2023 IEEE International Symposium on Mixed and Augmented Reality (ISMAR)

What And How Together: A Taxonomy On 30 Years Of Collaborative Human-Centered XR Tasks

Ryan K. Ghamandi* ISUE Lab University of Central Florida
Yahya Hmaiti† ISUE Lab University of Central Florida
Tam T. Nguyen‡ ISUE Lab University of Central Florida
Amirpouya Ghasemaghaei§ ISUE Lab University of Central Florida
Ravi Kiran Kattoju¶ ISUE Lab University of Central Florida
Eugene M. Taranta II‖ ISUE Lab University of Central Florida
Joseph J. LaViola Jr.** ISUE Lab University of Central Florida

Abstract

We present a taxonomy of human-centered collaborative XR tasks. XR technologies have extended into the realm of collaboration, improving the quality and accessibility of teamwork. However, after a comprehensive assessment of the literature on the interaction between XR technologies and collaboration, no comprehensive method that emphasizes task actions and properties exists to classify collaborative tasks. Thus, our suggested taxonomy represents a classification system for collaborative tasks. After conducting a thorough literature review across different research venues, we conducted several exhaustive classification and review cycles for over 800 papers collected, which resulted in 148 papers retained to create the taxonomy. We dissected the actions and properties that the collaborative endeavors and tasks of these papers encompass as well as the types of categorizations and relations these papers illustrate. We expand on the design choices and usage of our taxonomy, followed by its limitations and future work. We built this taxonomy in order to reduce ambiguities and confusion regarding the design and comprehension of human-based collaborative tasks that use XR technology, which could prove useful in aiding the development and understanding of these tasks. Our taxonomy reveals a framework for understanding how collaborative tasks are designed and a systematic way of classifying different methods by which people can collaborate and interact in environments that involve XR, while still promoting efficient communication, teamwork, goal achievement and productivity.

Index Terms: Human-centered computing—Human computer interaction (HCI)—Interaction paradigms—Virtual reality; Human-centered computing—Collaborative and social computing design and evaluation methods; Human-centered computing—HCI design and evaluation methods;

1 Introduction

Collaboration is the process in which people work together to realize a common goal [25, 86, 97, 146, 160]. Such a practice has been common since the dawn of mankind, and with the combination of advanced technological devices, the field of extended reality (XR) collaboration has emerged [88, 100, 163]. Collaboration using XR technologies involves individuals engaging in cooperative endeavors in virtual environments (VE), such that with XR, a large array of different modern co-creation and collaboration tasks (definite pieces of work that are meant to be completed by multiple individuals) was created over the past three decades across several domains [13, 30, 32, 48, 50, 127, 172]. It was found that through the incorporation of XR in collaboration processes several key advantages were uncovered: better communication, remote and real-time collaboration facilitation, immersive simulations, more accessibility and inclusion along with better contextualization and information exchange, etc. [88, 126] As the research work in collaboration is ongoing, the characteristics and properties of collaborative tasks evolve, which brings about a harder categorization process, and even designing efficient collaborative tasks using XR becomes challenging considering that new collaboration elements and properties are introduced [77, 113, 114, 191].

In this paper, we aim to analyze existing collaboration tasks that use XR technologies and classify their elements under the umbrella of a collaborative task taxonomy. To achieve this, we analyzed 148 papers picked from an initial pool of over 800 papers in the extended reality collaborative space to synthesize various collaborative tasks and their properties. The resulting comprehensive taxonomy details actions and properties associated with collaborative tasks. The classification system we propose for tasks performed collaboratively in extended reality expands on the XR collaboration literature by providing a taxonomy that encompasses other related taxonomies and reviews into a central classification for tasks that covers XR-related paradigms.

This paper contributes to XR collaboration by providing a classification of mixed reality tasks. The presented taxonomy through this work affords a classification regardless of the system employed, as well as identifying key actions and properties that XR collaborative tasks possess. We created this taxonomy to create a clearer depiction of these types of tasks to help people have a greater understanding of how they are structured and what they entail.

2 Related Work

Extended Reality technologies afford the facilitation of different forms of collaboration through the different realities in the mixed reality continuum [13, 84]. In such collaborative settings, several elements make up the collaborative task, which can be separated into properties and actions of a task. Prior work that details collaborative task design considerations suggests that the actions taken during a task can consist of environmental observation, locomotion, object selection/manipulation, etc. whereas the properties of a task include task location (virtual and physical) if the task is synchronous or asynchronous, roles of each entity partaking in the task, and the relation between the sub-tasks that constitute a task, etc. [71, 84, 93, 119, 136, 172, 189].

Prior work has shown that collaborative tasks using XR technologies are employed across several industries due to the benefit of having collaborative simulations and experiences similar to real-world scenarios [18, 70, 71, 172]. As the development and research in XR-based collaboration is progressing numerous classifications

*e-mail: ryanghamandi1@gmail.com
†e-mail: Yohan.Hmaiti@ucf.edu
‡e-mail: tamn0928@gmail.com
§e-mail: amirpouya.ghasemaghaei@ucf.edu
¶e-mail: kattoju.ravikiran@gmail.com
‖e-mail: etaranta@gmail.com
**e-mail: jlaviola@ucf.edu

2473-0726/23/$31.00 ©2023 IEEE
DOI 10.1109/ISMAR59233.2023.00047

of related collaborative tasks have been proposed. One such classification system which acts as the basis of many other classifications is the Mixed Reality Spectrum developed by Milgram et al. [100]. Other early classifications which encompass the types of environmental interactions which are fundamental to collaborative scenarios include Bowman's taxonomy of selection/manipulation techniques, which specifies the components of selection, manipulation, and release of objects in VEs [17] and Poupyrev's taxonomy of manipulation techniques which are based on exocentric and egocentric metaphors [125].

Prior work also shows that task analysis systems and methods are in place to aid the design of systems that pertain to tasks in general, not just for collaborative tasks. For example, Annett et al. [4] describe task analysis in a broad sense which applies to all types of tasks, not just ones that exist solely on the mixed reality spectrum. This specific method of task analysis is meant to decompose a task in order to identify the source of its cognitive or physical shortcomings so solutions can be devised for applications such as training scenarios, control tasks, etc. Along the same vein is the guide for engineering and design proposed by Stanton et al. [151], which focuses on using task analysis methodologies for design and evaluation of products and systems. Another example is the guidelines for design and evaluation of VEs proposed by Gabbard et al. [40], which lays out guidelines for environment and interaction design fueled by task analysis. More recent methods of VE design and evaluation have been introduced by Raimbaud et al. [128, 129], which also uses task analysis to drive the evaluation of virtual reality interaction design for construction and Building Information (BIM) related scenarios.

One of the most recent literature reviews on collaborative mixed reality was conducted by Schafer et al. [138] which discusses synchronous remote XR collaborative systems as well as a taxonomy of such systems, but not on the classification of tasks performed using these systems. The survey done by Wang et al. [172] was also conducted with a focus on AR and MR tasks, but these tasks were only physically-based tasks despite them being extracted from different fields (e.g. industrial, medical, etc). Other surveys and classifications conducted discuss other aspects of collaboration such as how collaboration is carried out synchronously or asynchronously in VR and AR [120], user experience in collaborative extended reality [105], how systems are structured for specific types of reality [95], the aspects of collaborative VEs [192], the general state of collaborative work in augmented reality [144], and remote assistance and training in mixed reality environments in relation to what components such scenarios are composed of [34]. These classifications and reviews focus essentially on the systems or aspects of the collaboration instead of classifying the related tasks that people work on using XR collaboration means.

The existing taxonomies and classifications of collaboration using technologies on the XR spectrum provided insight into XR collaboration with a focus on the individual tasks, and the different technical features and aspects that relate to them. While this is beneficial, those taxonomies and classifications do not elaborate comprehensively on tasks across multiple realities. Through our taxonomy, we narrow down the scope to human-to-human collaboration in order to offer a comprehensive classification of the task actions and properties that promote better collaboration between individuals.

3 METHODOLOGY

Through iterating over prior work, we noticed the presence of an extensive collection of research work related to XR technology usage for collaborative tasks. Accordingly, we crafted a taxonomy of collaborative tasks that rely on XR-related interactive technologies, which serves also as a classification that affords to categorize current literature to comprehend different types of collaborative tasks using interactive technologies and understand advancements, potential improvement areas, and determine future work within the field. In this section, we list the procedure and steps taken to curate an archive of applicable publications used to create the taxonomy.

Before moving forward with gathering papers, we first created a taxonomy amongst ourselves to create categories in which to classify information obtained while reading each relevant paper. This part of our methodology was loosely based on the process used by Fagerholm et al. [28] in order to create a basis for our classifications since no relevant task-based taxonomy existed in the first place, as well as to create a starting point for the actual taxonomy. This initial taxonomy was further modified after the information extraction step in order to arrive at the final taxonomy state. We note that the methodology used shares similar elements to the one developed by Moher et al. [102].

To curate an archive of research work and publications to interpret and analyze, we first conducted a systematic search in different relevant digital libraries and repositories, which include *IEEE Xplore*, *ACM Digital Library*, and *Springer*. In order to fine-tune our search to obtain the most relevant results, we chose search keywords that included *"collaboration", "collaboration Tasks", "Asynchronous Collaboration", "Synchronous Collaboration", "Collaboration Framework", "Collaborative Interaction", "Collaborative Virtual Reality Environment", "CVRE", "Virtual Reality", "Augmented Reality", "Mixed Reality", and "Extended Reality"*.

We performed several search queries, yet for ease of result replicability, we share the base query format we followed through a sample query, where the Boolean "AND" joins main terms, and "OR" enables the inclusion of either specified terms or synonyms surrounding it: ***"Collaboration" AND "Collaboration Task" AND ("Virtual Reality" OR "Augmented Reality" OR "Mixed Reality" OR "Extended Reality")***. Moreover, we not only varied the keywords and their order when querying, but we also used search queries where the keywords had their initials lowercase, search queries where all the keywords were uppercase, and also other queries where we used keyword acronyms instead of full words. The searches in these databases generated 800 to 6000 papers each.

After obtaining all these papers, we worked together to filter the papers that would be irrelevant to the taxonomy. We initially defined explicit criteria to determine the relevance of a paper to decide whether it would be excluded or not, and we refined the inclusion and exclusion (EX) criteria as the iteration process went through. We excluded a paper if: **(EX-1)** *The paper was not written in English.* **(EX-2)** *The paper's full-text could not be accessed.* **(EX-3)** *The paper was a poster or a short paper or was not peer-reviewed.* **(EX-4)** *The paper had no contribution relevant to the XR collaboration field.* **(EX-5)** *The paper was not focused on human-centered collaboration (i.e. robot centered collaboration, etc.).*

In the second iteration, we read every paper's title and abstract and then excluded the paper if it was deemed as irrelevant to our investigation, and we also used some exclusion criteria from the ones listed above in the second iteration, and in case we had doubts, we proceeded with exploring the remaining parts of the paper to make a more justified and decisive choice regarding keeping or excluding the paper. If the paper was to be excluded, yet had some slight correlation with our topic or had an important impact in relation to interactive technologies and their usage or just collaboration in settings other than XR, we took extra notes about it to be reviewed later if needed, yet it was still excluded. After this second filtering round, our final corpus of relevant research papers from all the research venues investigated consisted of 847 papers.

After obtaining a comprehensive set of relevant research papers, we extracted and classified information based on the categories of the pre-existing taxonomy. The classification components that were gathered from each paper included basic paper components such as ***Paper Title, Paper Link, Include Paper (Y/N)***, and the other collaboration-related classification components include ***actions taken, information communicated, input and output communication, entities and their roles/statuses, locomotion method,***



Figure 1: A taxonomy of human-to-human XR collaborative tasks.

temporal state, physical and virtual location(s), physically or virtually co-located, tasks, theory/model/framework, extra notes (if any), measures collected, and potential research gap/limitations.

The reading of the 847 papers was done individually by each author and also through group discussions, and we took detailed notes on each paper based on the pre-existing classifications. Emerging patterns, key components of each paper, and key findings were assessed continuously, and discussed by all the authors. Additionally, if anyone of the authors had some remarks regarding the technology, collaboration task, or content of the paper, an extra notes section was available for each paper considering that those remarks could influence the structure of the taxonomy. While reading each paper, papers that still did not have relevance to the taxonomy were discarded. The final pool of papers consisted of 148 papers.

