Pedestrians' perceptions of automated vehicle movements and light-based eHMIs
in real world conditions: A test track study

Stefanie Horn¹, Ruth Madigan¹, Yee Mun Lee¹, Fabio Tango², & Natasha Merat¹

¹Institute for Transport Studies, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, United Kingdom

²Centro Ricerche FIAT - Stellantis, 10043 Orbassano, Italy

Address correspondence to:

Stefanie Horn
University of Leeds
Institute for Transport Studies

Leeds LS1 9JT
United Kingdom
E-mail: tsseh@leeds.ac.uk

13 **ABSTRACT**

14 The development of increasingly automated vehicles (AVs) is likely to lead to new challenges around
15 how they will interact with other road users. In the future, it is envisaged that AVs, manually driven
16 vehicles, and vulnerable road users such as cyclists and pedestrians will need to share the road
17 environment and interact with one another. This paper presents a test track study, funded by the H2020
18 interACT project, investigating pedestrians' reactions towards an AV's movement patterns and
19 external Human Machine Interfaces (eHMIs). Twenty participants, standing on the side of a test-track
20 road and facing an approaching AV, were asked to raise their arm to indicate: (1) when they could
21 perceive the AV's eHMI, which consisted of either a Full Light Band (FLB) or a Partial Light Band
22 (PLB); (2) when they perceived the deceleration of the AV (with eHMI vs. no eHMI); and (3) when
23 they felt safe to cross the road in front of the approaching AV (with eHMI vs. no eHMI). Statistical
24 analyses revealed no effects of the presence of an eHMI on the pedestrians' crossing decision or
25 deceleration perception, but significant differences were found regarding the visibility of the FLB and
26 PLB designs. The PLB design could be perceived at further distances than the FLB design. Both eHMI
27 solutions were generally well-received, and participants provided high ratings of acceptance, perceived
28 safety, and confidence around the AV.

29 **Keywords:** pedestrian, AV, crossing, eHMI, acceptance, safety

30 1. INTRODUCTION

31 The introduction of automated vehicles (AVs) on public roads is a major goal for vehicle
32 manufacturers, governments, and academics in the automotive field (Frisoni et al., 2016). It has been
33 argued that road user interactions in mixed traffic environments will change with the addition of
34 “driverless” vehicles (Fekete et al., 2015), which are no longer controlled by a human operator (SAE
35 Levels 4 & 5, SAE, 2018). To achieve safe and efficient integration of AVs in mixed traffic
36 environments, they must gain both their passengers’ trust and acceptance (Körber et al., 2018;
37 Matthaei, 2015), and the trust, acceptance of other human traffic participants, such as manual car-
38 drivers, cyclists and pedestrians (Rothenbücher et al., 2016).

39 Observations of pedestrian-driver communication in real-time traffic situations have shown that traffic
40 participants’ communications are mostly based on implicit cues, such as use of the vehicle’s speed,
41 time to arrival, or distance, with less reliance on more explicit communication strategies, such as arm
42 and head movements, or vehicle-based lights and sounds (Ackermann et al., 2019; Dietrich et al., 2018;
43 Lee et al., 2020a; Petzoldt et al., 2018; Sun et al., 2015). However, in congested traffic environments,
44 such as urban settings, ambiguous situations are normally resolved through explicit interactions, via
45 gestures, facial expressions, or eye contact, to help express intentions (Merten, 1977; Rasouli et al.,
46 2018; Hölzel, 2008). The importance of visual search has been documented in a study by Schneemann
47 and Gohl (2016), who demonstrated that pedestrians searched for eye-contact at lower speeds (in a
48 30km/h zone), but made decisions based on vehicles’ behaviour at faster speeds (in a 50km/h zone).
49 Explicit communications are also thought to be more useful in “stand-off” conditions (Rasouli et al.,
50 2017; Sucha et al., 2017), for example, to resolve a conflict between two actors wishing to share the
51 same road space at the same time (Markkula et al., 2020).

52 As high-level AVs are not yet ready for operation in suburban or urban environments, real-life
53 interactions between pedestrians and AVs are rather unexplored, but a limited number of insights exist.
54 Recent studies suggest that when it comes to interactions between pedestrians and AVs, pedestrians
55 do not fully trust the AV’s behaviour and prefer to receive some form of explicit information about its
56 intention (De Clercq et al., 2019; Merat et al., 2018; Vissers et al., 2017). Pedestrians have also reported
57 feeling uncomfortable when there is no possibility of communicating with the driver of a car (Lundgren
58 et al., 2017, Hensch et al., 2019; Velasco et al., 2021). Therefore, it is critical to study future

59 communication solutions that could promote pedestrians' understanding of AVs' intentions, which
60 should also contribute to their acceptance (Färber, 2016).

61 External Human-Machine Interfaces (eHMIs) have been proposed as a means by which driver-
62 pedestrian communication can be replaced in AVs (Schieben et al., 2019a; Fridman et al., 2017). These
63 interfaces can be used to provide other road users with information about the AV's intended behaviour,
64 by displaying visual or auditory messages on the outside of the vehicle. Studies have shown that they
65 can enhance participants' perceived safety and comfort when encountering an AV (Böckle et al., 2017;
66 de Clercq et al., 2019). Research has also shown that message design, and the visibility of light-based
67 eHMIs can have a positive effect on how quickly pedestrians feel safe to cross in front of an
68 approaching AV (e.g. Song, et al., 2018; Lee et al., 2020b; Wang, & Xu, 2020).

69 Much of the current research around eHMIs is devoted to investigating pedestrians' information needs,
70 the best design options for eHMI signals, and how to gauge pedestrians' understanding of eHMI-
71 signals (Böckle et al., 2017; Faas et al., 2020; Kaup et al., 2019; Hochman et al., 2020; Lee et al.,
72 2020b). The literature presents several possible design solutions: LED-light signals, symbols, text-
73 messages, head-mounted displays, projections on the street, etc. (Chang et al., 2017; Deb et al., 2018;
74 Hillis et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2019; Song et al., 2018), with many studies showing higher willingness
75 to cross the road in front of an AV when an eHMI is provided (e.g. Song et al., 2018; Ackermans et
76 al., 2020; Dey et al., 2020). However, the visibility of these eHMI solutions must be taken into account
77 (Lee et al., 2020b), and this is affected by the size of display, the distance between the pedestrian and
78 AV, and the AV's approaching speed (Clamann et al., 2017). LED-based eHMI concepts which
79 communicate information through light signals provide a good option in terms of visibility. In
80 particular, sweeping and flashing lights can be perceived quite quickly, and learnt after a short training
81 session (Faas et al., 2019, Habibovic et al., 2018, Lee et al., 2019).

