The effects of spatial configuration on relative translation gain thresholds in redirected walking
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Abstract
In this study, we explore how spatial configurations can be reflected in determining the threshold range of Relative Translation Gains (RTGs), a translation gain-based Redirected Walking (RDW) technique that scales the user’s movement in Virtual Reality (VR) in different ratios for width and depth. While previous works have shown that various cognitive factors influence the RDW threshold, studies investigating the impact of environmental aspects on the RDW threshold with regard to the user’s visual perception were lacking. Therefore, we examined the effect of spatial configurations on the RTG threshold by analyzing the participant’s responses and gaze distribution data in two user studies. The first study concerned the size of the virtual room and the existence of objects within it, and the second study focused on the combined impact of room size and spatial layout. Our results show that room size, the existence of objects, and spatial layout all significantly affect the RTG threshold range. Based on our findings, we propose virtual space rescaling guidelines to increase the range of adjustable movable space with RTGs for developers: placing distractors in the room, setting the perceived movable space to be larger than the adjusted movable space for an empty room, and avoiding the placement of object clusters in the center of the room. Our findings can be used to adaptively rescale VR users’ space according to the target virtual space’s configuration with a unified coordinate system that enables the utilization of physical objects in a virtual scene.
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1 Introduction
With the growing demand for remote collaboration systems, avatar-based telepresence applications using Virtual Reality (VR) and Augmented Reality (AR) Head-Mounted Displays (HMDs) are drawing attention as a means to provide immersion and co-presence between users (Orts-Escolano et al. 2016; Piumsomboon et al. 2018; Kim et al. 2021b). In most cases, the virtual space accessed by the VR client is more expansive than the tracked space in which the user physically exists. To overcome this difference, Redirected Walking (RDW), which transforms users’ locomotion in VR to the extent that users do not notice the change in speed, was proposed (Razzaque et al. 2005). Most RDW techniques utilize rotation gain, which can achieve a more significant effect on expanding the explorable space than translation gain (Dong et al. 2020; Strauss et al. 2020; Williams et al. 2021a). However, it is challenging to utilize objects and walls in real space with rotation-based RDW on account of the distortion of coordinate systems between real and virtual spaces. On the other hand, the translation gain-based RDW
can generate a unified coordinate system between the virtual space and the tracked space while rescaling the VR space. Relative Translation Gains (RTGs), a translation gain-based RDW that transforms the horizontal and vertical ratios of space differently, have therefore been proposed to transform virtual spaces while maintaining a unified coordinate system (Kim et al. 2021a).

As RDW technologies transform the users’ perceived locomotion in VR, it is necessary to modify redirecting values within the threshold range where users do not significantly notice the difference in their movement (Steinicke et al. 2010; Grechkin et al. 2016). Since RDW visually changes the users’ movement, the threshold range varies depending on the subjects’ visual cognition in virtual environments. Previous studies have shown that subjects tend to underestimate their speed in a virtual environment (Ash et al. 2013; Banton et al. 2005; Bruder 2012; Caramenti 2018). Moreover, users’ individual differences and whether they perform other tasks while they are walking also affect the RDW threshold (Williams and Peck 2019; Bruder et al. 2015; Rietzler et al. 2018; Sakono et al. 2021). However, research on how RDW thresholds are affected by the configuration of virtual spaces has been scarce, even though the purpose of RDW is to match the physical tracked space with a virtual target space.

In this study, we analyzed users’ perception of their own locomotive speed and gaze information to reveal how RTG thresholds are affected by the configuration of virtual space. Based on our previous work on the effect of virtual room size and objects on RTG thresholds (Kim et al. 2022) (Study 1), we conducted an additional study (Study 2) focusing on the spatial layout of the virtual space to expand upon the implications of its findings and conduct an integrated analysis on how spatial configurations affect the range of RTG thresholds. In Study 1, RTG thresholds were estimated under a total of six spatial conditions (3 × 2) depending on the size of the virtual space (Small, Medium, Large) and the presence or absence of objects (Empty, Furnished). They were configured by differing Angles of Declination (AoDs) between the user’s eye-gaze and the forward-gaze (Fig. 1). In Study 2, we estimated the RTG threshold under eight spatial conditions (2 × 4) that were determined by the size of the virtual space and (Large, Small) spatial layout (Empty, Peripheral, Scattered, Centered). We analyzed the changes in gaze according to the virtual space configuration through AoD distribution and gaze heatmaps.

Our results showed that size, the existence of objects, and spatial layout all significantly affect the RTG threshold range. In Study 1, the RTG threshold range was greater in the largest size condition than in the two smaller size conditions, and the RTG threshold range further increased in the Furnished room than in the Empty one. In Study 2, the RTG threshold range was greater in the Scattered layout than in the Centered layout, and the AoD distribution decreased as the size of the empty room increased. Even though the placement of objects lowered the AoD distribution, the effect of the object as a distractor had a more significant effect on the RTG threshold range than the size of the virtual space. In addition, the gaze heatmaps showed that when objects are gathered into a single cluster, they function as a guide that helps users recognize their perceived speed in VR, leading to the RTG threshold range being lower in the centered layout than in the empty virtual room.

With these results, we analyzed the effects of different spatial configurations in VR on translation-based RDW thresholds. We derived three virtual space rescaling guidelines that can be applied to increase the range of adjustable movable space with RTGs. First, distractors should be placed in the virtual room to increase the adjustable movable space. Second, for empty spaces, the perceived movable space should be set to be larger than the adjusted movable space. Third, objects should not be placed where users can perceive them constantly. Our findings can aid developers in setting a suitable range of RTGs according to the spatial configuration of the virtual room and rescale the VR user’s space to fit the target virtual space adaptively. As RTGs enable the modification of the virtual spaces while maintaining the coordinate system between the physical and the virtual spaces, this method can further be applied to generate shared spaces for Mixed Reality (MR) remote collaboration where users occupy different physical environments while being co-located in the same virtual space.

2 Background

2.1 Redirected walking

Redirected Walking (RDW) is a VR locomotion technique that allows users to explore a more expansive virtual space with natural walking from the limited tracked space of VR users (Razzaque et al. 2005; Ropelato et al. 2021; Nilsson et al. 2018). RDW utilizes three types of gain: rotation gain that deforms the angle, translation gain that deforms the speed, and curvature gain that manipulates the user’s
orientation during walking. Various RDW controllers have been suggested to utilize these RDW gains to allow users to walk around an ample virtual space. The steer-to-center (S2C) method directs the user to the center of the tracked space, the steer-to-orbit (S2O) redirects the user to a specific orbit, and the steer-to-multi-target (S2OT) redirects to multiple targets frequently used as baseline RDW controllers (Hodgson and Bachmann 2013; Chen et al. 2018). In addition to directing users with fixed targets, Strauss proposed RDW with reinforcement learning (Strauss et al. 2020; Chen et al. 2021), and Williams suggested space-adaptive RDW controllers by comparing the layout of real and virtual spaces in real-time (Williams et al. 2021a; Williams et al. 2021b). Dong (Dong et al. 2017) introduced Smooth Assembly Mapping (SAM) to decompose ample virtual space and assemble them into the tracked space. Moreover, RDW controllers for multiple users were proposed to enable collaborative scenarios with RDW (Lee et al. 2020; Dong et al. 2020). Recently, RDW libraries that can compare each performance of RDW controllers were also presented to seek practical uses of RDW (Azmandian et al. 2016; Li et al. 2021).

When comparing the performance of the RDW controllers introduced earlier, most of them use the increased movable distance through their RDW methods and the number of resets when a collision occurs (Li et al. 2021; Strauss et al. 2020). This is because the RDW controller’s primary goal is to allow users to travel around virtual spaces larger than their tracked space (Bozgeyikli et al. 2019; Langbehn et al. 2017). However, another potential of RDW is that the semantic information between real and virtual spaces can also be matched when the coordinate systems of the two spaces are aligned, which means that physical components in the real space can be utilized in VR. Furthermore, since RDW using translation gain only controls the perceived speed (Interrante et al. 2007; Selzer et al. 2022; Kim et al. 2021a), it can be used to rescale the virtual space while maintaining the coordinate system between the physical and virtual spaces. Therefore, this study focused on the adaptive application of RDW to match the virtual space with the user’s actual space.

