uevice	5	2005	IEEE Symposium on Brod	iesearchgate.net	FDI	
			7	1.75	16	TKoester IF B	racted II lak	kohsen			The	ice of ev	e-tracking is	ucabilit	v tectir	on of medical	devices				2005	Proceedings of the	iournals sagepub.com		
			7	0.78	23	I Bowen A Hi	nze	cobseri			Usin	a ontolo	nies to reaso	n about	the us	ability of inter	active medical	devices i	in mul	Itiple situations of use	2012	Proceedings of the 4th A	dl.acm.org		
			6	6.00	5	N Chaniaud N	N Métaver O	) Megalaki	aki		Effe	t of Prin	r Health Kno	wledge	on the	Usability of To	vo Home Medi	cal Devic	ces: Us	sability Study	2020	JMIR mHealth and	mhealth.imir.org	HTML	
			6	1.50	13	F Tosi, A Rinale	di				Desi	an and u	sability of th	e next m	nedical	devices for th	e home care			····· ,	2017	The Design Journal	Taylor & Francis		
			6	1.20	72	US Departmen	nt of Health a	and Huma	n Services		App	ying hur	nan factors	and usab	ility en	ngineering to r	medical device	s			2016	Centers for Devices and	,	CITATION	
			6	1.50	73	US Departmen	nt of Health a	and Huma	an Services		Арр	ying hur	nan factors	and usab	ility en	ngineering to r	medical device	s: guidan	nce for	r industry and Food and Drug Administration staff	2017			CITATION	
			6	1.50	75	MHRA,					Hun	an facto	rs and usab	lity engir	neering	g–guidance fo	r medical devid	ces includ	ding d	drug-device combination products	2017	Med Healthc Prod Regul		CITATION	
			5	0.38	19	G Bhutkar, D K	(atre, N Rajh	ans			Usak	ility surv	ey of medic	al device	s used	in ICU			-		2008	Journal of HCI Vistas	researchgate.net	PDF	
			5	1.25	20	J Schiro, S Pela	ayo, T Weinh	nold			Usat	ility valio	lation of me	dical dev	vices: is	ssues in identi	fying potential	use error	rs		2017	Building Capacity for	books.google.com		
			c	0.00	- 11	C D D C+		72	-		10.20	04.144.4		a			z				2015	MEDINEO 2015			× *

#### 2.2. Search Strategies

The resources chosen for the review were three electronic databases (i.e., Scopus, Web of Science, and IEEE Xplorer). Boolean queries were prepared to include all the articles that have their titles, abstract or keywords conformed to the conjunction (i.e., AND Boolean operator) of the following expressions:

- "AAL", "ambient assisted living", "ambient assisted technology", "ambient assistive technology" or "ambient intelligence";
- "UX", "user experience", or "usability";
- "Evaluation" or "assessment".

The expressivity of the search procedure depends on the database. As an example, the query expression to retrieve articles from the Scopus database was de following: TITLE-ABS-KEY ((AAL or "ambient assisted living" or "ambient assisted technology" or "ambient assistive technology" or "ambient intelligence") and (UX or "user experience" or usability) and (evaluation or assessment)).

The following search terms were used: 'usability evaluation' or 'usability test' or 'usability testing' or 'user centered'. To limit the number of references, the search was restricted to the topic, which includes title, abstract, keywords and author fields.

Studies were sought using Web of Science Databases, because they index over 12,000 of the highest impact journals worldwide, including those of the Association for Computing Machinery - ACM Digital Library - and Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers - IEEE journals. The research was conducted on January 6, 2013.

The database search resulted in 2116 references, of those, 808 were excluded: 69 were duplicated, 171 did not have abstract and 568 were out of the research scope (Figure 1). All studies that use the term usability with a different meaning

### 2. LOCATE AND SELECT STUDIES

### TIPS

- Run the final search within 24 hours
- Save search strategy in database as well as in .TXT file
- Last update search should be done within six months of submission for publication
- Citation management
- Exploiting to endnote, Mendeley, or other
- Organizing search results
- Deduplication with endnote

#### 2.3. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

References were included if they reported on user-centered usability evaluation of AAL solutions that might be used to support older adults by promoting secure and supportive environments, optimizing healthcare provision, promoting healthy lifestyles, and facilitating social involvement and active participation in the society [6].