82 Although a number of studies have investigated pedestrians' responses to new eHMI solutions, real-
83 world investigations of the visibility of LED-based eHMIs, and pedestrians' interactions with these,
84 are rare. To date, most studies in this context have evaluated the visibility of LED-based eHMIs in
85 simulator environments (using pedestrian simulators, VR environments, or video-based analyses; Lee
86 et al., 2020b; Deb et al., 2018), which do not sufficiently reflect the changes in natural lighting of a
87 real-world setting. Clearly, for any design concepts to be deployed and used effectively, an
88 investigation of pedestrians' perception of these designs in real-world lighting conditions is crucial. In
89 addition, recent research has highlighted the need to consider the combined effects of vehicle
90 movement patterns and eHMIs on pedestrian responses (e.g. Dey et al., 2020; de Clercq et al., 2019;

Lee et al., 2020). To date, test-track studies in real-world conditions have used a Wizard-of-Oz (WOZ) method to simulate the impression of a driverless-car (e.g. Hensch et al., 2019; Palmeiro et al., 2018; Rothenbücher et al., 2016). However, the movement cues of a WOZ controlled vehicle are likely to be slightly different to a machine-controlled AV, and thus it is important to understand how AV movement cues are perceived by pedestrians.

The present study addressed these gaps in more detail, using a test-track study to explore participants' reactions to a machine-controlled AV with two different LED-based eHMI solutions. Specifically, the study aimed to answer three key questions:

- (1) the distance at which pedestrians could perceive the LED-based eHMI solutions,
- (2) the effect of eHMIs on the accuracy of pedestrians' perceptions about the AV's deceleration behaviour, and
- (3) whether pedestrians felt safe to cross the road in front of an approaching AV (with eHMI vs. no eHMI).

A final goal of the study was to investigate how pedestrians interpret the meaning of these eHMI solutions, and how they rate them, in terms of perceived usability and acceptance.

2. METHOD

2.1 PARTICIPANTS

Twenty-Four participants (14 males and 10 females) aged between 24 and 62 ($M_{age} = 36.96$ years, $SD_{age} = 12.57$) took part in the study. Due to ethical and security concerns about facilitating interactions with an automated vehicle, all participants were employees of Centro Ricerche FIAT - Stellantis (CRF-Stellantis) from Italy (with no expertise in the field of automated driving). Participants had a normal or corrected-to-normal vision. Ethical approval was obtained from the University of Leeds Research Ethics Committee (Reference Number AREA 19-058).

2.2 LOCATION AND DEMONSTRATOR

The study took place on a dedicated straight test-track area at the FIAT Safety Centre, near the CRF-Stellantis facilities in Orbassano, Italy (see Figure 1).

Figure 1: Study set-up, including participant’s starting position, their movement direction into the Area of Interest (AoI, red arrow), the experimenter’s position (E), AV’s approaching line (green arrow), and traffic cones at a 10m, 15m and 20m distance from the participant.

The experimental demonstrator vehicle for this study was an automated Jeep “Renegade” MY2018 (Figure 2) provided by CRF-Stellantis, operated by a Cooperation and Communication Planning Unit (see Markowski et al., 2019), which controlled the trajectory and speed of the vehicle, and triggered the relevant eHMI when a pedestrian was detected in a pre-defined area of interest (AoI, see red marking in Figure 1). A safety driver was present in the driver’s seat to intervene in the event of an emergency. The car was equipped with an LED-based light band (developed by interACT partner Hella) on the bottom of the windshield. Two eHMI solutions (see Figure 2) were implemented through this light band, which was connected to the AV’s control system. The eHMI designs were developed in the interACT research project as solutions for safe interactions between vulnerable road users and AVs (Weber et al., 2019). The eHMI solutions consisted of:

- (i) A Full Light Band eHMI design (FLB), which consisted of a slow-pulsing cyan-coloured light band stretching across the bottom of the windscreen.
- (ii) A Partial Light Band eHMI design (PLB), which was a smaller directed cyan-coloured light band, that glowed in the direction of the addressee.

Figure 2: eHMI solutions, the Full Light Band design (left), and the Partial Light Band design (right)

Both light bands pulsated at an average luminance of $\sim 1500\text{cd/m}^2$ at the highest luminance level, which dimmed to 2% of this value at the lowest luminance level. The light band pulsed between these two using a sinusoidal function, at two rates: slowly (0.4Hz) and quickly (2Hz). For the FLB, the entire light band was illuminated, whereas the directed light of the PLB was an illuminated moving block with a width of 35 pixels (35 cm). A dark cover was placed on the AV's bonnet to enhance the contrast of the cyan light of the eHMI, and to reduce reflections on the bonnet.

2.3 PROCEDURE & STUDY DESIGN

On arrival at the test track, participants were informed that the study aimed to examine pedestrians' interactions with automated vehicles, and their decision-making processes when crossing the road. They were told that for this experiment they would be interacting with a fully automated vehicle, which was driven autonomously, and that there would be a safety driver on board to monitor the system, but not control of the vehicle, apart from emergency situations. Participants started the experiment by standing at the side of the test track, and looking to their right, the opposite direction from the AV (see participant placement in Figure 1). The experimenter stood opposite the participant, facing the direction of the vehicle (see experimenter placement in Figure 1). The experimental procedure was as follows: On the experimenter's instruction, the participants were asked to step into the defined area of interest (AoI, the point at which the AV could detect the participant) and to turn their head to face the AV, which was approaching from their left at a maximum speed of $\sim 12\text{ km/h}$. A within-participant design was used for the study, which required participants to respond to three potential eHMI design variations: no eHMI, Full Light Band eHMI (FLB), and Partial Light Band eHMI (PLB). Depending on the experimental test condition, participants were asked to raise their arm straight up:

- (1) as soon as they could see the eHMI (eHMI Visibility);
- (2) as soon as they noticed that the vehicle was decelerating (Deceleration Perception); or
- (3) as soon as they felt safe to cross in front of the approaching AV (Crossing Decision).

