

Legacy Learning Using Few-Shot Font Generation Models for Automatic Text Design in Metaverse Content: Cases Studies in Korean and Chinese

Younghwi Kim¹, Seok Chan Jeong², and Sunghyun Sim³

¹*Safe & Clean Supply Chain Research Center, Pusan National University,*

30-Jan-jeon Dong, Geum-Jeong Gu, 46241, Busan, South Korea, dudgn16032@naver.com

²*Department of e-Business & AI Grand ICT Research Center, Dong-eui University,*

176 Eomgwang No, Gaya Dong 24, Busanjin Gu, 47340 Busan, South Korea, scjeong@deu.ac.kr

³*Departments of Industrial Management & Big Data Engineering, Dong-eui University,*

176 Eomgwang No, Gaya Dong 24, Busanjin Gu, 47340 Busan, South Korea, ssh@deu.ac.kr (corresponding Author)

Abstract. Generally, the components constituting a metaverse are classified into hardware, software, and content categories. As a content component, text design is known to positively affect user immersion and usability. Unlike English, where designing texts involves only 26 letters, designing texts in Korean and Chinese requires creating 11,172 and over 60,000 individual glyphs, respectively, owing to the nature of the languages. Consequently, applying new text designs to enhance user immersion within the metaverse can be tedious and expensive, particularly for certain languages. Recently, efforts have been devoted toward addressing this issue using generative artificial intelligence (AI). However, challenges remain in creating new text designs for the metaverse owing to inaccurate character structures. This study proposes a new AI learning method known as Legacy Learning, which enables high-quality text design at a lower cost. Legacy Learning involves recombining existing text designs and intentionally introducing variations to produce fonts that are distinct from the originals while maintaining high quality. To demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed method in generating text designs for the metaverse, we performed evaluations from the following three aspects: 1) Quantitative performance evaluation: we compared the differences between generated and existing text designs using Frechet inception distance and learned perceptual image patch similarity metrics; 2) Qualitative evaluation: the quality of the generated text designs was assessed through visual comparison; and 3) User usability evaluation: usability was evaluated using the system usability scale (SUS) with metaverse content designers. The quantitative and qualitative performance results indicated that the generated text designs differed from the existing ones by an average of over 30% while still maintaining high visual quality. Additionally, the SUS test performed with metaverse content designers achieved a score of 95.8, indicating high usability. This demonstrates that the proposed Legacy Learning method can significantly contribute to efficiency and cost reduction in text design for metaverse content. We anticipate that this will also enhance user immersion by generating high-quality text designs for metaverses.

Keywords: Automatic Font Design, Few-shot Font Generation, Legacy Learning, Metaverse, Metaverse Contents Design

1. Introduction

The metaverse is an immersive digital space that combines virtual reality with the real world, powered by digital technologies (Dwivedi et al., 2022). It enables people to engage in various social activities such as gaming, watching movies, specialized education, remote collaboration, and marketing (Kim et al., 2024)

The components of a metaverse can be divided into three main aspects: hardware, software, and content (Park and Kim, 2022). Each element has distinct characteristics and roles, working synergistically to enhance the functionality and user experience of the metaverse (Capatina et al., 2024). The hardware aspect includes various devices that enable visualization and user interaction within a metaverse (Richter & Richter, 2023). Key devices include headsets that provide extended reality (XR) experiences, such as virtual reality (VR), augmented reality (AR), and mixed reality. These devices are essential for creating immersive digital environments where users can interact with the virtual world (Xi et al., 2023; Yu et al., 2023; Pacchierotti et al., 2024). On the software side, a range of technologies is used to implement and optimize metaverse experiences (Park & Kim, 2022; Cappannari & Vitillo, 2022; Wang et al., 2022). Procedural content generation techniques allow the efficient creation of high-quality three-dimensional (3D) content, significantly reducing the time and cost required to build large-scale virtual environments (Mourtzis et al., 2022). Additionally, AI-based systems play a crucial role in managing XR applications, particularly in complex multi-user environments, ensuring that the user experience is seamless and engaging (Huynh-The et al., 2023). Content encompasses diverse activities and services that users can experience within a metaverse (Zallio & Clarkson, 2022; Park & Kim, 2022). The detailed elements of metaverse content include: 1) ***Virtual environments***: worlds that users can explore, offering varied landscapes and interactive elements (Sung et al., 2021; Dwivedi et al., 2022; Richter & Richter, 2023); 2) ***Avatars and interfaces***: tools that enable interaction between users and the virtual world, representing users in the digital space (Zhao et al., 2022; Kim et al., 2024); 3) ***Social Interactions and communities***: platforms for users to engage in social experiences, including communication, collaboration, and community building (López-Cabarcos & Piñeiro-Chousa, 2024). 4) ***Storytelling***: narratives and scenarios that immerse users deeply in a virtual environment, enhancing their engagement (Choi & Kim, 2017; Mogaji et al., 2023; Ruusunen et al., 2023). 5) ***Linguistic elements and text design***: essential components that facilitate interaction and communication within the virtual world, contributing to an overall immersive

experience (Chen, 2022; Sun et al., 2023; Morales-Fernández, 2024). Among these elements, text design in metaverse content is recognized as a key factor that enhances user readability and accessibility, enables clear communication, and increases user immersion within the metaverse (Yang, 2021; Xu, 2022; Elhagry, 2023; Woodward & Ruiz, 2023; He et al., 2024a).

In general, designers create text designs specifically tailored for the metaverse. The amount of work and the complexity of the design depend on the language. For example, in English, which consists of 26 letters, 26 lowercase letters and 26 uppercase letters are sufficient for all text design requirements. In contrast, Korean requires designing combinations of 19 onsets, 21 nuclei, and 28 codons, resulting in 11,172 possible designs ($19 \times 21 \times 28$). Chinese design is more complex than Korean design, necessitating the creation of over 60,000 designs.




Figure 1. Example of the text design process for Korean and Chinese.

Figure 1 is a detailed illustration of how Chinese and Korean are structured, including the names of their components. To design the Korean text “가ㅓ” on the left side of Figure 1, you first need to design the components that make up the text: the onset “ㄱ,” the nucleus “ㅏ,” and the coda “ㅓ.” In this case, “ㄱ,” “ㅏ,” and “ㅓ” are defined as components. Next, we combined the designed initial consonant, vowel, and final consonant results in what is defined as the content. Finally, the term “가ㅓ” applied to text design content is defined as a glyph.

