

Digital twin in virtual reality for human-vehicle interactions in the context of autonomous driving

S. Martín Serrano¹, R. Izquierdo¹, I. García Daza¹, M. A. Sotelo¹, D. Fernández-Llorca^{1,2}

Abstract—The traditional simulation methods present some limitations, such as the *reality gap* between simulated experiences and real-world performance. In the field of autonomous driving research, we propose the handling of an immersive virtual reality system for pedestrians to include in simulations real behaviors of agents that interact with the simulated environment in real time, to improve the quality of the virtual-world data and reduce the gap.

In this paper we employ a digital twin to replicate a study on communication interfaces between autonomous vehicles and pedestrians, generating an equivalent virtual scenario to compare the results and establish qualitative and quantitative measurements of the discrepancy. The goal is to evaluate the effectiveness and acceptability of implicit and explicit forms of communication in both scenarios and to verify that the behavior carried out by the pedestrian inside the simulator through a virtual reality interface is directly comparable with their role performed in a real traffic situation.

I. INTRODUCTION

As autonomous vehicle technology advances, the need for rapid prototyping and extensive testing is becoming increasingly important, as real driving tests alone are not sufficient to demonstrate safety [1]. The use of physics-based simulations allows the study of various scenarios and conditions at a fraction of the cost and risk of physical prototype testing, providing valuable insights into the behaviour and performance of autonomous vehicles in a controlled environment [2].

However, one of the main challenges in the development of autonomous driving digital twins is the lack of realism of simulated sensor data and physical models. The so-called *reality gap* can lead to inaccuracies because the virtual world does not adequately generalise all the variations and complexities of the real world [3], [4]. Furthermore, despite attempts to generate realistic synthetic behaviours of other road agents (e.g., vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists), simulation lacks empirical knowledge about their behaviour, which negatively affects the gap in behaviour and motion prediction, communication, and human-vehicle interaction [5].

Including behaviours and interactions from real agents in simulators is one way to reduce the *reality gap* of autonomous driving digital twins. This can be addressed by using real-time immersive virtual reality [6]. The immersive integration of real subjects into digital twins allows, on the one hand, human-vehicle interaction studies in fully controlled and safe environments. It allows to include various human-machine interface (HMI) modalities and to explore



Fig. 1. Digital twin for human-vehicle interaction in autonomous driving, a comparison between virtual (above) and real (bottom) experiments.

extreme scenarios without risk to people and vehicle prototypes. On the other hand, it makes it possible to obtain synthetic sequences from multiple viewpoints (i.e., simulated sensors of autonomous vehicles) based on the behaviour of real subjects, which can be used to train and test predictive perception models. However, this approach would only be valid if the behaviour of the subjects in the simulated environment is equivalent to their behaviour in a real environment. This is called the *behavioural gap*, and in order to model it, it is necessary to empirically evaluate the behaviour of the subjects in both real and simulated conditions.

In our previous work [6], we presented a framework to enable real-time interaction between real agents and CARLA simulator using immersive virtual reality and human motion capture systems. In this paper, we present the application of this framework to develop a digital twin of a real scenario, and replicate the field experiments carried out in real-world driving conditions [7] (see Fig. 1). The experiments are focused in studying human-vehicle interaction in crosswalks through the use of external HMIs and implicit communication based on the motion of the vehicle. We evaluate the

¹Computer Engineering Department, Universidad de Alcalá, Alcalá de Henares, Spain. sergio.martin@uah.es

²European Commission, Joint Research Centre, Seville, Spain.

effectiveness of different forms of communication between the autonomous vehicle and real pedestrians immersed in a virtual crosswalk scenario, which will then be used to establish a comparison with the same study at a real twin crosswalk and provide a measure of the *behavioural gap*.

II. RELATED WORK

For simulation-based testing to be a reliable substitute for real-world testing, previous works effort is directed at validating the sensor models used by quantifying the discrepancy between simulation and reality, such [8] does for radar perception and [9] for camera-based object detection algorithms. Other approaches seek to close the *reality gap* by applying feature embedding techniques or different levels of domain randomization [10], [11]. In [12] is proposed a method for the real-time generation of realistic images from simulator-rendered images using generative neural networks.

