A resource efficient, high-dose neurorehabilitation program for chronic stroke at home

Spencer A. Arbuckle[a,1], Anna Sophie Knill[b,c,1], Gabriela Rozanski[d], Michelle Chan-Cortés[a], Anastasia Elena Ford[a], Louis T. Derungs[a], David Putrino[d], Jenna Tosto-Mancuso[d,2], and Meret Branscheidt[c,e,f,2]

Following a stroke, both accumulating scientific evidence and medical guidelines recommend that patients receive high-dose neurorehabilitation to aid in recovery. The reality, however, is that most patients receive a fraction of the dose required. This gap between required and actual dose is due to implementational barriers, with lack of therapist availability and costs of high-dose delivery arguably being the two main ones. Here, we investigated the extent to which these barriers could be alleviated by using gamified self-training technologies at home under remote therapist supervision.

We delivered a comprehensive full-body, high-dose neurorehabilitation program to chronic stroke patients entirely at home. The goal was to achieve approximately 36 hours of Active Training Time (ATT) over 12-18 weeks. The program was designed to be resource efficient, relying mostly on the patient training on their own (asynchronously) with the MindMotion GO gamified therapy solution. Additional telerehabilitation (synchronous) sessions with a therapist were interspersed once weekly, during which therapists used teleconference technologies to deliver additional training and provide direct feedback. Throughout, therapists were able to use a web application to continuously monitor and manage the training program remotely.

We assessed effectiveness through reporting ATT, a measure more closely reflecting delivered dosage as opposed to scheduled dose. Patient recovery was evaluated with standardized impairment and functional clinical measures, and patient self-reported outcome measures. Finally, a cost model was computed to evaluate the resource efficiency of the program.

Data from 17 patients was included in this retrospective analysis of a real-world clinical service. Patients completed an average cumulative ATT dose of 39.7 ±21.4 hours and maintained high levels of training adherence over the course of 19.2 ±3.3 weeks. The majority of the total ATT was delivered asynchronously (82.2 ±10.8% of total ATT). Patients showed improvements in both upper-limb (Fugl-Meyer Upper Extremity, 6.4 ±5.1 points; p¡0.01) and gait and balance measures (Functional Gait Assessment, 3.1 ±2.6 points; p¡0.01; Berg Balance Scale, 6.1 ±4.4 points; p¡0.01). Overall, the program was viewed very favorably amongst patients, with 73.7% respondents being satisfied or very satisfied, while 63.2% of respondents reporting subjective improvements in physical abilities. Finally, therapist costs associated with the program amounted to $338 USD, thus representing a resource efficient alternative to delivering the same dose via one-on-one in-person training sessions (therapist costs amounting to $1903 USD).

This work demonstrates that effective high-dose neurorehabilitation can be delivered via gamified therapy technologies in the home setting. Furthermore, we show that training time can be successfully decoupled from therapist-presence without compromising therapy delivery and outcomes or patient satisfaction. In the context of a growing concern over therapist availability worldwide, this program presents a human resource-efficient model that delivers high-dose neurorehabilitation as mandated by recent medical guidelines, complementing existing clinic-based approaches.

Introduction

Stroke is a critical global health issue, leaving many individuals with enduring disability (1), and placing an immense economic burden on healthcare systems. Rehabilitation is pivotal in fostering recovery and restoring functional independence. However, accumulating evidence suggests that significantly improving clinical outcomes hinges on the provision of high-dose training. Studies indicate that providing at least 20 additional hours of training over 10 weeks, in addition to standard therapy, are needed to make a clinically meaningful impact (2–4). For example, 90 hours of targeted upper-limb training reduces impairment and improves function in chronic stroke patients (5). Similarly, higher doses of aerobic and stepping activity (e.g., 40 hours) lead to improved walking recovery and quality of life, with endurance gains retained over one year post-stroke (6). The need and clinical benefits of high-dose training is reflected in existing and emerging medical guidelines for stroke rehabilitation across major countries. In the US, existing American Heart Association/American Stroke Association guidelines recommend aerobic training of 60-300 minutes (completed over multiple sessions and days) per week in addition to strength and stretching exercises (7), while in the UK, the recent NICE guidelines update recommends at least 3 hours of targeted rehabilitation each day, 5 days a week, leading to an estimated total of 60-120 hours of training for an average length of stay (8).

