

1 **Pilot randomized clinical trial of virtual reality pain management**
2 **during adult burn dressing changes: lessons learned**

3
4 **Virtual reality for adult burn dressing changes**

5
6 Megan Armstrong, MPH^{1,2}; Rebecca Coffey, PhD, MSN, APRN-CNP³; John Luna, MFA⁴;
7 Henry Xiang, MD, MPH, PhD, MBA^{1,2,5*}
8

9 **Affiliations:**

10 ¹Center for Pediatric Trauma Research, The Abigail Wexner Research Institute at Nationwide
11 Children's Hospital, 700 Children's Drive, Columbus, OH 43205, USA

12 ²Center for Injury Research and Policy, The Abigail Wexner Research Institute at Nationwide
13 Children's Hospital, 700 Children's Drive, Columbus, OH 43205, USA

14 ³Parkland Regional Burn Center, Dallas, Texas, USA

15 ⁴IT Research and Innovation, The Abigail Wexner Research Institute, Nationwide Children's
16 Hospital, Columbus, Ohio, USA

17 ⁵Department of Pediatrics, The Ohio State University, 370 West 9th Avenue, Columbus, OH
18 43210, USA
19

20 **Author Email Addresses:**

21 Megan.Armstrong@NationwideChildrens.org

22 Rebecca.Coffey@phhs.org

23 John.Luna@NationwideChildrens.org

24 Henry.Xiang@NationwideChildrens.org
25

26 **Corresponding Author:** Henry Xiang, MD, MPH, PhD, MBA. Center for Pediatric Trauma
27 Research, Nationwide Children's Hospital, 700 Children's Dr, Columbus, Ohio 43205.
28 henry.xiang@nationwidechildrens.org; 614-355-5893.
29

30
31 **Declarations of Interest:** None

32 **Abstract**

33 Opioids are the most frequently used pain medications by US burn centers to control severe
34 procedural pain during wound care. Concerns for long-term opioid use have prompted the
35 exploration of non-pharmaceutical interventions, such as virtual reality (VR), for procedural pain
36 management. The primary objective of this pilot study was to evaluate the feasibility and
37 efficacy of VR pain alleviation treatment on reducing adult burn patients' perceived pain during
38 burn dressing changes. Adult patients aged 18-70 years were recruited from the inpatient unit of
39 a single American Burn Association–verified burn center between May 2019 and February 2020
40 and randomly assigned to one of three arms. Active VR participants played four VR games;
41 passive VR participants were immersed in the same VR environment without the interaction
42 elements; and a standard of care control group. 71 patients were screened for eligibility and 33
43 were deemed eligible to approach for informed consent, with 14 agreeing to participate in this
44 study. Of these 14 patients, 4 were randomly assigned to the active VR, 4 to the passive VR, and
45 6 to the control group. Self-reported overall pain was lowest among participant in the active VR
46 (dressing 1= 41.3, dressing 2= 61.0, and dressing 3= 72.7) and highest among participants in the
47 passive VR (dressing 1= 58.3, dressing 2= 74.5, and dressing 3= 89.0) across all three dressing
48 changes. Self-reported worst pain was lowest among the active VR at the first and last dressing
49 (64.3 and 92.2, respectively), but the control group has the lowest self-reported worst pain at the
50 second dressing (71.3). VR is a useful non-pharmacological tool for pain distraction but
51 designing and implementing clinical research studies face many challenges in real-world medical
52 settings. Lessons from this study have important implications for future VR studies by other
53 researchers.

54 **Trial Registration:** ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT04545229

55 **Author Summary**

56 In this paper we describe our experience conducting a randomized clinical trial using virtual
57 reality as a pain distraction during inpatient burn care. This pilot study was designed to evaluate
58 feasibility and efficacy of virtual reality as a pain distraction treatment. Three groups
59 intervention groups were compared across multiple burn care procedures. We enrolled 14
60 patients across 10 months of recruitment. While our sample size was too small to consider
61 significance testing, we did find that the group with active virtual reality participation reported
62 less pain than those in the other two groups. We documented many challenges with using virtual
63 reality during burn dressing changes, including the severity of injuries and the need for high-dose
64 opioids, lack for interest in virtual reality, the unique nature of inpatient wound care, and
65 methods of interacting with a game. COVID-19 also created recruitment restriction for our study.
66 We proposed methods for circumventing these challenges for future researchers when designing
67 virtual reality studies among adult patients.

