

# Collaborative Problem Solving in Mixed Reality: A Study on Visual Graph Analysis

Dimitar Garkov , Tommaso Piselli , Emilio Di Giacomo , Karsten Klein ,  
Giuseppe Liotta , *Senior Member, IEEE*, Fabrizio Montecchiani , Falk Schreiber 

**Abstract**—Problem solving is a composite cognitive process, invoking a number of systems and subsystems, such as perception and memory. Individuals may form collectives to solve a given problem together, in collaboration, especially when complexity is thought to be high. To determine if and when collaborative problem solving is desired, we must quantify collaboration first. For this, we investigate the practical virtue of collaborative problem solving. Using visual graph analysis, we perform a study with 72 participants in two countries and three languages. We compare ad hoc pairs to individuals and nominal pairs, solving two different tasks on graphs in visuospatial mixed reality. The average collaborating pair does not outdo its nominal counterpart, but it does have a significant trade-off against the individual: an ad hoc pair uses 1.46 more time to achieve 4.6 higher accuracy. We also use the concept of task instance complexity to quantify differences in complexity. As task instance complexity increases, these differences largely scale, though with two notable exceptions. With this study we show the importance of using nominal groups as benchmark in collaborative virtual environments research. We conclude that a mixed reality environment does not automatically imply superior collaboration.

**Index Terms**—Collaboration, controlled experiment, graph analysis, groups, immersive environments (IE), mixed reality (MR), problem solving

## I. INTRODUCTION

**P**ROBLEM solving is a consequential cognitive process. Everyday we are surrounded by situations that involve problem solving, in which we invoke sensation, perception, memory, and inference [1]. Searching, identification, memorization, or abstraction may be applied. Well-known strategies

Manuscript received xx x 202x; revised x xx 202x; accepted xx xxx 202x. Date of publication xx xxx 202x; date of current version xx xx 202x. This work was supported by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation), under Germany's Excellence Strategy - EXC 2117 - 422037984, and DFG project ID 251654672 - TRR 161, by MUR PRIN Proj. 2022TS4Y3N - EXPAND: scalable algorithms for EXPLoratory Analyses of heterogeneous and dynamic Networked Data, by MUR PRIN Proj. 2022ME9Z78 - NextGRAAL: Next-generation algorithms for constrained GRAPh visuALization, and by Università degli Studi di Perugia, Fondi di Ricerca di Ateneo, edizione 2022 - MiRA: Mixed Reality and AI Methodologies for Immersive Robotics. (Corresponding author: Dimitar Garkov)

Dimitar Garkov, Karsten Klein, and Falk Schreiber are with the Department of Computer and Information Science, University of Konstanz, Konstanz, Germany. E-mail: [firstname].[lastname]@uni-konstanz.de

Tommaso Piselli, Emilio Di Giacomo, Giuseppe Liotta, and Fabrizio Montecchiani are with the Department of Engineering, University of Perugia, Perugia, Italy. E-mail: [firstname].[lastname]@unipg.it, and tommaso.piselli@dottorandi.unipg.it

Falk Schreiber is with the Faculty of Information Technology, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia. E-mail: [firstname].[lastname]@monash.edu.

This article has supplementary downloadable material and data available at <https://doi.org/10.18419/darus-4231>, provided by the authors.

constitute divide-and-conquer, step-by-step solving, exhaustive search, reduction, and applying heuristics or analogies [2], [3]. Of course, problem solving varies in complexity, c. p. when comprising of tasks [4], [5].

Collaboration is a fundamental social process. It is characterized by the interaction among group members who have a shared goal. Among others, collaboration plays an important role in communication [6], teamwork [7], [8], collective behavior [9], coordination in game theory [10], and, more abstractly, in basic self-organization [11], [12]. Collaboration is linked to complexity, e. g., in grounding [6] by bringing everyone on the same page, or for devising more effective strategies [13]. But during collaboration group interaction also incurs load in the form of process costs [14]. Could process costs be overcome, benefits ought to scale with complexity [15], [16].

Graphs, or networks, represent a versatile concept widely applied for the representation and analysis of problems across domains and scales [17]. A graph can be represented in different ways, most notably, as a node-link diagram, an adjacency matrix, or both [18], [19]. To visualize a node-link diagram, layout methods in two (2-D) or three dimensions (3-D) may be employed. Graphs visualized in 3-D are particularly applicable in visuospatial problem solving, where locating, orienting, navigating, and understanding of spatial objects and their relationships are invoked concurrently [20].

For some time now, mixed reality (MR) has been deemed a new paradigm. In Milgram et al.'s taxonomy [21], mixed reality sits on a continuum, spanning from two extremes: reality and virtuality, including augmented reality (AR) and augmented virtuality (AV). Like other visuospatial mediums, MR is predominantly associated with stereoscopic head-mounted displays (HMD). The first such display was built for AR back in 1968 [22]. Since then, display technology and our understanding for it have advanced significantly, including more recently the emergence of dedicated fields, such as immersive analytics (IA) [23]. IA harnesses the affordances of virtual environments (VE) for sensemaking by transforming them in immersive environments (IE). Helped by improved and more affordable display and interaction technology, analysts can reach higher engagement and obtain better immersion. Collaboration in VE is not a new topic [24]–[27], but one that deserves revisiting. For only after the value of collaboration is quantified, can a bridge be built from fundamental results in group science to applications in collaborative virtual environments (CVE).




Fig. 1. Participants solving visuospatial tasks on graphs in mixed reality. Participants who were assigned to ad hoc pairs solved the tasks collaboratively, while remaining participants solved these on their own, either as individuals or in a nominal pair.

This study focuses on collaborative problem solving in a visuospatial collocated MR setting (Fig. 1). The vast majority of studies on collaboration in VE do not probe collaboration itself, and the few that do [28]–[31] take place in VE different from spatially immersive 3-D, and omit to control for group size effects. Apart from group size, in this study controlled was also the type of collaborative group. The study defines *task instance complexity* and examines its effects, it represents the first such experiment in VE.

While being in pairs or on their own, we asked participants to complete two graph tasks for two visually selected nodes: 1) determine the length of the shortest path; 2) count the number of common neighbors. The research questions posed for collaborative problem solving in MR were:

- RQ1** Do accuracy and completion time of any pair differ from that of one individual or two individuals?
- RQ2** Relatedly, do differences in accuracy and completion time change with task instance complexity and how?
- RQ3** Does teamwork affect cognitive load differently when total task instance complexity is high and low?

To tackle these questions we designed and conducted a controlled experiment, and made replication data and source code openly available [32]. Contributions include:

- a controlled experiment in collaborative problem solving in MR applying visual graph analysis, that was conducted in two countries and three languages,
- an investigation into how (collaborative) problem solving scales for different levels of task instance complexity,
- an elicitation of differences in solving strategies and the sense of flow in pairs and individuals,
- a benchmark for disentangling collaboration from *two heads are better than one* effects in pairs.

Results should further basic research at the intersection of those topics, and underpin the design of CVE.

## II. RELATED WORK

Any setting has a profound effect on its occupants, e.g., early research revealed electronic communication reduced

overall communication without increasing productivity [33], or more recently, the degree of AR’s impact in education [34]. Today’s emerging technology calls for renewed scrutiny of fundamental questions related to basic visuospatial reasoning [35], psychomotor learning, and realism [36]. A survey covering virtual reality (VR), collaborative problem solving, and learning spatial skills [20] categorize studies as having three foci: applications of VR, virtual factors supporting collaboration, and physical factors supporting collaboration; more generic surveys [37], [38] point out similar factors, such as awareness and presence. This highlights a strong trend of situating research in collaboration that stands in contrast with traditional research on groups. Groups in IE warrant more formal studies, as a way of backing a growing body of literature around CVE. Collaboration has already been identified as a *grand challenge* [39], and studies in collaborative graph analysis have targeted factors such as the environment [27], interaction [31], and symmetry [40].

In the following, we focus on controlled experiments and their implications, but do include other studies in an attempt to capture the state-of-the-art. Evaluations of systems, however, fall out of scope, given the higher complexity and lower controllability of such evaluations [41].

### A. Collaborative problem solving

In behavior science and social psychology, groups have been studied for most of the past hundred years. A group is defined as [42]:

*A group is an intact social system, complete with boundaries, interdependence for some shared purpose, and differentiated member roles.*

Group problem solving, as measured by time and score, depends on the task at hand [7], [43], [44]. For example, groups require more time per person [45], [46], but tend to achieve higher levels of abstraction [13], and have higher completion rates than individuals [43], [47]–[49]. The strength of groups lies more in the group’s self-correcting mechanism [43], [47], rather than the number of contributions [48].

When time is limited, aggregate solutions can be better than those of groups [50], [51]. Such findings stress the importance of evaluating groups against equally sized pools of individuals [47]–[49], [52].

Group effectiveness is inferior to pooled effectiveness, but it may be hypothetically veered by the interaction among its members [7], given the course of action in the group is often suboptimal [52]–[54]. Researchers have therefore sought exceptions to the rule in the form of *assembly bonus effects* [15], [54], such that groups can outperform individuals both alone and in aggregate. Task complexity may be one factor in that [15], however evidence has been scarce, e. g., regarding test questions [55] and encoding tasks [56].

More recently, Hackman and Katz [57] formulated questions for evaluating group effectiveness and identified responsibility, synchronicity, authority, and work type as group attributes. As research opportunities they outlined investigating established norms for new technologies and evaluating their usefulness. To this end, Wikstöm et al. [58] developed and evaluated a task for collaborative problem solving in VR and reality, that was a 3-D puzzle with shapes, similar to other 3-D puzzles [30]. Yet decision making has over time become the umbrella term for research on human and animal groups [54], [59], [60].

### B. Collaboration in virtual environments

Collaboration in and across VE can be collocated or distributed, and synchronous or asynchronous [61], [62]. Compared to VR, collocated collaboration in AR/MR benefits from face-to-face communication [63], [64], comparing well to unmediated face-to-face communication [65]. It preserves non-verbal cues (Exp. 1) [66] and serves well in communicating common ground [67] or spotting errors [68]. In collocated collaboration pairs tend to prefer a same-side perspective [69], for which dedicated techniques, such as supporting shared awareness [70], have started to emerge. Fellow representations are still underexplored, e. g., for different levels of immersion [71]. Exactly how interactions should be synchronized depends on the task [25], [72]–[74]. As to collaborative navigation, early results favored egocentric over exocentric perspectives [75]. Spatial referencing, which can help reduce process loss [14], was discussed by Heer and Agrawala [76], who identified nuanced pointing as one design consideration for improving collaboration.

In terms of space use, participants (individually or in small groups) seem to prefer utilizing physical objects like walls [77], whiteboards or tables [78], and transparent displays [79]. Without physical affordances, the use of space is more mixed, especially so when working alone [80], and not much different from established conventions in 2-D [81].

Just a few studies have investigated the value of collaboration in virtual environments. Comparing pairs to individuals, differences were found for earlier types of environments [28], [29], interaction techniques [31], and small group sizes [30]. Using propagating selection, pairs made less errors in finding the shortest path, and were faster than individuals when complexity was high (Exp. 1) [31]. In Sando et al.’s experiments pairs were more accurate than individuals and groups

of four judging relative distances (Exp. 1) [30]. In another task (Exp. 2) where more perspectives were used groups of four were more accurate. Individuals were faster overall, unless perspectives played a part, then the groups of four were faster (Exp. 3). There are no studies that have separated collaboration from aggregation in virtual environments, e. g., comparing against nominal groups (see Sec. III).

### C. Collaborative visual graph analysis in virtual environments

During collaborative task solving group performance is also affected by the visualization, e. g., by its interactivity [82] or stereoscopicity [83]. On the other hand, the effectiveness of a visualization links back to the task at hand [84]. For graphs, there are a number of task taxonomies to rely on in study design, such as for common low-level tasks [85], mental-map tasks [86], [87], tasks with groups [88], trees [89], and temporal graphs [90].

“Collaborative graph analysis is not represented prominently” [91] and there is not much empirical evidence from VE [27], [31], [40]. Prouzeau et al. [31] validated the aforementioned selection technique on large displays (Exp. 1). Participants were asked to find the shortest path in graphs of different size and density. The graphs were planar and small-world, drawn with a neural-network layout [92]. Cordeil et al. [27] proved the utility of HMD-mediated CVE over less affordable CAVE environments. The authors used two global tasks: 1) find the shortest path; and 2) count the number of triangles; in random graphs of varying size but equal density, drawn with constraint-based force-directed layout [93]. Tong et al. [40] evaluated asymmetric CVE and found their effectiveness to be on par with VR and non-VR environments. Alongside a document-reading task, pairs drew node-link diagrams as solving aids.

A parallel but separate line of research is found in the field of collaborative learning—learning with graph-oriented representations. In Suthers et al.’s study [94] of asynchronously communicating pairs, knowledge maps were consistent with higher hypothesis generation, consensus reaching, and integration of information, compared to threaded discussions. Subsequent studies explored the benefits of other representations, e. g., argumentative diagrams [95], concept maps [96], [97], game-tied matrices [98], three-part thinking graphs [99], and neural-network-supported knowledge graphs [100].

## III. DEFINITIONS

Here we introduce the formal terms we refer to in this paper.

a) **Individual**: a person who solves tasks independently.

b) **Ad hoc pair**: two persons who solve tasks together.

