Motion Sickness Conditioning to Reduce Cybersickness

Assem Kroma assem.kroma@carleton.ca Carleton University Ottawa, Ontario, Canada Naz Al Kassm naz.alkassm@carleton.ca Carleton University Ottawa, Ontario, Canada Robert J. Teather rob.teather@carleton.ca Carleton University Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

ABSTRACT

We present a remote longitudinal experiment to assess the effectiveness of a common motion sickness conditioning technique (MSCT), the Puma method, on cybersickness in VR. Our goal was to evaluate benefits of conditioning techniques as an alternative to visual cybersickness reduction methods (e.g., viewpoint restriction) or habituation approaches which "train" the user to become acclimatized to cybersickness. We compared three techniques - habituation, the Puma method conditioning exercise, and a placebo (Tai Chi) - in a cybersickness-inducing navigation task over 10 sessions. Preliminary results indicate promising effects.

CCS CONCEPTS

• Human-centered computing → User studies; Mixed / augmented reality; Virtual reality; Empirical studies in HCI.

KEYWORDS

Cybersickness, cybersickness reduction techniques, habituation, motion sickness, conditioning, longitudinal study, virtual reality

ACM Reference Format:

Assem Kroma, Naz Al Kassm, and Robert J. Teather. 2021. Motion Sickness Conditioning to Reduce Cybersickness. In *Symposium on Spatial User Interaction (SUI '21), November 9–10, 2021, Virtual Event, USA*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3485279.3485300

1 INTRODUCTION

Cybersickness commonly occurs in viewing immersive VR with a head-mounted display (HMD) while stationary, and navigating the virtual environment using a method that does not generate physical motion cues (e.g., joystick-based steering) [2]. Various techniques to reduce cybersickness have been developed. Common approaches like viewpoint snapping [2], and field of view (FOV) restriction [3, 10] tend to change the nature of the experience and could limit the creative choices of the system designer. Such techniques alter the users' view of the scene, which could affect user presence and performance, ultimately degrading the quality of VR experiences.

Habituation, repetitive exposure to a stimulus, is an alternative that has shown to work on reducing cybersickness [4]. Similarly, conditioning exercises have also been shown to be effective for reducing motion sickness [5]. Motion sickness and cybersickness

SUI '21, November 9–10, 2021, Virtual Event, USA

© 2021 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM. ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-9091-0/21/11...\$15.00 https://doi.org/10.1145/3485279.3485300 have similar symptoms and causes; thus, techniques that treat motion sickness may also work on cybersickness [9]. We study MSCTs and their potential in reducing cybersickness.

2 EXPERIMENT

We conducted a longitudinal study evaluating the use of a MSCT - the Puma method [7] - compared to habituation and a placebo. The workout conditions users through gradual exposure to motion sickness-inducing activities. This workout uses two conditioning exercises, the "spiral" and the "figure eight". There is little empirical evidence supporting claims of its effectiveness in treating cybersickness [6]. Experts have anecdotally suggested its effectiveness in treating motion sickness due to desensitization, despite the unavailability of multicentre trials of this method [5]. We thus employ the Puma method in an experiment to assess its effectiveness in conditioning participants to experience less cybersickness.

We recruited 12 participants aged 28 to 40 years old (mean age 34, 6 male and 6 female). Participants were divided into three groups:

- *Group 1: Habituation* (n=4, 2 male, 2 female): a control group, who experienced VR without any intervention as a baseline
- *Group 2: Placebo* (n=4, 2 male, 2 female): experienced a placebo workout (Tai Chi) and the VR experience. Tai Chi was chosen due to its reputation as a meditative treatment, while the only proven effect of Tai Chi is reducing tension headaches through long repetitive exposures for 15 weeks (30+ sessions) [1]. To eliminate any actual effects, the chosen exercises were basic and introductory to Tai Chi rather than actual training.
- *Group 3: Puma* (n=4, 2 male, 2 female): Used the Puma conditioning method, and the VR experience

Two groups conducted two short (~15 min) sessions per day for 10 days. Each session included a treatment (i.e., conditioning exercise or a placebo) and a VR session. The third (habituation, i.e., control) group completed one VR session per day, with no other treatment. We hypothesized that by the end of the study, participants exposed to MSCT would experience lower simulator sickness questionnaire (SSQ) scores [8] and lower nausea scores than those exposed to habituation or the placebo.

Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, we conducted the study remotely using the participant's mobile phone and a Google cardboard sent by mail. The study employed a between-subjects longitudinal single-blind placebo-controlled design. There were two independent variables:

- Conditioning Technique: Habituation, Placebo, Puma
- Session: 1, 2, ... 10

Conditioning technique was assigned between-subjects, while session was assigned within-subjects. The dependent variables included total SSQ scores (Cybersickness level), and nausea scores.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

SUI '21, November 9-10, 2021, Virtual Event, USA



Figure 1: Comparison among the total SSQ and Nausea scores (mean) as a function of session number among the three groups and their trendlines respectively. Lower score is better

3 PRELIMINARY RESULTS

We calculated Total SSQ scores for a session by subtracting the pre-test SSQ from the post-test SSQ scores, giving the difference in SSQ scores from the start to end of the session (i.e., how much participant's sickness levels increased due to VR exposure). This calculation gives the total scores seen in Figure 1-a.

