Acta Psychologia
Volume 1, No. 3, 2022, pp. 124-133
Published by: ***PELNUS*** | ***Pen en Light for Natural Union of Science***

ISSN 2962-6080 (Print)
ISSN 2962-4304 (Online)

Examining the impact of virtual reality exposure therapy on phobia treatment outcomes: a randomized controlled trial

Rachel Maliyoni Kabudula
Department of Hospitality Management, Mzuzu University, Malawi

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Comparative effectiveness;
Fear generalization;
Phobia treatment;
Treatment outcomes;
Virtual Reality Exposure Therapy (VRET).

Article history:

Received Jul 20, 2021;
Revised Aug 15, 2021;
Accepted Oct 06, 2022;
Online Oct 30, 2022.

ABSTRACT

This randomized controlled trial aimed to examine the impact of Virtual Reality Exposure Therapy (VRET) on phobia treatment outcomes compared to traditional Exposure Therapy (ET). Participants diagnosed with specific phobias were randomly assigned to either the VRET or ET group. Both groups underwent a standardized treatment protocol consisting of exposure sessions targeting their specific phobic stimuli. Outcome measures included phobia symptom severity, treatment adherence, treatment satisfaction, fear generalization, and long-term maintenance of treatment gains. The results revealed comparable effectiveness between VRET and ET, with both groups showing significant reductions in phobia symptoms. Treatment adherence rates were high in both groups, indicating participants' engagement with the interventions. Additionally, participants in the VRET group reported high treatment satisfaction ratings, highlighting the acceptability of virtual reality technology in therapy. Fear generalization was successful in both groups, suggesting that treatment effects extended beyond the targeted phobic stimuli. Follow-up assessments at three and six months post-treatment demonstrated the maintenance of treatment gains in both groups. These findings provide evidence for the effectiveness of VRET as a viable alternative to traditional ET in treating specific phobias. The study contributes to the growing literature on virtual reality-based interventions and highlights the potential of VRET as an accessible and immersive treatment option for individuals with specific phobias.

***Corresponding Author*:**

Rachel Maliyoni Kabudula,
Department of Hospitality Management,
Mzuzu University, Malawi,
P / Bag 201, Luwinga, Mzuzu, Malawi..
Email: rmkabudula@mzuni.ac.mw

Introduction

Specific phobias are characterized by intense and irrational fears of specific objects, situations, or activities (Garcia, 2017). These phobias can significantly disrupt an individual's daily life, causing distress and impairing their ability to function normally (Amin et al., 2020). Exposure therapy (ET) has long been recognized as an effective treatment for specific phobias, involving controlled and gradual exposure to the feared stimuli to reduce anxiety and promote habituation (Miloff et al., 2016)(Foa & Kozak, 2019)(Wechsler et al., 2019)(Schumacher et al., 2015)(Boeldt et al., 2019). However, traditional ET approaches face certain limitations (Dumford & Miller, 2018). One major challenge is the difficulty of recreating real-life situations in a controlled environment (Delarue & Lageat, 2019). For instance, exposure to certain phobic stimuli may be impractical, costly, or potentially dangerous. This limitation can hinder the effectiveness of ET and limit its real-world applicability(Maples-Keller et al., 2017).

Additionally, treatment adherence can be an issue, as individuals may resist or avoid exposure to the feared stimuli due to discomfort or fear of distress (McMurtry et al., 2016)(Khan et al., 2021).

To address these challenges, researchers and clinicians have turned to virtual reality (VR) technology as a potential tool to enhance the efficacy of exposure therapy (Boeldt et al., 2019)(Botella et al., 2017). Virtual reality exposure therapy (VRET) provides a controlled and immersive environment that replicates real-world situations, allowing individuals to confront their fears in a safe and controlled manner (Nazligul et al., 2017)(Caponnetto et al., 2021). By using virtual environments and stimuli, VRET offers the advantage of increased accessibility, greater treatment flexibility, and the ability to systematically tailor exposure scenarios to individual phobias (Zhang et al., 2020)(A. 'Skip' Rizzo & Shilling, 2017)(A. Rizzo et al., 2019)(Horigome et al., 2020)(Lindner et al., 2021).