These issues are not only present in metaverse environments but also occur in various

online content, games, and VR/AR environments. To address these issues, recent research has been actively exploring few-shot font generation (FFG) models using generative AI, such as the multiple localized expert FFG network (MX-font), dual memoraugmented font generation network (DM-font), and FFG with localized style representations and factorization (LF-font) (Cha et al., 2020; Park et al., 2021a; Park et al., 2021b). This approach designs only a minimal set of glyphs and automates the design of the remaining glyphs. This research has resulted in a shift from the traditional method of designing all 11,172 or 60,000 glyphs to complete a single-text design to a new method where only 5–10% of the glyphs need to be designed manually. The remaining glyphs can be automatically generated, significantly improving the efficiency of the text design (Chen et al., 2024; Lee & Choi, 2024).

Model Type	Num. of Train Glyph	Train Glyph	Generation Glyph Results	Comparison of the Quality of Glyph Generation Results
MX-Font	18			
	72			
	108			
DM-Font	18			
	72			
	108			
LF-Font	18			
	72			
	108			

Figure 2. Visualization Results of Generated Font Designs Based on the Increase in Glyphs Used for Training.

Despite these efforts, traditional approaches present several limitations. The quality of the

completed text design tends to decrease as the number of glyphs used in the FFG models decreases. Figure 2 provides an intuitive illustration of these limitations. Regardless of the model used to generate the text designs, the smaller number of glyphs used in training tended to result in more noise in the generated text designs. Conversely, as the number of glyphs used in training increased, the quality of the generated text design improved. The visualization results indicated that using a large number of glyphs for training can yield high-quality text designs. However, to achieve text designs with minimal noise and excellent quality, approximately 10% of the glyphs typically need to be used for training (Hassan et al., 2024; He et al., 2024b). This requirement translates to the need for approximately 1,100 and 6,000 glyphs for Korean and Chinese, respectively. This indicates the difficulty of applying automatic text design generation in metaverse content.

This study proposes 1) a new learning method referred to as Legacy Learning to overcome the limitations of existing FFG models, and 2) a service framework for automating the text design required for metaverse content. Legacy Learning leverages slight variations that occur between the input and output in generative AI models to introduce controlled transformations during the learning process. In the first stage of Legacy Learning, the entire initial text design is learned, resulting in a similar yet slightly transformed text design. In the second stage, the output from the first stage is used as the input text design for further learning, introducing additional subtle transformations. By repeating this process n times, new uniquely transformed text designs can be generated. Unlike the FFG model, which uses only a subset of glyphs from the entire text design, the proposed Legacy Learning method ensures high-quality glyphs across the board by utilizing the entire text design. In addition, by performing sufficient legacy-learning iterations, it is possible to generate a new text design that differs significantly from the initial design. Leveraging the strengths of Legacy Learning allows the automatic generation of diverse text designs required for metaverse content, which can be directly applied to metaverse environments. The contributions of this study are as follows.

- **(C1)** We developed a new text design learning method known as Legacy Learning, which enables the reliable generation of new high-quality text designs using the existing FFG model and a service model for automating text design for metaverse content based on Legacy Learning.
- **(C2)** A quantitative evaluation conducted to compare the performance of the proposed

Legacy Learning demonstrated that the new text design differed significantly from the initial text design, proving that it can generate novel text designs that are different from existing ones.

- **(C3)** Visual analysis of the new text designs obtained through Legacy Learning confirmed high-quality results with consistent local and global text structures.
- **(C4)** A SUS evaluation of the Legacy Learning-based text auto-design service conducted with designers performing text design tasks for metaverse content resulted in an average score of 95.78, demonstrating the practicality of the proposed service in real metaverse development environments.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the related research, and Section 3 introduces the Legacy Learning method for automating text design in metaverse content, along with the UI/UX implementation results obtained using this method. In Section 4, we evaluate the effectiveness of Legacy Learning using both quantitative and qualitative assessments. In addition, we conducted a SUS test with designers who worked on text design for metaverse content to verify the usability of the proposed auto-text design service. Finally, Section 5 summarizes the findings of this study and suggests directions for future research.

2. Related work

This section covers related work on text design in 3D virtual environments, such as metaverses, and related work on generative AI models for text design in virtual spaces.

2.1. Text design in 3D virtual spaces

Traditionally, text design in digital spaces has been known to directly contribute to enhancing user readability and immersion (Kojic et al., 2022). In 3D virtual environments such as VR, AR, and metaverse environments, text design is also closely linked to improving user performance across various tasks (Seinfeld et al., 2020; Shi et al., 2020; De Back et al., 2023).

Knaack et al. (2019) demonstrated that text design within a VR interface affects readability and directly influences user response time. Wang et al. (2020) demonstrated that text design preferences vary among users, and that applying text designs that match individual preferences can enhance both readability and immersion. Wei et al. (2020) examined how text design and other interface elements, such as voice, in 3D virtual environments such as the metaverse affect

user immersion, communication ability, and satisfaction. This study demonstrates that text design directly and indirectly affects immersion, readability, and communication ability.

As demonstrated in various related studies, text design in 3D virtual environments is key in enhancing user readability, communication capabilities, and content immersion. Because text design in 3D virtual environments, including metaverse environments, often needs to be created from scratch, designers commonly purchase various commercial font licenses or use subscription services to improve work efficiency (Elhagry, 2023; Hartini & Awaliyah, 2023). However, research has shown that users have varying preferences for text design. Therefore, even with existing font licenses or subscription services, fully enhancing readability, communication, and immersion for all users remains a challenge. To address this issue, a user-customized text design should be applied to metaverse content based on generative AI models.

2.2. AI-based font generation approach

As introduced in Section 2.1, research based on generative AI is being actively conducted to address the issues of high cost and time consumption associated with text design. Generative AI models for text design are classified into MFG and FFG models, both of which utilize image-to-image (I2I) translation methods (Park et al., 2021a; Tang et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2022). I2I translation is a visual task focused on mapping images from one domain to another while preserving the image content (Liu et al., 2022). In general, I2I translation has been applied in various fields, such as image animation, object transfiguration, and semantic segmentation, and is also actively used in text design generation (Xie et al., 2021; Tang et al., 2022). In text design generation, I2I translation methods are used to learn the shape of specific text designs and convert the input text into learned text designs while preserving text content. This approach was employed in both MFG and FFG models.

