

Augmenting reality to diminish distractions for cognitive enhancement

JangHyeon Lee¹ and Lawrence H. Kim¹

¹Simon Fraser University, School of Computing Science, Burnaby, BC, Canada.

Contributing authors: jla465@sfu.ca; lawkim@sfu.ca;

Abstract

Smartphones are integral to modern life, yet research highlights the cognitive drawbacks associated even with their mere presence. Physically removing them from sight is a solution, but it is sometimes impractical and may increase anxiety due to fear of missing out. In response, we introduce a simple but effective use of augmented reality (AR) head-mounted displays, focusing not on augmenting reality with virtual objects, but on diminishing reality by selectively removing or occluding distracting objects, from the user's field of view. We compared cognitive task performance across four conditions: the smartphone being physically nearby, physically remote, visually removed and visually occluded via AR. Our findings reveal that using AR to visually cancel out smartphones significantly mitigates cognitive distractions caused by their presence. Specifically, the AR interventions had effects similar to physically removing the phone. These results suggest potential for novel AR applications designed to diminish reality, thereby enhancing cognitive performance.

Keywords: Augmented Reality (AR), Diminished Reality (DR), Smartphones, Distractions, Cognitive Well-being

1 Introduction

In the digital age, the ubiquity of smartphones provides constant connectivity at a potential cognitive cost. This cost, known as the "brain drain" effect, depletes mental resources, impairing crucial cognitive functions including memory, attention, and executive processing [1]. Such depletion directly affects cognitive performance, weakening the ability to process information, make decisions, and effectively focus on tasks

[2]. Research has consistently showed that the mere presence of a smartphone can lead to decreased task performance [3–14]. This raises a question: If the presence of one’s smartphone reduces cognitive performance, will visually canceling its presence via augmented reality (AR) mitigate this cognitive impairment?

AR has emerged as a transformative technology with profound implications for cognitive load management. AR’s efficacy in modulating cognitive load aligns with the Cognitive Load Theory, which distinguishes between intrinsic, extraneous, and germane cognitive loads [15]. Intrinsic load relates to the complexity of the task itself, extraneous load is linked to how information is presented, and germane load involves the mental effort used in creating new knowledge. Through strategic information presentation and the enhancement of user environments, AR has demonstrated potential in reducing cognitive load, thereby facilitating learning, decision-making, and user experience across various domains [16–18]. Its applications span educational settings, therapeutic interventions, and consumer behavior, showcasing AR’s versatility in enhancing cognitive well-being [19–38]. These findings emphasize AR’s potential to add contextually relevant information to enhance learning or user experience.

In contrast to AR’s role in reducing cognitive load by amplifying the environment to support user experience, our work uses Diminished Reality (DR) techniques to reduce distracting elements, thereby directly targeting and reducing extraneous cognitive load. This simplification can be particularly effective in environments where excess visual information could lead to cognitive overload, distraction, or decreased efficiency in task completion. Using the Microsoft HoloLens 2, we implement two DR interventions: visual removal and visual occlusion. The visual removal technique projects a customized cuboid hologram over a smartphone to blend with the background, hiding it from the user’s view. In contrast, visual occlusion superimposes the smartphone with a context-appropriate hologram in harmony with the environment. These techniques aim to reduce visual distractions, much like noise-canceling headphones that eliminate auditory distractions.




Fig. 1: Diminished reality interventions. Visual removal (left) is designed to blend the smartphone into the environment by projecting a hologram of the same color and texture as the background, while visual occlusion (right) involves a projection of another virtual object on top of the smartphone to occlude it from the user’s sight.

By visually removing or occluding distracting elements from the user’s field of view using AR, we aim to diminish the ”brain drain” effect, thereby enhancing cognitive performance. This approach is grounded in the principle that reducing visual clutter can streamline cognitive processing, enabling individuals to focus more effectively on pertinent tasks or information [39–44]. However, empirical investigations into DR’s direct cognitive benefits, particularly in the context of mitigating smartphone-induced distractions, remain unexplored [45, 46]. This gap motivates our research questions: Do the DR interventions (visual removal or occlusion) lead to better cognitive performance than physically nearby phone condition? Moreover, how do levels of cognitive performance under DR interventions (visual removal or occlusion) compare to when the phone is physically removed?

To address these questions, we scrutinize the cognitive effects of visual removal and occlusion through a series of standardized tasks: Operation Span (OSPAN) [47], Raven’s Standard Progressive Matrices (RSPM) [48], and the Cue-Dependent Go/No-Go (GNG) [49]. These tasks are selected based on their proven effectiveness in measuring cognitive capacity and sustained attention [4].

The relevance of our investigation is further underscored by prior work demonstrating that the physical proximity of a smartphone can significantly influence cognitive capacity [4]. Additionally, research into the potential applications of DR indicates that visual alterations to the environment could positively impact concentration and subjective evaluations [42, 50]. Inspired by these insights, we formulated the following hypotheses. H1.1: The visually removed phone with AR will improve cognitive performance compared to the physically nearby phone condition. H1.2: The visually occluded phone with AR will improve cognitive performance compared to the physically nearby phone condition. H2.1: The visually removed phone with AR will lead to a similar level of cognitive performance compared to the physically removed phone condition. H2.2: The visually occluded phone with AR will lead to a similar level of cognitive performance compared to the physically removed phone condition.

2 Results

Task performance on OSPAN and RSPM to assess cognitive capacity. We conducted several analyses to evaluate the effects of different phone conditions (Fig. 2) on available cognitive capacity. Two domain-general cognitive function metrics were used: the OSPAN score and the RSPM score. These metrics were chosen for their reliance on limited-capacity attentional resources, thus serving as robust indicators for fluctuations in cognitive capacity.

To assess the impact of different phone conditions on a combination of the OSPAN and RSPM scores, we used a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). The Pillai’s Trace statistic revealed a significant effect of different conditions on cognitive capacity ($F(6, 112) = 4.1948, p = .0008$). Subsequent univariate ANOVAs were conducted for each dependent variable. For the OSPAN task, the ANOVA revealed a significant effect of the conditions, $F(3, 56) = 6.548, p = .0007, \eta^2 = 0.259$. Similarly, the conditions had a significant effect on RSPM scores, $F(3, 56) = 3.868, p = .0138, \eta^2 = 0.172$.




Fig. 2: Cognitive capacity task scores. The figure presents scores for OSPAN and RSPM across four conditions. The scores for Visually Removed and Visually Occluded are comparable to those for Physically Removed, indicating similar cognitive performance when the phone is either physically remote or visually canceled out. † is marginally significant, * is significant, and ** is highly significant.

