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**Abstract.**

**Purpose –** Business process modeling can involve multiple stakeholders, so it is natural that problems may occur in building and understanding them. One way to perceive these problems is to evaluate the comprehension of these models through the collection of data related to the readers' awareness with an eye-tracking device. The purpose of this paper is to provide a comprehensive overview of the use of eye-trackers in understanding process models and provides evidence on the contributions of eye-trackers to new empirical studies in this area.

**Design/methodology/approach –** To achieve this goal, we performed a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) following the good practices from the Evidence-Based Software Engineering (EBSE) field.

**Findings -** This study resulted in 10 primary studies selected for analysis and data extraction, from the 1,482 initially retrieved. The major findings indicate that the business process community still benefits little from the use of eye-tracking, do not offering, e.g., do not offering sufficient support for inexperienced designers and not having an explicit standardization in its use. These and other findings are synthesized in a research roadmap which results would benefit researchers and practitioners.

**Originality/value –** Performing an SLR is not a simple task. Thus, we present in detail the SLR process with the descriptions of all activities to register and trace data and decisions along the process. The models presented here may be contribute to other researchers in need to perform such a similar study for other research questions.

**Keywords:** Business Process Modeling, Understandability, Comprehension, Eye-Tracking, Systematic Literature Review.

**Paper type -** Literature review.

1. Introduction

Establishing efficient processes is the goal that all companies must pursue (Vaknin and Filipowska, 2017). Business processes are a set of activities, well determined, coordinated in time and space to achieve goals and organizational objectives (Alotaibi and Liu, 2017). Besides that, they can be represented in models or diagrams composed of visual components. These models are used as an instrument to facilitate the understanding or even to identify points of improvement in an organization (Melcher and Seese, 2008). In this perspective, business process models are essential so that the organizations keep control of their flows of activities.

Also, business processes help in specifying the requirements and design of information systems, representing all the data flow of processes. Thus, the path taken by many organizations to produce quality information systems has been to invest in the improvement of business process models. Therefore, processes are expected to result in quality information systems (Unterkalmsteiner *et al.*, 2011). Studies show that the growth of the models both increases the quality of the information systems produced and the productivity of this development (Gibson *et al.*, 2006; Mohd *et al.*, 2008; Hani, 2009).

Recent and more innovative researches analyze how these models are explained and perceived by their stakeholders (Mendoza *et al.*, 2018; Rodrigues *et al.*, 2015). Hereupon, users understand models differently, resulting in different abstractions (Figl and Recker, 2016). Contrary to this statement, in (Mendling *et al.*, 2007), the authors state that one of the main objectives of a process model is to facilitate communication between stakeholders. However, according to these authors, little is known about the factors that influence the understanding of a process model by human agents. Thus, despite the research that has already been done in this field, there are still unanswered questions about the perception of process models. Besides that, cognitive neuroscience and psychology can also provide valuable information about this field.

There are several alternatives to evaluating the understanding of business process models. These include experimenting with the collection of data, sometimes with the use of biometric sensors, on the performance of designers and other stakeholders in a given modeling task to know their level of understanding and preferences about the use of a modeling artifact to the detriment of another. Biometric sensors have been explored in recent years as data collection devices become more accessible. Additionally, one of the technologies that have deserved particular attention is eye tracking.

This paper focuses on these pillars (business process, comprehension, and eye-tracking), offering an overview of evaluating the understanding of process models through eye-tracking techniques. We use Evidence-Based Software Engineering (EBSE) to better understand the problem and the field of the research, and to extract and synthesize the results. EBSE provides a rigorous and reliable research methodology, together with auditing tasks to reduce the researchers’ bias on the result (Kitchenham *et al.*, 2004). Two of the core tools for evidence-based studies are systematic literature reviews (SLR) and systematic mapping studies (Petersen *et al.*, 2008).

Thus, between both types of methods, and based on their differences, we decided to perform an SLR process due to the possibility to have a more rigorous and controlled process, including a protocol definition and validation, and also because we are looking for some specific information regarding the mediation of terms: business processes, comprehension, and eye-tracking.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: section 2 gives an overview of introductory concepts; section 3 shows the method used in this study describing the planning phase; section 4 describes its RSL execution, presenting the selected studies, the classification scheme adopted; while, section 5 reports the findings. The section 6 discusses the threats to validity; and the section 7 show related works. Finally, section 8 summarizes some gaps in a specific investigation area, providing a research roadmap to guide decisions on new research activities, and conclude this paper in section 9.

1. Background
   1. Business Process Modeling

Business process modeling is an interdisciplinary area that has adopted a variety of paradigms and methodologies of different areas such as organizational management theory, computer science, mathematics, linguistics, semiotics, and philosophy (Ko, 2009). The aim of business process modeling is to build Business Process Diagrams (BPD), which are technical drawings that translate abstract representations of processes (Wahl and Sindre, 2006). This activity carried out in the early stages of a process elicitation and helps to identify problems in the beginning of the process development (Rolón et al., 2009), assisting in the design of valid process models.

Since the introduction of flowcharts in the 1920s (Indulska *et al.*, 2009) several notations have been developed to represent BPD. However, regardless of the notation used for a process model, its understanding by all stakeholders is of paramount importance to organizations. Moreover, a suitable analysis and verification of processes at the modeling stage would make easier the process maintenance tasks by reducing its implicit costs. This is why efforts should be made to impose quality characteristics to the process models. The next section presents some concepts about understanding.

* 1. Understanding

Since process diagrams are intended to support the activities of stakeholders with different technical backgrounds (e.g. process analysts, process designers, process implementers), they must have their proper understanding, among other purposes, to facilitate the communication among those kinds of stakeholders (Mendoza et al., 2018). Understanding is a criterion that helps to measure whether the information contained in a model can be understood by all stakeholders (Laue and Gadatsch, 2011). The authors also point out that understanding is one of the criteria used to evaluate the quality of a model. This definition implies that the opinion can be investigated from two central angles: personal factors, related to the reader of the model, and the factors that relate to the model itself.

