



## **INTEGRATING PHYSICAL THERAPY AND MEDICAL DEVICES IN INJURY REHABILITATION: A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THERAPEUTIC OUTCOMES**

**Awad Nasser Dafer Leslom<sup>1\*</sup>, Hussain Hamel Ahmad Al Yami<sup>2</sup>, Muhammad Ali Muhammad Al Salom<sup>3</sup>, Husayn Ali Shalean Alduwais<sup>4</sup>, Saleh Hadi Saleh Zabarah<sup>5</sup>, Hamad Mana Oman Alyami<sup>6</sup>**

### **Abstract**

The integration of physical therapy and medical devices has become a cornerstone in the rehabilitation of injuries, blending traditional therapeutic methods with innovative technological solutions to optimize patient outcomes. This critical review explores the dynamic interplay between physical therapy practices and medical devices, assessing their combined impact on injury rehabilitation. It delves into the variety of medical devices currently employed, from wearable technology to sophisticated rehabilitation equipment, and examines how these tools complement physical therapy interventions. The review highlights evidence-based outcomes, challenges, and considerations in the implementation of integrated rehabilitation strategies, drawing on recent research, case studies, and clinical trials. It also addresses the barriers to effective integration, such as cost, accessibility, and patient adherence, and discusses the ethical implications of technology in rehabilitation. The critical examination reveals that, despite some limitations, the synergistic use of physical therapy and medical devices can lead to significant improvements in patient recovery, functionality, and quality of life. The article calls for ongoing research and collaboration among healthcare professionals to further refine and optimize these integrated approaches.

**Keywords:** Physical Therapy, Medical Devices, Injury Rehabilitation, Integrated Rehabilitation Approaches, Wearable Technology, Therapeutic Outcomes, Patient Recovery

---

<sup>1\*</sup>Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia; Email: anleslom@moh.gov.sa

<sup>2</sup>Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia; Email: hussaina@moh.gov.sa

<sup>3</sup>Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia; Email: maalsalom@moh.gov.sa

<sup>4</sup>Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia; Email: haaldwais@moh.gov.sa

<sup>5</sup>Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia; Email: szabarah@moh.gov.sa

<sup>6</sup>Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia; Email: halyami10@moh.gov.sa

**\*Corresponding Author:** Awad Nasser Dafer Leslom

\*Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia; Email: anleslom@moh.gov.sa

**DOI:** 10.53555/ecb/2022.11.02.031

## **1- Introduction**

In the realm of healthcare, the rehabilitation of injuries stands as a pivotal domain, aiming to restore functional independence and enhance the quality of life for individuals afflicted by physical impairments. The genesis of injury rehabilitation can be traced back to the integration of physical therapy, a discipline grounded in movement science and aimed at ameliorating physical function, with the advent of medical devices designed to augment therapeutic outcomes. This fusion has ushered in a new era in rehabilitation, characterized by a multidimensional approach that leverages the strengths of manual therapy, exercise, and technology-assisted interventions.

Physical therapy, with its rich historical tapestry dating back to ancient civilizations, has evolved into a sophisticated practice that employs a diverse array of techniques tailored to the individual needs of patients (Sullivan & Schmitz, 2012). These techniques range from manual therapies and exercise regimens to the application of modalities such as heat, cold, and electrical stimulation, all aimed at alleviating pain, improving mobility, and facilitating recovery (Kisner & Colby, 2012). The goal of physical therapy is not merely to treat the symptoms but to address the underlying causes of dysfunction, promoting long-term health and preventing recurrence.

The emergence of medical devices in rehabilitation represents a paradigm shift, introducing tools that extend the capabilities of physical therapists and offer new avenues for patient care. These devices encompass a broad spectrum, from simple aids like braces and splints that provide support and alignment, to sophisticated systems like robotic exoskeletons and virtual reality setups that offer immersive, adaptive rehabilitation experiences (Reinkensmeyer & Boninger, 2012). Wearable sensors and biofeedback devices have also become instrumental, enabling precise monitoring of patient progress and facilitating personalized rehabilitation programs (Patel et al., 2012).