A trial ended with the response of the participant. Participants completed a total of 24 trials - the first 9 trials always consisted of Crossing Decision trials (randomized across 3 eHMI types x 3 AV distances) to avoid a situation where participants' crossing decision were affected by previous questions about eHMI Visibility or Deceleration Perception. The order of the remaining 15 trials was counterbalanced across eHMI Visibility (randomized across 2 eHMI designs x 3 AV distances) and Deceleration Perception trials (randomized across 3 eHMI types x 3 AV distances).

Prior to starting the main experiment, participants were allowed to complete as many practice trials as necessary to feel comfortable with the set-up. Additionally, participants were asked to provide their

168 feedback through post-trial and post-experimental questionnaires (see Section 2.5). In order to
169 investigate how intuitive the eHMI designs were, participants were not informed about their meaning.
170 The experiment lasted approximately 1.5 hours for each participant, with the chance for a break
171 halfway through the experiment.

172 2.4 OBJECTIVE MEASURES

173 A video camera was placed in the windshield of the AV, recording the view from the front of the
174 vehicle. GPS data was also recorded for the AV, along with absolute time in seconds, and distance to
175 the detected pedestrian in meters for each trial. To establish how participants responded to each task,
176 video recordings were analysed to extract data about participants' encounters with the approaching
177 AV. The time of each arm raise (in seconds) was identified from participant videos as the moment at
178 which the participant began to move their arm upwards. The distance (in meters) between the
179 participant and the AV at this moment was identified using the GPS data. Measurements of eHMI
180 Visibility, Crossing Decision Time, and Deceleration Perception Time were calculated as follows:

- 181 (1) **eHMI Visibility** was measured by asking participants to raise their arms as soon as they
182 perceived the eHMI. The distance (in meters) of the AV from the pedestrian was recorded at
183 the time of each arm raise.
- 184 (2) To investigate the pedestrians' **Crossing Decision Time** (*CDT*, in seconds), the AV's
185 deceleration onset time was first identified, based on the point at which the AV began to brake
186 evenly to come to a stop (see Figure 3 for an example). This deceleration onset point was
187 automatically identified using the findpeaks Matlab-function to detect the last peak in the
188 velocity graph (see blue line in Figure 3) for each trial. A threshold of 2 m/s (equivalent to 7.2
189 km/h) was set, to avoid the function returning the small peak before the AV stopped its'
190 movement completely (see the peak after 23 seconds in the velocity graph shown in Figure 3,
191 marked with a black arrow). In order to incorporate an understanding of whether the AV
192 kinematic behaviour affected pedestrians crossing decisions, *CDT* was calculated as the
193 pedestrian arm raise onset time for the crossing trials (*R*, see red response time marker in Figure
194 3), minus the AV deceleration onset time (*DEC*, see blue deceleration onset marker in Figure
195 3):

$$196 \quad CDT = R - DEC$$

197

(3) Similarly, **Deceleration Perception Time** (DPT , in seconds) was calculated as the pedestrian arm raise onset time (R) in the deceleration perception trials, minus AV deceleration onset time (DEC):

$$DPT = R - DEC$$

Figure 3: AV velocity graph showing a sample trial for one participant. Markers identify the participant’s initial movement into the AoI in green (IM), the AV’s deceleration onset in blue (DEC), and the participant’s response with an arm raise in red (R).

2.5 SUBJECTIVE MEASURES

After each of the Crossing Decision trials (first 9 trials), the participants were asked to provide a verbal rating on the following two items:

- ‘I felt confident in my decision of when to cross the road.’, and
- ‘I felt safe during this encounter with the automated vehicle.’,

using a 10-point-scale from 1- “Strongly Disagree” to 10- “Strongly Agree”.

When the participants completed all 24 experimental trials, they were asked about their interpretation of the two eHMI solutions, and a questionnaire was provided to assess the effects of the eHMI designs on usability and acceptance ratings. Usability was measured with the System Usability Scale (Brooke, 1986), a 10-item questionnaire rated from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The van der Laan Acceptance Scale (Van der Laan et al., 1997) with the two subdimensions ‘satisfaction’ and

217 ‘usefulness’ was applied to assess the acceptance of the eHMI solutions. The 5-point rating scale
 218 ranged from 1 (best) to 5 (worst) and consisted of nine semantic differentials.

219 3. RESULTS

220 3.1 Data Checking: Analysis of participants’ Initial Movement Distance

221 The instruction to step forward into the AoI was based on the experimenter’s judgment of when the
 222 AV reached certain markers on the road (see traffic cones at a 10m, 15m, and 20m distance from the
 223 participant in Figure 1). It was anticipated that there would be some variability in the participant’s
 224 “Initial Movement Distance” to the AV across participants and trials, as each participant was likely to
 225 have a certain reaction time to the experimenter’s instruction. Due to this variability, participants’
 226 initial movement distance to the AV for each eHMI condition were compared to ensure that this Initial
 227 Movement Distance did not differ significantly between the eHMI groups. The three distance
 228 conditions (10m, 15m, and 20m) were analysed as separate measurement groups and not statistically
 229 compared to each other. The resultant statistical analysis plan for the study’s results is described in
 230 Figure 4.

Dependent Variables	Independent Variables		Statistical test
	Distance	eHMI type	
eHMI Visibility Distance	10 m	→ FLB vs. PLB	t-test
	15 m	→ FLB vs. PLB	t-test
	20 m	→ FLB vs. PLB	t-test
Deceleration Perception Time	10 m	→ FLB vs. PLB vs. no eHMI	ANOVA
	15 m	→ FLB vs. PLB vs. no eHMI	ANOVA
	20 m	→ FLB vs. PLB vs. no eHMI	ANOVA
Crossing Decision Time	10 m	→ FLB vs. PLB vs. no eHMI	ANOVA
	15 m	→ FLB vs. PLB vs. no eHMI	ANOVA
	20 m	→ FLB vs. PLB vs. no eHMI	ANOVA

231
 232 **Figure 4:** Statistical analysis plan for the three objective measures (eHMI Visibility Distance, Deceleration perception
 233 Time, and Crossing Decision Time)

234 Following the statistical analysis plan in Figure 4, separate analysis of the Initial Movement Distance
 235 for (1) the eHMI Visibility trials, (2) the Deceleration Perception trials, and (3) the Crossing Decision
 236 trials were conducted:

- (1) For the eHMI Visibility trials, t-tests were performed between the two eHMI types (FLB vs. PLB), for each distance condition. The results showed no significant difference in the participants Initial Movement Distance between FLB and PLB trials at 10m ($t(15) = .69, p = .50$), 15m ($t(14) = -.10, p = .92$), or 20m distance ($t(11) = .05, p = .96$). The results of this analysis suggest that any differences in response times for the eHMI Visibility trials are not due to differences in Initial Movement Distance. The actual distances at the participants' initial movement had a spread of approximately 4-5 metres in each distance condition (see Appendix 1 for scatterplots of the eHMI Visibility trials for each distance condition).
- (2) For the Deceleration Perception trials three one-way ANOVAs were conducted for each distance condition between the three eHMI conditions (FLB vs. PLB vs. no eHMI). The pattern of results was similar to the eHMI Visibility trials (see Figure 5). The results showed no significant differences between eHMI conditions in the 10m ($F(2,40) = .45, p = .64$), and 20m ($F(2,38) = .47, p = .63$) trials. However, there was a significant difference between the initial movement distances for PLB and FLB in the 15m trials ($F(2,40) = 4.35, p = .02, r = .83$), with a large effect size (Rosenthal, 1991). A post-hoc-test with Bonferroni correction shows that the mean distance at the participant's initial movement into the AoI for the trial without eHMI was significantly longer than for the trials with PLB ($p = .04$). This could indicate that the AV was on average further away for trials without eHMI. Another reason could be the presence of an outlier data point in the PLB condition, at a distance of 8.90m (see Figure 5, second scatterplot). When this outlier was removed, the difference between PLB and no eHMI trials was no longer significant ($p > .5$). However, this significant effect for the 15m condition was taken into account in the interpretation of the Deceleration Perception Time trials (see section 3.2.2), with the anticipation that if the initial movement distance influenced the Deceleration Perception Time, participants would have faster Deceleration Perception Times for the no eHMI condition than for the other two conditions.
- (3) A check of the participant's Initial Movement Distance in the Crossing Decision trials (see scatterplots in Appendix 2), including three one-way ANOVAs for each distance condition between three eHMI conditions (FLB vs. PLB vs. no eHMI), revealed no significant differences at the 10m ($F(2,42) = 2.55, p = .09$), 15m ($F(2,42) = .09, p = .91$), or 20m ($F(2,32) = 1.22, p = .31$) distance conditions. The results of this analysis suggest that any differences in response times for the Crossing Decision trials are not due to differences in Initial Movement Distance.

269

270

271

272

273

Figure 5: Overview of the participant's **Initial Movement Distance** (x-axis) in the 10 m, 15 m, and 20m conditions for the **Deceleration Perception** trials, against their **Deceleration Perception Time** (y-axis), including data for each participant (one scatter point equals one participant's trial) and all three eHMI conditions (FLB, PLB, and no eHMI). Deceleration Perception Time below zero incorporates participant's response before AV started to decelerate.

274 3.2 OBJECTIVE MEASURES

275 3.2.1 Comparison of eHMI VISIBILITY DISTANCE between FLB and PLB

276 Figure 6 shows the average eHMI Visibility Distance for the trials with FLB and PLB. Repeated
 277 measures t-tests were conducted separately for each of the distance conditions. Results revealed that
 278 the participants detected the PLB at a significantly further distance than the FLB in the 10m ($t(21) = -$
 279 2.54, $p = .019$, $r = .48$), 15m ($t(18) = -3.73$, $p = .002$, $r = .66$), and 20m ($t(19) = -4.16$, $p < .001$, $r =$
 280 .69) distance conditions, with large effect sizes (Rosenthal, 1991).

281

282 **Figure 6:** Participant's eHMI Visibility Distance across three distance conditions (10m, 15m, 20m), and two eHMI types
 283 (FLB and PLB), boxplots including median and outliers (red points)

284 3.2.2 Comparison of DECELERATION PERCEPTION TIME between FLB, PLB and no eHMI

285 Three one-way ANOVAs were conducted to compare Deceleration Perception Times between eHMI
 286 conditions in the 10m, 15m, and 20m trials. As a significant difference in the participant's Initial
 287 Movement Distance into the AoI was found between PLB and no eHMI conditions in the 15m trials
 288 (see results pre-analysis in section 3.1), it could be expected that if the initial movement distance had
 289 an influence on deceleration perception, the participants would have perceived the deceleration for the

no eHMI trial condition quicker. However, results showed that there was no effect of the presence of an eHMI on how quickly the participants perceived the deceleration of the AV in the 10m ($F(2,40) = .40, p > .68$), 15m ($F(2,40) = 1.40, p = .26$) or 20m trial ($F(2,36) = .44, p = .65$).

Overall, the results revealed that, the closer the AV, the faster the Deceleration Perception Time (see Figure 7). Negative values indicate that participants responded/raised their arm before the AV started to decelerate. The spread of the data in the 20m distance condition is larger than in the 10m or 15m distance condition, suggesting participants had greater difficulty identifying AV behaviour at further distances.

Figure 7: Participant's Deceleration Perception Time across the three distance conditions (10m, 15m, 20m), and three eHMI conditions (FLB, PLB, no eHMI), boxplots including median and outliers (red points)

3.2.3 Comparison of CROSSING DECISION TIME between FLB, PLB, and no eHMI

When looking at the results for the Crossing Decision task (see Figure 8), the three one-way ANOVAs showed that there was no significant effect of the presence of an eHMI on participants' Crossing Decision Time in the 10m ($F(2,40) = .65, p = .53$), 15m ($F(2,40) = .08, p = .50$), or 20m distance condition ($F(2,40) = .08, p = .92$). At further distances (20m) the majority of the participants indicated a willingness to cross before the AV started the deceleration process (Crossing Decision Time < 0 sec).

Figure 8: Participant's Crossing Decision Time across the three distance conditions (10m, 15m, 20m), and three eHMI conditions (FLB, PLB, no eHMI), boxplots including median and outliers (red points)

3.3 COMPARISON OF SUBJECTIVE RESPONSES

3.3.1 PERCEIVED CONFIDENCE & SAFETY

After each Crossing Decision trial (the first 9 trials for each participant), participants were asked to provide ratings of their perceived confidence in their crossing decision and their perceived safety, on a 10-point-scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 10 (strongly agree), while encountering the AV. Three one-way ANOVAs showed no significant differences between the three eHMI conditions (FLB, PLB, no eHMI) on the perceived confidence or safety ratings of participants for any of the distance conditions (see Table 1). These findings suggest that there was no effect of the presence of an eHMI on how safe or confident participants felt when crossing the road in front of an approaching AV. Participants gave somewhat higher ratings of safety and confidence in their crossing decisions the further away the AV was. However, the ratings were high for both scales on the whole, and above the scale midpoint of 5.5.

