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ABSTRACT
Spatial recordings allow viewers to move within them and freely choose their viewpoint. However, such recordings make it easy to miss events and difficult to follow moving objects when skipping through the recording. To alleviate these problems we present the Who Put That There system that allows users to navigate through time by directly manipulating objects in the scene. By selecting an object, the user can navigate to moments where the object changed. Users can also view trajectories of objects that changed location and directly manipulate them to navigate. We evaluated the system with a set of sensemaking questions in a think-aloud study. Participants understood the system and found it useful for finding events of interest, while being present and engaged in the recording.

INTRODUCTION
Spatial recordings include virtual reality (VR) captures, volumetric recordings, motion captures, and 3D video game replays. In contrast to traditional video, the viewer is in a spatial recording and can move within it. Currently, more and more spatial recordings are being created. For example, modern 3D video games such as Fortnite come with the ability to record spatial recordings1, which can be shared with others. Media companies have also started experimenting with production of VR movies2 and volumetric captures3. Furthermore, future instrumented rooms [21, 14] and augmented reality (AR) devices will likely increase the amount of spatial recordings.

2Disney’s Cycles, https://doi.org/10.1145/3214745.3214818
3Zero Days VR, https://www.zerodaysvr.com/
Spatial recordings are viewed differently than traditional video. For example, while videos impose a fixed viewpoint, spatial recordings allow viewers to choose their own view and location within them. This gives viewers more control over the experience, but also puts a burden on them to use this freedom effectively. While spatial recordings are consumed differently, the main controls for actively exploring them are the same as for traditional video: a timeline as well as play, stop, fast-forward, and rewind. These controls limit how well viewers can interact with spatial recordings and can cause issues, such as missing of events, motion sickness, or a break of immersion. Further, limiting interaction to the control of time complicates exploration of a recording. Navigating by control of time requires skipping to find the moment when an interesting change occurred in the scene. This is especially burdensome for long recordings where it is easy to miss a relevant moment and where the resolution of the timeline is limited.

We propose to structure navigation through spatial recordings along the changes of objects therein. Viewers can explore and navigate recordings by directly interacting with objects. Instead of scrubbing through time, viewers can preview an object’s changes and go to the moment a change occurred. Continuous changes (e.g., change of location) are previewed in the form of trajectories, while discrete changes (e.g., shape change) are previewed as an animated loop of the change. Figure 1 shows an example of such previews. Navigating by manipulation of objects places control into the scene and ensures that viewers do not miss events of interest. This enables more efficient access to interesting parts of a recording and supports sensemaking by allowing users to infer relations among objects. For example, a viewer of a spatially recorded basketball game can inspect the ball’s trajectory to see if a player touched it before it went out of bounds. In a spatial recording of a game the viewer might wonder why, when and how a house was built. By stepping through house’s changes the viewer can see or infer the answers.

We exemplify the concept via the Who Put That There temporal navigation system for spatial VR recordings. The system contains a set of direct manipulation techniques which allow users to step through objects’ changes and navigate by objects’ trajectories. The system also allows scrubbing through time by using a timeline, as well as rewind, fast-forward, play and pause of the recording by using conventional media controls. We evaluated the system in a think-aloud study using a spatial recording of a virtual kitchen and a set of sensemaking questions. The results confirmed the usefulness of the system and provided insights for designing future object-based temporal navigation systems.

RELATED WORK
Earlier work on spatial recordings focused on ways of capturing them [8, 23, 21, 14] and less so on systems and techniques that improve the viewing experience. In the next subsections we first present conventional ways to temporally navigate recordings and their application to spatial recordings. Then we present the related work on direct manipulation techniques for temporal navigation of recordings.

Conventional Temporal Navigation
Conventional temporal navigation systems typically consist of a timeline as well as play, stop, fast-forward, and rewind controls. These help users find events of interest or get a quick overview of what happened in the video. Such tools can be complimented with automatically generated video summaries (e.g., a teaser) and video abstractions (e.g., a storyboard). Borgo et al. referred to these techniques as video visualization and provided a good overview of them in his recent report [2]. It is unclear how the techniques and research findings related to viewing of conventional videos apply to spatial recordings. For example, a study of fast-forward speeds for conventional videos showed that a speed of 1:64 works well for the viewers to still comprehend changes in the scene [32]. However, using such fast-forward speed in spatial recording might make the viewers nauseous or make them miss important events in their periphery. Similarly, conventional techniques for automatic video abstraction are not easily transferable to spatial recordings.

