

# UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

# Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Virtual Reality in Pediatrics

Effects on Pain and Anxiety

Eijlers, R.; Utens, E.M.W.J.; Staals, L.M.; de Nijs, P.F.A.; Berghmans, J.M.; Wijnen, R.M.H.; Hillegers, M.H.J.; Dierckx, B.; Legerstee, J.S.

DOI 10.1213/ANE.000000000004165

Publication date 2019 Document Version Final published version Published in

Anesthesia and Analgesia

CC BY-NC-ND

Link to publication

# Citation for published version (APA):

Eijlers, R., Utens, E. M. W. J., Staals, L. M., de Nijs, P. F. A., Berghmans, J. M., Wijnen, R. M. H., Hillegers, M. H. J., Dierckx, B., & Legerstee, J. S. (2019). Systematic Review and Metaanalysis of Virtual Reality in Pediatrics: Effects on Pain and Anxiety. *Anesthesia and Analgesia*, *129*(5), 1344-1353. https://doi.org/10.1213/ANE.000000000004165

# General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

# **Disclaimer/Complaints regulations**

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (https://dare.uva.nl)

# Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Virtual Reality in Pediatrics: Effects on Pain and Anxiety

Robin Eijlers, MSc,\* Elisabeth M. W. J. Utens, PhD,\*†‡ Lonneke M. Staals, MD, PhD,§ Pieter F. A. de Nijs, MD, PhD,\* Johan M. Berghmans, MD,\* René M. H. Wijnen, MD, PhD,¶ Manon H. J. Hillegers, MD, PhD,\* Bram Dierckx, MD, PhD,\* and Jeroen S. Legerstee, PhD\*

**BACKGROUND:** Medical procedures often evoke pain and anxiety in pediatric patients. Virtual reality (VR) is a relatively new intervention that can be used to provide distraction during, or to prepare patients for, medical procedures. This meta-analysis is the first to collate evidence on the effective-ness of VR on reducing pain and anxiety in pediatric patients undergoing medical procedures.

**METHODS:** On April 25, 2018, we searched EMBASE, MEDLINE, CENTRAL, PubMed, Web of Science, and PsycINFO with the keywords "VR," "children," and "adolescents." Studies that applied VR in a somatic setting with participants <21 years of age were included. VR was defined as a fully immersive 3-dimensional environment displayed in surround stereoscopic vision on a head-mounted display (HMD). We evaluated pain and anxiety outcomes during medical procedures in VR and standard care conditions.

**RESULTS:** We identified 2889 citations, of which 17 met our inclusion criteria. VR was applied as distraction (n = 16) during venous access, dental, burn, or oncological care or as exposure (n = 1) before elective surgery under general anesthesia. The effect of VR was mostly studied in patients receiving burn care (n = 6). The overall weighted standardized mean difference (SMD) for VR was 1.30 (95% Cl, 0.68–1.91) on patient-reported pain (based on 14 studies) and 1.32 (95% Cl, 0.21–2.44) on patient-reported anxiety (based on 7 studies). The effect of VR on pediatric pain was also significant when observed by caregivers (SMD = 2.08; 95% Cl, 0.55–3.61) or professionals (SMD = 3.02; 95% Cl, 0.79–2.25). For anxiety, limited observer data were available.

**CONCLUSIONS:** VR research in pediatrics has mainly focused on distraction. Large effect sizes indicate that VR is an effective distraction intervention to reduce pain and anxiety in pediatric patients undergoing a wide variety of medical procedures. However, further research on the effect of VR exposure as a preparation tool for medical procedures is needed because of the paucity of research into this field. (Anesth Analg 2019;129:1344–53)

# **KEY POINTS**

- **Question:** Is virtual reality (VR) effective in reducing pain and anxiety in pediatric patients undergoing medical procedures?
- **Findings:** VR was most often used as a distraction method during medical procedures and was found to be significantly more effective in reducing pain (14 studies) and anxiety (7 studies), with large effect sizes, than care as usual (CAU).
- **Meaning:** VR can be used effectively as a distraction method in clinical practice, but more research is needed to establish evidence on VR exposure as a preparation tool for medical procedures.

From the \*Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry/Psychology, Erasmus Medical Center-Sophia Children's Hospital, Rotterdam, the Netherlands; †Research Institute of Child Development and Education, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands; ‡Academic Center for Child Psychiatry, The Bascule/Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Academic Medical Center, Amsterdam, the Netherlands; §Department of Anesthesiology, Erasmus Medical Center-Sophia Children's Hospital, Rotterdam, the Netherlands; *IDepartment of Anesthesia, ZNA Middelheim, Queen Paola Children's Hospital, Antwerp, Belgium; and IIntensive Care and Department of Pediatric Surgery, Erasmus Medical Center-Sophia Children's Hospital, Rotterdam, the Netherlands.* 

Funding: This research is funded by the Zilveren Kruis foundation (project No. 2015233) and the Coolsingel foundation (project No. 401).

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Reprints will not be available from the authors.

Address correspondence to Elisabeth M. W. J. Utens, PhD, Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry/Psychology, Erasmus Medical Center-Sophia Children's Hospital, KP-2865, Wytemaweg 8, 3015 CN, Rotterdam, the Netherlands. Address e-mail to e.utens@erasmusmc.nl.

Copyright © 2019 The Author(s). Published by Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. on behalf of the International Anesthesia Research Society. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives License 4.0 (CCBY-NC-ND), where it is permissible to download and share the work provided it is properly cited. The work cannot be changed in any way or used commercially without permission from the journal. DOI: 10.1213/ANE.000000000004165

edical procedures often evoke pain, distress, and anxiety.<sup>1</sup> Especially in children, these feelings not only severely affect comfort levels during medical procedures but are also associated with adverse consequences, such as attempts to escape,<sup>2</sup> poor recovery,<sup>3</sup> eating and sleeping disturbances,<sup>3</sup> and posttraumatic stress symptoms.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, as pain and anxiety can lead to avoidance of health care,<sup>5,6</sup> interventions are needed to address pain and anxiety in pediatric patients.

Distraction is a commonly applied intervention during medical procedures. For example, the use of music<sup>7,8</sup> and movies<sup>9,10</sup> has been proven efficacious in reducing pain and anxiety. Virtual reality (VR) is a relatively new technique to provide distraction and might be more effective than traditional methods. VR consists of a computer-generated environment, in which orientation and 3-dimensional interaction are possible. This environment is projected right in front of the user's eyes via advanced head-mounted displays (HMDs), including a wide field of view and motion tracking systems.<sup>11</sup> VR can create full immersion, which is a feeling of presence in the virtual environment.<sup>11,12</sup> Importantly, more immersion is related to more pain reduction, because

Accepted for publication February 27, 2019.

less attention is available for pain perception.<sup>13,14</sup> VR is especially engaging for children, as they often become truly captivated by imaginative play.<sup>15</sup> Beyond providing distraction, VR can also alleviate pain and anxiety by providing exposure. Recently, VR exposure has been applied in a more preventive manner, to make patients feel at ease and increase their familiarity with the medical procedures and environments.<sup>16,17</sup> This preprocedural application of VR has not been thoroughly evaluated yet.

While the amount of research investigating the effect of VR on alleviating pain and anxiety has increased over the past years, studies are often small and encompass a wide variety of medical procedures. This emphasizes the need for a systematic evaluation of VR in pediatric populations. Although some reviews are available on the effectiveness of VR on pain,<sup>18,19</sup> the effectiveness on anxiety has received little attention. This is remarkable, because anxiety can intensify pain.<sup>20</sup> Only 1 meta-analysis is available on VR interventions,<sup>21</sup> but no meta-analysis has specifically focused on children. This distinction is important, because children are potentially even more affected by discomfort of medical procedures and might experience VR differently than adults.

In this meta-analysis, we will collate evidence on the effectiveness of VR as either a distraction or an exposure tool, compared to standard care, on pain and anxiety in pediatric patients undergoing medical procedures.

#### **METHODS**

We followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) guidelines for the reporting of meta-analyses of randomized controlled trials (RCTs).<sup>22</sup>

#### **Selection Criteria**

Studies reporting on the effect of VR on reducing pain and/ or anxiety in pediatric patients ≤21 years of age undergoing medical procedures were considered eligible for the systematic review. VR was defined as a fully immersive 3-dimensional computer-generated environment displayed in surround stereoscopic vision on an HMD. Studies that used 360° videos, which are not computer generated, displayed on a VR HMD were considered eligible as well. Studies were included in the meta-analysis if they had at least the following data available: a mean or median score for pain or anxiety during the procedure, as well as a measure of dispersion, for both the intervention and standard care groups. If not available, we requested these data by contacting the authors.

Exclusion criteria were the application of VR in nonsomatic patients samples, audiovisual glasses that offer visual and audio stimulation but do not allow interaction between the user and the computer-generated world, or no distinction made between pediatric and adult patients. Reviews, meta-analyses, single-case studies, dissertations, conference papers, and abstracts were excluded as well.

#### Search Strategy

An exhaustive search in the following electronic databases was established and conducted by a biomedical information specialist on April 25, 2018 for articles published in English: EMBASE, MEDLINE, CENTRAL, PubMed, Web of Science, and PsycINFO. No date limit was applied to the search. The search terms "VR" and "children" or "adolescents" were used. For each database, different search strategies were developed. Table 1 gives an overview of the search terms that were used.

# **Data Extraction**

A detailed overview of the study selection process is shown in Figure 1. The search yielded 2889 articles. Two of the authors (R.E. and P.F.A.d.N.) first assessed the identified studies for compliance with the inclusion and exclusion criteria, independently. Discrepancies (2%) were discussed until consensus was reached. Based on title and abstract, 44 of the 2889 studies were included. Next, both authors screened the full texts of these articles, independently. Discrepancies (16%) were discussed until consensus was reached. We excluded 27 of the 44 studies. Most of these studies (n = 11) were excluded because they did not use VR. Other reasons included, but were not limited to, overlap with a different age group or no inclusion of pediatric patients (see Figure 1). The final 17 studies were included.

#### **Assessment of Study Quality**


Two authors (R.E. and P.F.A.d.N.) independently evaluated the included studies with the Delphi list<sup>23</sup> (Table 2) to evaluate their methodologic quality. The Delphi list is often used in systematic reviews and is able to measure internal validity, external validity, and statistical aspects.<sup>23</sup> The Delphi list contains of 9 items, with equal weights, which can be evaluated as satisfactory (yes: scored 1) or nonsatisfactory (no: scored 0). Discrepancies in scores (17%) were discussed until consensus was reached.

