

Effects of multisensory virtual reality nature on affect, presence, and restorativeness

Renee F. Abbott¹, Jay E. Maddock², Suzanne T. Bell³, Ana Diaz-Artiles⁴

^{1,4}Department of Aerospace Engineering, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, USA

²Department of Environmental and Occupational Health, School of Public Health, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, USA

³Behavioral Health and Performance Laboratory, Biomedical Research and Environmental Division, NASA, Houston, TX, USA

*Correspondence:

Ana Diaz-Artiles

adartiles@tamu.edu

Keywords: virtual reality intervention, multisensory stimulation, natural environments, olfaction, haptics, psychological restoration

Abstract

Virtual reality (VR) can provide access to restorative environments and sensory stimulation for individuals in isolated, confined, and extreme environments. We developed a nature-based VR intervention featuring three scenes (Garden, Forest, Beach) and examined the effects of multisensory augmentation with location-based olfactory, wind, and thermal stimuli (VR+OWT). Over a two-week period, fifty-one participants were assigned to a no-intervention control, standard audiovisual VR, or augmented VR (VR+OWT) condition. Data collection included weekly assessments of affect, stress, and cognitive performance; post-VR measures of affect, presence, and perceived restorativeness; and open-ended feedback. Both VR and VR+OWT groups produced immediate and sustained reductions in negative affect with no sustained systematic benefits on cognitive performance. The addition of olfactory, wind, and thermal stimuli enhanced presence for some scenes; however, feedback indicated that sensory mismatches and stimulus intensity occasionally detracted from the experience and may have contributed to lower coherence ratings in the VR+OWT group. In contrast, the perceived restorativeness of the VR environment was driven primarily by scene content (Garden vs Forest vs Beach) rather than the level of sensory stimulation. These findings support the potential of virtual nature to promote well-being and underscore the importance of coherence across sensory modalities for multisensory augmentation.

Introduction

Living and working in isolated, confined, and extreme (ICE) environments, such as long-duration spaceflight, extended ocean voyages, and polar expeditions, are psychologically challenging and increases the risk of adverse behavioral health and cognitive conditions [1]. Depression, anxiety, withdrawal, interpersonal conflicts, and sleep disorders have been observed in astronauts and cosmonauts [2–4] and may impair performance and threaten mission success. Traditional psychological countermeasures, such as private conferences and care packages [5], rely on proximity to Earth and are unlikely to remain feasible for future exploration missions beyond low Earth orbit particularly for longer communication delays [6].

Exposure to natural environments reliably promotes well-being. Stress Recovery Theory [7,8] and Attention Restoration Theory [9] propose that natural settings provide uniquely restorative settings supporting affective regulation, psychophysiological recovery, and cognitive restoration, with demonstrated benefits for stress, anxiety, mood, and attention [10–12]. Although ICE inhabitants lack access to real nature, virtual reality (VR) offers a promising means of delivering nature-based countermeasures in environments where direct exposure is impractical [13].

While virtual nature can confer benefits comparable to real nature under certain conditions [14], its effects are often attenuated relative to physical exposure [15,16]. One likely contributor is limited sensory immersion: most VR applications rely primarily on audiovisual input. The term *immersion* refers to the objective sensory affordances of a system, whereas *presence* reflects the subjective sense of “being there” [17]. Greater *immersion* supports stronger *presence*, which is critical for effective virtual experiences [18–20].

Multisensory VR remains underexplored, particularly the integration of olfactory and haptic cues. Previous work suggests that incorporating multiple sensory modalities can enhance presence [21–23] and facilitate relaxation and psychophysiological recovery [24], with multimodal stimulation producing synergistic effects relative to unimodal input [25,26]. However, existing multisensory implementations typically employ static stimuli (e.g., constant temperature or scent), which may reduce believability and lead to sensory mismatches or neural adaptation [27]. In contrast, dynamic stimuli could enhance the virtual experience by increasing coherence across sensory modalities, sustaining perceptual engagement, and fostering greater presence. Further, dynamic stimuli add a layer of interaction between the user and the environment, which may further improve presence [18,28].

We evaluate the effects of varying levels of sensory stimuli in a VR nature intervention, comparing: a control condition, a standard audiovisual VR condition (VR), and a multisensory condition with VR that incorporated olfactory, wind, and thermal stimuli (VR+OWT). We examine immediate effects on affect, presence, and perceived restorativeness, as well as sustained changes in affect and stress and cognitive performance over a two-week intervention period. Together, these findings aim to characterize the influence of multisensory augmentation on both the short- and longer-term restorative potential of virtual nature.

Results

Immediate Effects of VR Intervention

PANAS: Positive Affect and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) scores by Condition (VR, VR+OWT) and Scene (T1, and Post-VR for the Garden, Forest, and Beach) are shown in Figure 1. Positive Affect (PA) scores were not significantly different between Conditions (estimated marginal mean (EMM) contrast=0.36, 95% CI [-3.93, 4.64], $t(32.0)=0.17$, $p=0.87$), and there was no significant effect of Scene [$F(3,91.0)=1.91$, $p=0.13$] or Condition x Scene [$F(3,91.0)=1.35$, $p=0.26$].

Similarly, Negative Affect (NA) scores were not significantly different between Conditions (EMM contrast=-0.04, 95% CI [-3.32, 3.23], $z=-0.03$, $p=0.98$) with no Condition x Scene interaction [Wald $\chi^2(3)=1.08$, $p=0.78$]. However, there was a significant effect of Scene [Wald $\chi^2(3)=23.53$, $p<0.001$]. Main effects contrasts, averaged over Condition, revealed that NA significantly decreased from T1 (baseline) to post-VR for the Garden (EMM contrast=-3.67, 95% CI [-5.60, -1.73], $z=-3.7$, $p=0.004$), Forest (EMM contrast=-3.79, 95% CI [-5.65, -1.94], $z=-4.0$, $p<0.001$), and Beach (EMM contrast=-3.86, 95% CI [-5.73, -1.98], $z=-4.0$, $p<0.001$). NA did not significantly differ between the three VR scenes (Garden, Forest, Beach), averaged over Condition (all $p>0.9$).

Simple effects contrasts revealed that compared to T1 (baseline), NA tended to decrease for the VR group in all scenes, but this was only significant in the Forest (EMM contrast=-3.56, 95% CI [-6.18, -0.94], $z=-2.6$, $p=0.019$) and Beach (EMM contrast=-3.82, 95% CI [-6.50, -1.14], $z=-2.8$, $p=0.016$) and not the Garden (EMM contrast=-2.75, 95% CI [-5.55, 0.05], $z=-1.9$, $p=0.11$). Additionally, for the VR+OWT group, NA decreased significantly from T1 to post-VR for all scenes (Garden (EMM contrast=-4.59, 95% CI [-7.26, -1.91], $z=-3.4$, $p=0.009$), Forest (EMM contrast=-4.03, 95% CI [-6.65, -1.41], $z=-3.0$, $p=0.014$), and Beach (EMM contrast=-3.90, 95% CI [-6.52, -1.27], $z=-2.9$, $p=0.014$)).

IPQ: iGroup Presence Questionnaire (IPQ) subscales and Total Presence scores by Condition (VR, VR+OWT) and Scene (Post-VR for the Garden, Forest, Beach) are shown in Figure 2. IPQ Experienced Realism scores were not significantly different by Condition (EMM contrast=0.34, 95% CI [-0.23, 0.90], $t(32.0)=1.2$, $p=0.23$), and there was no significant effect of Scene [$F(2,59.6)=1.33$, $p=0.27$] and weak evidence for an interaction between Condition x Scene [$F(2,59.6)=2.90$, $p=0.063$].

IPQ General Presence was significantly higher in the VR+OWT group than the VR group (EMM contrast=0.53, 95% CI [0.04, 1.07], $z=2.1$, $p=0.032$). There was no significant effect of Scene [Wald $\chi^2(2)=3.18$, $p=0.2$] or Condition x Scene [Wald $\chi^2(2)=2.25$, $p=0.3$]. Simple effects contrasts showed that differences between groups were most pronounced in the Garden ($p=0.03$), while other scenes showed similar trends that did not reach significance (both $p>0.19$).

IPQ Involvement was significantly higher in the VR+OWT group than the VR group (EMM contrast=0.64, 95% CI [0.07, 1.21], $t(31.9)=2.3$, $p=0.03$). There was a significant effect of Scene [$F(2,60.1)=9.08$, $p<0.001$] and a significant interaction between Condition x Scene [$F(2,60.1)=4.03$, $p=0.02$]. Simple effects contrasts showed that differences between groups were significant only for the Garden scene (EMM contrast=1.24, 95% CI [0.52, 1.96], $t(70.2)=3.4$, $p=0.003$) and not the Forest ($p=0.27$) or Beach ($p=0.53$). Furthermore, Involvement for the VR group was significantly higher in the Beach than the Garden (EMM contrast=1.23, 95% CI [0.69, 1.78], $t(60.4)=4.6$, $p<0.001$) and Forest (EMM contrast=0.74, 95% CI [0.22, 1.25], $t(60.4)=2.9$, $p=0.017$).

IPQ Spatial Presence across all scenes tended to be higher for the VR+OWT group than the VR group (EMM contrast=0.46, 95% CI [-0.004, 0.92], $t(32.0)=2.0$), though not statistically significant ($p=0.052$). There was no significant effect of Scene [$F(2,60.0)=1.89$, $p=0.16$] or Condition x Scene [$F(2, 60.0)=0.80$, $p=0.5$].