Conventional Temporal Navigation for Spatial Recordings
Current user interfaces for temporal navigation of spatial recording typically use the same controls as the conventional video user interfaces (e.g., [19, 18, 29]). Using conventional tools to navigate spatial recordings can cause issues such as missing of events, motion sickness and breaking of immersion. To combat the motion sickness caused by speeding through the recording, Nguyen et al. proposed a technique which shrinks users’ field of view (FOV) dynamically, depending on the motion in a recording [19]. While this technique does mitigate the motion sickness, it might break the immersion or make it more likely to miss events of interest. To avoid missing of events Liu et al. introduced view-dependent video textures [15] which loop a part of the scene until the viewer turns to a right direction to notice an important event. This technique is more suitable for passive viewing than active exploration of spatial recordings. Furthermore, it requires that the producer marks the important events in advance. To avoid braking of the immersion (e.g., while scrubbing the timeline) researchers have investigated more natural ways to interact with recordings. One way to accomplish this is by using gestures for temporal navigation [25, 24, 11, 16]. However, these gestures are often detached from the scene and mostly act as a substitute for play, pause, and rewind buttons.

Temporal Navigation by Direct Manipulation
In 1999, Satou and colleagues introduced the idea of using direct manipulation to temporally navigate videos [26]. They placed polygonal lines over a video to trace objects’ trajectories. These lines could then be used as spatio-temporal sliders. For example, by clicking on tennis ball trajectory, the video frame changed to the time when the tennis ball was at the clicked location. The idea to couple the temporal control to video’s spatial information gained traction a few years later when researchers investigated how to automate the technique [5, 7, 9, 10, 20]. They developed methods for extracting objects’ trajectories, dragging of objects in the video, and ways of dealing with a moving background and change of camera’s perspective.
Many of these challenges are specific to using objects’ trajectories in a traditional video. Since a conventional video recording is a 2D representation of 3D information, the spatial information is skewed. For example, the distance of an object can only be gauged by its size. Furthermore, the enforced static viewpoint limits the possible interactions as the users cannot move to, for example, look behind an occluder or to follow an object’s trajectory out of the current view.

There have been few explorations of direct manipulation techniques in spatial recordings. We are only aware of work by Kuhlen and colleagues, exploring navigation of scientific visualization [33, 35, 12]. Those systems were designed to navigate blood cell simulations, the workings of an impeller and similar. Therefore the interface was designed to assist detailed observation by controlling animation speed, zooming into sub-spaces and marking the spatio-temporal areas of interest. While such techniques incorporate aspects of object-based navigation, there were designed for a specialized use case. Furthermore, the techniques focused only on movement based changes (i.e., trajectories) without considering changes of appearance, configuration, topology and interactions between objects. We believe that temporal navigation by a variety of objects’ changes is beneficial for a multitude of spatial recordings, not only for scientific visualizations. Next, we present our interaction concept and a system that exemplifies it.

DIRECT MANIPULATION FOR SPATIAL RECORDINGS

Consider a spatial recording of a capture the flag match. A common way to watch it is to follow a player from the beginning of the recording to the end. However, not all of the recording is equally interesting. Rather, there are pivotal moments in a match, such as when a flag is stolen or a player enters the enemy compound. We posit that structuring and navigating recording by changes is especially useful for spatial recordings. Viewers are able to explore and navigate through a recording by directly interacting with changing objects, instead of having to use a timeline.

Concept

Figure 2 illustrates the concept. The fundamental idea is that viewers of spatial recordings are interested in finding moments of change. Instead of focusing on manipulation of time, we make changing objects and their direct manipulation central to viewing and navigation.

