

# MEASURING EYE-TRACKING ACCURACY AND ITS IMPACT ON USABILITY IN APPLE VISION PRO

Zehao Huang  
Center for Psychological Sciences  
Zhejiang University  
Hangzhou, China  
huangzehao@zju.edu.cn

Gancheng Zhu  
Center for Psychological Sciences  
Zhejiang University  
Hangzhou, China  
psycho@zju.edu.cn

Xiaoting Duan  
Center for Psychological Sciences  
Zhejiang University  
Hangzhou, China  
xiaoting\_duan@zju.edu.cn

Rong Wang  
Center for Psychological Sciences  
Zhejiang University  
Hangzhou, China  
artx@zju.edu.cn

Yongkai Li  
Center for Psychological Sciences  
Zhejiang University  
Hangzhou, China  
yongkai\_li@foxmail.com

Shuai Zhang  
Tianmushan Laboratory  
Hangzhou, China  
zhangshuai\_bht@tmslab.cn

Zhiguo Wang  
Center for Psychological Sciences  
Zhejiang University  
Hangzhou, China  
zhiguo@zju.edu.cn

**Abstract**—With built-in eye-tracking cameras, the Apple Vision Pro (AVP) enables gaze-based interaction, eye image rendering on external screens, and iris recognition for device unlocking. One of the technological advancements of the AVP is its heavy reliance on gaze- and gesture-based interaction. However, limited information is available regarding the specifics of the eye-tracking device in the AVP, and raw gaze data is inaccessible to developers. This study evaluated the eye-tracking accuracy of the AVP, leveraging foveated rendering, and examined how tracking accuracy relates to user-reported usability. The results revealed an overall gaze error of  $2.5^\circ$  (or 61.95 pixels) within a tested field of view (FOV) of approximately  $34^\circ \times 18^\circ$ . As expected, the lowest gaze error was observed in the central FOV, with higher gaze errors in peripheral areas. The usability and learnability scores of the AVP, measured using the standard System Usability Scale (SUS), were 73 and 70, respectively. Importantly, no statistically reliable correlation between gaze error and usability scores was found. These results suggest that the eye-tracking accuracy of the AVP is comparable to other VR/AR headsets. While eye-tracking accuracy is critical for gaze-based interaction, it is not the sole determinant of user experience in AR/VR.

**Keywords**—eye-tracking accuracy, Apple Vision Pro, usability, VR/AR

## I. INTRODUCTION

Eye-tracking is a technology used to measure the direction of gaze or the rotation of the eyeballs in humans and (or) animals and various eye-tracking technologies have been used for research and industrial applications. The past two decades have seen an increasing number of video-based eye-tracking devices, thanks to the advancements in computer vision technology. Video-based eye-tracking is more user-friendly than other solutions, e.g., EOG and DPI.

Yet, it can still provide high-precision eye movement data that meets the needs of both scientific and industrial applications. In recent years, eye-tracking has also found its application in consumer-grade VR/AR headsets. Several popular VR devices, such as Meta Quest Pro, Pico 4 Pro, and Apple Vision Pro, have already incorporated eye-tracking functionality. The integration of eye-tracking in AR/VR devices helps improve graphic computation, e.g., foveated rendering [1], [2], [3] and varifocal display [4]. Eye-tracking also helps to enhance the interactive experience in AR/VR [5], [6].

### A. Eye-tracking for foveated rendering

To provide an immersive visual experience, the resolution of head-mounted displays (HMDs) continues to increase in state-of-the-art VR/AR devices, e.g., from 2.3 million pixels per eye in Oculus Rift (2019) to 14 million pixels per eye in Varjo XR-4 (2024). AR/VR devices equipped with eye trackers allow foveated rendering, i.e., images rendered on the HMDs have high resolution only in the central visual field of the user, while the peripheral visual field is rendered in lower resolution (see Figure 1, for an illustration). Foveated rendering effectively reduces the computational load on AR/VR devices [7], it also aligns with the characteristics of the human visual system [8].




Fig. 1 A screenshot from AVP. Image elements inside the dashed circle are rendered clearer than those outside the circle

### B. Eye-tracking offers a new interaction modality

As an interactive and assistive technology, eye-tracking has been widely used in medical and healthcare fields [9], [10]. For instance, eye trackers allow patients with conditions like Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (ALS) to communicate through gazing on-screen interactive elements [11]. In the early era of VR, input methods were relatively limited. Users could only use controllers (e.g., Meta Quest 2, 3; Pico Neo 2) or head-turning (e.g., HoloLens 1) to interact with elements. Fernandes and his colleagues (2023) compared user acceptance of three interaction methods and found that eye-tracking and controllers received similar ratings on interaction efficiency and usability, both of which were higher than head-turning. However, in this study, eye-tracking had a significantly higher miss rate compared to the other two interaction methods. If we can achieve reasonable eye-tracking accuracy and reduce missed data, it would give us the confidence to promote eye-tracking as an acceptable and efficient interaction method for users.

There is a wealth of research or prototypes utilizing eye-tracking for interaction in VR/AR devices [13], [14], [15]. However, no product has abandoned controllers entirely, relying solely on eye-tracking and gesture control to operate the device. Menu navigation, object interaction, and other operations are still performed using controllers, with eye-tracking serving as a supplementary input [16]. For example, in Pico 4 Pro, the eye-tracker is only used to measure pupil position. Similarly, in PS VR2, eye-tracking can be used for foveated rendering or as an auxiliary input device in games. The limited use of eye-tracking in AR/VR devices may be partially due to the insufficient performance (accuracy, precision, data loss, etc.) of the eye-trackers available for VR/AR devices. The tracking accuracy of the eye-tracking devices integrated in VR headsets is generally lower compared to that of head-mounted eye trackers<sup>1</sup>. Furthermore, using eye-tracking for interaction requires significant modifications to the user interface [19], [20] and a steep learning curve for users [21], [22].

### C. Eye-tracking in Apple Vision Pro

Apple Inc. introduced gaze interaction to its AR/VR (or mix-reality device, MR) device, Apple Vision Pro

(hereinafter referred to as AVP) released in late 2023, setting up a new stage for eye-tracking in VR/AR. In AVP, the gaze position provided by the eye tracker is linked to the current area of interest of the user, such as an option in a menu or icon, like the function of a cursor. Users select elements that may require action through their gaze and then proceed to perform further actions on the selected icon, such as confirmation or zooming. Additionally, the gaze position from the eye tracker is also utilized for foveated rendering, to reduce visual fatigue or vertigo [23], [24], [25]. Unlike other AR/VR devices, AVP deprecated controllers in favor of a new interactive technology that relies on eye-tracking and hand-tracking, showing that Apple has strong confidence in its VR/AR eye-tracking device.

