



## Review Article

## Role of virtual reality technology and robotic rehabilitation in post stroke rehabilitation: Short review

Sathish Vandanapu<sup>1</sup>, Sheeba Kauser<sup>2,\*</sup>, Ali Jrani<sup>3</sup>, Subhasis Karmakar<sup>4</sup>, Mahendra Yadav<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Dept. of Neurosurgery, Asram Medical College, Eluru, Andhra Pradesh, India

<sup>2</sup>Dept. of Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation, AR Physiotherapy Centre, Nellore, Andhra Pradesh, India

<sup>3</sup>Dept. of Physiotherapy, Nanavati Super Speciality Hospital, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

<sup>4</sup>Physiotherapist, Dubai, UAE

<sup>5</sup>Heart Beat Medical Centre, One Day Surgery, Abu Dhabi, UAE



## ARTICLE INFO

## Article history:

Received 08-01-2022

Accepted 11-01-2022

Available online 05-03-2022

## Keywords:

Stroke

Rehabilitation

Virtualreality

Techno

Robotic rehabilitation

## ABSTRACT

This research assesses the viability of automated and computer generated reality advancements utilized for neurological recovery in stroke survivors. It analyzes every recovery innovation thusly prior to considering blends of these technologies and the intricacies of restoration result evaluation. There is great proof that upper-appendage mechanical recovery advancements further develop, strength and exercises of every day living, while the proof for automated lower-appendage restoration is as of now not as persuading. Augmented reality advances additionally further develop exercises of day by day living. While the advantage of these innovations over portion controlled regular restoration is probably going to be little, there is a job for the two advances as a component of a more extensive recovery program, where they might assist with expanding the force and measure of treatment conveyed. Joining mechanical and augmented reality advancements in a recovery program might additionally further develop restoration results and we would advocate randomized controlled preliminaries of these advances in mix.

This is an Open Access (OA) journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/), which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

For reprints contact: [reprint@ipinnovative.com](mailto:reprint@ipinnovative.com)

### 1. Introduction

Restoration assumes an essential part in working on the indedubiousness and personal satisfaction (QOL) of individuals with gained neurological conditions. The effectiveness of current multidisciplinary recovery systems is grounded for individuals with gained neurological conditions.<sup>1,2</sup> However, numerous people are still passed on with lingering inability that affects their capacity to work in every day life.<sup>3</sup> There is incredible interest in investigating novel restoration innovations to increase customary treatments to lessen neurological handicap and further develop work.

Gained neurological conditions are the commonest reason for extreme handicap obtained during adulthood. Stroke is the most well-known of these, affecting 16 million individuals a year globally.<sup>4,5</sup> The quantity of stroke survivors living in the UK is relied upon to beyond twofold by 2035, as the assessed cost to the UK economy ascends from £26 billion per year to £75 billion.<sup>6</sup> Making this a significant test for what's to come. Stroke related lower-appendage disability impacts on the 'mobility' space of QOL, and upper-appendage weakness on any remaining QOL domains.<sup>7</sup> Hence, restoration of stroke survivors is of crucial significance.

One of the significant limits of traditional rehabilitation programs is a lacking portion of rehabilitation treatment,

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [sheebaishaq.doc@gmail.com](mailto:sheebaishaq.doc@gmail.com) (S. Kauser).

as far as redundancy and power. Patients frequently get insufficient recovery treatment later a procured neurological condition.<sup>8</sup> The current proof recommends that there is a high practice edge needed to accomplish significant upper-appendage useful improvements.<sup>9</sup> This edge is reachable in humans.<sup>10</sup> to convey the redundancy and force that are believed to be significant in experience-subordinate plasticity.<sup>11</sup> Pollock et al. found moderate quality evidence of benefit from a high portion of errand practice however not for a low dose.<sup>12</sup> There is trust that new ways to deal with recovery could expand the treatment portion.

The utilization of novel restoration advances to convey these expanded portions is a quickly developing field. Restoration innovation advancement has been identified as vital region for research by the Medical Rehabilitation Research Coordinating council (USA).<sup>8</sup> There are a wide scope of advances with applications in recovery including mechanical and virtual reality advances, assistive gadgets, neuro prostheses and even cell phone applications.<sup>8</sup> Rehabilitation advances are defined as 'those whose basic role is to keep up with or further develop a singular's working and autonomy, to work with interest and to upgrade generally well-being'.<sup>13</sup> Rehabilitation advances there-front cross-over somewhat with advanced mechanics yet additionally incorporate non-automated advances, for example natural control systems and specialized gadgets. This survey centers around the use of mechanical and computer generated reality advancements in stroke survivors.