Change concerns the properties of objects or people (we use the former as a placeholder for both). For example, objects can move, change size or color, split, disappear, change internally or change relation to another object. Depending on the specific form of spatial recording and the nature of the scene, different properties are relevant for the viewer. For example, in a football match, the players’ movement, passes, strikes, and penalties can be crucial. While in a poker game the change of emotion or relation between two gazes could interest the viewer. Moreover, changes can be brief, constituting an event, such as a goal being scored, or they can happen over a longer duration of time (e.g., a player dribbling a ball from one side of the field to the other). For spatial recordings, such changes may be given as part of the recording (e.g., objects’ events in a VR application). They may also be derived from the recording, for instance by activity-recognition algorithms [13, 27, 28], or through techniques for finding moments of interest (i.e., keyframes) in a recording [30]. Changes structure spatial recordings into meaningful sequences and moments. In comparison to timeline navigation, the focus on changes in many situations aligns better to viewers’ questions and interests. With timeline controls, changes are secondary to the movement through time; users need to scrub the timeline while looking around the scene to see the changes occurring.

The second key idea is that a viewer can directly manipulate the objects of change to view the spatial recording. For instance, a user might select an object to inspect how it changed over time. Figure 2 shows a user selecting a cube to preview its changes; the trace of the cube’s movement and the moment it split in half. The previewed changes are shown directly in the scene, keeping the context of the spatial recording. How such changes are shown depends on their nature. If an object moved, this can be visualized as a trajectory (as in [5]). If an object changed shape, the changed object can be shown at the location of the change. With navigation, users can directly manipulate objects to move between episodes of change by acting upon a preview and being transported to that moment in the spatial recording. When changes are gradual (e.g., movement, scaling, color change) users can navigate via small units of change. For example, an object’s trajectory can act as a non-linear time slider on which users can scrub. If the change is momentary (e.g., object being cut in half), then users are transported to the beginning or end of the change. The change-to-time mapping hence can be discrete or continuous, depending on the nature of the change itself.

In comparison to timeline navigation, direct manipulation of objects places the navigation directly in the spatial recording. For example, viewers can select an object and jump to the moment in time it was last moved. Instead of manipulating time, viewers manipulate objects for the same effect.

Benefits

Navigating spatial recordings by direct manipulation of objects within the scene has a number of benefits.
Easy Mapping of Intentions to Actions
Embedding navigation actions in a scene makes it easier to find out how to navigate by making the actions visible and concrete. When navigating, users are interested in changes within a scene. To navigate they manipulate the scene. This means that the input and output vocabularies are similar which allows users to easily transfer their intentions into actions. For example, if a user is interested in putting that over there then pointing to that and then there is an easily discoverable and executable action [1]. Similarly, when viewers are interested in who put that there they can point to it and find out.

Changes are Visible In-Scene
Previewing changes in the scene guides the users’ view during navigation. For example, a viewer watching a spatial recording of a theater performance might wonder how a prop entered the stage. Instead of scrubbing through the timeline, the viewer can directly query the object. Once the trace of the object is revealed, the viewers can use it to temporally navigate by manipulating the prop’s position, knowing in advance where to focus their gaze. This helps users avoid missing events of interest (e.g., where the prop came from) and being overwhelmed by irrelevant changes when scrubbing the timeline.

Integrated Coarse and Fine-Grained Navigation
Our concept integrates coarse and fine-grained navigation. The temporal resolution of a timeline control is constant and limited by its width. This limitation does not apply to navigation via objects’ changes. For example, consider a viewer who is interested in the movement of a tiger in a ten-hour spatial recording. The tiger might be asleep for the first five hours, then wake up and walk around slowly for a bit, sprint to the boundary of the enclosure, and then go back to sleep for another four hours. Viewers scrubbing through such a recording could easily miss the sprinting tiger. Yet, when navigating by changes of the tiger’s state, this is easily found. At the same time, fine-grained navigation is supported. With our concept, the tiger’s movement trace could be shown as preview and allow users to scrub along the trace. Hence, temporal scrubbing is replaced by spatial scrubbing (with each position linked to a point in time). While timelines are limited in space, such trajectories can be much longer. They naturally have higher resolution when more change is happening (e.g., movement).

