

TITLE

The development of a home-based virtual reality therapy system to promote upper extremity movement for children with hemiplegic cerebral palsy

AUTHORS

William Li, BAsC, Sophie Lam-Damji, BSc, OT Reg (Ont), Tom Chau, PhD, PEng, Darcy Fehlings, MD, MSc, FRCP(C)*

From Bloorview Research Institute, Bloorview Kids Rehab, 150 Kilgour Road, Toronto, ON, Canada, M4G 1R8 (Li, Lam-Damji, Chau, Fehlings); Institute of Biomaterials and Biomedical Engineering (Li, Chau), Department of Occupational Science and Occupational Therapy (Lam-Damji), and Department of Paediatrics, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada (Fehlings)

*Corresponding author. Bloorview Research Institute, 150 Kilgour Road, Toronto, ON, Canada M4G 1R8

Tel: (416) 424-3822 Fax: (416) 424-3837

Email: dfehlings@bloorview.ca

ABSTRACT

Children with hemiplegic cerebral palsy (hemiplegia) have difficulty performing motor tasks with their hemiplegic upper extremity (UE). A virtual reality therapy home-based system (VRT-Home) using a Sony PlayStation 2 equipped with an “EyeToy” video camera was adapted for children to practise hemiplegic hand and arm movements and the system’s preliminary usability was evaluated. To use the VRT-Home, participants sit in a chair, hold down a button that occupies their non-hemiplegic side and keeps the system on, and perform movements with their

hemiplegic UE to play fun, immersive, games in virtual environments. Supervised test sessions with five child participants found that the system successfully elicited targeted hand/arm movements of the hemiplegic UE, particularly reaching activities that involve the shoulder and elbow. A further home usability study with five participants showed, through usage logging and caregiver and child satisfaction surveys, that the intervention with the VRT-Home was an enjoyable way to practise hemiplegic arm movements at home.

KEYWORDS cerebral palsy; hemiplegia; upper extremity; virtual systems; occupational therapy; rehabilitation

1 1. INTRODUCTION

2

3 Cerebral palsy (CP) describes a group of disorders of the development of movement and posture,
4 causing activity limitations that are attributed to non-progressive disturbances that have occurred
5 in the developing fetal or infant brain.^{1,2} Children with hemiplegic cerebral palsy (CP), or
6 hemiplegia, have a brain injury or anomaly of the motor cortex that creates a sensorimotor
7 impairment of the opposite upper extremity (UE). The impairments are multifactorial and
8 consist of a combination of muscle hypertonia, weakness, impaired selective motor control,
9 decreased sensation, and neglect of the involved UE. Movements that are typically difficult for
10 children with hemiplegia include shoulder abduction, elbow extension, forearm supination, wrist
11 and finger extension, and thumb extension. Consequently, through learned non-use, they
12 generally favour the use of their non-involved UE in everyday activities.³

13

14 Currently, therapy programs emphasize repetition and practise of motor activities with the
15 hemiplegic UE.^{4,5} Home-based practise, therefore, is essential. One means of encouraging such
16 practise is constraint-induced movement therapy (CIMT), in which the child's non-involved UE
17 is constrained in a sling, mitt or cast, thereby forcing the use of the hemiplegic UE in activities
18 and exercises.^{6,7} While effective, CIMT can cause a higher risk of falls, reduced independence,
19 and increased frustration for the child while wearing the constraint.³ As a less-invasive
20 alternative, therapists often recommend exercises for families to practise hand/arm movements
21 with their child. However, given the numerous competing pressures on caregivers' time,
22 adherence to such home programs may be difficult, making their effectiveness questionable.⁸

23

24 Virtual reality (VR) therapy can provide an immersive and interactive computer experience that

1 promotes practise of specific hand/arm movements for rehabilitation purposes.⁹ Pilot studies
2 with one institution-based VR therapy system that involves a video camera, video game
3 software, and a visual display have suggested that VR play-based activities for children with
4 cerebral palsy may increase their seated postural control⁹ and sense of self-efficacy.¹⁰ Another
5 study with patients recovering from stroke found that using this system induced cortical
6 reorganization and motor recovery.¹¹ While promising, the need for supervision, specialized
7 training, or expensive equipment make existing systems unsuitable for *home-based* therapy for
8 children with hemiplegia.