Bonferroni post-hoc tests were conducted to investigate pairwise differences among the four conditions: Physically Nearby (C1), Physically Removed (C2), Visually Removed (C3), and Visually Occluded (C4). C1 was set as the baseline. For the OSPAN task, significant differences were observed, as shown in Fig. 2. C1 vs. C2 yielded a significant difference ($p = 0.0022$), with an estimate of -4.00 (95% CI [-4.98, -3.02], SE = 0.50, Cohen’s $d = -1.45$). Similarly, C1 vs. C3 showed a significant difference ($p = 0.0415$), with an estimate of -2.87 (95% CI [-3.86, -1.88], SE = 0.50, Cohen’s $d = -1.04$). C1 vs. C4 also revealed a significant difference ($p = 0.0188$), with an estimate of -2.93 (95% CI [-3.84, -2.02], SE = 0.46, Cohen’s $d = -1.15$).

The RSPM task showed a similar pattern of results. C1 vs. C2 yielded a significant difference ($p = 0.00259$), with an estimate of -2.40 (95% CI [-3.18, -1.62], SE = 0.40, Cohen’s $d = -1.11$). Comparisons of C1 with C3 and C4 were marginally significant, with estimates of -2.20 and -2.00, 95% CIs of [-3.02, -1.38] and [-2.78, -1.22], SEs of 0.42 and 0.40, and effect sizes of -0.96 and -0.92. No significant differences were observed between C2 vs. C3 and C2 vs. C4 for both tasks.

Task performance on GNG to assess sustained attention. We analyzed the effects of smartphone salience on two behavioral measures of sustained attention: omission errors and reaction time in the GNG task. The ANOVA yielded no statistically significant effects of different conditions on either of these measures.

Smartphone saliency during hologram display. The calculated averages and standard deviations regarding participant responses for smartphone saliency (see




Fig. 3: Qualitative analysis in 7-point Likert scale. The figure shows responses to four questions, comparing perceptions of visual removal and visual occlusion holograms. Participants found the phone to be moderately less visible when the hologram was present. For both conditions, the hologram was noticeable, but the frequency of attention shifts was fairly even. The likelihood of using the holographic feature is generally favorable, particularly in the visually removed condition.

Fig. 3) are as follows: for the visually removed condition ($\mu = 2.37$, $\sigma = 1.40$), for the visually occluded condition ($\mu = 2.60$, $\sigma = 1.20$), and for the combined results across both conditions ($\mu = 2.48$, $\sigma = 1.31$). The distribution of responses was notably skewed toward the phone being perceived as "not salient." A majority of the participants reported that the phone was either completely invisible or nearly so when the hologram was in place. P12 and P16 mentioned "Could not see the phone" and "Phone was not visible at all, respectively." P14 and P24 also indicated that the phone was visible only under certain conditions, such as "when moving their head" or "focusing really closely at it", respectively.

Noticeability of holograms. The calculated averages and standard deviations regarding participant responses for the noticeability of the hologram (see Fig. 3) are as follows: for the visually removed condition ($\mu = 5.73$, $\sigma = 1.26$), for the visually occluded condition ($\mu = 6.03$, $\sigma = 0.80$), and for the combined results across both conditions ($\mu = 5.88$, $\sigma = 1.07$). The major sentiment was that the hologram was highly visible, often described as "bright" or possessing a "distinct glow." This characteristic allowed it to "stand out" even when participants were focused on other tasks, with phrases like "always in my field of view" being recurrent. P21 also mentioned how they "could constantly see it, but [became] not too significant later on," indicating a habituation effect, wherein the initial allure of the hologram wore off over time. Similarly, factors like the viewing angle and lighting were mentioned by P9

and P51 as elements that could modulate the hologram’s visibility.

Attention shift to holograms. The calculated averages and standard deviations regarding participant responses for attention shifts (see Fig. 3) are as follows: for the visually removed condition ($\mu = 4.00$, $\sigma = 1.32$), for the visually occluded condition ($\mu = 3.80$, $\sigma = 0.91$), and for the combined results across both conditions ($\mu = 3.90$, $\sigma = 1.14$). The remarks highlighted a nuanced interplay between the hologram’s visual salience and the participant’s engagement with their primary tasks. P37 noted, “*Curious to see if the hologram will interact during the study that may lead to distraction*”, highlighting potential curiosity-induced attention shifts. On the other hand, P3 stated, “*I wouldn’t be affected by it, but it seems like it can form some kind of an atmosphere that may help focus*”, indicating the hologram’s potential to create a conducive task environment. Several participants (P18, P24, P30) referred to the brightness of the hologram, with one saying, “*Due to the brightness, it was always noticeable but not distracting*”. The tendency for the hologram’s influence to wane over time was also noted, with P37 remarking, “*At the start, it was hard to ignore, but it became more mundane as time went on*”. Despite the hologram’s visibility, P38 observed, “*My focus remained steadfast, with only rare diversions towards the hologram*”. Overall, the feedback revealed that although the hologram was often perceptually noticeable, its impact on the primary task varied and often diminished over time.

Future adoption of holograms. The calculated averages and standard deviations regarding participant responses for future adoption (see Fig. 3) are as follows: for the visually removed condition ($\mu = 5.27$, $\sigma = 1.21$), for the visually occluded condition ($\mu = 5.53$, $\sigma = 1.23$), and for the combined results across both conditions ($\mu = 5.40$, $\sigma = 1.23$). One of the primary motivators for using the feature is its ability to reduce distractions, particularly from smartphones. Respondents (P14, P26, P27) often mention how the hologram helped them focus on tasks by obscuring their phones. Several participants (P8, P13, P24) noted studying and working as primary use cases. For instance, P7 said, “*For studying as it helps me decrease distraction when the hologram fully covers my phone*”, indicating an interest in leveraging the intervention to reduce the interference of smartphones during study sessions. The use of holographic features in a work environment was also highlighted. Comments (P9, P17) like “*for work to improve efficiency*” and “*when I am writing my research articles because I get distracted from my phone or other objects*” suggest that professionals could use the intervention to enhance focus. The technology is seen as beneficial in a co-working setting for maintaining individual concentration, as P44 mentioned using it “*in shared workspace, to maintain a sense of individual space and concentration*”. The holographic technology was also viewed as potentially useful in creating a private ambiance in public transport and open spaces. P39 also mentioned, “*In public transport, to create a more private ambiance by obscuring the crowd*”, suggesting a desire for increased personal space.

3 Discussion

The study aimed to explore the cognitive effects of smartphone presence and assess the potential of AR to mitigate these effects. Our work successfully replicated the findings from existing research that reports the negative cognitive effects of smartphones by comparing the cognitive task performance when a smartphone is physically nearby or remote [4]. More importantly, our study results demonstrate that DR interventions can effectively counteract this impact.

