IAES Journal of Electrical and Electronics Engineering
Vol. 6, No. 2, December 2019, pp. 28~32
ISSN: 2338-7432, DOI: 10.11591/jeee.v6i2.pp28-32

Assistive directional guidance for blind people: a review of sensing technologies, navigation architectures, and human–machine interaction

Adeng Kesuma Hutomi[1], Hendril Satria Purnama[2], Anggit Pamungkas[2]
[1]Faculty of Industrial Technology, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
[2]Embedded Systems and Power Electronics Research Group, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received Jul 19, 2018
Revised Mar 6, 2019
Accepted Apr 20, 2019

Keywords:

Assistive navigation
Blind people
Computer vision
Electronic travel aids
Haptic feedback
Indoor positioning
Obstacle detection

ABSTRACT

Independent mobility remains a major challenge for people who are blind or have severe visual impairment, particularly in unfamiliar buildings, crowded streets, and complex road environments. Conventional mobility aids, especially the long cane and guide dog, remain essential, but they do not independently provide comprehensive information about distant obstacles, indoor routes, landmarks, or changing traffic conditions. This review examines electronic and computer-based directional guidance technologies reported up to 2018, with emphasis on sensing, localization, route planning, and user feedback. The reviewed approaches include ultrasonic and time-of-flight sensors, stereo and RGB-D vision, GPS and indoor positioning, wearable cameras, smart canes, robotic mobility platforms, and audio or vibrotactile interfaces. The literature indicates that combining complementary sensors can improve environmental awareness, while context-sensitive guidance can make instructions more useful than simple proximity alarms. However, positioning errors, limited battery life, environmental sensitivity, cognitive workload, cost, and insufficient real-world evaluation continue to restrict adoption. The review argues that assistive navigation should complement rather than replace established orientation and mobility skills. Future systems should prioritize dependable obstacle detection, seamless indoor–outdoor transitions, accessible interaction, and co-design with blind users.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA license.

1. INTRODUCTION

Independent navigation is an important component of social participation, education, employment, and everyday life for people who are blind or have severe visual impairment. Walking through unfamiliar environments requires the ability to identify obstacles, recognize landmarks, maintain orientation, interpret spatial information, and select safe routes. The long cane and guide dog remain fundamental mobility aids because they provide practical information about the immediate walking environment and support established orientation and mobility techniques. However, these conventional aids have limitations when detecting elevated obstacles, identifying distant destinations, recognizing signs, and navigating complex indoor environments [1], [2].

Electronic directional guidance systems have therefore attracted research interest as complementary technologies for improving environmental awareness and independent travel. These systems use sensors, embedded processors, positioning technologies, and communication interfaces to translate environmental information into understandable instructions. Their functions range from detecting nearby obstacles to estimating a user's position and providing route guidance through buildings or outdoor spaces. This review examines the development of these technologies up to 2018 and evaluates their technical principles, practical benefits, and remaining limitations.

2. REVIEW SCOPE AND RESEARCH PROBLEMS

The literature considered in this review covers electronic travel aids, wearable navigation devices, indoor and outdoor positioning systems, computer-vision-based guidance, and user-interface technologies published no later than 2018. The selected studies include journal articles, peer-reviewed conference papers, and research chapters with identifiable DOI records. The review organizes the literature according to four interconnected functions: environmental sensing, localization, route planning, and information delivery. This organization makes it possible to examine how individual technologies contribute to a complete navigation system rather than treating obstacle detection as the only measure of effectiveness.

Three recurring research problems emerge from the literature. First, a device must detect relevant hazards reliably without generating excessive false alarms or distracting the user from environmental sounds. Second, localization and route guidance must remain useful across different environments, including buildings where satellite positioning is unavailable or unreliable. Third, information must be communicated through accessible interfaces that users can understand while walking and using their conventional mobility aids. These problems establish the basis for the technical discussion and the recommendations presented in this review [1], [3]-[5].

3. SENSING TECHNOLOGIES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS

3.1. Ultrasonic and distance-based sensing

Ultrasonic sensing is one of the most widely investigated approaches for electronic obstacle detection because it is relatively simple, compact, and inexpensive. A sensor estimates the distance to an object by transmitting an ultrasonic signal and measuring the time required for its reflection to return. The measured distance can then be converted into an audio signal or vibration pattern that indicates the presence and approximate proximity of an obstacle. Bousbia-Salah et al. demonstrated a microcontroller-based navigation aid combining ultrasonic sensors, vibrators, and synthetic speech to provide obstacle information to blind users [3].