For our assessment, criterion 7 ("Was the patient blinded?") was omitted, as it is impossible to be blinded to wearing a VR HMD or not. Consequently, the maximum possible score for studies in this review was 8 points.

Criteria 5 ("Was the outcome assessor blinded?") and 6 ("Was the care provider blinded?") also concern blinding but were not omitted, as these criteria could be either

Table 1	. Literature Search Terms Use	d for Keywords <sup>a</sup>
No.	Keywords	Included
1	Virtual reality	Virtual reality, virtual reality exposure therapy
2	Children	Boy, child, childhood, girl, infant, kid, pediatrics, preschool, school, toddler
3	Adolescents	Adolescence, adolescent, high school, juvenile, minor, prepubescent, prepuberty, pubescent, puberty, teen, teenager, underaged, youth
	1 AND 2 OR 3	

<sup>a</sup>The following electronic databases were searched: EMBASE, MEDLINE, CENTRAL, PubMed, Web of Science, and PsycINFO.



**Figure 1.** Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) flowchart of study selection.

Table 2. Delphi List for Quality Assessment of Randomized Clinical Trials	
Criteria	Evaluation
1. Treatment allocation: Was a method of randomization performed?	Yes (1)/No (0)
2. Treatment allocation: Was the treatment allocation concealed?	Yes (1)/No (0)
3. Were the groups similar at baseline regarding the most important prognostic indicators?	Yes (1)/No (0)
4. Were the eligibility criteria specified?	Yes (1)/No (0)
5. Was the outcome assessor blinded? <sup>a</sup>	Yes (1)/No (0)
6. Was the care provider blinded? <sup>a</sup>	Yes (1)/No (0)
7. Was the patient blinded? [omitted] <sup>b</sup>	
8. Were point estimates and measures of variability presented for the primary outcome measures?	Yes (1)/No (0)
9. Did the analyses include an intention-to-treat analysis?	Yes (1)/No (0)

<sup>a</sup>The applicability of criteria 5 and 6 depends on the moment at which virtual reality was applied. When virtual reality was applied before the medical procedure and outcome assessment, the maximum possible score was 8. When virtual reality was applied during the medical procedure and outcome assessment, the maximum possible score was 6.

<sup>b</sup>Criterion 7 was not applicable.

applicable (when VR was applied before the medical procedure and outcome assessment) or nonapplicable (when VR was applied during the medical procedure and outcome assessment).

#### **Synthesis of Results**

For the purpose of this systematic review and meta-analysis, we did not include data on distress, maladaptive behavior, nor physiological measures of arousal, such as heart rate. We only included data on pain and anxiety outcomes based on behavioral observations, self-reports, or questionnaires.

Mean scores and SDs for pain and anxiety during the procedure in VR intervention and standard care conditions were either extracted from articles, calculated using median scores and interquartile ranges, or received from authors. Other non–VR intervention conditions were not taken into account in our analyses. Data were entered into a worksheet in Comprehensive Meta-analysis software version 2 (Biostat Inc, Englewood, NJ) by 2 authors (R.E. and B.D.). The following data were also collated and entered into Comprehensive Meta-analysis: first author, publication year, title of study, sample size per condition, mean age per condition, medical procedure, assessment instruments, quality score, informant, and study design. We used patients as primary source of data within each study, because pain and anxiety are subjective experiences. Observations of pain and anxiety made by caregivers and professionals (eg, nurse or researcher) were also entered into the worksheet. Assessment instruments for pain and anxiety were classed as either visual scales (ie, visual analog, graphic rating, and different faces scales) or questionnaires. Study design was divided into parallel or crossover designs. For crossover designs, data from the first period only, that is, before crossover, were included when available. When authors merely provided combined data from both periods, as if groups were parallel, these data were used. When data were available on different components of pain (eg, cognitive, affective, and sensory pain) the sensory component of pain was used in the meta-analysis.

Pain and anxiety were analyzed separately. Effect sizes were generated as standardized mean difference (SMD) by calculating the mean difference on pain or anxiety outcomes between VR and standard care conditions during the procedure and dividing the result by the pooled SD.

Meta-analyses for either pain or anxiety were conducted for overall effect sizes of VR compared to control conditions. Because of the heterogeneity of studies, a random-effects model was used. Sensitivity analyses were performed by removing the study with the largest effect size and studies with low methodological quality (ie, a quality score of 0-2) from both meta-analyses. Separate sensitivity analyses were run for type of medical procedure. Furthermore, we investigated whether informant affected VR effectivity. To achieve a more reliable estimate of effect sizes, we also excluded outlying and low-quality studies from these analyses. To explore if young children respond differently to VR interventions than older children, a meta-regression analysis was performed with mean age of the study samples as predictor and a randomeffects model (with methods of moments).

Heterogeneity was assessed using the  $l^2$  statistic, with values  $\geq$ 75% indicating substantial heterogeneity.<sup>24</sup> In case of substantial heterogeneity, subanalyses were performed to explore sources of heterogeneity. Publication bias was assessed with funnel plot asymmetry and Egger tests.<sup>25</sup> All analyses were performed using Comprehensive Meta-analysis software version 2.

### RESULTS

#### **Study Characteristics**

Table 3 summarizes the main characteristics and results of the studies. We organized the final 17 studies based on the type of medical procedure. In 16 studies, VR was applied as a distraction technique during dental care (n = 2),<sup>26,27</sup> burn care (n = 6),<sup>28-33</sup> oncological care (n = 4),<sup>34-37</sup> or venous access (n = 4).<sup>38-41</sup> Oncological care includes quite heterogeneous procedures (ie, lumbar puncture),<sup>35</sup> port access (piercing of the skin to access a previously implanted catheter in the chest for chemotherapy),<sup>36,37</sup> or chemotherapy.<sup>34</sup> Only 1 study applied VR preprocedurally, before elective surgery under general anesthesia (n = 1).<sup>42</sup> The studies were conducted between 1999 and 2018. The number of included patients of the studies varied between 7 and 143, with a median of 38.

Fourteen studies were RCTs, of which 10 used a parallel design and 4 studies a crossover design. All RCTs compared the VR intervention group to care as usual (CAU). CAU was often not well defined. However, CAU varied widely and could involve either no distraction or rather intensive distraction, such as watching television or listening to music. Moreover, not all studies made clear whether or not parents remained present during the procedure, nor which pharmacological analgesia were used. Three RCTs added a third condition to their designs: movie distraction,<sup>32</sup> playing a non–VR computer game,<sup>36</sup> or applying external cold and vibration.<sup>40</sup> The 3 non–RCTs trials were quasi-experimental, of which 2 did not use randomization,<sup>26,39</sup> while the other study used an interrupted time series design with removed treatment.<sup>34</sup>

The age range of participants for 16 of the 17 studies varied between 4 and 21 years. One study reported a mean age of 6.5 years but did not indicate the age range.<sup>29</sup> Studies were heterogeneous regarding VR environments (software) and VR hardware.

#### **Study Quality Assessment**

We assessed all included studies with the Delphi list<sup>23</sup> to evaluate their methodologic quality. Blinding of the outcome assessor and caregiver (criteria 5 and 6 of the Delphi list) was only applicable to the study of Ryu et al<sup>42</sup> because they applied VR before, instead of during, the medical procedure. Therefore, the maximum possible score for this study was 8, while for the other studies, the maximum possible score was 6 (as the 2 criteria regarding blinding were not applicable).

The included studies varied in quality, as the quality scores ranged between 0 and 6 (see Table 3 for quality scores). The average quality score was 3.5 (SD = 1.7). Most studies had moderate quality, whereas 5 studies had high quality (ie, a maximum score, or 1 point below maximum). Four studies had poor quality (ie, a score of 0–2). Even though in 76% (n = 13) a method of randomization was performed, only 18% (n = 3) of the studies guaranteed a concealed treatment allocation. The majority of studies stated that a randomization scheme or table was used, but not enough information was provided to ensure that the allocation procedure was not transparent before assignment. In more than half of the studies, groups were similar at baseline regarding characteristics such as age, sex, and degree of injury (n = 10, 59%). Inclusion and exclusion criteria were not described precisely enough for 6 studies (35%). Seven studies (41%) included intention-to-treat analysis.

Other specific findings that could have influenced study quality were as follows: initially, Das et al<sup>28</sup> (burn care) only included patients who experienced burns for the first time, but they let some patients participate more than once (ie, 11 trials were undertaken from 7 patients). Piskorz and Czub<sup>39</sup> (venous access) let children play a VR game. If they enjoyed it, these children were included in the VR condition. Afterward, the authors collected data for the control group (who had not tried out the VR game). Gerceker et al<sup>40</sup> excluded all unsuccessful phlebotomy attempts from their analyses (ie, when there was no blood flow into the tube within 5 seconds during the first attempt). Ryu et al<sup>42</sup> observed less anxiety during the preoperative period but did not assess anxiety during induction of anesthesia, when anxiety peaks.

#### Virtual Reality and Pain Management

As shown in Figure 2, effect sizes for patient-reported pain could be generated for 14 of the 17 studies. For 2 studies, means and SDs were calculated using median values and interquartile ranges.<sup>32,35</sup> Calculated effect sizes were positive when VR reduced pain more than CAU. Across all studies, using a random-effects model, the weighted effect size of VR on pediatric pain during a medical procedure was large (SMD = 1.30; 95% CI, 0.68–1.91; P < .001). This indicated a substantial clinical benefit, but heterogeneity of study