The Puma group experienced the largest decrease in total SSQ scores compared to the other two conditions (mean SSQ 75 in session 1, down to 14 by session 10). See Figure 1-a. In contrast, the habituation group's SSQ scores decreased from 60 in session 1 to 32 by session 10. The placebo group was surprisingly lower, but experienced little change in total SSQ over the course of the study, starting at around 21.51, and ending at around 16.83 by session 10.

Repeated measures ANOVA revealed the effect of conditioning technique on SSQ was *not* statistically significant ($F_{2,9} = 1.035, p > .05$), while the effect of session was ($F_{9,81} = 6.125, p < .0001$). Moreover, the trial × group interaction effect was statistically significant ($F_{18,81} = 2.224, p < .01$), which suggests that although there was no global difference between conditioning techniques, their improvement rates were different. We plotted linear regressions of SSQ over session in Figure 1-a. A cross-over effect is evident at around session 6, and then around session 9. In both cases, the Puma method eventually yielded lower SSQ scores than either the placebo or habituation groups.

We also averaged nausea scores taken every 2 min per session. See Figure 1-b. Average nausea scores indicate the overall tendency of nausea scores to decrease with session. The Puma group again had the largest decrease in nausea scores (from 5.96 to 2.68) over the 10 sessions, compared to the other two conditioning techniques (3.86 to 2.75 for habituation, and 2.93 to 2.57 for placebo). Again, the placebo group exhibited the lowest overall nausea scores.

Repeated measures ANOVA, treating conditioning technique as a between-subjects factor, and both session and measurement number (nausea score 1 through 7 for a given session) as within-subjects factors revealed that conditioning technique was not statistically significant ($F_{2,9} = 2.4, p > .05$), while the effect of session was ($F_{9,81} = 3.6, p < .001$). Neither of the two-way interaction effects for session × group ($F_{18,81} = 1.3, p > .05$) nor session × measurement ($F_{9,54} = 1.14, p > .05$) were statistically significant. However, and likely most importantly, there was a significant 3way interaction effect between conditioning technique, session, and measurement number ($F_{108,486} = 1.3, p < .05$). Overall, this suggests that there was little difference in nausea scores between conditioning techniques, but the rate of change of nausea scores in each session varied by conditioning technique.

4 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

We conducted a single-blind placebo-controlled longitudinal remote study to evaluate a conditioning workout usually used for motion sickness in treating cybersickness. We compared this workout to habituation by regular exposure. Despite our relatively small sample size, our results suggest that there is some merit in using motion sickness conditioning methods in reducing cybersickness. We note that despite including only 12 participants, our analysis employed longitudinal data, including 120 VR exposure sessions (approx. 30 total hours of VR exposure) and 80 treatment sessions in total. However, further evaluation with a larger participant pool will better generalize our findings, and confirm the effects observed in this study. While the trendlines seen in our results show promise, they must be verified.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ryan B Abbott, Ka-Kit Hui, Ron D Hays, Ming-Dong Li, and Timothy Pan. 2007. A Randomized Controlled Trial of Tai Chi for Tension Headaches. Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative Medicine 4 (2007), 301476. https://doi.org/10. 1093/ecam/nel050
- [2] Yasin Farmani and Robert J. Teather. 2020. Evaluating discrete viewpoint control to reduce cybersickness in virtual reality. *Virtual Reality* (2020). https://doi.org/ 10.1007/s10055-020-00425-x
- [3] Ajoy S. Fernandes and Steven K. Feiner. 2016. Combating VR sickness through subtle dynamic field-of-view modification. 2016 IEEE Symposium on 3D User Interfaces, 3DUI 2016 - Proceedings (2016), 201–210. https://doi.org/10.1109/3DUI. 2016.7460053
- [4] Peter A. Howarth and Simon G. Hodder. 2008. Characteristics of habituation to motion in a virtual environment. *Displays* 29, 2 (2008), 117–123. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.displa.2007.09.009 Health and Safety Aspects of Visual Displays.
- [5] Euna Hwang, Susan M. Kuhn, and Beth Lange. 2019. 46 Motion Sickness. In Travel Medicine (Fourth Edition) (fourth edition ed.), Jay S. Keystone, Phyllis E. Kozarsky, Bradley A. Connor, Hans D. Nothdurft, Marc Mendelson, and Karin Leder (Eds.). Elsevier, London, 423–428. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-54696-6.00046-X
- [6] SUSAN PUMA. 2011. Motion Sickness Exercises Proposed as Cure for Cybersickness. https://www.prweb.com/releases/2011/7/prweb8625627.htm
- [7] Samuel C Puma and Susan W Puma. 2007. Method for conditioning to prevent motion sickness. US Patent 7,288,057.
- [8] Volkan Sevinc and Mehmet Ilker Berkman. 2020. Psychometric evaluation of Simulator Sickness Questionnaire and its variants as a measure of cybersickness in consumer virtual environments. *Applied Ergonomics* 82, July 2018 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apergo.2019.102958
- [9] Janan Al-Awar Smither, Mustapha Mouloua, and Robert Kennedy. 2008. Reducing Symptoms of Visually Induced Motion Sickness Through Perceptual Training. The International Journal of Aviation Psychology 18, 4 (2008), 326–339. https://doi.org/ 10.1080/10508410802346921 arXiv:https://doi.org/10.1080/10508410802346921
- [10] Joel Teixeira and Stephen Palmisano. 2021. Effects of dynamic field-of-view restriction on cybersickness and presence in HMD-based virtual reality. *Virtual Reality* 25, 2 (2021), 433–445. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10055-020-00466-2