

# Exploring the Design Space of Employing AI-Generated Content for Augmented Reality Display

YONGQUAN HU, University of New South Wales, Australia

MINGYUE YUAN, University of New South Wales, Australia

KAIQI XIAN, University of New South Wales, Australia

DON SAMITHA ELVITIGALA, University of New South Wales, Australia

AARON QUIGLEY, Data61, CSIRO, Australia

As the two most common display content of Augmented Reality (AR), the creation process of image and text often requires a human to execute. However, due to the rapid advances in Artificial Intelligence (AI), today the media content can be automatically generated by software. The ever-improving quality of AI-generated content (AIGC) has opened up new scenarios employing such content, which is expected to be applied in AR. In this paper, we attempt to explore the design space for projecting AI-generated image and text into an AR display. Specifically, we perform an exploratory study and suggest a “user-function-environment” design thinking by building a preliminary prototype and conducting focus groups based on it. With the early insights presented, we point out the design space and potential applications for combining AIGC and AR.

CCS Concepts: • **Human-centered computing** → **Human computer interaction (HCI)**; *augmented reality—empirical study % interactive system.*

Additional Key Words and Phrases: augmented reality display; generative AI; media generation.

## ACM Reference Format:

Yongquan Hu, Mingyue Yuan, Kaiqi Xian, Don Samitha Elvitigala, and Aaron Quigley. 2022. Exploring the Design Space of Employing AI-Generated Content for Augmented Reality Display. In *The ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI) 2023 Workshop: Generative AI and HCI*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

## 1 INTRODUCTION & RELATED WORK

Augmented Reality (AR) serves as a means to connect the physical and digital worlds, supplementing or extending the former in contrast to Virtual Reality (VR) [14, 20]. Three main methods of AR display exist: Spatial Augmented Reality (SAR), Head-Mounted Display (HMD), and Hand-Held Display (HHD) [9, 30]. Each method presents its own advantages and disadvantages for various tasks and scenarios, as examined extensively in previous studies. For instance, SAR has been identified to merge the real and virtual worlds by directly projecting light onto physical surfaces, but it poses privacy concerns as the displayed content is publicly visible [16, 24]. To address the limitations of individual AR display methods, researchers have explored the integration of multiple display technologies. For instance, Hartmann et al. proposed Augmented Augmented Reality (AAR) by combining wearable AR displays with wearable spatial augmented reality projectors to mitigate the isolated experience of using an individual AR device [11]. In short, AR displays offer enhanced contextual information and immersion while retaining focus on the physical world for users.

---

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

© 2022 Association for Computing Machinery.

Manuscript submitted to ACM

AR content primarily consists of images and text [2, 4, 13, 32], both of which currently require human involvement in their creation, such as 3D modeling using Unity or animation story scripting [3, 28]. However, recent advancements in Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology have improved the capabilities of AI-generated content (AIGC) to the extent that the boundary between human and machine-generated content has become impressively indistinguishable. For instance, OpenAI’s Generative Pre-trained Transformer 3 (GPT-3) model, the largest Natural Language Processing (NLP) model with 175 billion parameters, can automatically generate text, translate languages, and answer text-based questions [5, 8]. Additionally, the Stable Diffusion [25] has gained popularity due to its faster generation speed compared to earlier models like Disco Diffusion [23] and DALL-E 2 [17] for image generation, greatly reducing generation time to an average of dozens of seconds. Consequently, AI-based generative models are anticipated to become more prevalent in various applications, including automatic code generation and digital art creation, owing to their greater usability and flexibility.

As stated above, we see the opportunities that may open up by combining generative AI and AR (AIGC+AR), but there are few work on it. Although there have been some broad discussions on generative AI [6], specific consideration for AR domain is still lacking. Alternatively, some work applied generative AI model to AR scenarios with more attention on technical solutions or engineering tasks, but little discussion on the design guidance and holistic system analysis of generative AI in AR [33]. Hence, to the best of our knowledge, there is no work addressing the general discussion of design space where AIGC is employed into AR display. To sum up, in this paper, we deployed generative AI models in the AR display system, and then conducted an empirical study based on this prototype, for summarizing and exploring the design space and potential applications. In particular, our contributions are as follows:

- Concept and a preliminary prototype of combining two latest generative AI models with three AR display methods;
- Focus groups and discussion summary on a “user-function-environment” design thinking;
- Potential application scenarios for the combination of AIGC and AR;

## 2 PROTOTYPE IMPLEMENTATION

In order to enhance the more intuitive experience of subsequent interviewees and obtain more design references, we have developed a preliminary prototype system called “GenerativeAIR” (Generative AI plus AR). It could be seen as an instance of AIGC+AR to be explored. The system comprises of software (two multimodal generative AI models) and hardware (three AR display devices). We have chosen speech as the interactive input of the system, as it is a low-cost and natural way of interaction for users. The system generates media content based on text descriptions and outputs text and image displayed on different AR devices. The three types of AR displays used in our system are Samsung Freestyle projector [26] for SAR, HoloLens 2 [18] for HMD, and Oneplus 10 Pro [21] for HHD.

Specifically, we first use the built-in microphone in the mobile phone to convert the voice of the user into text due to the popularity of smartphone. Next, the application programming interface (api) provided by Google is leveraged for converting speech to text [10]. As for AI generation part, the interfaces of two text-input models is applied, i.e. the ChatGPT (GPT-3) [22] is for text-text generation, and the Stable Diffusion 2 [1] is for text-image generation. Furthermore, it is worth noting that these models are mounted on the cloud rather than deployed locally on the phone. The prompts for content generation and the generated results (image and text) are both transmitted through the wireless network, which inevitably leads to a certain but tolerable delay (the actual test delay in our network environment is at the millisecond level). As shown in the Figure 1, at the beginning, the user speaks through a microphone, and then the




Fig. 1. The workflow and display effect of our GenerativeAIR prototype: (a) The user’s speech into the microphone is converted into text, which is then fed into an AI model for generating artistic images and more text; (b) Generated content in Spatial Augmented Reality (SAR): an example of Samsung Freestyle project; (c) Generated content in Head-Mounted Display (HMD): an example of Microsoft HoloLens 2; (d) Generated content in Hand-Held Display (HHD): an example of OnePlus 10 Pro.

transcribed text is used as input into two AI models to generate corresponding images and text (as shown in Figure 1 (a)). Finally, the generated media content is transmitted to different AR devices through the network and displayed (as shown from Figure 1 (b) to (d)).

### 3 METHODOLOGY

In order to collect design factors for AIGC+AR in an open-ended fashion, we chose to use focus group interviews, which are particularly suitable for early exploration in identifying new problems and assessing users’ needs [19]. Moreover, we let each participant freely experience the our GenerativeAIR during conducting interviews.

#### 3.1 Participants

We recruited a diverse group of ten participants, 7 male and 3 female, for our focus group interviews. Participants were identified by the indices P1 to P10, and their backgrounds varied: 6 participants were academic researchers from different disciplines (computer science (4), mechanical engineering (1), and design (1)); and the remaining 4 were working professionals from various industries ( UI/UX design (2), telecommunications (1), and IT (1)). The mean age of the participants was 28.7 years (SD=6.90), and all of them had at least two years of experience studying the technology or design of AI or AR.

#### 3.2 Procedure

We conducted three focus groups with a total of ten participants (G1=3; G2=3; G3=4), each lasting approximately 80 minutes and consisting of five steps. Firstly, the moderator introduced the research purpose (~5 mins). Secondly, participants were asked to freely experience the GenerativeAIR system and respond to any questions raised during the process (~15 minutes). Thirdly, participants provided self-introductions and shared their initial impressions of the GenerativeAIR system (~10 mins). Fourthly, In the main discussion participants freely discussed two topics: RQ1) What are the characteristics need to be considered when comparing AIGC and AR with other related technologies; RQ2) what features should be envisioned when developing the AIGC and AR technology itself (~40 mins). Finally, a summary and debriefing of the discussion was provided (~10 minutes). It is worth mentioning that in the fourth step, for the first question RQ1, we sent a questionnaire to the participants, asking them to score and compare AIGC and AR with their related technologies. More details are in the following section 4.2.




Fig. 2. The comparisons of AR display+generative AI and their related techniques: (a) display performance comparison of AR, VR and normal monitor; (b) content-generation performance comparison of generative AI (machine), AI assist (machine+human) and human.

