DOI: 10.21088/potj.0974.5777.19326.9

Physiotherapy and Occupational Therapy Journal
Volume 19 Number 3, July - September 2026

REVIEW ARTICLE

Neuro Rehabilitation and its Future Trends: A Comprehensive Literature Review

S. Benedic Kingslin Suresh[1], C.R. Praveen Kumar[2]

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE:

S. Benedic Kingslin Suresh, C.R. Praveen Kumar. Neuro Rehabilitation and its Future Trends: A Comprehensive Literature Review. Therapy Jr. 2026; 19(2): 230-248.

ABSTRACT

This literature review examines the evolution of neuro rehabilitation with a specific focus on neuro physiotherapy as an evidence-based practice. The review traces the historical development of neuro rehabilitation approaches, evaluates current evidence supporting various therapeutic interventions, and explores emerging trends shaping the future of this field. Key traditional approaches such as Neuro Developmental Treatment (NDT), Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation (PNF), and more recent innovations including Constraint-Induced Movement Therapy (CIMT) and robotic-assisted rehabilitation are critically analyzed for their theoretical foundations and empirical support. The evidence reveals a paradigm shift from purely technique-oriented approaches toward more task-specific, goal-oriented, and technology-enhanced interventions. Future directions point toward increased integration of neuroplasticity principles, personalized medicine approaches, advanced technologies including virtual reality, robotics, and neuromodulation, and greater emphasis on telerehabilitation and home-based care models. This review highlights the importance of continuing to strengthen the evidence base for neuro physiotherapy while embracing innovative approaches that leverage technological advancements for improved patient outcomes.

KEYWORDS:

• Neuro rehabilitation • Neuro Developmental Treatment (NDT) • Constraint-Induced Movement Therapy (CIMT) • Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation (PNF)

AUTHOR'S AFFILIATION:

[1] Chief Physiotherapist, MGM Healthcare, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India.

[2] Assistant Professor, Sri Ramachandra Faculty of Physiotherapy, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

C.R. Praveen Kumar, Assistant professor, Sri Ramachandra Faculty of Physiotherapy, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India.

E-mail: praveenkumar.cr@sriramachandra.edu.in

➤ **Received:** 26-06-2026 ➤ **Accepted:** 25-07-2026

INTRODUCTION

Neurological disorders, including stroke, traumatic brain injury, spinal cord injury, multiple sclerosis, and Parkinson's disease, represent a significant global health burden. The World Health Organization estimates that neurological disorders affect up to one billion people worldwide and constitute a substantial proportion of global disability (WHO, 2022). Neuro rehabilitation, a complex medical process aimed at recovery from nervous system injury and minimization of functional alterations, has emerged as a critical component in the management of these conditions.

Neuro physiotherapy, a specialized branch of physiotherapy, plays a pivotal role within the broader neuro rehabilitation framework. It focuses on the assessment and treatment of individuals with movement and function disorders resulting from neurological conditions. The discipline employs therapeutic techniques to promote motor function, independence, quality of life, and reduce complications through mechanisms of neural plasticity and adaptation (Khan *et al.,* 2022).

The significance of neuro rehabilitation and neuro physiotherapy has grown substantially over recent decades, driven by several factors:

1. **Aging populations:** The global demographic shift toward older populations has increased the prevalence of neurological conditions requiring rehabilitation services.
2. **Advances in acute medical care:** Improved emergency and acute care have resulted in higher survival rates following neurological injuries, creating greater demand for rehabilitation services.
3. **Neuroplasticity research:** Scientific discoveries regarding the brain's capacity for reorganization and adaptation have revolutionized rehabilitation approaches and expectations.
4. **Evidence-based practice movement:** The emphasis on scientifically validated interventions has transformed the theoretical foundations and practical applications of neuro physiotherapy.

This literature review aims to trace the evolution of neuro physiotherapy as an evidence-based discipline, critically evaluate the scientific foundations of various neuro rehabilitation approaches, and explore emerging trends shaping the future of this field. By examining this trajectory, we can better understand the current state of practice and anticipate future developments that will influence patient care.

EVOLUTION OF NEUROPHYSIOTHERAPY AS EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICE (EBP)

The journey of neuro physiotherapy toward evidence-based practice represents a significant paradigm shift in the field of rehabilitation. This evolution can be conceptualized across several key phases that reflect broader movements in healthcare practice and research methodology.

Early Foundations (Pre-1950s)

The origins of neuro physiotherapy can be traced to the early 20th century, when treatment approaches were predominantly based on clinical observations, anatomical knowledge, and neurophysiological theories of the time. These early interventions lacked standardization and formal evaluation of outcomes. Practitioners relied heavily on mentorship, experiential learning, and theoretical constructs derived from neuroanatomy and neurophysiology (Hafsteinsdóttir, 1996).

During this period, pioneers such as Sister Elizabeth Kenny challenged prevailing medical approaches to poliomyelitis with her methods of hot packs and movement, demonstrating early empirical innovation in neurological rehabilitation, albeit without controlled research designs (Shepherd, 1991).

Emergence of Neurotherapeutic Approaches (1950s-1970s)

The mid-20th century witnessed the development of several influential neurotherapeutic approaches that would shape the field for decades to come. Berta Bobath and Karel Bobath introduced Neurodevelopmental Treatment (NDT), Margaret Rood developed sensory stimulation techniques, Signe Brunnstrom proposed her movement therapy approach, and Herman Kabat along with Margaret Knott developed Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation (PNF) (Tyson & Selley, 2007).

These approaches shared common characteristics:

- They were based on contemporary neurophysiological theories
- They developed from clinical observations rather than experimental research
- They relied heavily on the authority and expertise of their founders
- They were disseminated primarily through specialized training courses

While these approaches represented advances in systematic thinking about neurological rehabilitation, they preceded the era of randomized controlled trials and systematic evaluation of outcomes.

Transition to Scientific Inquiry (1980s-1990s)

The 1980s marked a turning point as the field began to adopt more rigorous scientific methods. This shift was catalyzed by several developments:

1. **Movement Science Revolution:** The work of Carr and Shepherd on the Motor Relearning Programme introduced principles from motor learning research and challenged existing neurofacilitation approaches (Carr & Shepherd, 1987).
2. **Early Clinical Trials:** The first randomized controlled trials comparing different neuro physiotherapy approaches began to emerge, although many had methodological limitations (Langhammer & Stanghelle, 2000).
3. **Professional Education Changes:** Physiotherapy education moved into university settings, emphasizing research methodology and critical appraisal skills (Moseley et al., 2002).
4. **Clinical Guidelines Development:** Early attempts to create clinical guidelines based on available evidence began to appear, though evidence quality was often limited.

This period represented a transitional phase where traditional approaches continued to dominate clinical practice while being increasingly subjected to scientific scrutiny.

EBP Integration and Maturation (2000s-Present)

The turn of the millennium saw the accelerated integration of evidence-based practice principles into neuro physiotherapy, characterized by:

1. **High-Quality Research:** A substantial increase in the number and quality of randomized controlled trials, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses examining neurological rehabilitation interventions (Pollock *et al.,* 2014).
2. **Standardized Outcome Measures:** The development and validation of standardized assessment tools to measure impairment, activity limitations, and participation restrictions (Quinn *et al.,* 2017).
3. **Clinical Practice Guidelines:** The development of evidence-based clinical guidelines by professional organizations and international consortia to guide practice (Winstein *et al.,* 2016).
4. **Knowledge Translation Initiatives:** Concerted efforts to bridge the research-practice gap through knowledge translation strategies, implementation science, and practice-based research networks (Bayley *et al.,* 2012).
5. **Patient-Centered Approaches:** Increased emphasis on shared decision-making, patient-reported outcomes, and personalized rehabilitation goals (Mayo *et al.,* 2015).