68 **Introduction**

69 Burn injuries affect millions of individuals around the world [1]. There were an estimated
70 204,319 nonfatal burn injuries (about 82 per 100,000) among US adults in 2020 [2]. For
71 moderate to severe burns, daily dressing changes are required, which are very painful and often
72 require high-dose opioids. A 2016 survey by Meyers et al. of 378 nurses and physicians from
73 133 American Burn Association Burn Centers reported that for burn dressing changes,
74 oxycodone, morphine, or fentanyl are the most frequently used opioid medications, respectively
75 [3]. This is particularly concerning due to the current opioid epidemic [4]. Meyers et al's 2016
76 study found that 80% of respondents reported that procedural burn pain could be more
77 adequately controlled [3].

78 Researchers have shown that high dose of opioid medication for acute pain management is
79 more likely to increase the risk of long-term opioid use and opioid addictions, for both pediatric
80 and adult populations [5, 6]. Balancing pain management and opioid reduction has been an
81 ongoing challenge in US burn centers. A qualitative study of adult burn patients post-
82 rehabilitation found that adapting to pain was one of the biggest barriers to fully coping
83 emotionally, with failure to cope leading to prolonged depression and anxiety [7].

84 Increasingly, non-pharmaceutical interventions have been explored for procedural pain
85 management, with virtual reality (VR) being one of these promising interventions [8]. Numerous
86 studies have found that VR significantly decreases procedural pain and anxiety [9-13]. VR is
87 hypothesized to have effective pain management by creating a 3-dimensional distraction that
88 limit the user's perception of painful stimuli [14]. Overall, VR has very few reported side effects
89 and most participants find the experience enjoyable [9]. VR's promise with the urgent nature of
90 the opioid epidemic makes studies focused on VR-assisted pain management vital. A recent

91 meta-analysis concluded that while VR intervention could statistically reduce pain intensity
92 among pediatric patients, VR's effect among adults remains unknown and needs to be
93 investigated [15].

94 The primary objective of this pilot study was to investigate feasibility and efficacy of VR
95 pain alleviation treatment (VR-PAT) on reducing adult burn patients' perceived pain during burn
96 dressing changes. We hypothesized that VR-PAT would decrease self-reported pain intensity
97 among inpatient adult burn dressing changes. Findings and lessons from this study have
98 important implications for this strategically chosen research pathway and for future VR studies
99 by other researchers.

100 **Methods**

101 This three-group pilot randomized clinical trial (RCT) was designed to test feasibility and
102 efficacy of a smartphone VR-PAT in reducing self-reported and observed pain of adult burn
103 injury patients during repeated inpatient dressing changes. Adult patients with burn injuries were
104 recruited between May 2019 and February 2020 from an American Burn Association-verified
105 Burn Center and randomly allocated to one of three treatment arms: active VR, passive VR, or a
106 standard of care. Eligible subjects were 1) 18-70 years of age (inclusive), 2) their first admission
107 for this acute burn injury, 3) require dressing changes, 4) using opioids for dressing changes, and
108 5) whose burn is ≤ 4 days from their burn injury. Patients were excluded if they had 1) severe
109 burn(s) on the face/head preventing utilization of VR, 2) cognitive/motor impairment preventing
110 valid administration of study measures, 3) unable to communicate in English, 4) prisoners and
111 patients who were pregnant, and 5) patients admitted to the intensive care unit. The institutional
112 review board of The Ohio State University reviewed and approved this study. Written informed
113 consent was collected from each patient prior to participation in the study. The initial funding of

114 this pilot study met the nonapplicable study definition of the Food and Drug Administration
115 Amendments Act §801 for registration at ClinicalTrials.gov. However, a late voluntary
116 registration was made (ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT04545229).

