THE ROLE OF VIRTUAL REALITY IN REHABILITATION CLINICAL EXPERIENCES AND RESULTS

Makhmudova Zarina Ilkhomovna
Assistant Samarkand State Medical University
Monnotov Bahodir Hamza o'g'li
student Samarkand State Medical University
Yuldoshov Javohir Sharof o'g'li
student Samarkand State Medical University
Mamatov Fayro'zbek Abdusattor o'g'li
student Samarkand State Medical University

Annotation

Virtual reality (VR) has emerged as a promising tool in the field of rehabilitation, offering immersive and interactive environments that enhance physical and cognitive recovery. This study investigates the role of VR in rehabilitation settings, focusing on clinical experiences and treatment outcomes across various conditions, including stroke, musculoskeletal injuries, and neurological disorders. The paper presents findings from both literature review and real-world clinical applications, evaluating the effectiveness of VR interventions in improving motor function, patient motivation, and therapy adherence. Results indicate that VR-based rehabilitation significantly enhances recovery outcomes when integrated with traditional therapy. Challenges such as cost, user adaptation, and technical limitations are also discussed, with recommendations for future implementation and research.

Keywords: Virtual reality, rehabilitation, clinical outcomes, stroke recovery, motor function, physical therapy, neurorehabilitation, immersive therapy, patient engagement, digital health.

Introduction

Rehabilitation plays a crucial role in restoring function and improving the quality of life for patients recovering from physical and neurological impairments. Traditional rehabilitation methods, while effective, often face limitations in terms of patient engagement, access, and adaptability. In recent years, virtual reality (VR) has gained attention as an innovative solution capable of addressing these challenges.

VR technology provides a simulated, interactive environment that enables patients to perform therapeutic exercises in engaging and motivating contexts. It allows for real-time feedback, personalized task design, and repetitive training—key components of effective rehabilitation. Studies have shown that VR-based rehabilitation may stimulate neuroplasticity and facilitate motor learning, particularly in stroke patients and individuals with mobility impairments.

This paper aims to explore the clinical applications of VR in rehabilitation, assess its effectiveness through real-life case studies and evidence-based research, and discuss both the benefits and limitations associated with its use in clinical settings.

Materials and Methods

This study adopts a mixed-method approach, combining a systematic literature review with observational analysis of clinical cases. For the literature review, databases such as PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science were searched using terms like "virtual reality rehabilitation," "stroke recovery VR," and "VR physical therapy," focusing on peer-reviewed articles published from 2015 to 2024.

In the clinical component, data were collected from rehabilitation centers that have integrated VR systems such as Oculus RehabVR and MindMotion™ into their therapy protocols. A sample of 20 patients with varying conditions (stroke, spinal cord injury, and orthopedic recovery) participated in the study. Each underwent a six-week VR-enhanced rehabilitation program, and their progress was evaluated using standardized functional assessment tools (e.g., Fugl-Meyer Assessment, Berg Balance Scale).

Qualitative data from patient feedback and therapist interviews were also analyzed to gain insight into the user experience and therapeutic perceptions of VR.

Results and Discussion

The clinical and literature-based findings of this study underscore the growing impact of virtual reality (VR) technologies in rehabilitation settings. Data were collected from 20 patients undergoing a six-week rehabilitation program enhanced

with VR tools. The conditions treated included post-stroke motor impairments (12 patients), spinal cord injury (4 patients), and lower limb musculoskeletal injuries (4 patients).

Quantitative assessment using the Fugl-Meyer Motor Scale (FMMS) for stroke patients showed an average improvement of 12.5 points (from a baseline mean of 38.3 to 50.8), indicating significant recovery in upper limb function. Patients engaged in VR-assisted arm-reaching tasks, balance training games, and hand-eye coordination exercises showed more rapid improvement compared to control groups from previous literature who received only conventional therapy.

For patients with musculoskeletal injuries, range of motion (ROM) increased by an average of 18%, and pain scores on the Visual Analog Scale (VAS) decreased from 6.2 to 3.1 over the six-week period. VR exercises involving gamified squatting, stepping, and functional walking in a 3D environment motivated patients to complete higher volumes of repetitions.

Balance and Mobility: Balance was evaluated using the Berg Balance Scale (BBS). Among stroke and spinal cord injury patients, the BBS score improved by an average of 7.6 points, which is considered clinically meaningful. Patients reported increased confidence in walking and performing daily activities after VR-based balance training, which included simulated walking paths, stair climbing, and obstacle avoidance scenarios.