The contemporary landscape of neuro physiotherapy as an evidence-based practice is characterized by several key features:

- **Methodological Rigor:** Higher standards for research design, reporting, and interpretation, including the use of core outcome sets and standardized protocols.
- **Critical Evaluation:** A willingness to question and potentially abandon traditional approaches when evidence fails to support their effectiveness.
- **Integration of Evidence Sources:** Recognition that evidence-based practice involves the integration of best research evidence with clinical expertise and patient values.
- **Continuous Professional Development:** Emphasis on lifelong learning and regular updating of knowledge based on emerging evidence.
- **Research-Practice Partnerships:** Closer collaboration between academic researchers and clinical practitioners to ensure research relevance and facilitate implementation.

The evolution of neuro physiotherapy into an evidence-based discipline represents a fundamental transformation in how neurological rehabilitation is conceptualized, delivered, and evaluated. This transformation has not been without challenges, including resistance to change, methodological difficulties in researching complex interventions, and tensions between research evidence and clinical experience. Nevertheless, the field has made remarkable progress in building a scientific foundation for practice, though much work remains to be done in strengthening the evidence base and implementing best practices consistently across clinical settings.

DETAILED ANALYSIS OF NEURO REHABILITATION APPROACHES

Neuro Developmental Treatment (NDT)/ Bobath Approach

Principles and Applications

The Neuro Developmental Treatment (NDT) approach, also known as the Bobath concept, was developed by Berta and Karel Bobath in the 1940s. Originally designed for children with cerebral palsy, it was later adapted for adults with neurological conditions, particularly stroke. The approach is based on the theoretical framework that abnormal muscle tone and movement patterns result from central nervous system damage, and that these can be inhibited while facilitating more normal movement patterns (Vaughan-Graham *et al.,* 2019).

Key principles of NDT include:

- Normalization of tone through specific handling techniques
- Inhibition of abnormal movement patterns and pathological reflexes
- Facilitation of automatic, normal postural reactions
- Integration of these reactions into functional activities
- Use of key points of control for guiding movement

NDT has evolved over time, with contemporary iterations incorporating more task-specific training elements and acknowledging the importance of active patient participation.

Evidence Evaluation

Despite its widespread use and popularity, the evidence supporting NDT's effectiveness is mixed and generally weak:

- A Cochrane review by Pollock *et al.* (2014) found no evidence that NDT was superior to other approaches in improving upper limb function after stroke.
- Systematic reviews by Novak *et al.* (2013) and Morgan *et al.* (2016) found insufficient evidence to support NDT for children with cerebral palsy, particularly when compared to task-specific or goal-directed approaches.
- In a landmark randomized controlled trial, Langhammer and Stanghelle (2000) compared NDT with a motor relearning program for acute stroke patients and found the latter to be more effective for functional recovery.
- More recent studies have questioned the theoretical foundations of NDT, particularly its emphasis on tone normalization and the facilitation of "normal" movement patterns, concepts that may not align with contemporary understanding of motor control and neuroplasticity (Raine, 2009).

Despite these limitations, proponents argue that modern NDT has evolved to incorporate evidence-based elements and that poor research results may reflect outdated versions of the approach rather than current practice (Vaughan-Graham *et al.,* 2015).

PROPRIOCEPTIVE NEUROMUSCULAR FACILITATION (PNF)

Principles and Applications

Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation (PNF), developed by Herman Kabat and further refined by Margaret Knott and Dorothy Voss in the 1940s and 1950s, is based on neurophysiological principles of motor learning and motor control. PNF uses spiral and diagonal patterns of movement combined with specific techniques to facilitate muscle action, improve neuromuscular control, and enhance functional performance (Adler *et al.,* 2014).

Key principles and techniques include:

- Spiral and diagonal movement patterns that mimic functional activities

- Resistance applied throughout range of motion
- Manual contacts to guide movement and provide sensory cues
- Verbal cues to enhance motor performance
- Techniques such as rhythmic initiation, combination of isotonics, hold-relax, and contract-relax

PNF is used in neurological rehabilitation to improve strength, flexibility, coordination, and functional performance.

Evidence Evaluation

The evidence for PNF in neurological rehabilitation shows mixed results:

- For improving range of motion and flexibility, PNF stretching techniques have demonstrated effectiveness in systematic reviews, particularly the hold-relax and contract-relax techniques (Hindle *et al.,* 2012).
- In stroke rehabilitation, studies by Wang (1994) and Kumar and Goyal (2019) have shown positive effects of PNF on gait parameters and functional independence.
- However, large-scale randomized controlled trials comparing PNF to other approaches for neurological conditions are limited, and most existing studies have methodological limitations including small sample sizes and heterogeneous outcome measures.
- A systematic review by Smedes *et al.* (2016) highlighted the limited evidence base for PNF, noting that while individual studies show promising results, more rigorous research is needed to establish its comparative effectiveness.

PNF principles continue to be applied in clinical practice, often as part of an eclectic approach rather than as a stand-alone treatment method. While some elements have empirical support, particularly for specific impairments like range of motion limitations, its overall effectiveness as a comprehensive neuro rehabilitation approach requires further investigation.

Motor Relearning Program (MRP)

Principles and Applications

The Motor Relearning Program (MRP), developed by Janet Carr and Roberta Shepherd in the 1980s, represents a significant paradigm shift in neuro rehabilitation. Unlike earlier approaches that focused on normalizing tone and movement patterns, MRP draws from motor learning theory and emphasizes task-specific training and active problem-solving by the patient (Carr & Shepherd, 2010).

Key principles include:

- Analysis of the task and the patient's performance
- Practice of missing components of the movement
- Practice of the whole task in context
- Transfer of learning to real-world environments
- Active patient participation in problem-solving
- Training that is specific to the goals and functional tasks

MRP focuses on regaining functional activities through targeted practice rather than addressing underlying impairments in isolation.

Evidence Evaluation

The evidence supporting MRP and task-specific training approaches is relatively strong:

- A landmark randomized controlled trial by Langhammer and Stanghelle (2000) found that stroke patients treated with MRP showed better motor function, shorter hospital stays, and improved ADL performance compared to those receiving traditional Bobath therapy.
- Subsequent studies and systematic reviews have consistently supported the efficacy of task-specific training for improving functional outcomes after stroke and other neurological conditions (French *et al.,* 2016).
- The principles underlying MRP align well with contemporary neuroscience understanding of motor learning and neuroplasticity, particularly the importance of specificity of training and active engagement in meaningful tasks (Kleim & Jones, 2008).
- A Cochrane review by French *et al.* (2016) found moderate to high-quality evidence that repetitive task training improves upper and lower limb function following stroke.

The MRP approach has significantly influenced modern neuro rehabilitation practice, with its emphasis on task-specific training now incorporated into many contemporary treatment approaches. Its alignment with motor learning principles and growing empirical support position it as one of the more evidence-based approaches in neuro physiotherapy.

CONSTRAINT-INDUCED MOVEMENT THERAPY (CIMT)

Principles and Applications

Constraint-Induced Movement Therapy (CIMT) emerged from Edward Taub's research on learned non-use in primates in the 1980s and was later developed into a clinical intervention for humans. CIMT addresses learned non-use by constraining the less affected limb (typically using a mitt or sling) while intensively training the more affected limb in functional tasks (Taub *et al.,* 2014).

Key components include:

- Restraint of the less affected upper limb for 90% of waking hours
- Intensive, graded practice with the affected limb (typically 3-6 hours daily)
- Behavioral techniques to overcome learned non-use
- Transfer of gains to real-world activities (transfer package)

Modified versions of CIMT (mCIMT) have been developed with reduced intensity and constraint requirements to enhance feasibility and adherence.

