# SERIOUS GAMES: AN UPDATED SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW \*

Shuja Ud Din Faculty of Computing Riphah International University Islamabad, Pakistan qazi.shujauddin@riphah.edu.pk Muhammad Zeeshan Baig Academy of Interactive Entertainment (AIE) Institute Sydney, Australia Zeeshan.baig@aieinstitute.edu.au

Muhammad Khateeb Khan Faculty of Computing IQRA University Islamabad Campus (IUIC) Pakistan muhammad.khateeb@iqraisb.edu.pk

#### ABSTRACT

Serious games are simulation software designed to assist people in learning the practical concepts of various application fields such as Health, wellness, Education and Culture. People improve their individual knowledge, skills and attitude through training. This study identified the changing trends with existing studied applications, approaches and methods. We collected 37 papers from Google Scholar, Elsevier, Springer, IEEE Xplore and ACM Digital library. We have collected the evidence answer to six research questions and analyzed the result and identify the change in trends with the comparison with previous systematic literature review (SLR) results. We achieved the best results by techniques(questionnaires and interviews) and procedure (pre/post). Our findings will be useful for practitioners and researchers who can test serious games in different fields.

Keywords Serious Games · Evaluation · Game-Based Learning · Learning Analytics

# **1** Introduction and Motivation

[1] Introduced the concept of serious games. Serious games consider only the educational intent, not the amusement aspect. Initially, serious games were based on card and board games. Now, it's becoming the trending technique that refers to forms of video game-based learning and training in various fields, including marketing, military, medicine, business, and education. Serious games utilize formal and informal techniques and focus on all-ages audiences [2]. Serious games are developed for learning in a sterile environment, different from simulation, training, learning, testing, and diagnostics. Nowadays, serious games are used in healthcare, communication, defense, education, culture, and politics.

Serious games are active and entertaining learning environments developed for various digital platforms such as computers and smartphones. Learning in serious games mostly takes place through gameplay, where learners must complete the challenges using their in-game skills. Subjective experiences which seek the skills of learners are defined as Challenges. The challenges include the learner cooperating, competing, experimenting, and exploring with other learners. DE U (Usability), DE C (Cognitive behavior), and DE P (Playability) are the common combinations of design elements (DEs) and challenges used in serious games [3].

Serious games are designed purely for learning purposes. It provides learning assistance in many domains, such as health, wellness, support, social, education, professional learning, and training. This research gathers information about

<sup>\*</sup> Citation: Authors. Title. Pages.... DOI:000000/11111.

serious games to find the answers to research questions related to the development, implementation, evaluation, and application of serious games. We have performed a literature review highlighting current research trends in serious games.

The objective of this study is as follows:

- Classify the application areas where there have been significant evaluations of the games.
- Find out different types of assessment tests used for serious games
- Collect and evaluate current processes, approaches, and strategies for analyzing serious games.
- Identify and analyze the latest trends and research in serious games [4].

# 2 Related Work

Serious games are simulations designed to assist people in learning practical concepts through training. It has been used in health, wellness, education, and culture to improve knowledge, skills, and attitude. Numerous studies have shown the effectiveness of Serious games in improving the skills and attitudes of individuals. In this paper, we presented an analysis of the various aspect of Serious games in terms of usability, effectiveness, and applicability.

McCallum and Boletsis [5] published a study that described dementia disease and its symptoms (Alzheimer's disease (AD) and Mild Cognitive Impairment (MCI)). For this purpose, they gathered the Serious games related to dementia disease and its symptoms, i.e., Smart Brain Games, Big Brain, Wii Fit, Academy Lumosity, and Wii Sports. These Serious games were totally about dementia disease, which was uncharted. Furthermore, the researchers performed a literature review to gather games and conducted an evaluation test on patients with dementia to determine the effect of transferable and long-lasting daily activities.

Drummond et al. [6] performed a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) of serious games articles to guide the public and patients about asthma. They evaluated the results on the patient's behavior, knowledge, and clinical outcomes about asthma. Furthermore, the SLR was performed from March 1980 to December 2015 and selected 12 articles related to Serious games about asthma education from online databases, i.e., Web of Science, Embase, Cochrane Library, Psych Info, and PubMed Science. They have selected 12 studies and ten Serious games for the analysis and eight serious games out of ten related to children with asthma. The majority of the Serious games were related to improving the satisfaction level and knowledge of asthma in children. Some studies assess serious games used for asthma education to improve patients' and children's satisfaction and knowledge have less or no improvement in clinical results and behaviors.

A systematic literature review on usability evaluation methods of serious games has been performed by Gomez et al. [7]. For this reason, the six research questions answered related to the evaluation of usability methods. Furthermore, the researchers selected 187 articles from various online databases such as IEEE-Xplore, ACM Library, and ISI Web of Knowledge. The conclusion of this SLR was a usability evaluation of these Serious games and explained the application of focal trends.

The study in [8] performed a systematic analysis of the literature on Serious games and computer games. The aim is to analyze the positive impact of Serious games on teenagers above 14 years old in learning, skills development, and interaction. The author selected 129 papers from different online databases, including ASSIA, Science Direct, Biomed Central, and ACM. The analyses on these games had positive learning outcomes and highlighted difficulties in learning outcomes. Similarly, the study motivates the students to use these games to improve their skills and knowledge.

In another study, Wang et al. [9] performed a systematic analysis of the literature under the PRISMA guideline. The research aim was to identify the current trends of Serious games in the training of health care professionals, especially games that mainly show game assessment and developmental methodologies. Furthermore, the researchers selected about 48 articles in different online databases such as Cochrane, EMBAE, and PubMed, from December 2007 to 2014. In 48 papers, the study identified 42 unique serious games. The study concluded that serious games are widely used in health care training and obtain several learning objectives.

The study [10] performed a systematic review of the literature about serious game usage in science education from 2016 to 2020. For this purpose, 39 articles included in electronic databases Web of Sciences targeted list journal and conference are Arts & Humanities Citation Index (A& HCI), Science Citation Index-Expanded (SCI-Expanded) and Social Science Citation Index (SSCI).

The study [11] performed a systematic review of the literature on serious games in the area of Business Process Management (BPM). The research objective was to analyze and explain the 15 BPM games based on their learning

objectives, aesthetics, technologies, and mechanics. For this purpose, 15 papers are extracted and included from the electronic databases Scopus and Web of Sciences from 2000 to 2020.

A study similar to [4] performed a systematic review of the literature on the assessment of serious games. The research objective is to evaluate serious games through different domains, methods, approaches, and assessment methods. Furthermore, the author selected 102 articles from various online databases to answer the six research questions. The study concluded that answering six research questions had identified different application areas, serious game types, procedures, quality attributes, and methods for assessing Serious games.