The purpose of this taxonomy was to present a survey and comprehensive assessment of the collaboration tasks that involve XR interactive technologies present in the literature. Our methodology to build the taxonomy was set based on different methodologies for taxonomies and surveys present in prior work. Additionally, during the multiple filtering phases, we diligently and carefully selected papers to avoid redundant and low-impact references. Furthermore, we collaboratively modified the taxonomy as the filtering and surveying were ongoing, and relied on using Inter-Rater Reliability (IRR) [36] to modify the structure of the taxonomy; as additional categories were proposed to be added to the taxonomy, the authors used IRR to add or discard them. We emphasized getting related work published during the past two decades as older papers would not provide much relevant insight to build a state-of-the-art taxonomy of collaborative tasks in the context of our investigation.

We hope that other researchers that plan to expand on the taxonomy or use it will contribute to expanding the dataset and its content, along with suggesting changes to the classification if present, and overall maintain a dynamic discussion about collaborative tasks and how our presented taxonomy can be updated especially when more collaboration tasks are created and published. Our research questions are ”What specific actions can we classify XR collaborative tasks under?” and ”What specific properties can we classify XR collaborative tasks under?”

4 Taxonomy on Human-Centered XR Collaborative Scenarios

The taxonomy of human-centered collaboration in XR is divided into two main components: ***Actions*** taken related to the task, and the ***Properties*** of the collaborative task, in which we explain each node in depth in the following subsections.

4.1 Actions

During any arbitrary task, individuals that participate in it and choose to progress through it and reach some sort of outcome or goal, achieve this by performing actions related to the task. To this end, such actions can be classified under three main categories: ***Environmental Engagement***, ***Locomotion***, and ***Communication***.

4.1.1 Environmental Engagement

Environmental Engagement refers to the methods by which the user can interact and modify the VE, which we classify into two types: ***Active (e.g. object manipulation)*** and ***Passive (e.g. observing the environment only)***

Active environmental engagement is the interaction with objects in the environment and its components. These manipulations can be achieved through selection, manipulation, release, spawning, destroying, and/or distortion.

Passive environmental engagement occurs when the individual assumes a more passive role and is mostly an observer of the VE, or when they are immersed in the VE and experiencing its content without direct input or active impact on the VE aspects and components.

4.1.2 Navigation

Navigation is the process by which individuals navigate around an environment. Navigation can be split into two components: ***Planning*** (where an individual determines a location where they want to move) and ***Locomotion*** (where an individual moves to a desired location). Locomotion can be further classified into three types: ***Natural*** (e.g. walking), ***semi-natural*** (e.g. scaled walking), and ***non-natural*** (e.g. use of joysticks).

4.1.3 Communication

Communication refers to the sharing of information between individuals. This can be classified as either ***Input*** or ***Output***. ***Input*** refers to the method used to send information to other individuals (e.g. voice, hand gestures, etc.). ***Output*** communication refers to the method used to receive and present information, which can either be visual, auditory, haptic, etc.

4.2 Properties

Every task has some sort of collection of aspects that define the nature of the task, from how individuals perform the task to where the task is performed, among other details. As such, these aspects or properties can be classified under multiple categories: ***Temporal***, ***Dependency***, ***Location***, ***Requirements***, ***Individual***, ***Environment***, ***Structure***, and ***Intended Population***.

4.2.1 Temporal State

Temporal state refers to when individuals are actively working on a task, which can be classified as either ***Synchronous*** or ***Asynchronous***. ***Synchronous temporal*** state means that individuals are actively working on a task together at the same time (simultaneously) while ***Asynchronous temporal*** state means that individuals are actively working on a task at different times [120].

4.2.2 Dependency

Dependency refers to the reliance that a task has on other tasks, which can be classified as either ***Dependent*** or ***Independent***. ***Dependent tasks*** are ones which are dependent on the outcomes of other task(s), while ***independent tasks*** are ones which are not dependent on the outcomes of other task(s).

4.2.3 Location

Location refers to the placement setting of individuals when performing a task. Location can be partitioned into two main categories; the ***physical location*** and the ***virtual location*** of the task.

The physical location refers to where individuals are located in the real world. This can be further broken down into individuals being distanced or co-located, and also into individuals having to be in either a specific or arbitrary location.

The virtual location refers to where individuals are located in a VE (if they happen to be in one). This can be further broken down into individuals being either ***distanced*** or ***co-located*** virtually.

4.2.4 Requirements

Requirements are the specific qualifications or abilities that individuals must possess to perform the task. This can be broken down into two types of requirements: ***Knowledge*** and ***Physiological*** requirements.

Knowledge requirements refer to the intellect or experience that an individual needs to complete a task. This can be further broken down into two types: educational (e.g. knowing a specific subject or topic in-depth) and social (being acquainted with a specific culture).

Physiological requirements refer to the physical capabilities that an individual needs to complete a task (e.g. being able to walk, use both hands, etc.)

4.2.5 Individual

The ***individual*** participating in a task possesses properties of their own in relation to the task. These properties are classified as the individual's ***Purpose*** and ***Role***.

Purpose refers to what an individual is meant to do in regards to a task. This is broken down into the individual either ***performing*** a task or ***advising/instructing*** another individual to complete the task.

Role refers to the part that an individual plays in a task. Roles can either be ***hierarchical*** (where individual(s) has/have authority over others e.g. a mentor and mentee) or ***non-hierarchical*** (where individuals have equal roles, e..g. peers working on a project).

4.2.6 Environment

Environment refers to the place where a task takes place. Every environment can be broken down into three elements: ***Space***, ***Objects***, and ***Type***.

Space refers to the area in which individuals are located. This area can be classified as either ***Shared*** (individuals are in the same area) or ***Different*** (individuals are not in the same area).

Objects include all the entities in the environment. Objects possess the elements of ***Fidelity*** and ***Activity Level***. ***Fidelity*** refers to the quality or exactness of an object compared to the real world. An object's fidelity can either be realistic or synthetic. ***Activity Level*** refers to the degree to which an object can be manipulated in an environment. An object may either be ***static*** (stays constant throughout a task and does not change), ***automated*** (meant to move or change at some point during a task), or ***interactive*** (individuals can interact with the object).

Type refers to where the environment exists on the mixed reality spectrum. An environment's type can either be ***virtual***, ***augmented***, ***mixed***, or ***real***.

4.2.7 Structure

Structure is the order in which sub-tasks of a task must be completed. Tasks can either be ***Ordered*** (sub-tasks must be completed in a specific order to reach an intended goal) or ***Unordered*** (sub-tasks may be completed in any order to accomplish an intended goal).

4.2.8 Intended Population

Intended Population refers to the specific group of individuals that a task is meant to be performed by. Tasks can either have a ***General*** intended population (e.g. anyone is able to participate in the task) or a ***Special/Specific*** population (e.g. firefighters engaging in a training task to prepare for actual fires).

5 Results

In this section, we elaborate using our findings on each node in the taxonomy. We show the classification of tasks from our corpus under the nodes of the actual taxonomy (see Table 1). We note that while we specify percentages for most nodes, they do not always add up to one hundred percent, e.g. ordered and unordered task percentages add up to 100% but synchronous and asynchronous do not; this is because tasks can possess multiple qualities of a property/action.

5.1 Actions

5.1.1 Environmental Engagement

Active environmental engagement involves many specific actions that can be carried out, which are detailed as ***manipulation*** (86.5% of tasks) [24, 26], ***spawning*** (21.6% of tasks) [67, 140], ***destroying*** (20.3% of tasks) [48, 60], ***distortion*** (11.5% of tasks) [29, 181], ***selection*** (86.5% of tasks) [101, 122], and ***release*** (86.5% of tasks) [104, 137]. However, not all objects necessarily go through the process of selection, manipulation, and release. Some objects can undergo only manipulation if they are indirectly manipulated by other objects, e.g. a ball thrown by an individual hits and moves another object when they collide.

Passive environmental engagement, on the other hand, involves a more passive role and is mostly observance of the VE, or immersion in the VE and experiencing its content ***without direct input or active impact*** on the VE aspects and components (100% of tasks). Such an action happens in every task as individuals retrieve information from the environment to make decisions on what to do next, e.g. being a mentee in a collaborative MR-based surgical procedure would closely observe the state of the patient to perform the surgery successfully [43, 155, 156, 161].

5.1.2 Navigation

Navigation allows users to interact, explore, move, and be spatially present in the VE, such that in several collaborative tasks it facilitates moving through multiple environments, searching for critical objects or information, and coordinating with others in the VE to complete tasks, etc. [87]

Our paper corpus is classified under the three classifications accordingly: ***Natural*** *(e.g. walking, 57.4% of tasks) [38, 131],* ***Semi-Natural*** *(e.g. scaled walking, 4.1% of tasks) [38, 111, 150], and* ***Non-Natural*** *(e.g. joysticks, 6.8% of tasks) [37, 42]*

We note that some prior work did not describe the locomotion method used for their task, or simply did not have any, such that the task individuals remained stationary or had very minimal locomotion. Accordingly, we found walking to be the most predominant form of locomotion, as many tasks involved augmented or mixed reality and were more so focused on the development of other actions to complete tasks (such as manipulations) rather than locomotion.

It should be noted that during our initial review of our paper corpus, we had considered placing ***Navigation*** as a sub-node under ***Passive*** Environmental Engagement. As traversing through an environment of any reality medium could fall within ***Environment Observation***, there are some nuances that warrant its respective node and sub-nodes. For example, planning the route of traversal is Passive Environmental Engagement while Locomotion may lead to Active Environmental Engagement should the participants interact with objects during their task(s),

5.1.3 Communication

Communication allows the sharing of information and feedback between the individuals participating in the collaborative task (94.6% of tasks) [54, 56, 70, 164, 190]. Additionally, communication promotes better teamwork, productivity, collaborative learning and problem-solving, and coordination, which drives reaching set common end goals through collaboration. We classify communication as an action composed of two main elements: ***Input*** and ***Output Information***. ***Input Information*** refers to the various methods the communication initiator or sender uses to send information to others, which include *voice, hand gestures, visual feedback, text, media, etc.*. On the other hand, ***Output Information*** refers to how the information sent is then received and presented to the receiver, which can be *visual, auditory, haptic, etc.*.

5.2 Properties

5.2.1 Temporal State

Synchronous tasks tend to rely on real-time interaction and problem-solving, active engagement, live feedback, communication, and coordination between individuals [78, 165, 188] (98% of tasks). Conversely, ***Asynchronous*** tasks allow the individuals partaking in it to work without synchronous and simultaneous engagement and presence, which potentially allows for more flexibility for completing tasks since individuals are able to actively work in their own time. [21, 60, 159] (5.4% of tasks). Many tasks can be performed both synchronously and asynchronously (e.g. working on a shared text document), which extends tasks efficiency, especially if a task that users cannot perform simultaneously at a particular moment can be completed in parallel at different times.

5.2.2 Dependency

If a participant's task success and completion depends on the output and or completion of another task or multiple others, we classify it as ***Dependent*** (54.7% of tasks) [73, 81, 92]. Such tasks tend to rely on synchronization, communication, and clear planning and coordination amongst individuals with the aim of reaching the expected goals without delays or increased wait times for the tasks that follow. On the other hand, other collaborative tasks can be achieved irrespective of other tasks without heavy reliance on the outcome or completion of other tasks, such tasks are classified as ***Independent*** (45.3% of tasks) [76, 80, 118], and they tend to afford more room for individual autonomy and contribution.

After reviewing our paper corpus, we discovered that many various papers whose tasks which were ***Dependent*** in nature also possessed the ***Synchronous*** property. As participants were interacting in real-time with each other, the overall task completion required various exchanges of outputs from other tasks.

5.2.3 Location

In terms of ***Physical Reality***, every individual exists in a discrete space in the real, physical world in which they perform any task; in that case, the task can either be conducted in an ***arbitrary physical location*** (e.g. at one's home) (95.9% of tasks) [26, 183, 186] or may require being in a ***specific location*** (e.g. a lab room or training facility) (4.1% of tasks) [12, 182]. Moreover, when individuals are collaborating, regardless of who is in a VR setting or not, the individual(s) can be either in the same physical area (60.1% of tasks) [2, 14] or at different physical locations (45.3% of tasks) [42, 74].

In contrast, for ***Virtual Reality***, if there are multiple individuals located and immersed in a VE where the collaborative task is occurring, if the entities partaking in the collaboration are located in the same VE, this qualified as ***co-located*** (49.3% of tasks) [46, 141]. However, in the case where those entities are placed in different VEs, or in the same VE but at different locations in it, in that case, the location is qualified as ***distanced*** [21, 85] (15.1% of tasks).