2.2.1. Many-shot font generation

MFG models use multi-mapping methods to generate text designs. These methods primarily train converters between different text designs, creating a complete target font using several target glyphs (Liu et al., 2022). Notable examples include Zi2zi, rewrite and hierarchical generative adversarial network, which generates fonts through supervised learning using thousands of character pairs based on generative adversarial network (GAN) (Tian, 2017; Tian, 2019; Chang et al., 2018a; Chang et al, 2018b). While MFG models demonstrate excellent performance, it has been reported that at least 775 text designs are required in languages with

a large number of glyphs, such as Korean or Chinese (Jiang et al., 2019). Owing to the substantial effort and cost involved, directly applying MFG models to practical metaverse content environments presents certain limitations (Xie et al., 2021; Park et al., 2021a).

2.2.2. Few-shot font generation

Because of the high cost associated with MFG models, recent research has actively focused on FFG models that learn text design using a small number of glyphs (Cha et al., 2020). The FFG model learns from a limited number of text designs to generate a complete text design (Park et al., 2021a). The early FFG model, multi-content GAN, succeeded in reducing the number of text designs required for training compared to MFG, but still incurred significant costs when dealing with languages such as Korean or Chinese, where the number of glyphs in the text design is significantly high (Park et al., 2018). Subsequently, FFG models such as encoder-mixer-decoder and artistic glyph image synthesis network, which separate the features of text design from those of the glyph level, have significantly improved FFG model performance (Zhang et al., 2018; Gao et al., 2019). Recently, FFG models such as DM-Font, LF-Font, and MX-Font have been proposed, which learn features at the component, context, and glyph levels, respectively (Cha et al., 2020; Park et al., 2021a; Park et al., 2021b). This advancement enables the generation of complete text designs from a small number of text designs, even for languages with a large number of glyphs, such as Korean and Chinese.

Despite these achievements, a limitation remains: for languages such as Korean and Chinese, which have a large amount of text content, at least 5–10% of the content must still be learned (Hassan et al., 2024; He et al., 2024b). This requirement hinders the ability to automatically generate text designs within metaverse content and provide customized text designs for users. This study proposes a new text design learning method known as Legacy Learning, which can directly generate high-quality, user-specific text designs and offers a text design auto-generation service for metaverse content using Legacy Learning.

3. Legacy Learning for automatic text design generation in metaverse contents

In this section, we introduce a Legacy Learning method for training text-design generation models in metaverse content, and a service that can provide personalized text designs for each user using this training model. Table 1 summarizes the notation used in Legacy Learning.

Table 1. Summary table of the notations used.

Notation	Description	Notation	Description
s	Text design of contents	f	Extracted feature
\hat{s}	Text design of contents	$x_{s,c}$	Text design of glyph
C	All content	$\hat{x}_{s,c}$	Output Text design
c	Few-shot content	$x_{s,c}$	Target Text design

3.1. Few-shot Font Generation Network for Legacy Learning

Legacy Learning employs FFG as its primary concept. The FFG approach typically adopts a learning method based on GAN. In this method, two components are adversarially trained: an encoder and decoder generator (G) that generate images with a distribution similar to the target image, and a discriminator (D) and component classifier (CLS) that assist in training G . When G produces fonts similar to the ground truth, D and CLS evaluate the quality of the generated text design by comparing it with the real text design. This feedback helps the G to ultimately produce text design images that closely resemble real images. This approach allows G to progressively learn and generate images with distributions that are increasingly similar to reality.




Figure 3. Structure of the FFG network.

Figure 3 illustrates the process described earlier. For instance, if the goal is to learn a text design comprising of three glyphs, G aims to create the desired text design. However, it may generate content that differs from the original input content. At this point, D and CLS provide additional supervision for G by evaluating the quality of the generated glyphs.

3.1.1. Generator for Legacy Learning

Generator G consists of an encoder Enc and a decoder Dec . Enc consists of Enc_c , which learns the content features of the text, and Enc_s , which learns the features of text design. Enc_c aims to extract the content feature f_c for each glyph from all glyphs, whereas Enc_s focuses on

extracting features related to text design. The features f_s and f_c extracted through this process are used by **Dec** to generate new text designs. This process can be represented by the following equation:

$$f_s = Enc_s(x_{s,c}) \text{ and } f_c = Enc_c(x_{s,c}) \quad (1)$$

$$\hat{x}_{s,c} = Dec(f_s, f_c) \quad (2)$$

$$G(x_{s,c}, x_{s,c}) = Dec(Enc_s(x_{s,c}), Enc_c(x_{s,c})) = \hat{x}_{s,c} \quad (3)$$

3.1.2. Discriminator for Legacy Learning

Discriminator **D** utilizes a multitask approach that assesses both text design and content, enhancing the quality of the outputs generated by **G**. During training, the inputs are $\hat{x}_{s,c}$ and the generated $x_{s,c}$. These inputs are classified into style and content labels. When $\hat{x}_{s,c}$ is the input, it is evaluated as $D(x_{s,c})$, while $\hat{x}_{s,c}$ is evaluated as $D(\hat{x}_{s,c})$. This process provides feedback to **G** throughout the training.

3.1.3. Component classifier for Legacy Learning

A **CLS** provides additional supervision for **G** by performing component classification for text designs with local components. During training, the features of the text design were extracted from the generated output $\hat{x}_{s,c}$ using the trained **Enc**. These features were classified and compared with the actual components of $x_{s,c}$. This is represented by $CLS(f_{s,\hat{x}})$ and $CLS(f_{s,x})$.

3.2. Legacy Learning for automatic text design generation

The FFG method involves learning the text design patterns of certain text content used during training, and subsequently applying these learned designs to the remaining text content. During this process, some text may be modified. Leveraging these characteristics of FFG, we propose an approach known as Legacy Learning that facilitates the creation of high-quality text designs that differ from the original ones.

Fig. 4 illustrates the training structure of Legacy Learning, which involves the following steps. **Step-I**: Construct a dataset with the desired combinations of text designs and train the existing FFG model. **Step-II**: Use the initially trained Legacy FFG model to generate text designs for the glyphs used in training. **Step-III**: Transfer learning is performed on the Legacy FFG model using the text designs generated in the previous step as training data. **Step-IV**:

Repeat Steps II and III until the design variations across the entire text design set converge, thus completing Legacy Learning. The number of iterations of Legacy Learning is defined as N . The Legacy Learning method ensures that, with each training session of the FFG model, a generalization process is conducted on a limited dataset. Initially, the model generated images similar to the original text designs; however, with each legacy iteration, transfer learning was applied using the output generated in the previous stage, inducing design variations. In addition, because the model learns from existing text designs, there is no limitation on the number of input glyphs, allowing the generation of stable text structures.




Figure 4. Visualization of the overall training structure of Legacy Learning.

