

Extended Reality for Neuraxial Anesthesia and Pain Procedures: A Scoping Review

James S. Cho, MD[†], Devaunsh M. Thaker, MD[‡], Rohan Jotwani, MD, MBA^{††}, and David Hao, MD[†]

From the

[†]Department of Anesthesia, Critical Care and Pain Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts

[†]Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts

[‡]Department of Anesthesiology, Perioperative Care, and Pain Medicine, NYU Langone Health, New York, New York

^{††}Department of Anesthesiology, Weill Cornell Medicine, New York, New York

Address correspondence to:

James S. Cho, MD, Department of Anesthesia, Critical Care and Pain Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA 02114 (e-mail: jcho@mgh.harvard.edu)

Conflicts of Interest:

Rohan Jotwani is a scientific board advisor for 3D Organon. He owns no shares and receives no financial remuneration for his work. The other authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Funding:

The authors have no sources of funding to declare for this manuscript.

Running Head:

Scoping Review: Extended Reality for Neuraxial Procedures

Keywords: Spatial computing, navigation, augmented reality, virtual reality, mixed reality, extended reality, AR, VR, MR, XR, neuraxial, spinal, epidural, anesthesia, pain, simulation, education

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 **Background**

3 Extended reality technology, encompassing augmented reality, mixed reality, and virtual reality,
4 has the potential to enhance the teaching and performance of neuraxial procedures. The diverse
5 applications of extended reality include immersive simulations and novel modes of procedural
6 navigation.

7
8 **Objectives**

9 This scoping review aims to explore the preclinical, clinical, and educational applications of
10 extended reality for neuraxial procedures while suggesting directions for future research.

11
12 **Evidence review**

13 A systematic search was conducted across PubMed, Embase, Web of Science, Cochrane Central
14 Register of Controlled Trials, and Google Scholar until December 2023. Additional sources were
15 identified via citation searching of relevant articles. The findings are reported using the Preferred
16 Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews
17 (PRISMA-ScR).

18
19 **Findings**

20 41 studies, including three pending clinical trials were included. The majority of included studies
21 were published after 2015. Extended reality technology was applied in diverse ways for teaching,
22 simulation, and navigation, but only four of the completed studies described clinical use. For the
23 display of visuals, computer screens were most commonly used, followed by head-mounted
24 devices, laser projectors, and semi-transparent mirrors.

25
26 **Conclusions**

27 Interest in utilizing extended reality technology for neuraxial procedures is growing. Preliminary
28 work shows promise for this technology in both education and clinical practice, but achieving
29 accurate image registration without disrupting existing workflows remains an ongoing barrier to
30 clinical testing. Additional research is needed to assess the cost-effectiveness and reliability of
31 this technology.

32 INTRODUCTION

33 Extended reality (XR) (encompassing augmented reality [AR] where digital objects overlay onto
34 physical surroundings, mixed reality [MR] where digital and physical objects interact, and virtual
35 reality [VR] where users interact with digital scenes and objects) holds significant potential in
36 medical education and clinical practice.[1–3] XR can be used to create immersive simulations or
37 enhance standard modes of anatomic navigation.[2] Despite these potential benefits, the use of
38 XR within anesthesiology and pain medicine remains limited.[4]

39
40 Neuraxial procedures for anesthesia and pain medicine are commonly taught and performed
41 using landmark-based approaches or with the use of ultrasound or fluoroscopy.[5,6] However,
42 each method has limitations related to accuracy, ergonomics, or radiation exposure. The
43 evolution of XR technology, combined with improved access to spatial computing devices, could
44 pave the way for innovative methods of teaching and performing neuraxial procedures. With
45 sufficient development and validation, XR technology may improve the quality of education and
46 patient care. However, the current progress in adopting this technology for neuraxial procedures
47 has not been systematically analyzed.

48
49 This scoping review aims to summarize the current applications of XR for neuraxial procedures
50 and to identify barriers to widespread use. The following questions were defined to inform our
51 search strategy:

- 52
- 53 1. How has extended reality been used for neuraxial procedures in clinical settings?
 - 54 2. How has extended reality been used for training clinicians to perform neuraxial
55 procedures?
 - 56 3. What are the benefits of and barriers to adopting XR for teaching or performing neuraxial
57 procedures?
 - 58 4. What are clinician attitudes towards adopting XR for teaching or performing neuraxial
59 procedures?
- 60

61 METHODS

62 A protocol for this scoping review was preregistered on the Open Science Framework on
63 November 5th, 2023.[7] The reporting of this scoping review was guided by the standards of the
64 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping
65 Reviews (PRISMA-ScR).[8]

67 Search Strategy and Sources of Evidence

68 A systematic search of the literature was performed on PubMed, Embase, Web of Science,
69 Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, and Google Scholar. The search query combined
70 ((augmented OR extended OR mixed OR virtual) AND reality) AND (epidural OR peridural OR
71 intrathecal OR spinal OR neuraxial) AND (anesthesia OR pain). No filters were applied. Due to

72 a high volume of irrelevant results on Google Scholar (greater than 200,000 results), we initially
73 screened the first 100 results for relevance, and later expanded to include 20 additional results in
74 the most recent search on December 14th, 2023. Additional references were identified through
75 citation searching of relevant articles. Pending trials were closely monitored, and the most recent
76 trial included was published on January 11th, 2024. The search strategy used for each database is
77 provided in the online supplemental appendix.