### 2.2 Cognitive threshold and visual perception

As RDW visually adjusts VR users’ locomotion in VR, the redirecting gain value should be varied within the threshold range where they do not notice a significant change in their moving speed. Since Steinicke (Steinicke et al. 2010) first estimated the RDW threshold, several studies have revisited the rotational, translational, and curvature gain threshold range (Grechkin et al. 2016; Zhang et al. 2018; Rietzler et al. 2018). Previous studies have shown that users tend to underestimate their speed when walking in a virtual environment while wearing VR HMDs (Ash et al. 2013; Banton et al. 2005; Bruder et al. 2012; Caramenti et al. 2018). Therefore, it is possible to induce users to move faster and wander around a more expansive space. As RDW techniques utilize the user’s visual perception in VR, various factors such as the visual compositions of VEs and the sense of embodiment (Nguyen et al. 2020; Kruse et al. 2018; Neth et al. 2012; Paludan et al. 2016) affect the RDW threshold range. In addition, the cognitive threshold range is also affected by the hardware capability of VR HMDs, such as the Field of View (FoV) (Williams and Peck 2019).

In particular, the RDW threshold value is affected by parameters related to cognitive ability in VR. When applying RDW to the user, gradually increasing the RDW gain value can change their locomotion more than the initially recognized range (Neth et al. 2012; Zhang et al. 2014; Sakono et al. 2021). Moreover, it is influenced by events occurring in the VR space. Past studies have shown that when performing other tasks while walking, the user’s attention was distributed to the task performance, making them less sensitive to changes in their speed (Ciamedean et al. 2020; Gao et al. 2020). Some found that events in VR can act as distractors that disperse users’ attention and enlarge the transformable range (Cools and Simeone 2019; Williams and Peck 2019). In order to adaptively transform spaces in VR, research on the effect of the composition of virtual space on RDW is required. Nguyen (Nguyen et al. 2018)’s study shows that the size of the virtual environment did not affect the threshold of curvature gain. In contrast, Kim et al. (Kim et al. 2021a) show that the translation gain threshold range increased in the larger virtual space. Even though the purpose of RDW is to match the tracked space to the virtual target space, studies focused on the effects of the spatial configuration of virtual space on the RDW threshold range were lacking.

#### 2.3 Relative translation gains

In our previous work, we proposed Relative Translation Gains (RTGs) to adaptively transform the VR user’s space by adjusting the user’s speed in virtual space by applying different translation gain values to width and depth, respectively (Kim et al. 2021a). Furthermore, unlike other RDW controllers that continuously change the rotation gain and translation gain values to redirect a user, RTG is applied only once according to the target space, which could maintain the alignment of the coordinate system between the physical space and the virtual space. The threshold range of RTG is defined as $\alpha_T$, which is the ratio of the two translation gains in a single pair of Relative Translation Gains and is expressed by the following formula:
where $g_{T,x}$ is the VR environment’s x-axis translation gain and $g_{T,y}$ is the VR environment’s y-axis translation gain used as the reference translation gain. The RTG threshold range is defined as the value between the maximum 2D translation ratio and the minimum 2D translation ratio. By utilizing two translation ratio values and the translation gain threshold range from Steinicke’s study, the moving speed can be adjusted at different ratios for the two axes in VR. Through RTG application, the shape of the virtual space can be deformed more adaptively according to the target virtual space’s configuration.

As RTG was proposed to transform movable space by controlling the user’s speed in VR, further studies on how virtual space components affect the thresholds were needed. When we proposed the concept of RTGs and estimated the threshold range, we initially found that the threshold range increased in a large-sized virtual room than in a smaller one (Kim et al. 2021a). Furthermore, we discussed how different locations of the virtual horizon according to the size of the virtual room affected the subjects’ visual perception of their walking speed (Messing and Durgin 2005). Based on previous findings, we wished to reveal how the subject’s gaze distribution varies depending on the composition of the virtual space and how it relates to the RTG threshold. In this study, we focused on structurally exploring the effect of virtual space configurations on RTG thresholds with users’ gaze data and proposed a method to apply RTGs for adaptive spatial modification in VR.

3 Methodology

3.1 Research questions and hypothesis

This study aims to investigate the effects of virtual space configurations on the user’s cognitive threshold when adjusting their speed using Relative Translation Gains (RTGs) and derives guidelines on utilizing RTGs as a means of spatial deformation. For this goal, we set the following research questions:

RQ1 How do configurations of the virtual space affect the threshold range of Relative Translation Gains?

RQ2 How do configurations of the virtual space affect the users’ gaze distribution?

To answer these questions, we conducted two studies to derive structured guidelines to adaptively determine the RTG threshold range according to different spatial configurations. We utilized our previous study results on the effects of room size and objects (Study 1) (Kim et al. 2022) and conducted a new study focused on the effects of spatial layout in different size conditions (Study 2). Study 1 was conducted for six conditions according to three room sizes (Large, Medium, and Small) and the existence or absence of objects (Empty, Furnished). Since six conditions in Study 1 eventually change the visibility level of space, we selected spatial layout as a variable to find out more about the impact of visibility on the RTG threshold. Study 2 was conducted for eight conditions according to two room sizes (Large, Small) and four spatial layouts (Empty, Centered, Scattered, and Peripheral). Through Study 2, we examined the effect of various spatial layouts configured by the arrangement of objects on the RTG threshold in a realistic scenario. Two size conditions from Study 1 (Small, Large) were used in Study 2 to compare the results between the two studies. In the case of spatial layout, we chose four spatial layouts for different levels of visibility in each virtual space.

Based on our previous results that found participants were less sensitive to being faster in a larger virtual room (Kim et al. 2021a), we set our first hypothesis on room size. In addition, we referred to Shin’s study (Shin et al. 2021)’s study to distinguish the level of visibility between the four layout conditions in drawing our hypothesis on the effect of spatial layout. We assumed that the spatial layout with low visibility might distract users’ attention more and make users less sensitive to being faster. For the last hypothesis concerning AoD, we assumed that the AoD distribution in a smaller room would be lower than in a larger one because the smaller room has a lower virtual horizon (Messing and Durgin 2005). As a result, the following hypotheses were set:

H1 The probabilities of “faster” responses to all Relative Translation Gains will be lower in the large size conditions than in smaller conditions.

H2 The probabilities of “faster” responses to all Relative Translation Gains will be lower in spatial layouts with lower visibility.

H3 The medians of AoD from participants will be lower in the large size conditions than in smaller conditions.

3.2 Study design

3.2.1 Study 1: Size $\times$ Object existence

We used three out of five paths from a previous study (Kim et al. 2021a), taking into account the location of objects
in the Furnished condition. Figure 2 shows the three pathways we used in our study. Subjects repeatedly performed the walking task in sequence from Path 1 to Path 3. Through Path 1 and Path 2, participants experienced maximum and minimum translation gains. In Path 3, they experienced the square mean of the maximum and minimum translation gains. We fixed the reference translation gain \( g_{T_1} \) at 1.0. To estimate the 2D translation ratio, another axis’s translation gain \( g_{T_2} \) was set at 0.825, 0.875, or 0.925 for the minimum ratio, and 1.15, 1.2, or 1.25 for the maximum ratio. These six Relative Translation Gains were randomly ordered and repeated seven times to get more reliable responses from participants about their walking speed.

