



## Science Arts & Métiers (SAM)

is an open access repository that collects the work of Arts et Métiers Institute of Technology researchers and makes it freely available over the web where possible.

This is an author-deposited version published in: <https://sam.ensam.eu>  
Handle ID: <http://hdl.handle.net/10985/23395>



This document is available under CC BY license

### To cite this version :

Mahdiyeh Sadat MOOSAVI, Pierre RAIMBAUD, Christophe GUILLET, Jeremy PLOUZEAU -  
Weight perception analysis using pseudo-haptic feedback based on physical work evaluation -  
Frontiers in Virtual Reality - Vol. 4, - 2023

Any correspondence concerning this service should be sent to the repository

Administrator : [scienceouverte@ensam.eu](mailto:scienceouverte@ensam.eu)



## Weight Perception Analysis using Pseudo-Haptic Feedback based on Physical Work Evaluation

1 Mahdiyeh Sadat Moosavi<sup>1\*</sup>, Pierre Raimbaud<sup>2</sup>, Christophe Guillet<sup>3</sup>, Jérémy Plouzeau<sup>1</sup>, Frédéric  
2 Mérienne<sup>1</sup>

3 <sup>1</sup> Arts et Métiers Institute of Technology, LISPEN, HESAM Université, F-71100 Chalon-Sur-Saône,  
4 France

5 <sup>2</sup> INRIA, Université Rennes 1, CNRS, IRISA, Rennes, France

6 <sup>3</sup> Université de Bourgogne, LISPEN, UBFC, F-71100 Chalon-Sur-Saône, France

7 \* **Correspondence:**

8 Corresponding Author

9 [mahdiyehsadat.moosavi@ensam.eu](mailto:mahdiyehsadat.moosavi@ensam.eu)

### 10 **Abstract**

11 Since kinesthetic cues are not present in virtual environments, users have difficulty feeling the  
12 heaviness of virtual objects. To address this issue, pseudo-haptic approaches have been proposed to  
13 illusorily induce the weight of virtual objects through the user's visual sensory system. In this paper,  
14 we used two methods to induce the impression of virtual objects' heaviness. One relies on the direct  
15 modification of the control-display (C/D) ratio when lifting objects, and the other depends on  
16 controlling this ratio based on a velocity restriction. We innovatively measured each approach's  
17 efficiency by analyzing physical work as an objective metric. In addition, we used Borg CR10 to  
18 measure users' hand fatigue during the experimental phases. Our findings are discussed in terms of  
19 individual lifting behavior in different pseudo-haptic methods. Furthermore, different virtual weight-  
20 lifting behaviors were compared to the same real-world weight-lifting behaviors. According to our  
21 results, the direct control of the C/D ratio method provides VR users with a more accurate weight  
22 perception than the velocity restriction one. Furthermore, with this first method, users' lifting behavior  
23 was closer to the behavior when lifting real objects.

24 **Keywords:** Virtual reality, Pseudo-haptic feedback, Multi-sensory integration, Weight perception,  
25 Illusion, Individual-lifting behavior

## 26 1 Introduction

27 One of the significant challenges and research topics in virtual reality (VR) is to enhance the user  
28 experience so that users can feel as if they were in a real environment. While many studies have been  
29 conducted on this topic (Nguyen & Bednarz, 2020), open problems still remain regarding creating a  
30 rich and believable virtual environment (VE). One crucial modality is haptics, which is typically  
31 delivered to VR users through haptic feedback (Burdea, 1996). It allows users to select and manipulate  
32 objects in a more realistic manner (Ramsamy, et al., 2006). Consequently, it gives users a greater sense  
33 of presence (Gibbs, et al., 2022).

34 By grasping and manipulating an object, humans obtain certain information about it, such as its size,  
35 shape, and texture. This information is mainly provided by the vision and haptic senses (Ernst & Banks,  
36 2002). Since visual perception occurs exclusively through the retina, visual information is unimodal.  
37 Alternatively, haptic perception involves several sources of information, including force feedback,  
38 proprioceptive feedback, and tactile feedback (Aman, et al., 2010). A single, unified haptic perception  
39 is thus obtained by combining such information (Sciutti, et al., 2010) (Burdea, 1996) (Burdea, 1999).  
40 Humans can recognize weight, inertia, and object hardness based on force feedback, while  
41 proprioceptive feedback provides information about body position, and tactile feedback is used to  
42 distinguish object surface (Burdea, 1999) (De Tinguy, et al., 2018).

43 Regarding users' interactions in VEs, visual feedback is usually fully supplied through the devices used  
44 (VR head-mounted display (HMD), mixed reality glasses, etc.). However, regarding other senses, the  
45 virtual environment does not provide this feedback, or elements from the real world can interfere (e.g.,  
46 ambient noise vs. displayed sound in the HMD). Therefore, a conflict happens between visual  
47 information and other sources of sensory information, especially haptic sensors. In addition, the  
48 mismatch between the real and virtual environment leads to difficulty in enabling true haptic feedback  
49 (Rietzler, et al., 2018), particularly concerning the kinesthetic feedback, which relies on the physical  
50 direction of the force and therefore is difficult to compensate for (Rietzler, et al., 2018). However,  
51 about other aspects of the haptic sense, some methods, such as vibration stimuli techniques, have been  
52 introduced in the literature and they succeeded in providing tactile feedback sensation. Regarding force  
53 feedback, when users perceive an object through their visual sensory system and want to interact with  
54 it and move it, they are usually unable to truly grasp or lift it since the object is not real. Thus, they do  
55 not correctly perceive its weight. Because of this, in the real world, users cannot perceive their own  
56 relative tiredness of lifting such objects in their muscles.

57 However, perceiving the heaviness of objects cannot be limited only to our haptic sensory system; it  
58 also relies on our visual sensory system (Runeson & Frykholm, 1981). Therefore, in VEs, approaches  
59 such as the "pseudo-haptic feedback" technique have been developed to benefit from the visual sensory  
60 system when evaluating virtual objects heaviness. Such approaches propose to induce heaviness by  
61 hacking human perception through visual stimuli, playing on the borders of human perception and  
62 sensory illusions. With this illusory method, users can enjoy a haptic experience induced only by visual  
63 stimuli only (Lécuyer, 2009). Previous studies have shown that a VR user's experience is improved by  
64 using this technique, making it feel closer to a real-world interaction (Yu & Bowman, 2020) (Ujitoko  
65 & Ban, 2021).

66 Even though this method is one of the most effective options for replacing costly and expensive haptic  
67 devices, it still requires significant improvement. One of the main challenges of this method is  
68 measuring the sense of presence, particularly when subjects are dealing with heavy objects. One  
69 particular issue is the need to evaluate and measure the sense of presence when using it, especially  
70 when subjects deal with heavy objects. Many studies (Rietzler, et al., 2018), (Maehigashi, et al., 2021),

71 (Lécuyer, et al., 2004), (Zenner & Krüger, 2017) focused on virtually induced weights of objects to  
72 VR participants focused on the use of subjective measurements to evaluate their pseudo-haptic  
73 methods. One issue regarding such measures is that they depend on the subject's point of view and rely  
74 only on intuition. However, few other studies focused on objective measurements: in particular, Samad  
75 et al. (Samad, et al., 2019) used the concept of work to evaluate their model, in the context of lifting  
76 light small cubes (185g). One limitation of this work is that in real environments, humans also  
77 manipulate heavier objects, about at least 1 kg and up to 5 kg, in everyday life.

78 We propose and evaluate different pseudo-haptic feedback techniques, used in the context of a lifting  
79 task in VR. We build our techniques relying on anisomorphic mapping, i.e., based on a difference  
80 between the motions performed by users in the real environment and those they observe in the VE.  
81 With these techniques, we allow users to lift "heavy" virtual objects. We propose two different pseudo-  
82 haptic feedback models. One is based on applying a determined control-distance (C/D) ratio to the  
83 object's displacement, and the other modifies the motion by limiting the maximum displacement speed  
84 of the object, both models being linked to the same (C/D) ratio concept. Finally, we simulate different  
85 virtual weights with both techniques in our experiments. Furthermore, we consider a control condition  
86 (lifting real objects) in which participants raise real objects with actual weights. Finally, we also  
87 provide the participants with a lifting technique without haptic or pseudo-haptic feedback as a control  
88 condition (isomorphic movements).

89 We propose a mechanism that can diminish visuo-kinesthetic conflicts in VR during lifting tasks and  
90 convey the concept of weight to VR users. Additionally, we offer to evaluate such an approach by  
91 measuring both the subjective effects of this mechanism (measuring fatigue) and the objective effects  
92 (physical activity, in terms of work) of VR users. As a result, this study makes the following  
93 contributions:

- 94 • Designing different manipulation conditions in VR, based on the physical work of  
95 expected/targeted objects' weight, to be induced in VR on virtual objects.
- 96 • Studying the effect of pseudo-haptic feedback on VR users' lifting behaviors and comparing  
97 them to lifting real objects.
- 98 • Extending previous work results from lighter objects (less than 0.5 kg) to heavier objects (1, 2,  
99 and 5 kg).
- 100 • Formalizing the notion of physical work to study different individual behaviors in virtual and  
101 real environments by using it as an objective measure of the sense of presence.
- 102 • Evaluating relationships regarding the sense of presence between objective (physical work) and  
103 subjective measurements (sensation of fatigue).