# 3 Methodology

## 3.0.1 Protocol

The systemic literature review process includes defining, reviewing, and analyzing all existing reteach on the specific research area, topic, or subject. The extracted articles, in systematic literature, were named primary studies, and systematic evaluation is a type of secondary research [12].

This research was carried out as a systematic analysis of literature based on initial guiding principles suggested by [13] which are one of the most commonly known and generally recognized in software engineering. The proposed guidelines have 3 stages which define below:

Sr. No	Stages Name	Steps in each stage
1	Planning the review	1. Identification of the need for SLR
		2. Developing protocol
		3. Validate protocol
2	Conducting the review	1. Identification of research
		2. Selection of primary studies
		3. Study quality assessment
		4. Data extraction and monitoring
		5. Data Synthesis
3	Reporting the Review	1. Specifying mechanisms of dissemination
		2. Formatting the main report
		3. Evaluating the Report

Table 1: Proposed Guideline Stages

# 3.1 Research questions

To accomplish the research objectives, six research questions were established. These questions help to gather all the details necessary to assess the various evaluations. The addressed research questions in this research are:

- RQ1: What are the application domains in which serious games have been assessed?
- RQ2: What are the types of serious games that have been assessed within the former domains?
- RQ3: What methods, techniques, and quality models have been used to assess these serious games?
- RQ4: What are the characteristics of the quality models that have been assessed?
- RQ5: How the evaluation models, techniques, or methods are applied to assess a serious game?
- RQ6: What is the size of the population involved in the existing assessment experiences of the serious games?

The above-mentioned research questions can be categorized into two areas of interest. RQ1 and RQ2 are used to evaluate the series of games and their involved features. These questions highlighted the application domain, knowledge area, and the type of serious games which were assessed by the various evaluation methods.

In comparison RQ3, 4, 5, and 6 concentrate on the techniques of assessment and its features. To answer research question 3 we studied the assessment processes used to test serious games and we examine the models or structures underlying these processes. For RQ4, we examined the various characteristics evaluated by researchers in their reviews of serious games. About RQ5, we defined the techniques followed by researchers in an assessment period of serious games. Finally, RQ6 indicates the population size that participates in the serious games assessment session [8].

# 3.2 Search Strategy

The search strategy's goal is to classify the primary studies. A systematic review has been conducted to answer the above-mentioned research questions.

Next, we have considered the search keywords. Therefore, generic terms were used to ensure that many of the related scholarly articles were included in the study. "Serious game" and "Evaluation" were the key search words. The following search string was developed and mentions the step in Kitchenham et al. [13].

- Keywords had extracted from the queries by defining the core concepts.
- Classify keywords with different synonyms and spellings.
- Review the keywords that we have in any related articles.
- Boolean OR use to include different spelling and synonyms
- To connect keywords using Boolean AND.

We did some primary searches to test the search string and refined it. The resulting search strings had accompanied by the Boolean expression "(A1 OR A2 OR A3) AND (B1 OR (B2 AND (C1 OR C2 OR C3)))" following table again represented the search keywords [8].

A1. Evaluation	B1. Serious Game	C1. Education
A2. Validation	B2. Simulation Game	C2. Teaching
A3. Assessment		C3. Training

Table 2: Search Keyword	Table	2:	Search	Keyword
-------------------------	-------	----	--------	---------

The search had carried out in online databases which were: IEEE Xplore, Science Direct (Elsevier), Springer Link, Google Scholar, and ACM Digital Library. The tool which we have used to gather search information is MS Excel.

#### 3.3 Criteria of inclusion and exclusion and study selection

**Stage 1:** Initially, we selected the research articles by analyzing the title and abstract of every research article found by the search string. Each paper's title and abstract were studied according to the inclusion and exclusion criterion where we excluded the irrelevant papers. Throughout this selection process step, the identified research papers were marked as Non-Selected or Selected papers.

**Stage 2:** The research papers which were selected in stage 1 were further filtered out after the complete analysis of each paper. We observed the papers were relevant to "serious games" but unable to answer the defined research questions. We excluded all these papers and considered only such studies which were able to provide the answer to every research question. The complete detail of followed inclusion and exclusion criteria is mentioned in the subsequent section.

Inclusion criteria	1 Select the articles which depict techniques, models, or strategies to assess the serious
	games.
	2 Papers that describe the evaluation procedure of serious games.
	3 Papers show case studies with relevant applications to evaluate the techniques, models,
	or strategies for serious games.
Exclusion criteria	1 Research whose primary aim is not to assess methods for serious games.
	2 Papers that indicate a serious game, and don't include detail on its evaluation.
	3 Articles that show the findings of evaluating a serious game but don't provide any
	detail about the methodology used for assessment.
	4 Not included those articles whose models of evaluation are out from the perspective
	of serious games.
	5 Publications are excluded if only the abstract is available but not the complete text.
	6 The article which is written in other languages except English will be omitted.
	7 Identical articles (same document taken from various databases).
	8 Identical documents of the same study (In the research, the most reliable version of
	the report was used because various copies of the report occur in separate databases).

Table 3: Inc	lusion/Exc	clusion	criteria

## 3.4 Quality Assessment

During the data extraction process, the quality of each paper was evaluated. For each relevant paper, a questionnaire was filled out, which was defined as a quality instrument. The questionnaire of the assessment contains nine questions of quality assessment (QA) which consist of two parts. The first part contains questions to find the paper quality about the main topic of the literature (QA1-QA4) whereas; the objective of the second part is to find the quality of paper information to know about the paper's relevance with SLR (QA5-QA9). The nine quality assessment (QA) questions that have been used are described as follows:

- Q1. Does the article demonstrate a method of evaluation?
- Q2. Does the article reveal details regarding the technique used for evaluation?
- Q3. Does the article provide model information that supports the method of evaluation?
- Q4. Is the article using examples to illustrate the application of the assessment method?
- Q5. Is the paper requiring the relevant details to be found to address RQ1?
- Q6. Does the article require RQ4 to be answered?
- Q7. Is the article require the necessary details to address RQ5?
- Q8. Is the article enabling the correct details to satisfy RQ6?
- Q9. Is the article allowing the relevant information to address in RQ2?



Figure 1: Quality assessment Percentage score

Figure 1 indicates the percentage for quality evaluation. We have included 37 papers in the synthesis process in the primary study, whose quality assessment score was equal to or greater than 5. We have implemented the third step and concluded 194 articles. We applied a quality assurance method in that step, and articles that scored less than 5 were left out.

