

Towards Recommending Usability Improvements with Multimodal Large Language Models

Sebastian Lubos
Graz University of Technology
Graz, Austria
slubos@ist.tugraz.at

Gerhard Leitner
University of Klagenfurt
Klagenfurt am Wörthersee, Austria
Gerhard.Leitner@aau.at

Alexander Felfernig
Graz University of Technology
Graz, Austria
alexander.felfernig@ist.tugraz.at

Julian Schwazer
University of Klagenfurt
Klagenfurt am Wörthersee, Austria
Julian.Schwazer@aau.at

Abstract

Usability describes a set of essential quality attributes of *user interfaces (UI)* that influence human-computer interaction. Common evaluation methods, such as usability testing and inspection, are effective but resource-intensive and require expert involvement. This makes them less accessible for smaller organizations. Recent advances in multimodal LLMs offer promising opportunities to automate usability evaluation processes partly by analyzing textual, visual, and structural aspects of software interfaces. To investigate this possibility, we formulate usability evaluation as a *recommendation task*, where multimodal LLMs rank usability issues by severity. We conducted an initial proof-of-concept study to compare LLM-generated usability improvement recommendations with usability expert assessments. Our findings indicate the potential of LLMs to enable faster and more cost-effective usability evaluation, which makes it a practical alternative in contexts with limited expert resources.

CCS Concepts

• **Information systems** → **Recommender systems; Language models**; • **Human-centered computing** → **Usability testing**.

Keywords

Usability Evaluation, Large Language Models, Multimodal LLM, Recommender Systems, Software Quality

ACM Reference Format:

Sebastian Lubos, Alexander Felfernig, Gerhard Leitner, and Julian Schwazer. 2025. Towards Recommending Usability Improvements with Multimodal Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of arXiv preprint (arXiv'25)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 5 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

arXiv'25, No location

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YYYY/MM
<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

1 Introduction

The *usability* of an application, website, or other software system interface can be defined by a collection of quality attributes that describe how well users can interact with it [21]. Good usability is essential to ensure that users interact appropriately with a system, which can directly impact a system's success and revenue. Jacob Nielsen emphasized this by stating, "*The first law of e-commerce is that if users cannot find the product, they cannot buy it either*" [13]. If we generalize "buying" to "consuming", e.g., products, functions, or information, usability is critical not only for e-commerce but for any application users rely on in professional and private contexts.

Ensuring good usability requires systematic evaluation to identify user difficulties and improve *usability* and *user experience (UX)* [4, 6]. To support this time-intensive task, recent studies investigated the automation of usability evaluation using multimodal *large language models (LLMs)* [23]. Unlike traditional LLMs that only process text, multimodal LLMs allow inputs like images for richer contextual understanding. These models showed promising results in detecting usability issues in mobile apps based on task descriptions, screenshots, and code snippets, although they could not replace expert validation [15].

In this paper, we frame the identification of usability issues as a *recommendation task*, where multimodal LLMs analyze the interfaces of software systems and generate ranked lists of usability issues prioritized by severity. Automating this process can make usability evaluation more efficient and accessible, particularly for small companies that lack resources for traditional, costly evaluations. To assess the quality, we compare expert recommendations with those generated by LLMs.

The main contributions of this paper are the following:

- (1) We formalize usability evaluation and improvement as a recommendation task to *prioritize critical usability issues*.
- (2) We report results of a *proof-of-concept study* that compared LLM-generated recommendations with expert assessments.

2 Background and Related Work

The *ISO 9241-11:2018* standard defines *usability* as the "*extent to which a product can be used by specified users to achieve specified goals with effectiveness, efficiency and satisfaction in a specified context of use*" [7]. It is a central operational path of *human-computer*

interaction (HCI), concerned with designing, evaluating, and enhancing interactive systems for human use [5]. In this sense, *usability evaluation* is applied throughout the entire *software development lifecycle* [17] to identify issues and suggest improvements. It can be categorized into *usability testing* with real users [4] and *usability inspections* by experts, who act as users [6]. Both approaches demand time and the active participation of target users or experts.

To ease the adoption of usability evaluation, usability guidelines to promote consistency with platform standards have been introduced [1]. For systematic evaluation, the *Nielsen heuristics* [12] provide general principles for identifying common interface issues. Complementary methods like *cognitive walkthroughs* [18] involve experts simulating user tasks to reveal potential usability barriers. Yet, their application still requires considerable manual effort.