## 104 2 Related Work

### 105 2.1 Manipulation interaction techniques

106 Bowman et al. (Bowman & Hodges, 1999) classified interactions into three categories: navigation,  
107 selection, and manipulation. A taxonomy was developed for each type of VE interaction. Regarding  
108 on Bowman's taxonomy about manipulation interaction techniques, the techniques are differentiated  
109 based on several criteria, such as the way to attach an object to the user or the way to move the object  
110 (translation and rotation). In a similar manner, Poupyrev et al. (Poupyrev, et al., 1998) (Poupyrev &  
111 Ichikawa, 1999) evaluated manipulation techniques based on a variety of criteria: exocentricity (users  
112 act as if they are outside the environment) or egocentricity (users act as if they are inside the

113 environment). Bowman et al. and Poupyrev et al. determined that the selection and manipulation of  
114 interaction techniques could be built in a similar manner and shared many criteria. The selection  
115 techniques studied by Argelaguet and Andujar (Argelaguet & Andujar, 2013) are very relevant to  
116 understanding manipulation interaction techniques, such as selection tools (e.g., hand, ray, cone) and  
117 the C/D ratio. Generally, the C/D is defined as the ratio between the input devices' translational motion  
118 and the selection tools' translational motions. The selection technique is called isomorphic when the  
119 C/D ratio is equal to 1; otherwise, it is anisomorphic - either scaled up (<1) or down (>1).

120 These different taxonomies for selection and manipulation techniques (Bowman & Hodges, 1999)  
121 (Bowman, et al., 2001) (Poupyrev, et al., 1998) (Poupyrev & Ichikawa, 1999) (Argelaguet & Andujar,  
122 2013) suggest that two main criteria should be considered when designing an interaction technique.  
123 First, the manipulation support (3D hand, raycast, etc.), and second, the nature of the mapping between  
124 the real and virtual movements. It has been demonstrated that C/D ratios different than 1 can be  
125 implemented for various selection and manipulation techniques. These techniques could be either using  
126 virtual hands, as with the Go-Go technique (Poupyrev, et al., 1996), or using raycast, as with the PRISM  
127 technique (Frees, et al., 2007) and the virtual pads technique (Andujar & Argelaguet, 2007). These  
128 studies utilized different C/D ratios in order to optimize interaction (for instance in downscaling the  
129 C/D ratio to provide more precision). However, few studies have attempted to provide pseudo-haptic  
130 feedback to users using anisomorphic manipulation techniques.

131

## 132 **2.2 Haptic and pseudo-haptic feedback**

133 Simulating a virtual objects' weight is challenging, as no kinesthetic cues are present in such  
134 environments. Researchers have traditionally concentrated on grounded haptic devices such as the  
135 Phantom device to overcome this problem (Pacchierotti, et al., 2017), (Burdea, 1999), (Massie, et al.,  
136 1994). In spite of the advantages of these devices, such as their dynamic range and degrees of freedom  
137 (Nisar, et al., 2018), their main disadvantages are their complexity, limited workspace, and cost  
138 (Pacchierotti, et al., 2017) (Samad, et al., 2019). Regarding movable haptic devices, numerous portable  
139 and wearable haptic devices provide significant range of motion; nonetheless, these mostly concentrate  
140 on tactile feedback. Such devices have mainly been designed to deliver tactile feedback (Nisar, et al.,  
141 2018). Nonetheless, it is worth mentioning that Choi et al (Choi, et al., 2017) developed a haptic glove  
142 called Grabity, which provides touch, texture, and weight sensations (but reduces the user's natural  
143 range of motion).

144 Following another approach, VR researchers have developed a pseudo-haptic technique to evoke haptic  
145 perception through visual cues (Ujitoko & Ban, 2021). As a result, they can provide haptic perception  
146 without using expensive or restrictive haptic devices. It is also consistent with findings by Ernst and  
147 Banks (Ernst & Banks, 2002) who found that visual-haptic perception dominates in judging objects'  
148 shape, size, and position. For example, in the literature, Rock and Victor (Rock & Victor, 1964) asked  
149 participants to wear distorted glasses and grasp a square, while they perceived rectangles through the  
150 lenses, and their results showed the importance of vision through the users' difficulties to grasp. Due  
151 to this, the object's shape is mostly perceived by vision, known as "visual capture" (Ernst & Banks,  
152 2002). These statements and results have prompted numerous VR research studies to employ the  
153 pseudo-haptic technique, namely to simulate different haptic sensations of virtual objects, including  
154 friction, stiffness, and texture (De Tinguy, et al., 2018) (Lécuyer, 2009), or to simulate the heaviness  
155 of objects (Jauregui, et al., 2014), (Palmerius, et al., 2014), (Yu & Bowman, 2020), (Samad, et al.,  
156 2019), (Lee, et al., 2019).

157 Pseudo-haptic feedback can be provided by manipulating the C/D ratio (Poupyrev, et al., 1996)  
 158 (Argelaguet & Andujar, 2013). To induce friction, Lécuyer et al. designed a coupling between slowing  
 159 down the velocity of the object's movement and incrementing the reaction force coming from the  
 160 device, creating some illusory force feedback (Lécuyer, et al., 2000). Other studies (Dominjon, et al.,  
 161 2005), (Nakakoji, et al., 2011), (Nakakoji, et al., 2010) designed experiments to induce the weight of  
 162 the object using the C/D ratio approach. While these experiments were conducted in a simple 2D  
 163 environment, the comparison with VE interactions with virtual objects is hard to perform. Nonetheless,  
 164 these studies were able to demonstrate that the C/D ratio method is effective.

165 Recent studies on weight perception in VR environments using pseudo-haptic feedback have  
 166 demonstrated that the pseudo-haptic method had an impact on increasing the sense of presence (Samad,  
 167 et al., 2019), (Rietzler, et al., 2018). A close connection between this illusionary approach and a sense  
 168 of presence resulted in a narrow line between increasing or eliminating the feeling of presence during  
 169 the VR experience. Rosa et al. (Rosa, et al., 2015) designed experiments to produce illusory weight  
 170 and temperature by influencing vibrational perception with visual signals like size and speed. In light  
 171 of their findings, Based on their findings, it can be stated that if the visual stimulus shows the gaining  
 172 of the weight of the virtual object, and at the same time, the tactile feedback has low intensity, the  
 173 illusory weight is not only intangible but also destructive to the sense of presence. It should be noted  
 174 that they did not quantify the relationship between visual and vibrotactile stimuli and perception of  
 175 weight in their experiment.

176 To conclude, according to the literature, it would be helpful to design and evaluate an isomorphic  
 177 manipulation technique to improve the user experience in VR without compromising the sense of  
 178 presence. In addition, in our study, we propose to link anisomorphic interaction techniques to the  
 179 importance of physics when lifting objects. Indeed, variations in the C/D ratio applied to lifted objects  
 180 can be linked to variations in the lifted weight.

### 181 **3 Materials and methods**

#### 182 **3.1 Overview**

183 First, we propose an approach based on physics to compute pseudo-haptic feedback in a virtual reality  
 184 environment while performing a lifting task. Second, we evaluate the responses of VR users to this  
 185 feedback through an experiment. Finally, we use both objective and subjective measures to determine  
 186 the effect of this feedback on the effort performed by the users and their perception of this effort.

187 Relying on our physical model, we developed and implemented two anisomorphic pseudo-haptic  
 188 manipulation techniques. We also implemented an isomorphic manipulation technique without any  
 189 feedback regarding the lifting task and object weights. Lastly, we also asked our VR users to lift real  
 190 objects (with their real expected weight) within the virtual environment, thus providing real haptic  
 191 feedback, as a baseline in terms of effort. Accordingly, we developed a repeated-measure experiment  
 192 in which participants were required to vertically move a water water carrier –that we called it in the  
 193 experiment water bottle- with different masses under the four conditions described above.

#### 194 **3.2 Our methods for pseudo-haptic feedback: from a physics model to anisomorphic** 195 **manipulations**

196 We propose an approach based on physics to produce pseudo-haptic feedback, in which the sole  
 197 opposition force to a vertically lifted object is its weight, when friction is ignored. Thus, the user must

198 produce at least a force equivalent to the weight of the lifted object, but in the opposite direction.  
 199 Traditional VR setups, however, do not provide real props that users can use to interact with virtual  
 200 objects. As a result, users only need to compensate for the weight of a VR controller during such a  
 201 lifting operation, in contrast to the actual weight of the virtual object being viewed. Therefore, the  
 202 relationship between the force exerted by the user to lift the VR controller and the force expected based  
 203 on the weight of the virtual object viewed can be expressed as a ratio function called  $k(m)$ :

$$204 \quad (\text{EQ 1}): k(m) = \frac{\overrightarrow{\|\text{Weight}_{\text{controller}}\|}}{\overrightarrow{\|\text{Weight}_{\text{object}}\|}} = \frac{\text{mass}_{\text{controller}}}{m}$$

205 Where  $m$  is the mass of the object. Then, we propose to use this ratio function to provide pseudo-haptic  
 206 feedback; it is converted into either a ratio of work (EQ 2) or a ratio of power (EQ 3) as follows:

$$207 \quad (\text{EQ 2}): W = \overrightarrow{\|\mathbf{F}\|} * d * \cos(\theta) = \overrightarrow{\|\mathbf{F}\|} * d, \quad \text{when } \theta = 0$$

$$208 \quad (\text{EQ 3}): P_{\text{instantaneous}} = \overrightarrow{\|\mathbf{F}\|} * v * \cos(\theta) = \overrightarrow{\|\mathbf{F}\|} * v, \quad \text{when } \theta = 0$$

209 In this equation,  $d$  is the displacement distance,  $v$  is the motion velocity, and  $F$  is the force applied. In  
 210 addition, we propose to use (EQ 2) to provide pseudo-haptic feedback in a distance-based approach  
 211 and (EQ 3) in a velocity-based approach. In our case,  $\theta = 0$  as the movement is on the vertical axis.