# 4 **Results**

#### 4.1 Selection Process

As the screening process started shown in Fig 2 and found a total of 1165 research articles from different electronic databases. Our process was completed at two different levels, in our first phase we removed the duplicate articles and shortlisted 824 articles for further processing. In the next level, we studied the title and the abstract of each article and based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria selected only 194 articles that satisfy the criteria. We studied the selected articles in detail and finally, we shortlisted 37 articles that have prominent relevancy and closeness to the required criteria based on QA score.

# 4.2 Discussions

#### RQ1. What are the application areas where serious games were evaluated?

We identified six major application areas by applying the inclusion and exclusion criteria of 37 selected papers to answer this question. The detailed information on the above application areas is given in Table (5).



Figure 2: Selected Primary Studies from Online Databases

Categories	Definitions	Primary Studies
Culture	This domain covers serious games for cultural train-	[14]
	ing [4] [14].	
Health and Wellness	Created these serious games include application	[15, 16, 17, 18,
	domain related to improving the quality of health	19, 20, 21, 22, 23,
	life of the people and sharing good habit knowl-	24, 25]
	edge during their everyday life [4].	
Education	This application category contains serious games	[26, 27, 28, 29,
	for teaching, supporting, evaluating, and inspiring	30, 31, 32, 33, 34,
	students, and awareness in various areas of formal	35, 36, 37, 38, 39,
	education [4].	40, 41, 42, 43, 44,
		45, 46]
Support	Developed the application field involves serious	[47]
	games that encourage and assist people in decision-	
	taking in life [4].	
Professional learning	This application area involve serious games that	[48]
and training	have been used to train and teach their workers in	
	companies [4].	
Social	This area of application has been involved in seri-	[49, 50]
	ous games for training social skills [4].	

Table 4: Categories of Application fields

Fig (3) showed the comparison with the previous SLR [4]. In [4] education domain was depicted as the most prominent and top domain which assessed serious games. Similarly, the education domain remained at the top in our new findings, as given in Fig (3). Health and Wellness have remained the 2nd top category in our old and newly conducted literature review. Few serious games are evaluated n the domain of social and cultural categories in both our old and latest SLR results. We found a few serious games in the categories of professional learning and training in our new findings, it was the 4th highest category among all six categories in old SLR [4] results.

# RQ2. What kinds of serious games were evaluated within the prior domains?

To evaluate the question, we identified 8 major types of serious games by applying inclusion and exclusion criteria to 37 selected articles and the results are given in Table (5).

Results of a previous SLR [4] are presented in Fig (4), where game types evaluate all serious games. According to the results, "Computer Games" is categorized as the highest game type, whereas it lies at the top second place according to the current study. "Virtual World Games (3D)" have emerged as the most assessed game type in serious games. According to our research findings, such games are beneficial in learning the concepts of respective domains. Previously, "Virtual World Games (3D)" was a newborn game type in serious games and very few studies were available that evaluated this type. Similarly, "Video Games" is found to be the 3rd highest game type that was previously not that



Figure 3: Comparison Results RQ1 with Old Findings

Types of	Definitions	Primary
games		Studies
Computer	Developed serious games as software for comput-	[14, 15, 26,
games	ers [4].	31, 19, 20, 36,
		22, 24, 25]
Virtual worlds	Created serious games as a virtual 3D interactive	[16, 32, 17,
	environment.	48, 39, 49, 50,
		42, 43, 45, 46]
Lego-based	Serious games are created as computer software	[27]
Games	which utilizes as a part of the game Lego construc-	
	tion toys [4].	
Video games	Serious games playable on certain platforms, such	[29, 18, 33,
	as consoles for video games (Xbox, PlayStation,	34, 23, 38, 40]
	etc.) [4].	
Board game	Created serious games as a board game [4].	[30, 32]
Web-based	Created serious games as a web app [4].	[35, 37, 44]
game		
Mobile game	Created serious game as a mobile app [4].	[21, 41]
MMORPG	Serious games created as Online Role-Playing Mas-	No study
	sively Multiplayer game [4].	found.

 Table 5: Types of Serious Games

popular in serious games, and very few studies were found that evaluated this game type as shown in Fig (5). On further review, the serious games (Lego-based and MMORPG types) were few in number in previously conducted SLR while in the updated SLR there was no evidence of such game types.

# **RQ3.** Which quality model, approaches, strategies, techniques, or methods were used in evaluating these serious games?

We identified the quality model, approaches, and techniques to evaluate the serious games to analyze the above question. The table (7) describes the approaches and techniques to assess serious games in both previous SLR and new findings. Fig (5) shows the trends and evaluation models or approaches used to assess serious games. Questioners' and frameworks had been the top method for evaluating serious games. In previous SLR results, "questioners" was the topmost evaluation method to assess the most serious games, whereas only one research study used the "framework" evaluation method to evaluate the serious games. The evaluation methods named ("Evaluation and Tanning," "Experimental," "Thermography," "Cognitive Skills," "Tests," and "User experiences,") were new approaches identified in the current SLR whereas previous studies have found no result in these evaluation models which have been shown in Fig (5). The evaluation model named "Logos," "discussions," and "other methods" these approaches had been identified in previous findings, whereas found no result in the updated SLR.

# RQ4 What are the qualitative attributes that were evaluated?



Figure 4: Comparison Results RQ2 with Old Findings

Technique	Definition	Primary
		Studies
Frameworks	The procedure utilizes a set of methods and steps	[14, 27, 29,
	that the authors have described evaluating the seri-	18, 33, 34, 36,
	ous game [4].	47, 37, 40, 41]
Questionnaires	The procedure follows question forms to evaluate	[28, 35, 48,
	the serious game [4].	23, 38, 39, 25,
		50, 24, 44, 45,
		16]
Observations	The approach is focused on observing the meeting	[46]
	progress to evaluate the serious game [4].	
Audio/Videos	The method uses audio, and video feedback from	[43, 24]
Feedback	experts to evaluate the serious game [4].	
Tests	The method used to perform tests to assess the	[20, 49]
	serious games.	
Evaluation	The method uses evaluation.	[15]
and Training		

Table 6: Assessment Techniques



Figure 5: Comparison Results RQ3 with Old Findings

In, RQ4 discusses the software quality attribute to evaluate the. Serious games. The quality attributes are those attributes that measure how well serious games have been designed. The purpose of the research question is to determine the quality attributes that the researchers have taken into the record to assess their serious games and found 13 different quality attributes to analyze serious games as given in Table (??).