As a novelty with respect to the aforementioned works, our approach intends to close the *reality gap* by inserting real behaviors into simulations through a virtual reality interface. We can find other studies that already incorporate human behavior in simulators using virtual reality, [13], [14], which also focus on the particular case of pedestrians and on the analysis of their behavior in interactions with autonomous vehicles [15], [16]. Virtual environments offer a flexible and controlled setting for conducting experiments with multiple types of vehicles and external HMI systems. Consequently, in order to justify the generation of synthetic sequences based on behaviors of real subjects we determine the *behavioral gap* by mean a study of communication between autonomous vehicles and pedestrians, as has been proposed in other works [17], [18], [19], [20], [21].

We advance in the approach of previous works adding the use of motion capture systems to integrate visual body feedback into the simulation [6] and designing a digital twinned environment [22] to empirically evaluate the *behavioral gap* in a equivalent virtual and real scenario.

III. EXPERIMENT DESCRIPTION

The designed experiment aims to produce an interaction situation between a simulated autonomous vehicle and a real pedestrian within a virtual environment. Since the traffic scenario where the interaction takes place is generated by the CARLA [23] autonomous driving simulator, we are not only able to conduct the experiment under controlled conditions, but also to evaluate the result by analysing the subjects performance through direct and indirect measurements and questions. This section describes the scene recreated in the autonomous driving simulator, the immersive and maneuverable virtual reality interface between the real subject and the virtual world, and the different experiment settings.

A. Experiment Configuration

As the objective of this experiment is to carry out a study of communication interfaces for autonomous vehicles under simulated conditions but whose result can be compared with the one obtained in real setting, we have developed a



Fig. 2. External HMI activated communicating a green status (a) and a red status (b).

digital twin of a real crosswalk from a georeferenced map to establish the same dimensions of the road, including the same arrangement of the rest of elements (i.e., traffic signs, other parked vehicles, vegetation) to faithfully reproduce the visibility conditions.

Figure 1 represents an example of the experiment which forces an interaction between a single autonomous vehicle and a single pedestrian. The vehicle circulates autonomously on the road when it reaches the crosswalk just as the pedestrian intends to cross perpendicular to the opposite sidewalk. The pedestrian can detect the vehicle a few meters ahead of the crosswalk before starting the crossing action, and lighting and weather conditions are favorable. To propitiate this encounter, the pedestrian is told to wait with their back to the crosswalk until the vehicle is close enough and s/he is given the order to turn around and move towards the road. The vehicle speed is 30 km/h and it starts a braking maneuver using a constant deceleration until it comes to a complete stop at the edge of the crosswalk to yield to the pedestrian.

B. Test Variations

The virtual autonomous vehicle is equipped with an external communication interface, so-called GRAIL (Green Assistant Interfacing Light) [24], which is represented in the simulator by a bar along the entire front of the car that changes color to communicate its intentions and current status to other agents on the road. As Figures 2a and 2b show, the interface emits a red color to warn the vehicle has not detected any obstacles on its path and that it does not plan to execute any braking maneuver, while the green color anticipates a stop to avoid a collision. It is also possible that the interface is turned off so the pedestrian does not have any information about the vehicle status.

Furthermore, we add an other implicit form of communication by varying the braking profile. To study the interaction if the pedestrian is in a situation of greater risk, we define a gentle braking maneuver, in which the vehicle decelerates at -0.9 m/s^2 , and a second, more aggressive braking maneuver, when the vehicle decelerates at -1.8 m/s^2 . In both cases, the vehicle reduces its 30 km/h speed to a complete stop, but the aggressive maneuver simulates less anticipation.

C. Test Batch

We designed five tests to assess the influence of each communication technique over the pedestrian level of confidence and their perceived level of safety during the experiment. Table I shows the variations in the braking maneuver in

combination or not with the activation of the external communication interface. Test number 0 purpose is to prime the participants with the environment and with the risk in which they may be involved if the vehicle does not stop. All tests were performed in random order except test number 0, which was always performed first for each participant.

TABLE I
EXPERIMENTATION TESTS SETTINGS

Test Number	Braking Maneuver	External HMI	Stop
0	-	-	No
1	Gentle	-	Yes
2	Aggressive	-	Yes
3	Gentle	GRAIL	Yes
4	Aggressive	GRAIL	Yes

D. Virtual Reality Setup

In order to allow the experiment to be conducted within a virtual environment, we harness the full immersive system for pedestrians described in [6] which adds some features to the CARLA simulator such as real-time avatar control, positional sound and the body tracking of the subject interacting with the scene through virtual reality. In this way, we take advantage of all the different options that CARLA offers to simulate specific traffic scenarios while there is a real subject playing the role of a pedestrian and being part of the simulation. We use Oculus Quest 2, created by Meta, as head mounted device (HMD) and Perception Neuron Studio (PNS) motion capture system for full-body tracking [25]. Quest 2 is connected to PC via WiFi and projects onto their lenses the CARLA spectator view. At the same time, the captured pose and motion of the subject is integrated into the virtual scenario, so the simulated sensors attached to the autonomous vehicle (i.e., radar, LiDAR, cameras) can be aware of their presence. So that the development of the experiment was not hindered, we reserved a preset area wide enough and free of obstacles where the participant could act as a real pedestrian inside the simulator.