In addition to this definition, in Mendling *et al.* (2012), the authors emphasize that the understanding of a process model is a function related to the characteristics of the model and to the users who will interpret it. For these authors, the understanding of the models by the stakeholders is a prerequisite for several tasks related to the model, such as communication, design, organizational reengineering, project management, end-user queries, etc.

* 1. Eye Tracking

Eye-tracking is a mechanism for collecting cognitive data from its users. This mechanism is used to conduct empirical studies and to study understanding models (Sharafi *et al.,* 2015a), to realize what can be improved to facilitate, for instance, the interaction of systems with their users. The systems that use this technology are based on theories of the human physiological system, such as the theory of visual perception, and cognitive theories, such as the visual attention theory (Moody, 2009).

Beyond the analysis of visual attention and cognitive processes, eye-data can also be examined to measure the workload of a task. Thus, the data can be studied with respect to certain areas of the stimuli, which are called areas of interest (AOI). An AOI can either be relevant or irrelevant for a given task that is being performed by a participant. For example, when considering a business process model as stimulus, a relevant AOI could be a specific activity that is used by the participant to perform a certain task, while an irrelevant AOI would be any other artifact in the model. Thus, such technology can allow to analyze user’s performance in reading and interpreting business process models.

This technology is used for research in several areas of human knowledge, especially in the areas of medicine, cognitive psychology, management and marketing, aeronautics, industrial design, among others. Specifically, in the context of model usability, there has been increasing interest in the application of this technology to empirical studies (Santos *et al.*, 2016). Researchers try to understand which cognitive processes underlie the various activities of a business designer, for example.

* 1. Systematic Literature Reviews (SLR)

An SLR aims to establish the state of evidence and identification of best practices based on empirical evidence (Kitchenham & Charters, 2007). The typical SLR process illustre in Figure 1 is composed of three main phases with the objectives to plan the SLR, conduct the search and report the results. In phase (A) “Plan the SLR” the objectives are to identify the need of the review, commission the review, specify research questions and review the protocol. In phase (B) “Search Studies” the objectives are to collect the studies, select primary studies, apply quality assessment, and extract and synthetize data. In phase (C) “Analyze Studies” the objective is to format and communicate results.
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**Figure 1** Typical Systematic Literature Reviews Processes[[1]](#footnote-1)*.*

In general, the complexity and rigor required to conduct an SLR is higher than in a systematic mapping study (Wohlin *et al.*, 2012). A summary of the main differences between both follows:

* Systematic mapping studies typically address broader research questions, and do not require the validation of the process artifacts nor do they impose a quality assessment of primary studies. Their main objective is to classify and summarize the data of some area of interest, with no deeper analysis (Kitchenham et al., 2011).
* SLRs, on the other hand, typically address focused research questions, and require protocol elaboration and validation as well as quality assessment of primary studies. Their main objective is to provide specific evidences based on very specific research questions (Kitchenham & Charters, 2007).

Our current research aims at building catalogues for a set of the existing studies to derive the selection of equipment types, the participants’ selection, and the study variables for the purpose of classifying them with respect to their context, benefits, content, and validation, in order to offer a comprehensive overview, as well as advices to overcome or limit threats to the validity of eye-tracking studies.

1. SLR Process

This section describes the SLR process to performing our study. Our initial intention was to simply apply the method proposed in Kitchenham and Charters (2007). However, as the application of the process evolved, the difficulties to establish and maintain a clear SLR strategy, manage the amount of data, deal with a set of non-structured search databases, deal with non-standardized papers metadata, manage changes during the process, ensure a minimum level of quality of the papers, and consolidate and classify data, led us to: define some control activities to manage data and changes during the execution of the SLR process.

These changes influenced the SLR process defined in Figure 1, where control activities, inputs and outputs were identified. The following subsections present our SLR discussing in detail how the subprocesses, which make up each of the three phases, were performed.

* 1. Plan the SLR

This sub process is composed of one other subprocess and four activities (see Figure 2). Two of those activities ((A.4) Review Protocol and (A.5) Define Templates and Rules) and more one subprocess ((A.1) Define Protocol) are assigned to the team of Researchers responsible and two ((A.2) Analyze Protocol and (A.3) Provide Feedbacks) are assigned to the Reviewers for the execution of the study.
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**Figure 2.** Subprocess (A) Plan the SLR.

In the expanded (A.1) Define Protocol subprocess illustrated in Figure 3 the research protocol is formed by the composition of the following dataobjects: Research Question list, Research Sources list, Research Query list, Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria list, Data Extraction Form and Quality Assessment Form. The following subsections describe each activity from Figure 2 and 3, showing how they were performed in our SLR.
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**Figure 3.** Subprocess define protocol.

* + 1. (A.1.1) Define Research Questions

The objective of this activity is to determine the scope of the study, defining one or more research questions. It is usually difficult to define the right research question, as it needs to be wide enough to include all relevant studies, but yet focused enough to be effective and selective in the size of the search space. According to Kitchenham and Charters (2007), it is useful to consider the PICOC method, first proposed in the medical area Petticrew and Roberts (2006). The results of applying PICOC to our research questions are presented in Table 1. This helps us focusing on what matters for the study in hand, guiding also the extraction phase of the process.