### D. Aims of the present study

The primary objective of this study is to evaluate the eye-tracking accuracy in AVP. There is no publicly available data on the eye-tracking accuracy in AVP. Based on previous studies examining the eye-tracking data quality of research-grade eye-trackers [18], [26], [27], [28], [29], [30], [31], [32], [33], [34], the best possible tracking accuracy of AVP is unlikely to be better than the gold standard EyeLink eye-trackers ( $0.3^\circ$ , in optimal operation conditions). Nevertheless, the eye-tracking accuracy of AVP could serve as a good baseline for VR/AR eye-tracking.

According to the privacy policy of AVP, developers cannot directly access the eye-tracking data. Therefore, we estimated the current gaze position based on the blurred area due to foveated rendering. Furthermore, although eye-tracking and gestures are not new interaction technologies in AR/VR [20], AVP is the first to completely abandon controllers and rely solely on eye-tracking and hand gestures. Whether this novel interaction method poses a great learning burden to users is yet documented. In addition to testing its eye-tracking accuracy, we also evaluated the usability of AVP to gain a more comprehensive picture of eye-tracking in AV/VR interaction.

## II. METHODS

The research protocol reported in this paper was approved by a local ethics committee at the Center for Psychological Sciences at Zhejiang University, and all volunteers provided written informed consent.

As in previous studies that examined the tracking accuracy of eye-tracking devices or algorithms [29], [35], [36], [37], a fixation task in which the volunteer looked at visual targets at pre-specified locations was tested. In the present test, we created a virtual panel to display the fixation targets and the virtual panel was placed on a physical tabletop.

### A. Volunteers

Twenty-seven volunteers took part in the test (11 females/ 16 males, age:  $M = 24.59$  years,  $SD = 2.72$ ). Three volunteers were excluded from the analysis because they did not follow the instructions to rest his/her head on the chinrest. Eleven volunteers wore contact lenses and four volunteers had makeup during the experiment (see Table 1).

<sup>1</sup> The eye-tracking devices used in VR/AR typically have similar sensor layouts as head-mounted eye trackers (HMET). However, with a small eye relief, eye-tracking cameras cannot be placed in the optimal tracking positions in VR/AR devices. As documented in the literature [14], [17], [18], the gaze error of VR/AR eye trackers is typically  $2\text{-}4^\circ$  higher than HMET.

## B. Equipment and tools

- **Device:** The AVP used in the test featured micro-OLED displays with a total of 23 million pixels and refresh rates of 90Hz, 96Hz, and 100Hz. It had four eye-tracking cameras for foveated rendering and external cameras for spatial awareness and hand tracking. Equipped with a dual-chip processor, the AVP provides efficient computational power. Additionally, the device operates on the newly developed visionOS (system version 1.10 for this test) and weighs approximately 600-650 grams.
- **Questionnaire:** The System Usability Scale (SUS) is a widely used tool for measuring system usability [38]. With only 10 items, the SUS is convenient to administer but still has high reliability and sensitivity, even on small samples [39]. The Chinese version of SUS has the same reliability and validity as the original version [40]. This tool was used to evaluate the overall user experience of AVP, which replaces the controllers typically seen in VR devices with gaze and hand gesture interaction.




Fig. 2. (A) The testing setup. (B) The task procedure of a single testing session.

## C. Testing setup and task procedure

The testing setup is illustrated in Figure 2A. During the fixation task, the volunteer rested his/her chin on a chinrest, which is firmly attached to a table. A ruler was placed 63cm away from the chinrest on the tabletop. The purpose of using a ruler was twofold: firstly, the ruler served as a reference line to allow the volunteer to place the virtual panel 63cm away from his/her eyes; and, secondly, we can use the ruler as a unit reference to convert gaze errors estimated from the recorded video into degree of visual angles ( $^{\circ}$ ).

Each testing session followed the following steps (see Figure 2B).

- 1) The volunteers first took part in a 10-minute training session to familiarize themselves with the functionality and use of the AVP.
- 2) Eye and hand setup in AVP (eye-tracking and hand-tracking calibration).
- 3) The volunteer sat by a table and rested his/her head on the chinrest (see Figure 2).

4) The volunteer opened a virtual panel with 9 fixation targets in the AVP and positioned the virtual panel behind a ruler placed on the tabletop. Here, the volunteer was instructed to align the bottom edge of the virtual panel with the ruler (see Figure 2A) and resize the panel to make sure the 9 fixation targets were within his/her field of view.

5) The volunteer switched AVP from the see-through mode to an immersive mode, so the virtual panel overlays on a black surface.

6) The volunteer started screen recording and sequentially fixated on the nine targets in a predefined sequence. The volunteer was explicitly instructed to look at each fixation target for 2-3 seconds.

7) After completing the fixation task, the volunteer was given an additional 10 minutes to freely explore the media contents and applications in the AVP.

8) Following the exploration, volunteers completed the Chinese version of the SUS.




Fig. 3. (A) In the virtual panel used in the experiment, the red circles are the fixation target, and the checkerboard is the background. (B) Fixation sequences. (C) the actual target positions relative to the central target.

During the test, volunteers were instructed to look at each visual target shown on the virtual panel (as shown in Figure 3A) in pre-specified sequences. Each volunteer completed four fixation sequences (see Figure 3B) and those sequences were balanced across the volunteers using a Latin square design.

Because the virtual panel was manually positioned on the tabletop by the volunteer, the fixation target may occupy slightly different spatial locations in the virtual space when testing different volunteers. Thus, we re-referenced the fixation targets to the central target and grouped the actual target positions from all recordings into 9 areas on the virtual panel (see Figure 3C). The 9 fixation targets spanned over a FOV of approximately  $34^{\circ} \times 18^{\circ}$ .

## D. Data analysis

- Eye tracking data

Raw gaze data is not available to AVP developers, so we devised a method to estimate gaze position, taking advantage of foveated rendering. With foveated rendering, visual details are rendered with the highest resolution in a small area

around the current gaze position whereas objects in the peripheral visual field are blurred to reduce the computational resource needed for graphics rendering (Figure 1). The effect of foveated rendering as seen in the screen recording captured by AVP is shown in Figure 4A, in which the area rendered with the highest resolution is highlighted with a circle.




Fig. 4. (A) A sample frame extracted from the AVP screen record. The visual elements in the blue circle were rendered with high resolution, whereas elements outside the circle were rendered with lower resolution. The red dots are the nine fixation targets the volunteers fixated in sequence. (B) The area rendered with high resolution is estimated with OpenCV.

