medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.23.24312233; this version posted August 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

A low-cost virtual reality stroke rehabilitation system: breaking down barriers to treatment

Aidan Fisk[1], Summer Fox[1], Jenna Floyd[1], Daniel Blustein[1]
[1]*Department of Psychology, Acadia University, Wolfville, NS, Canada*

Corresponding Author:
Daniel Blustein
18 University Ave, Wolfville, NS B4P 2R6, Canada
Phone: +1 902 585 1220
blustein.neuro@gmail.com

Abstract:

Stroke is a leading cause of disability worldwide. Following a stroke, high doses of intensive motor rehabilitation provide maximal benefit. Barriers to realizing recommended levels of rehabilitation therapy include cost, physical access, and clinical resource availability. Virtual Reality (VR) offers a potential solution to overcome these challenges and enable home-based, self-directed therapy. Here we present a low-cost system utilizing the off-the-shelf Meta Quest 2 headset running custom software to deliver immersive rehabilitation exercises. The system employs movement amplification to partially reduce motor deficits and enable more engaging task completion. It leverages recent advances in VR technology, including hand tracking, voice recognition, and an AI-driven virtual coach, to create a more accessible environment for users with no prior VR experience.

We tested the system in 60 able-bodied participants to assess feasibility for eventual clinical use. Participants completed three VR tasks with 30 participants receiving motor amplification. We measured motion sickness levels and attitudes towards the technology, while generating a set of normative motor performance data.

Results showed no significant effect of amplification on motor performance, indicating that the small amplification factors applied in this healthy sample did not markedly impact task outcomes. User attitudes towards VR improved after the experience and minimal motion sickness was reported.

This study suggests that low-cost VR systems may serve as a feasible option to increase post-stroke motor rehabilitation. Further study is needed to test the system in older adults and in stroke patients to determine feasibility in a more representative clinical setting.

Keywords: stroke rehabilitation, virtual reality, assistive technology

Funding details: This work was supported by ResearchNS under the New Health Investigator Grant program.

Disclosure statement: The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.23.24312233; this version posted August 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Data availability statement: All data and analysis code will be freely available at the OSF upon publication.

Introduction:

Stroke is a leading cause of disability worldwide, especially with recent improvements to acute treatments that have increased survival rates. In the past 30 years there has been a substantial increase in stroke incidence and disability-adjusted life-years lost, especially in lower and lower-middle-income countries (1). Motor, sensory, and cognitive deficits contribute to a loss of function that makes daily life challenging, often requiring intensive and expensive assistive care. The motor disability following a stroke is a reinforcing cycle, the more difficult it is to use an affected limb, the less it will be used, and the more quickly remaining function will be lost. Overcoming this process of *learned non-use*, particularly in the approximately 70% of stroke patients with upper limb motor deficits (2), is a key focus of chronic stroke rehabilitation.

Higher doses of therapy following a stroke – including physical therapy, occupational therapy, and speech and language therapy – lead to better recovery outcomes (3–5). Using and moving the limb affected by the stroke is critical to leveraging the brain's natural neuroplasticity in regaining lost motor and sensory function, and ultimately improving daily life functionality. Many effective treatments capitalize on this principle including constraint-induced movement therapy (6) and emerging robot-assisted systems (7). Therapy soon after the stroke seems to be the most effective; most motor recovery occurs in the first month following a stroke with nearly all recovery complete within 3 months (2,8–11). However, recent efforts have sought to leverage the inherent neuroplasticity in the adult brain to continue functional recovery in chronic stroke patients beyond this initial critical window (12).

There are numerous impediments to providing high volumes of motor rehabilitation therapy soon after a stroke, which means patients often receive less care than they should. Access to treatment can be limited by cost. A typical constraint-induced stroke rehabilitation protocol spans 10 to 15 days with up to 6 hours of therapy per day (13). In a public health care setting in Canada in 2011, a 15 session CIMT protocol was estimated to cost $1,857 CAD per patient, compared to $265 CAD per patient for current standard care to treat post-stroke arm dysfunction (14) [$2,489 vs. $355 adjusted to 2024 CAD (15)]. Private practitioner-led CIMT can cost significantly more (e.g. $5,000 to $10,000 AUD) and usually qualifies for only limited private health insurance reimbursement (16). Other emerging rehabilitation technologies such as robot-assisted therapy also require high costs and significant clinician oversight (7).

Physical access to stroke rehabilitation services is another barrier patients face. Long distances to clinics in areas with limited transportation options can be difficult to overcome, especially for patients that often suffer from limited mobility. Barriers to travel to seek rehabilitation services are amplified in rural areas (17).

