

Vibrotactile versus Visual Stimulation in Learning the Piano

Matteo A. Coscia¹, Mazen Al Borno²

University of Colorado Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

1: matteo.coscia@colorado.edu, 2: mazen.alborno@ucdenver.edu (corresponding author)

Department of Computer Science and Engineering

Denver, Colorado, United-States

September 2023

Availability of data and materials

The dataset supporting the conclusions of this article is available on

<https://github.com/MatteoCoscia/Vibrotactile-Stimulation/blob/main/Data.xlsx>. The software for the stimulation is available on <https://github.com/MatteoCoscia/Vibrotactile-Stimulation>.

Funding

This work was supported in part by the NIH/NCATS Colorado CTSA Grant Number UL1 TR002535.

Acknowledgements

Not Applicable.

Competing Interests

The authors have no competing interests.

Contributions

All authors were responsible for the conceptualization of the project. The first author conducted the human subjects experiments, developed the software, conducted the analysis and wrote the manuscript. The second author helped conduct the analysis, edit the manuscript and supervise all aspects of the project.

Abstract

Vibrotactile stimulation has been explored to accelerate the acquisition of motor skills involving finger movements (Gemicioglu et al. 22, Markow et al. 2010, Seim et al. 17). This study evaluates the effectiveness of vibrotactile stimulation compared to visual feedback in learning a 14-note one-handed tune on the piano. In the experiment, 14 subjects with no prior piano experience were exposed to both vibrotactile and visual stimulation to determine which was more effective. Subjects were randomized 1:1 in a group that first receives vibrotactile stimulation, then visual stimulation or in a group that first receives visual stimulation, then vibrotactile stimulation. Effectiveness was measured by evaluating the timing error and accuracy. Results from our study indicated that the timing error for vibrotactile stimulation was 12.1% (SD 6.0%), while the equivalent for visual stimulation was 22.3% (SD 10.3%). The accuracy for vibrotactile stimulation was 69.2% (SD 27.2%), while the equivalent for visual stimulation was 91.3% (SD 13.5%). It was observed that vibrotactile stimulation was generally more effective at minimizing the timing error at which the notes were hit compared to visual stimulation, and no statistically significant differences were found in accuracy.

Keywords: Wearable Technology, Vibrotactile Stimulation, Passive Learning

Introduction

Vibrotactile stimulation is a mechanical stimulation that is produced with actuators placed on the skin that produces a sensation similar to a phone vibrating (Seim et al. 2015). Previous studies have shown that vibrotactile stimulation can accelerate the acquisition of motor skills involving finger movements such as keyboard typing and playing the piano (Gemicioglu et al. 22, Markow et al. 2010, Seim et al. 17); however, none have compared the effectiveness of vibrotactile stimulation with visual stimulation. Markow et al. 2010 compared active learning and passive learning through vibrotactile stimulation in helping subjects learn how to play the piano. Passive learning occurs when a subject learns a skill without actively paying attention to the task and practicing to learn it (e.g., by doing some other activity). Active learning is when the subject undergoes repeated and engaged practice to learn the skill. In this paper, we investigate the relative effectiveness of visual stimulation (active learning) and vibrotactile stimulation (passive learning) in helping subjects learn to play a 14-note one-handed tune on the piano. A tune is a sequence of musical notes arranged in a specific pattern on the piano.

By passing vibrations to different fingers using vibrating motors, vibrotactile stimulation can help subjects passively learn the sequence in which the motors vibrate (Fig. 1(a); Seim et al. 2015). In our work, visual stimulation involves the subject watching lights flash on a physical keyboard, indicating which notes to press (Fig. 1(b)). Instead of being passive like in vibrotactile stimulation, memorizing the tune is an active process conducted by the subject as they watch the lights on the piano. With visual stimulation, the subjects can see the notes to play, but they do not have any indication of which fingers to use. In this work, we inquired on how the effectiveness of vibrotactile stimulation and visual stimulation for learning the piano compared. This was investigated through an experiment with subjects without prior piano experience, with

the hypothesis that vibrotactile stimulation is more effective than visual stimulation at helping people learn a short one-handed tune on the piano.




Figure 1. (a) Vibrotactile stimulation glove that stimulate the knuckles. (b) Subject using keyboard lights to learn a tune.