9
10 Our long-term aim, therefore, was to develop a low-cost, VR therapy home-based system (called
11 the VRT-Home) that promotes movements of the hemiplegic UE that the child finds difficult.
12 Guided by fun, goal-oriented games, children may willingly spend more time practising these
13 targeted hand/arm movements independently. Such a system should accommodate a wide range
14 of abilities, be enjoyable and usable in a home setting without professional assistance or
15 extensive monitoring by caregivers, and provide a simple way for clinicians to track usage. In
16 this article, we focus on the first steps of the development and implementation of such a device,
17 constructed largely from off-the-shelf hardware, by presenting the results of early supervised and
18 home-based studies of the system's usability with children with hemiplegia.

19

20 **2. VIRTUAL REALITY THERAPY HOME-BASED SYSTEM (VRT-Home)**

21

22 The VRT-Home, shown photographically in Figure 1 and schematically in Figure 2, has 3 main
23 components: a video game device, a chair and video signal control subsystem, and a personal
24 computer (PC) equipped with a fingerprint recognition device. The system's total cost is less

1 than US\$700. The software and hardware designs are freely available from the authors of this
2 paper.

3

4 **2.1. Video game subsystem**

5 The system uses a Sony PlayStation 2 (PS2), a commercially available home video game system,
6 and an EyeToy, a PS2 video camera accessory. When used together, players see a video image of
7 themselves on the screen and can manipulate overlaid virtual graphics with physical movements
8 (a type of augmented environment).¹² Two games from the “Play 2” disc were used. In “Secret
9 Agent,” players reach to “touch” toys while avoiding movement in “spotlight” areas that appear
10 throughout the screen; in “Mr. Chef,” the player performs such tasks as “shaking” milkshakes by
11 making circular arm motions or “chopping” pickles with slicing motions. Other accessories were
12 an 8 megabyte memory card for storing game data and an Intec 7089 rechargeable wireless
13 controller (which avoids tripping hazards). Within the “Play 2” software, the sensitivity was set
14 to “high” and the difficulty level was set to “easy.”

15

16 **2.2. Chair and video signal control subsystem**

17 To play the games, the child sits on an instrumented straight-back chair. Because children with
18 hemiplegia favour their non-hemiplegic UE, the chair’s purpose is to permit gaming with the
19 hemiplegic UE only. A Tash #58750 pillow switch (typically used for one-switch access devices)
20 is attached underneath the chair and is held with the non-involved hand, constraining it from
21 being used in the games, while a thoracic back switch (a Tash #58200 soft switch) is mounted on
22 the chair’s back to promote an upright seated posture and encourage elbow extension of the
23 hemiplegic UE by discouraging the participant from leaning forward. The child must comply
24 with the pushbutton switches because the video game is visible on the TV screen only if both

1 switches are pressed. Specifically, the switches activate a radiofrequency (RF) transmitter
2 mounted on the chair, which instructs a “video signal control box” connected to a personal
3 computer (PC) to block or pass the video signal from the PS2 to the television.

4

5 **2.3. Fingerprint recognition and user logging subsystem**

6 The VRT-Home’s PC has three functions: video signal control, fingerprint recognition to track
7 whether the child is using the system, and simple logging to record usage frequency and
8 duration. First, the child scans his or her fingerprint using an attached Microsoft USB Fingerprint
9 Reader. Once the fingerprint is recognized, the child can press the chair button switches to see
10 the PlayStation 2 video signal on the TV screen. Fingerprint-related events and switch activation
11 and release events are time-stamped and logged in a Microsoft Access database for later analysis.

12

13 **3. USABILITY EVALUATION**

14 This study evaluated the VRT-Home’s preliminary usability as defined by International
15 Organization of Standardization (ISO) document 9241-11: we examined whether the VRT-Home
16 could elicit targeted hand/arm movements (listed in Figure 4) with effectiveness (the extent to
17 which the task is achieved), efficiency (the rate at which the targeted movements were achieved),
18 and satisfaction (the attitudes toward the use of the system).¹³ Usability studies use an iterative
19 process, with changes made to the product design during repeated rounds of testing to address
20 usability issues that arise. These methods are well-established in the evaluation of new
21 technologies in healthcare settings.^{14,15} Given the sample sizes used, descriptive statistics were
22 used to assess the VRT-Home’s usability. All participants freely consented to the study. The
23 protocol was approved by the institutional research ethics board.