78

79 Eligibility Criteria

80 The PICO (population, intervention, comparison, and outcomes) framework was used to develop
81 the inclusion and exclusion criteria (**table 1**). All primary studies available in English and
82 investigating the use of XR in the performance or teaching of neuraxial procedures were
83 included. Technical reports and conference papers were also considered. No restrictions were
84 imposed on the publication year. Although review articles were ultimately excluded, each related
85 review underwent thorough evaluation, and relevant citations from these reviews were
86 incorporated into the screening pool. Essays and letters describing theoretical applications were
87 excluded.

88

89 **Table 1. Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
Population	Clinicians and trainees performing or learning neuraxial procedures; patients receiving neuraxial procedures	No additional limitations
Intervention	Use of extended reality to aid the teaching or performance of neuraxial anesthesia or pain procedures	Use of extended reality by patient (e.g. for anxiolysis during a procedure)
Comparison	All comparisons	No limitations
Outcomes	All outcomes	No limitations
Study Design	Any primary investigations	Reviews ^a and essays or letters describing theoretical applications
Years	Any	No limitations
Language	English full-text available	English full-text not available

90 a: Reviews were excluded, but relevant bibliography was screened and included as appropriate

91

92 Study Selection

93 After importing all retrieved articles into Covidence (Melbourne, Australia), automatic and
94 manual deduplication was performed. Two authors (JSC and DMT) screened the articles initially
95 by title and abstract, followed by a full-text review. When access to full-text was unavailable,
96 corresponding authors were contacted for access. A third author (DH) was available to provide
97 resolution if discrepancies could not be resolved via discussion.

98

99 Data Extraction

100 Two authors (JSC and DMT) manually extracted the following data into pre-designed forms on
101 Covidence: title, authors, year of publication, first author country, study design, purpose of XR
102 system, mode of XR, XR display device used, procedure taught or performed, number of
103 participants and description, key outcomes, clinician attitudes regarding adoption of XR,
104 limitations of described system, and suggestions for further research. For this review, AR and
105 MR were grouped into one category, as explained later in the study. Study designs were often not
106 explicitly stated and were manually coded by the authors.

107

108 To maximize congruence, we used an iterative approach where the two extractors periodically
109 compared their results (initially after each study and subsequently after every few studies),
110 achieved consensus, and discussed strategies to maximize accuracy. As with screening, a third
111 author (DH) was available to resolve disagreements.

112

113 **Synthesis of Results**

114 We grouped the included studies by the purpose for which XR applications were created and
115 summarized the device(s) used to achieve XR, the neuraxial procedure(s) performed, the
116 population studied, and key findings. Participants' responses to the use of XR as well as notable
117 limitations of the described system were also summarized. Study authors' suggestions for further
118 research were also tabulated.

119

120 **FINDINGS**

121 A PRISMA flowchart illustrating our review is shown in **figure 1**. Our initial search yielded 824
122 entries, and citation searching led to the addition of 28 additional references. One unindexed
123 article co-written by one of the authors (RJ) was manually included, as it met inclusion criteria.
124 280 duplicates were removed. After screening of titles and abstracts, 54 articles were selected for
125 full-text retrieval. All 54 full-text articles were successfully retrieved (three after contacting the
126 authors), and 41 studies were ultimately included in this review. References pertaining to the
127 same study were merged.

128

129 A total of 13 articles were excluded.[4,9–20] Three were deemed irrelevant as XR was not
130 utilized.[9–11] One article was not available in English and was excluded.[12] A letter
131 describing the theoretical impact of XR on obstetric anesthesia was also excluded.[13] Seven
132 reviews were excluded,[4,14–19] but relevant citations were incorporated into the screening
133 pool. One article was excluded as the reported progress (i.e. viewing educational content using a
134 head-mounted device) was not considered specific to teaching neuraxial procedures.[20]

135

136 The characteristics of the included evidence are displayed in **table 2**. Clinical use of XR was
137 infrequent, with only four of 38 completed studies reporting the use of XR in patient care.
138 Researchers from Canada and the United States were first authors for more than 50% of the
139 included studies, but those from Europe, China, and South Korea have made substantial

140 contributions. Both AR and VR were frequently used. Eighteen completed studies used computer
 141 screens to display XR visuals, and sixteen used head-mounted devices (HMDs). The remaining
 142 four studies employed either laser projectors or semi-transparent mirrors to project relevant
 143 visuals onto the subject's back.

144

145 **Table 2. Characteristics of included studies**

Characteristic	Value	N (%)
First author country	Canada	11 (26.8)
	United States	10 (24.4)
	China	6 (14.6)
	South Korea	4 (9.8)
	United Kingdom	3 (7.3)
	Germany	2 (4.9)
	Brazil	1 (2.4)
	Ireland	1 (2.4)
	Japan	1 (2.4)
	Portugal	1 (2.4)
	Singapore	1 (2.4)
Year of publication	Before 2000	2 (4.9)
	2000-2010	1 (2.4)
	2011-2020	18 (43.9)
	2021-2024	20 (48.8)
Form of XR	AR/MR	23 (56.1)
	VR	17 (41.5)
	Both AR and VR	1 (2.4)
Described use of XR ^a	Clinical use	4 (10.5)
	Preclinical development	13 (34.2)
	Educational	21 (55.3)
Study design	RCTs	5 (12.2)
	Planned RCTs	3 (7.3)
	Non-RCT Experiments	17 (41.5)
	Case report/series	4 (9.8)
	Technical report / Usability	12 (29.3)
XR device	Computer screen	18 (43.9)
	Head-Mounted Device	16 (39)
	Semi-transparent mirror	2 (4.9)
	Projector	2 (4.9)
	Unspecified	3 (7.3)
Source of funding	Not reported	9 (22)
	Not sponsored	4 (9.8)
	Industry	4 (9.8)
	Public, department, or non-profit	24 (58.5)

