# The Role of Virtual and Augmented Reality in Ophthalmic Surgical Training: **A Systematic Review**

Lucy Yang<sup>1</sup>, Abdullah Al-Ani<sup>2</sup>, Mohamed Bondok<sup>1</sup>, Patrick Gooi<sup>2</sup> <sup>1</sup>Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary <sup>2</sup>Division of Ophthalmology, Department of Surgery, University of Calgary

## BACKGROUND

- Extended reality (XR) includes virtual reality (VR) and augmented reality (AR).
- XR simulates realistic surgical scenarios, enabling trainees to learn and practice in a safe and controlled environment.
- There are a few VR training modalities available for ophthalmic training such as EyeSi, HelpMeSee, and MicroVis.
- Despite significant advancements in XR technologies, its role in ophthalmic surgical training remains unclear.
- To the best of our knowledge, this is the first systematic review that assesses the utility of XR in ophthalmic surgical training.

# **PURPOSE**

This systematic review aims to investigate the effectiveness of XR in enhancing the skills of ophthalmic surgeons and improving patient outcomes.

# **METHODS**

- A systematic search of Embase, MEDLINE, Scopus, Web of Science, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, CINAHL, and ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global yielded 1354 references.
- Of 1354 studies identified, 562 duplicates were removed automatically and manually.
- The titles and abstracts of 792 studies were screened and 746 studies were excluded due to not meeting inclusion criteria or for meeting exclusion criteria.
- Full texts of the remaining 46 studies were retrieved and underwent screening, which resulted in 36 studies to be included in the systematic review after excluding an additional 10 studies.

| Studies from databases/registers (n =<br>Embase (n = 699)<br>MEDLINE (n = 413)<br>Scopus (n = 106)<br>Web of Science (n = 88)<br>Cochrane Central Register of Controlle<br>CINAHL (n = 18)<br>ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Glob<br>Cochrane Database of Systematic Rev | 1354)ed Trials (n = 25)eal (n = 4)riews (n = 1)References removed (n = 562)Duplicates identified manually (n = 32)Duplicates identified by Covidence (n = 530)Marked as ineligible by automation tools (n = 0)Other reasons (n = 0)  |
|---|--|
| Studies screened (n = 792)<br>Studies sought for retrieval (n = 46)<br>Studies assessed for eligibility (n = 46)  | Studies excluded (n = 746) Studies not retrieved (n = 0) Studies excluded (n = 10)   |
| Studies included in review (n = 36)   | Wrong intervention $(n = 2)$<br>Wrong study design $(n = 3)$<br>Published article available $(n = 3)$<br>Not virtual or augmented reality<br>simulation $(n = 2)$  |
|   | Studies from databases/registers (n = 1<br>Embase (n = 699)<br>MEDLINE (n = 413)<br>Scopus (n = 106)<br>Web of Science (n = 88)<br>Cochrane Central Register of Controlle<br>CINAHL (n = 18)<br>ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Glob<br>Cochrane Database of Systematic Rev<br>Studies screened (n = 792)<br>Studies screened (n = 792)<br>Studies sought for retrieval (n = 46)<br>Studies assessed for eligibility (n = 46)<br>Studies included in review (n = 36) |

**Figure 1**. A PRISMA diagram depicting the search strategy.

#### **Inclusion criteria**

- Studies published from January 1, 2013 to April 6, 2023.
- Primary studies (excluded review studies, letters, commentaries and editorials).
- Use of XR for ophthalmic surgical training.
- Any population undergoing ophthalmic surgical training.

#### **Exclusion criteria**

- No training component.
- Non-extended reality simulations.
- Non-human ophthalmic surgery.
- Conference abstracts. published as research paper later
- Process of constructing an XR program.

## RESULTS

#### Study Type

Retrospective **Prospective Randomized Controlled Trial** 

> ■ Cohort ■ Observational ■ Pre-Post ■ Comparative Study ■ Case Series **RCT**

**Figure 2**. Types of study design used in the 36 primary studies included for review.

Thirty-six studies were included in the review made up of 12 retrospective studies, 14 prospective studies, and 10 randomized controlled trials.

### **Training Modalities**



**Figure 3.** Types of extended reality used in primary studies. VR studies are further subdivided into types of VR in the graph on the right.

Thirty-four studies investigated VR simulations (27 used EyeSi, two used HelpMeSee, one used MicroVis, and four used undisclosed forms of VR) while two studies used AR simulations.

### **Types of Surgery Trained**



**Figure 4.** Type of surgery trained using the XR training modality.

Of the 36 studies, five trained general microsurgery skills, one trained pars plana vitrectomies, one trained vitreoretinal surgery, and the other 29 trained cataract surgery procedures, including manual small-incision cataract surgery (MSICS).

# **DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION**

Our preliminary analysis demonstrates that there is an overall benefit of XR technology in the training of ophthalmic surgeries at various levels of education. XR training is effective for the purposes of learning new microsurgery skills, learning and practicing new ophthalmic procedures, as well as for pre-training before performing surgeries. XR training improves simulator-rated and observer-rated scores, decreases complication rates, decreases operating time, and improves trainee satisfaction and confidence.



# **Primary Outcomes**

XR perfo OR perfo

The 36 studies identified a variety of primary outcomes to explore XR efficacy for ophthalmic training.

Out of the 36 studies, 32 (89%) studies found a beneficial effect of using XR technologies to train ophthalmic procedures and techniques while 4 (11%) studies found no difference after or compared to XR training.





**Figure 5.** Surgical trainees' level of education.

The study populations involved medical students, residents, fellows, attending physicians, and other scientific faculty.

**Table 1.** Primary outcomes identified by the studies.

| Primary Outcome                         | Number of Studies |
|---|-------------------|
| Eyesi score                             | 16                |
| Complication rate                       | 14                |
| Operating time                          | 9                 |
| Trainee satisfaction                    | 4                 |
| ormance score rated by blinded observer | 4                 |
| ormance score rated by blinded observer | 4                 |
| Attempts on XR                          | 3                 |
| Self-rated skill                        | 2                 |
| Self-rated XR usefulness                | 1                 |
| Specialty interest                      | 1                 |
| Time to 100 cases                       | 1                 |
| Motor skill performance                 | 1                 |
| Number of errors                        | 1                 |
| Time to performance plateau             | 1                 |
| Clinical skills exam score              | 1                 |
| Written exam score                      | 1                 |
| Trainee confidence                      | 1                 |
| Number of cases                         | 1                 |

### **Concluded Effect**



No difference 11%

**Figure 6**. Studies' concluded effect of XR ophthalmic training.