3.2.1. Loss functions

In Legacy Learning, the loss functions used to train individual FFG models are applied sequentially during the training of G , D , and CLS . The overall loss function comprises the following four individual loss functions:

L_1 Loss. The difference between the actual and generated images is defined as a loss function to minimize the difference between the image generated by G and the actual image. The L_1 loss is structured as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{l_1} = \mathbb{E}_{x, \hat{x}} \left[\left\| x_{\hat{s}, C} - \hat{x}_{\hat{s}, C} \right\|_1 \right]. \quad (4)$$

Adversarial loss. The log probability of the image generated by G and the actual image is defined as the loss function. This encourages G to generate more plausible images and enables

D to better distinguish between generated and actual images. The adversarial loss is structured as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{adv} = \mathbb{E}_{x,\hat{x}}[\log D(x_{\hat{s},c})] + \mathbb{E}_{x,\hat{x}}[\log(1 - D(\hat{x}_{\hat{s},c}))]. \quad (5)$$

Feature-matching loss. The feature-matching loss function was defined by calculating the difference between the features of the image generated by \mathbf{G} and the actual image in each layer of \mathbf{D} . This aims to minimize the difference in features between the generated and actual images when \mathbf{G} generates the images. The Feature Matching loss is structured as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{fm} = \mathbb{E}_{x,\hat{x}} \left[\frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L \|D^{(l)}(x_{\hat{s},c}) - D^{(l)}(\hat{x}_{\hat{s},c})\|_1 \right] \quad (6)$$

Component-classification loss. The cross-entropy (CE) loss function is defined for \mathbf{CLS} to perform multiclass classification of component u from images generated by \mathbf{G} and real images. This is intended to help the model generate a clearer composition of the components constituting the glyphs. The component classification loss is structured as follows. Here, $f_{\hat{s},x}$, and $f_{\hat{s},\hat{x}}$ represent the text design features of the actual image and the image generated by \mathbf{G} , respectively; u denotes each component; and U denotes the set of all components.

$$\mathcal{L}_c = \mathbb{E}_{x,\hat{x}} [\sum_{u \in U} CE(\mathbf{CLS}(f_{\hat{s},x}), u)] + \mathbb{E}_{\hat{x}} [\sum_{u \in U} CE(\mathbf{CLS}(f_{\hat{s},\hat{x}}), u)]. \quad (7)$$

Full objective. The final objective function was formulated to optimize \mathbf{G} , \mathbf{D} , and \mathbf{CLS} using the various types of losses defined above. It is expressed as follows, where L_G , L_D , and L_c denote the losses for \mathbf{G} , \mathbf{D} , and \mathbf{CLS} respectively, and λ represents parameters controlling the importance of the loss functions. During the training process, \mathbf{D} maximized its loss, whereas \mathbf{G} and \mathbf{CLS} minimized it. Furthermore, \mathbf{G} , \mathbf{D} , and \mathbf{CLS} operated independently during parameter updates based on their respective losses.

$$\mathcal{L}_D = \lambda_{adv} \mathcal{L}_{adv}, \quad \mathcal{L}_{cls} = \lambda_c \mathcal{L}_c \quad (8)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_G = \lambda_{l1} \mathcal{L}_{l1} + \lambda_{adv} \mathcal{L}_{adv} + \lambda_{fm} \mathcal{L}_{fm} \quad (9)$$

3.2.2. Procedure of Legacy Learning

Legacy Learning begins by training an initial FFG model to output all glyphs based on the text design used during training. In this process, plausible glyphs are generated; however, they are not identical, indicating that some distortion occurs during text design generation. Thereafter,

the trained FFG model is transitioned to the next generation as a legacy, where it is retrained using plausible glyphs generated by the model of the previous generation. As this process was repeated, each generation experienced greater distortion than the original text design, ultimately resulting in an FFG model capable of generating text designs that differed from the original. Algorithm 1 provides the pseudocode for this process. In Algorithm 1, θ , η , and, $\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}$ represent the parameters, learning rate, and gradient of the loss function for D , CLS , and G , respectively.

Algorithm 1. Legacy Learning

Input: Train source glyph set $x_{s,c}$, Train target glyph set $x_{\hat{s},c}$
Output: output set \hat{x}_{set} of the Legacy Learning from the 1st to the N^{th}

- 1: $\hat{x}_{set} = []$
- 2: **for** $i \leftarrow 1$ to N **do**
- 3: **for** $j \leftarrow 1$ to Iterations **do**
- 4: $f_C = Enc_C(x_{s,c})$ *// extract content feature from $x_{s,c}$*
- 5: $f_{\hat{s}} = Enc_{\hat{s}}(x_{\hat{s},c})$ *// extract content feature from $x_{\hat{s},c}$*
- 6: $\hat{x}_{\hat{s},c} = Dec(f_{\hat{s}}, f_C)$ *// generate output image by FFG Dec*
- 7: $\theta_D = \theta_D - \eta_D \nabla_{\theta_D} \mathcal{L}_D$ *// update θ_D by taking optimizer on loss \mathcal{L}_D defined eq.(8)*
- 8: $\theta_{CLS} = \theta_{CLS} - \eta_{CLS} \nabla_{\theta_{CLS}} \mathcal{L}_{CLS}$ *// update θ_{CLS} by taking optimizer on loss \mathcal{L}_{CLS} defined eq.(8)*
- 9: $\theta_G = \theta_G - \eta_G \nabla_{\theta_G} \mathcal{L}_G$ *// update θ_G by taking optimizer on loss \mathcal{L}_G defined eq.(9)*
- 10: $\hat{x}_{\hat{s},c} = G(x_{\hat{s},c}, x_{s,c})$ *// Train glyph generation for model transfer*
- 11: Update $x_{s,c}$ and $x_{\hat{s},c}$ with the style of $\hat{x}_{\hat{s},c}$
- 12: $\hat{x}_{set}.append(\hat{x}_{\hat{s},c})$
- 13: **return** \hat{x}_{set}

3.3. Automatic text design generation service in metaverse contents

In this section, we introduce a service framework that leverages the previously discussed Legacy Learning to automatically generate and modify text designs within metaverse content. The proposed service framework operates in a metaverse environment through the following steps: 1) Service users (such as metaverse content designers and metaverse users) select their preferred text design(s) in the metaverse development environment. 2) The system trains the model using legacy learning. 3) Newly designed text outputs are visualized for each trained model. 4) Once the desired text design is selected, it is saved as a True Type Font (TTF) file. 5) Thereafter, the saved TTF file is applied within the metaverse environment, enabling text design changes across all or selected contents. Figure 5 illustrates this framework.




Figure 5. Overall framework of automatic text design generation service in metaverse contents.

