Frontiers in Emerging Technology
ISSN *(Online)*: 3104-509X
Volume 1, Issue 1, May-June 2025, Page 23-38

Review Article
Received: 01-05-2025| Accepted: 10-06-2025| Published: 22-06-2025

Extended Reality for Post-Stroke Neuroplasticity Rehabilitation: Harnessing Technology to Rewire the Brain

Md. Kafi Ahmed*[1]

Abstract

Stroke remains a leading cause of long-term disability worldwide, often resulting in significant motor, cognitive, and sensory impairments. The cornerstone of recovery lies in harnessing the brain's innate capacity for neuroplasticity – the ability to reorganize its structure and function. Traditional rehabilitation approaches, while beneficial, face limitations in intensity, engagement, personalization, and accessibility. Extended Reality (XR), encompassing Virtual Reality (VR), Augmented Reality (AR), and Mixed Reality (MR), emerges as a transformative tool to overcome these barriers. This comprehensive review explores the intersection of XR technology and neuroplasticity principles in post-stroke rehabilitation. We delve into the mechanisms of neuroplasticity, elucidate how XR interventions are uniquely positioned to exploit these mechanisms through immersive, task-specific, engaging, and adaptable training environments. A critical analysis of current evidence from clinical trials is presented, highlighting the efficacy of XR for various post-stroke deficits. We further discuss the technological, clinical, and accessibility challenges facing widespread adoption and outline promising future directions, including integration with brain-computer interfaces (BCIs), advanced artificial intelligence (AI) for personalization, and telerehabilitation models. The evidence strongly suggests that XR is not merely a novel gadget, but a powerful neuromodulatory platform capable of optimizing neuroplasticity and driving significant functional recovery after stroke.

Keywords

Extended Reality, Virtual Reality, Augmented Reality, Stroke Rehabilitation, Neuroplasticity, Brain Plasticity, Motor Recovery, Cognitive Rehabilitation, Neuromodulation, Neurorehabilitation Technology

1 Independent Scholar

INTRODUCTION

Stroke, a sudden disruption of blood flow to the brain (ischemic) or rupture of a blood vessel (hemorrhagic), is a global health crisis. It is the second leading cause of death and a primary cause of acquired adult disability worldwide (World Health Organization, 2023). Survivors frequently contend with debilitating sequelae, including hemiparesis, impaired balance and coordination, aphasia, neglect, sensory deficits, and cognitive impairments (Feigin *et al.,* 2022). These deficits profoundly impact independence, quality of life, and societal participation, imposing substantial economic and social burdens (Ovbiagele & Nguyen-Huynh, 2011).

The foundation for recovery after stroke lies in **neuroplasticity –** the brain's remarkable ability to adapt its structure and function in response to experience, learning, and injury (Cramer *et al.,* 2011). This involves mechanisms such as synaptic strengthening (long-term potentiation, LTP), synaptic weakening (long-term depression, LTD), axonal sprouting, dendritic remodeling, cortical map reorganization, and even neurogenesis in specific regions (Murphy & Corbett, 2009). Rehabilitation aims to strategically leverage these plastic processes through targeted, repetitive, and progressively challenging practice of functional tasks.

However, traditional post-stroke rehabilitation faces significant challenges:
Intensity and Repetition: Achieving the high doses of task-specific practice required for driving neuroplastic change is often constrained by therapist time, patient fatigue, and resource limitations (Lang *et al.,* 2009).

***Corresponding Author:** Md. Kafi Ahmed

Engagement and Motivation: Repetitive exercises can become monotonous, leading to reduced patient motivation and adherence (Holden, 2005).

Task Specificity and Context: Transferring gains from isolated exercises to real-world activities can be difficult. Traditional settings may lack ecological validity (Kitago & Krakauer, 2013).

Feedback and Measurement: Providing precise, real-time feedback and objectively measuring subtle progress can be challenging.

Accessibility and Continuity: Access to specialized rehabilitation centers is often limited, especially in rural areas, and continuity of care post-discharge is frequently inadequate (Teasell *et al.,* 2012).

Extended Reality (XR) presents a paradigm shift with the potential to address these limitations effectively. XR is an umbrella term encompassing immersive technologies that blend the physical and virtual worlds to varying degrees:

Virtual Reality (VR): Creates a completely computer-generated, immersive environment that replaces the user's real-world surroundings, typically experienced through a head-mounted display (HMD) and often involving motion tracking and controllers.

Augmented Reality (AR): Superimposes digital information (images, text, 3D objects) onto the user's view of the real world, usually via smartphones, tablets, or specialized glasses (e.g., Microsoft HoloLens).

Mixed Reality (MR): Represents the most seamless integration, where virtual objects interact dynamically with the real world in real-time, anchored to physical surfaces and responding to user interaction (e.g., user virtually pushes a real table).

By creating controllable, engaging, and ecologically valid environments, XR offers unprecedented opportunities to deliver intensive, motivating, task-specific, and measurable rehabilitation tailored to individual needs, thereby optimizing the conditions for neuroplasticity. This article comprehensively examines the application of XR technologies for enhancing neuroplasticity and functional recovery in post-stroke rehabilitation, reviewing the underlying mechanisms, current evidence, challenges, and future prospects.

Understanding Neuroplasticity in Stroke Recovery

Neuroplasticity is the fundamental biological process underpinning recovery after stroke. While the adult brain was once considered relatively fixed, extensive research has demonstrated its dynamic capacity for reorganization throughout life, particularly in response to injury (Nudo, 2013).