References were excluded if they (i) did not have abstracts, (ii) were not written in English, (iii) reported on reviews, surveys, or market studies, (iv) were books, reported on workshops, or special issues announcements, (v) reported on studies whose primary objectives were not usability assessment, or (vi) reported on studies that were not relevant for the objective of this systematic review.

#### 2.4. Screening Procedures

The analysis and selection of the studies were performed in three steps:

- First step—the authors removed the duplicates, the articles without abstract and not written in English;
- Second step—the authors assessed all titles and abstracts for relevance and those clearly not meeting the inclusion and exclusion criteria were removed;
- Third step—the authors assessed the full text of the remaining articles against the outlined inclusion and exclusion criteria and the final list of the studies to be considered for the review was created.

Throughout this entire process, all articles were analyzed by three authors and any disagreement between the authors was discussed and resolved by consensus.



#### 3. Results

\_\_\_\_\_

3.1. Study Selection

Figure 1 presents the flowchart of the systematic review. A total of 5635 studies were retrieved from the initial search of the selected databases.

. . . . . . . . . . . . .

. \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_



Figure 1. Systematic Reviews Flowchart.

### 3. EVALUATE THE SELECTED STUDIES

# After selecting the relevant articles, it is necessary to assess their methodological quality.

#### 2.6. Methodological Quality Assessment

Three authors independently assessed the methodological quality of included studies using a scale developed to assess the methodological quality of studies evaluating usability of electronic health products and services, the Critical Assessment of Usability Studies Scale (CAUSS) [30]. The CAUSS has 15 items that can be scored "yes" or "no". This scale is both valid and reliable (Intraclass Correlation Coefficient—ICC = 0.81) [30]. Each study was assessed by at least two authors. This quality assessment was undertaken in two steps: first three manuscripts were assessed by all the three authors involved in this step of the review to foster a common understanding of the scale items. Then, all the remaining manuscripts were independently assessed by two of the three authors. During both steps, disagreements were resolved by discussion and a final decision achieved by consensus. Percentage of agreement between the assessors was calculated for each one of the 15 items of the scale.

Did the study use valid measurement instruments of usability? Did the study use reliable measurement instruments of usability? Was there coherence between the procedures used to assess usability? Did the study use procedures of assessment for usability that were adequate to the development stage of the product/service? Did the study use procedures of assessment for usability adequate to study participants' characteristics? Did the study employ triangulation of methods for the assessment of usability? Was the type of analysis adequate to the study's aims and variables measurement scale? Was usability assessed using both potential users and experts? Were participants who assessed the product/service usability representative of the experts' population and/or of the potential user's population? Was the investigator that conducted usability assessments adequately trained? Was the investigator that conducted usability assessments external to the process of product/service development? Was the usability assessment conducted in the real context or close to the real context where product/service is going to be used? Was the number of participants used to assess usability adequate (whether potential users or experts)? Were the tasks that serve as the base for the usability assessment

representative of the functionalities of the product/service?

Was the usability assessment based on continuous and prolonged use of the product/service over time?

### 4. COLLECT THE DATA

A dataset is collected from each article (data collected depends on the purpose of the study):

#### 2.5. Data Extraction

Concerning data extraction, the following information was registered in a data sheet prepared by the authors for each of the studies included in the review: (i) the demographics of the study (i.e., authors and respective affiliations, year and source of publication); (ii) the scope of the study; (iii) the purpose of the AAL solution being reported; (iv) details of the interaction technologies being used; (v) the methods, techniques, instruments and procedures applied to evaluate usability; (vi) the characteristics of the participants involved in the usability evaluation; and (vi) the outcomes being reported.

### 5. ANALYZE AND PRESENT THE RESULTS

The analysis of the results can be:

- Qualitative
- Quantitative (meta-analysis)

It is the statistical combination of the results of 2 or more studies.

The prisma guidelines are widely followed by the researchers.