Table 3. Characteristics and Results of Included Studies That Report on the Effectiveness of Virtual Reality on Pain and Anxiety in Pediatric

s in anxiety based on K ing test after procedure prted pain (faces) and s in VR than CAU during f orted pain (faces scale) in VR than CAU in VR than CAU s in self-reported pain ( procedure	differences in anxiety based on Kop figure drawing test after procedure as self-reported pain (faces) and star (MCDA [f]) in VR than CAU during pro (MCDA [f]) in VR than CAU during pro procedure in VR than CAU differences in self-reported pain (FP and after procedure as self-reported cognitive, affective, apain (GRS) in VR than CAU during pr	s in anxiety based on K ing test after procedure in VR than CAU during p arted pain (faces) and st in VR than CAU during p in VR than CAU vrocedure orted cognitive, affective orted cognitive, affective in VR than CAU during p AU. No differences in sel erved pain (FLACC) during p in VR than in non–VR di in VR than in non–VR di in VR than in non–VR di in VR than in non–VR di	s in anxiety based on Koppitz ing test after procedure arted pain (faces) and stated a in VR than CAU during proced arted pain (faces scale) during in VR than CAU in VR than CAU arted cognitive, affective, and s arted cognitive, affective, and s in VR than CAU during procedu AU. No differences in self-repoi erved pain (YAS) during procedu at CAU in VR than in non-VR distracti an CAU in VR than in non-VR distracti an CAU arted pain (faces) during, less p arted pain (faces) during, and a creher-observed pain (FLACC) during an CAU	s in anxiety based on Koppitz huma ing test after procedure orted pain (faces) and stated anxiet in VR than CAU during procedure orted pain (faces scale) during in VR than CAU in VR than CAU s in self-reported pain (FPS-r) during procedure orted cognitive, affective, and sense orted cognitive, affective, and sense orted cognitive, affective, and sense in VR than CAU during procedure in aU. No differences in self-reported ( erved pain (YAS) during procedure orted pain (VAS) during, less parent an CAU in VR than in non-VR distraction bu an CAU orted pain (FLACC) during ses parent adre in VR than date, a cher-observed pain (FLACC) during adre in VR than CAU s in self-reported state anxiety (sta s in self-reported state anxiety (sta	No differences in anxiety based on Koppitz human figure drawing test after procedure Less self-reported pain (faces) and stated anxiety (MCDA [f]) in VR than CAU during procedure (MCDA [f]) in VR than CAU during procedure Less self-reported pain (FPS-r) during procedure in VR than CAU No differences in self-reported pain (FPS-r) during and after procedure Less self-reported cognitive, affective, and sensory pain (GRS) in VR than CAU during procedure in VR than CAU. No differences in self-reported or pain (GRS) in VR than INAN during procedure or VR than CAU. No differences in self-reported or pain (GRS) in VR than in non-VR distraction but nor less than CAU. Less self-reported pain (VAS) during procedure ferses self-reported pain (VAS) during procedure ferses self-reported pain (YAS) during mod after procedure in VR than CAU No differences in self-reported pain (FLACC) during and less researcher-observed pain (FLACC) during and less researcher-observed pain (YAS) during procedure trait anxiety inventory for children-1) during procedure No differences in self-reported pain (VAS) during procedure	s in anxiety based on Koppitz human ing test after procedure orted pain (faces) and stated anxiety in VR than CAU during procedure arted pain (faces scale) during in VR than CAU during procedure in VR than CAU s in self-reported pain (FPS-r) during procedure arted cognitive, affective, and sensory in VR than CAU during procedure in arted cognitive, affective, and sensory in VR than CAU during procedure in AU. No differences in self-reported or erved pain (VAS) during procedure arted pain (VAS) during, less parent- bain (VAS) before, during, less parent- bain (VAS) before, during, less parent- and cher-observed pain (FLACC) during and dure in VR than CAU s in self-reported state anxiety (state- y inventory for children-1) during bserved pain (VAS) in VR and non-VR than CAU during procedure is in self-reported pain (VAS) during than CAU during procedure is in researcher-observed pain (VAS) during procedure
ss self-reported pain (faces) and s (MCDA [f]) in VR than CAU during <sub>f</sub> (MCDA [f]) in VR than CAU during <sub>f</sub> ss self-reported pain (faces scale) procedure in VR than CAU differences in self-reported pain ( and after procedure	orted pain (faces) and sta in VR than CAU during pro orted pain (faces scale) di in VR than CAU si n self-reported pain (FP orcedure orted cognitive, affective, i ) in VR than CAU during pr	in VR than CAU during p in VR than CAU during p orted pain (faces scale) in VR than CAU s: in self-reported pain (f procedure orted cognitive, affective ) in VR than CAU during p ad U. No differences in sel served pain (FLACC) during p ad U. No differences in sel served pain (APPT-WRGS) in VR than in non-VR di nan CAU	in VR than CAU during proced in VR than CAU during proced orted pain (faces scale) during in VR than CAU in VR than CAU procedure orted cognitive, affective, and s in VR than CAU during procedu AU. No differences in self-repoi eerved pain (YAS) during procedu AU. No differences in self-repoi in VR than in non-VR distracti an CAU orted pain (faces) during, less p pain (VAS) before, during, less p codure in VA than CAU	Less self-reported pain (faces) and stated anxiet (MCDA [f]) in VR than CAU during procedure Less self-reported pain (FPS-r) during procedure in VR than CAU No differences in self-reported pain (FPS-r) during and after procedure Less self-reported cognitive, affective, and sense pain (GRS) in VR than CAU during procedure in VR than CAU. No differences in self-reported o parent-observed pain (APPT-WRGS) during procedure parent-observed pain (APPT-WRGS) during procedure Less self-reported pain (APPT-WRGS) during procedure in VR than CAU. No differences in self-reported o procedure in VR than in non–VR distraction bund less self-reported pain (APPT-WRGS) during arean brocedure in VR than in non–VR distraction bund tess self-reported pain (FLACC) during and after, a differences in self-reported pain (FLACC) during arean brocedure in VR than CAU Not differences in self-reported state anxiety (stated arean arean differences in self-reported state anxiety (stated arean arean brocedure in VR than CAU No differences in self-reported state anxiety (stated arean arean procedure in VR than CAU No differences in self-reported state anxiety (stated arean arean procedure in VR than CAU	Less self-reported pain (faces) and stated anxiety (MCDA [f]) in VR than CAU during procedure Less self-reported pain (FPS-r) during procedure in VR than CAU No differences in self-reported pain (FPS-r) during and after procedure Less self-reported cognitive, affective, and sensory pain (GRS) in VR than CAU during procedure in VR than CAU. No differences in self-reported or parent-observed pain (YAS) during procedure in VR than CAU. No differences in self-reported or parent-observed pain (APPT-WRGS) during procedure in VR than in non–VR distraction but not less than CAU Less self-reported pain (APPT-WRGS) during procedure in VR than in non–VR distraction but not less than CAU No differences in self-reported pain (FLACC) during and after procedure in VR than CAU No differences in self-reported state anxiety (state- trait anxiety inventory for children-1) during procedure No differences in self-reported pain (VAS) during procedure	Less self-reported pain (faces) and stated anxiety (MCDA [f]) in VR than CAU during procedure Less self-reported pain (FPS-r) during procedure in VR than CAU No differences in self-reported pain (FPS-r) during and after procedure pain (GRS) in VR than CAU during procedure pain (GRS) in VR than CAU during procedure in VR than CAU. No differences in self-reported or parent-observed pain (YAS) during procedure in VR than CAU. No differences in self-reported or parent-observed pain (YAS) during mocedure in VR than CAU. No differences in self-reported or parent-observed pain (YAS) during mocedure in VR than CAU. No differences in self-reported or parent-observed pain (YAS) during mocedure in VR than CAU Outing mocedure in VR than in non-VR distraction but not less than CAU Mo differences in self-reported pain (FLACC) during and after procedure in VR than CAU No differences in self-reported state anxiety (state- trait anxiety inventory for children-1) during procedure No differences in self-reported pain (VAS) during procedure No differences in self-reported pain (VAS) during procedure No differences in self-reported pain (VAS) in VR and non-VR distraction than CAU during procedure No differences in researcher-observed pain (CHEOPS), self-reported or parent-observed pain
rted pain (faces scale) n VR than CAU i in self-reported pain ( ocedure	ted pain (faces scale) di n VR than CAU i n self-reported pain (FP ocedure rted cognitive, affective, i in VR than CAU during pr	red pain (faces scale) A VR than CAU i in self-reported pain (f ocedure red cognitive, affective in VR than CAU during pi in VR than CAU during pi U. No differences in sel pred pain (APPT-WRGS) in VR than in non–VR dii an CAU	ted pain (faces scale) during A VR than CAU in self-reported pain (FPS-r) ocedure red cognitive, affective, and s in VR than CAU during procedu U. No differences in self-repoi erved pain (VAS) during procedu NR than in non–VR distracti an CAU an CAU in (VAS) before, during, less p ain (VAS) before, during, and a during in SAD red pain (FLACC) during, less p red pain (FLACC) during, less p	red pain (faces scale) during a VR than CAU i in self-reported pain (FPS-r) during ocedure red cognitive, affective, and sense in VR than CAU during procedure in U. No differences in self-reported ( red pain (APPT-WRGS) during red pain (APPT-WRGS) during red pain (APPT-WRGS) during red pain (APPT-WRGS) during red pain (FLACC) during, less parent ain (VAS) before, during, less parent ted pain (Faces) during, less parent ted pain (Fac	red pain (faces scale) during red pain (FPS-r) during ocedure in self-reported pain (FPS-r) during ocedure ted cognitive, affective, and sensory in VR than CAU during procedure in V. No differences in self-reported or reved pain (VAS) during procedure ted pain (VAS) during procedure ted pain (VAS) during, less parent- ain (VAS) before, during, less parent- ain (VAS) before, during, and after, and ther in VR than CAU the State anxiety (state- inventory for children-1) during s in self-reported pain (VAS) during in the state anxiety (state- vinventory for children-1) during	red pain (faces scale) during red pain (FPS-r) during ocedure in self-reported pain (FPS-r) during ocedure ted cognitive, affective, and sensory in VR than CAU during procedure than (FLACC) during procedure tred pain (VAS) during procedure red pain (VAS) during, less parent- ain (VAS) before, during, less parent- ain (VAS) before, during, less parent- ain (VAS) before, during, less parent- ted pain (FLACC) during and the in VR than in non-VR distraction but an CAU ted pain (FLACC) during and the in (VAS) before, during, less parent- ain (VAS) before, during, less parent- ted pain (VAS) before, during, and after, and cherobserved pain (VAS) in VR and non-VR than CAU tin self-reported pain (VAS) in VR and non-VR than CAU during procedure in researcher-observed pain AS) during procedure in researcher-observed pain AS) during procedure