### 3.3 Analysis

The discussions in each focus group were recorded and later transcribed and coded using Grounded Theory [27] by our two authors. To ensure the validity of the motivation categorization, efforts were made to minimize the influence of less logical statements that are common in focus groups. Specifically, the moderator encouraged participants to reflect on and verbalize the underlying logical meaning behind their statements. During the coding phase, less logical statements without support from other statements were excluded as evidence. Furthermore, a visualization analysis is also involved for the first question RQ1, in order to better clarify the consideration factors in system design.

## 4 DISCUSSIONS & FINDINGS

In this section, we present and analyze the results of focus group discussions on the design factors that need to be paid attention to when integrating AIGC and AR by answering the following two research questions: the first question is to investigate the importance of the overall system by presenting external characteristics; the second question is for studying the performance of the system itself through clarifying internal differences.

### 4.1 RQ1: What are the characteristics need to be considered when comparing AIGC and AR with other related technologies?

In order to identify the advantages and disadvantages of AIGC+AR in comparison to related technologies and discover more suitable application scenarios in the future, a visualization method to qualitatively compare the characteristics of distinct dimension was implemented [7]. Given the lack of related work that is similar to the overall system, we separately compared and analyzed its two components, namely, AR display and generative AI. The comparison was based on five different dimensions for both display performance (Figure 2 (a)) and content generation performance (Figure 2 (b)). The three gray pentagons of different sizes in the figure represent low, medium, and high levels, respectively. It should be noted that these ratings are based on extensive discussions with 10 participants, but they were not exhibited in any systematically reviewed literature. Therefore, these results cannot be considered as rigorous or unique findings, nor are they conclusive regarding the significance of related technologies. Rather, they are intended to address the external characteristics for design considerations.

With respect to display performance, most participants generally believed the AR technology is superior to traditional monitors in terms of functionality, interactivity, and immersion. However, it comes at a higher cost and with lower fidelity. Here, we define that the dimension “fidelity” refers to the degree of similarity between the displayed virtual objects and the physical world. For example, participant P2 expressed that using AR displays can obtain more interesting and rich experiences, but the displayed virtual objects are still very different from the physical objects in the real world by saying: *“I was very obsessed with Pokémon GO, a mobile AR game. Its novel operating experience and interesting settings brought me a lot of fun. Yet the display effect of Pokemon in the game is not satisfactory. For example, sometimes Pikachu will appear in the air on the edge of my table or the light and shadow of the displayed trees look strange. It is easy for people to realize that these virtual objects are fake.”* Considering the current gap between virtual simulation and the real world, some participants thought that a higher proportion of virtual components in the display might reduce the user’s real experience of the physical world. For example, the participant P6 worried that too many 3D virtual objects could aggravate her dizziness and cause discomfort by saying: *“I have 3D motion sickness, so I prefer AR to VR because it’s less virtual and I feel better. I’m looking forward to having a custom function for the displayed virtual part, so that I can easily decide its position, size and proportion of the screen.”* Certainly, there may be more complicated factors in practical cases that need to be considered in-depth in future work. For content generation performance, all participants agreed that generative AI has an unparalleled advantage over human generation in terms of speed and complexity, whether compared to human generation alone or human-machine collaborative generation. For example, the participant P1 greatly appreciated this convenience for his life by saying *“I am a painting enthusiast. Imagining that you only need to say a few words to the machine to generate a Van Gogh-style Opera House of Sydney. Generative AI is really amazing for me!”*. Participant P2 also believed that this high efficiency improved her work productivity by saying *“Chatgpt can help me program ! I tried to assign some simple code tasks to it, and it can be completed very well, which greatly improved my work efficiency.”*. In addition, we noticed that there was some controversy among the participants regarding the “accuracy” rating in Figure 2 (b), as accuracy refers to the gap between the generated content and the expected results of human generation, which is a relatively subjective indicator. Some participants (e.g., P1) felt that AIGC content (such as automatically generated art drawings) was better than self-made ones by saying: *“AI-generated paintings are better than mine”*, while others (e.g., P5) thought otherwise by saying: *“The layout and storytelling of AI paintings are far from meeting my expectations”*. Hence, we finally hypothesize that, regardless of complicating factors such as time cost or individual ability difference, the most satisfactory results are achieved when people are involved in the generation process. Although the results generated by state-of-the-art AI models are already close to human expectations in some specific cases, we consider the “medium” rating to be cautious.