146 Abbreviations: XR, extended reality; AR, augmented reality; MR, mixed reality; VR, virtual reality; RCT,
 147 randomized-controlled trial

148 a: excludes clinical trial pre-registrations

149 A summary of each study is provided in **supplemental table 1** and discussed below.

150

151 **Clinical applications of extended reality**

152 Among the four studies detailing the clinical use of XR, our review identified only one
153 randomized controlled trial (RCT) investigating XR navigation in patient care. Wiegelmann et
154 al.[21] used a previously described technique[22] to overlay a holographic line representing the
155 optimal needle trajectory from the skin to the thoracic epidural space. This holographic line was
156 visible to proceduralists wearing an HMD as they performed a thoracic epidural. This study
157 found a significant reduction in average procedure time with XR compared to traditional
158 approaches (4.5 minutes vs. 7.3 minutes, $p=0.02$).[21] Although there was a significant reduction
159 in the number of needle movements required (7.2 vs 14.4, $p=0.01$), there was no noticeable
160 difference in the pain associated with the procedure.

161

162 VR has successfully been used for preprocedure simulation in challenging interventional
163 procedures. A case report by Wang et al. describes the successful use of an existing VR anatomy
164 application to determine the optimal fluoroscopic angulation in a patient with a suspected
165 schwannoma undergoing a transforaminal epidural injection at the level of the lesion.[23] Seong
166 et al. developed VR software enabling clinicians to simulate needle interventions using patient
167 computed tomography (CT) scans.[24] This system allowed clinicians to simulate fluoroscopy
168 and obtain x-ray images representative of the real patient to determine the ideal approach.
169 Clinicians successfully executed a challenging transforaminal epidural injection following prior
170 failed attempts by implementing the preprocedure plan designed in VR.[24]

171

172 AR was applied in remote consultations during spinal cord stimulator surgeries. Fritz et al. detail
173 the use of AR goggles which enabled a remote specialist, located 200 miles away, to observe the
174 procedure and provide annotated images and live commentary.[25] This led to the successful
175 insertion of paddle leads in a patient with highly challenging anatomy.[25]

176

177 Our review includes three uncompleted clinical trial registrations, all filed by the same group of
178 investigators and listed as "not yet recruiting" according to the Chinese Clinical Trial
179 Registry.[26–28] The researchers aim to compare the success rates of first-pass lumbar punctures
180 for clinicians using mixed reality guidance versus those using the conventional approach. Efforts
181 to contact the researchers for updates on the studies were unsuccessful. A summary of the
182 group's previous work is provided later in this review.[29]

183

184 **Preclinical applications of extended reality**

185 We identified thirteen preclinical investigations of XR primarily exploring how AR/MR
186 technology could enhance or replace traditional navigation methods.

187

188 A significant focus was placed on improving ultrasound-assisted neuraxial procedures using AR
189 and MR. Three studies utilized image processing algorithms to automatically detect and project
190 lumbar spine levels[30,31] or the midline[32] during neuraxial ultrasound. A fourth study
191 introduced a machine learning/artificial intelligence-based system for automatic detection and
192 projection of spine levels.[33] The authors suggest such systems could be used clinically by
193 anesthesiologists to determine the appropriate site of initial needle insertion.

194

195 Continuous ultrasound guidance during needle placement can present ergonomic and visual
196 challenges. Ameri et al. reported a possible solution, using a tracked epidural needle and
197 augmented reality (AR) to improve visualization of the needle and anatomy on ultrasound. This
198 system showed a lower rate of accidental dural punctures compared to using only ultrasound in
199 trials conducted on a phantom.[34] An alternative approach involved using a head-mounted
200 display (HMD) to create a holographic line representing the optimal needle trajectory from the
201 skin to the epidural space.[22] This method was validated in a randomized controlled trial
202 (RCT), which is summarized earlier in this review.[21]

203

204 Fritz et al. addressed limitations of magnetic resonance imaging-guided lumbar spine
205 interventions by overlaying preprocedural axial magnetic resonance images onto the procedural
206 field using a semi-transparent mirror.[35,36] This system enabled successful epidural injections
207 on cadavers without repeat scanning, with a median procedure time of 8.6 minutes.[36]

208

209 In a study with volunteers, Wu et al. assessed the accuracy of overlaying holograms of spinous
210 processes on their actual locations.[29] Computed tomography (CT) images were used to
211 generate 3-dimensional images of the spine, which were projected over the subject's backs using
212 an HMD.[29] Markers were placed over the holographic spinous processes, and the subjects
213 underwent a repeat CT scan to assess the accuracy of marker placement. The maximum mean
214 error along one axis was 4.2 mm.[29] A significant limitation of this system is that, for clinical
215 use, patients would need to undergo preprocedural CT scanning while using a posture fixation
216 device and maintain that position during the neuraxial procedure. The researchers plan to
217 conduct a randomized controlled trial, and registrations were submitted to the Chinese Clinical
218 Trial Registry as discussed previously in this review.[26–28]