24

1 **3.1. Supervised Usability Study**

2 Two rounds of supervised test sessions at a rehabilitation hospital were conducted with 5
3 children with hemiplegic cerebral palsy (4 boys, 1 girl; age, 8.1 ± 1.4 years). The participants
4 had varying fine motor skills as indicated by their baseline scores in the House hand function
5 classification system¹⁶ (1 participant at level 2, 1 at level 4, and 3 at level 5) and the Quality of
6 Upper Extremity Skills Test (QUEST)¹⁷ (52.3 ± 18.2). In both videotaped 30-minute sessions,
7 participants played “Secret Agent” and “Mr. Chef,” the system logged usage, and one
8 occupational therapist reviewed the video footage to record the number of times that the child
9 performed each of the following hand/arm movements: shoulder flexion, abduction, external
10 rotation, or reach across midline; elbow extension; forearm supination; wrist extension; finger
11 extension; and thumb abduction, extension, or opposition. Each observed movement was
12 qualitatively classified as “less than half” or “greater than half” range of movement, with “full
13 range” defined as movement of the arm/hand through an established available range and “half
14 range” as movement through half of the available range. Child and caregiver questionnaires
15 administered at the end of each session were used to evaluate user satisfaction. These surveys
16 included statements about the usability of the VRT-Home with 5-point Likert scales (“strongly
17 disagree” to “strongly agree”) along with open-ended questions asking participants to
18 qualitatively describe their experience with the system. The usability issues identified in the first
19 round of testing contributed to design changes prior to the second round.

20

21 **3.2. In-Home Usability Study**

22 Following the two rounds of supervised testing, we conducted a home-based usability study with
23 5 additional children with hemiplegic cerebral palsy (4 boys, 1 girl; age, 8.0 ± 0.7 years), each of
24 whom showed an ability to play the VRT-Home games in individual supervised trial sessions. A

1 research assistant installed the system in each participant's home. The participants were
2 instructed to use the VRT-Home for 30 minutes per day for 10 days. The main outcomes were
3 caregiver and child questionnaires administered by a research assistant at the end of the study,
4 along with usage-logging by the VRT-Home's computer.

5

6 **4. RESULTS**

7 **4.1. Usability Issues**

8 In the first round of supervised testing, the chair's size and 20-degree back angle (recline) made
9 it difficult for some of the participants to sit upright and press the switches while playing the
10 games. A median score of 3 ("neither agree nor disagree") was seen for the survey statement,
11 "Holding down the buttons was easy." As well, some participants slid out of the chair as the
12 session progressed. To resolve these issues, the chair's back was made upright and a non-slip
13 Dycem mat on the seat of the chair helped the participants to stop slipping. Other usability
14 issues, such as the fingerprint reader's sensitivity, were also identified and resolved. In the
15 questionnaire administered after the in-home usability study, all 5 participants gave a score of 5
16 ("strongly agree") to the statement, "Once I started playing the games, I could keep the system
17 going."

18

19 **4.2. System Usage**

20 Figure 4 displays the average observed rates of each targeted movement over all 10 supervised
21 test sessions. Participants performed an average of 13 ± 4 movements per minute over a mean
22 playing time of 19 ± 3 minutes per session. The count of movements per minute of play in the
23 first round of testing and the participants' total QUEST scores, depicted in Figure 5, were
24 positively correlated ($R^2 = 0.64$, $p = 0.11$). Table 1 provides summary statistics collected from

1 the two rounds of supervised test sessions; Table 2 provides the average playing time for each of
2 the 5 participants in the in-home usability study. On average, participants used the system at
3 home for 29 ± 32 minutes per day. A decline in the average daily play time ($p=0.002$) is evident
4 in Figure 6.

5
6 The questionnaires provide insight into experiences with the VRT-Home. In the supervised tests,
7 the child participants stated that they “strongly agreed” that they “had lots of fun today,” “would
8 like to take the video games home to play,” and “would like to come back another day to play the
9 video games.” As well, all 5 caregivers responded “strongly agree” to the statement, “My child
10 would enjoy using this virtual reality therapy system at home,” and responded either “agree” or
11 ‘strongly agree’ to, “I think that my child would practice therapy activities every day with this
12 system at home” and “I would like to have this system at home.” Later, in the in-home usability
13 study’s questionnaire, all 5 child participants strongly agreed with the statement, “I enjoyed
14 playing the games.” Caregivers, meanwhile, responded with a median score of “strongly agree”
15 to the statement, “My child enjoyed using the virtual reality therapy system at home” and a
16 median score of 4 (“agree”) for the statement, “It was easy to get my child to play on the virtual
17 reality therapy system.” In both cases, the scores ranged from 2 (“disagree”) to 5 (“strongly
18 agree”). These responses are representative of the results from the entire questionnaire.

