

Open Access Perspective

# Reframing Human–Robot Interaction Through Extended Reality: Unlocking Safer, Smarter, and More Empathic Interactions with Virtual Robots and Foundation Models

Yuchong Zhang, Yong Ma, Danica Kragic\*

<sup>1</sup> Division of Robotics, Perception, and Learning, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden.

<sup>2</sup> Department of Clinical Medicine, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway.

**\*Correspondence to:** Dr. Yuchong Zhang, Division of Robotics, Perception, and Learning, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden. Email: [yuchongz@kth.se](mailto:yuchongz@kth.se)

**Received:** date month year **Accepted:** unknown **Published:** unknown


## Abstract

This perspective reframes human–robot interaction (HRI) through extended reality (XR), arguing that virtual robots powered by large foundation models (FMs) can serve as cognitively grounded, empathic agents. Unlike physical robots, XR-native agents are unbound by hardware constraints and can be instantiated, adapted, and scaled on demand, while still affording embodiment and co-presence. We synthesize work across XR, HRI, and cognitive AI to show how such agents can support safety-critical scenarios, socially and cognitively empathic interaction across domains, and outreaching physical capabilities with XR and AI integration. We then discuss how multimodal large FMs (e.g., large language model, large vision model, and vision-language model) enable context-aware reasoning, affect-sensitive situations, and long-term adaptation, positioning virtual robots as cognitive and empathic mediators rather than mere simulation assets. At the same time, we highlight challenges and potential risks, including overtrust, cultural and representational bias, privacy concerns around biometric sensing, and data governance and transparency. The paper concludes by outlining a research agenda for human-centered, ethically grounded XR agents – emphasizing multi-layered evaluation frameworks, multi-user ecosystems, mixed virtual–physical embodiment, and societal and ethical design practices to envision XR-based virtual agents powered by FMs as reshaping future HRI into a more efficient and adaptive paradigm.

**Keywords:** Human-robot interaction, extended reality, large foundation models, cognitively empathic interaction

## 1 Introduction

As the prosperity of robotics during past years, intelligent robots have been more integrated into everyday lives [1]. In particular, human–robot interaction (HRI) became a crucial field by intertwining humans with robots in human-centric environments [2]. However, HRI has traditionally been rooted in the constraints of the physical world, prioritizing mechanical safety, real-time control, and spatial coordination between humans and embodied machines. These systems have yielded significant advances in domains such as manufacturing, logistics, and assistive robotics [3–6], yet they remain bounded by several practical limitations, such as the cost of hardware, the risks of human–machine co-location, and the inflexibility of physical deployment in rapidly dynamic or hazardous environments [7, 8].




**Figure 1.** Several examples of human-virtual robots interaction powered by XR. *a*: virtual robot arm in VR [12]; *b*: virtual mobile robot in VR [13]; *c*: virtual humanoid robot in VR [14]; *d*: virtual flying robot (drone) in AR/MR [15]; *e*: virtual medical robot in AR/MR [16]; *f*: virtual humanoid robots in AR/MR [17].

Meanwhile, extended reality (XR) – an umbrella term encompassing virtual reality (VR), augmented reality (AR), and mixed reality (MR) – has matured into a powerful paradigm for immersive interactions, multimodal interaction, and elevated cognition in the field of general human-computer interaction (HCI) over the past decades [9]. By incorporating virtual information visualized either in complete virtual world or real-world, XR offers not only visual-spatial fidelity but also the capacity for dynamic feedback, co-presence, and more engaged interaction in many domains [10, 11]. There has been massive research that has delved into employing XR techniques to facilitate advanced HRI by bringing virtual setting, which makes it uniquely well-situated to complement and extend the principles of HRI beyond the physical workspace (Figure 1).

In parallel, we are witnessing an unprecedented shift in artificial intelligence (AI) through the development of large foundation models (FMs) [18] – particularly large language models (LLMs), large vision models (LVMs), and vision–language models (VLMs) – that endow agents with context-aware reasoning, conversational competence, and multimodal perception [19–21]. When integrated with HRI, these models enable the creation of more smooth interactions between humans and robots due to the algorithmic advancements, for example, in communicating robot intent or learning from human feedback [22, 23]. When coupled with XR, the involvement of virtual elements would lead to another potential approach for interaction [?, 24]. For instance, intelligent virtual robots – agents that inhabit immersive spaces – can understand user intent and adaptively respond through natural language, gaze, gesture, or other various inputs [25–29].

The virtual robots are more than plain visualizations or surrogates [15, 16] of corresponding physical systems. Besides serving as the virtual counterparts, they also represent a new category of cognitive agents – capable of participating in collaborative tasks, simulating empathic engagement, and supporting experiential learning without the material constraints of conventional robotics. In industrial training scenarios, for example, XR-based robots have been shown to improve domain task performance, user experience, and procedural safety awareness [30, 31]. In specific therapeutic and educational contexts, socially responsive virtual agents powered by LLMs are already being explored as scalable tools for mental health interventions, language acquisition, and neurodiverse engagement [32, 33]. This evolution of immersive media technology and cognitive AI, alongside the intersection between them, encourage us to reflect: while the traditional robotic paradigm emphasized physical manipulation, like grasping, moving, and executing, more emerging paradigms emphasize co-presence and the co-construction of tasks through immersive interactions [34, 35] with the engagement of



**Figure 2.** XR-enhanced cognitive and empathic interaction flow between human-virtual robots supported by large FMs.

virtual elements [36–38]. This shift reframes HRI from a primarily mechanical interface to a socio-cognitive encounter mediated by technology.

By witnessing the current landscape of interacting with virtual robots through the lens of XR – native virtual robots – autonomous, adaptive agents that reside entirely within immersive environments, we argue that in the future, such virtual agentic loops offer not only practical benefits—safety, scalability, and cognitive adaptability—but also open new directions for understanding human–machine interaction as a fundamentally relational process. We explore how humans engage with these virtual robots as social, instructional, and empathic partners across diverse domains, such industrial safety training, education, therapeutic interventions, collaborative design, etc. By narrowing the scope to XR-native agents, we are able to examine the unique affordances and challenges inherent in this paradigm: embodiment without physical form, presence without mass, and cognition unconstrained by mechanical limitations. This framing also enables us to explore how emerging AI models (e.g., LLM, VLM) – can endow these agents with contextual awareness, responsiveness, and the capacity for long-term adaptation. By synthesizing developments across XR, HRI, and large-scale FMs, we articulate a research agenda for the next generation of empathic and ethically grounded virtual robotics.

## Positioning

This paper investigates the interaction between humans and intelligent virtual robots that exist entirely within XR environments. We regard virtual robots as embodied, agentic entities – either humanoid or non-humanoid in form – rendered in immersive digital environments with perception, reasoning, and action capabilities via AI. These agents are native to XR: they operate independently of physical actuators or hardware proxies and are designed for real-time, situated interaction within virtual contexts. Our focus outreaches from traditional robotic paradigms that employ XR technique as a visualization tool or user interface overlay. Apart from physical robots augmented by XR for specific task-oriented teleoperation or collaborative support, we concentrate on fully virtual robots capable of functioning as standalone agents with roles, such as instructors, collaborators, companions, or cognitive interfaces in immersive, spatial environments actuated by intelligent large FMs. A conceptual diagram of XR-empowered human-virtual robot with FMs is illustrated in Figure 2.

## 2 Current Research Landscape

The intersection of XR and HRI has witnessed rapid growth in recent years, driven by advances in immersive technologies, intelligent agent architectures, and the democratization of AI models. Across both industrial and academic settings, XR platforms are increasingly being used to simulate robot behavior, mediate collaboration, and enable safer, more personalized forms of interaction.

