Supplementary Table S1: Paper demographics. Included works and their publication year, number of participants, reported participant demographics, and the country of the 1st author's institution. Brackets refer to the citation within the supplemental materiials while parentheses refer to the citation number on the main paper.

Citation	Authors	Year	No. of Participants	Sample	Country
[1] (63)	Alqahtani, H., & Kavakli-Thorne, M.	2020	91	Age: 16 to 65, Gender: 38 female, 53 male	Australia
[2] (64)	Bressler, D. M., & Bodzin, A. M.	2013	68	Age: 11 to 15, Gender: 33 female, 35 male	United States of America
[3] (64)	Bressler, Denise M. Shane Tutwiler, M. Bodzin, Alec M.	2021	68 208 110	6th, 7th, 8th grade 8th grade 8th grade	United States of America
[4] (18)	Carlos-Chullo, J. D., Vilca-Quispe, M., & Castro-Gutierrez, E.	2021	21	Age: 10 to 12, Gender: 11 female, 10 male; 5 female, male for intervention; 5 female, 5 male for control	Peru
[5] (65)	Cauchi, M., & Scerri, D.	2019	6	Age: 11 to 60+, Gender: Unreported	Malta
[6] (62)	Farella, Mariella; Taibi, Davide; Arrigo, Marco; Todaro, Giovanni; Fulantelli, Giovanni Chiazzese, Giuseppe	2021	30	Aged 11-14 years	Italy
[7] (66)	Fitz-walter, Z., Tjondronegoro, D., Koh, D., & Zrobok, M.	2007	7	Age: 6 to 14, Gender: Unreported	Australia
[8] (67)	Francese, R., Risi, M., Siani, R., & Tortora, G.	2018	14	Age: 16, Gender: Unreported	Italy
[9] (28)	Gardeli, A., & Vosinakis, S.	2019	26	Age: 9 to 10, Gender: 11 female, 15 male	Greece
[10] (68)	Hou, H., & Lin, Y.-C.	2017	52	Age: Avg. 17, Gender: 10 female, 42 male	Taiwan, China
[11] (69)	I. Di Loreto, M. Divitini, I. Trimailovas, M. Mander	2013	9	Age: Avg. 18, Gender unreported	Italy
[12] (50)	Kalmpourtzis, G., Aristotle, M., & Berthoix, M.	2015	20	*Unreported*	Greece
[13] (51)	Nisi, V., Cesario, V., & Nunes, N.	2021	16	Age: avg 17.25, Gender: 2 female, 14 male	Portugal
[14] (31)	Noreikis, M., Savela, N., Kaakinen, M., Xiao, Y., & Oksanen, A.	2019	176	Age: avg. 35.94, Gender: 98 female, 78 male (16 female, 16 male for interview)	Finland
[15] (52)	Parsons, D., & Petrova, K.	2012	14	*Unreported*	New Zealand
[16] (53)	Patricio, J. M., Costa, M. C., & Manso, A.	2019	70	Primary school (age and gender not reported)	Portugal
[17] (54)	Petridis, P., Dunwell, I., Liarokapis, F., Constantinou, G., Arnab, S., Freitas, S. De, Hendrix, M., Worlds, I., & Cv, C.	2013	5	*Unreported*	England
[18] (55)	Pokric, B., Krco, S., Pokric, M., Knezevic, P., & Jovanovic, D.	2015	19	*Unreported*	Serbia
[19] (56)	Pombo, L., & Marques, M. M.	2019	244	Age: 10 to16, Gender: 126 female, 118 male	Portugal
[20] (57)	Rapp, D., Muller, J., Bucher, K., & von Mammen, S.	2018	23	Age: avg. 22, Gender 10 female, 9 male, 4 unidentified	Germany
[21] (61)	Reisinho, Pedro Silva, Catia Vairinhos, Mario Oliveira, Ana Patricia Zagalo, Nelson	2021	5	10-12 years old, 5 female	Portugal
[22] (58)	Rogers, K., Frommel, J., Breier, L., Celik, S., Kramer, H., Kreidel, S., Brich, J., Riemer, V., & Schrader, C.	2015	30	Age: avg. 23.13, Gender: 11 female, 19 male	Germany
[23] (59)	Stefanidi, E., Arampatzis, D., Leonidis, A., Korozi, M., Antona, M., & Papagiannakis, G.	2020	10	Age: 7 to 12, Gender: 4 female and 6 male	Greece

Supplementary Table S2: Game Details. This table denotes the abstracted game subjects, game elements, instructional elements, and the explicitly stated pedagogical theories utilized. Brackets refer to the citation within the supplemental materiials while parentheses refer to the citation number on the main paper.