219

220 In fluoroscopy-guided neuraxial procedures, AR showed promise in reducing radiation exposure
221 without compromising accuracy. Reinacher et al. demonstrated high success rates with AR in
222 simulated neuraxial access on prone phantoms[37]. On phantoms with simulated respiratory
223 motion, AR combined with fluoroscopy reduced procedure time and radiation exposure.[38,39]

224

225 Finally, an atypical use case for XR neuraxial simulators was presented by Cometa et al.[40]
226 They compared the epidural space overshoot associated with different loss-of-resistance

227 techniques using measurements derived from an MR-based simulator. Intermittent needle
228 advancement with intermittent plunger pressure resulted in the most significant overshoot.[40]

229

230 **Educational applications of extended reality**

231 Early applications of XR for neuraxial education involved non-immersive VR, presenting a
232 virtual patient on a computer screen for a simulated neuraxial procedure.[41–45] Haptic devices
233 controlled the virtual needle and provided feedback as the needle traversed simulated tissues of
234 varying density. Attempts to enhance realism incorporated force data derived from porcine
235 models[41,42], CT data,[43] and MRI intensity levels[44]. In order to increase engagement,
236 some iterations incorporated gamification, or the use of game design elements in non-gaming
237 contexts,[46] by awarding points[43] and virtual “achievements”[47].

238

239 Kulcsár et al. conducted a pilot randomized-controlled trial using a non-immersive VR spinal
240 anesthesia simulator, comparing it to low-fidelity training on an orange.[48] Although no
241 significant differences were observed in multiple-choice and simulator-based tests, simulator-
242 trained interns exhibited better performance on real patients according to a global rating
243 scale.[48]

244

245 One advantage of XR is its ability to provide information that is typically unavailable. In one
246 study, an interactive spine model was used to improve trainee knowledge through simulation of
247 spinal ultrasound scanning.[49] Edwards et al. applied a mixed reality simulator to develop a
248 modified paramedian thoracic epidural technique, which was taught to trainees and then applied
249 in challenging patients.[50] In a 2015 RCT, Keri et al. found that residents who practiced
250 ultrasound-guided lumbar puncture with AR enhancement outperformed those who practiced
251 with ultrasound alone.[51]

252

253 Hologram-producing HMDs have found use in neuraxial education. Usability studies using
254 HoloLens (Microsoft Corporations, Redmond, Washington) for training garnered positive
255 responses from participants.[52–55] However, in an RCT conducted by Hayasaka et al., it failed
256 to demonstrate a lasting difference between students trained on an AR-enhanced phantom and
257 those trained without AR.[55]

258

259 Most recent VR applications were built using the Unity game engine (Unity Software Inc., San
260 Francisco, California).[47,56–59] Unity simplifies the development of XR applications and
261 reduces duplicate work by providing pre-built code.[60] In one RCT involving a Unity-based
262 immersive VR simulator, trainees learning lumbar transforaminal epidural block placement using
263 VR outperformed those who learned via text and video material alone.[58]

264

265 Although software like Unity has reduced the redundant work in the development of XR
266 education and simulation software, there is significant heterogeneity in how individual systems

267 are developed. Lampotang et al. argue that these heterogeneous approaches may lead to
268 increased validation and curriculum development costs. They describe the System of Modular,
269 Mixed and Augmented Reality Tracking Simulators (SMMARTS) as a potential solution.[61]
270 SMMARTs enables the reuse of hardware and software components and allows for the
271 development of varied procedural simulators, including an epidural loss-of-resistance
272 simulator.[61]

273

274 Our search strategy identified one validation study of commercial XR simulators. White and
275 Jung conducted a pre- and post-test study using a spinal cord stimulator training system.[62]
276 After seven minutes of instruction using the VR simulator, participants had subjective and
277 objective improvements in their performance.[62] A notable limitation was the \$50,000 cost of
278 the system (SPINE Mentor, Surgical Science, Göteborg, Sweden).[62]

279

280 **DISCUSSION**

281 To our knowledge, this is the first scoping review on the uses of XR technology for neuraxial
282 anesthesia and pain procedures. We identified 38 completed and three pending studies
283 investigating the use of XR for neuraxial procedures. Our findings demonstrate accelerating
284 interest in the use of XR technology. The first included article was published in 1996, but a
285 significant majority was published after 2015, as shown in **figure 2**, as mainstream commercial
286 XR devices were released. The release and widespread adoption of commercial, standalone
287 devices such as the Meta Quest 3 (Meta Inc., Menlo Park, CA) and the Vision Pro (Apple Inc.,
288 Cupertino, CA) is expected to further drive XR research.

289

290 While a significant number of studies have been conducted in Canada and the United States, our
291 results indicate global interest in XR for neuraxial procedures. However, when accounting for
292 duplicate authors, the total number of active research groups in this field remains limited.

293

294 To avoid confusion stemming from misuse of terminology, we intentionally grouped AR and
295 MR in our analysis. AR, MR, and VR exist on a spectrum[60], and modern spatial computing
296 devices often support multiple forms of XR. This makes functional categorization (e.g.,
297 simulation vs. procedural navigation) more relevant than the relative visibility of virtual and
298 physical content.

299

300 A majority of the included studies evaluated the use of XR in educational settings. Surveyed
301 trainees and clinicians displayed favorable responses to the adoption of XR for neuraxial
302 education.[19,44,52,53,55,63] The largest reported survey of trainees and anesthesiologists
303 included more than 90 respondents, and VR simulation was highly rated on various metrics,
304 including ease of use (median score eight out of ten) and visual quality (median score 8 out of
305 ten).[44] However, there is a lack of research into the clinical transferability of XR-based
306 training.