Solutions to automate usability assessments include rule-based tools and heuristic checkers, which often address limited aspects and struggle with subjective or context-dependent issues [2, 11]. Recently, multimodal LLMs capable of processing text and visual content have emerged [23]. Initial studies have demonstrated their potential to identify usability issues in mobile applications [15], although additional expert validation turned out to remain necessary. While this approach relied on UI code snippets as part of the context, our approach works with captured screenshots and role descriptions that describe the intended user. Additionally, we consider the ranking of identified issues by severity as a key component in generating usability improvement recommendations.

3 Recommending Usability Improvements Using Multimodal LLMs

Recent multimodal LLMs [23] enable new opportunities for automating usability evaluation by generating context-aware feedback, which can partly replace expert feedback [15]. In this context, we frame usability improvement as a *recommendation task*, where the application under evaluation defines the user context. The recommended “*items*” are usability issues along with explanations on how these could be resolved. These issues are ranked by severity to help users prioritize them.

Unlike traditional recommenders with fixed item catalogs, this approach follows an open recommendation paradigm, as it dynamically generates items (usability issues) using an LLM [9, 22]. The system predicts the most relevant issues for a given application context, while users review them to decide which recommendations to accept. This review demands sufficient user domain knowledge to validate the recommendations and identify misleading or irrelevant suggestions. Nevertheless, the system reduces the effort to manually evaluate the entire software application.

Figure 1 illustrates the *recommendation task*. For the LLM-based usability evaluation, the evaluation context is provided, including a general application description, a persona definition representing the user, specific criteria guiding the evaluation, and a screenshot of the application interface to be assessed. The respective prompt template is shown in Figure 2. To ensure focused and precise assessments, each prompt targets a single heuristic, selected either from the *Nielsen heuristics*¹ or *cognitive walkthrough* questions.²

¹<https://www.nngroup.com/articles/ten-usability-heuristics/>

²<https://www.nngroup.com/articles/cognitive-walkthroughs/>




Figure 1: Overview of the LLM-based usability evaluation as a recommendation task. Given the evaluation context, the LLM identifies and ranks usability issues by severity, which are then reviewed by the user.

You are a usability expert.
Your task is to do a usability evaluation based on the information you get for a view.
App description: {app_description}
Assume the following user task for this view: {persona}
A screenshot of the app view is provided.
{evaluation_criterion}
Explain your evaluation briefly in a maximum of 2 sentences.

Figure 2: Prompt template for the usability evaluation, where variables are shown in braces “{}”.

Evaluate the view based on the following Nielsen heuristic:
Match between System and Real World
It means the system should use familiar terminology and design controls that reflect real-world conventions, ensuring users easily understand and interact with it.
Assess the usability problem on a scale of 1 to 5 as follows:
1: No usability problem at all
2: Cosmetic problem, only fix if extra time is available
3: Minor usability problem, fix with low priority
4: Major usability problem, fix with high priority
5: Usability catastrophe, fix immediately

Figure 3: Example evaluation for Nielsen heuristics.

Evaluate the view based on Cognitive Walkthrough, considering:
Will the user notice that the correct action is available?
Answer the question with 'no' or 'yes'.

Figure 4: Example evaluation for cognitive walkthrough.

Although evaluating multiple heuristics or questions per prompt is possible, we restrict prompts to one for more precise assessments.

The LLM is instructed to assess the usability based on the screenshots explicitly, considering the persona and one selected evaluation criterion. For *Nielsen heuristics*, school grades (1-4 passed, 5 - failed) are assigned (see an example Figure 3), while for *cognitive walkthroughs*, a binary decision (passed/failed) is used (see an example Figure 4). Based on these ratings, the usability issues are *ranked by severity* to prioritize the most critical ones, where multiple issues can have the same severity assessment. For each identified issue, the LLM explains its assessment, similar to the evaluations provided by human experts. The user reviews these ranked usability issues to prioritize how these will be addressed.

4 Methodology

To validate whether the LLM-based approach can reliably recommend and rank usability issues by severity, we compared its outputs against evaluations from two usability experts. We selected the *KnowledgeCheckR* application [19] as representative for this study. *KnowledgeCheckR* is a learning platform offering microlearning, spaced repetition, and gamification. It supports multiple question types, provides immediate feedback, and is used for training, exams,

and compliance in corporate and educational settings. In our study, we focused on a university use case.