Evidence Evaluation

CIMT has one of the strongest evidence bases among neuro rehabilitation approaches:

- The landmark EXCITE trial (Wolf *et al*., 2006) demonstrated significant improvements in upper extremity function and increased use of the affected arm in daily activities following CIMT for chronic stroke patients, with benefits maintained at 12-month follow-up.
- A Cochrane review by Corbetta et al. (2015) concluded that CIMT was more effective than traditional rehabilitation for improving upper limb function in stroke survivors, though the quality of evidence was moderate.
- Systematic reviews and meta-analyses consistently show positive effects of CIMT on arm function and activities of daily living, with evidence of dose-response relationships (Kwakkel et al., 2015).
- Neuroimaging studies have demonstrated cortical reorganization following CIMT, providing neurophysiological evidence for its mechanisms of action (Mark et al., 2006).

Despite strong evidence for efficacy, implementation challenges include intensive resource requirements, patient selection criteria, and adherence issues. Modified versions with reduced intensity have shown promising results and may address some of these barriers (Fleet *et al.,* 2014).

ROOD'S APPROACH

Principles and Applications

Developed by Margaret Rood in the 1950s, this approach focuses on the developmental sequence of motor behavior and the use of sensory stimulation to elicit motor responses. The Rood approach posits that specific sensory stimuli can either facilitate or inhibit motor responses, and that motor development follows a predictable sequence (Levine & Kliebhan, 1981).

Key techniques include:

- Quick stretch to facilitate muscle contraction
- Heavy joint compression to enhance stability
- Light touch, icing, or brushing to facilitate movement
- Slow stroking or neutral warmth to inhibit hypertonicity
- Progression through developmental positions and movements

The approach aims to normalize muscle tone, facilitate appropriate movement patterns, and establish sequential motor control.

Evidence Evaluation

The Rood approach has limited empirical support and has fallen out of favor in contemporary practice:

- Few controlled studies have specifically evaluated the effectiveness of the Rood approach for neurological rehabilitation.

- Individual sensory stimulation techniques, such as quick icing, have shown some neurophysiological effects in laboratory studies, but these have not translated consistently to functional improvements in clinical populations (Cambier *et al.,* 2009).
- The developmental sequence aspect of the approach has been questioned based on contemporary understanding of motor development and control, which recognizes variability in developmental trajectories and the task-specific nature of motor learning (Thelen, 1995).
- Some elements of sensory stimulation have been incorporated into other approaches, but the comprehensive Rood approach is rarely used in its entirety in modern practice.

The Rood approach is largely considered outdated due to insufficient evidence supporting its theoretical foundations and clinical effectiveness. While sensory stimulation continues to be used as an adjunct to other interventions, the specific protocols and theoretical framework of the Rood approach have not been substantiated by modern research.

VOJTA THERAPY

Principles and Applications

Vojta therapy, developed by Czech neurologist Václav Vojta in the 1960s, is based on the principle of reflex locomotion. The approach posits that innate locomotor patterns are present from birth and can be activated through specific stimulation of "trigger zones" even in individuals with central nervous system damage (Vojta & Peters, 2007).

Key elements include:

- Precise positioning of the patient in specific starting positions (supine, prone, side-lying)
- Application of pressure to defined trigger zones to elicit reflex crawling or rolling
- Activation of global movement patterns involving the entire body
- Regular, frequent application of the technique, often multiple times daily
- Often initiated in infancy for conditions like cerebral palsy

The therapy aims to incorporate these activated movement patterns into spontaneous motor behavior and functional activities.

Evidence Evaluation

The evidence base for Vojta therapy is limited, particularly for adult neurological conditions:

- Most research has focused on pediatric applications, particularly cerebral palsy and high-risk infants, with mixed results (Jung *et al.,* 2017).
- A systematic review by Novak *et al.* (2013) classified Vojta therapy as having uncertain effects for children with cerebral palsy, noting limited high-quality evidence.
- Studies by Lim and Kim (2013) and Ha and Sung (2018) have shown some positive effects on gross motor function in children with cerebral palsy, but sample sizes were small and methodological quality was limited.
- For adult neurological conditions, research is particularly sparse, with few controlled trials examining its effectiveness.
- The theoretical foundation of reflex locomotion has been questioned in light of contemporary understanding of motor control and development (Damiano, 2009).

While Vojta therapy remains popular in certain regions, particularly Eastern Europe and parts of Asia, its limited evidence base and intensive application requirements have limited its adoption in many Western healthcare systems. More rigorous research is needed to establish its effectiveness compared to other approaches, particularly for adult neurological rehabilitation.

BRUNNSTROM APPROACH

Principles and Applications

The Brunnstrom approach, developed by Swedish physical therapist Signe Brunnstrom in the 1960s, is primarily used in stroke rehabilitation. Unlike approaches that aim to inhibit synergistic movement patterns, this method utilizes the natural sequence of recovery and synergies as a basis for treatment. Brunnstrom identified six stages of motor recovery after stroke, from flaccidity to near-normal movement (Brunnstrom, 1970).

Key principles include:

- Using primitive reflexes and synergy patterns to initiate movement
- Progressing through a predictable sequence of recovery stages
- Employing sensory stimulation to facilitate movement
- Gradually developing voluntary control outside of synergy patterns
- Ultimately working toward isolated joint movement and normal coordination

Treatment techniques are matched to the patient's current stage of recovery, with different strategies employed at each stage.

Evidence Evaluation

The evidence supporting the Brunnstrom approach is limited:

- Few randomized controlled trials have specifically evaluated the effectiveness of the Brunnstrom approach compared to other rehabilitation methods.
- The staging system developed by Brunnstrom has influenced assessment tools like the Fugl-Meyer Assessment, which has shown good reliability and validity as a measure of motor recovery after stroke (Gladstone *et al.,* 2002).
- Some studies, such as that by Pandian *et al.* (2012), have shown positive effects of the approach on upper extremity function in stroke patients, but sample sizes have been small.
- A systematic review by Veerbeek *et al.* (2014) found limited evidence for interventions based primarily on neurophysiological approaches like Brunnstrom.
- The theoretical assumptions regarding the invariable sequence of recovery have been challenged by research demonstrating more variable recovery patterns and the potential for task-specific recovery that doesn't follow the synergy progression (Kwakkel *et al.,* 2004).

While elements of the Brunnstrom approach, particularly its assessment framework, continue to influence stroke rehabilitation, its use as a comprehensive treatment approach has diminished in favor of more task-oriented and evidence-based methods. The approach is generally considered outdated in its pure form, though some clinicians incorporate aspects of synergy progression assessment into more contemporary practice frameworks.

TASK-ORIENTED TRAINING

Principles and Applications

Task-oriented training represents a paradigm shift from impairment-focused approaches to activity-based interventions. Emerging in the 1980s and 1990s, this approach focuses on the practice of specific functional tasks rather than treating underlying impairments or movement patterns in isolation. It is grounded in systems theory of motor control and contemporary motor learning principles (Winstein *et al.,* 2014).

Key principles include:

- Practice of whole tasks or task components in relevant environments
- Problem-solving and active patient participation
- Task-specific training rather than general exercise
- Variability of practice to enhance transfer of learning
- Progressive challenge and adaptation based on performance
- Meaningful and goal-directed activities

Task-oriented training can be applied across various neurological conditions and focuses on activities relevant to the individual's goals and life roles.