Sensemaking
Our concept supports sensemaking by allowing key questions (e.g., who, what, when) to be answered in ways timelines cannot support. Users can inspect the subjects in question and receive quick answers (e.g., “who left the burger on the table?”). Changes happening to objects are more likely to relate to viewers’ questions and interests. With a timeline, questions are secondary to control of time. Users need to look around the scene while scrubbing through time to find the moment or absence of change.

Navigating a recording by using objects’ changes also allows for easy discovery of causal sequences. For example, consider a recording where you see a broken coffee mug (as in Figure 1). With direct manipulation, the viewer can navigate to the moments the mug was used (i.e., touched, moved, filled or broken). At that point, the viewer might notice other things in the recording, such as a person interacting with the coffee drinker. The viewer could then follow that person to go back in time to when they entered the room, uncovering what they came in for (and why they disturbed the coffee drinker).

THE WHO PUT THAT THERE SYSTEM
We designed a system that enables users to temporally navigate spatial VR recordings by direct manipulation of objects within the scene. The Who Put That There system tracks changes of location, size, appearance (e.g., a pot getting dirty), configuration (e.g., a stove being turned on), and change of shape or topology (e.g., an object breaking), as well as interactions with an avatar (i.e., object being thrown). Users can select an object and preview its changes in two ways: (1) by stepping through notable changes, or (2) by showing the object’s trajectory, indicating the change in location. Users can then navigate via the previewed changes by either selecting one of them, or by scrubbing the object’s trajectory. The system also includes a timeline and conventional media controls to play, pause, fast-forward, and rewind the spatial recording.

Apparatus
We implemented the Who Put That There system using Unity3D. We used a HTC Vive Pro with Valve Index Controllers for all testing and evaluation of the system. These controllers allowed us to implement direct grasping interactions with objects. They also contain triggers and a thumbstick, which we mapped system commands to.

Stepping Through Objects’ Changes
To access the moments where an object changed, the users can select objects within the scene and step through their notable changes (see Figure 3). The changes we define as notable are: object going from static to moving or the other way around, object being grasped or released, change of configuration (e.g., microwave being opened or closed), appearance (e.g., a plate getting dirty), and shape or topology (e.g., burger being bitten in). Users can select an object by hovering the controller over it and then use the thumbstick to preview what happened to the object before or after their current time in the spatial recording. For example, Figure 3 shows what happened to the burger before and after being put on the kitchen counter. Once the preview is active the user can continue stepping through all the changes by using the thumbstick.

The preview is rendered in transparent sphere to separate it from the rest of the scene. It shows the selected moment of change as a looped animation. The objects outside the preview sphere stay static at the current time in the recording. To further distinguish the previewed objects, we render a gray outline around the previewed ones. Scale and position are retained and viewers can move to observe the preview from different angles. This preserves the context and supports viewers’ sensemaking activities.

Some objects stay static throughout the whole recording. To identify those that did change we included a reveal objects functionality which flashes the objects within the scene that changed at any point throughout the recording. Further, when
stepping through an object’s changes we show a contextual indicator (similar to [4]) which directs the user to the previewed change and indicates the relative time to it.

Skipping through previews allows viewers to quickly skim through all of an object’s changes without changing the whole scene around them. Essentially, viewers can peek into the past or future while staying grounded at their current position in the recording. However, we also allow viewers to fully transition to a previewed moment by selecting it. The spatial recording then skips to that moment in time and hence updates the rest of the scene. Where previewing allows viewers to select interesting moments, transitioning to these moments enables a broader set of activities. For example, in a spatial recording of a kitchen a viewer might find the moment the knife was last used. To see exactly how it was used and what else was happening in the other parts of the kitchen they can navigate to that moment and inspect the rest of the scene. For example, they might discover that other people were in the kitchen as well, or that the pan was already on the stove when the vegetables were still being cut.

**Scrubbing Objects’ Trajectory**

While stepping through changes works well for events, it is limiting when change occurs over longer duration. For example, when an object is carried around, this results in many location changes. For this case, we developed a trajectory-based navigation technique. To toggle an object’s trajectory, viewers select the object and, as shown in Figure 4, add the trajectory to the current scene. Viewers can enable multiple objects’ trajectories at the same time. Trajectories are color-coded per object to help distinguish them and to identify the object they belong to.