As shown in Fig. 1, the AoD \( \theta_{AoD} \) between eye-gaze and the forward-gaze can be measured from the position of the eye-gazed point \( P_{gaze} \) and the position of the eye \( P_{eye} \). We can calculate \( \theta_{AoD} \) with the following formula:

\[
\theta_{AoD} = \arctan \left( \frac{y_{gaze} - y_{eye}}{\sqrt{(x_{gaze} - x_{eye})^2 + (z_{gaze} - z_{eye})^2}} \right) 
\]

where the position of the eye-gazed point is \( P_{gaze} = (x_{gaze}, y_{gaze}, z_{gaze}) \) and the position of the eye is \( P_{eye} = (x_{eye}, y_{eye}, z_{eye}) \). Three size conditions were generated to differing average AoD values (Large: \(-10\)°, Medium: \(-20\)°, Small: \(-30\)°) and the location of objects was also set to differing the AoD distribution (Kim et al. 2022). Figure 3 shows three size conditions (Large: 17 m × 17 m, Medium: 8.2 m × 8.2 m, Small: 5.2 m × 5.2 m) and the presence or absence of objects conditions (Empty, Furnished) used in Study 1. Three room sizes and two object layouts were combined to generate six experimental conditions for estimating RTG thresholds, as shown in Fig. 4. Moreover, we added two conditions without RTG to determine the effect of RTG on VR Simulator Sickness Questionnaire (SSQ) scores (Kennedy et al. 1993). As our previous study (Kim et al. 2021a) found that post-SSQ was higher in a larger virtual space, we chose the Large condition to observe the effect of RTG on the VR SSQ score. Finally, we generated eight experimental conditions for Study 1 as follows: Small × Empty, Medium × Empty, Large × Empty, Large × Empty (No RTGs), Small × Furnished, Medium × Furnished, Large × Furnished, Large × Furnished (No RTGs). The experiment employed a mixed-subject method with the existence of objects as the between-subject variable and the size of the virtual room as the within-subject variable.

### 3.2.2 Study 2: Size × Spatial layout

In Study 2, we examined the effect of spatial layout according to object placement on the RTG threshold range. In designing the experiment conditions for Study 2, we used two size conditions (Small, Large) from Study 1, as shown in Fig. 5A. To analyze the effect of spatial layout on RTG thresholds, we decided to reduce the number of objects.
compared to Study 1. This is because when objects are placed densely, they may distract users’ attention regardless of their configured layout. To construct a realistic virtual space that is relatively less crowded, we assumed an exhibition room set-up consisting of four exhibition stands with 3D spacecraft models with similar volumes placed on them. This was to minimize the difference between each set of objects, whose locations determined the spatial layout, so that the level of distraction caused by their existence could be controlled.

In setting the spatial conditions, we visualized the adjusted movable space by applying the concepts proposed in Study 1 (Kim et al. 2022). The adjusted movable space refers to the floor area in which the user can walk about. Moreover, we defined perceived movable space as an area that includes not only the adjusted movable space but also the outer floor area where users cannot walk. The inner floor area in the Large condition, which is the same as the adjusted movable space. Based on the Empty layout, four exhibition stands were placed in different locations to create three spatial layouts, following Shin (Shin et al. 2021)’s study to set different levels of visibility afforded in each space. We selected Peripheral, Scattered, and Centered layouts for corresponding visibility levels at Low, Medium, and High. In the Peripheral condition, exhibition stands were placed at the four corners of the adjusted movable space (Fig. 5B Peripheral). In the Scattered conditions, two exhibition stands were placed inside the walking path, identical to Study 1, and the other two exhibition stands were positioned outside the path (Fig. 5B Scattered). Last, all four exhibition stands were gathered inside the triangle created by the walking path in the Centered layout (Fig. 5B Centered). By combining two size conditions (Small, Large) and four spatial layouts (Empty, Peripheral, Scattered, Centered), we generated eight experimental conditions to estimate the RTG threshold range, as illustrated in Fig. 6. The experiment employed a mixed-subject method with the size of the virtual room as the between-subject variable and the spatial layout of the VR room as the within-subject variable.

Fig. 4 Screenshot of the six conditions in Study 1. The combined paths and furniture are placed at the center of each condition

Fig. 5 A Two size conditions used in Study 2. B Top view of the four spatial layout conditions in the Small size condition
Both studies were set up in an empty 6 m × 6 m physical indoor space with four HTC VIVE base stations (v2.0) installed at the top corners. Participants wore an HTC VIVE Pro Eye with an HTC VIVE wireless adaptor. They held the VIVE controller in their hands and used the controller to press the button in the virtual scene. The virtual experience was operated using a desktop computer consisting of an i9-10900K 3.70GHz CPU, 128GB RAM, and a GeForce RTX 3090 24GB GPU. To implement a virtual conference room environment, we developed our system with Unity 3D (v2019.3.7f1) and steam VR Plugin (v1.16.10). Every virtual room condition was created from the same conference room prefab. We employed the SRanipal SDK and TobiiXR Plugin to obtain the gaze data for each participant. AoD data were acquired through Equation 2, which was approximately 36 $\theta_{\text{AoD}}$ samples per second. From the accumulated AoD values, we extracted data from each zone where users changed their paths or stood at a fixed position to answer questionnaires. In Study 2, the location gazed by the participants within the entire virtual room was acquired to draw the subjects’ gaze heatmap. In order to identify areas where participants frequently gazed, we measured the time the users’ gazes hit the four walls, floors, and objects, respectively.

### Participants

For both Study 1 and Study 2, we recruited 32 participants through the local university website and paid $ 20 in remuneration. All subjects were at least 18 years old and had normal or corrected to normal vision. In both studies, we separated subjects into two groups to reduce fatigue and learning effects during the experiment. We maintained the gender ratio among the groups, as it can potentially affect the cognitive threshold of Redirected Walking (Williams and Peck 2019). Furthermore, assuming that the AoD distribution might affect the threshold range, we balanced the average height between the two groups.

In Study 1, 20 participants identified as male and 12 as female. The mean age was 23.81 (SD = 3.86), and the mean interpupillary distance (IPD) was 64.17 (SD = 1.89). Most of them had a moderate level of experience in HMD-mediated VR environments: 24 participants had worn VR HMDs up to ten times before, and four for more. Only four of them had no prior VR experience. In Study 2, 16 identified as male and 16 as female. The participants’ mean age was 22.97 (SD = 3.32), and their mean interpupillary distance (IPD) was 64.01 (SD = 1.79). Most subjects had a moderate level of experience in HMD-mediated VR environments: 23 subjects had worn VR HMDs up to ten times before, and four for more. Only five of them had no prior experience. The detailed participants’ information on Study 1 is shown in Table 1, and Study 2 is shown in Table 2.

### Tasks and procedures

An institutional review board approved the content and procedures of both Study 1 and Study 2. Participants first wore an HTC VIVE Pro Eye and held the VIVE controller...
to complete an eye-tracking calibration session. They then conducted test trials before the main study trials, in which they walked along the three given paths in sequential order. After they walked along the paths, they were asked to answer whether their movements in the virtual environment were “faster” or “slower” than in the physical environment. From each participant’s response, we computed the probabilities of “faster” responses to each RTG to estimate the threshold range of RTGs. We used the pseudo-Two-Alternative Forced-Choice (pseudo-2AFC) method, which is widely used to estimate RDW redirected threshold ranges (Grechkin et al. 2016; Steinicke et al. 2010; Williams and Peck 2019). After the test trial, they took off the VR HMD and filled out the pre-SSQ. Next, participants conducted the main trials. They walk along the sequential path while experiencing changes to their perceived speed between the maximum and minimum translation gain values. In each condition, a participant repeated 42 trials (six Relative Translation Gains × seven repetitions) by pressing the “next” button. They were permitted to take breaks whenever they wanted.