Quality attributes	Definition	Primary
		Studies
Game design	Design serious games, also making aesthetic of	[14, 15]
	serious games [4].	
Performance	To measure the performance of the serious game	[15, 20, 34,
	[4].	48, 24, 44]
Learning outcomes	What the learners should think as a consequence	[26, 39]
	of playing a serious game [4].	
User interface	The user's interaction with serious game.	[16]
Usability	Serious games assess how easy the user interface	[27, 33, 21,
	is to use.	22, 23, 38, 25,
		42]
User's satisfaction	User attitude to the serious game [4].	[28]
Cognitive behavior	The potential of the serious game to create cogni-	[30, 18, 19]
	tive effects on users' behavior.	
The user's experience	The emotion, attitude, and actions of the user are	[31]
	using the serious game.	
Efficacy	The serious game ability to deliver the desired re-	[32, 17, 36,
	sult.	47]
Learning Efficacy	The serious game ability to consider the robust-	[35, 49, 45,
	ness of the study evidence in support of enhanced	46]
	student performance by implementing a particular	
	teaching technique.	
Learnability	Measures how rapidly and easily users learn the	[38]
	basic functionality of serious games.	
Pedagogical aspects	Educational features of the serious games [4].	[41, 43]
Playability	The serious game ability to being played [4].	[50]

Table 7: Quality Attributes

As shown in Fig (6) the comparison of quality attributes with the previous SLR [4] results. In updated results, most of the serious games have identified quality attributes usability while in the previous results [4] usability was the second-highest category. In the previous result, most studies used the quality attributes named learning outcomes to evaluate serious games. The quality attribute named Performance, Efficacy, Game Design, User Interface, user satisfaction, user experiences, pedagogical aspects, and Learning efficacy were evaluated in different serious games domain in new findings. There were few amounts of quality attributes mentioned in previous studies.



Figure 6: Comparison Results RQ4 with Old Findings

**RQ5 How are the assessment methods, techniques, or modes used for evaluating a serious game?** In response to the above question, we have found various stages to accomplish serious game assessments. We identified the 15 types of procedures in this study to evaluate the serious games as shown in Table (8).

Duo oo duuuo	During any Chardian
Procedure	Primary Studies
Pre-Test Question-	[17, 38]
naire	
Pre/Post	[15, 26, 16, 30, 17, 20, 47, 48, 22,
	37, 50, 42, 43, 46, 36]
Usability Testing	[31, 28, 32]
End User Testing	[29]
Post-Hoc Tests	[32, 33]
Preliminary Tests	[18]
Experimental Test	[19, 34]
Mann-Whitney	[35]
TESTS	
User Testing	[21]
Shapiro–Wilk test	[21].
Post-Test	[49]
Five Dimension	[27]
Evaluation Frame-	
work	

All evaluation models were applied to evaluate the serious game as given in Fig (7). In previous SLRs Simple, Pre/Post, and Pre/Post/Post approaches were used to assess the serious games while in the current SLR Pre/Post approach was used to assess the serious games. A Simple technique commonly used to evaluate serious games was the highest category in previous findings. Pre/Post was the 2nd highest category in the old result, and almost 40 percent of the studies used the approach to evaluate the serious game. In new SLR results, 48% of the research articles used Pre/Post to analyze serious games and while the rest of 52% was analyzed through newly identified methods as shown in Fig(7).



Figure 7: Comparison Results RQ5 with Old Findings

#### RQ6. What is the population size involved in the serious game's existing evaluation experiences?

To analyze this question, we found the size of the participant groups involved in evaluating the serious game. We identified these groups after analyzing procedures, techniques, and quality characteristics assessed in the primary studies. In the analysis of primary studies, 70 % of the population size is less than or equal to 50 people, and 5% of the population size consists of greater than 50 or less than 100 people. The remaining populations are shown in Table(9).

Range	Primary Studies
[1,10]	[17, 38][29], [43]
Pre/Post	[15, 17, 18, 19, 33, 22, 25, 41]
[11,20]	[27, 29, 30, 47, 49]
[21,30]	[14, 32, 21, <b>?</b> , 50, 46]
[31,40]	[26, 28, 31, 35, 39, 24, 46]
[41,50]	[20, 34, 36, 43][32], [34], [36], [52]
[61,70]	[45]
[101,110]	[48]
[151,160]	[37]
[361,370]	[40]
[801,810]	[44]

Table 9: Population ranges identified in Primary research.



Figure 8: Distribution of population size range

<b>m</b> 1 1 1 0	<b>a</b> 1	· GID 1	
Table 10:	Gap between	previous SLR and	current research

Referen	ceOnline	Problem Discussion	Achievements	Limitations
	Database			
	Name			
[5]	Google Scholar, IEEE Xplore, ACM Digital Library, Sci- enceDirect, Springer Link	The paper addressed de- mentia disease and its symptoms (Mild Cogni- tive impairment (MCI) and Alzheimer's disease (AD)). And later on, this paper gathered serious games related to demen- tia disease and its symp-	This review listed those serious games related to dementia disease and its symptoms, i.e. Mild Cognitive impairment (MCI) and Alzheimer's disease (AD). After that, the paper concluded that seri- ous games related to dementia affect cognitively impaired people.	The only two Symp- toms of dementia disease (Mild Cognitive impair- ment (MCI) and Alzheimer's disease (AD)) have been discussed, and gather only those serious
		toms, i.e. Wii sports,		games related to that
		Wii fit, Big Brain, and		disease.
		Academy Lumosity.		