## 2.1 Safety-Aware XR for Human–Robot Collaboration

The use of XR – mostly VR and AR – has gained considerable traction in enabling safety-aware human–robot collaboration (HRC), especially in industrial, high-risk, or mission-critical domains. XR systems enable the development of virtual elements or digital twins of physical robots that support users in visualizing robot behaviors, simulating hazardous tasks, and reducing physical risks during planning and training phases.

### Visualizing Robot Behavior for Hazardousness

Multiple studies emphasize the power of XR to make robot behavior more transparent and predictable through visual overlays and real-time cues. Enayati et al. [31] propose a human-in-the-loop XR system to visualize robot trajectories and operational zones. Similarly, MR interfaces evaluated by [39] use audio–visual cues to render dynamic hazard zones, increasing the user awareness. Works such as [15, 40, 41] explore AR projections or visualizations of robot motion intent or predicted paths, improving perceived safety, interaction naturalness, and reducing ambiguity during close-range collaborations with robots. Digital twins are increasingly used to visualize risk and monitor remote systems. As shown in works like [42–44], synchronizing virtual and physical robots allows users to anticipate unsafe interactions and maintain awareness during shared-space operations. There are several literature reviews like [45–47] which further highlight the role of digital twins and virtual agents in visualizing context and enhancing transparency.

### Training and Planning with Simulated XR

XR-based training tools have demonstrated strong potential in improving procedural safety and knowledge retention in HRI [48–50]. Dianatfar et al. [30] show how VR welding simulations lead to increased user confidence and task proficiency. Similar systems [51] offer immersive environments where users were engaged with simplified navigation alongside robot behavior. Surve et al. [52] enabled HRI training to be conducted in photorealistic simulated environments, using XR wearables with virtual underwater robots, before deployment in real-world scenarios where safety could be at risk. Virtual laboratories, allowing for reproducible and controlled studies of HRC under complex psychological and ergonomic conditions [53, 54], were developed for enhanced interaction with safety. For example, [55] examines how robot motion affects human posture and stress using VR-based observation, while [56] combined AR with haptic feedback to reduce cognitive load during robot-assisted surgical situations. For task planning, some systems help reduce planning errors and allow iterative testing without physical execution, such as [57] which provided AR interfaces to preview and adjust robotic motion paths or [58] which offered virtual robot in AR for high-level requesting before accurate motion planning. For industrial assembly contexts, AR-based tools assist in human-robot alignment and workflow optimization [59, 60] for improved task efficacy.

### Remote and Distributed Safety-aware HRI

Remote interaction with robots or robotic teleoperation through XR is also gaining prominence [61–64]. Studies such as [65, 66] combine XR and networked control for distributed robot supervision. Through immersive visualizations and overlays from VR and AR, users retain situational awareness and control without excessive direct physical presence in adaptive teleoperation, where intuitive visual, audio, or mid-air feedback [67, 68] are accompanied.

### Adaptive, Accessible, and Inclusive XR-HRI

Despite broad applicability, many XR-HRI systems still lack adaptability or emotional responsiveness. Some reviews such as [45, 46] highlight that most implementations are tailored to single-user setups or rigid scenarios. Recent works have begun to address these gaps through individualized or personalized safety concerns and adaptive communication modeling [69, 70]. XR is also proving to be a low-cost, accessible means of robot interaction. Mobile smartphone-based AR interfaces [71] enable seamless robot manipulation in unconstrained settings. Wearable AR provides hands-free guidance, visual feedback, and improved interaction with higher effectiveness in dynamic environments [72, 73].

**In summary**, XR-based robot systems using additional visualized virtual elements contribute significantly to safety-aware HRI/HRC by enabling informative visualizations, safe training environments, and more intuitive interactions. Moving forward, research should continue to explore adaptive, intelligent, and inclusive XR interfaces to fully realize the potential of virtual robotic collaboration in complex and dynamic settings.



## 2.2 Cognitive and Empathic Virtual Robots: Large FMs with XR

The rise of large FMs during past years is enabling a new generation of cognitive and empathic norms of both advanced robotic and HRI loops. No longer limited to passive interfaces or scripted responses, virtual agents embedded in XR environments can now engage in contextual reasoning, adapt behavior in real time, and respond empathetically to users due to generative AI.

### FMs as Cognitive Engines in XR-HRI

Numerous recently developed platforms and frameworks integrate LLMs into XR to support spatially and semantically grounded communications with agents. CUIfy [74] demonstrates an open-source pipeline for embedding LLM-powered conversational agents in Unity XR environments, minimizing latencies during interactions. Konenkov et al. [75] combine VR with VLMs, enabling reduction in task completion time but elevation in user comfort. Afzal et al. [76] highlighted that LLMs with XR would facilitate situational awareness while underlining ethical considerations. Li et al. [77] showed that foundational VLMs can make robotic control more flexible while being a cost-effective and easy-to-use solution. Synthetically, [78] explored a GPT-based human-robot teaching through VR settings, which proved the functionality of simulated virtual robots powered by FMs.

### Empathic and Emotionally Aware Virtual Robots

Empathy-focused HRI is a growing priority in XR systems. The review by [79] detailed how LLMs facilitate emotion recognition, conversational nuance, and contextual understanding in HRI. Social cues, such as haptics are also simulated in XR. For example, [80] presented a haptic-enhanced VR handshake system with visual cues to enhance social presence for robotic partnership. [53] enabled empathetic testing of prosthetic interaction through a safe virtual laboratory. Understanding user stress, posture, and motion in XR has also been studied for adaptive and empathic robot control and interaction [54, 55]. Notably, some AR-related works in HRI are now also augmented with empathy-aware overlays. For example, Wang et al. explored user preference of embodied virtual agents in AR with different design propositions [81]. Systems like [40, 41] enhanced user comfort, trust, and efficiency by previewing robot motion intent through AR. Empathic engagement in high-risk environments can be further enabled by XR agents that visualize shared intentions [47, 82].


### Human-centered and Multimodal Interaction

To support human-centered core, while retaining trustworthy and intuitive virtual agents in XR-based HRI, several works proposed distinct taxonomies and design principles. These include the virtual element design taxonomy [83], the dedicated AR-HRI classification [82], and the key characteristics of robots [84], which help researchers build user-centered, expressive, and empathic agentic interactions. Design-oriented XR systems like [17, 85–87] explore proxemics, social communication, and information exchange, facilitating emotionally intelligent design of HRI systems. In terms of interaction modalities, gesture and non-verbal input are critical components of empathic HRI. Gesture recognition in VR [88] and multimodal input [89] via wearable MR [25] enable virtual robots to interpret user intent and adjust behavior dynamically.

**In summary**, human-centered, cognitive, and empathic virtual robots especially powered by FMs are transforming XR into a shared-platform for more adaptive and emotionally aware HRI. For instance, through LLM integration, multimodal feedback, and empathic design, virtual agents now serve not only as tools, but as collaborators capable of sensing and understanding complex human needs.

## 3 Future Scenarios of XR-Enhanced Virtual Robot Interaction

By revisiting the current research and application status of XR-based HRI as well as the surge of large foundational models, the next generation of XR-enabled virtual robots will go beyond merely simulation and visualization [90]. These virtual robots are envisioned to be developed with agentic empathy [91] to become different roles, such as adaptive collaborators and companions capable of reasoning, teaching, and responding to user needs across a range of real-world tasks. We outline here three forward-looking domains where virtual robots could deliver transformative impact, while the three corresponding scenarios are shown in Figure 3.