19

20 **5. DISCUSSION**

21

22 The VRT-Home’s usability is discussed below in terms of effectiveness, efficiency, and user
23 satisfaction.

24

1 **5.1. Effectiveness**

2 As shown in Figure 4, the VRT-Home effectively elicited movements of the proximal
3 hemiplegic UE, including shoulder flexion and abduction, reach across midline, and elbow
4 extension. Fewer targeted movements of the wrist, fingers, and thumb were observed. This may
5 be because VRT-Home games are typically played with reaching-type movements. Meanwhile,
6 the hand and thoracic back switches appeared to be effective at occupying the non-hemiplegic
7 UE. The number of button releases decreased from 3.0 ± 2.7 switch releases/minute in the first
8 round to 1.9 ± 1.6 releases/minute in the second round of supervised testing, likely due to
9 successful design adjustments or increased familiarity with the system.

10

11 **5.2. Efficiency**

12 A home-based VR therapy system needs to elicit targeted hand/arm movements at substantial
13 rates. Figure 4 illustrates that this occurred with shoulder and elbow reaching activities –
14 participants performed shoulder abduction, for example, an average of 3 times per minute. In the
15 child survey, the statement “I don’t feel tired” had a median response of “neither agree nor
16 disagree,” which suggests that the physical demands of playing the games were challenging but
17 reasonable.

18

19 During the in-home study, the average playtime of 4 of the 5 participants was less than 30
20 minutes per day, as specified in the instructions for the study. Further, as the days passed, the
21 number of minutes played per day decreased, which likely meant that fewer UE movements were
22 performed. Introducing a wider variety of games or permitting greater scheduling flexibility with
23 the VRT-Home may mitigate this issue.

24

1 **5.3. User Satisfaction**

2 The questionnaire results suggest that the participants appeared to enjoy performing the
3 movements elicited by the VRT-Home. This is generally a positive finding that indicates that the
4 VRT-Home could be a fun way to promote therapy activities. However, it may also suggest a
5 gradual loss of novelty of the system, a possibility supported by the declining amount of playing
6 time observed in the in-home study. This may be an important consideration for game selection
7 and the design of longer future in-home study with clinical efficacy measurements. This could be
8 addressed by the periodic addition of new games.

9

10 **5.4. User characteristics that affect usability**

11 Figure 5 illustrates that every participant in the supervised testing were able to use the VRT-
12 Home and perform targeted hand/arm movements, but children with higher baseline function as
13 measured on the QUEST generally had greater rates of targeted movements in the first round of
14 testing. A larger sample size is needed to determine whether age, experience with playing video
15 games, or other user characteristics are important determinants of the VRT-Home's usability.

16

17 **5.5. Limitations**

18 In this study, our goal was to develop and begin to evaluate the usability of the VRT-Home as a
19 new technology. While the movements elicited and the participants' survey responses to the
20 VRT-Home are positive findings, with 5 patients per round, the sample size is not sufficiently
21 large for detailed statistical analyses. The next important step will be larger studies that assess of
22 the impact of playing the VRT-Home on the child's hand function and a potential decrease in
23 disregard/neglect using standardized outcome measures within a randomized controlled study
24 design.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

6. CONCLUSION

We have described the implementation and preliminary usability of a virtual reality therapy system designed for home use for training upper extremity function of children with hemiplegic cerebral palsy. The VRT-Home has been demonstrated to elicit certain proximal movements of the hemiplegic hand/arm with a high degree of enjoyment and satisfaction in children with hemiplegia. Further study is planned to investigate the potential for enhancement of upper extremity function via a VRT-Home-based therapy program.

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was funded by the Canada Research Chairs Program (grant no. 950-202082), Canadian Institutes of Health Research (grant no. FRN 80178), REMAD Foundation, and Bloorview Children’s Hospital Foundation.

REFERENCES

1. P. Rosenbaum, B. Dan, R. Fabiola, A. Leviton, N. Paneth and B. Jacobsson, Proposed definition and classification of cerebral palsy, April 2005. *Dev Med Child Neurol* **47** (2005), 571-576.
2. T.D. Sanger, M.R. Delgado, D. Gaebler-Spira, M. Hallett and J.W. Mink, Classification and definition of disorders causing hypertonia in childhood, *Pediatrics* **11** (2003), 89-97.
3. A.M. Gordon, J. Charles and S.L. Wolf, Methods of constraint induced movement therapy for children with hemiplegic cerebral palsy: development of a child-friendly intervention for improving upper-extremity function, *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* **86** (2005), 837-844.
4. S.V. Duff and A.M. Gordon, Learning of grasp control in children with hemiplegic cerebral palsy, *Dev Med Child Neurol* **45** (2003), 746-757.
5. J. Valvano, Activity-focused motor interventions for children with neurological conditions, *Phys Occup Ther Pediatr* **1/2** (2004), 79-107.
6. J.K. Willis, A. Morrelo, A. Davie, J.C. Rice, J.T. Bennett, Forced treatment of childhood hemiparesis, *Pediatrics* **110** (2002), 94-96.