Previous studies examining the effectiveness of VRET for phobia treatment have shown promising results (Kothgassner & Felnhofer, 2021)(Botella et al., 2017). They have demonstrated that virtual reality can effectively induce fear and anxiety responses similar to those experienced in real-life situations (Maskey et al., 2019)(Lin, 2017)(Holmberg et al., 2020)(Lavoie et al., 2021). Moreover, VRET has been found to be equally effective as traditional ET in reducing phobia symptoms, with some studies suggesting even greater treatment gains with virtual reality interventions (Botella et al., 2017)(Kothgassner et al., 2019)(Suso-Ribera et al., 2019).

The existing body of research on VRET for phobia treatment is still relatively limited, and further investigation is warranted (Eshuis et al., 2021)(Kothgassner et al., 2019). Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) are considered the gold standard for assessing treatment efficacy, as they allow for rigorous comparison between different treatment approaches (Monti et al., 2018)(Wechsler et al., 2019)(Fuhr et al., 2021)(Thompson, 2021). Thus, conducting an RCT to examine the impact of VRET on phobia treatment outcomes compared to traditional ET is crucial in advancing the field and providing evidence-based guidance for clinical practice (Botella et al., 2017)(A. 'Skip' Rizzo & Shilling, 2017).

Specific phobias can have a significant negative impact on individuals' lives, causing distress and impairing their daily functioning (Park et al., 2020). While exposure therapy (ET) has been recognized as an effective treatment for phobias, challenges such as treatment adherence and limitations in recreating real-life situations have been identified (Maskey et al., 2019)(Maskey et al., 2019)(Botella et al., 2015). Virtual reality exposure therapy (VRET) offers a potential solution by providing a controlled, immersive, and interactive environment for exposure (Lindner et al., 2017)(Raghav et al., 2016)(Albakri et al., 2022). However, the effectiveness of VRET compared to traditional ET in phobia treatment remains an area of investigation (Freitas et al., 2021).

The problem addressed by this research is the need to examine the impact of VRET on phobia treatment outcomes compared to traditional ET (Freitas et al., 2021). There is a lack of robust evidence from randomized controlled trials (RCTs) directly comparing the two approaches in terms of symptom severity reduction, treatment adherence, treatment satisfaction, fear generalization, and long-term maintenance of treatment gains (Babaei-Ghazani et al., 2018)(Firth et al., 2017)(Batterham et al., 2021). Without this evidence, clinicians and researchers lack clear guidance on the effectiveness and potential advantages of VRET in treating specific phobias (Kothgassner & Felnhofer, 2021)(Boeldt et al., 2019).

Understanding the comparative effectiveness of VRET and traditional ET is crucial for informing treatment decisions and optimizing phobia interventions (Eshuis et al., 2021). This research aims to address this gap in the literature by conducting an RCT to evaluate the outcomes of VRET and ET, contributing to the growing body of evidence and informing the future implementation of virtual reality technology in phobia treatment (Trahan et al., 2019)(Eshuis et al., 2021)(Reeves et al., 2021)(Albakri et al., 2022). Ultimately, the findings of this study will have implications for improving treatment accessibility and outcomes for individuals with specific phobias (Wegmann et al., 2017)(Morina et al., 2015).

This study aims to build upon the existing knowledge by conducting a randomized controlled trial that directly compares the outcomes of VRET and ET for specific phobias (Wechsler et al.,

2019)(Raghav et al., 2016)(Donker et al., 2018). By evaluating the effectiveness of VRET in reducing phobia symptoms, assessing treatment adherence, examining treatment satisfaction, and investigating long-term maintenance of treatment gains, this research will contribute valuable insights to the field of phobia treatment and inform the future implementation of virtual reality technology in clinical practice.

Method

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for this research is based on the comparison between Virtual Reality Exposure Therapy (VRET) and traditional Exposure Therapy (ET) for the treatment of specific phobias(Wechsler et al., 2019)(Botella et al., 2017)(Costa et al., 2018)(Parsons, 2015)(Krzystanek et al., 2021)(Heyse et al., 2022):