Evidence Evaluation

Task-oriented training has a strong evidence base:

- A Cochrane review by French *et al.* (2016) found moderate to high-quality evidence that repetitive task training improves upper and lower limb function after stroke.
- Multiple randomized controlled trials have demonstrated the effectiveness of task-specific training for improving walking ability, upper limb function, and activities of daily living in various neurological populations (van de Port *et al.,* 2012).

- Neurophysiological studies support the approach's theoretical foundation, demonstrating that task-specific practice drives neuroplastic changes in relevant neural networks (Boyd *et al.*, 2010).
- Systematic reviews by Rensink et al. (2009) and Hubbard *et al.* (2009) found consistent evidence supporting task-oriented approaches for improving functional outcomes after stroke.
- The approach aligns well with contemporary understanding of motor learning and neuroplasticity principles, particularly the specificity of learning and the importance of context (Kleim & Jones, 2008).

Task-oriented training represents one of the most evidence-supported approaches in modern neuro rehabilitation and has been incorporated into clinical practice guidelines for stroke and other neurological conditions. Its emphasis on functional relevance and active patient engagement has influenced the evolution of many traditional approaches toward more functional, goal-directed methods.

MIRROR THERAPY

Principles and Applications

Mirror therapy, introduced in the 1990s by Ramachandran for phantom limb pain, has since been adapted for neuro rehabilitation, particularly for upper limb recovery after stroke. The technique involves placing a mirror in the patient's midsagittal plane, so that the reflection of the unaffected limb appears in place of the affected limb. As the patient performs movements with the unaffected limb while watching its reflection, the visual feedback creates the illusion that the affected limb is moving normally (Ramachandran & Altschuler, 2009).

Key applications include:

- Upper limb motor recovery after stroke
- Lower limb function and gait rehabilitation
- Management of complex regional pain syndrome
- Treatment of phantom limb pain
- Supplementary technique in broader rehabilitation programs

The approach is theorized to work through visual feedback mechanisms, activation of mirror neurons, and facilitation of interhemispheric neural networks.

Evidence Evaluation

The evidence for mirror therapy shows promising results:

- A Cochrane review by Thieme *et al.* (2018) found moderate-quality evidence that mirror therapy improves motor function, activities of daily living, and pain after stroke, particularly when provided in addition to conventional therapy.
- Systematic reviews and meta-analyses by Broderick *et al.* (2018) and Zeng *et al.* (2018) reported significant effects on upper limb motor function, with greater benefits observed for distal than proximal movements.
- Neuroimaging studies have demonstrated increased activation in the ipsilesional primary motor cortex during mirror therapy, suggesting neurophysiological mechanisms underlying observed clinical improvements (Michielsen *et al.,* 2011).
- For lower limb rehabilitation, the evidence is less robust, though studies by Mohan *et al.* (2013) and Cha *et al.* (2016) have shown positive effects on gait parameters and balance.

Mirror therapy represents a relatively well-supported, low-cost intervention that can be easily implemented in various settings, including home-based rehabilitation. Its strongest evidence is for upper limb rehabilitation after stroke, though research into broader applications continues to emerge.

ROBOTIC AND VIRTUAL REALITY - ASSISTED THERAPY

Principles and Applications

Robotic and virtual reality (VR) technologies have emerged as significant innovations in neuro rehabilitation over the past two decades. These technologies enable high-intensity, repetitive, task-specific training with precise control, measurement, and augmented feedback capabilities (Mehrholz et al., 2018).

Key features include:

- Robotic devices providing movement assistance or resistance

- Automated delivery of high repetition therapy
- Quantitative feedback on performance
- Virtual environments simulating real-world tasks
- Gamification elements to enhance motivation and engagement
- Potential for telerehabilitation applications

Applications span upper and lower limb rehabilitation, with various devices designed for specific body segments and functional tasks.

Evidence Evaluation

The evidence base for these technologies continues to grow:

- A Cochrane review by Mehrholz *et al.* (2018) found moderate-quality evidence that robotic-assisted arm training improves arm function and muscle strength after stroke, though effects on activities of daily living were less clear.
- For lower limb rehabilitation, another Cochrane review by Mehrholz *et al.* (2020) found moderate-quality evidence that robotic-assisted gait training combined with physiotherapy increases the odds of independent walking after stroke.
- Systematic reviews of virtual reality interventions have shown positive effects on upper limb function, balance, and mobility in various neurological conditions, with additional benefits for motivation and adherence (Laver *et al.,* 2017).
- Neuroimaging studies have demonstrated that robotic and VR-based interventions can induce neuroplastic changes similar to conventional therapy, supporting their neurophysiological basis (Saleh *et al.,* 2017).
- Cost-effectiveness analyses suggest that despite high initial investment, robotic therapy may offer long-term economic benefits through reduced therapist time and potentially enhanced outcomes (Wagner *et al.,* 2011).

Robotic and VR-assisted therapies represent evidence-supported adjuncts to conventional rehabilitation, particularly for delivering high-intensity, repetitive training. While they don't necessarily outperform equivalent doses of conventional therapy, they offer advantages in standardization, measurement precision, and potential for independent practice.

FUNCTIONALELECTRICALSTIMULATION (FES)

Principles and Applications

Functional Electrical Stimulation (FES) uses electrical currents to activate paralyzed or weakened muscles in a functional manner. First developed in the 1960s, FES has evolved from simple stimulation systems to sophisticated devices that can be synchronized with voluntary effort and integrated into functional activities (Howlett *et al.,* 2015).

Key applications include:

- Upper limb function restoration (e.g., grasp and release)
- Lower limb function, particularly drop foot correction during walking
- Respiratory muscle training and cough assistance
- Bladder and bowel control
- Cardiovascular conditioning through FES cycling

FES can be implemented as a therapeutic intervention to facilitate neuroplasticity or as an assistive technology for long-term use.

Evidence Evaluation

The evidence supporting FES varies by application:

- For drop foot following stroke or incomplete spinal cord injury, randomized controlled trials and systematic reviews have demonstrated improved gait parameters, walking speed, and physiological cost of walking with FES compared to no intervention (Pereira *et al.,* 2019).
- A Cochrane review by Howlett et al. (2015) found moderate-quality evidence that FES improves upper limb function when combined with conventional therapy after stroke.
- For shoulder subluxation prevention and treatment, systematic reviews have shown positive effects of FES on reducing subluxation, although effects on pain and function are less consistent (Vafadar *et al.,* 2015).

- Long-term therapeutic effects (carryover when the device is not in use) have been demonstrated in some studies, supporting the neuroplasticity-enhancing potential of FES (Stein et al., 2015).
- Neurophysiological studies have shown that FES combined with voluntary effort can enhance motor cortex excitability more effectively than either intervention alone (Thompson & Stein, 2004).

FES represents a well-established intervention with good evidence for specific applications, particularly drop foot correction and upper limb function enhancement. Ongoing technological advancements, including the development of implantable systems and brain-computer interfaces for controlling stimulation, continue to expand its potential applications in neuro rehabilitation.

FUTURE TRENDS

The field of neuro rehabilitation and neuro physiotherapy is evolving rapidly, shaped by advances in neuroscience, technology, healthcare delivery models, and changing patient demographics. Several key trends are emerging that will likely define the future landscape of this discipline:

Integration of Neuroplasticity Principles

As our understanding of neuroplasticity mechanisms deepens, future neuro rehabilitation approaches will increasingly incorporate evidence-based strategies to optimize neural reorganization and recovery:

- **Critical Period Optimization:** Research into rehabilitation timing suggests the existence of heightened plasticity windows following neural injury. Future protocols may be designed to capitalize on these periods through earlier, more intensive intervention or through pharmacological or non-invasive brain stimulation methods that extend or reopen critical periods (Cassidy & Cramer, 2017).
- **Targeted Plasticity:** Rather than general approaches, interventions will increasingly target specific neural circuits and mechanisms. This may involve combining behavioral training with adjunctive techniques that prime the nervous system for plasticity, such as aerobic exercise, neuropharmacological agents, or neuromodulation (McDonnell *et al.,* 2015).
- **Biomarker-Guided Recovery Tracking:** Advances in neuroimaging and neurophysiological assessment will enable more precise tracking of neural reorganization and recovery. These biomarkers may guide personalized rehabilitation protocols and provide more accurate prognostication (Boyd *et al.,* 2017).

