## Current issues and challenges in research on virtual reality therapy for children with neurodisability

W J Farr<sup>1</sup>, I Male<sup>1</sup>, D Green<sup>2</sup>, C Morris<sup>3</sup>, H Gage<sup>5</sup>, S Bailey<sup>3</sup>, S Speller<sup>1</sup>, V Colville<sup>4</sup>, M Jackson<sup>4</sup>, S Bremner<sup>6</sup>, A Memon<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Sussex Community NHS Foundation Trust, Brighton, West Sussex, ENGLAND

<sup>2</sup>Department of Rehabilitation, Oxford Brookes University, Oxford, ENGLAND

<sup>3</sup>Medical School. University of Exeter, Exeter, ENGLAND

<sup>4</sup>Parent partnership advisors, Sussex Community NHS Foundation Trust, Brighton, ENGLAND

<sup>5</sup>School of Economics, University of Surrey, Surrey, ENGLAND

<sup>6</sup>Brighton and Sussex Medical School, Brighton, ENGLAND

will.farr@nhs.net

## ABSTRACT

A PICO (population, intervention, comparison, outcome) approach is adopted to discuss issues and challenges in virtual reality therapy research in community health settings. Widespread variation within and between populations, e.g. co-morbid conditions, complicates treatment fidelity and applicability. Interventions require flexible dose and frequency to fit into children's family circumstances, with clearly employed specialist paediatric research staff. Comparisons require adaptation to digital technology, and keep pace with development. Outcomes may overstate the impact of virtual reality therapy and technological novelty, while not fully unpacking hidden digital effects. A wide set of agreed, flexible, and patient-centred outcome measures are required to establish positive clinical baseline.

Full papers will be published in the Conference Proceedings and will be freely available to delegates at the conference and online on September 20, 2016.