self-reported pain ( dure	self-reported pain (FP dure cognitive, affective, ; R than CAU during pr	ielf-reported pain (l Jure cognitive, affective R than CAU during p n (FLACC) during p o differences in see a pain (APPT-WRGS) than in non-VR di AU	elf-reported pain (FPS-r) ( Jure cognitive, affective, and s a than CAU during procedu n (FLACC) during procedu o differences in self-repoi pain (VAS) during, less p AU AC) before, during, less p vAS) before, during, and a observed pain (FLACC) du observed pain (FLACC) du observed pain (FLACC) du	elf-reported pain (FPS-r) during Jure cognitive, affective, and senso R than CAU during procedure in o differences in self-reported o 1 pain (VAS) during procedure pain (APPT-WRGS) during in (APPT-WRGS) during pain (faces) during, less parent AU AU AU AD before, during, less parent AS) before, during, and after, a observed pain (FLACC) during in VR than CAU in VR than CAU aelf-reported state anxiety (sta antory for children-1) during	elf-reported pain (FPS-r) during Jure cognitive, affective, and sensory R than CAU during procedure in (FLACC) during procedure in o differences in self-reported or 1 pain (VAS) during procedure pain (APPT-WRGS) during than in non–VR distraction but AU than in non–VR distraction but AU than in non–VR distraction but AU in VR than CAU observed pain (FLACC) during and observed pain (FLACC) during and observed pain (FLACC) during and self-reported state anxiety (state- entory for children-1) during self-reported pain (VAS) during	elf-reported pain (FPS-r) during Jure cognitive, affective, and sensory 3 than CAU during procedure in o differences in self-reported or 1 pain (VAS) during procedure pain (APPT-WRGS) during than in non–VR distraction but 4U AS) before, during, less parent- observed pain (FLACC) during and pain (faces) during, less parent- during, and after, and observed pain (FLACC) during and in VR than CAU aself-reported state anxiety (state- entory for children-1) during self-reported pain (VAS) in VR and non–VR cAU during procedure esearcher-observed pain during procedure
	ognitive, affective, a than CAU during pr	agnitive, affective than CAU during I (FLACC) during pi differences in se aain (VAS) during ain (APPT-WRGS) han in non-VR di ban in non-VR di	agnitive, affective, and s than CAU during proced (FLACC) during procedu differences in self-repoi ain (APPT-WRGS) during han in non–VR distracti J in (faces) during, less p S) before, during, and a served pain (FLACC) du	agnitive, affective, and sense than CAU during procedure in differences in self-reported ( aain (APPT-WRGS) during nan in non-VR distraction bu lan in non-VR distraction bu lan in non-VR distraction bu lan in non-VR distraction bu lan in care, during, less parent sin (faces) during, less parent freported state anxiety (sta the CAU	agnitive, affective, and sense than CAU during procedure in differences in self-reported c aain (VAS) during procedure ain (APPT-WRGS) during han in non–VR distraction bu J in (faces) during, less parent sin (faces) during, less parent in (faces) during, less parent fireported state anxiety (stat tory for children-1) during fireported pain (VAS) during lf-reported pain (VAS) during	agnitive, affective, and senso than CAU during procedure in differences in self-reported c pain (NAS) during procedure ain (APPT-WRGS) during han in non–VR distraction bu lin (faces) during, less parent sib efore, during, and after, a served pain (FLACC) during (freported state anxiety (stater or for children-1) during if-reported pain (VAS) during ff-reported pain (VAS) in VR and non–V AU during procedure searcher-observed pain ported or parent-observed per uring procedure
ognitive, affective than CAU during		(FLACC) during pl differences in sel pain (VAS) during han (APPT-WRGS) han in non-VR dif J	(FLACC) during procedu differences in self-repol pain (VAS) during procec ain (APPT-WRGS) during han in non-VR distracti J ain (faces) during, less p (S) before, during, and a bserved pain (FLACC) du VR than CAU	(FLACC) during procedur differences in self-repor aain (VAS) during proced ain (APT-WRGS) during han in non–VR distractic han in non–VR distractic bar (faces) during, less p ain (faces) during, less p served pain (FLACC) dur VR than CAU served pain (FLACC) dur if-reported state anxiety ttory for children-1) durin	(FLACC) during procedur differences in self-repor aain (VAS) during proced ain (APPT-WRGS) during han in non–VR distractic han in non–VR distractic ban (faces) during, less pa ain (faces) during, less pa ain (faces) during, and af Served pain (FLACC) dur of than CAU of than CAU of the children-1) durin they for children-1) durin the ported pain (VAS) du	(FLACC) during procedur differences in self-repor aain (VAS) during proced ain (APT-WRGS) during han in non–VR distractic ban (faces) during, less pi ain (faces) during, less pi served pain (FLACC) dur VR than CAU vR than CAU if-reported state anxiety tory for children-1, durin if-reported pain (VAS) in VR and n if-reported pain (VAS) in VR and n if-reported or parent-observed pain ported or parent-observed pain ported or parent-observed uring procedure
RS) in VR than CAU du		rved pain (FLACC) dur CAU. No differences observed pain (VAS) di eported pain (APPT-W ure in VR than in non- <sup>-</sup> than CAU	rved pain (FLACC) dur CAU. No differences observed pain (VAS) di eported pain (APPT-W) ure in VR than in non- is than CAU eported pain (faces) di d pain (VAS) before, di d pain (VAS) before, di d pain (VAS) before, di acarcher-observed pair	ss observed pain (FLACC) durin VR than CAU. No differences in parent-observed pain (VAS) dur ss self-reported pain (APPT-WR procedure in VR than in non–Vf not less than CAU ss self-reported pain (faces) dur observed pain (VAS) before, dur less researcher-observed pain ( after procedure in VR than CAU differences in self-reported sta trait anxiety inventory for childr procedure	rved pain (FLACC) dur CAU. No differences observed pain (VAS) di eported pain (VAS) di eported pain (APT-WI s than CAU eported pain (faces) di d pain (VAS) before, di d pain (VAS) before, di cearcher-observed pair ceature in VR than CA ocedure in VR than CA orece in self-reported s ciety inventory for child re nces in self-reported p re	rved pain (FLACC) dur CAU. No differences observed pain (VAS) di eported pain (APT-W) erre in VR than in non- is than CAU eported pain (faces) di di di pin (VAS) ion than CAU during p roces in researcher-obs S), self-reported or pa ty (VAS) during procec
	ess observed pa	VR than CAU. No d parent-observed p ess self-reported pa procedure in VR th not less than CAU	VR than CAU. N parent-observe ess self-reportec procedure in VF not less than C ess self-reported observed pain ( less researcher	VR than CAU. N parent-observe ess self-reportec procedure in VF not less than C ess self-reported observed pain ( less researcher after procedure o differences in trait anxiety inv	VR than CAU. N parent-observe ess self-reportec procedure in VF not less than C ess self-reported observed pain ( less researcher after procedure o differences in trait anxiety inv procedure o differences in	VR than CAU. N parent-observe ess self-reportec procedure in VF not less than C ess self-reported observed pain ( less researcher after procedure o differences in procedure ess nurse-observ distraction thar o differences in procedure ess nurse-observ distraction thar o differences in procedure ess nurse-observ distraction thar o differences in procedure ess nurse-observ distraction thar o differences in procedure ess nurse-observ
		L C		NO CE ES ES	N N N L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L	NO CE NO CE CE CE LE
RCT crossover		RCT parallel RCT parallel	RCT parallel RCT parallel RCT parallel	RCT parallel RCT parallel RCT parallel RCT parallel Interrupted time series with reamoved treatment	RCT parallel RCT parallel RCT parallel Interrupted t series with removed treatment RCT parallel	RCT parallel RCT parallel RCT parallel Interrupted t series wit removed treatment RCT parallel RCT parallel
		ories, or	ories, or on,	ories, or on,	n, or	6
traction		traction elevision, st iic) traction R distraction	traction elevision, st sic) traction Adstraction traction traction bys, televisic ks)	visic tior		n, on, ories, -
VR distr	CAU	CAU VR distr CAU (tel musi VR distr Non-VR (telev CAU	AU R distr musi musi ctelev R distr (telev R distr R distr book	action levision c) action distrac distrac vs, telev s) s) action	action levision, stu c) action distraction distraction distraction ss, televisic s) action action	action levision, stories, c) action distraction distraction, ys, television, s) action action action action s:sonal computer :sonal computer
	XL50	x XL50 SR80 Z800 or or a on		VR distraction CAU (television music) VR distraction music) VR distraction Non-VR distraction CAU (toys, television) CAU (toys, television) VR distraction CAU (toys, television) CAU (toys, television)	VR distraction CAU VR distraction music) VR distraction Non–VR distraction (television) CAU VR distraction CAU (toys, televisic books) VR distraction CAU VR distraction CAU	VR distraction CAU VR distraction CAU (television, stories, or music) VR distraction Non-VR distraction (television) CAU VR distraction CAU (toys, television, books) VR distraction CAU VR distraction CAU
n//icor C/	VR-1280 ProView			LE0 R80 800 btical n n n n n	(L50 R800 800 br sr sr y LLC	r LLC y LLC y LLC
		nVisor VR-128 ProViev ProViev aDV 3DV SR8 SR8 rripc	nVisor SX VI VR-1280 C. ProView XL50 ProView SR80 eMagin, 2800 VI 3DVisor C. Kaiser Optical VI Kaiser Optical VI eMagin Z800 VI eMagin Z800 VI 3DVisor C.		tt50 SR80 S800 B800 sr y LLC	r 1150 1500 1500 1500 1500 1500 1500 150
During postburn	physical therapy		VR-1280 ProView XL50 ProView SR80 eMagin, Z800 3DVisor Kaiser Optical SR80a on tripod eMagin Z800 3DVisor	VR-1280 ProView XL50 ProView SR80 eMagin, Z800 3DVisor tripod eMagin Z800 3DVisor Virtual I0	VR-1280 ProView XL50 ProView SR80 eMagin, Z800 3DVisor Kaiser Optical SR80a on tripod eMagin Z800 3DVisor 3DVisor Virtual IO iP	VR-1280 ProView XL50 ProView SR80 eMagin, Z800 3DVisor Kaiser Optical SR80a on tripod eMagin Z800 3DVisor 3DVisor Virtual IO iPy Virtual IO iPy Virtual IO iPy Virtual IO iPy Virtual IO iPy Virtual IO iPy Virtual IO iPy Virtual IO iPy Systems LLC Unknown
