



**HAL**  
open science

## Entropy and a sub-group of geometric measures of paths predict the navigability of an environment

Demet Yesiltepe, Pablo Fernández Velasco, Antoine Coutrot, A. Ozbil Torun, Jan M. Wiener, Christoph Hölscher, Michael Hornberger, Ruth Conroy Dalton, Hugo J. Spiers

### ► To cite this version:

Demet Yesiltepe, Pablo Fernández Velasco, Antoine Coutrot, A. Ozbil Torun, Jan M. Wiener, et al.. Entropy and a sub-group of geometric measures of paths predict the navigability of an environment. Cognition, 2023, 236, pp.105443. 10.1016/j.cognition.2023.105443 . hal-04154242

**HAL Id: hal-04154242**

**<https://hal.science/hal-04154242v1>**

Submitted on 7 Jul 2023

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Entropy and a sub group of geometric measures of paths predict the navigability of an environment

D. Yesiltepe<sup>a,1,\*</sup>, P. Fernández Velasco<sup>b,1</sup>, A. Coutrot<sup>c</sup>, A. Ozbil Torun<sup>d</sup>, J.M. Wiener<sup>e</sup>,  
C. Holscher<sup>f</sup>, M. Hornberger<sup>g</sup>, R. Conroy Dalton<sup>d,\*</sup>, H.J. Spiers<sup>h</sup>

<sup>a</sup> School of Architecture, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK

<sup>b</sup> Department of Philosophy, Trinity College Dublin, University of Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

<sup>c</sup> LIRIS, CNRS, University of Lyon, Lyon, France

<sup>d</sup> Department of Architecture and Built Environment, Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

<sup>e</sup> Department of Psychology, Ageing and Dementia Research Centre, Bournemouth University, Poole, UK

<sup>f</sup> ETH Zürich, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zürich, Switzerland

<sup>g</sup> Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK

<sup>h</sup> Institute of Behavioural Neuroscience, Department of Experimental Psychology, Division of Psychology and Language Sciences, University College London, London, UK

## ARTICLE INFO

### Keywords:

Navigation  
Environmental features  
Virtual environments  
Space syntax

## ABSTRACT

Despite extensive research on navigation, it remains unclear which features of an environment predict how difficult it will be to navigate. We analysed 478,170 trajectories from 10,626 participants who navigated 45 virtual environments in the research app-based game *Sea Hero Quest*. Virtual environments were designed to vary in a range of properties such as their layout, number of goals, visibility (varying fog) and map condition. We calculated 58 spatial measures grouped into four families: task-specific metrics, space syntax configurational metrics, space syntax geometric metrics, and general geometric metrics. We used Lasso, a variable selection method, to select the most predictive measures of navigation difficulty. Geometric features such as entropy, area of navigable space, number of rings and closeness centrality of path networks were among the most significant factors determining the navigational difficulty. By contrast a range of other measures did not predict difficulty, including measures of intelligibility. Unsurprisingly, other task-specific features (e.g. number of destinations) and fog also predicted navigation difficulty. These findings have implications for the study of spatial behaviour in ecological settings, as well as predicting human movements in different settings, such as complex buildings and transport networks and may aid the design of more navigable environments.

## 1. Introduction

Some environments are famously hard to navigate. Patients in Homey Hospital (USA) reportedly avoided leaving their rooms for fear of getting lost (Peponis, Zimring, & Choi, 1990). The Seattle Central Library, while being widely acclaimed for its aesthetics, is renowned for being difficult to navigate (Carlson, Holscher, Shipley, & Dalton, 2010; Kuliga et al., 2019). In a recent incident in Australia, a man died after getting lost in a rarely-used stairwell in a shopping mall, and he was only found three weeks later (Jeffrey, 2019). Poor building design has real-world consequences. But what factors make an environment hard to navigate? This is a key question in the study of human navigation, and yet so far, the existing work within the cognitive sciences has failed to

provide a clear answer.

The shift in cognitive science toward real-world approaches has resulted in a renewed focus on the impact of environmental factors on spatial cognition. Wiener and Mallot (2003) found that region-connectivity influences navigation behaviour, in line with hierarchical theories of route planning. In their study of exploration patterns, Brunec, Nantais, Sutton, Epstein, and Newcombe (2023) analysed integration, a space syntax measure of how well connected a path is within its overall surroundings and found that those participants who spent more time in regions of high integration formed more accurate cognitive maps. However, most existing studies employ only a single or a few environmental metrics. This is a big setback because there is no consensus on which metrics impact navigation behaviour. Moreover, an important

\* Corresponding authors.

E-mail addresses: [d.yesiltepe@sheffield.ac.uk](mailto:d.yesiltepe@sheffield.ac.uk) (D. Yesiltepe), [ruth.dalton@northumbria.ac.uk](mailto:ruth.dalton@northumbria.ac.uk) (R. Conroy Dalton), [h.spiers@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:h.spiers@ucl.ac.uk) (H.J. Spiers).

<sup>1</sup> Contributed equally.

aspect in the study of navigation are computational models, which again often involve few environmental metrics (e.g. obstacles in [Edvardsen, Bicanski, & Burgess, 2020](#), or information cost at decision points in [Lancia, Eluchans, D'Alessandro, Spiers, & Pezzulo, 2023](#)). If we want to evaluate whether computational models reproduce human navigational patterns in a given environment, we need to further our understanding of precisely how that environment affects human navigation, and this step requires advancing our knowledge of the impact of different environmental metrics.

Previous research on the navigability of environments has come from a variety of disciplines ranging from psychology to architecture. To date, a series of environmental factors have been hypothesised to impact navigation behaviour, including: entropy of path orientations ([Batty, Morphet, Masucci, & Stanilov, 2014](#)), connectivity of paths ([Li & Klippel, 2012, 2016](#)), interconnection density ([Slone, Burles, & Iaria, 2016](#)), visibility ([He, McNamara, & Brown, 2019](#); [Li & Klippel, 2012](#)) and intelligibility of the paths/streets ([Barton, Valtchanov, & Ellard, 2014](#); [Hillier, 1996](#)). [Farr et al. \(2012\)](#) reviewed existing research on environmental factors that affect navigation and listed city layout, colour and light, maps, signage, visibility, inter-connection density and space syntax measures. Another research study included differentiation, visual access, layout complexity and signage as environmental factors that affect navigation performance ([Montello, 2005](#)). Another review article ([Wolbers & Hegarty, 2010](#)) identified the following environmental cues: discrete environmental objects, global orientation cues, geometric structure of the environment and symbolic representations were mentioned. Despite the large number of candidates, it is not clear yet which environmental factors help people more or make it harder to complete a navigation task.

Four main approaches have been used to study how the environment impacts navigation and spatial behaviour. These are: a) examining GPS trajectory data in real-world environments collected as part of daily activities such as running (e.g. [Bongiorno et al., 2021](#)), b) GPS trajectories from participants navigating real-world environments (e.g. [Coutrot et al., 2019](#)), c) testing navigation in the physical lab setting (e.g. [Hamburger & Knauff, 2011](#)), and d) testing with virtual reality (VR) environments (e.g. [Brown, Gagnon, & Wagner, 2020](#); [Ekstrom, Spiers, Bohbot, & Shayna Rosenbaum, 2018](#); [Javadi et al., 2019](#); [Slone, Burles, Robinson, Levy, & Iaria, 2015](#)). A challenge with studying navigation in the real-world is that environmental features are hard to separate experimentally, and, as a result of their interaction, it is hard to deduce their impact on the difficulty of navigating an environment ([Carlson et al., 2010](#); [Jeffery, 2019](#); [Montello, 2007](#)). A good example is [Haq and Giroto \(2003\)](#) study, in which they examined wayfinding in two separate hospital buildings in the U.S. to understand the relationship between wayfinding and intelligibility. While they found that intelligibility was a good predictor of success in mapsketching and pointing tasks, these results did not translate to wayfinding performance. The more intelligible environment was arranged around a very long corridor (with many decision points) along which most of the destinations were located. Small wayfinding errors would therefore result in participants having to retrace their steps, and thus incurring redundant decision point use (i.e. passing a decision point not required to complete the wayfinding task) and repeat decision point use (i.e. passing the same decision point twice). Furthermore, when participants became disoriented, they wandered around, increasing their exposure to the environment and potentially affecting their performance in the mapsketching task ([Haq & Giroto, 2003](#)). Results of another wayfinding experiment highlighted that analysing performance in only two environments was a significant limitation, because a host of unaccounted factors (e.g. the rectilinearity of the street network) could account for the differences in the studied measures ([Long & Baran, 2012](#)). Recent research exploring when patients with dementia become lost in real-world situations helps to extend beyond two environments ([Puthusserypady, Coughlan, Patel, & Hornberger, 2019](#); [Puthusserypady, Manley, Lowry, Patel, & Hornberger, 2020](#)), but lacks the capacity for

systematic comparison of variables that can be achieved in lab experiments. Previous studies in the lab and in virtual settings have compared a small number of environments while measuring a small number of environmental features. For instance, [Slone et al. \(2015\)](#) compared two virtual layouts systematically varying in one objective measure of plan complexity, the interconnection density ([Li & Klippel, 2012](#); [O'Neill, 1991](#); [Slone et al., 2016](#)). They found that more complex layouts were harder to navigate. The difficulty in assessing a given variable is that in the real-world it may interact with a plethora of other environmental features to determine the navigability of an environment. It is possible that when included with a range of other metrics across many environments the impact of a given metric becomes minimal.