307
308 Clinical use of XR for neuraxial procedures remains limited. This is in contrast to specialties
309 such as neurosurgery, where AR is used clinically for intraoperative navigation.[64] Similar
310 application of XR navigation would confer numerous benefits in neuraxial procedures. If patient-
311 specific anatomic holograms can be precisely overlaid onto the procedural field, XR may allow
312 intuitive and hands-free navigation (versus ultrasound), improve accuracy (versus blind
313 procedures), and reduce radiation exposure (versus fluoroscopy).

314
315 Despite these potential benefits, certain barriers hinder the widespread adoption of XR
316 technology for neuraxial navigation. The cost of XR systems can vary widely depending on
317 system complexity, and how clinicians and patients will respond to non-traditional navigation
318 modes is still unknown. However, the most significant barrier lies in displaying accurate
319 navigational information for each individual patient. Preprocedural cross-sectional imaging is
320 often unavailable for patients undergoing neuraxial procedures. Even when imaging is available,
321 patient positioning can dramatically affect the shape of the spine, making image-to-patient
322 registration challenging. Existing research suggests that it's possible to incorporate XR into
323 ultrasound-assisted neuraxial procedures with minimal impact on workflow[21]. However,
324 clinical validation for fluoroscopic-guided procedures has not been performed.

325
326 Based on the results of this review, several unanswered questions emerge. Does XR guidance
327 improve the safety and accuracy of neuraxial procedures? Are XR systems cost-effective for use
328 in neuraxial procedures? Do the benefits of XR-enhanced simulators translate to better clinical
329 performance? What role does machine learning play in registering preprocedural images onto
330 real patients? How can the research community minimize the need for duplicate work in XR
331 system development?

332 333 **Limitations**

334 This scoping review has several limitations. While our search and screening criteria allowed for
335 the inclusion of diverse studies published in various forms, there is likely to be publication bias
336 in the included studies, many of which report favorable results. A formal assessment of the
337 quality of the evidence is beyond the scope of a scoping review, and, as such, we do not provide
338 practice recommendations.

339
340 Our study deviated slightly from the pre-registered protocol in a few instances. During the
341 screening process, we decided to exclude studies not available in English, leading to the
342 exclusion of one study. Additionally, we excluded reviews, although relevant citations were
343 included. Originally, we did not anticipate the need to contact the authors of individual studies,
344 but we ended up having to contact three authors to obtain full-text articles. We believe that these
345 deviations had minimal or even positive impacts on the review.

346

347 Despite these limitations, this scoping review offers a comprehensive overview of the available
348 research on the use of XR for neuraxial procedures. Our broad and iterative search strategy led to
349 the screening of a large number of studies, and our inclusive eligibility criteria led to the
350 inclusion of diverse studies spanning nearly three decades. As intended, this scoping review
351 maps the existing evidence, identifies knowledge gaps, and provides suggestions for further
352 research.

353

354 CONCLUSIONS

355 This scoping review emphasizes the diverse applications of XR technology in the teaching and
356 performance of neuraxial procedures within the fields of anesthesiology and pain medicine.
357 Although many of the included studies were exploratory in nature, there is a growing cohort of
358 researchers investigating the potential of XR in clinical settings. To advance the field, future
359 research should prioritize investigations into the safety, accuracy, practicality, and cost-
360 effectiveness of XR. A concerted effort in these areas is expected to catalyze adoption of this
361 technology and enhance the quality of both education and patient care.

362

363 REFERENCES

364

- 365 1. Co M, Chiu S, Billy Cheung HH. Extended reality in surgical education: A systematic
366 review. *Surgery*. 2023 Nov;174(5):1175–83.
- 367 2. Zhang J, Lu V, Khanduja V. The impact of extended reality on surgery: a scoping review.
368 *Int Orthop*. 2023 Mar;47(3):611.
- 369 3. Curran VR, Xu X, Aydin MY, Meruvia-Pastor O. Use of Extended Reality in Medical
370 Education: An Integrative Review. *Med Sci Educ*. 2022 Dec 19;33(1):275–86.
- 371 4. Privorotskiy A, Garcia VA, Babbitt LE, Choi JE, Cata JP. Augmented reality in anesthesia,
372 pain medicine and critical care: a narrative review. *J Clin Monit Comput*. 2022
373 Feb;36(1):33–9.
- 374 5. Kamimura Y, Yamamoto N, Shiroshita A, Miura T, Tsuji T, Someko H, et al. Comparative
375 efficacy of ultrasound guidance or conventional anatomical landmarks for neuraxial
376 puncture in adult patients: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Br J Anaesth*
377 [Internet]. 2023 Oct 6 [cited 2023 Dec 14]; Available from:
378 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0007091223005020>
- 379 6. Manchikanti L, Knezevic NN, Navani A, Christo PJ, Limerick G, Calodney AK, et al.
380 Epidural Interventions in the Management of Chronic Spinal Pain: American Society of
381 Interventional Pain Physicians (ASIPP) Comprehensive Evidence-Based Guidelines. *Pain*
382 *Physician*. 2021 Jan;24(S1):S27–208.
- 383 7. Cho J, Thaker D. Extended Reality for Neuraxial Anesthesia and Pain Procedures: A
384 Scoping Review Protocol. 2023 Nov 5 [cited 2023 Dec 14]; Available from:
385 <https://osf.io/5u7zs>
- 386 8. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension
387 for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med*. 2018 Oct
388 2;169(7):467–73.
- 389 9. Kerby B, Rohling R, Nair V, Abolmaesumi P. Automatic identification of lumbar level with
390 ultrasound. *Annu Int Conf IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc Annu Int Conf*.
391 2008;2008:2980–3.
- 392 10. Lee RA, van Zundert TCRV, van Koesveld JJM, van Zundert A a. J, Stolker RJ, Wieringa