5.2.4 Requirements

In many cases, individuals may have to possess specific skills or abilities in order to complete certain tasks, else they may have difficulty or even the inability to complete the task. Thus, this is why we sought to classify such requirements based of if they are ***Physiological*** (47.3% of tasks) [177, 188] or ***Knowledge-Based*** (13.5% of tasks) [19, 115]. Physiological requirements can be associated heavily with natural and semi-natural locomotion techniques since individuals would have to perform some form of bodily movement to locomote; this means that they must have the physiological capability to do this.

5.2.5 Individual

Hierarchical Roles represent roles where specific knowledge or leadership initiatives are required such that having these roles promotes better collaborative guidance between individuals, better structure, and chain of command, which can ensure the provision of enough task guidance to others, clear accountability, and appropriate allocation of responsibilities (52% of tasks) [115, 121, 152]. On the other hand, ***Non-Hierarchical Roles*** consist of roles attributed to individuals such that they are not distinguishable by the amount of responsibility, authority, or power one has compared to others (62.2% of tasks) [63, 108, 177].

5.2.6 Environment

Objects in the environment have a certain level of detail, which especially depends on whether it is real or virtual and what kind of purpose it serves. By this logic, we classify objects as having a ***Fidelity*** that is either more ***realistic*** (43.9% of tasks) [123, 169] or more ***synthetic/virtual*** [47, 111] (100% of tasks), and also having an ***Activity Level*** related to the amount of interaction a specific object would undergo, with it either being ***static*** (100% of tasks) [135, 145], ***automated***, or ***interactive*** (84.5% of tasks) [162, 187] to some degree.

The environment where the task takes place exists on some part of the mixed reality spectrum, and the tasks involving multiple places may necessitate environments that belong to multiple parts of the mixed reality spectrum [58, 103]. For example, the task might require an environment place that is AR based only, and require another environment that is VR based. Thus, we classify the environment ***Type*** as being either ***Virtual*** (57.4% of tasks) [58, 76], ***Augmented*** (27% of tasks) [141, 175], ***Mixed*** (17.6% of tasks) [5, 158], or ***Real*** (22.3% of tasks) [11, 158].

It should be noted that for VE types, individuals would only be classified as virtually co-located or distanced if multiple individuals are in a VE. For example, if there is a task with one individual in VR and the other in AR, there would be no question of whether individuals are virtually co-located or distanced.

5.2.7 Structure

In a collaborative endeavor, some tasks can follow a certain structure whereas others can be executed without following a pre-defined or set structure. This dissimilarity in the type of structure of collaborative tasks brings about a classification of ***Ordered*** (62.2% of tasks) [49, 121] and ***Unordered*** (37.8% of tasks) [66, 68] tasks structures.

It is worth mentioning that collaborative tasks that possess the ***Ordered*** property may have their individual sub-tasks be ***Unordered***. This means that the sub-tasks can be completed in any order, but progressing through the order of the broader task requires that all of those are to be completed.

5.2.8 Intended Population

We classify the intended population in collaborative tasks as the group of people that the task is aimed toward, either ***General*** (83.1% of tasks) or ***Specific/Special*** (16.9% of tasks). If the task can be executed by any type of individual(s), then the intended population is general [107, 122]. On the other hand, if the task has specific requirements, for example, a task designed to help enhance learning in elementary school teaching, in that case, the intended population is specific and mainly relates to elementary school students and teachers [35, 48].

6 Discussion

While existing taxonomies within the collaborative space encompass the various environment types (***Virtual***, ***Augmented***, ***Mixed***, and ***Real***) individually, they do not consider categorizing them in a comprehensive manner. In our taxonomy, we made sure that we are able to provide classification for tasks under the whole mixed reality spectrum. Moreover, to ensure that we have made a valid classification system for any given human-to-human collaborative task, we focused on first defining the two larger aspects (*actions and properties*) for which we can create sub-nodes that can branch further in the specification.

One of the purposes served by utilizing the taxonomy is to highlight the clarity regarding the characterization of collaborative tasks. In addition, the proposed taxonomy provides a solid foundation to structure different elements in regard to conducting research within this space. Being able to dissect the different elements of a collaborative task, would help with clarity, foster future reproductions of the research conducted, and transfer novel discoveries. With collaborative tasks entailing high levels of contextual data and through different reality perspectives, it is imperative that there should be guidelines and metrics used to classify both the main task and its sub-components. Thus, the evaluation of collaborative task characteristics would be effectively facilitated through our taxonomy. We note that our proposed taxonomy is not meant to be definitive, but

Action ⇒ Environmental Engagement ⇒ Active ⇒ Manipulation	[1–3, 5, 7–12, 14–16, 20, 22–24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37–39, 41, 42, 44–49, 51–55, 57–59, 61, 62, 62, 64–68, 70, 74–76, 78–83, 85, 90, 92, 94, 96, 98, 99, 101, 104, 106, 108, 109, 111, 112, 115–118, 121–124, 131–134, 137, 139–143, 147–150, 153–159, 161, 162, 164–171, 173–176, 178, 179, 181–188, 190]
Action ⇒ Environmental Engagement ⇒ Active ⇒ Spawn	[11, 19, 24, 38, 42, 46, 48, 49, 60, 67, 68, 79, 83, 99, 109, 110, 112, 140, 143, 150, 156, 158, 159, 165, 168, 169, 182–185, 188, 190]
Action ⇒ Environmental Engagement ⇒ Active ⇒ Release	[1–3, 5, 7–12, 14–16, 20, 22–24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37–39, 41, 42, 44–49, 51–55, 57–59, 61, 62, 62, 64–68, 70, 74–76, 78–83, 85, 90, 92, 94, 96, 98, 99, 101, 104, 106, 108, 109, 111, 112, 115–118, 121–124, 131–134, 137, 139–143, 147–150, 153–159, 161, 162, 164–171, 173–176, 178, 179, 181–188, 190]
Action ⇒ Environmental Engagement ⇒ Active ⇒ Destroy	[11, 19, 24, 38, 42, 46, 48, 49, 60, 67, 69, 79, 83, 99, 109, 110, 112, 140, 143, 156, 158, 159, 165, 168, 169, 183–185, 188, 190]
Action ⇒ Environmental Engagement ⇒ Active ⇒ Distort	[14, 20, 29, 39, 46, 48, 52–54, 67, 82, 99, 115, 130, 152, 181, 188]
Action ⇒ Environmental Engagement ⇒ Active ⇒ Select	[1–3, 5, 7–12, 14–16, 20, 22–24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37–39, 41, 42, 44–49, 51–55, 57–59, 61, 62, 62, 64–68, 70, 74–76, 78–83, 85, 90, 92, 94, 96, 98, 99, 101, 104, 106, 108, 109, 111, 112, 115–118, 121–124, 131–134, 137, 139–143, 147–150, 153–159, 161, 162, 164–171, 173–176, 178, 179, 181–188, 190]
Action ⇒ Environmental Engagement ⇒ Passive ⇒ Environment Observation	[1–3, 5–12, 14–16, 19–24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37–39, 41, 42, 44–49, 51–62, 62–70, 72–76, 78–83, 85, 89–92, 94, 96, 98, 99, 101, 103, 104, 106–112, 115–118, 121–124, 130–135, 137, 139–143, 145, 147–150, 152–159, 161, 162, 164–171, 173–188, 190]
Action ⇒ Navigation ⇒ Locomotion ⇒ Natural	[2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 21–24, 26, 31, 38, 39, 41, 42, 46, 48, 52, 55, 56, 58, 60, 62, 62, 65, 70, 73–75, 80–83, 85, 89, 90, 92, 94, 101, 103, 104, 107–109, 115–117, 121–124, 130–132, 137, 139, 142, 143, 145, 153, 155–159, 161, 165–167, 169, 170, 174, 177–179, 182, 184–186, 190]
Action ⇒ Navigation ⇒ Locomotion ⇒ Semi-Natural	[38, 61, 70, 111, 150, 177]
Action ⇒ Navigation ⇒ Locomotion ⇒ Non-Natural	[12, 37, 38, 42, 83, 94, 122, 157, 177, 183]
Action ⇒ Communication ⇒ Input and Output	[1–3, 5–9, 11, 12, 14–16, 19–24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, 42, 44–49, 51–57, 59, 61, 62, 62–70, 72–76, 78–83, 85, 89–92, 94, 96, 98, 99, 101, 103, 106–112, 115–118, 121, 123, 124, 130–135, 139–143, 145, 147–150, 152–159, 161, 162, 164–171, 173–181, 183–188, 190]
Properties ⇒ Temporal ⇒ Synchronous	[1–3, 5–12, 14–16, 19–24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37–39, 41, 42, 44–49, 51–59, 61, 62, 62–70, 72–76, 78–83, 85, 89–92, 94, 96, 99, 101, 103, 104, 106–109, 111, 112, 115–118, 121–124, 130–135, 137, 139–143, 145, 147–150, 152–159, 161, 162, 164–171, 173, 174, 176–185, 185–188, 190]
Properties ⇒ Temporal ⇒ Asynchronous	[21, 39, 60, 98, 110, 159, 175, 182]
Properties ⇒ Dependency ⇒ Dependent	[1, 5–8, 12, 14–16, 20, 22, 23, 29, 31, 39, 41, 44–46, 48, 51, 52, 57, 59, 64–66, 70, 72, 73, 79, 81, 82, 89, 90, 92, 96, 99, 101, 104, 106, 107, 110, 112, 115, 117, 121, 123, 131–135, 137, 141–143, 147–150, 152–154, 158, 159, 161, 164, 165, 167, 169, 170, 173, 175, 176, 179, 181, 182, 184, 185, 188]
Properties ⇒ Dependency ⇒ Independent	[2, 3, 9–11, 19, 21, 24, 26, 27, 33, 35, 37, 38, 42, 47, 49, 53–56, 58, 60–62, 62, 63, 67–69, 74–76, 78, 80, 83, 85, 91, 94, 98, 103, 108, 109, 111, 116, 118, 122, 124, 130, 139, 140, 145, 155–157, 162, 166, 168, 171, 174, 177, 178, 180, 183, 186, 187, 190]
Properties ⇒ Location ⇒ Virtual Reality ⇒ Distanced	[21, 31, 33, 39, 42, 81, 82, 85, 89, 90, 98, 103, 110, 124, 139, 145, 150, 159, 175, 176]
Properties ⇒ Location ⇒ Virtual Reality ⇒ Co-Located	[2, 6–8, 10, 12, 15, 19, 22–24, 26, 27, 29, 37–39, 41, 45–47, 52–54, 56, 57, 62, 62–64, 66, 67, 69, 70, 72, 75, 76, 83, 92, 94, 96, 99, 101, 103, 104, 106, 107, 109, 111, 112, 115–117, 121, 122, 131–134, 137, 141, 147, 157, 161, 166, 167, 171, 177, 179, 183, 186, 187, 190]
Properties ⇒ Location ⇒ Physical Reality ⇒ Distanced	[1, 5, 9, 12, 16, 22, 23, 26, 33, 35, 39, 42, 44, 48, 49, 51, 57, 59, 62, 62, 65, 66, 68, 69, 72–76, 79–81, 85, 90, 92, 94, 98, 99, 103, 106, 110–112, 123, 124, 133–135, 143, 145, 147, 148, 150, 152, 153, 155–158, 162, 165, 169, 173, 182, 185–187]
Properties ⇒ Location ⇒ Physical Reality ⇒ Co-Located	[2, 3, 5–8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19–22, 24, 27, 29, 31, 37–39, 41, 45–47, 52–56, 58, 60–64, 67, 70, 78, 82, 83, 89, 91, 94, 96, 101, 103, 107–109, 115–118, 121, 122, 130–133, 137, 139–142, 149, 150, 154, 159, 161, 164, 166–168, 170, 171, 174–181, 183, 184, 187, 188, 190]
Properties ⇒ Location ⇒ Physical Reality ⇒ Arbitrary	[1–3, 5–11, 14–16, 19–24, 26, 27, 29, 33, 35, 37–39, 41, 42, 44–49, 51–59, 61, 62, 62–70, 72–76, 78–83, 85, 89–92, 94, 96, 98, 99, 101, 103, 104, 106, 108–112, 115–118, 121–124, 130–135, 137, 139–143, 145, 147–150, 152–159, 161, 162, 164–171, 173–175, 177–181, 183–188, 190]
Properties ⇒ Location ⇒ Physical Reality ⇒ Specific	[12, 31, 60, 107, 176, 182]
Properties ⇒ Requirements ⇒ Knowledge	[1, 12, 19, 22, 23, 35, 39, 48, 60, 63, 67, 82, 99, 106, 107, 115, 171, 175, 176, 188]
Properties ⇒ Requirements ⇒ Physiological	[2, 5, 9, 11, 12, 14, 19, 21, 24, 29, 33, 35, 38, 39, 41, 42, 47, 49, 58, 60, 62, 65, 69, 73, 75, 76, 79–81, 83, 85, 89, 101, 103, 106, 107, 109, 112, 116, 123, 124, 130–132, 140, 141, 143, 145, 150, 155–159, 161, 168, 169, 174, 175, 177–182, 184–186, 188, 190]
Properties ⇒ Individual ⇒ Role ⇒ Hierarchical	[1, 2, 5, 7, 9–12, 15, 19, 23, 26, 37, 41, 42, 44, 48, 49, 53, 54, 58, 59, 61, 62, 62, 65, 68, 73–75, 78–81, 89, 90, 94, 98, 101, 106–112, 115, 121, 123, 124, 134, 135, 139, 141, 143, 145, 148–150, 152–158, 161, 162, 164, 165, 167–169, 173, 178, 185, 188]
Properties ⇒ Individual ⇒ Role ⇒ Non-Hierarchical	[3, 3, 6, 8, 14, 16, 19–22, 24, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 38, 39, 41, 45–47, 51, 52, 52–57, 57, 60, 63, 64, 66, 67, 69, 69, 70, 72, 76, 82, 83, 85, 91, 92, 96, 99, 103, 104, 106–108, 111, 112, 115–117, 117, 118, 122, 130–133, 137, 140–142, 147, 153, 157, 159, 166, 167, 170, 170, 171, 174, 176, 177, 179, 180, 180–187, 190]
Properties ⇒ Environment ⇒ Objects ⇒ Fidelity ⇒ Realistic	[1, 5, 9, 11, 16, 19, 42, 44, 46, 48, 49, 55, 56, 58–60, 65, 68, 73–76, 78–82, 96, 98, 103, 107, 108, 110, 117, 118, 121–123, 130, 140–143, 145, 148, 152–156, 158, 159, 161, 165, 169–171, 173–175, 179, 182, 184, 185, 188]
Properties ⇒ Environment ⇒ Objects ⇒ Fidelity ⇒ Synthetic	[1–3, 5–12, 14–16, 19–24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37–39, 41, 42, 44–49, 51–62, 62–70, 72–76, 78–83, 85, 89–92, 94, 96, 98, 99, 101, 103, 104, 106–112, 115–118, 121–124, 130–135, 137, 139–143, 145, 147–150, 152–159, 161, 162, 164–171, 173–188, 190]
Properties ⇒ Environment ⇒ Objects ⇒ Activity Level ⇒ Static	[1–3, 5–12, 14–16, 19–24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37–39, 41, 42, 44–49, 51–62, 62–70, 72–76, 78–83, 85, 89–92, 94, 96, 98, 99, 101, 103, 104, 106–112, 115–118, 121–124, 130–135, 137, 139–143, 145, 147–150, 152–159, 161, 162, 164–171, 173–188, 190]
Properties ⇒ Environment ⇒ Objects ⇒ Activity Level ⇒ Interactive	[1–3, 5, 7–12, 14–16, 20, 22, 24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37–39, 41, 42, 44–49, 51–55, 58, 59, 61, 62, 62, 64–68, 70, 74–76, 78–83, 85, 90, 92, 94, 96, 98, 99, 101, 104, 106, 108, 109, 111, 112, 115, 116, 118, 121–124, 131–134, 137, 139–143, 147–150, 153–159, 161, 162, 164–171, 173–176, 178, 179, 181–188, 190]
Properties ⇒ Environment ⇒ Type ⇒ Virtual	[1, 2, 6–8, 10, 12, 15, 19, 21–24, 26, 27, 29, 35, 37–39, 41, 45, 47, 52–54, 56–58, 62, 62–64, 66, 67, 69, 70, 72, 76, 78, 82, 83, 85, 89–92, 94, 96, 99, 101, 103, 104, 106, 109, 111, 112, 116, 117, 124, 131, 132, 134, 137, 139, 145, 147, 149, 150, 154, 157, 159, 162, 164, 166, 167, 171, 176–179, 183, 186, 187, 190]
Properties ⇒ Environment ⇒ Type ⇒ Augmented	[1, 3, 14–16, 19, 49, 55, 56, 58–61, 65, 68, 73, 75, 80, 103, 107, 110, 118, 123, 140–143, 145, 148, 150, 152, 153, 165, 168, 170, 174, 175, 182, 184, 188]
Properties ⇒ Environment ⇒ Type ⇒ Mixed	[1, 5, 9, 11, 23, 42, 44, 48, 68, 74, 79, 81, 82, 121, 122, 154–156, 158, 159, 161, 169, 173, 174, 185, 185]
Properties ⇒ Environment ⇒ Type ⇒ Real	[1, 3, 5, 9, 11, 14–16, 37, 42, 61, 65, 68, 73, 74, 78, 79, 96, 103, 109, 123, 142, 143, 153, 154, 158, 168, 170, 174, 179, 182, 184, 185]
Properties ⇒ Structure ⇒ Ordered	[1, 5–9, 12, 15, 21–24, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37–39, 41, 42, 47, 49, 51–54, 56, 58–60, 63–65, 70, 72, 73, 75, 76, 79, 83, 85, 90, 92, 94, 96, 101, 103, 104, 106, 108–112, 116–118, 121–124, 131, 132, 137, 140, 142, 143, 145, 147, 149, 150, 153, 155–157, 159, 164, 166, 167, 169, 170, 176–179, 183, 185–187, 190]
Properties ⇒ Structure ⇒ Unordered	[2, 3, 10, 11, 14, 16, 19, 20, 26, 44–46, 48, 55, 57, 61, 62, 62, 66–69, 74, 78, 80–82, 89, 91, 98, 99, 115, 130, 133–135, 139, 141, 148, 152, 154, 158, 161, 162, 165, 168, 171, 173–175, 180–182, 184, 185, 188]
Properties ⇒ Intended Population ⇒ Specific/Special	[1, 2, 5, 6, 12, 16, 19, 22, 23, 31, 35, 39, 48, 53, 54, 67, 99, 115, 118, 130, 166, 176, 180, 181, 188]
Properties ⇒ Intended Population ⇒ General	[3, 7–11, 14, 15, 20, 21, 24, 26, 27, 29, 33, 37, 38, 41, 42, 44–47, 49, 51, 52, 55–62, 62–66, 68–70, 72–76, 78–83, 85, 89–92, 94, 96, 98, 101, 103, 104, 106–112, 116, 117, 121–124, 131–135, 137, 139–143, 145, 147–150, 152–159, 161, 162, 164, 165, 167–171, 173–175, 177–179, 182–187, 190]