### 212 3.2.1 Distance-based approach: our “direct-weight” technique

213 From (EQ1), (EQ2) transforms to the following:

$$214 \quad \frac{W_{\text{controller}}}{W_{\text{Object}}} = \frac{\overrightarrow{\|\text{Weight}_{\text{controller}}\|} * d_{\text{controller}}}{\overrightarrow{\|\text{Weight}_{\text{object}}\|} * d_{\text{object}}} = k(m) * \frac{d_{\text{controller}}}{d_{\text{object}}}$$

215 Furthermore, the condition of feedback that fully compensates for the difference in mass between the  
 216 object and the controller implies a ratio of work equal to 1:

$$217 \quad \frac{W_{\text{controller}}}{W_{\text{Object}}} = 1 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad k(m) * \frac{d_{\text{controller}}}{d_{\text{object}}} = 1$$

$$218 \quad \Leftrightarrow d_{\text{object}} = k(m) * d_{\text{controller}} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad d_{\text{object}} = \frac{\text{massController}}{m} * d_{\text{controller}}$$

219 To allow ranges of masses for our virtual objects that can be easily more than ten times the mass of  
 220 the VR controller, a constant  $c$  can be added in the previous equation as follows:

$$221 \quad (\text{EQ 4}): d_{\text{object}} = \left( \frac{\text{massController}}{m} + c \right) * d_{\text{controller}}$$

222 This constant also limits the ratio between the two distances since the mass ratio tends to zero as  $m$   
 223 increases. Through such a limit, pseudo-haptic feedback is prevented from being applied when it would  
 224 introduce such an excessive difference between real and viewed displacements. This limitation would



225 cause the VR user to lose the feeling of presence. Additionally, it determines the minimum mass for  
 226 obtaining some pseudo-haptic feedback, that is, the mass for which the ratio applied is 1, as shown  
 227 below:

$$228 \quad (\text{EQ 5}): \frac{d_{object}}{d_{controller}} = 1 \Leftrightarrow \frac{\text{massController}}{m_{\min}} + c = 1 \Leftrightarrow m_{\min} = \frac{\text{massController}}{1 - c}$$

229 Lastly, we used the relationship defined in (EQ 4) between distances to generate pseudo-haptic  
 230 feedback in VR based on the masses of the virtual object and the controller. In VR, the object is scaled  
 231 down compared to the distance traveled by the controller when using a C/D ratio greater than 1. In this  
 232 paper, this pseudo-haptic technique is referred to as **the direct-weight method** (direct modification of  
 233 C/D ratio, related to weight ratio), which is based on distances.

### 234 3.2.2 Velocity-based approach: our “speed-control” technique

235 From (EQ1), (EQ3) transforms to the following:

$$236 \quad \frac{P_{\text{instantaneousController}}}{P_{\text{instantaneousObject}}} = \frac{||\text{WeightController}|| * v_{\text{controller}}}{||\text{WeightObject}|| * v_{\text{object}}} = k(m) * \frac{v_{\text{controller}}}{v_{\text{object}}}$$

237 Further, conditions of feedback that fully compensates for the difference of masses between the object  
 238 and controller mean a ratio of *power* equal to 1:

$$239 \quad \frac{P_{\text{instantaneousController}}}{P_{\text{instantaneousObject}}} = 1 \Leftrightarrow k(m) * \frac{v_{\text{controller}}}{v_{\text{object}}} = 1$$

$$240 \quad v_{\text{object}} = k(m) * v_{\text{controller}} \Leftrightarrow v_{\text{object}} = \frac{\text{massController}}{m} * v_{\text{controller}}$$

241 For the same reason as in Section 3.2.1, a constant  $c$  is used here to allow a greater range of mass  
 242 values for the mass  $m$ :

$$243 \quad (\text{EQ 6}): v_{\text{object}} = \left( \frac{\text{massController}}{m} + c \right) * v_{\text{controller}}$$

244 As a result, the following algorithm is applied for each determined mass  $m$ :

$$245 \quad (\text{EQ 7A}): \text{if } V_{\text{controller}} < V_{\text{maxObject}}, \text{ then } v_{\text{object}} = v_{\text{controller}}$$


$$246 \quad (\text{EQ 7B}): \text{else } v_{\text{object}} = V_{\text{maxObject}} / v_{\text{controller}}$$

247 Finally, we used the relation defined in (EQ 6), (EQ 7A), and (EQ 7B) between velocities to describe  
 248 some pseudo-haptic feedback in VR depending on the mass of the virtual object and the controller; it  
 249 consists of applying a C/D ratio higher than 1, defined by the opposite of  $\left( \frac{\text{massController}}{m} + c \right)$  as in  
 250 Section 3.2.1, but this time only when the velocity of the real motion is above a determined maximum  
 251 speed. In this paper, we called this pseudo-haptic technique, based on velocity restriction, **the speed-**  
 252 **control technique** (modification of C/D ratio related to weights ratio, limiting to a maximum speed  
 253 related to object mass).

254 **3.3 Stimuli creation**

255 **3.3.1 Virtual objects, real objects, and VR controller**

256 In our experiment, we asked users to lift virtual water bottles under three conditions and real water  
257 bottles in one control condition (a real-world condition with the real weight, but still in VR, to prevent  
258 external differences between experimental conditions). This choice of water bottle was made because  
259 of its practicality to have multiple and identical real objects in terms of shape, but with possible  
260 different masses. In addition, it was easy to track such an object, with a HTC Vive tracker fixed on it.  
261 Moreover, water bottle grips can be easily grabbed by users, even when immersed in VR. Figures 1-A  
262 and B show a real and virtual bottle respectively, with their tracker attached. Regarding the VR  
263 controller, an HTC Vive controller with a mass of 308 g was used, as shown in Figure 1-C.




264

265 **Figure 1.** Real bottle (A) and virtual bottle (B) representations in our experiment, and (C) their  
266 tracker, the HTC Vive VR controller. Mass of 308 g, lifted by users during their task in VR.

267

268 **3.3.2 Incongruous lifting conditions: techniques with pseudo-haptic feedback**

269 Our two techniques with pseudo-haptic feedback (direct-weight and speed-control), both anisomorphic  
270 manipulations, could also be called incongruous conditions. Indeed, they were both designed to induce  
271 a conflict between the visual feedback of the motion, represented in VR by the bottle displacement,  
272 and the actual arm motion, shown in VR by the controller displacement. Figure 2 shows such a  
273 difference regarding the positions between the two elements during the lifting task. In these conditions,  
274 VR users could observe the bottle moving precisely in the same direction and orientation that they  
275 moved their hand, but with a difference in speed or distance concerning their natural velocity/position.



276

277 Figure 2. Incongruous conditions: visual discrepancy caused by differences in position/velocity  
 278 between the controller and the object, highlighted in yellow here.

279 *C/D ratio, visual discrepancy, and objects masses*

280 First, as explained by (EQ 5) and as used in our two techniques through (EQ 4) and (EQ 6), a constant  
 281  $c$  had to be defined concerning the chosen experimental conditions and not with the physics model  
 282 itself. In our experiment, we set  $c$  to a value of 0.5 for the following reasons and implications:

283 i) The constant of 0.5 makes the functions  $d(m)$  and  $v(m)$  in (EQ 4) and (EQ 6) tend towards 0.5.  
 284 This avoids distortions in the presence sensation caused by a visual discrepancy between real and  
 285 virtual movements.

286 ii) Regarding objects' masses, a value of 0.5 gives a minimum mass ( $m_{min}$ ) of 0.616 g according to (EQ  
 287 5) for a 0.308 g VR controller. Thus, it would mean that pseudo-haptic feedback would start for masses  
 288 above 0.616 g, with ratios decreasing then from 1 to 0.5. This would allow for interesting intermediate  
 289 points at 1 and 2 kg and a 5 kg point that would be already close to the 0.5 limits. As a result, the  
 290 masses used in our experiment were fixed to 0.616, 1, 2, and 5 kg. In addition, these values would  
 291 allow a significant evaluation of our pseudo-haptic techniques with masses that are already well beyond  
 292 the 0.308 gr of the VR controller and close to the masses of many everyday objects.