Trajectories enable a time-agnostic view of an object’s history. Hence, they allow viewers to answer a variety of questions about an object, such as: (1) where it came from, (2) whether it was used at a specific location, or (3) whether it covered an area with its movement. For example, users could be wondering where the pot was taken from or if the whole floor was mopped.

To navigate the spatial recording by using a trajectory the viewers are able to scrub along it or jump to any points on the trajectory (see Figure 4). By doing this the user moves to the time in the spatial recording when the object was at the selected position. The trajectory here acts as a form of timeline, yet differs from conventional timeline in many ways: (1) it is anchored in the world instead of being an overlay, (2) constant movement along a trajectory generally results in non-linear movement through time, instead of a fixed time-step, (3) their resolution is dependent on the movement speed of the object instead of the total duration of the recording, and (4) they are specific to one object instead of the whole recording. Trajectories hence take up little space when an object was static, yet allow for fine-grained navigation when objects were moving around a lot or at high speed.

Navigating by scrubbing an object’s trajectory concurrently updates the whole spatial recording. In other words, viewers always see a consistent world, in contrast to previewing discrete changes by stepping through an object’s changes. Further, trajectories give a snapshot of objects’ whole story and help viewers notice events they would not with a more limited preview, or when skipping through the recording. This is valuable for sensemaking as it allows viewers to discover what happened alongside the selected object’s changes. For example, as shown in Figure 4, they may discover that the canned beans were put in the pot but not the tomato.
The techniques we discussed so far only work on visible objects. To show trajectories of absent objects we implemented a trajectory search technique which allows users to find trajectories that passed through a region of space at any point in the recording. The users can enable a trajectory sphere which is anchored to one of their controllers. The sphere then acts as a magic lens revealing all the objects’ trajectories that passed through it. Users can move around with the sphere to scan the environment and uncover trajectories of interest. When the user disables the sphere the revealed trajectories disappear. To keep a revealed trajectory, the user needs to enable it while the trajectory sphere is active. Once the trajectory is enabled they can use it for scrubbing or jumping to any point on it. In addition to facilitating exploration the trajectory sphere allows users to inspect and enable objects’ trajectories from a distance.

Timeline Scrubbing
In addition to our direct manipulation techniques, we implemented a conventional timeline control (shown in Figure 5). When activated the timeline appeared at the bottom of the user’s view and was view-stabilized. Users can scrub the timeline via a raycasting pointer. While our direct interaction techniques allow users to quickly jump to and explore moments of change, conventional timeline controls are still useful. For example, when the user wants to jump to a specific point in time or to the end or beginning of a spatial recording.

Media Controls
To give users the basic control over the spatial recording we included the conventional media controls. The user can rewind, fast-forward, play and pause the recording. These controls enable users to fine-tune the playback while finding or viewing the moment of interest.

EVALUATION
To learn how users experience object-based navigation, we evaluated the Who Put That There system in a think-aloud study. In particular, we were interested in whether the system was easy to use, understandable, and useful. Participants were given a spatial recording and a set of sensemaking tasks. To complete the tasks, participants had to view the relevant parts of the recording. We encouraged them to verbalize their thoughts while they carried out the tasks. After they completed the tasks, we conducted an open-ended interview.
We split the think-aloud study into three blocks, each of them
produced a 22-minute spatial VR recording of a kitchen
"Why"
the first block, the participants navigated temporally only by
The experimenter took notes of participants’ interactions and
In the second block the participants used only \textit{media controls}
"What"
the participants used only \textit{media controls} and \textit{timeline}. We split the function-
limitations of the system into three blocks to ensure that participants
randomly assigned the questions to the blocks per participant.
Protocol
We recruited 11 participants (4 male, age 23–48, M = 31.9,
SD = 6.7) with limited VR experience. We first introduced
the two avatars arranged kitchen items, cooked, ate, cleaned,
and coded them with shorthands, focusing on participants lan-
We evaluated the “Who Put That There” system in a 22-minute
spatial recording of a kitchen. The blue trajectories show all the ob-
jects’ movement through the recording and the red trajectories the two avatars’ movement.

Figure 6. We evaluated the “Who Put That There” system in a 22-minute
spatial recording of a kitchen. The blue trajectories show all the ob-
jects’ movement through the recording and the red trajectories the two avatars’ movement.