Table 1: Full classification of collaborative tasks from our paper corpus under nodes of the taxonomy.

rather a milestone in the categorization efforts of collaborative tasks among all environment types and to fill in a gap in the literature in terms of the classification of collaborative tasks in the XR spectrum. Further elaboration, expansion, and refining by the community are welcomed in order to take full advantage of what we have proposed.

Our taxonomy can still benefit from being developed based on collaborative tasks using interactive XR that can be obtained through marketed apps and other non-scholarly sources. Furthermore, we emphasize that our goal in this work was to provide a meaningful, valuable, and comprehensive assessment and structure to better understand the field of human-centered XR collaborative tasks. Thus, the core insights and relations established through our taxonomy remain insightful and valuable as a representation of what is established in the field even if potential minor variations to the taxonomy can emerge if dissimilar assessment criteria are used.

In order to use the taxonomy provided, the main step that must be followed is to remember that every arbitrary task that is to be classified under the taxonomy will always have actions and properties, so tasks will always possess attributes from subnodes of both actions and properties. After considering this step, classification is a matter of asking the question of if the task qualifies of possessing the attribute of the subnode in question. This is demonstrated in Table 1, which shows the classifications of papers into most nodes on the taxonomy itself.

6.1 Limitations and Future Work

This taxonomy focused solely on human-to-human collaboration, without considering other entities such as machines or animals. Consequently, future research should consider incorporating such entities in future classifications of collaborative tasks. Another type of classification that is worth mentioning for the future is that of the types of systems or software/hardware that tasks require, which might reduce some ambiguity in terms of the types of technologies that an arbitrary task would normally require (e.g. if the task was AR-based, it may use either a head-mounted display or a smartphone, or even be applicable to both). Additionally, to maximize the usage and value of our taxonomy to the research community, we plan to evaluate uncommon features of collaborative task properties, for example, graphics dependency, the degree/possibility of the task being executed by individuals outside the specified population for the task, and the possibility of the task to be executed across different devices/XR technologies, and so on.

It is also worth mentioning that the initial collection of research papers required using a different set of keywords by our authors for optimized results, and we suspect that if new combinations of keywords were used, different results could have been obtained. Thus, keyword selection in order to conduct literature reviews is of essential matter for future investigations to reduce initial biases even if minimal, and future investigations could consider producing standards for keyword selection.

Furthermore, classifications for automated objects and indirect manipulation were not displayed in Table 1 as these attributes existed subtly in many papers and were ambiguously talked about; therefore, it was difficult to pinpoint an exact number of papers that existed for these classifications and thus they were excluded. Classifications for shared and different environments were also excluded from the table as they are inferred by co-location either virtually or physically.

It should also be noted that there is some degree of subjectivity to how every individual would classify a task for some nodes on the taxonomy, and as such there would be instances of disagreeability for some classifications among individuals.

6.2 Under-Researched Areas

Important advancements were made in collaborative XR. However, there are research directions in this field that could use more attention based on our observations while synthesizing task information for the constructed taxonomy from the paper corpus we went through, which could improve the overall quality of XR collaboration.

6.2.1 Asynchronous Tasks

As described before, tasks can either be classified as synchronous or asynchronous, or even both. However, most tasks observed were synchronous, with only 5.4% of all papers being partially or fully asynchronous. Asynchronous tasks can be particularly useful in scenarios where individuals have difficulty in working simultaneously e.g. being in different time zones or having to work on a separate subtask. Asynchronous capabilities would provide solutions to these cases, with work being done in this area helping to identify which practices would best improve XR collaboration overall.

6.2.2 Navigation

Navigation is a primitive action that any individual undertakes in numerous tasks, with over 50% of all tasks encountered in the corpus having some sort of navigation. Even though navigation widely exists in collaborative scenarios, not much research has been conducted to investigate the use of navigation in these tasks, especially locomotion techniques, as only 2 of the papers in our corpus directly investigated navigation techniques. Expansion on the use of various navigation techniques, especially natural ones, in these scenarios would be useful as they would allow people to navigate with more ease, especially with the arbitrary nature that a task may be of.

6.2.3 Communication Output

Communication is the method of transferring information between entities, and humans can receive that information through multiple senses; sight, hearing, touch, taste, and smell. While visual and auditory output channels of information reception are very common for receiving information in XR collaboration and have been researched extensively, other methods (haptic, olfactory, gustatory) are not as common; few papers used haptics to deliver information to individuals, and only one paper investigated the use of a gustatory interface for communication, but as an input method. These lesser-used methods of communication output have the potential to provide information to individuals in a subtle and even natural way in addition to the more commonly used senses, which can increase the collaborative capabilities of individuals.

7 Conclusion

Through this work, we created a taxonomy of collaborative tasks in the realm of XR technologies. Our taxonomy serves as an illustration of the main components of collaborative tasks based on the actions taken when performing the task, and the properties of each task. The taxonomy we present is the outcome of a thorough literature review, classification, and thematic analysis of the research work on XR collaboration. Our dataset of papers analyzed was gathered from principal research venues, while not necessarily complete, it has permitted us to expand beyond what is already known about collaborative tasks by producing a comprehensive collaboration taxonomy across the mixed reality spectrum.

We hope that our research work will contribute to advancing research efforts on the intersection of collaboration and interactive technologies. Our taxonomy can be extended to future investigations, and additional classifications and strategies could be extracted based on our methodology and later be applied to different datasets, or after adding newer papers to our existing dataset, or even to uncover and reach other goals expected from collaboration.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported in part by NSF Award IIS-1917728, Northrop Grumman., Unknot.id, and the Florida High Tech Corridor Council Industry Matching Research Program. We also thank the anonymous reviewers for their insightful feedback and the ISUE lab members for their support.

REFERENCES

[1] T. Alexander, A. Ripkens, M. Westhoven, M. Kleiber, and C. Pfendler. Virtual tele-cooperation: applying ar and vr for cooperative tele-maintenance and advanced distance learning. In *Advances in Human Factors in Training, Education, and Learning Sciences: Proceedings of the AHFE 2017 International Conference on Human Factors in Training, Education, and Learning Sciences, July 17-21, 2017, The Westin Bonaventure Hotel, Los Angeles, California, USA 8*, pp. 234–244. Springer, 2018.