The term *ad hoc* implies the pair is formed for a specific purpose and is not pre-arranged, practiced, or permanent. Practice or training may affect collaborative task solving [46], [50] and ad hoc pairs are preferred. Working in an ad hoc pair is what we refer to as *collaboration*.

c) **Nominal pair**: two persons (individuals) who solve tasks independently, but the result is evaluated collectively based on a specific setup (see Sec. IV-A1) [7], [14], [52], [57], related to the nominal group technique [101]. Such groups

have their uses, e.g., generating more new ideas [52], or in reference to the wisdom of crowds [60], [102]. We employ this technique to differentiate collaborative from aggregate contributions.

*d) Task complexity:* Following established theoretical frameworks [4], [44], we consider a task as *complex*, such that its composition of *task attributes* [4] consists of heterogeneous subcompositions [103], [104] (not just a series of subtasks [84], [85]), and the *behavior requirements* [4] to complete the task are high for a given level of abstraction. We use this concept to define *task instance complexity*.

*e) Task instance:* A task can be presented in several ways. For a given task representation, e.g., a set of instructions or a node-link diagram, there are one or more distinct *task instances* that can be acted on to solve the task, where any instance may affect task solving differently. The number of task instances is countable and independent of the viewpoint.

*f) Task instance complexity:* denoted by  $\xi$ , is determined by the following two factors:

- 1) the interactions with the instance using an optimal solving strategy,
- 2) the noise in the region of inspection (ROI).

With 1) we estimate the optimal interactions with task attributes on a path to the correct solution [5]. The ROI may also contain noise, with the intuition being that an increase in clutter results in a costlier processing of attributes [4], e.g., regarding identification, search, and memorization [2], or lack of certainty [105]. Noise interferes with applying an optimal solving strategy. Task instance complexity is a task-specific measure for the lower bound of necessary interactions with the representation under some noise constraint. We call 1) and 2) *signal instance complexity* and *noise instance complexity*, respectively.

Other studies have pursued the opposite approach: from a set of known metrics, test the predictive power based on observed data. Yoghurdjian et al. [104] apply dimensionality reduction to construct what they deem “task hardness”. Despite the single perspective under test (2-D screen), two classes of contributors seem present [104, Fig. 9], this, along with disparities across graph sizes and densities [104], [106], [107], would support the dual composition of task instance complexity.

### Graph preliminaries

An undirected graph  $G$ , or network, is a tuple  $G = (V, E)$  of set of vertices, or nodes,  $V$ , and set of edges, or links,  $E \subseteq V \times V$ . A graph representation  $\Gamma(G)$  is a graph drawing, or layout, of  $G$ , where every node is assigned a point, or position, in an Euclidean drawing space  $\mathbb{E}^3$  with an associated vector space. Additionally, every node and every edge has visual attributes, such as size, color, and edge type, attached to it.

Let  $deg(u)$  be the degree of  $u$ , i.e., the number of adjacent nodes, or neighbors, to  $u$ . Let  $dist(u, v) = ||v - u||$  be the distance from  $u$  to  $v$  in  $\Gamma(G)$ . For consistency, we use geodesic path [107, Fig. 2] to refer to  $dist(u, v)$ , and shortest path to refer to the shortest topological distance in  $G$  (see Sec. IV-B4).

## IV. EXPERIMENT

In this section, we report on the experiment in more detail. We discuss the experimental design, the posed tasks, the applied instance complexity methodology, the formulated hypotheses, and the experimental procedure.

### A. Experimental design

The experiment follows a mixed design with two independent variables: *group type* (ad hoc pairs, individuals, and nominal pairs), and *task instance complexity*. Dependent variables are: 1) accuracy, 2) completion time, and 3) weighted workload ratings from NASA-TLX [108] as a measure of cognitive load [109], [110].

*1) Between-subject design:* For group type, the design is between-subject, with nominal pairs invoked to differentiate collaborative from aggregate effects. To create pairs, we randomly assign half of all participants in the nominal pairs, and half—in the ad hoc pairs. Then, we randomly pick one individual from each nominal pair. Any comparisons are performed entirely against the ad hoc pairs. Picking individuals from the nominal pairs, as opposed to constructing nominal pairs from the individuals, avoids oversampling individuals and ensures independence between nominal pairs.

To harmonize nominal pairs, we employ the following setup [101]. Imagine we place each member of a nominal pair in a separate room. We record measures as in ad hoc pairs, assuming a parallel start. We have to wait for all members to complete, before we can compare results and pick the best. For accuracy, solving is disjunctive, whereas for completion time it is conjunctive [53]. The scenario is alternative to picking the first-to-complete member, regardless of the result.

To harmonize the responses of ad hoc pairs, members are required to reach consensus. Group consensus is important for decision making [111], [112] and naturally emerging in small groups [113]. In case of no consensus, consensus is technically enforced as part of the interface—members cannot proceed until consensus is reached.

*2) Within-subject design:* For task instance complexity, the design is within-subject and repeated-measures. We selected two distinct graph analytical tasks as to not inhibit generalizability, as compared to one task [114]. Introducing more tasks is, however, difficult due to the onset of discomfort after prolonged HMD use, e.g., in novice users, and in line with prior studies [27]. The number of instances per task is feasible, such that a procedure lasts around an hour [115], with no breaks for the sake of controllability. A participant gives 25 answers: 12 instances of each task, plus one control instance.

We counterbalance task order and randomize task instances. Randomization of task instances is performed based on answer value and after controlling graph properties. Between-subject participants are then paired to solve the same task instances. Pairing helps narrow differences to the group type.

### B. Tasks

To strengthen ecological validity [116], [117], we sought divisible, but not divided allocation of work. To inform task

selection, we consider several graph task taxonomies [85], [118] and tasks used in prior user studies on collaboration [27], [31] and complexity [104]. Our selection draws a dichotomy between local and global topological tasks on the graph. Under the broader framework of what constitutes a task [44], we asked participants to:

- (1) count the number of common neighbors for two selected nodes,
- (2) determine the length of the shortest path between two selected nodes,

where selected nodes are visually highlighted.

In posing the tasks, we control the environment, the graph, the layout, and certain network properties locally and globally and in terms of topology and representation. Additionally, for each task we remove outliers that may severely imbalance work division. We discuss separately each task with its instance complexity methodology in Sec. IV-B3 and Sec. IV-B4.

1) *Environment control variables*: A facing position prompts pairs to involve each other more than a side-by-side position [66], [79], e. g., it is beneficial while receiving instructions [119]. With this in mind, we set each ad hoc pair's starting position as facing across the task space, after which participants are allowed to move freely. Each graph is placed in the center of an empty  $9m^2$  area without specific physical arrangements as to avoid potential effects on participants' interactions and movement. The bounding box of each graph is uniform ( $1m^3$ ), resulting in equal distance to each starting point. The barycenter of each graph view is set to  $1.45m$  from the ground<sup>1</sup>. To not hinder verbal communication in ad hoc pairs, nodes are labeled with numbers. Labels are placed centrally on the nodes and orientated cylindrically outwards from the view's center.

Optical hand tracking is used and answer inputs are synchronized. To minimize interruptions in task solving and effects on movement, an input-typing interface stays with each participant (in front, slightly tilted, at about chest height), unless this would interfere with the graph, in which case the interface does not cross in the graph view. A progress bar shows the instances completed per task. No other interactions are provided to avoid any confounding due to tracking precision and interaction.

Graphs are drawn in the same slightly emissive sky blue color , whereas selected nodes are in vermilion . These colors belong to the Okabe-Ito CUD schema [121] and are selected to accommodate color blindness, as well as to achieve salient contrast to the surrounding environment. The lighting in the rendered scene follows a simple gradient model with emitters from above, below and any of the sides. Bright sunlight is dimmed, such that it would not interfere with any of the headset's tracking and rendering.

2) *Graph control variables*: Social networks are known to be globally sparse and locally dense [18], while being of practical relevance. We select real-world social networks from epidemiology, depicting the interactions of small mammalian species, known as field voles, during trapping sessions at four sites over the span of 7 years [122], [123]. As a single

<sup>1</sup>From NCD-RisC data [120], est. shoulder level  $0.85(\frac{1}{2}\overline{H}_{IT09} + \frac{1}{2}\overline{H}_{IT19} + \frac{1}{2}\overline{H}_{DE09} + \frac{1}{2}\overline{H}_{DE19}) \approx 145cm$ .

collection of real-world networks, the dataset contains similar networks with different topological properties, not readily found in a probability model, such as a random, modular, or small-world model. Graph mean size is 149 nodes ( $SD = 40$ ) and mean density is 0.05 ( $SD = 0.01$ ). Based on empirical evidence [104], we opt for larger, denser, and varied graphs to have task instances of different complexity, to limit ceiling effects in group types, and to study interaction effects [15], [54]. Task instances are randomly drawn from 34 graphs, where each graph is seen at most once by any participant.

a) *Layout*: Ways for computing graph layouts in 3-D for a semiphysical environment include: 1) transfer of common 2-D methods to 3-D (e. g., energy-based methods, such as force-directed [124], stress minimization [125], and multi-level [126] or layered [127] approaches); 2) layouts projecting and extending to 3-D [128]–[130] (e. g., spherical and radial); and 3) others (e. g., random layout). In light of the lack of comparative evaluations of layouts for collaboration in 3-D VE, we consider single-level energy-based methods, where the layout results from topology: a force-directed layout and stress minimization. In comparison, multi-level layouts are used in drawing very large graphs, in the tens of thousands of nodes.

For the force-directed method by Fruchterman and Reingold [124] and our viewing volume of choice ( $1m^3$ ), the extension to 3-D resulted in noticeable *boxing* along the view's bounds (see Suppl. Mat.). A custom variant without a strict cut-off during simulation and with uniform normalization of the final results, still had locally dense sub-networks drawn closely, even some node-node overlaps. Ultimately, we think an artifact-free distribution of the nodes depends on a different than the default choice of  $k$ , the ideal edge length [124], which would near the distribution achieved by stress minimization. Hence, we use stress minimization in 3-D as implemented in OGDF [131], post-removal of any smaller graph components.

b) *Graph properties*: For the tasks at hand, we consider global but also local graph properties. First, we calculate all node candidates per task. For task similarity purposes, the number of selected nodes is always two. Second, we consider subgraphs, formed by the 1-neighborhood. These subgraphs are not necessarily induced. Third, we calculate common network properties to control network topology and representation. Topologically, we calculate local density and local clustering coefficient, degree centrality (Task 1), and path betweenness (Task 2); geometrically, we calculate Euclidean node distance and fill ratio. Per graph we control for outliers, whose z-scores lie at least two standard deviations away from the mean.

We define fill ratio ( $FR$ ) as the ratio of the graph's representation to the drawing space, i. e., intuitively how full the view is. For crossings and overlaps, the element's dimensions, e. g., the element's own volume in 3-D, contribute equally. The general case is outlined in Eq. 1:

$$FR = \sqrt[n]{\frac{1}{\chi_n(view)} \sum_{x \in G|_{view}} \chi_n(x)}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\chi_n$  is the hypervolume in the  $n$ -dimension.

3) *Task 1 (Common neighbors)*: Identifying common neighbors starts by looking at each neighbor of a selected node, followed by inspecting incident edges to confirm or reject a connection to another selected node. Let  $u, v$  be the two selected nodes. Let  $w$  be a common neighbor of  $u, v$  with  $w \in N_{uv}$ , the set of common neighbors, and  $u \neq w \neq v$ . Further, let  $E_{uv}$  be the set of incident edges among  $w$  and  $u, v$ . For noticeable degree differences, one should start from  $u$ , given  $deg(u) \leq deg(v)$ , to reduce the overall number of inspections. This should then be followed by an exhaustive inspection of neighbors of  $u$  to identify  $w$ . A competing tendency, though less optimal, is to discretize the topological search space into concentric ROI over  $\Gamma$ . The likelihood a ROI contains  $w$  is proportional to the closeness to  $u, v$ . To interpret closeness, one starts from the closest point  $o$  to  $u, v$ , which is the mid-point of the segment  $\overline{uv}$  from  $u$  to  $v$  in the layout  $\Gamma$ . In both cases, traversing common neighbors is estimated via geodesic distances in the ROI, where for the optimal strategy this represents the lower bound that guarantees a correct solution. Prior empirical evidence linking geodesics and counting common neighbors is lacking [118].

Therewith, any measure of instance complexity should account for 1) the optimal strategy, based on the closeness of  $w$  to  $u, v$ ; and 2) finding  $w$  using the latter, sub-optimal strategy, where a higher cost is given to far  $w$  that are easier to overlook. Let construct a sphere  $S_{uv} = (o, \frac{\|u-v\|}{2})$  around  $u$  and  $v$ , with center  $o$  and radius, the distance  $\frac{\|u-v\|}{2}$  to  $u$  and  $v$ . Is  $w$  inside  $S_{uv}$ ,  $w$  is geometrically between  $u$  and  $v$  and falls in sight while looking at both. In this case, finding  $w$  is easier. Is  $w$  outside  $S_{uv}$ , the position of  $w$  is asymmetrical to  $u$  or  $v$  (or equally further away). Additional (or longer) searches are needed to find  $w$ , and its incident edges may not be immediately traceable. To quantify the signal instance complexity of Task 1, we propose  $\xi_1(\Gamma)$ :

$$\xi_1(\Gamma) = \sum_{w \in N_{uv}} \left( dist(w, u) + dist(w, v) - dist(u, v) \right)^2 \quad (2)$$

Over the simple solution of  $\sum_{w \in N_{uv}} dist(w, o)$ , the improvement can be seen for  $w$  on the segment  $\overline{uv}$ . In the simple solution, a node  $w$  on  $\overline{uv}$ , very close to  $u$  or  $v$  would be awarded a higher cost, despite being one of the easiest instances. In Eq. 2, all nodes  $w$  on  $\overline{uv}$  have the same value (zero) and small values close to it. By taking a low polynomial (square), we punish nodes that go beyond  $S_{uv}$ , though less strongly.