Finally, IPQ Total Presence was significantly higher for the VR+OWT group than the VR group (EMM contrast=0.48, 95% CI [0.07, 0.89], $t(32.0)=2.4$, $p=0.02$), and there was a significant effect of Scene [$F(2, 60.0)=6.33$, $p=0.003$] with weak evidence of a Condition x Scene interaction [$F(2, 60.0)=2.88$, $p=0.06$]. Averaged across Condition, Total Presence in the Beach was significantly higher than the Garden (EMM contrast=0.36, 95% CI [0.16, 0.57], $t(59.7)=3.5$, $p=0.003$) and Forest (EMM contrast=0.23, 95% CI [0.03, 0.43], $t(59.6)=2.3$, $p=0.036$). Simple effects contrasts showed that, for the VR group only, Total Presence was significantly higher in the Beach than the Garden (EMM contrast=0.60, 95% CI [0.30, 0.91], $t(59.9)=4.0$, $p=0.001$) and the Forest (EMM contrast=0.40, 95% CI [0.12, 0.69], $t(60.1)=2.8$, $p=0.02$). Further, Total Presence was significantly higher for the VR+OWT group than the VR group in the Garden (EMM contrast=0.69, 95% CI [0.21, 1.16],

t(57.2)=2.9, p=0.02) and Forest (EMM contrast=0.55, 95% CI [0.09, 1.01], t(52.1)=2.3, p=0.03), but not the Beach (EMM contrast=0.21, 95% CI [-0.26, 0.67], t(53.3)=0.9, p=0.38).

PRS: Perceived Restorativeness Scale (PRS) subscales and Total Restorativeness scores by Condition (VR, VR+OWT) and Scene (Garden, Forest, Beach) are shown in Figure 3. The environments were generally perceived as restorative, with mean scores above the midpoint (3 on a 0–6 scale) for all PRS subscales. PRS Being Away did not significantly differ by Condition (EMM contrast=0.58, 95% CI [-0.14, 1.30], t(31.9)=1.6, p=0.11), and there was no significant effect of Scene [F(2,60.0)=2.39, p=0.10] or Condition x Scene [F(2,60.0)=0.48, p=0.62].

PRS Coherence for the VR+OWT group showed a small, non-significant trend to be lower than the VR group (EMM contrast=-0.30, 95% CI [-0.81, 0.21], t(32.0)=-1.2, p=0.24). There was a significant effect of Scene [F(2,59.6)=3.62, p=0.03] and no Condition x Scene interaction [F(2,60.0)=0.80, p=0.46]. Averaged over Condition, Coherence was significantly higher in the Garden than the Forest (EMM contrast=-0.29, 95% CI [-0.54, -0.04], t(60.1)=-2.4, p=0.03) and the Beach (EMM contrast=-0.30, 95% CI [-0.54, -0.05], t(59.6)=-2.4, p=0.03). Simple effects contrasts did not reveal any significant differences between VR scenes for either the VR group or VR+OWT group (all p > 0.16).

PRS Compatibility did not differ by Condition (EMM contrast=0.18, 95% CI [-0.52, 0.88], t(31.8)=0.5, p=0.60), and there was no significant effect Scene [F(2,60.4)=1.58, p=0.22] or Condition x Scene [F(2,60.4)=1.10, p=0.34].

PRS Fascination did not significantly differ by Condition (EMM contrast=0.48, 95% CI [-0.28, 1.24], t(31.9)=1.3, p=0.21). However, there was a significant effect of Scene [F(2,60.0)=7.45, p=0.0013] and no Condition x Scene interaction [F(2,60.0)=0.16, p=0.86]. Averaged over Condition, Fascination was significantly higher in the Forest (EMM contrast=0.54, 95% CI [0.08, 0.99], t(60.5)=2.4, p=0.03) and Beach (EMM contrast=0.88, 95% CI [0.42, 1.33], t(59.9)=3.8, p < 0.001) than in the Garden. Simple effects contrasts showed that Fascination for the VR+OWT group was significantly higher in the Beach than the Garden (EMM contrast=0.99, 95% CI [0.37, 1.62], t(59.6)=3.2, p=0.01).

Finally, PRS Total Restorativeness did not significantly differ by Condition (EMM contrast=0.21, 95% CI [-0.29, 0.70], t(31.9)=0.9, p=0.40). The main effect of Scene approached significance [F(2,60.0)=3.05, p=0.055], and there was not a significant interaction of Condition x Scene [F(2,60.0)=0.20, p=0.82].

Longitudinal Changes: Affect and Stress

Figure 4 show PANAS PA, PANAS NA, and Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) scores over time (days since T1) by Condition (Control, VR, VR + OWT), and Table 1 summarizes the results from the LMM analysis.

For PANAS PA, there was not a significant effect of Condition, Time, or their interaction (all $p > 0.25$). For PANAS NA, there was a significant effect of Time [$F(1, 100.21) = 5.09$, $p = 0.03$], and a significant Condition x Time interaction [$F(2, 100.13) = 5.40$, $p = 0.037$]. Simple slopes analysis revealed that PANAS NA significantly decreased over Time for the VR group (estimated marginal trend (EMT) = -0.20 , 95% CI [-0.38 , -0.03], $t(99.4) = -2.4$, $p = 0.035$) and the VR+OWT group (EMT = -0.20 , 95% CI [-0.38 , -0.03], $t(100.4) = -2.3$, $p = 0.035$), but not for the Control group (EMT = 0.07 , 95% CI [-0.10 , 0.24], $t(100.9) = 0.8$, $p = 0.41$). The rate of change for the VR and VR+OWT groups was significantly different from the Control group (both $p = 0.04$), but not significantly different from each other ($p = 0.99$).

For the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS), there was a significant main effect of Time [$F(1, 48.5) = 78.98$, $p < 0.001$] but not Condition [$F(2, 48.0) = 0.03$, $p = 0.9$] or Condition x Time [$F(2, 48.5) = 1.3$, $p = 0.3$]. Averaged across Condition, PSS decreased by -0.23 points per day (95% CI [-0.28 , -0.18], $t(48.5) = -8.9$, $p < 0.001$). Simple slopes analysis showed that PSS significantly decreased with Time for all groups (Control: EMT = -0.18 , 95% CI [-0.27 , -0.10], $t(48.7) = -4.3$, $p < 0.001$; VR: EMT = -0.21 , 95% CI [-0.30 , -0.12], $t(48.2) = -4.8$, $p < 0.001$; VR+OWT: EMT = -0.28 , 95% CI [-0.37 , -0.19], $t(48.4) = -6.3$, $p < 0.001$). The rate of change was highest for the VR+OWT group and lowest for the Control group, but there was no significant difference in slope between any of the three groups.

Longitudinal Changes: Cognitive Performance

Table 2 reports the results from the mixed models analysis for the 19 Cognition speed and accuracy metrics. Model predictions with 95% confidence intervals are provided in Supplementary Figure 1 and Supplementary Figure 2. A significant Condition x Time interaction was observed for reaction times on the Abstract Matching (AM), Line Orientation Test (LOT), and Balloon Analog Risk Test (BART) and for accuracy on the Emotion Recognition Task (ERT).

For AM reaction time (RT), there was a significant main effect of Time [Wald $\chi^2(2) = 4.32$, $p = 0.038$], and Condition x Time [Wald $\chi^2(2) = 10.36$, $p = 0.006$]. Simple slopes analysis showed that AM reaction times significantly increased (worsened) for the Control (15.36 ms/day, 95% CI [3.91 , 26.8], $z = 2.6$, $p = 0.024$) and VR+OWT group (14.67 ms/day, 95% CI [2.71 , 26.63], $z = 2.4$, $p = 0.024$) but not the VR group (-0.85 ms/day, 95% CI [-20.22 , 3.20],

z=-1.4, p=0.15). Additionally, slopes for the Control and VR+OWT group were significantly greater than the VR group (both p=0.01).

For LOT RT, there was a significant interaction between Condition and Time [Wald $\chi^2(2)=10.13$, p=0.006]. Simple slopes analysis showed that LOT RT significantly increased for the Control group (49.10, 95% CI [10.63, 87.56], z=2.5, p=0.037), and reaction times tended to improve (decrease) for the VR group (-39.42, 95% CI [-78.76, -0.09], z=-2.0, p=0.07) and VR+OWT group (-4.71 ms/day, 95% CI [-44.90, 35.48], z=-0.2, p=0.82), though not significantly.

For BART RT, there was a significant main effect of Time [F(1,99.7)=6.95, p=0.010] and Condition x Time [F(2, 99.7)=5.80, p=0.004]. Simple slopes analysis showed that reaction time significantly increased (worsened) for the Control group only (24.28 ms/day, 95% CI [13.23, 35.33], t(100.1)=4.4, p<0.001). Furthermore, the rate of change for the Control group was significantly larger than the VR (p=0.009) and VR+OWT groups (p=0.008).

For ERT accuracy, there was a significant interaction between Condition and Time [F(2,103.77)=3.59, p=0.031]. Simple slopes analysis revealed that the rate of change for the VR group was significantly less than the Control and VR+OWT groups (both p=0.034), though the rate of change did not significantly differ from zero for any group (all p>0.1).