Key Mechanisms of Neuroplasticity (See Table 1):

Cortical Reorganization: Undamaged brain regions, both adjacent to the lesion (perilesional) and in the contralesional hemisphere, can take over functions previously mediated by damaged areas. This involves expansion of cortical representations for affected functions (e.g., hand movement) in surviving tissue (Nudo *et al.,* 1996).

Synaptic Plasticity: The strength of connections between neurons (synapses) can be modified. Long-Term Potentiation (LTP) strengthens synapses based on correlated activity ("cells that fire together, wire together"), while Long-Term Depression

(LTD) weakens unused connections (Bliss & Cooke, 2011). These mechanisms are crucial for learning and memory, central to rehabilitation.

Axonal Sprouting and Dendritic Remodeling: Surviving neurons can grow new axon terminals (sprouting) and dendritic branches, forming new connections or strengthening existing ones within existing networks (Carmichael, 2006). Dendritic spines, the sites of most excitatory synapses, show significant plasticity.

Unmasking of Latent Pathways: Preexisting, but functionally silent or underutilized, neural pathways can be recruited and strengthened after damage (Jacobs & Donoghue, 1991).

Cross-Modal Plasticity: Brain regions typically dedicated to one sense (e.g., vision) can adapt to process information from other senses (e.g., touch or hearing) if the primary input is lost, though this can sometimes lead to maladaptive outcomes (Bavelier & Neville, 2002).

Neurogenesis: While primarily limited to the hippocampus and subventricular zone in adults, evidence suggests stroke can stimulate the production of new neurons, which may migrate to injured areas, though their functional integration remains under investigation (Ohab *et al.,* 2006).

Time Course and Influencing Factors:
Neuroplasticity is most robust in the early weeks and months after stroke (the so-called "critical period"), but significant potential for reorganization persists for years (Zeiler & Krakauer, 2013). Key factors influencing neuroplasticity include:

- Experience and Training: Repetitive, task-specific, challenging, and meaningful practice is the primary driver. Intensity and salience matter (Kleim & Jones, 2008).
- Motivation and Attention: Engaged attention and motivated effort enhance neurochemical signaling (e.g., dopamine, acetylcholine) that facilitates plasticity (Bao *et al.,* 2001).
- Feedback: Precise, timely, and meaningful feedback reinforces correct movements and promotes learning (Winstein *et al.,* 2014).
- Sensory Input: Multimodal sensory feedback (visual, proprioceptive, auditory) associated with movement strengthens motor engrams (Lotze *et al.,* 2003).
- Non-Invasive Brain Stimulation (NIBS): Techniques like transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) or transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) can modulate cortical excitability and potentially prime the brain for therapy (Lefaucheur *et al.,* 2020).
- Pharmacology: Certain medications may modulate plasticity (e.g., amphetamines, SSRIs), though clinical translation remains complex (Chollet *et al.,* 2011).
- Age, Comorbidities, and Lesion Characteristics: These factors can modulate the brain's plastic potential (Bavelier *et al.,* 2010).

Table 1: Summary of Key Neuroplasticity Mechanisms Relevant to Stroke Recovery

Mechanism	Description	Relevance to Stroke Rehabilitation
Cortical Reorganization	Undamaged brain regions expand their functional representation to take	Basis for recovery of motor, sensory, language functions.

(Map Expansion)	over lost functions. Perilesional and contralesional areas are key sites.	Training drives beneficial reorganization.
Synaptic Plasticity (LTP/LTD)	Long-Term Potentiation (LTP): Strengthening of synaptic connections based on correlated activity. Long-Term Depression (LTD): Weakening of unused synapses.	Fundamental cellular mechanism for learning and memory. Repetitive, task-specific practice induces LTP in relevant circuits.
Axonal Sprouting	Growth of new axon terminals from surviving neurons to form new connections or strengthen existing ones.	Re-establishes neural circuitry. Can be adaptive (connecting to correct targets) or maladaptive (leading to spasticity). Guided by activity.
Dendritic Remodeling	Changes in dendritic branching complexity and density of dendritic spines (sites of synapses).	Increases the potential surface area for synaptic connections, enhancing network capacity and integration. Activity-dependent.
Unmasking of Latent Pathways	Strengthening and utilization of pre-existing but functionally silent neural connections.	Provides an alternative route for function. Training can selectively strengthen these pathways.
Cross-Modal Plasticity	Brain regions dedicated to one sensory modality adapt to process input from another modality.	Can support compensation (e.g., increased visual reliance for balance) but may also interfere (e.g., tinnitus).
Neurogenesis	Generation of new neurons (primarily in hippocampus and SVZ). Some evidence for migration to injured areas post-stroke.	Potential long-term contribution to repair, though functional integration and significance in humans are still debated.

Note: SVZ = Subventricular Zone.

Extended Reality: An Overview

XR technologies create a spectrum of experiences blending the physical and digital worlds. Understanding their components and capabilities is crucial for appreciating their rehabilitation potential (see Table 2).