Personalized Rehabilitation Approaches

The "one-size-fits-all" approach to neuro rehabilitation is giving way to personalized interventions tailored to individual patient characteristics:

Precision Rehabilitation: Similar to precision medicine, rehabilitation will increasingly consider genetic factors, biomarkers, imaging findings, and other individual characteristics to predict response to specific interventions and optimize treatment selection (Cramer *et al.,* 2017).

Artificial Intelligence for Decision Support: Machine learning algorithms analyzing large datasets will help identify patterns and predict which patients are likely to respond to particular interventions, supporting clinical decision-making and resource allocation (Krebs *et al.,* 2020).

Phenotype-Based Intervention Selection: Research is beginning to identify distinct recovery phenotypes or subgroups within diagnostic categories. Future approaches will likely target interventions based on these phenotypes rather than broad diagnostic classifications (Kwakkel *et al.,* 2017).

Advanced Technology Integration

Technological innovations are rapidly transforming rehabilitation possibilities:

- **Next-Generation Robotics:** Future robotic systems will feature increased portability, adaptability, and intuitive control mechanisms. Soft robotics and exosuits that provide assistance while allowing natural movement patterns represent a promising direction (Awad *et al.,* 2020).
- **Immersive Virtual Reality:** As VR technology becomes more sophisticated

and affordable, fully immersive environments will enable practice of complex activities in simulated real-world settings with precise control over difficulty and environmental factors (Kizony *et al.,* 2020).

- **Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCIs):** BCIs are evolving from laboratory tools to rehabilitation interventions. These systems, which translate brain activity into control signals for external devices, show promise for facilitating neural reorganization and providing functional assistance (Cervera *et al.,* 2018).
- **Wearable Technology:** Advanced sensors integrated into clothing or accessories will enable continuous monitoring of movement, physiological parameters, and even neural activity during daily activities, providing objective data on real-world functioning and recovery progression (Dobkin & Martinez, 2018).

Neuromodulation and Combined Approaches

Non-invasive and invasive neuromodulation techniques are increasingly being integrated with traditional rehabilitation:

- **Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation (TMS) and Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation (tDCS):** These non-invasive brain stimulation techniques are increasingly being used as adjuncts to behavioral training. Evidence suggests they may enhance motor learning, reduce spasticity, and facilitate recovery when appropriately timed with rehabilitation exercises (Liew *et al.,* 2014).
- **Closed-Loop Neuromodulation Systems:** Future systems will use real-time physiological monitoring to deliver stimulation precisely when the brain is most receptive, optimizing effects and minimizing side effects. These systems may adjust stimulation parameters based on ongoing brain activity, fatigue levels, or task performance (Zrenner *et al.,* 2016).
- **Multidisciplinary Protocols:** Research increasingly supports the combination of multiple approaches—behavioral training, neuromodulation, pharmacological interventions, and psychological support—delivered in coordinated protocols rather than as isolated interventions (Winstein *et al.,* 2019).

Telerehabilitation and Distributed Care Models

The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated the adoption of telerehabilitation, a trend likely to continue and expand:

- **Remote Assessment and Monitoring:** Advanced sensors and smartphone applications enable remote evaluation of movement quality, function, and adherence to home exercise programs, allowing therapists to track progress and adjust interventions without in-person visits (Chen *et al.,* 2020).
- **Virtual Therapy Delivery:** Videoconferencing platforms specifically designed for rehabilitation facilitate remote delivery of therapy sessions, including specialized applications for guiding exercise execution and providing feedback (Caughlin *et al.,* 2020).
- **Hybrid Models:** Future care models will likely blend in-person and remote interventions, with intensive periods of clinic-based therapy followed by longer periods of technology-supported home practice with remote monitoring (Peretti *et al.,* 2017).
- **Automated Therapy Systems:** AI-powered systems that can guide patients through therapy protocols, adjust difficulty based on performance, and provide feedback without constant therapist supervision will extend the reach of rehabilitation services (Krebs *et al.,* 2020).

Emphasis on Cognitive-Motor Integration

Recognition of the interplay between cognitive and motor functions is leading to more integrated approaches:

- **Dual-Task Training:** Future protocols will increasingly incorporate simultaneous motor and cognitive challenges, reflecting real-world functional demands and potentially enhancing transfer of rehabilitation gains to daily activities (Fritz *et al.,* 2015).
- **Cognitive Rehabilitation Integration:** Rather than treating cognitive and motor impairments separately, integrated approaches will address both domains

simultaneously, recognizing their interdependence in functional activities (Mullick *et al.*, 2015).

- **Metacognitive Strategies:** Training in self-awareness, self-regulation, and problem-solving will complement traditional motor interventions, empowering patients to adapt strategies to changing circumstances (Skidmore *et al.*, 2015).

Expanded Focus on Participation and Quality of Life

Future neuro rehabilitation will increasingly emphasize broader outcomes beyond impairment reduction:

- **Environmental Interventions:** Greater attention to modifying physical and social environments to support participation, including universal design principles and community accessibility initiatives (Brown & Winters-Stone, 2015).
- **Peer Support and Community Integration:** Structured programs to facilitate community reintegration and peer mentoring will complement traditional therapy approaches (Munce *et al.*, 2017).
- **Shared Decision Making:** Patient preferences and priorities will play a larger role in setting rehabilitation goals and selecting interventions, with greater emphasis on patient-reported outcomes (Levack e*t al.*, 2015).
- **Wellness and Prevention:** Rehabilitation will extend beyond recovery to include prevention of secondary complications and promotion of long-term health and well-being (Ellis *et al.*, 2015).

Clinical Research Methodologies

Advances in research methods will strengthen the evidence base for neuro rehabilitation:

- **Pragmatic Clinical Trials:** Increased emphasis on trials conducted in real-world clinical settings with diverse patient populations and clinically relevant outcomes (Bernhardt *et al.*, 2017).
- **Advanced Statistical Methods:** Techniques such as responder analyses, predictive modeling, and n-of-1 trials will complement traditional group comparison designs, providing insights into individual variability and treatment response patterns (Dijkers *et al.*, 2014).
- **Implementation Science:** Greater focus on understanding and addressing barriers to implementing evidence-based practices in clinical settings will help bridge the research-practice gap (Jones *et al.*, 2015).
- **Patient Engagement in Research:** Meaningful involvement of patients and caregivers in research design, conduct, and dissemination will ensure relevance and facilitate knowledge translation (Bright *et al.*, 2018).

These emerging trends reflect a dynamic field that continues to evolve in response to scientific discoveries, technological innovations, and changing healthcare landscapes. The future of neuro rehabilitation promises more personalized, technology-enhanced, and integrated approaches that better address the complex needs of individuals with neurological conditions.

DISCUSSION

The evolution of neuro rehabilitation and neuro physiotherapy over the past century reflects a fascinating interplay between scientific discovery, clinical innovation, and paradigm shifts in understanding human function and recovery. This review has traced the journey from early technique-focused approaches based primarily on clinical observation to contemporary evidence-based practices grounded in neuroscience and rigorous clinical research.