**Table 1**. PICOC when applied to our SLR.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Viewpoint | Description |
| P (population) | Works that use eye-tracking to analyze the understanding of process models. |
| I (Intervention) | The use of eye-tracking in understanding analysis. |
| C (comparison) | It doesn’t apply, as we won’t compare the analysis or the use of eye-tracking, we’ll just collect as much information as possible to build a catalog that contains a thorough analysis of approaches that use eye tracking with the intuition of measuring how much a model of business process is understandable. |
| O (outcome) | Relate factors of interest to professionals, e.g., the metrics used to analyze understanding, the notations used to map processes, when and where studies were published and which researchers are using eye-tracking to analyze model understanding of processes. |
| C (context) | Works that highlight the scope of using eye-tracking to analyze the understanding of process models. |

In summary, our goal is to identify the quality attributes and factors that are used by eye-tracking can help in understanding models. We hope that future research can use our findings to help business designers build their business process models. Thus, allowing the construction of more intuitive process models for all readers. Hence, the research questions defined to this SLR were:

* RQ1: Is eye-tracking technology being used in the analysis of the understanding of business process models?
* RQ2: What metrics are used to measure the visual comprehension of eye-tracking business process models?
* RQ3: Which business process model notations are evaluated in the studies?
* RQ4: What contributions have been reported about the application of the eye-tracker device to evaluate the understanding of the process models?
* RQ5: What is the profile of the subjects who used the eye-tracking device to evaluate understanding in process models?
  + 1. (A.1.2) Define Search Sources

The objective of this activity is to identify sources to perform searches, as well as the kind of search that should be performed. The search can be automatic in digital libraries, where the results are collected through a search query execution, or manual, where the results are collected manually in the selected conferences and journals databases. Typically, both alternatives are selected, and we did no different. The digital libraries sources selected for this study were:

* Web of Science;
* ACM Digital library;
* IEEE Explore;
* Science Direct (Elsevier);
* Scopus;
* Springer Link;
* Engineering Village.

The manual searches included conferences and journals related to business process. In both cases, DBLP and Google Scholar were used to support the searches with additional information on each paper, such as number of citations and author information.

No restriction of date period was applied during the search in the specified sources, as we did not want to risk ignoring useful information that would limit the value of our findings.

* + 1. (A.1.3) Define Search Queries

The objective of this activity is to define keywords and Boolean expressions to perform automatic searches in digital libraries. First step to define the search queries was the identification of keywords. The list of keywords was based on a preliminary ad-hoc search, so to guarantee that relevant terms would not be omitted from the very beginning. Table 2 shows the keywords used in the final queries, already grouped with Boolean operators.

**Table 2.** Search queries.’

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Digital Libraries | Query |
| Web of Science | TS=(("eye-tracker" OR "eye tracker" OR "eye-tracking" OR "eye tracking" OR "Restricted Focus Viewer") AND ("BPM" OR "Business Process Model" OR "Business Process" OR "Process Model") AND ("understanding" OR "comprehension" OR "comprehensibility")) |
| ACM Digital library | [[Abstract: eye-tracker] OR [Abstract: eye tracker] OR [Abstract: eye-tracking] OR [Abstract: eye tracking] OR [Abstract: restricted focus viewer]]] AND [[Abstract: BPM] OR [Abstract: business process model] OR [Abstract: business process] OR [Abstract: process model]] AND [[Abstract: understanding] OR [Abstract: comprehension] OR [Abstract: comprehensibility]] |
| IEEExplore | (("Abstract":eye-tracker OR "Abstract":eye tracker OR "Abstract":eye-tracking OR "Abstract":eye tracking OR "Abstract":Restricted Focus Viewer) AND  ("Abstract":BPM OR "Abstract":Business Process OR "Abstract":Process Models OR "Abstract":Business Process Models) AND ("Abstract":understanding OR "Abstract":understandability OR "Abstract":comprehension OR "Abstract":comprehensibility)) |
| Science Direct | (("eye-tracker" OR "eye tracker" OR "eye-tracking" OR "eye tracking" OR "Restricted Focus Viewer") AND ("BPM" OR "Business Process" OR "Process Models" OR "Business Process Models") AND ("understanding" OR "understandability" OR "comprehension" OR "comprehensibility")) |
| Scopus | TITLE-ABS-KEY (("eye-tracker" OR "eye tracker" OR "eye-tracking" OR "eye tracking" OR "Restricted Focus Viewer") AND ("BPM" OR "Business Process" OR "Process Model" OR "Business Process Model")AND("understanding" OR "understandability" OR "comprehension" OR "comprehensibility")) |
| Springer Link | (("eye-tracker" OR "eye tracker" OR "eye-tracking" OR "eye tracking" OR "Restricted Focus Viewer") and ("BPM" OR "Business Process" OR "Process Models" OR "Business Process Models")and ("understanding" OR "understandability" OR "comprehension" OR "comprehensibility") ) |
| Engineering Village | (("eye-tracker" OR "eye tracker" OR "eye-tracking" OR "eye tracking" OR "Restricted Focus Viewer") and ("BPM" OR "Business Process" OR "Process Models" OR "Business Process Models")and ("understanding" OR "understandability" OR "comprehension" OR "comprehensibility") ) |

* + 1. (A.1.4) Define Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

The objective of this activity is to establish a set of criteria to filter out unnecessary studies. Here it is interesting to highlight that even after refining the search queries, the resulting number of papers can still be refined through a set of inclusion and exclusion criteria, to guarantee minimal quality of the results. Table 3 shows our inclusion and exclusion criteria.

**Table 3**. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Criteria | Detail |
| I1 (inclusion) | We included peer-reviewed papers from journals, conferences and workshops that present use of eye-tracking technology in the analysis of the understanding of process models. |
| I2 (inclusion) | Relevant studies cited by authors of the papers we read during the conduction process obtained by forward snowball search. |
| E1 (exclusion) | Papers with unavailable access. |
| E2 (exclusion) | Papers with only abstract available; extended abstracts or short paper (less than six pages). |
| E3 (exclusion) | Duplicated papers. |
| E4 (exclusion) | Papers that did not apply to research questions. |
| E5 (exclusion) | Papers written in other than the English language. |
| E6 (exclusion) | Papers not meeting some quality criteria (regarding quality criteria, more details are given in the section 3.1.6). |

Given that not all the criteria are mutually exclusive and the execution order matters, we suggest an analysis of the criteria to define one equation to prioritize exclusion criteria and another for inclusion criteria. These equations ensure that exclusion and inclusion criteria are applied in the same sequence during each paper analysis. An example is given in Figure 4. This was particularly important in our case with four people executing the SLR.