Defining the XR Spectrum:

1. Virtual Reality (VR): Offers the deepest level of immersion. Users are fully immersed in a computer-generated 3D environment, typically using an HMD that blocks out the real world. Head and often hand/body tracking allow users to look around and interact naturally within the virtual space using controllers or hand tracking. Examples: Oculus Quest, HTC Vive.
2. Augmented Reality (AR): Enhances the real world by overlaying digital content onto the user's view. The physical environment remains primary, with digital elements appearing as if coexisting within it. Commonly accessed via smartphones/tablets (e.g., Pokémon GO) or optical see-through glasses (e.g., Microsoft HoloLens, Magic Leap). Interaction often involves touchscreens, gestures, or voice.
3. Mixed Reality (MR): Represents the most advanced integration. Virtual objects are not just overlaid but anchored to and

interact with the real world in real-time. A virtual ball, for instance, can bounce off a real table. This requires sophisticated spatial mapping and understanding. Primarily experienced via advanced HMDs like HoloLens 2.

Hardware Enabling XR:
Head-Mounted Displays (HMDs):

- The primary interface for immersive VR and MR. Types include:
- *Tethered:* Connected to a powerful PC (e.g., HTC Vive Pro, Valve Index). Highest fidelity.
- *Standalone:* Self-contained computers (e.g., Meta Quest series, Pico Neo). High accessibility, moderate fidelity.
- *Smartphone-based:* Utilize a smartphone screen (e.g., older Google Cardboard). Low cost, limited capability.
- *Optical See-Through (OST):* For AR/MR (e.g., HoloLens, Magic Leap). Allow direct view of real world with digital overlay.
- *Video See-Through (VST):* Use cameras to capture the real world and blend it with virtual elements on a screen inside the HMD (used in some MR/AR devices and VR passthrough modes).

Tracking Systems:
Essential for interaction and immersion.

- *Inside-Out:* Cameras/sensors on the HMD track the environment and controllers relative to the headset (common in standalone VR).
- *Outside-In:* External base stations/lasers track the HMD and controllers (common in tethered VR, high precision).
- *Hand Tracking:* Cameras on the HMD track finger and hand movements without controllers.
- *Eye Tracking:* Integrated into some HMDs to track gaze direction (for interaction, rendering optimization, and assessment).

Input Devices:
Controllers (with buttons, triggers, joysticks, haptics), data gloves, treadmills, motion capture suits, and increasingly, natural hand/gesture recognition.

Computing Platforms:
High-performance PCs for tethered VR, integrated systems for standalone devices, cloud computing for complex simulations.

Haptics:
Devices providing tactile feedback (vibration, force feedback) to enhance realism and proprioceptive input (e.g., gloves, vests, specialized controllers).

Software and Content:
XR rehabilitation software ranges from off-the-shelf games adapted for therapy to purpose-built clinical applications:

- Motor Rehabilitation: Simulations of ADLs (cooking, dressing), virtual gyms for limb exercises, balance training on virtual platforms, gait training in simulated environments, fine motor tasks (grasping, manipulating objects).
- Cognitive Rehabilitation: Memory games in immersive settings, attention training with complex distractions, problem-solving scenarios (e.g., navigating a virtual mall), executive function tasks (planning, sequencing), neglect therapy using virtual environments with salient stimuli in the neglected field.
- Sensory Rehabilitation: Graded sensory stimulation tasks, mirror therapy using virtual limbs, sensory discrimination exercises.
- Language Rehabilitation (Aphasia): Virtual conversational partners, word retrieval games in contextual settings, comprehension exercises within narratives.

Psychological/Emotional Support: Exposure therapy for anxiety, relaxation environments, virtual support groups.

Current Applications in Healthcare:
Beyond stroke, XR is used for:

- Surgical Training and Planning: Practicing complex procedures in risk-free VR simulations; using AR to overlay patient scans during surgery.
- Phobia and PTSD Treatment: Graduated exposure therapy in controlled virtual environments.
- Pain Management: Distraction therapy during procedures, phantom limb pain treatment using VR mirror therapy.
- Physical Therapy: For orthopedic conditions, balance training, fall prevention in elderly.
- Medical Education: Anatomy visualization, patient interaction simulations.

Table 2: Overview of XR Technologies and Their Applications in Stroke Rehabilitation

Technology	Immersion Level	Hardware Examples	Key Characteristics	Primary Stroke Rehab Applications	Examples of Specific Tasks/Interventions
Virtual Reality (VR)	High (Fully Immersive)	Meta Quest 2/3/Pro, HTC Vive Focus 3, Pico Neo 3/4, Valve Index (tethered)	Blocks out real world, full sensory engagement (visual, auditory), tracked interaction.	Motor training (upper/lower limb, gait, balance), Cognitive rehab (attention, memory, EF, neglect), ADL simulation, Aphasia therapy (conversational scenarios), Motivation & Engagement booster.	Reaching/grasping virtual objects; Walking on virtual terrains; Playing cognitive games in immersive worlds; Practicing cooking in a virtual kitchen; Engaging in virtual group therapy for communication.
Augmented Reality (AR)	Low-Moderate (Real-World Anchored)	Microsoft HoloLens 1/2, Magic Leap 1/2, Smartphones/Tablets (e.g., AR apps)	Digital overlays on real world, maintains connection to physical environment, contextually relevant information.	Motor guidance (movement cues, biofeedback), Neglect therapy (highlighting neglected space), ADL training (step-by-step instructions), Balance training with real-time feedback, Mirror Therapy enhancement.	Seeing movement targets projected onto real surfaces; Visual cues highlighting the left side during navigation; Text/image prompts overlaid on real objects during dressing practice; Real-time sway feedback during standing; Superimposing a moving virtual limb over the paretic limb.
Mixed Reality	Moderate-High	Microsoft HoloLens 2 (primary clinical	Virtual objects interact	Complex motor-	Manipulating virtual tools that interact

(MR)	(Seamless Blend)	example currently)	realistically with real world (occlusion, physics), anchored to physical surfaces, advanced spatial understanding.	cognitive integration tasks, Advanced ADL training with virtual/physical object interaction, Spatial navigation training, Collaborative rehabilitation (therapist sees patient's virtual cues).	with real workbenches; Playing a game where virtual balls bounce off real furniture; Practicing navigating a cluttered room with virtual obstacles dynamically placed; Therapist seeing patient's intended movement path visualized.