293

294 *Direct-weight condition*

295 Regarding this first incongruous condition, apart from the constant  $c$  and considered objects' masses,  
 296 no additional parameter was required to be set for our experiment.

297 *Speed-control Condition*

298 For this second condition, in addition to the constant  $c$  and masses of the objects, the  $V_{\max_{\text{object}}}$   
 299 parameter had to be set for our experiment according to (EQ 7A-7B), determined for a lifting task in  
 300 VR without any extra mass. If this value could be measured empirically with some users in a pre-  
 301 experiment, it could also be estimated theoretically, based on Fitts' Law studies and notably K. T.  
 302 Hagadorn's (Hagadorn, 2004). The originality of these values explains the Fitts' law applicability for  
 303 human movement in three dimensions, in the manipulation technique of moving objects, instead of  
 304 being related to 2D Fitts' law with selection or pointing tasks (Gillan, et al., 1990) (MacKenzie, 1993).

305 Additionally, this study also found that different Fitts' laws could exist depending on the mass of the  
 306 manipulated object. Therefore, we used the coefficients given in this study for objects of less than  
 307 450g, i.e.,  $a = 0.2138$  and  $b = 0.473$ , in their formula, as follows:

308 
$$(EQ\ 8): MT = a + \text{Log}_2(2 * d/w) * b$$


309 where  $MT$  is the task completion time,  $d$  the manipulation distance, and  $w$  the size of the target to reach.

310 The distance in our experiment was 1 m, and the target size was 0.4 m, yielding an  $MT$  of 1.32 s, which  
 311 implies an average speed of 0.75 m/s. From this average speed, we then needed to compute the  
 312 maximum speed during a vertical lifting task. For that, we captured a lifting task motion and computed  
 313 the instantaneous speed, as shown in Figure 3. Due to strength and other individual variability, the  
 314 maximum speed value cannot be directly considered as our experiment's value. However, the shape of  
 315 the velocity profile for this type of task can be maintained and analyzed (the same across multiple  
 316 users). Such motion can be decomposed in terms of velocity phases into acceleration and deceleration,  
 317 both representing half of the movement. From that, the maximum speed can be computed from the  
 318 average, by representing this velocity profile with two affine functions,  $f1$  (ascending) and  $f2$   
 319 (decreasing), as follows:

320 
$$(EQ\ 9): V_{average} = \frac{1}{2} * \int_0^{0.66} f1(t) + \frac{1}{2} * \int_{0.66}^{1.33} f2(t)$$

321 
$$\Leftrightarrow V_{average} = \frac{1}{2} * \left( \frac{0 + v_{max}}{2} \right) + \frac{1}{2} * \left( \frac{v_{max} + 0}{2} \right) \Leftrightarrow V_{average} = \frac{1}{2} * v_{max} \Leftrightarrow V_{max} = 2 * v_{average}$$

322 Thus, for our experiment, we found and set the **maximum speed to 1.5 m/s** ( $0.75 \times 2$ ) for masses below  
 323 or equal to 0.616 g, and for higher masses, we computed it from (EQ 6), based on this value.



324  
 325 Figure 3. Hand motion instantaneous speed across time for a lifting task (1 m distance, no extra mass).

326 **3.3.3 Congruous conditions: absence of pseudo-haptic feedback – no weight at all or real weight**

327 Besides the two conditions described in the previous section, our experiment also included the  
 328 following two congruent conditions without visual discrepance. When visual feedback aligned with the  
 329 actual hand motion, the condition named “isomorphic condition”. This condition refers to “traditional”  
 330 virtual manipulation technique with no haptic feedback and thus the same visual input and natural

331 motions for any masses lifted and the other condition is “haptic condition,” which is refer to the  
 332 “traditional” real manipulation technique, with full haptic feedback by lifting a real object with its  
 333 actual expected mass.

### 334 3.4 Apparatus

335 This study required users to stand throughout the whole experiment when lifting the objects from  
 336 bottom to top . However, they were permitted to rest at any time, especially between blocks of four  
 337 conditions. Physically, they were placed in a room facing a 46 cm high box at a distance, allowing  
 338 them to comfortably grasp and lift the objects placed on the box without bending. The virtual  
 339 environment displayed within the VR headset shared the same characteristics (room size, user’s  
 340 position, orientation, and relative distance to the objects to lift) – see Figure 4-A.

341 A HTC Vive Pro VR headset was used for our experiment, equipped with two cameras, hand  
 342 controllers to manipulate virtual objects, and hand trackers to record arm movements. The HTC vive  
 343 pro has a1440 x 1600 pixel resolution with a 110 degree field of view.This HMD featured, an electronic  
 344 gyroscope, and an eye comfort setting system (IPD).

345 The hand controller provides an indication of the position of the subject's dominant hand (left or right)  
 346 in the real environment, allowing the rendering engine to generate a visual representation of the hand  
 347 in VR in all conditions that involved virtual objects to lift. Hand trackers for lifting real objects,  
 348 attached to the wrist of the subjects, provide locational information to the rendering engine. This  
 349 information is used in order to generate a model of the subject's hand and the visual feedback about the  
 350 position of the user's dominant hand in haptic condition. Additionally, one tracker was placed on the  
 351 real object to track its displacement and to display it in the virtual environment accordingly, as shown  
 352 in Figures 4-B and C.



353  
 354 Figure 4. A) Virtual environment displayed in the VR HMD. B) User’s view before starting to lift the  
 355 bottle, grabbing the bottle (visual feedback in blue). C) View of the end of the task (bottle in green).

### 356 3.5 Participants

357 Twenty right-handed users (6 women and 14 men, ranging from 18 to 44 years with a mean age of  
 358  $26.24 \pm 7.98$  SD) participated in our experiment. All were healthy and had no neurological, muscular,  
 359 or cognitive disorders, with normal or corrected-to-normal vision. Users’ heights ranged from 156 to  
 360 185 cm, with a mean height of  $173.74 \pm 6.57$  cm. Users from different backgrounds, either from inside  
 361 or outside the university, agreed to participate voluntarily without compensation.

### 362 3.6 Experimental procedure

363 We conducted two phases of our experiment: the training and the main phases. In both phases, user  
 364 task was to lift an object upward with a single joint arm movement, with natural self-selected speed

365 (with rotation around the shoulder and maintaining the arm entirely extended). This object was visible  
366 in the environment as a water bottle and had to be placed at a defined height, represented by a green  
367 window (see Figure 4).

368 The training phase was meant to introduce users to our unusual manipulation techniques, compared to  
369 real-world lifting, notably for the incongruous conditions that cause conflicts between the actual hand  
370 movement and the given visual feedback. It would then help users to avoid “failing” to accomplish  
371 their lifting motion in terms of performance and “naturalness”. In this phase, eight lifting movements  
372 are performed before each manipulation interaction condition, in order to teach users how to perform  
373 upward lifting in our VR setup.

374 The main phase was divided into four blocks of lifting trials, one for each manipulation condition. With  
375 all our techniques, grabbing was always done through direct contact with objects, using a virtual hand  
376 metaphor. Each block included 20 trials, each consisting of five repetitions of lifting objects of four  
377 different masses (0.616, 1, 2, and 5 kg); see section 3.3.2 for more details. In all trials, users performed  
378 vertical arm motions almost exclusively at a distance of 1 m, starting from a similar point (46 cm from  
379 the ground). The mass of the objects was never disclosed to the users. Furthermore, the virtual objects  
380 displayed all had the same design, without any variation in size or color. The users were asked to  
381 perform natural and self-selected-speed movements under all conditions, with congruent conditions  
382 more favourable because of the absence of visual discrepancy, and incongruous conditions more  
383 challenging due to pseudo-haptic feedback.

384 We used a repeated-measure design to increase the number of measures and control differences  
385 between users, as they are usually not equal in terms of strength. A Latin-square order was used between  
386 participants, with the order of blocks within each block, i.e., between masses of objects, randomized  
387 for each participant. Thus, we used 20 of the 24 possible orders across our four manipulation  
388 conditions.

### 389 **3.7 Data gathering and measures**

#### 390 **3.7.1 Kinematic features and physical work**

391 In order to collect kinematic data on hand position and velocity, we tracked the VR hand controller in  
392 non-haptic conditions and the VR hand tracker in haptic conditions. Next, we applied a low-pass filter  
393 (Butterworth) with a cut-off frequency of 6 Hz to the velocity data.

394 From this data, we extracted the following parameters: 1) movement duration (MD): the time between  
395 lifting onset and termination; and 2) displacement (disp): the whole vertical displacement of the user’s  
396 real hand when lifting the bottle. In addition, we computed the physical work done by the users to  
397 perform the lifting task using the following formula:

398


$$399 \quad (\text{EQ 10}): W = m_{controller} Gh + m_{controller} * \int_s^e \alpha dx$$

400 This formula comes from the general principle of physics about forces, as expressed by the following:

401

$$(\text{EQ 11}) : \sum_{1=1}^n F = m_{controller} * a$$

402 Where  $m$  is the controller's mass, and  $a$  is the acceleration caused by users' movement. Then, still in  
 403 physics, work can be defined by the following equation at each instant: (EQ 12):  $dw = F \cdot dx$ , where  
 404  $dw$  is the element of work at each time,  $F$  is the force obtained from (EQ 11), and  $dx$  is the  
 405 displacement. In this study, two main forces were applied to the object, as shown in Figure 5. The first  
 406 one is the users' hand force ( $F$ ) applied to lift the object upward, and the second is gravity ( $P$ ).