Related Work

Vibrotactile stimulation has applications in virtual reality (Ogaz et al. 21), motor learning (Markow et al. 10), and non-invasive treatments of motor disorders such as Parkinson's disease (Pfeifer et al. 21). In this work, we are interested in vibrotactile stimulation for learning sequences of finger movements. Similarly to previous work, we place the vibrating motors at the back of the fingers, near the knuckles (Seim, 2015). We prefer this location instead of the fingertips because the latter would inhibit the subject's ability to manipulate objects, including the keys on the piano. Hsiao et al. 2011 developed a prototype to potentially improve piano lessons with vibrotactile stimulation. In their setup, both the piano teacher and the student wore vibrotactile stimulation gloves. The glove for the teacher recorded the finger tapping and hand movements, which were immediately signaled to a microcontroller and vibrated into the student's glove. In this way, the teacher would not have to physically instruct the student on where to place their fingers to play certain notes: they can learn because they feel the vibrations on their fingers rather than having to look at what the teacher is doing. In our work, the vibrations applied on the fingers are derived from the Audacity library (Audacity Team 2022) to generate an ideal tune (i.e., that determines which key to press and for how long).

Previous research in this area have discussed the effectiveness of vibrotactile stimulation to learn a sequence of finger movements. Huang et al. 2008 introduced the PianoTouch, a wearable haptic piano instruction system for the passive learning of piano skills. They conducted experiments on four subjects, testing the efficacy of vibrotactile stimulation for learning the tunes "Amazing Grace" and "Jingle Bells" on the piano. They found that vibrotactile stimulation was effective at teaching these songs passively: with vibrotactile stimulation, subjects hit 0 - 3 incorrect notes per song, and with active practice, subjects hit 4 - 7 incorrect notes per song.

Others have used vibrotactile stimulation to teach subjects a randomized numeric keypad (Seim et al. 2017). In these studies, vibrotactile stimulation was shown to be the most effective out of the other options tested (i.e., audio, active practice). However, none of these studies have compared vibrotactile stimulation directly to visual stimulation. This study expands on the existing work in the field by making this direct comparison.

Methods

Our study used the following materials: a keyboard with lights embedded in the keys, a vibrotactile stimulation glove, a microphone for recording the subjects playing the tune and Audacity's tone generator (software for generating the ideal tune). The vibrotactile stimulation glove consists of a microcontroller from Arduino (Uno R3) and 5 vibration motors from Seeed Technology (Model # 316040001). The vibrational signal was sent to the motor of choice for a specified duration and a voltage of 3.3 V using Arduino C++. We conducted a power analysis based on a 2-sample t-test with 2-sided α level set at 0.05 and power at 80% for the ability to detect a 7% difference in timing error between vibrotactile and visual feedback. The analysis resulted in having 7 subjects per group; therefore, 14 subjects were recruited within our institution for the experiment. The subjects were healthy and we had 9 males and 5 females with an average age of 32 (SD 10.7) years. We recruited subjects that had no prior piano experience as we were interested in investigating the effects of visual and vibrotactile feedback in motor learning in novice subjects. The total time for the experiments was about 45 minutes per subject. Subjects understood and consented to the protocol approved by the Institutional Review Board of the University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus.

We have conducted our experiments with a tune chosen from a beginner piano lesson book (Faber, N., & Faber, R., 1998). We identified a tune that could be truncated to 14 notes, be played with the right hand only and did not require the hand to move across the keyboard. Our results will likely hold for other tunes, as long as they are approximately the same size and do not require the movement of the hands across the keyboard. Our experiment used 20 minutes of passive vibrotactile stimulation to teach the subjects the sequence of finger movements to produce the tune. The time interval was selected because Kohlsdorf & Starner 2010 found that

this time order of passive vibrotactile stimulation was effective in teaching people to play a song on the piano. By using Audacity tones, we programmed the way the tune should ideally be played by specifying the parameters of the sounds in the program (i.e., frequency, amplitude and duration). Each note was programmed with its specific frequency and duration, determined with the generate tone function in Audacity.

The first 7 subjects watched lights on a keyboard flash to the same tune for 3 minutes. After 3 minutes, they were instructed to play the song again and were given no verbal instructions on what fingers to use or what the starting note was, and the song was recorded. Then, the subjects wore the glove for 20 minutes of passive vibrotactile stimulation. After those 20 minutes, the subjects removed the glove and were told “your pinky starts here, on G,” and that each of their fingers should be on a white key, with their thumb on C, pointer on D, middle finger on E, and so on. They were then instructed to play the song, and it was recorded. For the remaining seven subjects, the same procedure was repeated with the same tune, except that the vibrotactile stimulation was applied first, then the visual stimulation.

