

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Assessing the implementation of user-centred design standards on assistive technology for persons with visual impairments: A systematic review

**Luisa María Ortiz-Escobar^{1,2}, Mario Andres Chavarria^{2,3}, Klaus Schönenberger³,
Samia Hurst-Majno¹, Michael Ashley Stein^{4,5,6}, Anthony Mugeere⁷, Minerva Rivas-Velarde¹**

¹Institute of Ethics, History, and Humanities, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

²Vicerrectoría de Investigaciones, Universidad Autónoma de Occidente, Cali, Colombia

³EssentialTech Centre, EPFL, Lausanne, Switzerland

⁴Harvard Law School Project on Disability, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, USA.

⁵ Harvard Law School, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, USA.

⁶ Faculty of Law Centre for Human Rights, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa

⁷ Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda

Abstract

Despite scientific and technological advances in the field of assistive technology (AT) for people with visual impairment (VI), technological designs are frequently based on a poor understanding of the physical and social context of use, resulting in devices that are less than optimal for their intended beneficiaries. To resolve this situation, user-centred approaches in the development process of AT have been widely adopted in recent years. However, there is a

24 lack of systematization on the application of this approach. This systematic review registered
25 in PROSPERO (CRD42022307466), assesses the application of the ISO 9241-210 human-
26 centred design principles in allegedly “user-centred designed” AT developments for persons
27 with VI (see S1 PROSPERO Protocol). The results point to a wide variation of the depth of
28 understanding of user needs, a poor characterization of the application of the User Centred
29 Design (UCD) approach in the initial design phases or in the early prototyping, and a vague
30 description of user feedback and device iteration. Among the principles set out in ISO 9241-
31 210, the application of 5.6: "the design team includes multidisciplinary skills and perspectives"
32 is the one for which the least evidence is found. The results show there is not enough evidence
33 to fully assess the impact of UCD in 1. promoting innovation regarding AT products and
34 practices, and 2. Judging if AT produced following such standards is leading to better user
35 access, wellbeing outcomes and satisfaction. To address this gap it is necessary to, first,
36 generate better implementation of UCD in AT development and second, to strengthen evidence
37 regarding the implementation and outcomes of using UCD for AT. To better engage with the
38 realities of persons with VI, we propose capacity building across development teams regarding
39 UCD, its principles and components; better planning for UCD implementation; and cross-
40 fertilization across engineering disciplines and social and clinical science.

41 Introduction

42 User-Centred Design (UCD) has gained a stronger presence in Assistive Technology
43 (AT) development over the last decade [1]. This approach promotes the involvement of end
44 users in all stages of the design process, elicitation and understanding of their needs, and
45 characterization of social contexts as the basis for an iterative design process [2-3]. Therefore,
46 UCD adoption is believed to lead to better products [4]. However, there is limited evidence
47 regarding the implementation of these approaches or if their results are having the intended

48 impact across their target populations, particularly regarding AT [5-6]. This study aims to
49 assess the application of ISO 9241-210 human-centred design principles in the allegedly “user-
50 centred designed” assistive technology developments for persons with Visual Impairments
51 (VI).

52 The Global Report on Assistive Technology (GREAT) states that children and adults with
53 disabilities lack access to AT, particularly in low-and-middle-income Countries (LMICs)
54 where access was reported to be as low as 3% [7]. The current lack of access to AT reflects not
55 only an economic gap but a severe malfunction of social provision and coverage schemes as
56 well as in AT design and development [8]. Nevertheless, UCD and international standards’
57 adoption can help to alleviate these shortfalls by guiding the development of better and more
58 efficient AT solutions responding to the users’ priorities. Disability is very diverse and persons
59 with different impairments, namely sensorial, physical or cognitive or multiples, benefit from
60 different technological solutions; we need to learn more about similarities, as well as
61 differences. Therefore, in this paper, the focus is on AT for persons with VI. Worldwide, there
62 are approximately 39 million people with severe VI or blindness [9]. Although not all-disabling
63 loss of sight can be addressed by AT, for persons who are blind (visual acuity worse than 3/60)
64 some tools such as walking canes, screen readers, or braille embossers, amongst others, are of
65 great help. The Global report on disability calls for action and standard setting in a variety of
66 AT related fields, particularly regarding access [7]. Thus, investigating how internationally
67 adopted standards are implemented for technology design is relevant to close the AT gap. The
68 upcoming section explores relevant international standards for the production of AT.

69 AT and International Standards

70 International standards play a key role in the development, production and distribution
71 of technology [10]. The existence of clear, accessible, and commonly accepted International

72 Standards is vital for the manufacture of products that can be globally implemented and
73 commercialized. Standardization enhances product quality, safety, and reliability, it also allows
74 for higher interoperability and compatibility in different contexts and reduces maintenance
75 complexity and costs [11]. There are different studies on the positive effect of international
76 standardization on trade, industry and management [10, 12], including evidence of the
77 reduction of barriers to the export and acceptance of products between different global regions,
78 including products exported from LMICs to high income Countries [13]. Given the current AT
79 access gap and lack of evidence on how available technology responds to the needs of persons
80 with VI in LMIC it is relevant to look at how and whether the adoption of these standards can
81 lead to better and more efficient AT. Furthermore, infrastructure for AT production and a well-
82 defined value chain have an impact on AT access, nonetheless, this is outside the scope of this
83 paper.

84 The Standard of User-Centred Design

85 UCD is recognized by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) in their
86 standard ISO 9241-210, where it is described as an “approach to system design and
87 development that aims to make interactive systems more usable by focusing on system use and
88 applying human factors/ergonomics and usability knowledge and techniques” [3]. The standard
89 presents a framework giving examples of activities that can be developed when adopting the
90 approach. Furthermore, it clarifies that UCD is complementary to existing design
91 methodologies, for example regarding usability [14] and Measurement of quality in use
92 ISO/IEC 25022, amongst others. UCD is guided by the following 6 principles: (I) the design is
93 based upon an explicit understanding of users, tasks and environments; (II) users are involved
94 throughout design and development; (III) the design is driven and refined by user-centred

95 evaluation; (IV) the process is iterative; (V) the design addresses the whole user experience;
96 and (VI) the design team includes multidisciplinary skills and perspectives.

97 There is very narrow empirical evidence on the impact of standards on innovation,
98 particularly regarding AT [15]. However, forthcoming empirical literature shows a positive
99 influence of standards on the diffusion of technical knowledge and their contribution to
100 macroeconomic growth. For example, a set of studies performed within different countries
101 showed that the contribution of standards to the growth rate in each of the evaluated countries
102 was equivalent to “0.9% in Germany, 0.8% in France and Australia, 0.3% in the UK and
103 0.2% in Canada” [12]. Another set of studies, performed by the ISO in several companies
104 from different sectors in ten countries, showed an overall increase between 0.5% to 4% in the
105 companies’ annual sales revenues provided by the implementation of international standards
106 [13,16 -17].

107 The adoption of a user-centred design approach in the development process of AT has
108 increased in recent years. This systematic review assesses the application of the ISO 9241-
109 210 Human-centred design principles in the “user-centred designed” AT developments for
110 persons with VI. The goal is to better understand how systematically the approach has been
111 applied in the design and development of AT.

112 Method

113 The present review followed the Prisma guidelines for systematic reviews seeking to
114 answer the next question (S2 PRISMA Checklist) [18]

115 *Do user-centred designed assistive technology developments for persons with visual*
116 *impairments apply the human-centred design principles of the ISO 9241-210?*

117 The multidisciplinary databases Science Direct, Scopus, PubMed Central and Web of
118 Science, were defined as primary sources. The electronic searches were performed in January
119 2022, and updated on June 2022. The keywords visual impairments (blindness and low
120 vision), user-centred design, and assistive technology were used as search terms. The search
121 period was established between January 2012 and March 2022. Considering that standards
122 take time to become known and applied, a gap of two years was left between the publication
123 of ISO 9241-210 (2010) and the start date of the search (2012). In any case, the application of
124 the previous standard (ISO 13407) was considered during the revision. The complete Web of
125 Science search strategy, was adapted for the other databases:

126 Search string: (("visual+ impair+" OR "visual+ disab+" OR blind OR "low vision")
127 AND ("user-centred design" OR "human-centred design" OR "ISO 9241-210" NOT
128 "universal design") AND (assistive technology))

129 Eligibility Criteria

130 Inclusion criteria:

- 131 • Topic of study: papers are describing the design and/or development process of user
132 centred designed assistive technology for visually impaired persons..
- 133 • Type of scientific material to analyse: Peer-reviewed journals. Any type of research design:
134 experimental, descriptive, or analytic research design. Except for letters and editorials. It will
135 include systematic reviews and meta-analyses.
- 136 • Studies available in English / Spanish/ Portuguese / French
- 137 • Full text available
- 138 • Full conference papers

139 *Exclusion criteria:*

140 •Articles that are not exclusively addressed to persons with VI.