[2] A. Z. Amat, M. Breen, S. Hunt, D. Wilson, Y. Khaliq, N. Byrnes, D. J. Cox, S. Czarnecki, C. L. Justice, D. A. Kennedy, T. C. Lotivio, H. K. McGee, D. M. Reckers, J. W. Wade, M. Sarkar, and N. Sarkar. Collaborative virtual environment to encourage teamwork in autistic adults in workplace settings. In M. Antona and C. Stephanidis, eds., *Universal Access in Human-Computer Interaction. Design Methods and User Experience*, pp. 339–348. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2021.

[3] M. Andel, A. Petrovski, A. Henrysson, and M. Ollila. Interactive collaborative scene assembly using ar on mobile phones. In *Advances in Artificial Reality and Tele-Existence: 16th International Conference on Artificial Reality and Telexistence, ICAT 2006, Hangzhou, China, November 29-December 1, 2006. Proceedings*, pp. 1008–1017. Springer, 2006.

[4] J. Annett. Hierarchical task analysis. *Handbook of cognitive task design*, 2:17–35, 2003.

[5] Y. Ao, M. Kanbara, Y. Fujimoto, and H. Kato. Mr system to promote social participation of people who have difficulty going out. In *Human Aspects of IT for the Aged Population. Supporting Everyday Life Activities: 7th International Conference, ITAP 2021, Held as Part of the 23rd HCI International Conference, HCII 2021, Virtual Event, July 24–29, 2021, Proceedings, Part II*, pp. 383–402. Springer, 2021.

[6] D. Ardal, S. Alexandersson, M. Lempert, and A. T. Abelho Pereira. A collaborative previsualization tool for filmmaking in virtual reality. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM SIGGRAPH European Conference on Visual Media Production*, pp. 1–10, 2019.

[7] P. Arnold, R. A. Khot, and F. Mueller. " you better eat to survive" exploring cooperative eating in virtual reality games. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference on Tangible, Embedded, and Embodied Interaction*, pp. 398–408, 2018.

[8] J. Auda, L. Busse, K. Pfeuffer, U. Gruenefeld, R. Rivu, F. Alt, and S. Schneegass. I'm in control! transferring object ownership between remote users with haptic props in virtual reality. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Symposium on Spatial User Interaction*, pp. 1–10, 2021.

[9] H. Bai, P. Sasikumar, J. Yang, and M. Billinghurst. A user study on mixed reality remote collaboration with eye gaze and hand gesture sharing. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, CHI '20, p. 1–13. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2020. doi: 10.1145/3313831.3376550

[10] J. N. Bailenson and N. Yee. Virtual interpersonal touch: Haptic interaction and copresence in collaborative virtual environments. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, 37:5–14, 2008.

[11] Y. Bannai, H. Tamaki, Y. Suzuki, H. Shigeno, and K. Okada. A tangible user interface for remote collaboration system using mixed reality. In *Advances in Artificial Reality and Tele-Existence: 16th International Conference on Artificial Reality and Telexistence, ICAT 2006, Hangzhou, China, November 29-December 1, 2006. Proceedings*, pp. 143–154. Springer, 2006.

[12] H. Bannister, B. Selwyn-Smith, C. Anslow, B. Robinson, P. Kane, and A. Leong. Collaborative vr simulation for radiation therapy education. In *Digital Anatomy: Applications of Virtual, Mixed and Augmented Reality*, pp. 199–221. Springer, 2021.

[13] M. Billinghurst and H. Kato. Collaborative mixed reality. In *Proceedings of the first international symposium on mixed reality*, pp. 261–284, 1999.

[14] M. Billinghurst, H. Kato, K. Kiyokawa, D. Belcher, and I. Poupyrev. Experiments with face-to-face collaborative ar interfaces. *Virtual Reality*, 6:107–121, 2002.

[15] M. Billinghurst, S. Weghorst, and T. Furness. Shared space: An augmented reality approach for computer supported collaborative work. *Virtual Reality*, 3:25–36, 1998.

[16] P. Boonbrahm, C. Kaewrat, and S. Boonbrahm. Interactive augmented reality: a new approach for collaborative learning. In *Learning and Collaboration Technologies: Third International Conference, LCT 2016, Held as Part of HCI International 2016, Toronto, ON, Canada, July 17-22, 2016, Proceedings 3*, pp. 115–124. Springer, 2016.

[17] D. A. Bowman, D. B. Johnson, and L. F. Hodges. Testbed evaluation of virtual environment interaction techniques. In *Proceedings of the ACM symposium on Virtual reality software and technology*, pp. 26–33, 1999.

[18] S. Buchanan, J. Bott, and J. J. LaViola. The influence of multi-touch interaction on procedural training. In *Proceedings of the 2015 International Conference on Interactive Tabletops Surfaces*, ITS '15, p. 5–14. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2015. doi: 10.1145/2817721.2817740

[19] S. Butscher, S. Hubenschmid, J. Müller, J. Fuchs, and H. Reiterer. Clusters, trends, and outliers: How immersive technologies can facilitate the collaborative analysis of multidimensional data. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*, pp. 1–12, 2018.

[20] L. Chen, H.-N. Liang, F. Lu, K. Papangelis, K. L. Man, and Y. Yue. Collaborative behavior, performance and engagement with visual analytics tasks using mobile devices. *Human-centric Computing and Information Sciences*, 10(1):1–24, 2020.

[21] K. Chow, C. Coyiuto, C. Nguyen, and D. Yoon. Challenges and design considerations for multimodal asynchronous collaboration in vr. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.*, 3(CSCW), 11 2019. doi: 10.1145/3359142

[22] C. R. Da Silva and A. A. B. Garcia. A collaborative working environment for small group meetings in second life. *SpringerPlus*, 2(1):281, 2013.

[23] L. M. Daling, S. Khoadei, D. Kalkofen, S. Thurner, J. Sieger, T. Shepel, A. Abdelrazeq, M. Ebner, M. Ebner, and I. Isenhardt. Evaluation of mixed reality technologies in remote teaching. In *Learning and Collaboration Technologies. Novel Technological Environments: 9th International Conference, LCT 2022, Held as Part of the 24th HCI International Conference, HCII 2022, Virtual Event, June 26–July 1, 2022, Proceedings, Part II*, pp. 24–37. Springer, 2022.

[24] A. Dey, T. Piumsomboon, Y. Lee, and M. Billinghurst. Effects of sharing physiological states of players in a collaborative virtual reality gameplay. In *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, CHI '17, p. 4045–4056. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2017. doi: 10.1145/3025453.3026028

[25] P. Dillenbourg. What do you mean by collaborative learning?, 1999.

[26] T. Drey, P. Albus, S. der Kinderen, M. Milo, T. Segschneider, L. Chanzab, M. Rietzler, T. Seufert, and E. Rukzio. Towards collaborative learning in virtual reality: A comparison of co-located symmetric and asymmetric pair-learning. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, CHI '22. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2022. doi: 10.1145/3491102.3517641

[27] C. Elvezio, F. Ling, J.-S. Liu, and S. Feiner. Collaborative virtual reality for low-latency interaction. In *Adjunct Proceedings of the 31st Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, pp. 179–181, 2018.

[28] F. Fagerholm, M. Felderer, D. Fucci, M. Unterkalmsteiner, B. Marculescu, M. Martini, L. G. W. Tengberg, R. Feldt, B. Lehtelä, B. Nagyváradi, and J. Khattak. Cognition in software engineering: A taxonomy and survey of a half-century of research. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 54(11s), 9 2022. doi: 10.1145/3508359

[29] J. Fan, L. Beuscher, P. Newhouse, L. C. Mion, and N. Sarkar. A collaborative virtual game to support activity and social engagement for older adults. In *Universal Access in Human-Computer Interaction. Methods, Technologies, and Users: 12th International Conference, UAHCI 2018, Held as Part of HCI International 2018, Las Vegas, NV, USA, July 15-20, 2018, Proceedings, Part I 12*, pp. 192–204. Springer, 2018.

[30] Å. Fast-Berglund, L. Gong, and D. Li. Testing and validating extended

reality (xr) technologies in manufacturing. *Procedia Manufacturing*, 25:31–38, 2018.

[31] S. Felemban, M. Gardner, V. Callaghan, and A. Pena-Rios. Towards observing and assessing collaborative learning activities in immersive environments. In *Immersive Learning Research Network: Third International Conference, iLRN 2017, Coimbra, Portugal, June 26–29, 2017. Proceedings 3*, pp. 47–59. Springer, 2017.

[32] H. S. Ferdous, T. Hoang, Z. Joukhadar, M. N. Reinoso, F. Vetere, D. Kelly, and L. Remedios. " what's happening at that hip?" evaluating an on-body projection based augmented reality system for physiotherapy classroom. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 1–12, 2019.

[33] L. Fermoselle, S. Gunkel, F. t. ter Haar, S. Dijkstra-Soudarissanane, A. Toet, O. Niamut, and N. v. van der Stap. Let's get in touch! adding haptics to social vr. In *ACM International Conference on Interactive Media Experiences*, pp. 174–179, 2020.

[34] C. G. Fidalgo, Y. Yan, H. Cho, M. Sousa, D. Lindlbauer, and J. Jorge. A survey on remote assistance and training in mixed reality environments. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 29(5):2291–2303, 2023.

[35] C. Fleury, T. Duval, V. Gouranton, and A. Steed. Evaluation of remote collaborative manipulation for scientific data analysis. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Symposium on Virtual Reality Software and Technology*, VRST '12, p. 129–136. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2012. doi: 10.1145/2407336.2407361

[36] F. J. Fowler Jr. *Survey research methods*. Sage publications, 2013.

[37] J. P. Freiwald, L. Diedrichsen, A. Baur, O. Manka, P. B. Jorshery, and F. Steinicke. Conveying perspective in multi-user virtual reality collaborations. In *Proceedings of Mensch Und Computer 2020*, MuC '20, p. 137–144. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2020. doi: 10.1145/3404983.3405521

[38] J. P. Freiwald, J. Schenke, N. Lehmann-Willenbrock, and F. Steinicke. Effects of avatar appearance and locomotion on co-presence in virtual reality collaborations. In *Proceedings of Mensch Und Computer 2021*, MuC '21, p. 393–401. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2021. doi: 10.1145/3473856.3473870

[39] H. Fujiwara, T. Kano, and T. Akakura. Development of collaborative chemistry experiment environment using vr. In *Human Interface and the Management of Information. Information-Rich and Intelligent Environments: Thematic Area, HIMI 2021, Held as Part of the 23rd HCI International Conference, HCII 2021, Virtual Event, July 24–29, 2021, Proceedings, Part II*, pp. 14–26. Springer, 2021.

[40] J. L. Gabbard, D. Hix, and J. E. Swan. User-centered design and evaluation of virtual environments. *IEEE computer Graphics and Applications*, 19(6):51–59, 1999.

[41] G. Gamelin, A. Chellali, S. Cheikh, A. Ricca, C. Dumas, and S. Otmane. Point-cloud avatars to improve spatial communication in immersive collaborative virtual environments. *Personal and Ubiquitous Computing*, 25:467–484, 2021.

[42] L. Gao, H. Bai, M. Billinghurst, and R. W. Lindeman. User behaviour analysis of mixed reality remote collaboration with a hybrid view interface. In *Proceedings of the 32nd Australian Conference on Human-Computer Interaction*, OzCHI '20, p. 629–638. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2021. doi: 10.1145/3441000.3441038

[43] L. Gao, H. Bai, G. Lee, and M. Billinghurst. An oriented point-cloud view for mr remote collaboration. In *SIGGRAPH ASIA 2016 Mobile Graphics and Interactive Applications*, SA '16. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2016. doi: 10.1145/2999508.2999531

[44] L. Gao, H. Bai, G. Lee, and M. Billinghurst. An oriented point-cloud view for mr remote collaboration. In *SIGGRAPH ASIA 2016 Mobile Graphics and Interactive Applications*, pp. 1–4. 2016.

[45] A. S. García, D. Martínez, J. P. Molina, and P. González. Collaborative virtual environments: you can't do it alone, can you? In *Virtual Reality: Second International Conference, ICVR 2007, Held as part of HCI International 2007, Beijing, China, July 22-27, 2007. Proceedings 2*, pp. 224–233. Springer, 2007.

[46] A. S. García, D. Martínez, J. P. Molina, and P. González. Creation and evaluation of a virtual and collaborative playground. *Engineering the User Interface: From Research to Practice*, pp. 1–16, 2009.