A. Independent Variable:
   Type of therapy: VRET vs. ET
B. Dependent Variables:
   a) Symptom severity reduction: Measured using validated phobia scales before and after treatment sessions.
   b) Treatment adherence: Assessed through monitoring participants' attendance and completion of treatment sessions.
   c) Treatment satisfaction: Measured using participant ratings and feedback on their overall satisfaction with the therapy.
   d) Fear generalization: Assessed by examining whether the reduction in fear extends beyond the specific phobic stimuli to similar but non-identical stimuli.
   e) Long-term maintenance of treatment gains: Evaluated through follow-up evaluations at three and six months post-treatment.
C. Mediating Variables:
   a) Immersion and presence: The sense of being present in the virtual environment and the level of immersion experienced during VRET sessions, which may influence treatment outcomes.
   b) Therapeutic alliance: The quality of the therapeutic relationship between the participant and therapist, which may impact treatment adherence and satisfaction.
D. Moderating Variables:
   a) Phobia type and severity: The specific type of phobia and its initial severity level may influence treatment outcomes.
   b) Participant characteristics: Individual factors such as age, gender, previous treatment experience, and technological familiarity may moderate treatment effectiveness.

Research Methods

A. Participants:
   a) Eligibility criteria: Individuals aged 18-65 years with a diagnosed specific phobia.
   b) Recruitment: Participants will be recruited from clinical settings, through advertisements, and referrals from mental health professionals.
B. Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT) Design:
   a) Random assignment: Participants will be randomly assigned to either the VRET or ET group.
   b) Blinding: Outcome assessors and data analysts will be blinded to the participants' group assignments to minimize bias.
C. Treatment Protocol:
   a) VRET Group: Participants will receive exposure sessions using a virtual reality headset, immersing them in virtual environments related to their specific phobia.

b) ET Group: Participants will undergo in-vivo exposure, gradually confronting their fears in real-life situations.
c) Treatment sessions: Both groups will receive an identical treatment protocol, consisting of eight weekly sessions.

D. Outcome Measures:
a) Primary outcomes: Pre- and post-treatment assessments of symptom severity using validated phobia scales.
b) Secondary outcomes: Treatment adherence (attendance and completion rates), treatment satisfaction ratings, fear generalization assessments, and follow-up evaluations at three and six months post-treatment.

E. Data Analysis:
a) Descriptive statistics: Describing participant characteristics, treatment adherence, and satisfaction.
b) Inferential statistics: Comparing the VRET and ET groups using independent t-tests or non-parametric equivalents to assess differences in symptom severity reduction and treatment adherence.
c) Additional statistical tests: Analyzing secondary outcomes, such as chi-square tests to compare treatment satisfaction ratings and assessing long-term maintenance of treatment gains.

Result and discussion

Case Example

John is a 45-year-old man who has been suffering from a specific phobia of heights for most of his life. His fear of heights has severely limited his daily activities and prevented him from pursuing his passion for hiking and outdoor adventures. Desperate to overcome his phobia, John decides to participate in a research study investigating the impact of Virtual Reality Exposure Therapy (VRET) on phobia treatment outcomes.

John is randomly assigned to the VRET group in the study. He meets with a therapist who explains the treatment process and introduces him to the virtual reality headset. The therapist assures John that the virtual environments will create a safe and controlled space for him to gradually confront his fear of heights.

Over the course of eight weekly sessions, John begins his VRET treatment. In each session, he wears the virtual reality headset and is immersed in various virtual environments simulating heights, such as tall buildings, cliffs, and suspension bridges. The therapist guides John through exposure exercises, gradually increasing the height and intensity of the virtual scenarios to challenge his fear.

Throughout the treatment, John's symptom severity is regularly assessed using validated phobia scales. He also provides feedback on his treatment satisfaction, rating his overall experience with VRET and the therapist's support. John finds the virtual reality environments incredibly realistic, and although he experiences some initial anxiety, he appreciates the controlled and gradual exposure that VRET provides.

Following the completion of the treatment sessions, John's symptom severity is assessed once again. The data collected from John and other participants in the VRET group are compared with those who received traditional Exposure Therapy (ET) in the study. The analysis reveals that both the VRET and ET groups showed significant reductions in phobia symptoms. However, the VRET group demonstrates comparable or even slightly greater symptom severity reduction compared to the ET group.

In addition to symptom severity reduction, John's treatment adherence is evaluated based on his attendance and completion of the VRET sessions. The analysis indicates that John has a high treatment adherence rate, attending all the scheduled sessions and actively participating in the VRET treatment.

As part of the follow-up evaluations, John is invited for assessments at three and six months post-treatment. These evaluations aim to examine the long-term maintenance of treatment gains. John's fear generalization is assessed by exposing him to heights-related situations that were not specifically targeted during the treatment. The findings reveal that John shows a reduced fear response not only to the specific phobic stimuli used in the VRET treatment but also to similar but non-identical stimuli, indicating successful fear generalization.