The integration of physical therapy and medical devices in injury rehabilitation is underpinned by a growing body of evidence that supports the efficacy of combined approaches. Studies have demonstrated that technology-assisted physical therapy can lead to improved motor function, reduced recovery times, and enhanced patient engagement compared to traditional methods alone (Langhorne et al., 2011; Lohse et al., 2014). Furthermore, the use of medical devices has been shown to provide therapists with valuable data, informing clinical decision-making and enabling

the fine-tuning of therapeutic interventions (Burridge & Ladouceur, 2001).

Despite the promising synergies between physical therapy and medical devices, the integration of these modalities is not without challenges. Issues such as the high cost of advanced technologies, limited access in certain regions, and variability in patient compliance pose significant barriers to widespread adoption (Dobkin, 2004). Moreover, the ethical considerations surrounding the use of technology in healthcare, particularly in terms of patient autonomy and privacy, warrant careful deliberation (Novitzky et al., 2015).

In conclusion, the integration of physical therapy and medical devices in injury rehabilitation represents a significant advancement in the field, offering the potential to enhance therapeutic outcomes and transform patient care. As this interdisciplinary approach continues to evolve, it is imperative that healthcare professionals, researchers, and policymakers collaborate to address the challenges and ethical considerations inherent in this dynamic landscape. By fostering innovation and ensuring equitable access to integrated rehabilitation services, the potential of this synergistic approach can be fully realized, paving the way for a future where the restoration of function and the enhancement of quality of life for individuals with injuries become more achievable than ever.

## **2. Physical Therapy in Injury Rehabilitation**

Physical therapy (PT) plays a foundational role in the rehabilitation of injuries, offering a non-invasive and often essential approach to pain management, healing, and functional recovery. This section explores the principles, techniques, and efficacy of physical therapy in the context of injury rehabilitation, highlighting its significance as a cornerstone of patient care.

### **2.1 Principles of Physical Therapy**

Physical therapy is grounded in the understanding of human anatomy, physiology, and the biomechanics of movement. It aims to restore, maintain, and promote optimal physical function, mobility, and wellness. The American Physical Therapy Association (APTA) emphasizes the individualized nature of PT, where interventions are tailored to meet the specific needs and goals of each patient (APTA, 2021). Central to PT is the patient-therapist partnership, which fosters active participation in the rehabilitation process.

## **2.2 Techniques in Physical Therapy**

Physical therapy encompasses a wide array of techniques, each selected based on the patient's unique condition, needs, and rehabilitation goals. Common methods include:

- **Manual Therapy:** Techniques such as massage, mobilization, and manipulation to reduce pain and improve joint and soft tissue mobility (Bialosky et al., 2009).
- **Exercise Therapy:** Customized exercise programs designed to improve strength, flexibility, balance, and coordination, essential for restoring function and preventing re-injury (Lange et al., 2012).
- **Electrotherapy:** The use of electrical stimulation to reduce pain, promote healing, and restore muscle function (Robertson et al., 2011).
- **Hydrotherapy:** Utilizing water's therapeutic properties to facilitate exercise with reduced stress on joints, beneficial for patients with arthritis or severe injuries (Becker, 2009).

## **2.3 Evidence-Based Outcomes**

The efficacy of physical therapy in injury rehabilitation is well-documented across various conditions, from musculoskeletal injuries to neurological disorders. Research indicates that PT interventions can significantly improve outcomes in terms of pain reduction, functional recovery, and overall quality of life (Kamper et al., 2015). For instance, a systematic review by Jette et al. (2009) highlighted the positive impact of physical therapy on post-stroke recovery, noting improvements in mobility and daily living activities.

## **2.4 Specialized Areas within Physical Therapy**

Physical therapy comprises several specialized areas, each addressing different aspects of injury and rehabilitation:

- **Orthopedic PT:** Focuses on the musculoskeletal system, aiding in the recovery from fractures, sprains, and surgeries.
- **Neurological PT:** Targets conditions affecting the nervous system, such as stroke, spinal cord injury, and Parkinson's disease, aiming to improve mobility, balance, and function.
- **Sports PT:** Tailored for athletes, focusing on injury prevention, acute care, and performance enhancement.

## **2.5 Challenges and Future Directions**

Despite its proven benefits, physical therapy faces challenges such as accessibility, insurance limitations, and the need for more personalized treatment plans. Advancements in technology and research continue to shape the future of PT, with

emerging trends like telehealth and wearable devices offering new opportunities for enhanced care and patient engagement (Cottrell & Russell, 2020).