Cognitive Engagement and Motivation: Qualitative feedback revealed that 85% of participants found VR sessions more engaging than traditional therapy. Many patients described the immersive environment as "motivating" and "enjoyable," which contributed to higher adherence rates—95% of scheduled sessions were attended, compared to an institutional average of ~75% in standard rehabilitation programs.

Therapists observed increased concentration and participation, especially among younger patients. VR scenarios that incorporated real-world tasks (e.g., cooking simulations or virtual shopping) were particularly effective in stimulating cognitive and motor coordination.

Challenges and Limitations: Despite the positive outcomes, some challenges were noted:

User adaptation issues: Three elderly patients required additional assistance to understand the VR interface. Customizing interaction levels based on cognitive status is essential.

Motion sickness: Two patients experienced mild dizziness during the first sessions, which was resolved by adjusting frame rates and exposure time.

Technical problems: Occasional calibration errors and software glitches temporarily disrupted therapy in 10% of sessions.

Cost and training: Implementation of VR systems requires substantial initial investment and technical training for staff.

Comparison with Conventional Rehabilitation: Compared to conventional therapy alone, VR-based rehabilitation offers a more personalized and stimulating approach, with faster feedback loops and adaptable difficulty levels. These features are particularly valuable in maintaining long-term patient engagement and enabling therapists to monitor performance metrics in real time.

Studies from the literature support these findings. For example, a meta-analysis by Laver et al. (2018) reported that VR interventions in stroke rehabilitation lead to greater improvements in upper limb function compared to traditional approaches. Similarly, a 2022 study by Corbetta et al. showed that VR-based gait training improved walking speed by 25–30% in patients with neurological disorders.

Conclusion

Virtual reality has shown significant promise as a tool for enhancing rehabilitation outcomes across various patient populations. Its ability to deliver engaging, interactive, and adaptable therapy sessions has contributed to improvements in motor recovery, cognitive function, and patient satisfaction. Despite certain technical and practical limitations, the overall benefits of VR justify its integration into modern rehabilitation practices.

Future efforts should focus on expanding access to VR technology, refining user interfaces for diverse populations, and conducting large-scale clinical trials to further validate its efficacy. As VR technology continues to evolve, it is poised to play an increasingly central role in the future of rehabilitative medicine.

References:

1. Laver, K. E., Lange, B., George, S., Deutsch, J. E., Saposnik, G., & Crotty, M. (2018). Virtual reality for stroke rehabilitation. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, (11), CD008349.
2. Corbetta, D., Imeri, F., & Gatti, R. (2022). Rehabilitation that incorporates virtual reality is more effective than traditional approaches: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine, 54, jrm00245..
3. Maier, M., Rubio Ballester, B., Duff, A., Duarte Oller, E., & Verschure, P. F. M. J. (2019). Effect of specific over nonspecific VR-based rehabilitation on poststroke motor recovery: A systematic meta-analysis. Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair, 33(2), 112–129.
4. Nabiyeva, S. S., Rustamov, A. A., Malikov, M. R., & Ne'matov, N. I. (2020). Concept of medical information. European Journal of Molecular and Clinical Medicine, 7(7), 602-609.
5. Malikov, M. R., Rustamov, A. A., & Ne'matov, N. I. (2020). STRATEGIES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF MEDICAL INFORMATION SYSTEMS. Theoretical & Applied Science, (9), 388-392.
6. Berdiyevna, A. S., & Olimjonovna, T. F. (2022). INNOVATIVE APPROACHES IN THE EDUCATION SYSTEM TO INCREASE YOUTH PARTICIPATION. Web of Scientist: International Scientific Research Journal, 3(3), 674-677.
7. Esirgapovich, K. A. (2022). THE EASIEST RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CREATING A WEBSITE. Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal, 10(2), 758-761.
8. Toxirova, F. O., Malikov, M. R., Abdullayeva, S. B., Ne'matov, N. I., & Rustamov, A. A. (2021). Reflective Approach In Organization Of Pedagogical Processes. European Journal of Molecular & Clinical Medicine, 7(03), 2020.
9. Ne'matov, N., & Rustamov, T. (2022). SANATORIYLAR ISHINI AVTOMATLASHTIRISH: BRON XIZMATI VA UNING STRUKTURASI. Eurasian Journal of Academic Research, 2(11), 763-766.
10. Ismatullayevich, N. N. (2023). The role of educational websites in the development of student's higher education systems. Eurasian Journal of Research, Development and Innovation, 17, 17-20.