6–19 y D			VR-1280 ProView XL50 ProView SR80 eMagin, 2800 3DVisor Kaiser Optical SR80a on tripod eMagin 2800 3DVisor 3DVisor	cal VR-1280 py ProView XL50 ProView SR80 burn eMagin, Z800 sing 3DVisor ge Kaiser Optical burn EMagin Z800 burn eMagin Z800 burn eMagin Z800 sing 3DVisor ge Virtual I0 notherapy	cal VR-1280 py ProView XL50 ProView SR80 ourn eMagin, 2800 sing 3DVisor ge Kaiser Optical ment SR80a on tripod ourn eMagin 2800 sing 3DVisor ge Virtual IO otherapy umbar i-O Display ture Systems LLC	cal VR-1280 py ProView XL50 ProView SR80 burn eMagin, 2800 sing 3DVisor ge Kaiser Optical burn SR80a on tripod ourn eMagin 2800 sing 3DVisor ge Virtual IO otherapy umbar i-O Display ture Systems LLC oort Unknown ss for ootherapy
		physical therapy During burn dressing change treatment	physical VR-1280 therapy ProView XL50 ProView SR80 dressing 3DVisor change Kaiser Optical treatment tripod During burn eMagin Z800 dressing 3DVisor change change	physicalVR-1280therapyProView XL50therapyProView SR80During burmaDVisorchangeaDVisorchangeKaiser OpticaltreatmentSR80 ontreatmentSR80 ontripodaDVisorDuring burmeMagin Z800During burmeMagin Z800During burmeMagin Z800changeaDVisorchangeaDVisorchangeaDVisorchemotherapyvirtual IO	physicalVR-1280therapyProView XL50therapyProView SR80During burneMagin, 2800treatmentKaiser OpticaltreatmentKaiser OpticaltreatmentKaiser OpticaltreatmentSR80a ontreatmentKaiser OpticaltreatmentSasingDuring burneMagin 2800dressing3DVisorchangeNirtual IOchemotherapyVirtual IOchemotherapyVirtual IOpunctureSystems LLC	physicalVR-1280therapyProView XL50therapyProView SR80During burneMagin, 2800treatmentKaiser OpticaltreatmentKaiser OpticalDuring burnKaiser OpticaltreatmentKaiser OpticaltreatmentKaiser OpticaltreatmentKaiser OpticalDuring burneMagin, 2800dressing3DVisorchangeNirtual IOchemotherapyVirtual IOburing lumbarSystems LLCDuring portUnknownaccess forSystems LLC
54		physical therapy 11–17 y During burn dressing change 10–17 y During burn treatment	physical VR-1280   therapy ProView XL50   therapy ProView XL50   11-17 y During burn eMagin, 2800   10-17 y During burn Africal   10-17 y During burn Kaiser Optical   10-17 y During burn Rason   10-17 y During burn Rason   10-17 y During burn Raser Optical   change Change Change   freatment Rason Rason   change Change Change   freatment SR80a on Change   change Change Change   freatment SR80a on Change   freatment Change Change   fripod Change Change   fripod Change Change	physicalvR-1280therapyProView XL50therapyProView XL5011-17 yDuring burneMagin, 280010-17 yDuring burnRaiser OpticaltreatmentRaser OpticaltreatmentRaser OpticaltreatmentRaser OpticaltreatmentSR80a ontreatmentS10'isortreatmentItodtreatme	physicalvR-1280therapyProView XL50therapyProView SR8011-17 yDuring burneMagin, 280010-17 yDuring burnKaiser OpticaltreatmentKaiser Opticalripod4-16 yDuring burneMagin 280010-17 yDuring burneMagin 280010-17 yDuring burneMagin 280010-17 yDuring burneMagin 280010-17 yDuring burneMagin 280010-19 yDuring lumbaryirtual IOthemotherapyDuring lumbaryirtual IOtheratureSystems LLCpunctureSystems LLC	physical therapyVR-1280 ProView XL50 ProView XL50 ProView SR80 aDVisor aDVisor change treatment treatment treatment tripod10-17 y Uuring burn treatment treatment treatment treatment treatment tripodVR-1280 aDVisor aDVisor aDVisor change10-17 y uring burn treatment treatment treatmentVI-1280 adressing aDVisor aDVisor change10-17 y uring burn treatmentUnring burn solvisor adressing aDVisor solvisor change10-17 y to-19 yDuring burn solvisor chemotherapy7-19 y access for chemotherapyUnknown
		physical therapy During burn dressing change treatment	physicalVR-1280therapyProView XL50therapyProView SR8011-17 yDuring burn0dressing3DVisor10-17 yDuring burnKaiser OpticaltreatmentSR80a ontreatmentrripod4-16 yDuring burneMagin Z800dressing3DVisor	physicalVR-1280therapyProView XL50therapyProView SR8011-17 yDuring burmdressing3DVisorchangeRaiser OpticaltreatmentSR80a ontreatmentSR80a ontherasing3DVisortreatmentSR80a ontreatmentSR80a onthoung burmeMagin Z800therabythreatmenttherabyBuring burmtherabyBuring burmtherabyJO-17 ythougherapyVirtual IO	Physical therapyVR-1280 therapy11-17 yUnring burn dressingProView XL50 ProView SR80 aDVisor aDVisor aDVisor aDVisor aDVisor aDVisor advisor burng burn treatment10-17 yDuring burn treatment treatment treatment burng burn advisor burng burn burng burn burng burn treatment tripod10-17 yDuring burn treatment tripod10-17 yDuring burn tripod dressing advisor change10-19 yDuring lumbar burnt glumbar10-19 yDuring lumbar burnt glumbar	Physical therapyVR-1280 ProView XL50 ProView XL5011-17 yDuring burn dressingMagin, 2800 aDVisor change10-17 yDuring burn treatmentKaiser Optical Kaiser Optical tripod10-17 yDuring burn treatmentSR80a on tripod10-17 yDuring burn treatmentWaiser Optical Sr80a on tripod10-17 yDuring burn treatmentSR80a on tripod10-17 yDuring burn treatmentSR80a on tripod10-17 yDuring burn schangeSr80a on schange10-17 yDuring burn treatmentSr80a on schange10-17 yDuring burn changeSystems LLC Systems LLC7-19 yDuring port sccess for chemotherapyUnknown
hmitt et	al <sup>30</sup> (2011)	1) physical physical therapy 1. 41 11–17 y During burm dressing 2.8 10–17 y During burm treatment	1) physical VR-1280   therapy Proview XL50   41 11-17 y During burm   23 10-17 y During burm   28 10-17 y During burm   56 4-16 y During burm   56 4-16 y During burm   56 4-16 y During burm   6 Angin Z800   56 4-16 y   buring burm eMagin Z800   change change	1) physical VR-1280   21 11-17 y During burn Proview XL50   28 10-17 y During burn eMagin, 2800   28 10-17 y During burn Raiser Optical   28 10-17 y During burn Raiser Optical   56 4-16 y During burn SR80a on   51 10-17 y During burn Sr80a on   51 10-17 y During burn change   51 10-17 y During burn change   31 10-17 y During burn change   32 11 10-17 y During burn	1) physical VR-1280   21 11-17 y During burm Proview XL50   28 10-17 y During burm eMagin, 2800   28 10-17 y During burm Raiser Optical   28 10-17 y During burm Raiser Optical   28 10-17 y During burm Raiser Optical   56 4-16 y During burm SR80a on   56 10-17 y During burm Raiser Optical   57 11 10-17 y During burm SR80a on   30 10-17 y During burm SR80a on   11 10-17 y During burm S10   12 10-17 y During burm S10   134 10-17 y During burm S10   135 10-19 y During burm S10	1)   Physical   VR.1280     21   11-17 y   During burn   Proview XE0     28   10-17 y   During burn   eMagin, 2800     28   10-17 y   During burn   Raiser Optical     28   10-17 y   During burn   Raiser Optical     28   10-17 y   During burn   Raiser Optical     56   4-16 y   During burn   SR80a on     51   10-17 y   During burn   SR80a on     52   10-17 y   During burn   SR80a on     30   10-17 y   During burn   SR80a on     11   10-19 y   During burn   Stems LLC     12   10-19 y   During port   Virtual IO     13   10-19 y   During port   Systems LLC     14   59   7-19 y   During port   Unknown
Schmitt et	(エエハス) …10	privsical privisical therapy 41 11–17 y During burm dressing change 28 10–17 y During burm treatment	1) pnysical VF-1280   41 11-17 y During burn Proview XL50   2) 41 11-17 y During burn Ragin, 2800   2) 10-17 y During burn Raiser Optical   28 10-17 y During burn Raiser Optical   56 4-16 y During burn Raiser Optical   56 4-16 y During burn eMagin 2800   56 4-16 y During burn eMagin 2800	1) prystal VF-1280 therapy   2) 41 11-17 y During burn dressing Proview XL50 Proview XL50   2) 41 11-17 y During burn dressing 3DVisor   28 10-17 y During burn treatment Kaiser Optical   56 4-16 y During burn treatment SR80a on tripod   11 10-17 y During burn change Jirtual IO	al. <sup>3</sup> (2011)   provision therapy   VK-1280 Proview XL50     Kipping et   41   11–17 y al. <sup>31</sup> (2012)   Proview XL50     Jeffs et al. <sup>32</sup> 28   10–17 y dressing   During burn ang burn treatment   Raiser Optical SDVisor     Jeffs et al. <sup>32</sup> 28   10–17 y   During burn treatment   Raiser Optical SDVisor     Hua et al. <sup>33</sup> 56   4–16 y   During burn treatment   Raiser Optical SR80a on tripod     Hua et al. <sup>34</sup> 56   4–16 y   During burn treatment   Raiser Optical SR80a on tripod     Kaiser   10–17 y   During burn treatment   Raiser Optical SR80a on tripod     Schneider   11   10–17 y   During burn treatment   Sublisor     Schneider   11   10–17 y   During burn treatment   Sublisor     Schneider   11   10–17 y   During burn treatment   Sublisor     Schneider   11   10–17 y   During burn treatment   Virtual IO     and Workman <sup>34</sup> 10–17 y   During tumbar   Playsor     (2099)   30   10–19 y   During tumbar     and Workman <sup>34</sup> 10–19 y   During tumbar   Playsor <td>alrac (2011)   provision therapy   provision therapy   proview XL50 Proview SR80     Kipping et   41   11–17 y   buring burn dressing   Proview SR80     Jeffs et al<sup>32</sup>   28   10–17 y   buring burn dressing   SDVisor     Jeffs et al<sup>32</sup>   28   10–17 y   buring burn treatment   SB80a on tripod     Hua et al<sup>33</sup>   56   4–16 y   buring burn treatment   SR80a on tripod     Konteider   11   10–17 y   buring burn treatment   SR80a on tripod     Kaiser Optical   2015)   5   4–16 y   buring burn treatment   SR80a on tripod     Schneider   11   10–17 y   buring burn treatment   SR80a on tripod   SR80a on tripod     Schneider   11   10–17 y   buring burn treatment   SR80a on tripod   SR80a on tripod     Schneider   11   10–17 y   buring burn treatment   SR80a on tripod   SR80a on tripod     Schneider   11   10–17 y   buring burn treatment   SR80a on tripod   SR80a on tripod     Schneider   11   10–17 y   buring purn treatment   SR80a on tressing   SR80a on treatment</td>	alrac (2011)   provision therapy   provision therapy   proview XL50 Proview SR80     Kipping et   41   11–17 y   buring burn dressing   Proview SR80     Jeffs et al <sup>32</sup> 28   10–17 y   buring burn dressing   SDVisor     Jeffs et al <sup>32</sup> 28   10–17 y   buring burn treatment   SB80a on tripod     Hua et al <sup>33</sup> 56   4–16 y   buring burn treatment   SR80a on tripod     Konteider   11   10–17 y   buring burn treatment   SR80a on tripod     Kaiser Optical   2015)   5   4–16 y   buring burn treatment   SR80a on tripod     Schneider   11   10–17 y   buring burn treatment   SR80a on tripod   SR80a on tripod     Schneider   11   10–17 y   buring burn treatment   SR80a on tripod   SR80a on tripod     Schneider   11   10–17 y   buring burn treatment   SR80a on tripod   SR80a on tripod     Schneider   11   10–17 y   buring burn treatment   SR80a on tripod   SR80a on tripod     Schneider   11   10–17 y   buring purn treatment   SR80a on tressing   SR80a on treatment