7. E. Taub, S.L. Ramey, S. DeLuca and K. Echols, Efficacy of constraint-induced movement therapy for children with cerebral palsy with asymmetric motor impairment, *Pediatrics* **113** (2004), 305-312.
- 8 M. Law and G. King, Caregiver compliance with therapeutic interventions for children with cerebral palsy, *Dev Medicine Child Neurol* **35** (1993), 983-990.
9. D.T. Reid, Changes in seated postural control in children with cerebral palsy following a virtual play environment intervention: a pilot study, *Isr J Occup Ther.* **11** 2002, E75-E95.
10. D.T. Reid, Benefits of a virtual play rehabilitation environment for children with cerebral palsy: a pilot study, *Pediatr Rehabil* **5** 2002, 141-148.
11. S.H. Jang, S.H. You, T.H. Kim, M. Hallett, S.H. Ahn, Y.H. Kwon, J.H. Kim and M.Y. Lee, Virtual reality–induced cortical reorganization and associated locomotor recovery in chronic stroke: an experimenter-blind randomized study, *Stroke* **36** (2005), 1166-1171.
12. T. Chau, C. Eaton, A. Lamont, H. Schwellnus and C. Tam, Augmented environments for pediatric rehabilitation, *Technology and Disability* **4** 2006, 167-171.
13. ISO 9241-11:1998(E), Ergonomic requirements for office work with visual display terminals (VDTs) – Part 11: Guidance on usability. Geneva: International Organization for Standardization, 1998.

14. S.G.S. Shah and I. Robinson, User involvement in healthcare technology development and assessment: Structured literature review, *Int J Health Care Qual Assur* **19** 2006, 500-515.
15. M. Conyer, User and usability testing - how it should be undertaken? *Aust J Educ Technol* **11** (1995), 38-51.
16. J. House, F. Gwathney and M. Fidler, A dynamic approach to the thumb-in-palm deformity of cerebral palsy, *Bone Joint Surg Am* **63** (1981), 216-225.
17. C. DeMatteo, M. Law, D. Russell, N. Pollock, P. Rosenbaum, S. Walter, The reliability and validity of Quality of Upper Extremity Skills Test, *Phys Occup Therp Pediatr* **13** (1993), 1-18.

Table 1: Summary statistics for supervised usability test sessions

| Measurements | Round 1 (n=5) | Round 2 (n=5) |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Total neuromotor movements/minute of play | 10 ± 1 | 16 ± 8 |
| Quality of movements (Percentage of movements greater than 50% range) | 72% ± 17% | 70% ± 13% |
| Percentage of play time when switches were successfully pressed by user | 92% ± 9% | 94% ± 7% |
| Number of times that switches were released/minute of play | 3.0 ± 2.7 | 1.9 ± 1.6 |

NOTE. Values indicate mean ± standard deviation

Table 2: Average daily VRT-Home usage by participant in home study

| Participant | Daily usage of VRT-Home (minutes) |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | 19 ± 18 |
| 2 | 53 ± 55 |
| 3 | 26 ± 10 |
| 4 | 22 ± 16 |
| 5 | 22 ± 24 |

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Fig. 1

System setup. The participant sits approximately 2 meters away from the screen and “reaches” for virtual objects visible on the TV.

Fig. 2

Schematic of VR therapy system. Shaded boxes denote components added to the unmodified PlayStation 2 with EyeToy system.

Fig. 3

Block diagram of circuit that determines whether the computer or PlayStation 2 (PS2) video output should be seen on the television screen. Here, RF=radio frequency, DSR=data send ready, DTR=data transmit ready.

Fig. 4

The average rate and type of hand/arm movements observed over the ten sessions. Error bars represent the maximum and minimum observed rate of movements among the five participants.

Fig. 5

Relationship between average rate of targeted movements and level of UE function (QUEST score) for the five participants in the first round.

Fig. 6

Average playtimes in home-based usability trials. Error bars represent the maximum playtime on each day.




Fig. 1




Fig. 2




Fig. 3




Fig. 4




Fig. 5




Fig. 6