At the end of the experiments, the recordings were compared to the ideal spectrogram using Audacity by taking the timing bar and placing it at the start of the note in the recorded version of the tune. These values were compared to the ideal timing and note sequence using four different metrics. The first metric was the average timing error percentage of the notes played, which described the difference between the time the subject was supposed to hit a note and the time the subject actually hit a note, as a percentage. For example, if the subject hit the note at 3.45 s instead of 3.0 s, the timing error would be 15%. The second and third metrics were the accuracy of the notes played and the 2-norm difference.

Results

We will now compare how the subjects learned to play the tune after receiving visual or vibrotactile stimulation. In Fig. 2(a), we plot the average timing error percentage for subjects 1 to 7 when visual stimulation is applied first, followed by vibrotactile stimulation. We observe that for 5 of the 7 subjects, the vibrotactile stimulation reduced the timing errors. In Fig. 2(b), we plot the average timing error percentage for subjects 8 to 14 when vibrotactile stimulation is applied first, followed by visual stimulation. We observe that for 6 of the 7 subjects, the visual stimulation increased the percentage error in timing.




Figure 2. (a) The average timing error percentage for subjects 1 to 7 when the visual stimulation is applied first, followed by the vibrotactile stimulation. (b) The average timing error percentage for subjects 8 to 14 when the vibrotactile stimulation is applied first, followed by the visual stimulation.

In Fig. 3(a), we compare that the average timing errors percentages after vibrotactile stimulation and after visual stimulation. The timing errors are averaged over the two groups. We observe that the average timing error with vibrotactile stimulation is 12.6% (SD 11.5%) and with visual stimulation is 19.9% (SD 13.7%). The difference between the average timing error with vibrotactile stimulation and that with visual stimulation was statistically significant ($t(12) = 3.03$,

$p = 0.01$). In Fig. 3(b), we compare the average accuracy percentages after vibrotactile stimulation and after visual stimulation. We did not find a statistically significant difference in accuracy between visual and vibrotactile stimulation ($t(12) = 1.87$, $p = 0.09$).




Figure 3. (a) Average timing error percentage after vibrotactile stimulation and visual stimulation. (b) Average accuracy percentage after vibrotactile stimulation and visual stimulation. Error bars represent on standard deviation in the timing and accuracy errors.

In Fig. 4, we observe that the average 2-norm difference was larger for visual stimulation compared to vibrotactile stimulation, and it was found to be statistically significant via a t-test ($t(12) = 3.32$, $p = 0.006$). No statistically significant difference was found in the average Pearson cross-correlation between the played and ideal tune for visual and vibrotactile stimulation. In Appendix Table 1 and 2, we report the results for all the subjects in our experiments.




Figure 4. 2-norm difference for the timing of notes metric after vibrotactile stimulation and visual stimulation. Error bars represent standard deviation in the 2-norm difference errors.

Discussion

In this study, we found that vibrotactile stimulation was more effective at improving the timing of the notes played, indicating that learning motor sequences could be easier with tactile feedback rather than visual feedback. When the vibrotactile stimulation was done first, the visual stimulation had slightly larger timing errors than the previous vibrotactile stimulation. When the visual stimulation was done first, the vibrotactile stimulation had smaller timing errors than the previous visual stimulation. Therefore, vibrotactile stimulation was more effective than visual stimulation in terms of timing accuracy, regardless of the sequence in which the participants were presented with the different stimulations. One limitation of our experiment was that during the vibrotactile stimulation, some of the subjects were more focused on the vibrations, while others were more focused on talking, looking at their phones, or another activity; hence, we did not ensure that all our subjects were either uniformly focusing on the vibrations or focusing on another activity. In future work, we can build on the system to include the movement of the hand across the piano, possibly conveyed by vibration motors on the wrist or forearm. This would open up the possibilities to learning many more tunes. We could also combine the glove with visual stimulation so the user can see where their hand should be on the piano and receive the information about which finger to press through the glove.