All frames from the screen recordings captured by AVP were extracted using OpenCV (version 4.9.0). The edge of the foveated area in each frame was identified by computing the Laplacian variance, as illustrated in Figure 4B. Then, the center coordinates of the foveated area were estimated to infer the current gaze position. As shown in Figure 4A, the fixation target (ground truth gaze position) in each frame is marked with red disks, and its coordinates were estimated using the Hough Circle Transform. After extracting the target and gaze coordinates, we proceeded to analyze the gaze data as if it were generated by a 30Hz head-mounted eye tracker, as the screen recording in AVP was 30Hz.

We followed the field consensus to estimate and report eye-tracking data quality [35], [41]. Specifically, for each fixation target (ground truth), we selected three continuous frames (total duration  $\approx$  100 ms) that had the smallest gaze error from the target (see Figure 5, for an illustration). We then calculated the average gaze error (in pixels) of these three frames.

For easy comparison to other eye-tracking data quality studies, we converted the gaze errors from pixels to degrees of visual angle. Using DataThief 3 [42] and a physical ruler recorded with the virtual panel, we estimated the physical

size (in cm) of a single pixel in the screen recording, allowing us to convert the gaze error (in pixels) into real-world units (cm). Following this analysis step, we estimated the physical distance between the nine fixation targets and the chinrest. We then convert the tracking accuracy of AVP into degrees of visual angle ( $^{\circ}$ ).




Fig. 5. The first three set gaze and target coordinates were extracted from AVP screen recordings (volunteer #13). The gaze samples selected for estimating gaze errors are marked with vertical gray bars.

- SUS ratings

For the SUS ratings, we report the overall rating, as well as the ratings for its learnable and usable subscales. Learnability is evaluated by items 4 and 10 in SUS, whereas usability is evaluated with the other items on SUS.

### III. RESULTS

#### A. Gaze error

As noted, the analysis included data from 24 volunteers and the primary variable of interest in gaze error. For easy reference by UI designers, we report the gaze error for each fixation target in pixels<sup>2</sup>. Additionally, to facilitate comparison with other studies on eye-tracking data quality, we also present the gaze error in degrees of visual angle.

The volunteer was instructed to look at 9 fixation targets presented on a virtual panel, each gaze target is named according to its position, as shown in Figure 6A. An ANOVA on the gaze error revealed a significant main effect for the fixation target,  $F(1,23) = 9.29$ ,  $p = 0.006$ , showing that the gaze error varied across the visual field. Post-hoc contrasts (with Bonferroni correction) revealed that the gaze error for the Center target was lower than that for the bottom regions (Bottom-left, Bottom, Bottom-right, all  $p < 0.004$ ), and the Bottom-left target had the largest gaze error (significantly larger than Center, Top, and Top-right, all  $p < 0.04$ ). The gaze error at each target position from all volunteers is presented in Table 1.

The overall accuracy across all volunteers was  $2.5^{\circ}$  (range:  $0.25^{\circ}$ - $8.83^{\circ}$ , see Figure 6B) or 61.95 pixels (range: 6.05 – 212.46, see Figure 6C).

<sup>2</sup> The AVP screen recordings were 1080P videos of the central field of view (FOV) of the user. Our tests suggest that the size of a pixel in the 1080P AVP screen recording roughly corresponds to one "point" (the scalable graphics unit used for Apple devices).

TABLE I. THE GAZE ERROR (IN PIXELS) AT ALL TARGET LOCATIONS. NUMBERS IN THE PARENTHESIS ARE GAZE ERROR IN DEGREES OF VISUAL ANGLE.