(Continued)

Table 3.	Table 3. Continued								
Medical		Part	Participants					-	Quality
Procedure	Author (Year)	5	Age	Moment of VR	VR Equipment	Treatment Conditions <sup>a</sup>	Study Design	Key Findings S	Scoreb
Venous access	Gold et al <sup>38</sup> (2006)	20	8–12 y	During IV placement for magnetic resonance imaging or computed tomography scan	5DT HMD 800 with InterSens InertiaCube2 tracker	VR distraction CAU	RCT parallel	Less self-reported pain (FPS-r) in VR than CAU during procedure No differences in self-reported pain measured with faces during procedure No differences in self-reported, parent, or nurse- observed pain (VAS) during procedure	۵
	Piskorz and Czub <sup>39</sup> (2017)	38	7-17 y	During blood draw	Oculus Rift DK2	VR distraction CAU	Between subjects design (not randomized)	Less self-reported pain (VAS) and anxiety (VAS) than CAU during procedure	H
	Gerceker et al <sup>40</sup> (2018)	121	121 7-12 y	During blood draw	Samsung Galaxy S5 + Samsung Gear VR	VR distraction External cold and vibration CAU	RCT parallel	Less self-reported, parent-observed, and nurse- observed pain (faces) in both VR and external cold and vibration than CAU during procedure No differences in VR versus external cold and vibration during procedure	ო
	Gold and Mahrer <sup>41</sup> (2018)	143	143 10-21 y	During blood draw	Samsung Galaxy S6 + 1. Google Pixel Merge VR (10-12) 2. Samsung Gear VR (13-21)	VR distraction CAU (television)	RCT parallel	Less self-reported and parent-observed pain (VAS) and anxiety (VAS) in VR than CAU during procedure Patients with high anxiety sensitivity (CASI) benefit more from VR than with low anxiety sensitivity during procedure	ო
Preoperative	e Ryu et al⁴2 (2017)	69	69 4-10 y	Before entering the operating theatre	Samsung Galaxy S6 + Samsung Gear VR	VR exposure CAU (face-to- face information)	RCT parallel	Less researcher-observed preoperative anxiety (m-YPAS) in VR than CAU	Ŋ
Manufacturer Research Sys NY); Kaiser O Electronics O Samsung Gal	'information for the stems, Inc, Aptos, C pitcal SR80a (on tr o, Ltd, Suwon, Sout axy S6 (Samsung E	e equipri A); ProV ripod; Ka th Korea	nent noted 'iew XL50 ( aiser Optica ); Samsung cs Co, Ltd,	Manufacturer information for the equipment noted in the table: i-glasses f Research Systems, Inc. Aptos, CA); ProView XL50 (Kaiser Electro-Optics, I NY); Kaiser Optical SR80a (on tripod; Kaiser Optical Systems, Inc, Ann Art Electronics Co, Ltd, Suwon, South Korea); Samsung Gear VR (Facebook Te Samsung Galaxy S6 (Samsung Electronics Co, Ltd, Suwon, South Korea).	920HR (Ilixco, Inc, Mei Inc, Carlsbad, CA); Pro' bor, MI); 5DT HMD 80( schnologies, LLC, Menl	nlo Park, CA); i-glasses (i-O Disp View SR80 (Kaiser Electro-Optic 0 (5DT, Inc, Irvine, CA); Oculus R 10 Park, CA); Google Pixel (HTC (	ay Systems, LLC, S s, Inc, Carlsbad, CA ft DK2 (Facebook T orporation, New Tai	Manufacturer information for the equipment noted in the table: iglasses 920HR (llixco, Inc, Menlo Park, CA); iglasses (i-0 Display Systems, LLC, Sacramento, CA); nvisor SX (NVIS, Inc, Reston, VA); VR-1280 (Virtual Research Systems, Inc, Aptos, CA); ProView XL50 (Kaiser Electro-Optics, Inc, Carlsbad, CA); ProView SR80 (Kaiser Electro-Optics, Inc, Carlsbad, CA); envisor SX (NVIS, Inc, Reston, VA); VR-1280 (Virtual Research Systems, Inc, Aptos, CA); ProView XL50 (Kaiser Electro-Optics, Inc, Carlsbad, CA); envisor SX (NVIS, Inc, Reston, VA); VR-1280 (Virtual NY); Kaiser Optical SR80a (on tripod; Kaiser Optical Systems, Inc, Ann Arbor, MI); 5DT HMD 800 (5DT, Inc, Irvine, CA); Oculus Rift DK2 (Facebook Technologies, LLC, Menlo Park, CA); Samsung Galaxy S5 (Samsung Electronics Co, Ltd, Suwon, South Korea); Samsung Gear VR (Facebook Technologies, LLC, Menlo Park, CA); Samsung Cenctonics Co, Ltd, Suwon, South Korea); Samsung Gear VR (Facebook Technologies, LLC, Menlo Park, CA); Google Pixel (HTC Corporation, New Taipei City, Taiwan); Merge VR (Merge Labs, Inc, San Antonio, TX); Samsung Galaxy S6 (Samsung Galaxy S6 (Samsung Electronics Co, Ltd, Suwon, South Korea); Sawon, South Korea).	irtual on, ung
Abbreviations face, legs, ac scale; RCT, ra	S: APPT-WRGS, adolt tivity, cry, consolabi ndomized controlled	escent r ility; FPS vd trial; V	ediatric pa Fr, faces pa /AS, visual	Abbreviations: APPT-WRGS, adolescent pediatric pain tool - word graphic rating sca face, legs, activity, cry, consolability; FPS-r, faces pain scale-revised; GRS, graphic r scale; RCT, randomized controlled trial; VAS, visual analog scale; VR, virtual reality.	ating scale; CASI, chilt graphic rating scale; l' al reality.	dhood anxiety sensitivity index; ' V, intravenous; M, mean; MCDA	CAU, care as usual; (f), modified child d	Abbreviations: APPT-WRGS, adolescent pediatric pain tool - word graphic rating scale; CASI, childhood anxiety sensitivity index; CAU, care as usual; CHEOPS, Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario pain scale; FLACC, face, legs, activity, cry, consolability; FPS-r, faces pain scale; GRS, graphic rating scale; IV, intravenous; M, mean; MCDA (f), modified child dental anxiety scale (f); m-YPAS, modified Yale preoperative anxiety scale; RCT, randomized controlled trial; VAS, visual analog scale; VR, virtual reality.	ACC, ety
ale oll otions	on the second	1-0100		in the second if here	alianta Aveilatia	and the state of the	the first from the second s	andian) in adatad in honorinada	

November 2019 • Volume 129 • Number 5

<sup>a</sup>ln all studies, routhe pharmacological analgesia was administered, if applicable. Available information on nonpharmacological care as usual (distraction) is stated in brackets. <sup>b</sup>Maximum possible score for Ryu et al<sup>42</sup> is 8. Maximum possible score for all other studies is 6. <sup>c</sup>Based on 7 unique subjects, who could participate more than once.

Study	Medical procedure					Standardized mean difference and 95% Cl
		Effect size	Lower limit	Upper limit	p-value	
Aminabadi, 2012	Dental care	1.855	1.422	2.289	0.000	-=-
Das, 2005	Burn care	1.160	0.257	2.063	0.012	∎
Chan, 2007	Burn care	1.311	0.231	2.392	0.017	∎
Schmitt, 2011	Burn care	0.524	0.140	0.908	0.007	
Kipping, 2012	Burn care	0.465	-0.156	1.085	0.142	
Jeffs, 2014	Burn care	0.558	-0.390	1.505	0.249	
Hua, 2015	Burn care	0.891	0.381	1.400	0.001	-=-
Sander Wint, 2002	2 Oncological care	0.305	-0.421	1.031	0.411	-∔∎
Gershon, 2004	Oncological care	0.086	-0.506	0.677	0.776	-#-
Wolitzky, 2005	Oncological care	1.846	0.799	2.892	0.001	<b>∎</b>
Gold, 2006	Venous access	0.281	-0.600	1.161	0.532	_ <b>-,∎</b>
Piskorz, 2017	Venous access	0.839	0.176	1.503	0.013	
Gerceker, 2018	Venous access	11.384	9.567	13.202	0.000	
Gold, 2018	Venous access	0.320	-0.010	0.650	0.057	<b>.</b>
		1.297	0.680	1.914	0.000	
					-4.0	00 0.00 4.00

Figure 2. Random-effects meta-analysis for the effect of VR on patient-reported pain during a medical procedure compared to CAU. Note: study effect for Gerceker et al<sup>40</sup> is out of range. CAU indicates care as usual; VR, virtual reality.

effects was high ( $I^2 = 93.3\%$ ). A sensitivity analysis was performed by excluding the outlying study, that is, the study with the largest effect size (Gerceker et al<sup>40</sup>) and studies with low methodological quality.<sup>29,39</sup> This analysis still suggested effects of VR with an attenuated but still medium to large effect size, which indicated a robust effect (SMD = 0.73; 95% CI, 0.35–1.11; P < .001). Though, still substantial, this analysis had lower heterogeneity ( $I^2 = 78.3\%$ ).

The following sensitivity analyses were performed after removal of the outlying study<sup>40</sup> and low-quality studies<sup>29,39</sup> to achieve a more reliable estimate of effect sizes. Sensitivity analyses were run for caregivers and professionals as observers of pediatric pain. We found significant results based on both types of informants (caregivers<sup>31,33,36,41</sup>: SMD = 0.47; 95% CI, 0.22–0.72; P < .001;  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ , professionals<sup>31,33,36</sup>: SMD = 0.82; 95% CI, 0.48–1.15; P < .001;  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ). Finally, we ran sensitivity analyses on self-reported pain for each type of medical procedure, when data from >1 study were available. We found significant effects for burn care<sup>28,30-33</sup> (SMD = 0.66; 95% CI, 0.40–0.91; P < .001;  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ) and venous access<sup>38,41</sup> (SMD = 0.32; 95% CI, 0.01–0.62; P = .046;  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ) but not for oncological care<sup>35–37</sup> (SMD = 0.65; 95%) CI, -0.26 to 1.57; P = .159;  $I^2 = 76.3\%$ ). The suggested effect of VR for observed pain and for self-reported pain during burn care and venous access was associated with decreased effect sizes, but also with zero heterogeneity.