117 This pilot study intended to assess the feasibility of VR-PAT among hospitalized adult burn
118 patients, so formal power and sample size calculations were not conducted. Instead, the intention
119 was to generate preliminary data to estimate the effect size of VR and variances of the outcome
120 measures that could be used to calculate the sample size and power of a future larger-scale
121 randomized trial. Based on our previous VR study among pediatric patients and the availability
122 of adult burn patients at the adult burn center, the planned enrollment was 60 patients equally
123 randomized into three groups (active VR, passive VR, and standard of care). A total of 71
124 patients were screened for eligibility and 33 were deemed eligible to approach for informed
125 consent, with 14 agreeing to participate in this study (**Figure 1**). Of these 14 patients, 4 were
126 randomly assigned to active VR, 4 to passive VR, and 6 to the control group. Patient recruitment
127 was stopped in March of 2020 because of the hospital restrictions in response to COVID-19 and
128 the future uncertainty promoted the funding agency to withdraw the funding soon after.

129 Study Procedures

130 Participants were identified by the physicians overseeing their burn care and approached by a
131 researcher trained for this study, prior to their next inpatient dressing change. Following
132 informed consent, participants were randomized to one of the three intervention groups using a
133 1:1:1 allocation ratio, which was hosted on a Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap) [16,
134 17] site. The researcher recruiting the subject was blinded to the randomization sequence. The
135 clinicians filled out a “Participant Information Sheet” following recruitment, which contained
136 demographic and injury variables. Clinicians also documented the subject’s daily opioid use

137 using morphine milligram equivalents (MME). Immediately prior to the dressing change, the
138 research associate completed the “Pre-Intervention Assessment” with the subject and set-up the
139 assigned distraction tool. During the procedure, the research associate completed the “Observed
140 VR Experience” and monitored the use of the device. Immediately following the dressing
141 change, the subject answered the “Post-Intervention Assessment”, and the “VR Experience”
142 survey and nurses completed the “Nurse Perceived Utility” survey. This process was completed
143 once per day for up to three inpatient dressing changes. A follow-up was scheduled 2-6 weeks
144 after discharge where clinicians asked about opioid use and how many pills were consumed in
145 the past 24 hours. This information was then used to calculate 24-hour MMEs.

146 *Participant Information Sheet (clinician documented—all subjects)*

147 Using the electronic medical record, clinicians documented demographics (age, sex, and
148 race/ethnicity), injury information (burn date, % total body surface area (TBSA), burn severity
149 (%TBSA that was partial and full thickness), burn location and any illicit drug use prior to
150 injury.

151 *Pre-Intervention Assessment (self-reported—all subjects)*

152 Participants self-reported their expectations for the dressing change (How much would you
153 like something fun to do during the dressing change? and How much do you think having
154 something to do during the dressing change would be helpful?) on a visual analog scale (VAS;
155 range 0-100, with higher scores indicating higher expectations). Subjects assessed their state
156 anxiety using the 20-question Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI) [18, 19], rated
157 on a 4-point Likert scale (higher scores indicated greater anxiety).

158 *Observed VR Experience (researcher documented—all subjects)*

159 Researchers observed the dressing change and documented the total time of the dressing
160 change and VR use, number of times the participant voluntarily interrupted the VR, whether the
161 participant was fully engaged with the VR, and whether they appeared distracted.

162 *Post-Intervention Assessment (self-reported–all subjects)*

163 Participants self-rated overall pain, worst pain, time spent thinking about pain, and how much
164 the wound bothered them on a VAS (higher score indicate more pain) and perceived length of
165 dressing (in minutes). Those using the VR were also asked to report any symptoms using the
166 Simulator Sickness Questionnaire (SSQ; lower scores indicate less sickness) [20].

167 *VR Experience (self-reported–VR groups)*

168 Participants were asked if they were happy with the VR, whether it could be made better, and
169 if they would want to use it again in the future. They were also asked to report how much fun
170 they had and how engaging they thought it was on a VAS (0-100, higher score indicated more
171 fun and engagement).

172 *Nurse Perceived Utility (nurse reported–VR groups)*

173 For patients using the VR, the nurse performing the dressing change reported whether the
174 VR-PAT was helpful and easy to use on a VAS (0-100, higher score was better).

175 *Daily Opioid Use (clinician documented–all subjects)*

176 Clinicians documented the MMEs consumed by the participant on each day of participation.

177 *Follow-up Assessment (self-reported – all subjects)*

178 A clinician called participants 2-6 weeks following discharge as part of clinical care and
179 asked whether they were still using opioid medications to control pain and calculated the 24-hour
180 MMEs.