In Study 1, the order of four experimental conditions was randomized and counterbalanced. Participants were required to answer the post-SSQ after each condition was completed. After they finished every condition, they were subject to a short semi-structured interview on how the VR room’s configuration affected their response to the questionnaire. Each group of participants experienced 168 trials (42 trials × four experimental conditions) and took approximately 15 minutes for each experimental condition. The total duration of each study session was approximately two hours. The overall tasks and procedures of Study 2 were the same as Study 1, except for the experimented conditions in each group. Subject group 1 experienced four spatial layout conditions (Empty, Centered, Peripheral, Scattered) in a Large virtual room, and the other group experienced four spatial layout conditions (Empty, Centered, Peripheral, Scattered) in a Small virtual room.

### 4 Results

#### 4.1 Statistic results

We evaluated how room size (Size) and object existence (Object) affect the user’s Relative Translation Gain thresholds (Gain) in VR by comparing the probabilities of “faster” responses from Study 1 (Kim et al. 2022) (Size: $F(2, 490) = 16.690, p < .001$; Object: $F(1, 490) = 60.984, p < .001$). As shown in Fig. 7, the mean value for the probability of “faster” responses was significantly lower in the Large room than in the Medium and Small room for all six Relative Translation Gains (Large-Medium: $p < .001$; Large-Small: $p < .001$). Moreover, the mean probability value for the Furnished room was also significantly lower than for the Empty room across all gains ($p < .001$).

We investigated how the VR room size (Size) and spatial Layout (Layout) affect the user’s Relative Translation Gain thresholds (Gain) by comparing the probabilities of “faster” responses in Study 2. Identical to Study 1, the ART for non-parametric factorial ANOVA analysis ($\alpha = 0.05$) was adapted to conduct the multivariate analysis within the within-subject factor of Layout, the between-subject factor of Size, and the factor of Gain. The ART-C algorithm (Elkin et al. 2021) was also used for the multifactor post hoc

### Table 2 Participant Information for Study 2

| Between Condition | Group 1 | Group 2 |
|-------------------|---------|---------|
| Number of Male    | 8       | 8       |
| Number of Female  | 8       | 8       |
| Avg. Height (Male) | 173.5 cm (SD = 6.9) | 173.6 cm (SD = 6.4) |
| Avg. Height (Female) | 163.1 cm (SD = 5.9) | 163.6 cm (SD = 5.6) |

![Fig. 7](https://example.com/fig7.png)  
Effects of Size and Object Existence on the probabilities of “faster” responses ($\alpha$: mean)
contrast tests, and all pairwise comparisons were Bonferroni corrected. Size consists of Large and Small, and Layout consists of Empty, Centered, Peripheral, and Scattered conditions described in Section 3.2.2. Six Relative Translation Gain factors represent the following pairs of the x-axis and y-axis translation gain value: Gain 1 = (0.825, 1), Gain 2 = (0.875, 1), Gain 3 = (0.925, 1), Gain 4 = (1.15, 1), Gain 5 = (1.20, 1), and Gain 6 = (1.25, 1). We excluded the data of four participants: Two in the Small room condition and the other two in the Large room condition were extreme values or considered to be contaminated.

We found significant main effects of Layout ($F(3, 611) = 3.198$, $p = .023$) and Gain ($F(5, 611) = 228.642$, $p < .001$). However, there were no significant main effects of Size ($F(1, 611) = 3.157$, $p = .076$) was found. The pairwise comparison revealed significant differences between the Centered and Scattered conditions ($p = .035$). However, there was no significant difference between the other two pairs of spatial layouts (all $p > .05$).

We also found a significant interaction of Size and Layout ($F(3, 611) = 2.941$, $p = .033$). The post hoc analysis revealed significant differences between Large × Scattered and Small × Centered ($p = .003$) and between Large × Peripheral and Small × Centered ($p = .035$). However, there were no significant differences in the pairs of Size × Layout, nor significant main interaction effects between other factors (all $p > .05$).

We therefore found that the mean value for the probability of “faster” responses was significantly lower in the Scattered Layout than in the Centered Layout for all six Relative Translation Gains, as is shown in Fig. 8. In addition, the mean probability value in the Large × Scattered room was significantly lower than the Small × Centered room for all gains. Moreover, the mean probability value in the Large × Peripheral room was significantly lower than the Small × Centered room for all gains.

### 4.2 Threshold estimation

We plotted fitted psychometric functions of mean estimated threshold values from Study 1 and Study 2. Figure 9 shows the mean estimated threshold values and Standard Error of the Mean (SEM) for the experimented Relative Translation Gains. The graph’s x-axis shows the translation gain for the x-axis ($g_{T,x}$) of the virtual room where the reference translation gain ($g_{x}$) is fixed to 1.0. The graph’s y-axis shows the probabilities of “faster” responses to the questionnaire “Was the virtual movement faster or slower than the physical movement?”. We used a standard logistic psychometric function to fit the data, and it can be represented as follows:

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{ax+b}}$$

The Point of Subjective Equality (PSE), the value at which a user perceives the virtual speed to be identical to their actual speed, is obtained from the fitted psychometric functions. We used the 25% and 75% criterion from Steinicke (Steinicke et al. 2010) to estimate the RTG’s threshold value (2D translation ratio, $\alpha_T$). $\alpha_{T,lower}$ (minimum 2D translation ratio) refers to a lower boundary of the threshold range, and $\alpha_{T,upper}$ (maximum 2D translation ratio) refers to an upper boundary of the threshold range. When the participant’s perceived speed of one axis in the virtual environment is adjusted to be slower or faster between $\alpha_{T,lower}$ and $\alpha_{T,upper}$, they rarely notice their speed differences.

The estimated RTG thresholds from six virtual room conditions in Study 1 are given in Table 3. As shown in Table 3, estimated RTG threshold values are higher when the virtual room participants are in is larger. Furthermore, the RTG threshold values were higher in Furnished conditions than in Empty ones. The estimated RTG threshold values from eight virtual room conditions in Study 2 are

![Fig. 8 Effects of Size and Spatial Layout on the probabilities of “faster” responses (o: mean)](image-url)
given in Table 4. Results show the maximum 2D translation gain boundary value $\sigma_{T_{\text{upper}}}$ in Large × Scattered was higher than the same size conditions with other spatial layouts. Moreover, we found the RTG threshold values from the Small × Centered layout was lower than the Small × Empty layout.

4.3 Gaze distribution

4.3.1 AoD distribution

Figure 10 shows the distribution of AoD according to each condition. Figure 10A shows the distribution of AoD from Study 1, and Fig. 10B shows the distribution of AoD from Study 2.
Study 2. The x-axis of the AoD distribution graph is the AoD ($\theta_{\text{AoD}}$) calculated from the angle generated by the user’s eye-gaze and the forward-gaze. The graph’s y-axis shows the density of normalized AoD for each subject. $\theta_{\text{AoD}} = 0^\circ$ indicates that participants gaze straight ahead while walking. $\theta_{\text{AoD}}$ increases to a positive degree when they gaze upward and decreases to a negative degree when they gaze downward. The AoD degree with a high density value signifies that participants gaze at that particular AoD degree more frequently. As the AoD distribution graph aims to determine the relationship between the virtual horizon and the RTG threshold range, it is important to know how much the subjects perceived the virtual horizon in corresponding virtual room conditions. Humans typically recognize about 10 degrees downward from the location of the foveal area while they are walking (Hill and Kroemer 1986). We therefore set the horizon-noticeable gaze area of each room based on this principle. In the Small $\times$ Empty condition, the average AoD was set to $-30^\circ$ so we set the AoD area where the user could perceive the virtual horizon to be $-20^\circ$ to $-30^\circ$. Similarly, the horizon-noticeable gaze area in the Middle $\times$ Empty condition was $-10^\circ$ to $-20^\circ$, and in the Large $\times$ Empty conditions was $0^\circ$ to $-10^\circ$. In Fig. 10, we highlighted the AoD area of the Empty conditions where users could perceive the virtual horizon. The colored area in Fig. 10 (C1) is the horizon-noticeable gaze area in Large $\times$ Empty, the dotted area in Fig. 10 (C2) shows the area for Medium $\times$ Empty, and the dashed area in Fig. 10 (C3) shows that of Small $\times$ Empty.