[47] A. S. García, J. P. Molina, P. González, D. Martínez, and J. Martínez. An experimental study of collaborative interaction tasks supported by awareness and multimodal feedback. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Virtual Reality Continuum and its Applications in Industry*, pp. 77–82, 2009.

[48] D. Gasques, J. G. Johnson, T. Sharkey, Y. Feng, R. Wang, Z. R. Xu, E. Zavala, Y. Zhang, W. Xie, X. Zhang, K. Davis, M. Yip, and N. Weibel. Artemis: A collaborative mixed-reality system for immersive surgical telementoring. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, CHI '21. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2021. doi: 10.1145/3411764.3445576

[49] S. Gauglitz, B. Nuernberger, M. Turk, and T. Höllerer. World-stabilized annotations and virtual scene navigation for remote collaboration. In *Proceedings of the 27th annual ACM symposium on User interface software and technology*, pp. 449–459, 2014.

[50] N. Gavish, T. Gutiérrez, S. Webel, J. Rodríguez, M. Peveri, U. Bockholt, and F. Tecchia. Evaluating virtual reality and augmented reality training for industrial maintenance and assembly tasks. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 23(6):778–798, 2015.

[51] E. Giannopoulos, V. Eslava, M. Oyarzabal, T. Hierro, L. González, M. Ferre, and M. Slater. The effect of haptic feedback on basic social interaction within shared virtual environments. In *Haptics: Perception, Devices and Scenarios: 6th International Conference, EuroHaptics 2008 Madrid, Spain, June 10-13, 2008 Proceedings 6*, pp. 301–307. Springer, 2008.

[52] A. Girard, Y. Bellik, M. Auvray, and M. Ammi. Visuo-haptic tool for collaborative adjustment of selections. In *Haptic and Audio Interaction Design: 8th International Workshop, HAID 2013, Daejeon, Korea, April 18-19, 2013, Revised Selected Papers 8*, pp. 40–49. Springer, 2013.

[53] G. Goebbels and V. Lalioti. Co-presence and co-working in distributed collaborative virtual environments. In *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Computer Graphics, Virtual Reality and Visualisation*, AFRIGRAPH '01, p. 109–114. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2001. doi: 10.1145/513867.513891

[54] G. Goebbels, V. Lalioti, and M. Göbel. Design and evaluation of team work in distributed collaborative virtual environments. In *Proceedings of the ACM symposium on Virtual reality software and technology*, pp. 231–238, 2003.

[55] J. G. Grandi, H. G. Debarba, I. Bemdt, L. Nedel, and A. Maciel. Design and assessment of a collaborative 3d interaction technique for handheld augmented reality. In *2018 IEEE Conference on Virtual Reality and 3D User Interfaces (VR)*, pp. 49–56. IEEE, 2018.

[56] R. Grasset, P. Lamb, and M. Billinghurst. Evaluation of mixed-space collaboration. In *Proceedings of the 4th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Mixed and Augmented Reality*, ISMAR '05, p. 90–99. IEEE Computer Society, USA, 2005. doi: 10.1109/ISMAR.2005.30

[57] C. Gunn. Collaborative virtual sculpting with haptic feedback. *Virtual Reality*, 10(2):73–83, 2006.

[58] E. Gusai, C. Bassano, F. Solari, and M. Chessa. Interaction in an immersive collaborative virtual reality environment: A comparison between leap motion and htc controllers. In *New Trends in Image Analysis and Processing–ICIAP 2017: ICIAP International Workshops, WBICV, SSPandBE, 3AS, RGBD, NIVAR, IWBAAS, and MADiMa 2017, Catania, Italy, September 11-15, 2017, Revised Selected Papers 19*, pp. 290–300. Springer, 2017.

[59] J. D. Hart, T. Piumsomboon, L. Lawrence, G. A. Lee, R. T. Smith, and M. Billinghurst. Emotion sharing and augmentation in cooperative virtual reality games. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Annual Symposium on Computer-Human Interaction in Play Companion Extended Abstracts*, pp. 453–460, 2018.

[60] W. He, B. Swift, H. Gardner, M. Xi, and M. Adcock. Reducing latency in a collaborative augmented reality service. In *The 17th International Conference on Virtual-Reality Continuum and its Applications in Industry*, pp. 1–9, 2019.

[61] G. Herrera-Arcos and D. Pimentel. Mediated interdependence in motion: A co-op augmented reality (ar) and brain–computer interface

(bci) installation. *Mobile Brain-Body Imaging and the Neuroscience of Art, Innovation and Creativity*, pp. 189–194, 2019.

[62] A. H. Hoppe, R. Reeb, F. van de Camp, and R. Stiefelhagen. Interaction of distant and local users in a collaborative virtual environment. In *Virtual, Augmented and Mixed Reality: Interaction, Navigation, Visualization, Embodiment, and Simulation: 10th International Conference, VAMR 2018, Held as Part of HCI International 2018, Las Vegas, NV, USA, July 15-20, 2018, Proceedings, Part I 10*, pp. 328–337. Springer, 2018.

[63] A. H. Hoppe, F. van de Camp, and R. Stiefelhagen. Personal perspective: Using modified world views to overcome real-life limitations in virtual reality. In *2018 IEEE Conference on Virtual Reality and 3D User Interfaces (VR)*, pp. 577–578. IEEE, 2018.

[64] A. H. Hoppe, F. van de Camp, and R. Stiefelhagen. Shisha: Enabling shared perspective with face-to-face collaboration using redirected avatars in virtual reality. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.*, 4(CSCW3), jan 2021. doi: 10.1145/3432950

[65] A. H. Hoppe, K. Westerkamp, S. Maier, F. van de Camp, and R. Stiefelhagen. Multi-user collaboration on complex data in virtual and augmented reality. In *HCI International 2018–Posters' Extended Abstracts: 20th International Conference, HCI International 2018, Las Vegas, NV, USA, July 15-20, 2018, Proceedings, Part II 20*, pp. 258–265. Springer, 2018.

[66] H. Hrimech and F. Merienne. Interaction and evaluation tools for collaborative virtual environment. *International Journal on Interactive Design and Manufacturing (IJIDeM)*, 4:149–156, 2010.

[67] H. Huang, C. Lin, and D. Cai. Enhancing the learning effect of virtual reality 3d modeling: a new model of learner's design collaboration and a comparison of its field system usability. *Universal Access in the Information Society*, 20:429–440, 2021.

[68] W. Huang, L. Alem, F. Tecchia, and H. B.-L. Duh. Augmented 3d hands: a gesture-based mixed reality system for distributed collaboration. *Journal on Multimodal User Interfaces*, 12:77–89, 2018.

[69] W.-Y. Hwang, K. Wattanachote, T. K. Shih, S.-C. Yeh, and S.-Y. Zhan. Preliminary investigation of interactive behaviors in distant collaborative exergame. In *Advances in Web-Based Learning–ICWL 2013 Workshops: USL 2013, IWSLL 2013, KMEL 2013, IWCWL 2013, WIL 2013, and IWEEC 2013, Kenting, Taiwan, October 6-9, 2013, Revised Selected Papers 12*, pp. 213–222. Springer, 2015.

[70] R. L. Jackson and E. Fagan. Collaboration and learning within immersive virtual reality. In *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Collaborative Virtual Environments*, CVE '00, p. 83–92. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2000. doi: 10.1145/351006.351018

[71] R. L. Jackson, W. Taylor, and W. Winn. Peer collaboration and virtual environments: A preliminary investigation of multi-participant virtual reality applied in science education. In *Proceedings of the 1999 ACM symposium on Applied computing*, pp. 121–125, 1999.

[72] T. F. Ji, B. Cochran, and Y. Zhao. Vrbubble: Enhancing peripheral awareness of avatars for people with visual impairments in social virtual reality. In *Proceedings of the 24th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*, pp. 1–17, 2022.

[73] P. Kallioniemi, T. Heimonen, M. Turunen, J. Hakulinen, T. Keskinen, L. Pihkala-Posti, J. Okkonen, and R. Raisamo. Collaborative navigation in virtual worlds: how gender and game experience influence user behavior. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM Symposium on Virtual Reality Software and Technology*, pp. 173–182, 2015.

[74] J. Kangas, A. Sand, T. Jokela, P. Piippo, P. Eskolin, M. Salmimaa, and R. Raisamo. Remote expert for assistance in a physical operational task. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 1–6, 2018.

[75] S. Kasahara and J. Rekimoto. Jackin head: Immersive visual telepresence system with omnidirectional wearable camera for remote collaboration. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM Symposium on Virtual Reality Software and Technology*, VRST '15, p. 217–225. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2015. doi: 10.1145/2821592.2821608

[76] R. Khadka, J. Money, and A. Banic. Support collaboration across geographically distributed users using heterogeneous virtual reality systems. In *HCI International 2018–Posters' Extended Abstracts: 20th International Conference, HCI International 2018, Las Vegas, NV, USA, July 15-20, 2018, Proceedings, Part II 20*, pp. 280–288. Springer, 2018.

[77] S. Kim, M. Billinghurst, and K. Kim. Multimodal interfaces and communication cues for remote collaboration, 2020.

[78] S. Kim, A. Jing, H. Park, G. A. Lee, W. Huang, and M. Billinghurst. Hand-in-air (hia) and hand-on-target (hot) style gesture cues for mixed reality collaboration. *IEEE Access*, 8:224145–224161, 2020.

[79] S. Kim, G. Lee, M. Billinghurst, and W. Huang. The combination of visual communication cues in mixed reality remote collaboration. *Journal on Multimodal User Interfaces*, 14:321–335, 2020.

[80] S. Kim and J. Park. Collaborative haptic exploration of dynamic remote environments. *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications*, 38(5):84–99, 2018.

[81] J. Kolkmeier, E. Harmsen, S. Giesselink, D. Reidsma, M. Theune, and D. Heylen. With a little help from a holographic friend: The openimpress mixed reality telepresence toolkit for remote collaboration systems. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM Symposium on Virtual Reality Software and Technology*, pp. 1–11, 2018.

[82] R. Komiyama, T. Miyaki, and J. Rekimoto. Jackin space: designing a seamless transition between first and third person view for effective telepresence collaborations. In *Proceedings of the 8th Augmented Human International Conference*, pp. 1–9, 2017.

[83] J. Lacoche, N. Pallamin, T. Boggini, and J. Royan. Collaborators awareness for user cohabitation in co-located collaborative virtual environments. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM Symposium on Virtual Reality Software and Technology*, VRST '17. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2017. doi: 10.1145/3139131.3139142

[84] P. Ladwig and C. Geiger. A literature review on collaboration in mixed reality. In *International Conference on Remote Engineering and Virtual Instrumentation*, pp. 591–600. Springer, 2018.

[85] W. S. Lages, M. Nabiyouni, and L. Arantes. Krinkle cube: A collaborative vr game using natural interaction. In *Proceedings of the 2016 annual symposium on computer-human interaction in play companion extended abstracts*, pp. 189–196, 2016.

[86] E. R. Lai. Collaboration: A literature review. *Pearson Publisher. Retrieved November*, 11:2016, 2011.

[87] J. J. LaViola Jr, E. Kruijff, R. P. McMahan, D. Bowman, and I. P. Poupyrev. *3D user interfaces: theory and practice*. Addison-Wesley Professional, 2017.

[88] Y. Lee and B. Yoo. Xr collaboration beyond virtual reality: Work in the real world. *Journal of Computational Design and Engineering*, 8(2):756–772, 2021.

[89] B. Li, R. Lou, J. Posselt, F. Segonds, F. Merienne, and A. Kemeny. Multi-view vr system for co-located multidisciplinary collaboration and its application in ergonomic design. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM Symposium on Virtual Reality Software and Technology*, VRST '17. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2017. doi: 10.1145/3139131.3141210

[90] Z. Li, T. Teo, L. Chan, G. Lee, M. Adcock, M. Billinghurst, and H. Koike. Omniglobevr: A collaborative 360-degree communication system for vr. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference*, DIS '20, p. 615–625. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2020. doi: 10.1145/3357236.3395429

[91] F. Liu, L. Chen, and G. Chen. Collaboration upon heterogeneous platforms-from desktop pc to handheld device. In *2006 10th International Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work in Design*, pp. 1–6. IEEE, 2006.

[92] L. Liu and A. Kaplan. No longer alone: finding common ground in collaborative virtual environments. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Symposium on Applied Computing*, pp. 240–246, 2018.

[93] M. D. Lytras, E. Damiani, and H. Mathkour. Virtual reality in learning, collaboration and behaviour: content, systems, strategies, context designs, 2016.