Despite strong evidence supporting the benefits of high-dose rehabilitation, most stroke patients fail to receive the recommended amount of therapy dose (6, 9–12). During acute inpatient stays, this issue was succinctly captured by Bernhard and colleagues in their study titled “Inactive and alone”, which found patients to be active only 13% of their time and only 5.2% in contact with a therapist (13). Their follow-up review nearly a decade later suggested little had changed (14). Even following discharge to inpatient and outpatient rehab facilities, the amount of therapy dose remains equally concerning. For instance, even during therapy sessions that are usually scheduled for 45 minutes, patients typically spend a limited amount of time on active training, with an average of

Author affiliations: [a]MindMaze, Lausanne, Switzerland; [b]ETH Zurich, Rehabilitation Engineering Laboratory, Department of Health Sciences and Technology, Zurich, Switzerland; [c]Lake Lucerne Institute, Vitznau, Switzerland; [d]Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, Department of Rehabilitation and Human Performance, New York, United States; [e]cereneo, Center for Neurology and Rehabilitation, Weggis, Switzerland; [f]ETH Zurich, Department of Health Sciences and Technology, Zurich, Switzerland

All authors have completed an ICMJE uniform disclosure form. SAA is an independent researcher contracted by MindMaze; DP, JTM, and GR have a research service agreement with MindMaze; MCC, AEF, and LTD are employed by MindMaze; DP and JTM are board members of Precision Recovery Inc; All other authors declare no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced this work.

[1]SAA and ASK contributed equally to this work.

[2]To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: jenna.tostomountsinai.org; meret.branscheidtcereneo.ch

less than 20 minutes dedicated to activity-related arm training in the acute and subacute stages (15, 16). This issue becomes particularly pronounced at the chronic stage, where observational studies in outpatient settings have shown that overall training doses remain low: averaging just one purposeful leg or arm movement per minute (17, 18).

Thus, there is a stark gap between the evidence and need for high-dose rehabilitation, and the reality of what is delivered in current standard-of-care. Key implementational barriers that contribute towards this gap are human resource constraints, poor documentation of dose delivered during training, and poor patient compliance and engagement (2, 4, 19, 20). Arguably, therapist availability remains the most significant barrier, as most rehabilitation today is delivered one-on-one and relies solely on the therapist being present in person for the duration of the therapy session. Therapist availability is only expected to get worse with a recent two-year national US survey indicating that 66.6% of all therapists intend to leave the profession within the coming year (21).

To address these barriers, numerous previous studies have tried to dissociate therapist time and outpatient infrastructure from therapy itself, either by incorporating technologies, particularly robotics, into training programs in-clinic (22), utilizing home-based training with or without the aid of additional technologies (23), incorporating a one-to-many training model with a single therapist used to deliver training to multiple patients simultaneously (24, 25), or a combination of above approaches (26). To date, the main challenges with these approaches are that they often fail to sufficiently free up therapist time, are often costly and have low patient adherence and engagement. Additionally, they usually lack an explicit demonstration that scheduled training time equates to actual delivery of high-dose training. In fact, the vast majority of such studies fail to report on actual therapy time delivered (27).

Thus, in this real-world clinical service and retrospective analysis, we investigated the extent to which implementational barriers related to delivering high-dose neurorehabilitation using traditional means can be addressed with a technological approach. Our primary objective was to determine whether gamified training and monitoring technologies can be used to successfully deliver high-dose neurorehabilitation for chronic stroke survivors in a home without compromising on either therapy adherence or clinical outcomes. By setting the soft target that 80% of the training dose was to be delivered through patient self-training with the remaining 20% relying on synchronous telerehabilitation, we attempted to dissociate therapeutic dose delivery from synchronous therapist availability.

