

Cognitive Conflict in Virtual Reality Based Object Selection Task

An EEG study to understand brain dynamics associated with cognitive conflict in a Virtual Reality 3D object selection task

Student: Avinash Kumar Singh

Supervisor: Dr. Chin-Teng Lin

Co-Supervisors: Dr. Klaus Gramann & Dr. Jie Lu

December 2018

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

At

School of Software,

The Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology,

University of Technology Sydney, Australia

Certificate of Authorship/Originality

I, **Avinash Kumar Singh** declare that this thesis, is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Ph.D. degree, in the School of Software, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology at the University of Technology Sydney.

This thesis is wholly my own work unless otherwise reference or acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

This document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution.

This research is supported by the Australian Government Research Training Program.

Signature of Candidate

Production Note:
Signature removed prior to publication.

(Avinash Kumar Singh)

Acknowledgments

Foremost, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisors Prof. Chin-Teng Lin and Prof. Klaus Gramann for the continuous support of my research. Their patience, motivation, enthusiasm, and immense knowledge has guided me during my research and while writing my thesis. I could not have imagined having better advisors and mentors for my Ph.D. I would also like to thank Prof. Jie Lu and Dr. Tim Chen for their support throughout the Ph.D. journey.

My sincere thanks to all my lab members in Computational Intelligence and Brain-Computer Interface (CIBCI) group: Carlos Tirado, Anna Wunderlich, Tien-Thong, Howe, Ashlesha Akella, and Jenny Fang for their stimulating discussions and research support time to time. I would also like to appreciate and thanks to my friends: Sunny Verma, Garima Vats, Kristy Mamaril, and Marta Negri for their feedback, cooperation, encouragement, and for all the fun we had over countless cups of coffee before and during writing my thesis.

I gratefully acknowledge the funding sources that made my research possible. Special thanks go to UTS president scholarship to cover my tuition fee and living cost in Sydney, Australia. Furthermore, thanks to the School of Software and Center of Artificial Intelligence (CAI) for providing me with financial support for funding my conference travels and publication fees. Lastly, I would also like to express my sincere thanks to the proofreaders for correcting the language of this thesis and my publications.

Finally, my deep and sincere gratitude to my family for their continuous and unparalleled love, help, and support. Particularly, I am grateful to my mother for continuously being there for me as a friend and as an energy source. I am forever indebted for them to provide me the opportunities and experiences that have made me who I am. They selflessly encouraged me to explore new directions in life and seek my own destiny. This journey would not have been possible if not for them, and I dedicate this milestone to them.

Table of Contents

Certificate of Authorship/Originality	i
Acknowledgments	ii
List of Figures.....	viii
List of Tables.....	xiv
List of Publications.....	xv
Journal papers.....	xv
Conference papers	xv
List of Abbreviations	xvii
Abstract.....	19
Chapter 1 : Introduction.....	20
1.1. Thesis Definition.....	20
1.2. Cognitive Conflict in the field of Neuroscience	20
1.2.1. Cognitive conflict	20
1.2.2. The brain region involved in the cognitive conflict.....	22
1.3. Cognitive Conflict in the field of HCI	24
1.3.1. Conflict due to competing options.....	24
1.3.2. Conflicts due to visual appearance	25
1.3.3. Conflicts due to an error	26
1.4. Interaction with the 3D environment	26
1.4.1. Fitts' law	27
1.4.2. Visual and motor space.....	27
1.4.3. VR as a 3D environment.....	28
1.5. Applying Neuroscience Methodology in HCI: Brain-Computer Interface	28
1.6. Aims and Objectives	31
1.7. Stakeholders	33