Some of these barriers to accessing treatment can be reduced by prescribing home exercises which have been shown effective in reducing disability, improving quality of life, and increasing patient self-efficacy (18). However, at-home therapies face their own barriers to maximal effectiveness. Rates of exercise completion are low with about 60% of patients not fully adhering

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.23.24312233; this version posted August 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

to at-home physiotherapy programs (18,19), and even compliant patients incorrectly executing 10-20% of exercises after clinician instruction (18,20). One Canadian study found only 36% of patients demonstrated a high level of adherence to a home-based exercise program following stroke (21). Patients often struggle to incorporate exercises into their daily lives (19). Memory issues, especially in older adults, contribute to noncompliance (22). Increased clinician-patient interaction improves compliance with home exercise programs (23) yet resource constraints and access barriers limit this option.

Technology-based telemedicine solutions have the potential to enhance clinician-patient interaction, improve compliance, and ultimately improve stroke rehabilitation outcomes. Telehealth stroke care has become increasingly popular, particularly in response to the COVID-19 pandemic (24), and provides the potential to increase therapeutic dosing and access for patients. Accumulating evidence suggests virtual stroke therapy is equivalent to in-person interventions in terms of effectiveness and cost (24–31). One study showed that patients are generally satisfied with telerehabilitation services when they are implemented by trained professionals and include some social interaction (25).

Although there are some barriers to the use of technology, several approaches can be used to increase the adoption of technology-driven rehabilitation therapies. Best practice suggests using technology-based at-home treatments to supplement, and not replace, existing therapies (25,30). Attitudes towards virtual therapies, including virtual reality treatments, are malleable and can be improved with short exposures to the technology (32). Furthermore, as clinicians and patients gain experience with a technology, its use becomes more accepted. For example, when COVID-19 triggered a shift to remote stroke rehabilitation in Ontario, Canada, patients reporting technology problems dropped from 26% initially to 8% by 6 months post-rollout (33). However, most telerehabilitation efforts have focused on clinician-delivered therapies involving video conferencing enabling face-to-face interaction, which still require dedicated clinician time with limited cost-savings.

Several virtual reality systems have been developed to aid in stroke rehabilitation that could support more self-directed rehabilitation. To decrease cost and increase accessibility, software for existing (Nintendo Wii (34)) or novel systems (RehabMaster (35) and Motion Rehab AVE 3D (36)) has been created to provide a variety of game-like rehabilitation exercises for patients. These systems typically track patient movements with motion capture hardware and translate those movements to a virtual space on a computer. Clinician involvement is still required to operate these systems and to select the appropriate rehabilitation games. A usability study with the RehabMaster found that stroke patients experienced improved attention and immersion while occupational therapists found it easier to manage patient programs (35). Certain rehabilitation games have been found to be effective in increasing stroke patient sensitivity to proprioceptive feedback (37) or decreasing non-use through visual amplification (38). Patients receiving VR rehabilitation therapy as a supplement (39) or instead of (40) conventional rehabilitation therapy have shown significant improvements on the Box and Block Test and Fugle-Meyer Upper Extremity Scale, respectively. Research has also shown that VR rehabilitation might be ideal when delivering intensive high dose upper-limb therapy to maintain prolonged engagement (7,8).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.23.24312233; this version posted August 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

These findings highlight the potential VR has to assist in stroke rehabilitation for both patients and therapists.

Here we describe the development and testing of a novel virtual reality stroke rehabilitation system that addresses some of these systemic and individual patient barriers to treatment. Costs are reduced by running the custom software on a low-cost head mounted display (HMD) without the need for constant clinician oversight. We developed a virtual coach to provide guidance and feedback to patients during the virtual exercises. User-friendly interaction options make the technology more accessible, including hand tracking (i.e. the patients do not hold anything) and multiple interaction options (e.g. an option to speak commands to the virtual coach). Gamified tasks encourage patient engagement. Assistive motor amplification turns limited real-world movements into more complete virtual movements, reducing motor disability in the virtual world (38). This enables more consistent task completion and leads to more positive task engagement, particularly for those with severe motor deficits. Here we test this low-cost stroke rehabilitation platform in able-bodied individuals to generate a normative baseline of user performance, to investigate the effect of motor amplification in low-cost HMD VR, to gather feedback on user experience including motion sickness, and to collect data on user attitudes towards the technology. The results of this work have direct applications to the further development of a low-cost VR rehabilitation platform for stroke survivors.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.23.24312233; this version posted August 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Methods:

Technology Development

We developed a software program in which participants could engage in 12 gamified tasks, three of which were tested in this work. Tasks were designed to either emulate activities of daily living, such as pouring water into a glass, or serve as immersive games in which the hand becomes a controller in a classic game like Pong or Snake. Each task focused on one category of movement: 1) Gross reaching; 2) Reach and grasp; or 3) Precision Grasping.