To address the question of which factors are most important in spatial navigation, it is ideal to measure environmental features in a variety of environments, and then analyse wayfinding performance across many participants to account for individual differences in performance. This is a challenge because the time taken to test many environments may be longer than a standard experiment and testing many participants with such a test is difficult. Here, we surmounted these challenges by calculating 58 spatial metrics to examine the trajectories of over 10,000 participants navigating 45 virtual environments in the mobile video game *Sea Hero Quest (SHQ)* ([Coutrot et al., 2018](#); [Spiers, Coutrot, & Hornberger, 2021](#)). The gamification of experiments is a powerful tool for data acquisition. It has the potential to provide a large data set, especially if the game/experiment is designed to be fun and interactive ([De Leeuw, De Maeyer, & De Cock, 2020](#)). Moreover, gamified studies allow for the collection of data from large samples from different parts of the world, which is what SHQ was designed for ([Morgan, 2016](#)). However, previous studies stated that game worlds do not take into account the configurational preconceptions of their environments in full and game environments should be designed using different techniques, including space syntax ([Biyik & Surer, 2020](#)). This is also addressed during the design process of SHQ. Previous work has used SHQ to study the relationship between sleep duration and spatial navigation performance ([Coutrot et al., 2022b](#)), the environment and navigation ([Coutrot et al., 2022a](#)), the relationship between gender differences in navigation and countrywide gender inequality ([Coutrot et al., 2018](#)), and spatial navigation strategies ([West et al., 2022](#)). The richness and volume of this data set allowed us to study different combinations of environmental features and their impact on wayfinding. Analysing the data with a variable selection method, we isolated eight spatial metrics that best explained navigability.

## 2. Material and methods

### 2.1. Participants

Between May 2016 and March 2019, 3,881,449 participants from every country downloaded and completed at least the first level of the game. 60.8% of the participants entered their demographics (age, gender, and nationality). The profile of the participants who played only the first levels of the game is likely quite different from the participants who completed all 45 wayfinding levels. To avoid selection biases and to be able to compare the levels with one another, we used the subsample of participants who completed all the levels in the game and provided demographics for the further analysis (to see the proportion of the total number of players per level, see Appendix B). As a result of this sampling process, 10,626 participants were included in the analysis. Among them, 5219 were male (age:  $M = 41.89$  years,  $SD = 15.95$  years) and 5407 were female (age:  $41.98$  years,  $SD = 16.32$  years).

### 2.2. Task

In *Sea Hero Quest*, participants navigate a boat through a series of virtual environments (for an extensive description, see [Coutrot et al., 2018](#); [Spiers et al., 2021](#)). The wayfinding task was designed with

consideration of Wiener et al. 's taxonomy of human wayfinding tasks (2009) to involve wayfinding with path planning. The wayfinding performance in SHQ has been shown to be predictive of real-world navigation performance (Coutrot et al., 2019).

Participants navigated through 45 different levels. Level progression was linear, so participants needed to complete level N in order to access level N + 1. At the beginning of each level, participants were presented a map showing a series of goal locations. They had to navigate to the goal locations in the indicated order (i.e., they needed to reach goal 1 first, then goal 2, etc). Participants could study the map and, after clicking the close button, the map disappeared and participants started to navigate (Fig. 1). They used four commands during the game to move the boat: they tapped right to turn to the right, tapped left to turn to the left and swiped up to speed up, and swiped down to stop the boat. This was explained in the first levels of the game. If goals were not encountered in the required order, participants had to return from one goal to another in order to complete the task. The task was marked as complete once all goal locations had been visited in the appropriate order and the participant received between one and three stars depending on how quick they completed the level. If the participant took longer than a set time, an arrow indicated the direction to the goal along the Euclidean line to aid navigation. The results were uploaded on a server as soon as participants completed a level. If they were offline, then the data was stored on their device and sent when they were online again.

### 2.3. Level design

The levels were designed to vary in terms of spatial configuration, the number of goal locations, visibility conditions (i.e., fog versus clear environments), themes (e.g. arctic environment, swamps, etc), and landmark saliency (for more information about landmarks see Yesiltepe et al., 2020; Yesiltepe et al., 2020, Yesiltepe, Conroy Dalton, Ozbil Torun, Hornberger, & Spiers, 2020, Yesiltepe et al., 2020; Yesiltepe, Conroy Dalton, Ozbil Torun, Hornberger, & Spiers, 2020; Yesiltepe, Dalton, Torun, Noble, et al., 2020; Yesiltepe, 2021; Yesiltepe et al., 2019; Yesiltepe, Conroy Dalton, & Ozbil Torun, 2021). Some levels also used partially occluded maps (see Fig. 1), such that participants did not have a full preview of the environment, just the start locations and the arrangement of goals.

The levels were designed to have specific and controlled degrees of complexity that varied across levels. To this aim, we employed O'Neill's 'interconnection density' measure (ICD). As we mentioned, ICD is the average number of choices at decision points. In graph terms, ICD is the sum of the degrees of all decision points, divided by the total number of decision points in the graph. The reason we used ICD is that it has been found to be strongly correlated with the degree of perceived complexity of building layouts ( $r = 0.78, p < .01$ ) (O'Neill, 1991).

We generated layouts with a specific number of decision points and connections, resulting in a specific ICD measure for each layout. We produced a series of layouts varying in ICD values, and then analysed each potential layout to measure its intelligibility. Intelligibility is defined as the correlation between how well connected a space is (linked to the metric of degree centrality) and how accessible it is, which is expressed using a variation of the graph measure closeness centrality (Hillier, Burdett, Peponis, & Penn, 1987). In this process, intelligibility served as a fitness function for inclusion in the game levels. We selected the final layouts so that they formed three groups varying in intelligibility: highly intelligible (0.8–0.85), averagely intelligible (0.5), and highly unintelligible (0.15–0.2). The game was designed such that levels with lower intelligibility values were generally encountered later in the game, and we expected these levels to be harder to complete and that they would result in higher difficulty scores. The bottom part of Fig. 1 includes the difficulty of each level, which shows that the later levels are on average harder to navigate compared to the first wayfinding levels.

Once all the layouts were selected, they were transformed into the game levels by the game design company Glitchers Ltd. Another analysis

was undertaken after the game design process to ensure that they retained the correct levels of intelligibility, post-transformation. At the final stage, each level was user-tested by the design team and the scientific and architectural team to ensure it was suitable. For example, if a level was too easy/hard to complete the navigation task, then the level was revised by adding/removing deadends and simplifying/increasing what was estimated by the design team for complexity of the layout. All our environmental analyses for 58 metrics were completed only after the environment design was finalised and converted into game environments.



### 2.4. Environment analysis

To analyse the environmental configuration of each of the 45 levels, we employed 58 separate metrics (for a detailed description of each of the metrics, see Appendix A Table A1, and see Appendix A Table A.2. to see the results of our calculation for 58 metrics), which, based on previous studies, were all potentially linked to navigation performance. The metrics fall into four families: task-specific metrics; space syntax relational metrics; space syntax geometric metrics; and general geometric metrics.