**if** *paper* **http://www.somatematica.com.br/figuras/simbolos/contido.gif** (E1 | E2 | E3 | E4 | E5) **then** exclude (*paper*);

**if** *paper* **http://www.somatematica.com.br/figuras/simbolos/contido.gif** (!(E1 | E2 | E3 | E4 | E5) & (I1 | I2)) **then** include (*paper*) **else** exclude (*paper*)

**Figure 4**. Equation defining order of execution.

* + 1. (A.1.5) Define Data Extraction Strategy

The objective of this activity is to define a strategy to extract data from selected primary studies. In our case we define a template to record the relevant information related to the research questions. The five sections of this template should be filled according to the following indications:

* Section 1 (mandatory): records basic information on the paper: paper identifier, title, conference or journal, year, number of citations, digital library.
* Section 2 (optional): records the metrics are used to measure the visual comprehension of eye-tracking business process models.
* Section 3 (optional): records the business process model notation that was used in the study.
* Section 4 (optional): records the information directly associated the contributions have been reported about the application of the eye-tracker device.
* Section 5 (optional): records the profile of the subjects who used the eye tracking device.

The data extraction form must be filled with the mandatory section, and at least one of the optional sections. This is so because not all the papers answer all the research questions.

* + 1. (A.1.6) Define Quality Assessment

The objective of this activity is to define the criteria to measure the quality of each primary study. However, there isn't agreed definition of what a high-level quality study is; there is a common agreement that the quality of the selected primary studies is fundamental to obtain more reliable results (Kitchenham and Charters, 2007).

Thus, we defined four quality assessment criteria (QA1 – QA4) to be considered when applying the excluding criteria E6, using an approach similar to that in Jamshidi *et al.* (2012) and based on bibliometric impact information. While QA1 uses four general and four specific criteria (Table 4), QA2 uses the ranking of the publications forums, QA3 uses the papers’ citations and QA4 relaxes QA3. Each of these criteria is discussed next.

QA1 is calculated using the QualityScore given by Equation 1, where the General (G) and Specific (S) assessment factors are summarized in Table 4. The result is a numerical quantification to rank the selected studies. The quality assessment checklist, with G and S composed of four items each and each one with a maximum score of 1, shows a weighted average, where S weights 3 times more than G, as the specific contributions (S) of a study is more important than the general contributions (G). Papers with an overall score >= 2.5 were considered “high” quality studies; papers with a score >= 1.5 and < 2.5 were considered “medium” quality; and papers with a score < 1.5 were considered of "lower" quality and were excluded from the analysis. It is important to highlight that we do not evaluate the quality of the paper itself with this criterion, but only its contributions’ alignment with our purpose.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | (1) |

**Table 4**. Quality Assessment Checklist.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **General Items (G) = 25%** | **Specific Items (S) = 75%** |
| G1: Problem definition and motivation:   1. Explicit Definition (1.0) 2. General Definition (0.5) 3. No definition (0.0) | S1: Evaluation of the study:   1. Formalized evaluation (1.0) 2. Some informal evidences are provided (0.5) 3. Non-justified or ad-hoc validation (0.0) |
| G2: Research methodology:   1. An empirical methodology (1.0) 2. A generalized analysis (0.5) 3. Lacks any proper methods (0.0) | S2: Definition of the experimentation method:   1. Formalized experimentation method (1.0) 2. Some informal evidences are provided (0.5) 3. Non-justified or ad-hoc experimentation method (0.0) |
| G3: The study contributions refer to the study results:   1. Explicitly correlates contributions to results (1.0) 2. There isn't correlation between contributions and results (0.5) 3. There isn't description of contributions or results (0.0) | S3: Metrics to validate comprehension characteristics:   1. Formalized definition of metrics (1.0) 2. Some informal definition of metrics (0.5) 3. Non-justified or ad-hoc definition of metrics (0.0) |
| G4: Limitations and future implications of the study:   1. Formalized empirical evaluations (1.0) 2. Some informal evidences are provided (0.5) 3. Non-justified or ad-hoc validation (0.0) | S4: Use of another device in addition to eye-tracking:   1. Formalized definition of another device (1.0) 2. Some informal definition of another device (0.5) 3. No definition (0.0) |

The second quality assessment criteria (QA2) rates papers according to the forums where they were published. For this assessment we used CORE[[2]](#footnote-2) to determine the rates for conferences and SJR[[3]](#footnote-3) for journals. It considers “high” for papers published in conferences rated A or in journals rated Q1 and “medium” for papers published in conferences rated B or in journals rated Q2. It considers “lower” for papers published in conferences rated C or in journals rated Q3. For forums no have scored considers “lower” too.

The third quality assessment criteria (QA3) rates papers according to their citations. Where, one paper is considered a “high” score for articles with more than five citations, a “medium” score for articles with less than five citations and “lower” score for articles without citations. We will use Google Scholar[[4]](#footnote-4) to verify number of citations.

However, the QA3 will be unfair to recent work for having fewer citations. For these cases, the fourth quality assessment criteria (QA4) analyze, articles from the last five years, which have potentially "high" relevance, have at least one citation and articles that have not been cited have potentially "medium" relevance. For a paper to be included in review, an article must obtain CQ1> = 1.5 and its criteria for bibliographic impact CQ2, CQ3 and QA4 must be “medium” or higher.

* + 1. (A.2) Analyze Protocol, (A.3) Provide Feedback and (A.4) Review Protocol

The objective of these activities is to evaluate and validate the SLR protocol. Thus, outcomes from phase (A) where evaluated by Reviewers during a session with two specialists. These specialists are experts in EBSE. For this reviewing session, we prepared a 30-minute presentation with the objective of the study, the process followed, and the outcomes. After presentation, we had session to discuss and collect reviewer comments based on the presentation and a checklist was provided to the Reviewers for feedback. This checklist was composed of 10 questions, each evaluated in a range 1 to 5, where 1 meant full disagreement and 5 meant full agreement with the statement. In general, the feedback received was very good, as the quality assessment results ranged from 75% (average 4) to 100% (average 5).