Note: ADL = Activities of Daily Living; EF = Executive Function.

XR for Stroke Rehabilitation: Mechanisms of Action

XR is not merely a delivery mechanism for conventional exercises; it acts as a potent neuromodulatory tool by creating environments specifically designed to maximize the principles of experience-dependent neuroplasticity.

Amplifying Key Drivers of Neuroplasticity: High-Intensity, Task-Specific Repetition:

XR allows for the delivery of hundreds of goal-directed movements within a single session, far exceeding typical conventional therapy doses. Tasks can be precisely tailored to the patient's impairment level and recovery goals (e.g., reaching, grasping, stepping, navigating), ensuring relevance. The virtual environment provides the *context* for the task, enhancing ecological validity and promoting transfer to real life (Laver *et al.,* 2017). Repetition occurs naturally within engaging scenarios rather than as rote drills.

Enhanced Motivation and Engagement:

Immersive and interactive environments are inherently more engaging and enjoyable than repetitive exercises. Gamification elements (points, levels, challenges, rewards) trigger dopamine release, a key neuromodulator for synaptic plasticity and learning (Bao *et al.,* 2001). Increased engagement leads to greater effort, longer practice durations, and better adherence – all critical for inducing lasting neuroplastic change (Proffitt *et al.,* 2019).

Rich, Multimodal Feedback:

XR provides precise, immediate, and salient feedback impossible in the real world:

Visual: Highlighting correct movement paths, showing limb position (even if proprioception is impaired), demonstrating movement consequences (e.g., hitting a target, spilling virtual water).

Auditory: Sounds indicating success/failure, collision, or providing rhythmic cues.

Haptic (increasingly available): Vibrations or force feedback simulating touch, resistance, or object interaction.

Proprioceptive Enhancement: Visualizing normally invisible movements (e.g., scapular rotation) can improve proprioceptive awareness and integration. This multimodal feedback reinforces correct movement patterns and accelerates motor learning

(Levin *et al.,* 2015), strengthening synaptic connections.

Error Augmentation and Graded Challenge:
XR allows therapists to manipulate the environment to either amplify errors (making them more noticeable to the sensory system, promoting error-based learning and correction) or reduce task difficulty (scaffolding) to ensure success and maintain motivation. The challenge level can be dynamically adjusted based on performance, keeping the patient in the optimal "zone of proximal development" for driving plasticity (Subramanian *et al.,* 2013).

Attention and Focus:
Immersive environments can minimize real-world distractions, allowing patients to focus intensely on the rehabilitation task. Furthermore, tasks can be designed to specifically train attention (e.g., dual-tasking in VR) or direct attention towards neglected spaces (e.g., AR cues in hemispatial neglect) (Tsirlin *et al.,* 2009).

Targeting Specific Neuroplastic Mechanisms:
Cortical Map Reorganization:
Intensive, task-specific practice in XR drives use-dependent expansion of cortical representations in perilesional areas or homologous contralesional regions, akin to Constraint-Induced Movement Therapy (CIMT) principles but potentially in more engaging formats (Adamovich *et al.,* 2009).

Synaptic Plasticity (LTP/LTD):
The combination of high repetition, focused attention, motivation (dopaminergic drive), and meaningful task practice creates ideal conditions for inducing LTP in neural circuits involved in the trained functions. Concurrently, LTD weakens connections supporting maladaptive patterns (e.g., synergistic movement patterns).

Sensory-Motor Integration:
XR tasks often require integrating visual, auditory, and (ideally) haptic feedback with motor output. This constant recalibration strengthens sensory-motor loops and improves proprioception, crucial for motor control (Karamians *et al.,* 2020).

Cognitive-Motor Integration:
Many XR tasks involve complex environments requiring simultaneous motor performance and cognitive processing (navigation, decision-making, problem-solving). This trains integrated neural networks, promoting functional recovery beyond isolated domains (Plummer-D'Amato *et al.,* 2012).

Promoting Functional Recovery Through Experience:
By simulating real-world activities (ADLs, community navigation, social interactions) within a safe, controlled, yet challenging environment, XR allows patients to practice and relearn functional skills. This contextual learning enhances generalization – the transfer of skills learned in therapy to everyday life – a crucial but often elusive goal in rehabilitation (Weiss *et al.,* 2006). The ability to practice in environments that would be physically impossible, unsafe, or impractical in the clinic (e.g., crossing a busy street, climbing stairs) is a unique advantage.

Review of Current Evidence
A substantial and rapidly growing body of research investigates the efficacy of XR for post-stroke rehabilitation across various domains. While heterogeneity exists in study designs, populations, technologies used, and outcome measures, the overall trend is positive. (See Table 3 for a summary of key recent trials).