1.8.	Approach.....	33
1.9.	Findings.....	34
1.10.	Thesis Structure	34
Chapter 2 : Methodology		36
2.1.	Participants and Environment	36
2.2.	VR Setup	36
2.3.	EEG Setup.....	37
2.4.	EEG Data Analysis	37
2.4.1.	Downsampling and filtering	37
2.4.2.	Noisy electrodes.....	38
2.4.3.	Independent component analysis.....	39
2.4.4.	Dipole fitting.....	41
2.4.5.	Detecting noisy independent components	42
2.4.6.	Clustering.....	43
2.4.7.	Event-related spectral perturbation.....	46
2.4.8.	Extracting prediction error negativity and positivity.....	46
2.5.	Machine Learning Methods	47
2.5.1.	Linear discriminant analysis	47
2.5.2.	Bayesian classification.....	47
2.5.3.	Support vector machine	48
2.5.4.	Feed-forward neural network	49
2.6.	Object Selection Methods	50
2.6.1.	Fitts' law	50
2.6.2.	Optimized initial pulse model.....	50
2.7.	Subjective Measures	50
2.7.1.	Questionnaire on realism	50
2.7.2.	Behavioral inhibition system / behavioral activation system	50

2.7.3.	Igroup presence questionnaire	52
2.8.	Statistical Analysis	52
2.8.1.	Repeated measure analysis of variance	53
2.8.2.	Repeated measure analysis of covariance.....	53
Chapter 3 : Evoking the Cognitive Conflict in Virtual Reality and its Modulating Factors.....		54
3.1.	Experiment.....	54
3.1.1.	Participants and environment	54
3.1.2.	VR setup	54
3.1.3.	EEG setup	55
3.2.	Data Analysis	57
3.3.	Task Completion Time	58
3.4.	Statistical Analysis.....	58
3.5.	BIS Based Results.....	58
3.5.1.	Behavior results	58
3.5.2.	EEG results	60
3.6.	Task Completion Time based Results.....	61
3.6.1.	For intra-trial task completion time	61
3.6.2.	For inter-trial task completion	69
3.7.	Summary	76
Chapter 4 : Movement Velocity and Its Implication on Cognitive Conflict in Virtual Reality.....		77
4.1.	Experiment.....	77
4.1.1.	Participants and environment	77
4.1.2.	VR setup	78
4.1.3.	EEG setup	78
4.1.4.	Experiment scenario	78
4.2.	Data Analysis	80

4.2.1.	EEG data analysis	80
4.2.2.	Behavior data analysis	82
4.3.	Behavior Results	83
4.4.	EEG Results	93
4.5.	Summary	105
Chapter 5 : Closed-loop Brain-Computer Interface for Cognitive Conflict in Virtual Reality		106
5.1.	Experiment	106
5.1.1.	Participants and environment	106
5.1.2.	VR setup	107
5.1.3.	EEG setup	107
5.2.	Experiment Scenario	107
5.3.	Data Analysis and Classification	109
5.3.1.	EEG data analysis	109
5.3.1.	Closed-loop cognitive conflict classification.....	109
5.4.	Results.....	110
5.4.1.	Behavioral results	110
5.4.2.	EEG results	111
5.4.3.	Classification results.....	114
5.5.	Summary	114
Chapter 6 : Discussion and Limitations.....		115
6.1.	Modulating Factors of Cognitive Conflict.....	115
6.2.	Movement Velocity and its Implications	118
6.3.	Closed-loop Brain-Computer Interface.....	122
6.4.	Limitation of this Work	123
Chapter 7 : Conclusions and Future Work		126
7.1.	Conclusions.....	126

7.2. Future Work	127
7.2.1. Evaluating the importance of different factors for 3D object selection 127	
7.2.2. Manipulating sense	128
Appendix A: Tools Used	129
Appendix B: Questionnaire for VR Testing	130
Appendix C: BIS and BAS Questionnaire	132
Appendix E: Presence Questionnaire	134
References	139

List of Figures

Figure 1-1 Summary of all tasks performed toward this thesis work; where task 1 represents the development of novel scenario and finding the biomarker for cognitive conflict; task 2 is about evaluating the modulating factors of cognitive conflict in object selection in VR; task 3 is about evaluating the effect of movement velocity and its implication on the participant’s behavior like realism and sense of agency ; and task 4 is about developing the closed-loop brain-computer interface system to assess and evaluate the level of cognitive conflict in VR.....32