Specifically, our results confirmed that smartphone presence negatively affects cognitive capacity, as measured by OSPAN and RSPM scores, but not sustained attention, measured by omission errors and reaction time in the GNG task. This result is aligned with findings from prior work, indicating that even when individuals successfully maintain sustained attention, such as resisting the urge to check their phones, the mere presence of these devices can still diminish participants' cognitive capacity [4]. Hence, this suggests that although our AR interventions effectively "diminish" the smartphone from sight, improving cognitive function, it does not enhance sustained attention. This is because sustained attention isn't influenced by the smartphone's presence to begin with, clarifying the specific cognitive domains that could most benefit from the visual cancellation techniques.

The application of DR interventions, both visual removal and visual occlusion, demonstrated an improvement in cognitive performance compared to the baseline condition of having the phone physically nearby, as shown in Fig. 2. These findings confirm Hypotheses H1.1 and H1.2. The study findings also demonstrate that the DR conditions (C3 and C4) led to similar levels of cognitive performance as the physically removed phone condition (C1), thereby providing evidence to support Hypotheses H2.1 and H2.2. These quantitative results are further reinforced by qualitative responses from the participants. Many reported the smartphone as non-salient or completely invisible when the hologram was in place, aligning with the noted improvement in cognitive performance due to reduced cognitive burden. Additionally, while holograms were initially noticeable, participants experienced a habituation effect over time, suggesting that while these visual interventions initially draw attention, they do not persistently distract, thus supporting sustained cognitive engagement.

An intriguing aspect of our findings is the potential to alleviate the anxiety (i.e., fear of missing out) linked to smartphone separations [51–54]. P19 noted that using AR to visually hide the phone "helped me not to be tempted to look or interact with it while the anxiety of not having it around was at a minimum". This indicates that our AR methods not only offer a way to manage distractions but also alleviate the anxiety related to physical separation from the device. Emotional and psychological comfort also played a significant role. P7 said they would want "cute pets like cats" because they are "allergic to cat's hair, but if it would be an AR cat that could interact with me, I would be able to feel more relaxed". This statement showcases how holograms could provide emotional sustenance, filling in gaps where real-world objects or conditions may be insufficient or harmful. This blend of quantitative and qualitative results highlights the efficacy of DR in alleviating the cognitive costs of smartphone presence and highlights the potential for tailored AR designs to enhance cognitive performance in various environments that require higher cognitive capacity.

One compelling application lies in addressing prevalent issues such as glossophobia or stage fright [55]. The first step of the application involves DR techniques to visually remove or minimize elements within the audience that may cause stress or anxiety for the speaker. This could include faces exhibiting judgmental expressions or other distracting visual cues. Following this, the removed or minimized elements can be replaced with more comforting visuals. For example, speakers equipped with the AR headset could then see these visually diminished areas transformed into faces of friends or family [56], manipulated with filters [57], or replaced with calming landscapes. As an alternative, the audience could be transformed into non-judgmental, inanimate objects, further diminishing the stress associated with the perception of judgment.

However, there exist several limitations. First, the Microsoft HoloLens 2 has a constrained field of view (FOV) of 52 degrees. To circumvent this limitation, we restricted the users' position within the experiment. This constraint is noteworthy when considering the broader implications for cognitive performance. From a cognitive perspective, this restriction in FOV may serve as a form of implicit diminished reality (DR), focusing the user's attention on a smaller subset of the visual field and potentially facilitating concentration. However, the long-term cognitive effects of such limitations remain an open question. It remains to be seen whether this restricted FOV may indirectly influence other cognitive processes or tasks that require a broader spatial awareness [58]. Future research could further investigate how this limitation intersects with other cognitive and interactive variables, especially in applications extending beyond the constraints of our current study.

The second limitation is the inconsistent occlusion capability that hinders realistic implementation of AR technologies. The AR head-mounts use an additive display mechanism which doesn't provide as thorough an occlusion as VR devices, particularly under varied lighting conditions. Thus, AR perception studies are typically conducted within rigorously controlled environments to maximize the contrast and brightness between the virtual elements (e.g., holograms) and the real world. However, these virtual elements often appear as translucent overlays rather than entities fully integrated into the user's environment. In our study, we addressed this by dimming the ambient light to enhance the contrast between the virtual and real worlds, but this method comes with its own set of limitations. Specifically, modifying the lighting conditions is an impractical approach for real-world applications where lighting conditions can vary significantly. From a cognitive standpoint, the lack of effective occlusion could compromise the user's ability to focus, as the transparent virtual objects may not sufficiently obscure distracting elements in the real world. Following the advancements in occlusion capabilities of head-mounted AR can provide insights for achieving a more immersive user experience [59–61].

While the use of AR to enhance cognitive performance offers promising aspects for future applications, it equally demands rigorous ethical and societal scrutiny. A concern is that by selectively erasing or altering environmental elements, whether objects or people, we risk altering the human experience and undermining ethical norms in social interaction. This selective removal intersects with collective social realities, raising questions about the ethics of perception, the authority to determine what should

be diminished, and the broader societal ramifications of these choices. Adding a cultural perspective, the potential for misuse is highlighted in popular media; for instance, an episode of Black Mirror features a "block" function in which individuals are made invisible to society through mediated reality contact lenses [62]. When 'blocked,' the person appears as a distorted image, effectively ostracizing them from any social interaction. Such a dystopian vision illustrates the ethical complications that could arise, including questions surrounding consent, privacy, and the consequences of creating a society where people can be selectively excluded from shared reality. As this technology matures, it is imperative to engage in a thorough ethical examination to navigate the multitude of concerns that arise from modifying shared social environments.

In conclusion, smartphones, integral for communication, also introduce cognitive drawbacks due to their omnipresence. The "brain drain" phenomenon reports that having one's smartphone within sight or just in the same room can drain cognitive resources, compromising task performances even when users resist the temptation to check them. To address this, we used the Microsoft HoloLens 2 to visually remove or occlude the phone via AR. Our results showed that AR visual removal improved cognitive performance to levels similar to physically keeping the phone away, and occluding it had comparable effects. Although our study used smartphones, the approach is adaptable for visually canceling any objects that may be distracting. This offers new design perspectives, suggesting AR's potential not just for augmentation but also for diminishing distractions, with implications for enhancing cognitive environments.

4 Methods

The study confirmed with the ethical regulations and was approved by the ethics committee of the university. We have pre-registered our study at Open Science Framework (<https://osf.io/7gx64>) and all data, code, and supplementary video will be available at (<https://osf.io/8fy43/>).

Augmented reality or virtual reality. To closely evaluate cognitive performance in environments mirroring real-world scenarios, we designed our experimental setup to emulate typical desk-based tasks. Such an approach demanded a technology that could blend digital elements with the physical world, retaining an authentic connection to the user's immediate environment. AR stood out as the prime candidate for this purpose, and our decision to choose it over virtual reality (VR) was influenced by several technical and experiential considerations.