It provides guidance on how to write a systematic review and comprises of flow diagram and at 27 item checklist



The presentation of results generally considers the following elements:

- A list of all positive and/or negative outcomes;
- The state of the art about a specific topic;
- Number of participants/solutions/technologies;
- Classification of the methodological quality of studies;
- Other pertinent comments.

#### 3.2. Demographics of the Included Studies

Of the included 44 studies, some reported on the same research projects: studies [32,33], studies [45–47] and studies [36,52,58] were respectively related to the European funded projects ALADIN, iStoppFalls and Robot-ERA, while [68,74] were related to a project funded by the European Commission and co-funded by the Swiss Confederation.

In terms of publication types, ten studies were published in conference proceedings [31,32,34,35,38,40,42,61,62,72] and 34 studies were published in scientific journals [33,36,37,39,41,43–60,63–71,73,74].

Concerning the publication years, the included studies were published between 2008 (i.e., one study [31]) and 2020 (i.e., five studies [70–74]). The diagram in Figure 2 demonstrates a trend towards an increasing number of publications, and more than two-thirds of the studies (i.e., 30 studies [45–74]) were published in the last five years and more than one-third of the studies (i.e., 15 studies [60–74]) were published in the last two years.



\_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_

Distribution of the included studies by country



Figure 3. Distribution of the selected studies by country.

As can be seen in Table 1, 16 studies (i.e., 36% of the included studies) reported on the involvement of multinational research teams.

Table	1.	Multi	national	teams.
-------	----	-------	----------	--------

\_\_\_\_\_

References	Multinational Teams
[33]	Germany, United States of America, Italy, Austria, and Romain
[35]	Germany, Sweden, and France
[36]	Italy and Sweden
[37]	Finland and Spain
[39]	Spain and United Kingdom
[41]	Portugal and Spain
[47]	Austria, Australia, and Chile
[49]	Greece, Italy, and United Kingdom
[53,56]	Italy and Spain
[58]	United Kingdom, Italy, and Belgium
[63]	France and Greece
[64,68]	Switzerland and Sweden
[67]	Netherlands and Spain
[71]	Greece, Germany, Italy, and United Kingdom

\_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_

Domains	Purposes	References
Secure and supportive environment	Daily living activities	[31-34,36,38,39,42,49,57-60,69,71]
	Falls prevention	[45-48,66]
Healthcare provision	Home monitoring	[41,43,65,67,70]
	Telerehabilitation	[44,56,62,63]
	Remote care	[40,52,55]
	Medication management	[37,50]
Healthy lifestypes	Physical activity	[35,54,61,64,73]
	Cognitive activity	[72]
	Physical and cognitive activity	[68,74]
Social involvement and active participation	Social inclusion	[51]
	Participation in leisure activities	[53]

Table 2. Democratics and summaries of the AAT value from some set of her the included studies

\_\_\_\_\_

-----

Table 3. Interaction modalities and re	espective terminal	equipment.
--	--------------------	------------

Interaction	Terminal Equipment	References	
Visual Interaction	Personal computer	[66]	
	Mobile (i.e., tablet or smartphone)	[60,62,65,72]	
	Mobile and personal computer	[41]	
	Mobile and interactive TV	[54]	
	Interactive TV	[32,33,40,49]	
Visual and auditory interaction	Mobile	[37,51]	
	Interactive TV	[53,55,70]	
Visual and voice interaction	Mobile	[43]	
Visual, voice and auditory interaction	Mobile	[42,50,67]	
Service of the second	Mobile and interactive TV	[39]	
	Enhanced communication agents	[31,35]	
Visual and gesture interaction	Personal computer and WiiMote	[44]	
	Personal computer and Kinect	[61]	
	Interactive TV and wearable inertial	[68 74]	
	sensors	[00,/4]	
	Interactive TV, wearable inertial sensors and Kinect	[45-47]	
	Interactive TV and Kinect	[73]	
	Interactive TV and position sensors	[64]	
	Personal computer, RGB cameras and	1(2)	
	depth sensors	[63]	
Other interaction modalities	Immersive virtual reality	[56,69]	
	Robots	[34,36,38,48,52,57-59,71]	

