

Title	Anxiety classification in virtual reality using biosensors: A mini scoping review
Authors	Mevlevioğlu, Deniz;Tabirca, Sabin;Murphy, David
Publication date	2023-07-10
Original Citation	Mevlevioğlu, D., Tabirca, S. and Murphy, D. (2023) 'Anxiety classification in virtual reality using biosensors: A mini scoping review', PLOS ONE, 18(7), e0287984 (15 pp). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0287984 .
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0287984 - 10.1371/journal.pone.0287984
Rights	© 2023 Mevlevioğlu et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. - https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/
Download date	2024-12-04 04:09:08
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/15118



UCC

University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

Supplementary Material

Quality Assessment Scale

- QS1: Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?
 - Yes: Findings are explicitly stated and adequately discussed in relation to the initial research question
 - No: No information
 - Partially: The aims are stated but not sufficiently discussed
- QS2: Were the methods used justified in the paper?
 - Yes: The biosignals and machine learning methods used were described with the reasons and it had face validity
 - No: Not explained
 - Partially: Methods were explained but either not justified or not detailed enough and/or were open for interpretation
- QS3: Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research?
 - Yes: Sample size and population were determined before the research and justified as to why this population is the best for the aims of the study
 - No: There is no information regarding how the participants were selected
 - Partially: There was some information on the recruitment process but eligibility criteria
- QS4: Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?
 - Yes: The study received ethical approval from a committee and clearly states the policy number
 - No: No information
 - Partially: Ethical concerns were explained clearly for the reader to make out that enough was done to avoid them, but there was no mention of ethical approval from a committee

- QS5: Were the classification model(s) used clearly explained and sufficient?
 - Yes: There was a clear explanation of the analysis done and it was appropriate to study, specifically with diagrams and justification for them being used
 - No: No information
 - Partially: Process was briefly mentioned but without sufficient detail and/or open to interpretation
- QS6: Is there a clear statement of findings?
 - Yes: Findings are explicitly stated and adequately discussed in relation to the initial research question
 - No: No information
 - Partially: The findings are stated but not adequately discussed
- QS7: Are the limitations of the study thoroughly discussed?
 - Yes: There are references to sample and technical reasons that the study might not be generalisable
 - No: No limitations discussed
 - Partially: There are some limitations discussed, but there are some concerns that were not mentioned
- QS8: Are the contributions of the study to the literature and future research discussed?
 - Yes: There is an adequate discussion about the contribution of the study
 - No: No mention
 - Partially: Contributions to the literature are superficially discussed, with little evidence or justification from the findings of the paper and where they fit in the area