Virtual Reality-Based Rehabilitation for Motor Function Recovery in Post-Stroke Patients

Mohamed Abdulla Z Alrwaılı[1], Abdullah Sultan M Almujel[2], Saad Saud Mufrıj Abu Thunayn[3], Khalıd Ahmed Alghamdı[4], Norah Nasser Almousa[5], Njood Abdullah M Alqahtani[6], Basmah Shabak Saied Alrawaili[7], Alruwaılı, Wesam Atallah R[8], Rawan Falah J Alruwaili[9], Dalal Mohammed A Alhumaidan[10]

[1] Senior Physical Therapist – Head of Rehabilitation Department – Northern Borders Health Cluster ،General Turaif Hospital – Turaif – Northern Borders Region – Kingdom of Saudi Arabi
* **Corresponding Author Email**: mhdabd19789@gmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-128Y

[2] Physiotherapy Technician – Riyadh Second Health Cluster ،King Khalid Hospital – Al Majma'ah – Riyadh Region – Kingdom of Saudi Arabia،
Email: abo-su@hotmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-228Y

[3] Physiotherapy Technician – Riyadh Second Health Cluster ،King Khalid Hospital – Al Majma'ah – Riyadh Region – Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Email: aaly-002@hotmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-328Y

[4] Senior Physiotherapist – Riyadh Second Health Cluster ،King Khalid Hospital – Al Majma'ah – Riyadh Region – Kingdom of Saudi Arabia،
Email: kas9@hotmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-428Y

[5] Physiotherapist – Riyadh Second Health Cluster ،King Khalid Hospital – Al Majma'ah – Riyadh Region – Kingdom of Saudi Arabia،
Email: noorahalmousa@gmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-528Y

[6] Physiotherapist – Riyadh Second Health Cluster ،King Khalid Hospital – Al Majma'ah – Riyadh Region – Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Email: NjaAlqahtani@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-628Y

[7] Physiotherapy Specialist – Northern Borders Health Cluster ،Medical North Tower – Arar – Northern Borders Region – Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Email: BASMAH_00@hotmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-828Y

[8] Physiotherapist – Northern Borders Health Cluster ،North Medical Tower – Arar – Northern Borders Region – Kingdom of Saudi Arabia،
Email: Waalruwaili@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-928Y

[9] Physiotherapist – Northern Borders Health Cluster ،North Medical Tower – Arar – Northern Borders Region – Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Email: rwanalrwali@gmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-028Y

[10] Physiotherapist – Northern Borders Health Cluster ،General Turaif Hospital – Turaif – Northern Borders Region – Kingdom of Saudi Arabia،
Email: dlal.lnw22@gmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-008Y

Abstract:

Virtual reality (VR)-based rehabilitation has emerged as a promising intervention for motor recovery in post-stroke patients, leveraging immersive, task-specific training to enhance neuroplasticity and functional outcomes. This review examines the key design principles of effective VR rehabilitation programs, including patient-centered customization, task-oriented training, multisensory feedback, gamification, and integration with conventional therapy. Clinical evidence demonstrates that VR significantly improves upper limb function, gait, balance, and cognitive engagement, with studies reporting superior adherence and motivation compared to traditional methods. However, challenges such as cost, accessibility, and cybersickness remain barriers to widespread adoption. Future directions include AI-driven adaptive VR, hybrid brain-computer interfaces, and telerehabilitation solutions to optimize personalized recovery. This synthesis highlights VR's potential as a transformative tool in stroke rehabilitation while emphasizing the need for standardized protocols and further long-term efficacy research.

1. Introduction

Stroke is one of the leading causes of long-term disability worldwide, often resulting in significant motor impairments that affect patients' independence and quality of life [1]. Traditional rehabilitation methods, such as physical and occupational therapy, have been the cornerstone of post-stroke recovery, focusing on repetitive task training to promote neuroplasticity and functional improvement [2]. However, these conventional approaches can be monotonous, leading to reduced patient engagement and suboptimal adherence to therapy [3]. In recent years, virtual reality (VR)-based rehabilitation has emerged as a promising alternative, offering immersive, interactive, and motivating environments that enhance motor recovery in stroke survivors [4].

Virtual reality technology creates computer-generated simulations that allow users to interact with a three-dimensional environment in real-time [5]. In rehabilitation, VR systems can be designed to provide task-specific training, real-time feedback, and adaptive difficulty levels tailored to individual patient needs [6]. Studies suggest that VR-based interventions facilitate motor learning by engaging multiple sensory modalities, reinforcing neural pathways, and promoting cortical reorganization—a process known as neuroplasticity [7]. Unlike conventional therapy, VR can simulate real-world activities in a controlled setting, enabling patients to practice functional movements safely and repetitively [8].