Optical see-through (OST) head-mounted displays (OST-HMDs) or AR HMDs allow digital elements (i.e., holograms) to be overlaid directly onto a user's view of the real world. On the other hand, video pass-through (VPT) HMDs or VR HMDs recreates a user's environment within the virtual space. Though this VPT approach addresses challenges related to occlusion and the limited field of view of OST-HMDs, they are not devoid of limitations. These VR HMDs have been associated with introducing real-scene distortions and unstable visual experiences. Additionally, their resolution can often fall short of the clarity and details in the real world. In contrast, AR HMDs provide a distortion-free integration of the real and the digital worlds.

The video passthrough VR HMDs can also suffer from system latency issues. Such latency can create temporal inconsistencies between the user’s actions and the system’s responses. This discord can potentially distort the flow and integrity of cognitive tasks, thereby affecting the validity of experimental results. In contrast, AR, given its direct interaction with the immediate environment, presents fewer latency issues as it does not necessitate the virtual rendering of the real world. This ensures a more consistent user experience, allowing for a more accurate assessment of cognitive functions. While VR’s immersive capabilities are promising, its inherent trade-offs made AR more fitting for our study. AR’s ability to combine digital interventions with the real-world without significant discrepancies ensures that participants’ cognitive functions are assessed in a more reliable manner.

System design and implementation. We aim to address two main goals. First, we want to "cancel out" visual distractions in a manner similar to how noise-canceling headphones reduce auditory distractions. Second, we seek to develop AR holograms that seamlessly integrate into the environment without becoming distractions themselves. This leads to two DR techniques: visual removal and visual occlusion.

For visual removal, we project a 3D cuboid hologram over the user’s smartphone, hiding the smartphone from the user’s field of view. The hologram should be slightly larger to fully conceal the smartphone while replicating the visual features of the background. To achieve this, we first capture an image of the empty workspace. When the smartphone is placed in the workspace, we overlay it with the hologram that has been customized using these pre-captured background features. Our study uses a controlled environment featuring a simple white desk mat. We fine-tune the hologram’s color to blend with this white background, erasing the smartphone’s visual presence and rendering it hidden.

Unlike the visual removal approach, which aims to erase the object from view, visual occlusion places a context-appropriate hologram over the distracting object. Instead of camouflaging the smartphone, this method occludes it with a fitting visual element that is congruent with the environment, such as books on a desk. Through this obstruction, we block the distraction and introduce study-related objects like books, potentially fostering an environment that promotes focus by occluding visual distractions. When it comes to AR holograms, we carefully consider factors like color, texture, size, dimensionality, number and animation attributes to ensure an optimal diminished reality experience (see Supplementary. [A](#)).

The main difference between visual removal and visual occlusion lies in their approaches to handling distractions. Visual removal is akin to noise-canceling, where the goal is to erase the features of the distracting object and blend with the background from the user’s view. Like noise cancellation creating an anti-noise wave, visual removal uses a hologram that matches the distracting object’s shape and size but alters its visual features, like color and texture, to blend with the background, thereby neutralizing the object’s visual presence. In contrast, visual occlusion superimposes the distracting object with a contextually appropriate element, transforming the distraction into something more aligned with the task at hand. This method does not necessitate precise matching with the physical attributes of the distraction.

Instead, it obstructs the distraction with a relevant hologram fitting the scene, like a book, a plant, or even an emotional support animal, such as a cat, on a desk. Both techniques are necessary due to their distinct impact on the user’s cognitive state. While visual removal is about creating a distraction-free zone, visual occlusion is geared towards modifying the distraction and repurposing the space to enhance focus or task relevance.

Participants. 60 participants, 15 participants per condition, were recruited for our in-person lab study using the snowball sampling technique. The majority were Computer Science majors (46), with others from Engineering (5), Business (3), and other academic disciplines (6). The group consisted of 49 males, 11 females, and no non-binary participants, aged 20 to 35 ($\mu = 25$). Most were East Asian (41), with diverse ethnic backgrounds including Indian (9), Punjabi (2), Central Asian (1), South Asian (1), Hispanic or Latino (1), Middle Eastern or North African (2), Whites (2), and one who chose not to specify their ethnicity. Regarding AR/VR experience, 26 were first-time users, 26 had limited experience, 7 had moderate experience, and 1 participant had extensive experience. Sample size was set based on prior studies in this domain and revealed robust results with around 15 participants [42, 44, 50]. To be eligible, participants were required to have normal or corrected-to-normal vision and be free from neurological disorders (e.g., migraine and chronic fatigue). Each participant received financial compensation (\$15 per hour). The study was approved by the University’s Institutional Review Board, with subjects providing informed consent.

Experimental setup. Participants wore the Microsoft HoloLens 2. To deliver optimal user experience in a scenario where participants are engrossed in a task at a desk using their laptops, we provided specific guidelines. The intensity of the room’s lighting was minimized and curtains were installed to prevent external light intrusion, reducing potential disruptions in the AR’s occlusion capability. A white desk mat (Fig. 4) was placed on the table to serve as a uniform background for the holograms, particularly for visual removal. This arrangement allowed the AR elements to blend more seamlessly into their surroundings.

Given the limited field of view (52 degrees) of Microsoft HoloLens 2, precise positioning of all elements is critical. When the participant is seated in front of the laptop, the smartphone needs to be close to the laptop and within the user’s immediate field of view, as shown in Fig. 4. Importantly, the phone should remain within the AR system’s field of view at all times. This ensures that the holographic occlusion remains consistent and fully covers the smartphone, even during minor head movements. From our pilot study, we noticed that if a participant’s head moves extensively, the hologram could move away from the phone. To counteract this, the seating was pre-arranged. A stationary chair, devoid of wheels, was chosen to minimize inadvertent shifts. Furthermore, the chair was equipped with ergonomic back support to encourage a stable posture, reducing the likelihood of significant head movements.

Conditions. Our study employs a between-subjects design with participants equally distributed across four conditions. To circumvent potential bias, participants were




Fig. 4: Participant seating. The figure illustrates how participants sit in relation to the laptop and smartphone, considering the limitation of HoloLens 2 field of view. The setup ensures that the phone stays visible to both the participant and the AR system, allowing consistent holographic coverage.

randomly assigned to the following conditions. C1: Physically Nearby, where the phone was stationed on the desk, serving as our baseline. C2: Physically Removed, where the phone was relocated outside the room. C3: Visually Removed, where the phone was masked with a cuboid hologram of the same background features. C4: Visually Occluded, where the phone was covered with a hologram representing a stack of books.