Figure 2-1 EEG-based experiment setup (from experiment 1). In this setup, user wore a 32 electrodes EEG cap on the top of VR HMD including Leap Motion installed in front of HMD and performed the 3D object selection task 37

Figure 2-2 FIR for band-pass filtering. A) represents the 1 Hz high-pass filter (outputting magnitude and phase), and B) represents the 50 Hz low-pass filter (also outputting magnitude and phase) 38

Figure 2-3 An example of ICA decomposition method where all EEG scalp electrodes were decomposed in multiple independent components based on the unmixing matrix. (Image Source: SCCN) 40

Figure 2-4 ICA component scalp maps from one participant based on 64 electrodes EEG signals (participant#2) 40

Figure 2-5 Selected ICs are representing eye blinks (top-left), saccadic eye movements (top-right), brain signal (bottom-left), and broken EEG electrode (bottom-right) from participant#2..... 41

Figure 2-6 The clustered dipoles projected on a standard MRI image..... 42

Figure 2-7 The output from artifact rejection based on different criteria of autocorrelation, focal activity overall, focal activity based on trials, SNR, and residual variance of dipole fit 43

Figure 2-8 The scalp map of the average clustered component (top-left) and all the sub-components which contributed to it from one participant 44

Figure 2-9 The average scalp maps of all the clustered components from all participants 44

Figure 2-10 The corresponding clustered dipole for all the participants where the blue dipoles represent dipoles from one participant while the red dipoles represent the average of all the blue dipoles 45

Figure 2-11 ERSF from a clustered IC component in the normal condition of the 3D object selection task	46
Figure 3-1 EEG-based experiment evaluated the interaction techniques in VR by measuring intentionally elicited cognitive conflict.....	55
Figure 3-2 Experiment design for the 3D object selection task in VR.....	55
Figure 3-3 Change in the selection distance. ‘r’ is the normal radius, and ‘D’ is the changed radius that elicited the cognitive conflict.....	56
Figure 3-4 Top subfigure shows the scene of experiment. Each participant was instructed to touch cube 1 and then to reach for cube 2. The three subfigures at the bottom are the three hand styles used.....	56
Figure 3-5 Average of task completion time (in seconds) for all participants	59
Figure 3-6 Questionnaire results for a realistic level of the hand styles	59
Figure 3-7 Average ERPs from all participants in response to hand style 1 (H1), hand style 2 (H2), and hand style 3 (H3) with the two conditions of the normal (D1) and conflict radii (D2) over FCz based on the high and low BIS score-based groups	61
Figure 3-8 Average topoplots of the differences between the two conditions (change - normal) for participants with high (upper row) and low (lower row) BIS scores	62
Figure 3-9 Boxplot for short (fast) and long (slow) completion times trials for the normal and conflict condition (FN= fast trials with the normal condition; SN = slow trials with the normal condition; FC= fast trials with conflict condition; SC= slow trials with conflict condition).....	63
Figure 3-10 ERP for short (fast) and long (slow) completion times trials for normal and conflict conditions (SC= slow with conflict condition; SN = slow with normal condition; FC= fast with conflict condition; FN= fast with normal condition).	65
Figure 3-11 ERP for short (fast) and long (slow) completion times trials for all participant in normal and conflict condition (SC= slow with conflict condition; SN = slow with the normal condition; FC= fast with conflict condition; FN= fast with the normal condition)	65
Figure 3-12 Topoplots for PEN component at 50-150ms for normal and conflict condition for short (fast) and long (slow) task completion times trials (SC= slow with conflict condition; SN = slow with the normal condition; FC= fast with conflict condition; FN= fast with the normal condition).....	66
Figure 3-13 Topoplots for Pe at 250-350ms for normal and conflict condition for short (fast) and long (slow) task completion times trials (SC= slow with conflict	