Virtual Reality System. The VR setup used a Meta Quest 2 VR Headset connected to a Windows PC via a USB tether cable. The software used to develop this program was Unity3D with the use of the Oculus Integration Kit for VR interactions, including simulating the user's position in the virtual environment and capturing their inputs to drive actions like picking up an object. The headset can be used as a wireless standalone system to support eventual at home use.

Hand tracking and user input. The Meta Quest 2 headset utilizes four IR cameras built into the headset to facilitate positional tracking of the user in their environment, as well as to track hand positions for interactions in the program. This standalone headset enables the potential for future at home use with minimal setup, unlike typical VR headsets that require external IR cameras to be physically mounted in the environment around the user. Users can interact with the system by touching virtual buttons, manipulating objects and using voice commands detected with an onboard microphone.

Physics interactions. The virtual environment presented to participants simulates the physics of gravity and normal forces in the real-world using engines built into the Unity environment. Due to the lack of touch feedback with hand tracking, interactions with virtual objects rely on visual changes in VR. When the hand hovers over an object that it can interact with, the hand changes color from gray to yellow. When the first finger and thumb are pinched together while overlapping the object, the hand turns blue indicating that the object is being grasped. Now the object will move as the hand moves and can be moved to a different part of the virtual world. Users are given a demonstrative tutorial at the beginning of their VR experience to learn the nuances of interacting with a virtual environment.

Motor amplification. For users with limited range of motion, physical movements can be amplified in the virtual space, effectively increasing the range of motion in VR (38). The motor amplification algorithm works similarly to how a computer mouse’s sensitivity can be adjusted on a desktop computer. A "rest" or center position is determined during calibration, and the position of the amplified hand relative to that center point is multiplied by an amplification factor. For example, a user sitting with their arm on a chair’s armrest would have their rest position at that point in the world. Lifting the arm up 20 cm from that point, with an amplification amount of 2, would mean that the virtual hand would appear in VR to be 40 cm above the starting rest position. We accomplish this by taking the amplification factor and multiplying it by the position vector (the x,y,z value) of the amplification target. In the Unity3D environment, the x is the horizontal axis relative to the subject, the y is the vertical axis, and z is the depth (or the axis that extends directly out in front of the user).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.23.24312233; this version posted August 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

The amplification factor is determined through a calibration process which measures the range of motion for both of the upper arm extremities. The limb with more limited range of motion is selected to be amplified to match the side with more range of motion, and can be selected as the target hand to be used during virtual rehabilitation exercises.

In addition to the positional range of motion, the movement extent for wrist rotation and grasping can also be amplified. The grasping and wrist rotation amplification were not enabled during this study due to the tested tasks not employing those types of movements.

Motor smoothing. A side effect of the amplification process is that the jitter or shake of hand movements becomes more pronounced with stronger amplification factors. This is a result of noise in the IR camera tracking system that can result in some positional variability due to factors like lighting condition and the system's confidence in localizing the hand positions. In typical unamplified movements this is not an issue as the positional noise is nearly imperceptible, but when amplified it becomes apparent. To resolve this issue, the program uses a spring-damper function to adjust the hand's position proportional to the amount of amplification applied (i.e., the more a hand is amplified, the stronger the smoothing function becomes).

Usability Study

After initial development of the VR software, we tested a sample stroke VR rehabilitation session with healthy younger adult participants. All study protocols were conducted with the approval and oversight of the Acadia University Research Ethics Board. Sixty participants were recruited from the Acadia University student population using an online study recruitment platform. Students were enrolled in psychology courses and received course credit for their participation. Demographic information was collected from each participant including gender identity [M/F/other], handedness [L/R/other], and age.

Study setup overview. A Meta Quest 2 VR headset connected to a desktop computer, as described in the previous section, was used to implement the VR exercises. The experimenter could watch the participant's view of the virtual environment and provide assistance when needed. The VR exercises lasted approximately 10-15 minutes, which included an initial range of motion calibration. Participants completed a VR attitudes survey (before and after the VR experience), a technology experience survey (before), and a motion sickness survey (after). Motor amplification of hand position was applied to half of the participants; the other half served as a baseline control with no amplification.