4. Experiments

We conducted both quantitative and qualitative experiments to validate the performance of

Legacy Learning. First, in the quantitative experiment, we evaluated the extent to which the text designs generated during the Legacy Learning process were transformed compared to the original input designs. This demonstrates the capability of the proposed method for generating new text designs. Second, in a qualitative experiment, we visualized the text designs generated by Legacy Learning and assessed their quality. This provides evidence that Legacy Learning can produce high-quality text designs.

4.1. Dataset and experimental setting

In our experiments, we used seven Korean text design styles and eight Chinese text design styles, considering factors such as stroke thickness, sharpness, and spacing. Figure 6 shows the glyphs from the text designs used for training in each language. Glyphs for each text design were randomly selected, with 2000 glyphs for Korean and 6000 glyphs for Chinese used in the training process. Thereafter, evaluation was conducted using 500 glyphs for Korean and 1500 glyphs for Chinese, which were not used during the training.



Figure 6. Examples of the text designs used for training and the glyphs for each text design.

For Legacy Learning, it is necessary to select a learning network structure from existing FFG models. In our experiments, Legacy Learning was applied to three state-of-the-art high-performance FFG models: the DM-Font (Cha et al., 2020), LF-Font (Park et al., 2021), and MX-Font (Park et al., 2021). FFG models have been developed to generate text designs for

specific languages. For instance, the DM-Font was designed to generate text designs exclusively for Korean datasets, whereas the LF-Font was designed to generate text designs for Chinese datasets. Consequently, Legacy Learning was applied to the DM-Font to generate Korean text designs and to the LF-Font to generate Chinese text designs. In contrast, the MX-Font can generate text designs for both Korean and Chinese; therefore, Legacy Learning was applied to both languages. The training parameters were as follows: Legacy Learning was conducted for six iterations with 200,000 training steps per iteration. The Adam optimizer was used to optimize the \mathbf{G} , \mathbf{D} , and \mathbf{CLS} .

Perceptual-level evaluation metrics were employed to quantitatively assess the differences between the generated text designs and those used in the original training. Representative perceptual-level evaluation metrics include the Frechet inception distance (FID) and learned perceptual image patch similarity (LPIPS), which are expressed in Equations (10) and (11), respectively.

$$FID(x, \hat{x}) = \|\mu_x - \mu_{\hat{x}}\|^2 + Tr(\Sigma_x + \Sigma_{\hat{x}} - \sqrt{\Sigma_x \Sigma_{\hat{x}}}) \quad (10)$$

Equation (10) presents the formula for the FID. Here, \hat{x} represents the generated text design and x represents the original text design. The term μ denotes the mean extracted from the distribution of each text design, while Σ represents the covariance matrix of the text design distribution. Therefore, FID measures the similarity between two images and reflects the difference between their distributions.

$$LPIPS(x, \hat{x}) = \sum_l \frac{1}{H_l W_l} \sum_{h,w} \|w^l \odot (x_{hw}^l - \hat{x}_{hw}^l)\|_2^2 \quad (11)$$

Equation (11) represents the formula for LPIPS: Here, \hat{x} represents the generated text design and x represents the original text design. The term l refers to the layer number of the pre-trained VGG-16 network, H and W represent the height and width of the text design, respectively, and h and w are indices. Additionally, w^l represents the weights extracted from layer l , and x_{hw}^l and \hat{x}_{hw}^l represent the feature maps at positions h and w from layer l , respectively. Thus, LPIPS measures the similarity between two text designs by summing the Euclidean distances between the feature maps across each layer of the text design.

4.2. Experimental results

4.2.1. Quantitative results.

Tables 2 and 3 summarize the experimental results of the Legacy Learning. The values in the tables show the FID and LPIPS results for the generated text designs compared to the text designs used in the training process across the 1st through 6th iterations of Legacy Learning. According to the results listed in Tables 2 and 3, the FID and LPIPS values consistently increase as Legacy Learning progresses. These results indicate that the generated text designs have undergone modifications compared to the original text designs, demonstrating that they differ from existing text designs. Specifically, for LPIPS, the results indicate increases of 32.5, 56.3, 10.5, and 11% for DM, MX-kor, MX-chn, and LF, respectively, after six iterations of Legacy Learning, compared to the initial fonts. Similarly, the FID values increased by 205.36, 137.6, 98.8, and 151.5%. These results demonstrate that Legacy Learning can generate text designs that are distinct from the original designs.

Table 2. FID results comparing the original text designs with those generated after Legacy Learning.

Type of FFG	Language	Number of Legacy Learning					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
DM	KR	58.851	93.007	112.391	127.271	164.409	179.708
LF	CN	76.461	124.364	137.188	160.405	171.053	181.742
MX	KR	94.552	119.259	129.480	152.649	168.494	187.969
	CN	66.620	98.728	104.871	124.994	148.907	167.554

Table 3. LPIPS results comparing the original text designs with those generated after Legacy Learning.

Type of FFG	Language	Number of Legacy Learning					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
DM	KR	0.086	0.099	0.102	0.110	0.113	0.114
LF	CN	0.126	0.150	0.172	0.178	0.188	0.197
MX	KR	0.180	0.178	0.183	0.186	0.193	0.199
	CN	0.118	0.123	0.123	0.123	0.128	0.131

4.2.2. Qualitative results

Figures 7–10 show the results of visualizing the quality of text designs generated by different text-generation models as Legacy Learning progressed. For visualization, four fonts were randomly selected from each model (DM, MX-kor, MX-chn, and LF), and samples were extracted after applying 1st through 6th iterations of Legacy Learning. For DM and MX-kor, the initial results of Legacy Learning indicated that the designs were similar to existing text designs. In some cases, the generated glyphs contained noise, resulting in lower-quality text designs. However, as Legacy Learning progressed, the designs converged to more specific forms, and noise was removed. These results indicate that, although there may be initial underfitting, transfer learning gradually enhances text design.

Original	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤
N=1	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤
N=2	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤
N=3	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤
N=4	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤
N=5	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤
N=6	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤

Figure 7. Results of visualizing Korean text designs using Legacy Learning based on the DM-Font

Original	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤
N=1	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤
N=2	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤
N=3	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤
N=4	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤
N=5	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤
N=6	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤	꿈 말 콤

Figure 8. Results of visualizing Korean text designs using Legacy Learning based on the MX-Font.

Original	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄
N=1	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄
N=2	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄
N=3	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄
N=4	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄
N=5	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄
N=6	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄	洵 洵 玄

Figure 9. Results of visualizing Chinese text designs using Legacy Learning based on the LF-Font.