condition; SN = slow with the normal condition; FC= fast with conflict condition; FN= fast with the normal condition)	67
Figure 3-14 Grand average of PEN and Pe over Fz, FCz, and Cz for normal and conflict conditions in short (fast) and long (slow) task completion times trials for all participants (SC= slow with the conflict condition; SN = slow with the normal condition; FC= fast with the conflict condition; FN= fast with the normal condition)	68
Figure 3-15 Intra-trial regression analysis of short (fast) and long (slow) task completion times with PEN and Pe; A) slow conflict for PEN, B) slow conflict for Pe, C) fast conflict for PEN, and D) fast conflict for Pe.....	69
Figure 3-16 Task completion times for two groups of trials for normal and conflict condition (SC= slow with the conflict condition; SN = slow with the normal condition; FC= fast with the conflict condition; FN= fast with the normal condition)	70
Figure 3-17 ERP for short (fast) and long (slow) task completion times trials for normal and conflict condition back-projected to electrode Cz from selected components (SC= slow with the conflict condition; SN = slow with the normal condition; FC= fast with the conflict condition; FN= fast with the normal condition)	71
Figure 3-18 Topoplots for PEN component for normal and conflict condition for short (fast) and long (slow) task completion times trials (SC= slow with conflict condition; SN = slow with the normal condition; FC= fast with conflict condition; FN= fast with the normal condition).....	73
Figure 3-19 Topography for Pe component for normal and conflict condition for short (fast) and long (slow) trials (SC= slow with conflict condition; SN = slow with the normal condition; FC= fast with conflict condition; FN= fast with the normal condition).....	74
Figure 3-20 PEN and Pe over Fz, FCz, and Cz for normal and conflict condition (SC= slow with the conflict condition; SN = slow with the normal condition; FC= fast with the conflict condition; FN= fast with the normal condition)	75
Figure 3-21 Inter-trial regression analysis of short (fast) and long (slow) completion times with PEN and Pe; A) slow conflict for PEN, B) slow conflict for Pe, C) fast conflict for PEN, and D) fast conflict for Pe.....	75
Figure 4-1 Experiment setup showing the 64 electrodes EEG cap on the top of HTC Vive and Leap Motion while the participant performs the 3D object selection task.....	77
Figure 4-2 Experiment scenario for a single trial	78
Figure 4-3 The cubes appears in three different locations randomly in the scenario	79

Figure 4-4 D1 and D2 are the radii for the large cubes (left); d1 and d2 are the radii for the small cubes (right)	80
Figure 4-5 Data processing pipeline	81
Figure 4-6 Mean velocities of all participants for different conditions (NS = normal condition for small cubes; NB = normal condition for large cubes; CS= conflict condition for small cubes; CB= conflict condition for large cubes)	83
Figure 4-7 Mean task completion time for all participants over all conditions (NS = normal condition for small cubes; NB = normal condition for large cubes; CS= conflict condition for small cubes; CB= conflict condition for large cubes)	84
Figure 4-8 Hand movement trajectories for all conditions for one participant. A) normal condition for small cubes (NS); B) normal condition for large cubes (NB); C) conflict condition for small cubes (CS); D) conflict condition for large cube (CB)	85
Figure 4-9 Correlation between task completion times and amplitude in A) PEN for CS= conflict condition for small cubes, B) PEN for CB= conflict condition for large cubes, C) Pe for CS= conflict condition for small cubes, D) Pe for CB= conflict condition for large cubes	86
Figure 4-10 Correlation between hand movement velocity and amplitude for all participants in A) PEN for CS= conflict condition for small cubes, B) PEN for CB= conflict condition for large cubes, C) Pe for CS= conflict condition for small cubes, D) Pe for CB= conflict condition for large cubes	86
Figure 4-11 Correlation between latency and amplitude in A) PEN for CS= conflict condition for small cubes, B) PEN for CB= conflict condition for large cubes, C) Pe for CS= conflict condition for small cubes, D) Pe for CB= conflict condition for large cubes	88
Figure 4-12 Correlation between realism (IPQ questionnaire) and amplitude in A) PEN for CS= conflict condition for small cubes, B) PEN for CB= conflict condition for large cubes, C) Pe for CS= conflict condition for small cubes, D) Pe for CB= conflict condition for large cubes	88
Figure 4-13 Correlation between possibility to act (IPQ questionnaire) and amplitude in A) PEN for CS= conflict condition for small cubes, B) PEN for CB= conflict condition for large cubes, C) Pe for CS= conflict condition for small cubes, D) Pe for CB= conflict condition for large cubes	89
Figure 4-14 Correlation between quality of interface and amplitude in A) PEN for CS= conflict condition for small cubes, B) PEN for CB= conflict condition for large	