Task-specific measures correspond to those features that are not intrinsic to the spatial layout itself but that instead depend on the task that was set for participants to complete. These include: (a) the number of destinations (i.e. the number of goal locations the participant must reach before the task is marked as complete), (b) the weather (i.e. the presence or absence of fog within a level), map occlusion (i.e. whether or not the map is partially occluded) and the (c) shortest route (i.e. the shortest path passing all of the goal locations in the correct order from the starting point). In principle, tasks are made easier if goals are placed in a sequence that matches their ordering, while they are made more difficult if the shortest route between subsequent goals involves a lot of backtracking and crossing of previous routes. Other task related measures included map condition (occluded map vs clear map).

Space syntax relational metrics and space syntax geometric metrics were developed using space syntax (see Appendix C.1-C.11. for the images we prepared to illustrate some of the space syntax metrics for each level), a set of techniques designed to measure the spatial configuration of built environments (Hillier & Hanson, 1984). These methods are based on the analysis of either lines of sight/movement (drawn according to inter-visibility between two points) or points/grids. This includes axial and segment analysis—which are line-based—, and visibility graph analysis (VGA) and isovist analysis—which are based on points/grids. Axial analysis is based on drawing lines of sight, which relate the visibility and movement through navigable spaces. A segment is a line that transects the space between two junctions/decision points (Al-Sayed, Turner, Hillier, Iida, & Penn, 2014; Hillier & Iida, 2005). VGA is based on the visibility of each point (or grid) from the rest of the environment (Jiang & Claramunt, 2002; Turner, Doxa, O'Sullivan, & Penn, 2001). Isovists measure the set of visible sub-spaces from a specific point.

The space syntax analysis of the levels followed several stages. First, the layouts of all 45 levels were collected as .png files, in the form of solid-void versions of the layouts: black for barriers to navigation and white for navigable space (Fig. 2a). These were then converted to .dxf files to produce editable versions of the layouts. We used Depthmap X 0.50 to run the space syntax analysis (Varoudis, 2012). Axial maps were automatically generated with the software and the fewest-line layouts were used. In order to create segment maps of the layouts, the edges of navigable spaces were first defined with points in ArcMap, and Voronoi polygons were generated using those points. These Voronoi polygons were used to define segment maps, with the edges of the polygons shaping the segment lines. Once the segment maps and the axial maps had been created, we computed axial and segment analysis to generate the space syntax measures. VGA analysis was also automatically generated (Fig. 2b). The resulting space syntax measures are either



**Fig. 1.** Navigation Task Sea Hero Quest. Top row: Example maps shown to participants at the start of 5 of the 45 wayfinding levels tested. Each map is from a different themed region in the game. Maps show starting location (blue arrow) and checkpoints (red circles) to be navigated to in the order indicated by the numbers in the circles. Participants touched the close icon to close the map after studying the map (self-paced). Middle row: Views from the first-person view navigation period of the task. Tapping left or right of the boat allowed for steering. Stars at the top given an indication of time remaining to obtain 3, 2 or 1 star reward. Number of check-points reached is indicated top right. Middle map (level 38) shows an example of a map where the layout is obscured in the map image. Note: Levels with an obscured map layout were not consistently linked to levels with fog in the navigation phase. Bottom: Scaled difficulty of the levels is shown across time. The 45 wayfinding levels of the game were distributed across the 75 levels of the game which included other features of the game (see Spiers et al., 2021). (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)



**Fig. 2.** a: The procedure to create segment maps. Images from left to right: screenshot of the map of level 46, black and white image showing navigable spaces (in white), and segment map created from the same file using Voronoi polygons b: Illustrations of 3 space syntax analyses. Left and in middle: line-based maps; right: point/grid based analysis, see text for more details c: Simplified segment map and a rose plot of the segments' bearings. The rose plots are used to calculate street network entropy. All the images show the layout of level 46.

relational or geometric.

Geometric space syntax measures are *axial number of lines*, *axial line length* and the *ratio of the isovist view area* (from the start point) to the total area. These measures focus on geometric characteristics of the defined spaces. Relational metrics, on the other hand, include all syntactic measures that analyse the relationship between each space and all others, and they rely on an underlying graph-representation (decision points and edges) for their calculation. In brief, each of the space syntax relational measures are as follows: *Connectivity* measures the number of other lines that each line is connected to (Hillier & Hanson, 1984). *Integration* is a measure of centrality which calculates how accessible each segment is from the rest of the system in terms of the number of direction changes (which is strongly related to closeness centrality). *Integration* can be calculated at different radii from the centre of the environment, with the largest radius corresponding to a measure of global integration. *Intelligibility* is the correlation between global integration and connectivity, and it is generally understood to indicate how easy it is to comprehend the layout (Hillier, 1996; Hillier, Burdett, et al., 1987). Separate measures of integration, connectivity and intelligibility were produced using both line-based analysis (e.g. Seg\_Connectivity) and VGA analysis (e.g. VGA\_Connectivity). *Metric choice* measures the possibility for each segment to be selected as a part of the shortest route between origin and destination (Al-Sayed et al., 2014; Hillier & Hanson, 1984). Here, we used both choice and normalised choice, which adjusts choice values according to the depth of each segment in the system so that different environments can be compared (Hillier, Yang, & Turner, 2012). Finally, *metric reach* measures the total street length that can be reached from an origin to all possible directions up to a certain distance threshold (Peponis, Bafna, & Zhang, 2008), and *directional reach* measures the total street length captured with a specific number of direction

changes (Ozbil & Peponis, 2007).

In addition to space syntax measures, we employed the following general geometric measures, which were calculated employing methods outside of space syntax techniques: *number of decision points* (# of decisionpoint), the *area of navigable spaces* (area\_moveable spaces), the *number of dead ends* for both axial (# of deadends axial map) and segment maps (# of deadends seg-map), the *number of rings* (# of rings), *average segment length* (avrg\_segmnt\_length), *maximum segment length* (max\_segmnt\_length), *total segment length* (total segment length), and *entropy*. Here, we included segment length as an equivalent to street length, which, as mentioned in the background section, was hypothesised to be important for environmental layout complexity (Boeing, 2018). *Number of rings* corresponds to the number of rings in the environment, where circularity relates to a loop leading back to a prior location. *Entropy* is theoretically connected to many complexity metrics (Boeing, 2018, 2019), so that the higher the *entropy*, the more complex –i.e. less ordered– the network. To calculate *entropy*, we used the following formula:

Equation 1. Entropy formula.

$$H = - \sum_{i=1}^{36} P(o_i) \log(P(o_i)) \tag{1}$$

In the formula, H represents entropy, i indexes the bins and P(o<sub>i</sub>) represents the proportion of segment orientations that fall in the i<sup>th</sup> bin. This formula is based on Shannon's entropy and was originally defined to compute the Street Network Entropy (SNE) in a city street network (Boeing, 2018; Coutrot et al., 2022a). To calculate the entropy, segment lines were used and the Douglas and Peucker (1973) was used to simplify the line made of the connected segments (Fig. 2c). For all game levels, maximum offset tolerance was used between the original and the

simplified line of three pixels.

## 2.5. Task difficulty

To quantify the navigation difficulty score, we used the 10,626 trajectories we recorded for each level. Participants' trajectories, i.e., the path they used, were recorded by sampling the participants' coordinates in the environment with a rate of 2 Hz. The length of the trajectory was then calculated. The difficulty score for each level was calculated by subtracting the minimum trajectory length from the median trajectory length and then normalising it with the minimum trajectory length. The minimum trajectory corresponds to the optimal trajectory for a given level. Hence, the difference between the median and the minimum trajectories shows how far the median performance is from being optimal. We divided this difference by the minimum trajectory length to normalize the difficulty score according to the size of the level. Without this step, this difference would be proportional to the size of the level rather than to its navigation difficulty. We computed the difficulty score for each level, and for different demographics. We computed the difficulty score for Male vs Female participants, and for Younger (below the median age, 40 y.o.) vs Older (above 40 y.o.) participants.