Spatial Recording
We produced a 22-minute spatial VR recording of a kitchen
containing two avatars. The virtual kitchen was 6x4 meters in
size and contained two kitchen counters, two shelves, a fridge,
microwave, sink, stove, as well as an assortment of kitchen
and food items (plates, cups, boxes, cans, vegetables, drinks, etc.).

Sensemaking Task
To motivate a concrete use of our system, we asked participants
to answer a set of sensemaking questions while viewing the
spatial recording. We had two types of questions varying in
complexity. One type started with a “\textit{What}” referring to an
object (e.g., “\textit{What happened to the beer can?”}). Participants
could answer these by observing the object in question while
viewing the recording (e.g., the beer was taken off the shelf
and put on the counter by one of the avatars, then poured in a
glass by another avatar). The “\textit{What}” questions were 1) \textit{what
happened with the blue beer can}, 2) \textit{what happened with the
orange pot} and 3) \textit{what happened with the red mug}. Questions
of the second type started with “\textit{Why}” and were asking for
a reason an event had happened (e.g., “\textit{Why was the sliding
door left open?”}). The participants could not answer these
questions by solely focusing on the question’s subject (i.e.,
sliding door), but had to understand the context around an
event (e.g., one of the avatars broke a plate while preparing a
meal, she then hid the broken pieces in the closet leaving the
sliding door slightly open before rushing out of the kitchen).
The “\textit{Why}” questions were 4) \textit{why was the burger thrown out
of the window} 5) \textit{why was the trash bin kicked over} and 6) \textit{why
was the sliding door left open}.

Study Design
We split the think-aloud study into three blocks, each of them
containing one “\textit{What}” question and one “\textit{Why}” question. In
the first block, the participants navigated temporally only by
using \textit{media controls} and by stepping through objects’ changes.

In the third block the participants

Protocol
We recruited 11 participants (4 male, age 23–48, M = 31.9,
SD = 6.7) with limited VR experience. We first introduced
the participants to the VR setup and the concept of spatial
recordings. After, we gave them an overview of the study
and introduced them to the think-aloud protocol. To help
them familiarize themselves with the protocol we engaged
the participants in a simple think-aloud math task. Once the
general introduction was over, the participants went through a
training phase for the first block, where they were shown how
to use the \textit{media controls} and the \textit{stepping through objects’
changes} to navigate a spatial recording. For this we used a
training recording and in-application controller hints to guide
the participants to the right controller inputs.

Once the participants understood the techniques and were
comfortable with using them, they were put in the main spatial
recording and started with the first “\textit{What}” question. During
the task we encouraged participants to keep talking with verbal
prompts as well as a large “Keep talking” sign on one of the
walls in the virtual kitchen. After they answered the first
question they moved on to the “\textit{Why}” question. When they
finished with both of the questions they were offered to take
a break or to continue with the next block. The procedure
for the second and third block was similar except for the
techniques being used (i.e., in the second block they used
\textit{media controls} and \textit{objects’ trajectories}). At the end of the
study we conducted an open ended interview to gain additional
insight into their comments and the perceived advantages and
disadvantages of the individual techniques. On average, the
study took 60 minutes to complete.

Data Collection and Analysis
The experimenter took notes of participants’ interactions and
comments during the think-aloud study. Furthermore, we
recorded the participants’ comments by using the microphone
of the headset and screen captured the participants’ view while
they were interacting with the spatial recording. We analyzed
the collected data by following the approach of Braun and
Clarke [3]. We first identified meaningful bits in the data
and coded them with shorthands, focusing on participants lan-
guage, as well as the temporal navigation concepts described
in the previous sections. From the codes we identified broad
topics and reviewed them, omitting the ones irrelevant to our
research focus and merging the related ones into larger themes.
RESULTS
Three topics emerged from the thematic analysis of the think-aloud study and the end-interviews: being there, making sense, and having fun. All participants were able to understand and use all the functionality of the system to answer the questions. We note the observations directly related to usability in the usability subsection and discuss the improvements to the system in the discussion section.

