

Impact of Virtual Reality, Augmented Reality and Mixed Reality Technologies in Supporting Life with Disabilities - A Review

K.Pradeep¹, K.Prakasan²

¹Department of Production Engineering, PSG College of Technology, Coimbatore, India.

²Department of Production Engineering, PSG College of Technology, Coimbatore, India.

Email: ¹kpp.psgtech@gmail.com, ²kpr.prod@psgtech.ac.in

Abstract— *Virtual Reality (VR), Augmented Reality (AR) and Mixed Reality (MR) is seeing a pharaonic rise due to the developments in computer, graphics, and sensor technologies. Industry 4.0 is acting as a catalyst for the growth of these technologies. This review paper is prepared by perceiving research papers and medical reports published in the last 25 years where Virtual Reality and Mixed Reality technologies are used to bring solace into the life of disabled individuals. Outcomes of different research are compared and critically analyzed.*

Keywords— *virtual reality, mixed reality, augmented reality, disability*

1. INTRODUCTION

Virtual Reality technology has been in vogue since the mid-20th Century. Morton Leonard Heilig invented Sensorama in 1962, which is considered as the first Virtual Reality hardware ever made [1]. He made this device to enable users to be part of the movie that he has made. Since then, VR technology has grown multiple folds in terms of applications and users. The technology is finding applications in multiple domains such as training [2, 3 and 4], healthcare [5, 6 and 7], data visualization [8, 9 and 10], video games [11,12 and 13], education [14,15,16 and 17] and tourism [18, 19, 20 and 21]. The reason for the widespread acceptance of the technology is attributed to the sharp fall in the price to performance ratio of computers [22, 23], graphic cards [24] and sensors [25]. In the past decade, Virtual Reality technology has been finding its way to the consumer market due to the digitalization of day-to-day activities [26 and 27]. Artificial Intelligence [28], Cloud Computing [29] and 5G technologies are enabling technology firms to scale up their Virtual Reality applications and increase their profit margins. VR technology hit a stagnation point in the late 90's due to the high cost of sensors and graphic technology. Such limitations led to the rise of Augmented Reality in the early 21st century. This technology does not require any additional device other than the smart mobile devices that most people have and use these days. AR technology is intended for the consumer market, which is not willing to invest a lot of capital into VR technology that is still growing into the consumer market. Interest around this technology came to a halt when researchers and developers realised that it provides lesser immersion when compared to Virtual Reality technology. Both Virtual Reality and Augmented Reality are still popular in various domains. Shortcoming of Virtual Reality and Augmented Reality got overshadowed by Mixed Reality which picked the best apples out of both its predecessors. This technology enables the user to experience a very high

level of immersion by rendering a virtual environment on top of real objects which the users can interact with [30].

In healthcare, VR, AR and MR technologies are used for patient rehabilitation [31, 32 and 33], pre-surgery training [34, 35 and 36] and as a possible treatment for trauma [37, 38 and 39]. In this paper we have explored, compared and analysed the outcomes of these technologies in aiding rehabilitation and treatment of various disabilities. According to the World Health Organisation (WHO), over 15% of the human population has some form of disability [40]. WHO defines disability as the inability of an individual to carry out certain tasks or activities. Every individual will exhibit one or more types of disability during their lifetime. Disabilities are very prevalent in the elderly population. In a study conducted by the WHO, it is predicted that the world will have a large percentage of its population over the age 60 years or above by the year 2050 [41]. And thus any interventions that are designed should be suitable for the elderly population as well.

The International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) framework is assisting researchers and healthcare workers to understand qualitative and quantitative data with respect to disability [42]. This framework also helps to determine the kind of intervention a disabled individual will require. According to ICF, there is a relationship between the ability of an individual to carry out tasks or activities, environment in which the individual works or lives, individuals ability to participate in social activities, individuals personal character, body functions, structure and health condition.

The United Nations (UN) too have intervened to support the disabled individuals. The UN 2030 Agenda from which the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) are derived from have goals and targets set to improve the quality of life of the disabled individuals. The Goal 3 and Goal 10 of the SDG are framed to improve the health and livelihood of the marginalized populations, especially the disabled communities [43, 44 and 45].

