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Abstract: Internet around the world has become the prime source to satisfy the requirement of Entrepreneurs, customer and end users. As user comfort is the primary goal of all the entrepreneurs, the end user interacts through the internet to mine the knowledge. The user interacts the internet by apps and web. To attract the users, the user interface (UI) designers focus on Visual presentations to abet users to interact, comprehend, and navigate to the information. The work presents that how visual perceptions of Web page intricacy by perceptive users’ behavior, the indispensable cognitive effort for interaction with the UI can be understood. The work presents an extension of current methods for designing UI using model-based techniques, with the methods essential for the design of adaptive capacities required in different phases of development. These developments can be fused in Agent-Based Ergonomic User Interface Development Environment. This technique is bolstered by a solution based on Multi-Agent System (MAS) which offer adaptive capabilities to users, designed using the anticipated technique of Agent-Based Ergonomic User Interface Development Environment (AB-EUIDE). In [27] author has presented the various phases of the AB-EUIDE Framework. In this article author presents the analysis phase of the AB-EUIDE and explains how a compromise is done between Adaptation and Ergonomics while designing the user interface.
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I. INTRODUCTION

There are anonymous benefits of applying an efficient way to develop any application software. The design of a UI for software is a difficult task [1]. Within the paradigm of AB-EUIDE, which is designed to complement the classical model-based approaches [2, 3], with the features needed for carrying out the adaptation process. Ergonomics is increasingly becoming an investigative topic amongst cognitive science researchers, including linguists [18], and computer ergonomics [21,23, 25,26].

The proposed architecture use MAS. One of the main requirements of the architecture is the need to make decisions about which alternative adaptation is most appropriate. In this regard, an architecture based on the concept of agent will be a great benefit to the system, since it allows human decision-making modelling process [5]. MAS also encourages the sharing of responsibilities between different actors, facilitating the current trend of decentralization.

The organization of the paper is as follows: Section two presents analysis phase and domain model of AB-EUIDE. In section three user profiles in the system are discussed. Section four presents a compromise between adaptation and ergonomics. Finally, conclusions and feature direction of the work is presented in section five.

II. PROPOSED METHODOLOGY

During the analysis phase of the AB-EUIDE captures both non-functional and functional requirements, and model the same in a language that does not present ambiguities.

A. Modelling Domain Objects

The domain model consists of a diagram describing those objects that user interacts with the UI to perform the tasks. The two most widely used notation for modelling are entity/relationship and UML class diagrams. In AB-EUIDE proposes the use of class diagrams as a means to represent the domain model, since nowadays design methods are based on object-oriented/Software Composition paradigm, as they are more widespread than the model-based methods entity/relationship. The Software Composition paradigm like aspect oriented, role oriented, agent-oriented modelling and ontology is discussed in [5,6,22].

The domain model is needed for a comprehensive depiction of the data types involving both attributes and methods of classes. The attributes and methods along with interactive tasks; permit users to select the specific objects appropriate for interaction in each case. In this sense, the description of the types listed used greatly facilitates the selection of appropriate interaction concrete objects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Login: String</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Password: String</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+checkLogin(): Boolean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+setLogin(aLogin: String):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+setPassword(aPassword: String):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Domain Model of AB-EUIDE.

In Figure 1, exhibits how the user can register in the system; it describes the domain model for the realization of the use case Login identified in the requirements phase [27] of AB-EUIDE. The user is described by a user name (login) and a password. Three actions can be performed on such objects.
checkLogin: Validate the username and password.
setLogin: Assign the value to the user name.
setPassword: Assign the value to the password

III. THE USER PROFILES IN THE SYSTEM

Often, there are different types of people, enjoying different privileges or possessing different characteristics that can be specified statically at design time. For example: a sales application, have different types of profiles (roles) in the system for users. Of course, we have users / buyers, and the store manager. It would not be logical for all user profiles have access to the entire system, example: buyer shouldn’t be permitted to access areas of the store management. The system manager should be able to monitor the available stock and the current appearance of the store, thus introducing the concept of inheritance between profiles.

To address the modelling of system profiles and their relationship has chosen a UML class diagram has chosen, for its versatility to represent relationships between entities and especially their ability to express inheritance relationships. Figure 2 describes a possible model profile for the example described above. The concept of Role Oriented Software Composition is discussed in [5, 6, 22].

![Figure 2. Class diagram for AB-EUIDE](image)

IV. RESULT ANALYSIS

A COMPROMISE BETWEEN ADAPTATION AND ERGONOMICS: When developing the UI for a new application, apply a series of techniques that seek to create UI with a high degree of usability as discussed in [25, 26]. Among them we can highlight: The user-centered methods [7, 8], includes user in the design process, allowing validations of different prototypes at different levels by the user. The policy allows reuse of the experience amassed by developers during the development of applications over the years. This experience may be expressed as style guides [9, 10, 11] patterns [12, 13] or other methods [14], to apply transformations to convert a model other than or equal to levels of abstraction. These Transformations can be signified by different formalisms, such as rewriting terms XSLT transformation sheets or graph as in [15].

Within an adaptive UI, the UI is evolving, and this evolution will lead to a possible change in ergonomic criteria applied during the design of the UI. However, the evolution of ergonomic criteria of UI cannot be left to chance, but should be possible to define how these might evolve over the adaptation process of a UI, can restrict what type of variations in modified ergonomic criteria are valid and which are not. Example: when a UI undergoes a variation in size of the space where it is being displayed, it is necessary to assess possible adaptations of the UI to the new size. Importantly, the evolution of UI in different ways is subject to the current context.