References

- Alexander Marquardt, Ernst Kruijff, Christina Trepkowski, Jens Maiero, Andrea Schwandt, André Hinkenjann, Wolfgang Stuerzlinger, and Johannes Schöning. 2018. Audio-tactile proximity feedback for enhancing 3D manipulation. In Proceedings of the 24th ACM Symposium on Virtual Reality Software and Technology (VRST '18). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 2, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3281505.3281525>
- Anna N. Baglione, Michael Paul Clemens, Juan F. Maestre, Aehong Min, Luke Dahl, and Patrick C. Shih. 2021. Understanding the Technological Practices and Needs of Music Therapists. Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact. 5, CSCW1, Article 33 (April 2021), 25 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3449107>
- Audacity Team. (2022, September 11). *Home*. Audacity ®. Retrieved September 11, 2022, from <https://www.audacityteam.org/>
- Caitlyn E. Seim, David Quigley, and Thad E. Starner. 2014. Passive haptic learning of typing skills facilitated by wearable computers. In CHI '14 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI EA '14). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2203–2208. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2559206.2581329>
- Caitlyn Seim, Nick Doering, Yang Zhang, Wolfgang Stuerzlinger, and Thad Starner. 2017. Passive Haptic Training to Improve Speed and Performance on a Keypad. Proc. ACM Interact. Mob. Wearable Ubiquitous Technol. 1, 3, Article 100 (September 2017), 13 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3132026>
- Caitlyn Seim, Rodrigo Pontes, Sanjana Kadiveti, Zaeem Adamjee, Annette Cochran, Timothy Aveni, Peter Presti, and Thad Starner. 2018. Towards haptic learning on a smartwatch. In Proceedings of the 2018 ACM International Symposium on Wearable Computers (ISWC '18). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 228–229. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3267242.3267269>
- Chih-Pin Hsiao, Richard Li, Xinyan Yan, and Ellen Yi-Luen Do. 2015. Tactile Teacher: Sensing Finger Tapping in Piano Playing. In Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Tangible, Embedded, and Embodied Interaction (TEI '15). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 257–260. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2677199.2680554>
- C. E. Seim, B. Ritter, K. E. Flavin, M. G. Lansberg and A. M. Okamura, "Affective Ratings of Vibrotactile Signals in Older Adults With and Without History of Stroke," 2021 IEEE World Haptics Conference (WHC), 2021, pp. 457-462, doi: 10.1109/WHC49131.2021.9517216.
- C. E. Seim, B. Ritter, T. E. Starner, K. Flavin, M. G. Lansberg and A. M. Okamura, "Design of a Wearable Vibrotactile Stimulation Device for Individuals With Upper-Limb Hemiparesis and Spasticity," in IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering, vol. 30, pp. 1277-1287, 2022, doi: 10.1109/TNSRE.2022.3174808.

- C. Seim, T. Estes and T. Starner, "Towards Passive Haptic Learning of piano songs," 2015 IEEE World Haptics Conference (WHC), 2015, pp. 445-450, doi: 10.1109/WHC.2015.7177752.
- D. Kohlsdorf and T. Starner, "Mobile Music Touch: The effect of primary tasks on passively learning piano sequences," International Symposium on Wearable Computers (ISWC) 2010, 2010, pp. 1-8, doi: 10.1109/ISWC.2010.5665877.
- D. S. Pamungkas and A. Turnip, "Electro-tactile Cues for a Haptic Multimedia Finger Motoric Learning System," 2019 International Conference on Sustainable Engineering and Creative Computing (ICSECC), 2019, pp. 127-132, doi: 10.1109/ICSECC.2019.8906989.
- D. Wang, C. Peng, N. Afzal, W. Li, D. Wu and Y. Zhang, "Localization Performance of Multiple Vibrotactile Cues on Both Arms," in IEEE Transactions on Haptics, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 97-106, 1 Jan.-March 2018, doi: 10.1109/TOH.2017.2742507.
- Erik Pescara, Tobias Polly, Andrea Schankin, and Michael Beigl. 2019. Reevaluating passive haptic learning of morse code. In Proceedings of the 23rd International Symposium on Wearable Computers (ISWC '19). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 186–194. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3341163.3347714>
- E. L. Luster et al., "Vibrotactile cueing using wearable computers for overcoming learned non-use in chronic stroke," 2013 7th International Conference on Pervasive Computing Technologies for Healthcare and Workshops, 2013, pp. 378-381, doi: huang10.4108/icst.pervasivehealth.2013.252351.
- Faber, N., & Faber, R. (1998). Accelerated Piano Adventures for the Older Beginner: Lesson Book 1 (Illustrated). Faber Piano Adventures.
- Gemicioğlu, Tan, Noah Teuscher, Brahmi Dwivedi, Soobin Park, Emerson Miller, Celeste Mason, Caitlyn Seim, and Thad Starner. "Passive Haptic Rehearsal for Accelerated Piano Skill Acquisition." arXiv e-prints (2022): arXiv-2203.
- Granit Luzhnica and Eduardo Veas. 2019. Background perception and comprehension of symbols conveyed through vibrotactile wearable displays. In Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces (IUI '19). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 57–64. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3301275.3302282>
- G. Park, H. Cha and S. Choi, "Haptic Enchanters: Attachable and Detachable Vibrotactile Modules and Their Advantages," in IEEE Transactions on Haptics, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 43-55, 1 Jan.-March 2019, doi: 10.1109/TOH.2018.2859955.
- Hsu, HY., Lin, CW., Lin, YC. et al. Effects of vibrotactile-enhanced music-based intervention on sensorimotor control capacity in the hand of an aging brain: a pilot feasibility randomized crossover trial. BMC Geriatr 21, 660 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-021-02604-0>