2. METHOD

The objective of preparing this review paper is to share our interpretations and insights into various methods adopted by researchers in developing interventions for the disabled individuals using Virtual Reality, Augmented Reality and Mixed Reality. We have also compared and discussed the results of papers reviewed to facilitate proper selection of methodology, devices, and participants for future studies.

In this paper, we have explored, compared, and analyzed the outcomes of VR, AR and MR based interventions in rehabilitation and treatment of disabilities. We have considered motor, visual, and cognitive disabilities for this review. These three disabilities are plaguing the majority of individuals. Nine papers published in Scientific Report (4 papers), Eye (1 paper) and Virtual Reality (4 papers) are reviewed in this paper. The average age of participants in the paper selected is twenty five years (Mean Age, $M = 25$) and total number of participants is 450 (average count per study, $n = 17.31$). Classifications are not done based on genders. It is assumed that the Assistive Technologies will benefit individuals of all genders equally. We have also enumerated and discussed various hardware and software used for these studies.

3. DISCUSSION

We have compared the VR, AR and MR technology based interventions to the conventional interventions. We have reviewed the papers by comparing the studies based on whether the VR/AR/MR applications are created by using only the computer generated environment or a blend of computer generated visuals and real life entities. The qualitative comparison is done by considering various VR,AR and MR parameters like immersion, error, effectiveness of intervention to name a few. Details of the same are summarised in Table I and Table II.

TABLE I. COMPARING RESULTS OF RESEARCH WHERE RECREATION OF REAL WORLD IN THE VIRTUAL ENVIRONMENT

Authors	Target Function	Participant Information	Results compared to Traditional Training
Anglin <i>et al</i> [46]	Viscomotor	n = 24 M = 23.9	Immersion ↔ Sickness ↔ Target error ↔ Reaction time ↔ Movement time ↔ Cognitive response ↑
Rebecca <i>et al</i> [47]	Vision	n = 44 M = 24	Capacity of visual working memory ↑ Visual processing speed ↑
Nesaratnam <i>et al</i> [48]	Vision	n = 3 M = 47.33	Cost of testing ↑ Lancaster red-green score ↔ Hess screen score ↔ Lees screen score ↔
Alain <i>et al</i> [49]	Vision	n = 63	Auditory perception ↔
Chris <i>et al</i> [50]	Motor	n = 48 M = 23.9	Task completion time ↑ Users perception ↓

↔ No Change, ↓ Decreased, ↑ Increased, n = Number of participants and M = Mean Age of the Participants

TABLE II. COMPARING RESULTS OF RESEARCH WHERE CUSTOM MADE VIRTUAL ENVIRONMENT

Authors	Target Function	Participant Information	Results compared to Traditional Training
Yannick <i>et al</i> [51]	Vision	n = 60 M = 25.1	Accuracy in men ↑ Visual awareness ↑ Rod and Frame test ↑
Woong Choi <i>et al</i> [52]	Viscomotor	n = 17 M = 20.12	Tracking accuracy (Frontal and Sagittal Plane) ↑ Errors (Frontal and Sagittal Plane) ↓

Girolamo et al [53]	Vestibular system	n = 105	Vestibular ocular reflex ↑ Vestibulo spinal reflex ↑
Sha et al [54]	Motor	n = 30	Task completion time ↔ Effectivity of training ↑
Line et al [55]	Cognitive and Viscomotor	n = 22 M = 23	Score of copy and recall ↔

↔ No Change, ↓ Decreased, ↑ Increased, n = Number of participants and M = Mean Age of the Participants

After reviewing several research papers and reports by WHO, it is observed that 75% of the research is done to benefit the individuals with movement disability (*Table III*). This could be due to the large proportion of the population facing movement disability when compared to other disabilities. This could also be attributed to the fact that ageing and other age related illness causes some form of movement disability. Most papers concluded that the interventions were on the positive side, despite not conducting clinical trials. Authors did indicate the need for such trials and some authors even planned to conduct them after they published their initial findings.