We evaluated the delivery of a high-dose training program for chronic stroke patients over extended training durations in their home environment. The program combined self-directed training (asynchronous) and therapist-directed training (synchronous), with asynchronous training expected to account for 80% of the overall training dose to reduce burden of therapist availability. Training, specifically the asynchronous component, was delivered with the aid of a gamified training technology that enabled full-body training of the upper-limb, hand, trunk, and lower-limbs. Monitoring-technology was employed to track actual training times and to ensure that therapists were able to consistently oversee patient progress and uphold the quality and success of the training. We performed separate evaluations of patient adherence, clinical effectiveness of training, patient satisfaction, and overall resource and cost efficiency of the program.

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of analyzed patients

n	17
Age, y	54.8 ±14.1
Time post stroke, y	5.4 ±4.7
Sex	
Men	9
Women	8
Stroke Type	
Ischemic	9
Hemorrhagic	8
Affected Hemisphere	
Left	6
Right	11

Methods

Patients. Chronic stroke patients were identified from the Mount Sinai Abilities Research Center Clinical Program registry. Patients were informed of the clinical service and offered the option to participate in the high-dose, neurorehabilitation program (table 1). Admission to the program depended on if patients' were $\geq$22 years of age; had a first-time stroke $\geq$3 months prior; presented with either arm weakness and/or difficulty with balance (resulting in less than full scores for either Fugl-Meyer Upper Extremity assessment or the Berg Balance Scale); were able to follow multi-step commands; and showed willingness and ability to commit to the program length and the weekly training dose accompanied with virtual visits. Barriers to admission included if they had plegia of the affected upper limb; had severe pain; or had severe cognitive or physical challenges which made it difficult for them to participate in neurorehabilitation.

Twenty-six patients were assessed on the admission criteria and enrolled into the program. 23 patients started the training program (supp. fig. S1), with 6 either dropping out or were lost to follow-up. Dropout reasons included changes in medical status and refusal to partake in in-person discharge assessments. 17 patients completed the training program (8 women; mean age = 54.8 ±14.1 years; time post-stroke 5.4 ±4.7 years), and their data was analyzed retrospectively. There were no significant differences regarding chronicity, age, or impairment (tested with the baseline Fugl-Meyer Upper Extremity and Berg Balance Scale measures) between patients who completed the training program and those who did not, and no adverse events were reported during the program.

All subjects provided informed consent and the analysis was conducted in adherence with the Declaration of Helsinki and the local legislation and institutional prerequisites. Data collection as part of routine clinical care was approved by Mount Sinai Program for the Protection of Human Subjects institutional review board (Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, U.S.A.; STUDY-21-00345).

High-Dose Telerehabilitation Training Program. All patients were recruited into a single-arm treatment group involving a high-dose, home-based training program (fig. 1A-B). Overall, the program goal was to deliver 36 hours of training dose to patients over the duration of the program. The dose target was chosen to approximate that of a previous large telerehabilitation study that showed significant improvements in upper-limb impairment (42 hours; see 28). However, in contrast with previous telerehabilitation



Fig. 1. Design and technologies of the home-based training program. Patients were enrolled into a home-based training program that consisted of self-directed (asynchronous) training sessions performed by the patient each week complimented by multiple weekly (synchronous) sessions directly supervised by a physical therapist. (**A**) Prior to program start, patients were evaluated in-clinic by a physical therapist. The therapist would then create a training program for the evaluated patient. Patients set up the training system (MindMotion GO and Izar) at home. (**B**) During the training program, synchronous telerehabilitation sessions were scheduled as per therapist and patient availability, whereas asynchronous training (done by the patient) or remote monitoring (done by the therapist) could be completed at any time. Patients additionally underwent an in-clinic assessment battery prior to the program starting and upon program completion to evaluate clinical efficacy of the training program (not shown). (**C**) The MindMotion GO telerehabilitation device uses camera-based motion tracking to control gamified training activities displayed on a TV-screen. (**D**) The Izar, a therapeutic device to train hand function, being grasped in a hand.