1. Search Studies

This subprocess is composed of four activities (see Figure 5). From these activities, three are assigned to the Researchers responsible for the study and one is assigned to the Reviewers. The Researchers are responsible for the activities (B.1)Perform Search in the Sources, (B.2) Analyze Search Results and (B.3) Apply Quality Assessment; and the Reviewers is responsible for the activity (B.4) Review Primary Studies. Each activity will be detailed in next sections.
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**Figure 5**. Subprocess (B) Search Studies

4.1 (B.1) Perform Search in the Sources

The objective of this activity is to execute the searches in digital libraries. Thus, some specific configurations were considered during the search in each database, e.g., advanced search with command line was selected in all databases as it demonstrated to be more accurate than a simple advanced search. This said, papers metadata was used to perform the searches.

Figure 6 shows the distribution of studies by digital libraries. These studies were automatic coleted in digital libraries used the defined search queries (Table 2). In total, 1,482 were found, where it the majority 713 (48.27 %) come from the Springer Link library. The libery Science Direct returned 502 (33.99 %), the second-largest number of studies. The remaining libraries returned a much smaller amount of studies, in which: 180 (12.19 %) studies were retrieved from the ACM Digital Library, 27 (1.83 %) came from Scopus, 23 (1.56 %) were retrieved from the IEEE, 20 (1.35 %) came from Engineering Village and finally 12 (0.81 %) came from Web of Science.



**Figure 6.** Studies found distributed by digital libraries.

4.2 (B.2) Analyze Search Results and (B.3) Apply Quality Assessment

The objective of these activities is to analyze the studies to select the list of primary studies and perform quality assessment. In the Analyze Search Results activity the initial selection phase is carried out. At this stage, the inclusion and exclusion criteria (see Table 3), with the exception of E6, were applied in all the studies identified, through the evaluation of titles, keywords, and abstracts. However, in some cases, it was difficult to determine whether or not the research was relevant only by reading those data. Thus, whenever there was any doubt about the inclusion or not of a particular study, the recommendation adopted - at this stage - was by its inclusion, being the decision of keeping it postponed to the final selection.
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The Figure 7 shows the amount of studies founded, segmented by the selection criteria in the two selection phases. In this initial selection, of the 1,482 studies found, 1,455 were excluded when applying the equation defined in Figure 4. So, based on this first selection, only 27 primary studies were taken to the final selection.

Next, we applied the (B3) Apply Quality Assessment; in it all the inclusion and exclusion criteria (including the E6) were applied again in the studies included in the first stage, through the evaluation of their complete texts. Thus, for 27 studies selected in the previous phase, 3 were rejected by the exclusion criteria (E1 to E5) after reading the entire text. Therefore, the quality criteria were applied to 24 remaining studies.

When applying the E6 criteria, 14 papers obtained in the QA1 criterion a value less than 1.5 or were considered "lower" by one more of the other criteria (QA2, QA3 or Q4) reducing to 10 the number of studies for (B4) Review Primary Studies.

* 1. (B.4) Review Primary Studies

The objective of this activity is to reviews list of selected primary studies. The Reviewers’ related activity was performed by an expert in EBSE, with experience in business process management, with the objective to decide and confirm included and excluded papers.

Here it is interesting to highlight that the two selection stages were performed independently and in parallel by two researchers. Thus, any inconsistency of the researchers can be reviewed by a third person in the search for a concession between the selected papers. The product of this activity is a single list of selected and reviewed papers.

5. Analyze Studies

This sub process is composed of five activities (see Figure 8). From these activities, four are assigned to the Researchers of the study and one are assigned to the Reviewers. The Researchers apply the (C.1) Data Extraction Strategy, (C.2) Consolidate Results, (C.3) Analyze Consolidated Results, and (C.5) Review Consolidated Results. The Reviewer comments and review the results ((C.4) Comment and Review the Results).
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Figure 8. Subprocess (C) Analyze Studies.

5.1 (C.1) Apply Data Extraction Strategy and (C.2) Consolidate Results

The objective of these activities is to extract data from the selected primary studies and consolidate the findings. This, the set of 10 primary studies were analyzed for the data extraction process, and a form was filled for each paper. Each paper received a unique identifier in the data extraction form.

5.2 (C.3) Analyze Consolidated Results

The objective of this activity is to analyze the consolidated data to provide a classification and review results. Our analysis starts with a summary of the demographic data for the primary studies and proceeds to discussing the results according to the aforementioned research questions.

5.2.1 Demographic Data

This section describes important information such as where, when and who published the selected papers. Table 5 shows the segmented by type of publication. Half of the papers are conference articles and half of the studies are journal articles.

**Table 5**. Selected papers segmented by type of publication.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Publications type | Total | Studies |
| Conference paper | 5 | Chen *et al.* (2018), Vermeulen (2018), Zimoch *et al.* (2018); Petrusel and Mendling (2013), Pinggera *et al.* (2012) |
| Journal papers | 5 | Burattin *et al.* (2019), Tallon *et al.*, (2019), Bera *et al.* (2019), Petrusel *et al.* (2017), Petrusel *et al.* (2016) |

As can it be seen in Figure 7, the *Web of Science* database returned most (40%) of the selected studies. In turn, the *Engineering Village*, *Science Direct*, *Springer journals* presented 2 studies each.

Table 6 shows the names of the journals, conferences and workshops with their respective publication numbers. The table shows that the *International Conference on Business Process Management* has the largest number of publications, with three studies. On the other hand, there were no repetitions in relation to publications in journals.

**Table 6**. Selected papers segmented by publication location.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Source | Source Type | Total | Studies |
| Data & knowledge engineering | Joural | 1 | Burattin *et al.* (2019) |
| Decision Support Systems | Joural | 1 | Petrusel *et al.* (2017) |
| Expert systems with applications | Joural | 1 | Tallon *et al.* (2019) |
| Information and Software Technology | Joural | 1 | Petrusel *et al.* (2016) |
| MIS Quarterly | Joural | 1 | Bera *et al.* (2019) |
| International Conference on Business Process Management | Conference | 3 | Zimoch et al. (2018)  Chen et al. (2018)  Pinggera et al. (2012) |
| International Conference on Advanced Information Systems Engineering | Conference | 1 | Petrusel & Mendling (2013) |
| On the Move to Meaningful Internet Systems: OTM Workshops | Workshop | 1 | Vermeulen (2018) |

As mentioned earlier, citations citations were used as a quality assessment criteria. Thus, we observed the number of citations of the selected studies (Figure 9). From the 10 selected studies there are a total of 125 citations. The studies of the Petrusel *et al.* (2016); Petrusel et al. (2017); Petrusel & Mendling (2013); Pinggera et al. (2012) were the most cited accounting for 88% of citations. In this context, it is possible to highlight that perhaps the number of citations in the study by Pinggera et al. (2012) is due to its pioneering nature. But not least, we should also highlight the studies by Tallon et al. (2019); Bera et al. (2019); Vermeulen (2018) with just one quote, as they are more recent.