Figure 10A shows that there is a high-density peak in the area where users can perceive the virtual horizon from each Empty condition. In particular, this AoD peak is more pronounced in the Large sizes, as shown in Fig. 10(A1), consistent with the statistical results for AoD medians in that the participants tended to look downwards while they are walking in a larger room. Furthermore, Fig. 10(A1) shows that the existence of virtual objects biases the AoD distribution to be lower in Large conditions. In the Medium and Small virtual rooms, the Furnished condition also has a peak at a higher AoD value compared to the Empty condition, as shown in Fig. 10(A2, A3).

In order to more quantitatively analyze user gaze information, the Aligned Rank Transform (ART) for the non-parametric factorial ANOVA method ($\alpha = 0.05$) was adapted to handle the multivariate analysis, and all post hoc contrast comparisons were Bonferroni corrected.

### Table 3 Relative translation gain thresholds according to virtual room configurations in Study 1

| VE configuration     | $\alpha_{T,\text{lower}}$ | PSE   | $\alpha_{T,\text{upper}}$ |
|----------------------|---------------------------|-------|---------------------------|
| Large $\times$ Empty | 0.91                      | 1.07  | 1.22                      |
| Medium $\times$ Empty| 0.85                      | 0.98  | 1.12                      |
| Small $\times$ Empty | 0.73                      | 0.91  | 1.10                      |
| Large $\times$ Furnished | 1.02                      | 1.18  | 1.34                      |
| Medium $\times$ Furnished | 0.92                      | 1.08  | 1.23                      |
| Small $\times$ Furnished | 0.96                      | 1.10  | 1.24                      |

### Table 4 Relative translation gain thresholds according to virtual room configurations in Study 2

| VE configuration     | $\alpha_{T,\text{lower}}$ | PSE   | $\alpha_{T,\text{upper}}$ |
|----------------------|---------------------------|-------|---------------------------|
| Large $\times$ Empty | 0.76                      | 1.01  | 1.25                      |
| Large $\times$ Centered | 0.86                      | 1.05  | 1.25                      |
| Large $\times$ Peripheral | 0.83                      | 1.07  | 1.25                      |
| Large $\times$ Scattered | 0.84                      | 1.10  | 1.35                      |
| Small $\times$ Empty | 0.80                      | 1.02  | 1.25                      |
| Small $\times$ Centered | 0.73                      | 0.98  | 1.23                      |
| Small $\times$ Peripheral | 0.78                      | 1.02  | 1.25                      |
| Small $\times$ Scattered | 0.82                      | 1.04  | 1.25                      |

![Fig. 10](image-url) Density distribution of AoD according to VE configurations in A Study 1 and B Study 2. C The area where users could perceive the virtual horizon for C1 Large, C2 Medium, and C3 Small conditions.
Study 1, we investigated the user’s AoD values for the within-subject factor of Size and the between-subject factor of Object. The results only showed a significant main effect of Size ($F(2, 70) = 4.832, p < .011$). During the post hoc analysis, we found significant differences in pairs between Large and Medium ($p = .018$) and Large and Small ($p = .043$). However, there was no significant difference between the Medium and Small sizes ($p > .05$).

The other factor, Object, nor main interaction, showed no significant effects ($Object: F(1, 70) = 1.339, p = .251; Size \times Object: F(2, 70) = .172, p = .842$). The AoD distribution graph and statistical results confirmed that participants frequently notice the virtual horizon in Empty conditions, and they look more downward in larger conditions than in smaller ones. On the other hand, the presence of objects distributes users’ attention, which weakens the relationship between AoD distribution and room size in the Furnished conditions.

The AoD distribution graph from Study 2 shows that the percentage of horizon-noticeable gaze area, determined by the size of the virtual space, has no distinguishable peak in corresponding size conditions. They were not much different from the density distribution of horizon-noticeable gaze area in the Large x Empty condition. These AoD results from Large conditions imply that an inner floor area with different tiles functions as a distractor, distributing the user’s gaze to reach the virtual horizon configured by the wall and the floor. As the size of the inner floor area is the same as the Small room, the user’s AoD distribution is expected to be high between $-20^\circ$ and $-30^\circ$ when they attract the users’ attention. As shown in every Large condition from Fig. 10, the peak of AoD distribution exists in the AoD value between $-20^\circ$ to $-30^\circ$. On the other hand, in Small size conditions, the AoD peak exists near the AoD value between $0^\circ$ to $-10^\circ$.

As in Study 1, the ART for nonparametric factorial ANOVA analysis ($\alpha = 0.05$) was used to conduct the multivariate analysis within the within-subject factor of Layout, the between-subject factor of Size, and the factor of AoD Median. We also found a significant main effect of Size ($F(1, 98) = 65.109, p < .001$). However, no main effect of Layout ($F(3, 98) = 1.15, p = .951$) nor an interaction effect for Size x Layout was found ($F(3, 98) = .525, p = .666$). The user’s AoD values in Large and Small rooms were significantly different ($p < .001$). This indicates that subjects in the small virtual room were more likely to face the front wall while walking along the path. Moreover, Fig. 10 (B) shows the AoD peak in the Large size condition was presented between $-20^\circ$ to $-30^\circ$, which implies the boundary of an inner floor draws attention from subjects.

### 4.3.2 Gaze heatmap

We utilized the gaze heatmap to observe the effect of spatial layout on the user’s distribution of attention. We normalized the individual gaze information of the subjects for each condition and accumulated every subject’s gaze data from the same experimental condition. While participants walked the same path during the experiment, most of them gazed at the far end of the direction they were walking toward. In the four layout conditions of the Small room, the average gaze proportion reaching the wall was 76.08% (STD = 4.18). In Large size conditions, the average gaze proportion to the wall and the outer floor area (excluding adjusted movable space from perceived movable space) was 45.52% (STD = 4.5). Figure 11 shows the gaze heatmap in the eight spatial configurations using the gaze data of Study 2. Since the purpose of the gaze heatmap is to observe the user’s gaze distribution changes by spatial layout, only the gaze data within the inner floor area 5 cm away from each side of the inner floor were used.

Figure 11 shows that the gaze heatmaps from the same spatial layout share a similar pattern regardless of the size: Participants frequently focused their gaze on their walking paths. According to the spatial layout, the gaze distributions in the following pairs were similar: Empty and Peripheral, Centered and Scattered. In the Empty and Peripheral layouts, participants mostly gazed at the paths they walked on. In addition, the Peripheral condition’s gaze heatmap showed that the object located at the left top corner, which is less relevant to the path, rarely played a role in attracting the user’s attention. In the Centered and Scattered layouts, on the other hand, subjects viewed not only the path but also the objects inside the path. In the Centered layout, more participants tended to look at objects within the paths than those in other layout conditions did. From the gaze heatmap of the Scattered layouts, two object clusters inside the path were frequently gazed and also two objects outside the path were gazed at by the subjects. In conclusion, we verified that the subjects frequently perceived objects placed in the Centered and Scattered conditions through a gaze heatmap.

### 4.4 Post-VR sickness comparison

In Study 1, we compared the post-SSQ Total Score (TS) from two Large size conditions to determine the effect of RTG on users’ VR simulator sickness (Kim et al. 2022). Results show there was no significant difference in the mean post-SSQ TS scores for Large x Empty (with RTGs) and Large x Empty (no RTGs), nor between the Large x Furnished (with RTGs) and the Large x Furnished (no RTGs). Through statistical results from Study 1, we confirmed that Relative Translation Gains are not a significant factor in VR simulator sickness. In Study 2, we compared post-SSQ TS...
from each condition to compare the effect of spatial layout on the VR simulator sickness. The ART for non-parametric factorial ANOVA analysis was also used to handle multifactor analysis. Results show all factors and their interaction effect showed no significant main effects (Size: $F(1, 105) = 1.072$, $p = .303$; Layout: $F(3, 105) = .711$, $p = .548$; Size $\times$ Layout: $F(3, 105) = .132$, $p = .941$). We could confirm there was no significant effect of spatial layout on the VR simulator sickness.