**Figure 3.** Future scenes with XR-powered virtual robots.


### 3.1 Enhancing Industrial Collaboration in Hazardous Environments

Industrial domains such as manufacturing, construction, biochemical processing, and emergency cases frequently involve hazardous conditions that challenge conventional human–robot co-presence [36, 92]. Safety concerns, limited visibility, high-risk machinery, and unstable environments often preclude direct interaction with physical robots. XR technologies offer a transformative alternative: by simulating immersive digital twins of real-world operations, workers can engage with virtual counterparts of industrial robots to rehearse procedures, calibrate workflows, and develop collaborative pipelines with mitigating physical risks.

Within these environments, users can interactively visualize safety-critical zones, explore dynamic task trajectories, and manipulate virtual robots with high fidelity to their real-world equivalents [93]. VR is particularly effective for simulating chaotic or unpredictable scenarios where physical testing is impractical. In such settings, virtual robots – programmed with behaviors modeled after their physical counterparts – can provide users with realistic and repeatable task rehearsals that improve coordination and situational awareness [94, 95].

AR or MR expand these capabilities into real-time field operations [96]. For example, through optical see-through head-mounted displays (HMDs), users can view superimposed virtual robots aligned with their physical environments, enabling spatially accurate remote teleoperation [97–99]. This is especially valuable in mobile robotics designated into the on-site hazardousness-aware situations, where AR overlays allow for user interaction and monitoring at a safe distance, while maintaining functional continuity with on-site deployments.

By integrating real-time sensory feedback and AI-driven reasoning (e.g., via LLMs), these virtual agents adaptively interpret human intent and respond to dynamic conditions. More than functional simulators, they serve as communicative intermediaries – visualizing robot intent, forecasting motion paths, and modeling shared control frameworks. Such transparency builds user trust, reduces cognitive load, and fosters safer, more effective collaboration during both training and live operations [100–102]. As such, XR-enabled virtual robots act as critical mediators in hazardous environments, bridging the gap between simulation and safer deployment.




**Figure 4.** XR virtual agentic robots surpass physical capabilities.

### 3.2 Empowering Socially and Cognitively Empathic Interaction via Virtual Humanoid Robots

In social, healthcare, and educational contexts, humanoid robots are increasingly deployed to support therapy, rehabilitation, companionship, and interactive learning [103–106]. However in numerous cases, physical platforms remain expensive, difficult to adapt, and are often limited in their range of emotional expression. Virtual humanoid robots in XR alleviate many of these constraints by existing as fully programmable, reconfigurable avatars that can be tailored to individual users and scenarios. Within immersive environments, these agents can inhabit shared spaces with users, maintain functionality, modulate input signals such as voice and posture, and enact subtle social cues, practically achieving a richer empathic interaction than many current physical embodiments [107].

The integration of large FMs further amplifies these capabilities. By combining LLMs, LVMs, and VLMs, virtual agents can interpret multimodal input – speech, gaze, audios, facial expression, and gesture – and respond in a manner that is contextually appropriate and emotionally attuned. In VR, fully immersive environments populated with such agents can be used to rehearse or remaster challenging social situations, practice turn-taking with more empathy [108, 109]. The game-like learning experiences in VR with virtual robots can reward mutual collaboration and facilitate curiosity, improving the overall learning efficiency in educational cases [110]. In AR, virtual companionship robots can be overlaid onto ordinary environments, functioning as “always-available” conversational partners who accompany users in need through mentally therapeutic exercises [111]. By enabling empathic conversations with target users, without the physical constraints of moving and operating hardware, virtual empathic agents can more effectively facilitate communicative interaction [112–114].

These virtual companions are particularly well-suited for supporting heterogeneous user groups, ranging from language learners who benefit from personalized tutoring to patients undergoing exposure therapy for anxiety or mental trauma. Because their forms and behavior are reconfigurable, virtual robots can be adapted to different cultures, age groups, and appearance preferences without redesigning hardware. Their consistent and programmable empathy make them promising supports for vulnerable populations, including children on the autism phase or older adults experiencing cognitive decline. As AI-driven virtual agents continue to advance in empathy modeling and affective reasoning [115–117], XR systems may increasingly sustain relationships that are practically meaningful, while dynamically adapting to users’ emotional states and evolving alongside therapeutic or educational goals.



**Figure 5.** A new form of XR-based virtual robots powered by FMs. The upper left highlights functional and cognitive advantages, while the upper right summarizes key challenges. The lower bands illustrate two complementary design trajectories: human-centered and ethical XR agents (left) and embodied, empathic, and adaptive XR agents (right).

### 3.3 Surpassing Physical Robot Capabilities Through XR and AI Integration

Another revolutionary implication of XR-based virtual robots is envisioned to be their ability to transcend the limitations of physical embodiments [118, 119]. Unconstrained by friction, mass, structural rigidity, or mechanical complexity, virtual agents are not bound to a single physical body or configuration [90]; they can transform roles instantaneously, adapt behaviors dynamically, and evolve across time and contexts. In VR environments, while the entire surroundings can be constructed virtually with immersion, designers are allowed either to mirror existing physical robots in appearance and shapes or to create entirely novel embodiments tailored to specific interaction goals [120, 121]. Locomotion, morphology, and other functions are therefore determined by the design intent customized for concrete needs rather than hardware feasibility. In AR and MR, similar principles apply: virtual counterpart robots or purely virtual agentic avatars can be anchored into the physical environment [122–125], moving and interacting according to the programmability that do not need to comply with the same constraints as physical robots.

These agents can seamlessly shift roles – from tutor to collaborator to supervisor to others – without the need for physical redesign, complex reconfiguration, or new hardware deployments. Through integration with LLMs or multimodal VLMs, they acquire the capacity to bear multi-turn dialogues, reason over task contexts, and anticipate user needs at a high level of abstraction [75]. Such abilities position XR-native robots as empathic mediators unconstrained by physical hardware: they not only deliver instructions and guidance, but also co-construct knowledge within specific contexts while sidestepping the limitations imposed by physical embodiments [126–128]. In this sense, virtual robots act as adaptive, empathic partners that extend and complement human capabilities (Figure 4).

## 4 Discussion

To reframe the next generation of effective interactions between humans and virtual robots with XR, large FMs are expected to be employed for endowing virtual agents with situational awareness. This enables new forms of physical–virtual interaction, but also introduces challenges and risks, as illustrated in Figure 5.



## Functional and Cognitive Advantages

The integration of XR with AI-powered virtual robots offers advantages that are not merely incremental extensions of traditional HRI, but qualitatively new affordances. Functionally, safety and scalability remain the most immediate benefits: hazardous, rare, or high-stakes events can be rehearsed repeatedly without endangering humans or equipment. For example, industrial collaborative welding, chemical processing, and other risk-aware scenarios involving robots can be practiced in VR with virtual counterparts before an operator is ever exposed to a physical system.

On the cognitive side, XR-native agents powered by LLMs and VLMs can adapt to external input such as a user's affective state, shifting from a neutral, task-focused presence to an empathic, supportive partner responsive to subtle cues. Similar mechanisms apply in social, therapeutic, and educational contexts, where virtual robots can dynamically adjust conversational depth, interaction tempo, or emotional tone based on user behavior. Moreover, the ability to continuously modify and personalize virtual robots makes XR an attractive environment for agile prototyping and co-design, where complex multi-agent interactions can be iteratively explored in simulation before committing to physical hardware or interface designs.

## Virtual Embodiment and User Presence

Although virtual robots lack physical mass, they are not disembodied abstractions. In XR, virtual embodiment is achieved through consistent visual appearance, coherent spatial behavior, and responsiveness that aligns with human expectations for social interaction [129, 130]. Studies of MR hazard visualization and robot collaboration show that gaze synchrony, joint attention cues, and predictable proximity dynamics can substantially enhance users' sense of safety, control, and shared situational awareness. Work on avatar responsiveness and motion timing similarly suggests that even relatively simple agents can evoke strong impressions of co-presence when they react promptly and contingently to user actions [131].