[94] K. Marky, F. Müller, M. Funk, A. Geiß, S. Günther, M. Schmitz, J. Riemann, and M. Mühlhäuser. Teachyverse: Collaborative e-learning in virtual reality lecture halls. In *Proceedings of Mensch Und Computer 2019*, MuC'19, p. 831–834. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2019. doi: 10.1145/3340764.3344917

[95] B. Marques, S. Silva, J. Alves, T. Araújo, P. Dias, and B. S. Santos. A conceptual model and taxonomy for collaborative augmented reality. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 28(12):5113–5133, 2022. doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2021.3101545

[96] S. Martikainen, V. Wikström, M. Falcon, and K. Saarikivi. Collaboration face-to-face and in virtual reality - empathy, social closeness, and task load. In *Conference Companion Publication of the 2019 on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*, CSCW '19, p. 299–303. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2019. doi: 10.1145/3311957.3359468

[97] P. W. Mattessich and B. R. Monsey. *Collaboration: what makes it work. A review of research literature on factors influencing successful collaboration.* ERIC, 1992.

[98] A. Mayer, T. Combe, J.-R. Chardonnet, and J. Ovtcharova. Asynchronous manual work in mixed reality remote collaboration. In *Extended Reality: First International Conference, XR Salento 2022, Lecce, Italy, July 6–8, 2022, Proceedings, Part II*, pp. 17–33. Springer, 2022.

[99] Y. Mei, J. Li, H. De Ridder, and P. Cesar. Cakevr: A social virtual reality (vr) tool for co-designing cakes. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 1–14, 2021.

[100] P. Milgram and F. Kishino. A taxonomy of mixed reality visual displays. *IEICE TRANSACTIONS on Information and Systems*, 77(12):1321–1329, 1994.

[101] B. Moharana, C. Keighrey, D. Scott, and N. Murray. Subjective evaluation of group user qoe in collaborative virtual environment (cve). In *Proceedings of the 14th International Workshop on Immersive Mixed and Virtual Environment Systems*, pp. 23–29, 2022.

[102] D. Moher, A. Liberati, J. Tetzlaff, and D. G. Altman. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The prisma statement. *International Journal of Surgery*, 8(5):336–341, 2010. doi: 10.1016/j.ijsu.2010.02.007

[103] J. Müller, J. Zagermann, J. Wieland, U. Pfeil, and H. Reiterer. A qualitative comparison between augmented and virtual reality collaboration with handheld devices. In *Proceedings of Mensch Und Computer 2019*, MuC'19, p. 399–410. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2019. doi: 10.1145/3340764.3340773

[104] S. L. Müller, S. Stiehm, S. Jeschke, and A. Richert. Subjective stress in hybrid collaboration. In *Social Robotics: 9th International Conference, ICSR 2017, Tsukuba, Japan, November 22-24, 2017, Proceedings 9*, pp. 597–606. Springer, 2017.

[105] H. Nguyen and T. Bednarz. User experience in collaborative extended reality: overview study. In *Virtual Reality and Augmented Reality: 17th EuroVR International Conference, EuroVR 2020, Valencia, Spain, November 25–27, 2020, Proceedings 17*, pp. 41–70. Springer, 2020.

[106] H. Nguyen, C. Pontonnier, S. Hilt, T. Duval, and G. Dumont. Vr-based operating modes and metaphors for collaborative ergonomic design of industrial workstations. *Journal on Multimodal User Interfaces*, 11:97–111, 2017.

[107] S. Nilsson, B. J. Johansson, and A. Jönsson. A co-located collaborative augmented reality application. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Virtual Reality Continuum and Its Applications in Industry*, pp. 179–184, 2009.

[108] E. Noohi and M. Zefran. Quantitative measures of cooperation for a dyadic physical interaction task. In *2014 IEEE-RAS International Conference on Humanoid Robots*, pp. 469–474. IEEE, 2014.

[109] M. Norman, G. A. Lee, R. T. Smith, and M. Billingurst. The impact of remote user's role in a mixed reality mixed presence system. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Virtual-Reality Continuum and Its Applications in Industry*, VRCAI '19. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2019. doi: 10.1145/3359997.3365691

[110] B. Nuernberger, K.-C. Lien, L. Grinta, C. Sweeney, M. Turk, and T. Höllerer. Multi-view gesture annotations in image-based 3d reconstructed scenes. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Conference on Virtual Reality Software and Technology*, VRST '16, p. 129–138. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2016. doi: 10.1145/2993369.2993371

[111] M. Olaosebikan, C. Aranda Barrios, B. Kolawole, L. Cowen, and O. Shaer. Identifying cognitive and creative support needs for remote scientific collaboration using vr: Practices, affordances, and design implications. In *Creativity and Cognition*, pp. 97–110, 2022.

[112] P. A. Olin, A. M. Issa, T. Feuchtner, and K. Grønbæk. Designing for heterogeneous cross-device collaboration and social interaction in virtual reality. In *Proceedings of the 32nd Australian Conference on Human-Computer Interaction*, OzCHI '20, p. 112–127. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2021. doi: 10.1145/3441000.3441070

[113] G. M. Olson and J. S. Olson. Distance matters. *Human–computer interaction*, 15(2-3):139–178, 2000.

[114] J. S. Olson and G. M. Olson. How to make distance work work. *interactions*, 21(2):28–35, 2014.

[115] P. V. F. Paiva, L. S. Machado, A. M. G. Valença, T. V. Batista, and R. M. Moraes. Simcec: A collaborative vr-based simulator for surgical teamwork education. *Comput. Entertain.*, 16(2), 4 2018. doi: 10.1145/3177747

[116] K. S. Park, H.-S. Cho, J. Lim, Y. Cho, S. Kang, and S. Park. Learning cooperation in a tangible moyangsung. In *Virtual Reality: Second International Conference, ICVR 2007, Held as part of HCI International 2007, Beijing, China, July 22-27, 2007. Proceedings 2*, pp. 689–698. Springer, 2007.

[117] W. Pearson and M. Fraser. Collaborative identification of haptic-only objects. In *Haptics: Perception, Devices and Scenarios: 6th International Conference, EuroHaptics 2008 Madrid, Spain, June 10-13, 2008 Proceedings 6*, pp. 806–819. Springer, 2008.

[118] F. Pereira, S. B. i Badia, C. Jorge, and M. da Silva Cameirão. Impact of game mode on engagement and social involvement in multi-user serious games with stroke patients. In *2019 international conference on virtual rehabilitation (ICVR)*, pp. 1–6. IEEE, 2019.

[119] C. Pidel and P. Ackermann. Collaboration in virtual and augmented reality: A systematic overview. In L. T. De Paolis and P. Bourdot, eds., *Augmented Reality, Virtual Reality, and Computer Graphics*, pp. 141–156. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2020.

[120] C. Pidel and P. Ackermann. Collaboration in virtual and augmented reality: a systematic overview. In *Augmented Reality, Virtual Reality, and Computer Graphics: 7th International Conference, AVR 2020, Lecce, Italy, September 7–10, 2020, Proceedings, Part I 7*, pp. 141–156. Springer, 2020.

[121] T. Piumsomboon, A. Day, B. Ens, Y. Lee, G. Lee, and M. Billinghurst. Exploring enhancements for remote mixed reality collaboration. In *SIGGRAPH Asia 2017 Mobile Graphics & Interactive Applications*, pp. 1–5. 2017.

[122] T. Piumsomboon, G. A. Lee, and M. Billinghurst. Snow dome: A multi-scale interaction in mixed reality remote collaboration. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 1–4, 2018.

[123] T. Piumsomboon, G. A. Lee, J. D. Hart, B. Ens, R. W. Lindeman, B. H. Thomas, and M. Billinghurst. Mini-me: An adaptive avatar for mixed reality remote collaboration. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, CHI '18, p. 1–13. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2018. doi: 10.1145/3173574.3173620

[124] L. Pouliquen-Lardy, I. Milleville-Pennel, F. Guillaume, and F. Mars. Remote collaboration in virtual reality: asymmetrical effects of task distribution on spatial processing and mental workload. *Virtual Reality*, 20(4):213–220, 2016.

[125] I. Poupyrev, T. Ichikawa, S. Weghorst, and M. Billinghurst. Egocentric object manipulation in virtual environments: empirical evaluation of interaction techniques. In *Computer graphics forum*, vol. 17, pp. 41–52. Wiley Online Library, 1998.

[126] I. Radu. Augmented reality in education: a meta-review and cross-media analysis. *Personal and ubiquitous computing*, 18:1533–1543, 2014.

[127] I. Radu and B. Schneider. What can we learn from augmented reality (ar)? benefits and drawbacks of ar for inquiry-based learning of physics. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*, pp. 1–12, 2019.

[128] P. Raimbaud, R. Lou, F. Danglade, P. Figueroa, J. T. Hernandez, and F. Merienne. A task-centred methodology to evaluate the design of

virtual reality user interactions: a case study on hazard identification. *Buildings*, 11(7):277, 2021.

[129] P. E. F. Raimbaud et al. Virtual reality for building industry needs: guiding the design of user interactions through a task-centred methodology. 2020.

[130] V. Rinaldi, L. Hackman, and N. NicDaeid. Virtual reality as a collaborative tool for digitalised crime scene examination. In *Extended Reality: First International Conference, XR Salento 2022, Lecce, Italy, July 6–8, 2022, Proceedings, Part I*, pp. 154–161. Springer, 2022.

[131] A. Ríos, M. Palomar, and N. Pelechano. Users' locomotor behavior in collaborative virtual reality. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM SIGGRAPH Conference on Motion, Interaction and Games*, MIG '18. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2018. doi: 10.1145/3274247.3274513

[132] D. Roberts, I. Heldal, O. Otto, and R. Wolff. Factors influencing flow of object focussed collaboration in collaborative virtual environments. *Virtual Reality*, 10:119–133, 2006.

[133] D. Saffo, S. Di Bartolomeo, C. Yildirim, and C. Dunne. Remote and collaborative virtual reality experiments via social vr platforms. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 1–15, 2021.

[134] N. Sakata, T. Kobayashi, and S. Nishida. Communication analysis of remote collaboration system with arm scaling function. In M. Kurosu, ed., *Human-Computer Interaction. Interaction Modalities and Techniques*, pp. 378–387. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013.

[135] N. Sakata, Y. Takano, and S. Nishida. Remote collaboration with spatial ar support. In *Human-Computer Interaction. Advanced Interaction Modalities and Techniques: 16th International Conference, HCI International 2014, Heraklion, Crete, Greece, June 22-27, 2014, Proceedings, Part II 16*, pp. 148–157. Springer, 2014.

[136] B. Sales, L. Machado, and R. Moraes. Interactive collaboration for virtual reality systems related to medical education and training. *Technology and Medical Sciences*, 2011:157–162, 2011.

[137] E.-L. Sallnäs. Haptic feedback increases perceived social presence. In *Haptics: Generating and Perceiving Tangible Sensations: International Conference, EuroHaptics 2010, Amsterdam, July 8-10, 2010. Proceedings*, pp. 178–185. Springer, 2010.

[138] A. Schäfer, G. Reis, and D. Stricker. A survey on synchronous augmented, virtual, andmixed reality remote collaboration systems. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 55(6), 12 2022. doi: 10.1145/3533376

[139] W. A. Schafer and D. A. Bowman. Evaluating the effects of frame of reference on spatial collaboration using desktop collaborative virtual environments. *Virtual Reality*, 7:164–174, 2004.

[140] W. A. Schafer and D. A. Bowman. Supporting distributed spatial collaboration: An investigation of navigation and radar view techniques. *GeoInformatica*, 10:123–158, 2006.

[141] C. Schnier, K. Pitsch, A. Dierker, and T. Hermann. Collaboration in augmented reality: How to establish coordination and joint attention? In *ECSCW 2011: Proceedings of the 12th European Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work, 24-28 September 2011, Aarhus Denmark*, pp. 405–416. Springer, 2011.

[142] H. Seichter. Augmented reality and tangible interfaces in collaborative urban design. In *Computer-Aided Architectural Design Futures (CAADFutures) 2007: Proceedings of the 12th International CAADFutures Conference*, pp. 3–16. Springer, 2007.

[143] M. Sereno, L. Besançon, and T. Isenberg. Point specification in collaborative visualization for 3d scalar fields using augmented reality. *Virtual Reality*, 26(4):1317–1334, 2022.

[144] M. Sereno, X. Wang, L. Besançon, M. J. Mcguffin, and T. Isenberg. Collaborative work in augmented reality: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 28(6):2530–2549, 2020.