Table 2. Suggested weekly schedule

	Planned session duration (min)	Planned sessions per week (#)	Expected training per session (min)	Expected training per week (min)
Asynchronous training	*at patient discretion*	*at patient discretion*	*at patient discretion*	≥90
Synchronous training	30	1-3	15	30-45
Total				≥120

studies, training was not limited to one body area (29–31), but rather the dose was spread across effectors (i.e., upper-limb, hand, trunk, and lower-limb).

Patients were given the choice of achieving the 36 hours of training dose over a period between 12 and 18 weeks and were given a high-level goal to train for at least 120 minutes per week. Consistent with real-life conditions of clinical care, patients were permitted to take short breaks during the program (these breaks were incorporated in the analysis; see *Methods - Binning training data into weeks*). Patients were also free to continue additional regular rehabilitation services during the program duration. On any given week, the dose was delivered via two distinct types of sessions: either synchronous telerehabilitation or asynchronous training (table 2).

Synchronous sessions. These telerehabilitation sessions were guided directly by a physical therapist who was present virtually. The therapist scheduled one to three 30-minute synchronous sessions per week at times convenient for the patient, with the frequency dependent on clinical judgment and information gleaned about the patient's training performance through remote monitoring. The content of the sessions themselves was varied, and included gamified training using the MindMotion GO system (see *Methods - Full-body gamified system for asynchronous training*) under visual observation of the therapist and check-in conversations between the patient and the therapist to discuss training goals, training adjustments, feedback, etc.

Asynchronous sessions. These were self-directed training sessions where patients performed gamified training in an unsupervised environment. In contrast to synchronous training, asynchronous sessions did not rely on therapist presence, nor were there any pre-defined restrictions on their timing and length. Patients thus had the freedom to independently choose when and for how long to train asynchronously, and the ability to skip or repeat prescribed activities.

The content of the training sessions was defined by the supervising physical therapist, who chose combinations of gamified activities on the MindMotion GO system to build a tailored program for a patient. The program considered the patient's disease severity

(based on functional and behavioral assessments completed at initial evaluation), their therapeutic goals and preferences, and their physical capacity by using the range of motion calibrations on the MindMotion GO system to define the playable range of each activity. This calibration ensured that the gameplay was within the patient's safety envelope (e.g., so as to minimize pain and adverse events such as risk of falls). The gamified activities targeted one or more areas of the following: hand, upper limb(s), trunk, and/or lower limb(s). Patients tended to start training on the easiest difficulty (level 1) for each activity. Therapists revised an activity's difficulty level and each movement's playable range of motion remotely as needed, usually during synchronous sessions with the patient. These revisions could also include adding or removing activities and their intended duration.

Full-body gamified system for asynchronous training. We employed a commercially available technology (MindMotion GO; FDA Class-II) to deliver full-body gamified training throughout the program duration. This technology allowed both: *i*) the physical therapists to set up and track training, and *ii*) enabled patients to perform self-directed (asynchronous) training sessions and *iii*) provided teleconsultation capabilities for synchronous training and check-ins. Finally, although the technology was intended for training, it also captured performance measures during gameplay that allowed for the quantification of dose and nature of training delivered to each individual patient.

The MindMotion GO is a real-time, motion capture-based neurorehabilitation therapy technology (fig. 1C). The technology hosts a catalog of gamified activities intended to train various fully-body movements and functions relevant to neurorehabilitative therapy. Patients' body and limb kinematics were captured by accompanying optical hardware sensors (Kinect, LeapMotion), which in turn were used to drive mechanics of the gamified activities. An additional pressure-based sensor (Izar; fig. 1D) was used to capture fine-grained forces generated during hand and wrist control and use them for gameplay. During gameplay, the MindMotion GO captured a range of metrics related to a patients' training performance in real-time and uploaded them to a web platform (Companion). Therapists were able to use this web platform to remotely set up therapy plans and deliver them to a MindMotion GO installed at a patients' home, carry out video teleconferencing calls, and used the performance metrics generated during training to track the patients' progress and update the therapy plan if necessary.