Citation	Game Title	Game's Educational Subject	Gamified Elements	Instructional Elements	Instructional Game Elements	Theories / Frameworks
[1] (63)	*CybAR*	Cyberattacks and how to avoid them and stay safe online	Goals, points (rewards and threats (deductions)), achievements, leaderboards	Quizzes, prompts to replay if 65% base not met, positive and negative feedback	Replayability	Contructivism, inquiry-based
[2] (64)	*School Scene Investigators: The Case of the Stolen Score Sheets (SSI)*	Forensic science	Narrative, search, inquiry problem solving, collection, teamwork, win state, alerts, quests			Flow theory, jigsaw pedagogy, constructivist approach, situated learning theory
[3] (64)	*School Scene Investigators (Score Sheets, Mystery Powder)*	Forensic Science	Narrative, search, collection, teamwork, quest	Real-time feedback		Flow theory, jigsaw pedagogy, inquiry based
[4] (18)	*Voluminis*	Geometry volume formulae	Points (rewards and threats), bartering (can exchange points for hints), narrative	Real-time instructor monitoring, scores sent to instructor	Hints, replayability	Geometric theory
[5] (65)	*Untitled*	Cultural heritage tour content	Search, points (rewards and threats), clues	Quizzes	Hints	Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences
[6] (62)	*Treasure hunt (we respect our earth)*	Climate change and environmental stability	Clues, search, tangible pieces, teamwork, real reward, goal	Quizzes		
[7] (66)	*Secret SLQ*	Local library resources	Search, clues, leaderboard, points (reward), challenge, goals, interaction, achievement	Quizzes		
[8] (67)	*HGG (Hunting Game Generator)*	Cross-subject lesson content developed by teacher	Search, real world reward (highest scorer gets 1% boost to course grade), points, narrative, clues	Quizzes	Hints	Inquiry based learning
[9] (28)	*ARQuest*	Computational thinking skills	Goals, team vs. team, competition, narrative, constraints, and real world game tokens and board	Real-time feedback		Game-Based Learning (Gameplay approach) a constructivist approach, physical programming
[10] (68)	*O2LAB*	Chemistry experiments	Clues, teamwork, search, creation, goal	Real-time feedback		Anchored instruction theory
[11] (69)	*MagMAR*	Museum Content	Points, competition, teamwork, rule creation, search	Real-time monitoring		
[12] (50)	*Serious+*	Mathematics	Teamwork, search, problem solving, narrative, physical movement, tangible objects		Hints	
[13] (51)	*Memories of Carvalhal's Palace – Haunted Encounters*	Museum content	Narrative, clues, search, points (reward), reward for completion (digital token), problem solving, 3D model interaction, replayable with a different narrative, quest	Quizzes	Hints, replayability	Constructivism

[14] (31)	*ARQuiz*	Exhibition content	Search, hints, points (reward, no removal of points but possible to get 0), breadcrumbs (hints from other users, can reply to and leave own hints too. Live or off-line conversation supported. Labeled as messaging)	Quizzes, hints	Hints	
[15] (52)	*Untitled*	Managerial level decisions and work	Identification, 'interview,' search, collection, problem solving, teamwork, decision tree			
[16] (53)	*PlanetarySystemGO*	Astronomy concepts and celestial bodies	Points (reward), search, high scores	Quizzes		
[17] (54)	*Priory Undercroft; The Game*	Cultural heritage surrounding monastery monk life	search, clues, decision tree, physical movement, NPC's	Quizzes		
[18] (55)	*Arvatar*	Air quality and pollution	Points (reward), leaderboard, a daily game with accumulating points, animal avatars	Quizzes		
[19] (56)	*EduPARK*	Local flora and fauna	Search, time limit, riddles, clues, points (reward), point exchange for hints (bartering)	Quiz		Game-based learning; constructivist theories of contextualized and authentic learning (situated learning)
[20] (57)	*Pathomon*	Viruses	Search, crafting, fight monsters, teamwork, experience points, collection, shared global leaderboard	Unlockable information, text information linked viruses. Game mechanics support virus characteristics (player spread)		Biological information theory,
[21] (61)	*FlavourGame*	Nutritional literacy	Narrative, competition, tangible pieces, collection, creation, bartering, reward (power ups), quest, threat	Quizzes, real-time feedback	Hints, replayability	
[22] (58)	*UniRallye*	Familiarization with new physical environment	Goal, search, rewards, collection, leaderboard	Quizzes	Hints	
[23] (59)	*MagiPlay*	Programming	Rule-creation, collection, potential teamwork, and shared workspace	Real-time feedback, program simulation, rule deployment		LECTOR framework

