Examining the latest resurgence of interest of Virtual Reality

Dr. Andrew Ray – Radford University

Outline

•History

•Current trends

•What hasn't changed

•What it means for researchers and end users

•Long history dating back to the 60s (Sword of Damocles)

•Commercial ventures starting the in the late 80s / early 90s

• CAVE in 1992

•Generally high cost / low quality (compared to today)

Heavy interest

- ABC evening news segment in 1991 (quoting 50-200k price tag) -> 90k to 359k
 - Updating kitchen layout, Medical uses, Games, Military
 - Clearly stated limitations
- Arcade experiences
- •Never took off at the consumer level
 - Virtual boy



•Hype

• Publications, books, advertisement, TV spots, even a major movie

- •No "killer app" found
 - PCs had Spreadsheets
 - "It was remarkably crude, but the promise was pretty amazing" Ben Delaney
- •Reality
 - Too limited
 - Too expensive (consumer grade was \$1800 just for the hardware. Computer + Software...)
 - Too uncomfortable (heavy / not ergonomically designed)

•Mid 90s to 2012 was a lull in terms of consumer products

- Small community but kept the seeds of VR alive
- •Lower profile but consistent usage amongst different industries
 - Benefits of immersion needed to be validated
 - Military (Training)
 - Academia (Interaction, graphics, haptics, many more)
 - Industry (Oil exploration, flight simulators)
- •Required non-trivial but not outlandish investment for a system
 - 100,000 to a million
- •Has had niche success in research / industry
 - Visbox
 - Mechdyne

- •Technology kept improving in the 2000s
 - Graphics capabilities (games)
 - Sensors (phones)
 - Screens (phones)
- Cost to produce hardware was gradually decreasing
 - Still outside of consumer reach
- Research kept improving
 - Groundwork for successful hardware, software improvements
 - UI lessons
 - Researching VRs effectiveness in different areas (Mining engineering, Construction, Health Care, etc...)
 - Justification / analysis of benefit of immersion

Current Trends

• Resurgence centered around head mounted displays

- Kickstarter in 2012
 - 2.4 million dollars to bring the Oculus rift to life
 - 2 billion dollar buyout from Facebook (Hype or reality?)
- Oculus Rift, Sony VR, HTC Vive available in 2016
- Smaller manufacturers as well
- Focus is on entertainment (games)
 - Estimated 1.7 million sales amongst top 3 in 2016, 2.5-3 estimated in 2017 (compared to 53 million PS4s sold)
 - Since 2015 less than 20 games have a million+ sales (steam)
 - Median time spent in game is 2.3 hours (2 exceptions with > 10 hours median usage)
 - Popular non-VR games range in 4-80 hour median time played
 - Price (during a sale \$51 to free) vs (\$143 to free non-VR)
- Content available
 - 750 on SteamVR, 750+ on Rift store

• Founder of Oculus believes it will be 5-10 years before VR meets expectations...

Current Trends

•Has a measurable impact on VR Research

- IEEE VR 2017 paper analysis (6 CAVE, 32 HMD; 23 non display papers)
- Wide range of topics
 - Usage (Ethical use on children, cinematic experience)
 - Navigation / Interaction
 - Stereo / tracking
- •Requirements to do VR research / development today
 - \$350 Oculus Rift (Display, tracking, and interaction)
 - \$680 PC
 - Roughly \$1100
 - An idea and time to work on it

Factors in success

Fidelity

- What can be reliably done at 263x230 resolution (1995) [Original Eye-Phone] ?
- Current HMDs are 2160x1200 (90 hz refresh rate)

Interactivity

- Rotational and 3 buttons in 1995
- Rotational, positional and 5 buttons per hand 2017

•Cost

- Consumer level HMD equivalent to \$1800
- Started at \$800, down to \$350 in 2017
- •Content and creation
 - 1500+ games / experiences
 - 2 major game engines with HMD / CAVE support

Current direction

•Virtual Desktop Interfaces

• Basic interface borrowed from academic publications





Software development

•C++ support

• Windows only

•Guidelines on how to integrate with existing projects

- •Guide on how to best create VEs (lessons learned from academia)
- •Web options
 - ReactVR
 - Virtual reality and javascript (three.js)
 - A-Frame
 - X3D
 - WebAssembly

What hasn't changed

•HMDs are just a display

- Simple to code for and display in multiple operating systems
- Tracking software capability
 - Essentially Windows only development platform for official support
 - Linux is being slowly embraced by Vive
 - Oculus not providing official support
 - OpenHMD and SteamVR providing
- Software tools available for creation
 - Sample programs do not use VR Toolkits, they are all in one applications
 - Support for drivers in a non-Windows environment is problematic
 - Only 62 Linux VR games available vs 600+ on Windows

What hasn't changed

•Needs of researchers still not addressed

- Application Creation for an Immersive Virtual Measurement and Analysis Laboratory in 2016
- Everyone creates their own tools (part of dissertation work in 2008)
- •Existing VR software projects stagnated
 - VR Juggler, DIVERSE, VRUI, etc...
 - Some success at spreading beyond original creators
 - Long term questionable
 - Next generation never went beyond creators / research stage
 - 3DUI Tools (Viargo, Chasm, InTml, IFFI)

What it means for you

•Hardware is better than ever

- HMDs are cheaper than ever before
- Larger than HMD displays roughly unchanged

•Hardware driver support

- Not as robust as desired
- Generally windows based, some hope of 1st party Linux support

Software support

- Sample applications are pre-VR Toolkit level applications
- Prepare to build everything from the ground up
- Lock-in is an issue (Oculus rift)

Future

•Industry is building great hardware, making attempts at software

- Focus is on consumer usage
- Developers essentially given a game engine
- Web is the focus for hobbyist development
- •Performance benchmarking needed between traditional VR / Web based VR
 - Web assembly may be a game changer
- •Survey of VR researchers / users into their development requirements
- Standardized toolkit supported by industry
- •Standardized interaction library supported by industry