Being There
Depending on the used technique, the participants expressed different level of involvement with the spatial recording. P1 stated that when stepping through objects’ changes and dragging on objects’ trajectories he felt more “like being there”. Similarly, P6 compared scrubbing the global timeline to using the objects’ trajectories, and said that the first one is “more like watching a movie” while the second one is “more like playing a game”. The physicality of walking and manipulating objects gave the impression of being in an interactive world even when the possible manipulations were constrained to the recorded ones. However, this physicality also disturbed some participants as they would rather interact with objects at a distance and with less effort.

The Timeline was experienced as less interactive. Most often, the participants keep the view “pretty steady when using” the timeline (P1). A common pattern was to lock their view on the region of interest, start scrubbing from the beginning of the timeline, overshoot, and then correct to close in on the event of interest (e.g., a beer can being picked up). P4 mentioned that such scrubbing felt like waiting.

Making Sense
When using objects’ trajectories to complete the sensemaking tasks participants mentioned greater understanding of what had happened and the context around it. P5 compared using the timeline to reading the ending of a book to find out what happened, and using the objects’ trajectories to reading the full book and seeing how it happened. P11 experienced the timeline as efficient, however, it gave her the feeling of “not seeing the whole story” and “missing of events” even when she was sure she missed none. Similarly, P6 experienced trajectories as giving her more knowledge and allow for better reasoning when trying to interpret them.

The additional knowledge encoded in the trajectories could also confuse participants, especially when the trajectories were entangled or were of similar color (P10). On the other hand, many participants were quick to understand the associations between objects and trajectories. P8 mentioned it was easy to notice when an object broke or to which object the trajectory belongs just by the color. Stepping through objects’ changes also facilitated active exploration. Participants were quick to inspect changes of objects in question as well as the ones that might be related. For example, when asked to find out “Why the burger was thrown out of the window?” they inspected the fridge and the tomato, to see if those two objects played a role in it.

Having Fun
Most participants mentioned that using the object-based navigation was fun, interesting and “cool”. Part of this is the novelty effect which the timeline lacks. P9 mentioned that while the timeline was “definitely the simplest” it was also “the most primitive and not as much fun”. However, participants mentioned more than just novelty when interacting with objects’ trajectories. P2 especially liked the trajectory sphere and felt like it gave her “some kind of superpower”. P5 drew parallels to “seeing the code behind the matrix” and “realizing the canvas” on which the interactions happen.

Usability
Participants were quick to learn and use the full functionality of the system, despite most of them having little or no prior VR experience. Object-based techniques required more explanation than timeline and media controls, as participants were familiar with the latter two from traditional video recordings. Except for minor issues, such as miss-clicks because of difficulty using the thumbstick, the participants did not experience any major usability problems when using object-based techniques. Similarly, participants had no troubles when using the media controls, while a few experienced problems with precision when using the timeline. However, in general all participant were able to use all of the systems functionality to navigate the recordings and answer the sensemaking question.

DISCUSSION
We have presented a concept for interaction which helps users navigate spatial recordings, such as recordings of VR experiences, volumetric captures, motion captures, and 3D video games. The concept departs from the idea that viewers of spatial recordings are interested in finding moments of change. Therefore we structure the navigation of spatial recordings by objects’ changes. Viewers are able to directly manipulate the objects to preview changes and navigate through time. We illustrated the concept with the Who Put That There system, which enables such navigation for spatial VR recordings. We have argued that this way of interacting with spatial recordings helps users navigate in a meaningful manner while being closely integrated with the content of the recording. Next, we discuss the limitations, advance over previous work, potential extensions and future application scenarios.

Limitations
There are limitations to the presented concept, the Who Put That There system that exemplifies it, and the evaluation of the system. First, direct manipulation techniques might not be suitable for all scenarios. Our concept requires active engagement with the scene which can become exhausting or cumbersome in case of complex queries. Second, the Who Put That There system is only one instance of the presented concept. It does not track, preview and allow navigation by all possible changes that could happen to objects and avatars. Furthermore, the system does not support filtering of the tracked changes or compound operators for multiple objects. Third, the evaluation has limited generalizability as we only tested one scenario and recording duration. For a more comprehensive evaluation of the usability of the specific techniques, a comparison of them in different scenarios would be needed.
Advances over Previous Work

Current interfaces for navigating spatial recordings mainly use timelines, both in commercial interfaces (e.g., the Fortnite Replay System\(^4\), or VR Player\(^5\)) and in research (e.g., Vremiere [19], or [25]). As argued, timeline scrubbing has drawbacks when used for spatial recordings. For example, it makes it easy to miss events and difficult to follow moving objects, it can cause nausea, and can lower immersion. Timelines are excellent for questions about time, but less useful for making sense of spatial recordings when users ask questions about patterns (where is this object usually), causality (why is this here), and agency (who put this here).