- 393 PA, et al. Evaluation of the Mediseus epidural simulator. *Anaesth Intensive Care*. 2012
394 Mar;40(2):311–8.
- 395 11. Novak-Jankovič V. Simulation-Based Training of Regional Anesthesia. *Acta Clin Croat*.
396 2022 Sep 1;61.(Supplement 2):155–9.
- 397 12. Gomes DC, Machado LS. A Simulator for Regional Anesthesia Training. In: 2017 19th
398 Symposium on Virtual and Augmented Reality (SVR) [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2024 Jan 14].
399 p. 289–92. Available from: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8114450>
- 400 13. Rubin JE, White RS, Boyer RB, Jotwani R. Obstetric anesthesiology and extended reality:
401 an introduction to future uses of spatial computing in obstetric anesthesiology. *Int J Obstet*
402 *Anesth* [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2023 Dec 14]; Available from:
403 [https://www.obstetanesthesia.com/article/S0959-289X\(23\)00313-8/abstract](https://www.obstetanesthesia.com/article/S0959-289X(23)00313-8/abstract)
- 404 14. Kumar AH, Sultan E, Mariano ER, Udani AD. A modern roadmap for the use of simulation
405 in regional anesthesiology training. *Curr Opin Anaesthesiol*. 2022;35(5):654–9.
- 406 15. Vaughan N, Dubey VN, Wee MY, Isaacs R. A review of epidural simulators: where are we
407 today? *Med Eng Phys*. 2013;35(9):1235–50.
- 408 16. Sauer F, Vogt S, Khamene A. Augmented Reality. In: Peters T, Cleary K, editors. *Image-*
409 *Guided Interventions: Technology and Applications* [Internet]. Boston, MA: Springer US;
410 2008 [cited 2024 Jan 13]. p. 81–119. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-73858-1_4)
411 [73858-1_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-73858-1_4)
- 412 17. Dubey V, Vaughan N, Wee MY, Isaacs R, Andrade A. Biomedical engineering in epidural
413 anaesthesia research [Internet]. InTech London, UK; 2013 [cited 2023 Dec 14]. Available
414 from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5772/50764>
- 415 18. Elsharkawy H, Sonny A, Chin KJ. Localization of epidural space: A review of available
416 technologies. *J Anaesthesiol Clin Pharmacol*. 2017;33(1):16.
- 417 19. Ramlogan RR, Chuan A, Mariano ER. Contemporary training methods in regional
418 anaesthesia: fundamentals and innovations. *Anaesthesia*. 2021 Jan;76(S1):53–64.
- 419 20. Sargsyan N, Bassy R, Wei X, Akula S, Liu J, Seals C, et al. Augmented Reality Application
420 to Enhance Training of Lumbar Puncture Procedure: Preliminary Results. In: *EPIc Series*
421 *in Computing* [Internet]. EasyChair; 2019 [cited 2024 Jan 13]. p. 189–96. Available from:
422 <https://easychair.org/publications/paper/3dm5>
- 423 21. Wiegelmann J, Choi S, McHardy PG, Matava C, Singer O, Kaustov L, et al. Randomized
424 control trial of a holographic needle guidance technique for thoracic epidural placement.
425 *Reg Anesth Pain Med*. 2024 Jan 11;rapm-2023-104703.
- 426 22. Tanwani J, Alam F, Matava C, Choi S, McHardy P, Singer O, et al. Development of a
427 Head-Mounted Holographic Needle Guidance System for Enhanced Ultrasound-Guided
428 Neuraxial Anesthesia: System Development and Observational Evaluation. *JMIR Form*
429 *Res*. 2022;6(6):e36931.
- 430 23. Wang EF, Yu J, Rubin JE, Jotwani R. Virtual reality training and modeling to aid in pre-
431 procedural practice for thoracic nerve root block in the setting of a schwannoma. *Interv*
432 *Pain Med*. 2023 Mar 1;2(1):100180.
- 433 24. Seong H, Yun D, Yoon KS, Kwak JS, Koh JC. Development of pre-procedure virtual
434 simulation for challenging interventional procedures: an experimental study with clinical
435 application. *Korean J Pain*. 2022 Oct 1;35(4):403–12.
- 436 25. Fritz AK, Steele N, Patel C. Augmented Reality Technology in Neuromodulation Surgery.
437 *Neuromodulation*. 2022 Oct 1;25(7):S255–6.
- 438 26. Gu, W. Development and application of mixed reality guided spinal puncture. 2017;
439 Available from: <https://www.chictr.org.cn/showprojEN.html?proj=18023>
- 440 27. Lei, G. Mixed reality-assisted Versus Landmark-guided spinal puncture in elderly patients:
441 a randomized controlled pilot study. 2023; Available from:
442 <https://www.chictr.org.cn/showprojEN.html?proj=178960>
- 443 28. Lei, G, Gu, W. Mixed reality-assisted Versus Landmark-guided spinal puncture in elderly

