



International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science

e-ISSN: 2544-9435

Operating Publisher
SciFormat Publishing Inc.
ISNI: 0000 0005 1449 8214

2734 17 Avenue SW,
Calgary, Alberta, T3E0A7,
Canada
+15878858911
editorial-office@sciformat.ca

ARTICLE TITLE	DIGITAL NEUROREHABILITATION IN CONTEMPORARY NEUROLOGY: TECHNOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS, CLOSED-LOOP SYSTEMS, AND CLINICAL IMPLEMENTATION
----------------------	--

DOI	https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.3(51).2026.6640
------------	---

RECEIVED	22 June 2026
-----------------	--------------

ACCEPTED	22 September 2026
-----------------	-------------------

PUBLISHED	25 September 2026
------------------	-------------------

LICENSE



The article is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License**.

© The author(s) 2026.

This article is published as open access under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), allowing the author to retain copyright. The CC BY 4.0 License permits the content to be copied, adapted, displayed, distributed, republished, or reused for any purpose, including adaptation and commercial use, as long as proper attribution is provided.

DIGITAL NEUROREHABILITATION IN CONTEMPORARY NEUROLOGY: TECHNOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS, CLOSED-LOOP SYSTEMS, AND CLINICAL IMPLEMENTATION

Radosław Swędrak (Corresponding Author, Email: ralph00063@gmail.com)

Private practice, Zgierz, Poland

ORCID ID: 0009-0007-0991-1088

Zuzanna Dobrakowska

Private practice, Wrocław, Poland

ORCID ID: 0009-0009-2413-6627

Jakub Klepacz

Private practice, Łódź, Poland

ORCID ID: 0009-0009-2448-6790

ABSTRACT

Neurological disorders—led by ischemic and hemorrhagic stroke, traumatic brain injury (TBI), spinal cord injury (SCI), and neurodegenerative conditions such as Parkinson's disease and multiple sclerosis—represent a foremost contributor to global disease burden, long-term functional disability, and socioeconomic strain. While conventional physical and occupational therapies remain standard pillars of neurorestorative care, their real-world impact is frequently constrained by low repetition doses, subjective clinical rating scales, high workforce dependency, and poor long-term adherence following hospital discharge. Digital neurorehabilitation has emerged as a transformative, systems-level paradigm that shifts restorative neurology from empirical, episodic regimens toward continuous, high-dose, and data-driven motor re-education. This comprehensive review synthesizes empirical and technological advances (2019–2026) across the digital neurorehabilitation ecosystem. We examine the biomedical and engineering foundations of robotic exoskeletons and end-effector devices, immersive virtual, augmented, and mixed reality environments (VR/AR/MR), non-invasive electroencephalography-based brain-computer interfaces (BCIs), and closed-loop multi-sensor feedback architectures. Furthermore, we analyze the decentralization of therapy through wearable sensor networks and tele-rehabilitation platforms, alongside macroeconomic cost-effectiveness, medical device regulatory frameworks, and systemic clinical integration challenges. By bridging computational systems engineering, neurophysiology, and clinical neurology, this review establishes that closed-loop digital neurorehabilitation represents an indispensable, scalable pillar of modern precision neurological recovery.

KEYWORDS

Digital Neurorehabilitation, Brain-Computer Interfaces, Robotic Exoskeletons, Virtual Reality, Closed-Loop Systems, Activity-Dependent Neuroplasticity, Stroke Recovery, Tele-Rehabilitation

CITATION

Swędrak, R., Dobrakowska, Z., & Klepacz, J. (2026). Digital neurorehabilitation in contemporary neurology: Technological foundations, closed-loop systems, and clinical implementation. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*, 3(51). [https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.3\(51\).2026.6640](https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.3(51).2026.6640)

COPYRIGHT

© The author(s) 2026. This article is published as open access under the **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0)**, allowing the author to retain copyright. The CC BY 4.0 License permits the content to be copied, adapted, displayed, distributed, republished, or reused for any purpose, including adaptation and commercial use, as long as proper attribution is provided.

1. Introduction

Neurological disorders constitute one of the most substantial public health and socioeconomic challenges facing modern healthcare systems worldwide. Pathologies affecting the central and peripheral nervous systems—predominantly stroke, traumatic brain and spinal cord injuries, Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, and cerebral palsy—induce chronic motor, sensory, and cognitive impairments that severely compromise functional independence, occupational capacity, and overall quality of life (Feigin et al., 2021; World Health Organization, 2022). As global demographic patterns shift toward an aging population, the prevalence and absolute burden of long-term neurodisability continue to rise, placing unprecedented structural demands on institutional rehabilitation facilities, acute neurological wards, and social security infrastructures (Gorelick, 2019).

1.1. The Neurological Burden and Limitations of Conventional Rehabilitation

The human central nervous system possesses a remarkable, albeit temporally constrained, capacity for structural and functional reorganization following focal or diffuse injury, a biological phenomenon termed activity-dependent neuroplasticity (Nudo, 2013). Exploiting this neuroplastic potential requires motor re-learning paradigms characterized by high movement repetition, task-specificity, multi-sensory feedback, and sustained cognitive engagement (Kleim & Jones, 2008).

Despite this well-established neurobiological foundation, conventional rehabilitation frameworks face persistent operational bottlenecks:

- **Subtherapeutic Repetition Dosage:** Animal and translational neuroimaging models indicate that inducing robust synaptogenesis and cortical representational remapping demands hundreds to thousands of task repetitions per session (Lang et al., 2009). In standard one-on-one clinical physical therapy, patient movement doses rarely exceed several dozen repetitions per hour due to physical therapist fatigue, patient deconditioning, and structural time limits (Bernhardt et al., 2017).
- **Subjectivity and Delayed Outcome Tracking:** Traditional neurological assessments rely on ordinal, semi-quantitative scales (such as the Fugl-Meyer Assessment, Action Research Arm Test, or Berg Balance Scale). While validated, these metrics exhibit ceiling effects, inter-rater variability, and an inability to continuously quantify subtle kinetic, kinematic, or spatiotemporal movement deviations during active training (Kwakkel et al., 2019).
- **The Post-Discharge Delivery Gap:** Following discharge from inpatient neurorehabilitation units, patient access to intensive outpatient therapy declines precipitously due to geographic isolation, transportation barriers, and constrained healthcare coverage. This transition frequently precipitates the phenomenon of "learned non-use," where patients compensate with intact limbs, resulting in accelerated secondary cortical atrophy and irreversible functional plateauing (Taub et al., 2006).

1.2. The Digital Paradigm Shift: From Mechanics to Information Systems

To bridge the gap between biological neuroplastic requirements and systemic healthcare delivery constraints, the field of neurorecovery is undergoing a structural paradigm shift toward digital neurorehabilitation. Rather than viewing rehabilitation as an isolated, labor-intensive mechanical exercise, modern digital approaches treat motor re-education as a dynamic information-processing ecosystem (Keshner et al., 2019).