141 • Articles describing assistive technology design or developments addressed for persons with
142 VI without any consideration to the UCD approach.

143 Study Selection

144 All search results were imported into an EndNote database. Duplicates were removed.
145 Abstracts and titles that were noticeably unrelated to the review topic were dismissed. Two
146 researchers independently screened the titles and abstracts against the eligibility criteria and
147 selected those that met the inclusion criteria. Full-text reports were retrieved and again assessed
148 for final eligibility. Reasons for excluding full-text reports were documented. The selected
149 studies were analysed with a standardised data extraction form. Disagreements during the
150 selection process were discussed in a consensus meeting with a third reviewer who helped to
151 solve the discrepancies.

152 Data Extraction

153 The following data was extracted from the selected studies:

154 • Data about the publication (authors, title of the article and the journal), aims, methods,
155 design approaches (usability testing, workshops, interviews, focus groups, think-aloud,
156 observation, including others.), frameworks, and studies design.

157 • Data about participants: sample size, socio-demographic characteristics, inclusion and
158 exclusion criteria, type of impairments (low vision or blindness).

159 • Setting: country.

- 160 • And the application of ISO 9241-210's principles in assistive technology developments.

161 Data Quality Assessment

162 The quality assessment tool used in this review was drawn from Appendix D of
163 Hawker et al. [19]. It was applied independently by two researchers to perform a risk of bias
164 assessment, and disagreements were resolved through discussion with a third researcher. The
165 overall quality grades definitions used by Lorenc et al. were adopted [20]. The tool was
166 adapted to include the assessment of reviews. Only for this type of studies the scores were
167 adjusted as follows: high quality (A), 27-32 points; medium quality (B), 22-26 points; low
168 quality (C), 8-21 points (see S3).

169 Data Analysis

170 All search results and their respective reasons for inclusion or exclusion were
171 documented through The PRISMA flowchart. The body of evidence was analysed qualitatively
172 by the themes stated in the “data extraction” regarding the ISO 9241-210's principles
173 application and is presented through a descriptive overview. The quantitative data (publication
174 data, data about the participants, setting, and principles application) was analysed and presented
175 through descriptive statistics tools.

176 Protocol and Registration

177 The protocol describing this systematic review methodology was previously registered
178 in PROSPERO (CRD42022307466).

179 Results

180 Of the 348 references found in databases, 37 were fully analysed, and 28 were included
181 for systematic review (See Fig 1).

182 The aim of this systematic review is to examine and describe the application (or absence
183 of application) of the ISO 9241-210's principles in AT developments for persons with VI,
184 based on searches in multidisciplinary databases. Here, we first provide a descriptive analysis
185 of the papers outlining geographical representation and topics covered. Then, we present an in-
186 depth analysis of findings pertaining to the development and adoption of the UCD principles.

187 Themes covered in the literature and geo-representation

188 The results retrieved contributions from 16 countries. Regarding countries' distribution
189 by income category, it should be noted that 85.7% (24) of the papers included are from high-
190 income countries, four from middle-income, and none from low-income countries (Table 1).

191 Table 1. Number of studies per country

Country	N° of studies	Classification by income level
Austria	1	High
Belgium	1	High
Brazil	1	Upper middle
Brazil-Chile	1	Upper middle - High
Chile	1	High
France	2	High
Germany	1	High
Greece	1	High
Italy	2	High
Malaysia	1	Upper middle
Portugal	1	High
Saudi Arabia	2	High
Spain	2	High
Taiwan	1	High
Thailand	1	Upper middle
UK	2	High

USA	7	High
-----	---	------

192

193 AT designs or developments covered the following areas (according to the ISO
194 9999:2016) [22]: activities and participation relating to personal mobility and transportation
195 (ten papers); communication and information management (five papers); education and
196 training in skills (six papers); work activities and participation in employment (one paper); and
197 for assistive products for self-care activities and participation in self-care (two papers). Four of
198 the 28 articles were literature reviews, three are oriented towards ATs for activities related to
199 personal mobility and transportation, while the last one describes the usability of mobile
200 applications for VIs to support different types of activities.

201 Most of the articles (21/28) explicitly declare using/implementing the UCD framework
202 of reference. However, the implemented framework, namely the ISO 9241-210 (or its previous
203 version ISO 13407) was referenced in only five of the reviewed articles [21, 23-26]. Excluding
204 the aforementioned studies, only two papers [27-28], cited a reference, other than ISO 9241-
205 210, for UCD, specifically (Cheverst et al. [29]) and (Nielsen [30]).

206 Adoption of UCD principles

207 An analysis of the available evidence shows that papers documenting the development
208 of AT for persons with VI tend to present a more detailed description of the state of the art in
209 terms of the systems requirements than properly a characterization of the context of use or
210 preferences and needs of the target user. Also, there is a strong emphasis on usability-oriented
211 studies (64.29%). AT developments tend to engage users mostly at the end of the process to
212 test if the product can be used. More than one third (35.71%) of the articles did exactly that.
213 While 21.4% presented usability evaluation and results as part of the user-centred design
214 process. Another 21.4% aimed to apply the user-centred design process in the early stages of

215 the design or development process, looking at the feasibility of using the device and
216 highlighting the compatibility and advantages of using participatory design methodologies with
217 the UCD approach. The information extracted from the selected articles is presented below,
218 grouped under each of the six principles of ISO 9241-210 to review their application (Table 2).
219

Table 2. Data extraction regarding the implementation of user-centred design standards on assistive technology for persons with visual impairments.

Authors	Article Title	Publication Year	Country	Aim	Sample	5.2 The design is based upon an explicit understanding of users, tasks and environments	5.3 Users are involved throughout design and development	5.4 The design is driven and refined by user-centred evaluation	5.5 The process is iterative	5.6 The design addresses the whole user experience	5.7 The design team includes multidisciplinary skills and perspectives	Data collection tools, techniques
Conradie PD, De Marez L, Saldien J. [21]	Participation is Blind: Involving Low Vision Lead Users in Product Development	2015	Belgium	To present how the Lead User approach was applied, focusing on the tools and techniques we used.	Group 1 contained nine participants, while group 2 contained twelve.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not described	Qualitative interviews with six (four females and two males) blind persons by phone, followed by two focus group discussions
Façanha AR, Araújo MC, Viana W, Sánchez J. [23]	Design and evaluation of mobile sensing technologies for identifying medicines by people with visual disabilities	2019	Brasil	To assist people with visual impairments to identify their medicine by using mobile sensing technologies.	"Expert" group (computing undergraduate students, an assistive technology researcher and an ophthalmologist); 2 blind adults; 10 VIP for the usability test	Yes	Yes	Yes	Iteration is described in the theoretical framework, not in the development process	Yes	This group had four computing undergraduate students, an assistive technology researcher and an ophthalmologist.	usability evaluation instruments (SUS and SUBC), accompanied by a brief interview about the users' impressions
Ntakolia C, Dimas G, Lakovidis DK. [24]	User-centered system design for assisted navigation of visually impaired individuals in outdoor cultural environments	2020	Greece	To develop a human-computer interactive system addressed to guide VIs in outdoor cultural environments.	51 visually impaired, 77 non visually impaired for the questionnaire. For the evaluation process of the prototype 10 blinded users.	Yes	Users are involved in design and development, not in evaluation	Yes, but usability test was made with blinded participants	Yes	Yes	Not described	Observations in the outdoor environment, interviews, questionnaires, prototype usability test
Mattheiss E, Regal G, Sellitsch D, Tscheligi M. [25]	User-centred design with visually impaired pupils: A case study of a game editor for orientation and mobility training	2016	Austria	This aim raises open research questions on how to design an accessible O&M training game editor.	25 teenagers and young adults from several classes of a school for VI pupils in Vienna, Austria, with business and polytechnical focus.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The design team is not described.	Semi-structured expert interview Workshop about brainstorming methods, digital survey, Focus group, Behaviour observation and contextual, exploratory interview in game playing, Self-experience in O&M training
Sánchez J. [26]	Development of Navigation Skills Through Audio Haptic Videogaming in Learners Who are Blind	2012	Chile	The purpose of this work was to investigate whether the use of audio and haptic-based videogame has an impact on the development of O&M skills in school-age blind learners.	For the usability evaluation: 10 blind learners (ages from 9-15 years). None of these participants have any additional, associated disabilities other than VI. Cognitive impact test: 7 blind learners (10 and 15 years old).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The research team is not described, Authors described abundant team experience regarding interface design for blind children was also used in this design process.	Interaction data was collected from twenty independent onsite user evaluations, using observation together with a think-aloud protocol, field notes, semi-structured interview and a specialized checklist.
Nimmolrat A, Khuwuthyakom P, Wientong P, Thinnukool O. [27]	Pharmaceutical mobile application for visually-impaired people in Thailand: development and implementation	2021)	Thailand	The aim is to analyse, design and implement a mobile pharmaceutical application called "Ru Tan Ya" in the Thai language, which enables users to manage their medication and can be applied to both iOS and Android systems.	Sixty volunteers from the active members of the Vision Disability Association in northern Thailand were recruited. The inclusion criteria and sampling methods are presented.	Yes	Yes	Yes	no, but suggestions are made for improvements	Yes	not described	Interviews for the Identification of users' problems and needs. Feedback and ranking based in a usability questionnaire.
Yeh F, Yang C. [28]	Assisting the visually impaired to deal with telephone interview jobs using information and commutation technology	2014	Taiwan	The goal of this work was to develop a new ICT assisted blind telephone interview (ICT-ABTI) system to increase the working performance of the visually impaired.	Seven visually impaired people participated in this study. All of the participants graduated from university. All of the participants had enough experience in using computers. The ethnic backgrounds are presented. Participant's ages ranged from 24-39 years of age.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Not described	Interviews, This study adopted an ABAB design (Richards, Taylor, Ramasamy, & Richards, 1999) to execute the tests, in which A represented the baseline phase (without ICT-ABTI system) and B represented the intervention phase (with ICT-ABTI system).