At the time of this program implementation, the MindMotion GO included a catalog of 36 gamified activities with each designed to train a specific movement that is typically trained in regular neurorehabilitation (e.g., palmar grasp, lateral trunk flexion). A total of 27 unique movement training possibilities are available. A comprehensive list of the different movement possibilities is provided in the supplementary material (table S1).

Following successful enrollment, the MindMotion GO and associated hardware peripherals were shipped to the patients' home. The system was offered in a configuration that was connected to a TV. Detailed setup instructions and guidance were provided both in written form and through videos, which allowed the patients to set up the system by themselves or with the help of family members, care-givers, friends etc. With the exception of one patient, all patients successfully installed the system at home without requiring in-person assistance from the therapy team. Customer and technical support (via telephone or video-call) during business hours was provided for the duration of the program to ensure proper functioning of the system.

Quantification of dose and nature of training. We analyzed training data collected from the MindMotion GO device to assess program feasibility and patients' behavior. This data included the time the training occurred, the duration of the training, and the movement(s) trained.

Quantifying dose delivered. *Active Training Time* (ATT), here defined as the time spent engaging with the gamified activities, was used as a measure of dose delivered to patients. ATT is the recorded time in the training activity (i.e., from activity start to activity stop), minus any time necessary for set up, movement calibration, or when the activity was paused.

Binning training data into weeks. Our primary focus was on training program dosage (i.e., hours of training) rather than program duration (i.e., weeks in the program). The program start date for a patient corresponded to the date they began training with the devices and the end date was defined as the date they completed the exit assessments in-clinic. To visualize training consistency across weeks, patient's training data were binned into a *training week*. A patient's training week was defined as a consecutive, seven-day cycle that began on their start date and continued until the date of their program end assessment. For example, if a patient was to start training on a Thursday, their training week spanned from Tuesday to the following Wednesday. A patient's training data was then binned according to their defined training week. Therefore, data from the first (and subsequent) training week(s) across patients does not correspond to the same calendar dates.

Furthermore, given the multi-week structure and real-world nature of this training program, patients were allowed to take breaks or vacations during their participation. If a patient did not complete any training in one of their training weeks, that week was counted as null and excluded from analysis. This was rare: cumulative across patients, only 5.8% of all 346 weeks enrolled lacked any training data (approximately one week per patient). Therefore, all weekly representations of training data presented in the results (fig. 2A & C) may not reflect consecutive weeks of training, hence our use of the term "trained weeks" in the figures.

Assessing the stability of patients' asynchronous training across weeks. We investigated if patients, as a group, tended to increase or decrease their asynchronous ATT as the program progressed. For each patient, we used ordinary least-squares with a regressor term to capture the linear relationship between each week trained and the corresponding proportion of ATT trained asynchronously that week. An intercept term was included to account for the mean ATT trained asynchronously across weeks. Per patient, the sign of the fitted beta coefficient indicated whether a patient systematically increased (positive sign) or decreased (negative sign) their ATT trained asynchronously as the program progressed, and the magnitude reflected the percentage of this drift over a one week period from (e.g., a beta coefficient of 0.001 is +1% increase per week). The beta coefficient for each patient is plotted in Figure 2E.

Examining the nature of patients' training schedules. We tested if patients had idiosyncratic but nevertheless reliable training schedules. To this end, we computed training schedules for each patient that summarized the percent of their total ATT that was

done asynchronously during every hour for each of the 7 days of the calendar week. Asynchronous ATT data was summed into each hour of each day based on the timestamp of the start of each training session, and then divided by the patient's total ATT dosage, yielding a vector of 168 values (each of the 7 days * 24 hours). To assess both training schedule reliability within a patient and uniqueness across patients, two vectors (*schedules*) were computed for each patient: one using data from their even-numbered trained weeks and the other using data from their odd-numbered trained weeks. For a single patient, a Pearson's correlation between their even-week and odd-week training schedules indicated the reliability of their training schedule, and the uniqueness of their training schedule was calculated as the average Pearson's correlation across all possible pairs of their even and odd week schedules with all other patients' even and odd week schedules (2 schedules * 32 schedules from other patients = 64 different pairs per patient). The within-patient and across-patient correlations are plotted in Figure 3E.