#### 4.2 RQ2: What features should be envisioned when developing the AIGC and AR technology itself?

The comparison of AR and AIGC and related technologies stimulates ideas for application scenarios. Further exploration of their technical features and details can improve interactive experience and system performance.

Regarding display form, there are 7 participants who all involved remarks with similar meanings: the portability of AR glasses and mobile phones distinguishes them from stationary display methods like SAR. As almost everyone now owns a smartphone, it is expected to be the most common way for following related work on generative AR display. For example, the participant P3 mentioned that mobile phone AR (HHD) has unparalleled advantages in mobility and flexibility compared to the other two AR display methods by saying: *“I’m not always comfortable wearing AR glasses, and the projector works better at night. Compared with these time and space constraints, the mobile phone is more flexible and convenient because I can carry it with me anywhere and take it out to take a look at it at any time.”*. Another participant,

P7, chimed in that head-mounted AR displays (HMDs) are generally expensive and have limited uses. He expressed his opinion by saying: *“Although I was very impressed when I first tried Hololens 2, that feeling quickly faded away. I couldn’t help but wonder if there was a good reason for me to spend over three thousand dollars on a new gadget that doesn’t have much practical value. For me, the answer seems to be no.”* On the other hand, 4 participants who pointed out the deficiencies of HHD, i.e., the display scope of a projector is much larger than a mobile phone screen, which can hinder the recognition of generated text in AR apps. For example, the participant P8 claimed that the display content on mobile phone was difficult to view while moving by saying: *“I realized that it was difficult for me to stay focused on what was displayed on my phone when I was moving around, especially small text content.”* Therefore, tasks or scenes that rely heavily on text generation are not suitable for HHD devices. 8 participants highlighted that privacy and accessibility are important considerations, especially in multi-user collaboration and sharing scenarios. For instance, the participant P5 proposed that AIGC should be able to make some adjustments according to different situations by saying: *“Content privacy issues need to be taken seriously. For different scenarios or different display modes, the displayed media content can be displayed in layers according to different permissions. In the past, this matter was usually participated by humans, but now it may be handed over to AI for automatic processing.”* Potential solutions would be adopted for our AIGC+AR project include combining multiple display methods to surpass their limitations and providing hierarchical permissions for different users based on AI identification and authentication.

Additionally, as the main carrier of information, we noted that there is a significant difference in user experience between 2D and 3D content generation in consequence of the interview conversations. For image generation, many participants recognized that 3D virtual images can greatly increase user immersion and improve system usability. For example, the participant P9 expressed interest in trying on 3D virtual clothes by saying: *“The idea of AR virtual trying on clothes is not that new, it is very interesting but also a bit troublesome because the clothes to try on always need to be manually configured by humans. Now generative AI provides new possibilities, and it may be very interesting to change clothes by speaking.”* Nevertheless, a part of participants also showed rejection of 3D content, such as the P6 above-mentioned who has 3D motion vertigo by saying: *“I don’t think 3D objects in AR are necessary for me until I find a solution to my vertigo, 2D and 3D objects look fake anyway”*. Text generation, meanwhile, is more sensitive to display size and requires sufficient space or dynamic display methods like scrolling or refresh. One of participants, P7, said such statement: *“After trying your GenerativeAIR, I found that when the text generated by AI becomes too much, it is very difficult for me to read. Firstly, because of the limited size of some display devices such as head-mounted display or the small mobile screen. Secondly, since the generated content is not designed into a good layout and interaction, I have no way to adjust them.”* Alternatively, converting text interaction to audio interaction is a practicable solution. For example, applying ChatGPT for dialog generation and display on smaller mobile phone screens may not be user-friendly. For example, the P7 also supplemented: *“Of course, we don’t have to use our eyes to see. For text, it is also feasible to communicate only by voice for me.”*

## 5 DESIGN SPACE

Via clustering and merging, we have condensed the multiple factors gathered from the focus group interviews into three overarching categories, namely “user”, “function”, and “environment”. These categories are widely recognized as fundamental considerations in the design of interactive systems, as noted by previous studies [12, 29, 31]. Our objective is to explore the design space of AIGC+AR by investigating the relationships among these categories. Starting from user-centered thinking, our design space is structured into three aspects: what functions do the user need from the

system (user-function), how the environment provides feedback to the user (user-environment) and what are the differences in the needs of different users (user-user).