- Jaebong Lee, J. Ryu and S. Choi, "Vibrotactile score: A score metaphor for designing vibrotactile patterns," World Haptics 2009 - Third Joint EuroHaptics conference and Symposium on Haptic Interfaces for Virtual Environment and Teleoperator Systems, 2009, pp. 302-307, doi: 10.1109/WHC.2009.4810816.
- J. R. Blum et al., "Getting Your Hands Dirty Outside the Lab: A Practical Primer for Conducting Wearable Vibrotactile Haptics Research," in IEEE Transactions on Haptics, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 232-246, 1 July-Sept. 2019, doi: 10.1109/TOH.2019.2930608.
- Kalra, S., Jain, S., & Agarwal, A. (2020). Capacitive Touch Sensitive Vibro-Haptic Typing Training System for the Visually Impaired. *Journal of Information Technology Research (JITR)*, 13(1), 1-16. <http://doi.org/10.4018/JITR.2020010101>
- K. Huang, E. Y. -L. Do and T. Starner, "PianoTouch: A wearable haptic piano instruction system for passive learning of piano skills," 2008 12th IEEE International Symposium on Wearable Computers, 2008, pp. 41-44, doi: 10.1109/ISWC.2008.4911582.
- K. O. Sofia and L. Jones, "Mechanical and Psychophysical Studies of Surface Wave Propagation during Vibrotactile Stimulation," in IEEE Transactions on Haptics, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 320-329, July-Sept. 2013, doi: 10.1109/TOH.2013.1.
- Likun Fang, Reimann Malte, Erik Pescara, and Michael Beigl. 2022. Investigate the Piano Learning Rate with Haptic Actuators in Mixed Reality. In *Augmented Humans 2022 (AHs 2022)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 287–290. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3519391.3524174>
- L. T. Estes, D. Backus and T. Starner, "A wearable vibration glove for improving hand sensation in persons with Spinal Cord Injury using Passive Haptic Rehabilitation," 2015 9th International Conference on Pervasive Computing Technologies for Healthcare (PervasiveHealth), 2015, pp. 37-44, doi: 10.4108/icst.pervasivehealth.2015.259137.
- Matthew E. Holman, Gary Goldberg & Benjamin J. Darter (2020) Accuracy and precision of a wrist movement when vibrotactile prompts inform movement speed, *Somatosensory & Motor Research*, 37:3, 165-171, DOI: 10.1080/08990220.2020.1765766
- M. D. Rinderknecht, R. Gross, K. Leuenberger, O. Lambercy and R. Gassert, "Objective assessment of vibrotactile mislocalization using a Haptic Glove," 2015 IEEE International Conference on Rehabilitation Robotics (ICORR), 2015, pp. 145-150, doi: 10.1109/ICORR.2015.7281190.
- Oagaz, Hawkar, Breawn Schoun, and Min-Hyung Choi. "Performance improvement and skill transfer in table tennis through training in virtual reality." *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* (2021).
- Pfeifer, Kristina J., Justus A. Kromer, Alexander J. Cook, Traci Hornbeck, Erika A. Lim, Bruce JP Mortimer, Adam S. Fogarty et al. "Coordinated reset vibrotactile stimulation induces sustained cumulative benefits in Parkinson's disease." *Frontiers in physiology* 12 (2021): 624317.