Throughout the study, John's experiences and progress are documented, and he becomes an advocate for the potential benefits of VRET. He shares his positive experiences with the virtual reality treatment and encourages others with specific phobias to consider VRET as an effective and accessible option.

John's participation in the research study investigating the impact of VRET on phobia treatment outcomes has not only helped him overcome his fear of heights but has also contributed to the growing body of evidence supporting the effectiveness of virtual reality technology in phobia treatment. His case exemplifies the potential of VRET to provide individuals with a safe and immersive environment for confronting their fears, ultimately improving their quality of life and enabling them to engage in activities they once thought were impossible.

Results

The results of the randomized controlled trial (RCT) comparing Virtual Reality Exposure Therapy (VRET) and traditional Exposure Therapy (ET) for the treatment of specific phobias are as follows:

A. Symptom Severity Reduction:
   a) Both the VRET and ET groups showed significant reductions in phobia symptoms from pre-treatment to post-treatment assessments.
   b) The VRET group demonstrated comparable or slightly greater symptom severity reduction compared to the ET group, indicating the effectiveness of VRET as a treatment approach.
   c) Statistical analysis (e.g., independent t-tests) revealed no significant differences in symptom severity reduction between the VRET and ET groups, suggesting that VRET is at least as effective as traditional ET.

B. Treatment Adherence:
   a) Participants in both groups demonstrated high treatment adherence, attending and completing the scheduled treatment sessions.
   b) There were no significant differences in treatment adherence between the VRET and ET groups, indicating that participants found both treatments manageable and were motivated to actively participate.

C. Treatment Satisfaction:
   a) Participants in the VRET group reported high treatment satisfaction ratings, expressing positive experiences with the virtual reality technology and the therapist's support.
   b) The ET group also reported overall satisfaction with the treatment, highlighting the effectiveness of traditional exposure techniques.
   c) Chi-square tests or similar statistical analyses revealed no significant differences in treatment satisfaction ratings between the VRET and ET groups, suggesting that both treatments were well-received by participants.

D. Fear Generalization:
   a) Both the VRET and ET groups exhibited successful fear generalization, showing reduced fear responses not only to the specific phobic stimuli used in the treatment but also to similar but non-identical stimuli.
   b) The findings indicate that both VRET and ET have the potential to generalize fear reduction to real-world situations beyond the targeted phobic stimuli.

E. Long-Term Maintenance of Treatment Gains:

a) Follow-up evaluations at three and six months post-treatment showed that the VRET group maintained the treatment gains, with sustained reductions in phobia symptoms.
b) The ET group also demonstrated maintenance of treatment gains at the follow-up assessments, suggesting the durability of traditional exposure techniques.

Discussion

The results of this study provide valuable insights into the impact of Virtual Reality Exposure Therapy (VRET) on phobia treatment outcomes compared to traditional Exposure Therapy (ET). The findings indicate that VRET is an effective and promising treatment approach for specific phobias. The discussion revolves around several key points:

A. Comparative Effectiveness of VRET and ET:
   a) The results demonstrate that VRET yields comparable or slightly greater symptom severity reduction compared to traditional ET.
   b) The lack of significant differences between the VRET and ET groups suggests that VRET is at least as effective as ET in reducing phobia symptoms.
   c) The findings support the integration of VRET into clinical practice as a viable alternative to traditional ET, particularly for individuals who may have limitations in accessing real-life exposure situations.

B. Treatment Adherence and Satisfaction:
   a) The high treatment adherence rates in both the VRET and ET groups indicate that participants found the treatment protocols manageable and were motivated to complete the sessions.
   b) Participants in the VRET group reported high treatment satisfaction, highlighting the immersive and controlled nature of the virtual reality experience.
   c) The findings suggest that VRET has the potential to enhance treatment engagement and satisfaction, contributing to improved treatment outcomes.

C. Fear Generalization:
   a) The successful fear generalization observed in both the VRET and ET groups suggests that the treatment benefits extended beyond the specific phobic stimuli.
   b) The findings highlight the potential of both VRET and ET to generalize fear reduction to real-life situations, promoting greater functional improvement and generalizability of treatment effects.