5 Discussion

5.1 Analysis

We evaluate our three hypotheses for the study based on results from Sect. 4. Our first hypothesis on the impact of size on the RTG threshold was supported in Study 1, as there was a significant difference between Large and Medium, Large and Small. However, this hypothesis was not supported in Study 2, as no significant difference was found between the Large size condition. Contrasting results from the two studies for size seem to result from the fact that there was a difference in the number of conditions with distractors between the two studies. In Study 1, the Empty space without any distractors accounted for half of the experimental conditions. On the other hand, for Study 2, the proportion of the Empty room was only 25%, and the inner floor was expressed with bright tiles, which distribute the user's attention as shown in Fig. 11. Based on these statistical results and gaze distributions from two studies, we confirmed that the effect of size in the Empty room without distractors was significant: When the space is empty, the cognitive threshold increases to a greater degree when its size is more extensive. However, the effect of the size of the space is relatively small in conditions where distractors exist.

Figure 10A shows that participants from Study 1 often looked at the virtual horizon in the Empty condition regardless of the room size. However, subjects did not look at the virtual horizon frequently in the Furnished conditions, so the impact of size is relatively small. Furthermore, Fig. 10B also shows that users from Study 2 did not recognize the virtual horizon frequently in every condition. This supports that the RTG threshold was affected by the size of the virtual room only if it is empty and the virtual horizon is well noticeable to subjects. However, in the case of a virtual room with distractors, the effect of room size on the RTG threshold range is less pronounced because the objects in the VR room attract users’ attention.

Next, we verified the effect of the spatial layout on the RTG threshold range. The second hypothesis regarding the impact of spatial layout on the RTG threshold was partially accepted. The statistical results from Study 2 confirmed that the probability of “faster” responses in the Scattered layout is significantly lower than in the Centered layout. In the interaction effect analysis, we found the probability of
“faster” responses in the Large × Scattered condition was significantly lower than in the Small × Centered condition. Moreover, the probability of “faster” responses in the Large × Peripheral condition was lower than in the Small × Empty condition. Summarizing these statistical results and estimated RTG threshold ranges from Table 3 and Table 4, we conclude that subjects become less sensitive to an increase in their walking speed in the following order of layout conditions: Scattered, Peripheral, Empty, and Centered.

Figure 11 shows that subjects looked more at the area around the object under the Centered and Scattered conditions than the Empty and Peripheral conditions. Moreover, subjects gazed at the object more in the Centered layout than in the Scattered layout. In the post-experimental interview, many subjects said that in the Centered condition, they estimated their walking speed by referring to the speed at which objects in the space approached them. This indicates that users’ regarded objects differently according to the spatial layout. Users were less sensitive to being faster when objects distracted their gaze. In the Centered layout, however, they utilize objects as a guide to help them notice their speed to be faster. For instance, when objects are placed at the center and gathered as a single cluster, subjects are more aware of being faster in the virtual space by using objects as reference targets to estimate their speed. On the other hand, when objects are scattered in space and come in and out of sight depending on where a person is, objects act as distractors and make users less sensitive to be faster.

Our last hypothesis, which postulated that the AoD distribution would be lower in the small-sized conditions than in larger ones, was rejected both for Study 1 and Study 2. The statistical results from Study 1 show that the AoD medians from the Large conditions were significantly lower than those of the Medium and Small conditions. Likewise, in Study 2, the AoD medians in Large conditions were significantly lower than those in Small conditions. These results are reflected in Fig. 10, which shows that in every Large-sized condition, participants most frequently gazed at the area that fell between the AoD values from −30° to −20°, where the inner floor’s boundary exists. In every Small-sized condition, however, the area participants gazed at most often was between −10° to 0° of their AoD, meaning that they tended to look at the walls mostly while they were walking.

Figure 10 confirms that the relationship between AoD and the virtual horizon is well-revealed only in Empty conditions. This means that when objects exist in a virtual space, AoD distribution is less relevant in determining the value of RTG thresholds. This is because even though the main reason for measuring AoD is to determine how often users perceive a virtual horizon, the existence of distractors distributes users’ gaze and therefore makes it difficult to establish a causal relationship between the virtual horizon and the RTG threshold range. Instead, it is more effective to utilize the gaze heatmap in analyzing the entire space for conditions with distractors, as they can show how much each object attracts the user’s gaze, as shown in Fig. 11.

5.2 Virtual space rescaling guidelines with relative translation gains

Based on Sect 5.1, we propose virtual space rescaling guidelines with RTGs for system developers to increase the range of adjustable movable space with RTG as follows.

(1) Increase the adjustable movable space by placing distractors in the virtual room:

Both study results show that the existence of distractors in the virtual room should be considered first in adjusting the virtual space through RTGs. We observed that the RTG threshold range is greater in the Small × Furnished condition than in the Large × Empty from Study 1 in Table 3. This indicates that when objects are placed in a small virtual space and function as distractors, users will be less sensitive to increases in walking speed compared to a larger and empty virtual room. Moreover, the estimated RTG threshold range of Empty conditions in Study 2 was relatively higher than that of Study 1. This is because the floor tiles used in Study 2 to distinguish the adjusted movable space distracted the users. This means that the existence of a distractor in the virtual scene can create a virtual space that is larger than the users’ actual movable space. In this study, we could find the virtual room with distractor conditions such as placing objects densely, placing objects as a scattered layout if it is not dense, or displaying an adjusted movable space with bright tiles. A simple way for developers to increase the user’s exploratory area with distractors would be to visualize spatial boundaries with different colors or patterns on the floor.

(2) For empty spaces, set the perceived movable space to be larger than the adjusted movable space:

The size of the virtual room is essential for an empty virtual room. Users are less sensitive to being faster in the virtual room with a higher virtual horizon when they can recognize the horizon well while walking. They could recognize the virtual horizon well in an empty virtual room, so the threshold range of RTG shifted toward the size of the virtual room. From the perspective of space rescaling, we could increase a tracked space more when we fit it into the larger target virtual space. On the other hand, we could decrease the tracked space more when we rescaled it for matching to the smaller target virtual space. As the goal of applying RTGs to RDW is to maximize the aligned area between the virtual space and the real space, considering the effect of room size on
RTG thresholds is helpful to rescale and sync the tracked real space to the target virtual space. When developers generate a new empty virtual space, the space expansion effect can be maximized if the perceivable movable space is larger than the adjusted movable space.

(3) Avoid placing objects where they are constantly in a user’s sight:

Study 2 revealed that the role of objects in a VR space differs according to the spatial layout they configured. When objects are scattered in the virtual room, they function as distractors and increase the extendable range of adjustable movable space with RTGs. On the other hand, when objects gather to form a single cluster, they act as aids that help users estimate their walking speed, thereby reducing the extendable range of adjusted movable space. Our results show that the virtual movable space can be expanded with RTGs in the following order: Centered, Empty, Peripheral, and Scattered. In the case of Scattered and Peripheral layouts, objects frequently enter and exit the users’ field of view while they are walking and constantly distract their attention from their walking speed. In the Centered layout, however, users can consistently perceive and predict their location regardless of their position and direction along the walking path. Their fixed presence in sight, along with the users’ perception of how fast they approach or move away from them, help users estimate their walking speed. Therefore, it is necessary to distinguish the spatial layout of virtual space and figure out the role of objects to adaptively set the RTG threshold range and rescale the virtual space.

