

Paper: Rachida Djouab and Moncef Bari. An iso 9126 based quality model for the e-learning systems. International journal of information and education technology, 6(5):370, 2016.

Score: 0.6

Criteria	Yes (2)	Partial (1)	No (0)
Question / objective sufficiently de-scribed?	X		
Study design evident and appropriate?	X		
Context for the study clear?	X		
Connection to a theoretical frame-work / wider body of knowledge?	X		
Sampling strategy described, relevant and justified?			X
Data collection methods clearly described and systematic?	X		
Data analysis clearly described and systematic?			X
Use of verification procedure(s) to establish credibility?			X
Conclusions supported by the results?	X		
Reflexivity of the account?			X

Paper: John Estdale and Elli Georgiadou. Applying the iso/iec 25010 quality models to software product. In Systems, Software and Services Process Improvement: 25th European Conference, EuroSPI 2018, Bilbao, Spain, September 5-7, 2018, Proceedings 25, pages 492–503. Springer, 2018

Score: 0.65

Criteria	Yes (2)	Partial (1)	No (0)
Question / objective sufficiently de-scribed?	X		
Study design evident and appropriate?	X		

Context for the study clear?	X		
Connection to a theoretical frame-work / wider body of knowledge?	X		
Sampling strategy described, relevant and justified?			X
Data collection methods clearly described and systematic?		X	
Data analysis clearly described and systematic?	X		
Use of verification procedure(s) to establish credibility?			X
Conclusions supported by the results?	X		
Reflexivity of the account?			X

Paper: Syahrul Fahmy, Nurul Haslinda, Wan Roslina, and Ziti Fariha. Evaluating the quality of software in e-book using the iso 9126 model. International Journal of Control and Automation, 5(2):115–122, 2012.

Score: 0.55

Criteria	Yes (2)	Partial (1)	No (0)
Question / objective sufficiently de-scribed?	X		
Study design evident and appropriate?	X		
Context for the study clear?	X		
Connection to a theoretical frame-work / wider body of knowledge?		X	
Sampling strategy described, relevant and justified?			X
Data collection methods clearly described and systematic?			X
Data analysis clearly	X		

described and systematic?			
Use of verification procedure(s) to establish credibility?			X
Conclusions supported by the results?	X		
Reflexivity of the account?			X

Paper: Mariem Haoues, Asma Sellami, Han^ene Ben-Abdallah, and Laila Cheikhi. A guideline for software architecture selection based on iso 25010 quality related characteristics. International Journal of System Assurance Engineering and Management, 8:886–909, 2017

Score: 0.9

Criteria	Yes (2)	Partial (1)	No (0)
Question / objective sufficiently de-scribed?	X		
Study design evident and appropriate?	X		
Context for the study clear?	X		
Connection to a theoretical frame-work / wider body of knowledge?	X		
Sampling strategy described, relevant and justified?	X		
Data collection methods clearly described and systematic?	X		
Data analysis clearly described and systematic?	X		
Use of verification procedure(s) to establish credibility?			X
Conclusions supported by the results?	X		
Reflexivity of the account?	X		

Paper: Tetiana Hovorushchenko and Oksana Pomorova. Evaluation of mutual influences of software quality characteristics based iso 25010: 2011. In 2016 XIth International Scientific and Technical Conference Computer Sciences and Information Technologies (CSIT),

pages 80–83. IEEE, 2016.

Score: 0.7

Criteria	Yes (2)	Partial (1)	No (0)
Question / objective sufficiently de-scribed?	X		
Study design evident and appropriate?	X		
Context for the study clear?	X		
Connection to a theoretical frame-work / wider body of knowledge?	X		
Sampling strategy described, relevant and justified?			X
Data collection methods clearly described and systematic?			X
Data analysis clearly described and systematic?	X		
Use of verification procedure(s) to establish credibility?			X
Conclusions supported by the results?	X		
Reflexivity of the account?	X		

Paper: Ali Idri, Karima Moumane, and Alain Abran. On the use of software quality standard iso/iec9126 in mobile environments. In 2013 20th Asia-Pacific Software Engineering Conference (APSEC), volume 1, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2013

Score: 0.8

Criteria	Yes (2)	Partial (1)	No (0)
Question / objective sufficiently de-scribed?	X		
Study design evident and appropriate?	X		
Context for the study clear?	X		

Connection to a theoretical framework / wider body of knowledge?	X		
Sampling strategy described, relevant and justified?			X
Data collection methods clearly described and systematic?			X
Data analysis clearly described and systematic?	X		
Use of verification procedure(s) to establish credibility?	X		
Conclusions supported by the results?	X		
Reflexivity of the account?	X		

Paper: Ilham Kadi, Ali Idri, and Sofia Ouhbi. Quality evaluation of cardiac decision support systems using iso 25010 standard. In 2016 IEEE/ACS 13th International Conference of Computer Systems and Applications (AICCSA), pages 1–8. IEEE, 2016.

Score: 0.65

Criteria	Yes (2)	Partial (1)	No (0)
Question / objective sufficiently described?		X	
Study design evident and appropriate?	X		
Context for the study clear?	X		
Connection to a theoretical framework / wider body of knowledge?	X		
Sampling strategy described, relevant and justified?			X
Data collection methods clearly described and systematic?			X
Data analysis clearly described and systematic?	X		

Use of verification procedure(s) to establish credibility?			X
Conclusions supported by the results?	X		
Reflexivity of the account?	X		

Paper: H Panduwiyasa, M Saputra, ZF Azzahra, and AR Aniko. Accounting and smart system: functional evaluation of iso/iec 25010: 2011 quality model (a case study). In IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering, volume 1092, page 012065. IOP Publishing, 2021

Score: 0.6

Criteria	Yes (2)	Partial (1)	No (0)
Question / objective sufficiently de-scribed?	X		
Study design evident and appropriate?	X		
Context for the study clear?	X		
Connection to a theoretical frame-work / wider body of knowledge?	X		
Sampling strategy described, relevant and justified?			X
Data collection methods clearly described and systematic?		X	
Data analysis clearly described and systematic?		X	
Use of verification procedure(s) to establish credibility?			X
Conclusions supported by the results?	X		
Reflexivity of the account?			X

Paper: Emmanuel Peters and George Kwamina Aggrey. An iso 25010 based quality model for erp systems. Adv. Sci. Technol. Eng. Syst. J, 5(2):578–583, 2020.