TABLE III. DISTRIBUTION OF STUDIES BASED ON THE TYPE OF DISABILITY

S.No.	Technology	Targeted Disability	Number of Papers
1.	Virtual Reality	Movement Disability	16
		Cognitive Disability	03
		Vision Disability	03
		Hearing Disability	01
2.	Mixed Reality	Movement Disability	02
		Cognitive Disability	01

TABLE IV. SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS FROM THE STUDY CONDUCTED BY NASRIN ET AL [55]

S.No.	Recommended Framework of Intervention
1.	Games based interventions must be user friendly and entertaining.
2.	Participants prefer to engage in the rehabilitation programme along with their family members.

3.	As participants are not familiar with new technologies, special consideration must be given while designing interventions around them.
4.	As most of the daily activities performed by any individual heavily rely on hands, interventions must be designed to enhance upper limb motor functions.

From the papers reviewed, it is understood that there is little to no consideration given to the needs of a disabled individual. Interventions were designed around the problem and not the user who is facing the problem (not human centric). WHO's framework is not adopted either. This limits the capabilities of the disabled individual.

The potential of Mixed Reality technology is not explored by researchers while designing interventions around disability (table 2). Although this technology has been there for a while, only a few researchers used it in their work. It is our opinion that the use of Mixed Reality will be more effective and relevant, for studies that involve disabled individuals. This is from the fact that the Mixed Reality technology provided the highest level of immersion when compared to Virtual Reality (and Augmented Reality).

Hardware used in the studies are either commercially available in the market or designed and built for the purpose of the study. And most of these hardware are intended for gaming but repurposed for research. In this study, nineteen commercial and four custom build hardware were used. All the custom built hardware used will require large space to operate and hence is not feasible for intervention at home environment. Enumeration of the devices used is in Table V.

Most researchers have utilized Oculus Rift for their studies. Thus, it is safe to assume that the device is standardised for conducting experiments and designing interventions for the disabled individuals.

There are a lot of interventions designed by doctors who are treating patients with diseases that cause disabilities. Vast majority of the papers reviewed are from NeuroScience

HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE USED IN VARIOUS STUDIES

S.No.	Parameter / Method
1.	<p style="text-align: center;">Commercial Hardware used in studies:</p> Samsung Gear VR Microsoft Kinect Microsoft HoloLens Nintendo Balance Board Nintendo Fitness Plus Bertec Balance Advantage Leap Motion iPad Touch Oculus Rift nVisor SX HMD Optitrack VICON Nexus Motion Capture System Magnetic Tracker EMG Biofeedback System

	Phantom Omni EEG Sensors ArmeoSpring Braccio di Ferro Force Dimension Delta-6 Robot Intersense IS 1200 Optical Tracking System
2.	Software used in the studies: Unity Blender

4. CONCLUSIONS

Although this paper focuses extensively on Virtual Reality and Mixed Reality, it is worth noting that Augmented Reality could provide low cost solutions. The advantages of the technology are not capitalized yet by the research community. Most interventions use VR which is followed by MR and AR. Augmented Reality which lies between the VR and MR must be studied for its feasibility in designing interventions around disability. The technology could add value to cognitive studies and rehabilitation research [56]. Further studies must be conducted to understand the relationship between the accuracy of the virtual environment and level of immersion on the effectiveness of interventions. Based on our analysis, we recommend pursuing VR and MR based solutions for effective treatment and reduced treatment time. Moving towards AR is recommended only when cost of investment is a factor of concern. In continuation of our assessments in this paper, we have decided to build both VR and MR based solutions for the disabled individuals. Outcomes of our studies will be published shortly. VR, AR and MR have the ability to change the lives of the disabled individuals.

We hope that the data presented in this paper helps researchers in their studies and improve the quality, usability and affordability and effectiveness of the interventions that are designed around disability.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We are grateful to the management of PSG College of Technology for providing us access to valuable resources that helped in preparing this paper.