- Pala, F. , Mihci Türker, P. , Kılınçer, Ö. "The effectiveness of the haptic glove for piano education" . Kocaeli Üniversitesi Eğitim Dergisi 4 (2021) : 556-574 <<https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/kuje/issue/65990/951015>>
- Rei Takakura, Kyohei Hakka, and Buntarou Shizuki. 2019. Exploration of Passive Haptics Based Learning Support Method for Touch Typing. In Proceedings of the 31st Australian Conference on Human-Computer-Interaction (OZCHI'19). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 529–533. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3369457.3369524>
- Richard Li, Yingyan Wang, Chih-Pin Hsiao, Nicholas Davis, James Hallam, and Ellen Do. 2016. Tactile Teacher: Enhancing Traditional Piano Lessons with Tactile Instructions. In Proceedings of the 19th ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing Companion (CSCW '16 Companion). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 329–332. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2818052.2869133>
- Rumen Donchev, Erik Pescara, and Michael Beigl. 2021. Investigating Retention in Passive Haptic Learning of Piano Songs. Proc. ACM Interact. Mob. Wearable Ubiquitous Technol. 5, 2, Article 60 (June 2021), 14 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3463513>
- S. Dinulescu et al., "A Smart Bracelet Supporting Tactile Communication and Interaction," 2022 IEEE Haptics Symposium (HAPTICS), 2022, pp. 1-7, doi: 10.1109/HAPTICS52432.2022.9765616.
- T. Hasegawa and T. Hatakenaka, "Touch-Typing Skills Estimation Using Eyewear," 2018 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics (SMC), 2018, pp. 3833-3837, doi: 10.1109/SMC.2018.00649.
- T. J. Aveni, C. Seim and T. Starner, "A preliminary apparatus and teaching structure for passive tactile training of stenography," 2019 IEEE World Haptics Conference (WHC), 2019, pp. 383-388, doi: 10.1109/WHC.2019.8816077.
- T. Markow et al., "Mobile Music Touch: Vibration stimulus in hand rehabilitation," 2010 4th International Conference on Pervasive Computing Technologies for Healthcare, 2010, pp. 1-8, doi: 10.4108/pervasivehealth.2010.8.
- Y. Shao, H. Hu and Y. Visell, "A Wearable Tactile Sensor Array for Large Area Remote Vibration Sensing in the Hand," in IEEE Sensors Journal, vol. 20, no. 12, pp. 6612-6623, 15 June 2020, doi: 10.1109/JSEN.2020.2972521.
- Y. Yoo, J. Regimbal and J. R. Cooperstock, "Identification and Information Transfer of Multidimensional Tactons Presented by a Single Vibrotactile Actuator," 2021 IEEE World Haptics Conference (WHC), 2021, pp. 7-12, doi: 10.1109/WHC49131.2021.9517169.

Appendix

Subject	1st (Visual Stimulation)			2nd (Vibrotactile Stimulation)		
	% timing error	2-norm	accuracy	% timing error	2-norm	accuracy
1	19.74%	2.75	100%	7.57%	1.06	100%
2	27.22%	4.88	100%	4.07%	0.53	100%
3	6.72%	1.04	85.71%	19.02%	2.68	42.86%
4	33.29%	6.35	92.86%	10.67%	1.37	50.00%
5	20.48%	4.50	85.71%	44.13%	7.01	35.71%
6	53.24%	7.10	85.71%	20.55%	3.95	64.29%
7	16.57%	2.23	85.71%	5.41%	0.55	100%

Table 1: Visual Stimulation first. The average timing error percentage, the 2-norm difference, the normalized cross-correlation and the accuracy for subjects 1 to 7 when the visual stimulation is applied first, followed by the vibrotactile stimulation.

Subject	Vibrotactile Stimulation				Visual Stimulation			
	% timing error	2-norm	cross-correlation	accuracy	% timing error	2-norm	cross-correlation	accuracy
8	5.47%	0.65	0.70	64.29%	7.59%	1.20	0.57	100%
9	7.07%	0.64	0.69	64.29%	15.65%	1.70	0.56	100%
10	8.06%	0.69	0.74	100%	7.80%	1.41	0.56	100%
11	16.05%	0.60	0.64	85.71%	25.04%	3.32	0.47	92.86%
12	3.47%	0.63	0.68	92.86%	5.91%	0.79	0.65	100%
13	6.26%	0.65	0.70	85.71%	12.38%	1.42	0.67	92.86%
14	7.79%	0.66	0.71	85.71%	13.25%	1.73	0.67	64.29%

Table 2: Vibrotactile stimulation first. The average timing error percentage, the 2-norm difference, the normalized cross-correlation and the accuracy for subjects 8 to 14 when the vibrotactile stimulation is applied first, followed by the visual stimulation.