Authors	Article Title	Publication Year	Country	Aim	Sample	5.2 The design is based upon an explicit understanding of users, tasks and environments	5.3 Users are involved throughout design and development	5.4 The design is driven and refined by user-centred evaluation	5.5 The process is iterative	5.6 The design addresses the whole user experience	5.7 The design team includes multidisciplinary skills and perspectives	Data collection tools, techniques
Façanha AR, Darin T, Viana W, Sánchez J. [31]	O&M Indoor Virtual Environments for People Who Are Blind: A Systematic Literature Review	2020	Brazil-Chile	To systematically examine the literature on O&M virtual environments designed to support indoor navigation to identify techniques for both developing and evaluating the usability and cognitive impact of these applications.	51 papers describing O&M indoor virtual environments			N/A: Literature review			Not described	Regarding evaluation techniques, questionnaires, interviews, user observation, and performance logs are commonly used to evaluate usability in this context. Most papers do not report any strategies to evaluate the cognitive impact of O&M virtual environments on users' navigational and wayfinding skills.
Hakobyan L, Lumsden J, O'Sullivan D, Bartlett H. [32]	Mobile assistive technologies for the visually impaired	2013	UK	To review research and innovation within the field of mobile assistive technology for the visually impaired and, in so doing, highlight the need for successful collaboration between clinical expertise, computer science, and domain users to realize fully the potential benefits of such technologies.	168 articles were reviewed in detail			N/A: literature review			Authors highlighted the need for collaboration between clinical expertise and the field of computer science, but the research team behind the review is not described	"UCD encourages the use of user-focused design tools and practices including interviews, focus groups, surveys, usability testing, and participatory design processes."
Mascetti S, Picinali L, Gerino A, Ahmetović D, Bernareggi C. [33]	Sonification of guidance data during roadcrossing for people with visual impairments or blindness	2015	Italy	Two original auditory guiding modes based on data sonification are presented and compared with a guiding mode based on speech messages	Three sets of empirical evaluations were conducted: quantitative evaluation with 11 blindfolded sighted test subjects, a qualitative evaluation with 12 blind test subjects and, finally, a quantitative and qualitative evaluation conducted with 3 test subjects with VIB.	No	Users involved in preliminary and usability tests	No	Yes	No	The design team is not described.	Informal evaluations, preliminary evaluations, experimental tests, quantitative variables related with time responses to the audio cues were measured. Qualitative tests: The questionnaire is organized in two sets of Likert-scale items (derived from the System Usability Scale, and from IBM Computer Usability Satisfaction Questionnaire) and an additional set of open questions.
Najjar AB, Al-Issa AR, Hosny M. [34]	Dynamic indoor path planning for the visually impaired	2022	SAUDI ARABIA	To facilitate the navigation process for the VI, through developing a useful indoor navigation mobile application that can safely lead them to the desired destination.	17 participants in total, 10 non-VI volunteers, and 7 VI participants.	No	users are involved in usability	No	Yes	No	not mentioned	The System Usability Scale has been used here to assess the comfort and acceptability of system use.
Connors E, Chrastil E, Sánchez J, Merabet L. [35]	Action video game play and transfer of navigation and spatial cognition skills in adolescents who are blind	2014	USA	we have developed a novel approach to train navigation and spatial cognition skills in adolescents who are blind.	Seven early blind adolescents aged between 16 and 17 years (3 males) familiar with the use of a computer key board interface	Yes	Yes	Yes	not described	not described	not described	Navigation success was assessed by the number of correct paths executed (expressed as mean percentage correct). Then, statistical tools were used for the analysis. Conversations, interviews, and usability evaluations, to gather input from potential end-users as part of the user-centred design employed, are mentioned but not described in the paper.

Authors	Article Title	Publication Year	Country	Aim	Sample	5.2 The design is based upon an explicit understanding of users, tasks and environments	5.3 Users are involved throughout design and development	5.4 The design is driven and refined by user-centred evaluation	5.5 The process is iterative	5.6 The design addresses the whole user experience	5.7 The design team includes multidisciplinary skills and perspectives	Data collection tools, techniques
Al-Razgan M, Almoaiqeel S, Alrajhi N, Alhumegani A, Alshehri A, Alnefaie B. [36]	A systematic literature review on the usability of mobile applications for visually impaired users	2021	Saudi Arabia	The goal of this paper is to provide an overview of the developments on usability of mobile applications for people with visual impairments based on recent advances in research and application development.	Regarding the reviewed articles: 1. Most studies faced difficulties regarding the sample size and the fact that many of the participants were not actually blind or visually impaired but only blindfolded; 2. A commonly discussed future work in the chosen literature is to increase the sample sizes of people with visual impairment and focus on various ages and geographical areas to generalize the studies.	N/A: SR						Reported: The most prevalent methods to evaluate the usability of applications were surveys and interviews. Focus groups were also used extensively in the literature.
Aziz N, Mutalib AA, Sarif SM. [37]	User Experience of Interactive Assistive Courseware for Low Vision Learners (AC4LV): Initial Round	2017	Malaysia	to investigate user experience of AC4LV in terms of information accessibility, navigability, and pleasurability.	eight subjects with the average age 9 to 12 were involved.	No	Users are involved since the usability test of the prototype	No	The intention is declared by the authors.	Yes	Not described	Subjective feedbacks were obtained through observation and interview. Think-aloud Protocol.
Bateman A, Zhao OK, Bajcsy AV, Jennings MC, Toth BN, Cohen AJ, et al. [38]	A user-centered design and analysis of an electrostatic haptic touchscreen system for students with visual impairments	2018	USA	To detail the user-centered design and analysis of an electrostatic touchscreen system for displaying graph-based visual information to individuals who are visually impaired. Feedback AND to present the usability study of the AD developed	For the UCD process the participants included technology experts with visual impairments, principals and teachers of a school for VIPS. For the usability study, 12 VIP	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The design team is not described.	Interviews, preliminary tests, Usability test, Video analysis
Colley M, Walch M, Gugenheimer J, Askari A, Ruzkio E. [39]	Towards Inclusive External Communication of Autonomous Vehicles for Pedestrians with Vision Impairments	2020	Germany	This work presents an inclusive user-centered design for VPC, beneficial for both vision impaired and seeing pedestrians.	N=6 participants (SD=4.44; range: 45 to 56) years old, researchers conducted a between-subject study with N=8 VIP and N=25 seeing people.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Iteration is described in the theoretical framework, not in the development process	Yes	Not mentioned	The workshop consisted of three phases: introduction, evaluation and an open discussion. Objective dependent variables: During each crossing, the system logged position, the lateral angle of the view, and the current duration of the crossing in relation to when the auditory crossing signal was given. Time on street. Subjective dependent variables: • affective state: on a 7-point semantic scale using the self-assessment manikin (SAM), • cognitive load: raw NASA-TLX [37] on a 20-point scale, • subscale Predictability and Trust in Automation of the Trust in Automation questionnaire by Körber
Fidyka A, Matamala A. [40]	Audio description in 360° videos Results from focus groups in Barcelona and Kraków	2018	Spain	To gather user feedback, through a series of focus groups, on how AudioDescription (and secondarily AST) could be integrated in immersive content, both from the perspective of producers and consumers.	Barcelona: 6 participants: 2 end users (partially sighted), 3 audio describers and 1 technical expert. Kraków: 6 participants (3 end users (blind) and 3 audio describers). Sex, age and other user's characteristics are reported.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not declared	Yes	Not described	Focus groups