Figure 10. Results of visualizing Chinese text designs using Legacy Learning based on the MX-Font.

MX-chn and LF exhibit similar trends; after some initial design variations in the early stages of Legacy Learning, the models converge to specific text designs without significant deviations. Finally, when comparing the existing fonts with the text designs after the 6th Legacy Learning session, visual differences such as font size, stroke endings, and cursive style were observed. Additionally, the quality of the generated text design was confirmed to be excellent.

5. Analysis of user evaluation

We performed a usability evaluation of the proposed Legacy Learning and automatic text design generation service for metaverse content based on Legacy Learning. For this evaluation, we conducted a survey and analyzed 35 multidisciplinary designers. The participants were experts in gaming, metaversing, and interface design across five IT companies. The survey consisted of two parts: 1) Quantitative User Evaluation and a 2) System Usability Scale (SUS).

5.1. Quantitative user evaluation

The survey questions are structured from three perspectives: 1) Generation Perspective: “How novel is the text design provided by the service compared to existing text designs?”; 2) Readability Perspective: “How good is the readability of the new text designs provided by the service?”; and 3) Design Perspective: “How satisfactory is the design of the new text designs provided by the service?” Each perspective consisted of ten questions, all of which were evaluated using a 5-point Likert scale. The survey was conducted as follows: 1) Step 1: Respondents were shown three text contents composed of text designs before applying the

automatic text design generation service. 2) Step 2: Thereafter, they were shown three randomly selected text contents generated by an automatic text-design generation service. 3) Step 3: The respondents compared the differences before and after completing the survey.

Table 4 summarizes the statistics of the survey conducted by 35 multidisciplinary designers. The results indicate the average scores were 4.53 for the Generation Perspective, 4.79 for the Readability Perspective, and 4.82 for the Design Perspective. Notably, in the Generation Perspective, the item "The generated text design of the transformed text design differs from the original text design " received an average score of 4.91. In the Readability Perspective, the item "The generated text design maintains readability" achieved a perfect average score of 5.00. Additionally, in the Design Perspective, the items "The generated text design is overall satisfying" and "The generated text design enhances design diversity" received high scores of 4.91 and 4.94, respectively.

Table 4. LPIPS results comparing the original text designs with those generated after Legacy Learning.

Measure	Perspective		
	Generation	Readability	Design
Mean	4.53	4.79	4.82
Standard Deviation	0.09	0.07	0.08

5.2. System usability scale

We used the SUS to evaluate the usability and practical applicability of the automatic text design generation service for metaverse content, which is based on Legacy Learning. The SUS is a widely used tool for evaluating the usability of various products and systems such as websites and mobile phones (Tassabehji & Kamala, 2012). It provides the most reliable subjective evaluation results, regardless of sample size (Granić, Mitrović, & Marangunić, 2011). The SUS consists of ten questions related to usability, and respondents are given response options ranging from "Strongly Disagree (1)" to "Strongly Agree (5)." The questions are divided into five odd-numbered positive items and five even-numbered negative items, with scores calculated to yield interpretable scores ranging from 0 to 100. Equation (12), where U represents the item and n represents the item number, is expressed as follows:

$$SUS\ score = 2.5 \times [\sum_{n=1}^5 (U_{2n-1} - 1) + (5 - U_{2n})]. \quad (12)$$

Figure 10 illustrates the criteria for evaluating usability levels based on the SUS scores, as expressed in Equation (12). Through this process, we can evaluate the usability and practical

applicability of the proposed automatic text-design generation service for metaverse content.




Figure 10. Grade ranking of the SUS.

Table 5. Processing results of the SUS score.

User	Questions										Score
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	
1	5	2	4	1	5	1	5	1	5	2	92.5
2	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	2	4	1	95.0
3	5	1	5	2	4	1	5	1	5	2	92.5
4	4	1	4	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	95.0
5	5	1	5	1	5	1	4	1	5	1	97.5
6	5	2	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	97.5
7	4	1	5	2	5	2	5	1	5	1	92.5
8	5	1	5	2	5	1	5	1	5	1	97.5
9	5	1	4	2	4	1	5	1	5	1	92.5
10	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	100
11	5	1	5	1	5	1	4	1	5	1	97.5
12	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	2	97.5
13	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	100.0
14	5	2	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	97.5
15	4	1	5	2	4	1	5	2	5	1	90.0
16	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	100
17	5	1	4	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	97.5
18	5	1	5	1	5	1	4	1	5	1	97.5
19	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	2	5	1	97.5
20	5	1	5	1	5	2	5	1	5	1	97.5
21	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	100
22	5	2	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	97.5
23	4	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	4	1	95.0
24	5	1	4	1	4	1	4	2	5	2	87.5
25	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	100.0
26	5	1	5	2	5	1	5	1	5	1	97.5
27	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	100
28	5	1	3	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	95.0
29	4	1	5	1	4	1	5	1	4	1	92.5
30	5	2	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	2	95.0
31	5	1	4	1	5	1	4	1	5	1	95.0
32	5	1	5	1	4	2	5	1	5	1	95.0
33	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	2	5	1	97.5
34	4	2	5	2	5	1	4	1	4	2	85.0
35	5	1	4	1	5	1	5	1	4	1	95.0
Average											95.78

Table 5 summarizes the results of the SUS survey conducted with 35 design experts. The values in the table represent the Likert-scale responses and SUS scores for each question. Generally, positive odd-numbered items received high scores ranging between 4 and 5, whereas negative even-numbered items received low scores ranging between 1 and 2. This indicates that the designers found the Legacy Learning-based service framework highly practical for the metaverse. However, to ensure a clear qualitative evaluation beyond these overall scores, we used established criteria such as "Acceptability ranges," "Grade scale," and "Adjective ratings," as employed in several previous studies.

6. Discussions and conclusion

This study proposes a novel AI-based text design generation method known as Legacy Learning, which is specifically tailored to create text designs within metaverse content. We also introduce a service framework that combines this learning method with automatic text-design generation in metaverse environments. Text design for metaverse content is crucial for enhancing user readability, improving community engagement, and increasing immersion.

Text design tasks vary significantly according to the language. For instance, languages such as Korean and Chinese require designing tens of thousands of characters, which poses significant challenges. The results of this study offer a new approach to efficiently generate and modify text designs for metaverse content at a lower cost.

Recently, FFG models using generative AI have been developed for text design. However, these models frequently produce text designs with noise, limiting their applicability to automatic generation and metaverse content.