VR tasks. All participants first completed a Calibration phase, after which amplification was enabled for the experimental group and then all participants played the Bubble Pop game (see below for detailed descriptions of each task). Participants then completed two more tasks, a Pong game and an Animal Feeding game. The order of the last two tasks was counterbalanced: half of the participants within each group completed the Pong game first, the other half completed the Animal Feeding task first. Here is a description of each task along with their motor performance outcome measures:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.23.24312233; this version posted August 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Calibration: During this phase, participants reach towards different locations in the room indicated by colored cubes. The program logs the minimum and maximum extent of points reached by the left and right hands to calculate the range of motion for each. In the Amplification group, the hand with the smaller movement extent is selected to be amplified by the proportional difference between the sides. The range of motion is also used to set the boundary area for object interaction in the tasks that follow. Outcome metrics include the volume of the reachable motion envelope and the computed amplification factor.

Bubble Pop Task: The user pops as many bubbles that appear around them within one minute. The bubbles appear one at a time and only appear within the participant's field of view within the headset. During this period the user's hand positions are recorded every 50th of a second to map their movements in the space. Outcome measures include the number of bubbles popped in one minute, the total movement distance in one minute, and the 95th percentile hand velocity.

Pong Game: While seated at a table, the user controls a paddle by moving their hand forward or backward. The hand with the lower range of motion is assigned to control the paddle, with this hand amplified in the Amplification condition. A small ball bounces across the board which is oriented from left to right. On the side opposite the user's paddle is a paddle controlled by the computer. A point is earned if the ball passes by the paddle of the opposing player. Participants practice the task for one minute and then complete a two-minute game. Outcome measures include the number of times the paddle hits the ball, points scored, and opponent points scored.

Animal Feeding Task: The participant is seated at the end of a long table with a virtual animal visualized at the far end of the table. The participant pushes forward one of three cans sitting on the table until it crosses a white line to "feed" the animal, with the line's distance calibrated to the user's range of motion. Each can is labeled as a food for one of three animals (a dog, cat, and bird) and users must push the can that matches the visualized animal. Once the can has crossed the line, the animal will change its appearance into one of the other available options and play a sound clip (a bark for a dog, a meow for a cat, and a tweet for a bird). Participants practice the task for one minute and then complete a two-minute game. The outcome measure is the number of correct cans pushed during a two-minute period.

Surveys. After providing written informed consent, participants completed surveys that collected demographic information and pre-intervention data on VR experience and attitudes. One question asked, "How often have you used virtual reality systems?", with the options to select being *Very frequently*, *Frequently*, *Occasionally*, *Rarely*, *Never*. In the VR attitudes survey (Table I), participants responded to six statements using a Likert-scale [*Strongly Agree* (4), *Agree* (3), *Neutral* (2), *Disagree* (1), *Strongly Disagree* (0)]. The numerical equivalent scores reported for Statements 2 through 5 (Table I) were summed and their mean was used as an

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.23.24312233; this version posted August 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

overall metric indicating attitudes towards VR technology. Scores for Statements 3 and 6 were reverse-coded.

Following the VR exercises, an abbreviated motion sickness symptom assessment was administered and the VR attitudes survey was readministered. The difference between the pre-survey and post-survey mean scores was used to indicate the overall change in VR attitude attributed to the VR experience. The motion sickness symptom assessment consisted of 5 of 9 items from the Virtual Reality Sickness Questionnaire (VRSQ) (41): General Discomfort, Fatigue, Eyestrain, Difficulty Focusing, Headache. The mean score across the five items was used to indicate visually induced motion sickness immediately following the VR experience.

Table 1

The Statements Used to Assess Attitudes Towards Virtual Reality

Statement Number	Statement
1	I am very comfortable using technology (e.g., cellphones, computers, gaming systems).
2	I am very comfortable in virtual environments that are created using virtual reality systems.
3	I am concerned that I could damage the virtual reality system when I use it.
4	I think that virtual reality systems are easy to use.
5	I think that virtual reality could cause mental fatigue.
6	I am motivated to learn how to use virtual reality systems.

Analysis Plan

Range of motion and motor performance scores on each of the three VR tasks will be compared between groups using a two-sample t-test. For data presenting unequal variances, Welch's version of the test will be used. To determine if there is a change in VR attitude score across all participants following the VR experience, a Wilcoxon signed rank test will be run (on the medians) with the alternative hypothesis that the true location is not equal to 0 (median $\neq 0$). To determine if motion sickness levels exceeded minimal levels following the VR experience, a Wilcoxon signed rank test will be run (on the medians) with the alternative hypothesis that the true location is greater than 1 (median > 1). Wilcoxon rank sum tests will be run for comparisons between groups for both VR attitude change and reported motion sickness. Medians (and thus the nonparametric Wilcoxon tests) will be used with the non-normally distributed zero-inflated data we expect. Analysis scripts in the R programming language along with all data will be freely available at OSF upon publication.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.23.24312233; this version posted August 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Results:

Sixty healthy young adults completed VR rehabilitation exercises, with or without motor amplification. We sought to generate a normative baseline of user performance, measure attitudes towards the technology and how they change with VR exposure, gather feedback on user experience including motion sickness symptoms, and identify any effect of amplification on these metrics.