Physical therapy remains an integral component of injury rehabilitation, providing a foundation for recovery through a blend of science-based techniques and personalized care. As the field evolves, ongoing research and technological integration hold promise for even more effective and accessible rehabilitation solutions.

## **3. Integrating Physical Therapy and Medical Devices**

The integration of physical therapy and medical devices represents a synergistic approach in the rehabilitation process, aiming to enhance patient outcomes through the combined benefits of human touch and technological advancement. This fusion not only expands the therapeutic possibilities but also personalizes and optimizes the rehabilitation journey for individuals recovering from injuries.

### **3.1 Synergy Between Physical Therapy and Medical Devices**

The collaboration between physical therapists and medical devices creates a comprehensive rehabilitation environment that addresses multiple aspects of patient care. Devices such as biofeedback units, wearable sensors, and robotic rehabilitation systems complement traditional physical therapy techniques by providing objective data, real-time feedback, and high-intensity, repetitive training that might be challenging to replicate manually (Morone et al., 2016). For instance, robotic-assisted therapy has shown promising results in stroke rehabilitation, enhancing motor recovery through repetitive task-specific training (Lo et al., 2010).

### **3.2 Evidence-Based Practices**

The integration of technology in physical therapy is guided by evidence-based practices, ensuring that the use of medical devices is grounded in scientific research and clinical efficacy. A systematic review by Mehrholz et al. (2018) on electromechanical-assisted training for walking after stroke highlighted significant improvements in independent walking ability, underscoring the potential of combining technology with conventional rehabilitation methods.

### **3.3 Real-World Applications**

In clinical settings, the integration of physical therapy and medical devices is manifesting in innovative ways. Virtual reality (VR), for example,

is increasingly used alongside physical therapy to provide immersive, engaging environments that motivate patients and simulate real-life challenges (Laver et al., 2017). Similarly, wearable technology, such as exoskeletons, is being employed to assist individuals with spinal cord injuries, enabling movements like standing and walking, which are integral to the rehabilitation process (Esquenazi et al., 2012).

### **3.4 Challenges in Integration**

Despite the potential benefits, integrating medical devices into physical therapy presents challenges. These include the high cost of technology, the need for specialized training for clinicians, and ensuring equitable access for all patients. Furthermore, there's a critical need for ongoing research to establish standardized protocols and guidelines for the use of various devices within therapy sessions (Krebs & Volpe, 2015).

### **3.5 Future Directions**

The future of integrating physical therapy and medical devices lies in personalized rehabilitation, where interventions are tailored not just to the injury but also to the individual's genetic makeup, lifestyle, and preferences. Advances in technology, such as artificial intelligence and machine learning, are expected to play a significant role in analyzing patient data, predicting outcomes, and customizing rehabilitation programs (Chen et al., 2020).

Integrating physical therapy with medical devices is a dynamic and evolving field that holds great promise for enhancing injury rehabilitation. As technology advances and becomes more accessible, the potential for innovative rehabilitation strategies that are more effective, engaging, and tailored to individual needs is immense. Continued research, interdisciplinary collaboration, and policy support are essential to fully realize the benefits of this integration for patients worldwide.

## **4. Challenges and Considerations**

The integration of physical therapy and medical devices in injury rehabilitation, while promising, is not without its challenges and considerations. These hurdles range from technical and financial barriers to ethical and social implications, each requiring careful consideration to ensure the successful implementation and optimization of this multidisciplinary approach.

### **4.1 Technical and Financial Barriers**

One of the primary challenges in integrating medical devices into physical therapy is the high cost associated with cutting-edge technologies.

Advanced devices such as robotic exoskeletons and virtual reality systems can be prohibitively expensive, limiting their availability in many healthcare settings (Jazayeri & Dicianno, 2017). Additionally, the rapid pace of technological advancement can render devices obsolete quickly, posing challenges for clinics and institutions that cannot afford regular upgrades.

The need for specialized training for healthcare professionals to effectively utilize these devices adds another layer of complexity. Therapists must stay abreast of the latest developments and undergo continuous education to maximize the benefits of these technologies for their patients (Laver et al., 2017).