Capturing clinical outcomes and patient subjective experiences. We quantified the effect of training on patients' impairment and function. As training was delivered full-body, we captured a wide range of standardized upper-limb, gait and balance, and physiological measures to quantify training-related changes in impairment and function across multiple effectors. The core measures consisted of: Fugl-Meyer Upper Extremity (FM-UE) and Action Research Arm Test (ARAT) to assay the upper limb; the Berg Balance Scale (BBS), Functional Gait Assessment (FGA), 6-minute Walking Test (6minWT), and the 5-time Sit to Stand test (5xStS) to assess lower limb function and balance. A comprehensive list of these outcome measures is available in the supplementary material (table S2).

Furthermore, patients' subjective responses to the treatment program were collected to complement standardized outcome measures. A comprehensive list of these Patient Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs) is available in the supplementary material (table S3).

Clinical outcome measures and PROMs were captured at the beginning and the end of the program (12 - 18 weeks). The clinical outcome measures were assessed in person at the Abilities Research Center at Mount Sinai Hospital. Assessments were performed by a physical therapist who was not their supervising therapist to retain blindness. PROMs were completed by patients at home through online surveys. Additionally, a custom survey was administered to all enrolled patients at the end of the program, regardless of training completion, to gather information on their experiences, satisfaction, motivation, and perceived improvements.

Cost analysis. We conducted a simplified cost analysis to compare physical therapist resourcing costs for two distinct scenarios: *i*) this program where the training dose was delivered through a combination of the asynchronous and synchronous sessions, versus *ii*) where the entirely of the dose delivered in this program is theoretically delivered through standard-of-care (i.e., through the direct one-on-one supervision of a physical therapist).

For both scenarios, the median hourly salary for a physical therapist in the United States was taken from the US Bureau of Labor Statistics 2023 (32). Note, that the median hourly salaries do not include any additional fringe benefits (e.g., medical insurance) that an employer might incur.

For both scenarios, the physical therapist resourcing costs were computed as: the cumulative training dose delivered (hours) multiplied by the median physical therapist salary per hour (USD$), subsequently scaled by the percentage of physical therapist time required to deliver dose (%).

Statistical analysis. All analyses and statistical tests were performed using R (version 4.3.1; 33–36). Values presented in the results are the average across patients (plus or minus the standard deviation). For Pearson's correlation values, we first Fisher z-transformed the correlations and calculated the mean and standard deviation. The mean and standard deviation were transformed back to correlations and reported according to convention. We set the significance level to $p = 0.05$ for all statistical tests. To compare if the proportion of asynchronous ATT systematically changed for all patients across the program duration, we used a two-sided *t* test to compare the beta coefficients to zero (see *Methods - Assessing the stability of patients' asynchronous training across weeks*). To compare if patients had idiosyncratic asynchronous training schedules, we used a two-sided paired *t* test to compare the Fisher z-transformed correlations from within and across-patient comparisons of their training schedules (see *Methods - Examining the nature of patients' training schedules*).

For the analysis of clinical improvements, changes from baseline to program end were tested using paired two-sided paired *t* tests. As these tests involved multiple comparisons without any specified *a-priori* hypotheses, we adjusted the significance level by dividing by the number of clinical outcomes examined (i.e., Bonferroni correction) which was 12. For clarity, we report uncorrected p values in the text. Note that, for some assessments, a subset of the 17 analyzed patients were assessed and therefore the degrees of freedom varied across the clinical outcomes.