We draw inspiration from previous work on direct manipulation of video content [5, 26, 9, 7, 20] and expanded on their concepts. Systems like the one by Dragicevic [5] and Wolter [33] focused on changes in the form of movement. We allow for any type of change and exemplify the concept in a Who Put That There system, allowing navigation by change of appearance, configuration, and shape, among others. Furthermore, we include previewing and navigating by discrete as well as continuous changes.

We believe that our focus on sensemaking is unique. Earlier work has outlined how people relate to past in real [31] and virtual worlds [17]. It appears that relations to past are rarely solely about time, and are often focused around objects, activities and events. We choose change as the unit that connects them; partly because it is easy to integrate it and operate with it in a temporal navigation system. Furthermore, we demonstrate the usefulness of the our system for sensemaking with a qualitative study identifying additional qualities of interaction such as increased sense of presence.

Potential Extensions

The Who Put That There system could be extended in several ways. First, support for additional kinds of changes in spatial recordings could be added. For instance, objects might change their proximity to a specific area (e.g., knife leaving the kitchen area), or relative location to another object or an avatar (e.g., a cap being worn backwards instead of forwards). The system could also support person related changes such as change of emotion and other internal states.

Second, objects’ changes could be previewed and controlled in several additional ways. For example, changes could be visualized as multicolored sculptures (e.g., similar as in [34]) to be able to preview continuous changes of appearance, shape and size. Another improvement would be to encode more information in trajectories to show their direction, time differences between its points, or interactions between multiple trajectories. They could also visually highlight notable changes such as change of configuration. The previews could also be controlled in more ways. For example, the user could scale the object by pulling it apart and navigate by change of size (e.g., of a plant growing).

Third, many spatial recordings contain a notion of viewpoint or viewpoints; this is the case for VR, AR, and many game recordings. The Who Put That There system currently does not handle switching between viewpoints and viewers need to move to a new location on their own. Future systems could enable changing of viewpoints as well as stepping into viewpoints of an avatar. The latter would require ways to mitigating motion sickness, however, if possible this could further increase the sense of “being there”.

Fourth, in some cases changes in objects occur over large scales or far away from the viewers location. For example, consider a spatial recording that spans multiple rooms or buildings. To preview changes within such large space, the system could include a mini-map with abstracted preview and teleport transitions to navigate to them.

Further Application Scenarios

Using direct manipulation within spatial recordings to control time is a concept applicable to various settings. However, in our study we have focused on a daily life scenario demonstrated in VR. We envision similar interactions to be possible in AR in the near future. Apart from daily life, there are several other scenarios where the concept could be useful. Game replay systems could be complimented with navigating by changing objects. For example, in a capture the flag game the player could use a trajectory sphere to reveal the flag. Spatial sports recordings such as basketball games could benefit by keeping the viewer immersed while navigating through the highlights. Training material for tasks (e.g., engine assembly) that come in the form of spatial recordings (e.g., AR instructions [22], VR simulations [6], or educational application\(^6\)) could be enhanced to allow trainees to navigate through instructions step by step, and to allow the instructors to quickly review their performance.

CONCLUSION

We proposed structuring the navigation through spatial recordings by objects’ changes. The changing objects can be directly manipulated to preview and navigate to moments of interest. We exemplify the concept with the Who Put That There system, which among other, allows stepping through an object’s changes (e.g. change of appearance, configuration, grasp, size), and scrubbing on objects’ trajectories. We evaluated the system with a sensemaking task and demonstrated its usefulness. Furthermore we identified qualities such as increased sense of presence, engagement and understanding of activity in the recording.
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