The selection of these conditions was informed by existing research and aims to deepen our understanding of cognitive impacts related to smartphone presence. Specifically, Conditions C1 and C2 derive from the "brain drain" study, as they offer various scenarios of smartphone proximity and its effects on cognitive performance [4]. We chose the 'Physically Remote' condition over alternatives like placing the phone in a bag as this condition demonstrated the largest effect from prior work [4]. Conditions C3 and C4 incorporate DR interventions motivated by research indicating the potential for transparency and context relevance to reduce distractions, albeit without significant empirical evidence yet in AR settings [42, 43, 50].

To address concerns of anxiety from smartphone separation [54] when physically removed, we informed participants in advance about the session's length and their option to withdraw, reducing potential stress. Research indicates that knowing the duration of separation and having control reduces anxiety [63]. Additionally, studies confirm that temporary separation from smartphones does not intensify anxiety or harm well-being, suggesting minimal anxiety and cognitive load impact from phone removal in our study [64–66].

Tasks. Participants completed three tasks that were used in prior work [4]. The order of the tasks was randomized to control for potential order effects. Operation Span (OSPAN) [67] evaluates an individual's capability to retain information in working memory while processing additional unrelated details. Participants are initially presented with a simple math problem. After solving, participants press either the 'C' key if the equation is correct or the 'I' key if the equation is incorrect. Immediately following, a random letter is presented, which participants must remember. Each math problem paired with a letter presentation forms a single trial. Trial sets can contain

between 3 and 7 trials. After each set, participants recall the letters in the correct sequence. The focus is on both speed and accuracy. In our study, participants undertook 5 random trials: one for each trial set length (3, 4, 5, 6, and 7). The OSPAN Score, with a maximum of 25, serves as an indicator of an individual’s domain-general attentional resources. It measures the participant’s ability to process and store information simultaneously, thereby revealing aspects of working memory. Participants with an accuracy rate below 85% on the math operations are excluded [47].

Raven’s Standard Progressive Matrices (RSPM) measures a non-verbal component of general fluid intelligence that characterizes an individual’s capacity to reason and tackle unfamiliar problems [48]. Participants are shown incomplete pattern matrices and must determine the piece that completes the pattern. Grouped in five 12-item sets (A-E) of escalating difficulty, participants tackled 10 items from sets D and E of RSPM, precisely D2, D4, D6, D8, D10, D12, E1, E2, E4, and E6. The RSPM Score, with a maximum score of 10, is sensitive to the immediate availability of attentional resources due to the task’s escalating difficulty. Thus, a high RSPM Score indicates robust attentional control.

Cue-Dependent Go/No-Go (GNG) measures sustained attention [68]. In this task, participants respond to sequential ”go” and ”no go” targets on a computer screen. They press a button for ”go” targets and abstain for ”no go” targets. Each trial starts with an 800ms fixation point and a 500ms blank screen. A color-changing rectangle cue follows. Participants press the space bar for green ”go” cues and ignore blue ”no go” cues, with each cue lasting up to 1000ms. A 700ms gap separates the 100 trials, which are equally divided between ”go” and ”no go” targets. Metrics are omission errors and reaction time, offering a lens into sustained attention without the interference of working memory capacity [69]. Omission errors track missed ”go” responses, serving as a measure of sustained attention. Reaction time measures the speed of responses to ”go” targets, indicating attention agility. To handle commission errors, when participants incorrectly respond to ”no go” cues, we calculate the Commission Error Rate by dividing the number of commission errors by the total ”no go” cues. We use a 95% confidence interval and participants with rates outside this range are excluded due to potential non-compliance or misunderstanding [70].

Post-study interview. After the tasks, participants engaged in a post-study interview to share their experiences in depth. Subsequently, they were asked to rate the visual salience of the phone in the presence of the hologram on a 7-point Likert scale (Q1: ”How visually salient was the phone when the hologram was present?”). The hologram’s distinctness was similarly assessed (Q2: ”How noticeable was the hologram?”). Subsequent queries revolved around the frequency of participants’ attentional shifts toward the hologram, elucidating its potential to either captivate or distract (Q3: ”How often did your attention shift to the hologram?”). Participant inclination toward future adoption of holographic features in related scenarios was then measured, reflecting the hologram’s practicality and user acceptance (Q4: ”How likely are you to use a holographic feature in similar settings in the future?”).

Procedure. Each study session spanned an hour on average. Upon entering the lab, conditions were assigned at random to each participant. Consistent with previous studies, we asked participants to turn off their smartphones to eliminate distractions from notifications [4]. Given the variety of devices and settings among participants, standardizing phone settings was not feasible. Turning off the phones ensured a consistent environment for all, minimizing any potential disruptions to cognitive performance. For the physically removed condition, in line with typical lab protocol, we asked participants to leave all their belongings, including their smartphones, outside of the room. Then participants signed a consent form and completed a pre-study questionnaire. The questionnaire asked for general demographic information and prior experience with AR devices. Simultaneously, the examiner prepared the device and holograms for the experiment. To ensure consistency, all participants would wear HoloLens 2, thereby eliminating the "sunglass effect" when the device was not worn. The sunglass effect refers to the altered visual perception experienced when not wearing the device, akin to the brightness change when removing sunglasses.

Once the device was worn by the participants, an eye calibration process was initiated to ensure the accurate placement of holograms in the participants' field of view. Then, the participants engaged in a randomized sequence of the cognitive tasks. These tasks were conducted in isolation, without the examiner in the same room, to minimize any external influences. After all tasks, participants were interviewed to gather feedback concerning interactions with the hologram and the smartphone and their overall experience in the study. Throughout the experiment, the examiner monitored the progress by sharing the HoloLens 2 screen on the examiner's computer via the Windows Device Portal, while using Google Remote Desktop to facilitate the experiment remotely without entering the participant's room during the tasks.

Data analysis. We used a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to evaluate the cognitive capacity effects of different phone conditions on a combination of OSpan and RSPM scores. The GNG task was excluded from the MANOVA because it measures sustained attention, not cognitive capacity. Prior work also identifies that the GNG task's focus on attention does not correlate with the cognitive capacities assessed by OSpan and RSPM [4]. Following the MANOVA, we conducted ANOVA tests for each dependent variable to examine the impact of each condition. Finally, Bonferroni post-hoc tests were used to explore pairwise differences among the four conditions. The p-value was adjusted by dividing the conventional alpha level by the number of pairwise comparisons made, excluding the comparison between conditions C3 and C4 as predetermined. All statistical analyses were pre-registered on the Open Science Framework, ensuring the integrity of our experiments.