Distance-based systems can extend environmental awareness beyond the immediate contact range of a conventional cane. Nevertheless, ultrasonic measurements may be affected by object geometry, surface characteristics, sensor orientation, and environmental conditions. A narrow obstacle or an object with an unfavorable reflecting surface may not produce a reliable measurement. Consequently, ultrasonic sensing is most effective when integrated with appropriate sensor placement, filtering, and complementary detection methods.

3.2. Camera-based and depth-sensing technologies

Computer vision provides information that conventional distance sensors cannot easily obtain, including object appearance, structural features, and recognizable environmental landmarks. Stereo cameras estimate depth by comparing corresponding image features, while RGB-D systems combine color information with depth measurements. Ganz *et al.* [6], Rodríguez *et al.* [7] developed a stereo-vision obstacle detection system that used acoustic warnings to communicate detected hazards without completely occupying the user's hands or interrupting environmental hearing. Kanwal et al. subsequently demonstrated a navigation approach combining camera information and infrared depth sensing to identify obstacles and suggest safer movement directions [8]-[13].

Wearable vision systems have also been investigated for understanding walkable space and identifying meaningful objects. Wang et al. presented a wearable vision-based feedback system that combined a camera, embedded computing, computer vision, motion planning, and haptic communication [14]. Tian et al. examined RGB-D computer vision as an assistive technology for interpreting environmental information relevant to visually impaired users [8]. These approaches indicate that vision-based sensing can support richer scene understanding than distance-only detection, although performance remains dependent on lighting, camera position, processing capability, and environmental complexity [15].

3.3. Time-of-flight and multisensor integration

Time-of-flight sensors estimate distance by measuring the travel time of emitted light reflected from surrounding objects. Their compact form makes them suitable for wearable devices intended to detect obstacles without requiring physical contact. Katzschmann *et al.* [16] developed ALVU, a wearable system combining time-of-flight distance sensors with vibrotactile feedback to communicate nearby obstacles and physical boundaries. The study demonstrated the potential of combining spatial sensing with a tactile interface for local navigation.

Multisensor integration is important because individual sensing technologies have different strengths and weaknesses. Ultrasonic sensors can provide relatively simple distance measurements, while cameras can identify visual features and depth sensors can estimate spatial structure. Combining these

sources can improve the completeness of environmental information, provided that sensor alignment, processing delays, and conflicting measurements are properly managed. A practical design should therefore select sensors according to the hazards and environments that the device is intended to address.

4. POSITIONING AND DIRECTIONAL GUIDANCE

4.1. Outdoor navigation and global positioning

Outdoor navigation systems commonly rely on satellite-based positioning to estimate the user's location and support route guidance. GPS-based information can help users identify destinations, follow streets, and obtain directions over distances that are beyond the sensing range of wearable obstacle detectors. However, location estimates alone do not provide sufficient information about nearby obstacles, sidewalk conditions, or safe pedestrian crossings. A useful outdoor system must therefore combine route-level positioning with local environmental awareness and accessible instructions.

Crossing streets and identifying public transport are particularly important navigation tasks. Ivanchenko et al. introduced Crosswatch, a camera-phone system designed to help visually impaired pedestrians identify and orient themselves toward crosswalks [17]. Pan et al. developed a computer-vision-based system for detecting buses and recognizing route information, which could then be communicated through speech [15]. These studies illustrate that directional assistance should address meaningful travel tasks rather than simply provide a sequence of geographic coordinates.

4.2. Indoor positioning and navigation

Indoor navigation presents a different technical challenge because GPS signals are generally unavailable or insufficiently accurate inside buildings. Researchers have therefore explored alternatives such as RFID, sensor networks, computer vision, and infrastructure-assisted positioning. Guerrero *et al.* [5] proposed an indoor navigation system that estimates user movement, identifies possible obstacles along a trajectory, and provides navigation information through an interface designed with usability in mind. Ganz et al. introduced the PERCEPT system and evaluated its indoor navigation capabilities with blind and visually impaired participants in a multistory building [6].

RFID-based navigation offers another approach to indoor localization by using identifiable tags distributed throughout a building. Such systems can associate a user's detected position with stored information about rooms, corridors, and destinations. An RFID-based indoor navigation architecture for visually impaired and elderly users was presented by [18], demonstrating how localization and route guidance can be integrated into a single system. Despite these developments, infrastructure installation, maintenance, coverage, and map updates remain important considerations for practical deployment.