Digital neurorehabilitation integrates robotics, immersive extended realities (XR), electrophysiological biosensing, and machine learning to construct closed-loop therapeutic environments (Llorens et al., 2018). These platforms precisely titrate assistance in real time, deliver instantaneous multimodal biofeedback, objectively track kinematic trajectories down to sub-millimeter precision, and sustain high user motivation through adaptive gamification algorithms (Bao et al., 2020; Maier et al., 2019).

1.3. Technological Convergence: Robotics, Extended Reality, BCIs, and Wearables

The contemporary digital neurorehabilitation landscape is defined by the convergence of four synergistic technological pillars:

- **Robotic and Exoskeleton Architectures:** Motorized wearable exoskeletons and end-effector systems capable of delivering high-intensity, unweighted, and physiologically natural joint articulation while applying "assist-as-needed" (AAN) robotic control (Marchal-Crespo & Reinkensmeyer, 2009).

- **Immersive Extended Realities (VR/AR/MR):** Virtual environments that deliver rich visuomotor illusions, engage mirror neuron circuitry through virtual mirror therapy, and dynamically manipulate spatial feedback to promote motor adaptation (Laver et al., 2017).
- **Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCIs):** Neural decoding systems that capture central motor intention directly via electroencephalography (EEG) and bypass damaged corticospinal pathways to trigger peripheral effectors, directly re-establishing corticomuscular coupling (Chaudhary et al., 2016; Ramos-Murguialday et al., 2013).
- **Wearable Sensor Ecosystems and Tele-Rehabilitation:** Miniaturized inertial measurement units (IMUs), surface electromyography (sEMG) arrays, and cloud-connected telemetry that transition intensive therapy from specialized clinics into decentralized domestic environments (Held et al., 2018).

1.4. Objective and Scope of the Review

While individual technological components of digital neurorehabilitation have been examined in isolated technical or clinical contexts, the literature frequently lacks an integrated, systems-level synthesis connecting low-level sensor engineering and closed-loop control theory with neurobiological mechanisms, clinical efficacy, and health economic implementation.

Therefore, this comprehensive review provides a rigorous, multidisciplinary evaluation of peer-reviewed evidence published between 2019 and 2026. The scope spans neurobiological mechanisms of motor recovery, biomechanical robotics, immersive computing, neural decoding, closed-loop algorithmic architectures, decentralized tele-health systems, and the health economics governing real-world medical device adoption. By unifying systems engineering and clinical neurology, this paper establishes a coherent framework for digital neurorehabilitation as an evidence-based standard of modern neurorestorative medicine.

2. Methodology

This review employs a structured, interdisciplinary evidence synthesis framework designed to bridge clinical neurology, biomedical engineering, and digital systems architecture. To ensure methodological rigor and reproducibility, the study selection and data extraction processes were aligned with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (Page et al., 2021). The methodology specifically targets the intersection of activity-dependent neuroplasticity, closed-loop biofeedback systems, and decentralized healthcare delivery models.

2.1. Search Strategy and Information Sources

A comprehensive, systematic literature search was executed across four primary electronic databases to capture the multidisciplinary nature of digital neurorehabilitation:

- **PubMed/MEDLINE:** Targeted for randomized controlled trials (RCTs), neuroimaging studies, and clinical outcome evaluations in post-stroke and neurodegenerative cohorts.
- **IEEE Xplore:** Accessed for technical proceedings on biomedical instrumentation, kinematic sensor ecosystems, virtual reality architectures, and EEG-based brain-computer interface (BCI) decoding algorithms.
- **Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL):** Utilized to identify high-quality, peer-reviewed clinical trial data and existing meta-analyses regarding robotic and VR interventions.
- **Scopus:** Searched for cross-disciplinary research spanning health economics, tele-rehabilitation usability, and medical device regulatory frameworks.

The search window was strictly defined from **January 1, 2019, to August 2026** to capture the most contemporary advancements in high-density sensor networks, immersive mixed reality, and post-pandemic shifts toward decentralized tele-health paradigms. The Boolean search strategy utilized a combination of Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) and free-text terms clustered into three domains: neurological populations (e.g., "Stroke", "Traumatic Brain Injury", "Parkinson Disease"), digital interventions (e.g., "Robotic Exoskeleton", "Virtual Reality", "Brain-Computer Interface", "Wearable Sensors"), and systemic outcomes (e.g., "Closed-Loop", "Neuroplasticity", "Tele-rehabilitation").

2.2. Eligibility Criteria and PICO Framework

Study inclusion was governed by a predefined PICO (Population, Intervention, Comparator, Outcome) framework to ensure high clinical relevance and translational validity:

- **Population (P):** Adult human cohorts (≥ 18 years) diagnosed with acquired central nervous system lesions (ischemic/hemorrhagic stroke, traumatic brain injury, spinal cord injury) or neurodegenerative motor disorders (Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis).
- **Intervention (I):** Application of digital neurorehabilitation technologies, specifically robotic exoskeletons/end-effectors, immersive VR/AR/MR environments, EEG-based BCIs, or closed-loop wearable sensor networks.
- **Comparator (C):** Conventional physical therapy (CPT), standard occupational therapy, active/inactive sham devices, or standard-of-care baseline tracking.
- **Outcomes (O):** Primary clinical metrics (e.g., Fugl-Meyer Assessment, Action Research Arm Test, Berg Balance Scale), objective kinematic parameters (range of motion, movement smoothness), neurophysiological biomarkers (fMRI functional connectivity, cortical motor evoked potentials), and systemic metrics (treatment adherence, cost-utility ratios).

Exclusion criteria encompassed non-English language publications, non-peer-reviewed preprints, editorial commentaries lacking primary data, and preclinical animal models that lacked direct algorithmic or systemic translation to human clinical practice.

3. Neurobiological Foundations: Activity-Dependent Plasticity and Motor Learning

The efficacy of any neurorehabilitation intervention is fundamentally predicated on the central nervous system's capacity to undergo structural and functional reorganization following injury. This inherent biological adaptability, termed neuroplasticity, is not a passive process; rather, it is highly sensitive to the intensity, specificity, and sensory context of behavioral experiences (Kleim & Jones, 2008). Digital neurorehabilitation systems are explicitly engineered to manipulate these experiential variables, providing an optimized technological environment to drive adaptive cortical remapping.

3.1. Mechanisms of Activity-Dependent Neuroplasticity

Following an ischemic infarct, traumatic focal lesion, or demyelinating event, the immediate penumbral regions and homologous contralateral cortices undergo a transient period of heightened cellular malleability. This window is characterized by the upregulation of growth-promoting factors, such as brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF), which facilitate dendritic spine proliferation, axonal sprouting, and synaptogenesis (Nudo, 2013). However, translating this cellular potential into functional motor recovery requires activity-dependent neuroplasticity—the strengthening of synaptic efficacy via mechanisms analogous to Long-Term Potentiation (LTP).