No.	Target Location									Additional Information		
	Top-left	Top	Top-right	Left	Center	Right	Bottom-left	Bottom	Bottom-right	Nearsightedness	Contact lens	Make up
1	68.13 (2.67)	54.24 (2.26)	49.02 (1.92)	65.17 (2.71)	58.98 (2.57)	36.17 (1.50)	74.40 (2.92)	65.65 (2.73)	41.52 (1.63)	L: -4.50, R: -4.50	Yes	No
2	81.49 (3.20)	50.35 (2.09)	22.02 (0.86)	96.06 (3.99)	44.63 (1.94)	6.05 (0.25)	100.47 (3.94)	64.95 (2.70)	16.47 (0.64)	L: -4.00, R: -4.00	No	No
3	68.33 (2.68)	42.93 (1.78)	56.87 (2.23)	63.12 (2.62)	53.95 (2.35)	77.65 (3.23)	64.88 (2.54)	43.83 (1.82)	70.83 (2.78)	L: -3.25, R: -4.25	No	No
4	152.33 (5.97)	85.62 (3.56)	91.83 (3.60)	62.12 (2.58)	40.13 (1.75)	12.87 (0.53)	78.51 (3.08)	42.23 (1.75)	33.20 (1.30)	L: -2.00, R: -2.00	Yes	Yes
5	145.05 (5.69)	212.46 (8.82)	205.58 (8.06)	61.17 (2.54)	44.81 (1.95)	27.09 (1.12)	119.22 (4.68)	34.75 (1.44)	46.16 (1.81)	L: -3.00, R: -4.00	Yes	No
6	52.89 (2.07)	40.97 (1.70)	75.47 (2.96)	56.02 (2.33)	53.83 (2.34)	56.24 (2.34)	73.02 (2.86)	48.16 (2.00)	49.86 (1.95)	L: 0, R: -1.00	No	No
7	67.67 (2.65)	50.13 (2.08)	43.29 (1.70)	63.51 (2.64)	62.97 (2.74)	30.48 (1.27)	55.55 (2.18)	37.21 (1.55)	29.87 (1.17)	L: -4.00, R: -3.00	No	No
8	45.24 (1.77)	28.44 (1.18)	128.51 (5.04)	45.89 (1.91)	23.79 (1.03)	91.28 (3.80)	81.27 (3.19)	31.28 (1.30)	87.45 (3.43)	L: 0, R: 0	No	No
9	105.93 (4.15)	49.73 (2.07)	108.08 (4.24)	74.82 (3.11)	53.01 (2.31)	74.12 (3.08)	93.45 (3.67)	55.23 (2.30)	116.65 (4.58)	L: 0, R: 0	No	No
10	68.75 (2.70)	50.34 (2.09)	38.98 (1.53)	61.09 (2.54)	70.48 (3.07)	38.85 (1.61)	66.93 (2.62)	41.62 (1.73)	38.51 (1.51)	L: 0, R: 0	No	No
11	66.70 (2.62)	46.16 (1.92)	23.09 (0.9)	55.98 (2.33)	47.67 (2.08)	22.54 (0.93)	68.44 (2.68)	49.15 (2.04)	21.38 (0.84)	L: -5.25, R: -5.25	Yes	Yes
12	73.80 (2.89)	69.52 (2.89)	35.53 (1.39)	75.03 (3.12)	56.19 (2.45)	26.40 (1.10)	73.49 (2.88)	57.65 (2.40)	32.16 (1.26)	L: -7.50, R: -8.50	Yes	Yes
13	70.40 (2.76)	51.11 (2.12)	81.10 (3.18)	62.38 (2.59)	43.03 (1.87)	60.71 (2.52)	64.34 (2.52)	41.67 (1.73)	55.31 (2.17)	L: -3.00, R: -3.00	No	No
14	75.65 (2.97)	42.71 (1.77)	66.83 (2.62)	68.25 (2.84)	36.55 (1.59)	49.60 (2.06)	71.45 (2.80)	54.77 (2.28)	68.48 (2.68)	L: -6.50, R: -6.75	Yes	No
15	96.80 (3.80)	89.40 (3.72)	30.61 (1.20)	92.70 (3.86)	80.79 (3.52)	44.54 (1.85)	88.88 (3.49)	74.86 (3.11)	53.72 (2.11)	L: 0, R: 0	No	No
16	60.63 (2.38)	38.06 (1.58)	81.22 (3.19)	55.57 (2.31)	22.23 (0.97)	51.90 (2.16)	76.91 (3.02)	34.25 (1.42)	73.17 (2.87)	L: -2.75, R: -3.00	Yes	Yes
17	68.82 (2.70)	51.19 (2.13)	56.80 (2.23)	78.62 (3.27)	42.63 (1.86)	57.24 (2.38)	62.60 (2.45)	12.41 (0.51)	76.78 (3.01)	L: -3.75, R: -4.25	Yes	No
18	95.38 (3.74)	74.82 (3.11)	56.10 (2.20)	78.36 (3.26)	37.67 (1.64)	47.40 (1.97)	78.73 (3.09)	61.62 (2.56)	24.77 (0.97)	L: 0, R: 0	No	No
19	67.20 (2.64)	38.98 (1.62)	104.47 (4.10)	55.88 (2.32)	16.85 (0.73)	92.23 (3.84)	65.28 (2.56)	29.01 (1.20)	98.89 (3.88)	L: -4.00, R: 0	No	No
20	101.35 (3.98)	71.59 (2.98)	142.14 (5.58)	86.03 (3.58)	53.92 (2.35)	75.57 (3.14)	92.08 (3.61)	21.79 (0.90)	111.38 (4.37)	L: -2.25, R: -4.00	Yes	No
21	80.75 (3.17)	71.29 (2.97)	37.69 (1.48)	72.64 (3.02)	48.53 (2.11)	31.98 (1.33)	69.78 (2.74)	56.16 (2.33)	22.93 (0.90)	L: -5.50, R: -6.00	No	No
22	76.18 (2.99)	58.71 (2.44)	38.97 (1.53)	73.35 (3.05)	50.25 (2.19)	37.60 (1.56)	147.52 (5.78)	83.98 (3.49)	30.23 (1.18)	L: -7.50, R: -7.50	Yes	No
23	78.15 (3.06)	79.60 (3.31)	84.84 (3.33)	59.26 (2.46)	55.45 (2.42)	52.32 (2.18)	45.32 (1.78)	42.98 (1.79)	28.68 (1.12)	L: -2.00, R: -2.00	No	No
24	64.86 (2.54)	66.07 (2.75)	25.74 (1.01)	83.43 (3.47)	42.93 (1.87)	19.41 (0.80)	64.07 (2.51)	33.66 (1.40)	24.82 (0.97)	L: -2.25, R: -1.50	Yes	No
Mean	80.52 (3.16)	63.11 (2.63)	70.20 (2.76)	68.61 (2.86)	47.56 (2.08)	46.68 (1.94)	78.20 (3.07)	46.62 (1.94)	52.22 (2.05)			
SD	24.87 (0.98)	34.86 (1.45)	43.06 (1.69)	12.39 (0.52)	14.14 (0.62)	23.03 (0.96)	20.93 (0.82)	16.39 (0.68)	28.85 (1.13)			

TABLE II. THE USER RATINGS ON THE SYSTEM USABILITY SCALE

SUS items											Standardized SUS score		
No.	<i>1. I think that I would like to use AVP frequently.</i>	<i>2. I found the AVP unnecessarily complex.</i>	<i>3. I thought the AVP was easy to use.</i>	<i>4. I think that I would need the support of a technical person to be able to use the AVP.</i>	<i>5. I found the various functions in the AVP were well integrated.</i>	<i>6. I thought there was too much inconsistency in the AVP</i>	<i>7. I would imagine that most people would learn to use AVP very quickly.</i>	<i>8. I found AVP very awkward to use.</i>	<i>9. I felt very confident using the AVP</i>	<i>10. I needed to learn a log of thins before I could get going with AVP.</i>	<i>Usable</i>	<i>Learnable</i>	<i>Overall</i>
1	3	3	3	4	3	1	3	3	3	4	68.75	100.00	75.00
2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	75.00	62.50	72.50
3	2	3	3	4	2	3	2	2	2	3	59.38	87.50	65.00
4	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	81.25	100.00	85.00
5	2	3	3	2	4	3	2	3	2	1	68.75	37.50	62.50
6	4	3	3	2	2	2	4	3	4	3	78.13	62.50	75.00
7	3	2	3	4	3	3	3	2	3	4	68.75	100.00	75.00
8	4	3	3	2	3	4	4	3	4	4	87.50	75.00	85.00
9	4	4	4	4	1	2	4	4	4	4	84.38	100.00	87.50
10	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	90.63	75.00	87.50
11	3	2	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	2	68.75	37.50	62.50
12	2	4	4	4	3	2	2	3	2	4	68.75	100.00	75.00
13	2	2	1	2	3	4	2	2	2	4	56.25	75.00	60.00
14	1	1	1	1	3	3	1	2	1	2	40.63	37.50	40.00
15	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	59.38	75.00	62.50
16	2	3	3	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	56.25	25.00	50.00
17	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	1	3	4	62.50	87.50	67.50
18	4	4	4	2	3	3	4	4	4	4	93.75	75.00	90.00
19	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	93.75	87.50	92.50
20	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	81.25	100.00	85.00
21	4	4	3	1	4	2	4	3	4	3	87.50	50.00	80.00
22	3	4	4	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	81.25	50.00	75.00
23	4	2	2	1	3	2	4	2	4	1	71.88	25.00	62.50
24	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	87.50	75.00	85.00
Mean	3.04	3.08	3.04	2.54	2.79	2.75	3.04	2.83	3.04	3.13	73.83	70.83	73.23
SD	0.89	0.81	0.84	1.15	0.76	0.72	0.89	0.75	0.89	1.01	13.43	24.65	13.00





Fig. 6. The layout of the nine targets (A) and the gaze error in degrees of visual angle (B) and pixels (C) at each target position.