Table 1: Results for perceived confidence and safety including means for each of the eHMI conditions (FLB, PLB, no eHMI), within each distance condition

CONFIDENCE			
	10 distance condition	15 distance condition	20 distance condition
Means	$M_{FLB} = 8.83 (SD = 1.34)$	$M_{FLB} = 9.21 (SD = 1.10)$	$M_{FLB} = 9.33 (SD = .96)$
	$M_{PLB} = 8.75 (SD = 1.15)$	$M_{PLB} = 9.00 (SD = 1.14)$	$M_{PLB} = 9.38 (SD = .77)$
	$M_{no\ eHMI} = 8.96 (SD = 1.12)$	$M_{no\ eHMI} = 9.17 (SD = 1.09)$	$M_{no\ eHMI} = 9.38 (SD = .88)$
ANOVA	$F(2,46) = .65, p = .29$	$F(1.55,35.62) = 1.25, p = .29$	$F(2,46) = .06, p = .94$
SAFETY			
	10 distance condition	15 distance condition	20 distance condition
Means	$M_{FLB} = 8.92 (SD = 1.21)$	$M_{FLB} = 9.29 (SD = 1.19)$	$M_{FLB} = 9.33 (SD = 1.01)$
	$M_{PLB} = 8.88 (SD = 1.23)$	$M_{PLB} = 9.00 (SD = 1.35)$	$M_{PLB} = 9.33 (SD = .96)$
	$M_{no\ eHMI} = 8.88 (SD = 1.19)$	$M_{no\ eHMI} = 9.38 (SD = .92)$	$M_{no\ eHMI} = 9.21 (SD = 1.06)$
ANOVA	$F(2,46) = .06, p = .94$	$F(2,46) = 1.82, p = .17$	$F(2,46) = .38, p = .69$

3.3.2 INTERPRETATION OF THE SIGNAL

Responses to open-ended questions about the participants' interpretation of the eHMI solutions ('During the experiment how did you interpret the eHMI displayed in Figure 1/2?') were categorized and counted by two independent referees (see Table 2). Multiple responses were possible for the participants and, in total, 24 participants provided 29 responses regarding the FLB and 24 responses regarding the PLB. Results showed that, when observing the FLB signal, more than half of the participants' ($n = 13$) thought that the signal indicted 'AV detected me', with comments such as "Indication that the vehicle saw me" or "I think the eHMI switches on when it sees me". The other half of the participants provided less specific answers and interpreted the FLB signal as "a safe signal, to cross the road" ($n = 4$) or as the "beginning of braking action" ($n = 5$). Similarly, the most common interpretation categories for the meaning of the PLB signal were 'AV detected me' ($n = 6$) and 'AV detected me and my position' ($n = 8$) with comments such as "Indication that the vehicle saw me" and "It was like an eye. I knew exactly where the vehicle was looking at."

338 **Table 2:** Interpretation categories of the FLB and PLB, including number of participants' answers

FLB - interpretation categories	n / 29	PLB - interpretation categories	n / 24
AV detected me	13	AV detected me	6
safe to cross	4	AV detected me and my position	8
AV is braking	5	AV is braking	3
AV works correctly	1	safe to cross	2
distance to user	1		
AV's driving mode (automation on)	1		
no interpretation	4	no interpretation	5

339 3.3.3 USABILITY & ACCEPTANCE

340 System Usability Scores for each item were converted to an aggregated score ranging from 0 (worst)
341 to 100 (best). The mean System Usability Score (SUS) across all participants was 68.05 ($SD = 4.23$)
342 for the FLB and 66.17 ($SD = 4.06$) for the PLB. According to other literature in this area (Sauro, &
343 Lewis, 2016), scores under 68 are considered to be average, and systems scoring above 68 are
344 considered to be over average. Our results suggest that overall participants were rather indecisive
345 regarding the usability of the presented eHMIs. A t-test did not reveal a statistical difference between
346 the average SUS rating of the FLB and PLB ($t(23) = .71, p = .49$).

347 Van der Laan's (1997) acceptance scale was used to evaluate the usefulness and satisfaction with the
348 eHMIs. The 5-point rating scale ranged from 1 (best) to 5 (worst). Results showed that there was no
349 significant difference in the usefulness ratings ($t(23) = -.83, p = .42$), with generally high usefulness
350 ratings for PLB ($M = 0.97, SD = 0.91$) and FLB ($M = 0.87, SD = 0.84$). Similarly, there was no
351 significant difference in satisfaction ratings ($t(23) = -.96, p = .35$), with high satisfaction ratings for
352 PLB ($M = 1.05, SD = .85$) and FLB ($M = .95, SD = .75$).

353 4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

354 The aim of this test-track study was to investigate pedestrian reactions to LED-based eHMI solutions
355 and AV movement patterns in natural daylight conditions. We investigated three main topics: (1) the
356 visibility of the two eHMI designs, (2) the impact of the presence of an eHMI on participants' ability

357 to perceive the deceleration behaviour of an AV, and (3) the impact of an eHMI on pedestrians'
358 crossing decisions around an approaching AV.

359 Overall, the findings suggest that participants can see the Partial Light Band (PLB) design from a
360 further distance than the Full Light Band (FLB) design. This finding was unexpected, as research into
361 visual perception has generally suggested that larger objects or symbols appear in one's viewpoint
362 earlier than smaller objects (e.g. De Lucia, 1991). However, it is possible that the movement of the
363 PLB across the black LED band, and the contrast between the light and LED-band colour led to a
364 greater contrast, that was easier to detect. This observation was also made by Hensch et al. (2019) who
365 found that their moving light-based eHMI attracted more attention than a not moving eHMI signal.

366 There was no significant effect of eHMI on crossing decisions or deceleration perception, indicating
367 that the eHMI had no effect on participants ability to judge the movement patterns of the AV, or their
368 willingness to cross in front of the vehicle. Previous research has shown that participants made faster
369 crossing decisions in front of an AV with eHMI than without (e.g. Song, et al., 2018; Lee et al., 2020b;
370 Wang, & Xu, 2020). However, our data revealed that the presence or design of the LED-based eHMIs
371 didn't affect how quickly participants decided when it is safe to cross the road. Lee et al. (2020b) found
372 that the effect of their flashing headlights eHMI only emerged at particular kinematic combinations (at
373 speeds of 25, 30, and 35mph, equivalent to ~ 40 to 56km/h, and smaller time gaps of 2 to 3s). Thus, it
374 is possible that differences might emerge at faster speeds than the 12 km/h the AV was travelling at in
375 the current study.