Averaged over Condition, reaction time decreased over time on the Motor Praxis (MP) test (-1.7 ms/day, 95% CI [-3.26, -0.14], z=-2.1, p=0.032) and increased on the Digit Symbol Substitution Task (DSST) (3.69 ms/day, 95% CI [2.25, 5.14], z=5.0, p < 0.001). Over time, accuracy decreased on the AM (-0.002, 95% CI [-0.004, -0.0005], z=-2.6, p=0.011) and increased on the Matrix Reasoning Test (MRT) (0.003, 95% CI [0.0003, 0.0051], z=2.2, p=0.028). BART Risk Score significantly decreased over time (-0.002, 95% CI [-0.004, -0.0004], t(100.0)=-2.4, p=0.018).

Averaged over time, there were significant group-wise differences on the MRT RT and DSST accuracy. The Control group had significantly higher (worse) average reaction times than both the VR (p<0.001) and VR+OWT (p=0.039) groups, and the VR+OWT group had significantly lower (better) reaction times than the VR group (p=0.039). Averaged over time, accuracy on the DSST also tended to be higher for the Control and was significantly different from the VR group (p=0.044) but not the VR+OWT group (p=0.07).

Qualitative Feedback

Most participants in both VR and VR+OWT groups said they would use the intervention again (VR: 12/17; VR+OWT: 15/17). Many also described immediate benefits including relaxation, reduced stress, improved mood or focus, or a sense of calm (VR: 14/17;

VR+OWT: 11/17). Participants frequently characterized the experience as a “break from the day” that allowed them to disengage from ongoing stressors. One participant compared the experience to relaxation immediately after waking. Notably, two participants in the VR+OWT group reported sustained benefits lasting hours or days after VR use.

The proportion of participants selecting each scene as their favorite or least favorite is shown in Figure 5 (excluding one VR participant who completed only one scene). The Forest was the most frequently chosen favorite (45.5%; VR: 6, VR+OWT: 9), followed by the Beach (36.4%; VR: 8, VR+OWT: 4), and Garden (18.2%; VR: 2, VR+OWT: 4). Conversely, the Garden was most often selected as the least favorite scene (51.5%; VR: 12, VR+OWT: 5), followed by the Forest (27.3%; VR: 2; VR+OWT: 7) and the Beach (21.2%; VR: 2; VR+OWT: 5).

Across scenes, participants described favorite environments as offering exploration and interactivity, including climbing and object manipulation (e.g., stacking rocks). Scene realism, including visual and auditory fidelity, was also cited as a contributing factor. Least favorite scenes were described as restrictive, small in scale, or lacking opportunities for interaction.

Olfactory, Wind, and Thermal Stimuli: Participants in the VR+OWT group generally responded positively to olfactory, wind, and thermal stimuli, frequently noting that these cues enhanced immersion and environmental realism. Several participants described moments in which the multisensory feedback felt sufficiently realistic to evoke real-world expectations, such as warmth prompting thoughts of sun exposure. Others emphasized that dynamic changes in temperature, airflow, and scent helped align the experience with real-world outdoor environments, contributing to relaxation and embodied presence.

“It was what makes it real. If you only see the VR, like the screen, you would feel like you are watching a show in 3D. But with the wind, the smell, and the heat, to pull all your senses in, your whole body is in the VR environment, not only your eyes.”

When asked which additional stimulus they would retain if only one could remain, preferences were evenly distributed across scent (n=7), temperature (n=5), and wind (n=5). Participants consistently described all three as difficult to replicate and as critical contributors to realism. Scents were valued for novelty and relaxation, temperature for enhancing immersion and realism, and wind for its dynamic, multidirectional qualities that made participants feel physically surrounded by the environment. Synchronizing auditory wind cues with fan intensity also contributed to “a sense of movement in the area.”

Despite these benefits, multisensory augmentation also introduced challenges. Several participants reported that certain scents were too strong or distracting. Further, six

participants reported disliking at least one specific scent(s) (blossom and rose in the Garden, pine in the Forest, and beach in the Beach). Thermal feedback was occasionally described as uncomfortable or unrealistic, especially when heat intensity was high or temperature transitions were abrupt. One participant reported avoiding areas that they associated with excessive heat, and the maximum heating intensity was reduced for three participants due to discomfort with the thermal devices. Sensory mismatches, such as entering water without a corresponding temperature change, as well as fan noise, also occasionally disrupted immersion.

Participants also provided feedback on the overall system. Several requested clearer guidance regarding which objects were interactive and where to find them, as well as clearer navigation boundaries indicating map limits. Inconsistent abilities between scenes, such as being able to climb rocks in the Beach but not in the Garden or Forest, were another source of frustration. Participants also expressed interest in additional interactive elements, wildlife, smoother visual rendering, lighter or wireless headsets, faster movement speeds, and optional light gamification (e.g., collecting objects or completing low-stakes challenges).

Discussion

This experiment evaluated the restorative, psychological, and cognitive effects of a nature VR intervention with varying levels of sensory stimulation (audiovisual stimuli versus audiovisual, olfactory, wind, and thermal stimuli). ICE environments are characterized by reduced sensory stimulation and monotony, which contributes to boredom, frustration, and stress [29]. Multisensory VR nature experiences could provide benefits on two fronts: 1) providing enriching sensory input; and 2) providing access to natural environments. While prior work has demonstrated psychophysiological and cognitive benefits of virtual nature [14,30,31], most studies have relied on limited sensory stimulation and focused on immediate outcomes. Here, we found that virtual nature exposure produced both immediate and sustained reductions (improvement) in negative affect for both audiovisual VR and multisensory VR (VR+OWT). The addition of olfactory, wind, and thermal stimuli enhanced presence in certain scenes, whereas perceived restorativeness was influenced more strongly by scene content than by sensory immersion.

These findings extend previous work on affective responses to virtual nature. Consistent with earlier studies, exposure to virtual natural environments significantly reduced negative affect while maintaining positive affect [13,16,32–34]. In line with Attention Restoration Theory [9], reductions in negative affect may facilitate psychological disengagement from everyday demands, redirecting mental resources away from negative

mental mechanisms [35] and maladaptive thought patterns [36]. Prior work suggests that positive affective responses to nature depend on the availability of evolutionary relevant resources or hazards and may differ between real and simulated environments [37]. Because simulated nature does not afford physical access to such resources, positive affect may be maintained rather than enhanced, providing a potential explanation for the present findings.

Although affective responses were comparable across groups, multisensory augmentation significantly enhanced presence, particularly in General Presence, Involvement, and Total IPQ scores. Notably, these effects were scene dependent. Participants in the audiovisual VR condition reported reduced Involvement and Total Presence in the Garden and Forest relative to the Beach, whereas presence scores in the VR+OWT condition were more consistent across scenes. This suggests that multisensory augmentation helped elevate less-preferred environments, enhancing presence and enjoyment. Scene preferences mirrored this trend: the Garden was clearly least preferred in the VR group, while preferences were more evenly distributed in the VR+OWT group.

Perceived restorativeness was largely determined by scene content, with similar PRS scores observed across sensory conditions. The Garden was characterized with lower Fascination and higher Coherence relative to the Forest and Beach. Coherence reflects the perceived connectedness and scope of an environment [9,38]. Given the Garden had the smallest map size, its higher Coherence likely reflected connectedness rather than expansiveness. Structured elements such as paths, bridges, and benches may have reinforced this sense of organization. In contrast, the relatively ordinary nature of the Garden, compared to the more expansive and novel Forest and Beach environments, may have contributed to its lower Fascination scores. Together, these findings suggest that multisensory cues primarily influenced presence, whereas restorativeness was driven by scene characteristics.

Interestingly, PRS Coherence in all scenes tended to be lower in VR+OWT condition—an interesting, though non-significant reversal of group trends. These patterns likely reflect sensory mismatches and echo broader discussions of "credibility" [39] and "believability" [40] in VR environments, emphasizing that sensory realism alone is not sufficient. Rather, the alignment of multisensory cues with environmental context is critical to support coherence, as mismatches between expected and delivered sensory input can detract from the virtual experience [41–43]. These findings highlight that multisensory augmentation can both enhance and undermine the VR experience, depending on implementation.

Scene-level differences revealed that the Beach tended to evoke stronger Involvement and Total Presence for the audiovisual VR group and higher Fascination in both conditions. Features such as moving waves, underwater exploration, and climbable rock formations may have added visual interest and increased engagement compared to the Garden and Forest. The aquatic component may also have played a role, consistent with evidence that “blue spaces” are associated with enhanced affective and restorative outcomes [44].

Overall, multisensory augmentation enhanced presence and helped equalize enjoyment across environments, while affective benefits and perceived restorativeness remained comparable between groups. In some cases, however, thermal and wind cues acted as distractions, reducing coherence. Participants were especially sensitive to temperature mismatches, underscoring the need for more precise environmental mapping of thermal stimuli. Participant preferences also favored cooling sensations, suggesting future designs may benefit from emphasizing cooler temperatures, reducing maximum heat intensity, and individual thermal feedback calibration calibrating thermal feedback. Feedback also indicated that some scents were disliked either due to intensity level or personal taste, which influences the perception of an odor’s hedonic valence [45,46]. Exposure to unpleasant scents could have confounded results by eliciting negative emotions [47] instead of positive ones, though most participants reported no disliked scents. Future implementations could benefit from baseline olfactory testing to determine ideal odor intensities for each individual and potentially remove or substitute odors perceived as unpleasant.

Several technical improvements could further enhance the multisensory experience. For example, ray-casting techniques could detect visual occlusions (e.g., shade from trees) and dynamically adjust thermal feedback. Cooling sensations when entering water and more gradual temperature transitions would better align sensory cues with environmental context. Reducing fan noise and noise-canceling headphones may further improve immersion.