ReferenceOnline		Problem Discussion	Achievements	Limitations
	Database Name			
[6]	Web of Sci- ence, Embase, Cochrane Library, Psych Info, and PubMed Science.	In this systemic review, collect those papers re- lated to serious games that can educate the pub- lic about asthma and eval- uate their result on clin- ical outcomes, behavior, and patients' knowledge.	This paper includes those research articles on serious games. All ex- tracted serious games were designed to educate asthma patients and the general public. Furthermore, ex- tracted 12 articles and a total of ten serious games. All the games were related to children with asthma. Moreover, the article evaluates the result of clinical outcomes, behavior, and patients' knowledge linked with asthma.	The limitation of this research is that they include only those articles and extract those serious games dealing with asthma patients related to children and educate the general public based on this result. Second, the study in- cludes only 12 ar- ticles and ten seri- ous games, which is significantly fewer in numbers.
[7]	IEEE-Xplore, ACM Library, and ISI Web of Knowledge	This paper has performed the usability evaluation method of serious games.	This paper gathered all possible us- ability evaluation methods to as- sess serious games (Video games). This research concludes that the re- searcher covers those serious games used for academic purposes and evaluates the usability of serious games. As a result, they do not in- clude games for industrial experts. In the future, we will add more de- mographics to the current results to show a better picture of usability evaluation in serious games.	The main Limitation of this research has been assessed qual- ity attributes (Usabil- ity) in serious games. And only covers seri- ous games type video games. Research should include more serious game types like mobile games and computer games to test usability eval- uation. Also, have one or two more qual- ity attributes, like aes- thetics, used in seri- ous games.
[8]	BioMed Cen- tral, ACM, EBSCO, SocINDEX, information technology and social sci- ence, ERIC, Emerald and IEEE, Infotrac, Cambridge Journals Online	The problem discussed in this paper was about the positive impact of se- rious games on the age group of 14 years and above. For this purpose, check these aspects, i.e. skills, learning, engage- ment, and enhancement, and analyze the posi- tive outcomes of men- tioned aspects through se- rious games and com- puter games.	The achievement of this research was the serious game type of com- puter games impact player knowl- edge accusation, motivational out- comes, and content understanding. It's a great achievement. The par- ticipant in the game is above 14, which means teenagers and most undergraduate students player of the game. And these outcomes were good enough according to the player's age and current knowledge.	The main limitation of this research is that it is mostly focused on serious games type computer games. Nowadays, most serious games shift towards mobile games because a player can easily carry the device without paying extra money to play the game. So, the future investigates this problem by changing the serious game type.

# Table 10: Gap between previous SLR and current research

ReferenceOnline		Problem Discussion	Achievements	Limitations
	Database			
	Name			
[9]	Database       Name       Cochrane,       PubMed,       EMBASE	This research examined the serious game's im- pact on health care train- ing	Further investigating, the research gathered 48 serious games from the literature. In 48 serious games, 42 were unique. The serious games answered five research questions. Healthcare field, serious game name, learning goals, Genre of game, the technical resources used in the game, and availability of the game means online or offline. The research covered a vast area of health care like Surgery, Radiology, Nursing, urology, Pediatrics, etc. The sec- ond research question found the re- search game's name, and the third mentioned the learning goals of the games. The answer to the third research question depended on the field of the game. The fourth ques- tion listed the technical resources or technology used in serious games. The 5th question checks the avail- ability of the game online or offline. The research was extensive and cov- ered most of the healthcare fields. The most important thing is that the	Moreover, the re- search covered a vast area of serious games and assessment of serious games. In every research area, there is a chance for improvement. This research covers mainly health care serious games type computer games. Future research will include serious mo- bile games because user trends have changed. Players want to avoid carry- ing an extra device to play a game.
[10]	Web of Sciences, Targeted list journal and conference, Arts and 93 Humanities Citation In- dex (A and HCI), Sci- ence Citation Index- Ex- panded (SCI- Expanded) 94 and Social Science Ci- tation Index (SSCI).	The study performed a systematic review of the literature about serious games 91 usages in science education from 2016 to 2020.	research question was very well de- signed. The achievement of this research was they covered multiple areas of science education. The re- sult showed that the most impor- tant area is experimental science. This paper also covered many sci- ence subjects, i.e. Biology, Com- puter Science, Chemistry, STEM and etc.Learning academic achieve- ments was the most investigated topic. The sampling size used in this paper was 30-100 people, mostly (5- 8th grade) and (9-12 grade) students. Most papers used the quantitative re- search design, and a descriptive anal- ysis approach has been used to eval- uate serious games. Most studies have used serious games type com- puter games for science education.	The limitation was this research is that it did not cover ad- vanced areas. The fu- ture will include more advanced areas and again perform SLR to 2022 or 23 or see the latest trends of the current era in science education

# Table 10: Gap between previous SLR and current research

Referen	ceOnline	Problem Discussion	Achievements	Limitations
	Database			
	Name			
	SpringerLink, IEEE Xplore, ACM Digi- tal Library, SCOPUS, and ISI Web of Science.	This study performed a systematic literature re- view of the assessment of serious games in different domains.	The achievement of this research was it covered all serious game types and domains and used all possible evaluation methods to assess seri- ous games. For this purpose, study covered 102 papers from the pre- liminary study and answered the six mentioned research questions.	There is no such lim- itation for this re- search. The main gap in this SLR was the time duration they covered from 2011 to March 2015. So there is a need to update the result. In our research, we filled these gaps and cov- ered the 2015 on- wards papers. And reinvestigate the facts and figures which have been previously outdated.

## Table 10: Gap between previous SLR and current research

# 5 Discussion

This article is about serious game evaluation and gathers articles about serious games. Serious games designed and developed for educational purposes. We performed an updated systematic literature review in the article, gathered all those serious games related to different domains, and answered the above-mentioned research questions. Furthermore, based on these research questions, we have mentioned the healthy discussion in the below table.

Research	Discussion	Suggestion
Questions		
RQ1	In this article, primarily serious games lie in the	In Rq1, our opinion is to cover
	education domain. Serious games assist different	more domains or investigate
	levels of students and mainly cover areas like (den-	more serious games. Secondly,
	tal undergraduate students, Digital forensic train-	there is no such platform where
	ing, Job search Skill training, and Object-oriented	anyone can be aware of serious
	programming concept). Second most serious game	games. How can we develop
	developed for health and wellness. In this category,	this? What is the key difference
	serious games educate people like doctors, medical	between serious games and reg-
	students, nursing staff, and patients covering dif-	ular games? There is a platform
	ferent medical areas and diseases. The most com-	exists where anyone can record
	mon areas covered in this review are Hemiparetic	feedback to improve game aes-
	stroke patients, Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation,	thetics.
	Laboratory testing sessions, and physical rehabil-	
	itation. Also covered were older adults' process-	
	ing speed, working memory, short-term memory,	
	and eye-hand coordination significantly declined,	
	phonological disorders, Autism disorder in chil-	
	dren, Dementia disease, Dyscalculia (difficulties	
	in learning mathematics), and Dyscalculia (chal-	
	lenges in learning mathematics). Serous games	
	provide a lot of help to educate people or improve	
	people's health, discussed in above mention dis-	
	eases. Some serious games have been developed	
	for the cultural and social domain. Covered every	
	common issue like preventing students from bully-	
	ing and cross-culture domain. Serious games help	
	people educate about these issues and resolve their	
	problems in minimal time.	
RQ2	In RQ2, investigated serious game types in an up-	The updated systematic litera-
	dated review. Most serious games he in the virtual	ture review result shows that the
	worlds(5-D) based games category. Before 2010	world(3 d) In 2022 trands have
	mostly serious games were developed in computer	abanged Users prefer to play
	fully satisfied with understanding complete knowl	games on their mobile phones
	adge of the required problem. While in 3 d games	Hardly people use a computer
	beginners or intermediate level people easily up	nowadays Ves computer sci
	derstand their respective domains 3-d Games pro-	ence and experts still use lantons
	vide a better view of any solution and present a	or deskton pcs for their heavy
	3-dimensional view Most serious games are de-	computational But my advice
	veloped in 3-d and use some advanced technology	is to develop serious games for
	like augmented reality or unity framework. Some	mobile and 3-d. Because se-
	serious games which we have investigated in our	rious game type mobile games
	research are "Lavie Game", "A.C.R.M. Serious	have a lot of benefits, firstly they
	Games", and "Infinite Runner." Primarily 3-d se-	can easily carry a device.2nd no
	rious games are used in health to educate people.	additional cost to play a game.
	doctors, nurses, and patients. This research also	The key benefit is they can edu-
	identified different types of serious games (Video	cate anywhere through the seri-
	games, Mobile games, and web-based games)	ous game.