For noise, an increase in visual clutter and crossings hinders understanding and performance [106], [132]–[135], with multiplicity outweighing direction [136]. A ROI should include any  $w$ , as well as  $u, v$ . Let  $deg(u) \leq deg(v)$ . For the optimal strategy, the ROI should further include any neighbor of  $u$ , where each neighbor of  $u$  is inspected separately. Therefore, we construct a sphere  $S(o, r)$  with center  $o$  and radius  $r = dist(o, far(u))$ , the distance from  $o$  to the furthest neighbor of  $u$ . A single geometric object as the sphere serves as a simple and robust estimator of the view—ensuring the task is solved correctly requires looking within  $S$ . Eq. 3 shows the noise in

the ROI, where the measure  $\mu(x)$  of an element  $x \in G$  is the length of  $x$ .

$$\xi_1^{\rightarrow}(\Gamma) = \sum_{\substack{x \notin N_{uv} \cup E_{uv} \\ \text{and } x \in S(o, r)}} \mu(x) \quad (3)$$

4) *Task 2 (Shortest path)*: To find the shortest path between two nodes, readers tend to prioritize search in the direction of the target node [106], [107]. Starting from one of the nodes, readers progressively include edges as they approach the target node; increases in proximity serve intuitively to track progress. Before including an edge, readers perform a series of quick forward scans, that is about the straight line to a target node. This is known as the geodesic-path tendency [107], and can e. g., be seen in scanpath data on public transit maps [137]. Simpler, shorter paths tend to be approximated altogether, cf. path-continuity tendency [106], [118]. There is a strong tendency to map topological onto spatial distances, under the constraint of minimality. For graphs with many crossings or nodes, metrics such as path length serve as good predictors for visuospatial complexity [104].

Going back to our initial assumption, edges that go away from the target node are less likely to be searched. Such edges necessarily form approximately sharp node angles. Small angles have previously been found to have an adverse effect on graph comprehension [135], [138]. In graph drawing, angles are used to maximize the separation of outgoing edges [134], [135], [139] and the orthogonality of edge crossings [138], with further uses in the design of layout algorithms [140] and in machine learning models, e. g., point classifiers [141].

For a graph representation  $\Gamma$  we seek to estimate the instance complexity of finding the shortest path,  $\xi_2(\Gamma)$ , before considering the noise. Let  $u \dots v$  be the shortest path, let  $w \in u \dots v$ . Let  $u$  be the start node with  $deg(u) \leq deg(v)$ . Let the node angle at  $w$  be  $\theta = \angle(prev(w) - w, next(w) - w)$ , where  $w$  is the common neighbor of  $prev(w)$ ,  $next(w) \in u \dots v$ . When  $prev(w)$  or  $next(w)$  do not exist,  $\theta$  is 0. Note,  $\theta$  is always the smaller of the two angles.  $\xi_2(\Gamma)$  is given as

$$\xi_2(\Gamma) = \max_{\forall u \dots v} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{w \in u \dots v} (1 - \cos(180^\circ - \theta)) \cdot dist(w, v) \right\} \quad (4)$$

where the geodesic paths  $dist(w, v)$  are considered in reference to the angle difference  $180^\circ - \theta$ . For the latter, there are three cases.

- $\theta > 90^\circ$ : the polyline  $(prev(w), w), (w, next(w))$  approximates a line or a curve. The reader can more easily follow the outgoing edge  $(w, next(w))$ , therefore  $dist(w, v)$  is adjusted lower.
- $\theta \approx 90^\circ$ : the outgoing edge  $(w, next(w))$  is near-orthogonal to the ingoing edge  $(prev(w), w)$ . The reader is not approaching  $v$  or zigzagging toward  $v$ ,  $dist(w, v)$  is adjusted for this case.
- $\theta < 90^\circ$ : the polyline  $(prev(w), w), (w, next(w))$  approximates a sharp bend. The reader has to search more for the outgoing edge  $(w, next(w))$ , which may be going away from  $v$ , therefore  $dist(w, v)$  is adjusted higher.

Note, the geodesic path distance  $dist(u, v)$  is always included as-is. With  $\frac{1}{2}$  we normalize the range of

$1 - \cos(180^\circ - \theta)$  between 0 and 1. If there are more than one shortest paths  $u \dots v$ , the maximum corresponds to task instance complexity's lower bound for any of the shortest paths. The proposed measure differentiates paths of different shapes. It also scales well with the number of nodes. That is, let us fix node positions in space, and insert nodes in the shortest path. Any inserted node  $w'$  is a common neighbor of two other nodes,  $prev(w')$  and  $next(w')$ ; the previous edge  $(prev(w'), next(w'))$  is replaced by two new edges  $(prev(w'), w')$  and  $(w', next(w'))$ .

- $w'$  lies on or near the previous edge: the respective geodesic distances are adjusted for no or minimal increase in instance complexity.
- $w'$  lies away from the previous edge:  $w'$  represents an increase in instance complexity, deviating from geodesic-path tendency, and the respective geodesic distances are adjusted accordingly.

Back on the shortest path, let us now pull all nodes apart while the rest of the graph remains fixed. As a consequence, the adjusted distance will increase, but so would the noise. More generally, instead of the adjusted distance in absolute terms, we can set  $dist(u, v) = 1$  to have  $dist(w, v)$  relative, after which the estimated measure becomes dimensionless and scale-invariant. For the absolute adjusted distance, comparisons across view sizes can still be made after normalizing for the view's maximum distance.

Given a geometric container, i. e., a geometric object within  $\Gamma$  [142], we estimate noise by how one looks at the path. To determine a suitable geometric container, we proceed to overlay all path instances. We transform each instance, so that all  $u$  have the same start and all  $v$  have the same end position; geodesic path distance normalized to 1. Based on the aggregate shape of all instances (see Suppl. Mat.), an ellipsoid is inferred as the shape of the container. Over each instance, we find the minimum volume enclosing ellipsoid [143], [144], where the points used are the positions of the nodes  $w \in u \dots v$  (Fig. 2). A node or an edge is counted as noise, when one or more points  $x$  satisfy  $(x - c)^T A (x - c) \leq 1$ . In quadratic form,  $A$  is the  $3 \times 3$  positive-definite matrix for the ellipsoid  $E_3$  with center  $c$ . That is, an edge or node must lie wholly or partly inside  $E_3$  and not be part of  $u \dots v$ . Compared to a sphere, the ellipsoid shape approximates  $u \dots v$ 's shape more closely after the radius constraint is relaxed. As a single object, it shows how one looks at the path: contained elements, which may interfere with path-following, are visible from different perspectives. The noise,  $\vec{\xi}$ , is given in Eq. 5, where for an element  $x \in G$ , the measure  $\mu(x)$  is the element's length. If there are more than one shortest paths  $u \dots v$ , the minimum is the closest approximation of the geodesic path and the smallest ROI.

$$\vec{\xi}_2(\Gamma) = \min_{\forall u \dots v} \left\{ \sum_{\substack{x \notin u \dots v \\ x \in E_3}} \mu(x) \right\} \quad (5)$$




Fig. 2. Path nodes  $w \in u \dots v$  (yellow) are enclosed by their minimum volume ellipsoid  $E_3$  (red), as seen in the small view. Nodes and edges not part of  $u \dots v$ , which lie wholly or partly in  $E_3$ , are then counted as noise (cyan).

### C. Hypotheses

- (H1)** An ad hoc pair has higher accuracy than an individual and a nominal pair.

For our study we define accuracy as a value between 0 and 1, such that:

$$Accuracy = \max \left( 1 - \frac{|a_{correct} - a_{actual}|}{a_{correct}}, 0 \right), \quad (6)$$

where  $a_{correct} - a_{actual}$  is the difference between the correct and actual answers. Higher accuracy of ad hoc pairs is expected in spite of process loss [14]. For higher values of common neighbors and node degrees (Task 1), memorization could outdemand identification (and benefit collaboration), whereas for lower values any difference in accuracy should be less apparent. For longer and denser paths (Task 2), ad hoc pairs should achieve higher accuracy also, e.g., via error correction and use of multiple perspectives.

The difference to nominal pairs should thus be smaller, confirming the presence of collaborative effects, even on smaller time scales. To achieve this, we expect the emergence of collaborative effects from interaction in the pair, while cognitive resources are the same as in the nominal pair. Collaborative effects may include more frequent applications of appropriate solving strategies, more iterative refinements of understanding, use of divide-and-conquer solving, and synchronization of individual cognitive processes, such as perception and memory.

- (H2)** An ad hoc pair has slower completion time than an individual, but is faster than a nominal pair.

The tasks we pose are of mixed composition (see Sec. III), and the workload is divisible. If we apply Amdahl's law [145], [146], the theoretical upper speedup of pairs would be two, or twice as fast. This is however unlikely, rather ad hoc pairs will need to communicate and coordinate more, i.e., verbally,

referentially, and spatially. Reaching consensus and searching overlooked neighbors and shorter paths will be less present in or executed more efficiently by individuals.

Then, the question arises: does collaborative solving reduce the time difference of two individuals solving the task separately? We have graph analytical tasks of varied instance complexity in an environment that predisposes information pooling, use of perspectives, and trust to allow temporal gains from collaboration. For the setting under test, we expect ad hoc pairs to be faster than nominal pairs.

- (H3)** With increased task instance complexity, 1) the difference in accuracy increases, that is between ad hoc pair vs. individual and nominal pair; and 2) the difference in completion time decreases between ad hoc pair and individual, and increases between ad hoc pair and nominal pair.

We expect task instance complexity to interact with group type. The interaction would confirm the utility of collaborative solving when instance complexity changes. As a factor for group outperformance first hypothesized about 50 years ago [15], task complexity, across its many definitions, has remained empirically elusive [52], [55], [56], [59]. Motivated by this new and yet untested integration of environment and visuospatial tasks, we think collaborating pairs can pool their resources and tackle higher instance complexity better than separate individuals, in terms of accuracy and time. The format of the experiment however also acts as a constraint: on smaller time scale effect sizes will not be outsized.

Searching and identification of the optimal interactions with graph elements in the more complex instances will be superior in ad hoc pairs. Error correcting will further support ad hoc pairs, at least accuracy-wise, and especially on Task 2. Since hand and gaze interactions are excluded, division of workload will not be that evident and require additional coordination and strategy building, where Task 1 will allow easier division. Multiple perspectives will be effectively found and shared reducing the detrimental effects of visual clutter.

#### D. Additional observation

A study of its own would be warranted to measure and analyze cognitive load in its entirety. We instead accommodate a previously operationalized subjective measure of cognitive load in our study design [109]. **RQ3** investigation is observational for task solving in MR across all task instances.

- (O1)** Total task instance complexity affects the cognitive load of ad hoc and nominal pair members differently.

Increased cognitive work results in mental fatigue, explained by metabolic regulation in the brain [147]. Collaborating in IE can mean varying cognitive load [40], [148], [149]. How collaboration alone affects cognitive load is more nuanced. For example, division of workload, insights generation, and information pooling should decrease the impact of task instance complexity. On the other hand, spatial and temporal coordination, and uneven division of workload, should increase it. Therefore, we do expect collaboration to interact with task instance complexity, but cannot set the direction.

#### E. Experimental procedure

We ran a pilot study with 8 participants across two locations. Four Meta Quest Pro headsets (v62) were used with video pass-through and inside-out tracking, such that the software prototype was built on each device. In both locations, each pair of headsets was connected to a dedicated server in a local area network.

Participants could determine the language of choice themselves (Italian, German, or English)<sup>2</sup>. Then, participants were briefed and agreed to participate in the study. Several covariates were considered, using a demographics and prior experience questionnaire. Participants were introduced to and prepared for each of the three overarching topics. As part of learning about graphs, participants were asked to solve three training tasks on paper and in a casual setting—ad hoc pairs could also talk to each other. Before entering MR, participants were instructed how to put on the headset, where to start, what the general format is, and how to adjust eye focus if needed. Prior to task solving, participants were walked through an illustrative example involving a book rendering: the goal was to get familiar with viewing, moving, and typing, as well as to ask any questions. After completing all task instances, participants were asked to fill out NASA TLX and participate in a short interview, before final debriefing. A procedure lasted between 1 hour and 1.5 hours, with few ad hoc groups around the 2-hour mark.

After controlled randomization, the correct answers varied from 2–11 for Task 1, and 3–16 for Task 2; distributions were positively skewed and had heavy tail (see Suppl. Mat.). We logged data, such as accuracy and completion time, via the headset. Due to high temporal resolution, small time differences appeared in ad hoc pairs, for which the longer of the two completion times was used. The first instance in each series was discarded, as well as any other instances where interruptions occurred (4), plus one faulty instance.