Authors	Article Title	Publication Year	Country	Aim	Sample	5.2 The design is based upon an explicit understanding of users, tasks and environments	5.3 Users are involved throughout design and development	5.4 The design is driven and refined by user-centred evaluation	5.5 The process is iterative	5.6 The design addresses the whole user experience	5.7 The design team includes multidisciplinary skills and perspectives	Data collection tools, techniques
Shi L, Lawson H, Zhang Z, Azenkot S. [41]	Designing interactive 3D printed models with teachers of the visually impaired	2019	United States	In this paper, we present two studies that investigate how to design 3D models as effective teaching aids. In both studies	1st Workshop: 16 TVIs participated (1 with low vision, 2 blinds, 13 sighted). 2nd workshop: 19 TVIs (1 with low vision, 1 blind, 17 sighted). Age, experience and other participant's data are reported.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	One of the researchers is an expert in education for students with VI. An accessibility specialist was included in the researchers team to assess the usability of the application before delivering it to the TVIs.	Workshops, brainstorming, meetings. The remote meetings between the researcher and each TVI, and the TVIs feedback to their students' were recorded. The data provided by the TVIs was the only one used because of "feasibility and privacy concerns".
Dough IA, Pontelli E. [42]	Non-visual navigation of spreadsheets	2013	USA	To measure the accuracy and the time needed when the user completes chart recognition tasks for bar, scatter, and line charts using the haptic/sound interface. The suitability of the feeling of the force feedback and the accuracy and effectiveness of the audio cues were also measured. Another goal was to compare the accuracy and time needed to navigate charts using the proposed system and using charts printed on tactile paper.	7 unpaid students (3 females and 4 males) from New Mexico School for the Blind and Visually Impaired, 5 blind, 2 VI.	No	Involved in the usability test	No	Yes	no	Not described	1. Quantitative measurements. 2. A questionnaire about each performed task and a questionnaire of the usability and accessibility of the system and potential suggestions to improve the system
Adebiyi A, Sorrentino p, Bohlool S, Zhang C, Arditti M, Goodrich G, et al. [43]	Assessment of feedback modalities for wearable visual aids in blind mobility	2017	USA	The purpose of this paper is to report on a study comparing two types of ETA outputs (speech or tactile) in a group of blind test subjects.	All subjects were blind with regards to functional vision. Subject code, age, gender and visual diagnosis are shown. For 1st Experiment : 11 participants, 2nd experiment: 10 participants	No	Users are involved in tests to compare audio and vibrotactile ETA outputs.	No	Intention declared	No	not described	A "person-in-loop" testing sessions. The variables measured were: Compliance (indoor and outdoor); Average Reaction Time, preferred walking speed with the cane (Control) and with each MFS (mobility feedback system). After all testing, SUS score.
Giraud S, Th�rouanne P, Steiner DD. [44]	Web accessibility: Filtering redundant and irrelevant information improves website usability for blind users	2018	France	the main goal of the three experiments presented below was to test if this filtering provides a benefit in terms of cognitive load and usability according to the three usability criteria: effectiveness, efficiency and satisfaction	Participants were contacted via Internet through e-mail and forums dealing with disability. Fifty screen reader users voluntarily participated in these experiments.	No	Involved in the usability test	Yes	Yes	No	Not described	The NASA-RTLX questionnaire measured cognitive load, three usability criteria were assessed (effectiveness, efficiency, and satisfaction), questionnaire "System Usability Scale". Conducting semi-structured interviews would be necessary in order to collect the perceptions of users with blindness of such a tool (advantages, risks, opportunities)
Lopes SI, Vieira JM, Lopes OF, Rosa PR, Dias NA. [45]	MobiFree: A Set of Electronic Mobility Aids for the Blind	2012	Portugal	To design a set of complementary electronic mobility aids for the blind, to cover as much as possible, his personal, near and far spaces: an improved long cane; the concept of a pair of sunglasses focus in the detection of head-level obstacles and a directional speaker to obtain echo information of surrounding elements	Two blind people were invited	NO	In the paper only is stated user participation in the evaluation	No	Yes	No	Collaboration with the Department of Communication and Arts of the Aveiro University. In the design process, is reported.	In order to give some feedback about the device and improvement tips, 1 person used the cane for more than two hours, and the other used the cane during a week. Both gave positive feedback and some functional tips.
Mascetti S, Ahmetovic D, Gerino A, Bemareggi C, Busso M, Rizzi A. [46]	Robust traffic lights detection on mobile devices for pedestrians with visual impairment	2015	Italy	this paper focuses on the problem of recognizing traffic lights with the aim of supporting a user with VIB in safely crossing a road.	The experiment involved 2 blind subjects and 2 low-visioned subjects (unable to see the traffic lights involved in the experiment).	No	Users are involved in usability tests	No	Yes	No	The design team is not described.	A supervisor recorded whether the task was successfully completed and took note of any problem or delay in the process. The subjects were asked to answer a questionnaire.

Authors	Article Title	Publication Year	Country	Aim	Sample	5.2 The design is based upon an explicit understanding of users, tasks and environments	5.3 Users are involved throughout design and development	5.4 The design is driven and refined by user-centred evaluation	5.5 The process is iterative	5.6 The design addresses the whole user experience	5.7 The design team includes multidisciplinary skills and perspectives	Data collection tools, techniques	
Kammoun S, Parsehian G, Gutierrez O, Brihault A, Serpa A, Raynal M, et al. [47]	Navigation and space perception assistance for the visually impaired: The NAVIG project	2012	France	The aim was to design and evaluate a powerful assistive device combining both micro- (sensing the immediate environment) and macronavigation (reaching a remote destination) functions.	in collaboration with the Institute of Young Blinds (CESDV-LIA, Toulouse). A panel of 21 VI users has been involved during all design steps. These users have been selected using several criteria, including motivation to participate in the project, self-sufficiency in O&M, and some degree of practice with new technologies. The subjects in the panel were between 16 and 65 years old; eight females and 13 males	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NAVIG brings together two research laboratories in computer science and information technology and one research laboratory in human perception. IRIT-Elipse, the project leader, is an interdisciplinary research group in Human Computer Interaction (HCI).	The brainstorming sessions and discussions with VI users highlighted that an ideal system has to provide the best-suited level of audio guidance information	
Lee K, Hong J, Jarjue E, Mensah EE, Kacorri H. [48]	From the Lab to People's Home: Lessons from Accessing Blind Participants' Interactions via Smart Glasses in Remote Studies	2022	United States	To explore ways to overcome challenges associated with remote observations of blind participants' interactions via video conferencing with smart glasses	12 blind participants, serving as a case study.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Our team, including four sighted researchers and one blind researcher.	videos	
Younis O, Al-Nuaimy W, Rowe F, Alomari M. [49]	A Smart Context-Aware Hazard Attention System to Help People with Peripheral Vision Loss	2019	UK	This paper presents a new context-aware hybrid (indoor/outdoor) hazard classification assistive technology to help people with peripheral vision loss in their navigation using computer-enabled smart glasses equipped with a wide-angle camera.	5 visually impaired	Yes	Yes	Yes	Intention declared	Yes	Authors declared research collaboration with the Department of Health Services Research	3 Questionnaires: 1 about the challenges VIP face that would affect their QoL and their independent navigation; 1 about the hazardous situations while navigating. Dataset for hazard detection and classification; 1 Feedback regarding the system concept and alerts. Group meeting with patients.	
Feiz S, Borodin A, Bi X, Ramakrishnan IV. [50]	Towards Enabling Blind People to Fill Out Paper Forms with a Wearable Smartphone Assistant	2021	USA	To present PaperPal, a wearable smartphone assistant which blind people can use to fill out paper forms independently.	For the WOZ pilot study: 8 blind participants. For the user study: 8 blind participants. Gender, age, skills, and other participants' data were reported.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	not described	semi-structured interview to gather demographic data, reading/writing habits, and prior experiences with assistive smartphone apps. The experimenter making notes throughout the video recorded session. A single ease question to each participant to rate the difficulty of assembling the holder and completing each form, on a scale of 1 to 7 open-ended discussion	
Real S, Araujo A. [51]	Navigation Systems for the Blind and Visually Impaired: PastWork, Challenges, and Open Problems	2019	Spain	To re-evaluate the perspective of navigation systems for the BVI in this new context, attempting to integrate key elements of what is frequently a disaggregated multidisciplinary background.	N/A						N/A: Literature review	not described	N/A