cubes, C) Pe for CS= conflict condition for small cubes, D) Pe for CB= conflict condition for large cubes.....	89
Figure 4-15 Correlation between self-evaluation of performance and amplitude in A) PEN for CS= conflict condition for small cubes, B) PEN for CB= conflict condition for large cubes, C) Pe for CS= conflict condition for small cubes, D) Pe for CB= conflict condition for large cubes.....	90
Figure 4-16 IPQ questionnaire scores for all participants.....	91
Figure 4-17 Correlation between latency and task completion times in A) PEN for CS= conflict condition for small cubes, B) PEN for CB= conflict condition for large cubes, C) Pe for CS= conflict condition for small cubes, D) Pe for CB= conflict condition for large cubes.....	92
Figure 4-18 Correlation between latency and hand movement velocity in A) PEN for CS= conflict condition for small cubes, B) PEN for CB= conflict condition for large cubes, C) Pe for CS= conflict condition for small cubes, D) Pe for CB= conflict condition for large cubes.....	92
Figure 4-19 Clustered ICA component scalp maps for all participants	93
Figure 4-20 Clustered components selected as anterior cingulate cortex (ACC) and its dipoles	93
Figure 4-21 Averaged ERP for all participants over FCz back-projected from ACC IC (NS = normal condition for small cubes; NB = normal condition for large cubes; CS= conflict condition for small cubes; CB= conflict condition for large cubes).....	95
Figure 4-22 Difference in ERP for ACC IC (NS = normal condition for small cubes; NB = normal condition for large cubes; CS= conflict condition for small cubes; CB= conflict condition for large cubes)	95
Figure 4-23 The selected components representing posterior cingulate cortex (PCC) from the clustered ICs.....	96
Figure 4-24 ERP back-projected to FCz from PCC IC (NS = normal condition for small cubes; NB = normal condition for large cubes; CS= conflict condition for small cubes; CB= conflict condition for large cubes)	96
Figure 4-25 Difference in ERP for PCC IC (NS = normal condition for small cubes; NB = normal condition for large cubes; CS= conflict condition for small cubes; CB= conflict condition for large cubes)	97
Figure 4-26 Topoplots for PEN (50-150ms)	99
Figure 4-27 Topoplots for Pe (250-350ms).....	100

Figure 4-28 ERSP from ACC IC	101
Figure 4-29 ERSP from PCC IC	102
Figure 4-30 The ERP for SMC. A) ERP for left-SMC in all conditions, B) difference in ERP for left SMC in all conditions (NS = normal condition for small cubes; NB = normal condition for large cubes; CS= conflict condition for small cubes; CB= conflict condition for large cubes)	103
Figure 4-31 ERP for SMC. A) ERP for right SMC in all conditions, B) difference in ERP for all conditions for right SMC (NS = normal condition for small cubes; NB = normal condition for large cubes; CS= conflict condition for small cubes; CB= conflict condition for large cubes)	104
Figure 5-1 The schematic diagram for the closed-loop BCI system	106
Figure 5-2 Experimental scenario for one trial.....	107
Figure 5-3 Selection radius representation where D1 is the normal radius, D2 is a radius larger than normal, and D3 is the radius smaller than normal	108
Figure 5-4 Data processing pipeline for the open and closed-loop BCI system	110
Figure 5-5 Averaged questionnaire results.....	111
Figure 5-6 ERP for all participants individually over FCz (Lar Rad is a radius larger than the normal radius, Med Rad is equal to the normal radius, and Small Rad is the radius smaller than normal)	112
Figure 5-7 A) Averaged ERP for all participants; B) extracted PEN and Pe amplitudes (Lar Rad is a radius larger than the normal radius, Med Rad is the equal to the normal radius, and Small Rad is the radius smaller than normal).....	113
Figure 6-1 Visual appearance of hand styles used in the first experiment.....	115