E. Participants

18 volunteers of different ages from inside and outside the University area accepted to join the experiment. Most of them had never had any virtual reality experience before and they were informed about the risk of dizziness or disorientation. Fortunately, all the participants felt good during the experiment and there were no incidents.

IV. EXPERIMENT EVALUATION

This section presents the measurement tools used to evaluate the influence of the communication interfaces over the confidence level of the participants. The tests include an explicit and an implicit communication interface, the external HMI and the braking maneuver profile respectively. For this analysis, after each test in Table I, they were asked to fill out a questionnaire about their subjective perception of the interaction. In addition, direct measurement variables were




Fig. 3. Crossing event example in the gentle braking maneuver.

registered from the scenario to also evaluate changes in their observable behavior.

A. Questionnaire

Throughout the experiment, the participants had short rest periods between tests in which they did not leave the virtual reality when a researcher asked them the following questions about their last interaction with the vehicle:

- Q1: *What was your level of confidence that the vehicle would stop and yield to you?*
- Q2: *How did you perceive the braking of the vehicle?*
- Q3: *Has the visual communication interface improved your confidence to cross?*

Answers to these questions are tabulated on a 7-step Likert scale [26] and allow to study the influence of communication interfaces from the subjective point of view of the pedestrian.

B. Direct Measurements

In addition to having specific control over traffic conditions, CARLA simulations enable access to all agents and environment variables so we directly obtain the participant's location on the map and their full-body pose. The reconstruction of their trajectory allows us to generate synthetic sequences from multiple points of view based on their real behavior and to extract some valuable parameters as the label of the crossing decision event, the label of the crossing event or their eye contact with the vehicle. The experiments are recorded and can be replayed to compare results for different sensors or configurations. The direct measurements used to quantitatively analyze the interaction during the experimentation are the distance to the pedestrian, the vehicle speed and the time-to-collision (TTC) computed as $TTC = d/v$. Figure 3 shows the evolution of these variables in the gentle braking maneuver, as well as a crossing event example.

C. Crossing Event

The crossing event is defined as the moment in which the pedestrian is exposed to a real collision risk by entering in the



Fig. 4. The crossing event is defined when the pedestrian enters the vehicle lane and is exposed to a possible collision.

lane of the vehicle, as shown in Figure 4. It is considered a metric to evaluate the behaviour of the pedestrian: if crosses earlier, s/he feels more confident in the vehicle. The crossing event is used instead of the previous crossing decision event because it can be unequivocally identified by mean the lane marking. If the subject perceives that the situation is more risky and hesitates to cross, we detect this in a subsequent crossing event. Both braking maneuvers are repeated in every experiment, so labeling of the crossing event is needed for directly observable measurements to be meaningful in the study.

V. RESULTS

This section presents the results obtained both in the questionnaires and in the labeling of the direct measurements. We search for significant differences between the tests from Table I to determinate the utility of the communication interfaces involved. In Figure 5 we can observe an interaction example with the external HMI activated. The Virtual Reality headset projects the crosswalk onto the participant and allows displacement through the scenario. To compare the responses to the questionnaires and the direct measurements we use the Wilcoxon signed-rank test and the Student t-test respectively.

A. Questionnaire Results

The Wilcoxon Signed Rank test [27] is a non-parametric statistical hypothesis test used to determinate whether the difference between two related samples taken from the same population is statistically significant. The alternative hypothesis matrix showed in Table II expresses categorical statements which compare the answers to the questions from Q1 to Q3 obtained in each test from the experiment. A check-mark in a specific cell means the null hypothesis $H_0 : \mu_i \leq \mu_j$ is rejected and the alternative hypothesis $H_1 : \mu_i > \mu_j$ is accepted when comparing the answers provided in test i (left column) and in test j (top row). Rejecting H_0 and accepting H_1 implies there is a significant difference in the answers and that the score in test i is higher than in test j .