Supplementary Table S3: Study Breakdown. This table outlines the reported aims of each study, their study design, findings, reported future work, and reported limitations. Brackets refer to the citation within the supplemental materiials while parentheses refer to the citation number on the main paper.

Citation	Aims/objectives of study	Research design	Findings	Reported Future Work	Reported limitations
[1] (63)	Increase awareness of cybersecurity in safe environment leveraging AR. To overcome shortfalls of web-based cybersecurity education games.	Pre/post surveys capturing perceived learning outcomes and perception of CybAR	Participants reported that CybAR was a fun and effective way to learn about cybersecurity. Participants were also motivated to learn more about cybersecurity outside of the game. The game elements were essential and better than only reading about cybersecurity.	Larger sample size, long-term post evaluation to assess retention, improve the game with more gamified elements, implementation of narrative and game refinement theory.	Sample size
[2] (64)	Assess whether teen users of vision-based AR games experience 'flow' in learning	Pre/post surveys, field observation, group interviews to capture features of flow (if presented) and the relationship	Participants experienced a sense of discovery, flashes of intensity, and a drive for higher performance. Game potentially increases interest and affords learning of collaboration skills.	Investigate scalability, and gender effects	Generalizability concerns

		of science interest, gaming attitude, and gender have on flow experience	Participants experienced flow and were highly engaged.		
[3] (64)	Promote flow and subject interest to understand if increased flow denotes triggered science interest	Post-surveys about flow and interest, also general game feedback.	Students with higher flow states indicate higher triggered scientific interest.	Integrate flow measurements during gameplay. Interest eval pre/post/distal. Better generalizability.	Correlational study so directionality is unclear. Need more robust outcome measures. Limited generalizability. Did not assess group membership.
[4] (18)	Leverage AR modality to afford 3D interaction for spatial geometry (object volume) to support student learning, and to support instructors through real-time monitoring	Pre/post measures of performance between control group (regular instruction) and mobile AR serious game (MARSG) group. Post participant reported perception of Voluminis	No difference between control and intervention, but both control and intervention reported significant improvement in geometry scores. Intervention participants reported higher motivation to learn about geometry and a desire to access the game at home.	Include more interaction methods, perhaps different visualizations (ice cream orb on cone, calculate the volume of both separately, etc.)	Some students were clicking answers randomly, some did not understand what surfaces to use AR on
[5] (65)	Leverage MARSG to improve tourist experience and enrich learning	Pre/post interviews, game data, and tracking log of game history. Assessing use and perception of game enjoyment and usefulness	Participants reported having a more enjoyable experience than a standard tour and that AR is helpful for learning.	Markerless AR for tours	Scalability of results
[6] (62)	Understand student experiences of ARLectico built games	Semistructured interviews	Increased reported engagement and positive attitude.		Quantitative analysis of AR effectiveness
[7] (66)	Understand and improve engagement of children with library, understand how MARSG can support this goal	Informal post-intervention feedback to capture enjoyability of experience and improvements.	MGAR is usable for delivering experience, but large environments should be carefully considered	Collect more feedback from users	
[8] (67)	Create a game-building tool for instructors to use to teach and motivate students	Post-intervention semi-structured focus groups. Capturing participant perception of HGG learning modality	Participants felt HGG was useful and improved their knowledge. Participants also report that HGG should be integrated into traditional teaching. Participants reported higher interest and enjoyment.	Evaluate teacher perception and technology acceptance. Consider the use of the tool by students to develop games as a learning exercise in itself.	Threat of focus group bias (though tried to mitigate).
[9] (28)	Examine impact of a MARSG on computational thinking skill development and collaboration	Post survey capturing enjoyment, learnability, collaboration, and interactivity. Behavioral observation recording collaboration patterns (turn taking, etc.) Gameplay decisions logged.	Participants were highly engaged with game intervention and motivated during activity. Collaboration was high. Participants have greater learning benefit with individual screens. Individual screens do not impede collaboration.	Examine scalability for richer environments. Additional interactivity.	Simple game rules with small number of commands. Desks were slightly too high for students to hold device above.
[10] (68)	To reduce risk and material waste associated with chemistry labs and young learners, and understand how MARSG can support this goal	Pre/post-test survey to assess learning effectiveness and flow	Integration of MARSG improves student learning. Participants experienced flow	Control group and examination of student behaviors	