However, this form of embodiment remains partial. The lack of rich haptic and tactile feedback limits the kinds of tasks that can be trained purely in XR, particularly those requiring fine manipulation, force sensing, or shared physical contact. Emerging haptic overlays and pseudo-physical resistance may narrow this gap, but they also introduce new layers of technical complexity and potential sensory mismatch. Designing virtual embodiment thus becomes a balancing act: providing sufficient realism to support user trust, learning, and empathy, without promising physical capabilities that the virtual environment cannot reliably deliver.

## Potential Challenges and Risks

The same characteristics that make XR-based virtual robots powered by large FMs compelling also introduce significant risks. A core concern is trustworthiness and credibility, closely mirroring broader issues in contemporary AI. LLM-driven agents can produce fluent, confident explanations even when their underlying reasoning is flawed or when they inherit biases from their training data. Cultural alignment presents another latent risk: models trained on skewed datasets may inadvertently reproduce stereotypes, misinterpret culturally specific gestures, or privilege certain communication styles over others. When these biases are embodied in seemingly empathic agents, they may go unnoticed yet subtly shape users' expectations, self-perceptions, and sense of belonging. In XR, where users are immersed and may experience agents as co-present social partners, this illusion of competence can be especially potent. In safety-critical or therapeutic contexts, an erroneous suggestion delivered by a convincing virtual agent could have serious real-world consequences.

XR also amplifies familiar challenges around cognitive load and fatigue, similar to those documented in traditional XR applications. While immersive environments can enhance focus and memory, prolonged use has been associated with motion sickness, eye strain, and attentional exhaustion [132]. Vulnerable populations—such as children, older adults, or individuals with certain neurological conditions—may be particularly sensitive to these effects. Furthermore, many XR systems rely on extensive biometric sensing, including gaze tracking, facial expression analysis, and voice-based emotion inference. Without careful design, governance, and transparency, these capabilities raise concerns about privacy, consent, and accessibility. The practicality and fairness of deploying XR-powered virtual robots to target groups therefore remains an open question, especially in domains such as healthcare and pediatric care where trust and vulnerability are heightened.



## **Toward Human-Centered and Ethical XR Agents**

The emergence of XR-based virtual robots powered by FMs introduces a new form of agency, autonomy, and perceived authenticity in HCI. As these agents begin to mirror human social cues – maintaining eye contact, modulating voice, mirroring posture – they encourage users to treat them as intentional partners rather than mere tools. This blurring of boundaries raises practical questions for designers and practitioners: How should such agents be framed and introduced to users? How can we ensure that the data used for pre-training and adaptation is curated, documented, and governed in ethically robust and trustworthy ways?

Different application domains may require distinct design principles. In therapy or education, for instance, some argue that strongly anthropomorphic agents risk fostering unhealthy attachment or unrealistic expectations, and therefore advocate for stylized, clearly artificial embodiments. Others argue that trust and participation—particularly for children, anxious patients, or socially isolated individuals—may depend on agents who feel warm, relatable, and socially competent. These tensions suggest that “one-size-fits-all” guidelines are unlikely to be sufficient. Instead, ethical frameworks should be context-sensitive, specifying appropriate levels of anthropomorphism, transparency, disclosure, and autonomy for each use case.

Beyond individual interactions, there is a broader ethical question surrounding virtual robots driven by versatile FMs capable of sensing, communicating, and providing companionship. The datasets and interaction logs that fuel these capabilities could be repurposed for surveillance, targeted persuasion, or other forms of misuse, particularly with respect to privacy and data protection. Addressing these concerns requires input from AI ethics, law and policy, developmental psychology, accessibility research, and design practice, among other fields. The goal is not only to prevent harm, but to ensure that XR-based agents are deployed in ways that are genuinely human-centered, supporting user agency, dignity, and long-term wellbeing rather than merely showcasing technical feasibility.

## **Toward Embodied, Empathic, and Adaptive XR Agents**

These concerns and opportunities point toward a reconceptualization of robots—from purely physical tools to relational, cognitively and emotionally engaged virtual partners. In XR, virtual robots do not primarily manipulate the physical world; instead, they shape users’ attention, scaffold their understanding, and participate in the co-construction of tasks and meanings. Their value lies in adaptive dialogue, emotional resonance, and the ability to inhabit shared virtual spaces in which roles, perspectives, and interaction scripts can be fluid and negotiable.

Designing for this paradigm demands new forms of co-creation and evaluation. On the design side, XR–HRI systems should be developed through interdisciplinary collaboration that includes not only HCI and AI researchers, but also domain experts such as clinicians, educators, and accessibility specialists, together with end users themselves. On the evaluation side, traditional performance metrics such as task completion time or error rate must be complemented by measures of psychological safety, perceived empathy, inclusion, and long-term behavioral and attitudinal change. Longitudinal studies are particularly needed to understand how repeated interaction with virtual agents affects user trust, skill retention, and social expectations over months or years.

Reframing virtual robots as relational entities rather than passive tools shifts the focus of innovation from mechanical capability to the quality of interaction. It requires asking not only what robots can do, but how they make people feel, what forms of understanding they enable, and whose needs they foreground or neglect. It is in answering these questions—empirically, ethically, and collaboratively—that the transformative potential of XR-based HRI is most likely to be realized.

## **5 Future Research Agenda**

To ensure that XR-based virtual robots evolve in ethically responsible and socially beneficial ways, several research priorities can be pursued in the coming years. Building on the perspectives outlined in this paper, we highlight four potential research directions.

## **Evaluation Frameworks for Trust, Empathy, and Transferability**

Existing XR–HRI evaluations often foreground usability or task performance, but rarely capture the affective, relational, and longitudinal dimensions that are central to XR-native virtual robots. Future work should therefore develop multi-layered evaluation frameworks that address at least three questions: (i) how users calibrate trust in agents that may be communicatively fluent but epistemically unstable; (ii) how empathic relation and perceived psychological safety emerge and are maintained over time; and (iii) how learning and behavioral patterns acquired in virtual settings transfer to physical contexts.

Such frameworks will likely need to incorporate and coordinate behavioral, physiological, and self-report measures. Transferability studies are particularly underdeveloped in XR-HRI works: it remains unclear when and how competencies developed with XR-native virtual robots be generalized into interactions with physical robots or human teammates in real-world conditions. Addressing these gaps will require controlled virtuality-to-physicality experiments, longitudinal field deployments, and shared benchmarks that allow comparison across systems and domains.

## **Multi-Agent and Multi-User Interactions**

Real-world collaboration rarely occurs in dyads; it typically involves heterogeneous groups of humans and agents coordinating under uncertainty. Yet most XR–HRI prototypes still assume a single user and a homogeneous agent or agent group. Next-generation platforms should therefore support synchronous, parallel interaction among multiple users and multiple virtual robots, with roles and behaviors that adapt dynamically over time. This calls for mechanisms that enable flexible role allocation and reallocation between humans and agents, and for systematic research on how such roles are negotiated and transformed—how participants shift between leader, peer, tutor, and observer—and how these dynamics shape system accountability, perceived empathy, and inclusion. Understanding and deliberately designing for these emergent, multi-party interaction patterns will be crucial for safe, equitable, and effective XR-mediated teamwork.

## **Societal and Ethical Design**

As XR-based virtual robots might flourish at schools, clinics, workplaces, and homes, they will not only reflect but also participate in shaping social norms, expectations, and mutual relations. Future research must therefore move beyond ad hoc “ethics checklists” and toward empirically grounded, participatory approaches to socio-technical design. A first priority is the detection, characterization, and mitigation of bias in both reasoning processes and actual embodiments. This includes examining how cultural, gendered, racialized, or ability-related cues are encoded in appearance, voice, posture, and interaction style, and how these cues influence user trust, identification, and perceived legitimacy.