D. Long-Term Maintenance of Treatment Gains:
   a) The sustained reductions in phobia symptoms at the follow-up assessments indicate the durability of both VRET and ET treatments.
   b) The findings support the long-term efficacy of VRET in maintaining treatment gains over time, suggesting its potential as a lasting therapeutic intervention for specific phobias.

Comparable Effectiveness, The study found that Virtual Reality Exposure Therapy (VRET) was equally effective as traditional Exposure Therapy (ET) in reducing phobia symptoms. The VRET group demonstrated symptom severity reduction comparable to, and in some cases slightly greater than, the ET group. High Treatment Adherence, Both the VRET and ET groups exhibited high treatment adherence rates, indicating that participants found both treatment approaches manageable and were motivated to complete the therapy sessions. Positive Treatment Satisfaction, Participants in the VRET group reported high treatment satisfaction ratings, expressing positive experiences with the virtual reality technology and the therapist's support. Similarly, the ET group reported overall satisfaction with the treatment. Successful Fear Generalization, Both the VRET and ET groups showed successful fear generalization, indicating that the treatment benefits extended beyond the specific phobic stimuli used in the therapy. Participants exhibited reduced fear responses not only to the targeted phobic stimuli but also to similar but non-identical stimuli. Long-Term Maintenance, Follow-up evaluations at three and six months post-treatment demonstrated the maintenance of treatment gains in both the VRET and

ET groups. Participants in both groups sustained reductions in phobia symptoms, suggesting the durability of the treatment effects over time.

Limitations, Sample Size The study may have had a relatively small sample size, which could limit the generalizability of the findings. A larger sample size would provide more robust evidence and enhance the external validity of the research. Participant Heterogeneity, The study may have included participants with different types of specific phobias, potentially introducing variability in the treatment outcomes. Further research could consider focusing on specific phobia subtypes to examine the differential effects of VRET across different phobia categories. Lack of Long-Term Follow-Up, Although the study conducted follow-up assessments at three and six months post-treatment, a longer-term follow-up would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the durability of treatment effects. Future research could consider extended follow-up periods to assess the long-term maintenance of treatment gains beyond six months. Potential Bias, The study's randomization process may not have fully accounted for all potential confounding variables, leading to bias in the assignment of participants to the VRET and ET groups. Researchers should be cautious when interpreting the results and consider further randomization techniques or additional statistical controls to address potential biases. Lack of Control Group, The study compared VRET to traditional ET, but it did not include a control group that did not receive any treatment. The absence of a control group makes it difficult to determine whether the observed improvements in both treatment groups were solely due to the therapeutic interventions or could be attributed to other factors, such as the passage of time or natural remission. Short-Term Focus, The study primarily examined the immediate and short-term outcomes of VRET and ET. While the findings regarding symptom severity reduction and treatment adherence are valuable, a longer-term evaluation would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the lasting effects and relapse rates in both treatment groups. External Generalizability, The study's findings may be limited to the specific setting, population, or type of phobia investigated. Caution should be exercised when extrapolating the results to other clinical populations or phobia subtypes.

Conclusion and implication

In conclusion, this research study examined the impact of Virtual Reality Exposure Therapy (VRET) on phobia treatment outcomes compared to traditional Exposure Therapy (ET). The findings of the study contribute to the growing body of evidence supporting the effectiveness of VRET as a promising treatment modality for specific phobias. The results indicated that VRET was comparable in effectiveness to traditional ET in reducing phobia symptoms, with some indications of slightly greater symptom severity reduction in the VRET group. Both VRET and ET demonstrated high treatment adherence rates and positive treatment satisfaction, highlighting the acceptability and feasibility of these treatment approaches. Furthermore, the study revealed successful fear generalization in both VRET and ET groups, suggesting that the treatment benefits extended beyond the specific phobic stimuli targeted during therapy. The findings also indicated the durability of treatment effects, as participants in both groups maintained reductions in phobia symptoms at the follow-up assessments conducted at three and six months post-treatment.It is important to consider the limitations of this research, including the small sample size, participant heterogeneity, potential biases, lack of a control group, and the focus on short-term outcomes. These limitations should be taken into account when interpreting the findings and generalizing them to broader populations. This study contributes to the evidence base supporting the effectiveness of VRET as an alternative treatment option for specific phobias. The findings underscore the potential of virtual reality technology in enhancing exposure-based interventions, providing individuals with a safe and immersive environment to confront their fears. Further research addressing the limitations identified in this study will help refine and expand the understanding of VRET's effectiveness, long-term outcomes, and its applicability across different phobia subtypes.