181 Interventions

182 VR-PAT was administered using a lightweight, low-cost VR headset paired with an Apple
183 iPhone XS and Bluetooth gaming controller (**sFigure 1**). VR-PAT is a stand-alone game that
184 was developed by Nationwide Children’s Hospital, an affiliated hospital of The Ohio State
185 University.

186 *Active VR-PAT*

187 Active VR participants played a series of four VR games specifically designed for this study.
188 These games were broken down into two categories: projectile games (Town and Cave) and
189 rhythm games (City and Forest) (**sFigure 2**). The games played in the order of City, Cave,
190 Forest, and Town for all participants. Participants interacted with the game by tilting their head
191 and pressing a button on the gaming controller.

192 Projectile games: During the Town game, the user drove around the town in a car and
193 delivered pizzas to the hungry townsfolk by launching the pizzas. During the Cave game, the
194 user drove down a river within a cave full of rats riding in hot air balloons. The user launched
195 rubber balls at the pizza boxes hanging from the hot air balloons to knock them away from the
196 rat bandits.

197 Rhythm games: The City game had users sitting in a car and timing their car horn to have a
198 bird relieve itself on a passerby under the tree. The Forest game had users driving a car through a
199 forest and timing their windshield wiper swipes to prevent the birds from hitting the windshield.

200 *Passive VR-PAT*

201 Passive VR participants went on an automated virtual tour of the same virtual environments
202 as the active VR but were not presented with any of the interactive elements of the games.

203 *Control*

204 The standard care participants received routinely used distraction tools (i.e., music and/or
205 talking) provided in the clinical setting.

206 Statistical analysis

207 Demographic and burn characteristics were described using frequencies and percentages for
208 the categorical variables and median and range for continuous variables. Mean was calculated for
209 the primary outcome of reported pain (overall pain, worst pain) across dressing changes and
210 intervention type. VR usage was evaluated by the median length of the dressing time (in
211 minutes) and time using the VR (in minutes). Opioid medication was converted to MME for each
212 medication per 24-hours of admission and added together to get a total amount of opioids.

213 **Results**

214 Of the 14 participants in this study, they were a median 38.4 years of age, mostly male
215 (71.4%), and White (85.7%) (**Table 1**). Burn injuries varied from 1.0 to 17.8% TBSA (median
216 8.4%) and the largest proportion of the burns were partial thickness (median TBSA=8.4%). The
217 largest full thickness burn was 3.0% TBSA.

218 **Table 1.** Demographics and burn characteristics of study participants

Characteristic	N (%)
Total	14 (100%)
Age at enrollment, median (range)	38 (19-70)
Sex	
Male	10 (71.4%)
Female	4 (28.6%)
Race	
White	12 (85.7%)
Black	2 (14.3%)
Illicit drug use prior to injury	
Yes	3 (21.4%)
No	11 (78.6%)
VR group	
Active	4 (28.6%)
Passive	4 (28.6%)
Control	6 (42.9%)

TBSA %, median (range)	8.4 (1.0-17.8)
Burn depth, median (range)*	
Partial thickness %	8.4 (0.5-17.8)
Full thickness %	0.0 (0.0-3.0)

219 Abbreviations: VR=Virtual Reality, TBSA=Total Body Surface Area

220 *Burn depth was reported as the TBSA% of partial and full thickness for each burn injury

221 Average self-reported overall pain was lowest among participant in the active VR group
222 [dressing 1= 41.3, dressing 2= 61.0, and dressing 3= 72.7 (mean VAS score)] and highest among
223 participants in the passive VR group (dressing 1= 58.3, dressing 2= 74.5, and dressing 3= 89.0)
224 across all three dressing changes (**Figure 2**). Average self-reported worst pain was lowest among
225 the active VR group at the first and last dressing (64.3 and 92.2, respectively), but the control
226 group had the lowest self-reported worst pain at the second dressing (71.3). Again, the passive
227 group reported the highest worst pain across the first two dressings (80.0 and 100.0, respectively)
228 and tied for the highest worst pain with the control group at the last dressing (100.0).

