



LUND UNIVERSITY

Participants know best : The effect of calibration method on data quality

Holmqvist, Kenneth; Nyström, Marcus; Andersson, Richard; van de Weijer, Joost

Published in:
[Publication information missing]

2011

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Holmqvist, K., Nyström, M., Andersson, R., & van de Weijer, J. (2011). Participants know best : The effect of calibration method on data quality. *[Publication information missing]*.

Total number of authors:
4

General rights

Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117
221 00 Lund
+46 46-222 00 00

Participants know best – the effect of calibration method on data quality

Kenneth Holmqvist¹, Marcus Nyström¹, Richard Andersson¹ and Joost van de Weijer¹
¹Humanities Laboratory, Lund University, Sweden

BACKGROUND

1. Automatic calibration

Software decides when eye feature samples are recorded.

2. Operator-controlled

The operator clicks a button to record eye feature samples.


3. **Participant-controlled:** The participant clicks a button to record samples.

Challenges

The participant must look straight at the calibration target, and keep the eye still. Also, optical conditions may confuse gaze the estimation algorithm.


The participant may move his eye during calibration for a variety of reasons

- Anticipation (looking ahead too soon)
- Square-wave jerks, glissades, blinks
- Distraction
- Poor task instructions
- Etc.



Gaze estimation may be faltering due to

- Reflection in glasses
- Split corneal reflection in lenses
- The corneal reflection is in the sclera
- The pupil or corneal reflection are covered by eyelids or lashes
- Etc.



METHOD

Data recording

Four stations with identical SMI HiSpeed 500 Hz binocular
 Six operators (five experienced, one novice)
 149 non-prescreened students of economics
 Two recordings: Just after calibration, and after 15 minutes of reading.

Automatic (44), Operator-controlled (62), Participant-controlled (43)

Glasses (12), lenses (35), uncorrected vision (102)
 Mascara (37), clean eye-lashes (112)
 Dominant left eye (64), right eye (85)
 Eye-lashes directed down (8), forward (32), up (109)
 Eye cleft: medium (13), narrow (3), open (133)
 Eye colour: blue (112), brown (35), quite other (2)






Figure 4: Experimental setup ($d = 670$ mm, $h = 670$ mm, $\alpha = x^\circ$, $w = \frac{3}{4} \cdot W$ mm, $h = \frac{3}{4} \cdot H$ mm)

$$\theta_{\text{Offset}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i \quad \theta_{\text{RMS}} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \theta_i^2} = \sqrt{\frac{\theta_1^2 + \theta_2^2 + \dots + \theta_N^2}{N}}$$

High PRECISION
Low ACCURACY




Low PRECISION
High ACCURACY



✚ True gaze position
• Measured gaze position

RESULTS

Histograms over all data



Data analysis using a linear mixed-effects model: the lme4 package of R.

Accuracy (offset) is predicted by:

Predictor	min95	mean95	max95	p-value
Participant-controlled	-0.1192	-0.06668	-0.0072	0.0302
Operator-controlled	-0.07222	-0.01998	0.03953	0.4958
Off-center target	-0.00098	0.00000	0.00005	0.5402
Target placed low	-0.0001	-0.00005	0.00000	0.0022
measurementNo2	0.2454	0.2747	0.3045	0.0001
EyeColorBrownish	-0.06158	-0.00443	0.06161	0.8762
EyeColorOther	-0.1189	0.2259	0.8560	0.2520
VisualAidsGlasses	0.03837	0.1619	0.3061	0.0064
VisualAidsLenses	0.1613	0.2458	0.3362	0.0001
EyeLashesForward	0.01188	0.08243	0.1661	0.0248
EyeLashesDown	0.04827	0.1828	0.3482	0.0052
Mascara	0.00034	0.06581	0.1448	0.0570
Eye Right	-0.01801	0.1299	0.04165	0.3790
DominantEye Right	-0.02526	0.03098	0.09206	0.2830
EyeR:DominantEyeR	-0.07155	-0.03789	-0.00102	0.0400
EyePhysiologyMedium	-0.2306	-0.1059	0.08341	0.2292
EyePhysiologyOpen	-0.2547	-0.1462	0.0079	0.0680