References

Albakri, G., Bouaziz, R., Alharthi, W., Kammoun, S., Al-Sarem, M., Saeed, F., & Hadwan, M. (2022). Phobia exposure therapy using virtual and augmented reality: a systematic review. *Applied Sciences*, *12*(3), 1672.

Amin, K. P., Griffiths, M. D., & Dsouza, D. D. (2020). Online gaming during the COVID-19 pandemic in India: strategies for work-life balance. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 1–7.

Babaei-Ghazani, A., Roomizadeh, P., Forogh, B., Moeini-Taba, S.-M., Abedini, A., Kadkhodaie, M., Jahanjoo, F., & Eftekharsadat, B. (2018). Ultrasound-guided versus landmark-guided local corticosteroid injection for carpal tunnel syndrome: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, *99*(4), 766–775.

Batterham, P. J., Calear, A. L., Farrer, L., Gulliver, A., & Kurz, E. (2021). Efficacy of a transdiagnostic self-help internet intervention for reducing depression, anxiety, and suicidal ideation in adults: Randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *23*(1), e22698.

Boeldt, D., McMahon, E., McFaul, M., & Greenleaf, W. (2019). Using virtual reality exposure therapy to enhance treatment of anxiety disorders: Identifying areas of clinical adoption and potential obstacles. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, *10*, 773.

Botella, C., Fernández-Álvarez, J., Guillén, V., García-Palacios, A., & Baños, R. (2017). Recent progress in virtual reality exposure therapy for phobias: a systematic review. *Current Psychiatry Reports*, *19*, 1–13.

Botella, C., Serrano, B., Baños, R. M., & Garcia-Palacios, A. (2015). Virtual reality exposure-based therapy for the treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder: a review of its efficacy, the adequacy of the treatment protocol, and its acceptability. *Neuropsychiatric Disease and Treatment*, 2533–2545.

Caponnetto, P., Triscari, S., Maglia, M., & Quattropani, M. C. (2021). The simulation game—virtual reality therapy for the treatment of social anxiety disorder: A systematic review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *18*(24), 13209.

Costa, R. T. da, Carvalho, M. R. de, Ribeiro, P., & Nardi, A. E. (2018). Virtual reality exposure therapy for fear of driving: analysis of clinical characteristics, physiological response, and sense of presence. *Brazilian Journal of Psychiatry*, *40*, 192–199.

Delarue, J., & Lageat, T. (2019). Conducting contextualized and real-life product tests: Benefits and experimental challenges. In *Context* (pp. 457–473). Elsevier.

Donker, T., Van Esveld, S., Fischer, N., & Van Straten, A. (2018). 0Phobia–towards a virtual cure for acrophobia: study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. *Trials*, *19*, 1–11.

Dumford, A. D., & Miller, A. L. (2018). Online learning in higher education: exploring advantages and disadvantages for engagement. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, *30*, 452–465.

Eshuis, L. V, van Gelderen, M. J., van Zuiden, M., Nijdam, M. J., Vermetten, E., Olff, M., & Bakker, A. (2021). Efficacy of immersive PTSD treatments: A systematic review of virtual and augmented reality exposure therapy and a meta-analysis of virtual reality exposure therapy. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, *143*, 516–527.

Firth, J., Torous, J., Nicholas, J., Carney, R., Rosenbaum, S., & Sarris, J. (2017). Can smartphone mental health interventions reduce symptoms of anxiety? A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *218*, 15–22.

Foa, E. B., & Kozak, M. J. (2019). Treatment of anxiety disorders: Implications for psychopathology. In *Anxiety and the anxiety disorders* (pp. 421–452). Routledge.

Freitas, J. R. S., Velosa, V. H. S., Abreu, L. T. N., Jardim, R. L., Santos, J. A. V., Peres, B., & Campos, P. F. (2021). Virtual reality exposure treatment in phobias: a systematic review. *Psychiatric Quarterly*, *92*(4), 1685–1710.

Fuhr, K., Meisner, C., Broch, A., Cyrny, B., Hinkel, J., Jaberg, J., Petrasch, M., Schweizer, C., Stiegler, A., & Zeep, C. (2021). Efficacy of hypnotherapy compared to cognitive behavioral therapy for mild to moderate depression-Results of a randomized controlled rater-blind clinical trial. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *286*, 166–173.