### 5.1 User-Function Design

The AIGC+AR system is envisioned to offer diverse functions for multiple purposes, with particular attention paid to the AI-related software in this design phase as the AI algorithms are crucial to realizing these functions. In addition to the core generative AI, other AI algorithms can be integrated into the system to supplement and enhance its functionality, such as automated text prompts for the generated model. *“Context-aware visualization is one such function that supports user daily activities. By integrating sensors, the system can perceive and predict user behavior and provide potential visual support for tasks such as recommending applications or adapting the interface. (P10)”*. Another function is lifelogging based on data mining and video/image abstraction. *“By capturing and analyzing personal data, such as images and text on social media accounts, AI can create personalized lifelog visualizations in the form of AR displays. (P5)”*. However, issues concerning personal privacy may arise, which we will address in more detail in later sections [15].

### 5.2 User-Environment Design

For such a system, the feedback supplied by the environment to the user is mainly dependent on the presentation of the AR display. As mentioned above, the three AR display methods (SAR, HMD and HHD) have separate display performances, particularly in terms of functionality, portability and privacy. *“The potential application scenarios of HHD based on mobile phones are vast and varied. (P3)”*. Alternatively, in different scenarios (e.g., indoors, outdoors, working and entertainment), environmental factors (e.g., light and sound) should be included in the design as well, which is beneficial for ameliorating user experience such as immersion and interactivity. *“It would be fun if a machine could somehow know my current mood and adapt the content and style of the generated image accordingly. (P4)”*.

### 5.3 User-User Design

We consider the coordination of AI and AR to meet the differences in needs among multiple users. One feasible way to classify users is: for AR display, the needs of “presentation user” (who conducts the AR device for presenting purpose) and “observation user” (who observes the AR display as a viewer) to engage with media content is asymmetric. Similar issues have been discussed in other studies. For instance, the HMD user, in Hartmann’s work [11], refers to the “presentation user”, and external user there means the “observation user” in our paper. For “presentation user”, apart from having a wider range of operational permissions, they care more about portability, privacy, portability. For “observation users”, their main needs are immersion, low cognitive cost and communication with other users. Therefore, both of AI part and AR part need to be coordinated for distinctive needs for multiple users, such as hierarchical user accessibility based on AI recognition and authentication, or content sharing and switching based on different AR display methods. *“If the generated content involves my privacy, such as my photo albums and life vlog, I would like AI to understand which content can be shown to my friends. If it generates or shows what I don’t want others to see content, it would be too embarrassing. (P2)”*.

## 6 POTENTIAL APPLICATIONS

In this section, we summarize and highlight three potential applications enabled by Stable Diffusion 2. Firstly, generative AI models can enhance real-time creative media generation, as illustrated in Figure 3 (a), where a boy wearing AR glasses interacts with a virtual teddy bear. Secondly, AR displays can optimize lifelog by supplementing captured objects



Fig. 3. Potential Applications of GenerativeAIR: (a) Boosting real-time creative media generation; (b) Optimizing lifelog; (c) Facilitating multi-user collaboration.

with relevant information, as shown in Figure 3 (b) where an ice cream photo is analyzed and its calorie content is displayed. Furthermore, GenerativeAIR can address privacy and privilege classification issues in multi-user scenarios by assigning hierarchical display content based on user permissions and privacy levels through id-authentication, as depicted in Figure 3 (c).

To interpret these application scenarios, we employ a user-centered design approach as discussed in section 5. Specifically, (a) and (b) are intended for single users, while (c) is designed for multiple users. GenerativeAIR offers various functions to meet diverse requirements, and the interaction between user and environment remains a persistent theme.