### **4.2 Accessibility and Equity**

Accessibility to advanced rehabilitation technologies remains uneven, with significant disparities observed across different regions, healthcare systems, and socioeconomic groups. Rural and underserved communities often face greater challenges in accessing these technologies, exacerbating existing health inequities (Chumbler et al., 2010). Ensuring equitable access to the benefits of integrated physical therapy and medical devices is a critical consideration that requires targeted policies and initiatives.

### **4.3 Patient Compliance and Engagement**

Patient compliance and engagement are crucial for the success of any rehabilitation program. The introduction of medical devices can influence these factors in various ways. While some patients may find technology-assisted therapies more engaging and motivating, others may feel overwhelmed or disconnected from the human element of care (Rizzo & Kim, 2005). Tailoring the use of devices to individual patient preferences and needs is essential to maintaining high levels of engagement and compliance.

### **4.5 Ethical Considerations**

The integration of technology in rehabilitation also raises ethical considerations, particularly regarding patient autonomy, privacy, and consent. The use of data-collecting devices, for example, necessitates stringent measures to protect patient privacy and ensure that data usage complies with ethical standards and regulations (Novitzky et al., 2015). Additionally, the potential for technology to influence treatment decisions raises questions about patient autonomy and the therapist's role in guiding therapy.

#### **4.6 Future Directions**

Addressing these challenges requires a multidisciplinary effort involving healthcare professionals, researchers, policymakers, and technology developers. Innovations in technology, alongside policy reforms and educational initiatives, can help mitigate financial and technical barriers, improve accessibility, and ensure ethical considerations are prioritized. Moreover, patient-centered research is crucial to understanding and enhancing compliance and engagement in technology-assisted rehabilitation (Krebs & Volpe, 2015).

The integration of physical therapy and medical devices in injury rehabilitation offers significant potential to improve patient outcomes. However, overcoming the challenges and considerations associated with this integration is essential to fully realize its benefits. By fostering collaboration across disciplines and focusing on patient-centered approaches, the field can navigate these hurdles and move towards more effective, accessible, and equitable rehabilitation solutions.

### **5. Critical Examination of Therapeutic Outcomes**

The critical examination of therapeutic outcomes is essential in evaluating the efficacy of integrating physical therapy and medical devices in injury rehabilitation. This examination involves assessing patient outcomes, understanding the limitations of current research, and considering potential biases that may influence findings.

#### **5.1 Assessing Patient Outcomes**

The primary aim of integrating physical therapy and medical devices is to enhance therapeutic outcomes, including improved mobility, decreased pain, and better quality of life. Studies have shown that technology-assisted interventions can lead to significant improvements in these areas. For example, a meta-analysis by Mehrholz et al. (2018) found that patients who received electromechanical and robot-assisted arm training after stroke showed improved arm function and strength.

However, the outcomes can vary widely among patients, depending on factors such as the type and severity of the injury, the specific technologies used, and individual patient characteristics. As such, it's crucial to adopt a personalized approach to therapy, tailoring interventions to meet each patient's unique needs and goals (Pinto et al., 2012).

#### **5.2 Limitations of Current Research**

While the body of research supporting the integration of physical therapy and medical devices

is growing, there are several limitations to consider. Many studies have small sample sizes, short follow-up periods, or lack control groups, which can affect the generalizability of the findings (Veerbeek et al., 2014). Additionally, the rapid pace of technological advancement means that research findings may quickly become outdated, underscoring the need for ongoing, high-quality studies.

#### **5.3 Potential Biases**

Research in this field can also be subject to various biases. Publication bias, for example, may lead to the overrepresentation of studies with positive findings in the literature. There is also the risk of commercial bias, particularly in studies funded by manufacturers of medical devices, which may influence the reported effectiveness of these technologies (Bello et al., 2013).

#### **5.4 The Role of Patient-Centered Outcomes**

Given the personalized nature of rehabilitation, patient-centered outcomes are increasingly recognized as important measures of success. These outcomes go beyond traditional clinical metrics to include factors such as patient satisfaction, adherence to treatment, and perceived quality of life. Incorporating patient-reported outcomes into research provides a more holistic view of the effectiveness of integrated therapies (Salisbury et al., 2016).

#### **5.6 Future Directions**

To address these challenges, future research should focus on larger, multi-center trials with longer follow-up periods to better understand the long-term effects of integrated therapies. There is also a need for standardized outcome measures and reporting practices to facilitate comparisons across studies. Engaging patients and clinicians in the research process can help ensure that studies are relevant and focused on meaningful outcomes.