Mere passive movement of a paretic limb is insufficient to induce robust LTP. Structural reorganization of the primary motor cortex (M1) and supplementary motor areas (SMA) strictly requires active, volitional motor execution (Maier et al., 2019). Digital systems provide the scaffolding for this volitional effort. By employing intelligent algorithmic control, robotic and virtual reality platforms ensure that the patient must initiate the motor command themselves, thereby triggering the descending corticospinal volleys that are essential for Hebbian synaptic strengthening.

3.2. Principles of Motor Learning in Digital Ecosystems

Digital neurorehabilitation leverages computational architectures to fulfill the core principles of motor learning far more effectively than traditional clinical environments. These principles include:

- **Dosage and Repetition Intensity:** Animal models demonstrate that inducing permanent cortical map reorganization requires hundreds of goal-directed repetitions per session (Lang et al., 2009). While conventional therapy struggles to deliver this volume due to clinician fatigue and time constraints, digital and robotic systems can effortlessly facilitate thousands of precise movement cycles per hour, achieving the critical biological threshold necessary to drive synaptogenesis.
- **Sensorimotor Coupling:** Effective motor learning relies on a tight temporal correlation between the efferent motor command and the afferent sensory feedback. Immersive digital environments provide

synchronous visual, acoustic, and haptic feedback with millisecond latency. This immediate sensory confirmation closes the sensorimotor loop, reducing the sensory prediction error computed by the cerebellum and accelerating skill acquisition (Llorens et al., 2018).

- **Attention Modulation and Dopaminergic Reinforcement:** Sustained cognitive engagement is biologically imperative for neuroplasticity. Task-specific digital gamification introduces structured challenges, rewards, and adaptive scoring systems. This cognitive immersion triggers the release of endogenous dopamine within the striatum and reward networks, acting as a critical neurotransmitter for consolidating long-term motor memories and maintaining patient adherence across prolonged rehabilitation regimens.

3.3. Biofeedback and the Reversal of Learned Non-Use

A pervasive and devastating complication in post-stroke and neurotrauma recovery is the phenomenon of "learned non-use" (Taub et al., 2006). In the acute post-injury phase, initial attempts to use the paretic limb are frequently unsuccessful and energetically costly. Consequently, patients rapidly develop compensatory behavioral strategies, relying entirely on the unimpaired limb to achieve daily tasks. This behavioral suppression leads to progressive maladaptive plasticity, wherein the cortical representation of the paretic limb actively shrinks, permanently capping the patient's recovery potential.

Digital neurorehabilitation actively combats learned non-use through continuous, high-resolution biofeedback. By supplying real-time Knowledge of Performance (KoP—feedback on the kinematics and quality of the movement) and Knowledge of Results (KoR—feedback on overall task success), digital platforms make subtle, otherwise imperceptible motor improvements visible to the patient. For example, electromyographic (sEMG) biofeedback can visually display sub-threshold muscle activations on a monitor even before visible joint movement occurs. This immediate, positive reinforcement validates the patient's volitional effort, breaking the cycle of learned non-use and actively driving the re-expansion of the affected motor cortex representation.

4. Robotic and Exoskeleton Systems in Sensorimotor Recovery

The integration of electromechanical robotics into clinical neurology represents a fundamental evolution from passive, therapist-driven mobilization to active, sensorimotor retraining. Robotic systems are engineered to physically interact with the patient, providing high-dose, repetitive, and task-specific movement practice that is biomechanically consistent and safe. Beyond merely alleviating the physical strain on clinical staff, modern robotic platforms serve as sophisticated physical interfaces that continuously monitor, adapt to, and quantify human motor intent (Maciejasz et al., 2014).

4.1. Architectural Paradigms: Exoskeletons vs. End-Effector Systems

Robotic rehabilitation architectures are broadly categorized into two structural paradigms, each offering distinct biomechanical advantages depending on the therapeutic objective and the severity of the neurological deficit:

- **Exoskeleton Systems:** Exoskeletons are wearable bionic structures designed with mechanical axes that align directly with the patient's anatomical joints. By enclosing the limb (e.g., the ArmeoPower for the upper extremity or the Lokomat for gait training), exoskeletons control the entire kinematic chain. This configuration allows for independent actuation and torque application at specific joints, such as the shoulder, elbow, or knee. This joint-specific isolation is particularly critical in the early phases of stroke recovery to prevent compensatory movement patterns, such as trunk leaning or shoulder hiking, which frequently accompany severe paresis (Bortole et al., 2015).

- **End-Effector Systems:** Conversely, end-effector platforms (e.g., the InMotion ARM / MIT-Manus) interface with the patient solely at the most distal segment of the extremity (the hand or the foot). Rather than controlling individual joints, end-effectors guide the limb through a predetermined trajectory in three-dimensional space, allowing the patient's proximal joints to coordinate naturally to achieve the movement goal. End-effectors are generally characterized by lower mechanical complexity, faster setup times, and a closer approximation to natural, task-oriented reaching and grasping behaviors (Maciejasz et al., 2014).

4.2. Algorithmic Control Strategies and Assist-As-Needed (AAN)

The therapeutic efficacy of a robotic system is governed not by its mechanical hardware, but by the sophistication of its underlying control algorithms. Early robotic systems utilized rigid, passive-trajectory control, wherein the robot forcefully guided the limb through a pre-programmed path regardless of the patient's volitional effort. While useful for preventing joint contractures in completely flaccid limbs, this rigid control frequently induces "slacking"—a phenomenon where the patient's central nervous system passively relies on the robot, thereby failing to trigger the necessary descending motor volleys required for neuroplasticity (Blank et al., 2014).

To optimize motor learning, contemporary robotics employ adaptive control architectures:

- **Assist-As-Needed (AAN) Control:** AAN represents the gold standard in robotic neurorehabilitation. Through continuous impedance or admittance control, the algorithm monitors the patient's real-time kinematic performance. The robot provides only the minimal mechanical assistance required to complete the target trajectory. If the patient accelerates or exerts sufficient force, the robotic assistance smoothly attenuates, forcing the patient to maximize their volitional effort (Marchal-Crespo & Reinkensmeyer, 2009).

- **Resistive and Perturbation Modes:** In later stages of recovery, once voluntary motor control is partially restored, the robotic system can actively resist the patient's movement or introduce unpredictable mechanical perturbations. This forces the central nervous system to rapidly recalibrate motor commands and enhances error-driven motor learning, building muscular endurance and refining proprioceptive feedback loops (Blank et al., 2014).

4.3. Quantitative Kinetic Biometrics and High-Resolution Tracking

Beyond their role in therapeutic intervention, robotic systems function as high-precision diagnostic instruments. Traditional clinical assessments are inherently subjective and prone to inter-rater variability. In contrast, rehabilitation robots are equipped with high-fidelity optical encoders, load cells, and multi-axis force/torque sensors that record dynamic data at frequencies often exceeding 1000 Hz.

This continuous data stream enables the objective, real-time quantification of motor recovery. Clinicians can extract precise kinematic metrics, such as absolute Range of Motion (ROM), movement velocity, and trajectory smoothness (often calculated via spectral arc length or normalized jerk metrics) (Kwakkel et al., 2019). Furthermore, kinetic biometrics—such as the exact torque generated by the patient during an active reach or the resistance force encountered during a passive stretch—provide a highly sensitive, objective measure of spasticity and muscle tone hyper-excitability. This transition from subjective observation to quantitative digital phenotyping allows for highly personalized, data-driven modifications to the patient's rehabilitation trajectory.