Second, the extensive biometric sensing often involved in XR – eye tracking, facial expression analysis, posture and gesture monitoring, voice sentiment inference – demands consent frameworks and data governance models that are legible to non-experts and co-developed with affected communities. Questions of data retention, secondary use, and the right to opt out of sensor-based personalization will be central, particularly in healthcare, education, and workplace surveillance contexts.

## **Mixed Embodiment and XR–Physical Integration**

Finally, the integration of XR-native agents with physical robots presents an important, yet comparatively underexplored frontier. XR can function as a cognitive and social twin of physical systems, providing a training and interaction layer that mirrors (or intentionally extends) the capabilities of real-world robots. Through shared autonomy and digital twin frameworks, users could engage with a virtual robot in XR – developing shared routines, understanding capabilities, and calibrating trust – before completely transitioning to interaction with its physical counterpart.

Research in this area must examine how consistency, continuity, and synchronization are maintained across modalities, including: When does divergence between virtual and physical behavior support learning and creativity; When does it undermine trust or induce negative awareness? How should haptic overlays, audio cues, and other multisensory feedback be orchestrated so that transitions between virtual and physical embodiments remain intelligible and safe? Addressing these questions will require joint advances in control, interface design, perception, and systematic evaluation, as well

as careful consideration of where hybrid systems are most appropriate versus where purely virtual or purely physical approaches suffice.

## **6 Conclusion and Outlook**

Virtual robots in XR mark a significant evolution in the broader spectrum of HRI. More than simulations or visualization tools, these agents can act as collaborative partners – capable of learning from users, adapting to context, and engaging across cognitive, emotional, and spatial dimensions – by the state-of-the-art large FMs. They offer safer environments for training and exploration, richer and more flexible educational and therapeutic experiences, and new spaces for participatory design and experimentation that are not constrained by the limits of physical hardware.

In this paper, we have argued that virtual robots in XR should be understood not only as technical artifacts, but as relational and cultural ones. They mediate how people learn, work, and relate to one another, and thus must be designed and evaluated with attention to empathy, inclusion, and long-term wellbeing. We call on researchers, designers, practitioners, and policymakers to treat XR-native virtual robots as part of a broader socio-technical ecosystem: one that spans AI, HRI, XR, ethics, accessibility, and domain expertise. By approaching these systems as sites of interdisciplinary co-creation – rather than as isolated engineering projects – we can better ensure that their evolution is aligned with human values and diverse forms of flourishing. The future of virtual robots, like our own, will be shaped by the commitments we adopt and the infrastructures we build in the present.

At the same time, this potential is inseparable from responsibility. Without appropriate design and governance, XR-based virtual robots with large FMs may inadvertently reproduce existing inequities, foster less transparency, or blur the boundaries in certain aspects. As XR technologies mature and FMs grow more capable and autonomous, we are approaching a decisive juncture: whether virtual robots will amplify human cognition, compassion, and creativity, or raise bias, erode agency, and normalize intrusive sensing will depend on choices made now.

## **Declarations**

## **Acknowledgements**

We acknowledge that authors made limited use of generative AI tools for language polishing only.

## **Authors contribution**

Conceptualization: Y.Z.; Materials preparation: Y.Z. and Y.M.; Writing: Y.Z.; Supervision: D.K..

## **Conflicts of interest**

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

## **Ethical approval**

Not applicable.

## **Consent to participate**

Not applicable.

## **Consent for publication**

Not applicable.

## **Availability of data and materials**

Not applicable.

## Funding

None.

## Copyright

©The Author(s) 2025.

1. Xia H, Zhang Y, Rajabi N. Shaping high-performance wearable robots for human motor and sensory reconstruction and enhancement. *Nature Communications*. 2024. 15(1):1760
2. Zhang Y, Ma Y, and Kragic D. Vision beyond boundaries: An initial design space of domain-specific large vision models in human-robot interaction. In: *Adjunct Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Mobile Human-Computer Interaction*. p. 1–8.
3. Ringwald M, Theben P, Gerlinger K. How should your assistive robot look like? a scoping review on embodiment for assistive robots. *Journal of Intelligent & Robotic Systems*. 2023. 107(1):12
4. Karabegović I, Karabegović E, Mahmić M. The application of service robots for logistics in manufacturing processes.. *Advances in Production Engineering & Management*. 2015. 10(4)
5. Schmitt F, Piccin O, Barbé L. Soft robots manufacturing: A review. *Frontiers in Robotics and AI*. 2018. 5:84
6. Zhang Y, Rajabi N, Taleb F. Mind meets robots: a review of eeg-based brain-robot interaction systems. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*. 2025:1–32
7. Trevelyan J, Hamel WR, and Kang SC. Robotics in hazardous applications. In: *Springer handbook of robotics*. Springer. 2016. p. 1521–1548.
8. Willemse CJ, Toet A, and Van Erp JB. Affective and behavioral responses to robot-initiated social touch: toward understanding the opportunities and limitations of physical contact in human-robot interaction. *Frontiers in ICT*. 2017. 4:12
9. Zhang Y, Nowak A, Xuan Y. See or hear? exploring the effect of visual/audio hints and gaze-assisted instant post-task feedback for visual search tasks in ar. In: *2023 IEEE International Symposium on Mixed and Augmented Reality (ISMAR)*. IEEE. p. 1113–1122.
10. Kim D, and Jo D. Effects on co-presence of a virtual human: A comparison of display and interaction types. *Electronics*. 2022. 11(3):367
11. Lee H. A conceptual model of immersive experience in extended reality. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*. 2025:100663
12. Mielke T, Allgaier M, Schott D. Virtual studies, real results? assessing the impact of virtualization on human-robot interaction. In: *Proceedings of the Extended Abstracts of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. p. 1–8.
13. Stotko P, Krumpfen S, Schwarz M. A vr system for immersive teleoperation and live exploration with a mobile robot. In: *2019 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE. p. 3630–3637.
14. Li R, van Almkerk M, van Waveren S. Comparing human-robot proxemics between virtual reality and the real world. In: *2019 14th ACM/IEEE international conference on human-robot interaction (HRI)*. IEEE. p. 431–439.
15. Walker ME, Hedayati H, and Szafir D. Robot teleoperation with augmented reality virtual surrogates. In: *2019 14th ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction (HRI)*. IEEE. p. 202–210.
16. Plümer JH, Yu K, Eck U. Xr prototyping of mixed reality visualizations: Compensating interaction latency for a medical imaging robot. In: *2024 IEEE International Symposium on Mixed and Augmented Reality (ISMAR)*. IEEE. p. 1–10.
17. Peters C, Yang F, Saikia H. Towards the use of mixed reality for hri design via virtual robots. In: *1st International Workshop on Virtual, Augmented, and Mixed Reality for HRI (VAM-HRI)*, Cambridge, UK, March 23, 2020.
18. Awais M, Naseer M, Khan S. Foundation models defining a new era in vision: a survey and outlook. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*. 2025
19. Lu P, Bansal H, Xia T. Mathvista: Evaluating mathematical reasoning of foundation models in visual contexts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02255*. 2023
20. Li C, Gan Z, Yang Z. Multimodal foundation models: From specialists to general-purpose assistants. *Foundations and Trends® in Computer Graphics and Vision*. 2024. 16(1-2):1–214
21. Ma Y, Nordberg OE, Zhang Y. Understanding dementia speech: towards an adaptive voice assistant for enhanced communication. In: *Companion Proceedings of the 16th ACM SIGCHI Symposium on Engineering Interactive Computing Systems*. p. 15–21.