Equation 2. Difficulty score formula.

$$\text{Difficulty Score} = \frac{(\text{median}(\text{trajectory length}) - \text{min}(\text{trajectory length}))}{\text{min}(\text{trajectory length})} \quad (2)$$

Equipped with the spatial metrics outlined in previous sub-sections and with the difficulty score, we can now rephrase our central research question as follows: Which spatial metrics (including task-specific metrics) best explain how difficult a level is? The challenge to answer this question empirically is that we had as many as 58 metrics (some of which were strongly correlated) and 45 levels. This multicollinearity means that we could not simply apply a standard regression to predict difficulty from metrics. We applied a principal component analysis (PCA), but the interpretation of its loadings was not straightforward, as highlighted in the results sections. Rather, we used a shrinkage and variable selection method for regression models: the Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator (LASSO) regression (Tibshirani, 1996). LASSO is similar to standard regression, but it penalises the number of predictors, leading to a sparser and more interpretable model. The formula for the LASSO regression is as follows:

Equation 3. Lasso regression formula.

$$L_{\text{lasso}}(\hat{\beta}) = \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - x_i^T \hat{\beta})^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^m |\hat{\beta}_j| \quad (3)$$

Where  $\beta$  are the coefficients (i.e., the importance) of the selected metrics  $x$  in predicting the difficulty,  $i$  is the level number,  $y_i$  is the difficulty score of the  $i$ th level, and  $\lambda$  penalises the number of variables (the higher  $\lambda$ , the sparser the model). The selected metrics  $x$  are normalised (z-score) to be on the same scale. The penalisation variable  $\lambda$  is determined with 10-fold cross validations for different values of  $\lambda$ . We chose the  $\lambda$  corresponding to the minimum cross-validation error plus one standard deviation.

We bootstrapped the LASSO regression 1000 times to generate 95% confidence intervals for each coefficient. We first ran the LASSO regression for each of the four families of metrics and selected the metrics with non-zero coefficients.

- For task-specific features, the metrics selected were: *number of destinations* and *weather*.
- For general geometric features, the metrics selected were: *number of decision points*, *area of navigable spaces*, *number of circles*, and *Entropy*.
- For space syntax geometric features, the metrics selected were: *number of axial lines*, and *isovist view area from the start/total*.
- For space syntax relational features, the metrics selected were: *axial choice*, *axial integration*, *VGA connectivity*, *segment integration*, and

*metric reach* for a threshold of 25 units (MR 25). We used 25, 50, 75, 100 units based on the size of all environments. 25 units mean 0.5 cm here.

We then ran a second LASSO regression for all the selected metrics from each family. We also generated a correlation matrix with all the selected metrics in the four families.

Finally, we explored whether different demographics affected the selection of metrics. To this end, we re-ran the whole analysis outlined above for Male and Female participants, and for Younger (below the median age, 40 y.o.) and Older (above 40 y.o.) participants separately.

## 3. Results

### 3.1. Principal component analysis

Our primary aim was to understand which spatial metrics best explain how difficult a virtual environment is to navigate. As a first approach, we ran a Principal Component Analysis (PCA) on the 58 metrics of the 45 levels. The first component of the PCA (C1) explained 40% of the variance, and the second component (C2) explained 18% of the variance (Appendix D). The first component was strongly and positively correlated with difficulty ( $r = 0.74, p < .001$ ), and the second component was weakly and negatively correlated with difficulty ( $r = -0.25, p = .12$ ). As mentioned in the methods section, the issue with the Principal Component Analysis is that with 58 metrics, interpreting the loadings is not straightforward. In contrast, a Lasso regression allows us to select a limited number of important variables, which is much more useful when addressing our central question.

### 3.2. Lasso regression

We plotted all of the resulting metrics, together with difficulty, in a correlation matrix (Fig. 3). The correlation matrix shows that the difficulty of levels is positively correlated with the number of decision points ( $r = 0.76, p < .001$ ), number of circles ( $r = 0.76, p < .001$ ) and number of destinations ( $r = 0.74, p < .001$ ). There is a negative correlation between the difficulty and isovist view area from the start/total ( $r = -0.54, p < .001$ ), weather ( $r = -0.48, p < .001$ ; i.e. worse performance with fog) and segment integration ( $r = -0.41, p < .05$ ). The results show that several geometric (general) and task specific features correlated with difficulty.

We then ran another LASSO regression including all the selected metrics from each family (Fig. 4a). *Weather* and *segment integration* were selected with negative coefficients, and *number of destinations*, *number of decision points*, *area of navigable spaces*, *number of circles*, *entropy* and *metric reach* were selected with positive coefficients.

### 3.3. Effects of demographics

We re-ran the Lasso regression to separately predict the level difficulty computed for Male and Female participants, then for Younger (below 40 y.o.) and Older (above 40 y.o.) participants. Younger and older participants were defined considering median age as a cut-off point. This resulted in different sets of coefficients for each demographic (see Fig. 4b and Fig. 4c, respectively, but also see Appendix E for the Lasso coefficients for the selected metrics across age groups). For several metrics, there was a difference in the resulting coefficients but not in whether these were positive or negative (e.g. *area of navigable space* has a higher coefficient for Older than for Younger participants). Notably, there were some metrics that were selected only for one demographic profile but not for the others. *Number of decision points* and *axial integration* were selected for Female but not for Male participants. Finally, *axial integration* was selected for Older but not for Younger participants.




Fig. 3. Correlation matrix with all the metrics that met threshold for significant correlation with difficulty using our Lasso approach. Each data point represents a wayfinding level. The line represents the least square regression line, the number next to it the correlation and the number on the right shows the p values. Histograms show the metrics distribution.

#### 4. Discussion


In this study, we aimed to understand the factors that make an environment hard to navigate. We used an online app-based navigation test with a variety of virtual environments and a large sample of participants to determine which environmental features best explain navigability. We measured 58 spatial metrics —divided into four families— and, using a Lasso regression, we found the set of metrics from each family that best explained navigation difficulty. Re-applying the Lasso regression for the selected metrics returned a final selection of eight metrics. Several of these are consistent with past predictions of factors that make environments difficult to navigate (e.g. number of decision points, the presence of fog, area of navigable spaces, and metric reach), other factors were more nuanced and relate to the complexity of the path structure of an environment (e.g. entropy, number of circles and segment integration). Critically, we also discovered that several other predicted metrics, such as intelligibility, did not predict difficulty. Thus, our results indicate that perceived ‘complexity’ of an environment alone is insufficient to predict how difficult it will be to navigate. Instead, specific geometric features of an environment need to be measured. We also discovered differences between socio-demographic groups. For example, the number of decision points was more predictive of navigational performance among female participants than among male participants, and among younger participants than among older ones. These findings help to explain why some environments are more

difficult to navigate than others and provide design principles for navigable environments. Below we discuss the theoretical importance of each of the selected metrics. We then discuss an interesting finding of the current study: some variables (*axial integration* and *number of decision points*) had an impact on difficulty only for certain demographics in our sample. Finally, we discuss limitations of our study related to the use of mobile testing, the inclusion of participants, and the impact of landmarks on navigation.

##### 4.1. Theoretical import of the selected metrics

It is hardly disputable that the more complex an environment is, the harder it is to navigate. The challenge is how to measure that complexity (Boeing, 2019). Street network entropy had been previously hypothesized to be a good measure of the complexity of spatial configuration (Batty, 2005; Batty et al., 2014). This is exactly what we find using SHQ: the higher the path network entropy of an environment, the harder it is to navigate that environment. Entropy is an informational measure of unpredictability, and our study shows that it also predicts wayfinding difficulty (Barhorst-Cates, Chiara Meneghetti, Zhao, & Creem-Regehr, 2021). This is also consistent with results from a recent study that showed that people who grew up in more entropic environments (e.g. rural environments or organic cities) are better at navigating more entropic game levels in SHQ than people who grew up in less entropic environments (e.g. griddy cities like Chicago) (Coutrot et al., 2022a).





**Fig. 4.** Lasso coefficients for the selected metrics from each family (a), coefficients for Males and Females (b), and coefficients for different Younger and Older participants (c). The Lasso computation was bootstrapped 1000 times, and the boxplots represent the distribution of the coefficients across these iterations. In the boxplots, the horizontal bar represents the sample median, the hinges represent the first and third quartiles, and the whiskers extend from the hinges to the largest/lowest value no further than  $\pm 1.5 * \text{IQR}$  from the hinge (where IQR is the interquartile range).

Our results suggest that growing up in more entropic environments provides greater challenge for wayfinding thus training navigation abilities compared to growing up in environments with more organised grid-like layout.