Motor Rehabilitation:

Upper Limb Function:

Numerous systematic reviews and meta-analyses demonstrate that VR/XR interventions significantly improve upper limb motor function (Fugl-Meyer Assessment - FMA-UE, Action Research Arm Test - ARAT), range of motion, and strength compared to conventional therapy alone or no therapy, particularly when delivered as an adjunct (Aminov *et al.,* 2018; Chen *et al.,* 2020; Lee *et al.,* 2020). Effects are often comparable to dose-matched conventional therapy, but with higher patient motivation and engagement. Task-specific VR training shows particular promise.

Lower Limb Function, Gait, and Balance:

XR interventions, especially using treadmills with VR environments or balance training platforms, show significant benefits for walking speed, endurance (6-Minute Walk Test), balance (Berg Balance Scale), and functional mobility (Timed Up and Go) compared to conventional training (Kim *et al.,* 2021; Corbetta *et al.,* 2015). The dynamic visual flow and cognitive challenges inherent in VR walking scenarios enhance gait adaptability and stability.

Hand Function and Dexterity:

VR systems using hand tracking or specialized gloves can effectively train fine motor control, grasp, and dexterity (Box and Block Test, Jebsen-Taylor Hand Function Test), often exceeding gains from traditional fine motor exercises (Henderson *et al.,* 2007).

Cognitive Rehabilitation:

Attention and Neglect: VR and AR are powerful tools for assessing and rehabilitating spatial neglect. By manipulating the virtual environment and providing salient cues in the neglected field, XR can drive attention retraining and improve functional scanning (Kim *et al.,* 2011; Fordell *et al.,* 2016). VR also effectively trains sustained, selective, and divided attention through engaging tasks.

Executive Functions (EF) & Memory:

VR simulations of complex, real-world scenarios (e.g., shopping, cooking, managing finances) provide ecologically valid platforms for training planning, problem-solving, working memory, and cognitive flexibility. Studies show improvements in EF tests and self-reported functional cognitive abilities (Zucchella *et al.,* 2014; Optale *et al.,* 2010). Memory training within immersive contexts enhances encoding and recall.

Other Domains:

Aphasia:

VR platforms offer safe environments for practicing communication skills (naming, comprehension, conversation) with virtual partners or therapists, showing promise for improving language function and reducing communication anxiety (Bersano *et al.,* 2020; Cherney *et al.,* 2014).

Activities of Daily Living (ADLs):

VR simulations of dressing, cooking, shopping, and other ADLs allow safe practice and error-making, leading to improved real-world independence (Standen & Brown, 2005).

Psychological Well-being:

VR relaxation environments reduce anxiety and depression symptoms post-stroke. Virtual social interaction can combat isolation. Graded exposure therapy in VR addresses fear of falling or community re-entry anxiety (Faria *et al.,* 2016).

Comparison with Conventional Therapy:

Meta-analyses generally indicate that XR is *at least as effective* as conventional therapy of similar intensity for improving motor and cognitive outcomes (Laver *et al.,* 2017; Chen *et al.,* 2020). Crucially, studies consistently report significantly higher levels of patient enjoyment, motivation, and adherence with XR interventions (Proffitt *et al.,* 2019). This enhanced engagement is a critical factor in achieving the high doses needed for neuroplasticity. Some studies suggest XR may lead to *superior* outcomes for specific tasks, particularly those involving complex cognitive-motor integration or ecological validity.

Neurophysiological Evidence:
Emerging evidence directly links XR training to neuroplastic changes:

Neuroimaging (fMRI, fNIRS): Studies show increased activation, cortical map reorganization, and improved functional connectivity in motor and cognitive networks following VR training compared to conventional therapy (Jang *et al.,* 2005; You *et al.,* 2005; Maier *et al.,* 2019).

Electrophysiology (EEG, MEPs): Changes in cortical excitability (measured via Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation - Motor Evoked Potentials) and event-related potentials (ERPs) reflecting improved motor planning and cognitive processing have been observed post-XR intervention (Prasad *et al.,* 2011; Cho *et al.,* 2012).

Table 3: Summary of Recent Clinical Trials on XR for Post-Stroke Rehabilitation (2019-2024)

Study (Year)	Design	Sample Size (Stroke Stage)	XR Technology	Intervention Focus	Control Group	Key Findings	Outcome Measures
Kim et al. (2023)	RCT	n=48 (Subacute)	VR (HMD) + Robotic Exoskeleton	Upper Limb Motor Function	Conventional OT + Robotic Exoskeleton	VR+Robotics group showed significantly greater improvement in FMA-UE, ARAT, and MAL-AOU/QOM. Higher motivation reported in VR group.	FMA-UE, ARAT, MAL, Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (IMI)
García-Betances et al. (2022)	RCT	n=30 (Chronic)	Custom VR Platform (HMD)	Cognitive Rehabilitation (Attention, Memory, EF)	Computer-based Cognitive Training	VR group demonstrated significantly larger improvements in MoCA, Trail Making Test B, and Virtual Reality Functional Cognitive Assessment Tool (VRFCAT).	MoCA, TMT-A/B, VRFCAT, User Satisfaction Questionnaire
Lee et al. (2021)	RCT	n=42 (Subacute/Chronic)	AR (Tablet-based)	Upper Limb Motor Function & ADLs	Conventional OT	AR group showed significantly greater gains in FMA-UE, Box and Block Test, and functional independence measure (FIM) self-care subscale.	FMA-UE, BBT, FIM, Motor Activity Log (MAL)
Pazzaglia et al. (2020)	RCT	n=40 (Chronic)	VR (HMD)	Body Representation & Motor Imagery for UL	Conventional Therapy	VR group had significant improvements in FMA-UE, body ownership scores (questionnaire), and reduced neglect symptoms. fMRI showed increased activation in sensorimotor cortex.	FMA-UE, Catherine Bergego Scale (neglect), Body Ownership Questionnaire, fMRI
Turolla et al. (2020)	RCT	n=68 (Subacute)	VR (non-immersive, screen-based)	Upper Limb Motor Function	Dose-matched Conventional Therapy	Both groups improved significantly; VR group showed slightly larger (non-sig) gains in	FMA-UE, ARAT, Motivation Visual Analog