- 444 patients: a stratified randomized controlled trial. 2023; Available from:
445 <https://www.chictr.org.cn/showprojEN.html?proj=189622>
- 446 29. Wu J, Gao L, Shi Q, Qin C, Xu K, Jiang Z, et al. Accuracy Evaluation Trial of Mixed
447 Reality-Guided Spinal Puncture Technology. *Ther Clin Risk Manag*. 2023;19:599–609.
- 448 30. Ashab HAD, Lessoway VA, Khallaghi S, Cheng A, Rohling R, Abolmaesumi P. An
449 augmented reality system for epidural anesthesia (AREA): prepuncture identification of
450 vertebrae. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng*. 2013;60(9):2636–44.
- 451 31. Ashab HAD, Lessoway VA, Khallaghi S, Cheng A, Rohling R, Abolmaesumi P. AREA: an
452 augmented reality system for epidural anaesthesia. *Annu Int Conf IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc*.
453 2012;2012:2659–63.
- 454 32. Toews A, Massey S, Gunka V, Lessoway V, Rohling R. ProjectAlign: a real-time
455 ultrasound guidance system for spinal midline detection during epidural needle placement.
456 In 2018.
- 457 33. Hetherington J, Lessoway V, Gunka V, Abolmaesumi P, Rohling R. SLIDE: automatic
458 spine level identification system using a deep convolutional neural network. *Int J Comput*
459 *Assist Radiol Surg*. 2017;12(7):1189–98.
- 460 34. Ameri G, Rankin A, Baxter JSH, Moore J, Ganapathy S, Peters TM, et al. Development
461 and Evaluation of an Augmented Reality Ultrasound Guidance System for Spinal
462 Anesthesia: Preliminary Results. *Ultrasound Med Biol*. 2019;45(10):2736–46.
- 463 35. Fritz J, U-Thainual P, Ungi T, Flammang A, Cho N, Fichtinger G, et al. Augmented Reality
464 Visualization With Image Overlay for MRI-Guided Intervention: Accuracy for Lumbar Spinal
465 Procedures With a 1.5-T MRI System. *Am J Roentgenol*. 2012;198(3):W266–73.
- 466 36. Fritz J, U-Thainual P, Ungi T, Flammang A, Fichtinger G, Iordachita I, et al. Augmented
467 reality visualisation using an image overlay system for MR-guided interventions: technical
468 performance of spine injection procedures in human cadavers at 1.5 Tesla. *Eur Radiol*.
469 2013;23(1):235–45.
- 470 37. Reinacher PC, Cimniak A, Demerath T, Schallner N. Usage of augmented reality for
471 interventional neuraxial procedures: A phantom-based study. *Eur J Anaesthesiol*.
472 2023;40(2):121–9.
- 473 38. Lim S, Ha J, Yoon S, Sohn Y, Seo J, Koh J, et al. Augmented Reality Assisted Surgical
474 Navigation System for Epidural Needle Intervention. In 2021. p. 4705–8.
- 475 39. Jun EK, Lim S, Seo J, Lee KH, Lee JH, Lee D, et al. Augmented Reality-Assisted
476 Navigation System for Transforaminal Epidural Injection. *J Pain Res*. 2023;16:921–31.
- 477 40. Cometa MA, Lopez BM, Vasilopoulos T, Destephens AJ, Bigos A, Lizdas DE, et al. Does
478 the Technique for Assessing Loss of Resistance Alter the Magnitude of Epidural Needle
479 Tip Overshoot? *Simul Healthc J Soc Simul Healthc*. 2020 Jun;15(3):154–9.
- 480 41. Stredney D, Sessanna D, McDonald J, Hiemenz L, Rosenberg L. A virtual simulation
481 environment for learning epidural anesthesia. In 1996. p. 164–75.
- 482 42. Vaughan N, Dubey VN, Wee MYK, Isaacs R. Advanced Epidural Simulator with 3D
483 Flexible Spine and Haptic Interface. *J Med Devices [Internet]*. 2012;6(017524). Available
484 from: <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.4026702>
- 485 43. Färber M, Hoeborn E, Dalek D, Hummel F, Gerloff C, Bohn CA, et al. Training and
486 evaluation of lumbar punctures in a VR-environment using a 6DOF haptic device. *Stud*
487 *Health Technol Inform*. 2008;132:112–4.
- 488 44. Hiemenz L, McDonald J, Stredney D, Sessanna D. A physiologically valid simulator for
489 training residents to perform an epidural block. In 1996. p. 170–3. Available from:
490 <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/493141/citations#citations>
- 491 45. Vaughan N, Dubey VN, Wee MYK, Isaacs R. Virtual Reality Based Enhanced Visualization
492 of Epidural Insertion. In *American Society of Mechanical Engineers Digital Collection*;
493 2013. p. 1413–8. Available from: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1115/DETC2012-70951>
- 494 46. Deterding S, Khaled R, Nacke L, Dixon D. Gamification: Toward a definition. *CHI 2011*