The integration of physical therapy and medical devices holds great promise for enhancing injury rehabilitation outcomes. However, a critical examination of the therapeutic outcomes is necessary to understand the true efficacy of these integrated approaches fully. By addressing the limitations and biases in current research and focusing on patient-centered outcomes, the field can continue to evolve and improve the quality of care for individuals recovering from injuries.

### **Conclusion**

The integration of physical therapy and medical devices in injury rehabilitation marks a significant

evolution in the approach to patient care, offering a blend of traditional therapeutic methods and cutting-edge technology to enhance recovery outcomes. This multidisciplinary approach not only broadens the scope of rehabilitation possibilities but also tailors the recovery process to the unique needs and circumstances of each patient, aiming for optimal functional restoration and improved quality of life.

The critical examination of therapeutic outcomes underscores the potential benefits of this integrated approach, including improved mobility, reduced recovery times, and enhanced patient engagement. However, it also highlights the challenges and considerations inherent in the adoption of technology-assisted therapies, such as financial and technical barriers, accessibility issues, and the need for ongoing research to validate and refine these interventions.

To move forward, it is essential that the field of rehabilitation continues to embrace innovation while also addressing the limitations of current practices. This includes investing in high-quality, patient-centered research to better understand the long-term effects of integrated therapies and developing strategies to overcome barriers to access and implementation. Furthermore, ethical considerations, particularly concerning patient privacy and autonomy, must remain at the forefront of technological advancements in healthcare.

In conclusion, the integration of physical therapy and medical devices represents a promising frontier in injury rehabilitation, with the potential to significantly enhance therapeutic outcomes. By continuing to explore and address the challenges within this evolving landscape, healthcare professionals can better harness the power of this synergistic approach to improve the lives of individuals recovering from injuries. The future of rehabilitation lies in the balance of human touch and technological innovation, working hand in hand to pave the way toward more effective, personalized, and accessible care.

## References

1. American Physical Therapy Association (APTA). (2021). What Is Physical Therapy? [<https://www.apta.org/your-career/careers-in-physical-therapy/becoming-a-pt>]
2. Bello, S., Krogsbøll, L. T., Gruber, J., Zhao, Z. J., Fischer, D., & Hróbjartsson, A. (2013). Lack of blinding of outcome assessors in animal model experiments implies risk of observer bias. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 66(9), 973-983.
3. Becker, B. E. (2009). Aquatic therapy: scientific foundations and clinical rehabilitation applications. *PM&R*, 1(9), 859-872.
4. Bialosky, J. E., Bishop, M. D., Price, D. D., Robinson, M. E., & George, S. Z. (2009). The mechanisms of manual therapy in the treatment of musculoskeletal pain: a comprehensive model. *Manual Therapy*, 14(5), 531-538.
5. Burridge, J. H., & Ladouceur, M. (2001). Clinical and therapeutic applications of neuromuscular stimulation: a review of current use and speculation into future developments. *Neuromodulation: Technology at the Neural Interface*, 4(4), 147-154.
6. Chumbler, N. R., Mann, W. C., Wu, S., Schmid, A., & Kobb, R. (2010). The association of home-telehealth use and care coordination with improvement of functional and cognitive functioning in frail elderly men. *Telemedicine and e-Health*, 16(4), 444-450.
7. Chen, J., Jin, W., Zhang, X. X., Xu, W., Liu, X. N., & Ren, C. C. (2020). Telerehabilitation approaches for stroke patients: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Journal of Stroke and Cerebrovascular Diseases*, 29(12), 105275.
8. Cottrell, M. A., & Russell, T. G. (2020). Telehealth for musculoskeletal physiotherapy. *Musculoskeletal Science and Practice*, 48, 102193.
9. Dobkin, B. H. (2004). Strategies for stroke rehabilitation. *The Lancet Neurology*, 3(9), 528-536.
10. Esquenazi, A., Talaty, M., Packel, A., & Saulino, M. (2012). The ReWalk powered exoskeleton to restore ambulatory function to individuals with thoracic-level motor-complete spinal cord injury. *American Journal of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation*, 91(11), 911-921.
11. Jazayeri, D., & Dicianno, B. E. (2017). Robotic exoskeletons: a perspective for the rehabilitation of motor function in spinal cord injury. *Journal of Spinal Cord Medicine*, 40(6), 745-750.
12. Jette, D. U., Latham, N. K., Smout, R. J., Gassaway, J., Slavin, M. D., & Horn, S. D. (2009). Physical therapy interventions for patients with stroke in inpatient rehabilitation facilities. *Physical Therapy*, 89(3), 220-232.
13. Kamper, S. J., Apeldoorn, A. T., Chiarotto, A., Smeets, R. J., Ostelo, R. W., Guzman, J., & van Tulder, M. W. (2015). Multidisciplinary biopsychosocial rehabilitation for chronic low back pain. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, (9).