## 2. Mechanical Advancements

A robot is 'a machine fit for doing a mind boggling series of activities automatically'.<sup>14</sup> Robotic innovations in restoration are a set up and quickly developing field. Automated advances in recovery empower engine re-learning determined to lessen disable ment.<sup>15</sup> Robotic advances offer various likely benefits over customary treatments, boss among these being the capacity to give extreme focus dreary preparing.

A Cochrane orderly review<sup>16</sup> tracked down excellent proof of a benefit of upper-appendage advanced mechanics (for example Emulate, Bi-Manu-Track and ARMin) on exercises of day by day living ADL, arm capacity and arm muscle strength, albeit the effect size is little and heterogeneity among studies considerable. These findings are steady with Ferreira et al., whose new efficient audit found a benefit of upper-appendage advanced mechanics contrasted with ordinary treatment on engine control and strength, however not on different proportions of body work or structure; ADL results were not analysed.<sup>17</sup> Another new precise survey by Vee rbeek et al. additionally found a benefit of upper-appendage advanced mechanics (when contrasted with regular treatment) on engine control and strengthbe that as it may, no benefit on ADL.<sup>18</sup> This might

be clarified by the consideration of more investigations with over double the quantity of members in the Mehrholz et al. Cochrane review.<sup>16</sup> ADL examination in contrast with the Veerbeek et al. ana-lysis,<sup>18</sup> as proven by a comparable normalized mean dif-ference esteem yet a more extensive confidence span in the Veerbeek audit. Nonetheless, a subgroup investigation for portion by Veerbeek et al. found a genuinely significant benefit of advanced mechanics on ADLs for non-portion matched preliminaries yet not for portion matched trials<sup>18</sup>; sadly, there was no affectability investigation on portion matching in the Cochrane review<sup>16</sup> to investigate the effect on their find-ings. Recovery portion is known to be vital; for sure, sub-bunch investigation by Ferreira et al. evil spirit strated an effect of the quantity of treatment meetings and treatment volume on the effects seen.<sup>17</sup> We along these lines infer that upper-appendage mechanical technology further develop ADLs essentially as much as traditional treatment, however there is mongrel rently insufficient proof of prevalence.

A methodical audit of advanced mechanics for lower-appendage restoration, including the Lokomat and Gait Trainer gadgets, exhibited that the utilization of electro-mechanical-helped stride preparing gadgets in combination with physiotherapy expands the shot at strolling freely later stroke.<sup>19</sup> However, the gadgets were not displayed to further develop strolling speed or distance strolled in 6 min. The best benefits in autonomy in strolling and strolling speed were accomplished by members who were non-walking toward the beginning of the review and in those for whom the between ventions were applied early post-stroke.

The proof up until this point recommends that it is impossible that mechanical frameworks will give extra benefit over traditional restoration techniques with precisely identical sum and force of therapy.<sup>20</sup> However, regardless of whether that is valid, there is as yet a spot for automated frameworks, as in many settings, it is basically not attainable to give such a high portion of escalated con-ventional recovery treatment because of an absence of assets, particularly an absence of advisor time. There may be worry among certain advisors that mechanical advancements are a danger to their occupations; notwithstanding, this isn't true, as these automated frameworks actually need arrangement, programming and observing. All things being equal, these frameworks will empower advisors to utilize their time all the more efficiently by administering a few people at the same time to accomplish better restoration results, effectively maximising the benefit of the restricted specialist resource.<sup>21</sup>

Worries about the expenses of mechanical gadgets should likewise be placed into viewpoint. While gadgets are without a doubt exorbitant right now, one necessities to consider the expense reserve funds of advisor time, where patients utilize automated frameworks autonomously, just as more extensive monetary benefits identified with usefulness

gains. Besides, with such an expansion of gadgets, it is logical that opposition and large scale manufacturing will eventually drive costs down. There are additionally some minimal expense mechanical gadgets in beginning phases of research.<sup>22</sup> A formal exceptional expense effectiveness investigation is missing; notwithstanding, work from 2011 recommended that the expense effectiveness of automated gadgets was similar to that of customary therapy.<sup>23</sup>