Figure 9**.** Number of citations per study.

Figure 10 shows the distribution of the studies considering the year of its publication. The first two studies found date from the year 2013. There is a concentration of publications in the last two years totaling 6 studies.

Figure 10**:** Distribution of studies per year.

Table 7 presents the 33 authors of the selected studies. Out of the 33 authors, 5 (15.15%) have more than one article included in the RSL. The authors with more reviews are Razvan Petrusel and Jan Mendling owning three studies. They are followed by the authors Barbara Weber, Hajo A. Reijers, Manfred Reichert and Rüdiger Pryss with two studies.

**Table 7.** Authors of studies.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total | Autors |
| 3 | Razvan Petrusel, Jan Mendling |
| 2 | Barbara Weber, Hajo A. Reijers, Manfred Reichert, Rüdiger Pryss |
| 1 | Andrea Burattin, Jakob Pinggera, Jeffrey Parsons , Katharina Reiter, Katrin Rakoczy, Manuel Neurauter, Marco Furtner, Mark W. Greenlee, Markus Martini , Marta Indulska, Michael Kaiser, Michael Winter, Michael Zimoch, Miles Tallon, Palash Bera, Pierre Sachse, Pnina Soffer, Shazia Sadiq, Stefan Zugal, Sven Vermeulen, Thomas Probst, Tianwa Chen, Tim Mohring, Ulrich Frick, Wei Wang, Winfried Schlee, |

5.2.2 Context

Is eye-tracking technology being used in the analysis of the understanding of business process models?All the studies found used the eye-tracking device to verify comprehension in business process models, each study using the device to evaluate different topics in the understanding of the models. The Table 8 presents the categorization of studies by these topics. Studies Zimoch *et al*. (2018) and Bera *et al*. (2019) use the eye tracking device to evaluate different business process modeling notations to determine which is best understood. Studies Petrusel *et al*. (2016), and Chen *et al*. (2018) assess the understanding of structures or specific elements from which they were added in the notation. The remaining studies evaluate how different readers understand business process models in a particular notation.

**Table 8:** Studies Classification.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Application | Total | Studies |
| In the comparison between notations | 2 | Zimoch *et al*. (2018), Bera *et al*. (2019) |
| In addition of new artifacts | 2 | Petrusel *et al*., (2016), Chen *et al*. (2018) |
| In the evaluation of the models | 6 | Pinggera *et al*., (2012), Petrusel and Mendling, (2013),  Petrusel *et al*., (2017), Vermeulen, (2018),  Burattin *et al*., (2019), Tallon *et al*., (2019) |

What metrics are used to measure the visual comprehension of eyetracking business process models? Typically, there are many methods for exploring eye-data. The most common one is to analyse the visual path (scan-path) of the participant across a computer screen, where each eye-data observation is translated into pixel coordinates. From there, the presence or absence of eye-data points in different AOIs can be examined Sharafi et al. (2015b). This type of analysis, found in studies, is used to determine which features are seen, when a particular feature captures attention, how quickly the eye moves, what content is overlooked, among other gaze-related questions.

Thus, Table 9 presents the metrics used to evaluate the understanding of business process models. Ocular data found in the studies were classified based on 4 (four) indicators:

* Fixation: the eye-fixation metric was used in most (70%) of the mapped studies. The fixation consists of the visual attention time of the participant in an area of interest while performing a task (Santos et al., 2016). On average the eyes move to a new fixation position during business process model viewing about three times each second, though there is a good deal of variability in the duration of fixations (Burattin et al., 2019; Bera et al., 2019; Vermeulen, 2018; Zimoch et al., 2018; Petrusel et al., 2017, 2016; Pinggera et al., 2012). Two important issues for understanding eye movements during models perception are: where a fixation tends to be directed; and how long it typically remains there. In this context, researchers in psychology claim that most of the information acquisition and cognitive processing occur during fixations (Irwin, 2004). These eye fixations are intercalated by rapideye jumps, called saccades, during which vision issuppressed.
* Saccade: the saccade metric was used in 20% and consist of the sudden, swift movement that occurs between eye-fixations, it has a duration of about 40 to 50 mil liseconds (Santos et al., 2016). Researchers in psychology claim that there is evidence that these saccade-induced shifts of visual attention not only facilitate stimulus processing at the saccade target location, but also influence the contents of mental representations as well (Irwin, 2004). This metric supports the conclusion that attention shifts obligatorily to the location of the saccade target, thereby increasing the likelihood that features near that location will be conjoined and encoded as integrated objects into memory (Vermeulen, 2018; Zimoch et al., 2018). Thus, understanding a business process model involve the sequencing, scan-path, those saccades.
* Scan-Path: a scan-path metric is a set of fixations or AOI, in chronological order. Here, they were used in 30% of the studies. In this context it is interesting to highlight that an AOI is visited if there is at least one fixation in it. Thus, scan-paths and AOI can be connecte with the participants’ understanding strategies of the business process models. Researchers in psychology showed that scan-paths are representative of the tasks being performed by participants Sharafi et al. (2015b).
* Duration: also, as a metric we found the duration, which was used in 50% of the studies. The duration represents the time that the participant takes to complete a given task Sharafi et al. (2015b). Typically, these tasks involve checking the understanding of the models (what does the model represent?). That is, check if the participants have difficulties in performing the tasks (Bera et al., 2019; Tallon et al., 2019; Vermeulen, 2018; Petrusel et al., 2017; Pinggera et al., 2012).