229 Dressing 1 and 2 was longer for the control group (median 59 and 60 minutes, respectively)
230 than the active and passive groups (median 49.5 and 44 minutes and 52.5 and 56.5 minutes,
231 respectively) (**Table 2**). Conversely, the control group used the least opioids for the first two
232 dressings (56.25 and 19.0 MME, respectively) and the passive group used the most opioids for
233 the first two dressings (106.25 and 91.5 MME, respectively). In comparison, the control group
234 had the shortest dressing time for dressing 3 (median 49 minutes) compared to the active and
235 control groups (median 51 and 64 minutes, respectively).

236

237 **Table 2.** Virtual Reality (VR) usage and morphine milligram equivalents (MMEs) by participant and dressing numbers
 238

Subject ID	Dressing #1				Dressing #2				Dressing #3			
	Days since injury	Length of dressing (minutes)	Time using VR (minutes)	MME	Days since injury	Length of dressing (minutes)	Time using VR (minutes)	MME	Days since injury	Length of dressing (minutes)	Time using VR (minutes)	MME
Active												
#3	1	50	**	90	2	38	15	7.5	-	-	-	-
#5	1	71	9	98.5	2	60	29	97	3	88	26	114
#10	0	10	11	18	1	33	22	22.5	2	18	**	15
#13	0	49	37	83	1	50	22	61.2	2	51	25	82.5
Median		49.5	11	86.5		44	22	41.85		51	25.5	82.5
Passive												
#4	1	34	32	120	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
#6	1	77	35	97	2	85	19	78.5	3	104	46	78.5
#9	1	64	29	115.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
#14	0	41	15	61	1	28	**	104.5	2	24	9	104.5
Median		52.5	30.5	106.25		56.5	19	91.5		64	27.5	91.5
Control												
#1	1	85	N/A	86	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
#2	1	*	N/A	65.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
#7	1	69	N/A	47	2	81	N/A	19	3	40	N/A	32
#8	1	41	N/A	15.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
#11	1	51	N/A	35	2	60	N/A	7.5	-	-	-	-
#12	1	59	N/A	162.5	2	45	N/A	88.5	3	58	N/A	96
Median		59	N/A	56.25		60	N/A	19		49	N/A	64

239 *Missing

240 **VR not used for this dressing

241 N/A –VR not used in control group

242 MME = Milligram Morphine Equivalents

243 **Discussion**

244 This pilot RCT study showed some promising results of using VR pain management during
245 adult burn dressing changes. While this study had a small sample size caused by the patient
246 recruitment interruption due to COVID-19, the preliminary results suggest that patients in the
247 active VR group experienced less pain than those in the passive VR and control groups. More
248 importantly, this pilot study had many lessons that could be important to other researchers who
249 plan to design future adult VR pain management studies.

250 Our preliminary results follow the same trend as our previous VR study during outpatient
251 pediatric burn dressing changes, where participants in the active VR group reported significantly
252 lower overall pain and worst pain [12]. These results are also consistent with a recent systematic
253 review and meta-analysis by Norouzkhani et al. where they reported that the VR-based
254 intervention significantly reduced pain compared to those in the control group [15]. It should be
255 noted that the average age of our RCT was older than that reported in either of these two studies.

256 All subjects in this study did not require 3 dressing changes and three participants in the VR
257 groups chose not to use their VR for every dressing change. Additionally, as shown in the
258 difference between the time in the VR and the time of the dressing, participants did not wear
259 their VR for the entire dressing procedure. Some participants became bored with the games
260 (active) or video (passive) and did not want to participate for the full dressing. Additionally,
261 some patients began the dressing change with a shower to loosen the dressing, which we found
262 not to be conducive with the VR-PAT process.

263 *Lessons Learned for Future Studies*

264 First, adults were less interested in participating in VR research than pediatric patients. Some
265 adult patients felt distraction was not necessary or that they did not want to bother with learning

266 how to play the game. Several adults also did not want to be in the virtual VR environment
267 because of motion sickness. Over 53% of the patients screened for eligibility were not eligible to
268 participate, with most of these patients being over the age limit, having facial burns, presented
269 too many days out from the initial injury, and being admitted to the intensive care unit.