References

- [1] Kool, W., McGuire, J.T., Rosen, Z.B., Botvinick, M.M.: Decision making and the avoidance of cognitive demand. *Journal of experimental psychology: general* **139**(4), 665 (2010)
- [2] Lane, D.M.: Limited capacity, attention allocation, and productivity. *Information*

- processing and decision making **2**, 121 (1982)
- [3] Thornton, B., Faires, A., Robbins, M., Rollins, E.: The mere presence of a cell phone may be distracting. *Social Psychology* (2014)
 - [4] Ward, A.F., Duke, K., Gneezy, A., Bos, M.W.: Brain drain: The mere presence of one's own smartphone reduces available cognitive capacity. *Journal of the Association for Consumer Research* **2**(2), 140–154 (2017)
 - [5] Johannes, N., Veling, H., Verwijmeren, T., Buijzen, M.: Hard to resist? *Journal of Media Psychology* (2018)
 - [6] Kim, I., Kim, R., Kim, H., Kim, D., Han, K., Lee, P.H., Mark, G., Lee, U.: Understanding smartphone usage in college classrooms: A long-term measurement study. *Computers & Education* **141**, 103611 (2019)
 - [7] Tanil, C.T., Yong, M.H.: Mobile phones: The effect of its presence on learning and memory. *PloS one* **15**(8), 0219233 (2020)
 - [8] Wacks, Y., Weinstein, A.M.: Excessive smartphone use is associated with health problems in adolescents and young adults. *Frontiers in psychiatry* **12**, 762 (2021)
 - [9] Sunday, O.J., Adesope, O.O., Maarhuis, P.L.: The effects of smartphone addiction on learning: A meta-analysis. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports* **4**, 100114 (2021)
 - [10] Schwaiger, E., Tahir, R.: The impact of nomophobia and smartphone presence on fluid intelligence and attention. *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace* **16**(1) (2022)
 - [11] Fabio, R.A., Stracuzzi, A., Lo Faro, R.: Problematic smartphone use leads to behavioral and cognitive self-control deficits. *International journal of environmental research and public health* **19**(12), 7445 (2022)
 - [12] Daniyal, M., Javaid, S.F., Hassan, A., Khan, M.A.: The relationship between cellphone usage on the physical and mental wellbeing of university students: A cross-sectional study. *International journal of environmental research and public health* **19**(15), 9352 (2022)
 - [13] Hartanto, A., Lee, K.Y., Chua, Y.J., Quek, F.Y., Majeed, N.M.: Smartphone use and daily cognitive failures: A critical examination using a daily diary approach with objective smartphone measures. *British Journal of Psychology* **114**(1), 70–85 (2023)
 - [14] Skowronek, J., Seifert, A., Lindberg, S.: The mere presence of a smartphone reduces basal attentional performance. *Scientific Reports* **13**(1), 9363 (2023)
 - [15] Sweller, J.: Cognitive load theory. *Psychology of learning and motivation* **55**,

37–76 (2011)

- [16] Jeffri, N.F.S., Rambli, D.R.A.: A review of augmented reality systems and their effects on mental workload and task performance. *Heliyon* **7**(3) (2021)
- [17] Buchner, J., Buntins, K., Kerres, M.: A systematic map of research characteristics in studies on augmented reality and cognitive load. *Computers and Education Open* **2**, 100036 (2021)
- [18] Buchner, J., Buntins, K., Kerres, M.: The impact of augmented reality on cognitive load and performance: A systematic review. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning* **38**(1), 285–303 (2022)
- [19] Schall Jr, M.C., Rusch, M.L., Lee, J.D., Dawson, J.D., Thomas, G., Aksan, N., Rizzo, M.: Augmented reality cues and elderly driver hazard perception. *Human factors* **55**(3), 643–658 (2013)
- [20] Desai, K., Bahirat, K., Ramalingam, S., Prabhakaran, B., Annaswamy, T., Makris, U.E.: Augmented reality-based exergames for rehabilitation. In: *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Multimedia Systems*, pp. 1–10 (2016)
- [21] Yoon, S., Anderson, E., Lin, J., Elinich, K.: How augmented reality enables conceptual understanding of challenging science content. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society* **20**(1), 156–168 (2017)
- [22] Baumeister, J., Ssin, S.Y., ElSayed, N.A., Dorrian, J., Webb, D.P., Walsh, J.A., Simon, T.M., Irlitti, A., Smith, R.T., Kohler, M., *et al.*: Cognitive cost of using augmented reality displays. *IEEE transactions on visualization and computer graphics* **23**(11), 2378–2388 (2017)
- [23] Ruiz-Ariza, A., Casuso, R.A., Suarez-Manzano, S., Martínez-López, E.J.: Effect of augmented reality game pokémon go on cognitive performance and emotional intelligence in adolescent young. *Computers & Education* **116**, 49–63 (2018)
- [24] İbili, E.: Effect of augmented reality environments on cognitive load: pedagogical effect, instructional design, motivation and interaction interfaces. *International Journal of Progressive Education* **15**(5), 42–57 (2019)
- [25] İbili, E., Billinghamurst, M.: Assessing the relationship between cognitive load and the usability of a mobile augmented reality tutorial system: A study of gender effects. *International Journal of Assessment Tools in Education* **6**(3), 378–395 (2019)
- [26] Zhang, L., Luczak, T., Smith, E., Burch, R.F., *et al.*: Using microsoft hololens to improve memory recall in anatomy and physiology: A pilot study to examine the efficacy of using augmented reality in education. *Journal of Educational*

- Technology Development and Exchange (JETDE) **12**(1), 2 (2019)
- [27] Thees, M., Kapp, S., Strzys, M.P., Beil, F., Lukowicz, P., Kuhn, J.: Effects of augmented reality on learning and cognitive load in university physics laboratory courses. *Computers in Human Behavior* **108**, 106316 (2020)
 - [28] Geng, X., Yamada, M.: An augmented reality learning system for japanese compound verbs: study of learning performance and cognitive load. *Smart Learning Environments* **7**, 1–19 (2020)
 - [29] Keller, S., Rumann, S., Habig, S.: Cognitive load implications for augmented reality supported chemistry learning. *Information* **12**(3), 96 (2021)
 - [30] Cho, M.-G.: A study on augmented reality-based virtual pets for the elderly living alone. In: *2021 International Conference on Information and Communication Technology Convergence (ICTC)*, pp. 1280–1283 (2021). IEEE
 - [31] Chiam, B.S.W., Leung, I.M.W., Devilly, O.Z., Da Ow, C.Y., Guan, F.Y., Tan, B.L.: Novel augmented reality enhanced solution towards vocational training for people with mental disabilities. In: *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Mixed and Augmented Reality Adjunct (ISMAR-Adjunct)*, pp. 195–200 (2021). IEEE
 - [32] Tugtekin, U., Odabasi, H.F.: Do interactive learning environments have an effect on learning outcomes, cognitive load and metacognitive judgments? *Education and Information Technologies* **27**(5), 7019–7058 (2022)
 - [33] Uriarte-Portillo, A., Ibáñez, M.-B., Zatarain-Cabada, R., Barrón-Estrada, M.-L.: Higher immersive profiles improve learning outcomes in augmented reality learning environments. *Information* **13**(5), 218 (2022)
 - [34] Ji, C., Isbister, K.: Ar fidget: Augmented reality experiences that support emotion regulation through fidgeting. In: *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems Extended Abstracts*, pp. 1–4 (2022)
 - [35] Javornik, A., Marder, B., Barhorst, J.B., McLean, G., Rogers, Y., Marshall, P., Warlop, L.: ‘what lies behind the filter?’uncovering the motivations for using augmented reality (ar) face filters on social media and their effect on well-being. *Computers in Human Behavior* **128**, 107126 (2022)
 - [36] Wenk, N., Penalver-Andres, J., Buetler, K., Nef, T., Müri, R.M., Marchal-Crespo, L.: Effect of immersive visualization technologies on cognitive load, motivation, usability, and embodiment. *Virtual Reality* **27**(1), 307–331 (2023)
 - [37] Li, X., Zheng, C., Pan, Z., Huang, Z., Niu, Y., Wang, P., Geng, W.: Comparative study on 2d and 3d user interface for eliminating cognitive loads in augmented reality repetitive tasks. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction*, 1–17 (2023)