It is interesting to highlight that associated with the metrics; 40% of the studies (Tallon et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2018; Zimoch et al., 2018; Pinggera et al., 2012) used a questionnaire with questions about the domain of business process models. According to the number of correct answers, the studies indicate whether the participants understood the models or not.

**Table 9.** Evaluation Metrics.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Metrics | Total | Studies |
| Eye Fixation | 7 | Pinggera *et al.* (2012), Petrusel *et al.* (2016),  Petrusel *et al.* (2017), Vermeulen, (2018),  Zimoch *et al.* (2018), Bera *et al.* (2019),  Burattin *et al.* (2019) |
| Saccade | 2 | Vermeulen, (2018), Zimoch *et al*. (2018) |
| Scan Path | 3 | Petrusel *et al.* (2017), Vermeulen (2018),  Zimoch *et al.* (2018) |
| Duration | 5 | Pinggera *et al.* (2012), Petrusel *et al.* (2017),  Vermeulen, 2018, Tallon et al. (2019),  Bera *et al.* (2019) |

Which business process model notations are evaluated in the studies? As it can be seen in the all studies evaluate the understanding of business process models in BPMN notation (OMG, 2011). Study Bera *et al.* (2019) compares the understanding between models in BPMN (OMG, 2011) and EPC (Scheer and Nüttgens, 2000).

What contributions have been reported about the application of the eye-tracker device to evaluate the understanding of process models? The selected studies present results that show that the application of the eye-tracking device can offer essential contributions to the understanding of the process models. Table 10 presents the contributions of the selected studies.

**Table 10.** Studies Contributions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Study | Contributions |
| Tallon et al., (2019) | This study has two experiments. In the first experiment has a sample with 1047 students from school classes were evaluated. The second study had a sample of 21 specialists and 15 beginners in the use of process models. Three process models, in BPMN notation, with increasing complexity levels were used in the experiment. Participants in both samples demanded longer response times with increasing model complexity. For the Sample I, Six latent classes with qualitatively differing solution profiles were adequate to classify scholars. These configurative and non-ordered profiles can be interpreted as separate solution patterns, where specific model parts are understood better than others. For de sample ||, could not find significant differences in cognitive solution patterns between experts and novices. Thus, understanding and “solving” process models does not seem to depend too much on visual literacy as defined in this study. Apparently, comprehending the logic behind IF and OR gates as well as recognizing pathways is crucial to follow the information flow in process models. |
| Bera et al. (2019) | The authors perform a comparative study between the EPC and EPC-H notation, the latter is a variant of the EPC, proposed by the authors, in which the organizational units and the associated activities in an EPC model are highlighted by marking each function with a different color. In addition, the authors carry out a second comparative study between EPC-H and BPMN. The study found that participants viewed EPC models spent significantly more time in terms of fixation and duration than participants viewed EPC-H and BPMN models. In addition, participants viewed the variation in EPC notation proposed by the authors (EPC-H) spent significantly more time than participants who viewed BPMN models. The study indicates that coloring the EPC model has beneficial effects on its understanding, however even without the use of colors, the BPMN notation has better compressibility than colored EPC. |
| Vermeulen (2018) | It is a work in progress, appearing only the strategy of how a future experiment will run. In the pilot experiment, the visual behavior of 10 participants was analyzed to confirm the theory of the existence of different BPD reading strategies. |
| Zimoch *et al.* (2018) | The performance of participants decreases as the level of difficulty increases. However, regardless of their level of expertise, all individuals have similar standards when faced with process models that exceed a certain level of difficulty. Participants' overall performance demonstrates a better understanding of business process models in EPC notation compared to the BPMN. |
| Petrusel *et al.* (2017) | There is no influence between the reader's familiarity with business mastery and the proper understanding of the model. They point out that a Visual Cognition Efficiency (measured by Scan Path Precision and Recall) and Visual Cognition Intensity (measured by Total Fixtures and Total Fixture Length) better explain the comprehension performance (higher efficiency, shorter duration) than a model of personal knowledge and model complexity. For them, higher levels of specialization in business process modeling and lower complexity of the model lead to better cognitive efficiency. |
| Petrusel *et al.* (2016) | The performance in the understanding of the models was better with the collaborative model than the individual and the layout change of the BPMN models proposed by the experiment. |
| Petrusel and Mendling (2013) | The elements of the area of interest are fixed for longer than other elements of the model by the subjects who provided the correct answer to the question of understanding. More elements of the area of interest are set than other elements of the model by subjects who provided the correct answer to the question of understanding. |
| Pinggera *et al.* (2012) | It can be observed that the average duration are smaller for the fixations in the task description compared to the fixations in the process model. The perceived lower complexity, once, allows the modelers to consider additional features of the model, such as secondary notation of the process model from the outset. It is noticeable that when the average length of fixings is increased by about 30%, the participants are facing a challenging part of the model. |
| Burattin *et al.* (2019) | The new analysis technique and the exploring of new source data resulted in higher precision at identifying the types of phases in the process of models’ creation in relation to the traditional technique. This technique allowed identifying factors such as: problems comprehension, methods discovery, semantic and syntactic validation. |
| Chen *et al.* (2018) | The results of matched post-hoc comparisons show that diagrammatic integration is associated with greater accuracy of comprehension than text annotation and link integration. Obviously, there is no significant difference in mental effort between different integration approaches. The presence and quantity of XOR gateways, AND gateways and issues that require navigation of constructions through loop structures, seems to influence understanding. |

5.3 (C.4) Comment and Review Results and (C.6) Review Consolidated Results

The objective of these activities is to evaluate and validate the data consolidation files. Thus, classified and consolidated results were evaluated by two Reviewers. These Reviewers’ background was on business process managemment, software engineering, empirical software engineering and statistics. The final results were validated with the insertion of some suggestions to represent the results of the data.