5. REFERENCES

- [1] Grigore C. Burdea and Philippe Coiffet, “Virtual Reality Technology”, 2nd Edition, Wiley IEEE Press, 2003.
- [2] Alexandra D. Kaplan, Jessica Cruit, Mica Endsley, Suzanne M. Beers, Ben D. Sawyer and P. A. Hancock, “The Effects of Virtual Reality, Augmented Reality, and Mixed Reality as Training Enhancement Methods: A Meta-Analysis”, Human Factors and Ergonomics Society, vol.63, no.4, pp.706-726, February 2020.
- [3] Dorota Kamińska, Grzegorz Zwoliński, Sławomir Wiak, Lidija Petkovska, Goga Cvetkovski, Paolo Di Barba, Maria Evelina Mognaschi, Rain Eric Haamer and Gholamreza Anbarjafari, “Virtual Reality-Based Training: Case Study in Mechatronics”, Technology, Knowledge and Learning, August 2020.

- [4] Kunjal Ahir, Kajal Govani, Rutvik Gajera and Manan Shah, “Application on Virtual Reality for Enhanced Education Learning, Military Training and Sports”, *Augmented Human Research*, vol.5, no.1, pp.1-9, December 2020.
- [5] Mathilde R. Desselle, Ross A. Brown, Allan R. James, Mark J. Midwinter, Sean K. Powell and Maria A. Woodruff, “Augmented and Virtual Reality in Surgery”, *Computing in Science & Engineering*, vol.22, no.3, pp.18-26, February 2020.
- [6] Cecilia Sik-Lanyi, “Virtual Reality Healthcare System could be a Potential Future of Health Consultations”, 2017 IEEE 30th Neumann Colloquium (NC), pp.15-20, January 2018.
- [7] OmarLópez Chávez, Luis-FelipeRodríguez and J. OctavioGutierrez-Garcia, “A Comparative Case Study of 2D, 3D and Immersive-Virtual-Reality Applications for Healthcare Education”, *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, vol.141, pp.1-9 , June 2020.
- [8] Ciro Donalek, S. G. Djorgovski, Alex Cioc, Anwell Wang, Jerry Zhang, Elizabeth Lawler, Stacy Yeh, Ashish Mahabal, Matthew Graham, Andrew Drake, Scott Davidoff, Jeffrey S. Norris and Giuseppe Longo, “Immersive and Collaborative Data Visualization using Virtual Reality Platforms”, 2014 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data), pp. 609-614, January 2015.
- [9] Ekaterina Olshannikova, Aleksandr Ometov, Yevgeni Koucheryavy and Thomas Olsson, “Visualizing Big Data with augmented and virtual reality: challenges and research agenda”, *Journal of Big Data*, vol.2, no.22, October 2015.
- [10] Richen Liu, Hailong Wang, Chuyu Zhang, Xiaojian Chen, Lijun Wang, Genlin Ji, Bin Zhao, Zhiwei Mao and Dan Yang, “Narrative Scientific Data Visualization in an Immersive Environment”, *Bioinformatics*, July 2021.
- [11] AaronDrummond, James D.Sauer, Christopher J.Ferguson, Peter R.Cannona and Lauren C.Halla, “Violent and Non-violent Virtual Reality Video Games: Influences on Affect, Aggressive Cognition, and Aggressive Behavior. Two Pre-registered Experiments”, *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, vol.95, March 2021.
- [12] Christopher J. Ferguson, Anastasiia Gryshyna, Jung Soo Kim, Emma Knowles, Zainab Nadeem, Izabela Cardozo, Carolin Esser, Victoria Trebbi and Emily Willis, “Video Games, Frustration, Violence, and Virtual Reality: Two Studies”, *British Journal of Social Psychology*, June 2021.
- [13] Daniel M. Shafer, Corey P. Carbonara, and Michael F. Korpi, “Factors Affecting Enjoyment of Virtual Reality Games: A Comparison Involving Consumer-Grade Virtual Reality Technology”, vol.8, no.1, pp. 15-23, February 2019.
- [14] Nikolaos Pellas, Stylianos Mystakidis and Ioannis Kazanidis, “Immersive Virtual Reality in K-12 and Higher Education: A Systematic Review of the Last Decade Scientific Literature”, *Virtual Reality*, January 2021.
- [15] Jack Pottle, “Virtual reality and the transformation of medical education”, *Future Health Journal*, vol.6, no.3, pp.181-185, October 2019.
- [16] Dorota Kamińska, Tomasz Sapiński, Sławomir Wiak, Toomas Tikk, Rain Eric Haamer, Egils Avots, Ahmed Helmi, Cagri Ozcinar and Gholamreza Anbarjafari “Virtual Reality and Its Applications in Education: Survey”, *Multimodal Technologies and Interaction*, vol.10, no.10, September 2019.
- [17] Areej Abuhammad, Jannat Falah, Salasabeel F. M. Alfalah, Muhannad Abu-Tarboush, Ruba T. Tarawneh, Dimitris Drikakis and Vassilis Charissis, “MedChemVR: A Virtual Reality Game to Enhance Medicinal Chemistry Education”, *Multimodal Technologies and Interaction*, vol.5, no.3, March 2021.