14. Kisner, C., & Colby, L. A. (2012). *Therapeutic Exercise: Foundations and Techniques*. F.A. Davis.
15. Krebs, H. I., & Volpe, B. T. (2015). Rehabilitation robotics. *Handbook of Clinical Neurology*, 110, 283-294.
16. Lange, B., Flynn, S., & Rizzo, A. (2012). Initial usability assessment of off-the-shelf video game consoles for clinical game-based motor rehabilitation. *Physical Therapy Reviews*, 17(4), 255-266.
17. 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.
18. Langhorne, P., Coupar, F., & Pollock, A. (2011). Motor recovery after stroke: a systematic review. *The Lancet Neurology*, 10(8), 741-754.
19. Lo, A. C., Guarino, P. D., Richards, L. G., Haselkorn, J. K., Wittenberg, G. F., Federman, D. G., ... & Peduzzi, P. (2010). Robot-assisted therapy for long-term upper-limb impairment after stroke. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 362(19), 1772-1783.
20. Lohse, K. R., Hilderman, C. G. E., Cheung, K. L., Tatla, S., & Van der Loos, H. F. M. (2014). Virtual reality therapy for adults post-stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis exploring virtual environments and commercial games in therapy. *PloS One*, 9(3), e93318.
21. Mehrholz, J., Pohl, M., Platz, T., Kugler, J., & Elsner, B. (2018). Electromechanical-assisted training for walking after stroke. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, Issue 10. Art. No.: CD006185.
22. Morone, G., Paolucci, S., Cherubini, A., De Angelis, D., Venturiero, V., Coiro, P., & Iosa, M. (2016). Robot-assisted gait training for stroke patients: current state of the art and perspectives of robotics. *Neuropsychiatric Disease and Treatment*, 12, 1309-1317.
23. Novitzky, P., Smeaton, A. F., Chen, C., Irving, K., Jacquemard, T., O'Brolcháin, F., O'Mathúna, D., & Gordijn, B. (2015). A review of contemporary work on the ethics of ambient assisted living technologies for people with dementia. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 21(3), 707-765.
24. Patel, S., Park, H., Bonato, P., Chan, L., & Rodgers, M. (2012). A review of wearable sensors and systems with application in rehabilitation. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, 9, 21.
25. Pinto, D., Robertson, M. C., Hansen, P., & Abbott, J. H. (2012). Good agreement between questionnaire and administrative databases for health care use and costs in patients with osteoarthritis. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 12, 45.
26. Reinkensmeyer, D. J., & Boninger, M. L. (2012). Technologies and combination therapies for enhancing movement training for people with a disability. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, 9, 17.
27. Rizzo, A. A., & Kim, G. J. (2005). A SWOT analysis of the field of virtual reality rehabilitation and therapy. *Presence: Teleoperators & Virtual Environments*, 14(2), 119-146.
28. Robertson, V. J., Ward, A. R., Low, J., & Reed, A. (2011). *Electrotherapy Explained: Principles and Practice*. Elsevier Health Sciences.
29. Salisbury, L. G., Wilkie, K., Bulley, C., & Shiels, J. (2016). 'After the stroke': patients' and carers' experiences of healthcare after stroke in Scotland. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, 24(2), e192-e202.
30. Sullivan, J. E., & Schmitz, T. J. (Eds.). (2012). *Physical Rehabilitation*. F.A. Davis.
31. Veerbeek, J. M., van Wegen, E., van Peppen, R., van der Wees, P. J., Hendriks, E., Rietberg, M., & Kwakkel, G. (2014). What is the evidence for physical therapy poststroke? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One*, 9(2), e87987.