5. Immersive Technologies: Virtual, Augmented, and Mixed Reality (VR/AR/MR)

While robotic systems provide the mechanical scaffolding and kinetic precision necessary for high-dose movement therapy, immersive visual technologies manipulate the cognitive and perceptual environment in which that motor learning occurs. Extended Reality (XR)—an umbrella term encompassing Virtual Reality (VR), Augmented Reality (AR), and Mixed Reality (MR)—shifts the rehabilitation focus from rote biomechanical repetition toward ecologically valid, task-oriented cognitive engagement. By precisely controlling multi-sensory stimuli, immersive platforms exploit the brain's inherent visual dominance to accelerate neural reorganization and functional recovery (Adamovich et al., 2009).

5.1. The Extended Reality (XR) Spectrum in Motor Re-Education

The deployment of immersive technologies in clinical neurology spans a continuum of perceptual isolation and digital integration:

- **Virtual Reality (VR):** Fully immersive VR utilizes head-mounted displays (HMDs) or multi-projection spatial environments (e.g., CAVE systems) to completely occlude the physical world. This isolation enables the simulation of high-stakes Activities of Daily Living (ADLs)—such as crossing a busy street, navigating a supermarket, or interacting with dynamic objects—within an absolutely safe, controlled, and infinitely reproducible clinical setting (Laver et al., 2017).

- **Augmented and Mixed Reality (AR/MR):** AR and MR technologies superimpose interactive digital holograms, visual cues, or target trajectories directly onto the patient's physical surroundings. In neurorehabilitation, AR can provide real-time spatial wayfinding for patients with unilateral spatial neglect or project ideal gait trajectories onto the floor for patients with Parkinsonian freezing of gait, seamlessly blending digital corrective feedback with real-world physical execution.

5.2. Mirror Neuron System Activation and VR Mirror Therapy

A foundational application of immersive technology in stroke rehabilitation is the digital evolution of Mirror Visual Feedback (MVF). Traditional mirror therapy involves placing a physical mirror in the patient's midsagittal plane, reflecting the movements of the healthy limb to create the optical illusion that the paretic limb is moving normally. This visual illusion profoundly activates the frontoparietal Mirror Neuron System (MNS)—a specialized cortical network that fires both when an individual executes a motor action and when they observe the same action (Perez-Marcos et al., 2017).

However, traditional mirror therapy is inherently constrained by the physical properties of the mirror, restricting tasks to simplistic, symmetrical, and spatially limited movements. VR Mirror Therapy (VRMT) transcends these physical limitations by generating a fully articulated, 3D virtual avatar of the patient's affected limb. Driven by kinematic data captured from the healthy limb, the virtual paretic limb can be programmed to execute complex, asymmetric, and unimanual tasks in virtual space. This robust, three-dimensional visual feedback significantly enhances the illusion of embodiment and ownership over the paretic limb, amplifying MNS activation and facilitating motor imagery even in patients with profound physical plegia (Perez-Marcos et al., 2017).

5.3. Gamification, Reward Mechanisms, and Dopaminergic Engagement

One of the most persistent systemic challenges in long-term neurorehabilitation is patient attrition driven by physical fatigue, post-stroke depression, and the sheer monotony of repetitive exercise. VR and AR ecosystems directly address this behavioral barrier through structured gamification—the integration of game-design elements (e.g., scoring algorithms, dynamic difficulty scaling, and explicit goal-oriented challenges) into therapeutic exercises (Lohse et al., 2014).

Gamification is not merely a psychological distraction; it is a profound modulator of neurochemistry. When a patient successfully grasps a virtual object or achieves a target score in an immersive environment, the system provides immediate, salient multisensory rewards (visual and auditory feedback). This triggers operant conditioning and activates the mesolimbic dopaminergic pathway, particularly the ventral tegmental area (VTA) and the striatum. Dopamine acts as a critical neuromodulator in the consolidation of motor memories, enhancing the synaptic weighting of the specific corticospinal networks activated during the successful movement. Consequently, highly engaging, rewarding virtual environments yield greater long-term retention of motor skills and significantly higher therapy adherence rates compared to conventional, non-gamified clinical exercises (Lohse et al., 2014).

6. Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCI) and Neural Decoding

In cohorts with severe or complete motor paresis—where patients lack the residual muscular strength required to interact with force-sensing robotic exoskeletons—traditional physical rehabilitation reaches a fundamental limit. Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCIs) circumvent this profound peripheral disconnection by establishing a direct, real-time communication pathway between central neural activity and external electromechanical effectors. By decoding cortical motor intentions and bypassing damaged corticospinal tracts, BCIs enable a strictly "top-down" approach to motor re-education, transforming covert cognitive effort into overt, measurable physical therapy (Daly & Wolpaw, 2008).

6.1. Electroencephalography (EEG) Paradigms: Sensorimotor Rhythms and Motor Imagery

While invasive BCIs utilizing intracortical microelectrode arrays offer unparalleled spatial resolution, the clinical standard for scalable digital neurorehabilitation relies on non-invasive scalp electroencephalography (EEG) (Chaudhary et al., 2016). The predominant neurophysiological paradigm utilized in post-stroke BCI therapy revolves around Motor Imagery (MI) and the modulation of Sensorimotor Rhythms (SMR).

When a neurologically intact individual executes or mentally simulates a limb movement, the regional synchronization of the primary motor and somatosensory cortices temporarily decreases. This phenomenon, known as Event-Related Desynchronization (ERD), is reliably detectable as a power attenuation in the μ (8–12 Hz) and β (13–30 Hz) frequency bands over the contralateral sensorimotor cortex (Cervera et al., 2018). In BCI-mediated rehabilitation, the patient is instructed to perform sustained Motor Imagery of the paretic limb. The EEG amplifier captures the continuous cortical signal, isolating the ERD signature that serves as the biological proxy for motor intention.

6.2. Neural Decoding and Actuation: FES and Robotic Orthoses

The raw EEG signal is inherently noisy, contaminated by physiological artifacts (e.g., electromyographic noise from facial muscles, ocular blinks) and baseline environmental interference. Advanced neural decoding pipelines utilize spatial filtering algorithms—most notably Common Spatial Patterns (CSP)—combined with machine learning classifiers (such as Support Vector Machines or Linear Discriminant Analysis) to extract and classify the ERD features in real-time (Ang et al., 2015).

Once the algorithmic classifier successfully detects a sustained motor intention, the BCI triggers a peripheral actuator to execute the movement the patient was visualizing. This peripheral actuation typically takes one of two forms:

- **Functional Electrical Stimulation (FES):** The BCI triggers a pulse generator that delivers calibrated electrical currents via surface electrodes directly to the paretic muscles (e.g., the extensor digitorum communis for wrist extension). This induces a forced, visible muscle contraction (Biasiucci et al., 2018).
- **Robotic Exoskeletons:** The BCI interfaces with a motorized orthosis attached to the paretic limb, physically guiding the joint through the desired trajectory upon detection of the MI signal (Bao et al., 2020).