407

408 Figure 5. Forces applied to an object during the lifting task.

409  $F$  is the force applied by the participants' hand on the object. Therefore, according to the physic base  
 410 rules, we obtain

411 (EQ 13):  $\vec{F} + \vec{P} = m\vec{a} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \vec{F} - \vec{P} = m\vec{a}$  Since  $F$  and  $P$  are not in the same direction

412 Then, using the formula  $P = mg$ , we can obtain the following equation along the vertical axis:

413 (EQ 14):  $F = mg + ma$

414 Using (EQ 12), we can express the work of the force applied by the hand of the users between the  
 415 starting point, called (s) here, and the end point, called (e) here, as follows:

416 (EQ 15):  $W = \int_s^e dw = \int_s^e F \cdot dx \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad W = \int_s^e mg + ma \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad W = \int_s^e mg dx + \int_s^e ma dx$

417 Finally, from (EQ 15), (EQ 10) is obtained and used to compute the user's hand work when lifting.

### 418 3.7.2 Perceived fatigue

419 We used the Borg CR10 (Borg, 1990) questionnaire to evaluate the effect of pseudo-haptic feedback.  
 420 A modified version of it was used to compare how users perceived tiredness after different object lifting  
 421 conditions. This provides a self-report measure of the perceived effort, relying on a 10-point self-report  
 422 inventory with defined levels. Users were asked to give each manipulation condition a score according  
 423 to its difficulty, allowing for the measure of their hand fatigue.

### 424 3.8 Hypotheses

425 As part of this study, we examined how pseudo-haptic feedback can enhance perception of an object's  
 426 weight in VR. We are also interested in understanding how we can create artificial tiredness in users'  
 427 arms in a manner similar to the tiredness produced by lifting real objects. Additionally, we sought to  
 428 determine which pseudo-haptic techniques would enhance users' perception of weight in VR in  
 429 comparison with real lifting behaviors. A further objective was to understand the inter-subject  
 430 variability caused by different simulations of weight perception models based on individual lifting  
 431 behaviors. Therefore, the following hypotheses were investigated in this experiment:

- 432 • How does modifying the C/D ratio affect the physical work obtained from distance control  
433 and speed control? In order to replicate the haptic experience (real bottle lifting) in VR, we  
434 sought to determine which pseudo-haptic models could accomplish this.
- 435 • What are the effects of different proposed models on the fatigue level experienced by VR  
436 users?
- 437 • How do individuals perceive different weight lifting conditions in terms of perception (non-  
438 haptic) and execution (haptic)?

## 439 4 Results

### 440 4.1 Statistical Analysis

441 Statistical analyses were performed with SPSS software (version 26, IBM SPSS) on all variables. A  
442 two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed on different variables ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ). The  
443 independent variables were “condition” (4 levels; haptic, isomorphic, speed-control, direct-weight) and  
444 “weight” (4 levels; 0.616, 1, 2, 5 in kg). In addition, for each condition, a one-way ANOVA test was  
445 separately applied to see the effect of real and virtual weight (independent variable) on physical work  
446 (dependent variable). To control false discovery rate, we used the Benjamini–Hochberg (B-H) model  
447 at a level of 0.05 (Benjamini & Hochberg, 1995). In all our tables, the symbol \* indicates a p-value <  
448 0.05, \*\* a p-value < 0.01, and \*\*\* a p-value < 0.001.

449

### 450 4.2 Quantitative Analysis

451 After the training session, all users could perform lifting movement correctly. Table 1 shows the mean  
452 and standard deviation of kinematic (movement duration MD, arm displacement Disp) and kinetic  
453 (physical work) features. It should be highlighted that Disp for congruous conditions was  
454 approximately 1 meter, but that, for incongruous conditions, it increased in relation with the object  
455 mass (reaching more than 2 meters for 5 kg in the direct-weight condition; Table 1-displacement).  
456

457 A significant change in MD was observed when subjects were asked to lift bottles of different weights  
458 ( $F(3, 1598) = 10.578, p < 0.0001, \eta_p^2 = 0.019$ ). Different conditions also influenced MD ( $F(3, 1598)$   
459  $= 71.208, p < 0.0001, \eta_p^2 = 0.118$ ). Furthermore, the interaction between conditions and weight  
460 significantly affected MD ( $F(9, 1589) = 7.317, p < 0.0001, \eta_p^2 = 0.04$ ). According to the Tukey post  
461 hoc analysis, MD significantly changed in relation to all multiple comparison conditions ( $p < 0.0001$ ).  
462 A pair-wise comparison of B-H results did not reveal any false p-values. As a result of posthoc analysis,  
463 MD values for 0.616 and 1 kg were not statistically different ( $p > 0.05$ ), as well as for 2 and 5 kg ( $p >$   
464  $0.05$ ), while MD values for all other comparisons were notably different ( $p < 0.05$ ). In addition, the  
465 results of the B-H test confirm those obtained from the posthoc analysis.

466 Conditions significantly affected Disp ( $F(3, 1598) = 94.224, p < 0.0001, \eta_p^2 = \mathbf{0.15}$ ) as well as weight  
467 ( $F(3, 1598) = 44.998, p < 0.0001, \eta_p^2 = \mathbf{0.078}$ ). The interaction effect of condition and weight on disp  
468 was also significant ( $F(9, 1598) = 36.369, p < 0.0001, \eta_p^2 = \mathbf{0.170}$ ). Multiple-comparison Tukey post  
469 hoc analysis showed that there is a significant effect of different weights on Disp ( $p < 0.0001$ ), except  
470 for 0.616 and 1 kg ( $p > 0.05$ ). However, Tukey post hoc for all multiple comparisons of different



471 conditions showed significant discrepancy between different conditions ( $p < 0.0001$ ), except for speed-  
 472 control and haptic ( $p > 0.05$ ). B-H method confirmed all post-hoc results (no false discovery).

473 Physical work significantly changed by different weights ( $F(3, 1598) = 22.593, p < 0.0001, \eta_p^2 =$   
 474 **0.041**) as well as conditions ( $F(3, 1598) = 118.036, p < 0.0001, \eta_p^2 = \mathbf{0.181}$ ). The interaction  
 475 between condition and weight for work was also significant ( $F(9, 1598) = 10.578, p < 0.0001, \eta_p^2 =$   
 476 **0.09**). Tukey's HSD test for multiple comparison found that the mean value of work was significantly  
 477 different between haptic and isomorphic ( $p < 0.0001, 95\% \text{ C.I.} = 41.65, 58.00$ ) as well as between  
 478 haptic and direct-weight ( $p < 0.0001, 95\% \text{ C.I.} = 39.2055, 26$ ) and between haptic and speed-control ( $p$   
 479  $< 0.0001, 95\% \text{ C.I.} = 40.08, 56.28$ ). Meanwhile, the mean value of work significantly changed between  
 480 different weights. Post hoc HSD analysis demonstrated that there is a significant difference between  
 481 0.616 and 2 kg ( $p < 0.0001, 95\% \text{ C.I.} = -18.84, -2.66$ ), as well as between 0.616 and 5 kg ( $p < 0.0001,$   
 482  $95\% \text{ C.I.} = -30.65, -14.49$ ), 1 and 2 kg ( $p = 0.026, 95\% \text{ C.I.} = -16.93, -0.75$ ), 1 and 5 kg ( $p < 0.0001,$   
 483  $95\% \text{ C.I.} = -28.74, -12.57$ ), and 2 and 5 kg ( $p = 0.01, 95\% \text{ C.I.} = -19.91, -3.72$ ). The B-H method also  
 484 confirmed the Tukey post hoc results and did not detect any false p-values for multiple comparison of  
 485 conditions or weights.


486 Table 1. Kinematics features and physical work of weight lifting movement with different masses in  
 487 VR.

	Masses (kg)	Haptic	Isomorphic	Speed-control	Direct-weight
Disp (m)	0.616	1.27±0.05	1.01±0.30	1.17±0.29	1.00±0.76
	1	1.39±0.94	0.94±0.06	1.27±0.40	1.23±0.12
	2	1.22±0.91	0.96±0.19	1.54±0.77	1.79±0.32
	5	1.16±0.54	0.96±0.12	1.56±0.61	2.47±0.68
MD (s)	0.616	4.6±0.6	1.3±0.56	1.7±0.5	1.5±0.68
	1	3.6±0.46	1.3±0.51	1.8±0.39	2.3±0.12
	2	4.5±0.59	1.2±0.51	2.3±0.99	3.7±0.18
	5	4.2±0.55	1.2±0.51	2.4±0.79	5.2±0.37
Work (J)	0.616	21.88±39.93	4.94±2.10	5.30±1.65	4.62±0.62
	1	28.91±51.86	4.51±0.63	5.75±2.26	5.43±0.80
	2	61.72±101.57	4.64±1.07	7.01±3.96	7.99±1.78
	5	106.51±135.0 2	4.63±0.93	7.02±3.16	11.16±3.00

488

489 **4.2.1 Haptic Condition**

490 Figure 6 illustrates the mean value and standard deviation of the physical work performed by 20  
 491 subjects as they lifted real bottles in an upward movement with a real mass. Mean ± SD of physical  
 492 work for this condition related to different weights released the tight connection between mass and  
 493 physical work values (see Table 1-physical work, column Haptic). Because users were lifting real  
 494 bottles here, the value of the physical work was significantly greater than that for the other conditions  
 495 (see Table 1-physical work column Haptic). Results of one-way ANOVA for different weights  
 496 (independent variable, four levels) in this condition on work values (dependent variable) showed that  
 497 ( $F(3, 390) = 18.041, p < 0.0001$ ). Tukey post hoc revealed significant differences for all paired  
 498 comparisons ( $p < 0.05$ ), except between weights of 0.616 and 1 kg ( $p > 0.05$ ) and 1 and 2 kg ( $p > 0.05$ ).  
 499 B-H results confirm post hoc results.