- [18] Myung Ja Kim and C. Michael Hall, “A Hedonic Motivation Model in Virtual Reality Tourism: Comparing Visitors and Non-visitors”, *International Journal of Information Management*, vol.46, pp.236-249, June 2019.
- [19] Myung Ja Kim, Choong-Ki Lee and Timothy Jung, “Exploring Consumer Behavior in Virtual Reality Tourism Using an Extended Stimulus-Organism-Response Model”, *Journal of Travel Research*, vol.59, no.1, pp.69-89, December 2018.
- [20] Adam Wagler and Michael D. Hanus, “Comparing Virtual Reality Tourism to Real-Life Experience: Effects of Presence and Engagement on Attitude and Enjoyment”, *Communication Research Reports*, vol.35, No.5, pp.456-464, October 2018.
- [21] Iis P.Tussyadiah, Dan Wang, Timothy H.Jung and M.Claudiatom Dieck, “Virtual reality, presence, and attitude change: Empirical evidence from tourism”, *Tourism Management*, vol.66, pp.140-154, June 2018.
- [22] Dinesh S.Dave and Kathy E.Fitzpatrick, “Price/performance of desktop computers in the U.S. computer industry”, *Information & Management*, vol.20, No.3, pp.161-182, March 1991.
- [23] Lukasz Szustak, Roman Wyrzykowski, Lukasz Kuczynski and Tomasz Olas, “Architectural Adaptation and Performance-Energy Optimization for CFD Application on AMD EPYC Rome”, vol.32, no.12, pp.2852-2866, May 2021.
- [24] Carsten Kutzner, Szilárd Páll, Martin Fechner, Ansgar Esztermann, Bert L. de Groot and Helmut Grubmüller, “More bang for your buck: Improved use of GPU nodes for GROMACS 2018”, *Journal of Computational Chemistry*, vol.40, no.27, pp.2418-2431, July 2019.
- [25] Lingyun Jiang, Ruchuan Wang, Wenxiang Qian and Yachao Lv, “Low-Cost VR System Based on Wireless Accelerometer Sensor”, *Communications in Computer and Information Science*, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, vol.334, pp.127-136, 2013.
- [26] Joshua McVeigh-Schultz and Katherine Isbister, “The Case for “Weird Social” in VR/XR: A Vision of Social Superpowers Beyond Meatspace”, *CHI: Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp.1-10, May 2021.
- [27] Patrice Rondao Alface, Maarten Aerts, Donny Tytgat, Sammy Lievens, Christoph Stevens, Nico Verzijp and Jean François Macq, “16K Cinematic VR Streaming”, *MM 17: Proceedings of the 25th ACM international conference on Multimedia*, pp.1105-1113, October 2017.
- [28] Di Qi, Adam Ryason, Nicholas Milef, Samuel Alfred, Mohamad Rassoul Abu-Nuwar, Mojdeh Kappus, Suvranu De and Daniel B. Jones, “Virtual Reality Operating Room With AI Guidance: Design and Validation of a Fire Scenario”, *Surgical Endoscopy*, Vol.35, No.2, pp.779-789, February 2021.
- [29] Victor Chang, “An Overview, Examples, and Impacts Offered by Emerging Services and Analytics in Cloud Computing Virtual Reality”, *Neural Computing and Applications*, Vol.29, No.5, pp.1243-1256, April 2017.
- [30] Franco Tecchia, Giovanni Avveduto, Raffaello Brondi, Marcello A Carrozzino, Massimo Bergamasco and Leila Alem, “I’m in VR!: using your own hands in a fully immersive MR system”, *VRST 14: Proceedings of the 20th ACM Symposium on Virtual Reality Software and Technology*, pp.73-76, November 2014.
- [31] Negin Hamzeheinejad, Daniel Roth, Samantha Monty, Julian Breuer, Anuschka Rodenberg and Marc Erich Latoschik, “The Impact of Implicit and Explicit Feedback on Performance and Experience during VR-Supported Motor Rehabilitation”, *2021 IEEE Virtual Reality and 3D User Interfaces*, pp.382-391, May 2021.