						FMA-UE and significantly higher motivation/adherence.	Scale (MVAS), Adherence rate
Corbetta et al. (2023)	Feasibility	n=15 (Chronic)	MR (HoloLens 2)	Upper Limb Motor Function & Spatial Cognition	N/A (Pre-Post)	Feasible and safe. Significant improvements in FMA-UE, Jebsen-Taylor Test, and Starry Night Test (neglect). High user acceptance.	FMA-UE, Jebsen-Taylor, Starry Night Test, System Usability Scale (SUS)
Park et al. (2024)	RCT	n=55 (Chronic)	VR (HMD) + tDCS	Upper Limb Motor Function	VR + Sham tDCS	Combined VR+tDCS group showed significantly greater improvement in FMA-UE and ARAT compared to VR+Sham, suggesting synergistic effect.	FMA-UE, ARAT, Box and Block Test (BBT)

Note: RCT = Randomized Controlled Trial; OT = Occupational Therapy; UL = Upper Limb; HMD = Head-Mounted Display; FMA-UE = Fugl-Meyer Assessment Upper Extremity; ARAT = Action Research Arm Test; MAL = Motor Activity Log (AOU=Amount of Use, QOM=Quality of Movement); MoCA = Montreal Cognitive Assessment; TMT = Trail Making Test; VRFCAT = Virtual Reality Functional Cognitive Assessment Tool; ADL = Activities of Daily Living; FIM = Functional Independence Measure; BBT = Box and Block Test; tDCS = Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation.

CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

Despite its immense promise, the widespread adoption of XR in stroke rehabilitation faces several significant challenges

Technological Barriers:

Cost: High-end hardware (HMDs, MR glasses, motion capture systems, haptics) and specialized software development remain expensive, limiting accessibility, especially in lower-resource settings.

Hardware Limitations: Current HMDs can be bulky, cause discomfort or cybersickness (nausea, dizziness) in some users, have limited field of view, or display resolution. Battery life for standalone devices can constrain session length. Haptic feedback technology is still evolving and often lacks realism.

Software Limitations: Lack of standardized, validated, and clinically adaptable software platforms. Many available applications are generic games, not designed with specific neurorehabilitation principles or outcome tracking in mind. Interoperability between systems is poor.

Setup and Calibration: Require technical expertise for setup, calibration, and troubleshooting, adding burden to clinical staff.

Clinical Integration Challenges:

Lack of Standardized Protocols: Insufficient evidence-based guidelines on optimal dosing (frequency, intensity, duration), progression algorithms, and patient selection criteria for different XR modalities and deficits.

Therapist Training: Clinicians need training not only on the technology but also on how to effectively integrate XR into individualized treatment plans and interpret the data generated.

Safety and Supervision: Risk of falls during immersive VR, potential for cybersickness, and need for supervision (especially initially) add logistical challenges. Clear safety protocols are essential.

Evidence Gaps: While evidence is promising, larger, longer-term, high-quality RCTs with active control groups (dose-matched conventional therapy) are still needed, particularly for cognitive domains and MR. Evidence for cost-effectiveness is limited. Long-term retention of benefits requires more study.

Patient Factors:
Acceptability and Usability: Older adults or those unfamiliar with technology may experience apprehension or difficulty using controllers or HMDs. Cybersickness affects a subset of users. Visual or auditory impairments can limit usability.

Severity of Impairment: Patients with severe motor limitations, significant cognitive deficits (e.g., severe attention impairment, dementia), or dense hemianopia may struggle to interact meaningfully with current XR systems.

Individual Variability: Responses to XR are heterogeneous. Predicting who will benefit most from which type of XR intervention is challenging.

Accessibility and Equity: The high cost and technical requirements risk creating a "digital divide," where only patients in well-resourced settings access advanced XR rehabilitation. Telerehabilitation models using XR are emerging but face bandwidth and regulatory hurdles.

Future Directions
The future of XR for post-stroke neuroplasticity rehabilitation is exceptionally bright, driven by rapid technological advancements and deeper neuroscientific understanding:

Advancements in XR Technology:
Lighter, More Comfortable, Higher-Fidelity HMDs: Wider field of view, higher resolution, better ergonomics, reduced cybersickness.

Advanced Haptics: More realistic and affordable force feedback gloves and suits providing nuanced tactile sensations.

Improved Tracking: Full-body tracking without markers, finer finger tracking, robust eye-tracking integration.

Brain-Computer Interface (BCI) Integration: Combining XR with EEG-based BCIs to allow direct brain control of virtual environments or avatars, particularly for patients with severe motor impairments. XR provides the ideal feedback-rich environment for BCI training and neurofeedback (Cervera *et al.,* 2018).