Unlike affect and stress, cognitive performance remained largely stable over time. While some time-dependent trends and group-by-time interactions emerged, results were mixed and did not reveal consistent cognitive benefits associated with either VR condition. These findings suggest that observed cognitive changes may reflect external influences rather than systematic effects of the intervention. This interpretation is consistent with prior work indicating that cognitive and psychological benefits of nature exposure may operate through distinct mechanisms [48–50]. Given evidence that nature can provide immediate cognitive benefits [49–52], future research should more closely examine the temporal dynamics of these effects.

Natural VR environments may provide psychological restoration in spaceflight and ICE environments characterized by prolonged isolation and sensory deprivation/monotony. Sensory deprivation can negatively impact affective state and contribute to depressive symptoms, while affective state may in turn influence sensory perception [53]. In the context of ICE environments, multisensory VR interventions could provide enriching sensory stimulation and help mitigate sensory monotony by leveraging the bidirectional relationship between sensory perception and psychological state. Similar VR-based interventions have demonstrated feasibility in ICE environments such as Antarctica [13,43], although microgravity introduces additional challenges. For implementation in spaceflight environments, the system would likely require further technological breakthroughs to reduce mass, volume, and power requirements [54]. Scent delivery may require alternative approaches in microgravity (e.g., nasal cannula), as limited gravity-driven convection could impair scent circulation and ambient diffusion could increase unwanted odor dispersion with the shared, confined space. Spaceflight itself may also alter odor perception, though evidence remains mixed and the underlying mechanisms unclear [55]. Despite these operational considerations, the present findings support the potential of multisensory VR nature as a behavioral health countermeasure for spaceflight and other settings with limited access to natural environments.

Several limitations warrant consideration. First, some longitudinal assessments (T2 and T3) occurred shortly after VR exposure, raising the possibility of carry-over effects that may have contributed to reductions in negative affect. Further, perceived stress was only evaluated pre/post experiment. Measuring stress at T2 may have provided further insight as stress levels may have influenced negative affect results independent of the intervention. Second, the study environment and population differed substantially from ICE environments. Although academic stressors are significant [56,57], they do not produce the same psychological or cognitive vulnerabilities as ICE environments.

Third, although cybersickness was minimized through optional teleportation-based locomotion, mild symptoms were reported in a few sessions. Technical issues, particularly unstable Bluetooth connections to thermal devices, may also have affected the consistency of sensory feedback. Fourth, cognitive performance was assessed weekly, which may have limited sensitivity to short-term cognitive changes. In addition, the small sample size may have limited statistical power to detect meaningful effects in questionnaire-based and cognitive measures, particularly analyses of immediate effects when subdivided by VR scene. Finally, while the study compared audiovisual to multisensory VR, it did not isolate the contributions of individual sensory modalities. Participant feedback nevertheless suggests that the combined and synchronized presentation of cues was central to the immersive experience.

Future work should prioritize personalization, as participants varied widely in their sensory preferences and responses. Customizing temperature ranges, olfactory intensity, environmental features, or scene selection may enhance benefits. For example, crews could tailor their scenes and stimuli prior to a Mars mission. When personalized environments are impractical, offering a broad range of options could be a feasible alternative. Integrating mindfulness practices may further amplify restorative effects [58–61], and several participants spontaneously engaged in meditative behaviors during VR exposure. While scenes were intentionally non-gamified to isolate the effects of nature exposure, gamified elements could also reap positive benefits [62], and participants were often observed creating their own informal challenges during exploration.

In summary, both audiovisual and multisensory VR reliably reduced negative affect immediately and over time. Multisensory augmentation enhanced presence and balanced scene enjoyment but was sensitive to mismatches in sensory feedback, particularly thermal cues. Cognitive performance remained stable, suggesting that long-term affective benefits may not directly translate to sustained cognitive improvements within the study timeframe. Together, these findings highlight the promise and complexity of multisensory VR countermeasures, emphasizing the importance of sensory coherence, personalization, and interactivity in future designs. Beyond spaceflight and ICE environments, such interventions may also benefit other nature-deprived populations, including nursing home residents and large city residents in our increasingly urbanized world.

Methods

Participants

We recruited healthy young adults from Texas A&M University and the surrounding area. Fifty-one participants (mean age = 24.1 ± 2.9 years; 30 male) completed the study. Interested participants completed a prescreening survey to assess eligibility. Participants had to be 18–64 years old and in good general health. Exclusion criteria included anosmia (i.e., loss of part or all sense of smell), color blindness, and a history of neurological disorders. Additionally, individuals with high susceptibility to motion sickness (scored >12 on the 6-item Visually Induced Motion Sickness Questionnaire [63]) were excluded to reduce the likelihood that they could not complete the study. The protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Board at Texas A&M University (IRB2023-0944D) in accordance with the declaration of Helsinki. Informed consent was obtained from study participants prior to any data collection.

Experimental Design

A between-subjects design was employed (Figure 6). Participants were randomly assigned to one of three groups: 1) control (no VR); 2) VR with audio and visual stimuli only (VR); or 3) VR with audio, visual, olfactory, wind, and thermal stimuli (VR+OWT). All participants first completed a Familiarization session, during which demographics and general health questionnaires were administered. Participants were then introduced to the Cognition test battery, a series of cognitive tasks that they would complete periodically throughout the experiment. A standardized instructional presentation and video were provided, followed by shortened practice versions of 8 of the 10 Cognition tests (practice versions were not provided for the Visual Object Learning Task and the Balloon Analog Risk Task). Practice versions were available for subsequent administrations but were not required after the Familiarization session. Cognition data from the Familiarization session were not included in analyses.

The study duration was approximately two weeks (mean $\pm$ SD = 15.5 $\pm$ 2.4 days). T1 data collection (i.e., baseline) occurred at least one day after Familiarization. At T1, participants completed questionnaires assessing affect, stress, and a measure of cognitive performance. Participants in the VR and VR+OWT groups were additionally trained in the use of the head-mounted display (HMD) and controllers and given a brief equipment practice period.

Follow-up assessments occurred approximately one week (T2) and two weeks (T3) after T1. At T2, participants completed measures of affect and cognitive performance. At T3, participants completed measures of affect, stress, cognitive performance, and participated in a semi-structured interview.

Between T1 and T3, participants in the VR and VR+OWT groups were eligible to complete up to five VR sessions on weekdays, with no more than one VR session per day. During each VR session, participants selected one of three VR environments (Garden, Forest, or Beach) and spent 15 minutes exploring freely. Navigation was primarily controller-based, with limited physical movement permitted within a 9 ft $\times$ 6 ft play area. After each session, participants completed surveys assessing affect, perceived restorativeness, presence, and motion sickness symptoms. Participants in the control group did not receive a substitute intervention and only participated in data collection at T1, T2, and T3.

All participants received \$50 in gift cards for completing the study; participants in VR conditions received an additional \$10 for each VR session they attended.

Virtual Reality Environments

Three computer-generated nature VR environments—a Garden, Forest, and Beach—were developed using Unreal Engine 5 (Figure 7). Participants experienced the VR environments using an HTC Vive Pro Eye headset (HTC Corporation, Xindian, New Taipei City, Taiwan).

The landscapes were selected to represent a range of environmental qualities previously associated with psychological restoration. The Garden combined built and natural elements and featured the highest plant biodiversity, which has been linked to enhanced restorative outcomes [64]. The Forest environment included mountainous terrain and a mix of deciduous and coniferous trees; forests are commonly used in restorative environment research and have been shown to confer substantial benefits, as reflected in practices such as forest bathing (Shinrin-yoku) [65]. The Beach environment, which included large rock formations and tropical vegetation, was selected because aquatic settings have been associated with increased restorative effects [44]. Accordingly, all scenes incorporated an aquatic element. Across environments, tree branches swayed in the wind, and no people or animals were included. Additional details for each scene are provided in Table 3 and videos of these environments are available at: <https://youtu.be/7tHSgggd-Hk?si=FyNg8sAoR39K2aO..>

Each environment included spatialized 3D audio that adapted to the user’s surroundings to enhance realism and reduce repetition [66]. Audio was delivered through the HMD’s integrated on-ear headphones and could be adjusted by the participant as desired. Audio consisted of a continuous ambient base layer, location-specific sounds (e.g., waves near the shoreline), and randomized transient sound events (e.g., bird calls). These sounds were spatialized using interaural time and level differences, with distance-based attenuation to convey direction and proximity.

Based on feedback from prior work, each environment included two visually distinct physics-enabled interactive objects: stones and sunflowers in the Garden, pinecones and mushrooms in the Forest, and coconuts and starfish in the Beach. Interactive objects were highlighted with a Niagara particle “sparkle” effect around the item to indicate the user could interact with it (Figure 7). Participants could use the VR hand controllers to pick up, carry, and throw objects. Interactive objects responded dynamically to the environment and other objects through simulated physical properties such as gravity, damping, and collision interactions (e.g., rolling down a hill, creating a splash when thrown into water, stacking with other objects). Uniquely, the coconuts in the Beach environment demonstrated buoyancy when placed in the ocean. Additionally, two controller-based locomotion methods were available, continuous movement and point-and-teleport, and

participants could toggle between them during the experience. Teleportation was included to reduce motion sickness while preserving user control [67].

Dynamic olfactory, wind, and thermal stimuli were implemented in the VR+OWT condition. These stimuli were spatially mapped within each environment and varied based on the user's location (Figure 8).