We defined two personas with different roles in a shared task: (i) a teacher creating a quiz with all available question types, and (ii) a student accessing a quiz via an invitation link and answering questions. We considered *KnowledgeCheckR* well-suited for this usability study as it is a non-trivial application with many configuration features that targets non-expert users like students and teachers who rely on good usability. Also, it was developed with a focus on functionality, and only limited efforts could be invested in user guidance, so it likely contains multiple usability issues.

For a baseline evaluation, two usability experts conducted independent usability assessments using the same guidelines (*Nielsen heuristics* and *cognitive walkthrough*) and the same rating scheme (school grades and binary decisions) as applied in the LLM-based approach. The first expert has over 20 years of experience in usability engineering, specializing in HCI and UX, and has numerous scientific publications and long university teaching experience. The second expert focuses on multimodal user interfaces for human-machine collaboration, with expertise in developing intelligent interactive systems. During their evaluation, they captured application screenshots for each persona task they performed to document their assessments. These screenshots were then used as input in the LLM prompts to ensure a consistent evaluation context. Depending on the task, multiple screenshots could exist (e.g., varying quiz outcomes). In these cases, LLM evaluated each separately, and the worst rating was used as the final assessment to emphasize the identification of critical issues.

Both experts independently evaluated the *teacher/student* usage scenario by interacting with the application deployed in production.³ As a result, their explicit tasks differed and were not directly comparable. Thus, the LLM was instructed separately for each expert’s screenshots, and its output was compared individually to their assessment, resulting in two evaluations of the same system.

To analyze the impact of different models, we evaluated six LLMs from *OpenAI* [8, 14] and *Google* [20], covering both *general-purpose* and *reasoning-optimized* variants (see Table 1). Although exact model sizes are undisclosed, we categorize them by type and relative size. This comparison highlights trade-offs in performance, speed, and cost, which are critical for practical deployment, where smaller models may offer more efficient solutions.

Table 1: Included LLMs. Category describes the model’s classification in our context. The temperature parameter was set to 0 for all LLMs except o1, which does not include this option.

LLM	Version	Category
gemini-2.0-flash-lite	001	small, general
gemini-2.5-pro	preview-03-25	large, general
gemini-2.0-flash-thinking	exp-01-21	reasoning
gpt-4.1-nano	2025-04-14	small, general
gpt-4.1	2025-04-14	large, general
o1	2024-12-17	reasoning

The model performance was evaluated in two steps. Firstly, we measured agreement with expert assessments using *Cohen’s Kappa*⁴

³<https://www.knowledgecheckr.com>

⁴The metric ranges from -1 (perfect disagreement) to 1 (perfect agreement), with 0 indicating chance-level agreement.

[10], by comparing the ratings for each user task (based on the screenshots) and evaluation criterion. For ordinal ratings (*Nielsen heuristics*), we used the quadratically weighted version to give more credit to near matches. Binary ratings (*cognitive walkthrough*) were evaluated without weighting. Secondly, we assessed the predictive accuracy of recommended usability issues using *Accuracy* and *Hit rate* [3], treating expert rankings as ground truth. Since usability issues are often related to multiple heuristics, we computed mean ratings across criteria to rank the issues by severity per task to help users identify which screenshots included the most critical issues. Additionally, we manually compared expert explanations with those generated by the LLMs to evaluate whether they highlighted the same issues. This aspect is relevant to acknowledge the inherently qualitative nature of usability evaluation.

5 Evaluation Results and Discussion

We first evaluated the agreement between each LLM and the two usability experts (exp_1, exp_2) based on the *Nielsen heuristics* and *cognitive walkthrough* evaluation (Table 2). For *Nielsen heuristics*, agreement scores were consistently near or below zero, which indicates substantial disagreement. It is possible that the LLMs struggled with the abstract character of the heuristics and the school-grade rating scale. Providing richer context could improve the alignment.

In contrast, the *cognitive walkthrough* results were better, as at least one LLM achieved *fair* agreement ($0.2 \leq \kappa < 0.4$) per expert [10]. This indicates that LLMs align better with more structured evaluations supported by explicit questions as criteria.

Table 2: Cohen’s Kappa measuring agreement between usability experts and LLMs.