List of Tables

Table 2-1 Questionnaire description for realism	51
Table 2-2 Questionnaire description for BIS/BAS.....	51
Table 2-3 Questionnaire description for modified version of IPQ.....	52
Table 3-1 Statistics for all normal and conflict condition trials before and after splitting into short (fast) and long (slow) completion times group of trials	62
Table 3-2 Correlation matrix between short (fast) and long (slow) task completion times with PEN and Pe over Fz, FCz, and Cz (** p < 0.01 and *p < 0.05).....	69
Table 3-3 Behavioral results.....	70
Table 3-4 Correlation matrix for slow and fast user trials over Fz, FCz, and Cz (** p < 0.01 and *p < 0.05).....	72
Table 5-1 Questionnaire results for all the participants.....	110
Table 5-2 PEN and Pe amplitude for all participants for the three conditions of the selection radius (Lar Rad is a radius larger than the normal radius, Med Rad is equal to the normal radius, and Small Rad is the radius smaller than normal)	113
Table 5-3 Classification results based on different machine learning methods	114
Table 6-1 Correlation matrix for high and low BIS scores with PEN and Pe amplitude for H1, H2, and H3. Bold-highlighted cells represent that a correlation is significant.	116

List of Publications

Journal papers

1. **Singh, A.K.**, and Lin, C.T., 2019. Closed-loop Brain-Computer Interface to mitigate the effect of Cognitive Conflict. (drafted).
2. **Singh, A.K.**, Gramann, K., Chen, H.T., and Lin, C.T., 2019. Velocity Profile Modulates the Prediction Error Negativity in a Virtual 3D Object Selection Task (drafted).
3. **Singh, A.K.**, Chen, H.T., Gramann, K. and Lin, C.T., 2019. Intra-individual Completion Time Modulates the Prediction Error Negativity in a Virtual 3D Object Selection Task, *IEEE Transaction on Cognitive Developmental Studies* (accepted). [SJR Q1]
4. **Singh, A.K.**, Wang, Y.K., and Lin, C.T., 2018. Cognitive Involving Video Game Changes Resting-State Brain Dynamics. (under review). [SJR Q1]
5. **Singh, A.K.**, Chen, H.T., Cheng, Y.F., King, J.T., Ko, L.W., Gramann, K. and Lin, C.T., 2018. Visual Appearance Modulates Prediction Error in Virtual Reality. *IEEE Access*, 6, pp.24617-24624. [SJR Q1]
6. Lin, C.T., Chiu, C.Y., **Singh, A.K.**, King, J.T. and Wang, Y.K., 2018. A Wireless Multifunctional SSVEP-Based Brain-Computer Interface Assistive System. *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive and Developmental Systems*. [SJR Q1]
7. Lin, C.T., King, J.T., **Singh, A.K.**, Gupta, A., Ma, Z., Lin, J.W., Machado, A.M.C., Appaji, A. and Prasad, M., 2018. Voice Navigation Effects on Real-World Lane Change Driving Analysis Using an Electroencephalogram. *IEEE Access*, 6, pp.26483-26492. [SJR Q1]
8. Lin, C.T., Huang, C.S., Yang, W.Y., **Singh, A.K.**, Chuang, C.H. and Wang, Y.K., 2018. Real-time EEG signal enhancement using canonical correlation analysis and Gaussian mixture clustering. *Journal of healthcare engineering*, 2018. [SJR Q1]
9. Lin, C.T., Chuang, C.H., Cao, Z., **Singh, A.K.**, Hung, C.S., Yu, Y.H., Nascimben, M., Liu, Y.T., King, J.T., Su, T.P. and Wang, S.J., 2017. Forehead EEG in support of future feasible personal healthcare solutions: Sleep management, headache prevention, and depression treatment. *IEEE Access*, 5, pp.10612-10621. [SJR Q1]