### 2.1. Virtual reality advancements

virtual reality (VR) includes utilizing intelligent simulations delivered by PC innovation to permit clients to take part in conditions that intently take after this present reality. VR can be utilized for reenacted autonomous practice at higher portions than that could be accomplished through regular therapy.<sup>12</sup> These advances in this manner share a portion of the benefits of mechanical technology as far as expanding preparing force and redundancies, and decreasing specialist time. The run of the mill depiction in the lay media of VR is typically that of a purported 'vivid' VR, with a head-mounted screen<sup>24</sup>. However, low submersion frameworks including a basic flat screen are significantly more ordinary. For sure, commercially accessible video gaming frameworks have been adjusted for use in VR rehabilitation.<sup>25</sup>

The arrangement of visual and frequently multi-tangible input is a vital property of VR advances. People who have endure neurological wounds, for example, a stroke regularly have tactile debilitations, remembering for proprioception, and thusly have lost a portion of the ordinary input related with a normal engine action.<sup>12</sup> It is perceived that criticism plays an import-subterranean insect job in ability acquisition<sup>26</sup> and is a fundamental component in experience-subordinate plasticity.<sup>27</sup> In engine learning, it is vital to get input not simply on the outcome – 'achievement or disappointment' – however on development per-formance;<sup>28</sup> this is conceivable with the utilization of VR advances.

VR can likewise assist with patient commitment and motivation.<sup>29</sup> Psychological issues are normal later stroke and SCI,<sup>30,31</sup> and systems that emphasis on tolerant commitment are significant for effective rehabilitation.<sup>8</sup> The degree of commitment affects the level of dynamic interest which thus can further develop results. Mekki et al. shown that when people were given both criticism on their strolling rate and contest against virtual opponents, there was expanded muscle activity.<sup>32</sup> Laver et al. in their survey of VR advancements suggested that future examinations assess the effect of VR on tolerant inspiration and engagement.<sup>33</sup>

There is developing interest in VR advances, with<sup>34</sup> new preliminaries distributed in a two-year period.<sup>33</sup> The most modern Cochrane audit found a significant benefit to upper-appendage work with a moderate effect size (normalized

mean difference 0.49, 95% confidence stretch 0.21–0.77) when VR was utilized as an extra to regular consideration yet not when contrasted with portion controlled traditional therapy.<sup>33</sup> However, there was a little benefit in ADLs with VR innovation, which expanded to a moderate benefit when treatment was not portion controlled. In this way, while VR may not be better than customary recovery treatment, it very well may be a valuable aide to build treatment length and power. Mix advances

It is essential to recall that restoration is a multi-disciplinary and multi-modular undertaking and not a 'one size fits all' intercession. A mix of between ventions might be more qualified to treat the multifactorial idea of the inability related with neurological conditions, like engine and tactile debilitations, intellectual issues and mental issues. Veerbeek et al. suggest that automated treatment is seen not as a 'independent treatment', yet is incorporated into a comprehensive restoration programme.<sup>17</sup>

The blend of VR and automated innovation is specific intriguing as it can hypothetically initiate a greater amount of the neural circuits associated with engine learning, and subsequently advancing neuroplasticity.<sup>34,35</sup> Various controlled preliminaries have explored the mix of VR and mechanical advancements in upper-appendage rehabilitation. Thielbar et al. researched the utilization of a robot-helped finger preparing framework connected to the developments of a virtual hand and found a significant improvement in upper-appendage action and undertaking execution contrasted with controls<sup>36</sup> Byl et al. analyzed an automated orthosis in a virtual preparing climate and viewed as no between-bunch differences.<sup>37</sup> Unfortunately, not exclusively did the two investigations have not many members yet both utilized a control gathering of exercise based recuperation just, which makes it difficult to decide whether any benefits identified are identified with the blend innovation or essentially one of its parts, for example the mechanical technology. Klamroth-Marganska et al. taken a gander at the effects of the exoskeleton robot ARMin, which gives escalated task-specific preparing in a virtual climate, when contrasted with ordinary treatment and found a little benefit in the Fugl – Meyer furthest point scale which was not clinically significant.<sup>38</sup> Whilst this preliminary had a moderate example size, it again contrasted the blend innovation with exercise based recuperation as it were. There are right now no randomized con-savaged preliminaries (RCTs) of double VR-mechanical innovation mixes for upper-appendage restoration with a solitary innovation control bunch.