376 Interview data revealed some ambiguity in how participants interpreted the eHMI signals portrayed in
377 this study. Half of the participants interpreted the eHMIs as providing information about the AV's
378 detection of the pedestrian (FLB and PLB) and the detection of the position of the pedestrian (PLB).
379 A smaller group interpreted the signals as providing information that the AV was braking or that it
380 was safe to cross (FLB and PLB), and a few participants were not able to infer any reasonable meaning.
381 Thus, there was no consistent meaning assigned to either eHMI across participants. This rather low
382 level of comprehensibility of LED- or light-based eHMI signals was also reported in previous research
383 works (Ackermann et al., 2019; Lee et al., 2019, Schieben et al., 2019b, and Hensch et al., 2019).
384 Regardless of the eHMI type or absence of the eHMIs, pedestrians generally provided feedback that
385 they felt safe and confident in interacting with the AV. Taken together, these results suggest that
386 participants did not use the eHMI to inform their crossing decisions. Indeed, although there was
387 variance in crossing decisions and deceleration perception times at further distances, participants
388 provided slightly higher ratings of perceived confidence and safety the further away the AV was. This

suggests that pedestrians felt safer crossing at further distances from the AV, regardless of their perception of the eHMI or deceleration behaviour. These results are supported by previous finding from Suh et al. (2013) and Clamann et al. (2017) that the distance is a main determinant in pedestrians' decision to cross. However, the slow speed of the AV must be taken into account, as research by Beggiato et al. (2017) has shown that pedestrians' decisions to cross are affected by estimations of time to arrival.

4.1 LIMITATIONS

In the current study, the participant's initial movement distance to the AV had two sources of errors: First, the experimenter's judgment of when the AV reached the distance markers on the road (10m, 15m, 20m) could vary, leading to some inconsistency in the participant's Initial Movement Distance towards the AV. Second, the participants' own reaction time to the experimenter's instruction also led to a small delay. In order to counteract this issue, we checked the participants' initial movements into the AoI for all three test conditions (eHMI Visibility, Deceleration Perception, and Crossing Decision) across all three distances (10m, 15m, and 20m) and all three eHMI conditions (FLB, PLB, and no eHMI). As already mentioned, this difference did not have an evident influence on this study's outcome (see section 3.2.2), but it did limit the comparisons across the three distances, which is something future research should consider. Furthermore, our study was conducted with a small number of participants, and only involved one AV and therefore couldn't represent the realistic traffic environment where the pedestrian has to interact with several traffic participants at the same time.

4.2 CONCLUSIONS

To our knowledge, this is the first study evaluating pedestrians' responses to a machine-controlled AV and eHMI signals in real world conditions. Both eHMI solutions showed good visibility in daylight conditions across all distances examined, although the PLB design was perceived further away than the FLB design. This suggests that a moving light signal, with high contrast to the surrounding vehicle may be an optimal way to convey messages in a real-world setting. While there were no differences in crossing decision or deceleration perception times based on eHMI design or presence, both eHMI designs were rated highly, suggesting that their inclusion may aid acceptance and perceived usability of AVs. Future research, in higher speed and more complex settings is required to understand how these factors influence visibility and perception of AV eHMIs and movement patterns in naturalistic environments.

419 5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

420 The authors wish to thank colleagues from HELLA, DLR, and ICCS for their invaluable contributions
421 to the research project. This work is part of the interACT project. interACT has received funding from
422 the European Union's Horizon 2020 research & innovation program under grant agreement no.
423 723395. The content reflects only the authors' view and the European Commission is not responsible
424 for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

425 References

- 426 Ackermann, C., Beggiato, M., Schubert, S., Krems, J.F. (2019). An experimental study to investigate
427 design and assessment criteria: what is important for communication between pedestrians and
428 automated vehicles? *Applied Ergonomics*, 75, 272–282
- 429 Ackermans, S., Dey, D., Ruijten, P., Cuijpers, R. H., & Pfleging, B. (2020). The effects of explicit
430 intention communication, conspicuous sensors, and pedestrian attitude in interactions with
431 automated vehicles. In *Proceedings of the 2020 chi conference on human factors in computing*
432 *systems* (pp. 1-14).
- 433 Beggiato, M., Witzlack, C., & Krems, J. F. (2017). Gap acceptance and time-to-arrival estimates as
434 basis for informal communication between pedestrians and vehicles. In *Proceedings of the 9th*
435 *international conference on automotive user interfaces and interactive vehicular applications* (pp.
436 50-57).
- 437 Böckle, M. P., Brenden, A. P., Klingegård, M., Habibovic, A., & Bout, M. (2017). SAV2P: Exploring
438 the impact of an interface for shared automated vehicles on pedestrians' experience. In
439 *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Automotive User Interfaces and Interactive*
440 *Vehicular Applications Adjunct* (pp. 136-140).
- 441 Brooke, J. (1986). *System usability scale (SUS): a quick-and-dirty method of system evaluation user*
442 *information*. Reading, UK: Digital Equipment Co Ltd, 43, 1-7.
- 443 Chang, C.-M., Toda, K., Sakamoto, D., Igarashi, T., (2017). Eyes on a Car: an Interface Design for
444 Communication between an Autonomous Car and a Pedestrian, in: *Proceedings of the 9th*
445 *ACM International Conference on Automotive User*
- 446 Clamann, M., Aubert, M., & Cummings, M. L. (2017). Evaluation of vehicle-to-pedestrian
447 communication displays for autonomous vehicles (No. 17-02119).
- 448 De Clercq, K., Dietrich, A., Núñez Velasco, J. P., de Winter, J., & Happee, R. (2019). External human-
449 machine interfaces on automated vehicles: Effects on pedestrian crossing decisions. *Human*
450 *Factors*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018720819836343>
- 451 Deb, S., Hudson, C. R., Carruth, D. W., & Frey, D. (2018). Pedestrians receptivity in autonomous
452 vehicles: Exploring a video-based assessment. *Proceedings of the Human Factors and*
453 *Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting*, 62(1), 2061–2065.