233 The design is based upon an explicit understanding of users, tasks,
234 and environments.

235 In reviewing the application of this principle in the available evidence, we sought compliance
236 with the following points: identification of user and stakeholder groups, understanding of users’
237 needs and description of the context of use: “specified users, having specified goals, performing
238 specified tasks”.

239 All the reviewed articles reported the participation of VI users, even though six studies
240 complemented their samples with non-VI participants. Regarding sample sizes, the number of
241 participants varies from two to 128 (55 VI, 71 non-VI), being 12 participants the number that
242 appears the most often. Only seven articles reported sample sizes with more than 12 users.
243 There is no clear rationale for why and how these samples were designed and selected,
244 especially when considering the quantitative methodologies. Only one paper, Nimmolrat et al.
245 reported the sampling technique and inclusion criteria for a sample of 60 participants [27].

246 Quantitative standards regarding sampling were not observed either. Mascetti et al, reported
247 difficulties in recruiting test subjects with VI or blindness [33]. Under that argument, the paper
248 added non-VI participants to the study and reported on results that merge data from both non-
249 VI individuals and VI individuals. Najjar et al., whose sample consisted of 10 non-VI and seven
250 VI participants, noted their limitations without being specific or addressing bias on the data
251 analysis [34]. Connors et al. acknowledged that their sample size (7 blind adolescents) was
252 “relatively small” and limited to carry out a correlation-based analysis [35].

253 Absence of persons with VI tend to be common, Al-Razgan et-al., reports that “most studies
254 faced difficulties regarding the sample size and the fact that many of the participants were not
255 actually blind or visually impaired but only blindfolded” [36].

256 When qualitative methods were applied, no standard sampling techniques nor quality assurance
257 practices for qualitative sampling were reported, e.g. characterization of patterns, and
258 variations among the participants, data saturation. Studies such as Aziz et al., argued that the
259 sample size (8) was sufficient considering its qualitative nature, without providing any further
260 rationale [37]. Furthermore, Conradie et al. claimed that two focus groups (sample sizes 9 and
261 12) “served to reveal the experiences and knowledge of blind persons” to the researchers which
262 make it possible to sketch broad user needs within the target group and specifying varying
263 degrees of mobility needs and assistive device demands [21].

264 In terms of characterising users, participants’ details were poorly described. The sex of the
265 sample members was reported by 19 papers, the same number of articles stated the age of the
266 participants, four of the studies were addressed to minors (8-17); two other papers reported
267 participation of teenagers and young adults; the rest of the studies included adults only in
268 different age ranges (18-78). Other types of data reported were: the participant’s skills related
269 to the use of the designed AT (14 papers); the education level of the participants (10 papers),
270 their occupation (five studies), the number of years lived with visual disability or the year when
271 the disability was acquired (five papers), and the use of aids (two studies). Environment of use
272 was often not mentioned. Only one paper reported an analysis of the physical environment in
273 which the product will be used, the user’s social and organisational milieu and the technical
274 environment and associated technical constraints [24].

275 As for stakeholder identification, 8 papers mentioned the involvement of stakeholders. Four
276 papers declared the participation of academics (principals, teachers and O&M trainers), three
277 studies included representatives from disabled people’s organisations, and four studies
278 included technology experts [23-26, 38-41]. Bateman et al., included all the above [38].

279 Users are involved throughout the design and development.

280 All of the reviewed articles reported user involvement, but rarely throughout all of the stages
281 of the design process. Four of the studies present data from the design phases in which
282 participants were actively involved [21, 25, 39-40]. Their involvement included “in-depth
283 requirements analysis” through users and stakeholders’ feedback through a series of UCD
284 comprehensive methods. Mattheiss, et al. first centred on analysing the requirements in the
285 areas of Orientation and Mobility (O&M) training and accessible video game play to later work
286 on the first iterations of the design, implementation, and evaluation of the developed game
287 editor [25]. In this case, authors declared the involvement of children (end-users) as design
288 partners.

289 User participation in the final stages, namely for evaluating the solutions, was stated by 5
290 studies: 4 in usability testing [37, 42-44] and 1 in field testing [45]. Involvement, both in the
291 design and testing phases, was reported by 14 studies [23, 26-28, 33-35, 38, 41, 46-50].
292 Although, it is pertinent to point out that: on the one hand, some studies mention the
293 involvement of the participants at the beginning and at the end of the process, but not in all the
294 stages of the process. On the other hand, how users were involved tend to be unclear and
295 reporting of such involvement tends to be rather superficial, for example, Najjar et al.
296 mentioned the identification of potential users’ requirements, but these are not presented in the
297 article [34], instead a previous study is referred to. Nimmolrat et al. provide a better description
298 of users’ participation during the design process [27]. Ntakolia et al. [24] detailed user’s
299 participation in the design and development phases, however, usability testing was done with
300 blindfolded non-VI participants only [24].

301

302 The design is driven and refined by user-centred evaluation

303 The use of user-centred evaluation tends to be more explicit, explained and applied in studies
304 that used qualitative methods, such as behavioural observation, think aloud techniques, in-
305 depth interviews, and focus groups, among others these kinds of evaluation methods allow the
306 user's perspective to be addressed early [21, 23-27, 37-38, 40, 50]. The analysis of the context
307 of use could determine the user's needs against which the preliminary design solutions will be
308 tested.

309 Usability evaluations reported on the evidence collected included both quantitative and
310 qualitative methods. There is a stronger emphasis on quantitative scales to assess usability,
311 such as the System Usability Scale. In addition, usability was assessed in terms of the
312 performance of the technology and other quantitative variables related to efficiency (time) and
313 effectiveness. Except for the studies by Najjar et al. and Giraud et.al, the studies which applied
314 quantitative methods for usability testing, also reported users' feedback without specifying the
315 methods used to gather that data [34, 44], e.g. Lopes et al., stated that subjects had the chance
316 to use the device and were asked to give feedback, but did not describe the methods for data
317 collection [45].

318 There is a lack of real-world scenarios when evaluating AT. Some studies claim that this was
319 because they are focused on preliminary solutions, and in some others, because the study has
320 pure research and non-commercial orientation [25, 28, 34, 44]. Ntakolia et al., excluded users
321 from its evaluation process of the prototype, reporting that future research would include VI
322 users for the usability test [24].

323 The process is iterative

324 In reviewing compliance with iteration, which dictates the iterative repetition of a sequence of
325 steps until the desired outcome is achieved, it is important to remember that not all the included
326 articles report the complete UCD process, but some focus on design and several, as presented
327 initially, are limited to the usability evaluation of prototypes. Thus, all the studies reported
328 iterations, or the intention to make them, based on the feedback gathered from studies'
329 participants. Iteration involves not only the prototype but also the descriptions and
330 specifications, the refinement of information from the feedback obtained during the
331 development process and in usability testing, is also considered. From this perspective, a
332 noteworthy study on this subject is that of Bateman et al. where design and re-designs were
333 submitted to preliminary tests with expert users [38]. Finally, the usability test conducted with
334 12 students confirmed that the previously expressed needs regarding accessibility and
335 effectiveness were met. The authors went beyond mentioning that an iterative UCD process
336 was carried out, in fact, they went on to explain the information gathered and the stakeholder's
337 characteristics through every round of interviews. The iterations made and the preliminary test
338 results were also detailed. In other words, iterations were placed in the context of use.