Paradigm Shifts in Theoretical Foundations

A striking pattern emerging from this review is the progressive shift in theoretical foundations underpinning neuro rehabilitation approaches. Early methods such as NDT, PNF, Rood, and Brunnstrom were developed during a period when neurophysiological understanding was limited and relied heavily on reflex-hierarchical models of motor control. These approaches generally assumed that abnormal movement patterns resulted from impaired neural mechanisms and that rehabilitation should focus on normalizing these patterns through external facilitation or inhibition.

The late 20th century witnessed a significant paradigm shift toward systems and task-oriented models that recognized the complex, dynamic nature of motor control and the importance of context and goal-directed activity. This shift is exemplified by the emergence of approaches like the Motor Relearning Program and task-specific training, which focus on functional outcomes rather than normalized movement patterns.

Contemporary approaches increasingly integrate principles from neuroscience, particularly regarding neuroplasticity mechanisms, leading to interventions that specifically target neural reorganization through intensive, progressive, and engaging practice. The theoretical evolution continues with emerging models that recognize the influence of psychological factors, cognitive processes, and environmental contexts on recovery and rehabilitation outcomes.

Evidence Base: Strengths and Limitations

The evidence base for neuro rehabilitation has grown substantially but remains characterized by significant variability in quality and conclusiveness. Several observations emerge from this review:

1. **Methodological Challenges:** Researching complex rehabilitation interventions presents unique challenges, including difficulties in standardizing interventions, blinding participants and therapists, selecting appropriate control conditions, and measuring clinically meaningful outcomes. These challenges have contributed to the limited evidence supporting many traditional approaches.
2. **Strength of Evidence Hierarchy:** Based on current evidence, a hierarchy emerges in which task-oriented approaches (including MRP, CIMT, and task-specific training) generally have stronger empirical support than traditional neurophysiological approaches (such as NDT, Rood, and Brunnstrom). Emerging technology-enhanced interventions, particularly robotics and FES, also demonstrate promising evidence for specific applications.
3. **Research-Practice Gap:** Despite advances in evidence-based practice, a significant gap remains between research findings and clinical implementation. Many practitioners continue to use approaches with limited empirical support, often based on clinical experience, patient preferences, or practical considerations such as training availability.
4. **Individual Variability:** The heterogeneity of neurological conditions and recovery patterns means that group-level evidence may not capture individual responses to intervention. This highlights the need for personalized approaches and more sophisticated research methodologies that can identify predictors of treatment response.

Integration of Technology and Traditional Practice

The integration of technology represents one of the most significant developments in contemporary neuro rehabilitation. This integration is occurring on multiple levels:

1. **Augmentation of Traditional Therapy:** Technologies such as FES, robotics, and virtual reality are increasingly used to supplement conventional therapy approaches, enabling higher intensity, precision, and engagement.
2. **Quantification and Measurement:** Advanced sensing technologies provide objective measures of movement quality, function, and neural activity, enhancing assessment precision and enabling more tailored interventions.
3. **Extending Therapy Reach:** Telerehabilitation and home-based technologies are expanding access to rehabilitation services, particularly for underserved populations and those with mobility limitations.
4. **Ethical and Practical Considerations:** The rapid proliferation of technology raises important questions about cost-effectiveness, accessibility, and the changing role of therapists in increasingly technology-mediated interventions.

Rather than replacing traditional practice, technology is most effective when integrated thoughtfully into comprehensive rehabilitation programs that consider the unique needs and contexts of individual patients.

Implications for Clinical Practice

Several implications for clinical practice emerge from this review:

1. **Evidence-Informed Eclecticism:** While evidence should guide practice, the

limitations of current research suggest that clinicians must often integrate evidence with clinical expertise and patient preferences. This may involve selecting elements from various approaches based on individual patient characteristics rather than adhering rigidly to a single method.

2. **Focus on Meaningful Outcomes:** Regardless of the specific approach, interventions should prioritize outcomes that are meaningful to patients and relevant to their life contexts, particularly activity and participation levels.
3. **Continued Professional Development:** The rapidly evolving nature of neuro rehabilitation requires ongoing professional development to stay current with emerging evidence and innovations.
4. **Measurement and Documentation:** Systematic assessment and documentation of patient outcomes are essential for clinical decision-making, quality improvement, and contributing to the evidence base.
5. **Patient-Centered Care:** Involving patients and caregivers in goal-setting, intervention selection, and progress evaluation enhances engagement and potentially improves outcomes.

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

This review highlights several priorities for future research:

1. **Comparative Effectiveness Studies:** More high-quality trials comparing different approaches for specific patient populations would help clarify which interventions work best for whom.
2. **Predictors of Treatment Response:** Research identifying factors that predict response to specific interventions would facilitate more personalized treatment selection.
3. **Implementation Science:** Studies addressing barriers and facilitators to implementing evidence-based practices in real-world settings are needed to bridge the research-practice gap.
4. **Long-Term Outcomes:** More research examining long-term maintenance of rehabilitation gains and strategies to prevent functional decline over time is essential.
5. **Combined Interventions:** Studies of multi-modal interventions that combine different approaches (e.g., behavioral training with neuromodulation) may yield insights into synergistic effects.
6. **Technology Evaluation:** Rigorous evaluation of emerging technologies, including cost-effectiveness analyses and implementation considerations, will guide appropriate integration into clinical practice.

CONCLUSION

Neuro rehabilitation and neuro physiotherapy have evolved from technique-focused approaches based on limited neurophysiological understanding to evidence-informed practices grounded in contemporary neuroscience. The field continues to advance through scientific discovery, technological innovation, and evolving healthcare models. While challenges remain in strengthening the evidence base and implementing best practices consistently, the future holds promise for increasingly effective, personalized, and accessible rehabilitation approaches that maximize recovery and quality of life for individuals with neurological conditions.

The ongoing integration of neuroplasticity principles, advanced technologies, and patient-centered approaches, combined with rigorous research methodologies, will likely lead to further refinements in practice and improved outcomes. As the field continues to evolve, maintaining a balance between innovation and evidence while centering patient needs and preferences will be essential to realizing the full potential of neuro rehabilitation.

REFERENCES

1. Adler, S. S., Beckers, D., & Buck, M. (2014). PNF in practice: An illustrated guide (4th ed.). Springer.
2. Awad, L. N., Esquenazi, A., Francisco, G. E., Nolan, K. J., & Jayaraman, A. (2020). The ReWalk ReStore™ soft robotic exosuit: A multi-site clinical trial of the safety, reliability, and feasibility of exosuit-augmented post-stroke gait rehabilitation. Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation, 17(1), 80.
3. Bayley, M. T., Hurdowar, A., Richards, C. L., Korner-Bitensky, N., Wood-Dauphinee,

S., Eng, J. J., McKay-Lyons, M., Harrison, E., Teasell, R., Harrison, M., & Graham, I. D. (2012). Barriers to implementation of stroke rehabilitation evidence: Findings from a multi-site pilot project. Disability and Rehabilitation, 34(19), 1633-1638.