47 participants identified as women, 10 as men and 3 as non-binary. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 39 years old (mean age = 19.7 years, SD = 3.22 years). Three self-reported as left-handed.

During the calibration task, a Welch two-sample t-test indicated that the range of motion (ROM) for the left hand ($\mu = 0.41m^2$, range: 0.13 – 1.17 m^2) was not statistically different ($t(117.97) = -0.266$, $p = 0.79$) from the right-hand ROM ($\mu = 0.42m^2$, range: 0.12 – 1.07 m^2) (Fig. 1, Supplementary Fig. 1).

Figure 1. Range of motion (ROM) by hand during calibration. See Supplementary Fig. 1 for a breakdown of ROM by hand and amplification status.

Based on an individual's difference in ROM between the hands, an amplification factor was calculated to make these ROMs equal. The amplification factor calculated for participants with

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.23.24312233; this version posted August 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

smaller left-hand ROMs (μ = 1.056, range: 1.003 – 1.201, n = 25) was slightly larger than those with smaller right hand ROMs (μ = 1.035, range: 1.002 – 1.164, n = 35), but this was not a statistically significant difference (t(38.19) = 1.77, p = 0.085, Welch's t-test) (Fig. 2). After centering the amplification factors around zero (i.e. >0 indicates a right-hand amplification), a one-sample t-test indicated the amplification factors were not statistically different from zero (μ = -0.003, t(59) = -0.376, p = 0.71), indicating no hand side bias in detected ROM in this able-bodied participant sample.



Figure 2. Computed amplification factor for left and right hands across all participants.

With these small amplification factors, we observed no statistically significant effect of amplification on motor performance indicators across the three games tested (Figs. 3-5). In the Bubble Pop task, the amplified participant group popped a mean of 116.4 bubbles in one minute [SD = 66.3, range: 10 - 299] and the control group popped 102.5 bubbles [SD = 44.9, range: 13 - 235] (Fig. 3). A Welch's t-test indicated this was not a statistically significant difference (t(50.99) = -0.95, p = 0.34).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.23.24312233; this version posted August 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 3. Bubble pop results for participants without and with amplification.

In the Pong Game, the amplified participant group hit the ball a mean of 26.8 times in 2 minutes [SD = 3.00, range: 19 - 33] and the control group hit the ball 27.1 times [SD = 2.30, range: 23 - 32] (Fig. 4). A Welch's t-test indicated this was not a statistically significant difference ($t(54.32) = 0.39$, $p = 0.70$).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.23.24312233; this version posted August 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 4. Pong Game results for participants without and with amplification.

In the Animal Feeding Task, the amplified participant group pushed a mean of 38.1 cans in two minutes [SD = 21.1, range: 6 - 68] and the control group pushed 39.8 cans [SD = 18.8, range: 2 - 73] (Fig. 5). A Welch's t-test indicated this was not a statistically significant difference ($t(57.24) = 0.37$, $p = 0.74$).



Figure 5. Animal Feeding results for participants without and with amplification

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.23.24312233; this version posted August 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Across all participants in both conditions, there was an average increase in attitude towards VR of 0.23 (SD = 0.54) (Fig. 6A), representing a small effect size (Cohen's d = 0.44) that was statistically significant as indicated by a Wilcoxon signed rank test with continuity correction (V = 987, p < .001). The means for both conditions were numerically equivalent at 0.23 per question change in VR attitude score (amplification group SD = 0.53, control group SD = 0.56) (Fig. 6B).



Figure 6. Attitude change towards VR following the VR experience. A. Mean per question score change from the pre- to post-survey for all participants. A Wilcoxon signed rank test with continuity correction showed this change to be statistically significant (V = 987, p < .001). B. Same data as in A broken down by intervention group, with and without motor amplification.

Across all participants in both conditions there was a mean motion sickness score of 0.57 immediately following the VR experience (SD = 0.44, median = 0.4) (Fig. 7A). Note that three participants did not complete all of the questions on the motion sickness survey and their data have been omitted from these results. As a motion sickness score below 1 indicates a minor effect (average response below 'slightly' in response to individual symptoms), a Wilcoxon signed rank test with continuity correction rejected the alternative hypothesis that u > 1 (V =

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.23.24312233; this version posted August 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

95.5, p = 1). Amplified group participants showed slightly higher motion sickness scores (mean = 0.64, median = 0.6) compared to control participants (mean = 0.50, median = 0.4) but a Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction indicated that this was not a statistically significant difference (W = 326, p = .20) (Fig. 7B).