[11] (69)	Enhance museum fruition expereince for teenagers while allowing educator monitoring	Post-intervention surveys	Students indicated that they had fun and were strongly engaged in discussing strategy. Sociability was important and students found collaboration fun and helpful. Being able to challenge the other team improved game experience and creating questions was helpful to learn more about the museum materials. AR may have been distracting due to limitations.	Monitoring element of MagMar should be further investigated. More extensive trials with more students should be done.	
[12] (50)	The effectiveness of MARSG and technology integration into the classroom for mathematic instruction	Game data recorded, observational, to capture engagement and teamwork	Participants display a higher average performance in the post evaluation of their mathematical skill. Participants also had higher motivation to stay in classroom and spent more time than peers outside of intervention on mathematical concepts. Participants also attained higher difficulty levels by the end of the intervention	Record conversations of students to better capture their discussions	
[13] (51)	Determine if MARSG promotes engagement of teenage visitors in the museum experience, thus enhancing learning. Hoping to improve teen interest in museums.	Post-intervention surveys	Participants felt the game added value to the museum experience, thus resulting in improved motivation and engagement.	Balance difficulty of challenges with hints. Continue evaluation of the game with a better gender-balanced sample, within the museum setting.	Small sample, had to use museum reproduction for questionnaire process
[14] (31)	Examine impacts of MARSG in public venues	Pre/post surveys, recorded semi-structured interviews (limited participants: 28). Real-time data during play. Capturing usage, perceived enjoyment of the app, exhibition, and quizzes, and perceived usefulness of game	Participants reported positive learning experiences that AR could improve learning and make it more enjoyable. Authors found that the more participants felt the content was useful and enjoyable, the more likely they were to have high quiz scores, and to have higher sociability after the game.	Privacy concerns must be addressed.	Participant added hints were not consistent across study days. Participants reported finding the quiz questions difficult.
[15] (52)	Create a reusable learning tool for business related work that is freely available, and easily deployable	Post-intervention survey to capture game perception, and interview	Participants found the game engaging and motivating, and were successful at desired skill development by the end	Adjust game for better team activity	The current iteration did not support team elements well
[16] (53)	Evolve SolarSystemGo from web-based to MAR	Post-intervention survey to capture enjoyment, perception of the experience, whether the game fulfills learning requirements	Teacher participants report that the game fulfills the requirements of the syllabus. Student participants report enjoyable experiences and that they would play the game again.		
[17] (54)	Creation and evaluation of immersive museum experience through MARSG	Post-intervention survey and saved game data to capture user engagement and perception	Participants state they prefer playing and learning simultaneously and that MARSG helped them understand and learn		
[18] (55)	Develop novel MARSG using IoT to raise awareness about environmental issues	Post-intervention survey to capture perceived entertainment, intuitiveness, and use	Participants believe that the game is educational and entertaining (no significant results, however)		
[19] (56)	Assess participant perception of mobile devices for learning and	Post-intervention survey to capture advantages to	Participants report positive perspectives of mobile learning, stating that it is motivating. App		Participants may have been overexcited at the