500

501

Figure 6. Mean  $\pm$ SD of work for 20 users for the reference (Haptic) condition.

#### 502 4.2.2 Isomorphic condition

503 Figure 7-I shows the result of mean  $\pm$  SD of work for 20 users in the isomorphic condition. The mean  
 504 values of the physical work related to this condition for different masses are the same (see Table 1-  
 505 physical work, column Isomorphic). As a result of the group analysis (one-way ANOVA) showed that,  
 506 that the related physical activity did not vary significantly with different weights 0.616, 1, 2, and 5 kg  
 507 as the virtual object's mass increased  $F(3, 391) = 1.923, p = 0.126$ ).

#### 508 4.2.3 Speed-Control condition

509 In this condition, the subjects saw a visual conflict when their maximum velocity reached the threshold.  
 510 For example, when subjects' performance corresponded to lifting lighter virtual objects (0.616 or 1 kg)  
 511 using the controller, they could easily adjust their velocity to achieve the authorized threshold.  
 512 However, during the lifting of heavier objects (2 or 5 kg), the velocity of the virtual bottles usually was  
 513 not aligned to the actual hand movement. Figure (7-S) illustrates the mean and standard deviation for  
 514 physical work performed by twenty users under a speed control condition. As part of the speed control  
 515 condition, a one-way ANOVA was conducted in order to compare the effects of virtual weight on  
 516 work. ANOVA analysis confirms that virtual weights significantly affect physical activity ( $F(3, 396)$   
 517  $= 9.204, p < 0.0001$ ). The Tukey post hoc analysis revealed a significant difference in work values  
 518 between 0.616 and 2 kg ( $p = 0.0001, 95\% \text{ confidence interval} = -2.76, -0.65$ ), 0.616 and 5 kg ( $p = 0.0001,$   
 519  $95\% \text{ confidence interval} = -2.75, -0.66$ ), 1 and 2 kg ( $p = 0.012, 95\% \text{ confidence interval} = -2.31, -$   
 520  $0.19$ ), and 1 and 5 kg ( $p = 0.011, 95\% \text{ confidence interval} = -2.32, 0.21$ ). Based on the B-H results, no  
 521 significant differences were observed between the work values associated with weights of 0.616 and 1  
 522 kg and 2 and 5 kg ( $p\text{-value} > 0.05$ ).

#### 523 4.2.4 Direct-weight condition

524 As Table 1- physical work (column direct-weight) shows, by increasing the weight of the virtual object,  
 525 subjects' physical work also increased (see Figure 7-D). In addition, the results of one-way ANOVA  
 526 revealed that virtual weight has a significant effect on physical work ( $F(3, 421) = 282.456, p < 0.0001$ ).  
 527 Tukey post hoc analysis showed that different virtual weights significantly affect physical work ( $p <$   
 528  $0.05$ ). B-H test results confirmed the Tukey post hoc results.


529 Table 2. ANOVA results for kinematic feature physical work between different masses for each  
530 condition.

	Conditions	Masses (Kg)	Physical Work one way -ANOVA(p-value)	Significance
Congruous Conditions	Haptic	0.616	5.537e-11cf0.05***	<0.001
		1		
		2		
		5		
	Isomorphic	0.616	0.1252 > 0.05	0.125
		1		
		2		
		5		
Incongruous Condition	Speed-control	0.616	6.724e-06 < 0.05***	<0.001
		1		
		2		
		5		
	Direct-Weight	0.616	2.023e-100 < 0.05***	<0.001
		1		
		2		
		5		

531 Table 3 demonstrates the results of a one-tailed paired sample t-test between pair conditions with the  
532 similar masses. Despite the small masses, these results suggest that the amount of physical effort users  
533 expend when lifting a virtual object is significantly different from real weightlifting. This analysis  
534 confirms that there is no significant difference between direct weights and isomorphics for the small  
535 mass (0.616 kg) (p-value > 0.05). In a similar manner, there are no differences between speed control  
536 and isomorphic conditions (p-value > 0.05). Statistical differences were evident for all masses (p-  
537 value < 0.05) except for 1 kg (p-value > 0.05).  
538  
539

540 Table 3. Results of t-test analysis for physical work between different conditions and same masses  
541 (D=direct-weight, H=haptic, S=speed-control, I=isomorphic).

Conditions /mass	H-I (p-value)	H-D (p-value)	H-S (p-value)	D-S (p-value)	D-I (p-value)	S-I (p-value)
0.616 kg	5.06 e-05 ***	3.67e-05 ***	7.02e-05 ***	0.0001 ***	0.1583	0.191
1 kg	9.21 e-06 ***	1.84e-05 ***	2.37e-05 ***	0.177	1.45e-16 ***	6.64e-07 ***
2 kg	2.70 e-07 ***	1.08e-06 ***	7.31e-07 ***	0.025**	5.61e-37 ***	6.94e-08 ***
5 kg	3.52 e-11 ***	3.50e-10 ***	8.24e-11 ***	3.43e-18 ***	2.61e-43 ***	5.00e-11 ***




543

544 Figure 7. Mean  $\pm$ SD of work for 20 users for the VR (non-haptic) conditions. From left to right:  
 545 D=direct weight condition, I=Isomorphic condition, S=speed control condition.

546

547 Figure 8 indicates the 20 individual behaviors in the haptic and non-haptic conditions. By increasing  
 548 the mass of the object, in the control condition, users follow a constant trend (also see Table 2,  
 549 Isomorphic). However, in other conditions, users' physical work follows an increasing trend.

550 Figure 8-A shows different individual behaviors for the non-haptic conditions. In the direct-weight  
 551 condition (D), by increasing the heaviness of the virtual bottle, users follow the same trend as the haptic  
 552 condition (see Figure 8-B). It is therefore evident that in the direct weight condition, by increasing the  
 553 mass of the object, the physical work of the users is augmented (work performed by approximately  
 554 95% of users), in a similar manner to the haptic condition (75% of users). The increase in mass also  
 555 affected the work value of each user in the speed-control condition (see Figure 8-A, S); however, this  
 556 fluctuation between 2 and 5 kg was not substantial (T-test, p-value = 0.05), and only 30% of the users'  
 557 physical work value increased. The isomorphic condition (see Figure 8-A, I) shows that work values  
 558 did not change statistically across masses (see Table 2), and only 5% of users could determine the  
 559 object's weight.




560

561 Figure 8. Differences between different users' behaviors in haptic and non-haptic conditions. A)  
 562 Individual values (dots) and mean values (bar plot) of work in different conditions in VR for different  
 563 masses. B) Individual and mean values of "physical work" (bar plot) in reference conditions (haptic).  
 564 Data are shown as mean  $\pm$ SD. Gary lines present users' behavior trends for different masses.

### 565 4.3 Qualitative Analysis

#### 566 4.3.1 Borg CR10

567 After each condition, users were asked to complete a Borg CR10 questionnaire to measure their level  
 568 of fatigue. To assess the level of fatigue among 20 subjects, we calculated the mean and standard  
 569 deviation of the fatigue levels (Figure 9). In contrast to the other conditions, users did not experience  
 570 tiredness in their hands when they were in the isomorphic condition. The mean values of the fatigue  
 571 questionnaire for the direct-weight and haptic conditions are  $3.65 \pm 2.4$  and  $3.65 \pm 2.66$ , respectively. It  
 572 is noteworthy that although the users reported the same level of fatigue in their hands during the haptic  
 573 and direct-weight conditions, the level of tiredness in these conditions increased in comparison with  
 574 the isomorphic condition. According to the one-way ANOVA test, subjects' sense of tiredness was  
 575 significantly affected by the conditions under which they were tested ( $F(3, 77) = 6.600, p < 0.0005$ ).  
 576 Based on the post-hoc analysis, there are no significant differences between the haptic and direct-  
 577 weight conditions, nor between the haptic and speed-control conditions ( $p_s > 0.05$ ). In addition, the B-  
 578 H results support the conclusions reached in the post-hoc analysis.



579

580 Figure 9. Results of the modified Borg CR10 questionnaire: mean and standard deviation of fatigue  
 581 for 20 users after performing each condition.