Olfactory stimuli: Scents were delivered using a Compact Scent Generator (Olorama Technology Ltd, Valencia, Spain) following methods from a previous study [32]. Specific aromas were triggered based on proximity to environmental features (e.g., wet ground near water). The Garden environment included the aromas of fresh grass, rosemary, roses, blossom, and wet ground; the Forest featured fresh grass, lavender, pine, wet ground, and woods; and the Beach included beach scent, fresh grass, and wet ground. Each scent release used a 300 ms scent cartridge activation followed by a 9 second fan-driven dispersion. Using a pulsed approach enabled rapid onset and clearance of olfactory stimuli. If participants remained in the same area, scents were re-administered in 2-minute intervals.

Wind stimuli: Wind was delivered via three external fans placed in a triangular arrangement around the play area. Each fan was controlled by an electronic speed controller connected to an Arduino Nano microcontroller. Unreal Engine sent real-time fan commands via serial communication, sending a single digit integer (0–5) to each fan that was mapped to pulse widths (1100–1345 μ s) controlling fan speed, producing wind speeds ranging from approximately 2–3 m/s when measured 3 feet from the fan. Wind audio volume was synchronized with fan intensity.

Thermal stimuli: Thermal sensations were delivered using ThermoReal flexible thermoelectric devices (TEGway, Daejeon, South Korea), worn on the arms and attached to the HMD. Devices communicated wirelessly via Bluetooth and operated using a pulsed pattern (6 seconds on, 2 seconds off). Intensity values ranged from 1.0 to 10.0, with 1.0–5.9 producing cold and 6.0–10.0 producing heat. Pilot testing established comfort thresholds, and intensities were capped at 3.5 (~14 °C) and 7.25 (~56 °C) on the arms, and 6.25 (~46 °C) on the forehead.

Like the olfactory stimuli, thermal and wind stimuli were dynamically synchronized with the user's location based on predefined zones within the VR environment. Shaded areas were assigned to cooler temperatures and lower wind speeds, whereas open areas were assigned to warmer temperatures and higher wind speeds. To enhance naturalism, both thermal and wind stimuli included small random fluctuations in intensity.

Dependent Variables

Self-report surveys were administered to assess participants' psychological mood and their experience in VR throughout the experiment. Additionally, a cognitive test battery was used to evaluate cognitive performance over time.

Experiences in Virtual Reality

iGroup Presence Questionnaire (IPQ): Presence was assessed using the IPQ [28,68,69]. Participants responded to 14 statements on a 7-point Likert scale (Supplementary Table 1). Items belonged to one of three subscales (Spatial Presence, Involvement, and Experienced Realism) and a fourth factor, General Presence, which consisted of a single item. Internal reliability (McDonald's omega) was $\omega = 0.71$, $\omega = 0.75$, and $\omega = 0.70$ for Spatial Presence, Involvement, and Experienced Realism, respectively.

Perceived Restorativeness Scale (PRS): The 16-item PRS [38] assessed the restorative quality of the VR environment across four subdomains aligned with Attention Restoration Theory: Being Away, Fascination, Coherence (extent), and Compatibility. Participants rated the extent to which each statement described their most recent VR experience on a 7-point Likert scale (0 = not at all, 6 = completely) (Supplementary Table 2). Items within each subscale were averaged, and Coherence items were reverse-scored so that higher values indicated greater perceived Coherence. Internal reliability (McDonald's omega) was $\omega = 0.89$ for Being Away, $\omega = 0.94$ for Fascination, $\omega = 0.78$ for Coherence, and $\omega = 0.93$ for Compatibility.

Psychological State

Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS): Affect was measured using the PANAS [70], consisting of 10 positive and 10 negative affect items (Supplementary Table 3). Participants rated the extent to which they experienced each emotion using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = very slightly or not at all, 2 = a little, 3 = moderately, 4 = quite a bit, 5 = extremely). Subscale scores were summed, with higher values indicating greater affect. Internal reliability (McDonald's omega) was $\omega = 0.88$ for positive affect (PA) and $\omega = 0.89$ for negative affect (NA).

Perceived Stress Scale (PSS): Perceived stress was measured using a 4-item version of the PSS [71]. Items were rated on a 5-point scale (0 = never, 1 = almost never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = fairly often, 4 = very often), with two items reverse-scored (Supplementary Table 4). Responses were summed to generate a total stress score, with higher scores indicating greater perceived stress. Internal reliability (Cronbach's alpha) for the total PSS was $\alpha = 0.77$.

Qualitative Feedback

After each VR session, participants reported any VR sickness symptoms and provided optional open-ended feedback. At T3, participants completed a semi-structured interview addressing favorite and least favorite scenes, perceived benefits, willingness to reuse the intervention, and (for VR+OWT participants) perceptions and preferences regarding multisensory stimuli.

Cognitive Performance

Cognitive performance was assessed using the *Cognition* battery (v3.0.9), comprised of 10 distinct neurobehavioral tasks designed to evaluate a broad spectrum of cognitive domains, including attention, memory, executive function, and processing speed [72]. The 10 tasks (Motor Praxis (MP) task, Visual Object Learning Test (VOLT), Fractal 2-Back (F2B), Abstract Matching (AM) test, Line Orientation Test (LOT), Emotion Recognition Task (ERT), Matrix Reasoning Test (MRT), Digit Symbol Substitution Task (DSST), Balloon Analog Risk Test (BART), and Psychomotor Vigilance Test (PVT)) are described in Supplementary Table 5. Testing was conducted on a laptop using Joggle Research software (Pulsar Informatics Inc., Philadelphia, USA).

Performance on all tasks was measured through two metrics: an accuracy metric and a speed metric. Accuracy outcomes spanned a range of 0 to 1, with 1 signifying optimal performance. Conversely, lower values in speed outcomes denote shorter response times, indicating higher speed.

For most tasks, accuracy was calculated as the proportion of correct responses, and the speed metric is reported as the mean reaction time over the task duration. Accuracy was not calculated for the Motor Praxis (MP) task because the instructions for this task did not emphasize accuracy. For the Fractal 2-Back (F2B) test, accuracy was calculated as the average proportion of correctly identified targets and the proportion of correctly identified decoys (correct non-responses). In the Line Orientation Test (LOT), accuracy was calculated as 3 minus the average number of clicks off, divided by 3. If the average number of clicks off was greater than 3, then the accuracy score was set to 0. In the Balloon Analog Risk Test (BART), the number of pumps was divided by the total number of possible pumps across all 30 balloons to calculate a Risk Score. The speed metric for the PVT was calculated as 10 minus the average reciprocal reaction time ($1/[\text{Reaction time in seconds}]$) across the task, as this has been shown to have greater sensitivity compared to standard reaction time [73]. Accuracy in the PVT was calculated as shown in Equation 1:

$$PVT\ accuracy = 1 - \frac{N\ lapses + N\ false\ starts}{N\ stimuli + N\ false\ starts} \quad (1)$$

where responses ≤ 100 ms were labelled as false starts and responses ≥ 355 ms were labelled as lapses. Speed and accuracy metrics were adjusted using published corrections with a “short” interval to account for stimulus set effects and practice effects due to repeated administrations [74].

Statistical Analysis

Data were screened for quality prior to analysis. One Cognition DSST run was excluded due to noncompliance. Linear mixed models (LMMs) were used to assess immediate and longitudinal effects, with subject included as a random intercept. When assumptions were violated, robust linear mixed models (RLMMs) were used because they are less sensitive to deviations from normality and missing data [75]. Model fit was evaluated through tests for dispersion, outliers, and distribution (i.e., Kolmogorov-Smirnov) using the DHARMA package. Residual heteroscedasticity was assessed using Levene's test.

Overall significance of the main effects and interactions was evaluated using an omnibus F-test on the estimated marginal means (joint tests from the emmeans package) with the Kenward-Rogers approximation for degrees of freedom. RLMMs were evaluated using an asymptotic Wald χ^2 test as the Kenward-Rogers approximation is not supported for robust models. Follow-up estimated marginal means (EMM) and estimated marginal trend (EMT) analyses for LMMs are reported using t-statistics and associated degrees of freedom, while RLMMs are reported using asymptotic Wald z-statistics.

Immediate Effects of VR Intervention

Because participants could repeat VR scenes, post-VR PANAS, IPQ, and PRS scores were first averaged per scene (Garden, Forest, Beach) for each participant for LMM analysis. Fixed factors for PANAS models included Condition [categorical: VR or VR+OWT], Scene [categorical: T1, Garden, Forest, Beach], and the interaction Condition x Scene. Fixed factors for the IPQ and PRS models were Condition [categorical: VR or VR+OWT], Scene [categorical: Garden, Forest, Beach], and the interaction Condition x Scene. PANAS NA residuals violated the normality assumption and IPQ General Presence residuals were heteroscedastic, so these outcomes were refit using RLMM.

Significant effects of Condition, Scene, or their interaction were followed by post-hoc contrasts. When an interaction effect was present, simple effects contrasts were conducted in two ways: first, each Scene (Garden, Forest, Beach) was compared within each Condition (VR group vs VR+OWT group); and second, Condition was compared within each Scene. When the interaction was not significant, main effect contrasts were evaluated in two ways: first, comparing each scores for each Scene (Garden, Forest, Beach) averaged over Condition (VR group and VR+OWT group); and second, comparing

each Condition averaged over all Scenes. When a main effect contrast was significant, follow up simple effects contrasts were performed according to the procedures described above.