Figure 7. Motion sickness immediately following the VR experience. A. Mean score per statement for all participants. A Wilcoxon signed rank test with continuity correction rejected the alternative hypothesis that mean is greater than 1 (V = 95.5, p = 1). B. Same data as in A broken down by intervention group, with and without motor amplification.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.23.24312233; this version posted August 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Discussion:

We tested a virtual reality stroke rehabilitation platform in healthy younger adults and generated a pool of normative motor performance data. These data, alongside forthcoming data from healthy older adults, will enable quantitative motor recovery comparisons in stroke patients.

Importantly, we observed no statistically significant differences in motor performance between the amplification and no amplification groups. Despite the small amplification factors in the healthy participants (90% of participants had amplification factors less than 10%), the amplification still presents a visual perturbation. We have verified that this manipulation does not inadvertently affect baseline motor performance in healthy younger adults.

Participant attitudes towards VR technology improved following the VR experience, with similar positive shifts observed in both the amplification and no amplification groups. These results suggest the feasibility for more widespread clinical adoption of such VR exercises.

Another important finding is that minimal motion sickness was reported, though slightly higher motion sickness levels were observed in the motor amplification group. Although this was not a statistically significant difference, it could indicate potential issues with the greater amplification factors required in clinical populations. Careful study with participants with reduced ROM requiring increased amplification is necessary to further investigate this.

Seven out of 60 participants did present average motion sickness scores above 1 suggesting that there is room for improvement in the VR system. However, no baseline motion sickness data were collected so it is possible that other factors could have contributed to the feelings of motion sickness data reported. Nevertheless, emerging headsets with improved graphics and hand tracking may organically reduce experienced motion sickness. Lessons learned from this study have led to subsequent software improvements including a more standardized testing environment, improved virtual coach instructions and demonstrations, and more stringent task constraints to reduce head movements.

As an initial feasibility assessment of this new technology, our study has several limitations that should be addressed in future work. The focus here on a healthy younger adult population, while necessary, restricts the generalizability of our findings to inform the system's future clinical deployment. A forthcoming study testing healthy older adults as well as ongoing work with stroke patients will address this limitation. Additionally, the VR exposure in this study was limited to three tasks in a single session. Ongoing comprehensive testing will study the system's feasibility when implemented across multiple sessions in a clinical setting.

Overall, the VR system presented here shows strong potential for clinical deployment as a stroke rehabilitation solution. Importantly, the use of a low-cost consumer headset could make this emerging treatment paradigm accessible to more patients than previous VR stroke rehabilitation systems. Before clinical deployment, next steps include a forthcoming feasibility study with healthy older adults and clinical studies with stroke survivors.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.23.24312233; this version posted August 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References:

1. Feigin VL, Brainin M, Norrving B, Martins S, Sacco RL, Hacke W, et al. World Stroke Organization (WSO): Global Stroke Fact Sheet 2022. International Journal of Stroke. 2022 Jan 1;17(1):18–29.

2. Nakayama H, Jørgensen HS, Raaschou HO, Olsen TS. Recovery of upper extremity function in stroke patients: the Copenhagen Stroke Study. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 1994 Apr;75(4):394–8.

3. Wang H, Camicia M, Terdiman J, Mannava MK, Sidney S, Sandel ME. Daily treatment time and functional gains of stroke patients during inpatient rehabilitation. PM R. 2013 Feb;5(2):122–8.

4. Imura T, Nagasawa Y, Fukuyama H, Imada N, Oki S, Araki O. Effect of early and intensive rehabilitation in acute stroke patients: retrospective pre-/post-comparison in Japanese hospital. Disabil Rehabil. 2018 Jun;40(12):1452–5.

5. Schneider EJ, Lannin NA, Ada L, Schmidt J. Increasing the amount of usual rehabilitation improves activity after stroke: a systematic review. J Physiother. 2016 Oct;62(4):182–7.

6. Taub E, Uswatte G, King DK, Morris D, Crago JE, Chatterjee A. A Placebo-Controlled Trial of Constraint-Induced Movement Therapy for Upper Extremity After Stroke. Stroke. 2006 Mar;37(4):1045–9.

7. Krakauer JW, Kitago T, Goldsmith J, Ahmad O, Roy P, Stein J, et al. Comparing a Novel Neuroanimation Experience to Conventional Therapy for High-Dose Intensive Upper-Limb Training in Subacute Stroke: The SMARTS2 Randomized Trial. Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair. 2021;35(5):393–405.