- 495 Gamification Workshop Proceedings. In: 2011 Annual Conference on Human Factors in
496 Computing Systems (CHI'11). 2011.
- 497 47. Brazil AL, Conci A, Clua E, Bittencourt LK, Baruque LB, Silva Conci N da. Haptic forces
498 and gamification on epidural anesthesia skill gain. *Entertain Comput.* 2018 Mar 1;25:1–13.
- 499 48. Kulcsar Z, Aboulafia A, Hall T, Shorten GD. Determinants of learning to perform spinal
500 anaesthesia: a pilot study. *Eur J Anaesthesiol.* 2008 Dec;25(12):1026–31.
- 501 49. Ramlogan R, Niazi AU, Jin R, Johnson J, Chan VW, Perlas A. A Virtual Reality Simulation
502 Model of Spinal Ultrasound: Role in Teaching Spinal Sonoanatomy. *Reg Anesth Pain Med.*
503 2017;42(2):217–22.
- 504 50. Edwards DA, Vazquez R, Lizdas D, Lampotang S. A mixed reality simulator augmented
505 with real-time 3D visualization helps develop a modified technique for accessing the
506 thoracic epidural space. *Reg Anesth Pain Med [Internet].* 2016;41(5). Available from:
507 [https://www.embase.com/search/results?subaction=viewrecord&id=L614572639&from=ex](https://www.embase.com/search/results?subaction=viewrecord&id=L614572639&from=export)
508 [port](https://www.embase.com/search/results?subaction=viewrecord&id=L614572639&from=export)
- 509 51. Keri Z, Sydor D, Ungi T, Holden MS, McGraw R, Mousavi P, et al. Computerized training
510 system for ultrasound-guided lumbar puncture on abnormal spine models: a randomized
511 controlled trial. *Can J Anesth.* 2015;62(7):777–84.
- 512 52. da Silva D, Costa CB, da Silva NA, Ventura I, Leite FP, Lopes DS. Augmenting the training
513 space of an epidural needle insertion simulator with HoloLens. *Comput Methods Biomech*
514 *Biomed Eng Imaging Vis.* 2022;10(3):260–5.
- 515 53. Lau WK, Chan JJI, Chan CLJ, Tan CW, Sng BL. Use of Augmented Reality in Learning
516 Lumbar Spinal Anatomy for Training in Labor Epidural Insertion: A Pilot Study. *Bali J*
517 *Anesthesiol.* 2023;7(3):135–40.
- 518 54. Huang X, Yan Z, Gong C, Zhou Z, Xu H, Qin C, et al. A mixed-reality stimulator for lumbar
519 puncture training: a pilot study. *BMC Med Educ.* 2023 Mar 22;23(1):178.
- 520 55. Hayasaka T, Kawano K, Onodera Y, Suzuki H, Nakane M, Kanoto M, et al. Comparison of
521 accuracy between augmented reality/mixed reality techniques and conventional techniques
522 for epidural anesthesia using a practice phantom model kit. *BMC Anesth.* 2023;23(1):171.
- 523 56. Shewaga R, Uribe-Quevedo A, Kapralos B, Alam F. A Comparison of Seated and Room-
524 Scale Virtual Reality in a Serious Game for Epidural Preparation. *IEEE Trans Emerg Top*
525 *Comput.* 2020;8(1):218–32.
- 526 57. Moo-Young J, Weber TM, Kapralos B, Quevedo A, Alam F. Development of Unity
527 Simulator for Epidural Insertion Training for Replacing Current Lumbar Puncture
528 Simulators. *Cureus.* 2021;13(2):e13409.
- 529 58. Kim JY, Lee JS, Lee JH, Park YS, Cho J, Koh JC. Virtual reality simulator's effectiveness
530 on the spine procedure education for trainee: a randomized controlled trial. *Korean J*
531 *Anesth.* 2023;76(3):213–26.
- 532 59. Zheng T, Xie H, Gao F, Gong C, Lin W, Ye P, et al. Research and application of a teaching
533 platform for combined spinal-epidural anesthesia based on virtual reality and haptic
534 feedback technology. *BMC Med Educ.* 2023;23(1):794.
- 535 60. Unity - Manual: XR [Internet]. Unity Documentation. [cited 2024 Jan 19]. Available from:
536 <https://docs.unity3d.com/Manual/XR.html>
- 537 61. Lampotang S, Bigos AK, Avari K, Johnson WT, Mei V, Lizdas DE. SMMARTS: An Open
538 Architecture Development Platform for Modular, Mixed, and Augmented Reality Procedural
539 and Interventional Simulators. *Simul Heal.* 2021;16(5):353–61.
- 540 62. White WW Jr, Jung MJ. Three-Dimensional Virtual Reality Spinal Cord Stimulator Training
541 Improves Trainee Procedural Confidence and Performance. *Neuromodulation.*
542 2023;26(7):1381–6.
- 543 63. Kagalwala DZ, Adhikary S, Murray WB, Webster R. The use of a computerized haptic
544 simulation model to track angles of epidural needle insertion by anesthesiology residents.
545 *Br J Anaesth.* 2012;108((Kagalwala D.Z.; Adhikary S.; Murray W.B.; Webster R.)

546 Pennsylvania State University, College of Medicine, Hershey, PA, United States):ii179–80.
547 64. Cannizzaro D, Zaed I, Safa A, Jelmoni AJM, Composto A, Bisoglio A, et al. Augmented
548 Reality in Neurosurgery, State of Art and Future Projections. A Systematic Review. Front
549 Surg. 2022 Mar 11;9:864792.

550

551 **Figure Legends**

552

553 **Figure 1:** PRISMA flowchart of the review process

554

555 **Figure 2:** Number of included studies by year (1996 to 2023)


556 a: Release of Oculus Rift DK1

557 b: Release of Microsoft HoloLens

558 c: Release of Microsoft HoloLens 2

559 d: Release of Meta Quest 3

560 e: Release of Apple Vision Pro



Included studies ongoing (**n = 3**)

NUMBER OF INCLUDED STUDIES BY YEAR (1996-2023)