LLM	Nielsen Heuristics		Cognitive Walkthrough	
	exp_1	exp_2	exp_1	exp_2
gemini-2.0-flash-lite	0.092	-0.018	0.167	0.319
gemini-2.5-pro	-0.129	0.092	-0.111	0.057
gemini-2.0-flash-thinking	-0.339	0.054	0.333	0.172
gpt-4.1-nano	-0.154	-0.436	0.056	-0.099
gpt-4.1	-0.156	-0.169	-0.167	0.299
o1	-0.284	-0.164	0.0	0.029

While the agreement metrics suggest that LLMs are not yet reliable substitutes for severity assessments, they may still help prioritize usability issues if their relative rankings align with expert judgments. To evaluate this, we computed the *Hit rate@k* (Table 3) to assess how often the top-ranked issues identified by the LLM matched at least one of those from expert evaluations. Starting from $k \geq 3$, there was at least one overlapping issue, particularly in the *cognitive walkthrough* evaluations. LLMs appear to perform better with explicit criteria and binary rating scales. For $k \geq 5$, all models showed at least one overlap with expert assessments. In contrast, for the more abstract *Nielsen heuristics*, smaller models (*gemini-2.0-flash-lite*, *gpt-4.1-nano*) failed to produce relevant results, whereas larger models generated more relevant recommendations.

To complement the *hit rate*, *Accuracy@k* (Table 5) measures how many recommendations were relevant. For *Nielsen heuristics*, several LLMs retrieved multiple relevant issues at $k = 5$, with *o1*

Table 3: Hit rate@k for recommending user tasks based on screenshots where the most severe usability issues were identified, comparing LLM predictions with expert assessments.

LLM	Nielsen Heuristics		Cognitive Walkthrough	
	@3	@5	@3	@5
<i>gemini-2.0-flash-lite</i>	0	0	1	1
<i>gemini-2.5-pro</i>	0	1	1	1
<i>gemini-2.0-flash-thinking</i>	1	1	1	1
<i>gpt-4.1-nano</i>	0	0	0	1
<i>gpt-4.1</i>	0	1	1	1
<i>o1</i>	0	1	0	1
<i>Average LLM</i>	0.167	0.667	0.667	1.0

and *gemini-2.0-flash-thinking* identifying 3 out of 5. At $k = 10$, all models reached $\approx 60\%$ accuracy, with *gpt-4.1-nano* performing best.

Cognitive walkthrough results were higher, with *gemini-2.0-flash-lite* leading across all k values. This emphasizes again that LLMs perform better with explicit binary assessments compared to more abstract heuristics. Further studies are needed to understand the impact of model size and reasoning capabilities in detail. Overall, the LLMs show potential to support usability evaluations by prioritizing critical issues, which could reduce manual effort.

Additionally, we conducted a qualitative analysis by comparing LLM-generated explanations with those provided by the usability experts. The goal was to explore whether LLMs identified the same issues and to obtain insights that warrant further investigation in future work. Table 4 presents selected examples to illustrate explanation quality and highlight potential strengths and weaknesses.

The comparison shows that LLMs can identify and describe relevant usability issues similar to experts. However, they occasionally miss aspects due to limited interaction with the interface, as they miss the dynamic application interaction, which could improve the accuracy. As multiple LLMs may interpret issues differently, a majority vote strategy could enhance reliability using a collaborative resolution of disagreements, which is common in expert reviews.

In summary, our study results suggest that multimodal LLMs can support and accelerate usability evaluations by recommending issues ranked by severity. LLMs performed best with explicit criteria and binary ratings, as in *cognitive walkthroughs*, where their recommendations aligned more closely with expert assessments. Furthermore, the performance varied across LLMs, with no clear advantage for larger or *reasoning-optimized* variants.

6 Limitations and Future Work

Despite encouraging results, several limitations must be addressed to strengthen the validity of our findings. Firstly, the study's scope was limited to two experts and a single application, which constrains generalizability. Secondly, the selected LLMs and prompt designs likely influenced performance, and alternative configurations may yield different results. Thirdly, expert evaluations are inherently subjective and may introduce bias.

Additionally, the qualitative analysis highlighted opportunities for improving our approach. One direction involves enhancing the LLMs' understanding of usability principles, potentially through advanced prompting strategies such as *chain-of-thought* or *few-shot prompting* [16]. Another critical aspect is accounting for the

temporal and interactive nature of user interfaces. Since our study used static screenshots, certain issues related to dynamic interaction could not be captured. Therefore, we plan to explore the usage of video screen recordings as the evaluation context in future work.

7 Conclusions

This work investigated the use of multimodal LLMs to support usability evaluation by identifying and prioritizing issues and explaining how these could be resolved. Our study shows that LLM-generated recommendations of severe usability issues can align with expert assessments, particularly for structured evaluation methods like *cognitive walkthroughs* using binary ratings. Yet, the performance varied across models, which highlights the need for further refinement. While LLMs are not yet a substitute for expert analysis, they show promise in assisting and accelerating usability evaluation (particularly for teams with limited resources or expertise).