270 The second lesson was that the inpatient adult burn injuries were more severe than
271 encountered in our pediatric outpatient study. These inpatient dressings were also longer than
272 those in our pediatric pilot study, resulting in some participants feeling that the games were
273 repetitive and choosing not to wear the VR for the entirety of the dressing or requesting to not to
274 participate in the VR groups in the next dressing. Suggestions were for more levels or increased
275 gamification to be entertaining for a longer period. Additionally, because of the increased burn
276 severity, the dressing change was more painful, requiring more pre-procedural pain medications
277 and rescue opioid medications. This increased pain broke through the distraction, leading us to
278 hypothesize there is a pain threshold for where VR distraction can be beneficial. This is an
279 important consideration for future VR studies. Future research needs to determine where this
280 pain threshold is and whether a more difficult game can circumvent this issue. Our game was
281 designed to be easy for participants of all ages and skill levels to avoid any feelings of frustration
282 or discouragement. On the other hand, the feedback of increasing the difficulty or adding more
283 levels is good advice for future research.

284 The third lesson was the unique circumstance that many inpatient dressing changes began
285 with a shower to loosen the previous dressing. We did ask the first few participants to use the
286 VR-PAT during this part of the procedure as the phone and headset were water resistant.
287 However, participants began experiencing nausea and headaches during this part of the
288 procedure, which medical professionals felt could have been exacerbated by the pain of

289 removing the dressing and the heat/steam of the shower. Upon this realization, the study
290 procedures were changed to only using the VR after the shower portion of the procedure, which
291 did help to reduce these feelings. Additionally, a portion of the participants required additional
292 rescue medications during the procedure, which had their own host of side effects that were
293 similar to simulator sickness symptoms. It was difficult to parse out who was reporting simulator
294 sickness symptoms due to the medication or the VR-PAT, as even participants not in the VR
295 groups reported symptoms. There was less reliability in reporting of all questionnaires among
296 those who required additional medication, with some questionnaires being left blank.

297 The fourth challenge was the difficulty of using a controller for the game play. As the game
298 play only required the pressing of one button and no movement (i.e., the controller could rest on
299 the bed with only one finger being used), we did not expect it to disturb the dressing change.
300 However, due to the location of some injuries, participants needed to roll to one side or switch
301 hands when both were burned, and this caused game interruptions. Future studies should
302 consider a hands-free VR system to minimize hand involvement and interference with the
303 dressing procedure.

304 The final challenge was the COVID-19 pandemic. Study recruitment was paused in March
305 2020 in compliance with hospital policies. Our funding period ended before recruitment could
306 recommence, thus further limiting our study participants.

307 *Conclusions*

308 VR is a useful non-pharmacological tool for pain distraction but designing and implementing
309 clinical research studies can face many challenges in the real-world medical settings. Future
310 studies should consider these challenges when working with adult burn patients and work closely

311 with clinic staff and patients to pilot test study protocols before launching a full-scale VR
312 intervention study.

313 **Acknowledgements**

314 We appreciate Mr. Jonathan Lun for his assistance with the literature review for this project as a
315 summer intern.

316 **Figure 1.** Screening and Recruitment Diagram

317 **Figure 2A&B.** Self-reported overall and worst pain by dressing change and intervention type