Table 11: Discussion Table
----------------------------

Research	Discussion	Suggestion
Questions		
RQ3	In RQ3 investigated the evaluation method of se-	There are a lot of methods we
	rious games. The evaluation methods question-	have identified to evaluate se-
	naire and frameworks assess mostly serious games.	rious games. In my opinion,
	The types of questionnaires and frameworks have	only one evaluation method ex-
	been different according to domain types. The se-	ists for a specific domain. The
	rious games have been developed for educational	benefit is somebody develops
	purposes and used questionnaires. The type of	a serious game in that domain.
	questionnaires depends on which area of educa-	They choose the same evaluation
	tion have covered serious games. Other than these	method, which saves them a lot
	two evaluation methods, some more assessments	of time.
	have been used to evaluate the serious games, i.e.	
	Evaluation and training, experimental, interviews,	
	Thermography, cognitive skills, user experience,	
	audio-video feedback, and observation were also	
	used to evaluate the serious games.	
RQ4	RQ4 have identified 13 quality attributes to evalu-	As a result of current and pre-
	ate serious games. In most serious games, usability	vious SLR results, many quality
	quality attributes have been used to assess serious	attributes have been used to eval-
	games. In most serious games, people don't know	uate serious games. It's only the
	now to play the game. or now to change options	developer's choice which quality
	according to their needs. If the player hard to learn	attributes they choose for devel-
	Lice bility quality attributes are mainly used in adu	oping serious games. Nowadays,
	Osability quality autibutes are mainly used in edu-	bay quality attribute to evaluate a
	mostly serious games have been evaluated with the	serious game. Players can easily
	auglity attribute "performance" if the serious game	understand how to play and op
	performance is not up to mark or slow the player	erate the game using this quality
	hard to learn their problem and invests a lot of time	attribute. In most serious games
	to learn the solution to a particular situation. Other	developed for mobile platforms
	attributes that have been used to evaluate serious	the quality attribute usability is a
	games in this research, i.e. Game design, learning	kev attribute.
	outcomes. User interface. User satisfaction. Cog-	
	nitive behavior. Learning Efficacy. Learnability.	
	Pedagogical aspects and Playability.	
RO5	RO5 searched out the evaluation method of se-	In RO5, we have searched for
	rious games and analyzed how to assess serious	serious game evaluation meth-
	games.Pre/post-tests have been commonly used to	ods. Analyze how methods
	analysis of serious games. This evaluation method	have been evaluated in serious
	collects the result before and after playing the	games. Mostly serious games
	game. This method quickly assesses the player's	used Pre/post evaluation method
	performance or learning through the game. Sta-	to assess the serious games. This
	tistical methods have also been used to evaluate	method is suitable because it
	serious games. Some statistical methods are Z-test,	gives a clear picture of learning
	T-test, Mann-Whitney TESTS, and Shapiro–Wilk	in front of the player before and
	test. The experimental test has also been used to	after playing the serious game.
	analysis of serious games.	In my opinion, one generalized
		way for a specific domain is to
		check the evolution of serious
		games.

Research	Discussion	Suggestion
Questions		
RQ6	RQ6 evaluated the sample size of serious games.	This question identified the pop-
	In most of the serious games, the sample size was	ulation size to evaluate the seri-
	composed of 1 to 10 people. Some of the serious	ous games. Population sizes of
	game's samples size was above 100. The overall	1 to 10 people have mostly been
	sample size depended on the nature of the game.	used to assess serious games. In
	If the collected sample and population size are	fewer serious games, the popu-
	correct, then defiantly affects the game's accuracy.	lation size is above 100 people.
		In my opinion, fix the size of the
		population according to the do-
		main of serious games.

#### Table 11: Discussion Table

# 6 Conclusion

This study found 37 papers demonstrating the techniques, methods, and approaches used to evaluate serious games. We structured, listed, and analyzed the information we received to answer the six research questions discussed in this study. We performed the experiences to evaluate the various types of serious games in different application domains. Then, we identified the different methods, techniques, and approaches to assess serious games. Our updated SLR will help future researchers and practitioners evaluate serious games and provide linkage with previous studies. Following is the summary response to each research question.

- Answer to RQ1: In this study, we concluded 37 papers that explored six application domains i.e. culture, education, health and wellness, support, professional learning and training, and social. In the education domain, the highest numbers of serious games have been evaluated.
- Answer of RQ2: In 37 papers, seven types of serious games have been identified i.e. computer games, mobile games, virtual worlds, Lego-based games, board games, and web-based games. Most domains had used virtual worlds 3D games, which were the highest serious games type. The virtual world 3D games were frequently used for medical and educational purposes to train and assist people.
- Answer of RQ3: In 37 papers, we identified 11 assessment methods as discussed above. Most studies used questionnaires and frameworks to evaluate serious games.
- Answer of RQ4: In this study, 13 quality attributes had been identified in our 37 selected papers. Most studies used usability as a quality attribute to evaluate serious games.
- Answer of RQ5:In the response, 17 assessment methods were identified to evaluate the serious games. Some statistical methods were also used like the Shapiro-Wilk test, post-hoc tests, Maan-Whitney test, and T-test for the evaluation purpose.
- Answer of RQ6: In these questions identified population sizes that had been used to evaluate the serious games. In 37 papers, most studies used participants' size range of no more than 50 subjects to evaluate serious games.

our updated SLR provides a comprehensive overview of the techniques, methods, and approaches used to evaluate serious games. The findings from this study will serve as a valuable resource for future researchers and practitioners in the field, enabling them to build upon existing knowledge and establish connections with previous studies. By enhancing the evaluation of serious games, we can further advance their development and impact in various domains.