#### F. Participants

We performed an a priori power analysis to determine sample sizes with G\*Power v3.1.9.7 [150] targeting practical effect sizes in exploratory research. 72 participants took part in the study, evenly split in two countries: Italy and Germany. We conducted the study in three languages (English, German, Italian). Mean age was 25.3 years ( $SD = 7.6$ , range: 19–59), with 35 being female, and 37 male. Education level included bachelor (39), master (20), doctoral (9), or other (4), across 18 fields. Except 5, all participants reported normal or normal-to-corrected vision. 41 reported familiarity with networks, 25 with visualizations, and 25 with research on groups. Due to controlling and extraneous circumstances we discarded and redid sessions with 15 persons (10 together, 5 alone). No participants withdrew from the experiment.

## V. RESULTS

We performed quantitative and qualitative analysis based on our design (see Sec. IV-A). For the quantitative analysis,

<sup>2</sup>The interface and/or NASA TLX were still administered in English.




Fig. 3. a) Absolute difference in accuracy, paired, between group types. Error bars mark significant difference from the null, based on bootstrapped 95% CI. b), c) Average completion time, seconds, given by group type. Horizontal bars (top) indicate significance after post hoc correction.

we considered mixed-effects modeling to account for individual variability and within-subject correlation in estimating population averages [151]. We also used stratified bootstrap resampling where necessary to go beyond just reporting p-values [152], [153], e.g., non-parametric rank tests. The plots used in verifying model assumptions can be found in Suppl. Mat. The alpha level was set at 0.05.

#### A. Quantitative results

The starting point of our analysis was a linear mixed-effects model:

$$Y_{ijk} = \mu + \alpha_i + \delta_{k(i)} + \epsilon_{ijk}, \quad (7)$$

where  $Y_{ijk}$  is the response of the  $k^{\text{th}}$  individual/pair of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  group type for the  $j^{\text{th}}$  measurement;  $\alpha_i$  the fixed group type effect;  $\delta_{k(i)}$  the random effect of individual/pair  $k$ , nested in group type  $i$ ; and  $\epsilon_{ijk}$  the error term. Bootstrapping techniques were used to derive 95% CI or replace a model if assumptions had been violated (**H1**).

1) **Accuracy**: Residuals were not normally distributed. No transformation could meet the assumptions in Eq. 7. Therefore, we applied nonparametric bootstrap resampling ( $R = 10^4$ ) to obtain estimates for the paired mean difference. Resampling was also stratified to account for repeated measures. Bootstrap resampling guarantees the sampling distribution of paired mean differences to converge to a normal distribution [154]. A paired permutation test was used to obtain p-values.

a) **Ad hoc pair—Individual**: The average accuracy of the ad hoc pair was 93.9%, whereas an individual could achieve 89.2%. Results (Fig. 3 (a), bottom) from stratified bootstrap resampling evidenced the ad hoc pair to have a 4.6% higher mean accuracy with 95% CI [2.9%, 6.5%]. The paired permutation test p-value stood at  $p = 0.0001$ .

b) **Ad hoc pair—Nominal pair**: The average accuracy of a nominal pair was 94.4%. Results (Fig. 3 (a), top) from bootstrapping lacked evidence of a clear advantage: 0.5% with 95% CI [1.9%, -0.9%] in favor of the nominal pair. The paired permutation test found no significant difference.

2) **Completion time**: Residuals were not normally distributed, but followed log-normal distributions. We therefore applied logarithmic transformation. Tukey-Anscombe plots indicated homoscedasticity of residuals. Random effects appeared to be normally distributed, despite smaller sample sizes (36). For increased robustness and closer 95% CI estimates, we then applied stratified bootstrap resampling ( $R = 10^4$ ) refitting each model.

a) **Ad hoc pair—Individual**: The average measured completion time of an ad hoc pair was  $83.17s \pm 64.74$ , whereas an individual used  $57.59s \pm 59.87$ . The geometric mean completion time was  $65.16s$  and  $44.73s$ , respectively. The two were significantly different ( $t = -3.032$ ,  $df = 34$ ,  $p = 0.00463$ ), estimating the ad hoc pair's completion time to be  $e^{0.37628} \approx 1.46$  times higher, see Fig. 3 (b). The bootstrapped 95% CI were ( $61.31s$ ,  $69.27s$ ) for the ad hoc pair, and ( $38.91s$ ,  $51.46s$ ) for the individual. An ad hoc pair is estimated to be between 1.58 and 1.35 times slower. Ca. 27.1% of the total variance (95% CI [ $e^{0.27}$ ,  $e^{0.45}$ ]) was from participants.

b) **Ad hoc pair—Nominal pair**: The average measured completion time of a nominal pair was  $80.00s \pm 64.35$ , compared to the ad hoc pair's  $83.17s \pm 64.74$ . The geometric mean completion time was  $65.16s$  and  $65.50s$ , respectively. There was no significant difference between the means (Fig. 3 (c)), which was consistent with bootstrapping. Ca. 20.7% of the total variance (95% CI [ $e^{0.22}$ ,  $e^{0.38}$ ]) was from participants.

3) **Task instance complexity,  $\xi$** : We treated  $\xi$  as fixed and not random effect, since the graphs, from which task instances were randomly drawn, had been selected of specific type (see Sec. IV-B2). Interaction between  $\xi$ 's components was excluded. Noise instance complexity followed a log-normal distribution, and was transformed accordingly.

a) **Accuracy**: Accuracy is bounded in  $[0, 1]$  and does not follow a normal distribution. A logistic transformation of accuracy was not applicable due to a bimodal distribution of residuals. Mixed-effects logistic regression in the form of a generalized linear mixed-effects model was used instead [155]. An analysis with DHARMA [156] revealed no clear violations of




Fig. 4. Completion time by task instance complexity for ad hoc and nominal pairs. As signal instance complexity increases (left), nominal pairs tend to slow down more than ad hoc pairs. For increases in noise instance complexity (right), the difference between pair types remains largely unchanged.

assumptions; random effects were normally distributed. Multicollinearity was acceptable and incorporation of curvilinear components supported the log-transformation of noise instance complexity. As a result, the probability  $\pi_{ijk}$  of accurate answer was modeled as:

$$\log\left(\frac{\pi_{ijk}}{1-\pi_{ijk}}\right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \times G_i + \beta_2 \times \xi_j + \beta_3 (G \times \xi)_{ij} + \delta_{k(i)}, \quad (8)$$

where  $\xi_j = (\xi_{1,2} + \log(\xi_{1,2}))_j$ ,  $G_i$  is the group type, and  $\delta_{k(i)}$  the random effect;  $\beta_l$  with  $l = 0, \dots, 3$  denotes each multiple regression coefficient.

A Wald test did not find specific evidence toward improved ad hoc pair's odds while task instance complexity increased, i. e.,  $\beta_3$  in Eq. 8, which was the case for both the ad hoc—individual and ad hoc—nominal comparisons.

*b) Completion time:* For completion time, we extended our previous model, Eq. 7, to include  $\xi$ :

$$Y_{ijk} = \mu + \alpha_i + \beta_j + (\alpha\beta)_{ij} + \delta_{k(i)} + \epsilon_{ijk}, \quad (9)$$

where  $\beta_j$  is the added corresponding fixed effect, and  $(\alpha\beta)_{ij}$  the interaction. After log-transformation of completion time, residuals were normally distributed in each model. Tukey-Anscombe plotting indicated constant variance and random effects appeared normally distributed in their Q-Q plots.

*b) a) Ad hoc pair—Individual.* For increased task instance complexity, the difference in completion time between the ad hoc pair and the individual did not decrease. In fact, an ad hoc pair tended to become slightly slower, but not significantly.

*b) b) Ad hoc pair—Nominal pair.* The difference in completion time between the ad hoc pair and the nominal pair increased with increases in task instance complexity (Fig. 4). In particular, our bootstrapped model suggested a small evidence of interaction with signal instance complexity. As signal instance complexity increased, the nominal pair's completion time increased  $e^{0.098} \approx 1.1$  times proportionally more (bootstrapped 95% CI [1.01, 1.21]). Evidence of interaction with

noise instance complexity was inconclusive, though marginally in favor of nominal pairs.

*4) Cognitive load (CL):* NASA-TLX was administered after completion of all task instances. Responses ranged between 0 (low) and 100 (high), where exact totals of 0 and 100 are unlikely. Responses approximated a beta distribution, based on which we proceeded to fit a beta regression model [157] of the probability  $\pi_{ik}$  to have high CL:

$$\log\left(\frac{\pi_{ik}}{1-\pi_{ik}}\right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \times G_i + \beta_2 \times \Xi + \beta_3 (G \times \Xi)_i, \quad (10)$$

where  $\Xi = \sum \xi_j$  is the combined task instance complexity a participant experiences across all instances. To reduce multicollinearity, we centered  $\xi$ 's components around their mean. For model diagnostics, we consulted an example from a recent review on the topic [158]. Plotting of deviance residuals did not reveal particular deviations. Two responses corresponding to levels of comparatively low CL (17.00 and 23.67) were flagged as outliers. After closer inspection, we kept the responses, e. g., recorded when  $\xi$ 's components crossed.

*a) Ad hoc pair—Nominal pair.* When total noise instance complexity increased, the probability of high CL significantly increased in ad hoc pairs ( $z = 2.397$ ,  $df = 7$ ,  $p = 0.0165$ ), with the opposite effect when it decreased, see Fig. 5. The effect was pronounced: The odds of high CL were predicted to increase/decrease by 15% for every  $e^{0.1}$  change in total noise instance complexity from the sample mean of 194m (95% CI [3%, 25%]). The interaction between collaboration and total signal instance complexity was not significant.

*5) Post hoc analysis:* Following a recent discussion on corrections for multiple testing in applied research [159], we divided inferences into three families: 1) ad hoc pair—individual performance; 2) ad hoc—nominal pair performance; and 3) effects of paired solving on cognitive load for lower/higher total task instance complexity. These account for the nesting of tests in a hypothesis and include the atomicity of responses, e. g., accuracy and time. Because in our design nominal pairs cannot be compared with individuals, an omnibus null hypothesis cannot be tested and correction is not necessary (see **RQ1–3**). To control the error rate of false-positive inferences in each family, we used the Holm-Bonferroni correction. Adjusted p-values did not markedly differ from the original p-values, see Suppl. Mat.




Fig. 5. Average probability of high cognitive load for total noise instance complexity from the sample mean of 194m.




Fig. 6. Average predicted probability of accurate answer for noise instance complexity and group type: ad hoc–individual (left) and ad hoc–nominal (right).

In our post hoc analysis, we also explored how task instance complexity alone affects responses, that is across group types.

*a) Accuracy:* The effect of signal instance complexity was not significant, however, that of noise instance complexity was ( $z = -5.514$ ,  $p < 0.0001$ ;  $z = -5.518$ ,  $p < 0.0001$ ). The odds of answering accurately were predicted to decrease by 49% for every  $e^1$  increase in noise instance complexity (95% CI [35%, 60%]). Fig. 6 shows how the average predicted probability of accurate answer decreases as noise instance complexity increases for any group type.

*b) Completion time:* Signal instance complexity had significant effect on completion time ( $t = 7.301$ ,  $df = 753.1$ ,  $p < 0.0001$ ;  $t = 7.463$ ,  $df = 753.4$ ,  $p < 0.0001$ ): For every increase in signal instance complexity, completion times were  $e^{0.2884} \approx 33\%$  times higher (bootstrap 95% CI [25%, 43%]). Noise instance complexity also significantly affected completion time ( $t = 10.202$ ,  $df = 753.8$ ,  $p < 0.0001$ ;  $t = 10.426$ ,  $df = 754.3$ ,  $p < 0.0001$ ), such that completion times were  $e^{0.2152} \approx 24\%$  times higher (bootstrap 95% CI [18%, 30%]) for every  $e^1$  increase in noise instance complexity.

*c) Cognitive load:* Total signal instance complexity had a small significant effect ( $z = -2.219$ ,  $df = 7$ ,  $p = 0.0265$ ). For every increase from the sample mean of 16.5, the odds of high CL were predicted to decrease by 11% (95% CI [1%, 20%]). Total noise instance complexity had larger, but not significant, effect on increasing the odds of high CL.

## B. Qualitative results

At the end, we conducted a short interview with the participants. Interview questions were about subjective aspects and aspects difficult to quantify, e.g., what solving strategy did participants apply and did they face any particular challenges. The summary of qualitative results can be found in the curated dataset in DaRUS [32].

*1) Perceived difficulty:* Each participant rated task difficulty on a scale of one, the least, to five, the most, and reasoned the choice in their own words. Ad hoc pairs found

on average each of the two tasks slightly easier than nominal pairs (Task 1: 2.66  $\leftrightarrow$  2.88, Task 2: 3.08  $\leftrightarrow$  3.22), with the shortest path task (SP) slightly more difficult than the common neighbors task (CN). By frequency, participants’ explanations why SP was more difficult included: a larger solving space physically and analytically, an increased sense of uncertainty, and being a more visually demanding task, e.g., due to density. For CN, feedback pointed to greater memory involvement and being a less intuitive task. SP and CN thus made for a more global and a more local, systematic task, respectively.