Conference papers

1. Pan, Y., **Singh, A.K.**, Lin, C.T., Sugiyama and M. and Sang, I., Stochastic Multi-Channel Ranking for Brain Dynamics Preferences, Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI) 2019 (under review).
2. Pan, Y., **Singh, A.K.**, Lin, C.T., and Sang, I., Online Bayesian Ranking for Real-time Mental Fatigue Monitoring, ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD) 2019 (under review).
3. Aldini, S., Akella, A., **Singh, A.K.***, Wang, Y.K., Carmichael, M., Liu, D., and Lin, C.T., Effect of Mechanical Resistance on Intuitiveness in Physical

- Human-Robot Collaboration via Cognitive Conflict Identification, International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA) 2019 (accepted). [Core Rank B]
4. Gehrke, L., Akman, S., Lopes, P., **Singh, A.K.**, Chen, H.T., Lin, C.T., and Gramann, K., 2019. Towards a Complementary Metric of Haptic Immersion in VR using Event-Related Brain Potentials, CHI 2019 (accepted) [Core Rank A*]
 5. **Singh, A.K.**, Chen, T., King, J.T. and Lin, C.T., 2017, July. Measuring Cognitive Conflict in Virtual Reality. In *The First Biannual Neuroadaptive Technology Conference* (Vol. 1, p. 150). [First Time Conference]
 6. Nascimben, M., Wang, Y.K., **Singh, A.K.**, King, J.T. and Lin, C.T., 2017, May. Influence of EEG tonic changes on Motor Imagery performance. In *Neural Engineering (NER), 2017 8th International IEEE/EMBS Conference on* (pp. 46-49). IEEE. [One of top conference in Neural Engineering]
 7. Chiu, C.Y., **Singh, A.K.**, Wang, Y.K., King, J.T. and Lin, C.T., 2017, May. A wireless steady state visually evoked potential-based BCI eating assistive system. In *Neural Networks (IJCNN), 2017 International Joint Conference on* (pp. 3003-3007). IEEE. [Core Rank A]
 8. **Singh, A.K.**, Wang, Y.K. Wang, Chiu, C.Y., Yu, Y.H., Nascimben, M., King, J.T., Chuang, C.H., Chen, S.A., Ko, L.W., Pal, N.R. and Lin, C.T., 2016. Attention in Complex Environment of Brain Computer Interface, 6th International Brain Computer Interface (BCI) Meeting, Pacific Grove, California (USA), May 30 – June 3, 2016.
 9. Nascimben, M., Yu, Y.H., Lin, C.T., King, J.T. **Singh, A.K.**, Chuang, C.H., 2016. Effect of a cognitive involving videogame on MI task, 6th International Brain Computer Interface (BCI) Meeting, Pacific Grove, California (USA), May 30 – June 3, 2016.
 10. **Singh, A.K.**, Wang, Y.K., King, J.T., Lin, C.T. and Ko, L.W., 2015, November. A simple communication system based on Brain Computer Interface. In *Technologies and Applications of Artificial Intelligence (TAAI), 2015 Conference on* (pp. 363-366). IEEE.