References

- [1] Laura Carvajal, Ana M. Moreno, María-Isabel Sánchez-Segura, and Ahmed Sefah. 2013. Usability through Software Design. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 39, 11 (2013), 1582–1596. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2013.29>
- [2] John W. Castro, Ignacio Garnica, and Luis A. Rojas. 2022. Automated Tools for Usability Evaluation: A Systematic Mapping Study. In *Social Computing and Social Media: Design, User Experience and Impact*, Gabriele Meiselwitz (Ed.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 28–46.
- [3] Asela Gunawardana, Guy Shani, and Sivan Yogev. 2022. *Evaluating Recommender Systems*. Springer US, New York, NY, 547–601. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-0716-2197-4_15
- [4] Christopher Hass. 2019. *A Practical Guide to Usability Testing*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 107–124. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-96906-0_6
- [5] Thomas T Hewett, Ronald Baecker, Stuart Card, Tom Carey, Jean Gasen, Marilyn Mantei, Gary Perlman, Gary Strong, and William Verplank. 1992. *Human-Computer Interaction*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 5–29.
- [6] Tasha Hollingsed and David G. Novick. 2007. Usability inspection methods after 15 years of research and practice. In *Proceedings of the 25th Annual ACM International Conference on Design of Communication (El Paso, Texas, USA) (SIGDOC '07)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 249–255. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1297144.1297200>
- [7] International Organization for Standardization. 2018. ISO/IEC/IEEE International Standard - Ergonomics of human-system interaction – Part 11: Usability: Definitions and concepts. *ISO/IEC/IEEE 9241-11:2018(E)* (2018).
- [8] Ananya Kumar, Jiahui Yu, John Hallman, Michelle Pokrass, and Other Authors. 2025. Introducing GPT-4.1 in the API. <https://openai.com/index/gpt-4-1/>. Accessed: 23.04.2025.
- [9] Jianghao Lin, Xinyi Dai, Yunjia Xi, Weiwen Liu, Bo Chen, Hao Zhang, Yong Liu, Chuhan Wu, Xiangyang Li, Chenxu Zhu, Hui Feng Guo, Yong Yu, Ruiming Tang, and Weinan Zhang. 2025. How Can Recommender Systems Benefit from Large Language Models: A Survey. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 43, 2, Article 28 (Jan. 2025), 47 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3678004>
- [10] Mary McHugh. 2012. Interrater reliability: The kappa statistic. *Biochemia medica : časopis Hrvatskoga društva medicinskih biokemičara / HDMB* 22 (10 2012), 276–82. <https://doi.org/10.11613/BM.2012.031>
- [11] Abdallah Namoun, Ahmed Alrehailli, and Ali Tufail. 2021. A Review of Automated Website Usability Evaluation Tools: Research Issues and Challenges. In *Design, User Experience, and Usability: UX Research and Design*, Marcelo M. Soares, Elizabeth Rosenzweig, and Aaron Marcus (Eds.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 292–311.
- [12] Jakob Nielsen. 1994. Enhancing the explanatory power of usability heuristics. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (Boston, Massachusetts, USA) (CHI '94)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 152–158. <https://doi.org/10.1145/191666.191729>
- [13] Jacob Nielsen. 2012. Usability 101: Introduction to Usability. <https://www.nngroup.com/articles/usability-101-introduction-to-usability/>. Accessed: 22.04.2025.
- [14] OpenAI and Other Authors. 2024. OpenAI o1 System Card. arXiv:2412.16720 [cs.AI] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.16720>
- [15] Ali Ebrahimi Pourasad and Walid Maalej. 2025. Does GenAI Make Usability Testing Obsolete?. In *2025 IEEE/ACM 47th International Conference on Software*

Table 4: Comparison of example explanations for usability evaluation provided by human experts and LLMs.