6. Threats to Validity

The main limitations of this study are related to the manual control process, as well as the subjectivity to classify and consolidate data. To minimize the impact of these limitations, a set of review activities was performed. A validation session with 2 software engineering specialists was undertaken during phase (A) Plan the SLR, with two activities assigned to the Reviewers, (A.2) Analyze Protocol and (A.3) Provide Feedback. In phase (B) Search Studies, one activity was assigned to the Reviewer (B.4) Review Primary Studies. Their feedback was very useful to improve the quality of the process artifacts. For example, quality assessment was applied to primary studies to support the Reviewers’ evaluation. During phase (C) Analyze Studies, the Reviewers performed an activity, (C.4) Comment and Review Results and the Researchers more a (C.5) Review Consolidated Results.

Regarding our SLR we were so totally immersed in the work that objectivity could be thought as an issue. To mitigate this risk, in additiona to chosing only peer-reviewed papers, we used the QualityScore approach to reduce the subjectivity of the analysis, and used quality assessment criteria based on bibliometric impact information (approach widely used in systematic reviews published in the literature).

1. Related Works

The studies of the Dikici et al. (2018) and Figl (2017) investigate the factors that influence the understanding of process models but do not specifically address the use of do eye-tracking as a way of measuring comprehension. However, there is the study Sharafi *et al.,* (2015b) that verifies the use of eye-tracking technology in software engineering. This study conducts a comprehensive survey, but that does not explicitly address business process models. Moreover, this research (Sharafi *et al.*, 2015b) is limited until the year 2014 and with only one search source. After the research by similar studies and in the context already mentioned in work, it was necessary to perform the systematic mapping to know the aspects involved in the understanding of the business process models through techniques and eye-traking.

In recent work, we performed a systematic literature mapping (SLM) that identifies and analyses primary studies that to provide an overview of researches that evaluate the understanding of process models through eye-tracking techniques (Anonymous et al., 2019)[[5]](#footnote-5). However, the underlying protocol don't they impose a quality assessment of primary studies. Furthermore, this study only presents a list with studies on using eye-tracking for investigating quality aspect of business process models (or their notations).

In this paper, we revisit the SLM described in Anonymous et al. (2019), enriching the process with quality assessment measures to evaluate primary studies list. Quality measure is an important way to classify the primary studies to allow further analysis and prioritization. The quality assessment measures applied during this revisit determines the relevance and impact of the paper. Additionally, as presented in section Threats to Validity, a set of control activities was included in the revisit to add transparency to the execution and management activities.

Finally, in this revisit we present several open issues, identifing gaps in current research in order to suggest areas for further investigation. Therefore, we also differentiate ourselves from previous work by providing a structure and background for the proper development of future research activities.

1. Research Roadmap

The previous discussions of the results and major findings highlight several open issues, suggesting worthwhile topics for future research. In particular:

* **To propose a method for the quantitative evaluation of the quality of business process models and their modelling activities:** the idea here is to define (bio)metrics, with the aid of eye-tracking, about the models and the way stakeholders interact with them, using scenarios to evaluate their usability (understanding) in terms of appropriateness recognisability and learnability.
* **To evaluate the effect of the layout guidelines on the modelling novice stakeholders' ability to understand and review your business process models:** the idea here is to performe an experiment where participants were given tasks of the understanding and reviewing. Both tasks must involve a model with a bad layout and another model following layout guidelines with good practice. Thus, with the aid of eye-tracking, it will be possible to evaluate the impact of layouts by combining the success level in those tasks and the required effort to accomplish them.
* **To define a consistent terminology with metrics names, and methods:** the idea here is to define standard guidelines and terminology while conducting and reporting an eye-tracking experiment. Using standard guidelines to design experiments for modellig tasks could reduce the risks of failure and also mitigates threats to validity. Using a uniform way to report an experiment that uses eye-tracking can benefit our community. This standardization can provide valuable information on how to review, replicate and analyze the data from an experiment with the eye-tracking. Here it is worth mentioning that conducting an eye-tracking experiment requires further, more specific recommendations with regards to the limitations associated with this technology.
* **To study the differences in business process models comprehension watching navigation strategies between experienced and less experienced business designers in the modelling languages:** the idea here is to use eye-tracking technology and have investigated how designers understand business models. That is, to use the eye-tracking technology to study the differences in models comprehension and models reading navigation strategies between experienced and less experienced business designers in the notations to represent BPD, e.g., BPMN.
* **To verify the cognitive effectiveness of business process models:** In particular, the business process community is concerned with bridging the perceived gap between sophisticated modelling languages approaches and the stakeholders with whom designers need to interact with. As such, devising ways of making these processes languages more accessible is perceived as very important. Idea here is to propose approaches to help improving the understandability of processes models, by improving the concrete syntax of those models through the definition of a set of principles, for designing cognitively effective visual notations. In this case, cognitive effectiveness must be obtained by the speed, ease and precision with which the business model content can be understood by the stakeholders.

1. Conclusions

Performing an SLR is not a simple task. The challenges are several and the skills and time required are not always available in a research group, and hardly in an industry-like set up. This paper presents an enriched SLR process with control activities and discusses how to achieve the prescribed objectives. Also, it shares a set of templates to register and trace data and decisions along the process is also presented

Thus, with this SLR we performed a study to find empirical evidence about how the eye-tracking technology has been applied in the understanding of the business process models. The end result is an overview of the current practice of eye-tracking in business process models, and it can be seen that the business process community benefits little from the use of eye-tracking. The evidence found indicates that the selected studies are strongly concerned with the understanding of process models, but none of them are concerned with recognition and the ability to learn modeling itself. Also, it was possible to verify that there is no standardization about the use of eye-tracking technology in the analysis of the process models. Although there is a standardization of terms used in the use of eye-tracking, for instance, ocular, sacral, sweep path, duration and attempt-pill.

These issues identified can be used to offer a research agenda. In works intended for the near future, we will focus our research on the system atization of the manner in which an evaluation with an eye-tracking should be built. Also, we will contribute to improve the state of practice with the conduction of controlled experiments to evaluate the understanding of business process modeling on the fly
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