The impact of entropy on wayfinding difficulty connects the present findings with recent information-theoretic approaches to the study of navigation (Lancia et al., 2023). Previous experimental work has employed information theory measures to model the saliency of different decision points when processing route directions (Takemiya, Richter, & Ishikawa, 2012), the capacity of grid cells in spatial memory (Mathis, Herz, & Stemmler, 2012), agent-signage interaction (Dubey, Thrash, Kapadia, Hoelscher, & Schinazi, 2021), or the cognitive cost of shortcuts (Lancia et al., 2023), to name but a few examples. Our findings advance this line of work by showing that the information-theoretic measure of street network entropy captures much of what makes an environment difficult to navigate. Moreover, because we used the Lasso regression to account for entropy as well as other potential predictor, our results are more robust than previous studies employing a single environmental metric. Furthermore, as entropy is a measure of

unpredictability, this finding links with predictive approaches to spatial cognition. If, as recent models of hippocampal and prefrontal function suggest (e.g. Brunec & Momennejad, 2022; Stoianov, Maisto, & Pezzulo, 2022), navigation depends on hierarchically nested predictions of the environment, it is congruent that the predictability of the environment (i.e. street network entropy) becomes a key factor in navigation difficulty.

Our novel finding that segment integration is a key determinant of what makes an environment difficult to navigate may help explain some prior brain dynamics during navigation. *Segment integration*, which is linked to the closeness centrality of paths, measures how accessible each segment of a path is from the rest of the system. Using neuroimaging, we have previously found that the right anterior hippocampus tracked the changes in segment integration of the streets entered during navigation in London (Javadi et al., 2017). Given the central importance of the hippocampus in navigation guidance (Nyberg, Duvelle, Barry, & Spiers, 2022) our new results may explain why segment integration is tracked by the hippocampus during navigation. Previous behavioural studies have also shown a link between wayfinding and segment integration.

Peponis et al. (1990) and Willham (1992) found high correlations between wayfinding behaviour and local integration values. More recently, Haq, Hill, and Pramanik (2009) found local integration to be an effective predictor of both exploration and wayfinding. As for global integration values, such as the one we employed, Emo, Hölscher, Wiener, and Dalton (2012) tasked participants with a search task and found global integration to be the most effective measure of spatial configuration when explaining their path choices. Our results go beyond past studies showing integration is not only a good predictor of trajectories (Hillier, Ann Penn, Hanson, & Xu, 1993; Penn, 2003), but also help predict how difficult an environment is to navigate.

The findings here also speak to the use of line-based vs grid-based analyses. In isovist and visibility graph analyses, navigable space is represented with grids and the relationship between grids are investigated. Previous studies comparing the two approaches discovered that grid-based analysis produces a better correlation with movement (Desyllas & Duxbury, 2001). While that might remain the case for predicting pedestrian movement, our findings show that line-based analysis (in our case *segment integration*) is better at predicting navigation difficulty. One of the reasons for the disparities in results could be the environment studied in the 2001 study. Instead of multiple layouts, only one urban area, the area around St Giles Circus in Central London, was studied. Furthermore, pedestrian flow was sampled for 5-min intervals every hour from morning to evening. The differences in methods and case studies could explain the disparity in results.

Richter (2009) had previously hypothesised that the more branches there are at a given decision point, the more difficult it is to navigate that intersection. Here, we find evidence supportive of the impact of decision points on difficulty, in that we found the *number of decision points* is a key metric to explain navigational difficulty. In addition, the inclusion of the *number of circles* in the set of significant factors is interesting because it has been the subject of debate. Some architects considered that ringiness might aid navigation, as it makes it easier for people to remediate their wrong turns (see also Natapov, Kuliga, Dalton, & Hölscher, 2020). This idea, which was not supported by empirical evidence, led to the construction of many newly built nursing homes in the shape of a continuous path around an inside courtyard. When Marquardt and Schmiege (2009) tested the hypothesis empirically, they discovered an effect in the opposite direction: circular floor plans hampered orientation. This can be explained with architectural differentiations: a circular path without salient objects can cause many locations to appear similar to other locations, causing confusion. Hence, the relationship between simplicity of plan configurations and orientation needs to be considered (Weisman, 1981). Our findings support the argument that ringiness—the presence of rings within the environment/spatial layout—makes an environment more difficult to navigate (Hillier, Hanson, & Graham, 1987). Ringiness in Sea Hero Quest paths provided participants with alternate routes (e.g., they could take one route to a destination and another one to go back). Furthermore, when combined with the other environmental factors, such as the presence of fog or the absence of salient objects, it may be more difficult for participants to recover from any wrong decisions. Therefore, the more rings an environment has, the more navigational choices participants have. This could cause confusion and make it harder for people to complete the wayfinding task. Furthermore, environments with many rings will require more circumnavigation of a region. Such circumnavigation has been found to distort representation of travel time and Euclidean distance between locations (Brunec, Javadi, Zisch, & Spiers, 2017). Such distortions may play a role in leading to more errors in navigation.

In the context of this experiment, the metric *weather* indicates the presence/absence of fog, and by extension, the degree of visibility within a level. Unsurprisingly fog leads to worse navigation. The importance of *weather* makes sense when we consider the importance of vision for human navigation (Ekstrom, 2015). In addition, if it is foggy, it is more difficult for participants to see environmental cues and use them to inform and navigate. The inclusion of the *number of destinations* in the

final list is also not altogether surprising either, given that goals were not generally encountered in the order of passage. This results in a higher demand to keep multiple goals in mind and more back-tracking, both features of navigation found to drive increased activity in the prefrontal cortex (Javadi et al., 2019; Patai & Spiers, 2021). An increase in the *number of destinations* corresponds to an increase in the ‘intrinsic cognitive load’ (Sweller, 2010) of the task itself, which in turn is argued to increase wayfinding difficulty (Armougum, Orriols, Gaston-Bellegarde, Joie-La Marle, & Piolino, 2019; Giannopoulos, Kiefer, Raubal, Richter, & Thrash, 2014). We also found that the larger the *area of navigable* spaces, the more difficult that level was to navigate. This finding is consistent with evidence that participants who travel longer distances tend to make larger directional errors (Ishikawa, Fujiwara, Imai, & Okabe, 2008). We note that by including minimum trajectory length in the calculation, we normalised the difficulty score according to the area of each level, to avoid larger environments resulting automatically in higher difficulty scores due the very fact of being larger.

The two other measures of complexity that made the final Lasso selection were *metric reach* and *segment integration*, which originate in space syntax methods. *Metric reach* captures the density of paths and path connections accessible from each individual path segment (Peponis et al., 2008). The higher the *metric reach* of an environment, the more complex it is. *Metric reach* has previously been found to be a good predictor of pedestrian movement (Ozbil, Yesiltepe, & Argin, 2015). Here, we find that it is also a good predictor of wayfinding difficulty. Moreover, prior studies have suggested intelligibility would be an important factor for predicting difficulty (Conroy, 2001; Hillier, 2012; Kim, 1999). Yet, we found no relationship between it and difficulty. This may be because other variables manipulated here, such as the number of decision points, may have a more dramatic effect on difficulty and these can be high in environments which score high on intelligibility.

#### 4.2. The impact of the variables on different socio-demographic groups

Finally, our analysis stratified participants by gender and age. Notably, we found a roughly equal proportion of men and women in the pool of participants who completed the 45 levels, similar to the proportion who initially downloaded the game. This is interesting because on average men perform better at navigating in SHQ (Coutrot et al., 2018). Thus, this suggests that perseverance in completing the game was not solely a function of navigation skill, but also of participants’ determination. Even if participants became disoriented or made incorrect decisions during navigation, they could retrace their steps and complete the navigation tasks. There were a few differences between groups in our lasso analysis. *Axial integration* was selected for Female and Older participants but not for Male or Younger participants. Axial lines are determined in terms of visibility, following the “line of sight” concept (Hillier & Hanson, 1984). This implies that female participants and older participants are more sensitive to length of the view in an environment. Additionally, we found female, but not male, participants were impacted by the *number of decision points*. It is unclear why this is. Female participants tend to be more likely to re-use prior learned routes or follow route strategies (Boone, Maghen, & Hegarty, 2019; Fields & Shelton, 2006; Marchette, Bakker, & Shelton, 2011). It may be that increasing the *number of decision points* makes determining a route (e.g. left, then right, etc) more difficult, but more research would be useful to replicate this finding and explore it further.