A random-effects model (with methods of moments) was used for the meta-regression analysis with age as a predictor. The results suggested that VR interventions for pain reduction were more efficacious for younger than for older children (P = .015). More specifically, the effect size of VR on pain decreased with 0.26 when age increased with 1 year. After removing the study with the largest effect size,<sup>40</sup> age was still a significant predictor of the effect of VR on pain (P < .001).

# Virtual Reality and Anxiety Management

Effect sizes for patient-reported anxiety could be generated for 7 of the 17 studies (Figure 3). For 1 study, mean and SD were calculated using median value and interquartile range.<sup>42</sup> Using the random-effects model, a large effect size was found for VR on anxiety (SMD = 1.32; 95% CI, 0.21– 2.44; P = .020). This indicated substantial clinical benefit, but heterogeneity of study effects was high ( $I^2 = 96.6\%$ ). A sensitivity analysis was performed by excluding the outlying study (Asl Aminabadi et al<sup>27</sup>) and studies with low methodological quality.<sup>34,39</sup> This analysis still suggested effects of VR (SMD = 0.50; 95% CI, 0.20–0.79; P = .001) with an attenuated but still medium effect size, which indicated a robust effect. Moreover, heterogeneity decreased significantly in this analysis ( $I^2 = 22.4\%$ ).

The following sensitivity analyses were performed after removal of the outlying study<sup>27</sup> and low-quality studies<sup>34,39</sup> to achieve a more reliable estimate of effect sizes. Unfortunately, very limited data were available for caregivers and professionals as observers of pediatric anxiety. We were only able to run a separate analysis for caregiver as informant,<sup>36,41</sup> which did not yield a significant result (SMD = 0.31; 95% CI, -0.02 to 0.63; P = .067;  $I^2 = 0\%$ ). Regarding different types of medical procedures, only for oncological care, enough data were available to run a sensitivity analysis on self-reported anxiety,<sup>36,37</sup> which yielded a significant result (SMD = 0.53; 95% CI, 0.10–0.96; P = .015;  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ). The effect of VR during oncological care was associated with a decreased effect size but also with zero heterogeneity.

A random-effects model (with methods of moments) was used for the meta-regression analysis with age as a predictor. The results suggested that VR interventions for anxiety reduction were more efficacious for younger than for older children (P = .023). More specifically, the effect size of VR on anxiety decreased to 0.35 when age increased with 1 year. After




Figure 3. Random-effects meta-analysis for the effect of VR on patient-reported anxiety during a medical procedure compared to CAU. Note: study effect for AsI Aminabadi et al<sup>27</sup> is out of range. CAU indicates care as usual; VR, virtual reality.

removing the study with the largest effect size,<sup>27</sup> age was still a significant predictor of the effect of VR on anxiety (P = .037).

#### **Publication Bias and Heterogeneity**

Funnel plots for pain and anxiety showed asymmetry, but Egger regression asymmetry tests did not confirm the presence of a significant publication bias for pain (P = .105) nor anxiety (P = .282). Funnel plots indicated that there was one clear outlier for pain<sup>40</sup> and one for anxiety.<sup>27</sup> These outliers correspond to the studies with the largest effect sizes which we have removed from the sensitivity analyses.

As discussed above, substantial heterogeneity of study effects was found for the overall meta-analysis on pain ( $l^2 = 93.3\%$ ) and anxiety ( $l^2 = 96.0\%$ ). We found that the outlying and low-quality studies were important sources of heterogeneity, because removal of these studies was associated with decreased heterogeneity ( $l^2 = 78.3\%$  for pain and  $l^2 = 22.4\%$  for anxiety). Moreover, the available data suggested that the different medical procedures were an important source of heterogeneity as well because the study effects of these sensitivity analyses were associated with zero heterogeneity.

#### DISCUSSION

This is the first systematic review and meta-analysis that specifically focused on VR in pediatric patients. Our meta-analysis, based on 14 studies for pain and 7 studies for anxiety, showed VR to be an effective tool to diminish patient-reported pain (SMD = 1.30) and anxiety (SMD = 1.32) during a range of medical procedures. The effect of VR on pediatric pain was also significant when observed by caregivers or professionals. For anxiety, limited observer data were available on VR effectivity. Due to small groups, it was difficult to compare VR effectivity in different types of medical procedures. VR was most often applied during burn care.

Our results showed that VR interventions for pain and anxiety were potentially more efficacious for younger than for older children. A possible explanation is that younger children tend to have higher levels of anxiety before medical procedures.<sup>43,44</sup> A different possible explanation is that VR is especially engaging for younger children, as they are often more engaged in magical thinking<sup>45</sup> and become truly captivated by imaginative play.<sup>15</sup>

However, because the relationship of age with VR efficacy on pain or anxiety could be different within each study compared to across studies, the relationship shown between age and VR efficacy in the meta-regression may not represent the true relation. This phenomenon is called ecological fallacy.<sup>46</sup>

VR was found to be significantly more effective in reducing pain and anxiety than CAU. However, it remains difficult to differentiate between the added value of VR over other forms of distraction, for example, watching television, and no distraction, because CAU was often not well defined. The high weighted effect sizes we found suggest that VR distraction is possibly more effective than other distraction interventions during medical procedures. For example, a Cochrane review<sup>47</sup> found an effect size of 0.61 for the impact of distraction (eg, games, music, and toys) on self-reported pain during needle-related procedures. Similarly, a metaanalysis including trials on music therapy as distraction during different types of medical procedures (eg, dental care, magnetic resonance imaging scans, and venipuncture) showed a significant reduction in pain and anxiety with an effect size of 0.35.48 Because VR exposure as a preparation tool for medical procedures is a fairly unexplored area of research, it is not (yet) possible to compare effect sizes for VR preparation to other forms of preparative interventions to reduce pain and anxiety during medical procedures.

The studies in the current systematic review and metaanalysis varied in quality. Most studies applied randomization and clearly described their inclusion and exclusion criteria. However, concealed treatment allocation was often not guaranteed and intention-to-treat analyses were often not performed. Also, very few studies focused on possible moderating factors of VR effectivity, such as anxiety sensitivity and temperament.

An important area of focus is immersion, which is influenced by interaction with the virtual environment by means of translation (changing position), rotation (changing orientation), point of view (perspective), and field of view.<sup>19,49</sup> Non–VR content, that is, regular (cartoon) videos or 360° videos, creates less immersion, because the user

is limited to the filmmaker's movements and progress of the video. This difference in content is important, as it has been hypothesized that more immersion is related to more pain reduction, because less attention is available for pain perception.<sup>13,14</sup> Even though some studies included guestions about subjective feelings of immersion, it is difficult to objectively analyze this phenomenon. During certain medical procedures, for example, dental treatment, patients were required to keep their head still, which may have limited immersion as well. True VR creates a more compelling illusion of presence in the virtual world than more passive audiovisual glasses and non-VR (360°) videos. However, the supposed superiority of VR over audiovisual glasses and non-VR content regarding efficacy in medical care has yet to be proven.<sup>11</sup> Therefore, the role of immersion should be a focus of future research.

# Implications

VR distraction has a large impact on pediatric pain and anxiety during medical procedures, especially for younger children. This easy-to-use tool can be used effectively in clinical practice. More research like the study of Ryu et al<sup>42</sup> is needed to establish evidence on VR exposure as preparation to reduce pain and anxiety during medical procedures. This is crucial, because anticipatory anxiety can lead to more pain and distress during the medical procedure itself.<sup>50,51</sup>

# Limitations

The following limitations should be taken into account when interpreting the results of the current review and meta-analysis. First, effect sizes for patient-reported anxiety could be generated for only 7 studies. Second, limited observer data were available, especially for anxiety outcomes. Third, means and SDs were estimated using median values and interquartile ranges for 3 studies.32,35,42 This was necessary to pool all data, but is unclear how reliable these estimations are. Fourth, substantial heterogeneity was present in the findings. We have identified outlying and low-quality studies as important sources of heterogeneity. Moreover, there was a difference in effect of VR for different medical procedures, so one should be careful when generalizing the suggested effect for VR to clinical practice. However, in our opinion, the mean pooled effect of all medical procedures still provides the most useful information, especially because certain procedures have not been studied extensively or have not been studied at all, regarding VR interventions. Finally, the included studies applied various kinds of VR software, which could have influenced the amount of immersion and VR effectivity. On the other hand, it is also possible that VR software only plays a small role, as Kenney and Milling<sup>21</sup> found no differences in their metaanalysis between commercially available VR games and VR software that was specifically developed for distraction.

# CONCLUSIONS

This systematic review and meta-analysis indicate that pediatric patients undergoing a range of medical procedures benefit from VR as a tool to reduce pain and anxiety. Due to limited available observer data, we could not provide insight into possible differences in perspective between patients, caregivers, and professionals. VR research in pediatrics has mainly focused on VR as a distraction tool. Using VR exposure as a preparation tool could be an innovative way to decrease anxiety and pain before and during medical procedures. However, further research into this field is needed.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank biomedical information specialists Gerdien B. de Jonge, MSc, and Wichor M. Bramer, MSc, of the Medical Library, Erasmus Medical Center, University Medical Center Rotterdam, Rotterdam, the Netherlands, for their assistance in conducting the systematic literature search.

# DISCLOSURES

Name: Robin Eijlers, MSc.

**Contribution:** This author helped perform the literature searches, study selection, and statistical analyses; extract the data; write the protocol draft, which was revised for important intellectual content by all other authors; and approve the final version of the manuscript.

Name: Elisabeth M. W. J. Utens, PhD.

**Contribution:** This author, as principal investigator of this project, helped provide important intellectual content and approve the final version of the manuscript.

Name: Lonneke M. Staals, MD, PhD.

**Contribution:** This author helped provide important intellectual content and approve the final version of the manuscript.

Name: Pieter F. A. de Nijs, MD, PhD. Contribution: This author helped perform the literature searches and study selection, provide important intellectual content, and

approve the final version of the manuscript.

Name: Johan M. Berghmans, MD.

**Contribution:** This author helped provide important intellectual content and approve the final version of the manuscript.

Name: René M. H. Wijnen, MD, PhD.