#### Quality Assurance



Did the study use valid measurement instruments of usability? Did the study use reliable measurement instruments of usability? Was there coherence between the procedures used to assess usability? Did the study use procedures of assessment for usability that were adequate to the development stage of the product/service? Did the study use procedures of assessment for usability adequate to study participants' characteristics? Did the study employ triangulation of methods for the assessment of usability? Was the type of analysis adequate to the study's aims and variables measurement scale? Was usability assessed using both potential users and experts? Were participants who assessed the product/service usability representative of the experts' population and/or of the potential user's population? Was the investigator that conducted usability assessments adequately trained? Was the investigator that conducted usability assessments external to the process of product/service development? Was the usability assessment conducted in the real context or close to the real context where product/service is going to be used?

Was the number of participants used to assess usability adequate (whether potential users or experts)?

Were the tasks that serve as the base for the usability assessment representative of the functionalities of the product/service?

Was the usability assessment based on continuous and prolonged use of the product/service over time?

Figure 4. Number of studies that met each item, after consensus was reached between reviewers.

Table 4. Level of agreement between the reviewers for each item of CAUSS.

Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Agreement	78%	78%	98%	93%	87%	80%	<mark>78%</mark>	83%	<mark>8</mark> 9%	85%	<mark>91%</mark>	<mark>87</mark> %	85%	96%	78%

Table 5. Usabili	y assessment	t d	esign	l.
------------------	--------------	-----	-------	----

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

*	Solution Being Evaluated		Т	Test			Inquiry Particip			Participants			Test Environment			Test Environment			
		$\mathbf{P}^1$	o'	тз	$\mathbf{W}^{\mathbf{a}}$	1ª	S <sup>6</sup>	Q7	C <sup>8</sup>	Number	Mean Age (Years)	10	L <sup>10</sup>	P <sup>11</sup>	R 17				
[31]	Smart companion	-	-	-	x	-	-		-	10	82	x	-	-	-				
[32]	Adaptive lighting application	-	x	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	- 13	x		-	-				
[33]	Adaptive lighting application	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	71	x	-	-	-				
[34]	Social robot	-	-	х	-	-	-	х	-	16	77	-	x	-	-				
[35]	Virtual physical training	-	-	-	-	x	-	x	-	30	69	x	-	-	-				
[36]	Social robot	-	х	-	-	-	-	х	-	25	74	-	x	-	-				
[37]	Medication	-	х	-	-	x	-	-	-	4	80	x	-	-	-				
[38]	Social robot	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	-	15	74	-	x	-	-				
[39]	Smart Kitchen	-		-	-	-	-	Δ.	-	63	- 13	-		-	-				
[40]	Remote care	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	30	58	x	-	-	-				
[41]	Home monitoring	-	-	-	-	-	-	x	-	11	70	-	-	x	-				
[42]	Smart companion		-	-	-	-		*	-	4	90	-	*	-	-				
4.3	Tome monitoring	x	x	x	-	-	x	x	-	32	65		-	x	-				
[45]	Falls presention		÷.			-				153	73				^				
1461	Falls prevention	-	÷.	-	-	ĩ	÷.	-	-	12	73		÷.	x	-				
47	Falls prevention	-	-	-	-	x	-	-	-	62	74	-	-	x	-				
[48]	Falle prevention	-	-	-	-	x	-	-	-	14	_ 13	-	-	×	-				
[49]	Social rebot	-	-	-	-	х	х	х	-	7	79	-	-	x	-				
[50]	Medication management Application to	-	х	x	-	-	x	x	-	10	70	-	-	-	x				
[51]	promote social inclusion	х	-	-	-	x	-	x	-	22	66	-	-	x	-				
[52]	Remote care	-	-	-	-	-	-	x	-	23	73	-	x	-	-				
[53]	Leisure activities	х	-	-	-	-	-	x	-	20	70	-	-	x	-				
[54]	Virtual physical training	-	-	-	-	-	x	-	x	14	73	-	x	-	-				
[55]	Remote care	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	-	62	_ 13	-	-	x	-				
[56]	Telerehabilitation	-	-	-	-	х	x	-	-	5	70	-	-	-	x				
[57]	Social robot	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	-	17	75	-	x	-	-				
[58]	Social rebot	-	-	-	-	-		*	-	92	78	-	*	-	-				
59	Social robot	-	-	-	-	-	х	-	-	25	37	-	-	-	x				
[60]	Virtual Physical		-	-	-				-	12	73	-	x	-	x				
	training																		
[62] [63]	Telerehabilitation	× -	x -	-	-	x	1	x	2	6	72 80	x	-	1	- -				
[64]	Virtual physical training	*	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	12	72	x	-	-	-				
[65]	Home monitoring		-	-	-	-		τ.		10	80	т	-	-	-				
[66]	Falls prevention application		-		-			-	-	15	. 13	-	-	-	×				
[67]	Home monitoring	-	-	-	-	-	х	х	-	26	_ 13	-	-	x	-				
[68]	Virtual physical and cognitive training	x	x	x	-	-	x	x	-	21	74	-	-	x	-				
[69]	Support to daily tasks	-	-	-	-	x	x	-	-	6	60	-	-	-	x				
[70]	Home monitoring	-	-	-	-	-	x	-	-	19	73	-	-	x	-				
[71]	Robot		-	-	-	-		-	-	104	74		-	-	-				
[72]	Cognitive game Virtual physical		-	-	-		-	x		63 135	- 13	x	-	-	-				
[74]	training Virtual physical and	,			-	-			-	21	71		x	-	*				
	cognitive training																		