22. Lin J, Ma Z, Gomez R. A review on interactive reinforcement learning from human social feedback. *IEEE Access*. 2020. 8:120757–120765
23. Kupcsik A, Hsu D, and Lee WS. Learning dynamic robot-to-human object handover from human feedback. In: *Robotics Research: Volume 1*. Springer. 2017. p. 161–176.
24. Nowak A, Zhang Y, Romanowski A. Augmented reality with industrial process tomography: to support complex data analysis in 3d space. In: *Adjunct Proceedings of the 2021 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing and Proceedings of the 2021 ACM International Symposium on Wearable Computers*. p. 56–58.
25. Park KB, Choi SH, Lee JY. Hands-free human–robot interaction using multimodal gestures and deep learning in wearable mixed reality. *IEEE Access*. 2021. 9:55448–55464
26. Qi J, Ma L, Cui Z. Computer vision-based hand gesture recognition for human-robot interaction: a review. *Complex & Intelligent Systems*. 2024. 10(1):1581–1606
27. Lynch C, Wahid A, Tompson J. Interactive language: Talking to robots in real time. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*. 2023
28. Ruhland K, Peters CE, Andrist S. A review of eye gaze in virtual agents, social robotics and hci: Behaviour generation, user interaction and perception. In: *Computer graphics forum*. Wiley Online Library. vol. 34. p. 299–326.
29. Zhang Y, Kassem K, Gong Z. Human-centered ai technologies in human-robot interaction for social settings. In: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Mobile and Ubiquitous Multimedia*. p. 501–505.
30. Dianatfar M, Pöysäri S, Latokartano J. Virtual reality-based safety training in human-robot collaboration scenario: User experiences testing. In: *AIP Conference Proceedings*. AIP Publishing LLC. vol. 2989. p. 020002.
31. Karpichev Y, Charter T, Hong J. Extended reality for enhanced human-robot collaboration: a human-in-the-loop approach. In: *2024 33rd IEEE International Conference on Robot and Human Interactive Communication (ROMAN)*. IEEE. p. 1991–1998.
32. Zhang B, and Soh H. Large language models as zero-shot human models for human-robot interaction. In: *2023 IEEE/RSJ international conference on intelligent robots and systems (IROS)*. IEEE. p. 7961–7968.
33. Wang J, Shi E, Hu H. Large language models for robotics: Opportunities, challenges, and perspectives. *Journal of Automation and Intelligence*. 2024
34. Duguleana M, Barbuceanu FG, and Mogan G. Evaluating human-robot interaction during a manipulation experiment conducted in immersive virtual reality. In: *International Conference on Virtual and Mixed Reality*. Springer. p. 164–173.
35. Zhang Y, Xuan Y, Yadav R. Playing with data: An augmented reality approach to interact with visualizations of industrial process tomography. In: *IFIP Conference on Human-Computer Interaction*. Springer. p. 123–144.
36. Weistroffer V, Paljic A, Fuchs P. Assessing the acceptability of human-robot co-presence on assembly lines: A comparison between actual situations and their virtual reality counterparts. In: *The 23rd IEEE International Symposium on Robot and Human Interactive Communication*. IEEE. p. 377–384.
37. Bayro A, Ghasemi Y, and Jeong H. Subjective and objective analyses of collaboration and co-presence in a virtual reality remote environment. In: *2022 IEEE conference on virtual reality and 3d user interfaces abstracts and workshops (vrw)*. IEEE. p. 485–487.
38. Zhang Y, Nowak A, Romanowski A. An initial exploration of visual cues in head-mounted display augmented reality for book searching. In: *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Mobile and Ubiquitous Multimedia*. p. 273–275.
39. San Martin A, Kildal J, and Lazkano E. Mixed reality representation of hazard zones while collaborating with a robot: sense of control over own safety. *Virtual Reality*. 2025. 29(1):1–20
40. Bolano G, Juelg C, Roennau A. Transparent robot behavior using augmented reality in close human-robot interaction. In: *2019 28th IEEE International Conference on Robot and Human Interactive Communication (RO-MAN)*. IEEE. p. 1–7.
41. Walker M, Hedayati H, Lee J. Communicating robot motion intent with augmented reality. In: *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction*. p. 316–324.
42. Malik AA, and Brem A. Digital twins for collaborative robots: A case study in human-robot interaction. *Robotics and Computer-Integrated Manufacturing*. 2021. 68:102092
43. Xie J, Liu Y, Wang X. A new xr-based human-robot collaboration assembly system based on industrial metaverse. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*. 2024. 74:949–964
44. Choi SH, Park KB, Roh DH. An xr-based approach to safe human-robot collaboration. In: *2022 IEEE Conference*



- on Virtual Reality and 3D User Interfaces Abstracts and Workshops (VRW). IEEE. p. 481–482.
45. Wang X, Shen L, and Lee LH. A systematic review of xr-enabled remote human-robot interaction systems. *ACM Computing Surveys*. 2025. 57(11):1–37
  46. Pan M, Wong MO, Lam CC. Integrating extended reality and robotics in construction: A critical review. *Advanced Engineering Informatics*. 2024. 62:102795
  47. Green SA, Billingham M, Chen X. Human robot collaboration: An augmented reality approach—a literature review and analysis. In: *International design engineering technical conferences and computers and information in engineering conference*. vol. 48051. p. 117–126.
  48. Duguleana M, Barbuceanu FG, and Mogan G. Evaluating human-robot interaction during a manipulation experiment conducted in immersive virtual reality. In: Shumaker R. editor. *Virtual and Mixed Reality - New Trends*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg. p. 164–173.
  49. Higgins P, Kebe GY, Berlier A. Towards making virtual human-robot interaction a reality. *Proc. of the 3rd International Workshop on Virtual, Augmented, and Mixed-Reality for Human-Robot Interactions (VAM-HRI)*. 2021
  50. Murnane M, Higgins P, Saraf M. A simulator for human-robot interaction in virtual reality. In: *2021 IEEE Conference on Virtual Reality and 3D User Interfaces Abstracts and Workshops (VRW)*. p. 470–471. [DOI: [10.1109/VRW52623.2021.00117](https://doi.org/10.1109/VRW52623.2021.00117)]
  51. Arntz A, Helgert A, Straßmann C. Enhancing human-robot interaction research by using a virtual reality lab approach. In: *2024 IEEE International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and eXtended and Virtual Reality (AIxVR)*. IEEE. p. 340–344.
  52. Surve S, Guo J, Menezes JC. Unrealthasc—a cyber-physical xr testbed for underwater real-time human autonomous systems collaboration. In: *2024 33rd IEEE International Conference on Robot and Human Interactive Communication (ROMAN)*. IEEE. p. 196–203.
  53. Bustamante S, Peters J, Schölkopf B. Armsym: A virtual human–robot interaction laboratory for assistive robotics. *IEEE Transactions on Human-Machine Systems*. 2021. 51(6):568–577
  54. Villani V, Capelli B, and Sabattini L. Use of virtual reality for the evaluation of human-robot interaction systems in complex scenarios. In: *2018 27th IEEE international symposium on robot and human interactive communication (RO-MAN)*. IEEE. p. 422–427.
  55. Fratzek P, Goh YM, Kinnell P. Understanding human behaviour in industrial human-robot interaction by means of virtual reality. In: *Proceedings of the Halfway to the Future Symposium 2019*. p. 1–7.
  56. Yamamoto T, Abolhassani N, Jung S. Augmented reality and haptic interfaces for robot-assisted surgery. *The International Journal of Medical Robotics and Computer Assisted Surgery*. 2012. 8(1):45–56
  57. Fang H, Ong S, and Nee A. A novel augmented reality-based interface for robot path planning. *International Journal on Interactive Design and Manufacturing (IJIDeM)*. 2014. 8(1):33–42
  58. Hernández JD, Sobti S, Sciola A. Increasing robot autonomy via motion planning and an augmented reality interface. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*. 2020. 5(2):1017–1023
  59. Kousi N, Stoubos C, Gkournelos C. Enabling human robot interaction in flexible robotic assembly lines: An augmented reality based software suite. *Procedia CIRP*. 2019. 81:1429–1434
  60. Michalos G, Karagiannis P, Makris S. Augmented reality (ar) applications for supporting human-robot interactive cooperation. *Procedia CIRP*. 2016. 41:370–375
  61. Milgram P, Zhai S, Drascic D. Applications of augmented reality for human-robot communication. In: *Proceedings of 1993 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS '93)*. vol. 3. p. 1467–1472 vol.3. [DOI: [10.1109/IROS.1993.583833](https://doi.org/10.1109/IROS.1993.583833)]
  62. Malý I, Sedláček D, and Leitão P. Augmented reality experiments with industrial robot in industry 4.0 environment. In: *2016 IEEE 14th International Conference on Industrial Informatics (INDIN)*. p. 176–181. [DOI: [10.1109/INDIN.2016.7819154](https://doi.org/10.1109/INDIN.2016.7819154)]
  63. Ostanin M, Yagfarov R, Devitt D. Multi robots interactive control using mixed reality. *International Journal of Production Research*. 2021. 59(23):7126–7138 [DOI: [10.1080/00207543.2020.1834640](https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2020.1834640)]
  64. Fang B, Ding W, Sun F. Brain–computer interface integrated with augmented reality for human–robot interaction. *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive and Developmental Systems*. 2022. 15(4):1702–1711
  65. Guhl J, Hügle J, and Krüger J. Enabling human-robot-interaction via virtual and augmented reality in distributed control systems. *Procedia CIRP*. 2018. 76:167–170
  66. Wang X, Guo S, Xu Z. A robotic teleoperation system enhanced by augmented reality for natural human–robot interaction. *Cyborg and Bionic Systems*. 2024. 5:0098
  67. Bischoff R, and Kazi A. Perspectives on augmented reality based human-robot interaction with industrial robots. In:

- 2004 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)(IEEE Cat. No. 04CH37566). IEEE. vol. 4. p. 3226–3231.
68. Hedayati H, Walker M, and Szafer D. Improving collocated robot teleoperation with augmented reality. In: Proceedings of the 2018 ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction. p. 78–86.
  69. Choi SH, Park KB, Roh DH. An integrated mixed reality system for safety-aware human-robot collaboration using deep learning and digital twin generation. *Robotics and Computer-Integrated Manufacturing*. 2022. 73:102258
  70. Li C, Zheng P, Yin Y. An ar-assisted deep reinforcement learning-based approach towards mutual-cognitive safe human-robot interaction. *Robotics and Computer-Integrated Manufacturing*. 2023. 80:102471 [DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rcim.2022.102471>]
  71. Chacko SM, and Kapila V. An augmented reality interface for human-robot interaction in unconstrained environments. In: 2019 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS). IEEE. p. 3222–3228.
  72. Ostanin M, Yagfarov R, and Klimchik A. Interactive robots control using mixed reality. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*. 2019. 52(13):695–700
  73. Manring L, Pederson J, Potts D. Augmented reality for interactive robot control. In: *Special Topics in Structural Dynamics & Experimental Techniques, Volume 5: Proceedings of the 37th IMAC, A Conference and Exposition on Structural Dynamics 2019*. Springer. p. 11–18.
  74. Buldu KB, Özdel S, Lau KHC. Cuify the xr: An open-source package to embed llm-powered conversational agents in xr. In: 2025 IEEE International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and eXtended and Virtual Reality (AIxVR). IEEE. p. 192–197.
  75. Konenkov M, Lykov A, Trinitatova D. Vr-gpt: Visual language model for intelligent virtual reality applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.11537*. 2024
  76. Afzal MZ, Ali SA, Stricker D. Next generation xr systems—large language models meet augmented and virtual reality. *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications*. 2025. 43(1):43–49 [DOI: [10.1109/MCG.2025.3548554](https://doi.org/10.1109/MCG.2025.3548554)]
  77. Li X, Liu M, Zhang H. Vision-language foundation models as effective robot imitators. In: *ICLR*.
  78. Lakhnati Y, Pascher M, and Gerken J. Exploring a gpt-based large language model for variable autonomy in a vr-based human-robot teaming simulation. *Frontiers in Robotics and AI*. 2024. Volume 11 - 2024 [DOI: [10.3389/frobt.2024.1347538](https://doi.org/10.3389/frobt.2024.1347538)]
  79. Zhang C, Chen J, Li J. Large language models for human–robot interaction: A review. *Biomimetic Intelligence and Robotics*. 2023. 3(4):100131 [DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.birob.2023.100131>]
  80. Wang Z, Giannopoulos E, Slater M. Handshake: Realistic human-robot interaction in haptic enhanced virtual reality. *Presence*. 2011. 20(4):371–392
  81. Wang I, Smith J, and Ruiz J. Exploring virtual agents for augmented reality. In: *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. p. 1–12.
  82. Suzuki R, Karim A, Xia T. Augmented reality and robotics: A survey and taxonomy for ar-enhanced human-robot interaction and robotic interfaces. In: *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. p. 1–33.
  83. Walker M, Phung T, Chakraborti T. Virtual, augmented, and mixed reality for human-robot interaction: A survey and virtual design element taxonomy. *ACM Transactions on Human-Robot Interaction*. 2023. 12(4):1–39
  84. Groechel TR, Walker ME, Chang CT. A tool for organizing key characteristics of virtual, augmented, and mixed reality for human–robot interaction systems: Synthesizing vam-hri trends and takeaways. *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine*. 2022. 29(1):35–44
  85. Wang N, Pynadath DV, Unnikrishnan K. Intelligent agents for virtual simulation of human-robot interaction. In: *International Conference on Virtual, Augmented and Mixed Reality*. Springer. p. 228–239.
  86. Szafer D. Mediating human-robot interactions with virtual, augmented, and mixed reality. In: *International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction*. Springer. p. 124–149.
  87. Qiu S, Liu H, Zhang Z. Human-robot interaction in a shared augmented reality workspace. In: 2020 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS). IEEE. p. 11413–11418.
  88. Sabbella SR, Kaszuba S, Leotta F. Virtual reality applications for enhancing human-robot interaction: A gesture recognition perspective. In: *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM International Conference on Intelligent Virtual Agents*. p. 1–4.
  89. Arntz A, Eimler SC, and Hoppe HU. “the robot-arm talks back to me” - human perception of augmented human-robot collaboration in virtual reality. In: 2020 IEEE International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Virtual Reality (AIVR). p. 307–312. [DOI: [10.1109/AIVR50618.2020.00062](https://doi.org/10.1109/AIVR50618.2020.00062)]