- [38] Barta, S., Gurrea, R., Flavián, C.: Using augmented reality to reduce cognitive dissonance and increase purchase intention. *Computers in Human Behavior* **140**, 107564 (2023)
- [39] Mann, S.: Mediated reality. *Linux J.* **1999**(59es), 5 (1999)
- [40] Herling, J., Broll, W.: Advanced self-contained object removal for realizing real-time diminished reality in unconstrained environments. In: 2010 IEEE International Symposium on Mixed and Augmented Reality, pp. 207–212 (2010). IEEE
- [41] Mori, S., Ikeda, S., Saito, H.: A survey of diminished reality: Techniques for visually concealing, eliminating, and seeing through real objects. *IPSJ Transactions on Computer Vision and Applications* **9**(1), 1–14 (2017)
- [42] Cheng, Y.F., Yin, H., Yan, Y., Gugenheimer, J., Lindlbauer, D.: Towards understanding diminished reality. In: Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, pp. 1–16 (2022)
- [43] Chan, S.W., Ryskeldiev, B., Nanayakkara, S.: Declutterar: Mobile diminished reality and augmented reality to address hoarding by motivating decluttering and selling on online marketplace. In: 2022 IEEE International Symposium on Mixed and Augmented Reality Adjunct (ISMAR-Adjunct), pp. 870–874 (2022). IEEE
- [44] Yokoro, K., Perusquia-Hernandez, M., Isoyama, N., Uchiyama, H., Kiyokawa, K.: Decluttar: An interactive visual clutter dimming system to help focus on work. In: Proceedings of the Augmented Humans International Conference 2023, pp. 159–170 (2023)
- [45] Murph, I., McDonald, M., Richardson, K., Wilkinson, M., Robertson, S., Karunakaran, A., Gandy Coleman, M., Byrne, V., McLaughlin, A.: Diminishing reality: Potential benefits and risks. In: Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting, vol. 65, pp. 164–168 (2021). SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA
- [46] Murph, I., Richardson, K., McLaughlin, A.: Methods of training to overcome distraction via diminished reality. In: Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting, vol. 66, pp. 1844–1848 (2022). SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA
- [47] Unsworth, N., Heitz, R.P., Schrock, J.C., Engle, R.W.: An automated version of the operation span task. *Behavior research methods* **37**(3), 498–505 (2005)
- [48] Raven, J.: Court jh. manual for raven’s progressive matrices and vocabulary scales. Assessment. Oxford: Oxford Psychologists Press (1998)
- [49] Bezdjian, S., Baker, L.A., Lozano, D.I., Raine, A.: Assessing inattention and

- impulsivity in children during the go/nogo task. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology* **27**(2), 365–383 (2009)
- [50] Koshi, M., Sakata, N., Kiyokawa, K.: Augmented concentration: Concentration improvement by visual noise reduction with a video see-through hmd. In: 2019 IEEE Conference on Virtual Reality and 3D User Interfaces (VR), pp. 1030–1031 (2019). IEEE
- [51] Cheever, N.A., Rosen, L.D., Carrier, L.M., Chavez, A.: Out of sight is not out of mind: The impact of restricting wireless mobile device use on anxiety levels among low, moderate and high users. *Computers in Human Behavior* **37**, 290–297 (2014)
- [52] Hartanto, A., Yang, H.: Is the smartphone a smart choice? the effect of smartphone separation on executive functions. *Computers in human behavior* **64**, 329–336 (2016)
- [53] Niu, G.-f., Shi, X.-h., Yang, W.-c., Jin, S.-y., Sun, X.-j., *et al.*: Can smartphone presence affect cognitive function? the moderating role of fear of missing out. *Computers in Human Behavior* **136**, 107399 (2022)
- [54] Terzimehić, N., Aragon-Hahner, S., Hussmann, H.: The tale of a complicated relationship: Insights from users’ love/breakup letters to their smartphones before and during the covid-19 pandemic. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies* **7**(1), 1–34 (2023)
- [55] Khurpade, J.M., Gangawane, A.A., Ostwal, G.S., Lalwani, D.M., Vidye, R.G.: The effect of virtual reality and heart rate variability using deep learning for reducing stage fright-glossophobia. In: 2020 International Conference on Industry 4.0 Technology (I4Tech), pp. 195–198 (2020). IEEE
- [56] Arias, P., Bedoya, D., Johansson, P., Hall, L., Aucouturier, J.-J.: Controlling dyadic interactions with real-time smile transformations. In: *Society for Affective Science 2021 Conference* (2021)
- [57] Leong, J., Perteneder, F., Rajvee, M.R., Maes, P.: “picture the audience...”: Exploring private ar face filters for online public speaking. In: *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 1–13 (2023)
- [58] Caluya, N.R., Plopski, A., Sandor, C., Fujimoto, Y., Kanbara, M., Kato, H.: Does overlay field of view in head-mounted displays affect spatial memorization? *Computers & Graphics* **102**, 554–565 (2022)
- [59] Kiyokawa, K., Kurata, Y., Ohno, H.: An optical see-through display for mutual occlusion with a real-time stereovision system. *Computers & Graphics* **25**(5), 765–779 (2001)