Early work by Mirelman et al. with members with lower-appendage disabilities observed that in people given blend VR and automated treatment, contrasted with robot treatment alone, there was a significant speed up and distance.<sup>39</sup> Furthermore, people announced less exhaustion in the meetings, required more limited rest time and

less specialist signals, regardless of the quantity of reiterations being something very similar. Uçar et al. analyzed the effectiveness of the Lokomat gadget, a treadmill and lower-appendage automated exoskeleton mix along with a computer generated simulation screen show, when contrasted with traditional therapy.<sup>40</sup> They found a significant improvement in the Timed Up and Go test and the Ten Meter Walk test in the intercession bunch as compared to the benchmark group.

It is vital to be clear with regards to what isn't correct blend innovation. Numerous preliminaries of upper-appendage mechanical technology have incorporated some type of visual input through a PC screen. Kutner et al. showed a progression of LEDs on a screen and members needed to stretch out their hand up to the objective LED.<sup>41</sup> Kahn et al. utilized a screen to show the objective plots for arm 'yaw and pitch' alongside the real 'yaw and pitch' points of the member's arm.<sup>42</sup> Masiero et al. utilized the screen to show a virtual arm with bolts demonstrating the direction that members should move their arm.<sup>43</sup> The normal subject in this multitude of cases is that, while innovation is utilized to give straightforward visual input, members are not taking part in conditions that intently look like this present reality, and subsequently this doesn't meet the measures for augmented reality innovation.

### 3. Discussion

Evaluation of recovery results is perplexing, due to partially to the customized idea of restoration, just as the need to survey results across the International Classification of Function, Disability and Health (ICF) domains.<sup>12</sup> Whilst we really want to guarantee we are estimating the right markers in our research, 8 figuring out what patients need stays sick defined.<sup>44</sup> There is surely no agreement among scholastics on what the best result measures are – a new orderly audit of upper-appendage result measures in stroke recovery found 48 different result measures utilized in these investigations with just 15 result measures utilized in over 5% of the studies. Sivan et al. taken a gander at upper-appendage result measures for mechanical restoration and found that while most investigations have estimated results at the hinderment level, this doesn't really convert into measurement of constraint of action or limitation of participation. They proposed a precise system for choosing measures dependent on schedule since stroke and degree of arm shortcoming. A few creators, notwithstanding, contend against movement and support measures, as these can be improved with compensatory instruments and as such the genuine engine weakness isn't being assessed.<sup>9</sup> Geroin et al. found no agreement on lower-appendage automated recovery results, with result measures being used, a large number of which have poor psychometric properties.

Psychometric assessments of intellectual result measures are more uncommon, in spite of the way that cognitive

weakness is normal because of both age 8 and neurological conditions, for example, stroke and that machine gear-piecenitive hindrance affects a singular's capacity to function in day by day life. Many preliminaries have avoided patients with intellectual debilitations, which is baffling given the potential for VR innovations specifically to improve cognition.<sup>33</sup> Moreover, not very many preliminaries have surveyed QOL or cost-effectiveness, despite the fact that assessment of both is fundamental, for another recovery mediation to be taken on in an openly financed medical services system.<sup>44</sup> Robust proof is needed to have the option to legitimize to medical care officials why they should finance new restoration advancements. A new Cochrane survey made a suggestion that future preliminaries ought to incorporate proportions of ADL, QOL and cost-effectiveness.<sup>19</sup>

There is excellent proof that upper-appendage automated innovation further develops muscle strength, engine capacity and ADLs. There is proof from subgroup examinations that more noteworthy quantities of treatment meetings and more prominent treatment volume are identified with engine outcomes.<sup>18</sup> This is steady with the findings of Pollock et al., who proposed a more noteworthy benefit for higher portion therapy.<sup>12</sup> Robotic lower-appendage restoration expanded the chances of people strolling freely however didn't affect strolling speed or the distance strolled in 6 min. We would ask alert in the translation of the autonomous strolling findings, as this examination was significantly flawed, with most of studies seeing no adjustment of strolling autonomy between the beginning and end of the review.