**Contribution:** This author helped provide important intellectual content and approve the final version of the manuscript. **Name:** Manon H. J. Hillegers, MD, PhD.

**Contribution:** This author helped provide important intellectual content and approve the final version of the manuscript.

Name: Bram Dierckx, MD, PhD. Contribution: This author helped extract the data, perform statisti-

cal analyses, provide important intellectual content, and approve the final version of the manuscript.

Name: Jeroen S. Legerstee, PhD.

**Contribution:** This author helped interpret the results of statistical analyses, provide important intellectual content, and approve the final version of the manuscript.

This manuscript was handled by: James A. DiNardo, MD, FAAP.

#### REFERENCES

- 1. Ploghaus A, Narain C, Beckmann CF, et al. Exacerbation of pain by anxiety is associated with activity in a hippocampal network. *J Neurosci.* 2001;21:9896–9903.
- 2. Chorney JM, Kain ZN. Behavioral analysis of children's response to induction of anesthesia. *Anesth Analg.* 2009;109:1434–1440.
- 3. Kain ZN, Mayes LC, Caldwell-Andrews AA, Karas DE, McClain BC. Preoperative anxiety, postoperative pain, and behavioral recovery in young children undergoing surgery. *Pediatrics*. 2006;118:651–658.
- 4. Meentken MG, van Beynum IM, Legerstee JS, Helbing WA, Utens EM. Medically related post-traumatic stress in children and adolescents with congenital heart defects. *Front Pediatr.* 2017;5:20.
- 5. Wong ML, Chia KS, Yam WM, Teodoro GR, Lau KW. Willingness to donate blood samples for genetic research: a survey from a community in Singapore. *Clin Genet*. 2004;65:45–51.
- 6. Inal S, Kelleci M. Distracting children during blood draw: looking through distraction cards is effective in pain relief of children during blood draw. *Int J Nurs Pract.* 2012;18:210–219.
- Aitken JC, Wilson S, Coury D, Moursi AM. The effect of music distraction on pain, anxiety and behavior in pediatric dental patients. *Pediatr Dent*. 2002;24:114–118.

- 8. Whitehead-Pleaux AM, Baryza MJ, Sheridan RL. The effects of music therapy on pediatric patients' pain and anxiety during donor site dressing change. *J Music Ther.* 2006;43:136–153.
- 9. Landolt MA, Marti D, Widmer J, Meuli M. Does cartoon movie distraction decrease burned children's pain behavior? *J Burn Care Rehabil*. 2002;23:61–65.
- 10. Mifflin KA, Hackmann T, Chorney JM. Streamed video clips to reduce anxiety in children during inhaled induction of anesthesia. *Anesth Analg.* 2012;115:1162–1167.
- 11. Wismeijer AA, Vingerhoets AJ. The use of virtual reality and audiovisual eyeglass systems as adjunct analgesic techniques: a review of the literature. *Ann Behav Med.* 2005;30:268–278.
- 12. Malloy KM, Milling LS. The effectiveness of virtual reality distraction for pain reduction: a systematic review. *Clin Psychol Rev.* 2010;30:1011–1018.
- 13. Hoffman HG, Sharar SR, Coda B, et al. Manipulating presence influences the magnitude of virtual reality analgesia. *Pain.* 2004;111:162–168.
- Gutierrez-Martinez O, Gutierrez-Maldonado J, Cabas-Hoyos K, Loreto D. The illusion of presence influences VR distraction: effects on cold-pressor pain. *Stud Health Technol Inform.* 2010;154:155–159.
- 15. Lillard AS. Pretend play skills and the child's theory of mind. *Child Dev.* 1993;64:348–371.
- Bekelis K, Calnan D, Simmons N, MacKenzie TA, Kakoulides G. Effect of an immersive preoperative virtual reality experience on patient reported outcomes: a randomized controlled trial. *Ann Surg.* 2017;265:1068–1073.
- 17. Eijlers R, Legerstee JS, Dierckx B, et al. Development of a virtual reality exposure tool as psychological preparation for elective pediatric day care surgery: methodological approach for a randomized controlled trial. *JMIR Res Protoc.* 2017;6:e174.
- Pourmand A, Davis S, Marchak A, Whiteside T, Sikka N. Virtual reality as a clinical tool for pain management. *Curr Pain Headache Rep.* 2018;22:53.
- Won AS, Bailey J, Bailenson J, Tataru C, Yoon IA, Golianu B. Immersive virtual reality for pediatric pain. *Children (Basel)*. 2017;4:1–15.
- 20. Woo AKM. Depression and anxiety in pain. *Rev Pain*. 2010; 4:8–12.
- Kenney MP, Milling LS. The effectiveness of virtual reality distraction for reducing pain: a meta-analysis. *Psychology of Consciousness: Theory, Research, and Practice.* 2016;3:199–210.
- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG; PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Ann Intern Med.* 2009;151:264–269.
- Verhagen AP, de Vet HC, de Bie RA, et al. The Delphi list: a criteria list for quality assessment of randomized clinical trials for conducting systematic reviews developed by Delphi consensus. J Clin Epidemiol. 1998;51:1235–1241.
- Melsen WG, Bootsma MC, Rovers MM, Bonten MJ. The effects of clinical and statistical heterogeneity on the predictive values of results from meta-analyses. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2014;20:123–129.
- Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ*. 1997; 315:629–634.
- Sullivan C, Schneider PE, Musselman RJ, Dummett CO Jr, Gardiner D. The effect of virtual reality during dental treatment on child anxiety and behavior. *ASDC J Dent Child*. 2000; 67:193–196.
- 27. Asl Aminabadi N, Erfanparast L, Sohrabi A, Ghertasi Oskouei S, Naghili A. The impact of virtual reality distraction on pain and anxiety during dental treatment in 4-6 year-old children: a randomized controlled clinical trial. *J Dent Res Dent Clin Dent Prospects.* 2012;6:117–124.
- Das DA, Grimmer KA, Sparnon AL, McRae SE, Thomas BH. The efficacy of playing a virtual reality game in modulating pain for children with acute burn injuries: a randomized controlled trial [ISRCTN87413556]. BMC Pediatr. 2005;5:1.
- 29. Chan EA, Chung JW, Wong TK, Lien AS, Yang JY. Application of a virtual reality prototype for pain relief of pediatric burn in Taiwan. *J Clin Nurs*. 2007;16:786–793.

- Schmitt YS, Hoffman HG, Blough DK, et al. A randomized, controlled trial of immersive virtual reality analgesia, during physical therapy for pediatric burns. *Burns*. 2011;37:61–68.
- Kipping B, Rodger S, Miller K, Kimble RM. Virtual reality for acute pain reduction in adolescents undergoing burn wound care: a prospective randomized controlled trial. *Burns*. 2012;38:650–657.
- Jeffs D, Dorman D, Brown S, et al. Effect of virtual reality on adolescent pain during burn wound care. J Burn Care Res. 2014; 35:395–408.
- 33. Hua Y, Qiu R, Yao WY, Zhang Q, Chen XL. The effect of virtual reality distraction on pain relief during dressing changes in children with chronic wounds on lower limbs. *Pain Manag Nurs.* 2015;16:685–691.
- 34. Schneider SM, Workman ML. Effects of virtual reality on symptom distress in children receiving chemotherapy. *Cyberpsychol Behav.* 1999;2:125–134.
- Sander Wint S, Eshelman D, Steele J, Guzzetta CE. Effects of distraction using virtual reality glasses during lumbar punctures in adolescents with cancer. *Oncol Nurs Forum.* 2002;29:E8–E15.
- Gershon J, Zimand E, Pickering M, Rothbaum BO, Hodges L. A pilot and feasibility study of virtual reality as a distraction for children with cancer. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry. 2004;43:1243–1249.
- Wolitzky K, Fivush R, Zimand E, Hodges L, Rothbaum BO. Effectiveness of virtual reality distraction during a painful medical procedure in pediatric oncology patients. *Psychol Health*. 2005;20:817–824.
- Gold JI, Kim SH, Kant AJ, Joseph MH, Rizzo AS. Effectiveness of virtual reality for pediatric pain distraction during i.v. placement. *Cyberpsychol Behav.* 2006;9:207–212.
- Piskorz J, Czub M. Effectiveness of a virtual reality intervention to minimize pediatric stress and pain intensity during venipuncture. J Spec Pediatr Nurs. 2018;23:1–6.
- Gerceker GO, Binay S, Bilsin E, Kahraman A, Yilmaz HB. Effects of virtual reality and external cold and vibration on pain in 7- to 12-year-old children during phlebotomy: a randomized controlled trial. J Perianesth Nurs. 2018;33:981–989.
- Gold JI, Mahrer NE. Is virtual reality ready for prime time in the medical space? A randomized control trial of pediatric virtual reality for acute procedural pain management. *J Pediatr Psychol.* 2018;43:266–275.
- Ryu JH, Park SJ, Park JW, et al. Randomized clinical trial of immersive virtual reality tour of the operating theatre in children before anaesthesia. *Br J Surg.* 2017;104:1628–1633.
- Davidson AJ, Shrivastava PP, Jamsen K, et al. Risk factors for anxiety at induction of anesthesia in children: a prospective cohort study. *Paediatr Anaesth.* 2006;16:919–927.
- Jay SM, Ozolins M, Elliott CH, Caldwell S. Assessment of children's distress during painful medical procedures. *Health Psychol.* 1983;2:133.
- Bolton D, Dearsley P, Madronal-Luque R, Baron-Cohen S. Magical thinking in childhood and adolescence: development and relation to obsessive compulsion. *Br J Dev Psychol.* 2002;20:479–494.
- Thompson SG, Higgins JP. How should meta-regression analyses be undertaken and interpreted? *Stat Med.* 2002;21:1559–1573.
- Uman LS, Birnie KA, Noel M, et al. Psychological interventions for needle-related procedural pain and distress in children and adolescents. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2013;10:CD005179.
- Klassen JA, Liang Y, Tjosvold L, Klassen TP, Hartling L. Music for pain and anxiety in children undergoing medical procedures: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Ambul Pediatr.* 2008;8:117–128.
- Cummings JJ, Bailenson JN. How immersive is enough? A meta-analysis of the effect of immersive technology on user presence. *Media Psychology* 2016;19:272–309.
- Blount RL, Piira T, Cohen LL, Cheng PS. Pediatric procedural pain. *Behav Modif*. 2006;30:24–49.
- 51. American Academy of Pediatrics. Committee on Psychosocial Aspects of Child and Family Health; Task Force on Pain in Infants, Children, and Adolescents. The assessment and management of acute pain in infants, children, and adolescents. *Pediatrics* 2001;108:793–797.