Based on the results showed on Table II, we cannot state that the gentle braking maneuver with the external HMI non-activated contributes to increase the pedestrian's

TABLE II
WILCOXON SIGNED RANK TEST, Q1-Q3, $\alpha=0.05$

$H_1 : \mu_i > \mu_j$		Test number j				
		1	2	3	4	
Test number i	Q1	1	-			
		2		-		
		3	✓	✓	-	✓
		4	✓	✓		-
Q2	1	-				
	2	✓	-	✓	✓	
	3			-		
	4	✓		✓	-	
Q3	1	-				
	2		-			
	3	✓	✓	-		
	4	✓	✓		-	

confidence in the vehicle (Q1: test1 vs test2), but we can do state that the gentle braking maneuver with the external HMI activated does contribute to increase the pedestrian's confidence in the vehicle (Q1: test3 vs test4). The external HMI does contribute to increase the pedestrian's confidence in the vehicle (Q1: test3 vs test1 and test4 vs test2) and pedestrians perceived the aggressive braking maneuver as "more aggressive" or "less conservative" than the gentle braking maneuvers (Q2: test2 vs test1 and test4 vs test3).

B. Direct Measurements Results

In the direct measurements analysis we use the Student's t-test [28] that determines if there is a significant difference between the means of two samples groups. The alternative hypothesis matrix is represented in Table III. A check-mark in a specific cell means the null hypothesis $H_0 : \mu_i \leq \mu_j$ is rejected and the alternative hypothesis $H_1 : \mu_i > \mu_j$ is accepted when comparing the direct measurements labeled on test i (left column) and test j (top row). Rejecting H_0 and accepting H_1 implies distance, speed and/or TTC at the crossing event in test i are significantly higher than in test j . Figure 6 shows the box-plots of the distance between the pedestrian and the vehicle in the labeled crossing event in each trial.

TABLE III
STUDENT T-TEST, $\alpha=0.05$

$H_1 : \mu_i > \mu_j$		Test number j				
		1	2	3	4	
Test number i	Distance	1	-	✓		
		2		-		
		3	✓	✓	-	✓
		4		✓		-
Speed	1	-	✓			
	2		-			
	3	✓	✓	-	✓	
	4		✓		-	
TTC	1	-				
	2	✓	-	✓	✓	
	3			-		
	4				-	




Fig. 5. Interaction example between pedestrian and virtual vehicle equipped with external HMI: (a) The pedestrian starts with their back to the crosswalk and is told to turn around when the vehicle approaches. (b) The pedestrian makes eye contact with the vehicle and hesitate to cross. (c) The external HMI switches from red to green. (d) The pedestrian enters the vehicle lane establishing the crossing event. (e) The pedestrian crosses the road.




Fig. 6. Box-plots of the distances to the pedestrian at the crossing event.

Based on the results showed on Table III we can state that the gentle braking maneuver does contribute to increase the distance at the crossing event (distance: test1 vs test2 and test3 vs test4) and the external HMI does contribute to increase the distance at the crossing event (distance: test3 vs test1 and test4 vs test2). The alternative hypothesis matrix of the vehicle speed confirms the previous statements: the greater the distance to the pedestrian, the greater the vehicle speed due to its constant deceleration. The aggressive braking maneuver with the external HMI non-activated increases the time-to-collision (TTC: test2 vs test1, test2 vs test3 and test2 vs test4). It is inferred that in test number 2 the pedestrian confidence drops dramatically and many participants waited for the vehicle to come to a complete stop.

C. Results Discussion

In the responses to Q1, participants express greater confidence whenever the external HMI is activated. It should be noted that the virtual environment does not distort the

appreciation of the braking maneuver, since in the responses to Q2 the aggressive maneuver is always described as “more aggressive” than the gentle maneuver. However, it draws our attention that the non-activation of the external HMI in combination with the aggressive maneuver implies that the same braking maneuver is perceived as even more aggressive (Q2: test2 vs test4). We can make the statement that the activation of the external HMI has much more influence on the risk perception of the participant, above the type of maneuver used in the test.