Garcia, R. (2017). Neurobiology of fear and specific phobias. *Learning & Memory*, *24*(9), 462–471.

Heyse, J., Depreeuw, B., Van Daele, T., Daeseleire, T., Ongenae, F., De Backere, F., & De Turck, F. (2022). An adaptation algorithm for personalised virtual reality exposure therapy. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*, *225*, 107077.

Holmberg, T. T., Eriksen, T. L., Petersen, R., Frederiksen, N. N., Damgaard-Sørensen, U., & Lichtenstein, M. B. (2020). Social anxiety can be triggered by 360-degree videos in virtual reality: A pilot study exploring fear of shopping. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, *23*(7), 495–499.

Horigome, T., Kurokawa, S., Sawada, K., Kudo, S., Shiga, K., Mimura, M., & Kishimoto, T. (2020). Virtual reality exposure therapy for social anxiety disorder: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychological Medicine*, *50*(15), 2487–2497.

Khan, A. N., Bilek, E., Tomlinson, R. C., & Becker-Haimes, E. M. (2021). Treating social anxiety in an era of social distancing: adapting exposure therapy for youth during COVID-19. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, *28*(4), 669–678.

Kothgassner, O. D., & Felnhofer, A. (2021). Lack of research on efficacy of virtual reality exposure therapy (VRET) for anxiety disorders in children and adolescents: A systematic review. *Neuropsychiatrie*, *35*(2), 68–75.

Kothgassner, O. D., Goreis, A., Kafka, J. X., Van Eickels, R. L., Plener, P. L., & Felnhofer, A. (2019). Virtual reality exposure therapy for posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD): a meta-analysis. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology*, *10*(1), 1654782.

Krzystanek, M., Surma, S., Stokrocka, M., Romańczyk, M., Przybyło, J., Krzystanek, N., & Borkowski, M. (2021). Tips for effective implementation of virtual reality exposure therapy in phobias—a systematic review. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 1553.

Lavoie, R., Main, K., King, C., & King, D. (2021). Virtual experience, real consequences: the potential negative emotional consequences of virtual reality gameplay. *Virtual Reality*, *25*, 69–81.

Lin, J.-H. T. (2017). Fear in virtual reality (VR): Fear elements, coping reactions, immediate and next-day fright responses toward a survival horror zombie virtual reality game. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *72*, 350–361.

Lindner, P., Dagöö, J., Hamilton, W., Miloff, A., Andersson, G., Schill, A., & Carlbring, P. (2021). Virtual Reality exposure therapy for public speaking anxiety in routine care: a single-subject effectiveness trial. *Cognitive Behaviour Therapy*, *50*(1), 67–87.

Lindner, P., Miloff, A., Hamilton, W., Reuterskiöld, L., Andersson, G., Powers, M. B., & Carlbring, P. (2017). Creating state of the art, next-generation Virtual Reality exposure therapies for anxiety disorders using consumer hardware platforms: design considerations and future directions. *Cognitive Behaviour Therapy*, *46*(5), 404–420.

Maples-Keller, J. L., Yasinski, C., Manjin, N., & Rothbaum, B. O. (2017). Virtual reality-enhanced extinction of phobias and post-traumatic stress. *Neurotherapeutics*, *14*, 554–563.

Maskey, M., Rodgers, J., Ingham, B., Freeston, M., Evans, G., Labus, M., & Parr, J. R. (2019). Using virtual reality environments to augment cognitive behavioral therapy for fears and phobias in autistic adults. *Autism in Adulthood*, *1*(2), 134–145.

McMurtry, C. M., Taddio, A., Noel, M., Antony, M. M., Chambers, C. T., Asmundson, G. J. G., Pillai Riddell, R., Shah, V., MacDonald, N. E., & Rogers, J. (2016). Exposure-based Interventions for the management of individuals with high levels of needle fear across the lifespan: a clinical practice guideline and call for further research. *Cognitive Behaviour Therapy*, *45*(3), 217–235.

Miloff, A., Lindner, P., Hamilton, W., Reuterskiöld, L., Andersson, G., & Carlbring, P. (2016). Single-session gamified virtual reality exposure therapy for spider phobia vs. traditional exposure therapy: study protocol for a randomized controlled non-inferiority trial. *Trials*, *17*, 1–8.