- [32] Hanin A. Almurashi and Rahma Bouaziz, “Augmented Reality and Autism Spectrum Disorder Rehabilitation: Scoping Review”, 2020 IEEE International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Virtual Reality, Vol.1, pp243-246, 2021.
- [33] Teresa Vilar Paredes, Octavian Postolache, João Monge and Pedro Silva Girão, “Gait Rehabilitation System based on Mixed Reality”, Telecoms Conference (ConfTELE), pp.1-6, May 2021.
- [34] Abel J Lungu, Wout Swinkels, Luc Claesen, Puxun Tu, Jan Egger and Xiaojun Chen, “A Review On The Applications Of Virtual Reality, Augmented Reality and Mixed Reality in Surgical Simulation: An Extension to Different Kinds of Surgery”, Expert Review of Medical Devices, vol.18, no.1, pp.47-62, January 2021.
- [35] Vuthea Chheang, Patrick Saalfeld, Fabian Joeres, Christian Boedecker, Tobias Huber, Florentine Huettl, Hauke Lang, Bernhard Preim and Christian Hansen, “A Collaborative Virtual Reality Environment For Liver Surgery Planning”, Computer & Graphics, vol.99, pp.234-246, July 2021.
- [36] Fabio A. Casari, Nassir Navab, Laura A. Hruby, Philipp Kriechling, Ricardo Nakamura, Romero Tori, Fátima de Lourdes dos Santos Nunes, Marcelo C. Queiroz, Philipp Fürnstahl and Mazda Farshad, “Augmented Reality in Orthopedic Surgery Is Emerging from Proof of Concept Towards Clinical Studies: a Literature Review Explaining the Technology and Current State of the Art”, Current Reviews in Musculoskeletal Medicine, vol.14, pp.192-203, February 2021.
- [37] Minhua MaLakhmi C. JainPaul Anderson, “Virtual, Augmented Reality and Serious Games for Healthcare 1”, Ed.1, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2014.
- [38] Ehsan Azimi, Alexander Winkler, Emerson Tucker, Long Qian, Manyu Sharma, Jayfus Doswel, Nassir Navab and Peter Kazanzides, “Evaluation of Optical See-Through Head-Mounted Displays in Training for Critical Care and Trauma”, 2018 IEEE Conference on Virtual Reality and 3D User Interfaces (VR), pp.1-9, August 2018.
- [39] Deborah C.Beidel, B. Christopher Frueh, Sandra M.Neer, Clint A.Bowers, Benjamin Trachik, Thomas W.Uhde and Anouk Grubaugh, “Trauma Management Therapy with Virtual-reality Augmented Exposure Therapy for Combat-related PTSD: A Randomized Controlled Trial”, Journal of Anxiety Disorder, vol.61, pp.64-74, August 2019.
- [40] World Health Organization, “World report on disability”, WHO Library Publication Data, pp.27-37, 2011.
- [41] World Health Organization, “World report on ageing and health”, WHO Library Publication Data, pp.56-88, 2015.
- [42] World Health Organization, “How to use the ICF: A practical manual for using the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF)”, 2013.
- [43] Beth Sprunt, Joanne Deppeler, Kitone Ravulo, Savaira Tinaivunivalu and Umesh Sharma, “Entering the SDG era: What do Fijians prioritise as indicators of disability-inclusive education?”, Disability and the Global South, vol.4, no.1, pp.1065-1087, January 2017.
- [44] Claire E. Brolan, “A Word of Caution: Human Rights, Disability, and Implementation of the Post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals”, Laws, vol.5, no.2, pp.1-18, May 2016.
- [45] Christopher J L Murray, “Choosing Indicators for the Health-related SDG Targets”, The Lancet, vol.386, no.10001, pp.1214-1317, October 2015.
- [46] J. M. Anglin, T. Sugiyama and S. L. Liew, “Visuomotor Adaptation in Head-mounted Virtual Reality Versus Conventional Training”, Scientific Reports, April 2017.