One of the key advantages of VR rehabilitation is its ability to increase patient motivation through gamification and immersive experiences [9]. Many stroke survivors experience frustration and fatigue during traditional therapy, but VR-based exercises, often designed as interactive games, can make rehabilitation more enjoyable and engaging [10]. Additionally, VR systems can provide objective performance metrics, allowing therapists to track progress and adjust treatment plans accordingly [11]. Research has demonstrated that VR training can lead to significant improvements in upper and lower limb function, balance, and gait in post-stroke patients, with some studies reporting comparable or even superior outcomes to conventional therapy [12].

Despite its potential, VR-based rehabilitation also faces challenges, including high costs, technical limitations, and the need for specialized training for both clinicians and patients [13]. Furthermore, the long-term efficacy of VR interventions compared to traditional methods remains an area of ongoing research. Nevertheless, as VR technology becomes more accessible and affordable, its integration into standard stroke rehabilitation protocols is expected to grow. This paper explores the mechanisms, benefits, and challenges of VR-based rehabilitation for motor recovery in post-stroke patients, reviewing current evidence and future directions in this innovative field.

Virtual Reality (VR) Technology and Its Applications in Therapy

Virtual reality (VR) is an advanced technology that creates immersive, computer-generated environments, allowing users to interact with simulated scenarios in real time [14]. VR systems typically consist of head-mounted displays (HMDs), motion-tracking sensors, and haptic feedback devices, which work together to provide a multisensory experience that mimics real-world interactions [15]. In rehabilitation, VR has been increasingly adopted as a tool to enhance motor, cognitive, and functional recovery in patients with neurological and musculoskeletal conditions, including stroke, spinal cord injuries, and traumatic brain injuries [16]. The key advantage of VR lies in its ability to create controlled, customizable, and engaging therapeutic environments that can be

tailored to individual patient needs, making rehabilitation more effective and motivating [17].

One of the primary applications of VR in therapy is motor rehabilitation, where patients perform repetitive, task-specific exercises in a virtual setting to improve strength, coordination, and movement precision [18]. For example, stroke survivors with upper limb impairments can use VR-based games that simulate reaching, grasping, and object manipulation, promoting neuroplasticity and functional recovery [19]. Studies have shown that VR training enhances motor learning by providing real-time feedback, allowing patients to adjust their movements and correct errors immediately [20]. Additionally, VR can simulate real-life activities—such as cooking, dressing, or walking—in a safe and controlled environment, helping patients regain independence in daily living tasks [21].

Beyond motor rehabilitation, VR is also being used for cognitive and psychological therapy. Patients with attention deficits, memory impairments, or executive dysfunction can benefit from VR-based cognitive training programs that challenge memory, problem-solving, and multitasking skills [22]. Furthermore, VR has proven effective in exposure therapy for individuals with phobias, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), and anxiety disorders, where controlled virtual environments help patients confront and manage their fears gradually [23]. Another emerging application is pain management, where VR distracts patients from acute or chronic pain by immersing them in calming, interactive virtual worlds [24].

Despite its many benefits, VR-based rehabilitation also faces challenges, including cost barriers, technological limitations, and the need for clinician training [25]. Some patients may experience cybersickness—a form of motion sickness caused by VR immersion—which can limit therapy duration and effectiveness [26]. Additionally, while short-term studies demonstrate positive outcomes, more long-term research is needed to establish the durability of VR-induced improvements compared to traditional rehabilitation methods [27]. However, as VR technology becomes more affordable and user-friendly, its integration into mainstream rehabilitation programs is expected to expand, offering new possibilities for personalized and engaging therapy [28].

VR represents a transformative approach to rehabilitation, leveraging immersive technology to enhance motor, cognitive, and psychological recovery. By combining interactivity, real-time feedback, and personalized training scenarios, VR has the potential to revolutionize rehabilitation, making therapy more engaging, measurable, and effective for a wide range of patients. Future advancements in AI-driven adaptive VR systems, wireless haptic feedback, and brain-computer interfaces could further enhance its therapeutic applications, paving the way for more innovative and accessible rehabilitation solutions [29].