582 **4.3.2 Presence Questionnaire**


583 Another questionnaire we used to subjectively measure the sense of presence in our VE was a presence  
 584 questionnaire (Witmer & Singer, 1998). After performing each condition, users were asked to fill out  
 585 this questionnaire and explain how they felt.

586 Table 4. Results of ANOVA test for presence questionnaire features between different conditions (H:  
 587 Haptic, I: isomorphic, S: speed-control, D: direct-weight).

Presence questionnaire feature	Conditions	ANOVA (p-value)
Quality of interface	H, I, S, D	0.444 > 0.05
Possibility to examine	H, I, S, D	0.889 > 0.05
Self-evaluation	H, I, S, D	0.224 > 0.05
Haptic	H, I, S, D	0.320 > 0.05
Realism	H, I, S, D	0.124 > 0.05
Possibility to act	H, I, S, D	0.246 > 0.05

588

589 A plot of the mean values of quality of the interface, possibility to examine, self-evaluation of  
 590 performance, haptics, realism, and possibility to act is shown in Figure 10. It is evident from this figure  
 591 that users had similar feelings in all conditions. Table 4 presents the results of an ANOVA group  
 592 analysis for each feature of this questionnaire among all users under different conditions. Under  
 593 different experimental conditions, there was no significant difference in presence features (see Table  
 594 4, p-value > 0.05).



595

596 Figure 10. Presence questionnaire: Mean of responses of 20 users to measure the different features of  
 597 presence questionnaire, completed by users after each condition.

598

## 599 5 Discussion

600 In this study, we conducted an experiment in the context of lifting an object in virtual reality. Four  
 601 conditions were evaluated, two congruous and two incongruous, in terms of perceived and performed  
 602 movements. We used a haptic as the reference condition. Finally, we assessed the perception of the  
 603 effort to lift the object for each condition through objective measurements (physical work) and  
 604 subjective measurements (Borg CR10 questionnaire and presence questionnaire).

605 As expected and as a consequence of our pseudo-haptic feedback approaches, the actual hand  
 606 displacement feature (disp; see Table 1-displacement) showed that the value of the disp is  
 607 approximately 1 meter in the congruous conditions. While in incongruous conditions (speed-control  
 608 and direct-weight), by increasing the weight of the virtual object, the value of the disp feature increases.

609 Two-way ANOVA results also showed that the displacement feature remained consistent during bottle  
 610 lifting with different weights in different conditions. However, when subjects lifted 0.616 and 1 kg,  
 611 their hand displacement remained consistent, while heavier bottles led to changes in displacements.  
 612 Therefore, according to the displacement feature, the weight of one kilogram could be a threshold  
 613 weight that participants can lift both in VR and real environments without noticing any difference in  
 614 their hand displacements.

615 Regarding movement duration, the result of the two-way ANOVA showed that it was not stable for  
 616 congruous and incongruous conditions and different weights. This inconsistency of the movement  
 617 duration showed that users tried to compensate for the weight of the object by incrementing their actual  
 618 hand movement distance. Therefore, logically, this displacement increase leads to an increased  
 619 movement duration.

620 The results of the fatigue questionnaire showed that users sensed the same amount of fatigue in their  
 621 hands when they were lifting real objects in haptic conditions and when they lifted virtual bottles in

622 the direct-weight condition. Similarly, the results of the presence questionnaire showed that users in  
623 non-haptic conditions had the same sense of presence that they had in haptic conditions. More  
624 generally, Table 4 confirms that there were no significant differences between users' feelings of  
625 presence in different conditions. These results demonstrate that users were immersed in the VE and  
626 that we succeeded in inducing the same amount of tiredness in haptic and direct-weight conditions.

627 Despite the large differences in physical work between haptic and isomorphic conditions, pseudo-  
628 haptic approaches strongly impact individual physical work (see Figures 6 and 7). Our formulation did  
629 not take into account the mass of the subjects' arms, which may explain the large discrepancy. The  
630 formula for work (EQ 10) implies that work is directly related to the weight of an object. However,  
631 Figure 8 indicates that for some individuals, the value of work decreases when the weights of the  
632 objects are increased from 2 to 5 kg in the haptic condition. Meanwhile, all users, with the exception  
633 of one, appear to be able to increase the value of their work as a result of increasing the weight of the  
634 virtual objects. In VR, users modify their lifting behaviors, and our pseudo-haptic methods affect their  
635 movement patterns. This cannot be accidental; comparing direct-weight to isomorphic conditions,  
636 users did not recognize the weights of the virtual objects in the isomorphic condition since there was  
637 no pseudo-haptic feedback. Therefore, they performed the same hand movements for all weights in the  
638 isomorphic condition.

639 Likewise, in speed-control conditions, users are able to observe the effects of visuomotor conflict on  
640 their hand movements. Comparatively to the isomorphic condition, visual feedback has a significant  
641 impact on the work's value. In speed control, however, the virtual bottle's velocity changes as a function  
642 of the weight of the bottle. For 0.616 kg, there is no statistically significant difference between the  
643 isomorphic condition and the speed-control condition, whereas for heavier weights (1, 2, and 5 kg),  
644 there are significant differences. In other words, the integration of multi-sensory conflict affects the  
645 acceleration and displacement of the users' hands, resulting in them performing more actions on the  
646 controller.

647 By comparing the findings between the speed-control and direct-weight conditions, we discovered that  
648 the direct-weight condition caused subjects to increase their weights to 2 and 5 kilograms more  
649 effectively (post hoc-Tukey, p-value 0.05). While subjects perceived the difference between 2 and 5  
650 kilograms in the speed-control condition (post hoc Tukey, p-value > 0.05).

651 Our methods (direct-weight and speed control) have been shown to simulate fatigue similar to haptic  
652 conditions in the hands of users (Borg CR10). Therefore, our methods were successful in terms of  
653 enhancing the user's sense of presence.

654 We identify a number of benefits for VR designers who are faced with the challenge of providing  
655 virtual object weight to the user of a VR hand controller. This study's primary strength is direct  
656 interaction with virtual objects using a VR controller and trackers. Secondly, we induced heavier  
657 weights that are close to the weight of objects that people encounter in their daily lives, while previous  
658 studies focused on objects that weigh less than 500 grams (Samad, et al., 2019). A pseudo-haptic model  
659 can successfully induce these weights in VR participants without any additional haptic devices, when  
660 the weight of the virtual object is equal to or less than 1 kg. However, for heavier virtual weights such  
661 as (2 and 5 kg), subjects may experience the same fatigue in their hands as in the haptic condition. To  
662 avoid discrepancies between visual and kinaesthetic cues, extra haptic devices should be used. Doing  
663 so ensures that the subject will not be affected by the VR environment in terms of their sense of  
664 presence.



665 Consequently, these approaches could be beneficial in other VR fields and decrease the reliance of VR  
666 on hardware devices. Weight perception can be used to interact more naturally with virtual objects  
667 rather than limiting the interaction with the VE. The other contribution of our work is the use of the  
668 physical work formula as an objective measurement evaluator based on kinematic data. As a result,  
669 subjective judgment is not required. There is generally no real-world testing of haptic interfaces in the  
670 evaluation process, which results in inaccurate weight perception assessment results (Lim, et al., 2021).  
671 We conducted different lifting conditions with both real objects and virtual bottles to clearly evaluate  
672 the object's weight perception.

## 673 **6 Conclusion**

674 Inducing the a feeling of weight of virtual objects to VR users is a difficult task due to lack of force  
675 feedback cues. This research focused on simple force feedback simulation approaches, through visual  
676 cues, instead of using expensive and large hardware and physical interfaces. By utilizing the concept  
677 of pseudo-haptic feedback, we designed two different approaches based on the C/D ratio concept and  
678 aimed to evaluate the effect of each approach on human behavior lifting in VR without extra real weight  
679 and compared it with the effect of real object lifting. To evaluate our findings, we benefited from the  
680 concept of physical work and different questionnaires (fatigue, presence). According to our findings,  
681 the modified C/D ratio method based on distance control can induce virtual object heaviness (and in a  
682 better way than velocity control), with object lifting behavior close to real object lifting one. This  
683 finding could be interesting for VR developers who want to develop more reliable VE with such tasks.

## 684 **Acknowledgment**

685 This work was conducted using the equipment of the technological platform of the Lispen laboratory  
686 in the framework of the collaborative project Continuum. The authors want to thank Jean-Luc Martinez  
687 who proposed the idea of pseudo-haptic interaction for the weighting task.

688

## 689 **References**

- 690 Aman, J., Lu, C.-h. & Konczak, J., 2010. The integration of vision and haptic sensing: a  
691 computational & neural perspective. *integration*, Volume 96, p. 98.
- 692 Andujar, C. & Argelaguet, F., 2007. *Virtual pads: Decoupling motor space and visual space for*  
693 *flexible manipulation of 2d windows within ves.* s.l., s.n.
- 694 Argelaguet, F. & Andujar, C., 2013. A survey of 3D object selection techniques for virtual  
695 environments. *Computers & Graphics*, Volume 37, p. 121–136.
- 696 Benjamini, Y. & Hochberg, Y., 1995. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful  
697 approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal statistical society: series B (Methodological)*,  
698 Volume 57, p. 289–300.
- 699 Borg, G., 1990. Psychophysical scaling with applications in physical work and the perception of  
700 exertion. *Scandinavian journal of work, environment & health*, p. 55–58.