	the value of a MARSG within formal and informal contexts	mobile learning, perceived ease of use, motivation, and fun. Gameplay data collected.	data revealed high educational value through good performance and student engagement.		time of survey collection as they took place immediately post conclusion of a timed game. Team composition may also play a role in app data.
[20] (57)	Use MARSG to support virus education. Understand emotional impact of game	Post-intervention survey with subset of players to assess flow, competence, challenge, positive and negative affect, tension, and sensory and imaginative immersion	Participants report the game was too hard, but high competence. Participants also report immersion and positive affect when playing.	Examine effectiveness of learning, further development of game	Technical issues
[21] (61)	Evaluate prototype usability and whether an AR game could transmit knowledge of cooking habits.	Pre/post surveys and observation.	Difficulty in holding phone and cards. 80% wanted to continue playing until they won the challenge (quest). Participants had success in learning cooking habits.		Iterate on game, fix elements not well understood by participants.
[22] (58)	Proposal and evaluation of a MARSG focused on navigation and learning a new environment	Pre/post surveys to capture motivation and affinity for technology	Participants rated the usefulness of the game as very satisfying. Open-ended comments report positive feedback	Closer look at motivation. Efficacy needs to be evaluated too.	
[23] (59)	Effectiveness of leveraging MARSG and intelligent environments to teach programming	Observation of children using system, post-intervention survey to capture perception, engagement, and possible changes	Participants were positively engaged, enjoyed the game, and showed enthusiasm.	Explore ways to enable MagiPlay's simulation feature as a debugging facility. Further feedback development	Simple If-Then rules used

References

1. Alqahtani, H.; Kavakli-Thorne, M. Design and Evaluation of an Augmented Reality Game for Cybersecurity Awareness (CybAR). *Information* **2020**, *11*, 121. https://doi.org/10.3390/info11020121.
2. Bressler, D.; Bodzin, A. A mixed methods assessment of students' flow experiences during a mobile augmented reality science game. *J. Comput. Assist. Learn.* **2013**, *29*, 505–517. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12008.
3. Bressler, D.M.; Tutwiler, M.S.; Bodzin, A.M. Promoting student flow and interest in a science learning game: A design-based research study of School Scene Investigators. *Educ. Technol. Res. Dev.* **2021**, *69*, 2789–2811. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-021-10039-y.
4. Carlos-Chullo, J.D.; Vilca-Quispe, M.; Castro-Gutierrez, E. Voluminis: An Augmented Reality Mobile System in Geometry Affording Competence to Evaluating Math Comprehension. *Adv. Intell. Syst. Comput.* **2021**, *1231*, 288–299. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-52575-0_23.
5. Cauchi, M.; Scerri, D. Enriching Tourist UX via a Location Based AR Treasure Hunt Game. In Proceedings of the 2019 IEEE 9th International Conference on Consumer Electronics (ICCE-Berlin), Berlin, Germany, 8–11 September 2019; pp. 199–204. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCE-Berlin47944.2019.8966141.
6. Farella, M.; Taibi, D.; Arrigo, M.; Todaro, G.; Fulantelli, G.; Chiazzese, G. An augmented reality mobile learning experience based on treasure hunt serious game. In Proceedings of the ECEL 2021 20th European Conference on E-Learning, Berlin, Germany, 28–29 October 2021; Academic Conferences International limited: Manchester, UK, 2021; pp. 148–154. https://doi.org/10.34190/EEL.21.109.
7. Fitz-walter, Z.; Tjondronegoro, D.; Koh, D.; Zrobok, M. Mystery at the Library: Encouraging Library Exploration using a Pervasive Mobile Game. In Proceedings of the OzCHI'12: Proceedings of the 24th Australian Computer-Human Interaction Conference, Melbourne, Australia, 26–30 November 2007; pp. 142–145.
8. Francese, R.; Risi, M.; Siani, R.; Tortora, G. Augmented Treasure Hunting Generator for Edutainment. In Proceedings of the 2018 22nd International Conference Information Visualisation (IV), Fisciano, Italy, 10–13 July 2018; pp. 524–529. https://doi.org/10.1109/iV.2018.00097.
9. Gardeli, A.; Vosinakis, S. ARQuest: A Tangible Augmented Reality Approach to Developing Computational Thinking Skills. In Proceedings of the 2019 11th International Conference on Virtual Worlds and Games for Serious Applications (VS-Games), Vienna, Austria, 4–6 September 2019; p. 8.