For PANAS scores, two additional contrasts were specified: the first contrast compared the VR group versus the VR+OWT group at T1 (i.e., baseline); and the second contrast compared the VR group versus the VR+OWT group averaged across all post-VR points (i.e., Garden, Forest, Beach).

Longitudinal Changes

PANAS, PSS, and all Cognition speed and accuracy metrics were analyzed using LMMs and RLMMs. Fixed effects included Condition (Control, VR, or VR+OWT), Time (days since T1), and their interaction (Condition x Time). When Condition effects were significant, post-hoc contrasts were performed on the estimated marginal means averaged across Time. To assess changes over time, marginal trends (slopes) were estimated for each Condition. When the effect of Time was significant, follow-up simple slopes analyses were conducted to test whether each group-specific slope differed from zero. Significant slopes were then compared pairwise to determine whether rates of change differed between groups.

The Benjamini and Hochberg correction was applied to adjust p-values and control for false discovery rate in both immediate and longitudinal analyses, with significance set at $\alpha = 0.05$. All statistical analyses were conducted in R version 4.4.2. LMMs and RLMMs were fit using the lme4 [76] and robustlmm [75] packages. Model diagnostics were assessed using the lmerTest [77] and DHARMA packages [78]. Adjusted means, slopes, and contrasts were calculated using the emmeans package [79].

References

1. Palinkas, L. A. & Suedfeld, P. Psychosocial issues in isolated and confined extreme environments. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* **126**, 413–429 (2021).
2. Slack, K. J. et al. Risk of Adverse Cognitive or Behavioral Conditions and Psychiatric Disorders: Evidence Report. *NASA Human Research Program* Preprint at (2016).
3. Alexander, D. J. Illnesses Seen in Spaceflight. *Handbook of Bioastronautics* 573–592 (2021) doi:10.1007/978-3-319-12191-8_133.
4. Shepanek, M. Human behavioral research in space: Quandaries for research subjects and researchers. *Aviat. Space Environ. Med.* **76**, B25–B30 (2005).

- 685 5. Kanas, N. *Behavioral Health and Human Interactions in Space*. *Behavioral Health*
686 *and Human Interactions in Space* (Springer International Publishing, 2023).
687 doi:10.1007/978-3-031-16723-2.
- 688 6. Dev, S. I., Moody, N. D., Arias, D. P. & Bell, S. T. Fly me to the moon: Family
689 conferencing with communication delays on lunar missions. *Acta Astronaut.* **242**,
690 48–57 (2026).
- 691 7. Ulrich, R. S. *et al.* Stress recovery during exposure to natural and urban
692 environments. *J. Environ. Psychol.* **11**, 201–230 (1991).
- 693 8. Ulrich, R. S. Aesthetic and Affective Response to Natural Environment. in *Behavior*
694 *and the Natural Environment* (eds. Altman, I. & Wohlwill, J. F.) vol. 6 85–125 (Springer
695 US, Boston, MA, 1983).
- 696 9. Kaplan, R. & Kaplan, S. *The Experience of Nature: A Psychological Perspective*.
697 *Contemporary Psychology: A Journal of Reviews* vol. 35 (Cambridge University Press,
698 1989).
- 699 10. Hartig, T., Evans, G. W., Jamner, L. D., Davis, D. S. & Gärling, T. Tracking restoration
700 in natural and urban field settings. *J. Environ. Psychol.* **23**, 109–123 (2003).
- 701 11. Hall, C. & Knuth, M. An Update of the Literature Supporting the Well-Being Benefits
702 of Plants: A Review of the Emotional and Mental Health Benefits of Plants. *J. Environ.*
703 *Hortic.* **37**, 30–38 (2019).
- 704 12. Schertz, K. E. & Berman, M. G. Understanding Nature and Its Cognitive Benefits.
705 *Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci.* **28**, 496–502 (2019).
- 706 13. Anderson, A., Stankovic, A., Cowan, D., Fellows, A. & Buckey, J. Natural Scene
707 Virtual Reality as a Behavioral Health Countermeasure in Isolated, Confined, and
708 Extreme Environments: Three Isolated, Confined, Extreme Analog Case Studies.
709 *Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society* **65**,
710 1266–1278 (2023).
- 711 14. Spano, G. *et al.* Virtual nature, psychological and psychophysiological outcomes: A
712 systematic review. *J. Environ. Psychol.* **89**, 102044 (2023).
- 713 15. Mayer, F. S., Frantz, C. M., Bruehlman-Senecal, E. & Dolliver, K. Why Is Nature
714 Beneficial? *Environ. Behav.* **41**, 607–643 (2009).
- 715 16. Browning, M. H. E. M., Mimnaugh, K. J., van Riper, C. J., Laurent, H. K. & LaValle, S. M.
716 Can Simulated Nature Support Mental Health? Comparing Short, Single-Doses of

- 717 360-Degree Nature Videos in Virtual Reality With the Outdoors. *Front. Psychol.* **10**,
718 1–14 (2020).
- 719 17. Slater, M. A note on presence terminology. *Presence Conn.* **3**, 1–5 (2003).
- 720 18. Slater, M. & Wilbur, S. A Framework for Immersive Virtual Environments (FIVE):
721 Speculations on the Role of Presence in Virtual Environments. *Presence:*
722 *Teleoperators and Virtual Environments* **6**, 603–616 (1997).
- 723 19. Cummings, J. J. & Bailenson, J. N. How Immersive Is Enough? A Meta-Analysis of the
724 Effect of Immersive Technology on User Presence. *Media Psychol.* **19**, 272–309
725 (2016).
- 726 20. Felton, W. M. & Jackson, R. E. Presence: A Review. *Int. J. Hum. Comput. Interact.* **38**,
727 1–18 (2022).
- 728 21. Dinh, H. Q., Walker, N., Hodges, L. F., Chang Song & Kobayashi, A. Evaluating the
729 importance of multi-sensory input on memory and the sense of presence in virtual
730 environments. in *Proceedings IEEE Virtual Reality (Cat. No. 99CB36316)* 222–228
731 (IEEE Comput. Soc, 1999). doi:10.1109/VR.1999.756955.
- 732 22. Ranasinghe, N. et al. Season Traveller: Multisensory Narration for Enhancing the
733 Virtual Reality Experience. in *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human*
734 *Factors in Computing Systems* 1–13 (ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2018).
735 doi:10.1145/3173574.3174151.
- 736 23. Ranasinghe, N., Jain, P., Karwita, S., Tolley, D. & Do, E. Y.-L. Ambiotherm: Enhancing
737 Sense of Presence in Virtual Reality by Simulating Real-World Environmental
738 Conditions. in *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in*
739 *Computing Systems* 1731–1742 (ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2017).
740 doi:10.1145/3025453.3025723.
- 741 24. Song, C. et al. Effects of simulated multi-sensory stimulation integration on
742 physiological and psychological restoration in virtual urban green space
743 environment. *Front. Psychol.* **15**, 1382143 (2024).
- 744 25. Thepsatitporn, S., Rujiganjanarat, K. & Makmee, P. Multi-Sensory Stimuli Improve
745 Relaxation and Sleep Quality in Rotating Shift Workers: A Randomized Controlled
746 Trial. *J. Multidiscip. Healthc.* **17**, 1435–1445 (2024).
- 747 26. Naef, A. C. et al. Investigating the role of auditory and visual sensory inputs for
748 inducing relaxation during virtual reality stimulation. *Sci. Rep.* **12**, 1–11 (2022).
- 749 27. Benda, J. Neural adaptation. *Current Biology* **31**, R110–R116 (2021).

- 750 28. Regenbrecht, H. & Schubert, T. Real and Illusory Interactions Enhance Presence in
751 Virtual Environments. *Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments* **11**, 425–
752 434 (2002).
- 753 29. Vessel, E. A. & Russo, S. *Effects of Reduced Sensory Stimulation and Assessment of*
754 *Countermeasures for Sensory Stimulation Augmentation. NASA Report (NASA/TM-*
755 *2015-218576)* <http://ston.jsc.nasa.gov/collections/TRS> (2015).
- 756 30. Mostajeran, F., Fischer, M., Steinicke, F. & Kühn, S. Effects of exposure to immersive
757 computer-generated virtual nature and control environments on affect and
758 cognition. *Sci. Rep.* **13**, 1–13 (2023).
- 759 31. Léger, M. T. & Mekari, S. Simulating the Benefits of Nature Exposure on Cognitive
760 Performance in Virtual Reality: A Window into Possibilities for Education and
761 Cognitive Health. *Brain Sci.* **12**, 1–8 (2022).
- 762 32. Abbott, R. (Woodruff) & Diaz-Artiles, A. The impact of digital scents on behavioral
763 health in a restorative virtual reality environment. *Acta Astronaut.* **197**, 145–153
764 (2022).
- 765 33. Anderson, A. P. et al. Relaxation with immersive natural scenes presented using
766 virtual reality. *Aerosp. Med. Hum. Perform.* **88**, 520–526 (2017).
- 767 34. Schutte, N. S., Bhullar, N., Stilinović, E. J. & Richardson, K. The Impact of Virtual
768 Environments on Restorativeness and Affect. *Ecopsychology* **9**, 1–7 (2017).
- 769 35. Hoffman, H. G., Doctor, J. N., Patterson, D. R., Carrougner, G. J. & Furness, T. A.
770 Virtual reality as an adjunctive pain control during burn wound care in adolescent
771 patients. *Pain* **85**, 305–309 (2000).
- 772 36. Van Den Berg, A. E., Koole, S. L. & Van Der Wulp, N. Y. Environmental preference and
773 restoration: (How) are they related? *J. Environ. Psychol.* **23**, 135–146 (2003).
- 774 37. McMahan, E. A. & Estes, D. The effect of contact with natural environments on
775 positive and negative affect: A meta-analysis. *J. Posit. Psychol.* **10**, 507–519 (2015).
- 776 38. Hartig, T., Korpela, K., Evans, G. W. & Gärling, T. A measure of restorative quality in
777 environments. *Scandinavian Housing and Planning Research* **14**, 175–194 (1997).
- 778 39. Goncalves, G., Melo, M., Vasconcelos-Raposo, J. & Bessa, M. Impact of Different
779 Sensory Stimuli on Presence in Credible Virtual Environments. *IEEE Trans. Vis.*
780 *Comput. Graph.* **26**, 3231–3240 (2020).