#### 4.3. Limitations and future directions

Our study contains a number of limitations that are useful to consider. Firstly, although we have shown navigation in Sea Hero Quest predicts real-world navigation (Coutrot et al., 2019) and that flat-screen VR is a good approximation to the real-world for spatial memory (Zisch et al., 2022) there are many differences in our experiment to real-world navigation. Navigation in physical environments typically provides a

wide field of view while it can be more restricted in virtual environments, which can cause difficulty of spatial learning (Barhorst-Cates, Rand, & Creem-Regehr, 2019). In addition, idiothetic information is available and the control of movement is different. Thus, it will be useful to use the findings from this study to make predictions about the navigational difficulty of real-world environments. Due to constraints in creating a coherent video game we were limited in the extent to which we could make environments that were extreme for particular properties. For example, it would be useful to contrast an extremely griddy to maximally entropic environment to show the extent of the impact of street network entropy on navigation. A similar approach could be taken for the other variables, such as the impact of regional boundaries on navigation (Griesbauer, Manley, McNamee, Morley, & Spiers, 2022), and extended to other animals and artificial agents (de Cothi et al., 2022). Finally, the participants who entered our analysis were those that completed all the levels. Further research may be useful to explore different sampled groups of participants. It would also be useful to explore how different environmental features impact the performance of participants using different strategies to navigate (e.g. a counting-dependent strategy vs. a landmark-dependent strategy, as in (West et al., 2022; Garg et al., 2023).

## 5. Conclusion

In conclusion, we find the key elements that determine the navigability of an environment, in other words, navigational difficulty, are: *entropy*, *segment integration* (closeness centrality of paths), *number of decision points*, *number of rings*, *weather*, *number of destinations*, *area of navigable spaces*, and *metric reach*. Further empirical work could look at environments that vary along our proposed key environmental features. Researchers could also study the way in which the proposed set of key environmental features interact with other important elements for navigation, such as visibility. Finally, further analysis could be carried out to understand in detail why particular metrics did not pass the selection process, such as intelligibility, which had previously been hypothesised to predict difficulty (Conroy, 2001; Hillier, 2012; Kim, 1999). Overall, our findings are relevant for psychology and neuroscience, and they can also inform future urban planning and architectural design. Built environments can be designed considering these factors in order to help people find their way.

## Ethics

Participant consent was provided by UCL Ethics project ID: CPB/2013/015. The procedure followed to conduct environmental analyses was approved by Northumbria University Ethics Committee (Submission ID: 7939).

## Funding

The authors would like to thank Deutsche Telekom for supporting and funding this research, Alzheimer Research UK (ARUK-DT2016-1) for funding the analysis. PFV was supported and funded by the Irish Research Council (GOIPD/2021/570).

## CRedit authorship contribution statement

**D. Yesiltepe:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Investigation, Visualization, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **P. Fernández Velasco:** Conceptualization, Investigation, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **A. Coutrot:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Investigation, Visualization, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **A. Ozbil Torun:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Writing - review & editing. **J.M. Wiener:** Conceptualization, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **C. Holscher:** Conceptualization. **M.**

**Hornberger:** Conceptualization. **R. Conroy Dalton:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Supervision, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **H.J. Spiers:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Supervision, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing.

## Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

## Data availability

Data is shared online here: [https://osf.io/acmkb/?view\\_only=6c90e16f89d846109f207def12d92a80](https://osf.io/acmkb/?view_only=6c90e16f89d846109f207def12d92a80)

## Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Deutsche Telekom and Alzheimer Research UK (ARUK-DT2016-1) for supporting this research, the Glitchers Limited for the design and game production, Saatchi and Saatchi London for project management.

## Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2023.105443>.

## References

- Al-Sayed, K., Turner, A., Hillier, B., Iida, S., & Penn, A. (2014). Space syntax methodology. In *4th Edition*. London: Bartlett School of Architecture, UCL, London.
- Armougum, A., Orriols, E., Gaston-Bellegarde, A., Joie-La Marle, C., & Piolino, P. (2019). Virtual reality: A new method to investigate cognitive load during navigation. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 65, Article 101338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2019.101338>
- Barhorst-Cates, E. M., Chiara Meneghetti, Y., Zhao, F. P., & Creem-Regehr, S. H. (2021). Effects of home environment structure on navigation preference and performance: A comparison in Veneto, Italy and Utah, USA. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 74, Article 101580. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2021.101580>
- Barhorst-Cates, E. M., Rand, K. M., & Creem-Regehr, S. H. (2019). Navigating with peripheral field loss in a museum: Learning impairments due to environmental complexity. *Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications*, 4(1), 41. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41235-019-0189-9>
- Barton, K. R., Valtchanov, D., & Ellard, C. (2014). Seeing beyond your visual field: The influence of spatial topology and visual field on navigation performance. *Environment and Behavior*, 46(4), 507–529. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916512466094>
- Batty, M. (2005). *Cities and complexity: Understanding cities with cellular automata, agent-based models, and fractals*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Batty, M., Morphet, R., Masucci, P., & Stanilov, K. (2014). Entropy, complexity, and spatial information. *Journal of Geographical Systems*, 16(4), 363–385. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10109-014-0202-2>
- Biyik, E. A., & Surer, E. (2020). Developing a space syntax-based evaluation method for procedurally generated game levels. *Mugla Journal of Science and Technology*, 6(2), 79–88.
- Boeing, G. (2018). Measuring the complexity of urban form and design. *Urban Design International*, 23(4), 281–292. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41289-018-0072-1>
- Boeing, G. (2019). Urban spatial order: Street network orientation, configuration, and entropy. *Applied Network Science*, 4(1), 67. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41109-019-0189-1>
- Bongiorno, C., Zhou, Y., Kryven, M., Theurel, D., Rizzo, A., Santi, P., ... Ratti, C. (2021). Vector-based pedestrian navigation in cities. *Nature Computational Science*, 1(10), 678–685. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43588-021-00130-y>
- Boone, A. P., Maghen, B., & Hegarty, M. (2019). Instructions matter: Individual differences in navigation strategy and ability. *Memory & Cognition*, 47(7), 1401–1414. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-019-00941-5>
- Brown, T. I., Gagnon, S. A., & Wagner, A. D. (2020). Stress disrupts human hippocampal-prefrontal function during prospective spatial navigation and hinders flexible behavior. *Current Biology*, 30(10), 1821–1833.e8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2020.03.006>
- Brune, I. K., Javadi, A.-H., Zisch, F. E. L., & Spiers, H. J. (2017). Contracted time and expanded space: The impact of circumnavigation on judgements of space and time. *Cognition*, 166, 425–432. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2017.06.004>