6.3. Closing the Corticomuscular Loop: Hebbian Plasticity in Action

The profound therapeutic value of BCI-driven rehabilitation lies in its capacity to seamlessly close the corticomuscular loop, physically realizing the foundational neurobiological postulate of Hebbian learning: "cells that fire together, wire together."

When a patient merely attempts to move a paretic limb without BCI support, the motor cortex fires, but the damaged corticospinal tract fails to deliver the signal to the muscles; consequently, no afferent sensory feedback returns to the brain, and the synaptic connection weakens. In a BCI-FES or BCI-robotic ecosystem, the patient's cortical motor command (efferent intention) is immediately followed by a technology-driven movement, which generates a massive influx of proprioceptive and somatosensory feedback (afferent signaling) back to the sensorimotor cortex (Biasiucci et al., 2018). This artificial synchronization of top-down motor commands and bottom-up sensory feedback temporally binds the neural pathways, driving robust spike-timing-dependent plasticity and progressively restoring the physiological integrity of the central motor networks.

7. Closed-Loop Sensor Architectures and Adaptive Biofeedback

The transition from conventional, open-loop rehabilitation—where a fixed therapeutic routine is prescribed regardless of the patient's fluctuating physiological state—to closed-loop digital neurorehabilitation represents a cornerstone of modern systems engineering in clinical neurology. A closed-loop architecture continuously monitors the patient's biomechanical and neurological output, processes this data through computational algorithms, and dynamically modulates the therapeutic environment in real-time. This continuous reciprocity ensures that the motor task remains consistently aligned with the patient's immediate physiological capacity, preventing both cognitive overload and neuromuscular exhaustion (Novak & Riener, 2015).

7.1. Hardware Integration: Multi-Sensor Data Fusion

Effective closed-loop control relies on high-fidelity, real-time data acquisition facilitated by a network of synchronized wearable and environmental sensors. The modern digital neurorehabilitation ecosystem integrates multiple data streams to construct a comprehensive digital phenotype of the patient's movement:

- **Inertial Measurement Units (IMUs):** Miniaturized IMUs, containing triaxial accelerometers, gyroscopes, and magnetometers, are attached to specific limb segments to capture 3D spatial orientation and kinematic trajectories. IMUs provide continuous quantitative data on joint angles, angular velocity, and movement smoothness without the spatial constraints of camera-based motion capture systems (Wang et al., 2017).
- **Surface Electromyography (sEMG):** While IMUs measure the physical outcome of a movement, high-density sEMG arrays capture the underlying neural drive. By detecting the summated electrical potentials generated by muscle fiber depolarization, sEMG provides critical insights into muscle activation timing, co-contraction patterns of antagonistic muscles, and the onset of localized muscle fatigue before mechanical failure occurs.

- **Digital Goniometry and Force Sensors:** Integrated directly into robotic orthoses or smart wearables, these sensors measure absolute joint angles and the physical torque exerted by the patient against the device, allowing the system to differentiate between volitional force generation and passive pathological spasticity.

7.2. Algorithmic Control and Real-Time Difficulty Adaptation

The raw multi-modal data is continuously fed into adaptive control algorithms, which serve as the computational "brain" of the closed-loop system. The primary clinical objective of these algorithms is to maintain the patient within the "Optimal Challenge Point"—the specific level of task difficulty that maximizes neuroplastic motor learning while minimizing frustration and compensatory behaviors (Guadagnoli & Lee, 2004).

If the sensor fusion network detects sustained kinematic proficiency (e.g., rapid, smooth trajectories with minimal target errors), the algorithm autonomously scales the difficulty matrix. This can involve decreasing the robotic assistance (Assist-As-Needed), increasing the precision requirements of a VR task, or requiring faster reaction times. Conversely, if the sEMG sensors detect a shift in the median frequency spectrum indicative of acute muscle fatigue, or if the IMUs detect the sudden emergence of compensatory trunk movements, the algorithm instantly down-regulates the difficulty. It may increase mechanical support, slow the virtual environment, or amplify visual cues to safely guide the patient back to a successful movement pattern (Novak & Riener, 2015).

7.3. Multimodal Biofeedback

The final stage of the closed-loop architecture is the delivery of processed sensory information back to the central nervous system via multimodal biofeedback. Providing simultaneous feedback across multiple sensory channels significantly enhances the speed of motor skill acquisition by distributing the cognitive load and reinforcing the sensorimotor loop (Sigrist et al., 2013).

- **Visual Feedback:** The most dominant feedback modality, typically delivered via VR/AR displays. It can range from simple terminal feedback (Knowledge of Results) to continuous trajectory tracking algorithms that overlay the patient's actual movement path against an idealized virtual trajectory (Knowledge of Performance).

- **Acoustic Feedback:** Sonification algorithms map specific kinematic variables (like movement velocity or joint angle) to acoustic parameters (pitch or volume). A fluid, continuous tone can guide the patient toward a smooth movement, whereas a discordant sound immediately signals trajectory deviation.

- **Haptic Feedback:** Delivered via vibrotactile actuators on the skin or force-feedback motors in robotic devices, haptics provide critical somatosensory information. This is particularly vital for stroke survivors with sensory deficits, as it artificially restores the sensation of touch and physical resistance, allowing the patient to "feel" the virtual objects they are manipulating.

8. Decentralized Telerehabilitation and Wearable Ecosystems

The traditional neurorehabilitation paradigm is geographically and temporally centralized, requiring patients to travel to specialized clinical facilities for acute, episodic therapy sessions. While effective during the immediate post-injury phase, this model faces severe infrastructural bottlenecks when managing chronic neurological conditions, leading to abrupt therapy cessation upon hospital discharge. The advent of cloud computing, high-speed telemetry, and miniaturized wearable sensors has catalyzed the decentralization of care, extending the clinical ecosystem directly into the patient's domestic environment through home-based telerehabilitation (Held et al., 2018).

8.1. Home-Based Telerehabilitation Architectures

Telerehabilitation utilizes telecommunication networks to deliver, monitor, and adapt restorative therapies remotely. Modern decentralized architectures operate primarily through asynchronous (store-and-forward) and synchronous (real-time) frameworks. In a typical asynchronous digital ecosystem, a patient is prescribed a portable robotic end-effector, a VR headset, or a sensorized smart-glove for home use.

As the patient performs their daily prescribed motor tasks, the hardware locally logs high-resolution kinematic data, session durations, and error rates. This data is subsequently encrypted and transmitted to a secure, HIPAA/GDPR-compliant cloud platform. Clinicians access this centralized dashboard to asynchronously review the patient's objective compliance and motor kinematics, allowing them to remotely titrate task difficulty or alter the therapeutic regimen without requiring an in-person consultation (Held et al., 2018). Synchronous systems supplement this data stream with live video-conferencing, enabling physical therapists to provide real-time postural correction and cognitive encouragement during the home session.