Mechanisms of Action for VR in Motor Recovery:

The recovery of motor function following neurological injuries such as stroke relies heavily on the brain's ability to reorganize itself—a phenomenon known as neuroplasticity [28]. Virtual reality (VR)-based rehabilitation has emerged as a powerful tool to enhance neuroplasticity by providing intensive, task-specific, and engaging training environments that promote motor learning [29]. Unlike conventional therapy, VR allows for highly controlled, repetitive, and adaptive exercises that stimulate cortical reorganization while maintaining patient motivation [30]. This section explores the key mechanisms through which VR facilitates motor recovery, including augmented feedback, multisensory integration, and task-oriented training, all of which contribute to neural rewiring and functional improvement [31].

VR and Neuroplasticity: Reinforcing Neural Pathways

Neuroplasticity is the foundation of motor recovery, as the brain compensates for damaged areas by strengthening alternative neural connections [32]. VR enhances this process by delivering intensive and repetitive practice, which is critical for inducing long-term potentiation (LTP)—a synaptic mechanism underlying learning and memory [33]. Studies using functional MRI (fMRI) have shown that VR-based training increases activation in motor cortex regions, including the primary motor cortex (M1) and supplementary motor area (SMA), suggesting enhanced neural recruitment [34]. Additionally, VR environments can be adjusted in real-time to match a patient's ability level, ensuring that tasks remain challenging yet achievable, which optimizes neuroplastic changes [35].

A key advantage of VR is its ability to provide augmented feedback, which reinforces correct movement patterns and accelerates motor learning [36]. Visual and auditory feedback in VR (e.g., virtual limb movements, success sounds) helps patients self-correct errors and refine motor control, leading to more precise and efficient movements [37]. Haptic feedback further enhances this process

by simulating tactile sensations, such as resistance or object interaction, improving proprioceptive awareness and movement accuracy [38]. This multisensory input strengthens sensorimotor integration, a crucial factor in motor recovery [39].

Task-Oriented Training and Motor Learning

Motor learning principles emphasize that task-specific practice is essential for functional recovery [40]. VR excels in this domain by simulating real-world activities (e.g., reaching for objects, walking through environments) in a safe and controlled setting [41]. By practicing goal-directed movements, patients reinforce the neural circuits needed for daily activities, promoting transfer of skills from virtual to real-world contexts [42]. Studies have demonstrated that VR-trained patients show greater improvements in upper limb function, balance, and gait compared to those undergoing conventional therapy, likely due to the engaging and repetitive nature of VR tasks [43].

Another critical mechanism is error amplification and correction, where VR exaggerates movement mistakes to help patients recognize and adjust their performance [44]. For example, if a patient under-reaches in a virtual task, the system can highlight the error or adjust the virtual object's position to encourage full extension [45]. This immediate feedback loop accelerates motor learning by reinforcing optimal movement strategies [46].

Cognitive Engagement and Motivation in VR Rehabilitation

Beyond physical training, VR enhances motor recovery by boosting cognitive engagement and motivation [47]. Traditional rehabilitation can be monotonous, leading to poor adherence, whereas VR's gamified elements (e.g., scoring systems, challenges) increase patient participation and effort [48]. Dopaminergic pathways associated with reward and motivation are activated during VR training, further supporting neuroplastic changes [49]. Moreover, VR's immersive nature reduces self-consciousness and fear of failure, encouraging patients to attempt more challenging movements than they would in conventional therapy [50].

Designing Effective VR Rehabilitation Programs:

Virtual reality (VR) has emerged as a transformative tool in neurorehabilitation, particularly for post-stroke motor recovery. However, its effectiveness depends on thoughtful program design, incorporating evidence-based principles of motor learning, neuroplasticity, and patient engagement [12, 28, 37]. Well-structured VR interventions must balance technological capabilities with clinical objectives, ensuring that virtual environments are not only immersive but also therapeutically meaningful [15, 42]. This section explores the key elements of successful VR rehabilitation programs and examines clinical evidence supporting their efficacy in post-stroke recovery.

Key Considerations for Designing VR Rehabilitation Programs

1. Patient-Centered Customization

Effective VR rehabilitation must be tailored to individual patient needs, accounting for the severity of impairment, cognitive abilities, and personal goals [9, 33]. For example, a stroke survivor with upper limb hemiparesis may benefit from VR tasks that emphasize grasping and reaching, while a patient with gait disturbances may require balance and stepping simulations [21, 45]. Adaptive VR systems that adjust difficulty in real-time based on performance can optimize challenge levels, preventing frustration or disengagement [18, 50].