### B. SUS ratings

The SUS ratings were first converted to standard scores and then aggregated separately on the usability and learnability dimensions (see Table 2). In reference to the industrial norm of SUS [43], the average usability score for AVP is 73.83, which falls within the B- grade, higher than 65-69% of products. The learnability of the AVP score is 70.83, falling within grade C, higher than 41-59% of products.

To examine how eye-tracking accuracy impacts usability, we calculated the Pearson correlation between gaze error and usability scores, and the results revealed no statistically reliable correlation (see Figure 7) between the overall gaze error and the two SUS subscales, usable ( $r = 0.049$ ,  $p = 0.821$ ) and learnable ( $r = 0.076$ ,  $p = 0.725$ ), as well as the overall SUS score ( $r = 0.069$ ,  $p = 0.749$ ).



The 7. Scatter plots showing the correlation between gaze error and (A) usable score, (B) learnable and (C) SUS scores.

## IV. DISCUSSION

### A. The gaze error of AVP

The primary objective of this study was to evaluate the eye-tracking accuracy in AVP. We used a standard fixation task, in which the volunteers looked at 9 fixation targets on a mixed reality panel (see Figure 3A). Due to restrictions imposed by Apple Inc., developers are not allowed to access the raw eye-tracking data of AVP. Thus, we measured the gaze position reported by AVP by leveraging foveated rendering. The testing results indicate that the overall gaze error of AVP is 61.95 pixels (2.5°). Furthermore, there is no correlation between gaze error and user-reported usability of AVP.

Eye-tracking data quality is evaluated with multiple metrics, e.g., accuracy, precision, latency, and data loss [35], [41]. The same set of data quality metrics also applies to VR/AR eye-tracking. For example, previous studies have shown that, with foveated rendering, the latency of the gaze signal should not exceed 70 ms [44]. For accuracy, Sipatchin and her colleagues tested an HTC Vive Pro Eye and revealed that the gaze error of the built-in Tobii eye-tracking device varied between 0.94° to 10.77° (mean = 4.16°) over an FOV of 48° × 48° [14]. Schuetz & Fiehler performed a similar test on the same device and reported an overall gaze error between 0.09° and 4.99° (mean = 1.08°) [34]. Both studies have shown that the central area of the FOV of the eye-tracking device has the lowest gaze error, whereas gaze error increases moving towards more peripheral regions. The present test results show that the overall gaze error of AVP is 2.5° (range: 0.25° - 8.83°), which is on par with other VR devices [14], [34], [45].

Apple acquired SensoMotoric Instruments (SMI) in 2017; the eye-tracking capability in AVP may be based on the eye-tracking technology of SMI. The present testing results, however, showed that the eye-tracking accuracy of AVP is likely lower than the last eye-tracking glasses released by SMI (SMI-ETG2) before its acquisition by Apple Inc. Previous studies showed that the gaze error of SMI-ETG2 ranged between 0.55° [33] to 1.21° [36]. The placement of the infrared cameras in AVP may be different from SMI-ETG2, as the eye relief is smaller in AVP. A similar camera placement is not possible in AVP and other VR/AR devices, making it difficult to achieve the same level of tracking accuracy as eye-tracking glasses [46]. New eye-tracking techniques that can greatly improve tracking accuracy are much needed for VR/AR applications.

### B. Gaze error and gaze-based interaction in VR/AR

Previous studies have extensively explored the possible application of eye-tracking in interaction, however, few studies have examined the tracking accuracy needed for different types of interaction [19], [22], [47], and there is no universally agreed tracking accuracy range for interactive applications. Previous studies have shown that large icons and menus facilitate quicker and more accurate gaze-based selection [48], [49], [50], but they also impose serious space restrictions on UI design. Conversely, excessively small icons can make interaction challenging, diminishing user experience. Feit and her colleagues conducted a benchmark test of multiple eye-tracking devices for daily input, and they found a significant decrease in tracking accuracy and precision in screen corners [19]. Therefore, they suggested that UI design should adaptively adjust the size of UI elements based on their positions. For example, icons at the bottom of the screen should be as large as possible.

Gaze-based interaction is critical to AVP, which deserted controllers in favor of gaze and gesture interaction. The Apple Design Guidelines recommend that the gaze target should be at least 60 points. For example, a circular icon may have a diameter of 44 points, but the associated interactive area is larger, forming a square with a side length of 60 points. Apple also recommended that the center-to-center distance between two icons should be at least 60 points [51]. These design guidelines align well with the results of the present testing, which revealed that the gaze error of AVP is 62 pixels overall and down to 41 pixels in the central FOV. It is conceivable that Apple has done extensive tests and is confident that this level of tracking accuracy is sufficient for gaze-based interaction. The present testing results can be used as a baseline reference for other AR/VR manufacturers to evaluate their eye-tracking solutions.

### C. Gaze error and usability

Fernandes, Murdison & Proulx compared three target selection methods and found that controllers were the most precise, but eye-tracking input was more natural and easier to use, and both are better than head-turning [12]. Luro & Sundstedt also found that gaze-based selection significantly reduces cognitive load [52]. However, studies are showing that gaze-based input methods decrease interaction accuracy [53]. Importantly, most empirical studies that evaluated eye-tracking data quality reported that the gaze error of eye-trackers is greater than  $1.0^\circ$  [14], [36], [54], [55], suggesting that eye-tracking error may be a hurdle to usability.

In the present study, volunteers were able to accurately select and manipulate menus during both the testing task and the free exploration most time in AVP. The testing results also showed that the gaze error of AVP does not appear to impact user evaluation of device usability. These findings indicate that the usability of gaze-based interaction is not determined by gaze accuracy but rather heavily influenced by interaction design. For example, previous work has shown that using well-designed feedback allows users to quickly and easily identify their currently selected UI elements during gaze-based interaction [56], [57], [58]. In the present study, many volunteers reported having difficulty in accurately selecting the “close” button located at the bottom FOV, likely attributable to the lower tracking accuracy in the bottom as compared to the center FOV [14], [18], [30], [55]. However, the feedback design of AVP allowed the

volunteers to learn that they did not select a target, and then adjust their head orientation or gaze until the target was selected. These adjustments in gaze direction and head orientation are mostly spontaneous behaviors and do not cause much confusion among the users.