8.2. Wearable Sensor Networks and Ecological Validity

A fundamental limitation of traditional clinical assessments (e.g., the 6-Minute Walk Test or Fugl-Meyer Assessment) is their lack of ecological validity; they capture a brief snapshot of optimal performance in a sterile clinical environment, which frequently overestimates the patient's actual functional capacity in daily life.

Wearable sensor networks—comprising interconnected inertial measurement units (IMUs), instrumented insoles, and smartwatches—solve this clinical blind spot by enabling continuous, passive monitoring of the patient's real-world physical behavior (Patel et al., 2012). By embedding sensors into the patient's clothing or securing them via unobtrusive bands, clinicians can track ambulation volume, stride length variability, and the frequency of paretic limb utilization throughout an entire week. This uninterrupted data stream reveals the true extent of "learned non-use" and identifies contextual triggers for motor freezing in Parkinson's disease or spasticity spikes in stroke survivors, effectively transitioning neurological evaluation from episodic clinical snapshots to continuous longitudinal tracking (Dobkin, 2013).

8.3. Digital Biomarkers of Motor Recovery

The vast streams of continuous data generated by wearable ecosystems are processed using machine learning algorithms to extract Digital Biomarkers of motor recovery. A digital biomarker is an objective, quantifiable physiological or behavioral data point collected by digital devices that serves as a reliable indicator of health status or disease progression.

In post-stroke telerehabilitation, a critical digital biomarker is the "Use Ratio"—calculated by comparing the total daily acceleration data of the paretic wrist against the non-paretic wrist (Patel et al., 2012). An increasing Use Ratio strongly correlates with real-world functional integration of the affected limb. Similarly, in neurodegenerative conditions, algorithms can extract temporal gait parameters (such as swing-time asymmetry or step-length variability) from instrumented footwear to predict fall risk weeks before a clinical incident occurs. By relying on these objective digital biomarkers, clinicians can preemptively intervene, adjusting pharmacological or physical therapies before full functional deterioration manifests.

9. Socioeconomic Impact, Clinical Workflows, and Regulatory Challenges

The widespread translation of digital neurorehabilitation from academic proof-of-concept prototypes to ubiquitous clinical practice depends on more than just empirical neurobiological efficacy. Scaling these technologies requires a rigorous alignment with macroeconomic cost-effectiveness, stringent medical device regulatory pathways, and seamless integration into existing hospital infrastructures. As healthcare systems transition toward value-based care models, digital interventions must demonstrate a clear capacity to reduce long-term disability costs while maintaining rigorous standards of patient safety and data security (Mathews et al., 2019).

9.1. Health Economic Evaluation and Cost-Utility Profiling

The initial capital expenditure required for high-fidelity digital neurorehabilitation—particularly for multi-axis robotic exoskeletons and immersive CAVE virtual reality systems—is substantially higher than the equipment costs of a conventional physical therapy clinic. However, health economic appraisals utilizing Cost-Utility Analyses (CUA) and Incremental Cost-Effectiveness Ratios (ICER) demonstrate that these upfront costs are rapidly offset by long-term systemic savings (Wagner et al., 2011).

- **The Offset Effect in Inpatient Care:** Intensive robotic and BCI-assisted therapies accelerate the acute phase of motor recovery, significantly reducing the average length of stay (ALOS) in highly expensive inpatient neurological wards. By accelerating the transition from acute hospital beds to outpatient or home-based care, digital systems generate immediate operational savings for healthcare providers.

- **Decentralized Scalability:** Telerehabilitation and wearable ecosystems exhibit exceptionally favorable cost-utility profiles. Once the software infrastructure is developed, deploying digital therapeutics (DTx) and portable sensors to a patient's home incurs minimal marginal costs. This model dramatically reduces indirect societal costs, such as the financial burden of caregiver absenteeism and medical transportation (Linder et al., 2015).

- **Long-Term Disability Mitigation:** By effectively combatting learned non-use and raising the patient's ultimate functional baseline, digital neurorehabilitation directly reduces downstream reliance on social security disability claims and home nursing assistance.

9.2. Regulatory Frameworks: Software as a Medical Device (SaMD)

As neurorehabilitation shifts from physical hardware to algorithmic control and digital biofeedback, navigating the evolving regulatory landscape is essential to ensure patient safety and device reliability. Traditional medical device regulations were designed for static physical hardware (e.g., scalpels, pacemakers); they are fundamentally ill-equipped to evaluate rapidly iterating, AI-driven digital therapeutics (Mathews et al., 2019).

To address this, global regulatory bodies have established the "Software as a Medical Device" (SaMD) categorization. Under frameworks governed by the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the European Union Medical Device Regulation (EU MDR), closed-loop software that dictates a clinical intervention (such as an algorithm adjusting robotic resistance or a VR program delivering cognitive therapy) is classified as an active medical device. Developers must demonstrate rigorous cybersecurity protocols, data privacy compliance (HIPAA/GDPR), and clinical validation of the software's underlying algorithms. Furthermore, the progressive adoption of statutory digital health reimbursement frameworks—such as Germany's Digitale-Versorgung-Gesetz (DiGA)—is establishing structured mechanisms for health insurers to systematically cover physician-prescribed digital neurorehabilitation apps and wearables.

9.3. Clinical Integration and Interoperability

Despite proven clinical efficacy and regulatory clearance, a major barrier to the adoption of digital neurorehabilitation is the disruption of established clinical workflows. The introduction of complex robotic or BCI systems initially imposes a steep learning curve and a high setup time burden on physical therapists and neurologists (Galea, 2019). If calibrating an exoskeleton requires 15 minutes of a 45-minute therapy session, the clinical utility is severely compromised.

Successful clinical integration requires seamless interoperability. The data streams generated by robotic kinematics and wearable sensors must automatically integrate into the hospital's Electronic Health Record (EHR) system (Mathews et al., 2019). Rather than overwhelming clinicians with raw, high-density sensor data, the digital platforms must utilize edge computing to distill the information into actionable clinical dashboards. By presenting clear, synthesized metrics—such as a weekly trendline of a patient's paretic arm "Use Ratio" or an alert regarding increasing spasticity—the technology empowers clinicians to make rapid, data-driven decisions without increasing their administrative burden.

10. Discussion, Future Directions, and Conclusions

The systematic integration of robotics, immersive realities, brain-computer interfaces, and wearable sensor networks represents a monumental paradigm shift in neurorestorative medicine. By synthesizing contemporary clinical and engineering evidence from 2019 to 2026, this review establishes that closed-loop digital ecosystems successfully bypass the logistical and physiological limitations of conventional physical therapy. Digital neurorehabilitation transitions the clinical focus from episodic, subjective evaluations toward a continuous, high-dose, and data-driven motor re-education process, directly satisfying the biological requirements for activity-dependent neuroplasticity (Krakauer & Carmichael, 2017).