4.3. Route planning and context awareness

Accurate localization is only one part of a successful navigation system because users also need instructions that are appropriate to their current surroundings. Route planning should consider obstacles, corridor geometry, changes in direction, destination information, and the availability of accessible paths. Bousbia-Salah *et al.* [3] and Guerrero *et al.* [5] illustrate approaches that combine environmental information with movement guidance rather than relying exclusively on obstacle alarms. Cosgun *et al.* [12] investigated robot-like motion planning combined with a vibrotactile belt to guide a person toward a target while avoiding obstacles. Context-aware systems can make instructions more meaningful by distinguishing between different navigation situations. For example, an instruction to turn left is more useful when accompanied by a recognizable landmark or an indication of the distance to the turning point. Similarly, information about a staircase, doorway, elevator, or pedestrian crossing may be more important than a generic warning that an object is nearby. These considerations suggest that route planning should prioritize information according to its relevance to the user's immediate mobility task.

5. HUMAN–MACHINE INTERACTION AND USER EVALUATION

5.1. Audio and haptic feedback

The effectiveness of a navigation device depends not only on its ability to detect environmental features but also on how clearly it communicates the results. Audio feedback can convey spoken instructions, warning tones, and descriptions of nearby objects. Rodríguez *et al.* [7] used bone-conduction audio to communicate obstacle warnings while preserving access to important environmental sounds. Maidenbaum *et al.* [9] presented the EyeCane, which uses auditory and tactile feedback to extend the environmental information available through a conventional cane.

Haptic interfaces provide another communication channel through vibration patterns delivered to the hand, wrist, waist, or torso. Their main advantage is that directional information can be communicated without requiring continuous spoken instructions. Cosgun *et al.* [12] demonstrated the use of a vibrotactile belt for directional guidance, while Katzschmann *et al.* [16] used wearable vibration units to communicate obstacle proximity. However, users must learn the meaning of the vibration patterns, and poorly designed signals can create confusion or increase cognitive workload.

5.2. Smart canes and wearable devices

Smart canes combine the familiarity of conventional mobility aids with electronic sensing and feedback functions. Bhatlawande *et al.* [10] developed an electronic mobility cane intended to provide obstacle detection and wayfinding assistance through information about the surrounding environment. The EyeCane study also demonstrated how a familiar mobility-aid concept could be enhanced with electronic sensing and sensory substitution [9]. Wearable systems offer additional flexibility because sensors and feedback units can be placed on belts, clothing, or other body locations.

Nevertheless, the addition of electronics does not automatically make a device suitable for everyday use. Weight, comfort, battery life, durability, affordability, and compatibility with conventional mobility techniques all influence adoption. Velázquez discussed wearable assistive devices and the engineering considerations involved in their development [2]. Roentgen et al. evaluated two electronic mobility aids and found that user performance and satisfaction depended on device characteristics and individual preferences [11]. These findings emphasize the importance of evaluating devices with intended users rather than relying only on laboratory measurements.

6. TECHNICAL CHALLENGES AND RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES

Despite considerable progress, several challenges continue to limit the practical use of electronic directional guidance systems. Environmental sensing can be affected by lighting variation, reflective surfaces, moving objects, weather, and sensor blind spots. Localization may become unreliable in buildings with limited infrastructure or in outdoor environments where satellite signals are obstructed. Furthermore, the processing requirements of camera-based systems can increase power consumption, device size, and cost.

Human factors are equally important because navigation instructions must be understandable without overwhelming the user's attention. Excessive audio warnings may mask traffic sounds, while complex haptic patterns may require substantial training. Devices should also be compatible with established orientation and mobility practices, particularly the use of a long cane or guide dog. Research should therefore measure not only detection accuracy but also walking confidence, route completion, collision frequency, usability, and user acceptance.

Future development should prioritize hybrid architectures that combine complementary sensors with reliable positioning and context-aware route planning. Indoor and outdoor navigation should be connected through consistent interfaces so that users do not need to switch between unrelated systems when entering or leaving buildings. User-centered development should involve blind participants throughout the design, testing, and evaluation process. Long-term field trials in realistic environments are also necessary to determine whether laboratory improvements translate into safer and more independent mobility.

7. CONCLUSION

Electronic directional guidance technologies provide valuable opportunities to improve environmental awareness and independent mobility for blind people. Ultrasonic, time-of-flight, stereo-vision, RGB-D, GPS, and indoor positioning approaches address different aspects of obstacle detection and navigation. Audio and haptic interfaces translate the information produced by these technologies into accessible guidance, while smart canes and wearable systems offer practical platforms for everyday use. However, sensing limitations, positioning reliability, usability, affordability, and insufficient real-world validation remain significant barriers to widespread adoption. The most promising direction is the development of integrated, user-centered systems that complement conventional mobility aids and established orientation skills. Ultimately, successful assistive navigation should be judged by its contribution to safe, understandable, and genuinely independent travel.

REFERENCES

[1] D. Dakopoulos and N. G. Bourbakis, "Wearable obstacle avoidance electronic travel aids for blind: A survey," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part C: Applications and Reviews*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 25–35, 2010. doi: 10.1109/TSMCC.2009.2021255.