339 Another interesting example is the study by Shi et al., where two studies were conducted to
340 understand how to design effective, interactive 3D models for education purposes for blind
341 students [41]. In the first study, two design workshops were performed with teachers of VI
342 students (TVIs) in which suggestions from conceptual designs were aggregated. Then, the
343 second study was performed with three teachers of VI students, not only to design, but to
344 deploy sample interactive 3D models over seven weeks. In-depth work with individual TVIs,
345 and deployment of interactive 3D models in their classrooms were reported by the
346 researchers, resulting in improvements to the prior system and mobile application
347 development that supports the use of interactive 3D printed models in an educational setting.

348 Additionally, the authors stated that based on the feedback from the second study, the mobile
349 application could be further improved.

350 Although in less depth than the cases previously discussed, Conradie et. al and Mattheiss et
351 al. highlighted the importance of rapid prototyping in the execution of iterations [21, 25].
352 Adebisi et al. and Feiz et al. emphasised the effectiveness of the “Wizard of Oz” technique in
353 achieving development improvements [43, 48]. This technique consists of a tactic used for
354 low fidelity prototyping in which the participant receives instructions in order to perform
355 tasks while testing a prototype, and a human simulates the behaviour of the completed AT.
356 For example, for a navigation device, a person will simulate the task that the device will
357 perform by providing vocal instructions to the users.

358 In turn, Doush and Pontelli reported “iterative modifications have been applied to the system
359 based on empirical studies carried out with the participation of sighted and blind users”.
360 However, they do not describe the iterations performed or how these studies were conducted,
361 nor do they explain why non-visually impaired participants were involved [42]. Likewise,
362 Mascetti et. al, stated that “during the design of the auditory guiding modes several test subjects
363 were asked to use the application and provide feedback” this was done via informal test [33].
364

365 The design addresses the whole user experience

366 ISO 9241 stresses that usability goes beyond "making products easy to use", by considering
367 perceptual and emotional aspects as keys to understanding the user’s experience from their
368 own perspective.

369 Still, several studies assessed usability mainly by considering parameters such as ease of use,
370 accessibility, or satisfaction with the device [33-34, 42-44, 46]. These studies applied

371 quantitative scales. To have information to improve the device, three papers reported to have
372 included questionnaires or open-ended questions (not described in the papers) [33, 42, 46]. In
373 yet another case, in which only System Usability Scale (SUS) was applied, feedback from
374 users was reported as results of "anecdotal comments" [43].

375 Mascetti et al., reported as a result of feedback from participants after evaluation of the
376 prototype, that they did not desire to hold a mobile phone in one hand while holding a cane in
377 the other [46]. This type of information evidences that the characterisation of users' needs and
378 preferences was not carried out at an early stage and therefore, users' previous experiences
379 and perspective were not addressed.

380 Other feedback refers to the time the user needs to get familiar with the device, the need for
381 more training time was expressed by the participants in the studies conducted by Doush and
382 Pontelli and by Mascetti et al. [42, 46]. It was also stated by Najjar et al. [34]. On the other
383 hand, although Giraud et al., did not include feedback within the methods or results, they did
384 express the future need of conducting semi-structured interviews "in order to collect the
385 perceptions of users with blindness of such a tool (advantages, risks, opportunities)" [44].

386 Alternatively, preferences and expectations were mainly assessed in the studies of Mattheiss
387 et al., and Aziz et al.: design for skills development in VI children through an interactive
388 learning material and a videogame, respectively [25, 37].

389 Furthermore, Sánchez obtained feedback from users regarding their emotions [26]. Colley et
390 al., also considered affective state variables, namely 'control over the situation' in the
391 analysis [39]. Nimmolrat et al., assessed satisfaction with the functionality of the application
392 through interviews [27]. Finally, eight studies (28.57%) based their development on the
393 available literature and did not include collecting any empirical data.

394 The design team includes multidisciplinary skills and perspectives.

395 The large majority of studies did not report multidisciplinary skills and perspectives. Only
396 two studies described the research team. Facanha et al., stated that the design team included
397 four undergraduate students in the computer sciences, an assistive technology researcher and
398 an ophthalmologist [23]. Shi et al., mentioned that one of the researchers of the team is an
399 expert in education for students with visual impairments, and that they included an
400 accessibility specialist [41]. Nevertheless, some authors did report collaborations: Kammoun
401 et al., declared the participation of different engineering research groups in human
402 perception, human-computer interaction, audio and acoustic, and spatial cognition and
403 perception. Further, the authors mentioned the project leader, is an interdisciplinary research
404 group in Human Computer Interaction [47]. Other reports of collaborations outside the
405 engineering team are: Lopes et. al, who mentioned a collaboration with the Department of
406 Communication and Arts of Aveiro University [45] and Younis et al., who declared a
407 research collaboration with the Department of Health Services Research in the UK [49].

408 Discussion

409 The literature reports a growing trend in the application of user-centred design in the
410 development of assistive technology for the visually impaired persons [51]. However, the
411 results show that evidence on the effective implementation of UCD with VI on the design of
412 AT is scarce. Publications show that the principles of the ISO 9241-210 (user-centred design)
413 tended to be not fully applied, despite being called guiding principles and despite the
414 increasing availability of models and frameworks that could facilitate their application [52].

415 The focus was on the system requirements, not its user.

416 The information on the system architecture reported in the state of the art in the analysed
417 studies, was prioritised over the participants' needs with respect to AT. For these articles, it
418 was common not to find specifics on sample size calculation and participant's selection.
419 Participation of potential users was low and was accompanied by a superficial description of
420 their profiles. Users' involvement was reported mainly in usability assessment at the end of the
421 process rather than in design phases, and when users' involvement was reported in design
422 phases, it was usually not thoroughly described. This contrasts with the extent in which
423 technological aspects of the development were informed. Also, a stronger focus on the
424 verification of the system, over its validation, was observed. According to quality management
425 standards, such as the ISO 9001, independent validation and verification (V&V) processes need
426 to be performed to determine if a developed system meets the defined requirements and
427 specifications and fulfils its intended purpose [53-54]. Specifically, the verification process
428 focuses on the system's requirements ("Did we developed the system right?") while the
429 validation process focuses on the system's worthiness, i.e., if it fulfils its intended purpose,
430 user expectations, etc. ("Did we developed the right system?") [55].

431 For usability assessment, most studies used surveys and quantitative methods to gather
432 information. Though standard parameters of quality on those methods, such as rationale for
433 power and limitation of the sample size calculation, were not met. Feedback from users, when
434 present, took the form of "informal", "casual" or "anecdotal" data. Moreover, in these studies
435 iterations are often mentioned in the evaluation phase and not in the design phase. At this point,
436 it is important to emphasise that according to the ISO 9241-210, iterations should be done
437 throughout the process and not only at the evaluation stage.

438 Regarding usability, ISO 9241-210 states the need to go beyond the concepts of ease of use
439 and effectiveness, and to incorporate users' experience. In this perspective, the standard
440 recommends to consider the users' skills, habits and personal goals, as well as emotional
441 aspects and experiences of previous solutions or alternatives. Notwithstanding, the studies
442 under consideration fall short in assessing the whole users' experience, there was little or no
443 information on the social and environmental context in which these devices were intended to
444 be used. In this regard infrastructural constraints such as internet availability, road safety or
445 social aspects like stigma are not accounted for.

446 Moving towards better understanding of the final users

447 Characterization of user needs was often unstructured, lacked robustness or tended to be
448 underreported. This trend has been previously observed in the study of requirements
449 elicitation techniques [52]. This was also observed in the present review. Among the reasons
450 given to justify such behaviour are limited resources, time and endeavour to conduct a
451 thorough requirements assessment process [52]. Similarly, some of the studies in this review
452 reported major logistical challenges in recruiting participants.

453 There is a growing number of articles that seek to better engage with users of AT. This was
454 generally achieved either because they took care to obtain larger samples under previously
455 defined selection criteria or because they selected more appropriate methods (qualitative or
456 mixed) with respect to the objective pursued, or due to both reasons [24-25, 27, 47]. It is also
457 pertinent to highlight the importance of having included stakeholders in these studies [23-25,
458 27, 40-41, 47-48].