Upper-appendage VR restoration contrasted with conventional treatment further develops ADLs yet not upper-appendage engine work. While the ADL benefit is little when VR is contrasted with portion controlled regular therapy, this increments to a moderate benefit when not portion controlled. This proposes a likely job for VR as a subordinate to build all out treatment time and along these lines recovery benefit.

Mechanical innovation when joined with VR may offer some benefits in patients with lower-appendage disablments by speeding up and remove, albeit this depends on the findings of a solitary little preliminary. The examinations which checked out joined mechanical and VR recovery of the upper-appendage show blended outcomes, with one little preliminary finding a treatment benefit, another little preliminary no benefit and a third bigger preliminary a little treatment benefit which isn't clinically significant. Translation in every one of these examinations is hampered by the absence of a solitary innovation control bunch. While the writing on mix advancements is presently restricted, this is a promising space of examination deserving of additional examination. It can regularly be difficult to stop mine from perusing concentrates on whether the revealed 'virtual

climate' involved meets the measures for augmented reality innovation. Subsequently, we would urge creators to give sufficient data on their intercession for this judgment to be made.

This writing survey has analyzed the effectiveness of automated and VR advancements on neurological recovery. One limit of this audit is the fizzle to analyze different types of advancements with applications in recovery. Also, albeit the aim of this audit isn't to restrict itself by neurosensible determination, most of the distributed literature concerns stroke survivors, which will in general be illustrative of the neurological recovery literature overall.

This audit has inspected the effectiveness of recovery advances on stroke survivors just; consequently, generalisability to patients with other neuro-sensible conditions might be restricted. We would energize research on other patient gatherings to confirm applicability of the findings in stroke survivors to a more extensive population. Another restriction is that while there are an abundance of investigations of automated upgraded restoration, there is extraordinary inconstancy between review as far as members' attributes, recovery system, therapy span and power. Most are likewise little in size. Some consistency between studies would help; a beginning stage would be settlement on the utilization of out-come measures.

#### 4. Conclusion

In synopsis, there is excellent proof that upper-appendage automated innovation is just about as effective as portion controlled traditional treatment at further developing ADLs, engine capacity and strength; the proof for mechanical upgraded lower-appendage recovery is presently not as persuading. There is a little benefit in ADLs with VR innovations when contrasted with portion controlled.

#### 5. Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

#### 6. Source of Funding

None.