## 7 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE WORK

This work aims to explore the potential design space of generative AI for using a simple prototype GenerativeAIR. The limitations of our work primarily lie in the technical aspects that require further improvement. For example, our current prototype only generates 2D images using the Stable Diffusion model, and we acknowledge the potential benefits of generating 3D content in AR. Additionally, our prototype is currently offline and lacks real-time interaction, hindering its practical application. Future work will focus on implementing real-time functionality and integrating additional software and hardware to enrich the system’s functions. Moreover, we have not addressed the hierarchical difficulty of privacy and permissions in multi-user scenarios, which is a critical issue for collaborative and sharing settings.

## 8 CONCLUSION

This paper introduces the concept of AIGC+AR and explores its design space. We first construct a prototype by integrating two text-input generative AI models with three common AR displays in section 2. More details about our focus group could be seen in section 3. Next, in section 4, we provide a qualitative comparison of the advantages and disadvantages of our work compared to related studies. Also we discuss factors that need to be considered in technology development itself. Furthermore, a “user-functon-environment” design thinking is proposed and discussed section 5. Last, in section 6, we present and analyze potential application scenarios.



## REFERENCES

- [1] Stability AI. 2022. Stable Diffusion 2. <https://stability.ai/blog/stable-diffusion-v2-release>.
- [2] Benjamin Bach, Ronell Sicut, Hanspeter Pfister, and Aaron Quigley. 2017. Drawing into the AR-CANVAS: Designing embedded visualizations for augmented reality. In *Workshop on Immersive Analytics, IEEE Vis*.
- [3] Zahraa Bassyouni and Imad H Elhadj. 2021. Augmented reality meets artificial intelligence in robotics: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Robotics and AI* (2021), 296.
- [4] Pei-Hsuan Chiu, Po-Hsuan Tseng, and Kai-Ten Feng. 2018. Interactive mobile augmented reality system for image and hand motion tracking. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* 67, 10 (2018), 9995–10009.
- [5] Robert Dale. 2021. GPT-3: What’s it good for? *Natural Language Engineering* 27, 1 (2021), 113–118.
- [6] Valdemar Danry, Joanne Leong, Pat Pataranutaporn, Pulkit Tandon, Yimeng Liu, Roy Shilkrot, Parinya Punpongson, Tsachy Weissman, Pattie Maes, and Misha Sra. 2022. AI-Generated Characters: Putting Deepfakes to Good Use. In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems Extended Abstracts*. 1–5.
- [7] Sebastian S Feger, Lars Semmler, Albrecht Schmidt, and Thomas Kosch. 2022. ElectronicsAR: design and evaluation of a mobile and tangible high-fidelity augmented electronics toolkit. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 6, ISS (2022), 700–721.
- [8] Luciano Floridi and Massimo Chiriatti. 2020. GPT-3: Its nature, scope, limits, and consequences. *Minds and Machines* 30, 4 (2020), 681–694.
- [9] Lorenzo Giunta, Jamie O’Hare, James Gopsill, Elies Dekoninck, et al. 2018. A review of augmented reality research for design practice: looking to the future. *DS 91: Proceedings of NordDesign 2018, Linköping, Sweden, 14th-17th August 2018* (2018).
- [10] Google. 2022. Speech-to-Text. <https://cloud.google.com/speech-to-text>.
- [11] Jeremy Hartmann, Yen-Ting Yeh, and Daniel Vogel. 2020. AAR: Augmenting a wearable augmented reality display with an actuated head-mounted projector. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*. 445–458.
- [12] Karen Henriksen and Jadwiga Indulska. 2006. Developing context-aware pervasive computing applications: Models and approach. *Pervasive and mobile computing* 2, 1 (2006), 37–64.
- [13] Allison Jing, Chenyang Xiang, Seungwon Kim, Mark Billingham, and Aaron Quigley. 2019. SnapChart: an augmented reality analytics toolkit to enhance interactivity in a collaborative environment. In *The 17th International Conference on Virtual-Reality Continuum and Its Applications in Industry*. 1–2.