8. Bahouth MN, Zink EK, Ahmad O, Roy P, Zeiler SR, Urrutia VC, et al. Bringing High-Dose Neurorestorative Behavioral Training Into the Acute Stroke Unit. American Journal of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation. 2023 Feb;102(2S):S33.

9. Prabhakaran S, Zarahn E, Riley C, Speizer A, Chong JY, Lazar RM, et al. Inter-individual Variability in the Capacity for Motor Recovery After Ischemic Stroke. Neurorehabil Neural Repair. 2008 Jan;22(1):64–71.

10. Hankey GJ, Spiesser J, Hakimi Z, Bego G, Carita P, Gabriel S. Rate, degree, and predictors of recovery from disability following ischemic stroke. Neurology. 2007 May 8;68(19):1583–7.

11. Cramer SC. Repairing the human brain after stroke: I. Mechanisms of spontaneous recovery. Ann Neurol. 2008 Mar;63(3):272–87.

12. Zhao LR, Willing A. Enhancing endogenous capacity to repair a stroke-damaged brain: An evolving field for stroke research. Progress in Neurobiology. 2018 Apr 1;163–164:5–26.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.23.24312233; this version posted August 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

13. Viana R, Teasell R. Barriers to the Implementation of Constraint-Induced Movement Therapy Into Practice. Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation. 2012 Mar;19(2):104–14.

14. Constraint-Induced Movement Therapy for Rehabilitation of Arm Dysfunction After Stroke in Adults. Ont Health Technol Assess Ser. 2011 Nov 1;11(6):1–58.

15. Bank of Canada [Internet]. [cited 2024 Jun 7]. Inflation Calculator. Available from: https://www.bankofcanada.ca/rates/related/inflation-calculator/

16. Christie LJ, Fearn N, McCluskey A, Lovarini M, Rendell R, Pearce A. Cost-Effectiveness of Constraint-Induced Movement Therapy Implementation in Neurorehabilitation: The ACTIveARM Project. PharmacoEconomics Open. 2022 May 1;6(3):437–50.

17. Jia H, Cowper DC, Tang Y, Litt E, Wilson L. Postacute Stroke Rehabilitation Utilization: Are There Differences Between Rural-Urban Patients and Taxonomies?: Stroke Rehabilitation and Rural-Urban taxonomy. The Journal of Rural Health. 2012 Jun;28(3):242–7.

18. Peek K, Sanson-Fisher R, Mackenzie L, Carey M. Patient adherence to physiotherapist prescribed self-management strategies: A critical review. International Journal of Therapy and Rehabilitation. 2015 Nov 2;22(11):535–43.

19. Campbell R. Why don't patients do their exercises? Understanding non-compliance with physiotherapy in patients with osteoarthritis of the knee. Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health. 2001 Feb 1;55(2):132–8.

20. Schoo AMM, Morris ME, Bui QM. The effects of mode of exercise instruction on compliance with a home exercise program in older adults with osteoarthritis. Physiotherapy. 2005 Jun 1;91(2):79–86.

21. Mayo NE, MacKay-Lyons MJ, Scott SC, Moriello C, Brophy J. A randomized trial of two home-based exercise programmes to improve functional walking post-stroke. Clin Rehabil. 2013 Jul;27(7):659–71.

22. Rastall M, Brooks B, Klarneta M, Moylan N, McCloud W, Tracey S. An Investigation into Younger and Older Adults' Memory for Physiotherapy Exercises. Physiotherapy. 1999 Mar 1;85(3):122–8.

23. Reilly K, Lovejoy B, Williams R, Roth H. Differences between a supervised and independent strength and conditioning program with chronic low back syndromes. J Occup Med. 1989 Jun;31(6):547–50.

24. Understanding the Needs of People Living With Heart Disease and Stroke During the Covid-19 Pandemic: A Public Opinion Survey. Unpublished. Toronto, Ontario, 2021. In: Canadian Stroke Best Practice Recommendations: Virtual Stroke Rehabilitation Interim Consensus Statement [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2023 Jun 15]. p. 1076–82. Available from: https://journals.lww.com/10.1097/PHM.0000000000002062

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.23.24312233; this version posted August 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

25. Caughlin S, Mehta S, Corriveau H, Eng JJ, Eskes G, Kairy D, et al. Implementing Telerehabilitation After Stroke: Lessons Learned from Canadian Trials. Telemedicine and e-Health. 2020 Jun 1;26(6):710–9.