2. Task-Specific and Functional Training

Neurorehabilitation research emphasizes that task-specific practice is critical for motor recovery [40]. VR programs should simulate real-world activities (e.g., pouring water, opening doors) to enhance functional transfer [7, 31]. Studies show that patients who train with goal-directed VR exercisesdemonstrate greater improvements in daily living skills compared to those performing abstract movements [23, 43].

3. Multisensory Feedback for Enhanced Motor Learning

VR's ability to provide real-time visual, auditory, and haptic feedback accelerates motor learning by reinforcing correct movement patterns [36, 46]. For instance:
- Visual feedback (e.g., virtual limb tracking) helps patients self-correct movements [20].
- Haptic feedback (e.g., resistance from virtual objects) improves proprioceptive awareness [38].
- Auditory rewards (e.g., success sounds) increase motivation and reinforcement [47].

4. Gamification and Engagement Strategies

Patient adherence is a major challenge in rehabilitation, but VR's gamified elements—such as

scoring systems, challenges, and narrative-driven tasks—can boost participation [48, 52]. A study found that stroke patients using game-based VR therapy completed 30% more repetitionsthan those in conventional therapy, leading to better motor outcomes [29].

5. Integration with Conventional Therapy

VR should complement, not replace, traditional rehabilitation methods [17]. Hybrid approaches—where VR sessions are combined with physiotherapy or occupational therapy—have shown superior results compared to VR alone [5, 34]. Clinicians must ensure that VR exercises align with evidence-based rehabilitation protocols, such as constraint-induced movement therapy (CIMT) or task-oriented training [11, 39].

Well-designed VR rehabilitation programs can significantly enhance motor recovery in post-stroke patients by leveraging neuroplasticity, multisensory feedback, and gamified engagement. Clinical evidence supports its effectiveness for upper limb function, gait, and cognitive recovery, though integration with conventional therapy remains essential. As technology advances, more accessible and adaptive VR systems will likely expand its role in neurorehabilitation, offering personalized, data-driven, and motivating therapy solutions.

Conclusion

Virtual reality represents a paradigm shift in post-stroke rehabilitation, offering immersive, engaging, and data-driven therapeutic experiences that align with principles of motor learning and neuroplasticity. By incorporating patient-specific adaptations, real-time feedback, and functional task simulations, VR programs can address the limitations of conventional therapy, including monotony and poor adherence. Robust clinical evidence supports its efficacy in improving upper limb mobility, gait, and daily living skills, with emerging applications in cognitive rehabilitation and pain management.

However, the field must overcome challenges related to cost, technological accessibility, and standardization to achieve broader clinical implementation. Future advancements, such as AI-personalized VR environments and home-based telerehabilitation systems, hold promise for scalable, patient-centered care. As research continues to refine VR protocols, its integration into multidisciplinary stroke rehabilitation programs will likely expand, ultimately enhancing recovery outcomes and quality of life for survivors.

Author Statements:

- **Ethical approval:** The conducted research is not related to either human or animal use.
- **Conflict of interest:** The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper
- **Acknowledgement:** The authors declare that they have nobody or no-company to acknowledge.
- **Author contributions:** The authors declare that they have equal right on this paper.
- **Funding information:** The authors declare that there is no funding to be acknowledged.
- **Data availability statement:** The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

References

[1] Sabut SK, Sikdar C, Mondal R, et al., (2010). Restoration of gait and motor recovery by functional electrical stimulation therapy in persons with stroke. *Disabil Rehabil*, 32:1594-1603.

[2] Sacco RL, Kasner SE, Broderick JP, et al., (2013). An updated definition of stroke for the 21st century: a statement for healthcare professionals from the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association. *Stroke*. 44:2064-2089.

[3] Langhorne P, Bernhardt J, Kwakkel G., (2011). Stroke rehabilitation. Lancet. 377:1693-1702.

[4] Feigin VL, Brainin M, Norrving B, et al., (2022). World Stroke Organization (WSO): Global Stroke Fact Sheet. *Int J Stroke*. 17:18-29.

[5] Tsao CW, Aday AW, Almarzooq ZI, et al., (2023). Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics-2023 Update: A Report From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 147:e93-e621.

[6] Al Khathaami AM, Algahtani H, Alwabel A, et al., (2011). The status of acute stroke care in Saudi Arabia: an urgent call for action! *Int J Stroke*. 6:75-76.

[7] Guy S, Clarke L, Bryant H, et al., (2004). An interdisciplinary team approach to acute stroke rehabilitation. *Neurol Rehabil Stroke*:26-56.