List of Abbreviations

2D	Two-dimensional
3D	Three-dimensional
ACC	Anterior Cingulate Cortex
ADJUST	Automatic EEG artifact Detection based on the Joint Use of Spatial and Temporal feature
ANCOVA	Analysis of Co-variance
ANN	Artificial Neural Network
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
AR	Augmented Reality
BAS	Behavioral Activation System
BACH	Brain Automated Chorales
BCI	Brain-Computer Interface
BIS	Behavioral Inhibition System
BSS	Blind Source Separation
DAL	Dual-augmented Lagrange
DIPFIT	Dipole Fitting
EEG	Electroencephalogram
EMS	Electric muscle stimulation
ERN	Error-Related Negativity
ERP	Event-Related Potential
ERSP	Event-Related Spectral Perturbation
FFNN	Feed-forward Neural Network
FIR	Finite Impulse response
fMRI	Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging
fNIRS	Functional Near-Infrared Spectroscopy
FPS	Frame per Second
FRN	Feedback-Related Negativity
GMM	Gaussian Mixture Modelling
GSR	Galvanic Skin Response
HCI	Human-Computer interface
HMD	Head Mounted Display
IC	Independent Component

ICA	Independent Component Analysis
ID	Index of Difficulty
IMU	Inertial Measurement Unit
IPQ	Igroup Presence Questionnaire
IQR	Inter-Quartile Range
ITC	Inter-Trial Coherence
LDA	Linear Discriminant Analysis
MMN	Mismatch Negativity
MoBI	Mobile Brain / Body Imaging
MR	Magnetic Resonance
N2	Negativity at 200ms
Ne	Negativity
OCD	Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder
oFRN	Observational Feedback-Related Negativity
OLED	Organic Light-Emitting Diode
P300	Positivity at 300ms
PCC	Posterior Cingulate Cortex
Pe	Positivity
PEN	Prediction Error Negativity
PET	Positron Emission Tomography
pre-SMA	pre-Supplementary Motor Area
QDA	Quadratic Discriminate Analysis
SASICA	Semi-Automatic Selection of Independent Components for Artifact
SCCN	Swartz Center for Computational Neuroscience
SD	Standard Deviation
SDK	Software Development Kit
SFG	Superior Frontal Gyrus
SNR	Signal-to-Noise Ratio
SVM	Support Vector Machine
TV	Television
UAV	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle
VE	Virtual Elements
VR	Virtual Reality

Abstract

Cognitive conflict is an essential part of everyday interaction with the environment and is often characterized as a brain's action monitoring and control system that activates when prediction based on previous experience acquired from the environment does not match with derived knowledge from sensory inputs from cognitive processing. Although cognitive conflict can be seen as an essential part of learning about the environment, it requires the brain to assign a higher number of cognitive resources such as attention, memory, and engagement compared to non-conflicting conditions. In this work, cognitive conflict has been evaluated in a three-dimensional (3D) object selection task in a virtual reality environment by assessing, evaluating, and understanding the factors of visual appearance, task completion time, movement velocity during interaction and its implications for a sense of agency, and presence in a virtual reality (VR) environment. An electroencephalogram (EEG)-based approach along with behavioral information is used. The results show that the amplitude of negative event-related potential (50-150 ms), defined as prediction error negativity (PEN), correlates with the realism of the rendering style of virtual hands during the interaction. It was also found that PEN amplitudes are significantly more pronounced in slow trials than fast trials. Based on these findings, a closed-loop BCI system has been designed to assess the effect of cognitive conflict in 3D object selection and provide the matrices which can improve users' feelings of a sense of agency towards VR. These findings suggest that a realistic representation of the user's hand, compatible task completion time and hand movement velocity are essential components for the better integration of information from both visual and proprioceptive systems during the interaction to avoid cognitive conflict due to a mismatch between action and expected feedback. The findings also suggest that the assessment of cognitive conflict measured by PEN can improve the overall experience of the 3D object selection task in a VR environment. Collectively, these findings provide a glimpse of understanding into how the brain dynamics behind interaction works and its implications in assessment for the content development industries in VR.