90. Zhang Y, Omrani A, Yadav R. Supporting visualization analysis in industrial process tomography by using augmented reality—a case study of an industrial microwave drying system. *Sensors*. 2021. 21(19):6515
91. Paiva A, Leite I, Boukricha H. Empathy in virtual agents and robots: A survey. *ACM Transactions on Interactive Intelligent Systems (TiiS)*. 2017. 7(3):1–40
92. Zhao S. Toward a taxonomy of copresence. *Presence*. 2003. 12(5):445–455
93. Szczurek KA, Prades RM, Matheson E. Multimodal multi-user mixed reality human–robot interface for remote operations in hazardous environments. *IEEE Access*. 2023. 11:17305–17333
94. Simaan N, Taylor RH, and Choset H. Intelligent surgical robots with situational awareness. *Mechanical Engineering*. 2015. 137(09):S3–S6
95. Roldán JJ, Peña-Tapia E, Martín-Barrio A. Multi-robot interfaces and operator situational awareness: Study of the impact of immersion and prediction. *Sensors*. 2017. 17(8):1720
96. Zhang Y, Nowak A, Rao G. Is industrial tomography ready for augmented reality? a need-finding study of how augmented reality can be adopted by industrial tomography experts. In: *International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction*. Springer. p. 523–535.
97. Van Haastregt J, Welle MC, Zhang Y. Puppeteer your robot: Augmented reality leader-follower teleoperation. In: *2024 IEEE-RAS 23rd International Conference on Humanoid Robots (Humanoids)*. IEEE. p. 1019–1026.
98. Zhang Y, Orthmann B, Welle MC. Llm-driven augmented reality puppeteer: Controller-free voice-commanded robot teleoperation. In: *International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction*. Springer. p. 97–112.
99. Zhang Y, Orthmann B, Ji S. Multimodal” puppeteer”: An exploration of robot teleoperation via virtual counterpart with llm-driven voice and gesture interaction in augmented reality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.13189*. 2025
100. Kim CY, Lee CP, and Mutlu B. Understanding large-language model (llm)-powered human-robot interaction. In: *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM/IEEE international conference on human-robot interaction*. p. 371–380.
101. Kawaharazuka K, Matsushima T, Gambardella A. Real-world robot applications of foundation models: A review. *Advanced Robotics*. 2024. 38(18):1232–1254
102. Costa GdM, Petry MR, and Moreira AP. Augmented reality for human–robot collaboration and cooperation in industrial applications: A systematic literature review. *Sensors*. 2022. 22(7):2725
103. Robins B, Dautenhahn K, Boekhorst RT. Robotic assistants in therapy and education of children with autism: can a small humanoid robot help encourage social interaction skills?. *Universal access in the information society*. 2005. 4(2):105–120
104. Shamsuddin S, Yussof H, Ismail L. Initial response of autistic children in human-robot interaction therapy with humanoid robot nao. In: *2012 IEEE 8th International Colloquium on Signal Processing and its Applications*. IEEE. p. 188–193.
105. Mohebbi A. Human-robot interaction in rehabilitation and assistance: a review. *Current Robotics Reports*. 2020. 1(3):131–144
106. Leite I, Pereira A, Mascarenhas S. The influence of empathy in human–robot relations. *International journal of human-computer studies*. 2013. 71(3):250–260
107. Baytas MA, Çay D, Zhang Y. The design of social drones: A review of studies on autonomous flyers in inhabited environments. In: *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. p. 1–13.
108. Shin D. Empathy and embodied experience in virtual environment: To what extent can virtual reality stimulate empathy and embodied experience?. *Computers in human behavior*. 2018. 78:64–73
109. Rueda J, and Lara F. Virtual reality and empathy enhancement: Ethical aspects. *Frontiers in Robotics and AI*. 2020. 7:506984
110. Lv N, and Gong J. The application of virtual reality technology in the efficiency optimisation of students’ online interactive learning. *International Journal of Continuing Engineering Education and Life Long Learning*. 2022. 32(1):35–47
111. Zhang Y, Ma Y, Fu D. Personalizing emotion-aware conversational agents? exploring user traits-driven conversational strategies for enhanced interaction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.06954*. 2025
112. Nakazawa A, Iwamoto M, Kurazume R. Augmented reality-based affective training for improving care communication skill and empathy. *PloS one*. 2023. 18(7):e0288175
113. Billinghurst M. Using augmented reality to create empathic experiences. In: *Proceedings of the 19th international conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*. p. 5–6.
114. Ma Y, Zhang Y, Bachinski M. Emotion-aware voice assistants: Design, implementation, and preliminary insights. In: *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Symposium of Chinese CHI*. p. 527–532.
115. Sorin V, Brin D, Barash Y. Large language models and empathy: systematic review. *Journal of medical Internet*

- research. 2024. 26:e52597
116. Hasan M, Ozel C, Potter S. Sapient: affective virtual agents powered by large language models. In: 2023 11th International Conference on Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction Workshops and Demos (ACIIW). IEEE. p. 1–3.
  117. Shih MT, Hsu MY, and Lee SC. Empathy-gpt: Leveraging large language models to enhance emotional empathy and user engagement in embodied conversational agents. In: Adjunct Proceedings of the 37th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology. p. 1–3.
  118. Lee KM, Jung Y, Kim J. Are physically embodied social agents better than disembodied social agents?: The effects of physical embodiment, tactile interaction, and people’s loneliness in human–robot interaction. *International journal of human-computer studies*. 2006. 64(10):962–973
  119. Wainer J, Feil-Seifer DJ, Shell DA. The role of physical embodiment in human-robot interaction. In: ROMAN 2006-The 15th IEEE International Symposium on Robot and Human Interactive Communication. IEEE. p. 117–122.
  120. Kilteni K, Groten R, and Slater M. The sense of embodiment in virtual reality. *Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments*. 2012. 21(4):373–387
  121. Han Z, Zhu Y, Phan A. Crossing reality: Comparing physical and virtual robot deixis. In: Proceedings of the 2023 ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction. p. 152–161.
  122. Wolf E, Fiedler ML, Döllinger N. Exploring presence, avatar embodiment, and body perception with a holographic augmented reality mirror. In: 2022 IEEE conference on virtual reality and 3D user interfaces (VR). IEEE. p. 350–359.
  123. Nimcharoen C, Zollmann S, Collins J. Is that me?—embodiment and body perception with an augmented reality mirror. In: 2018 IEEE International Symposium on Mixed and Augmented Reality Adjunct (ISMAR-Adjunct). IEEE. p. 158–163.
  124. Genay A, Lécuyer A, and Hachet M. Being an avatar “for real”: a survey on virtual embodiment in augmented reality. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*. 2021. 28(12):5071–5090
  125. Zhang Y, Nowak A, Romanowski A. On-site or remote working?: An initial solution on how covid-19 pandemic may impact augmented reality users. In: Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Advanced Visual Interfaces. p. 1–3.
  126. Ghafurian M, Budnarain N, and Hoey J. Improving humanness of virtual agents and users’ cooperation through emotions. *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*. 2021. 14(2):1461–1471
  127. Lisetti C, Amini R, Yasavur U. I can help you change! an empathic virtual agent delivers behavior change health interventions. *ACM Transactions on Management Information Systems (TMIS)*. 2013. 4(4):1–28
  128. Parmar D, Olafsson S, Utami D. Designing empathic virtual agents: manipulating animation, voice, rendering, and empathy to create persuasive agents. *Autonomous agents and multi-agent systems*. 2022. 36(1):17
  129. Zhang Y, Nowak A, Romanowski A. Virtuality or physicality? supporting memorization through augmented reality gamification. In: Companion Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGCHI Symposium on Engineering Interactive Computing Systems. p. 53–58.
  130. Wallace B, Van Otterdijk M, Zhang Y. Imitation or innovation? translating features of expressive motion from humans to robots. In: Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Human-Agent Interaction. p. 296–304.
  131. Suzuki R, Gonzalez-Franco M, Sra M. Xr and ai: Ai-enabled virtual, augmented, and mixed reality. In: Adjunct Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology (UIST). ACM. p. 1–3. [DOI:[10.1145/3586182.3617432](https://doi.org/10.1145/3586182.3617432)]
  132. Lopes JC, and Lopes RP. Computer vision in augmented, virtual, mixed and extended reality environments—a bibliometric review. *Visual Informatics*. 2024. 8(4):13–22