The different ways UI evolves must be controlled in terms of ergonomic criteria that should be maximized for each platform. It required specification of what criteria should be prioritized, because although ideally all criteria are important, often, increasing in one of them may lead to the reduction of another. For example, if a user wants to maximize the visibility criteria, may be inconsistent with the maximization of accessibility criteria. If the user wants to maintain a large enough font size to improve the UI for vision impaired people will not always be compatible with maintaining the visibility of all elements necessary for the current task. Therefore, it is necessary a priori specification of criteria which should be maximized when an adaptation in response to a change in the current context of use.

![Figure 3. Example of adaptation options depending ergonomic criteria.](image)
A. Usability Specification commitment

The specification of the commitment of usability (usability trade-off) involves the description of usability requirements for each platform where the application can be executed. As we have seen, within the Requirements Engineering it pursues to adequately capture the requirements of a system and its transformation into a valid and useful input for the system analysis phase. The Requirements Engineering is responsible for identifying the goals to be accomplished by the future system, the operation of such goals as constraints and services, and to assign the responsibilities for the resulting requirements to agents (software, devices or humans). The system requirements are usually classified into non-functional and functional requirements.

In the present case pursued specifying usability criteria that must preserve adaptivity during the evolution of the UI for its adaptation. A Requirement Goal-Oriented Language (GRL) [16] is proposed, based on the notation I* [17], which allows the designer to capture usability requirements and documents.

B. Goal-oriented requirements in adaptive UIs

The specification of the compromise between the several criteria that make up the usability of the future system is performed using GRL notations. In AB-EUIDE describes a commitment to usability for each one type of target platforms. The usability commitment doesn't have to be equal for a desktop computer and mobile device since the characteristics of both platforms are different.

![Figure 4. The usability criteria contribute to the main objective: Adaptivity.](image)

Usability criteria are represented by non-functional goals and objectives that contribute to the ultimate goal (the criterion of adaptivity) (see Figure 4). Thus, the priority criteria of usability should be within the future system when the application is represented by adaptation contribution relationships of each one criterion to the general objective of adaptivity. Criteria can be broken down into sub-criteria, for greater precision. Usability criteria that can be evaluated directly be represented using targets, while those depend for evaluation of a set of sub criteria are represented using non-functional objectives. In Figure 4 specifies possible compromise usability. In this case, two objectives contribute to target (non-functional) to achieve adaptivity consistency and visibility. Note how the visibility is specified by a target, the designer believes it is directly measurable, however the consistency is shown as a non-functional goal, as its not directly assessable. For evaluation it’s decomposed into three assessable objectives: (1) buttons/links consistency, (2) text outline consistency, and (3) color scheme consistency. Both the consistency criterion and visibility like in this case have the same weight (positive) engagement during the evaluation of usability (some+).

![Figure 5. The accessibility criterion has a negative impact on visibility](image)

The accessibility criterion has a negative impact on visibility. Figure 5. The accessibility criterion has a negative impact on visibility

![Figure 6. Documentation contribution of beliefs visibility criterion](image)

Figure 6. Documentation contribution of beliefs visibility criterion

Note how the visibility is specified by a target, the designer directly measured, the designer can specify how equally influence other criteria using the correlation relationship in GRL (See Figure 5). Relationships correlation equals and unknown types are not considered in the model.
In this way, the designer identifies which are the conflicts between the various criteria that make a commitment to usability. In the example, in Figure 5 the designer has specified the criteria of accessibility go against the criterion visibility (hurt). Therefore, when evaluating the visibility, this shall be adversely affected by the value of accessibility obtained. If instead, the designer would specify a relation of the type correlation Help (aid), the value obtained in the evaluation of the visibility has been influenced surely by the value obtained when evaluating the accessibility.

To improve communication between developers and project documentation, the designer can document the decisions taken during the design by adding usability commitment beliefs into the specification itself. Figure 6 has documented the contribution of visibility by a belief.

V. CONCLUSION

The work described an architecture that allows the user to provide a set of adaptation capabilities that are designed using the method proposed. The proposed architecture is built on the notion of an agent, also describes how to carry out each stage of the process of adaptation in MAS. The work has posed an effort to improve software quality, especially an improvement in the quality of ergonomic UI. To do this, in recent years, it has delved to improve the usability of the system on several fronts. In effect, there has been interesting work on improving the usability of user interfaces by incorporating the experience, the design interfaces post-WIMP user methodology for the design of UI solutions, and ultimately improving the ergonomics of the system through the adaptation of the system to the characteristics of the context of use (platform, environment user, & current task) and their changes. This work gives a solution to the design of UIs which intelligently adapts to the context of use while maintaining their usability.

Future directions of the research will focus on:

- The work will also present the remaining phases (Design, and Implementation) of AB-EUIDE.
- The development of the AB-EUIDE for affective computing [19], and social computing [20] for emotional well-being of users can be explored.
- The methods to register the Intellectual property (IP) was identified in [24], an extension of the same will be instigated for EUI.
- The problem of designing an AB-EUIDE for the Internet of things is extremely pertinent and has a lot of unsolved and controversial tasks and decisions.
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