*2) Perceived duration:* Immersive analytics [23] is concerned with establishing immersion for analysis’ sake, often through a sense of flow, where the very perception of time is distorted. To this end, participants provided estimates of the time they spent task solving. In cases of several estimates, we considered the initial, individual estimate over latter, more educated guesses. Self-reported and recorded values followed a log-normal distribution and were transformed accordingly. The perceived and the recorded time aligned overall based on a paired t-test. This is notable considering access to watches and mobile devices was restricted, and may demonstrate a good blend of realism and engagement in the MR setting. Pairs and individuals may perceive differently the time in MR spent task solving, as indicated by a paired t-test ( $t = 2.282$ ,  $df = 35$ ,  $p = 0.029$ ), which may be caused by altered in-pair perception ( $t = -1.929$ ,  $df = 35$ ,  $p = 0.062$ ).

*3) Applied strategies:* An overview of the applied strategies is in Fig. 7, where these differed in each task. In the first task (CN), a smaller set of participants reported applying an exhaustive search method, such as following all edges or sweeping the space inside the ROI. Occupying a middle ground, slightly more participants focused on any of the two nodes, depending on its perspective, proximity or some other criteria, while the majority of participants initiated their search from the lower degree node. In the second task (SP), participants reported applying various strategies, often jointly and sometimes in succession, such as focusing on cut and hub nodes or the related long edges in the layout, geodesic path following, comparing with or discussing multiple paths. Other strategies included stepwise exploration, e.g., circumventing “dead ends”, and round-trip traversing.

Ad hoc pairs regularly consulted, and if needed reached consensus by explaining the intermediate steps. Ad hoc pairs developed less strategies than nominal pairs, but could better correct for suboptimal strategies (Sec. III, Def. f), 1)). Ad hoc pairs subdivided the space, but did share any good viewing perspective. Indeed, many of the ad hoc pairs’ strategies had a common tendency for perspectives, on the other hand, certain pairs struggled to find a cooperative strategy.

*4) Ad hoc pair interaction:* Process loss [14] occurred primarily in two forms, view synchronization and consensus reaching, e.g., via explanation. Still, notable trade-offs were evident, at the start one of the members would ensure common ground by bringing the pair on the same page. Later, members would share new insights, such as label use or the location of a selected node, any doubts they might have, and ultimately the common strategy. Gradually as a pair got accustomed to working together, communication and strategy use became more




Fig. 7. Applied strategy to solve each of the two tasks by ad hoc pairs (left) and individuals (right). Vertical stacking in each heatmap indicates whether several strategies were jointly used or when these may have evolved gradually (bottom to top).

efficient. For example, members would solve in parallel and opt for brief exchanges, some even communicating through the interface, with deeper interactions saved for more complex instances. Others would engage in a dialogue throughout, e.g., being side by side, and/or proceeding step by step; and may actively split workload as in counting CN. We also observed a build-up of trust, where a member might trust their partner without necessarily expecting clarification or continuing to solve the task themselves. Overall, ad hoc pairs rated interaction to be 4.5 on the previous one to five scale.

5) **Preferred viewing position:** Participants’ reported either combining exocentric and egocentric exploration, or relying exclusively on exocentric viewpoints as their preferred viewing positions. Ad hoc pairs especially preferred exocentric or a mixture of both. Only a few participants adopted an egocentric view of the graph. Lack of awareness and “fear of contact” were reasons, at least initially, why some preferred outside; labels orientation was also pointed out. Depending on where the selected nodes were, the outer viewpoint could vary and even include top and bottom. If density was high, participants would employ an egocentric, even *node-centric*, view to reduce clutter. On the other hand, density was why many disliked being inside the graph (e.g., “edges would go in my eyes”). The majority of participants were closer to the graph solving the CN task, and leveraged distance to the graph to obtain an overview for the SP task. Exocentric exploration was crucial in finding good perspectives in any of the tasks.

6) **Challenges and discomforts:** Challenges and discomforts introduce added difficulty to task solving. Challenges were partitioned depending on if remarks were predominantly made by ad hoc pairs or by individuals. Edge crossings and graph density, along with memory demand and visual clarity were most common and mostly reported by individuals.

A participant described density as “mentally and physically demanding”, related with frequent shifts of perspective. In this context, some individuals mentioned long SP as another challenge. Lack of interactive node selection was often the expressed workaround for high memory demand (also by few pairs). Visual clarity encompassed overall sharpness and pixelation, as well as difficulties in discerning edges and degrees specifically. Ad hoc pairs focused on challenges hindering their interaction, such as issues related to labels and graph synchronization. The difference in views, just like around any object, was also mentioned by a couple of pairs, e.g., “You had to walk over there and lose where you are”, which is in line with more comments by pair members adjusting to MR.

Wearing the HMD, at least one discomfort was indicated by over half of all participants. Responses included primarily head and eye problems, e.g., headache and eye strain. Few also complained from balance problems, fatigue or frustration.

## VI. DISCUSSION

Results from our experiment show that this type of visuospatial mixed reality setting is viable for collocated collaboration. Testable duration, however, seems to be limited to the minute range based on the record of discomforts; more research is needed to investigate frequent and prolonged problem solving wearing HMD. Despite notable exceptions, ad hoc pair results were largely in line with established research on groups—an MR environment does not automatically imply superior collaboration.

In terms of accuracy and completion time, neither ad hoc pairs nor nominal pairs outperformed. Against individuals, the accuracy-time trade-off of ad hoc pairs was evident: ad hoc pairs used 1.46 more time to achieve 4.6% higher accuracy. Collaborative effects did emerge, most notably in establishing

common ground, correcting for suboptimal strategies, and pooling insights to reach consensus. Collaboration was mostly fluid and tended to vary between pairs, e. g., regarding communication style, or strategy building. Yet, on average an ad hoc pair was still only as accurate as the more accurate of two individuals, and as slow as the slower of two individuals. One explanation for this could be unnecessary coordination, which, as one pair surprisingly found, can be reduced with the use of local copies, i.e. *semi-distributed collaboration*. But to have pair's collaborative effects outweigh aggregate effects, especially in accuracy, more than improved coordination seems to be required.

To investigate group type differences for different degrees of perceivable complexity, we introduced and operationalized the concept of task instance complexity. This estimates the lower bound of necessary interactions under some perturbation required to solve a task instance. More concretely, the complexity comprises the signal and noise complexity of that instance. An instance that deviates from the trivial case (task-specific) has higher signal complexity. Since deviations are adjusted in absolute terms, longer paths (Task 2) would have higher signal complexity, but also have their instances associated with the actual environment and its properties, such as division of workload. An instance has higher noise complexity, if inspection of the instance is hindered by non-instance elements in the region. Analogously, noise multiplicity is measured in absolute terms, where for Tasks 1 and 2 the elements' length serves as a simple estimator of visual occlusion as projected to some average view.

Somewhat surprisingly, average differences between group types scaled well for increases in task instance complexity, with just a few notable exceptions. In particular, as signal instance complexity increased, ad hoc pairs slowed down 10% less than nominal pairs. In other words, collaborative solving helped the slower individual reduce completion time increasingly more. Increases in noise instance complexity might have the opposite effect, but more research is required. The reported changes in cognitive load may give us more clues. In the sample of the study we observed the odds of high cognitive load in pair members to increase alongside accumulated noise instance complexity, i.e., by 15% for differences as small as 27%. Since nominal pairs seemed less affected, the ad hoc pair's strength, its coordination and exchange of information, may also become its weakness when noise instance complexity is high. While the underlying causes are generally consistent between group types, such as edge crossings and graph density, in ad hoc pairs these manifest in increasingly difficult coordination and loss of common ground.

Visuospatial mixed reality as such cannot improve collaboration alone, that is to yield higher collective intelligence than aggregate groups [60] like nominal pairs. Our results therefore serve to quantify collaboration and should not be viewed as a verdict against collaboration.

#### *On task instance complexity*

In our post hoc analysis we explored the effects of task instance complexity. The predicted probability of an accurate

answer followed a power law as noise instance complexity increased (Fig. 6), which was independent of group type. The decrease in probability could be caused by various perceptual factors across both tasks, such as occlusion and overlaps distorting normal use of perspectives, higher information load, and uncertainty. Very high noise complexity would eventually render solving not much different than guesswork. Less expected was the effect of signal instance complexity on the odds of an accurate answer, or rather, the lack of it (in Suppl. Mat. a slightly positive trend can be observed). We attribute this to the limits of the experimental design, and in particular to some of the characteristics of shortest paths in social networks, which we elucidate in Sec. VII.

In our MR setting, both signal and noise instance complexity affected completion time. Given instances were drawn in controlled randomization, each measure seems to estimate what intuitively constitutes complexity of a task instance. While a narrow answer range can be good for isolating specific effects, we suspect that this would be prone to learning effects. Learning effects can then be mitigated by including instances outside the range to discard later, but in exchange of feasibility.

The results presented here serve to validate the operationalization of task instance complexity in experiments involving visuospatial problem solving, while more research will help refine and expand its use.

## VII. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE WORK

The type of group is one limitation, where results might differ for practiced groups [52], [160]. Ad hoc pairs are nevertheless preferable over mixed groups and practiced pairs are experimentally less feasible. Conclusions should translate well to more cohesive groups of similar sizes, that is, when ad hoc pairs exceeded. Other activities, tasks and task types in collaborative immersive environments can aid generalization. Laboratory measurements are also prone to social facilitation [161], unlike those in the wild, and as in our case, may include participants with different incentives.

Due to higher path lengths, solution plurality per task instance was not limited to one. For a fixed task instance complexity, solution singularity may be a co-contributing factor toward increased complexity. For certain graph tasks, e. g., the shortest path task, high signal instance complexity may require sufficiently large graphs, where singular points, such as cut vertices, can be better controlled for, since otherwise, somewhat counterintuitively, accuracy can increase with signal complexity.

MR is inherently visuospatial, linking visual attention and spatial reasoning. For any increase in instance complexity, so do perception and memory requirements. In our study, while we acknowledge that, we tried not to attenuate one or the other. Technical limitations, such as the sharing of spatial anchors between HMD without prior verification in the Meta Horizon store, should also be noted, whereby subtle tracking offsets were noticeable despite strict procedural routines. We are also inadvertently limited by current display technology: HMD, the predominant stereoscopic technology today, are well known for obfuscating awareness and facial cues [62], [64], and may pose challenges (Sec. V-B6) limiting prolonged use.

## VIII. CONCLUSION

In this paper we reported on a study investigating collaborative problem solving by means of visual graph analysis in mixed reality. We could provide simple answers to our research questions and uncover new research directions. A visuospatial immersive environment, like the one in this study, has potential for overcoming process loss in small groups. Nominal groups can represent an added benchmark in empirically validating collaborative applications. In any such study design, individuals can then be naturally compared against to explore specific trade-offs. Complexity as a decisive factor for collaboration remains elusive, however, elements of task instance complexity did result in exceptions to the rule. Research into signal and noise instance complexity could reveal mechanisms of dealing with instance complexity in collaboration.