### D. Limitations of the present work

Before we conclude this paper, it is important to note that the present tests did not capture gaze data from eye-tracking API directly but rather inferred gaze position from foveated rendering in AVP. Furthermore, it remains unclear how well the mixed reality environment of AVP accurately captures the real physical environment [59], [60]; consequently, the distance between the virtual panel and eyes may deviate from the testing setup (63 cm). These methodological limitations may inflate the estimated gaze error of AVP in terms of visual angles.

Due to the restrictions imposed by Apple Inc., we were unable to evaluate other eye-tracking data quality measures, most notably precision, and latency, both of which may heavily impact the user experience of gaze-based interaction.

## V. CONCLUSION

The eye-tracking module of the recently released Apple Vision Pro (AVP) mixed reality device is exclusively used for gaze-based interaction and graphics rendering. To address privacy concerns, AVP does not allow developers to access its raw eye-tracking data. It remains unclear whether Apple will eventually open its eye-tracking interface to developers for applications in education, clinical research, and other fields. The current study devised a method to evaluate the tracking accuracy of the eye-tracking module of the AVP, leveraging foveated rendering. The test results revealed an overall gaze error of  $2.5^\circ$  (range:  $0.25^\circ$  to  $8.83^\circ$ ) over a tested FOV of approximately  $34^\circ \times 18^\circ$ . This level of tracking accuracy is worse than eye-tracking glasses, such as the SMI-ETG2, Tobii Pro Glasses 2, and AdHawk MindLink (see [36] for a recent test). Interestingly, we found that the overall usability ratings do not vary much with eye-tracking accuracy, showing that an overall tracking accuracy of  $2.5^\circ$  is sufficient for gaze-based interactions in VR/AR. Our verdict is that future research on AR/VR eye-tracking should focus on improving interaction design rather than improving eye-tracking accuracy.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

*Open practices statement Data, experimental scripts, and analysis tools are available for research purposes and can be accessed from*  
<https://pan.baidu.com/s/1p1PH1s0jaqceDxUNXk7jhw?pwd=ec39x>

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. Kim *et al.*, ‘Foveated AR: dynamically-foveated augmented reality display’, *ACM Trans. Graph.*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 1–15, Aug. 2019, doi: 10.1145/3306346.3322987.
- [2] X. Meng, R. Du, and A. Varshney, ‘Eye-dominance-guided Foveated Rendering’, *IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graph.*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 1972–1980, May 2020, doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2020.2973442.
- [3] A. Patney *et al.*, ‘Towards foveated rendering for gaze-tracked virtual reality’, *ACM Trans. Graph.*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 1–12, Nov. 2016, doi: 10.1145/2980179.2980246.
- [4] D. Dunn, ‘Required Accuracy of Gaze Tracking for Varifocal Displays’, in 2019 IEEE Conference on Virtual Reality and 3D User