Results of the exit survey are reported as a proportion of total survey respondents, which differs from patients who completed the program. We chose to present the exit survey results for all respondents to ensure all views were included, irrespective of whether a patient officially completed the program. Nineteen patients completed the exit survey, of which 16 completed the program and 3 did not (2 dropped out and 1 declined to attend the in-person program end assessment).

Results

Long-term, high-dose training can be achieved for chronic stroke patients in the home. A retrospective analysis was carried out for the 17 chronic stroke patients who completed the high-dose neurorehabilitation. Overall, the goal was for patients to receive a minimum 36 hours of Active Training Time (ATT; see *Methods*), delivered entirely at home and spread across all major motor functions (i.e., upper-limb, hand, trunk, and lower-limb). Training was delivered using a gamified therapy solution (MindMotion GO with Izar), through a combination of the patients following prescribed training plans on their own (self-directed asynchronous training), or through weekly training sessions with a therapist being virtually present (therapist-directed synchronous telerehabilitation). Throughout, therapists were able to remotely define and alter training plans and maintain oversight of the program using a web-based application for patient monitoring (Companion).

All patients exceeded the intended program minimum duration of 12 weeks, with an average duration of 19.18 ±3.24 weeks. To ensure consistent training, they were given a soft target of 120 minutes per week. Patients maintained this goal across the program, with an average weekly ATT of 120.51 ±52.47 minutes (fig. 2A). Overall, patients achieved an average cumulative training



Fig. 2. Training dose. (**A**) Active training time (ATT) per week averaged across patients. The thickness of the line represents the number of patients who remained in the program by that training week. The shaded area indicates the standard deviation above and below the average (for weeks with n>3), and the dashed line indicates the target weekly dosage of 120 minutes. (**B**) The total ATT dosage achieved at program end. Each dot corresponds to one patient. The blue box indicates the average and the vertical line indicates the standard deviation above and below the average. The solid gray line indicates the total expected dosage if each patient achieved 120 minutes ATT per week they were training in the program, with the dashed lines reflecting the standard deviation around the average expected dose (patients completed a varying number of training weeks in the program). (**C**) Proportion of total ATT that patients spent training their upper limbs (UL), hands, trunk, or lower limbs (LL). Each patient's data is plotted as a gray line with the average in blue. (**D**) The proportion of weekly ATT that was achieved asynchronously, averaged across patients. Similar formatting as in **A**. (**E**) Quantifying patients' tendency to increase, decrease, or maintain their ratio of asynchronous-to-synchronous ATT across training weeks (see Methods). On average, patients maintained consistency across weeks in the proportion of ATT achieved asynchronously.

dose of 39.67 ±21.37 hours that matched and slightly surpassed the program goal of achieving 2 hours of ATT per week (fig. 2B). This cumulative training dose was distributed over the full body, with a slight tendency towards upper limb training (43.20 ±9.06% of total ATT) compared to the lower limb (28.40 ±8.27%), hand (15.40 ±14.09%) and trunk (13.01 ±4.25%; see fig. 2C). Overall, these results demonstrate the feasibility of asynchronous/synchronous programs to deliver actual high-dose training distributed across the full-body.

It is important to note that the ATT dose measure used in this analysis is a closer representation of dose actually delivered in an intervention, as compared to the scheduled dose that is almost exclusively reported in other high-dose neurorehabilitation studies (5, 10, 28, 37, 38). Furthermore, this dose was delivered on top of any other care received by patients. Indeed, 11 out of the 17 patients reported also receiving care outside the program (e.g., physiotherapy, occupational therapy, or general exercise), highlighting the program's complementarity to standard of care neurorehabilitation.

Despite the extended program length of approximately 19 weeks, patients reported high levels of satisfaction. In the exit survey, 73.7% of respondents indicated they were either very satisfied or satisfied with the program (57.9% and 15.8%, respectively; supp. fig. S2A). Additionally, patients expressed strong motivation to continue training beyond the program length, with 57.9% reporting they were very motivated or motivated to continue (42.1% and 15.8%, respectively; supp. fig. S2B). This was particularly apparent in one patient who continued training up to 29 weeks, far surpassing the official program length.