Results of the study are important for and beyond the area of collaborative virtual environments. In particular, the results have implications for the development of interactive methods and visualizations that reduce coordination loss, increase information flow, and improve collaboration.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would want to thank all study participants, as well as all pilot study participants from each respective chair.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Wang, Y. Wang, S. Patel, and D. Patel, "A layered reference model of the brain (LRMB)," *IEEE Trans. Syst., Man, and Cybern. C, Appl. Rev.*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 124–133, Mar. 2006, doi: 10.1109/TSMCC-2006.871126.
- [2] Y. Wang and V. Chiew, "On the cognitive process of human problem solving," *Cogn. Syst. Res.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 81–92, Mar. 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.cogsys.2008.08.003.
- [3] J. Condell, J. Wade, L. Galway, M. McBride, P. Gormley, J. Brennan, and T. Somasundram, "Problem solving techniques in cognitive science," *Artif. Intell. Rev.*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 221–234, Jun. 2010, doi: 10.1007/s10462-010-9171-0.
- [4] R. E. Wood, "Task complexity: Definition of the construct," *Org. Behav. Hum. Decis. Processes*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 60–82, Feb. 1986, doi: 10.1016/0749-5978(86)90044-0.
- [5] D. J. Campbell, "Task complexity: A review and analysis," *Acad. Manage. Rev.*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 40–52, Jan. 1988, doi: 10.5465/amr.1988.4306775.
- [6] H. H. Clark and S. E. Brennan, "Grounding in communication," in *Perspectives on socially shared cognition*, L. B. Resnick, J. M. Levine, and S. D. Teasley, Eds. Washington, DC, USA: American Psychological Assoc., 1991, ch. 7, pp. 127–149, doi: 10.1037/10096-006.
- [7] J. R. Hackman and C. G. Morris, "Group tasks, group interaction process, and group performance effectiveness: A review and proposed integration," in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, L. Berkowitz, Ed. New York, NY, USA; Orlando, FL, USA; San Diego, CA, USA: Academic, 1975, vol. 8, pp. 45–99, doi: 10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60248-8.
- [8] D. Stokols, K. L. Hall, B. K. Taylor, and R. P. Moser, "The science of team science: overview of the field and introduction to the supplement," *Amer. J. Prev. Med.*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. S77–S89, Aug. 2008, doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2008.05.002.
- [9] I. D. Couzin, "Collective cognition in animal groups," *Trends Cogn. Sci.*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 36–43, Jan. 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.tics.2008.10.002.
- [10] R. Axelrod and W. D. Hamilton, "The evolution of cooperation," *Science*, vol. 211, no. 4489, pp. 1390–1396, Mar. 1981, doi: 10.1126/science.7466396.
- [11] A. M. Turing, "The chemical basis of morphogenesis," *Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. B*, vol. 237, no. 641, pp. 37–72, Aug. 1952, doi: 10.1098/rstb.1952.0012.
- [12] G. Nicolis and I. Prigogine, *Self-organization in nonequilibrium systems: From dissipative structures to order through fluctuations*. Hoboken, NJ, USA: Wiley, 1977, isbn: 978-0471024019.
- [13] D. L. Schwartz, "The emergence of abstract representations in dyad problem solving," *J. Learn. Sci.*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 321–354, 1995, doi: 10.1207/s15327809jls0403\_3.
- [14] I. D. Steiner, *Group process and productivity*. New York, NY, USA; Orlando, FL, USA; San Diego, CA, USA: Academic, 1972, isbn: 978-0126653502.
- [15] M. E. Shaw and N. Ashton, "Do assembly bonus effects occur on disjunctive tasks? A test of Steiner's theory," *Bull. Psychon. Soc.*, vol. 8, no. 6, pp. 469–471, Dec. 1976, doi: 10.3758/BF03335201.
- [16] M. Wolf, R. H. Kurvers, A. J. Ward, S. Krause, and J. Krause, "Accurate decisions in an uncertain world: collective cognition increases true positives while decreasing false positives," *Proc. Roy. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*, vol. 280, no. 1756, Apr. 2013, Art. no. 20122777, doi: 10.1098/rspb.2012.2777.
- [17] A.-L. Barabási, "The network takeover," *Nature Phys.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 14–16, Jan. 2012, doi: 10.1038/nphys2188.
- [18] N. Henry, J.-D. Fekete, and M. J. McGuffin, "NodeTrix: a hybrid visualization of social networks," *IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graphics*, vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 1302–1309, Dec. 2007, doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2007.70582.
- [19] E. Di Giacomo, W. Didimo, G. Liotta, F. Montecchiani, and A. Tappini, "Comparative study and evaluation of hybrid visualizations of graphs," *IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graphics*, vol. 30, pp. 3503–3515, Jan. 2023, doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2022.3233389.
- [20] X. Huang, X. Shao, and M. Thompson, "Learning spatial skills collaboratively in immersive virtual environments: A systematic review," in *2022 8th Int. Conf. Immer. Learn. Res. Netw. (iLRN)*, 2022, pp. 1–5, doi: 10.23919/iLRN55037.2022.9815990.
- [21] P. Milgram, H. Takemura, A. Utsumi, and F. Kishino, "Augmented reality: A class of displays on the reality-virtuality continuum," in *Proc. SPIE 2351 Telemanipul. Telepres. Technol.*, H. Das, Ed., 1995, pp. 282–292, doi: 10.1117/12.197321.
- [22] I. E. Sutherland, "A head-mounted three dimensional display," in *Proc. AFIPS '68: Fall Joint Comput. Conf. I*, 1968, pp. 757–764, doi: 10.1145/1476589.1476686.
- [23] K. Marriott, F. Schreiber, T. Dwyer, K. Klein, N. H. Riche, T. Itoh, W. Stuerzlinger, and B. H. Thomas, *Immersive analytics*, ser. LNCS, vol. 11190. New York; Berlin, Germany; Vienna, Austria: Springer-Verlag, 2018, doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-01388-2.
- [24] C. Cruz-Neira, D. J. Sandin, T. A. DeFanti, R. V. Kenyon, and J. C. Hart, "The CAVE: audio visual experience automatic virtual environment," *Commun. ACM*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 64–72, Jun. 1992, doi: 10.1145/129888.129892.
- [25] D. Schmalstieg, A. Fuhrmann, G. Hesina, Z. Szalavári, L. M. Encarnaçao, M. Gervautz, and W. Purgathofer, "The Studierstube augmented reality project," *Pres. Teleoper. Virt. Environ.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 33–54, Feb. 2002, doi: 10.1162/105474602317343640.
- [26] H. Kato and M. Billinghurst, "Marker tracking and HMD calibration for a video-based augmented reality conferencing system," in *Proc. IWAR '99: 2nd IEEE ACM Int. Workshop Augment. Real.*, 1999, pp. 85–94, doi: 10.1109/IWAR.1999.803809.
- [27] M. Cordeil, T. Dwyer, K. Klein, B. Laha, K. Marriott, and B. H. Thomas, "Immersive collaborative analysis of network connectivity: CAVE-style or head-mounted display?" *IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graphics*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 441–450, Aug. 2016, doi: 10.1109/TVCG-2016.2599107.
- [28] I. Haldal, M. Spante, and M. Connell, "Are two heads better than one?: object-focused work in physical and in virtual environments," in *Proc. VRST '06: ACM Symp. Virt. Real. Softw. Technol.*, 2006, pp. 287–296, doi: 10.1145/1180495.1180553.
- [29] A. S. García, D. Martínez, J. P. Molina, and P. González, "Collaborative virtual environments: you can't do it alone, can you?" in *Virt. Real.: 2nd Int. Conf. ICVR 2007*, ser. LNCS, vol. 4563, R. Shumaker, Ed., 2007, pp. 224–233, doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-73335-5\_25.
- [30] T. Sando, M. Tory, and P. Irani, "Impact of group size on spatial structure understanding tasks," in *2011 IEEE Pacif. Vis. Symp.*, 2011, pp. 107–114, doi: 10.1109/PACIFICVIS.2011.5742379.
- [31] A. Prouzeau, A. Bezerianos, and O. Chapuis, "Evaluating multi-user selection for exploring graph topology on wall-displays," *IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graphics*, vol. 23, no. 8, pp. 1936–1951, Jul. 2016, doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2016.2592906.
- [32] D. Garkov, T. Piselli, E. Di Giacomo, K. Klein, G. Liotta, F. Montecchiani, and F. Schreiber, "Collaborative problem solving in mixed reality: A study on visual graph analysis - replication data," 2024, DaRUS,

- the data repository of the University of Stuttgart, doi: 10.18419/darus-4231.
- [33] J. M. Levine and R. L. Moreland, "Progress in small group research," *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 585–634, Feb. 1990, doi: 10.1146/annurev.ps.41.020190.003101.
- [34] H.-Y. Chang, T. Binali, J.-C. Liang, G.-L. Chiou, K.-H. Cheng, S. W.-Y. Lee, and C.-C. Tsai, "Ten years of augmented reality in education: A meta-analysis of (quasi-) experimental studies to investigate the impact," *Comput. Educ.*, vol. 191, Dec. 2022, Art. no. 104641, doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2022.104641.
- [35] E. S. Spelke, "Principles of object perception," *Cogn. Sci.*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 29–56, Jan. 1990, doi: 10.1207/s15516709cog1401\_3.
- [36] M. Mori, K. F. MacDorman, and N. Kageki, "The uncanny valley [from the field]," *IEEE Robot. Automat. Mag.*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 98–100, Jun. 2012, doi: 10.1109/MRA.2012.2192811.
- [37] R. A. J. de Belen, H. Nguyen, D. Filonik, D. Del Favero, and T. Bednarczyk, "A systematic review of the current state of collaborative mixed reality technologies: 2013–2018," *AIMS Electron. Elect. Eng.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 181–223, May 2019, doi: 10.3934/ElectrEng.2019.2.181.
- [38] M. Sereno, X. Wang, L. Besançon, M. J. McGuffin, and T. Isenberg, "Collaborative work in augmented reality: A survey," *IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graphics*, vol. 28, no. 6, pp. 2530–2549, Oct. 2020, doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2020.3032761.
- [39] B. Ens, B. Bach, M. Cordeil, U. Engelke, M. Serrano, W. Willett, A. Prouzeau, C. Anthes, W. Büschel, C. Dunne et al., "Grand challenges in immersive analytics," in *Proc. 2021 CHI Conf. Hum. Factors Comput. Syst.*, 2021, pp. 1–17, Art. no. 459, doi: 10.1145/3411764-3446866.
- [40] W. Tong, M. Xia, K. K. Wong, D. A. Bowman, T.-C. Pong, H. Qu, and Y. Yang, "Towards an understanding of distributed asymmetric collaborative visualization on problem-solving," in *2023 IEEE Conf. Virt. Real. 3D User Interfaces (VR)*, 2023, pp. 387–397, doi: 10.1109/VR55154.2023.00054.
- [41] N. A. of Sciences, Policy, G. Affairs, B. on Research Data, Information, D. on Engineering, P. Sciences, C. on Applied, T. Statistics, B. on Mathematical Sciences et al., *Reproducibility and replicability in science*. Washington, DC, USA: National Academies Press, 2019, isbn: 978-0309486163.
- [42] J. R. Hackman, "From causes to conditions in group research," *J. Org. Behav.*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 428–444, Jan. 2012, doi: 10.1002/job.1774.
- [43] R. L. Thorndike, "The effect of discussion upon the correctness of group decisions, when the factor of majority influence is allowed for," *J. Soc. Psychol.*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 343–362, Aug. 1938, doi: 10.1080/00224545.1938.9920036.
- [44] J. R. Hackman, "Toward understanding the role of tasks in behavioral research," *Acta Psychol.*, vol. 31, pp. 97–128, 1969, doi: 10.1016/0001-6918(69)90073-0.
- [45] R. W. Husband, "Cooperative versus solitary problem solution," *J. Soc. Psychol.*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 405–409, Feb. 1940, doi: 10.1080/00224545.1940.9918759.
- [46] D. W. Taylor and W. L. Faust, "Twenty questions: efficiency in problem solving as a function of size of group," *J. Exp. Psychol.*, vol. 44, no. 5, pp. 360–368, Nov. 1952, doi: 10.1037/h0054376.
- [47] M. E. Shaw, "A comparison of individuals and small groups in the rational solution of complex problems," *Amer. J. Psychol.*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 491–504, Jul. 1932, doi: 10.2307/1415351.
- [48] D. I. Marquart, "Group problem solving," *J. Soc. Psychol.*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 103–113, Feb. 1955, doi: 10.1080/00224545.1955.9714255.
- [49] W. L. Faust, "Group versus individual problem-solving," *J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol.*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 68–72, Jul. 1959, doi: 10.1037/h0048521.
- [50] D. J. Fox and I. Lorge, "The relative quality of decisions written by individuals and by groups as the available time for problem solving is increased," *J. Soc. Psychol.*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 227–242, Jun. 1962, doi: 10.1080/00224545.1962.9710920.
- [51] G. E. Littlepage and J. R. Poole, "Time allocation in decision making groups," *J. Soc. Behav. Personal.*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 663–672, Jan. 1993.
- [52] G. W. Hill, "Group versus individual performance: Are  $N + 1$  heads better than one?" *Psychol. Bull.*, vol. 91, no. 3, pp. 517–539, May 1982, doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.91.3.517.
- [53] I. D. Steiner, "Models for inferring relationships between group size and potential group productivity," *Behav. Sci.*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 273–283, Jul. 1966, doi: 10.1002/bs.3830110404.
- [54] N. L. Kerr and R. S. Tindale, "Group performance and decision making," *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 623–655, Feb. 2004, doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.142009.
- [55] L. K. Michaelsen, W. E. Watson, and R. H. Black, "A realistic test of individual versus group consensus decision making," *J. Appl. Psychol.*, vol. 74, no. 5, pp. 834–839, Oct. 1989, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.74.5-834.
- [56] P. R. Laughlin, B. L. Bonner, and A. G. Miner, "Groups perform better than the best individuals on letters-to-numbers problems," *Org. Behav. Hum. Decis. Processes*, vol. 88, no. 2, pp. 605–620, Jul. 2002, doi: 10.1016/S0749-5978(02)00003-1.
- [57] J. R. Hackman and N. Katz, "Group behavior and performance," in *Handbook of social psychology*, 5th ed., S. T. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert, and G. Lindzey, Eds. Hoboken, NJ, USA: Wiley, 2010, pp. 1201–1251, doi: 10.1002/9780470561119.socpsy002032.
- [58] V. Wikström, S. Martikainen, M. Falcon, J. Ruistola, and K. Saarikivi, "Collaborative block design task for assessing pair performance in virtual reality and reality," *Heliyon*, vol. 6, no. 9, Sept. 2020, Art. no. e04823, doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e04823.
- [59] P. R. Laughlin, *Group problem solving*. Princeton, NJ, USA: Princeton Univ. Press, 2011, doi: 10.1515/9781400836673.
- [60] T. Kameda, W. Toyokawa, and R. S. Tindale, "Information aggregation and collective intelligence beyond the wisdom of crowds," *Nature Rev. Psychol.*, vol. 1, no. 6, pp. 345–357, Apr. 2022, doi: 10.1038/s44159-022-00054-y.
- [61] P. Isenberg, N. Elmqvist, J. Scholtz, D. Cernea, K.-L. Ma, and H. Hagen, "Collaborative visualization: Definition, challenges, and research agenda," *Inf. Vis.*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 310–326, Jul. 2011, doi: 10.1177/1473871611412817.
- [62] M. Billinghamurst, M. Cordeil, A. Bezerianos, and T. Margolis, "Collaborative immersive analytics," in *Immersive Analytics*, ser. LNCS, vol. 11190, K. Marriott, F. Schreiber, T. Dwyer, K. Klein, N. H. Riche, T. Itoh, W. Stuerzlinger, and B. H. Thomas, Eds. New York; Berlin, Germany; Vienna, Austria: Springer-Verlag, 2018, pp. 221–257, doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-01388-2\_8.
- [63] J. Rekimoto, "Transvision: A hand-held augmented reality system for collaborative design," in *Proc. VSMM '96: Virt. Syst. Multimedia*, 1996, pp. 18–20.
- [64] M. Billinghamurst, S. Weghorst, and T. Furness, "Shared space: An augmented reality approach for computer supported collaborative work," *Virt. Real.*, vol. 3, pp. 25–36, Mar. 1998, doi: 10.1007/BF01409795.
- [65] M. Billinghamurst, H. Kato, K. Kiyokawa, D. Belcher, and I. Poupyrev, "Experiments with face-to-face collaborative AR interfaces," *Virt. Real.*, vol. 6, pp. 107–121, Oct. 2002, doi: 10.1007/s100550200012.
- [66] K. Kiyokawa, M. Billinghamurst, S. E. Hayes, A. Gupta, Y. Sannohe, and H. Kato, "Communication behaviors of co-located users in collaborative AR interfaces," in *Proc. Int. Symp. Mix. Augment. Real.*, 2002, pp. 139–148, doi: 10.1109/ISMAR.2002.1115083.
- [67] M. Benk, R. P. Weibel, S. Feuerriegel, and A. Ferrario, "Is it my turn?" Assessing teamwork and taskwork in collaborative immersive analytics," *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.*, vol. 6, no. CSCW2, pp. 1–23, Nov. 2022, Art. no. 479, doi: 10.1145/3555580.
- [68] X. Wang and P. S. Dunston, "Comparative effectiveness of mixed reality-based virtual environments in collaborative design," *IEEE Trans. Syst., Man, and Cybern. C, Appl. Rev.*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 284–296, Jan. 2011, doi: 10.1109/TSMCC.2010.2093573.
- [69] L. P. Poretski, J. Lanir, R. Margalit, and O. Arazy, "Physicality as an anchor for coordination: Examining collocated collaboration in physical and mobile augmented reality settings," *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.*, vol. 5, no. CSCW2, pp. 1–29, Oct. 2021, Art. no. 470, doi: 10.1145/3479857.
- [70] R. Bovo, D. Giunchi, M. Alebri, A. Steed, E. Costanza, and T. Heinis, "Cone of vision as a behavioural cue for VR collaboration," *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.*, vol. 6, no. CSCW2, pp. 1–27, Nov. 2022, Art. no. 502, doi: 10.1145/3555615.
- [71] J. Zagermann, S. Hubenschmid, D. I. Fink, J. Wieland, H. Reiterer, and T. Feuchtner, "Challenges and opportunities for collaborative immersive analytics with hybrid user interfaces," in *2023 IEEE Int. Symp. Mix. Augment. Real. Adj. (ISMAR-Adj.)*, 2023, pp. 191–195, doi: 10.1109/ISMAR-Adjunct60411.2023.00044.
- [72] M. Agrawala, A. C. Beers, I. McDowall, B. Fröhlich, M. Bolas, and P. Hanrahan, "The two-user responsive workbench: support for collaboration through individual views of a shared space," in *Proc. SIGGRAPH '97: 24th Annu. Conf. Comput. Graphics Interact. Techn.*, 1997, pp. 327–332, doi: 10.1145/258734.258875.
- [73] S. Lee and H. Hua, "Effects of viewing conditions and rotation methods in a collaborative tabletop ar environment," *IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graphics*, vol. 17, no. 9, pp. 1245–1258, Mar. 2011, doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2011.49.