Accuracy:

Participant-controlled calibration best
 Higher position on monitor better
 Glasses make accuracy worse
 Open eye physiology better
 Better accuracy on dominant eye
 Accuracy decreases over time

Precision (RMS) is predicted by:

Predictor	min95	mean95	max95	p-value
Participant-controlled	-0.00352	-0.00200	-0.00034	0.0160
Operator-controlled	-0.00233	-0.00090	0.00061	0.2444
Off-center target	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	0.0001
Target placed low	0.00001	0.00001	0.00001	0.0001
measurementNo2	0.00059	0.00088	0.00116	0.0001
EyeColorBrownish	-0.00530	-0.00391	-0.00252	0.0001
EyeColorQuite other	-0.01265	-0.00772	-0.00097	0.0268
VisualAidsGlasses	0.00709	0.01041	0.01421	0.0001
VisualAidsLenses	-0.00286	-0.00142	0.00001	0.0602
EyeLashesForward	-0.00328	-0.00172	-0.00007	0.0394
EyeLashesDown	-0.00313	-0.00035	0.00261	0.8178
Mascara Residues	-0.00135	0.00131	0.00436	0.3572
Mascara Yes	-0.00116	0.00040	0.00218	0.6330
Eye Right	0.00114	0.00159	0.00203	0.0001
DominantEye Right	-0.00044	0.00098	0.00247	0.1674
EyeR:DominantEyeR	-0.00016	0.00039	0.00094	0.1692
EyePhysiologyMedium	-0.00971	-0.00603	-0.00162	0.0084
EyePhysiologyOpen	-0.00901	-0.00534	-0.00126	0.0134

Precision:

Participant-controlled calibration best
 Higher position on monitor better
 Blue eyes are worse than brown
 Glasses make precision worse
 Open eye physiology is better
 Precision decreases over time

Amount of data loss is predicted by:

Predictor	min95	mean95	max95	p-value
Operator-controlled	-0.01641	0.00055	0.01495	0.9420
System-automatic	-0.03424	-0.01335	0.00484	0.1490
Off-center target	-0.01163	-0.01021	-0.00891	0.0001
Target placed low	-0.00288	-0.00211	-0.00130	0.0001
ValidationNo2	-0.01487	-0.01012	-0.00546	0.0001
VisualAidsGlasses	0.00128	0.02323	0.03943	0.0416
VisualAidsNone	0.00509	0.01761	0.02817	0.0084
EyeLashesForward	-0.03211	-0.01099	0.00548	0.2156
EyeLashesDown	-0.02165	0.00730	0.02955	0.5834
EyeColorBrownish	-0.02104	-0.00306	0.01148	0.7100
EyeColorOther	-0.34447	-0.11866	0.00422	0.0582
Mascara Residues	-0.05155	-0.01597	0.01105	0.2794
Mascara Yes	-0.03460	-0.01330	0.00287	0.1206
Eye Right	0.00063	0.00689	0.01243	0.0296
DominantEye Right	-0.00451	0.00884	0.02010	0.1864
EyePhysiologyMedium	-0.06264	0.00194	0.03843	0.9310
EyePhysiologyOpen	-0.01082	0.02937	0.05129	0.1228
EyeR:DominantEyeR	-0.00993	-0.00121	0.00716	0.7792


Data loss:

Higher position on monitor better
 Glasses make data loss worse
 Lenses make data loss worse
 Data loss increases over time


RESULTS

Accuracy is better with experienced operators

Dominant eye (Miles test) gives better accuracy



Operators 2-6 had extensive experience with this particular eye-tracker. Operator 1 had only recorded with head-mounted eye-trackers.



No difference between L and R eye.

Left dominant (LD) and right dominant (RD) eye give better accuracy than non-dominant eyes (LN and RN).