- 781 40. Magnenat-Thalmann, N., HyungSeok Kim, Egges, A. & Garchery, S. Believability and
782 Interaction in Virtual Worlds. in *11th International Multimedia Modelling Conference*
783 2–9 (IEEE, 2005). doi:10.1109/MMMC.2005.24.
- 784 41. Melo, M. *et al.* Do Multisensory Stimuli Benefit the Virtual Reality Experience? A
785 Systematic Review. *IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graph.* **28**, 1428–1442 (2022).
- 786 42. Bessa, M., Melo, M., Augusto de Sousa, A. & Vasconcelos-Raposo, J. The effects of
787 body position on Reflexive Motor Acts and the sense of presence in virtual
788 environments. *Computers and Graphics (Pergamon)* **71**, 35–41 (2018).
- 789 43. Thoolen, S. J. J. *et al.* Virtual reality-based sensory stimulation preferences at
790 Amundsen-Scott South Pole station in Antarctica. *NPJ Microgravity* **11**, (2025).
- 791 44. White, M. *et al.* Blue space: The importance of water for preference, affect, and
792 restorativeness ratings of natural and built scenes. *J. Environ. Psychol.* **30**, 482–493
793 (2010).
- 794 45. Arshamian, A. *et al.* The perception of odor pleasantness is shared across cultures.
795 *Current Biology* **32**, 2061–2066.e3 (2022).
- 796 46. Laing, D. G. Relationship between Molecular Structure, Concentration and Odor
797 Qualities of Oxygenated Aliphatic Molecules. *Chem. Senses* **28**, 57–69 (2003).
- 798 47. Kadohisa, M. Effects of odor on emotion, with implications. *Front. Syst. Neurosci.* **7**,
799 1–6 (2013).
- 800 48. Stenfors, C. U. D. *et al.* Positive effects of nature on cognitive performance across
801 multiple experiments: Test order but not affect modulates the cognitive effects.
802 *Front. Psychol.* **10**, 1413 (2019).
- 803 49. Berman, M. G., Jonides, J. & Kaplan, S. The Cognitive Benefits of Interacting With
804 Nature. *Psychol. Sci.* **19**, 1207–1212 (2008).
- 805 50. Berman, M. G. *et al.* Interacting with nature improves cognition and affect for
806 individuals with depression. *J. Affect. Disord.* **140**, 300–305 (2012).
- 807 51. Bailey, A. W., Allen, G., Herndon, J. & Demastus, C. Cognitive benefits of walking in
808 natural versus built environments. *World Leis. J.* **60**, 293–305 (2018).
- 809 52. Pasanen, T., Johnson, K., Lee, K. & Korpela, K. Can nature walks with psychological
810 tasks improve mood, self-reported restoration, and sustained attention? Results
811 from two experimental field studies. *Front. Psychol.* **9**, (2018).

- 812 53. Canbeyli, R. Sensory stimulation via the visual, auditory, olfactory and gustatory
813 systems can modulate mood and depression. *European Journal of Neuroscience* **55**,
814 244–263 (2021).
- 815 54. Kuhail, M. A., Abdulkerim, A. Z., Thornquist, E. & Haile, S. Y. A review on the use of
816 immersive technology in space research. *Telematics and Informatics Reports* **17**,
817 100191 (2025).
- 818 55. Olabi, A. A., Lawless, H. T., Hunter, J. B., Levitsky, D. A. & Halpern, B. P. The effect of
819 microgravity and space flight on the chemical senses. *Journal of Food Science* vol.
820 67 468–478 Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2621.2002.tb10622.x> (2002).
- 821 56. Brown, R. T. Helping Students Confront and Deal with Stress and Procrastination. *J.*
822 *College Stud. Psychother.* **6**, 87–102 (1992).
- 823 57. O'Donovan, A. & Hughes, B. Social support and loneliness in college students:
824 Effects on pulse pressure reactivity to acute stress. *Int. J. Adolesc. Med. Health* **19**,
825 (2007).
- 826 58. Costa, M. R., Bergen-Cico, D., Razza, R., Hirshfield, L. & Wang, Q. Perceived
827 Restorativeness and Meditation Depth for Virtual Reality Supported Mindfulness
828 Interventions. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* **12425 LNCS**, 176–189 (2020).
- 829 59. Marocco, S., Vitale, V., Grossi, E., Presaghi, F. & Talamo, A. The potential of virtual
830 natural environments: a critical analysis of a VR-based mindfulness approach.
831 *Front. Psychol.* **16**, 1637669 (2025).
- 832 60. Djernis, D. et al. A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Nature-Based
833 Mindfulness: Effects of Moving Mindfulness Training into an Outdoor Natural Setting.
834 *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **16**, 3202 (2019).
- 835 61. Choe, E. Y., Jorgensen, A. & Sheffield, D. Does a natural environment enhance the
836 effectiveness of Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR)? Examining the mental
837 health and wellbeing, and nature connectedness benefits. *Landsc. Urban Plan.* **202**,
838 103886 (2020).
- 839 62. Hamari, J., Koivisto, J. & Sarsa, H. Does Gamification Work? -- A Literature Review of
840 Empirical Studies on Gamification. in *2014 47th Hawaii International Conference on*
841 *System Sciences* 3025–3034 (IEEE, 2014). doi:10.1109/HICSS.2014.377.
- 842 63. Golding, J. F., Rafiq, A. & Keshavarz, B. Predicting Individual Susceptibility to Visually
843 Induced Motion Sickness by Questionnaire. *Front. Virtual Real.* **2**, (2021).

- 844 64. Carrus, G. *et al.* Go greener, feel better? The positive effects of biodiversity on the
845 well-being of individuals visiting urban and peri-urban green areas. *Landsc. Urban*
846 *Plan.* **134**, 221–228 (2015).
- 847 65. Wen, Y., Yan, Q., Pan, Y., Gu, X. & Liu, Y. Medical empirical research on forest
848 bathing (Shinrin-yoku): A systematic review. *Environ. Health Prev. Med.* **24**, 70-
849 (2019).
- 850 66. Kern, A. C. & Ellermeier, W. Audio in VR: Effects of a Soundscape and Movement-
851 Triggered Step Sounds on Presence. *Front. Robot. AI* **7**, 1–13 (2020).
- 852 67. Riecke, B. E. & Zielasko, D. Continuous vs. Discontinuous (Teleport) Locomotion in
853 VR: How Implications can Provide both Benefits and Disadvantages. in *2021 IEEE*
854 *Conference on Virtual Reality and 3D User Interfaces Abstracts and Workshops*
855 *(VRW)* 373–374 (IEEE, 2021). doi:10.1109/VRW52623.2021.00075.
- 856 68. Schubert, T. W. The sense of presence in virtual environments. *J. Media Psychol.* **15**,
857 69–71 (2003).
- 858 69. Schubert, T., Friedmann, F. & Regenbrecht, H. The Experience of Presence: Factor
859 Analytic Insights. *Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments* **10**, 266–281
860 (2001).
- 861 70. Watson, D., Clark, L. A. & Tellegen, A. Development and validation of brief measures
862 of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **54**, 1063–
863 1070 (1988).
- 864 71. Cohen, S., Kamarck, T. & Mermelstein, R. A Global Measure of Perceived Stress. *J.*
865 *Health Soc. Behav.* **24**, 385–396 (1983).
- 866 72. Basner, M. *et al.* Development and Validation of the Cognition Test Battery for
867 Spaceflight. *Aerosp. Med. Hum. Perform.* **86**, 942–952 (2015).
- 868 73. Basner, M. & Dinges, D. F. Maximizing Sensitivity of the Psychomotor Vigilance Test
869 (PVT) to Sleep Loss. *Sleep* **34**, 581 (2011).
- 870 74. Basner, M. *et al.* Cognition test battery: Adjusting for practice and stimulus set
871 effects for varying administration intervals in high performing individuals. *J. Clin. Exp.*
872 *Neuropsychol.* **42**, 516–529 (2020).
- 873 75. Koller, M. robustlmm: An R Package for Robust Estimation of Linear Mixed-Effects
874 Models. *J. Stat. Softw.* **75**, (2016).

- 875 76. Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B. & Walker, S. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models
876 Using lme4. *J. Stat. Softw.* **67**, (2015).
- 877 77. Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoff, P. B. & Christensen, R. H. B. lmerTest Package: Tests in
878 Linear Mixed Effects Models. *J. Stat. Softw.* **82**, (2017).
- 879 78. Hartig, F. DHARMA: Residual Diagnostics for Hierarchical (Multi-Level / Mixed)
880 Regression Models. *CRAN: Contributed Packages* Preprint at
881 <https://doi.org/10.32614/CRAN.package.DHARMA> (2016).
- 882 79. Lenth, R. V. emmeans: Estimated Marginal Means, aka Least-Squares Means. *R*
883 *package version 1.11.2-80001* Preprint at <https://rvlenth.github.io/emmeans/>
884 (2025).