- Brunec, I. K., & Momennejad, I. (2022). Predictive representations in hippocampal and prefrontal hierarchies. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 42(2). <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1327-21.2021>, 299 LP – 312.
- Brunec, I. K., Nantais, M. M., Sutton, J. E., Epstein, R. A., & Newcombe, N. S. (2023). Exploration patterns shape cognitive map learning. *Cognition*, 233, Article 105360. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2022.105360>
- Carlson, L. A., Hölscher, C., Shipley, T. F., & Dalton, R. C. (2010). Getting lost in buildings. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 19(5), 284–289. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721410383243>
- Conroy, R. (2001). "Spatial Navigation in Immersive Virtual Environments" Unpublished PhD thesis, Bartlett Faculty of the Built Environment. London: Department of Architecture, University College London.
- de Cothi, W., Nyberg, N., Griesbauer, E.-M., Ghanamé, C., Zisch, F., Lefort, J. M., ... Spiers, H. J. (2022). Predictive maps in rats and humans for spatial navigation. *Current Biology*, 32(17), 3676–3689.e5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2022.06.090>
- Coutrot, A., Lazar, A. S., Richards, M., Manley, E., Wiener, J. M., Conroy Dalton, R., ... Spiers, H. J. (2022b). Reported sleep duration reveals segmentation of the adult life-course into three phases. *Nature Communications*, 13(1), 7697. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-34624-8>
- Coutrot, A., Manley, E., Goodroe, S., Gahnstrom, C., Filomena, G., Yesiltepe, D., ... Spiers, H. J. (2022a). Entropy of City street networks linked to future spatial navigation ability. *Nature*, 604(7904), 104–110.
- Coutrot, A., Schmidt, S., Coutrot, L., Pittman, J., Hong, L., Wiener, J. M., ... Spiers, H. J. (2019). Virtual navigation tested on a Mobile app is predictive of real-world wayfinding navigation performance. *PLoS One*, 14(3), Article e0213272.
- Coutrot, A., Silva, R., Manley, E., de Cothi, W., Sami, S., Bohbot, V. D., ... Spiers, H. J. (2018). Global Determinants of Navigation Ability. *Current Biology*, 28(17). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2018.06.009>, 2861–2866.e4.
- De Leeuw, D., De Maeyer, P., & De Cock, L. (2020). A Gamification-Based Approach on Indoor Wayfinding Research. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information*, 9(7), 423. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijgi9070423>
- Desyllas, J., & Duxbury, E. (2001). Axial maps and visibility graph analysis. Pp. 27.1–27.13. In *3rd International Space Syntax Symposium*. Atlanta, Georgia.
- Douglas, D. H., & Peucker, T. K. (1973). Algorithms for the reduction of the number of points required to represent a digitized line or its caricature. *Cartographica: The International Journal for Geographic Information and Geovisualization*, 10(2), 112–122. <https://doi.org/10.3138/FM57-6770-U75U-7727>
- Dubey, R. K., Thrash, T., Kapadia, M., Hoelscher, C., & Schinazi, V. R. (2021). Information theoretic model to simulate agent-signage interaction for wayfinding. *Cognitive Computation*, 13(1), 189–206. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12559-019-09689-1>
- Edvardsen, V., Bicanski, A., & Burgess, N. (2020). Navigating with grid and place cells in cluttered environments. *Hippocampus*, 30(3), 220–232. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hipo.23147>
- Ekstrom, A. D. (2015). Why vision is important to how we navigate. *Hippocampus*, 25(6), 731–735. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hipo.22449>
- Ekstrom, A. D., Spiers, H. J., Bohbot, V. D., & Shayna Rosenbaum, R. (2018). *Human spatial navigation*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Emo, B., Hölscher, C., Wiener, J. M., & Dalton, R. C. (2012). Wayfinding and spatial configuration: Evidence from street corners. In *Eighth international space syntax symposium* (pp. 1–16). Santiago de Chile: PUC.
- Farr, A. C., Kleinschmidt, T., Yarlagadda, P., & Mengersen, K. (2012). Wayfinding: A simple concept, a complex process. *Transport Reviews*, 32(6), 715–743. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2012.712555>
- Fields, A. W., & Shelton, A. L. (2006). Individual skill differences and large-scale environmental learning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 32(3), 506–515. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.32.3.506>
- Garg, T., Velasco, P. F., Patai, Z. E., Malcolm, C. P., Kovalets, V., Bohbot, V. D., ... Spiers, H. (2023). The relationship between object-based spatial ability and virtual navigation performance. *bioRxiv*.
- Giannopoulos, I., Kiefer, P., Raubal, M., Richter, K. F., & Thrash, T. (2014). Wayfinding decision situations: A conceptual model and evaluation. In *International conference on geographic information science* (pp. 221–234). Cham: Springer.
- Griesbauer, E.-M., Manley, E., McNamee, D., Morley, J., & Spiers, H. (2022). What determines a boundary for navigating a complex street network: Evidence from London taxi drivers. *The Journal of Navigation*, 75(1), 15–34. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0373463321000679>
- Hamburger, K., & Knauff, M. (2011). SQUARELAND: A virtual environment for investigating cognitive processes in human wayfinding. *Psychology Journal*, 9(2), 137–163.
- Hag, S., & Giroto, S. (2003). Ability and intelligibility: Wayfinding and environmental cognition in the designed. Pp. 68.1–68.20. In *4th international space syntax symposium*. London, United Kingdom.
- Hag, S., Hill, G., & Pramanik, A. (2009). Topological configuration in wayfinding and spatial cognition: A study with real and virtual buildings for design relevance. In *P. TX: 171–178 in ARCC 2009 - leadership in architectural research, between academia and the profession*. San Antonio.
- He, Q., McNamara, T. P., & Brown, T. I. (2019). Manipulating the visibility of barriers to improve spatial navigation efficiency and cognitive mapping. *Scientific Reports*, 9(1), 11567. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-48098-0>
- Hillier, B. (1996). *Space is the machine: A configurational theory of architecture*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Hillier, B. (2012). Studying cities to learn about minds: Some possible implications of space syntax for spatial cognition. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 39(1), 12–32. <https://doi.org/10.1068/b34047t>
- Hillier, B., Ann Penn, J., Hanson, T. G., & Xu, J. (1993). Natural movement: Or, configuration and attraction in urban pedestrian movement. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 20(1), 29–66.
- Hillier, B., Burdett, R., Peponis, J., & Penn, A. (1987). Creating life: Or, does architecture determine anything? *Architecture et Comportement / Architecture and Behaviour*, 3(3), 233–250.
- Hillier, B., & Hanson, J. (1984). *The social logic of space*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Hillier, B., Hanson, J., & Graham, H. (1987). Ideas are in things: An application of the space syntax method to discovering house genotypes. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 14, 363–385.
- Hillier, B., & Iida, S. (2005). Network and Psychological Effects in Urban Movement. In A. G. Cohn, & D. M. Mark (Eds.), *Spatial Information Theory* (pp. 475–490). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Hillier, B., Yang, T., & Turner, A. (2012). Normalising least angle choice in Depthmap - and how it opens up new perspectives on the global and local analysis of City space. *Journal of Space Syntax*, 3(2), 155–193.
- Ishikawa, T., Fujiwara, H., Imai, O., & Okabe, A. (2008). Wayfinding with a GPS-based Mobile navigation system: A comparison with maps and direct experience. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 28(1), 74–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2007.09.002>
- Javadi, A.-H., Emo, B., Howard, L. R., Zisch, F. E., Yichao, Y., Knight, R., ... Spiers, H. J. (2017). Hippocampal and prefrontal processing of network topology to simulate the future. *Nature Communications*, 8(1), 14652. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms14652>
- Javadi, A.-H., Patai, E. Z., Marin-Garcia, E., Margois, A., Tan, H.-R. M., Kumaran, D., ... Spiers, H. J. (2019). Backtracking during navigation is correlated with enhanced anterior cingulate activity and suppression of alpha oscillations and the 'default-mode' network. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 286(1908), 20191016. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2019.1016>
- Jeffery, K. (2019). Urban architecture: A cognitive neuroscience perspective. *The Design Journal*, 22(6), 853–872. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14606925.2019.1662666>
- Jeffrey, J. C. (2019). *Why people get lost in buildings: The influence of architecture, information and navigator cognition on indoor wayfinding and Waylosing*. PhD Thesis. Birmingham City University.
- Jiang, B., & Claramunt, C. (2002). Integration of space syntax into GIS: New perspectives for urban morphology. *Transactions in GIS*, 6(3), 295–309. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9671.00112>
- Kim, Y. O. (1999). *Spatial configuration, spatial cognition and spatial behaviour: The role of architectural intelligibility in shaping spatial experience*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of London.
- Kuliga, S. F., Nelligan, B., Dalton, R. C., Marchette, S., Shelton, A. L., Carlson, L., & Hölscher, C. (2019). Exploring individual differences and building complexity in wayfinding: The case of the Seattle central library. *Environment and Behavior*, 51(5), 622–665. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916519836149>
- Lancia, G. L., Eluchans, M., D'Alessandro, M., Spiers, H. J., & Pezzulo, G. (2023). Humans account for cognitive costs when finding shortcuts: An information-theoretic analysis of navigation. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 19(1), Article e1010829.
- Li, R., & Klippel, A. (2012). Wayfinding in libraries: Can problems be predicted? *Journal of Map & Geography Libraries*, 8(1), 21–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15420353.2011.622456>
- Li, R., & Klippel, A. (2016). Wayfinding behaviors in complex buildings: The impact of environmental legibility and familiarity. *Environment and Behavior*, 48(3), 482–510. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916514550243>
- Long, Y., & Baran, P. K. (2012). Does intelligibility affect place legibility? Understanding the relationship between objective and subjective evaluations of the urban environment. *Environment and Behavior*, 44(5), 616–640. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916511402059>
- Marchette, S. A., Bakker, A., & Shelton, A. L. (2011). Cognitive mappers to creatures of habit: Differential engagement of place and response learning mechanisms predicts human navigational behavior. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 31(43). <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3634-11.2011>, 15264 LP – 15268.
- Marquardt, G., & Schmiege, P. (2009). Dementia-friendly architecture: Environments that facilitate wayfinding in nursing homes. *American Journal of Alzheimer's Disease & Other Dementias*, 24(4), 333–340. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1533317509334959>
- Mathis, A., Herz, A. V. M., & Stemmler, M. (2012). Optimal population codes for space: Grid cells outperform place cells. *Neural Computation*, 24(9), 2280–2317. [https://doi.org/10.1162/NECO\\_a\\_00319](https://doi.org/10.1162/NECO_a_00319)
- Montello, D. R. (2005). Navigation. In *The Cambridge handbook of visuospatial thinking* (pp. 257–294). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Montello, D. R. (2007). The Contribution of Space Syntax to a Comprehensive Theory of Environmental Psychology. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Space Syntax Symposium*. Istanbul, Turkey (pp. 1–12).
- Morgan, J. (2016). Gaming for dementia research: A quest to save the brain. *The Lancet Neurology*, 15(13), 1313. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422\(16\)30123-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(16)30123-5)
- Natapov, A., Kuliga, S., Dalton, R. C., & Hölscher, C. (2020). Linking building-circulation typology and wayfinding: Design, spatial analysis, and anticipated wayfinding difficulty of circulation types. *Architectural Science Review*, 63(1), 34–46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00038628.2019.1675041>
- Nyberg, N., Duvelle, É., Barry, C., & Spiers, H. J. (2022). Spatial goal coding in the hippocampal formation. *Neuron*, 110(3), 394–422. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2021.12.012>
- O'Neill, M. J. (1991). Evaluation of a conceptual model of architectural legibility. *Environment and Behavior*, 23(3), 259–284. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916591233001>