#### References

1. Veerbeek JM, Van Wegen E, Van Peppen R. What is the evidence for physical therapy poststroke? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 2014;9(2):e87987. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0087987.
2. Pollock A, Baer G, Campbell P. Physical rehabilitation approaches for recovery of function, balance and walking after stroke. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2014;4:CD001920. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD001920.
3. Yang Y, Shi Y, Zhang N. The disability rate of 5-year post-stroke and its correlation factors: a national survey in China. *PLoS One*. 2016;11(11):e0165341. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0165341.
4. Murray CJ, Lopez AD. Mortality by cause for eight regions of the world: global burden of disease study. *Lancet*. 1997;349(9061):1269–76. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(96)07493-4.
5. World Health Organization. Neurological disorders: public health challenges. Geneva: WHO Press; 2006.
6. Patel A, Berdunov V, King D. Executive summary Part 2: societal cost of Stroke in the next 20 years and potential returns from increased spending on research. In: London: Stroke Association; 2017.
7. Franceschini M, Porta FL, and MA. Is health-related-quality of life of stroke patients influenced by neurological impairments at one year after stroke? *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med*. 2010;46(3):389–99.
8. Frontera WR, Bean JF, Damiano D. Rehabilitation Research at the National Institutes of Health: moving the field forward (Executive Summary). *Am J Occup Ther*. 2017;97(4):393–403. doi:10.1093/ptj/pzx027.
9. Krakauer JW, Carmichael ST, Corbett D. Getting neurorehabilitation right - what can we learn from animal models? *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2012;26(8):923–31. doi:10.1177/1545968312440745.
10. Birkenmeier RL, Prager EM, Lang CE. Translating animal doses of task-specific training to people with chronic stroke in 1-hour therapy sessions: a proof-of-concept study. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2010;24(7):620–35. doi:10.1177/1545968310361957.
11. Subramanian SK, Massie CL, Malcolm MP. Does provision of extrinsic feedback result in improved motor learning in the upper limb poststroke? A systematic review of the evidence. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2010;24(2):113–24. doi:10.1177/1545968309349941.
12. Pollock A, Farmer SE, Brady MC. Interventions for improving upper limb function after stroke. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2014;11:CD010820. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD010820.
13. World Health Organization. Assistive devices and technologies. (2018, accessed 8 November 2018); 2018. Available from: [www.who.int/disabilities/technology/en/](http://www.who.int/disabilities/technology/en/).
14. Oxford Dictionaries. Definition of robot in English. (accessed 8 November 2018); 2018. Available from: <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/robot>.
15. Fassoli SE, Krebs HI, Hogan N. Robotic technology and stroke rehabilitation: translating research into practice. *Top Stroke Rehabil*. 2004;11(4):11–9. doi:10.1310/G8XB-VM23-1TK7-PWQU.
16. Mehrholz J, Pohl M, Platz T. Electromechanical and robot-assisted arm training for improving activities of daily living, arm function, and arm muscle strength after stroke. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2018;11:CD006876. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD006876.
17. Ferreira F, Chaves M, Oliveira VC. Effectiveness of robot therapy on body function and structure in people with limited upper limb function: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(7):e0200330. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0200330.
18. Veerbeek JM, Langbroek-Amersfoort AC, van Wegen E, Meskers CM, Kwakkel G. Effects of robot-assisted therapy for the upper limb after stroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2017;31(2):107–21. doi:10.1177/1545968316666957.
19. Mehrholz J, Thomas S, Werner C, Kugler J, Pohl M, Elsner B, et al. Electromechanical-assisted training for walking after stroke. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2017;5(5):CD006185. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD006185.
20. Kwakkel G, Van Wegen EE, Meskers CM. Invited commentary on comparison of robotics, functional electrical stimulation, and motor learning methods for treatment of persistent upper extremity dysfunction after stroke: a randomized controlled trial. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2015;96(6):991–3. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2015.02.004.
21. Lo K, Stephenson M, Lockwood C. Effectiveness of robotic assisted rehabilitation for mobility and functional ability in adult stroke patients: a systematic review protocol. *JBI Database System Rev Implement Rep*. 2017;15(1):39–48. doi:10.11124/JBISRIR-2016-002957.
22. Sivan M, Gallagher J, Makower S. Home-based computer assisted arm rehabilitation (hCAAR) robotic device for upper limb exercise after stroke: results of a feasibility study in home setting. *J Neuroeng Rehabil*. 2014;11:163. doi:10.1186/1743-0003-11-163.
23. Wagner TH, Lo AC, Peduzzi P, Bravata DM, Huang GD, Krebs HI, et al. An economic analysis of robot-assisted therapy for long-term upper-limb impairment after stroke. *Stroke*. 2011;42(9):2630–2. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.110.606442.