[145] S. Serubugo, D. Skantarova, N. Evers, and M. Kraus. Facilitating asymmetric collaborative navigation in room-scale virtual reality for public spaces. In *Interactivity, Game Creation, Design, Learning, and Innovation: 6th International Conference, ArtsIT 2017, and Second International Conference, DLI 2017, Heraklion, Crete, Greece, October 30–31, 2017, Proceedings 6*, pp. 64–73. Springer, 2018.

[146] C. E. Shannon. A mathematical theory of communication. *ACM SIGMOBILE mobile computing and communications review*, 5(1):3–55, 2001.

[147] J. Simard and M. Ammi. Haptic interpersonal communication: improvement of actions coordination in collaborative virtual environments. *Virtual reality*, 16:173–186, 2012.

[148] R. S. Sodhi, B. R. Jones, D. Forsyth, B. P. Bailey, and G. Maciocci. Bethere: 3d mobile collaboration with spatial input. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 179–188, 2013.

[149] P. Spanger, M. Yasuhara, R. Iida, and T. Tokunaga. A japanese corpus of referring expressions used in a situated collaboration task. In *Proceedings of the 12th European workshop on natural language generation (ENLG 2009)*, pp. 110–113, 2009.

[150] A. Stafford, B. H. Thomas, and W. Piekarski. Comparison of techniques for mixed-space collaborative navigation. In *Proceedings of the Tenth Australasian Conference on User Interfaces - Volume 93*, AUIC '09, p. 61–70. Australian Computer Society, Inc., AUS, 2009.

[151] N. Stanton, P. M. Salmon, and L. A. Rafferty. *Human factors methods: a practical guide for engineering and design*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2013.

[152] W. Steptoe, A. Steed, A. Rovira, and J. Rae. Lie tracking: social presence, truth and deception in avatar-mediated telecommunication. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 1039–1048, 2010.

[153] M. Tait and M. Billinghurst. The effect of view independence in a collaborative ar system. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 24:563–589, 2015.

[154] F. Tecchia, L. Alem, and W. Huang. 3d helping hands: A gesture based mr system for remote collaboration. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM SIGGRAPH International Conference on Virtual-Reality Continuum and Its Applications in Industry*, VRCAI '12, p. 323–328. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2012. doi: 10.1145/2407516.2407590

[155] T. Teo, A. F. Hayati, G. A. Lee, M. Billinghurst, and M. Adcock. A technique for mixed reality remote collaboration using 360 panoramas in 3d reconstructed scenes. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM Symposium on Virtual Reality Software and Technology*, VRST '19. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2019. doi: 10.1145/3359996.3364238

[156] T. Teo, L. Lawrence, G. A. Lee, M. Billinghurst, and M. Adcock. Mixed reality remote collaboration combining 360 video and 3d reconstruction. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, CHI '19, p. 1–14. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2019. doi: 10.1145/3290605.3300431

[157] T. Teo, G. A. Lee, M. Billinghurst, and M. Adcock. Investigating the use of different visual cues to improve social presence within a 360 mixed reality remote collaboration*. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Virtual-Reality Continuum and Its Applications in Industry*, VRCAI '19. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2019. doi: 10.1145/3359997.3365687

[158] T. Teo, M. Norman, G. A. Lee, M. Billinghurst, and M. Adcock. Exploring interaction techniques for 360 panoramas inside a 3d reconstructed scene for mixed reality remote collaboration. *Journal on Multimodal User Interfaces*, 14:373–385, 2020.

[159] S. Thanyadit, P. Punpongsanon, and T.-C. Pong. Efficient information sharing techniques between workers of heterogeneous tasks in 3d cve. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.*, 2(CSCW), 11 2018. doi: 10.1145/3274441

[160] P. Thomas. *CSCW requirements and evaluation*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

[161] B. Thoravi Kumaravel, C. Nguyen, S. DiVerdi, and B. Hartmann. Transceivr: Bridging asymmetrical communication between vr users and external collaborators. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, UIST '20, p. 182–195. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2020. doi: 10.1145/3379337.3415827

[162] S. Ullah, X. Liu, S. Otmane, P. Richard, and M. Mallem. What you feel is what i do: a study of dynamic haptic interaction in distributed collaborative virtual environment. In *Human-Computer Interaction.*

Interaction Techniques and Environments: 14th International Conference, HCI International 2011, Orlando, FL, USA, July 9-14, 2011, Proceedings, Part II 14, pp. 140–147. Springer, 2011.
[163] A. Vasilchenko, J. Li, B. Ryskeldiev, S. Sarcar, Y. Ochiai, K. Kunze, and I. Radu. Collaborative learning & co-creation in xr. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 1–4, 2020.
[164] M. Velez, M. M. Tremaine, A. Sarcevic, B. Dorohonceanu, A. Krebs, and I. Marsic. " who's in charge here?" communicating across unequal computer platforms. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction (TOCHI)*, 11(4):407–444, 2004.
[165] J. Venerella, T. Franklin, L. Sherpa, H. Tang, and Z. Zhu. Integrating ar and vr for mobile remote collaboration. In *2019 IEEE International Symposium on Mixed and Augmented Reality Adjunct (ISMAR-Adjunct)*, pp. 104–108. IEEE, 2019.
[166] F. Vona, S. Silleresi, E. Beccaluva, and F. Garzotto. Social matchup: Collaborative games in wearable virtual reality for persons with neurodevelopmental disorders. In M. Ma, B. Fletcher, S. Göbel, J. Baalsrud Hauge, and T. Marsh, eds., *Serious Games*, pp. 49–65. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2020.
[167] G. Wadley and N. Ducheneaut. The 'out-of-avatar experience': object-focused collaboration in second life. In *ECSCW 2009*, pp. 323–342. Springer, 2009.
[168] K. Waldow, A. Fuhrmann, and S. M. Grünvogel. Investigating the effect of embodied visualization in remote collaborative augmented reality. In *Virtual Reality and Augmented Reality: 16th EuroVR International Conference, EuroVR 2019, Tallinn, Estonia, October 23–25, 2019, Proceedings 16*, pp. 246–262. Springer, 2019.
[169] C.-H. Wang, S. Yong, H.-Y. Chen, Y.-S. Ye, and L. Chan. Hmd light: Sharing in-vr experience via head-mounted projector for asymmetric interaction. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, pp. 472–486, 2020.
[170] J. Wang, Y. Hu, and X. Yang. Multi-person collaborative augmented reality assembly process evaluation system based on hololens. In *Virtual, Augmented and Mixed Reality: Applications in Education, Aviation and Industry: 14th International Conference, VAMR 2022, Held as Part of the 24th HCI International Conference, HCII 2022, Virtual Event, June 26–July 1, 2022, Proceedings, Part II*, pp. 369–380. Springer, 2022.
[171] J. Wang and L. Jing. Operation efficiency study on a new cooperative vr whiteboard system. In *HCI International 2021-Posters: 23rd HCI International Conference, HCII 2021, Virtual Event, July 24–29, 2021, Proceedings, Part III 23*, pp. 629–636. Springer, 2021.
[172] P. Wang, X. Bai, M. Billinghurst, S. Zhang, X. Zhang, S. Wang, W. He, Y. Yan, and H. Ji. Ar/mr remote collaboration on physical tasks: A review. *Robotics and Computer-Integrated Manufacturing*, 72:102071, 2021.
[173] P. Wang, S. Zhang, X. Bai, M. Billinghurst, W. He, S. Wang, X. Zhang, J. Du, and Y. Chen. Head pointer or eye gaze: Which helps more in mr remote collaboration? In *2019 IEEE conference on virtual reality and 3D user interfaces (VR)*, pp. 1219–1220. IEEE, 2019.
[174] R. Wang and X. Wang. Experimental investigation of co-presence factors in a mixed reality-mediated collaborative design system. In *Cooperative Design, Visualization, and Engineering: 6th International Conference, CDVE 2009, Luxembourg, Luxembourg, September 20-23, 2009. Proceedings 6*, pp. 333–340. Springer, 2009.
[175] Z. Wang, Y. Wang, X. Bai, X. Huo, W. He, S. Feng, J. Zhang, Y. Zhang, and J. Zhou. Sharideas: a smart collaborative assembly platform based on augmented reality supporting assembly intention recognition. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, 115(1-2):475–486, 2021.
[176] M. Webb, M. Tracey, W. Harwin, O. Tokatli, F. Hwang, R. Johnson, N. Barrett, and C. Jones. Haptic-enabled collaborative learning in virtual reality for schools. *Education and Information Technologies*, pp. 1–24, 2022.
[177] T. Weissker, P. Bimberg, and B. Froehlich. Getting there together: Group navigation in distributed virtual environments. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 26(5):1860–1870, 2020.
[178] F. Welsford-Ackroyd, A. Chalmers, R. K. dos Anjos, D. Medeiros, H. Kim, and T. Rhee. Asymmetric interaction between hmd wearers and spectators with a large display. In *2020 IEEE Conference on Virtual Reality and 3D User Interfaces Abstracts and Workshops (VRW)*, pp. 670–671. IEEE, 2020.
[179] J. Wideström, A.-S. Axelsson, R. Schroeder, A. Nilsson, I. Heldal, and Å. Abelin. The collaborative cube puzzle: A comparison of virtual and real environments. In *Proceedings of the third international conference on Collaborative virtual environments*, pp. 165–171, 2000.
[180] W. Wilkowska, T. Leonhardt, M. Ehlenz, and M. Ziefle. Technology-enhanced learning: Correlates of acceptance of assistive technology in collaborative working setting. In *Learning and Collaboration Technologies. Designing Learning Experiences: 6th International Conference, LCT 2019, Held as Part of the 21st HCI International Conference, HCII 2019, Orlando, FL, USA, July 26–31, 2019, Proceedings, Part I 21*, pp. 423–439. Springer, 2019.
[181] F. Winberg. Supporting cross-modal collaboration: Adding a social dimension to accessibility. In *Haptic and Audio Interaction Design: First International Workshop, HAID 2006, Glasgow, UK, August 31-September 1, 2006. Proceedings 1*, pp. 102–110. Springer, 2006.
[182] K. Woodward, E. Kanjo, and W. Parker. Dropar: Enriching exergaming using collaborative augmented reality content. In *HCI in Games: 4th International Conference, HCI-Games 2022, Held as Part of the 24th HCI International Conference, HCII 2022, Virtual Event, June 26–July 1, 2022, Proceedings*, pp. 652–663. Springer, 2022.
[183] H. Xia, S. Herscher, K. Perlin, and D. Wigdor. Spacetime: Enabling fluid individual and collaborative editing in virtual reality. In *Proceedings of the 31st annual ACM symposium on user interface software and technology*, pp. 853–866, 2018.
[184] C. Xu, Y. Wang, W. Quan, and H. Yang. Multi-person collaborative interaction algorithm and application based on hololens. In *Recent Trends in Intelligent Computing, Communication and Devices: Proceedings of ICCD 2018*, pp. 303–315. Springer, 2020.
[185] J. Yang, P. Sasikumar, H. Bai, A. Barde, G. Sörös, and M. Billinghurst. The effects of spatial auditory and visual cues on mixed reality remote collaboration. *Journal on Multimodal User Interfaces*, 14:337–352, 2020.
[186] A. Yassien, E. B. Makled, P. Elagroudy, N. Sadek, and S. Abdennadher. Give-me-a-hand: The effect of partner's gender on collaboration quality in virtual reality. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 1–6, 2021.
[187] S.-C. Yeh, W.-Y. Hwang, J.-L. Wang, and Y.-R. Chen. Effects of multi-symbols on enhancing virtual reality based collaborative task. *Transactions on Edutainment VIII*, pp. 101–111, 2012.
[188] K. Yu, U. Eck, F. Pankratz, M. Lazarovici, D. Wilhelm, and N. Navab. Duplicated reality for co-located augmented reality collaboration. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 28(5):2190–2200, 2022.
[189] R. Zaker and E. Coloma. Virtual reality-integrated workflow in bim-enabled projects collaboration and design review: a case study. *Visualization in Engineering*, 6(1):1–15, 2018.
[190] C. H. Zaman, A. Yakhina, and F. Casalegno. Nroom: An immersive virtual environment for collaborative spatial design. In *Proceedings of the International HCI and UX Conference in Indonesia*, CHIuXiD '15, p. 10–17. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2015. doi: 10.1145/2742032.2742034
[191] C. Ziker, B. Truman, and H. Dodds. Cross reality (xr): Challenges and opportunities across the spectrum. *Innovative learning environments in STEM higher education: Opportunities, challenges, and looking forward*, pp. 55–77, 2021.
[192] L. Ştefan. Immersive collaborative environments for teaching and learning traditional design. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 51:1056–1060, 2012. The World Conference on Design, Arts and Education (DAE-2012), May 1-3 2012, Antalya, Turkey. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.08.287