- [14] Timothy Jung and M Cluadia tom Dieck. 2018. Augmented reality and virtual reality. *Ujedinjeno Kraljevstvo: Springer International Publishing AG* (2018).
- [15] Mohammed Korayem, Robert Templeman, Dennis Chen, David Crandall, and Apu Kapadia. 2016. Enhancing lifelogging privacy by detecting screens. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 4309–4314.
- [16] Andreas Kotsios. 2015. Privacy in an augmented reality. *International journal of law and information technology* 23, 2 (2015), 157–185.
- [17] Gary Marcus, Ernest Davis, and Scott Aaronson. 2022. A very preliminary analysis of DALL-E 2. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.13807* (2022).
- [18] Microsoft. 2019. HoloLens AR Glasses. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/holens/buy>.
- [19] D Morgan. 1997. The focus group guidebook: sage publications.
- [20] Michael Nebeling and Maximilian Speicher. 2018. The trouble with augmented reality/virtual reality authoring tools. In *2018 IEEE international symposium on mixed and augmented reality adjunct (ISMAR-Adjunct)*. IEEE, 333–337.
- [21] OnePlus. 2022. OnePlus 10 Pro Mobile Phone. <https://www.oneplus.com/au/10-pro>.
- [22] OpenAI. 2022. ChatGPT. <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>.
- [23] Jonathan Rafael-Patino, Gabriel Girard, Raphaël Truffet, Marco Pizzolato, Emmanuel Caruyer, and Jean-Philippe Thiran. 2021. The diffusion-simulated connectivity (DiSCo) dataset. *Data in Brief* 38 (2021), 107429.
- [24] Franziska Roesner, Tadayoshi Kohno, and David Molnar. 2014. Security and privacy for augmented reality systems. *Commun. ACM* 57, 4 (2014), 88–96.
- [25] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. 2022. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 10684–10695.
- [26] Samsung. 2022. Freestyle Projector. [https://www.samsung.com/au/projectors/the-freestyle/the-freestyle-sp-lsp3blaxxy/?cid=au\\_paid\\_ppc\\_google\\_TV-PREMIERE\\_ongoing\\_ao\\_Paid-CDM\\_text\\_none\\_none&gclid=Cj0KCQiA7bucBhCeARIsAIOwr--avyzlyRvaDyXKaSodCq3HQal5smR9zI094\\_qhu9uagQDOWPp88aAleJEALw\\_wcB&gclsrc=aw.ds](https://www.samsung.com/au/projectors/the-freestyle/the-freestyle-sp-lsp3blaxxy/?cid=au_paid_ppc_google_TV-PREMIERE_ongoing_ao_Paid-CDM_text_none_none&gclid=Cj0KCQiA7bucBhCeARIsAIOwr--avyzlyRvaDyXKaSodCq3HQal5smR9zI094_qhu9uagQDOWPp88aAleJEALw_wcB&gclsrc=aw.ds).
- [27] Anselm Strauss and Juliet Corbin. 1998. Basics of qualitative research techniques. (1998).
- [28] Heli K Vääätäjä, Mari J Ahvenainen, Markus S Jaakola, and Thomas D Olsson. 2013. Exploring augmented reality for user-generated hyperlocal news content. In *CHI’13 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 967–972.
- [29] Norha M Villegas, Cristian Sánchez, Javier Diaz-Cely, and Gabriel Tamura. 2018. Characterizing context-aware recommender systems: A systematic literature review. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 140 (2018), 173–200.
- [30] Peng Wang, Xiaoliang Bai, Mark Billingham, Shusheng Zhang, Xiangyu Zhang, Shuxia Wang, Weiping He, Yuxiang Yan, and Hongyu Ji. 2021. AR/MR remote collaboration on physical tasks: A review. *Robotics and Computer-Integrated Manufacturing* 72 (2021), 102071.
- [31] Xingzhi Wang, Ang Liu, and Sami Kara. 2022. Constructing Product Usage Context Knowledge Graph Using User-Generated Content for User-Driven Customization. *Journal of Mechanical Design* (2022), 1–48.

- [32] Maheshya Weerasinghe, Aaron Quigley, Klen Čopič Pucihar, Alice Toniolo, Angela Miguel, and Matjaž Kljun. 2022. Arigatō: Effects of Adaptive Guidance on Engagement and Performance in Augmented Reality Learning Environments. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 28, 11 (2022), 3737–3747.
- [33] Minrui Xu, Dusit Niyato, Hongliang Zhang, Jiawen Kang, Zehui Xiong, Shiwen Mao, and Zhu Han. 2023. Generative AI-empowered Effective Physical-Virtual Synchronization in the Vehicular Metaverse. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.07636* (2023).