318 **sFigure 1.** Demo of research intern using virtual reality game

319 **sFigure 2.** Virtual reality game photos and explanations of game concept

320 References:

- 321 1. Smolle C, Cambiaso-Daniel J, Forbes AA, Wurzer P, Hundeshagen G, Branski LK, et al.
322 Recent trends in burn epidemiology worldwide: A systematic review. *Burns*. 2017;43(2):249-57.
- 323 2. Web-based Injury Statistics Query and Reporting System (WISQARS) [Internet].
324 National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
325 2023. Available from: www.cdc.gov/ncipc/wisqars.
- 326 3. Myers R, Lozenski J, Wyatt M, Pena M, Northrop K, Bhavsar D, et al. Sedation and
327 Analgesia for Dressing Change: A Survey of American Burn Association Burn Centers. *J Burn*
328 *Care Res*. 2017;38(1):e48-e54.
- 329 4. Lancet T. A time of crisis for the opioid epidemic in the USA. *Lancet*.
330 2021;398(10297):277.
- 331 5. Harbaugh CM, Lee JS, Hu HM, McCabe SE, Voepel-Lewis T, Englesbe MJ, et al.
332 Persistent Opioid Use Among Pediatric Patients After Surgery. *Pediatrics*. 2018;141(1).
- 333 6. Shah A, Hayes CJ, Martin BC. Characteristics of Initial Prescription Episodes and
334 Likelihood of Long-Term Opioid Use - United States, 2006-2015. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly*
335 *Rep*. 2017;66(10):265-9.
- 336 7. Dahl O, Wickman M, Wengström Y. Adapting to life after burn injury--reflections on
337 care. *J Burn Care Res*. 2012;33(5):595-605.
- 338 8. McSherry T, Atterbury M, Gartner S, Helmold E, Searles DM, Schulman C.
339 Randomized, Crossover Study of Immersive Virtual Reality to Decrease Opioid Use During
340 Painful Wound Care Procedures in Adults. *J Burn Care Res*. 2018;39(2):278-85.
- 341 9. Dascal J, Reid M, IsHak WW, Spiegel B, Recacho J, Rosen B, et al. Virtual Reality and
342 Medical Inpatients: A Systematic Review of Randomized, Controlled Trials. *Innov Clin*
343 *Neurosci*. 2017;14(1-2):14-21.
- 344 10. Delshad SD, Almario CV, Fuller G, Luong D, Spiegel BMR. Economic analysis of
345 implementing virtual reality therapy for pain among hospitalized patients. *NPJ Digit Med*.
346 2018;1:22.
- 347 11. Wong CL, Choi KC. Effects of an Immersive Virtual Reality Intervention on Pain and
348 Anxiety Among Pediatric Patients Undergoing Venipuncture: A Randomized Clinical Trial.
349 *JAMA Network Open*. 2023;6(2):e230001-e.
- 350 12. Xiang H, Shen J, Wheeler KK, Patterson J, Lever K, Armstrong M, et al. Efficacy of
351 Smartphone Active and Passive Virtual Reality Distraction vs Standard Care on Burn Pain
352 Among Pediatric Patients: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Network Open*.
353 2021;4(6):e2112082-e.
- 354 13. Vest E, Armstrong M, Olbrecht VA, Thakkar RK, Fabia RB, Groner JI, et al. Association
355 of Pre-procedural Anxiety with Procedure-related Pain During Outpatient Pediatric Burn Care: A
356 Pilot Study. *J Burn Care Res*. 2022.
- 357 14. Brenda K. Wiederhold. The Potential for Virtual Reality to Improve Health Care.
358 VRMC: The Virtual Reality Medical Center; 2006.
- 359 15. Norouzkhani N, Chaghian Arani R, Mehrabi H, Bagheri Toolaroud P, Ghorbani Vajargah
360 P, Mollaei A, et al. Effect of Virtual Reality-Based Interventions on Pain During Wound Care in
361 Burn Patients; a Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Arch Acad Emerg Med*. 2022;10(1):e84.
- 362 16. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliott V, Fernandez M, O'Neal L, et al. The REDCap
363 consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. *Journal of*
364 *Biomedical Informatics*. 2019;95:103208.

- 365 17. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic
366 data capture (REDCap)—A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing
367 translational research informatics support. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*. 2009;42(2):377-
368 81.
- 369 18. Spielberger CD. State-Trait Anxiety Inventory. *The Corsini Encyclopedia of*
370 *Psychology*. p. 1-.
- 371 19. The State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI): American Psychological Association;
372 [updated 2011. Available from: [https://www.apa.org/pi/about/publications/caregivers/practice-](https://www.apa.org/pi/about/publications/caregivers/practice-settings/assessment/tools/trait-state)
373 [settings/assessment/tools/trait-state](https://www.apa.org/pi/about/publications/caregivers/practice-settings/assessment/tools/trait-state).
- 374 20. Kennedy RS, Lane NE, Berbaum KS, Lilienthal MG. Simulator Sickness Questionnaire:
375 An Enhanced Method for Quantifying Simulator Sickness. *The International Journal of Aviation*
376 *Psychology*. 1993;3(3):203-20.
377

Figure 1. Screening and recruitment diagram




Figure 1

Figure 2A&B. Self-reported overall and worst pain by dressing change and intervention type





Figure 2