- [47] Rebecca M. Foerster, Christian H. Poth, Christian Behler, Mario Botsch and Werner X. Schneider, “Using the Virtual Reality device Oculus Rift for Neuropsychological Assessment of Visual Processing Capabilities”, *Scientific Reports*, November 2016.
- [48] N Nesaratnam, P Thomas and A Vivian, “Stepping into the Virtual Unknown: Feasibility Study of a Virtual Reality-based Test of Ocular Misalignment”, *Eye*, vol.31, pp.1503-1506, June 2017.
- [49] Alain Londero, Isabelle Viaud-Delmon, Alexis Baskind, Olivier Delerue, Stéphanie Bertet, Pierre Bonfils and Olivier Warusfel, “Auditory and Visual 3D Virtual Reality Therapy for Chronic Subjective Tinnitus: Theoretical Framework”, *Virtual Reality*, vol.14, pp.143-151, September 2009.
- [50] Chris Heinrich, Matthew Cook, Tobias Langlotz, Holger Regenbrecht, “My Hands? Importance of Personalised Virtual Hands in a Neurorehabilitation Scenario”, *Virtual Reality*, July 2020.
- [51] Yannick Rothacher, Anh Nguyen, Bigna Lenggenhager, Andreas Kunz and Peter Brugger, “Visual Capture of Gait During Redirected Walking”, *Scientific Report*, vol.8, December 2018.
- [52] Woong Choi, Jongho Lee, Naoki Yanagihara, Liang Li and Jaehyo Kim, “Development of a Quantitative Evaluation System for Visuo-motor Control in Three-dimensional Virtual Reality Space”, *Scientific Reports*, September 2018.
- [53] S. Di Girolamo, W. Di Nardo, P. Picciotti, G. Paludetti, F. Ottaviani and O. Chiavola, “Virtual Reality in Vestibular Assessment and Rehabilitation”, *Virtual Reality*, vol.4, pp.169-183, September 1999.
- [54] Sha Ma, Martin Varley, Lik-Kwan Shark and Jim Richards, “Overcoming the Information Overload Problem in a Multiform Feedback-based Virtual Reality System for Hand Motion Rehabilitation: Healthy Subject Case Study”, *Virtual Reality*, vol.16, pp.325-334, March 2012.
- [55] Sharon M. Nijenhuis, Gerdienke B. Prange, Farshid Amirabdollahian, Patrizio Sale, Francesco Infarinato, Nasrin Nasr, Gail Mountain, Hermie J. Hermens, Arno H. A. Stienen, Jaap H. Buurke and Johan S. Rietman, “Feasibility Study into Self-administered Training at Home using an Arm and Hand Device with Motivational Gaming Environment in Chronic Stroke”, *Journal Of Neuroengineering And Rehabilitation*, vol.11, no.89, pp.1-12, October 2015.
- [56] Corey J. Bohil, Bradly Alicea and Frank A. Biocca, “Virtual Reality in Neuroscience Research and Therapy”, *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, vol.12, pp.752-762, November 2011.