459 Researches did not fully apply all ISO 9241-210's principles. However, it can be argued that
460 a better compliance to the first principle (*the design is based upon an explicit understanding*
461 *of users, tasks, and environments*) increased the probability of applying the subsequent four

462 principles. The fact that some studies integrated participatory design approaches into the
463 methodology boosted the involvement of participants in the whole process [23, 25, 27-28, 41,
464 48]. The participation of both potential users and stakeholders in the early design phases and
465 throughout the process, as well as the type of instruments applied to collect information,
466 allowed the design to be “driven and refined by user-centred evaluation”. Iterations were
467 reported both in the information collected to guide the design, and in the prototypes.

468 Regarding usability, in addition to the application of validated surveys and the analysis of
469 system performance parameters, qualitative methods were used to obtain feedback from users
470 in a more systematic and deeper way, and to compare it with the initial information from the
471 context of use. In some cases, the user experience was assessed in a more comprehensive way
472 by considering the emotions evoked through interaction during the prototypes assessment
473 [25, 37, 39].

474 Multidisciplinary skills and perspectives

475 So far, the application of five of the six principles of the ISO 9241-210 in the reviewed
476 articles has been discussed. Regarding the application of the last principle “The design team
477 includes multidisciplinary skills and perspectives” in the reviewed studies, this is where the
478 least evidence was reported. Although the standard does not define the need for broad
479 heterogeneity of the disciplines involved in the process, since it is designed to guide
480 processes of different natures, it is understood that disciplines from diverse fields are needed
481 to elicit and comprehend users’ needs and to address the system's requirements.

482 Multidisciplinary teams would not only allow dealing with the issues related to technology
483 but also those that have to do with the users’ functionality, and above all, it would facilitate
484 the mixed methodological approach.

485 As for the literature, in addition to designers and engineers, it is proposed in specific cases to
486 work with clinicians, health professionals or rehabilitation professionals and with
487 Commercial specialists [51-53].

488 From user centred to person centred

489 Literature addresses two streams of user-centred design, one in which the “user” is placed at
490 the centre of the design process and another, which focuses on the “person” [56]. The main
491 difference lies in the fact that the first considers the interaction between the user and the
492 product and “is concerned with ensuring that artifacts function as intended by the designers”.
493 While the latter also accounts for context-determined interactions and focuses on “enabling
494 many individual or cultural conceptions to unfold into uninterrupted interfaces with
495 technology.” Giacomini et al., add that products acquire meaning when used by persons, and
496 that it is the understanding of that meaning that should guide the design. In their words, “the
497 natural focus of questions, insights and activities is on the people for whom the product,
498 system or service is intended, rather than on the designer's personal creative process or on the
499 material and technological substrates of the artefact” [56]. We might say that most articles
500 followed the first trend (user-centred), while there is less evidence of the second
501 understanding (person-centred) when it comes to AT.

502 Conclusion

503 This review explores how well the principles of ISO 9241-210 are applied in the case of AT.
504 As for the implications, on the one hand, it highlights that the application of the UCD
505 approach is not standardised in the field of AT design for the visually impaired. Although
506 there is a standard that guides the implementation of the approach and has been thoroughly
507 reviewed by ISO experts, it has not been embraced in this field. On the other hand, there is

508 also a lack of methodological rigour in understanding the needs of users in their context,
509 revealing that people are not at the centre of the process in a generalised manner.
510 Furthermore, it is evident that the developments are carried out in a disarticulated manner, so
511 that recommendations made by international authorities on the subject, such as those given by
512 WHO in GREAT [7], are also disregarded.

513 Based on these findings, we emphasise the need to pay greater attention to the principle:
514 ‘Users are involved throughout the design and development’, meaningfully engaging with
515 users would lead to better identification of their needs and preferences. It shall also improve
516 the possibility to have better recruitment procedures, representative samples and more
517 representative and robust results.

518 Engaging with users will require a broad level of expertise and full implementation of ISO
519 9241-210 principle 5.7 ‘The design team includes multidisciplinary skills and perspectives’.
520 Transdisciplinarity could have reduced methodological flaws observed in the literature today.
521 Transdisciplinarity shall open the possibility of cross-fertilization between the different fields
522 of knowledge and in conjunction with people with visual impairments as potential direct
523 users and with their stakeholders. The application of this principle shall enable design teams
524 to include not only diverse classes of engineers, but also designers, health and rehabilitation
525 professionals, social scientists including disability scholars, anthropologists, and economists,
526 among others. Such teams shall be better equipped to develop and apply a range of
527 methodologies that understand the social, physiological, cultural and technological needs of
528 the target users and develop AT that responds to them. The strengthening of this last principle
529 of the standard would lead the work towards the consolidation of adequate methodologies to
530 gain a better understanding of how AT could enable visually impaired people to live the lives
531 they would like to live.

532 Design of AT should be focusing on enhancing the user's agency, bodily integrity, and
533 capabilities, and not trying to “fix disabled bodies”. Evidence collected suggests that
534 assistive technology has focused on functional deficiency solely, namely impairment rather
535 than in enhancing wellbeing for its users [6, 57]. The latter seems to be the prevalent
536 approach today as users are for the most part not meaningfully included in the design and
537 development and only call to test a final product that aims to provide a ‘solution’. “Nothing
538 About Us Without Us” should resonate with the design, development and implementation of
539 any technological development that concerns persons with disabilities.

References

1. Blind K, Von Laer M. Paving the path: drivers of standardization participation at ISO. *JTT*. 2022; 47: p. 1115–1134.
2. Thomas V, Remy C, Bates O. The limits of HCD: Reimagining the anthropocentricity of ISO 9241-210. *LIMITS '17 Workshop on Computing Within Limits*. 2017;: p. 85-92.
3. International Organization for Standardization. ISO 9241-210:2019. Part 210: Human-centred Design for Interactive Systems. In *Standardization IOF. ISO 9241: Ergonomics of Human-system Interaction.*; 2019.
4. Chammas A, Quaresma M, Mont'Alvão C. A closer look on the user centred design. *Procedia Manuf*. 2015; 3: p. 5397-5404.
5. Magnier C, Thomann G, Villeneuve F, Zwolinsk P. Investigation of methods for the design of assistive device: UCD and medical tools. In *IDMME_P30; 2010; Bordeaux, France*. p. 5397-5404.
6. ChavarriaVaron, MA, Mugeere A, Schönenberger K, Hurst S, Rivas-Velarde M, havarria, M. A., Mugeere, A. Design approaches for creating person centered, context sensitive, and sustainable assistive technology with the Global South. In Stein MA, Lazar J. *Accessible Technology and the Developing World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2021. p. 248-268.
7. World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). *Global report on assistive technology*. Geneva; 2022.
8. Stein M, Lazar J. *Accessible Technology and the Developing World*. Stein M, Lazar J, editors. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2021.
9. World Health Organization (WHO). *World report on vision*. Geneva: World Health Organization, Department of Noncommunicable Diseases; 2019. Report No.: WHO/NMH/NVI/19.12.
10. Banerjee T. Assessment of the impact of ISO Standards – a study of Chinese firms. *JETIR*. 2020; 7(9).
11. Martincic CJ. *A Brief History of ISO*. University of Pittsburgh. [Internet]. [Online].; 1997 [cited 2022 07]. Available from: <http://www.sis.pitt.edu/mbclass/standards/martincic/isohistr.htm>.
12. Ferguson W. Impact of the ISO 9000 Series Standards on Industrial Marketing. *Ind. Mark. Manag*. 1996; 25: p. 305-310.
13. Martincus CV, Castresana S, Castagnino T. ISO standards: A certificate to expand exports? Firm-level evidence from Argentina. *Rev. Int. Econ*. 2010; 18(5): p. 896-912.
14. International Organization for Standardization. ISO 9241-11:2018. Part 11: Usability: Definitions and concepts. In *Standardization IOF, editor. ISO 9241: Ergonomics of human-system interaction*. Geneva.
15. Blind K. The impact of standardisation and standards on innovation. In *Publishing EE, editor. Handbook of innovation policy impact.*; 2016. p. 423-449.
16. International Organization for Standardization. *Economic Benefits of Standards: International Case Studies*. 1st ed. Geneva; 2011.
17. International Organization for Standardization. *Economic Benefits of Standards: International Case Studies*. 2nd ed. Geneva; 2012.
18. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffman TC, Murlow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Syst Rev*. 2021; 10(89).