In contrast, the proposed Legacy Learning method overcomes the limitations of existing FFG models by enabling the creation of new high-quality text designs suitable for direct use and application in metaverse environments. Quantitative and qualitative evaluations were conducted to validate text designs generated through Legacy Learning. A quantitative evaluation using the FID and LPIPS metrics demonstrated that the generated text designs differed from the initial designs by 2.05 and 32%, respectively. Qualitative evaluation involved visualizing and comparing the generated text designs in detail, confirming that the new designs maintained high quality while presenting noticeable intuitive differences from the original designs. For the service framework that applied Legacy Learning to automatic text design in

metaverse content, usability testing was conducted with designers, yielding a high score of 95.8. This result demonstrates the practical utility of the proposed service for creating metaverse content.

The Legacy Learning method and service framework developed in this study have significant potential as valuable tools for text design in metaverse environments. This study is expected to stimulate further studies on AI-based services for metaverse creation.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the Korea government (MSIT)(No.RS-2023-00218913, 50%) and by MSIT, Korea, under the Grand Information Technology Research Center support program (IITP-202-2020-0-01791, 50%) supervised by the Institute for Information & Communications Technology Planning & Evaluation.

Reference

- Cappannari, L., & Vitillo, A. (2022). XR and metaverse software platforms. Roadmapping Extended Reality: Fundamentals and Applications, 135-156. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119865810.ch6>
- Chang, B., Zhang, Q., Pan, S., & Meng, L. (2018a, March). Generating handwritten chinese characters using cycleGAN. In 2018 IEEE winter conference on applications of computer vision (WACV) (pp. 199-207). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/WACV.2018.00028>
- Chang, J., Gu, Y., Zhang, Y., Wang, Y. F., & Innovation, C. M. (2018b, September). Chinese Handwriting Imitation with Hierarchical Generative Adversarial Network. In BMVC (p. 290).
- Cha, J., Chun, S., Lee, G., Lee, B., Kim, S., & Lee, H. (2020). Few-shot compositional font generation with dual memory. In Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XIX 16 (pp. 735-751). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-58529-7_43
- Chen, S. C. (2022). Multimedia research toward the metaverse. IEEE multimedia, 29(1), 125-127. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MMUL.2022.3156185>
- Chen, X., Wu, L., Su, Y., Meng, L., & Meng, X. (2024). Font transformer for few-shot font generation. Computer Vision and Image Understanding, 104043. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cviu.2024.104043>
- Choi, H. S., & Kim, S. H. (2017). A content service deployment plan for metaverse museum exhibitions—Centering on the combination of beacons and HMDs. International journal of information management, 37(1), 1519-1527. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2016.04.017>

- De Back, T. T., Tinga, A. M., & Louwerse, M. M. (2023). Learning in immersed collaborative virtual environments: design and implementation. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 31(8), 5364-5382. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2021.2006238>
- Dwivedi, Y. K., Hughes, L., Baabdullah, A. M., et al. (2022). Metaverse beyond the hype: Multidisciplinary perspectives on emerging challenges, opportunities, and agenda for research, practice and policy. *International journal of information management*, 66, 102542. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2022.102542>
- Elhagry, A. (2023, October). Text-to-metaverse: towards a digital twin-enabled multimodal conditional generative metaverse. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Multimedia* (pp. 9336-9339). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3581783.3613432>
- Gao, Y., Guo, Y., Lian, Z., Tang, Y., & Xiao, J. (2019). Artistic glyph image synthesis via one-stage few-shot learning. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (ToG)*, 38(6), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3355089.3355657>
- Granić, A., Mitrović, I., & Marangunić, N. (2011). Exploring the usability of web portals: A Croatian case study. *International journal of information management*, 31(4), 339-349. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2010.11.001>
- Hartini, S., & Awaliyah, L. S. (2023). Civil Law Protection against Misuse of Free for Personal Use License Copyright Works of a Font Design. *Journal for ReAttach Therapy and Developmental Diversities*, 6(9s (2)), 1607-1624. 10.55908/sdgs.v11i12.2008
- Hassan, A. U., Memon, I., & Choi, J. (2024). Learning font-style space using style-guided discriminator for few-shot font generation. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 242, 122817. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2023.122817>
- He, S., Chen, Y., Xia, Y., Li, Y., Liang, H. N., & Yu, L. (2024a). Visual harmony: text-visual interplay in circular infographics. *Journal of Visualization*, 27(2), 255-271. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12650-024-00957-3>
- He, X., Zhu, M., Wang, N., & Gao, X. (2024b). Few-shot font generation by learning style difference and similarity. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TCSVT.2024.3382621>
- Huynh-The, T., Pham, Q. V., Pham, X. Q., Nguyen, T. T., Han, Z., & Kim, D. S. (2023). Artificial intelligence for the metaverse: A survey. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, 117, 105581. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engappai.2022.105581>
- Jiang, Y., Lian, Z., Tang, Y., & Xiao, J. (2019, July). Sefont: Structure-guided chinese font generation via deep stacked networks. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence* (Vol. 33, No. 01, pp. 4015-4022). <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v33i01.33014015>

- Kim, T., Jin, H., Hwang, J., Kim, N., Im, J., Jeon, Y., & Sung, Y. (2024). Being excluded in the metaverse: Impact of social ostracism on users' psychological responses and behaviors. *International Journal of Information Management*, 78, 102808. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2024.102808>
- Kojic, T., Vergari, M., Möller, S., & Voigt-Antons, J. N. (2022, June). Assessing user experience of text readability with eye tracking in virtual reality. In *International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction* (pp. 199-211). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-05939-1_13
- Lee, J. S., & Choi, H. C. (2024). One-shot font generation via local style self-supervision using Region-Aware Contrastive Loss. *Journal of King Saud University-Computer and Information Sciences*, 36(4), 102028. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jksuci.2024.102028>
- Liu, W., Liu, F., Ding, F., He, Q., & Yi, Z. (2022). Xmp-font: Self-supervised cross-modality pre-training for few-shot font generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition* (pp. 7905-7914). <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR52688.2022.00775>
- López-Cabarcos, M. Á., & Piñeiro-Chousa, J. (2024). Illusion or reality? Building a metaverse community focused on value creation in the agricultural sector. *International Journal of Information Management*, 77, 102782. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2024.102782>
- Mogaji, E., Wirtz, J., Belk, R. W., & Dwivedi, Y. K. (2023). Immersive time (ImT): Conceptualizing time spent in the metaverse. *International Journal of Information Management*, 72, 102659. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102659>
- Morales-Fernández, B. (2024). New Linguistic Spaces in Cyberculture: The Influence of the Metaverse on the Minifiction of Social Networks. In *The Future of Digital Communication* (pp. 27-38). CRC Press.
- Mourtzis, D., Panopoulos, N., Angelopoulos, J., Wang, B., & Wang, L. (2022). Human centric platforms for personalized value creation in metaverse. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, 65, 653-659. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmsy.2022.11.004>
- Narin, N. G. (2021). A content analysis of the metaverse articles. *Journal of Metaverse*, 1(1), 17-24.
- Pacchierotti, C., Chinello, F., Koumaditis, K., Di Luca, M., Ofek, E., & Georgiou, O. (2024). Haptics in the Metaverse: Haptic feedback for Virtual, Augmented, Mixed, and eXtended Realities. *IEEE Transactions on Haptics (ToH)*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TOH.2024.3369192>
- Park, H., Yoo, Y., & Kwak, N. (2018). Mc-gan: Multi-conditional generative adversarial network for image synthesis. *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1805.01123>
- Park, S., Chun, S., Cha, J., Lee, B., & Shim, H. (2021a, May). Few-shot font generation with localized