885

886 Acknowledgements

887 This work is supported by a NASA Space Technology Graduate Research Opportunity
888 (80NSSC21K1263) and the Sydney and J.L. Huffines Institute for Sports Medicine and
889 Human Performance – Student Seed Grant.

890 Funding

891 This work is supported by a NASA Space Technology Graduate Research Opportunity
892 (80NSSC21K1263) and the Sydney and J.L. Huffines Institute for Sports Medicine and
893 Human Performance – Student Seed Grant.

894 Author Contributions

895 Conceptualization: R.A., A.D.A.; Data acquisition: R.A.; Analysis and interpretation: all
896 authors; Funding acquisition: R.A., A.D.A.; Methodology: R.A., S.B., A.D.A.; Project
897 administration: R.A., A.D.A.; Writing – original draft: R.A.; Writing – review and editing: all
898 authors.

899 Data Availability

900 The datasets analyzed during the current study are available in the BHP-Lab repository,
901 <https://github.com/BHP-Lab/Immersive-VR/tree/main/SciRep%20Paper>.

Additional Information

The authors declare no competing interests.

Figure Legends




Figure 1: Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) scores by Scene and Condition (VR: audiovisual VR group; VR+OWT: audiovisual, olfactory, wind, and thermal VR group). The T1 points correspond to baseline. The Garden, Forest, and Beach values were measured immediately after post-VR. If a subject did multiple VR sessions in the same scene, scores were averaged for those sessions. Scores may range from [10, 50]. Mean $\pm$ SE shown. Asterisk (*) denote significant differences between T1 and Post-VR (Garden, Forest, or Beach) for the estimated marginal means averaged over the factor Condition. $**p < 0.01$, $***p < 0.001$.




Figure 2: iGroup Presence Questionnaire (IPQ) scores by Scene and Condition (VR: audiovisual VR group; VR+OWT: audiovisual, olfactory, wind, and thermal VR group). IPQ scores are shown for the four subscales (Experienced Realism, General Presence, Involvement, and Spatial Presence) along with a Total Presence score. If a subject did multiple VR sessions in the same scene, scores were averaged for those sessions. Data are presented as mean $\pm$ SE. Asteriks (*) indicate significant differences between scenes. Pound signs (#) indicate significant differences between the VR group and VR+OWT group. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.




Figure 3: Perceived Restorativeness Scale (PRS) scores by Scene and Condition (VR: audiovisual VR group; VR+OWT: audiovisual, olfactory, wind, and thermal VR group). PRS scores are shown for the four subscales (Being Away, Coherence, Compatibility, and Fascination) along with a Total score. If a subject did multiple VR sessions in the same scene, scores were averaged for those sessions. Data are presented as mean $\pm$ SE. Asterisk (*) denote significant differences between VR Scenes (Garden, Forest, or Beach) for the estimated marginal means averaged over the factor Condition. * $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.001$.




Figure 4: Linear mixed models for positive affect (PA), negative affect (NA), and perceived stress scale (PSS). Models are presented as predicted mean $\pm$ 95% confidence interval. Fixed factors included Time [days], Condition [categorical: Control, VR, VR+OWT], and the interaction Time $\times$ Condition. Subjects were included as random factors. PA: Positive Affect, NA: Negative Affect, PSS: Perceived Stress Scale.




Figure 5: Favorite and least favorite VR scenes for the VR group ($n = 16$) and VR+OWT group ($n = 17$). One VR group participant that completed only one VR session was excluded.




Figure 6: Overview of the experiment protocol. All groups completed surveys and the Cognition battery at the beginning of the study, approximately halfway through, and at the end of the experiment. Participants in the VR and VR+OWT groups were asked to complete up to 5 VR sessions during the intervention period. PSS: Perceived Stress Scale, PANAS: Positive and Negative Affect Scale, IPQ: iGroup Presence Questionnaire, PRS: Perceived Restorativeness Scale, VR: Virtual Reality, VR+OWT: Virtual Reality + olfactory, wind, and thermal stimuli.






Figure 7: Representative screenshots from the three nature-inspired virtual reality environments used. Users could look underwater in the Beach scene. Images in the bottom row illustrate the two types of interactive, physics-based objects available in each scene: stones and sunflowers in the Garden, pinecones and mushrooms in the Forest, and coconuts and starfish in the Beach. Interactive objects were highlighted with particle “sparkle” effects to signal interactivity.

Sensory stimuli 1:
Wind simulation



Sensory stimuli 2:
Odor simulation



15 min VR session

Sensory stimuli 3:
Thermal simulation



Visual and auditory stimuli:
One scene chosen by participant



Linked sensory stimuli and
specific environment

Figure 8: Illustration of the multisensory VR scenarios incorporating wind, olfactory, and thermal stimuli. Wind was delivered using three external fans, scents were provided through a digital scent generator, and thermal stimuli (hot and cold) were delivered via wearable thermoelectric devices placed on the arms and head.

Tables

Table 1: Summary of statistical results for PANAS Positive Affect, PANAS Negative Affect, and Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) linear mixed models. Fixed factors included Time [numeric: days since T1], Condition [categorical: Control, VR, or OVR], and the interaction Time x Condition. Subjects were included as random factors. Overall significance of the main and interaction effects were assessed using an omnibus F-test on each model with the Kenward-Rogers approximation for degrees of freedom. Bold values indicate significance ($p < 0.05$).

Variable	P value		
	Condition	Time	Condition x Time
PANAS PA	0.25	0.54	0.31
PANAS NA	0.85	0.026	0.037
PSS	0.97	<0.001	0.28

Table 2: Summary of statistical results for Cognition linear and robust linear mixed models. Fixed factors included Time [numeric: days since T1], Condition [categorical: Control, VR, or VR+OWT], and the interaction Condition x Time. Subjects were included as random factors. Overall significance of the main and interaction effects were assessed using an omnibus F-test with the Kenward-Rogers approximation for degrees of freedom for each model or an asymptotic Wald χ^2 test for robust models. [†]denotes robust models. VOLT: Visual Object Learning Test; F2B: Fractal 2-Back; AM: Abstract Matching; LOT: Line Orientation Test; ERT: Emotion Recognition Task; MRT: Matrix Reasoning Test; DSST: Digit Symbol Substitution Task; BART: Balloon Analog Risk Test; PVT: Psychomotor Vigilance Test; MP: Motor Praxis. Bold values indicate significance ($p < 0.05$).

Variable	Units	P value		
		Condition	Time	Condition x Time
Speed Metrics				
VOLT RT	ms	0.31	0.66	0.66
F2B RT	ms	0.90	0.45	0.73
AM RT [†]	ms	0.41	0.038	0.006
LOT RT [†]	ms	0.38	0.89	0.006
ERT RT	ms	0.18	0.62	0.90
MRT RT	ms	<0.001	0.12	0.18
DSST RT [†]	ms	0.94	<0.001	0.73
BART RT	ms	0.16	0.010	0.004
PVT Slowness [†]	10 – 1/s	0.45	0.35	0.18
MP RT [†]	ms	0.38	0.032	0.66
Accuracy Metrics				
VOLT Accuracy [†]	% [0-1]	0.73	0.84	0.26
F2B Accuracy [†]	% [0-1]	0.71	0.77	0.98
AM Accuracy [†]	% [0-1]	0.82	0.011	0.71
LOT Accuracy	% [0-1]	0.54	0.12	0.86
ERT Accuracy	% [0-1]	0.88	0.22	0.031
MRT Accuracy [†]	% [0-1]	0.68	0.028	0.16
DSST Accuracy [†]	% [0-1]	0.035	0.07	0.93
BART Risk Score	—	0.81	0.018	0.23
PVT Accuracy [†]	% [0-1]	0.87	0.84	0.88

975 *Table 3: Descriptions and attributes of the three computer-generated VR scenes.*

VR scene	Garden	Forest	Beach
Description	A small bamboo garden on a sunny day featuring a variety of vegetation (e.g., juniper, Japanese maple, and elm trees, rosemary, ginger lily, roses, hydrangeas) with a pond and island in the center.	A forest, in a valley between snowcapped mountains, composed of coniferous and deciduous trees with some sunny open lavender meadows.	A tropical beach near sunset with gentle ocean waves, large rock formations, and a palm tree jungle providing shady areas along the shore.
Sounds	Birds (e.g., cardinal, robin), frogs, wind, rustling leaves	Birds (e.g., finch, owl, woodpecker), insects (e.g., katydid, cricket), pond trickling, wind, rustling leaves	Birds (e.g., sandpiper, seagulls), insects (e.g., cicadas, crickets) ocean waves, wind, rustling grass
Scents	Fresh grass, rosemary, roses, blossom, and wet ground	Fresh grass, lavender, pine, and wet ground	Beach, fresh grass, and wet ground
Interactive items	Stones and sunflowers	Pinecones and mushrooms	Coconuts and starfish
Aquatic elements	Pond	Large pond	Ocean
Human-made elements	Benches, fences, bridge, path, and gazebo	Path and fences	Beach chair and umbrella
Approximate size	0.04 km ²	1.9 km ²	0.54 km ²

976

977