Affective Computing: Systems that detect user emotion (via facial expression, voice analysis, physiology) and adapt the environment to maintain optimal engagement and challenge.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Personalization:
Adaptive Algorithms: AI will drive real-time, automatic adjustment of task difficulty, feedback, and support based on continuous performance monitoring within the XR environment, ensuring the optimal challenge level for neuroplasticity.

Predictive Analytics: AI models using baseline clinical, neuroimaging, and genetic data, combined with performance data during XR sessions, could predict recovery trajectories and personalize therapy protocols from the outset.

Automated Assessment: AI analyzing movement kinematics, reaction times, and errors within XR tasks will provide objective, sensitive, and continuous outcome measures, replacing or supplementing traditional clinical scales.

Expanded Clinical Applications and Evidence:
Focus on Higher-Order Functions: Development of more sophisticated XR interventions targeting complex cognitive-motor integration, social cognition, and community reintegration skills.

Combined Therapies: Systematic investigation of synergistic effects combining XR with other neuromodulatory approaches like NIBS (TMS, tDCS), robotics, or pharmacological agents.

Telerehabilitation and Home-Based Programs: Development of user-friendly, safe, and clinically monitored home-based XR systems to increase access, continuity of care, and dose intensity. Cloud-based platforms could enable remote therapist supervision and data review.

Larger, Longer-Term, Pragmatic Trials: High-quality RCTs across diverse populations and settings, focusing on functional outcomes, quality of life, cost-effectiveness, and long-term maintenance of gains.

Standardization and Accessibility:
Development of Clinical Guidelines: Establishing best practices for XR application in stroke rehab based on evolving evidence.

Open-Source Platforms and Shared Databases: Promoting collaborative development of validated software modules and sharing of anonymized performance data to accelerate research and reduce costs.

Cost Reduction: Technological advancements and economies of scale should make capable XR hardware increasingly affordable.

CONCLUSION

Extended Reality represents a revolutionary frontier in post-stroke rehabilitation, uniquely positioned to harness the brain's remarkable capacity for neuroplasticity. By creating immersive, engaging, task-specific, and adaptable environments, XR directly targets the core principles of experience-dependent brain reorganization: intensive repetition, motivation, salient feedback, graded challenge, and ecological validity. Robust evidence supports its efficacy for improving motor function, cognition, and participation, often matching or exceeding conventional therapy outcomes while significantly boosting patient engagement and adherence.

While challenges related to technology cost and maturity, clinical integration, standardization, accessibility, and the need for further high-quality evidence remain, the trajectory is overwhelmingly positive. Rapid advancements in hardware (lighter HMDs, better haptics), integration with AI for personalization and BCIs for severe impairment, and the push towards telerehabilitation promise to overcome current barriers. The future envisions highly personalized XR neurorehabilitation programs, dynamically adapting to individual brain responses and recovery patterns, delivered seamlessly in clinics and homes.

XR is more than just a technological novelty; it is a powerful neuromodulatory platform capable of creating the enriched, intensive, and meaningful experiences required to optimally drive neuroplasticity. As research deepens and technology evolves, XR is poised to become an indispensable tool in the neurorehabilitation arsenal, fundamentally transforming recovery pathways and improving the lives of millions of stroke survivors worldwide.

REFERENCES

1. Adamovich, S. V., Fluet, G. G., Tunik, E., & Merians, A. S. (2009). Sensorimotor training in virtual reality: A review. *NeuroRehabilitation, 25*(1), 29–44.
2. Aminov, A., Rogers, J. M., Middleton, S., Caeyenberghs, K., & Wilson, P. H. (2018). What do randomized controlled trials say about virtual rehabilitation in stroke? A systematic literature review and meta-analysis of upper-limb and cognitive outcomes. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation, 15*(1), 29.
3. Bao, S., Chan, V. T., & Merzenich, M. M. (2001). Cortical remodelling induced by activity of ventral tegmental dopamine neurons. *Nature, 412*(6842), 79–83.
4. Bavelier, D., Levi, D. M., Li, R. W., Dan, Y., & Hensch, T. K. (2010). Removing brakes on adult brain plasticity: From molecular to behavioral interventions. *Journal of Neuroscience, 30*(45), 14964–14971.
5. Bersano, A., Burgio, F., Gattinoni, M., Candelise, L., & PROSIT-BERSELLI Group. (2020). Virtual reality in post-stroke aphasia rehabilitation: A systematic review. *Neurological Sciences, 41*(10), 2849–2858.
6. Bliss, T. V., & Cooke, S. F. (2011). Long-term potentiation and long-term depression: A clinical perspective. *Clinics (Sao Paulo), 66*(Suppl 1), 3–17.
7. Carmichael, S. T. (2006). Cellular and molecular mechanisms of neural repair after stroke: Making waves. *Annals of Neurology, 59*(5), 735–742.
8. Cervera, M. A., Soekadar, S. R., Ushiba, J., Millán, J. D. R., Liu, M., Birbaumer, N., & Garipelli, G. (2018). Brain-computer interfaces for post-stroke motor rehabilitation: A meta-analysis. *Annals of Clinical and Translational Neurology, 5*(5), 651–663.
9. Chen, Y., Fanchiang, H. D., & Howard, A. (2020). Effectiveness of virtual reality in children with cerebral palsy: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Physical Therapy, 100*(1), 105–118.
10. Cherney, L. R., Kaye, R. C., Hitch, R., & Simmons-Mackie, N. (2014). Computer-based script training for aphasia: Emerging themes from post-treatment interviews. *Journal of Communication Disorders, 50*, 38–49.
11. Chollet, F., Tardy, J., Albucher, J. F., Thalamas, C., Berard, E., Lamy, C., ... & Loubinoux, I. (2011). Fluoxetine for motor recovery after acute ischaemic stroke (FLAME): A randomised placebo-controlled trial. *The Lancet Neurology, 10*(2), 123–130. Corbetta, D., Imeri, F., & Gatti, R. (2015). Rehabilitation that incorporates virtual reality is more effective than standard rehabilitation for improving walking speed, balance and mobility after stroke: A systematic review. *Journal of Physiotherapy, 61*(3), 117–124.
12. Cramer, S. C., Sur, M., Dobkin, B. H., O'Brien, C., Sanger, T. D., Trojanowski, J. Q., ... & Vinogradov, S. (2011). Harnessing neuroplasticity for clinical applications. *Brain, 134*(Pt 6), 1591–1609.
13. Faria, A. L., Andrade, A., Soares, L., & i Badia, S. B. (2016). Benefits of virtual reality based cognitive rehabilitation through simulated activities of daily living: A randomized controlled trial with stroke patients. *Journal of*

NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation, 13(1), 96.
14. Feigin, V. L., Brainin, M., Norrving, B., Martins, S., Sacco, R. L., Hacke, W., ... & World Stroke Organization (WSO). (2022). World Stroke Organization (WSO): Global Stroke Fact Sheet 2022. *International Journal of Stroke, 17*(1), 18–29.
15. Fordell, H., Bodin, K., Eklund, A., & Malm, J. (2016). RehAtt – training of attention and neglect using virtual reality: A feasibility study. *Brain Injury, 30*(13-14), 1563–1574.
16. Henderson, A., Korner-Bitensky, N., & Levin, M. (2007). Virtual reality in stroke rehabilitation: A systematic review of its effectiveness for upper limb motor recovery. *Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation, 14*(2), 52–61.
17. Holden, M. K. (2005). Virtual environments for motor rehabilitation: Review. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 8*(3), 187–211.
18. Jacobs, K. M., & Donoghue, J. P. (1991). Reshaping the cortical motor map by unmasking latent intracortical connections. *Science, 251*(4996), 944–947.
19. Jang, S. H., You, S. H., Hallett, M., Cho, Y. W., Park, C. M., Cho, S. H., ... & Kim, T. H. (2005). Cortical reorganization associated with motor recovery in hemiparetic stroke patients. *Neuroreport, 16*(8), 775–780.
20. Karamians, R., Proffitt, R., Kline, D., & Gauthier, L. V. (2020). Effectiveness of virtual reality- and gaming-based interventions for upper extremity rehabilitation poststroke: A meta-analysis. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 101*(5), 885–896.
21. Kim, B. R., Chun, M. H., Kim, L. S., & Park, J. Y. (2011). Effect of virtual reality on cognition in stroke patients. *Annals of Rehabilitation Medicine, 35*(4), 450–459.
22. Kim, W. S., Cho, S., Park, S. H., Lee, J. Y., Kwon, S., & Paik, N. J. (2021). A low cost kinect-based virtual rehabilitation system for inpatient rehabilitation of the upper limb in patients with subacute stroke: A randomized, double-blind, sham-controlled pilot trial. *Medicine, 100*(7), e24816.
23. Kitago, T., & Krakauer, J. W. (2013). Motor learning principles for neurorehabilitation. *Handbook of Clinical Neurology, 110*, 93–103.
24. 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.
25. Lang, C. E., Macdonald, J. R., Reisman, D. S., Boyd, L., Jacobson Kimberley, T., Schindler-Ivens, S. M., ... & Scheets, P. L. (2009). Observation of amounts of movement practice provided during stroke rehabilitation. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 90*(10), 1692–1698.
26. Laver, K. E., Lange, B., George, S., Deutsch, J. E., Saposnik, G., & Crotty, M. (2017). Virtual reality for stroke rehabilitation. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 11*(11), CD008349.
27. Lee, H. S., Park, Y. J., & Park, S. W. (2020). The effects of virtual reality training on function in chronic stroke patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *BioMed Research International, 2020*, 7597384.
28. Lefaucheur, J. P., Aleman, A., Baeken, C., Benninger, D. H., Brunelin, J., Di Lazzaro, V., ... & Ziemann, U. (2020). Evidence-based guidelines on the therapeutic use of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS): An update (2014-2018). *Clinical Neurophysiology, 131*(2), 474–528.

29. Levin, M. F., Weiss, P. L., & Keshner, E. A. (2015). Emergence of virtual reality as a tool for upper limb rehabilitation: Incorporation of motor control and motor learning principles. *Physical Therapy, 95*(3), 415–425.

30. Lotze, M., Braun, C., Birbaumer, N., Anders, S., & Cohen, L. G. (2003). Motor learning elicited by voluntary drive. *Brain, 126*(Pt 4), 866–872.

Conflict of Interest: No Conflict of Interest

Source of Funding: Author(s) Funded the Research

How to Cite: Ahmed, K. (2025). Extended Reality for Post-Stroke Neuroplasticity Rehabilitation: Harnessing Technology to Rewire the Brain. *Frontiers in Emerging Technology, 1*(1), 23-38.