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In the section [how to make content usable for people with learning and cognitive disabilities](https://www.w3.org/TR/coga-gap-analysis/#appendix-making-content-usable-for-people-with-cognitive-and-learning-disabilities) it is asked by the Editor’s note of “section A.5.1 Differences from usability testing with the general population” if the text “Some brief guidance on usability testing:” is useful or beyond the scope.

A quick answer is that I believe that the text is absolutely relevant because the references to the usability guidelines you proposed are not covering the same points.

However, the current text requires an amendment. In the text, the following statement is reported:

“As a short overview, usability could be measured based on efficacy, efficiency and satisfaction. This can be done by measuring or tracking:

* successes and noting any errors to measure efficacy,
* time taken per task to measure efficiency, note that the relative time between tasks is often more useful than absolute numbers. and
* user’s mood and comments to measure satisfaction.”

I believe that this text needs to be amended like that:

“As a short overview, usability could be measured based on efficacy, efficiency and satisfaction **in a specific context of use**. This can be done by measuring or tracking:

* successes and noting any errors to measure efficacy,
* time taken per task to measure efficiency, note that the relative time between tasks is often more useful than absolute numbers. and
* **Satisfaction in the usage by standardized questionnaires (see for instance:** [**https://www.usability.gov/how-to-and-tools/methods/system-usability-scale.html**](https://www.usability.gov/how-to-and-tools/methods/system-usability-scale.html)**), and notes relative to user’s comments about the quality of the interaction**.”

I strongly believe that this modification is essential to convey that: (i) satisfaction is a key part of usability evaluation, and (ii) satisfaction is not something related to the mood! Moreover, satisfaction is not a factor that you may measure with unreliable and qualitative/homemade surveys, but it is a well-defined concept that must be measured with well-defined, established and reliable measures.

I advise you to add this amendment and to keep this text because the usability guideline’s links you referenced are not covering these important aspects.

Best regards,

Stefano Federici and Simone Borsci