26. Laver KE, Adey-Wakeling Z, Crotty M, Lannin NA, George S, Sherrington C. Telerehabilitation services for stroke. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Sep 23];2020(1). Available from: https://www.readcube.com/articles/10.1002%2F14651858.CD010255.pub3

27. Tchero H, Tabue Teguo M, Lannuzel A, Rusch E. Telerehabilitation for Stroke Survivors: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. J Med Internet Res. 2018 Oct 26;20(10):e10867.

28. Chen J, Jin W, Zhang XX, Xu W, Liu XN, Ren CC. Telerehabilitation Approaches for Stroke Patients: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis. 2015 Dec;24(12):2660–8.

29. Sarfo FS, Ulasavets U, Opare-Sem OK, Ovbiagele B. Tele-Rehabilitation after Stroke: An Updated Systematic Review of the Literature. J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis. 2018 Sep;27(9):2306–18.

30. Appleby E, Gill ST, Hayes LK, Walker TL, Walsh M, Kumar S. Effectiveness of telerehabilitation in the management of adults with stroke: A systematic review. PLoS One. 2019;14(11):e0225150.

31. Knepley KD, Mao JZ, Wieczorek P, Okoye FO, Jain AP, Harel NY. Impact of Telerehabilitation for Stroke-Related Deficits. Telemed J E Health. 2021 Mar;27(3):239–46.

32. Fox S, Fisk A, Harris K, Blustein D. Patients and clinicians as collaborators on the development and acceptance of a virtual reality stroke rehabilitation platform. In Medical Rehabilitation Research Resource Network; 2023.

33. Toronto Rehabilitation Stroke Program: Toronto Rehab Virtual Care Toolkit Evaluation Survey. Unpublished data. Toronto, Canada, 2022. In: Canadian Stroke Best Practice Recommendations: Virtual Stroke Rehabilitation Interim Consensus Statement [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2023 Jun 15]. p. 1076–82. Available from: https://journals.lww.com/10.1097/PHM.0000000000002062

34. Tsekleves E, Paraskevopoulos IT, Warland A, Kilbride C. Development and preliminary evaluation of a novel low cost VR-based upper limb stroke rehabilitation platform using Wii technology. Disability and Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology. 2016 Jul 3;11(5):413–22.

35. Shin JH, Ryu H, Jang SH. A task-specific interactive game-based virtual reality rehabilitation system for patients with stroke: a usability test and two clinical experiments. J NeuroEngineering Rehabil. 2014 Dec;11(1):32.

36. Trombetta M, Bazzanello Henrique PP, Brum MR, Colussi EL, De Marchi ACB, Rieder R. Motion Rehab AVE 3D: A VR-based exergame for post-stroke rehabilitation. Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine. 2017 Nov;151:15–20.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.23.24312233; this version posted August 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

37. Cho S, Ku J, Cho YK, Kim IY, Kang YJ, Jang DP, et al. Development of virtual reality proprioceptive rehabilitation system for stroke patients. Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine. 2014 Jan;113(1):258–65.

38. Ballester BR, Nirme J, Duarte E, Cuxart A, Rodriguez S, Verschure P, et al. The visual amplification of goal-oriented movements counteracts acquired non-use in hemiparetic stroke patients. J NeuroEngineering Rehabil. 2015 Dec;12(1):50.

39. Ikbali Afsar S, Mirzayev I, Umit Yemisci O, Cosar Saracgil SN. Virtual Reality in Upper Extremity Rehabilitation of Stroke Patients: A Randomized Controlled Trial. Journal of Stroke and Cerebrovascular Diseases. 2018 Dec;27(12):3473–8.

40. Kiper P, Szczudlik A, Agostini M, Opara J, Nowobilski R, Ventura L, et al. Virtual Reality for Upper Limb Rehabilitation in Subacute and Chronic Stroke: A Randomized Controlled Trial. Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation. 2018 May;99(5):834-842.e4.

41. Kim HK, Park J, Choi Y, Choe M. Virtual reality sickness questionnaire (VRSQ): Motion sickness measurement index in a virtual reality environment. Applied Ergonomics. 2018 May;69:66–73.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.23.24312233; this version posted August 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Supplementary Figure 1. ROM calculated during calibration, broken down by hand and amplification status. Lines connect the left and right ROM for each individual participant. For amplified participants, the hand which had the lower extent in at least 2 of the 3 dimensions was selected to be amplified. For one right hand amplified participant (right panel), even with this criterion, the volume of the range of motion envelope was larger in the amplified side.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.23.24312233; this version posted August 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Supplementary Figure 2. Total distance moved during the calibration phase and bubble pop task, broken down by hand and amplification status. White filled circles indicate group means.