19. Hawker S, Payne S, Kerre C, Hardey M, Powell J. Appraising the evidence: reviewing disparate data systematically.. *Qual. Health Res.* 2002 Nov; 12(9).
20. Lorenc T, Petticrew M, Whitehead M, Neary D, Clayton S, Wright K, et al. Crime Fear of Crime and Mental Health: Synthesis of Theory and Systematic Reviews of Interventions and Qualitative Evidence. *Public Health Research.* 2014 Mar; 2(2).
21. Conradie PD, De Marez L, Saldien J. Participation is blind: Involving low vision lead users in product development. *Procedia Comput. Sci.* 2015; 67: p. 48-56.
22. International Organization for Standardization. ISO 9999:2016. Assistive products for persons with disability—classification and terminology. Geneva: International Organization for Standardization; 2016.
23. Façanha AR, Araújo MC, Viana W, Sánchez J. Design and evaluation of mobile sensing technologies for identifying medicines by people with visual disabilities. *Int. J. Pervasive Comput. Commun.* 2019; 15(3/4): p. 121-143.
24. Ntakolia C, Dimas G, Lakovidis DK. User-centered system design for assisted navigation of visually impaired individuals in outdoor cultural environments.. *Univers Access Inf Soc.* 2020;: p. 1-26.
25. Mattheiss E, Regal G, Sellitsch D, Tscheligi M. User-centred design with visually impaired pupils: A case study of a game editor for orientation and mobility training. *Int. J. Child-Comput. Interact.* 2017; 11: p. 12-18.
26. Sánchez J. Development of navigation skills through audio haptic videogaming in learners who are blind. *Procedia Comput. Sci.* 2012; 14: p. 102-110.
27. Nimmolrat A, Khuwuthyakorn P, Wientong P, Thinnukool O. Pharmaceutical mobile application for visually-impaired people in Thailand: development and implementation. *BMC Medical Inform. Decis. Mak.* 2021; 21(1): p. 1-19.
28. Yeh FH, Yang CC. Assisting the visually impaired to deal with telephone interview jobs using information and commutation technology. *Res Dev Disabil.* 2014 Dec; 35(12): p. 3462-3468.
29. Cheverst K, Clarke K, Dewsbury G, Hemmings T, Kember S, Rodden T, et al. Cheverst K, Clarke K, Dewsbury G, Hemmings T, Kember S, Rodden T, et al. Designing assistive technologies for medication regimes in care settings. *Univers Access Inf Soc.* 2003; 2(3): p. 235–242.
30. Nielsen J. Heuristic evaluation. In Nielsen J, Mack RL, editors. *Usability inspection methods.* New York: Wiley; 1994.
31. Façanha AR, Darin T, Viana W, Sánchez J. O&M Indoor Virtual Environments for People Who Are Blind: A Systematic Literature Review. *ACM Trans. Access. Comput.* 2020 June; 13(2): p. 1-42.
32. Hakobyan L, Lumsden J, O’Sullivan D, Bartlett H. Mobile assistive technologies for the visually impaired. *Surv. Ophthalmol.* 2013; 58(6): p. 513-528.
33. Mascetti S, Picinali L, Gerino A, Ahmetovic D, Bernareggi C. Sonification of guidance data during road crossing for people with visual impairments or blindness. *Int. J. Hum. Comput. Stud.* 2016; 85: p. 16-26.
34. Najjar AB, Al-Issa AR, Hosny M. Dynamic indoor path planning for the visually impaired. *J. King Saud Univ. - Comput. Inf. Sci.* 2022 ;: p. 1319-1578.
35. Connors E, Chrastil E, Sánchez J, Merabet L. Action video game play and transfer of navigation and spatial cognition skills in adolescents who are blind. ; 8, 133. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 2014; 8(133).

36. Al-Razgan M, Almoaiqel S, Alrajhi N, Alhumeigani A, Alshehri A, Alnefaie B. A systematic literature review on the usability of mobile applications for visually impaired users. *PeerJ Comput. Sci.* 2021; 7(e771).
37. Aziz N, Mutalib AA, Sarif SM. User experience of interactive Assistive Courseware for Low Vision learners (AC4LV): Initial round.. *TEM J.* 2017; 6(3).
38. Bateman A, Zhao OK, Bajcsy AV, Jennings MC, Toth BN, Cohen AJ, et al. A user-centered design and analysis of an electrostatic haptic touchscreen system for students with visual impairments. *Int. J. Hum. Comput. Stud.* 2018; 109: p. 102-111.
39. Colley M, Walch M, Gugenheimer J, Askari A, Ruzkio E. Towards inclusive external communication of autonomous vehicles for pedestrians with vision impairments. *Proc SIGCHI Conf Hum Factor Comput Syst.* 2020;: p. 1-14.
40. Fidyka A, Matamala A. Audio description in 360° videos: Results from focus groups in Barcelona and Kraków. *Transl. Spaces(Neth.)*. 2018; 7(2): p. 285-303.
41. Shi L, Lawson H, Zhang Z, Azenkot S. Designing interactive 3D printed models with teachers of the visually impaired. In ; 2019. p. 1-14.
42. Doush IA, Pontelli E. Non-visual navigation of spreadsheets. *Total Qual. Manag. Bus. Excell.* 2013; 12(2): p. 143-159.
43. Adebisi A, Sorrentino p, Bohlool S, Zhang C, Arditti M, Goodrich G, et al. Assessment of feedback modalities for wearable visual aids in blind mobility. *PLOS ONE.* 2017; 12(2).
44. Giraud S, Thérouanne P, Steiner DD. Web accessibility: Filtering redundant and irrelevant information improves website usability for blind users. *Int. J. Hum. Comput. Stud.* 2018;(111): p. 23-35.
45. Lopes SI, Vieira JM, Lopes OF, Rosa PR, Dias NA. MobiFree: a set of electronic mobility aids for the blind. *Procedia Comput. Sci.* 2012; 14: p. 10-19.
46. Mascetti S, Ahmetovic D, Gerino A, Bernareggi C, Busso M, Rizzi A. Robust traffic lights detection on mobile devices for pedestrians with visual impairment. *Comput. Vis. Image Underst.* 2016; 148: p. 123-135.
47. Kammoun S, Parsehian G, Gutierrez O, Brilhault A, Serpa A, Raynal M, et al. Navigation and space perception assistance for the visually impaired: The NAVIG project. *IRBM.* 2012; 33(2): p. 182-189.
48. Lee K, Hong J, Jarjue E, Mensah EE, Kacorri H. From the lab to people's home: lessons from accessing blind participants' interactions via smart glasses in remote studies. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Web for All Conference*; 2022. p. 1-11.
49. Younis O, Al-Nuaimy W, Rowe F, Alomari M. A smart context-aware hazard attention system to help people with peripheral vision loss. *Sensors.* 2019; 19(7).
50. Feiz S, Borodin A, Bi X, Ramakrishnan IV. Towards Enabling Blind People to Fill Out Paper Forms with a Wearable Smartphone Assistant. *Proc. - Graph. Interface.* 2021.
51. Real S, Araujo A. Navigation systems for the blind and visually impaired: Past work, challenges, and open problems. *J. Sens.* 2019; 19(15).
52. Blackburn SJ, Cudd PA. A discussion of systematic user requirements gathering from a population who require assistive technology. *Technol Disabil.* 2012; 24(3): p. 193-204.
53. International Organization for Standardization. *ISO 9001:2015 Quality management systems - Requirements.* 5th ed. Geneva: ISO; 2015.
54. GHTF Study Group 3. *Quality Management Systems - Process Validation Guidance.* The Global Harmonization Task Force (GHTF); 2004.

55. Project Management Institute (PMI) Standard. A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK Guide). 4th ed.; 2011.
56. Giacomini. What is Human Centred Design? Des. J. 2014; 17(4): p. 606-623.
57. Verlager A. Decloaking disability: images of disability and technology in science fiction media M.Sc. Thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; 2006.

Supporting information

S1. PROSPERO PROTOCOL


S2. PRISMA 2020 Checklist

S3. Quality assessment for the studies

Fig 1. Prisma flow diagram

Table 2. Data extraction regarding the implementation of user-centred design standards on assistive technology for persons with visual impairments

Fig 1. Prisma flow diagram



Adapted from: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71

Fig 1. PRISMA flow diagram for eligible article identification