[2] R. Velázquez, "Wearable assistive devices for the blind," in *Wearable and Autonomous Biomedical Devices and Systems for Smart Environment*, Lecture Notes in Electrical Engineering, vol. 75, pp. 331–349, 2010. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-15687-8_17.

[3] M. Bousbia-Salah, M. Bettayeb, and A. Larbi, "A navigation aid for blind people," *Journal of Intelligent & Robotic Systems*, vol. 64, pp. 387–400, 2011. doi: 10.1007/s10846-011-9555-7.

[4] T. H. Riehle, P. Lichter, and N. A. Giudice, "An indoor navigation system to support the visually impaired," in *Proceedings of the 2008 IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society Conference*, pp. 4435–4438, 2008. doi: 10.1109/IEMBS.2008.4650195.

[5] L. A. Guerrero, F. Vasquez, and S. F. Ochoa, "An indoor navigation system for the visually impaired," *Sensors*, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 8236–8258, 2012. doi: 10.3390/s120608236.

[6] A. Ganz, J. Schafer, S. Gandhi, E. Puleo, C. Wilson, and M. Robertson, "PERCEPT indoor navigation system for the blind and visually impaired: Architecture and experimentation," *International Journal of Telemedicine and Applications*, vol. 2012, Art. no. 894869, 2012. doi: 10.1155/2012/894869.

[7] A. Rodríguez, J. J. Yebes, P. F. Alcantarilla, L. M. Bergasa, J. Almazán, and A. Cela, "Assisting the visually impaired: Obstacle detection and warning system by acoustic feedback," *Sensors*, vol. 12, no. 12, pp. 17476–17496, 2012. doi: 10.3390/s121217476.

[8] Y. Tian, "RGB-D sensor-based computer vision assistive technology for visually impaired persons," in *Advances in Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2014. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-08651-4_9.

[9] S. Maidenbaum *et al.*, "The 'EyeCane', a new electronic travel aid for the blind: Technology, behavior & swift learning," *Restorative Neurology and Neuroscience*, vol. 32, no. 6, pp. 813–824, 2014. doi: 10.3233/RNN-130351.

[10] S. Bhatlawande, M. Mahadevappa, J. Mukherjee, M. Biswas, D. Das, and S. Gupta, "Design, development, and clinical evaluation of the electronic mobility cane for vision rehabilitation," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 1148–1159, 2014. doi: 10.1109/TNSRE.2014.2324974.

[11] U. R. Roentgen, G. J. Gelderblom, and L. P. de Witte, "User evaluation of two electronic mobility aids for persons who are visually impaired: A quasi-experimental study using a standardized mobility course," *Assistive Technology*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 110–120, 2012. doi: 10.1080/10400435.2012.659794.

[12] A. Cosgun, E. A. Sisbot, and H. I. Christensen, "Guidance for human navigation using a vibro-tactile belt interface and robot-like motion planning," in *Proceedings of the 2014 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 6350–6355, 2014. doi: 10.1109/ICRA.2014.6907796.

[13] N. Kanwal, E. Bostanci, K. Currie, and A. F. Clark, "A navigation system for the visually impaired: A fusion of vision and depth sensor," *Applied Bionics and Biomechanics*, vol. 2015, Art. no. 479857, 2015. doi: 10.1155/2015/479857.

[14] H.-C. Wang, R. K. Katzschmann, S. Teng, B. Araki, L. Giarré, and D. Rus, "Enabling independent navigation for visually impaired people through a wearable vision-based feedback system," in *Proceedings of the 2017 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 6533–6540, 2017. doi: 10.1109/ICRA.2017.7989772.

[15] H. Pan, C. Yi, and Y. Tian, "A primary travelling assistant system of bus detection and recognition for visually impaired people," in *Proceedings of the 2013 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo Workshops*, 2013. doi: 10.1109/ICMEW.2013.6618346.

[16] R. K. Katzschmann, B. Araki, and D. Rus, "Safe local navigation for visually impaired users with a time-of-flight and haptic feedback device," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 583–593, 2018. doi: 10.1109/TNSRE.2018.2800665.

[17] V. Ivanchenko, J. Coughlan, and H. Shen, "Crosswatch: A camera phone system for orienting visually impaired pedestrians at traffic intersections," in *Computers Helping People with Special Needs*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 5105, pp. 1122–1128, 2008. doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-70540-6_168.

[18] C. Tsirmpas, A. Rompas, O. Fokou, and D. Koutsouris, "An indoor navigation system for visually impaired and elderly people based on radio frequency identification (RFID)," *Information Sciences*, vol. 320, pp. 288–305, 2015. doi: 10.1016/j.ins.2014.08.011.