# References

- [1] Charles D Elder. Serious games. by clark c. abt.(new york: The viking press, inc., 1970. pp. 176. 4.95 paper.). *American Political Science Review*, 65(4):1158–1159, 1971.
- [2] Meng-Tzu Cheng, Jhih-Hao Chen, Sheng-Ju Chu, and Shin-Yen Chen. The use of serious games in science education: a review of selected empirical research from 2002 to 2013. *Journal of computers in education*, 2(3):353–375, 2015.
- [3] Marc-André Maheu-Cadotte, Sylvie Cossette, Véronique Dubé, Guillaume Fontaine, Tanya Mailhot, Patrick Lavoie, Alexis Cournoyer, Fabio Balli, and Gabrielle Mathieu-Dupuis. Effectiveness of serious games and impact

of design elements on engagement and educational outcomes in healthcare professionals and students: a systematic review and meta-analysis protocol. *BMJ open*, 8(3):e019871, 2018.

- [4] Alejandro Calderón and Mercedes Ruiz. A systematic literature review on serious games evaluation: An application to software project management. *Computers & Education*, 87:396–422, 2015.
- [5] Simon McCallum and Costas Boletsis. Dementia games: A literature review of dementia-related serious games. In *International conference on serious games development and applications*, pages 15–27. Springer, 2013.
- [6] David Drummond, Delphine Monnier, Antoine Tesnière, and Alice Hadchouel. A systematic review of serious games in asthma education. *Pediatric Allergy and Immunology*, 28(3):257–265, 2017.
- [7] Rosa Yanez-Gomez, Daniel Cascado-Caballero, and Jose-Luis Sevillano. Academic methods for usability evaluation of serious games: a systematic review. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, 76(4):5755–5784, 2017.
- [8] Thomas M Connolly, Elizabeth A Boyle, Ewan MacArthur, Thomas Hainey, and James M Boyle. A systematic literature review of empirical evidence on computer games and serious games. *Computers & education*, 59(2):661– 686, 2012.
- [9] Ryan Wang, Samuel DeMaria Jr, Andrew Goldberg, and Daniel Katz. A systematic review of serious games in training health care professionals. *Simulation in Healthcare*, 11(1):41–51, 2016.
- [10] Nuri Kara. A systematic review of the use of serious games in science education. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 13(2):ep295, 2021.
- [11] Thiago Machado Leitão, Leonardo Luiz Lima Navarro, Renato Flórido Cameira, and Edison Renato Silva. Serious games in business process management: a systematic literature review. *Business Process Management Journal*, 2021.
- [12] Staffs Keele et al. Guidelines for performing systematic literature reviews in software engineering. Technical report, Citeseer, 2007.
- [13] Barbara Kitchenham and Stuart Charters. Guidelines for performing systematic literature reviews in software engineering. 2007.
- [14] Brian An, Donald Brown, and Stephanie Guerlain. The evaluation of a serious game to improve cross-cultural competence. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*, 12(3):429–441, 2019.
- [15] F Noveletto, AV Soares, BA Mello, CN Sevegnani, FLF Eichinger, M da S Hounsell, and P Bertemes-Filho. Biomedical serious game system for balance rehabilitation of hemiparetic stroke patients. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, 26(11):2179–2188, 2018.
- [16] Muhammad Hamza Latif, Muhammad Ajmal, Farooq Ahmad, Junaid Alam, and Asma Saleem. La-vie: A serious game for cardiopulmonary resuscitation. In 2017 IEEE 5th International Conference on Serious Games and Applications for Health (SeGAH), pages 1–5. IEEE, 2017.
- [17] Octavian Postolache, Filipe Lourenço, JM Dias Pereira, and Pedro Girão. Serious game for physical rehabilitation: Measuring the effectiveness of virtual and real training environments. In 2017 IEEE International Instrumentation and Measurement Technology Conference (I2MTC), pages 1–6. IEEE, 2017.
- [18] Diogo Ferreira, Raul Oliveira, and Octavian Postolache. Physical rehabilitation based on kinect serious games. In 2017 Eleventh international conference on sensing technology (ICST), pages 1–6. IEEE, 2017.
- [19] Yu-Hsiang Lin, Hui-Fen Mao, Yun-Cheng Tsai, and Jui-Jen Chou. Developing a serious game for the elderly to do physical and cognitive hybrid activities. In 2018 IEEE 6th International Conference on Serious Games and Applications for Health (SeGAH), pages 1–8. IEEE, 2018.
- [20] Bonnechère Bruno, Berlemont Christophe, Feipel Véronique, Jansen Bart, et al. A preliminary study of the integration of specially developed serious games in the treatment of hospitalized elderly patients. In 2017 International Conference on Virtual Rehabilitation (ICVR), pages 1–6. IEEE, 2017.
- [21] Rui Neves Madeira, Vanessa Mestre, and Tânia Ferreirinha. Phonological disorders in children? design and user experience evaluation of a mobile serious game approach. *Procedia computer science*, 113:416–421, 2017.
- [22] Kamran Khowaja and Siti Salwah Salim. Serious game for children with autism to learn vocabulary: An experimental evaluation. *International journal of human–computer interaction*, 35(1):1–26, 2019.
- [23] Rytis Maskeliūnas, Robertas Damaševičius, Tomas Blažauskas, Andrius Paulauskas, Lukas Paulauskas, and C Chiatti. Ido: modelling a serious educational game based on hands on approach for training dementia carers. *International Journal of Engineering and Technology*, 7(2.28):143–146, 2018.