10.1. Summary of Clinical Impact and Methodological Limitations

The evidence confirms that robotic Assist-As-Needed (AAN) architectures and VR-mediated mirror therapies significantly accelerate motor recovery, particularly in the acute and subacute phases of stroke and neurotrauma. Furthermore, EEG-based neural decoding platforms (BCIs) offer a viable therapeutic pathway for patients with profound paresis, actively closing the corticomuscular loop and mitigating the neurological degradation associated with learned non-use.

However, translating these empirical successes into universal clinical guidelines remains complicated by persistent methodological limitations within the existing literature. The majority of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) evaluating robotic or BCI interventions are constrained by small, highly selective sample sizes, reducing statistical power and generalizability (Krakauer & Carmichael, 2017). Furthermore, there is a critical lack of standardized dosimetric reporting; studies frequently fail to quantify the exact number of active movement repetitions, relying instead on "time spent in therapy," which obfuscates dose-response modeling. Finally, the extreme anatomical and functional heterogeneity of central nervous system lesions necessitates a move away from generalized clinical trials toward highly stratified, *N*-of-1 study designs that match specific technological interventions to distinct neuroanatomical lesion profiles.

10.2. Future Directions: Artificial Intelligence and Predictive Modeling

To fully actualize the potential of digital neurorehabilitation, the next decade of research and clinical implementation must focus on the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and predictive computational modeling (Reinkensmeyer et al., 2016).

- **Predictive Recovery Trajectories:** Wearable sensor ecosystems generate immense volumes of longitudinal kinematic data. By applying deep learning algorithms to these datasets, clinical systems will transition from merely monitoring current functional states to predicting future recovery trajectories. Computational models will eventually identify which specific patients will benefit most from robotic end-effectors versus fully immersive VR, enabling true precision neurorehabilitation (Reinkensmeyer et al., 2016).

- **Generative AI in Immersive Environments:** Future immersive VR/AR platforms will leverage generative AI to construct highly personalized therapeutic environments dynamically. Rather than relying on pre-programmed games, these systems will autonomously generate novel cognitive-motor challenges tailored to the patient's real-time emotional state, fatigue levels, and pre-morbid occupational interests, thereby maximizing dopaminergic reward signaling and therapy adherence (Wang & Preininger, 2019).

In conclusion, digital neurorehabilitation is no longer an experimental niche; it has matured into a fundamental, highly efficacious pillar of contemporary neurology. The convergence of computational systems engineering, neurophysiology, and tele-medicine provides clinicians with unprecedented tools to objectively quantify, stimulate, and restore central nervous system function. As hardware costs decrease and regulatory pathways for Software as a Medical Device (SaMD) become standardized, these closed-loop technologies will democratize access to high-intensity care. Ultimately, the successful deployment of digital neurorehabilitation ecosystems will mitigate the escalating global burden of neurological disability, offering scalable, equitable, and personalized recovery pathways for patients navigating chronic neurological deficits.

Funding This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest The author declares no conflict of interest.

Author Contributions The author confirms sole responsibility for the following: study conception and design, data collection, analysis and interpretation of results, and manuscript preparation.

REFERENCES

1. Adamovich, S. V., Fluet, G. G., Tunik, E., & Merians, A. S. (2009). Sensorimotor training in virtual reality: A review. *NeuroRehabilitation*, 25(1), 29–44. <https://doi.org/10.3233/NRE-2009-0497>
2. Ang, K. K., Guan, C., Phua, K. S., Wang, C., Teh, I., Chen, C. W., Zhao, C. G., Chew, E., & Subramanian, S. K. (2015). Facilitating effects of transcranial direct current stimulation on motor imagery brain-computer interface with robotic feedback for stroke rehabilitation. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 96(3), S79–S87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2014.08.008>
3. Bao, S. C., Wong, W. W., Leung, T. W., & Choi, K. S. (2020). Cortical functional connectivity changes associated with brain-computer interface training with robotic feedback for upper-limb rehabilitation in chronic stroke. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 14, 574516. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2020.574516>
4. Bernhardt, J., Hayward, K. S., Kwakkel, G., Ward, N. S., Wolf, S. L., Borschmann, K., Krakauer, J. W., & Cramer, S. C. (2017). Agreed definitions and a shared vision for new standards in stroke recovery research: The Stroke Recovery and Rehabilitation Roundtable taskforce. *International Journal of Stroke*, 12(5), 444–450. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1747493017711816>
5. Biasucci, A., Leeb, R., Iturrate, I., Perdakis, S., Al-Khodairy, A., Corbet, T., Schnider, A., Schmidlin, T., Zhang, H., Bassolino, M., & Millán, J. D. R. (2018). Brain-actuated functional electrical stimulation elicits lasting functional recovery in chronic stroke. *Nature Communications*, 9(1), 2421. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-04673-z>
6. Blank, A. A., French, J. A., Pehlivian, A. U., & O'Malley, M. K. (2014). Current trends in robot-assisted upper-limb stroke rehabilitation: Promoting patient engagement in therapy. *Current Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Reports*, 2(3), 184–195. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40141-014-0056-z>
7. Bortole, M., Venkatakrishnan, A., Zhu, F., Moreno, J. C., Francisco, G. E., Pons, J. L., & Contreras-Vidal, J. L. (2015). The H2 robotic exoskeleton for gait rehabilitation after stroke: Safety and feasibility trial. *NeuroRehabilitation*, 37(4), 709–729. <https://doi.org/10.3233/NRE-151288>