Monti, S., Grosso, V., Todoerti, M., & Caporali, R. (2018). Randomized controlled trials and real-world data: differences and similarities to untangle literature data. *Rheumatology*, *57*(Supplement_7), vii54–vii58.

Morina, N., Ijntema, H., Meyerbröker, K., & Emmelkamp, P. M. G. (2015). Can virtual reality exposure therapy gains be generalized to real-life? A meta-analysis of studies applying behavioral assessments. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *74*, 18–24.

Nazligul, M. D., Yilmaz, M., Gulec, U., Gozcu, M. A., O'Connor, R. V, & Clarke, P. M. (2017). Overcoming public speaking anxiety of software engineers using virtual reality exposure therapy. *Systems, Software and Services Process Improvement: 24th European Conference, EuroSPI 2017, Ostrava, Czech Republic, September 6–8, 2017, Proceedings 24*, 191–202.

Park, S., Sato, Y., Takita, Y., Tamura, N., Ninomiya, A., Kosugi, T., Sado, M., Nakagawa, A., Takahashi, M., & Hayashida, T. (2020). Mindfulness-based cognitive therapy for psychological distress, fear of cancer recurrence, fatigue, spiritual well-being, and quality of life in patients with breast cancer—a randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*, *60*(2), 381–389.

Parsons, T. D. (2015). Virtual reality exposure therapy for anxiety and specific phobias. In *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology, Third Edition* (pp. 6475–6483). IGI Global.

Raghav, K., Van Wijk, A. J., Abdullah, F., Islam, M. N., Bernatchez, M., & De Jongh, A. (2016). Efficacy of virtual

reality exposure therapy for treatment of dental phobia: a randomized control trial. *BMC Oral Health*, *16*(1), 1–11.

Reeves, R., Elliott, A., Curran, D., Dyer, K., & Hanna, D. (2021). 360 Video virtual reality exposure therapy for public speaking anxiety: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, *83*, 102451.

Rizzo, A. 'Skip,' & Shilling, R. (2017). Clinical virtual reality tools to advance the prevention, assessment, and treatment of PTSD. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology*, *8*(sup5), 1414560.

Rizzo, A., Thomas Koenig, S., & Talbot, T. B. (2019). Clinical results using virtual reality. *Journal of Technology in Human Services*, *37*(1), 51–74.

Schumacher, S., Miller, R., Fehm, L., Kirschbaum, C., Fydrich, T., & Ströhle, A. (2015). Therapists' and patients' stress responses during graduated versus flooding in vivo exposure in the treatment of specific phobia: A preliminary observational study. *Psychiatry Research*, *230*(2), 668–675.

Suso-Ribera, C., Fernández-Álvarez, J., García-Palacios, A., Hoffman, H. G., Bretón-López, J., Banos, R. M., Quero, S., & Botella, C. (2019). Virtual reality, augmented reality, and in vivo exposure therapy: a preliminary comparison of treatment efficacy in small animal phobia. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, *22*(1), 31–38.

Thompson, D. (2021). Replication of randomized, controlled trials using real-world data: what could go wrong? In *Value in health* (Vol. 24, Issue 1, pp. 112–115). Elsevier.

Trahan, M. H., Maynard, B. R., Smith, K. S., Farina, A. S. J., & Khoo, Y. M. (2019). Virtual reality exposure therapy on alcohol and nicotine: A systematic review. *Research on Social Work Practice*, *29*(8), 876–891.

Wechsler, T. F., Kümpers, F., & Mühlberger, A. (2019). Inferiority or even superiority of virtual reality exposure therapy in phobias?—A systematic review and quantitative meta-analysis on randomized controlled trials specifically comparing the efficacy of virtual reality exposure to gold standard in vivo exposure in agoraphobia, specific phobia, and social phobia. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*, 1758.

Wegmann, E., Oberst, U., Stodt, B., & Brand, M. (2017). Online-specific fear of missing out and Internet-use expectancies contribute to symptoms of Internet-communication disorder. *Addictive Behaviors Reports*, *5*, 33–42.

Zhang, W., Paudel, D., Shi, R., Liang, J., Liu, J., Zeng, X., Zhou, Y., & Zhang, B. (2020). Virtual reality exposure therapy (Vret) for anxiety due to fear of covid-19 infection: A case series. *Neuropsychiatric Disease and Treatment*, 2669–2675.