If we look at the distance to the pedestrian and the vehicle speed in Table III, we obtain the same information of the crossing event since the braking maneuver follows a constant deceleration. If participants cross earlier, we can infer they feel more confident, because the vehicle is farther away from coming to a complete stop. Despite the fact that in the questionnaire the participants claimed that they mostly felt safer with the external HMI activated, even with the aggressive maneuver (Q1: test4 vs test1), in practice they also crossed the road earlier when the vehicle followed a gentle braking maneuver. In any case, the activation of the external HMI continues to have a very high influence in making the decision to cross sooner. The non-activation of the external HMI in combination with the aggressive braking maneuver rises sharply the time-to-collision (TTC: test2 vs test1, test2 vs test3 and test2 vs test4). We suggest that this is because the participants perceive the situation as high risk and wait for the vehicle to reduce its speed to almost zero.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

Both the questionnaire and direct measurements support the external HMI increases the pedestrian confidence and also leads to an earlier crossing event. On the other hand, in the questionnaire participants do not express greater confidence in gentle braking maneuver compared to aggressive braking maneuver without the activation of the external HMI. We suggest that the participants above all claim to feel safer activating the external HMI due to its high visibility in the

virtual scenario, although the gentle braking maneuver also entails an earlier crossing event.

As future work, more results are expected from comparing the same study on the real scenario [7]. The final goal is to verify that the *behavioral gap* is not critical, so it is possible to include real behaviors in simulations through our proposal of a fully immersive virtual reality system [6] for vulnerable road users in the context of autonomous driving research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was funded by Research Grants PID2020-114924RB-I00 and PDC2021-121324-I00 (Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation) and partially by S2018/EMT-4362 SEGVAUTO 4.0-CM (Community of Madrid). D. Fernández Llorca acknowledges funding from the HUMANIT project by the Directorate-General Joint Research Centre of the European Commission.