8. Cervera, M. A., Soekadar, S. R., Ushiba, J., Millán, J. D. R., Liu, M., Birbaumer, N., & Garipelli, G. (2018). Brain-computer interfaces for post-stroke motor rehabilitation: A meta-analysis. *Annals of Clinical and Translational Neurology*, 5(5), 651–663. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acn3.544>
9. Chaudhary, U., Birbaumer, N., & Ramos-Murguialday, A. (2016). Brain–computer interfaces for communication and rehabilitation. *Nature Reviews Neurology*, 12(9), 513–525. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrneurol.2016.113>
10. Daly, J. J., & Wolpaw, J. R. (2008). Brain–computer interfaces in neurological rehabilitation. *The Lancet Neurology*, 7(11), 1032–1043. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422\(08\)70223-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(08)70223-0)
11. Dobkin, B. H. (2013). Wearable motion sensors to continuously measure real-world physical activities. *Current Opinion in Neurology*, 26(6), 602–608. <https://doi.org/10.1097/WCO.0000000000000026>
12. Feigin, V. L., Vos, T., Nichols, E., Owolabi, M. O., Carroll, W. M., Dichgans, M., Deuschl, G., Parmar, P., Brainin, M., & Murray, C. (2021). The global burden of neurological disorders: Translating evidence into policy. *The Lancet Neurology*, 19(3), 255–265. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422\(19\)30411-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(19)30411-9)
13. Galea, M. D. (2019). Telemedicine in rehabilitation. *Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Clinics of North America*, 30(2), 473–483. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmr.2018.12.002>
14. Gorelick, P. B. (2019). The global burden of stroke: Persistent and disabling. *The Lancet Neurology*, 18(5), 417–418. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422\(19\)30030-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(19)30030-4)
15. Guadagnoli, M. A., & Lee, T. D. (2004). Regulation of cognitive effort in motor learning: Information-processing and the optimal challenge point. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 30(4), 878–890. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.30.4.878>
16. Held, J. P., Ferrer, B., Graf, C., Luft, A. R., & Veerbeek, J. M. (2018). Usability and effectiveness of a mobile app for home-based upper limb rehabilitation after stroke: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, 15(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12984-018-0435-0>
17. Keshner, E. A., Weiss, P. T., Geifman, D., & Levin, M. F. (2019). Tracking the evolution of virtual reality applications to targeted clinical populations in neurorehabilitation. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, 16(1), 76. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12984-019-0545-2>
18. Kleim, J. A., & Jones, T. A. (2008). Principles of experience-dependent neural plasticity: Implications for rehabilitation after brain damage. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 51(1), S225–S239. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2008\)018](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2008)018)
19. Krakauer, J. W., & Carmichael, S. T. (2017). *Broken movement: The neurobiology of motor recovery after stroke*. MIT Press.
20. Kwakkel, G., Van Wegen, E. E., Burridge, J. H., Winstein, C. J., van Dokkum, L. E., Alt Murphy, M., Levin, M. F., & Krakauer, J. W. (2019). Standardized measurement of quality of upper limb movement after stroke: Consensus-based core recommendations from the Second Stroke Recovery and Rehabilitation Roundtable. *International Journal of Stroke*, 14(8), 783–791. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1747493019873519>
21. Lang, C. E., Macdonald, J. R., Reisman, D. S., Boyd, L., Kimberley, T. J., Schindler-Ivens, S. M., Hornby, T. G., Ross, S. A., & Scheets, P. L. (2009). Observation of amounts of movement practice provided during stroke rehabilitation. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 90(10), 1692–1698. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2009.04.005>
22. Laver, K. E., Lange, B., George, S., Deutsch, J. E., Saposnik, G., & Crotty, M. (2017). Virtual reality for stroke rehabilitation. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, 11(11), CD008349. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD008349.pub4>
23. Linder, S. M., Rosenfeldt, A. B., Bay, R. C., Sahu, K., Wolf, S. L., & Alberts, J. L. (2015). Improving quality of life and depression after stroke through telerehabilitation. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 69(2), 6902290020p1–6902290020p10. <https://doi.org/10.5014/ajot.2015.014498>
24. Llorens, R., Fuentes, M. A., Borrego, A., Latorre, J., Alcañiz, M., & Colomer, C. (2018). Effectiveness of a virtual reality-based intervention on functional outcomes after stroke: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, 15(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12984-018-0402-9>
25. Lohse, K. R., Hilderman, C. G. E., Cheung, K. L., Tatla, S., & Van der Loos, H. F. M. (2014). Virtual reality therapy for adults post-stroke: A systematic review and meta-analysis exploring virtual environments and commercial games in therapy. *PLoS One*, 9(3), e93318. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0093318>

26. Maciejasz, P., Eschweiler, J., Gerlach-Hahn, K., Jansen-Troy, A., & Leonhardt, S. (2014). A survey on robotic devices for upper limb rehabilitation. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, 11(1), 3. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1743-0003-11-3>
27. Maier, M., Ballester, B. R., & Verschure, P. F. (2019). Principles of neurorehabilitation after stroke based on motor learning and brain plasticity mechanisms: An update. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 13, 74. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2019.00074>
28. Marchal-Crespo, L., & Reinkensmeyer, D. J. (2009). Review of control strategies for robotic movement training after neurologic injury. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, 6(1), 20. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1743-0003-6-20>
29. Mathews, S. C., McShea, M. J., Hanley, C. L., Ravitz, A., Labrique, A. B., & Cohen, A. B. (2019). Digital health: A path to validation. *npj Digital Medicine*, 2(1), 38. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-019-0111-3>
30. Novak, D., & Riener, R. (2015). Catching the right moment: A brief review of adaptive strategies in rehabilitation robotics. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, 12(1), 85. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12984-015-0076-2>
31. Nudo, R. J. (2013). Recovery after brain injury: Mechanisms and principles. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 7, 887. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00887>
32. Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., ... Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
33. Patel, S., Park, H., Bonato, P., Chan, L., & Hesse, M. (2012). A review of wearable sensors and systems with application in rehabilitation. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, 9(1), 21. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1743-0003-9-21>
34. Perez-Marcos, D., Chevalley, O., Schmidlin, T., Garipelli, G., Serino, A., Vuadens, P., ... & Millán, J. D. R. (2017). Increasing upper limb training intensity in chronic stroke using embodied virtual reality: A pilot study. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, 14(1), 119. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12984-017-0328-9>
35. Ramos-Murguialday, A., Broetz, D., Rea, M., Läer, L., Yilmaz, Ö., Brasil, F. L., Liberati, G., Curado, M. R., Garcia-Cossio, E., Vyziotis, A., Cho, W., Agostini, M., Soares, E., Soekadar, S., Caria, A., Cohen, L. G., & Birbaumer, N. (2013). Brain-machine interface in chronic stroke rehabilitation: A controlled study. *Annals of Neurology*, 74(1), 100–108. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.23879>
36. Reinkensmeyer, D. J., Burdet, E., Casadio, M., Krakauer, J. W., Kwakkel, G., Lang, C. E., Swinnen, S. P., Ward, N. S., & Schweighofer, N. (2016). Computational neurorehabilitation: Modeling plasticity and learning to predict recovery. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, 13(1), 42. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12984-016-0148-3>
37. Sigrist, R., Rauter, G., Riener, R., & Wolf, P. (2013). Augmented visual, auditory, haptic, and multimodal feedback in motor learning: A review. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 20(1), 21–53. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-012-0333-8>
38. Taub, E., Uswatte, G., & Mark, V. W. (2006). The motor-deficit paradigm and neurorehabilitation. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 10(4), 143–149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2006.02.012>
39. Wagner, T. H., Lo, A. C., Peduzzi, P., Bravata, D. M., Huang, G. D., Krebs, H. I., Ringer, R. J., Federman, D. G., Richards, L. G., Haselkorn, J. K., Wittenberg, G. F., Volpe, B. T., Bever, C. T., Duncan, P. W., Sirota, A., & Volpe, B. T. (2011). An economic analysis of robot-assisted therapy for long-term upper-limb impairment after stroke. *Stroke*, 42(9), 2630–2632. <https://doi.org/10.1161/STROKEAHA.110.606442>
40. Wang, F., & Preininger, A. (2019). AI in health: State of the art, challenges, and future directions. *Yearbook of Medical Informatics*, 28(01), 16–26. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0039-1677908>
41. Wang, Q., Markopoulos, P., Yu, B., Chen, W., & Timmermans, A. (2017). Interactive wearable systems for upper body rehabilitation: A systematic review. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, 14(1), 20. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12984-017-0229-y>
42. World Health Organization. (2022). *World Health Organization: Neurological disorders*. WHO Press.