- [60] Avveduto, G., Tecchia, F., Fuchs, H.: Real-world occlusion in optical see-through ar displays. In: *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM Symposium on Virtual Reality Software and Technology*, pp. 1–10 (2017)
- [61] Mori, S., Ikeda, S., Plopski, A., Sandor, C.: Brightview: Increasing perceived brightness of optical see-through head-mounted displays through unnoticeable incident light reduction. In: *2018 IEEE Conference on Virtual Reality and 3D User Interfaces (VR)*, pp. 251–258 (2018)
- [62] Muller, C.: We have only ourselves to fear: Reflections on ai through the black mirror of “white christmas”. *Through the Black Mirror: Deconstructing the Side Effects of the Digital Age*, 95–107 (2019)
- [63] Tams, S., Legoux, R., Léger, P.-M.: Smartphone withdrawal creates stress: A moderated mediation model of nomophobia, social threat, and phone withdrawal context. *Computers in Human Behavior* **81**, 1–9 (2018)
- [64] Wilcockson, T.D., Osborne, A.M., Ellis, D.A.: Digital detox: The effect of smartphone abstinence on mood, anxiety, and craving. *Addictive behaviors* **99**, 106013 (2019)
- [65] Kneidinger-Müller, B.: When the smartphone goes offline: A factorial survey of smartphone users’ experiences of mobile unavailability. *Computers in Human Behavior* **98**, 1–10 (2019)
- [66] Brailovskaia, J., Delveaux, J., John, J., Wicker, V., Noveski, A., Kim, S., Schillack, H., Margraf, J.: Finding the “sweet spot” of smartphone use: Reduction or abstinence to increase well-being and healthy lifestyle?! an experimental intervention study. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied* **29**(1), 149 (2023)
- [67] Engle, R.W.: Working memory capacity as executive attention. *Current directions in psychological science* **11**(1), 19–23 (2002)
- [68] O’Connell, R.G., Dockree, P.M., Bellgrove, M.A., Turin, A., Ward, S., Foxe, J.J., Robertson, I.H.: Two types of action error: electrophysiological evidence for separable inhibitory and sustained attention neural mechanisms producing error on go/no-go tasks. *Journal of cognitive neuroscience* **21**(1), 93–104 (2009)
- [69] Redick, T.S., Calvo, A., Gay, C.E., Engle, R.W.: Working memory capacity and go/no-go task performance: selective effects of updating, maintenance, and inhibition. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* **37**(2), 308 (2011)
- [70] Littman, R., Takács, Á.: Do all inhibitions act alike? a study of go/no-go and stop-signal paradigms. *PloS one* **12**(10), 0186774 (2017)

A Hologram Design Considerations

The effectiveness of our DR interventions are inherently tied to the technical capabilities of the Microsoft HoloLens 2. These capabilities, in turn, determine the available choices for background and hologram integration. The following design considerations become essential when delivering the intended visual cancellation experiences.

A.1 Color

Holographic displays augment the real world by adding light, resulting in more transparent darker or 'black' colors compared to brighter or 'white' colors, as shown in Fig. 5. This contrasts with subtractive color systems, where the introduction of more colors results in darker hues. Thus, dark holograms were not feasible due to this transparency with HoloLens 2. We used the Graffiti 3D application from Microsoft Store to further verify color behaviors on the AR display (Fig. 5). For the white-background test, we used a spectrum of holograms ranging from bright white to dark grey.



Fig. 5: Different colors of holograms. The intensity of the color brightness directly correlates with its ability to obscure objects behind it. Brighter colors render the background objects less transparent, which is critical.

For the black-background test, we used a range from bright orange to a darker, brownish-orange. We also performed a holistic assessment to determine the efficiency of hologram rendering against different backgrounds. This involved comparing the rendering of both bright and dark holograms against a white background, and, similarly, bright and dark holograms against a black background. This analysis showed that brighter holograms were rendered more efficiently against darker backgrounds. This phenomenon can be attributed to the principle of visual contrast, where the juxtaposition of a bright element against a dark backdrop accentuates the former. For optimal blending, one would typically choose a hologram color analogous to the background. However, the AR's additive display rendered darker colors translucent, limiting our choice to the pair of a bright hologram with a bright background (Fig. 6).



Fig. 6: Background and hologram color pairs. For optimal performance in obscuring physical objects, bright holograms on bright backgrounds are more effective than dark holograms on dark backgrounds.

A.2 Texture

The realism of an AR hologram is tied to its texture. Shadows, patterns, and nuanced details play a pivotal role in a hologram’s believability. The 3D Builder application from Microsoft Store allows the overlay of 2D images onto 3D models. This adaptability facilitates the creation of environment-specific textures, an important feature for visual removal where blending is key. However, reflective surfaces and intricate patterns, like wood grain, can impede a hologram’s authenticity if the reconstruction is inaccurate or mismatched with the background (Fig. 7). Given these hurdles, selecting a simple, non-reflective, plain white background proves advantageous. This neutral choice ensures ease of replication and minimizes discrepancies between the hologram and its environment, optimizing the overall realism and efficacy of the AR experience.



Fig. 7: Complex textures. The sequence illustrates the steps of visual removal with a focus on complex textures, such as wood grain. Due to the intricate pattern of the wood grain, the hologram appears unnatural because of mismatched patterns, highlighting the need for accurate texture matching in holographic displays.

A.3 Size

The accurate sizing of AR holograms is critical for any intended visual intervention, especially for visual removal. The hologram’s dimensions should slightly exceed those of the phone, as seen from the viewer’s perspective. This ensures the phone is entirely obscured from the visual field. However, given the diverse range of smartphone sizes, influenced by brand variations, model specifications, and additional factors like cases or holders, a dynamic approach to adjusting the hologram’s size in real time is essential. For visual occlusion, the book hologram must adequately occlude the phone. Also, maintaining environmental congruence is vital. If the hologram aligns too closely with the phone’s dimensions, it might seem anomalous, as most books aren’t the exact size of a typical smartphone.

A.4 Dimension

The dimensionality of the hologram plays a pivotal role in achieving a convincing AR experience. Inadequate dimensionality can hinder the effectiveness of visual canceling techniques. An example is the Mirage application from Microsoft Store, which creates virtual monitors to display desktop content. Despite offering options like live-streaming an empty background or using pre-recorded video, the application falls short in its 2D representation. The virtual monitors appear to hover above the smartphone. This limitation also extends to attempts to use basic 2D images for obscuring the smartphone, underscoring the necessity for design choices that prioritize 3D in AR holograms.

A.5 Quantity & Animation

The quantity and animation of holograms are additional factors in the design process. Our design was refined to include only a single hologram in response to user feedback in a pilot study, indicating that multiple holograms could strain cognitive resources. Moreover, we chose static holograms instead of dynamic or animated ones (Fig. 8). This decision aimed to minimize any additional cognitive load on the participants, ensuring that the focus remained solely on the visual canceling techniques.



Fig. 8: Static and dynamic holograms. The dynamic dog hologram (right) constantly makes barking movements. We opted for static holograms (left) to lessen the potential cognitive load on participants due to the motion of holograms.