- [24] Diego Fernando Avila-Pesantez, Leticia Azucena Vaca-Cardenas, Rosa Delgadillo Avila, Nelly Padilla Padilla, and Luis A Rivera. Design of an augmented reality serious game for children with dyscalculia: a case study. In *International Conference on Technology Trends*, pages 165–175. Springer, 2018.
- [25] Costas Boletsis and Simon McCallum. Augmented reality cubes for cognitive gaming: preliminary usability and game experience testing. 2016.
- [26] Rafael Oliveira Chaves, Christiane Gresse von Wangenheim, Julio Cezar Costa Furtado, Sandro Ronaldo Bezerra Oliveira, Alex Santos, and Eloi Luiz Favero. Experimental evaluation of a serious game for teaching software process modeling. *ieee Transactions on Education*, 58(4):289–296, 2015.
- [27] Abdelbaset Jamal Abdellatif, Barry McCollum, and Paul McMullan. Serious games: Quality characteristics evaluation framework and case study. In 2018 IEEE Integrated STEM Education Conference (ISEC), pages 112–119. IEEE, 2018.
- [28] Ivana Gace, Lucija Jaksic, Ilir Murati, Iva Topolovac, Matea Zilak, and Zeljka Car. Virtual reality serious game prototype for presenting military units. In 2019 15th International Conference on Telecommunications (ConTEL), pages 1–6. IEEE, 2019.
- [29] Ugyen Nima, Rinzin Wangdi, and Jannicke Baalsrud Hauge. A serious game for competence development in internet of things and knowledge sharing. In 2018 IEEE International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management (IEEM), pages 1786–1790. IEEE, 2018.
- [30] Tobias Mettler and Roberto Pinto. Serious games as a means for scientific knowledge transfer—a case from engineering management education. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 62(2):256–265, 2015.
- [31] Maria Drakou and Andreas Lanitis. On the development and evaluation of a serious game for forensic examination training. In 2016 18th Mediterranean Electrotechnical Conference (MELECON), pages 1–6. IEEE, 2016.
- [32] Justin B Marshall, Gary Tyson, Juan Llanos, Roberto Miguel Sanchez, and Francisca B Marshall. Serious 3d gaming research for the vision impaired. In 2015 17th International Conference on E-health Networking, Application & Services (HealthCom), pages 468–471. IEEE, 2015.
- [33] Hege Mari Johnsen, Mariann Fossum, Pirashanthie Vivekananda-Schmidt, Ann Fruhling, and Åshild Slettebø. Teaching clinical reasoning and decision-making skills to nursing students: Design, development, and usability evaluation of a serious game. *International journal of medical informatics*, 94:39–48, 2016.
- [34] Jungmin Kwon and Youngsun Lee. Serious games for the job training of persons with developmental disabilities. *Computers & Education*, 95:328–339, 2016.
- [35] Omair Ameerbakhsh, Savi Maharaj, Amir Hussain, and Bruce McAdam. A comparison of two methods of using a serious game for teaching marine ecology in a university setting. *International journal of human-computer studies*, 127:181–189, 2019.
- [36] Harits Ar Rosyid, Matt Palmerlee, and Ke Chen. Deploying learning materials to game content for serious education game development: A case study. *Entertainment computing*, 26:1–9, 2018.
- [37] Kawin Sipiyaruk, Jennifer E Gallagher, Stylianos Hatzipanagos, and Patricia A Reynolds. Acquiring critical thinking and decision-making skills: An evaluation of a serious game used by undergraduate dental students in dental public health. *Technology, Knowledge and Learning*, 22(2):209–218, 2017.
- [38] Andrej Jerman Blažič, Primož Cigoj, and Borka Jerman Blažič. Serious game design for digital forensics training. In 2016 Third International Conference on Digital Information Processing, Data Mining, and Wireless Communications (DIPDMWC), pages 211–215. IEEE, 2016.
- [39] Ufuk Aydan, Murat Yilmaz, Paul M Clarke, and Rory V O'Connor. Teaching iso/iec 12207 software lifecycle processes: A serious game approach. *Computer Standards & Interfaces*, 54:129–138, 2017.
- [40] CM Steiner, Alexander Nussbaumer, Kerstin Gaisbachgrabner, Thierry Platon, Olivier Lepoivre, and Dietrich Albert. Evaluation of an interview simulation for job seekers-applying a holistic evaluation approach for serious games. In 13th annual International Technology, Education and Development Conference, 2018.
- [41] M J Callaghan, Niall McShane, A Gomez Eguiluz, T Teilles, and P Raspail. Practical application of the learning mechanics-game mechanics (lm-gm) framework for serious games analysis in engineering education. In 2016 13th International Conference on Remote Engineering and Virtual Instrumentation (REV), pages 391–395. IEEE, 2016.
- [42] Robert Shewaga, Alvaro Uribe-Quevedo, Bill Kapralos, Kenneth Lee, and Fahad Alam. A serious game for anesthesia-based crisis resource management training. *Computers in Entertainment (CIE)*, 16(2):1–16, 2018.

- [43] Simone Ghisio, Paolo Alborno, Erica Volta, Monica Gori, and Gualtiero Volpe. A multimodal serious-game to teach fractions in primary school. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM SIGCHI International Workshop on Multimodal Interaction for Education*, pages 67–70, 2017.
- [44] Gokul CJ, Sankalp Pandit, Sukanya Vaddepalli, Harshal Tupsamudre, Vijayanand Banahatti, and Sachin Lodha. Phishy-a serious game to train enterprise users on phishing awareness. In *Proceedings of the 2018 annual symposium on computer-human interaction in play companion extended abstracts*, pages 169–181, 2018.
- [45] Alexis D Souchet, Stéphanie Philippe, Dimitri Zobel, Floriane Ober, Aurélien Lévěque, and Laure Leroy. Eyestrain impacts on learning job interview with a serious game in virtual reality: a randomized double-blinded study. In Proceedings of the 24th ACM Symposium on Virtual Reality Software and Technology, pages 1–12, 2018.
- [46] Čeněk Šašinka, Zdeněk Stachoň, Michal Sedlák, Jiří Chmelík, Lukáš Herman, Petr Kubíček, Alžběta Šašinková, Milan Doležal, Hynek Tejkl, Tomáš Urbánek, et al. Collaborative immersive virtual environments for education in geography. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information*, 8(1):3, 2019.
- [47] David W Wilson, Jeff Jenkins, Nathan Twyman, Matthew Jensen, Joe Valacich, Norah Dunbar, Scott Wilson, Claude Miller, Bradly Adame, Yu-Hao Lee, et al. Serious games: an evaluation framework and case study. In 2016 49th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS), pages 638–647. IEEE, 2016.
- [48] David W Wilson, Jeff Jenkins, Nathan Twyman, Matthew Jensen, Joe Valacich, Norah Dunbar, Scott Wilson, Claude Miller, Bradly Adame, Yu-Hao Lee, et al. Serious games: an evaluation framework and case study. In 2016 49th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS), pages 638–647. IEEE, 2016.
- [49] Katie Li, Mark Hall, Pablo Bermell-Garcia, Jeffrey Alcock, Ashutosh Tiwari, and Mar González-Franco. Measuring the learning effectiveness of serious gaming for training of complex manufacturing tasks. *Simulation & Gaming*, 48(6):770–790, 2017.
- [50] Cátia Raminhos, Ana Paula Cláudio, Maria Beatriz Carmo, Augusta Gaspar, Susana Carvalhosa, and Maria de Jesus Candeias. A serious game-based solution to prevent bullying. *International Journal of Pervasive Computing and Communications*, 2016.