5.3 Limitations

There are some limitations in this work that should be addressed in the future. The first limitation is that the studies were only conducted in a static environment. In various locomotion-based VR applications, virtual objects and information frequently move around or pop up in the air. As this study confirmed that distractors in fixed positions in virtual space significantly influence the RTG threshold range, further investigation on whether dynamic objects or information also function as distractors in specific situations and how they affect the RTG threshold range should be conducted.

Second, we should conduct a user study with the virtual space rescaled with RTGs. As RTGs were proposed to transform the virtual space while maintaining a coordinate system between physical and virtual spaces, we should investigate the user experience in rescaled virtual space. Furthermore, to determine whether applying RTGs to RDW is beneficial for real-world scenarios in merging physical spaces with the target virtual space, we should compare the rescaled space based on RTGs with spaces generated from previous RDW methods.

Last of all, our study was limited to a situation where only one user occupies a virtual space. When a user co-exists with game characters or remote users in VR, various modes of interaction with them can influence the user’s visual perception and recognition of changes in their walking speed. As users’ gaze distribution in VR will be affected by how other users behave in the same space, factoring in the presence of others should be a needed step in expanding the scope of our current work. In particular, further studies are needed in multi-user remote collaboration scenarios where users from heterogeneous spaces gather together and communicate in a mutual space.

6 Conclusion and future work

In this study, we analyzed how spatial configurations of the virtual space affect the Relative Translation Gains (RTGs) threshold range and derived guidelines on how the virtual space can be adaptively rescaled with RTG-based RDW. To verify the influence on the user’s visual perception according to the composition of the virtual space, we utilized the distribution of AoDs and gaze heatmaps generated from the user’s gaze data. Our results show that the three components of the virtual space—size, the existence of the objects, and the spatial layout—significantly affect the RTG threshold. The adjustable movable space can be increased further when distractors exist in the virtual room. Moreover, the adjustable movable space can be expanded when the perceived movable space is larger than the actual movable space in empty VR environments. Lastly, the adjustable movable space increases in a scattered layout where objects function as distractors, but it decreases in a centered layout where objects function as guides by which users can estimate their walking speed.

When applying translation gain-based RDW, proper threshold values must be set to avoid VR simulator sickness. Using the virtual space rescaling guidelines derived from our results, developers can determine proper RTG threshold ranges according to the configuration of the target virtual space. Our proposed translation gain-based spatial deformation method can synchronize the target virtual space with the tracked physical space while maximizing the movable area for the user. More specifically, this can be achieved by precisely matching the boundaries of physical objects to virtual ones through RTG-based deformation, which can unify the coordinate system of the two spaces.

Our future work will explore the effect of dynamic objects and information on the RTG threshold range. In addition, we will determine the performance of RTG-based rescaling methods with 3D indoor scene data sets obtained from tools.
such as Matterport 3D (Chang et al. 2017) and compare the generated explorative virtual space results with previous methods (Lehment et al. 2014; Keshavarzi et al. 2020; Keshavarzi et al. 2022). We will also experiment with a scenario where multiple VR clients’ avatars move around in the same target VR space according to their adaptive RTG values. Ultimately, we aim to develop and apply RTG-based RDW to generate a mutual collaborative space for Extended Reality (XR) that aligns heterogeneous physical spaces to a single VR space with a unified coordinate system.

**Funding** This research was supported by the National Research Council of Science and Technology (NST) funded by the Ministry of Science and ICT (MSIT), Republic of Korea (Grant No. CRC 21011), and the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the Korea government (MSIT) (No. 2021R1A2C2011459).

**Data availability statement** The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

**Declarations**

**Conflicts of interest** The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

**References**

Ash A, Palmisano S, Aphthor D, Allison RS (2013) Vection in depth during treadmill walking. Perception 42(5):562–576. https://doi.org/10.1068/p7449

Azmandian M, Grechkin T, Bolas M, Suma E (2016) The redirected walking toolkit: a unified development platform for exploring large virtual environments. In: IEEE pp 9–14. https://doi.org/10.1109/WEVR.2016.7859537

Banton T, Stefanacci J, Durgin F, Fass A, Proffitt D (2005) The perception of walking speed in a virtual environment. Presence 14(4):394–406. https://doi.org/10.1162/10548400577485262

Bozgeyikli E, Raij A, Katkoori S, Dubey R (2019) Locomotion in virtual reality for room scale tracked areas. Int J Human-Comput Interact 35(7):742–748. https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2019.1597836

Brotz G, Steinicke F, Wieland P, Lappe M (2012) Tuning self-motion perception in virtual reality with visual illusions. IEEE Trans Vis Comput Gr 18(7):1068–1078. https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2011.274

Bruder G, Lubos P, Steinicke F (2015) Cognitive resource demands of redirected walking. IEEE Trans Vis Comput Gr 21(4):539–544. https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2015.2391864

Caramenti M, Lafortuna CL, Mugellini E, Abou Khaled O, Bresciani J-P, Dubois A (2018) Matching optical flow to motor speed in virtual reality while running on a treadmill. PLOS ONE 13(4):1–13. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0195781

Chang A, Dui A, Funkhouser T, Halber M, Niessen M, Savva M, Song S, Zeng A, Zhang Y (2017) Matterport3d: learning from rgb-d data in indoor environments. In: International Conference on 3D Vision (3DVF). URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1709.06158

Chen H, Chen S, Rosenberg E (2018) Redirected walking in irregularly shaped physical environments with dynamic obstacles. In: 2018 IEEE Conference on Virtual Reality and 3D User Interfaces (VR), pp 523–524, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, IEEE Computer Society. URL https://doi.ieeecomputersociety.org/10.1109/VR.2018.8446563

Chen Z-Y, Li Y-J, Wang M, Steinicke F, Zhao Q (2021) A reinforcement learning approach to redirected walking with passive haptic feedback. In: 2021 IEEE International Symposium on mixed and augmented reality (ISMAR), pp 184–192. https://doi.org/10.1109/ISMAR52148.2021.00033

Ciucu-Cmean C-B, Patras C, Cibulskis M, Varadi N, Nilsson NC (2020) Mission impossible spaces: using challenge-based distractors to reduce noticeability of self-overlapping virtual architecture. In: Symposium on spatial user interaction, SUI ’20, New York, NY, USA, Association for computing machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/3357251.3357580

Dong T, Chen X, Song Y, Ying W, Fan J (2020) Dynamic artificial potential fields for multi-user redirected walking. In: 2020 IEEE conference on virtual reality and 3D user interfaces (VR), pp 146–154. https://doi.org/10.1109/VR46266.2020.00033

Dong Z-C, Fu X-M, Zhang C, Wu K, Liu L (2017) Smooth assembled redirection: multimodal integration of incongruent visual and auditory cues for redirected walking. In: 2020 IEEE international symposium on mixed and augmented reality (ISMAR), pp 639–648. https://doi.org/10.1109/ISMAR50242.2020.00092

Grechkin T, Thomas J, Azmandian M, Bolas M, Suma E (2016) Revisiting detection thresholds for redirected walking: Combining translation and curvature gains. In: Proceedings of the ACM symposium on applied perception, SAP ’16, pp 113-120, New York, NY, USA, association for computing machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/2931002.2931018

Hill SG, Kroemer KHE (1986) Preferred declination of the line of sight. Human Factors 28(2):127–134. https://doi.org/10.1177/00187208860280201

Hodgson E, Bachmann E (2013) Comparing four approaches to generalized redirected walking: simulation and live user data. IEEE Trans Vis Comput Gr 19(4):634–643. https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2013.28

Interrante V, Ries B, Anderson L (2007) Seven league boots: a new metaphor for augmented locomotion through moderately large scale immersive virtual environments. In: 2007 IEEE symposium on 3D user interfaces, https://doi.org/10.1109/3DUI.2007.340791