DISCLAIMER

The views expressed in this article are purely those of the authors and may not, under any circumstances, be regarded as an official position of the European Commission.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Kalra and S. M. Paddock, "Driving to safety: how many miles of driving would it take to demonstrate autonomous vehicle reliability?" RAND Corporation" Research Report, 2016.
- [2] C. Schwarz and Z. Wang, "The role of digital twins in connected and automated vehicles," *IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Magazine*, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 41–51, 2022.
- [3] A. Stocco, B. Pulfer, and P. Tonella, "Mind the gap! a study on the transferability of virtual vs physical-world testing of autonomous driving systems," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, pp. 1–13, 2022.
- [4] I. García Daza, R. Izquierdo, L. M. Martínez, O. Benderius, and D. Fernández Llorca, "Sim-to-real transfer and reality gap modeling in model predictive control for autonomous driving," *Applied Intelligence*, 2022.
- [5] T. Eady. (2019, May) Simulations can't solve autonomous driving because they lack important knowledge about the real world – large-scale real world data is the only way. [Online]. Available: <https://medium.com/@strangecosmos/simulation-cant-solve-autonomous-driving-because-it-lacks-necessary-empirical-knowledge-403feec15e0>
- [6] S. M. Serrano, D. F. Llorca, I. G. Daza, and M. Á. Sotelo, "Insertion of real agents behaviors in CARLA autonomous driving simulator," in *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Computer-Human Interaction Research and Applications, CHIRA*, 2022, pp. 23–31.
- [7] R. Izquierdo, S. Martín, J. Alonso, I. Parra, M. A. Sotelo, and D. Fernández Llorca, "Human-vehicle interaction for autonomous vehicles in crosswalk scenarios: Field experiments with pedestrians and passengers," *arXiv*, 2023.
- [8] A. Ngo, M. P. Bauer, and M. Resch, "A multi-layered approach for measuring the simulation-to-reality gap of radar perception for autonomous driving," in *2021 IEEE International Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference (ITSC)*, 2021, pp. 4008–4014.
- [9] F. Reway, A. Hoffmann, D. Wachtel, W. Huber, A. Knoll, and E. Ribeiro, "Test method for measuring the simulation-to-reality gap of camera-based object detection algorithms for autonomous driving," in *2020 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, 2020, pp. 1249–1256.
- [10] N. Gadipudi, I. Elamvazuthi, M. Sanmugam, L. I. Izhar, T. Prasetyo, R. Jegadeeshwaran, and S. S. A. Ali, "Synthetic to real gap estimation of autonomous driving datasets using feature embedding," in *2022 IEEE 5th International Symposium in Robotics and Manufacturing Automation (ROMA)*, 2022, pp. 1–5.
- [11] E. Candela, L. Parada, L. Marques, T.-A. Georgescu, Y. Demir, and P. Angeloudis, "Transferring multi-agent reinforcement learning policies for autonomous driving using sim-to-real," in *2022 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, 2022, pp. 8814–8820.
- [12] N. Cruz and J. Ruiz-del Solar, "Closing the simulation-to-reality gap using generative neural networks: Training object detectors for soccer robotics in simulation as a case study," in *2020 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, 2020, pp. 1–8.
- [13] Z. Xu, Y. Fang, N. Zheng, and H. L. Vu, "Analyzing the inconsistency in driving patterns between manual and autonomous modes under complex driving scenarios with a vr-enabled simulation platform," *Journal of Intelligent and Connected Vehicles*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 215–234, 2022.
- [14] G. M. Grasso, G. d'Italia, and S. Battiato, "A flexible virtual environment for autonomous driving agent-human interaction testing," in *2020 AEIT International Conference of Electrical and Electronic Technologies for Automotive (AEIT AUTOMOTIVE)*, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [15] D. Li, X. Jiang, Y. Xiao, B. Li, B. Xiao, J. Zhang, C. Pan, and H. Lyu, "Pedestrian interaction algorithm for autonomous vehicles considering crossing intention and driving style," in *2022 6th CAA International Conference on Vehicular Control and Intelligence (CVCI)*, 2022, pp. 1–6.
- [16] M. Hartmann, M. Viehweger, W. Desmet, M. Stolz, and D. Watzenig, "'pedestrian in the loop': An approach using virtual reality," in *2017 XXVI International Conference on Information, Communication and Automation Technologies (ICAT)*, 2017, pp. 1–8.
- [17] C.-M. Chang, K. Toda, D. Sakamoto, and T. Igarashi, "Eyes on a car: an interface design for communication between an autonomous car and a pedestrian," in *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Automotive User Interfaces and Interactive Vehicular Applications (AutomotiveUI'17)*, 2017, pp. 65–73.
- [18] K. Holländer, P. Wintersberger, and A. Butz, "Overtrust in external cues of automated vehicles: An experimental investigation," in *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Automotive User Interfaces and Interactive Vehicular Applications*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2019, p. 211–221.
- [19] S. Deb, D. W. Carruth, M. Fuad, L. M. Stanley, and D. Frey, "Comparison of child and adult pedestrian perspectives of external features on autonomous vehicles using virtual reality experiment," in *Advances in Human Factors of Transportation*, N. Stanton, Ed. Springer International Publishing, 2020, pp. 145–156.
- [20] S. Deb, D. W. Carruth, and C. R. Hudson, "How communicating features can help pedestrian safety in the presence of self-driving vehicles: Virtual reality experiment," *IEEE Transactions on Human-Machine Systems*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 176–186, 2020.
- [21] U. Gruenefeld, S. Weiß, A. Löcken, I. Virgilio, A. L. Kun, and S. Boll, "Vroad: Gesture-based interaction between pedestrians and automated vehicles in virtual reality," in *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Automotive User Interfaces and Interactive Vehicular Applications: Adjunct Proceedings*, ser. AutomotiveUI '19, 2019, p. 399–404.
- [22] B. Yu, C. Chen, J. Tang, S. Liu, and J.-L. Gaudiot, "Autonomous vehicles digital twin: A practical paradigm for autonomous driving system development," *Computer*, vol. 55, no. 9, pp. 26–34, 2022.
- [23] A. Dosovitskiy, G. Ros, F. Codevilla, A. Lopez, and V. Koltun, "CARLA: An open urban driving simulator," in *Proceedings of the 1st Annual Conference on Robot Learning*, 2017, pp. 1–16.
- [24] R. Izquierdo, C. Salinas, J. Alonso, I. Parra, D. Fernández-Llorca, and M. A. Sotelo, "Testing predictive automated driving systems: Lessons learned and future recommendations," *IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Magazine*, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 77–93, 2022.
- [25] Noitom. (2022) Perception neuron studio system. [Online]. Available: <https://neuronmocap.com/perception-neuron-studio-system>
- [26] A. Joshi, S. Kale, S. Chandel, and D. K. Pal, "Likert scale: Explored and explained," *British journal of applied science & technology*, vol. 7, no. 4, p. 396, 2015.
- [27] R. F. Woolson, "Wilcoxon signed-rank test," *Wiley encyclopedia of clinical trials*, pp. 1–3, 2007.
- [28] J. C. De Winter, "Using the student's t-test with extremely small sample sizes," *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, vol. 18, no. 1, p. 10, 2013.