- [74] O. Oda, C. Elvezio, M. Sukan, S. Feiner, and B. Tversky, "Virtual replicas for remote assistance in virtual and augmented reality," in *Proc. UIST 15: 28th Annu. ACM Symp. User Interface Softw. Technol.*, 2015, pp. 405–415, doi: 10.1145/2807442.2807497.
- [75] H. Yang and G. M. Olson, "Exploring collaborative navigation: the effect of perspectives on group performance," in *Proc. CVE '02: 4th Int. Conf. Collabor. Virt. Environ.*, 2002, pp. 135–142, doi: 10.1145/571878.571899.
- [76] J. Heer and M. Agrawala, "Design considerations for collaborative visual analytics," in *2007 IEEE Symp. Vis. Anal. Sci. Technol.*, 2007, pp. 171–178, doi: 10.1109/VAST.2007.4389011.
- [77] B. Lee, X. Hu, M. Cordeil, A. Prouzeau, B. Jenny, and T. Dwyer, "Shared surfaces and spaces: Collaborative data visualisation in a co-located immersive environment," *IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graphics*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 1171–1181, Oct. 2020, doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2020.3030450.
- [78] W. Luo, A. Lehmann, H. Widengren, and R. Dachsel, "Where should we put it? Layout and placement strategies of documents in augmented reality for collaborative sensemaking," in *Proc. 2022 CHI Conf. Hum. Fact. Comput. Syst.*, 2022, pp. 1–16, Art. no. 627, doi: 10.1145/3491102.3501946.
- [79] J. Gong, J. Sun, M. Chu, X. Wang, M. Luo, Y. Lu, L. Zhang, Y. Wu, Q. Wang, and C. Liu, "Side-by-side vs face-to-face: Evaluating colocated collaboration via a transparent wall-sized display," *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.*, vol. 7, no. CSCW1, pp. 1–29, Apr. 2023, Art. no. 147, doi: 10.1145/3579623.
- [80] A. Batch, A. Cunningham, M. Cordeil, N. Elmqvist, T. Dwyer, B. H. Thomas, and K. Marriott, "There is no spoon: Evaluating performance, space use, and presence with expert domain users in immersive analytics," *IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graphics*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 536–546, Aug. 2019, doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2019.2934803.
- [81] Y. Yang, T. Dwyer, M. Wybrow, B. Lee, M. Cordeil, M. Billinghurst, and B. H. Thomas, "Towards immersive collaborative sensemaking," *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.*, vol. 6, no. ISS, pp. 722–746, Nov. 2022, Art. no. 588, doi: 10.1145/3567741.
- [82] S. Bresciani and M. J. Eppler, "The benefits of synchronous collaborative information visualization: Evidence from an experimental evaluation," *IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graphics*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 1073–1080, Oct. 2009, doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2009.188.
- [83] M. Narayan, L. Waugh, X. Zhang, P. Bafna, and D. Bowman, "Quantifying the benefits of immersion for collaboration in virtual environments," in *Proc. VRST '05: ACM Symp. Virt. Real. Softw. Technol.*, 2005, pp. 78–81, doi: 10.1145/1101616.1101632.
- [84] M. Brehmer and T. Munzner, "A multi-level typology of abstract visualization tasks," *IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graphics*, vol. 19, no. 12, pp. 2376–2385, Oct. 2013, doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2013.124.
- [85] B. Lee, C. Plaisant, C. S. Parr, J.-D. Fekete, and N. Henry, "Task taxonomy for graph visualization," in *Proc. BELIV '06: 2006 AVI Workshop BEyond Time Errors: Novel Eval. Methods Inf. Vis.*, 2006, pp. 1–5, doi: 10.1145/1168149.1168168.
- [86] H. C. Purchase, E. Hoggan, and C. Görg, "How important is the 'mental map'—an empirical investigation of a dynamic graph layout algorithm," in *Graph Draw.: 14th Int. Symp., GD 2006*, ser. LNCS, vol. 4372, M. Kaufmann and D. Wagner, Eds., 2007, pp. 184–195, doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-70904-6\_19.
- [87] D. Archambault and H. C. Purchase, "The 'map' in the mental map: Experimental results in dynamic graph drawing," *Int. J. Hum.-Comput. Stud.*, vol. 71, no. 11, pp. 1044–1055, Nov. 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhcs.2013.08.004.
- [88] B. Saket, P. Simonetto, and S. Kobourov, "Group-level graph visualization taxonomy," in *Proc. EuroVis '14: Eurographics Conf. Vis.—Short Papers*, N. Elmqvist, M. Hlawitschka, and J. Kennedy, Eds., 2014, doi: 10.2312/eurovisshort.20141162.
- [89] A. Pandey, U. H. Syeda, C. Shah, J. A. Guerra-Gomez, and M. A. Borkin, "A state-of-the-art survey of tasks for tree design and evaluation with a curated task dataset," *IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graphics*, vol. 28, no. 10, pp. 3563–3584, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2021.3064037.
- [90] N. Kerracher, J. Kennedy, and K. Chalmers, "A task taxonomy for temporal graph visualisation," *IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graphics*, vol. 21, no. 10, pp. 1160–1172, Apr. 2015, doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2015.2424889.
- [91] T. Von Landesberger, A. Kuijper, T. Schreck, J. Kohlhammer, J. J. van Wijk, J.-D. Fekete, and D. W. Fellner, "Visual analysis of large graphs: state-of-the-art and future research challenges," *Comput. Graphics Forum*, vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 1719–1749, Apr. 2011, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8659.2011.01898.x.
- [92] B. Meyer, "Self-organizing graphs—a neural network perspective of graph layout," in *Graph Draw.: 6th Int. Symp., GD 1998*, ser. LNCS, vol. 1547, S. Whitesides, Ed., 1998, pp. 246–262, doi: 10.1007/3-540-37623-2\_19.
- [93] T. Dwyer, Y. Koren, and K. Marriott, "IPSep-CoLa: An incremental procedure for separation constraint layout of graphs," *IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graphics*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 821–828, Nov. 2006, doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2006.156.
- [94] D. D. Suthers, R. Vatrupu, R. Medina, S. Joseph, and N. Dwyer, "Beyond threaded discussion: Representational guidance in asynchronous collaborative learning environments," *Comput. Educ.*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 1103–1127, May 2008, doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2006.10.007.
- [95] M. Van Amelsvoort, J. Andriessen, and G. Kanselaar, "Representational tools in computer-supported collaborative argumentation-based learning: How dyads work with constructed and inspected argumentative diagrams," *J. Learn. Sci.*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 485–521, Dec. 2007, doi: 10.1080/10508400701524785.
- [96] H. Gijlers and T. de Jong, "Using concept maps to facilitate collaborative simulation-based inquiry learning," *J. Learn. Sci.*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 340–374, Jan. 2013, doi: 10.1080/10508406.2012.748664.
- [97] K. Kim and A. A. Tawfik, "Different approaches to collaborative problem solving between successful versus less successful problem solvers: Tracking changes of knowledge structure," *J. Res. Technol. Educ.*, vol. 55, no. 4, pp. 628–645, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1080/15391523.2021.2014374.
- [98] H.-Y. Sung and G.-J. Hwang, "A collaborative game-based learning approach to improving students' learning performance in science courses," *Comput. Educ.*, vol. 63, pp. 43–51, Apr. 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2012.11.019.
- [99] J. Chen, M. Wang, T. A. Grotzer, and C. Dede, "Using a three-dimensional thinking graph to support inquiry learning," *J. Res. Sci. Teach.*, vol. 55, no. 9, pp. 1239–1263, Mar. 2018, doi: 10.1002/tea.21450.
- [100] L. Zheng, J. Niu, M. Long, and Y. Fan, "An automatic knowledge graph construction approach to promoting collaborative knowledge building, group performance, social interaction and socially shared regulation in CSCL," *Brit. J. Educ. Technol.*, vol. 54, no. 3, pp. 686–711, Oct. 2022, doi: 10.1111/bjet.13283.
- [101] A. L. Delbecq, A. H. Van de Ven, and D. H. Gustafson, *Group techniques for program planning: A guide to nominal group and Delphi processes*. Glenview, IL, USA: Scott, Foresman, 1975.
- [102] F. Galton, "Vox populi," *Nature*, vol. 75, pp. 450–451, Mar. 1907, doi: 10.1038/075450a0.
- [103] J. Kim and T. Wilhelm, "What is a complex graph?" *Phys. A: Statist. Mech. Appl.*, vol. 387, no. 11, pp. 2637–2652, Apr. 2008, doi: 10.1016/j.physa.2008.01.015.
- [104] V. Yoghoudjian, Y. Yang, T. Dwyer, L. Lawrence, M. Wybrow, and K. Marriott, "Scalability of network visualisation from a cognitive load perspective," *IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graphics*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 1677–1687, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2020.3030459.
- [105] D. Sacha, H. Senaratne, B. C. Kwon, G. Ellis, and D. A. Keim, "The role of uncertainty, awareness, and trust in visual analytics," *IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graphics*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 240–249, Aug. 2015, doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2015.2467591.
- [106] C. Ware, H. Purchase, L. Colpoys, and M. McGill, "Cognitive measurements of graph aesthetics," *Inf. Vis.*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 103–110, Jun. 2002, doi: 10.1057/palgrave.ivs.9500013.
- [107] W. Huang, P. Eades, and S.-H. Hong, "A graph reading behavior: Geodesic-path tendency," in *2009 IEEE Pacif. Vis. Symp.*, 2009, pp. 137–144, doi: 10.1109/PACIFICVIS.2009.4906848.
- [108] S. G. Hart, "NASA task load index (TLX)," 1986, Accessed: Dec. 2024. [Online]. Available: TLX\_pappen\_manual.pdf.
- [109] T. Kosch, J. Karolus, J. Zagermann, H. Reiterer, A. Schmidt, and P. W. Woźniak, "A survey on measuring cognitive workload in human-computer interaction," *ACM Comput. Surv.*, vol. 55, no. 13s, pp. 1–39, Jul. 2023, Art. no. 283, doi: 10.1145/3582272.
- [110] B. Schneider, G. Sung, E. Chng, and S. Yang, "How can high-frequency sensors capture collaboration? A review of the empirical links between multimodal metrics and collaborative constructs," *Sensors*, vol. 21, no. 24, Dec. 2021, Art. no. 8185, doi: 10.3390/s21248185.
- [111] J. R. Dyer, A. Johansson, D. Helbing, I. D. Couzin, and J. Krause, "Leadership, consensus decision making and collective behaviour in humans," *Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*, vol. 364, no. 1518, pp. 781–789, Dec. 2008, doi: 10.1098/rstb.2008.0233.
- [112] L. Conrard and T. J. Roper, "Conflicts of interest and the evolution of decision sharing," *Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*, vol. 364, no. 1518, pp. 807–819, Dec. 2008, doi: 10.1098/rstb.2008.0257.