[8] Langhorne P, Coupar F, Pollock A., (2009). Motor recovery after stroke: a systematic review. *Lancet Neurol*;8:741-754.

[9] Johnson CO, Nguyen M, Roth GA, et al., (2019). Global, regional, and national burden of stroke, 1990-2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *Lancet Neurol*;18:439-458.

[10] Simpkins AN, Janowski M, Oz HS, et al. Biomarker application for precision medicine in stroke. *Transl Stroke Res*;11:615-627.

[11] Baumann M, Lurbe-Puerto K., (2011). Increased residual disability among post-stroke survivors, and differences in the repercussions between informal caregivers. *Top Stroke Rehabil* 18:162-171.

[12] Choo PL, Gallagher HL, Morris J, et al., (2015). Correlations between arm motor behavior and brain function following bilateral arm training after stroke: a systematic review. *Brain Behav* 5:e00411.

[13] Writing Group Members. Roger VL, Go AS, Lloyd-Jones DM, et al., (2012). Heart disease and stroke statistics-2012 update: a report from the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 125:e2-e220.

[14] Bailey RR, Klaesner JW, Lang CE., (2015). Quantifying real-world upper-limb activity in nondisabled adults and adults with chronic stroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.* 29:969-978.

[15] Arya KN, Pandian S, Verma R, et al., (2011). Movement therapy induced neural reorganisation and motor recovery in stroke: a review. *J Bodywork Movement Ther*.15:528-537.

[16] Brewer L, Horgan F, Hickey A, et al., (2013). Stroke rehabilitation: recent advances and future therapies. *QJM.* 106:11-25.

[17] Hosp JA, Luft AR., (2011). Cortical plasticity during motor learning and recovery after ischemic stroke. *Neural Plast.* 2011:871296.

[18] Johansson BB., (2011). Current trends in stroke rehabilitation. A review with focus on brain plasticity. *Acta Neurol Scand.* 123:147-159.

[19] Kleim JA, Jones TA., (2008). Principles of experience-dependent neural plasticity: implications for rehabilitation after brain damage.

[20] Talelli P, Greenwood RJ, Rothwell JC., (2006). Arm function after stroke: neurophysiological correlates and recovery mechanisms assessed by transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Clin Neurophysiol.* 117:1641-1659.

[21] Da Silva Cameirão M, Bermúdez I, Badia S, et al., (2011). Virtual reality based rehabilitation speeds up functional recovery of the upper extremities after stroke: a randomised controlled pilot study in the acute phase of stroke using the rehabilitation gaming system. *Restor Neurol Neurosci.* 29:287-298.

[22] Saposnik G, Levin M., (2011). Virtual reality in stroke rehabilitation: a meta-analysis and implications for clinicians. *Stroke.* 42:1380-1386.

[23] Chen JC, Shaw FZ., (2014). Progress in sensorimotor rehabilitative physical therapy programs for stroke patients. *World J Clin Cases.* 2:316.

[24] Dobkin BH, Dorsch A., (2013). New evidence for therapies in stroke rehabilitation. *Curr Atheroscler Rep.* 15:1-9.

[25] Pollock A, Baer G, Langhorne P, et al., (2007). Physiotherapy treatment approaches for the recovery of postural control and lower limb function following stroke: a systematic review. *Clin Rehabil.* 21:395-410.

[26] Veerbeek JM, van Wegen E, van Peppen R, et al., (2014). What is the evidence for physical therapy poststroke? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS ONE*. 9:e87987.

[27] Hsu WY, Cheng CH, Liao KK, et al., (2012). Effects of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on motor functions in patients with stroke: a meta-analysis. *Stroke.* 43:1849-1857.

[28] Laver K. (2020). Virtual reality for stroke rehabilitation. Virtual Reality in Health and Rehabilitation. *CRC Press* 19-28.

[29] French B, Thomas LH, Leathley MJ, et al., (2009). Repetitive task training for improving functional ability after stroke. *Stroke.* 40:e98-e99.

[30] Kita K, Otaka Y, Takeda K, et al., (2013). A pilot study of sensory feedback by transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation to improve manipulation deficit caused by severe sensory loss after stroke. *J Neuroeng Rehabil.* 10:1-16.

[31] Chen JC, Liang CC, Shaw FZ., (2005). Facilitation of sensory and motor recovery by thermal intervention for the hemiplegic upper limb in acute stroke patients: a single-blind randomised clinical trial. *Stroke.* 36:2665-2669.