Expert	LLM	Observations
The goal of sharing the created quiz with a student is reasonable [...], especially since the key and share buttons are prominently displayed.	gemini-2.0-flash-lite : The view provides clear options to add new questions, and the existing questions are displayed with their types [...]. The teacher can easily add new questions and share the quiz with the student.	Both explanations mention quiz sharing, though the LLM places less emphasis on it. More detailed context or cropped screenshots could improve relevance.
The user might have difficulties identifying the correct selection on the dialogue. In the current task, this would be “Knowledge-Check” [...]	gemini-2.0-flash-lite : The user might not easily identify the “Knowledge-Check” option as the correct action to start the quiz, leading to confusion. gemini-2.0-flash-thinking : The “Knowledge-Check” button is visible and labeled appropriately for accessing the quiz, so the student will likely notice the correct action.	All explanations mention the “Knowledge-Check” option. However, one LLM and the expert indicate potential user confusion, while the other assumes clarity. This variation suggests that a majority vote could enhance assessment reliability.
Once the user enters an input field, the entire description help [...] is gone, and they must remember which information they are currently inputting.	o1 : Important fields (e.g., quiz name, question description, question type icons) are visible, reducing users’ memory load. However, more in-context help (e.g., tooltips for question-type icons) would further clarify available options and improve recognition.	This shows a current limitation of the LLM-based evaluation. The expert identifies an interaction issue that is not visible in a static screenshot. More dynamic input (e.g., multiple frames) could help capture such issues.

Table 5: Accuracy@k for recommending user tasks based on screenshots where the most severe usability issues were identified, comparing LLM predictions with expert assessments.

(a) Nielsen heuristics.

LLM	@3	@5	@10
<i>gemini-2.0-flash-lite</i>	0.0	0.0	0.60
<i>gemini-2.5-pro</i>	0.0	0.40	0.60
<i>gemini-2.0-flash-thinking</i>	0.333	0.60	0.60
<i>gpt-4.1-nano</i>	0.0	0.0	0.70
<i>gpt-4.1</i>	0.0	0.20	0.60
<i>o1</i>	0.0	0.60	0.60
Average LLM	0.056	0.30	0.617

(b) Cognitive walkthrough.

LLM	@3	@5	@10
<i>gemini-2.0-flash-lite</i>	0.667	0.60	0.80
<i>gemini-2.5-pro</i>	0.333	0.40	0.60
<i>gemini-2.0-flash-thinking</i>	0.333	0.60	0.80
<i>gpt-4.1-nano</i>	0.0	0.40	0.70
<i>gpt-4.1</i>	0.333	0.60	0.70
<i>o1</i>	0.0	0.20	0.70
Average LLM	0.278	0.467	0.717

Engineering (ICSE). IEEE Computer Society, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, 675–675. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE55347.2025.00138>

- [16] Laria Reynolds and Kyle McDonell. 2021. Prompt Programming for Large Language Models: Beyond the Few-Shot Paradigm. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Yokohama, Japan) (CHI EA '21). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 314, 7 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3411763.3451760>
- [17] Nayan B. Ruparelia. 2010. Software development lifecycle models. *SIGSOFT Softw. Eng. Notes* 35, 3 (May 2010), 8–13. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1764810.1764814>
- [18] Rick Spencer. 2000. The streamlined cognitive walkthrough method, working around social constraints encountered in a software development company. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (The Hague, The Netherlands) (CHI '00). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 353–359. <https://doi.org/10.1145/332040.332456>
- [19] Martin Stettinger, Trang Tran, Ingo Pribik, Gerhard Leitner, Alexander Felfernig, Ralph Samer, Muesluem Atas, and Manfred Wundara. 2020. KnowledgeCheckR: Intelligent Techniques for Counteracting Forgetting. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Prestigious Applications of Intelligent Systems – PAIS@ECAI2020* (Santiago de Compostela, Spain) (ECAI 2020). Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications, 3034–3039. <https://doi.org/10.3233/FAIA200479>

- [20] Gemini Team and Other Authors. 2024. Gemini: A Family of Highly Capable Multimodal Models. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.11805>
- [21] Sebastian Winter, Stefan Wagner, and Florian Deissenboeck. 2008. A Comprehensive Model of Usability. In *Engineering Interactive Systems*, Jan Gulliksen, Morton Borup Harning, Philippe Palanque, Gerrit C. van der Veer, and Janet Wesson (Eds.). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 106–122.
- [22] Likang Wu, Zhi Zheng, Zhaopeng Qiu, Hao Wang, Hongchao Gu, Tingjia Shen, Chuan Qin, Chen Zhu, Hengshu Zhu, Qi Liu, et al. 2024. A survey on large language models for recommendation. *World Wide Web* 27, 5 (2024), 60.
- [23] Shukang Yin, Chaoyou Fu, Sirui Zhao, Ke Li, Xing Sun, Tong Xu, and Enhong Chen. 2024. A survey on multimodal large language models. *National Science Review* 11, 12 (Nov. 2024). <https://doi.org/10.1093/nsr/nwae403>