4. Bernhardt, J., Hayward, K. S., Kwakkel, G., Ward, N. S., Wolf, S. L., Borschmann, K., Krakauer, J. W., Boyd, L. A., Carmichael, S. T., Corbett, D., & 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.
5. Boyd, L. A., Hayward, K. S., Ward, N. S., Stinear, C. M., Rosso, C., Fisher, R. J., Carter, A. R., Leff, A. P., Copland, D. A., Carey, L. M., Cohen, L. G., Basso, D. M., Maguire, J. M., & Cramer, S. C. (2017). Biomarkers of stroke recovery: Consensus-based core recommendations from the Stroke Recovery and Rehabilitation Roundtable. International Journal of Stroke, 12(5), 480-493.
6. Boyd, L. A., Vidoni, E. D., & Wessel, B. D. (2010). Motor learning after stroke: Is skill acquisition a prerequisite for contralesional neuroplastic change? Neuroscience Letters, 482(1), 21-25.
7. Bright, F. A., Kayes, N. M., Worrall, L., & McPherson, K. M. (2018). Exploring relational engagement practices in stroke rehabilitation using the Voice Centred Relational Approach. International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 21(1), 35-48.
8. Broderick, P., Horgan, F., Blake, C., Ehrensberger, M., Simpson, D., & Monaghan, K. (2018). Mirror therapy for improving lower limb motor function and mobility after stroke: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 99(3), 555-568.e1.
9. Brown, D. A., & Winters-Stone, K. M. (2015). Promoting successful aging through competitive sports participation. Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Clinics of North America, 26(4), 691-701.
10. Brunnstrom, S. (1970). Movement therapy in hemiplegia: A neurophysiological approach. Harper & Row.
11. Cambier, D. C., De Corte, E., Danneels, L. A., & Witvrouw, E. E. (2009). Treating sensory impairments in the post-stroke upper limb with intermittent pneumatic compression. Results of a preliminary trial. Clinical Rehabilitation, 23(1), 14-23.
12. Carr, J. H., & Shepherd, R. B. (1987). A motor relearning programme for stroke. Butterworth-Heinemann.
13. Carr, J. H., & Shepherd, R. B. (2010). Neurological rehabilitation: Optimizing motor performance (2nd ed.). Churchill Livingstone.
14. Cassidy, J. M., & Cramer, S. C. (2017). Spontaneous and therapeutic-induced mechanisms of functional recovery after stroke. Translational Stroke Research, 8(1), 33-46.
15. Caughlin, S., Mehta, S., Corriveau, H., Eng, J. J., Eskes, G., Kairy, D., Meltzer, J., Sakakibara,
16. B. M., & Teasell, R. (2020). Implementing telerehabilitation after stroke: Lessons learned from Canadian trials. Telemedicine and e-Health, 26(6), 710-719.
17. 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.
18. Cha, H. G., Oh, D. W., & Choi, J. D. (2016). Immediate effects of mirror therapy on lower extremity motor function in stroke patients: A randomized controlled trial. Journal of Physical Therapy Science, 28(9), 2501-2504.
19. Chen, Y., Abel, K. T., Janecek, J. T., Chen, Y., Zheng, K., & Cramer, S. C. (2020). Home-based technologies for stroke rehabilitation: A systematic review. International Journal of Medical Informatics, 133, 104016.
20. Corbetta, D., Sirtori, V., Castellini, G., Moja, L., & Gatti, R. (2015). Constraint-induced movement therapy for upper extremities in people with stroke. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, (10), CD004433.
21. Cramer, S. C., Wolf, S. L., Adams, H. P., Chen, D., Dromerick, A. W., Dunning, K., Ellerbe, C., Grande, A., Janis, S., Lansberg, M. G., Lazar, R. M., Palesch, Y., Richards, L., Roth, E., Savitz, S. I., Wechsler, L. R., Wintermark, M., & Broderick, J. P. (2017). Stroke recovery and rehabilitation research: Issues, opportunities, and the NIH StrokeNet. Stroke, 48(3), 813-819.
22. Damiano, D. L. (2009). Rehabilitative therapies in cerebral palsy: The good, the not as good, and the possible. Journal of Child Neurology, 24(9), 1200-1204.
23. Dijkers, M. P., Hart, T., Tsaousides, T., Whyte, J., & Zanca, J. M. (2014). Treatment

taxonomy for rehabilitation: Past, present, and prospects. Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 95(1 Suppl), S6-S16.

24. Dobkin, B. H., & Martinez, C. (2018). Wearable sensors to monitor, enable feedback, and measure outcomes of activity and practice. Current Neurology and Neuroscience Reports, 18(12), 87.

25. Ellis, T., Boudreau, J. K., DeAngelis, T. R., Brown, L. E., Cavanaugh, J. T., Earhart, G. M., Ford, M. P., Foreman, K. B., & Dibble, L. E. (2015). Barriers to exercise in people with Parkinson disease. Physical Therapy, 93(5), 628-636.

26. Fleet, A., Page, S. J., MacKay-Lyons, M., & Boe, S. G. (2014). Modified constraint-induced movement therapy for upper extremity recovery post stroke: What is the evidence? Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation, 21(4), 319-331.

27. French, B., Thomas, L. H., Coupe, J., McMahon, N. E., Connell, L., Harrison, J., Sutton, C. J., Tishkovskaya, S., & Watkins, C. L. (2016). Repetitive task training for improving functional ability after stroke. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, (11), CD006073.

28. Fritz, N. E., Cheek, F. M., & Nichols-Larsen, D. S. (2015). Motor-cognitive dual-task training in persons with neurologic disorders: A systematic review. Journal of Neurologic Physical Therapy, 39(3), 142-153.

29. Gladstone, D. J., Danells, C. J., & Black, S. E. (2002). The Fugl-Meyer assessment of motor recovery after stroke: A critical review of its measurement properties. Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair, 16(3), 232-240.

30. Ha, S. Y., & Sung, Y. H. (2018). Effects of Vojta method on trunk stability in healthy individuals. Journal of Exercise Rehabilitation, 14(4), 624-629.

31. Hafsteinsdóttir, T. B. (1996). Neurodevelopmental treatment: Application to nursing and effects on the hemiplegic stroke patient. Journal of Neuroscience Nursing, 28(1), 36-47.

32. Hindle, K. B., Whitcomb, T. J., Briggs, W. O., & Hong, J. (2012). Proprioceptive neuromuscular facilitation (PNF): Its mechanisms and effects on range of motion and muscular function. Journal of Human Kinetics, 31, 105-113.

33. Howlett, O. A., Lannin, N. A., Ada, L., & McKinstry, C. (2015). Functional electrical stimulation improves activity after stroke: A systematic review with meta-analysis. Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 96(5), 934-943.

34. Hubbard, I. J., Parsons, M. W., Neilson, C., & Carey, L. M. (2009). Task-specific training: Evidence for and translation to clinical practice. Occupational Therapy International, 16(3-4), 175-189.

35. Jones, C. A., Roop, S. C., Pohar, S. L., Albrecht, L., & Scott, S. D. (2015). Translating knowledge in rehabilitation: Systematic review. Physical Therapy, 95(4), 663-677.

36. Jung, M. W., Landenberger, M., Jung, T., Lindenthal, T., & Philippi, H. (2017). Vojta therapy and neurodevelopmental treatment in children with infantile postural asymmetry: A randomised controlled trial. Journal of Physical Therapy Science, 29(2), 301-306.

37. Khan, F., Amatya, B., Galea, M. P., Gonzenbach, R., & Kesselring, J. (2022). Neurorehabilitation: Applied neuroplasticity. Journal of Neurology, 269(4), 1598-1624.

38. Kizony, R., Zeilig, G., Dudkiewicz, I., Schejter-Margalit, T., & Rand, D. (2020). Immersive virtual reality for individuals with spinal cord injury. Journal of Spinal Cord Medicine, 43(4), 508-518.

39. 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.

40. Krebs, H. I., Fautsch, M. K., Calvez, M., Koller, J., Hinrichs, U., Fasoli, S. E., & Stein, J. (2020). Rehabilitation robotics: Twenty years of evolution. Journal of Neuroengineering and Rehabilitation, 17(1), 92.