- 454 De Lucia, P.R. (1991). Pictorial and motion-based information for depth perception, *Journal of*
455 *Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 17, 738-748.
- 456 Dey, D., Matviienko, A., Berger, M., Pfleging, B., Martens, M., & Terken, J. (2020).
457 Communicating the intention of an automated vehicle to pedestrians: The contributions of
458 eHMI and vehicle behaviour. *Information Technology*, doi: [https://doi.org/10.1515/itit-2020-](https://doi.org/10.1515/itit-2020-0025)
459 0025
- 460 Dietrich, A., Willrodt, J.-H., Wagner, K., Bengler, K. (2018). Projection-based external human
461 machine interfaces-enabling interaction between automated vehicles and pedestrians. In:
462 *Proceedings of the DSC 2018 Europe VR*
- 463 Faas, S. M., & Baumann, M. (2019). Light-Based External Human Machine Interface: Color
464 Evaluation for Self-Driving Vehicle and Pedestrian Interaction. *Proceedings of the Human*
465 *Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting*, 63(1), 1232–1236.
- 466 Faas, S. M., Mathis, L. A., & Baumann, M. (2020). External HMI for self-driving vehicles: which
467 information shall be displayed?. *Transportation research part F: traffic psychology and*
468 *behaviour*, 68, 171-186.
- 469 Färber, B. (2016). Communication and communication problems between autonomous vehicles and
470 human drivers. In *Autonomous driving* (pp. 125-144). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- 471 Fekete, S., Vollrath, M., Huemer, A.K., & Salchow, C. (2015). Interaktionen im Straßenverkehr:
472 Kooperation und Konflikt [Interactions in Road Traffic: Cooperation and Conflict]. In VDI
473 Wissensforum GmbH (Ed.), *Der Fahrer im 21. Jahrhundert: Fahrer, Fahrerunterstützung und*
474 *Bedienbarkeit* (pp. 325–338). Düsseldorf: VDI Verlag.
- 475 Fridman, L., Mehler, B., Xia, L., Yang, Y., Facusse, L. Y., & Reimer, B. (2017). To walk or not to
476 walk: Crowdsourced assessment of external vehicle-to-pedestrian displays. *arXiv preprint*
477 *arXiv:1707.02698*.
- 478 Frisoni, R., Dall'Oglio, A., Nelson, C., Long, J., Vollath, C., Ranghetti, D., McMinimy, S. (2016).
479 Research for TRAN Committee – Self-piloted cars: The future of road transport?. *European*
480 *Parliament - POLICY DEPARTMENT B: STRUCTURAL AND COHESION POLICIES*.
- 481 Habibovic, A., Lundgren, V. M., Andersson, J., Klingegård, M., Lagström, T., Sirkka, A., ... Larsson,
482 P. (2018). Communicating Intent of Automated Vehicles to Pedestrians. *Frontiers in Psychology*,
483 9, 1336.
- 484 Hensch, A. C., Neumann, I., Beggiato, M., Halama, J., & Krems, J. F. (2019). Effects of a light-based
485 communication approach as an external HMI for Automated Vehicles - A Wizard-of-Oz Study.
486 *Transactions on Transport Sciences*, 10(2).
- 487 Hillis, W. D., Williams, K. I., Tombrello, T. A., Sarrett, J. W., Khanlian, L. W., Kaehler, A. L., &
488 Howe, R. (2016). U.S. Patent No. 9,475,422. Washington, DC: U.S. Patent and Trademark
489 Office.

- 490 Hochman, M., Parmet, Y., & Oron-Gilad, T. (2020). Pedestrians' Understanding of a Fully
491 Autonomous Vehicle's Intent to Stop: A Learning Effect Over Time. *Frontiers in psychology*,
492 11.
- 493 Hölzel, A. (2008). Unterscheidung von formeller und informeller Kommunikation im Straßenverkehr
494 (Doctoral dissertation, uni-wien). http://othes.univie.ac.at/2541/1/2008-11-12_9547261.pdf
495 (20.01.2020)
- 496 Kaup, M., Willrodt, J.H., Schieben, A., Wilbrink, M. (2019). interACT D4.3 – Final design and HMI
497 solutions for the interaction of AVs with user on-board and other traffic participants ready for
498 final implementation
- 499 Körber, M., Baseler, E., & Bengler, K. (2018). Introduction matters: Manipulating trust in automation
500 and reliance in automated driving. *Applied ergonomics*, 66, 18-31.
- 501 Lee, Y. M., Madigan, R., Garcia, J., Tomlinson, A., Solernou, A., Romano, R., ... & Uttley, J.
502 (2019). Understanding the messages conveyed by automated vehicles. In *Proceedings of the*
503 *11th international conference on automotive user interfaces and interactive vehicular*
504 *applications* (pp. 134-143).
- 505 Lee, Y. M., Madigan, R., Giles, O., Garach-Morcillo, L., Markkula, G., Fox, C., ... & Merat, N.
506 (2020a). Road users rarely use explicit communication when interacting in today's traffic:
507 implications for automated vehicles. *Cognition, Technology & Work*, 1-14.
- 508 Lee, Y. M., Madigan, R., Uzundu, C., Garcia, J., Romano, R., Markkula, G., & Merat, N. (2020b).
509 Learning to interpret novel eHMI: The effect of vehicle kinematics and eHMI familiarity on
510 pedestrians' crossing behaviour.
- 511 Lundgren, V. M., Habibovic, A., Andersson, J., Lagström, T., Nilsson, M., Sirkka, A., . . . & Saluäär,
512 D. (2017). Will there be new communication needs when introducing automated vehicles to the
513 urban context?. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Applied Human Factors*
514 *and Ergonomics (AHFE '16)*, 485–497.
- 515 Markowski, R., Lapoehn, S., Bolovinou, A., Drainakis, G., Drakoulis, R., Althoff, M., Klischat, M.,
516 Tango, F., Borello, G. (2019). interACT D3.2 Cooperation and Communication Planning Unit
517 prototype and accompanying report
518
- 519 Markkula, G., Madigan, R., Nathanael, D., Portouli, E., Lee, Y. M., Dietrich, A., Billington, J.,
520 Schieben, A., & Merat, N. (2020). Defining interactions: A conceptual framework for
521 understanding interactive behaviour in human and automated road traffic. *Theoretical Issues in*
522 *Ergonomics Science*, 21(6), 728-752.
- 523 Matthaei, R. (2015). 'Autonomes Fahren', in Winner, H.e.a. (ed.) *Handbuch Fahrerassistenzsysteme:*
524 *Grundlagen, Komponenten und Systeme für aktiver Sicherheit und Komfort*, 3rd edn., pp. 1139–
525 1165.
- 526 Merat, N., Louw, T., Madigan, R., Wilbrink, M., & Schieben, A. (2018). What externally presented
527 information do VRUs require when interacting with fully Automated Road Transport Systems
528 in shared space?. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 118, 244-252.

