

1-2021

Provider Perceptions of Virtual Reality as a Therapeutic Tool

Christine Vincent

Thomas Jefferson University, christine.vincent@students.jefferson.edu

Margaret Eberts

Thomas Jefferson University, margaret.eberts@students.jefferson.edu

Tejal U. Naik

Thomas Jefferson University, tejal.naik@jefferson.edu

C. Virginia O'Hayer

Thomas Jefferson University, virginia.ohayer@jefferson.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://jdc.jefferson.edu/si_dh_2023_phase1



Part of the [Therapeutics Commons](#)

[Let us know how access to this document benefits you](#)

Recommended Citation

Vincent, Christine; Eberts, Margaret; Naik, Tejal U.; and O'Hayer, C. Virginia, "Provider Perceptions of Virtual Reality as a Therapeutic Tool" (2021). *Phase 1*. Paper 7.

https://jdc.jefferson.edu/si_dh_2023_phase1/7

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Jefferson Digital Commons. The Jefferson Digital Commons is a service of Thomas Jefferson University's [Center for Teaching and Learning \(CTL\)](#). The Commons is a showcase for Jefferson books and journals, peer-reviewed scholarly publications, unique historical collections from the University archives, and teaching tools. The Jefferson Digital Commons allows researchers and interested readers anywhere in the world to learn about and keep up to date with Jefferson scholarship. This article has been accepted for inclusion in Phase 1 by an authorized administrator of the Jefferson Digital Commons. For more information, please contact: JeffersonDigitalCommons@jefferson.edu.

SKMC Class of 2023: SI/DH Abstract

Word count: 243

Title: Provider Perceptions of Virtual Reality as a Therapeutic Tool

Christine Vincent; Margaret Eberts, Tejal Naik MD*, Virginia O’Hayer PhD***

Introduction: Virtual reality (VR) can be an effective healthcare tool, particularly applied to anxiety and pain management. Despite significant interest in VR, lack of resources and knowledge regarding feasibility are barriers to implementation. This study aims to understand the current clinical usage of VR and the achievability of VR as a standardized therapy, by assessing VR healthcare providers.

Methods: An online, self-administered questionnaire with five sections—respondent demographics, VR value, onboarding, billing, and clinical use—was distributed. Providers, identified on VR application websites, were contacted via email. Inclusion criteria was providers in the United States using VR actively or in the past year as a therapeutic tool. Twenty-two responses were received, and four excluded due to incomplete data.

Results: Providers most commonly reported using VR for acute pain/anxiety (N=11, 61.1%), followed by specific and social phobia (N=6, 33.3% each). Providers expressed greatest interest in extending VR use to chronic and acute pain patients. All providers agreed VR is a valuable tool they would recommend to colleagues. The majority (N=15, 93.8%) believed VR helped their patients progress in treatment, compared with other methods. Providers cited the ability to individualize treatment (N=14, 87.5%) and increase patient engagement (N=15, 93.8%) as main

benefits of VR. A minority reported negative feedback from patients (N=4, 25.0% content-related; N=6, 37.5% technology-related), whereas all reported some form of positive feedback.

Discussion: VR is a treatment adjunct that is well-received by patients and providers, allowing increased patient engagement and treatment individualization.