41. Kumar, S., & Goyal, M. (2019). Comparison of proprioceptive neuromuscular facilitation and motor relearning programme in rehabilitation of post-stroke hemiparetic hand: A randomized clinical trial. Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research, 13(11), YC01-YC05.

42. Kwakkel, G., Kollen, B. J., & Krebs, H. I. (2015). Effects of robot-assisted therapy on upper limb recovery after stroke: A systematic review. Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair, 22(2), 111-121.

43. Kwakkel, G., Kollen, B., & Lindeman, E. (2004). Understanding the pattern of functional recovery after stroke: Facts and theories. Restorative Neurology and Neuroscience, 22(3-5), 281-299.

44. Kwakkel, G., Lannin, N. A., Borschmann, K., English, C., Ali, M., Churilov, L., Saposnik, G., Winstein, C., van Wegen, E. E., Wolf, S. L., Krakauer, J. W., & Bernhardt, J. (2017).

45. Standardized measurement of sensorimotor recovery in stroke trials: Consensus-based core recommendations from the Stroke Recovery and Rehabilitation Roundtable. International Journal of Stroke, 12(5), 451-461.

46. Langhammer, B., & Stanghelle, J. K. (2000). Bobath or motor relearning programme? A comparison of two different approaches of physiotherapy in stroke rehabilitation: A randomized controlled study. Clinical Rehabilitation, 14(4), 361-369.

47. 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), CD008349.

48. Levack, W. M., Weatherall, M., Hay-Smith, E. J., Dean, S. G., McPherson, K., & Siegert, R. J. (2015). Goal setting and strategies to enhance goal pursuit for adults with acquired disability participating in rehabilitation. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, (7), CD009727.

49. Levine, P., & Kliebhan, L. (1981). The sensory motor integration principles of the Rood approach. Physical & Occupational Therapy in Geriatrics, 1(2), 9-21.

50. Liew, S. L., Santarnecchi, E., Buch, E. R., & Cohen, L. G. (2014). Non-invasive brain stimulation in neurorehabilitation: Local and distant effects for motor recovery. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 8, 378.

51. Lim, H., & Kim, T. (2013). Effects of Vojta therapy on gait of children with spastic diplegia. Journal of Physical Therapy Science, 25(12), 1605-1608.

52. Mark, V. W., Taub, E., & Morris, D. M. (2006). Neuroplasticity and constraint-induced movement therapy. Europa Medicophysica, 42(3), 269-284.

53. Mayo, N. E., Bronstein, D., Scott, S. C., Finch, L. E., & Miller, S. (2015). Necessary and sufficient causes of participation post-stroke: Practical and philosophical perspectives. Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 96(8), S14-S23.

54. McDonnell, M. N., Koblar, S., Ward, N. S., Rothwell, J. C., Hordacre, B., & Ridding, M. C. (2015). An investigation of cortical neuroplasticity following stroke in adults: Is there evidence for a critical window for rehabilitation? BMC Neurology, 15, 109.

55. Mehrholz, J., Pohl, M., Platz, T., Kugler, J., & Elsner, B. (2018). Electromechanical and robot-assisted arm training for improving activities of daily living, arm function, and arm muscle strength after stroke. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, (9), CD006876.

56. Mehrholz, J., Thomas, S., Kugler, J., Pohl, M., & Elsner, B. (2020). Electromechanical-assisted training for walking after stroke. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, (10), CD006185.

57. Michielsen, M. E., Selles, R. W., van der Geest, J. N., Eckhardt, M., Yavuzer, G., Stam, H. J., Smits, M., Ribbers, G. M., & Bussmann, J. B. (2011). Motor recovery and cortical reorganization after mirror therapy in chronic stroke patients: A phase II randomized controlled trial. Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair, 25(3), 223-233.

58. Mohan, U., Babu, S. K., Kumar, K. V., Suresh, B. V., Misri, Z. K., & Chakrapani, M. (2013). Effectiveness of mirror therapy on lower extremity motor recovery, balance and mobility in patients with acute stroke: A randomized sham-controlled pilot trial. Annals of Indian Academy of Neurology, 16(4), 634-639.

59. Morgan, C., Darrah, J., Gordon, A. M., Harbourne, R., Spittle, A., Johnson, R., & Fetters, L. (2016). Effectiveness of motor interventions in infants with cerebral palsy: A systematic review. Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology, 58(9), 900-909.

60. Moseley, A. M., Herbert, R. D., Sherrington, C., & Maher, C. G. (2002). Evidence for physiotherapy practice: A survey of the Physiotherapy Evidence Database (PEDro). Australian Journal of Physiotherapy, 48(1), 43-49.

61. Mullick, A. A., Subramanian, S. K., & Levin, M. F. (2015). Emerging evidence of the association between cognitive deficits and arm motor recovery after stroke: A meta-analysis. Restorative Neurology and Neuroscience, 33(3), 389-403.

62. Munce, S. E., Fehlings, M. G., Straus, S. E., Nugaeva, N., Jang, E., Webster, F., & Jaglal, S. B. (2017). Views of people with traumatic spinal cord injury about the components of self-management programs and program delivery: A Canadian pilot study. BMC Neurology, 17(1), 209.

63. Novak, I., McIntyre, S., Morgan, C., Campbell, L., Dark, L., Morton, N., Stumbles, E., Wilson, S. A., & Goldsmith, S. (2013). A systematic review of interventions for children with cerebral palsy: State of the evidence. Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology, 55(10), 885-910.

64. Pandian, S., Arya, K. N., & Davidson, E. W. (2012). Comparison of Brunnstrom movement therapy and Motor Relearning Program in rehabilitation of post-stroke hemiparetic hand: A randomized trial. Journal of Bodywork and Movement Therapies, 16(3), 330-337.

65. Pereira, S., Mehta, S., McIntyre, A., Lobo, L., & Teasell, R. W. (2019). Functional electrical stimulation for improving gait in persons with chronic stroke. Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation, 19(6), 491-498.

66. Peretti, A., Amenta, F., Tayebati, S. K., Nittari, G., & Mahdi, S. S. (2017). Telerehabilitation: Review of the state-of-the-art and areas of application. JMIR Rehabilitation and Assistive Technologies, 4(2), e7.

67. Pollock, A., Baer, G., Campbell, P., Choo, P. L., Forster, A., Morris, J., Pomeroy, V. M., & Langhorne, P. (2014). Physical rehabilitation approaches for the recovery of function and mobility following stroke. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, (4), CD001920.

68. Quinn, T. J., Elliott, E., & Langhorne, P. (2017). Cognitive and mood assessment tools for use in stroke. Stroke, 49(2), 483-490.

69. Raine, S. (2009). The Bobath concept: Developments and current theoretical underpinning. In S. Raine, L. Meadows, & M. Lynch-Ellerington (Eds.), Bobath concept: Theory and clinical practice in neurological rehabilitation (pp. 1-22). Wiley-Blackwell.

70. Ramachandran, V. S., & Altschuler, E. L. (2009). The use of visual feedback, in particular mirror visual feedback, in restoring brain function. Brain, 132(7), 1693-1710.

71. Rensink, M., Schuurmans, M., Lindeman, E., & Hafsteinsdóttir, T. (2009). Task-oriented training in rehabilitation after stroke: Systematic review. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 65(4), 737-754.

72. Saleh, S., Fluet, G., Qiu, Q., Merians, A., Adamovich, S. V., & Tunik, E. (2017). Neural patterns of reorganization after intensive robot-assisted virtual reality therapy and repetitive task practice in patients with chronic stroke. Frontiers in Neurology, 8, 452.

73. Shepherd, R. B. (1991). Exercise and training to optimize functional motor performance in stroke: Driving neural reorganization? Neural Plasticity and Neurorehabilitaiton, 8(1), 181-189.