10. Hou, H.-T.; Lin, Y.-C. The Development and Evaluation of an Educational Game Integrated with Augmented Reality and Virtual Laboratory for Chemistry Experiment Learning. In Proceedings of the 2017 6th IIAI International Congress on Advanced Applied Informatics (IIAI-AAI), Hamamatsu, Japan, 9–13 July 2017; pp. 1005–1006. https://doi.org/10.1109/IIAI-AAI.2017.14.
11. Di Loreto, I.; Divitini, M.; Trimailovas, I.; Mander, M. Playing in museums by constructing your game. In Proceedings of the Workshop Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Intelligent Environments, Athens, Greece, 16–17 July 2013; IOS Press: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2013; Volume 17, pp. 519–529. https://doi.org/10.3233/978-1-61499-286-8-519.
12. Kalmpourtzis, G.; Aristotle, M.; Berthoix, M. Serious+ : A technology assisted learning space based on gaming. In Proceedings of the 2015 International Conference on Interactive Mobile Communication Technologies and Learning (IMCL), Thessaloniki, Greece, 19–20 November 2015; pp. 430–432.
13. Nisi, V.; Cesario, V.; Nunes, N. Augmented Reality Museum's Gaming for Digital Natives : Haunted Encounters in the Carvalhal's Palace. In Proceedings of the 1st Joint International Conference on Entertainment Computing and Serious Games: ICEC-JCSG 2019, Arequipa, Peru, 11–15 November 2019; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2021; pp. 1–21.
14. Noreikis, M.; Savela, N.; Kaakinen, M.; Xiao, Y.; Oksanen, A. Effects of Gamified Augmented Reality in Public Spaces. *IEEE Access* **2019**, *7*, 148108–148118. https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2019.2945819.
15. Parsons, D.; Petrova, K.; Ryu, H. Mobile Gaming—A Serious Business! In Proceedings of the 2012 IEEE 7th International Conference on Wireless, Mobile and Ubiquitous Technology in Education (WMUTE), Takamatsu, Japan, 27–30 March 2012; pp. 17–24. https://doi.org/10.1109/WMUTE.2012.11.
16. Patricio, J.M.; Costa, M.C.; Manso, A. A Gamified Mobile Augmented Reality System for the Teaching of Astronomical Concepts. In Proceedings of the 2019 14th Iberian Conference on Information Systems and Technologies (CISTI), Coimbra, Portugal, 19–22 June 2019. https://doi.org/10.23919/CISTI.2019.8760658.
17. Petridis, P.; Dunwell, I.; Liarokapis, F.; Constantinou, G.; Arnab, S.; de Freitas, S.; Hendrix, M. The Herbert Virtual Museum. *J. Electr. Comput. Eng.* **2013**, *2013*, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/487970.
18. Pokric, B.; Krco, S.; Pokric, M.; Knezevic, P.; Jovanovic, D. Engaging citizen communities in smart cities using IoT, serious gaming and fast markerless Augmented Reality. In Proceedings of the 2015 International Conference on Recent Advances in Internet of Things (RIoT), Singapore, 7–9 April 2015; pp. 7–9. https://doi.org/10.1109/RIOT.2015.7104905.
19. Pombo, L.; Marques, M.M. Improving students' learning with a mobile augmented reality approach—The EduPARK game. *Interact. Technol. Smart Educ.* **2019**, *16*, 392–406. https://doi.org/10.1108/itse-06-2019-0032.
20. Rapp, D.; Muller, J.; Bucher, K.; von Mammen, S. Pathomon: A Social Augmented Reality Serious Game. In Proceedings of the 2018 10th International Conference on Virtual Worlds and Games for Serious Applications (VS-Games), Würzburg, Germany, 5–7 September 2018; p. 4.
21. Reisinho, P.; Silva, C.; Vairinhos, M.; Oliveira, A.P.; Zagalo, N. Tangible Interfaces and Augmented Reality in a Nutrition Serious Game for Kids. In Proceedings of the 2021 IEEE 9th International Conference on Serious Games and Applications for Health(SeGAH), Dubai, United Arab Emirates, 4–6 August 2021.
22. Rogers, K.; Frommel, J.; Breier, L.; Celik, S.; Kramer, H.; Kreidel, S.; Brich, J.; Riemer, V.; Schrader, C. Mobile Augmented Reality as an Orientation Aid: A Scavenger Hunt Prototype. In Proceedings of the 2015 International Conference on Intelligent Environments (IE), Prague, Czech Republic, 15–17 July 2015; pp. 172–175.
23. Stefanidi, E.; Arampatzis, D.; Leonidis, A.; Korozi, M.; Antona, M.; Papagiannakis, G. MagiPlay: An Augmented Reality Serious Game Allowing Children to Program Intelligent Environments. *Trans. Comput. Sci. XXXVII Spec. Issue Comput. Graph.* **2020**, *12230*, 144–169.