- style representations and factorization. In Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence (Vol. 35, No. 3, pp. 2393-2402). <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v35i3.16340>
- Park, S., Chun, S., Cha, J., Lee, B., & Shim, H. (2021b). Multiple heads are better than one: Few-shot font generation with multiple localized experts. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision (pp. 13900-13909). <https://doi.org/10.1109/iccv48922.2021.01364>
- Park, S. M., & Kim, Y. G. (2022). A metaverse: Taxonomy, components, applications, and open challenges. *IEEE access*, 10, 4209-4251. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3140175>
- Richter, S., & Richter, A. (2023). What is novel about the Metaverse?. *International Journal of Information Management*, 73, 102684. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102684>
- Ruusunen, N., Hallikainen, H., & Laukkanen, T. (2023). Does imagination compensate for the need for touch in 360-virtual shopping?. *International Journal of Information Management*, 70, 102622. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102622>
- Seinfeld, S., Feuchtner, T., Pinzek, J., & Müller, J. (2020). Impact of information placement and user representations in vr on performance and embodiment. *IEEE transactions on visualization and computer graphics*, 28(3), 1545-1556. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2020.3021342>
- Shi, Y., Du, J., & Worthy, D. A. (2020). The impact of engineering information formats on learning and execution of construction operations: A virtual reality pipe maintenance experiment. *Automation in construction*, 119, 103367. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2020.103367>
- Sun, L., Li, H., & Muhammad, G. (2023). A Metaverse text recognition model based on character-level contrastive learning. *Applied Soft Computing*, 149, 110969. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2023.110969>
- Sung, E. C., Bae, S., Han, D. I. D., & Kwon, O. (2021). Consumer engagement via interactive artificial intelligence and mixed reality. *International journal of information management*, 60, 102382. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2021.102382>
- Tang, L., Cai, Y., Liu, J., et al. (2022). Few-shot font generation by learning fine-grained local styles. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition (pp. 7895-7904). <https://doi.org/10.1109/cvpr52688.2022.00774>
- Tassabehji, R., & Kamala, M. A. (2012). Evaluating biometrics for online banking: The case for usability. *International Journal of Information Management*, 32(5), 489-494. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2012.07.001>
- Tian, Yuchen. (2017). "Rewrite: Neural style transfer for chinese fonts." Retrieved from <<https://github.com/kaonashi-tyc/Rewrite>>.
- Tian, Yuchen. (2019). "Master Chinese calligraphy with conditional adversarial networks." Retrieved

from <<https://github.com/kaonashi-tyc/zi2zi>>.

- Wang, Y., Su, Z., Zhang, N., Xing, R., Liu, D., Luan, T. H., & Shen, X. (2022). A survey on metaverse: Fundamentals, security, and privacy. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 25(1), 319-352. <https://doi.org/10.1109/COMST.2022.3202047>
- Wang, Z., Gao, P., Ma, L., & Zhang, W. (2020). Effects of font size, line spacing, and font style on legibility of chinese characters on consumer-based virtual reality displays. In *HCI International 2020–Late Breaking Posters: 22nd International Conference, HCII 2020, Copenhagen, Denmark, July 19–24, 2020, Proceedings, Part I 22* (pp. 468-474). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-60700-5_59
- Wei, C., Yu, D., & Dingler, T. (2020, March). Reading on 3D surfaces in virtual environments. In *2020 IEEE Conference on Virtual Reality and 3D User Interfaces (VR)* (pp. 721-728). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/VR46266.2020.00095>
- Woodward, J., & Ruiz, J. (2023, June). Designing Textual Information in AR Headsets to Aid in Adults' and Children's Task Performance. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual ACM Interaction Design and Children Conference* (pp. 27-39). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3585088.3589373>
- Xie, Y., Chen, X., Sun, L., & Lu, Y. (2021). Dg-font: Deformable generative networks for unsupervised font generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition* (pp. 5130-5140). <https://doi.org/10.1109/cvpr46437.2021.00509>
- Xi, N., Chen, J., Gama, F., Riar, M., & Hamari, J. (2023). The challenges of entering the metaverse: An experiment on the effect of extended reality on workload. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 25(2), 659-680. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-022-10244-x>
- Xu, Z. (2022, April). Design of Visual Packaging Communication in VR System. In *International Conference on Multi-modal Information Analytics* (pp. 365-372). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-05237-8_45
- Yang, B. (2021, April). Innovation and development analysis of visual communication design based on digital media art context. In *2021 International Conference on Computer Technology and Media Convergence Design (CTMCD)* (pp. 192-195). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CTMCD.53128.2021.00047>
- Yu, H., Shokrnezhad, M., Taleb, T., Li, R., & Song, J. (2023). Toward 6g-based metaverse: Supporting highly-dynamic deterministic multi-user extended reality services. *IEEE Network*, 37(4), 30-38. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MNET.004.2300101>
- Zallio, M., & Clarkson, P. J. (2022). Designing the metaverse: A study on inclusion, diversity, equity, accessibility and safety for digital immersive environments. *Telematics and Informatics*, 75, 101909. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2022.101909>

- Zhang, Y., Zhang, Y., & Cai, W. (2018). Separating style and content for generalized style transfer. In Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition (pp. 8447-8455). <https://doi.org/10.1109/cvpr.2018.00881>
- Zhao, Y., Jiang, J., Chen, Y., Liu, R., Yang, Y., Xue, X., & Chen, S. (2022). Metaverse: Perspectives from graphics, interactions and visualization. *Visual Informatics*, 6(1), 56-67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.visinf.2022.03.002>