- [113] M. Sherif, "A study of some social factors in perception," Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. Psychol., Columbia Univ., New York, USA, 1935.
- [114] H. C. Purchase, *Experimental human-computer interaction: a practical guide with visual examples*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2012, isbn: 978-0521279543.
- [115] L. Rebenitsch and C. Owen, "Estimating cybersickness from virtual reality applications," *Virt. Real.*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 165–174, May 2020, doi: 10.1007/s10055-020-00446-6.
- [116] M. Schmuckler, "What is ecological validity? A dimensional analysis," *Infancy*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 419–436, Oct. 2001, doi: 10.1207/S15327078IN0204\_02.
- [117] M. Correll, "Position paper: Are we making progress in visualization research?" in *2022 IEEE Eval. Beyond-Method. Approaches Vis. (BELIV)*, 2022, pp. 1–10, doi: 10.1109/BELIV57783.2022.00005.
- [118] M. Burch, W. Huang, M. Wakefield, H. C. Purchase, D. Weiskopf, and J. Hua, "The state of the art in empirical user evaluation of graph visualizations," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 4173–4198, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3047616.
- [119] L. Pouliquen-Lardy, F. Mars, F. Guillaume, and I. Milleville-Pennel, "Virtual collaboration: effect of spatial configuration on spatial statements production," *Cogn. Process.*, vol. 16, no. Suppl 1, pp. 337–342, Jul. 2015, doi: 10.1007/s10339-015-0672-2.
- [120] NCD Risk Factor Collaboration, "Evolution of height over time," 2009–2019, Accessed: Feb. 2024, [Online]. Available: [www.ncdrisc.org/height-mean-map.html](http://www.ncdrisc.org/height-mean-map.html).
- [121] M. Okabe and K. Ito, "Color universal design (CUD) - How to make figures and presentations that are friendly to colorblind people," 2008, Accessed: Feb. 2024, [Online]. Available: [jfly.uni-koeln.de/color](http://jfly.uni-koeln.de/color).
- [122] S. Davis, B. Abbasi, S. Shah, S. Telfer, and M. Begon, "Spatial analyses of wildlife contact networks," *J. Roy. Soc. Interface*, vol. 12, no. 102, Jan. 2015, Art. no. 20141004, doi: 10.1098/rsif.2014.1004.
- [123] P. Sah, J. D. Méndez, and S. Bansal, "A multi-species repository of social networks," *Sci. Data*, vol. 6, no. 1, Apr. 2019, Art. no. 44, doi: 10.1038/s41597-019-0056-z.
- [124] T. M. Fruchterman and E. M. Reingold, "Graph drawing by force-directed placement," *Softw. Pract. Exper.*, vol. 21, no. 11, pp. 1129–1164, Nov. 1991, doi: 10.1002/spe.4380211102.
- [125] T. Kamada, S. Kawai et al., "An algorithm for drawing general undirected graphs," *Inf. Process. Lett.*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 7–15, Apr. 1989, doi: 10.1016/0020-0190(89)90102-6.
- [126] S. Hachul and M. Jünger, "Drawing large graphs with a potential-field-based multilevel algorithm," in *Graph Draw.: 12th Int. Symp., GD 2004*, ser. LNCS, vol. 3383, J. Pach, Ed., 2004, pp. 285–295, doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-31843-9\_29.
- [127] K. Sugiyama, S. Tagawa, and M. Toda, "Methods for visual understanding of hierarchical system structures," *IEEE Trans. Syst., Man, Cybern.*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 109–125, Feb. 1981, doi: 10.1109/TSMC-1981.4308636.
- [128] M. S. T. Carpendale, D. J. Cowperthwaite, and F. D. Fracchia, "Extending distortion viewing from 2D to 3D," *IEEE Comput. Graphics Appl.*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 42–51, Aug. 1997, doi: 10.1109/38.595268.
- [129] O.-H. Kwon, C. Muelder, K. Lee, and K.-L. Ma, "A study of layout, rendering, and interaction methods for immersive graph visualization," *IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graphics*, vol. 22, no. 7, pp. 1802–1815, Jan. 2016, doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2016.2520921.
- [130] P. Kobina, T. Duval, and L. Brisson, "3D radial layout for centrality visualization in graphs," in *Proc. 7th Int. Conf. Augment. Real., Virt. Real., Comput. Graphics, AVR 2020, I*, ser. LNCS, vol. 12242, L. De Paolis and P. Bourdot, Eds., 2020, pp. 452–460, doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-58465-8\_33.
- [131] M. Chimani, C. Gutwenger, M. Jünger, G. W. Klau, K. Klein, and P. Mutzel, "The open graph drawing framework (OGDF)," in *Handbook of graph drawing and visualization*, R. Tamassia, Ed. Boca Raton, FL, USA: CRC Press, 2013, ch. 17, pp. 543–569, isbn: 978-1584884125.
- [132] H. C. Purchase, R. F. Cohen, and M. James, "Validating graph drawing aesthetics," in *Symp. Graph Draw., GD 1995*, ser. LNCS, vol. 1027, F. J. Brandenburg, Ed., 1996, pp. 435–446, doi: 10.1007/BFb0021827.
- [133] H. C. Purchase, R. F. Cohen, and M. I. James, "An experimental study of the basis for graph drawing algorithms," *J. Exp. Algorithm.*, vol. 2, Jan. 1997, Art. no. 4, doi: 10.1145/264216.264222.
- [134] H. Purchase, "Which aesthetic has the greatest effect on human understanding?" in *Graph Draw.: 5th Int. Symp., GD 1997*, ser. LNCS, vol. 1353, G. Di Battista, Ed., 1997, pp. 248–261, doi: 10.1007/3-540-63938-1\_67.
- [135] W. Huang, "Using eye tracking to investigate graph layout effects," in *2007 6th Int. Asia-Pacif. Symp. Vis.*, 2007, pp. 97–100, doi: 10.1109/APVIS.2007.329282.
- [136] W. Huang and M. Huang, "Exploring the relative importance of number of edge crossings and size of crossing angles: A quantitative perspective," *Int. J. Adv. Intell. Paradigms*, vol. 3, pp. 25–42, Jan. 2011. [Online]. Available: <http://hdl.handle.net/10453/18242>
- [137] P. Schäfer, N. Rodrigues, D. Weiskopf, and S. Storandt, "Group diagrams for simplified representation of scanpaths," in *Proc. VINCI '22: 15th Int. Symp. Vis. Inf. Commun. Interact.*, 2022, pp. 1–8, doi: 10.1145/3554944.3554971.
- [138] W. Huang, P. Eades, and S.-H. Hong, "Larger crossing angles make graphs easier to read," *J. Vis. Lang. Comput.*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 452–465, Aug. 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.jvlc.2014.03.001.
- [139] S. van Wageningen, T. Mchedlidze, and A. Telea, "An experimental evaluation of viewpoint-based 3D graph drawing," *Comput. Graphics Forum*, vol. 43, no. 3, Jun. 2024, Art. no. e15077, doi: 10.1111/cgf-15077.
- [140] W. Didimo, G. Liotta, and S. A. Romeo, "Topology-driven force-directed algorithms," in *Graph Draw.: 18th Int. Symp., GD 2010*, ser. LNCS, vol. 6502, U. Brandes and S. Cornelsen, Eds., 2010, pp. 165–176, doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-18469-7\_15.
- [141] R. A. Potamias, A. Neofytou, K. M. Bintsi, and S. Zafeiriou, "Graph-walks: efficient shape agnostic geodesic shortest path estimation," in *2022 IEEE/CVF Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit. Workshops (CVPRW)*, 2022, pp. 2967–2976, doi: 10.1109/CVPRW56347.2022.00335.
- [142] D. Wagner, T. Willhalm, and C. Zaroliagis, "Geometric containers for efficient shortest-path computation," *J. Exp. Algorithm.*, vol. 10, Dec. 2005, Art. no. 3, doi: 10.1145/1064546.1103378.
- [143] N. Moshtagh, "Minimum volume enclosing ellipsoids," GRASP Lab., School Eng. Appl. Sci., Univ. Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA, Tech. Rep. 111, 2005.
- [144] L. G. Khachiyan, "Rounding of polytopes in the real number model of computation," *Math. Oper. Res.*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 307–320, May 1996, doi: 10.1287/moor.21.2.307.
- [145] G. M. Amdahl, "Validity of the single processor approach to achieving large scale computing capabilities," in *Proc. AFIPS '67: Spring Joint Comput. Conf.*, 1967, pp. 483–485, doi: 10.1145/1465482.1465560.
- [146] J. L. Gustafson, "Reevaluating Amdahl's law," *Commun. ACM*, vol. 31, no. 5, pp. 532–533, May 1988, doi: 10.1145/42411.42415.
- [147] A. Wiehler, F. Branzoli, I. Adanyeguh, F. Mochel, and M. Pessiglione, "A neuro-metabolic account of why daylong cognitive work alters the control of economic decisions," *Current Biol.*, vol. 32, no. 16, pp. 3564–3575, Aug. 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2022.07.010.
- [148] I. Milleville-Pennel, F. Mars, and L. Pouliquen-Lardy, "Sharing spatial information in a virtual environment: How do visual cues and configuration influence spatial coding and mental workload?" *Virt. Real.*, vol. 24, pp. 695–712, Mar. 2020, doi: 10.1007/s10055-020-00430-0.
- [149] H. Bai, P. Sasikumar, J. Yang, and M. Billinghurst, "A user study on mixed reality remote collaboration with eye gaze and hand gesture sharing," in *Proc. 2020 CHI Conf. Hum. Factors Comput. Syst.*, 2020, pp. 1–13, doi: 10.1145/3313831.3376550.
- [150] F. Faul, E. Erdfelder, A.-G. Lang, and A. Buchner, "G\* Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences," *Behav. Res. Methods*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 175–191, May 2007, doi: 10.3758/BF03193146.
- [151] L. Meier, *ANOVA and mixed models: a short introduction using R*. London, U.K./Boca Raton, FL, USA: Chapman & Hall/CRC Press, 2023, isbn: 978-0367-704209, doi: 10.1201/9781003146216.
- [152] M. Aichem, K. Klein, S. Kobourov, and F. Schreiber, "De-emphasise, aggregate, and hide: A study of interactive visual transformations for group structures in network visualisations," *IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graphics*, early access, May 9 2024, doi:10.1109/TVCG.2024.3397785.
- [153] P. Dragicevic, "Fair statistical communication in HCI," in *Modern Statistical Methods for HCI*, ser. HCIS, J. Robertson and M. Kaptein, Eds. New York; Berlin, Germany; Vienna, Austria: Springer-Verlag, 2016, ch. 7, sec. 2, pp. 291–330, doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-26633-6\_13.
- [154] B. Efron and R. J. Tibshirani, *An introduction to the bootstrap*. London, U.K.: Chapman & Hall, 1994, isbn: 978-0412042317.
- [155] P. Dixon, "Models of accuracy in repeated-measures designs," *J. Memory Lang.*, vol. 59, no. 4, pp. 447–456, Nov. 2008, doi: 10.1016/j.jml.2007.11.004.
- [156] F. Hartig, L. Lohse, and M. de Souza Leite, *DHARMa: residual diagnostics for hierarchical (multi-level/mixed) regression models*, 2022, Version 0.4.6, doi: 10.32614/CRAN.package.DHARMa.
- [157] S. Ferrari and F. Cribari-Neto, "Beta regression for modelling rates and proportions," *J. Appl. Statist.*, vol. 31, no. 7, pp. 799–815, Aug. 2004, doi: 10.1080/0266476042000214501.

- [158] E. Geissinger, C. Khoo, I. Richmond, S. Faulkner, and D. Schneider, "A case for beta regression in the natural sciences," *Ecosphere*, vol. 13, no. 2, Feb. 2022, Art. no. e3940, doi:10.1002/ecs2.3940.
- [159] M. A. García-Pérez, "Use and misuse of corrections for multiple testing," *Methods Psychol.*, vol. 8, Nov. 2023, Art. no. 100120, doi: 10.1016/j.metip.2023.100120.
- [160] I. Lorge, D. Fox, J. Davitz, and M. Brenner, "A survey of studies contrasting the quality of group performance and individual performance, 1920-1957," *Psychol. Bull.*, vol. 55, no. 6, pp. 337–372, Nov. 1958, doi: 10.1037/h0042344.
- [161] R. B. Zajonc, "Social facilitation: A solution is suggested for an old unresolved social psychological problem," *Science*, vol. 149, no. 3681, pp. 269–274, Jul. 1965, doi: 10.1126/science.149.3681.269.