# Responses to proposal Feedback

## Section 1 Introduction:

* Defined objective and subjective evaluation when terms are introduced

## Section 2 Background:

2.1:

* Improved caption of image

2.2.1:

* Added much more detail on travel techniques

2.2.2:

* Explained the advantages of THI in more detail
* Explained the problems with stereoscopic depth and 2D interface elements in VEs more clearly

2.2.3:

* Explained more precisely how object manipulation in VEs differs from that in Desktop applications

2.3:

* Did not do comparison using table as VE systems and results are too few and varied, table would be very sparse and not easily readable.
* Mentioned that HMD cables getting twisted around user is a reason that HMD systems are bad for indoor navigation
* Described haptic feedback and swapping tools

2.4:

* Reworded first paragraph to be more objective

3.1:

* Defined the research question on modelling speed to be more definite and measurable

4.1.2:

* Added detail to iterative user-based design plan. Talked about using expert users together with a heuristic evaluation of the interface

4.2:

* Changed design to within-groups
* Specified that test subjects will be required to have university level experience with 3D modelling
* Explained why not using expert test subjects and why this is not a significant problem
* Incorporated the use of concept art into the experimental design

4.3:

* Not using video recording as analysis would be too complex, out of scope, additionally controls are motion tracked which allows for precise records of input to be kept.
* Not using interviews as we believe our data collection methods are sufficient and would prefer to keep participant time required to a minimum.

4.3 & 4.4:

* Referred to the ITC sense of presence survey as a tool for measuring certain VE related issues