- Ozbil, A., & Peponis, J. (2007). Modeling Street Connectivity and Pedestrian Movement According to Standard GIS Street Network Representations. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Space Syntax Symposium, Istanbul, Turkey* (pp. 1–10).
- Ozbil, A., Yesiltepe, D., & Argin, G. (2015). Modeling walkability: the effects of street design, street-network configuration and land-use on pedestrian movement. *AJ ZITU Journal of the Faculty of Architecture*, 12(3), 189–207.
- Patai, E. Z., & Spiers, H. J. (2021). The versatile Wayfinder: Prefrontal contributions to spatial navigation. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 25(6), 520–533. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2021.02.010>
- Penn, A. (2003). Space syntax and spatial cognition: Or why the axial line? *Environment and Behavior*, 35(1), 30–65. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916502238864>
- Peponis, J., Bafna, S., & Zhang, Z. (2008). The connectivity of streets: Reach and directional distance. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 35(5), 881–901. <https://doi.org/10.1068/b33088>
- Peponis, J., Zimring, C., & Choi, Y. K. (1990). Finding the building in wayfinding. *Environment and Behavior*, 22(5), 555–590. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916590225001>
- Puthusseryppady, V., Coughlan, G., Patel, M., & Hornberger, M. (2019). Geospatial analysis of environmental risk factors for missing dementia patients. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease : JAD*, 71(3), 1005–1013. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-190244>
- Puthusseryppady, V., Manley, E., Lowry, E., Patel, M., & Hornberger, M. (2020). Impact of road network structure on dementia-related missing incidents: A spatial buffer approach. *Scientific Reports*, 10(1), 18574. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-74915-y>
- Richter, K.-F. (2009). Adaptable Path Planning in Regionalized Environments. In K. S. Hornsby, C. Claramunt, M. Denis, & G. Ligozat (Eds.), *Spatial Information Theory* (pp. 453–470). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Slone, E., Burles, F., & Iaria, G. (2016). Environmental layout complexity affects neural activity during navigation in humans. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, 43(9), 1146–1155. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejn.13218>
- Slone, E., Burles, F., Robinson, K., Levy, R. M., & Iaria, G. (2015). Floor plan connectivity influences wayfinding performance in virtual environments. *Environment and Behavior*, 47(9), 1024–1053. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916514533189>
- Spiers, H. J., Coutrot, A., & Hornberger, M. (2021). Explaining world-wide variation in navigation ability from millions of people: Citizen science Project Sea Hero quest. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 15(1), 120–138. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tops.12590>
- Stoianov, I., Maisto, D., & Pezzulo, G. (2022). The hippocampal formation as a hierarchical generative model supporting generative replay and continual learning. *Progress in Neurobiology*, 217, Article 102329. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pneurobio.2022.102329>
- Sweller, J. (2010). Element interactivity and intrinsic, extraneous, and germane cognitive load. *Educational Psychology Review*, 22(2), 123–138. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-010-9128-5>
- Takemiya, M., Richter, K.-F., & Ishikawa, T. (2012). In C. Stachniss, K. Schill, & D. Uttal (Eds.), *Linking Cognitive and Computational Saliences in Route Information BT - Spatial Cognition VIII* (pp. 386–404). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 58(1), 267–288.
- Turner, A., Doxa, M., O'Sullivan, D., & Penn, A. (2001). From Isovists to visibility graphs: A methodology for the analysis of architectural space. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 28(1), 103–121. <https://doi.org/10.1068/b2684>
- Varoudis, T. (2012). *Depthmap X: Multi-platform spatial network analysis software. OpenSource (version 0.30)*. London: University College London.
- Weisman, J. (1981). Evaluating architectural legibility: Way-finding in the built environment. *Environment and Behavior*, 13(2), 189–204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916581132004>
- West, G. L., Patai, Z. E., Coutrot, A., Hornberger, M., Bohbot, V. D., & Spiers, H. J. (2022). Landmark-dependent navigation strategy declines across the human life-span: Evidence from over 37,000 participants. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 1–16. [https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn\\_a.01956](https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a.01956)
- Wiener, J. M., Büchner, S. J., & Hölscher, C. (2009). Taxonomy of human wayfinding tasks: A knowledge-based approach. *Spatial Cognition and Computation*, 9(2), 152–165. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13875860902906496>
- Wiener, J. M., & Mallot, H. A. (2003). 'Fine-to-coarse' route planning and navigation in regionalized environments. *Spatial Cognition & Computation*, 3(4), 331–358. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15427633scc0304\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15427633scc0304_5)
- Willham, D. B. (1992). *The topological properties of wayfinding in architecture*. Unpublished master's thesis, Atlanta: Georgia Institute of Technology.
- Wolbers, T., & Hegarty, M. (2010). What determines our navigational abilities? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 14(3), 138–146. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2010.01.001>
- Yesiltepe, D. (2021). *The relationship between wayfinding performance, spatial layout and landmarks in virtual environments*. PhD Thesis in Architecture., Northumbria University.
- Yesiltepe, D., Conroy Dalton, R., & Ozbil Torun, A. (2021). Landmarks in wayfinding: A review of the existing literature. *Cognitive Processing*, 22(3), 369–410. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10339-021-01012-x>
- Yesiltepe, D., Conroy Dalton, R., Ozbil Torun, A., Coutrot, A., Hornberger, M., & Spiers, H. (2020). In J. Škilters, N. S. Newcombe, & D. Uttal (Eds.), *A study on visual and structural characteristics of landmarks and Experts' and non-Experts' evaluations BT - spatial cognition XII* (pp. 95–107). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Yesiltepe, D., Conroy Dalton, R., Ozbil Torun, A., Dalton, N., Noble, S., Hornberger, M., Coutrot, A., Spiers, H. (2019). Usage of landmarks in virtual environments for wayfinding: Research on the influence of global landmarks 220–21, 220–10. 12th international space syntax symposium. Beijing.
- Yesiltepe, D., Conroy Dalton, R., Ozbil Torun, A., Hornberger, M., & Spiers, H. (2020). In J. Škilters, N. S. Newcombe, & D. Uttal (Eds.), *Understanding cognitive saliency by using an online game BT - spatial cognition XII* (pp. 76–87). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Yesiltepe, D., Conroy Dalton, R., Ozbil Torun, A., Noble, S., Dalton, N., Hornberger, M., & Spiers, H. (2020). In J. Škilters, N. S. Newcombe, & D. Uttal (Eds.), *Redefining global and local landmarks: When does a landmark stop being local and become a global one? BT - spatial cognition XII* (pp. 111–121). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Yesiltepe, D., Ozbil Torun, A., Coutrot, A., Hornberger, M., Spiers, H., & Conroy Dalton, R. (2020). Computer models of saliency alone fail to predict subjective visual attention to landmarks during observed navigation. *Spatial Cognition and Computation*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13875868.2020.1830993>
- Zisch, F. E., Newton, C., Coutrot, A., Murcia, M., Motala, A., Greaves, J., ... Spiers, H. J. (2022). Comparable human spatial memory distortions in physical, desktop virtual and immersive virtual environments. *BioRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.11.475791>