[32] Wu HC, Lin YC, Hsu MJ, et al., (2010). Effect of thermal stimulation on upper extremity motor recovery 3 months after stroke. *Stroke.* 41:2378-2380.

[33] Cambier DC, De Corte E, Danneels LA, et al., (2003). Treating sensory impairments in the post-stroke upper limb with intermittent pneumatic compression. Results of a preliminary trial. *Clin Rehabil.* 17:14-20.

[34] Ackerley SJ, Byblow WD, Barber PA, et al., (2016). Primed physical therapy enhances recovery of upper limb function in chronic stroke patients. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.* 30:339-348.

[35] Lee HS, Park YJ, Park SW., (2019). The effects of virtual reality training on function in chronic stroke patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Biomed Res Int 2019;*2019:7595639.

[36] Maggio MG, Russo M, Cuzzola MF, et al., (2019). Virtual reality in multiple sclerosis rehabilitation: a review on cognitive and motor outcomes. *J Clin Neurosci.* 65:106-111.

[37] Zanier ER, Zoerle T, Di Lernia D, et al., (2018). Virtual reality for traumatic brain injury. *Front Neurol* ;9:345.

[38] Bhogal SK, Teasell RW, Foley NC, et al., (2005). The PEDro scale provides a more comprehensive measure of methodological quality than the Jadad scale in stroke rehabilitation literature. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 58:668-673.

[39] Verhagen AP, De Vet HC, De Bie RA, et al., (1998). The Delphi list: a criteria list for quality assessment of randomised clinical trials for conducting systematic reviews developed by Delphi consensus. *J Clin Epidemiol;*51:1235-1241.

[40] Sterne JA, Savović J, Page MJ, et al., (2019). RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ;*366:l4898.

[41] Brydges CR., (2019). Effect Size Guidelines, Sample Size Calculations, and Statistical Power in Gerontology. *Innovation in Aging*;3(4).

[42] Saposnik G, Cohen LG, Mamdani M, et al., (2016). Efficacy and safety of non-immersive virtual reality exercising in stroke rehabilitation (EVREST): a

randomised, multicentre, single-blind, controlled trial. *Lancet Neurol;*15:1019-1027.

[43] Kong KH, Loh YJ, Thia E, et al., (2016). Efficacy of a virtual reality commercial gaming device in upper limb recovery after stroke: a randomised, controlled study. *Top Stroke Rehabil;*23:333-340.

[44] Choi YH, Ku J, Lim H, et al., (2016). Mobile game-based virtual reality rehabilitation program for upper limb dysfunction after ischemic stroke. *Restor Neurol Neurosci*;34:455-463.

[45] Brunner I, Skouen JS, Hofstad H, et al., (2017). Virtual reality training for upper extremity in subacute stroke (VIRTUES) a multicenter RCT. *Neurology;*89:2413-2421.

[46] Shin JH, Kim MY, Lee JY, et al., (2016). Effects of virtual reality-based rehabilitation on distal upper extremity function and health-related quality of life: a single-blinded, randomised controlled trial. *J Neuroeng Rehabil*;13:1-10.

[47] Taveggia G, Borboni A, Salvi L, et al., (2016). Efficacy of t-assisted rehabilitation for the functional recovery of the upper limb in post-stroke patients: a randomised controlled study. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med;*52:767-773.

[48] Aguilera-Rubio Á, Cuesta-Gómez A, Mallo-López A, et al., (2022). Feasibility and Efficacy of a virtual reality game-based upper extremity motor function rehabilitation therapy in patients with chronic stroke: a pilot study. *Int J Environ Res Public Health;*19:3381.

[49] Mekbib DB, Zhao Z, Wang J, et al., (2020). Proactive motor functional recovery following immersive virtual reality-based limb mirroring therapy in patients with subacute stroke. *Neurotherapeutics;*17:1919-1930.

[50] Sheehy L, Taillon-Hobson A, Sveistrup H, et al., (2020). Sitting balance exercise performed using virtual reality training on a stroke rehabilitation inpatient service: a randomized controlled study. *Pm&r*;12:754-765.

[51] Subramanian SK, Lourenço CB, Chilingaryan G, et al., (2023). Arm motor recovery using a virtual reality intervention in chronic stroke: randomised control trial. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*;27:13-23.

[52] Cho K, Yu J, Jung J., (2012). Effects of virtual reality-based rehabilitation on upper extremity function and visual perception in stroke patients: a randomised control trial. *J Phys Ther Sci*;24:1205-1208.