Notes: x reported; - not reported; Test method (<sup>1</sup> Performance; <sup>2</sup> Observation; <sup>3</sup> Think aloud; <sup>4</sup> Wizard of Oz); Inquiry method (<sup>2</sup> Interviews; <sup>5</sup> Scales; <sup>7</sup> Questionraines; <sup>8</sup> Card sorting); Test environment (<sup>6</sup> Institutional site; <sup>10</sup> Living lab; <sup>11</sup> Participant home; <sup>12</sup> Research lab); Participants (<sup>13</sup> Meanage of the participants not reported).

\_\_\_\_\_

#### . . . .

Table 6. Usability evaluation methods.

Methods	Studies	-
Exclusively test methods	[31-33,40,62]	-
Exclusively inquiry methods	[35,38,41,47-49,52,54-60,63,67,69,70,72]	
Multimethod (test and inquiry methods)	[34,36,37,39,42-46,50,51,53,61,64-66,68,71,73,74]	

Table 7. Usability evaluation instruments.

Instruments Nature	Study	
Validated scales and questionnaires	[34,42,43,45,50,54,56,58,59,61,64-71,74]	
Ad-hoc scales and questionnaires	[35,36,38,39,41,49,52,53,55,60,63,73]	
Scales and questionnaires based on technology acceptance models	[44,51,57,72]	

Table 8. Environments where the usability evaluations were conducted.

Test Environment	Studies
Participant's home	[41,43,46-49,51,53,55,64,67,68,70]
Institutional site as day care or nursing home	[31-33,35,37,40,63,65,71,72]
Living lab	[34,36,38,39,42,45,52,54,57,58,60,73]
Research lab	[44,50,56,59,61,62,66,69,74]

### 6. INTERPRET THE RESULTS

#### Discussion

- Benefits vs. cons
- Quality of studies
- Bias in the review process
- Agreement or disagreement with other existing revisions

Conclusion

- Implications for practice
- Implications for the investigation

### STRUCTURE OF THE SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

- Abstract
- Introduction
- Methods (research questions, search strategy, study selection, study quality assessment checklists and procedures and data extraction strategy)
- Results (flow diagram and the main results including quality assessment results)
- Discussion
- Conclusion

### **IMPORTANT RESOURCES**

IE RES M

#### PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	ltem #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported	
TITLE				
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.		
ABSTRACT				
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.		
INTRODUCTION				
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.		
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.		
METHODS				
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.		
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.		
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.		
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.		
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.		
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.		
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.		
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.		
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.		
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).		
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.		
-	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.		
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.		
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).		
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.		
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).		
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.		



http://www.prisma-statement.org/

# Thank you

# Questions?





Ana Isabel Martins, PhD

anaisabelmartins@ua.pt