- 529 Merten, K. (1977). Kommunikationsprozesse im Straßenverkehr. Bundesanstalt für Straßenwesen,
530 Cologne.
- 531 Palmeiro, A. R., van der Kint, S., Vissers, L., Farah, H., de Winter, J. C., & Hagenzieker, M. (2018).
532 Interaction between pedestrians and automated vehicles: A Wizard of Oz experiment.
533 Transportation research part F: traffic psychology and behaviour, 58, 1005-1020.
- 534 Petzoldt, T., Schleinitz, K., Banse, R. (2018). Potential safety effects of a frontal brake light for motor
535 vehicles. IET Intelligent Transport Systems, 12, 449–453.
- 536 Rasouli A., Kotseruba I., Tsotsos J.K. (2018) Understanding pedestrian behavior in complex traffic
537 scenes. IEEE Trans Intell Veh 3(1):61– 70. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tiv.2017.2788193>
- 538 Rasouli, A., Kotseruba, I., & Tsotsos, J. K. (2017). Agreeing to cross: How drivers and pedestrians
539 communicate. In Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV), 2017 IEEE (pp. 264-269).
- 540 Rothenbücher, D., Li, J., Sirkin, D., Mok, B., & Ju, W. (2016). Ghost driver: A field study investigating
541 the interaction between pedestrians and driverless vehicles. In 2016 25th IEEE international
542 symposium on robot and human interactive communication (RO-MAN) (pp. 795-802). IEEE.
- 543 SAE International (2016). J3016: Taxonomy and Definitions for Terms Related to Driving
544 Automation Systems for On-Road Motor Vehicles. Warrendale, PA: SAE International.
- 545 Sauro, J., Lewis, J. (2016). Quantifying the user experience: Practical statistics for user research.
546 Amsterdam; Waltham, MA: Elsevier/Morgan Kaufmann.
- 547 Schieben, A., Wilbrink, M., Kettwich, C., Dodiya, J., Weber, F., Sorokin, L., Lee, Y.M., Madigan, R.,
548 Markkula, G., Merat, N., Dietrich, A. (2019a). Testing external HMI designs for automated
549 vehicles—An overview on user study results from the EU project interACT. In 9. Tagung
550 Automatisiertes Fahren.
- 551 Schieben, A., Wilbrink, M., Kettwich, C., Madigan, R., Louw, T., & Merat, N. (2019b). Designing the
552 interaction of automated vehicles with other traffic participants: Design considerations based on
553 human needs and expectations. Cognition, Technology and Work, 21, 69–85.
554 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10111-018-0521-z>.
- 555 Schneemann, F., and Gohl, I. (2016). “Analyzing driver-pedestrian interaction at crosswalks: a
556 contribution to autonomous driving in urban environments,” in IEEE Intelligent Vehicles
557 Symposium (IV) (Washington, DC: The Allen Institute for Artificial Intelligence), 38–43.
- 558 Song, Y. E., Lehsing, C., Fuest, T., & Bengler, K. (2018). External HMIs and their effect on the
559 interaction between pedestrians and automated vehicles. In International Conference on
560 Intelligent Human Systems Integration (pp. 13-18). Springer, Cham.
- 561 Sucha (2017). Pedestrian-driver communication and decision strategies at marked crossings.
562 Accident Analysis & Prevention, Volume 102, 41-50.
- 563 Suh, W., Henclewood, D., Greenwood, A., Guin, A., Guensler, R., Hunter, M. P., & Fujimoto, R.
564 (2013). Modeling pedestrian crossing activities in an urban environment using microscopic
565 traffic simulation. Simulation, 89(2), 213-224.

- 566 Sun, R., Zhuang, X., Wu, C., Zhao, G., and Zhang, K. (2015). The estimation of vehicle speed and
567 stopping distance by pedestrians crossing streets in a naturalistic traffic environment. *Transp.*
568 *Res. Part F Traffic Psychol. Behav.* 30, 97–106. doi: 10.1016/j.trf.2015.02.002
- 569 Van Der Laan, J. D., Heino, A., & De Waard, D. (1997). A simple procedure for the assessment of
570 acceptance of advanced transport telematics. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging*
571 *Technologies*, 5(1), 1-10.
- 572 Velasco, J. P. N., Lee, Y., Uttley, J., Solernou, A., Farah, H., van Arem, B., ... Merat, N. (2021).
573 Will pedestrians cross the road before an Automated Vehicle? The Effect of Drivers'
574 Attentiveness and Presence on Pedestrians' Road Crossing Behavior.
575 <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/d4vgp>.
- 576 Vissers, L. K., van der Schagen, S., & INLG van & Hagenzieker, M. P. (2017). Safe interaction
577 between cyclists, pedestrians and automated vehicles: What do we know and what do we need
578 to know? *SWOV Institute for Road Safety Research*, 46.
- 579 Wang, Y., & Xu, Q. (2020). A Field Study of External HMI for Autonomous Vehicles When
580 Interacting with Pedestrians. In *International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction* (pp.
581 181-196). Springer, Cham.
- 582 Weber F., Sorokin L., Schmidt E., Schieben A., Wilbrink M., Kettwich C., Dodiya J., Oehl M., Kaup
583 M., Willrodt J., Lee Y., Madigan R., Markkula G., Romano R., Merat N. (2019). “interACT
584 D4.2 Final interaction strategies for the interACT Automated Vehicles“

585 **Appendix 1:** Overview of the participant's **Initial Movement Distance** (x-axis) in the 10 m, 15 m, and 20m conditions
 586 for the **eHMI Visibility** trials, against their **eHMI Visibility Distance** (y-axis), including data for each participant (one
 587 scatter point equals one participant's trial) and two eHMI solutions (FLB and PLB).

588

589 **Appendix 2:** Overview of the participant's **Initial Movement Distance** (x-axis) in the 10 m, 15 m, and 20m
 590 conditions for the **Crossing Decision** trials, against **their Crossing Decision Time** (y-axis). One scatter point
 591 equals one participant's trial in each of the three eHMI conditions (FLB, PLB and, no eHMI). Crossing
 592 Decision Time below zero incorporates participant's crossing before AV started to decelerate.

593