- 701 Bowman, D. A. & Hodges, L. F., 1999. Formalizing the design, evaluation, and application of  
702 interaction techniques for immersive virtual environments. *Journal of Visual Languages &*  
703 *Computing*, Volume 10, p. 37–53.
- 704 Bowman, D. A., Johnson, D. B. & Hodges, L. F., 2001. Testbed evaluation of virtual environment  
705 interaction techniques. *Presence*, Volume 10, p. 75–95.
- 706 Burdea, G. C., 1996. *Force and touch feedback for virtual reality*. s.l.:John Wiley & Sons, Inc..
- 707 Burdea, G. C., 1999. *Haptic feedback for virtual reality*. s.l., s.n., p. 17–29.
- 708 Choi, I. et al., 2017. *Grabity: A wearable haptic interface for simulating weight and grasping in*  
709 *virtual reality*. s.l., s.n., p. 119–130.
- 710 De Tinguy, X., Pacchierotti, C., Marchal, M. & Lécuyer, A., 2018. *Enhancing the stiffness*  
711 *perception of tangible objects in mixed reality using wearable haptics*. s.l., s.n., p. 81–90.
- 712 Dominjon, L. et al., 2005. *Influence of control/display ratio on the perception of mass of manipulated*  
713 *objects in virtual environments*. s.l., s.n., p. 19–25.
- 714 Ernst, M. O. & Banks, M. S., 2002. Humans integrate visual and haptic information in a statistically  
715 optimal fashion. *Nature*, Volume 415, p. 429–433.
- 716 Frees, S., Kessler, G. D. & Kay, E., 2007. PRISM interaction for enhancing control in immersive  
717 virtual environments. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction (TOCHI)*, Volume 14, p.  
718 2–es.
- 719 Gibbs, J. K., Gillies, M. & Pan, X., 2022. A comparison of the effects of haptic and visual feedback  
720 on presence in virtual reality. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, Volume 157, p.  
721 102717.
- 722 Gillan, D. J. et al., 1990. *How does Fitts' law fit pointing and dragging?*. s.l., s.n., p. 227–234.
- 723 Hagadorn, K. T., 2004. The Effects of Object Weight and Three-Dimensional Movement on Human  
724 Movement Time and Fitts' Law.
- 725 Harley, D. et al., 2018. *Sensory vr: Smelling, touching, and eating virtual reality*. s.l., s.n., p. 386–  
726 397.
- 727 Jauregui, D. A. G. et al., 2014. Toward" pseudo-haptic avatars": Modifying the visual animation of  
728 self-avatar can simulate the perception of weight lifting. *IEEE transactions on visualization and*  
729 *computer graphics*, Volume 20, p. 654–661.
- 730 Kim, Y. M., Rhiu, I. & Yun, M. H., 2020. A systematic review of a virtual reality system from the  
731 perspective of user experience. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, Volume 36,  
732 p. 893–910.
- 733 Lécuyer, A., 2009. Simulating haptic feedback using vision: A survey of research and applications of  
734 pseudo-haptic feedback. *Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments*, Volume 18, p. 39–53.

- 735 Lécuyer, A., Burkhardt, J.-M. & Etienne, L., 2004. *Feeling bumps and holes without a haptic*  
736 *interface: the perception of pseudo-haptic textures*. s.l., s.n., p. 239–246.
- 737 Lécuyer, A. et al., 2000. *Pseudo-haptic feedback: can isometric input devices simulate force*  
738 *feedback?*. s.l., s.n., p. 83–90.
- 739 Lee, J., Kim, J.-I. & Kim, H., 2019. *Force Arrow 2: A Novel Pseudo-Haptic Interface for Weight*  
740 *Perception in Lifting Virtual Objects*. s.l., s.n., p. 1–8.
- 741 Lim, W. N. et al., 2021. A Systematic Review of Weight Perception in Virtual Reality: Challenges  
742 and Road Ahead. *IEEE Access*.
- 743 MacKenzie, I. S., 1993. Fitts' law as a performance model in human-computer interaction..
- 744 Maehigashi, A. et al., 2021. *Virtual Weight Illusion: Weight Perception of Virtual Objects Using*  
745 *Weight Illusions*. s.l., s.n., p. 1–6.
- 746 Massie, T. H., Salisbury, J. K. & others, 1994. *The phantom haptic interface: A device for probing*  
747 *virtual objects*. s.l., s.n., p. 295–300.
- 748 Nakakoji, K., Yamamoto, Y. & Koike, Y., 2010. *Toward principles for visual interaction design for*  
749 *communicating weight by using pseudo-haptic feedback*. s.l., s.n., p. 1–6.
- 750 Nakakoji, K., Yamamoto, Y., Matsubara, N. & Koike, Y., 2011. *Tciex: an environment for designing*  
751 *and experiencing a variety of visuo-haptic sensory conflicts*. s.l., s.n., p. 23–26.
- 752 Nguyen, H. & Bednarz, T., 2020. *User experience in collaborative extended reality: Overview study*.  
753 s.l., s.n., p. 41–70.
- 754 Nisar, S. et al., 2018. Effects of Different Hand-Grounding Locations on Haptic Performance With a  
755 Wearable Kinesthetic Haptic Device. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, Volume 4, p. 351–358.
- 756 Pacchierotti, C. et al., 2017. Wearable haptic systems for the fingertip and the hand: taxonomy,  
757 review, and perspectives. *IEEE transactions on haptics*, Volume 10, p. 580–600.
- 758 Palmerius, K. L., Johansson, D., Höst, G. & Schönborn, K., 2014. *An Analysis of the Influence of a*  
759 *Pseudo-haptic Cue on the Haptic Perception of Weight*. s.l., s.n., p. 117–125.
- 760 Poupyrev, I., Billinghurst, M., Weghorst, S. & Ichikawa, T., 1996. *The go-go interaction technique:*  
761 *non-linear mapping for direct manipulation in VR*. s.l., s.n., p. 79–80.
- 762 Poupyrev, I. & Ichikawa, T., 1999. Manipulating objects in virtual worlds: Categorization and  
763 empirical evaluation of interaction techniques. *Journal of Visual Languages & Computing*, Volume  
764 10, p. 19–35.
- 765 Poupyrev, I., Weghorst, S., Billinghurst, M. & Ichikawa, T., 1998. *A study of techniques for selecting*  
766 *and positioning objects in immersive VEs: effects of distance, size, and visual feedback*. s.l., s.n.
- 767 Ramsamy, P., Haffegge, A., Jamieson, R. & Alexandrov, V., 2006. *Using haptics to improve*  
768 *immersion in virtual environments*. s.l., s.n., p. 603–609.

- 769 Rietzler, M., Geiselhart, F., Gugenheimer, J. & Rukzio, E., 2018. *Breaking the tracking: Enabling*  
770 *weight perception using perceivable tracking offsets*. s.l., s.n., p. 1–12.
- 771 Rock, I. & Victor, J., 1964. Vision and touch: An experimentally created conflict between the two  
772 senses. *Science*, Volume 143, p. 594–596.
- 773 Rosa, N., Hürst, W., Vos, W. & Werkhoven, P., 2015. *The Influence of visual cues on passive tactile*  
774 *sensations in a multimodal immersive virtual environment*. s.l., s.n., p. 327–334.
- 775 Rosa, N., Hürst, W., Vos, W. & Werkhoven, P., 2015. *The Influence of Visual Cues on Passive*  
776 *Tactile Sensations in a Multimodal Immersive Virtual Environment*. s.l., ACM.
- 777 Runeson, S. & Frykholm, G., 1981. Visual perception of lifted weight.. *Journal of experimental*  
778 *psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, Volume 7, p. 733.
- 779 Samad, M. et al., 2019. *Pseudo-haptic weight: Changing the perceived weight of virtual objects by*  
780 *manipulating control-display ratio*. s.l., s.n., p. 1–13.
- 781 Sciutti, A. et al., 2010. Predicted sensory feedback derived from motor commands does not improve  
782 haptic sensitivity. *Experimental brain research*, Volume 200, p. 259–267.
- 783 Ujitoko, Y. & Ban, Y., 2021. Survey of pseudo-haptics: Haptic feedback design and application  
784 proposals. *IEEE Transactions on Haptics*, Volume 14, p. 699–711.
- 785 Witmer, B. G. & Singer, M. J., 1998. Measuring presence in virtual environments: A presence  
786 questionnaire. *Presence*, Volume 7, p. 225–240.
- 787 Yu, R. & Bowman, D. A., 2020. Pseudo-haptic display of mass and mass distribution during object  
788 rotation in virtual reality. *IEEE transactions on visualization and computer graphics*, Volume 26, p.  
789 2094–2103.
- 790 Zenner, A. & Krüger, A., 2017. Shifty: A weight-shifting dynamic passive haptic proxy to enhance  
791 object perception in virtual reality. *IEEE transactions on visualization and computer graphics*,  
792 Volume 23, p. 1285–1294.
- 793