- Interfaces (VR), Osaka, Japan: IEEE, Mar. 2019, pp. 1838–1842. doi: 10.1109/VR.2019.8798273.
- [5] A. L. Gardony, R. W. Lindeman, and T. T. Brunyé, ‘Eye-tracking for human-centered mixed reality: promises and challenges’, in *Optical Architectures for Displays and Sensing in Augmented, Virtual, and Mixed Reality (AR, VR, MR)*, B. C. Kress and C. Peroz, Eds., San Francisco, United States: SPIE, Feb. 2020, p. 27. doi: 10.1117/12.2542699.
  - [6] S. Nam and J. Choi, ‘Development of a user evaluation system in virtual reality based on eye-tracking technology’, *Multimed. Tools Appl.*, vol. 82, no. 14, pp. 21117–21130, Jun. 2023, doi: 10.1007/s11042-023-14583-y.
  - [7] B. W. Nyamtiga, D. K. P. Asiedu, A. A. Hermawan, Y. F. Luckyarno, and J.-H. Yun, ‘Adaptive foveated rendering and offloading in an edge-assisted virtual reality system’, *IEEE Access*, pp. 1–1, 2024, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2024.3359708.
  - [8] L. Wang, X. Shi, and Y. Liu, ‘Foveated rendering: A state-of-the-art survey’, *Comput. Vis. Media*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 195–228, Jun. 2023, doi: 10.1007/s41095-022-0306-4.
  - [9] P. Chatelain, H. Sharma, L. Drukker, A. T. Papageorghiou, and J. A. Noble, ‘Evaluation of gaze tracking calibration for longitudinal biomedical imaging studies’, *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 153–163, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1109/TCYB.2018.2866274.
  - [10] L. Larsson, M. Nyström, R. Andersson, and M. Stridh, ‘Detection of fixations and smooth pursuit movements in high-speed eye-tracking data’, *Biomed. Signal Process. Control*, vol. 18, pp. 145–152, Apr. 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.bspc.2014.12.008.
  - [11] J. Wang, S. Xu, Y. Dai, and S. Gao, ‘An eye tracking and brain-computer interface-based human-environment interactive system for amyotrophic lateral sclerosis patients’, *IEEE Sens. J.*, vol. 23, no. 20, pp. 24095–24106, Oct. 2023, doi: 10.1109/JSEN.2022.3223878.
  - [12] A. S. Fernandes, T. S. Murdison, and M. J. Proulx, ‘Leveling the playing field: a comparative reevaluation of unmodified eye tracking as an input and interaction modality for VR’, *IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graph.*, vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 2269–2279, May 2023, doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2023.3247058.
  - [13] Y. S. Pai, T. Dingler, and K. Kunze, ‘Assessing hands-free interactions for VR using eye gaze and electromyography’, *Virtual Real.*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 119–131, Jun. 2019, doi: 10.1007/s10055-018-0371-2.
  - [14] A. Sipatchin, S. Wahl, and K. Rifai, ‘Eye-tracking for clinical ophthalmology with virtual reality (VR): a case study of the HTC vive pro eye’s usability’, *Healthcare*, vol. 9, no. 2, p. 180, Feb. 2021, doi: 10.3390/healthcare9020180.
  - [15] Y. Wei et al., ‘Predicting gaze-based target selection in augmented reality headsets based on eye and head endpoint distributions’, in *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, Hamburg Germany: ACM, Apr. 2023, pp. 1–14. doi: 10.1145/3544548.3581042.
  - [16] I. B. Adhanom, P. MacNeillage, and E. Folmer, ‘Eye Tracking in Virtual Reality: a Broad Review of Applications and Challenges’, *Virtual Real.*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 1481–1505, Jun. 2023, doi: 10.1007/s10055-022-00738-z.
  - [17] S. Pastel, J. Marlok, N. Bandow, and K. Witte, ‘Application of eye-tracking systems integrated into immersive virtual reality and possible transfer to the sports sector - A systematic review’, *Multimed. Tools Appl.*, vol. 82, no. 3, pp. 4181–4208, Jan. 2023, doi: 10.1007/s11042-022-13474-y.
  - [18] B. V. Ehinger, K. Groß, I. Ibs, and P. König, ‘A new comprehensive eye-tracking test battery concurrently evaluating the Pupil Labs glasses and the EyeLink 1000’, *PeerJ*, vol. 7, p. e7086, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.7717/peerj.7086.
  - [19] A. M. Feit et al., ‘Toward Everyday Gaze Input: Accuracy and Precision of Eye Tracking and Implications for Design’, in *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, Denver Colorado USA: ACM, May 2017, pp. 1118–1130. doi: 10.1145/3025453.3025599.
  - [20] K. Pfeuffer, B. Mayer, D. Mardanbegi, and H. Gellersen, ‘Gaze + pinch interaction in virtual reality’, in *Proceedings of the 5th Symposium on Spatial User Interaction*, Brighton United Kingdom: ACM, Oct. 2017, pp. 99–108. doi: 10.1145/3131277.3132180.
  - [21] M. Akiyoshi and H. Takeno, ‘An estimation framework of a user learning curve on web-based interface using eye tracking equipment’, in *Human-Computer Interaction. Human-Centred Design Approaches, Methods, Tools, and Environments*, vol. 8004, M. Kurosu, Ed., in *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 8004., Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013, pp. 159–165. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-39232-0\_18.
  - [22] N. V. Valtakari, I. T. C. Hooge, C. Viktorsson, P. Nyström, T. Falck-Ytter, and R. S. Hessels, ‘Eye tracking in human interaction: Possibilities and limitations’, *Behav. Res. Methods*, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 1592–1608, Aug. 2021, doi: 10.3758/s13428-020-01517-x.
  - [23] G. A. Koulieris, K. Akşit, M. Stengel, R. K. Mantiuk, K. Mania, and C. Richardt, ‘Near-eye display and tracking technologies for virtual and augmented reality’, *Comput. Graph. Forum*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 493–519, May 2019, doi: 10.1111/cgf.13654.
  - [24] B. Mohanto, A. T. Islam, E. Gobetti, and O. Staadt, ‘An integrative view of foveated rendering’, *Comput. Graph.*, vol. 102, pp. 474–501, Feb. 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.cag.2021.10.010.
  - [25] Y. Zhou, J. Zhang, and F. Fang, ‘Vergence-accommodation conflict in optical see-through display: review and prospect’, *Results Opt.*, vol. 5, p. 100160, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.rio.2021.100160.
  - [26] S. D. Aziz and O. V. Komogortsev, ‘An assessment of the eye tracking signal quality captured in the Hololens 2’, in *2022 Symposium on Eye Tracking Research and Applications*, Jun. 2022, pp. 1–6. doi: 10.1145/3517031.3529626.
  - [27] J. Brand, S. G. Diamond, N. Thomas, and D. Gilbert-Diamond, ‘Evaluating the data quality of the Gazepoint GP3 low-cost eye tracker when used independently by study participants’, *Behav. Res. Methods*, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 1502–1514, Aug. 2021, doi: 10.3758/s13428-020-01504-2.
  - [28] H. C. Cuve, J. Stojanov, X. Roberts-Gaal, C. Catmur, and G. Bird, ‘Validation of Gazepoint low-cost eye-tracking and psychophysiology bundle’, *Behav. Res. Methods*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 1027–1049, Apr. 2022, doi: 10.3758/s13428-021-01654-x.
  - [29] R. S. Hessels, R. Andersson, I. T. C. Hooge, M. Nyström, and C. Kemner, ‘Consequences of eye color, positioning, and head movement for eye-tracking data quality in infant research’, *Infancy*, vol. 20, no. 6, pp. 601–633, Nov. 2015, doi: 10.1111/inf.12093.
  - [30] K. Holmqvist, S. L. Orbom, M. Miller, A. Kashchenevsky, M. M. Shovman, and M. W. Greenlee, ‘Validation of a prototype hybrid eye-tracker against the DPI and the Tobii Spectrum’, in *ACM Symposium on Eye Tracking Research and Applications*, Stuttgart Germany: ACM, Jun. 2020, pp. 1–9. doi: 10.1145/3379155.3391330.
  - [31] I. T. C. Hooge, D. C. Niehorster, R. S. Hessels, J. S. Benjamins, and M. Nyström, ‘How robust are wearable eye trackers to slow and fast head and body movements?’, *Behav. Res. Methods*, Nov. 2022, doi: 10.3758/s13428-022-02010-3.
  - [32] J. D. Morgante, R. Zolfaghari, and S. P. Johnson, ‘A critical test of temporal and spatial accuracy of the Tobii T60XL eye tracker’, *Infancy*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 9–32, Jan. 2012, doi: 10.1111/j.1532-7078.2011.00089.x.
  - [33] S. Pastel, C.-H. Chen, L. Martin, M. Naujoks, K. Petri, and K. Witte, ‘Comparison of gaze accuracy and precision in real-world and virtual reality’, *Virtual Real.*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 175–189, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.1007/s10055-020-00449-3.
  - [34] I. Schuetz and K. Fiehler, ‘Eye tracking in virtual reality: Vive pro eye spatial accuracy, precision, and calibration reliability’, *J. Eye Mov. Res.*, vol. 15, no. 3, Sep. 2022, doi: 10.16910/jemr.15.3.3.
  - [35] K. Holmqvist, M. Nyström, and F. Mulvey, ‘Eye tracker data quality: what it is and how to measure it’, in *Proceedings of the Symposium on Eye Tracking Research and Applications*, Santa Barbara California: ACM, Mar. 2012, pp. 45–52. doi: 10.1145/2168556.2168563.
  - [36] Z. Huang, X. Duan, G. Zhu, S. Zhang, R. Wang, and Z. Wang, ‘Assessing the data quality of AdHawk MindLink eye-tracking glasses’, *Behav. Res. Methods*, Jan. 2024, doi: 10.3758/s13428-023-02310-2.
  - [37] J. J. Macinnes, S. Iqbal, J. Pearson, and E. N. Johnson, ‘Wearable Eye-tracking for Research: Automated dynamic gaze mapping and accuracy/precision comparisons across devices’, *Neuroscience*, preprint, Jun. 2018. doi: 10.1101/299925.
  - [38] J. R. Lewis, ‘The System Usability Scale: past, present, and future’, *Int. J. Human-Computer Interact.*, vol. 34, no. 7, pp. 577–590, Jul. 2018, doi: 10.1080/10447318.2018.1455307.
  - [39] A. Bangor, P. T. Kortum, and J. T. Miller, ‘An empirical evaluation of the system usability scale’, *Int. J. Hum.-Comput. Interact.*, vol. 24, no. 6, pp. 574–594, Jul. 2008, doi: 10.1080/10447310802205776.
  - [40] Y. Wang, T. Lei, and X. Liu, ‘Chinese System Usability Scale: Translation, Revision, Psychological Measurement’, *Int. J. Human-Computer Interact.*, vol. 36, no. 10, pp. 953–963, Jun. 2020, doi: 10.1080/10447318.2019.1700644.