Kennedy RS, Lane NE, Berbaum KS, Lilienthal MG (1993) Simulator sickness questionnaire: an enhanced method for quantifying simulator sickness. Int J Aviat Psychol 3(3):203–220. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327108ijap0303_3

Keshavarzi M, Yang AY, Ko W, Caldas L (2020) Optimization and manipulation of contextual mutual spaces for multi-user virtual and augmented reality interaction. In: 2020 IEEE conference on virtual reality and 3D user interfaces (VR), pp 353–362, https://doi.org/10.1109/VR46266.2020.00055

Keshavarzi M, Zollhoefer M, Yang AY, Peluse P, Caldas L (2022) Mutual scene synthesis for mixed reality telepresence. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.00161

Kim D, Shin J-e, Lee J, Woo W (2021a) Adjusting relative translation gains according to space size in redirected walking for mixed reality mutual space generation. In: 2021 IEEE virtual
realities and 3D user interfaces (VR), pp 653–660. https://doi.org/10.1109/VR50410.2021.00091
Kim D, Kim J, Shin J-E, Yoon B, Lee J, Woo W (2022) Effects of virtual room size and objects on relative translation gain thresholds in redirected walking. In: 2022 IEEE conference on virtual reality and 3D user interfaces (VR), pp 379–388. https://doi.org/10.1109/VR51125.2022.00057
Kim H-I, Kim T, Song E, Oh SY, Kim D, Woo W (2021b) Multiscale mixed reality collaboration for digital twin. In: 2021 IEEE international symposium on mixed and augmented reality (ISMAR-Adjunct), pp 435–436. https://doi.org/10.1109/ISMAR-Adjunct54149.2021.00098
Kruske L, Langbehn E, Steinicke F (2018) I can see on my feet while walking: sensitivity to translation gains with visible feet. In: 2018 IEEE conference on virtual reality and 3D user interfaces (VR), pp 305–312. https://doi.org/10.1109/VR.2018.8446216
Langbehn E, Lubos P, Bruder G, Steinicke F (2017) Application of redirected walking in room-scale VR. In: 2017 IEEE virtual reality (VR), pp 449–450. https://doi.org/10.1109/VR.2017.7892373
Lee D-Y, Cho Y-H, Min D-H, Lee I-K (2020) Optimal planning for redirected walking based on reinforcement learning in multi-user environment with irregularly shaped physical space. In: 2020 IEEE conference on virtual reality and 3D user interfaces (VR), pp 155–163. https://doi.org/10.1109/VR46266.2020.00034
Lehment NH, Merget D, Rigoll G (2014) Creating automatically aligned consensus realities for ar videoconferencing. In: 2014 IEEE international symposium on mixed and augmented reality (ISMAR), pp 201–206. https://doi.org/10.1109/ISMAR.2014.6948428
Li Y-J, Wang M, Steinicke F, Zhao Q (2021) Operndrw: A redirected walking library and benchmark with multi-user, learning-based functionalities and state-of-the-art algorithms. In: 2021 IEEE International symposium on mixed and augmented reality (ISMAR), pp 21–30. https://doi.org/10.1109/ISMAR52148.2021.00016
Messing R, Durgin FH (2005) Distance perception and the visual horizon in head-mounted displays. ACM Trans Appl Percept 2(3):234–250. https://doi.org/10.1145/1077399.1077403. (ISSN 1544-3558)
Neth CT, Souman JL, Engel D, Kloos U, Bulthoff HH, Mohler BJ (2012) Velocity-dependent dynamic curvature gain for redirected walking. IEEE Trans on Vis Comput Gr 18(7):1041–1052. https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2011.275
Nguyen A, Rothacher Y, Kunz A, Brugger P, Lenggenhager B (2018) Effect of environment size on curvature redirected walking thresholds. In: 2018 IEEE conference on virtual reality and 3D user interfaces (VR), pp 645–646. https://doi.org/10.1109/VR.2018.8446225
Nguyen A, Rothacher Y, Lenggenhager B, Brugger P, Kunz A, Effect of sense of embodiment on curvature redirected walking thresholds. In: ACM symposium on applied perception, (2020) SAP ’20, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for computing machinery. DOI 10(1145/3385955):3407932
Orts-Escolano S, Riemann C, Fanello S, Chang W, Kowdle A, Degtarev Y, Kim D, Davidson PL, Khamis S, Dou M, Tankovich V, Loop C, Cai Q, Chau PA, Menningen S, Valentin J, Pradeep V, Wang S, Kang SB, Kohli P, Lutchyn Y, Keskin C, Izadi S (2016) Holoportation: Virtual 3d teleportation in real-time. In: Proceedings of the 29th annual symposium on user interface software and technology, UIST ’16, pp 741-754, New York, NY, USA, association for computing machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/2984511.2984517
Paludan A, Elbaek J, Mortensen M, Zobbe M, Nilsson NC, Nordahl R, Reng L, Serafin S (2016) Disguising rotational gain for redirected walking in virtual reality: effect of visual density. In: 2016 IEEE virtual reality (VR), pp 259–260. https://doi.org/10.1109/VR.2016.7504752
Piumsomboon T, Lee GA, Hart JD, Ens B, Lindemann RW, Thomas BH, Billinghamurst M (2018) Mini-Me: an adaptive avatar for mixed reality remote collaboration, pp 1-13. In: association for computing machinery, New York, NY, USA, https://doi.org/10.1109/3173574.3173620
Razzaque S, Kohn Z, Whitton MC (2005) Redirected walking. Citeseer
Rietzler M, Gugenheimer J, Hirzle T, Deubzer M, Langbehn E, Rukzieo E (2018) Rethinking redirected walking: on the use of curvature gains beyond perceptual limitations and revisiting bending gains. In: 2018 IEEE international symposium on mixed and augmented reality (ISMAR), pp 115–122, https://doi.org/10.1109/ISMAR.2018.00041
Ropelato S, Menozzi M, Huang MY-Y (2021) Hyper-reoriented walking in minimal space. Virtual Real 26(3):1009–1017. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10055-021-00608-0
Sakono H, Matsumoto K, Narumi T, Kuzuoka H (2021) Redirected walking using continuous curvature manipulation. IEEE Trans Vis Comput Gr 27(11):4278–4288. https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2021.3106501
Selzer MN, Larrea ML, Castro SM (2022) Analysis of translation gains in virtual reality: the limits of space manipulation. Virtual Real. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10055-022-00640-8
Shin J-e, Yoon B, Kim D, Woo W (2021) A user-oriented approach to space-adaptive augmentation: the effects of spatial affordance on narrative experience in an augmented reality detective game. In: Proceedings of the 2021 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems, CHI ’21, New York, NY, USA, association for computing machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445675
Steinicke F, Bruder G, Jerald J, Frenz H, Lappe M (2010) Estimation of detection thresholds for redirected walking techniques. IEEE Trans Vis Comput Gr 16(1):17–27. https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2009.62
Strauss RR, Ramanujan R, Becker A, Peck TC (2020) A steering algorithm for redirected walking using reinforcement learning. IEEE Trans Vis Comput Gr 26(5):1955–1963. https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2020.2973060
Williams NL, Peck TC (2019) Estimation of rotation gain thresholds considering fov, gender, and distractors. IEEE Trans Vis Comput Gr 25(11):3158–3168. https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2019.2932213
Williams NL, Bera A, Manocha D (2021) Arc: Alignment-based redirection controller for redirected walking in complex environments. IEEE Trans Vis Comput Gr 27(5):2535–2544. https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2021.3067781
Williams NL, Bera A, Manocha D (2021) Redirected walking in static and dynamic scenes using visibility polygons. IEEE Tran Vis Comput Gr 27(11):4267–4277. https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2021.3106432
Zhang R, Li B, Kuhl SA (2014) Human sensitivity to dynamic translation gains in head-mounted displays. In: SUI ’14, pp 62-65, New York, NY, USA, association for computing machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/2659766.2659783