Score: 0.55

Criteria	Yes (2)	Partial (1)	No (0)
Question / objective sufficiently de-scribed?	X		
Study design evident and appropriate?	X		
Context for the study clear?	X		
Connection to a theoretical frame-work / wider body of knowledge?	X		
Sampling strategy described, relevant and justified?			X
Data collection methods clearly described and systematic?			X
Data analysis clearly described and systematic?		X	
Use of verification procedure(s) to establish credibility?			X
Conclusions supported by the results?	X		
Reflexivity of the account?			X

Paper: Anderson Ravello, Jean-Marc Desharnais, Luis Eduardo Bautista Villalpando, Alain April, and Abdelouahed Gherbi. Performance measurement for cloud computing applications using iso 25010 standard characteristics. In 2014 Joint Conference of the International Workshop on Software Measurement and the International Conference on Software Process and Product Measurement, pages 41–49. IEEE, 2014.

Score: 0.9

Criteria	Yes (2)	Partial (1)	No (0)
Question / objective sufficiently de-scribed?	X		
Study design evident and appropriate?	X		
Context for the study clear?	X		

Connection to a theoretical framework / wider body of knowledge?	X		
Sampling strategy described, relevant and justified?	X		
Data collection methods clearly described and systematic?	X		
Data analysis clearly described and systematic?	X		
Use of verification procedure(s) to establish credibility?			X
Conclusions supported by the results?	X		
Reflexivity of the account?	X		

Paper: Maximilian Speicher. What is usability? a characterization based on iso 9241-11 and iso/iec 25010. arXiv preprint arXiv:1502.06792, 2015

Score: 0.6

Criteria	Yes (2)	Partial (1)	No (0)
Question / objective sufficiently described?	X		
Study design evident and appropriate?	X		
Context for the study clear?	X		
Connection to a theoretical framework / wider body of knowledge?	X		
Sampling strategy described, relevant and justified?			X
Data collection methods clearly described and systematic?			X
Data analysis clearly described and systematic?			X

Use of verification procedure(s) to establish credibility?			X
Conclusions supported by the results?	X		
Reflexivity of the account?	X		

Paper: Millati Izzatillah. Quality measurement of transportation service application go-jek sing iso 25010 quality model. Simetdris: Jurnal Teknik Mesin, Elektro dan Ilmu Komputer, 10(1):233–242, 2019.

Score: 0.6

Criteria	Yes (2)	Partial (1)	No (0)
Question / objective sufficiently de-scribed?	X		
Study design evident and appropriate?	X		
Context for the study clear?	X		
Connection to a theoretical frame-work / wider body of knowledge?	X		
Sampling strategy described, relevant and justified?			X
Data collection methods clearly described and systematic?			X
Data analysis clearly described and systematic?			X
Use of verification procedure(s) to establish credibility?			X
Conclusions supported by the results?	X		
Reflexivity of the account?	X		

Paper: Behshid Behkamal, Mohsen Kahani, and Mohammad Kazem Akbari. Customizing iso 9126 quality model for evaluation of b2b applications. Information and software technology, 51(3):599–609, 2009

Score: 0.75

Criteria	Yes (2)	Partial (1)	No (0)	N/A
Question / objective sufficiently de-scribed?	X			
Study design evident and appropriate?	X			
Method of subject/comparison group selection or source of information/input variables described and appropriate?	X			
Subject (and comparison group, if applicable) characteristics sufficiently described?	X			
If interventional and random allocation was possible, was it described?				X
If interventional and blinding of investigators was possible, was it reported				X
If interventional and blinding of subjects was possible, was it reported?				X
Outcome and (if applicable) exposure measure(s) well defined and robust to measurement / misclassification bias? Means of assessment reported?	X			
Sample size appropriate?			X	
Analytic methods described/justified and appropriate?		X		
Some estimate of variance is reported for the main results?			X	
Controlled for confounding?				X
Results reported in sufficient detail?	X			

Conclusions supported by the results	X			
--------------------------------------	---	--	--	--

Paper: Aditia Arga Pratama and Achmad Benny Mutiara. Software quality analysis for halodoc application using iso 25010: 2011. Int. J. Adv. Comput. Sci. Appl, 12(8):383–392, 2021

Score: 0.64

Criteria	Yes (2)	Partial (1)	No (0)	N/A
Question / objective sufficiently de-scribed?	X			
Study design evident and appropriate?	X			
Method of subject/comparison group selection or source of information/input variables described and appropriate?	X			
Subject (and comparison group, if applicable) characteristics sufficiently described?	X			
If interventional and random allocation was possible, was it described?				X
If interventional and blinding of investigators was possible, was it reported				X
If interventional and blinding of subjects was possible, was it reported?				X
Outcome and (if applicable) exposure measure(s) well defined and robust to measurement / misclassification bias? Means of assessment reported?			X	
Sample size appropriate?			X	
Analytic methods described/justified and appropriate?	X			

Some estimate of variance is reported for the main results?			X	
Controlled for confounding?			X	
Results reported in sufficient detail?	X			
Conclusions supported by the results	X			