- [41] M. J. Dunn et al., 'Minimal reporting guideline for research involving eye tracking (2023 edition)', *Behav. Res. Methods*, Jul. 2023, doi: 10.3758/s13428-023-02187-1.
- [42] B. Tummers, 'Data Thief III'. 2006. [Online]. Available: <https://datathief.org/>
- [43] J. R. Lewis and J. Sauro, 'Item benchmarks for the system usability scale', *J. Usability Stud.*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 158–167, 2018.
- [44] R. Albert, A. Patney, D. Luebke, and J. Kim, 'Latency requirements for foveated rendering in virtual reality', *ACM Trans. Appl. Percept.*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 1–13, Oct. 2017, doi: 10.1145/3127589.
- [45] V. Clay, P. König, and S. U. König, 'Eye tracking in virtual reality', *J. Eye Mov. Res.*, vol. 12, no. 1, Apr. 2019, doi: 10.16910/jemr.12.1.3.
- [46] F. B. Narcizo, F. E. D. Dos Santos, and D. W. Hansen, 'High-accuracy gaze estimation for interpolation-based eye-tracking methods', *Vision*, vol. 5, no. 3, p. 41, Sep. 2021, doi: 10.3390/vision5030041.
- [47] P. Majoranta and A. Bulling, 'Eye tracking and eye-based human-computer interaction', in *Advances in Physiological Computing*, S. H. Fairclough and K. Gilleade, Eds., in *Human-Computer Interaction Series*, London: Springer London, 2014, pp. 39–65. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4471-6392-3\_3.
- [48] Y. Kammerer and W. Beinbauer, 'Gaze-based web search: the impact of interface design on search result selection', in *Proceedings of the 2010 Symposium on Eye-Tracking Research & Applications - ETRA '10*, Austin, Texas: ACM Press, 2010, p. 191. doi: 10.1145/1743666.1743713.
- [49] Y. Niu et al., 'Improving accuracy of gaze-control tools: Design recommendations for optimum position, sizes, and spacing of interactive objects', *Hum. Factors Ergon. Manuf. Serv. Ind.*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 249–269, May 2021, doi: 10.1002/hfm.20884.
- [50] W. Yi-yan et al., 'Design recommendations of target size and tracking speed under circular and square trajectories for smooth pursuit with Euclidean algorithm in eye-control system', *Displays*, vol. 81, p. 102608, Jan. 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.displa.2023.102608.
- [51] 'Designing for spatial input'. Apple Developer, 2023. Accessed: May 18, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://developer.apple.com/videos/play/wwdc2023/10073?time=741>
- [52] F. L. Luro and V. Sundstedt, 'A comparative study of eye tracking and hand controller for aiming tasks in virtual reality', in *Proceedings of the 11th ACM Symposium on Eye Tracking Research & Applications*, Denver Colorado: ACM, Jun. 2019, pp. 1–9. doi: 10.1145/3317956.3318153.
- [53] Y. Y. Qian and R. J. Teather, 'The eyes don't have it: an empirical comparison of head-based and eye-based selection in virtual reality', in *Proceedings of the 5th Symposium on Spatial User Interaction*, Brighton United Kingdom: ACM, Oct. 2017, pp. 91–98. doi: 10.1145/3131277.3132182.
- [54] M. Lamb, M. Brundin, E. Perez Luque, and E. Billing, 'Eye-Tracking Beyond Peripersonal Space in Virtual Reality: Validation and Best Practices', *Front. Virtual Real.*, vol. 3, p. 864653, Apr. 2022, doi: 10.3389/frvir.2022.864653.
- [55] D. C. Niehorster, R. S. Hessels, and J. S. Benjamins, 'GlassesViewer: Open-source software for viewing and analyzing data from the Tobii Pro Glasses 2 eye tracker', *Behav. Res. Methods*, vol. 52, no. 3, pp. 1244–1253, Jun. 2020, doi: 10.3758/s13428-019-01314-1.
- [56] C. Kumar, R. Hedeshy, I. S. MacKenzie, and S. Staab, 'TAGSwipe: touch assisted gaze swipe for text entry', in *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, Honolulu HI USA: ACM, Apr. 2020, pp. 1–12. doi: 10.1145/3313831.3376317.
- [57] R. Menges, C. Kumar, and S. Staab, 'Improving user experience of eye tracking-based interaction: introspecting and adapting interfaces', *ACM Trans. Comput.-Hum. Interact.*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 1–46, Dec. 2019, doi: 10.1145/3338844.
- [58] M. Zhao et al., 'Gaze speedup: eye gaze assisted gesture typing in virtual reality', in *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*, Sydney NSW Australia: ACM, Mar. 2023, pp. 595–606. doi: 10.1145/3581641.3584072.
- [59] K. B. Chen, R. A. Kimmel, A. Bartholomew, K. Ponto, M. L. Gleicher, and R. G. Radwin, 'Manually Locating Physical and Virtual Reality Objects', *Hum. Factors J. Hum. Factors Ergon. Soc.*, vol. 56, no. 6, pp. 1163–1176, Sep. 2014, doi: 10.1177/0018720814523067.
- [60] H. Hong, 'A method to measure the uniformity of the virtual image distance in an augmented reality or virtual reality device', *J. Soc. Inf. Disp.*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 335–343, Apr. 2022, doi: 10.1002/jsid.1113.