24. Gaggioli A, Keshner E, Weiss PL. Advanced technologies in rehabilitation. United States: IOS Press; 2009.
25. Levac D, Espy D, Fox E. "Kinect-ing" with clinicians: a knowledge translation resource to support decision making about video game use in rehabilitation. *Phys Ther.* 2015;95(3):426-40. doi:10.2522/ptj.20130618.
26. Muratori LM, Lamberg EM, Quinn L. Applying principles of motor learning and control to upper extremity rehabilitation. *J Hand Ther.* 2013;26(2):94-102. doi:10.1016/j.jht.2012.12.007.
27. Kleim JA, Jones TA. Principles of experience-dependent neural plasticity: implications for rehabilitation after brain damage. *J Speech Lang Hear Res.* 2008;51(1):225-39. doi:10.1044/1092-4388(2008/018).
28. Cirstea M, Levin MF. Improvement of arm movement patterns and endpoint control depends on type of feedback during practice in stroke survivors. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.* 2007;21(5):398-411. doi:10.1177/1545968306298414.
29. Lewis GN, Rosie JA. Virtual reality games for movement rehabilitation in neurological conditions: how do we meet the needs and expectations of the users? *Disabil Rehabil.* 2012;34(22):1880-6. doi:10.3109/09638288.2012.670036.
30. Ii K, Lincoln NB. Psychological problems after stroke and their management: state of knowledge. *Neurosci Med.* 2012;3(1):83-9.
31. Post MWN, Van Leeuwen C. Psychosocial issues in spinal cord injury: a review. *Spinal Cord.* 2012;50(5):382-9. doi:10.1038/sc.2011.182.
32. Mekki M, Delgado AD, Fry A, Putrino D, Huang V. Robotic rehabilitation and spinal cord injury: a narrative review. *Neurotherapeutics.* 2018;15(3):604-17. doi:10.1007/s13311-018-0642-3.
33. Laver KE, Lange B, George S. Virtual reality for stroke rehabilitation. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2017;11(11):CD008349. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD008349.
34. Comani S, Velluto L, Schinaia L. Monitoring neuro-motor recovery from stroke with high-resolution EEG, robotics and virtual reality: a proof of concept. *IEEE Trans Neural Syst Rehabil Eng.* 2015;23(6):1106-16. doi:10.1109/TNSRE.2015.2425474.
35. Saleh S, Bagec H, Qiu Q. Mechanisms of neural reorganization in chronic stroke subjects after virtual reality training. *Conf Proc IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc.* 2011;2011:8118-21. doi:10.1109/IEMBS.2011.6092002.
36. Thielbar KO, Lord TJ, Fischer HC, Lazzaro EC, Barth KC, Stoykov ME, et al. Training finger individuation with a mechatronic-virtual reality system leads to improved fine motor control post-stroke. *J Neuroeng Rehabil.* 2014;11:171. doi:10.1186/1743-0003-11-171.
37. Byl NN, Abrams GM, Pitsch E. Chronic stroke survivors achieve comparable outcomes following virtual task specific repetitive training guided by a wearable robotic orthosis (UL-EXO7) and actual task specific repetitive training guided by a physical therapist. *J Hand Ther.* 2013;26(4):343-52. doi:10.1016/j.jht.2013.06.001.
38. Klamroth-Marganska V, Blanco J. Three-dimensional, task-specific robot therapy of the arm after stroke: a multicentre, parallel-group randomised trial. *Lancet Neurol.* 2014;13(2):159-66. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(13)70305-3.
39. Mirelman A, Bonato P, Deutsch JE. Effects of training with a robot-virtual reality system compared with a robot alone on the gait of individuals after stroke. *Stroke.* 2008;40(1):169-74. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.108.516328.
40. Uçar DE, Paker N, Buğdaycı D. Lokomat: A therapeutic chance for patients with chronic hemiplegia. *Neuro Rehabilitation.* 2014;34(3):447-53. doi:10.3233/NRE-141054.
41. Kutner NG, Zhang R, Butler AJ, Wolf SL, Alberts JL. Quality-of-life change associated with robotic-assisted therapy to improve hand motor function in patients with subacute stroke: a randomized clinical trial. *Phys Ther.* 2010;90(4):493-504. doi:10.2522/ptj.20090160.
42. Kahn L, Zygman M, Rymer W. Robot assisted reaching exercise promotes arm recovery in chronic hemiparetic stroke: a randomized controlled pilot study. *J NeuroEng Rehabil.* 2006;3:12. doi:10.1186/1743-0003-3-12.
43. Masiero S, Celia A, Rosati G. Robotic-assisted rehabilitation of the upper limb after acute stroke. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2007;88(2):142-9. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2006.10.032.
44. Cheeran B, Cohen L. The future of restorative neurosciences in stroke: driving the translational research pipeline from basic science to rehabilitation of people after stroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.* 2009;23(2):97-107. doi:10.1177/1545968308326636.

## Author biography

**Sathish Vandanapu**, Chief and Consultant

**Sheeba Kauser**, Director and Chief Physiotherapy

**Ali Jrani**, Professor and HOD

**Subhasis Karmakar**, Physiotherapist

**Mahendra Yadav**, HOD and Chief Physiotherapist

**Cite this article:** Vandanapu S, Kauser S, Jrani A, Karmakar S, Yadav M. Role of virtual reality technology and robotic rehabilitation in post stroke rehabilitation: Short review. *IP Indian J Neurosci* 2022;8(1):3-8.