Majority of program dose was delivered without a therapist present. While most training was delivered asynchronously, the program kept therapists in-the-loop to ensure quality. Monitoring data provided insights into training quantity and schedule, allowing therapists to tailor and track progress effectively.

On average, therapists were advised to schedule synchronous telerehabilitation sessions with patients as per their discretion, with the goal to ensure compliance to the overall program. Therapists provided a soft target of scheduling at least one synchronous session a week wherein some remotely supervised training would occur. However, at least 75% of the total program dose was expected to be delivered asynchronously. Of the cumulative dosage trained by patients, approximately 34.18 ±21.72 hours were delivered asynchronously. Per patient, this corresponded to an asynchronous dosage of 82.19 ±10.81% of their total ATT (fig. 2D), constituting the majority of their overall dose and higher than the 75% soft target for asynchronous ATT.

As the program progressed across weeks, patients continued to complete most of their training asynchronously (fig. 2D). The ratio



Fig. 3. Training distribution across days of the week and times of the day. (**A**) Bar chart depicting the proportion of total ATT (averaged across patients) binned according to the day of the week. Synchronous training times were only logged during the weekdays. Error bars reflect the standard deviation across patients. (**B-C**) Bar charts depicting the proportion of total ATT (averaged across patients) binned according to the starting hour of the training session for training done on weekdays (**B**) and weekends (**C**). Similar formatting as in **A**. (**D**) Percent of total ATT that occurred (blue) / did not occur (gray) during standard working hours, when the therapist was available for synchronous training sessions (blue box in **B**). Each dot corresponds to one patient. The boxes indicate the averages and the vertical lines indicate the standard deviations above and below the averages. (**E**) Quantifying uniqueness of patients' average weekly asynchronous training profiles (see *Methods*). Each dot in the within-patient grouping (red) reflects a patient's consistency of their weekly training profile, and each dot in the across patients grouping (white) reflects the average correlation between that patient's training profile and the training profiles of all other patients. The boxes and vertical lines are formatted the same as in D. *significant difference between within patient and across patient correlations (two-sided paired *t* test, $p<0.05$).

between synchronous and asynchronous training dose remained relatively stable week-to-week, and there was no systematic decrease (or increase) observed in the proportion over the duration of the program (fig. 2E; average $\hat{\beta}$ = -1.3e-3 ±4.4e-3, two-sided *t* test vs. 0: t_{16} = -1.24, p = 0.23).

Consistent with therapist availability being limited to normal office hours, all synchronous sessions were delivered during regular 8am-5pm (Mon-Fri) working hours (fig. 3A-C). In contrast, asynchronous training offered patients the flexibility of training at any time, uncoupled by restrictions of therapist availability. Indeed, an analysis of patients' training schedules demonstrates that a substantial proportion of total ATT (37.45% ±22.84%, 15.70 ±12.29 hours) was logged outside of working hours and on weekends (fig. 3D).

However, the convenience of training only partially relates to therapist availability—patients' own work schedules and life both imposed restrictions on when they were able to train. Interestingly, in this home program, even though patients were given a high-level training target per week (2 hours minimum) and could train at any time, patients nonetheless ended up training on reliable schedules that were unique to themselves. While the majority of patients remained relatively consistent in their overall training schedules from week-to-week (within patient Pearson's r = 0.46 ±0.34, red dots in fig. 3E), the training schedules were highly individual (across patients Pearson's r = 0.08 ±0.04, white dots in fig. 3E; two-sided paired *t* test vs. within-patient schedule reliability: t_{16} = -4.74, p = 2.22e-4).

Taken together, these results demonstrate that patients remained highly adherent to the home-based training program even if training was largely delivered asynchronously.

Patients showed significant improvements in gait, balance, and upper-limb function. Next, we investigated the effect of our high-dose training program on patient's recovery and self-reported well-being. As training was delivered full-body, we captured a wide range of standardized upper-limb, gait and balance, and physiological measures to quantify training related changes in impairment and function across multiple effectors (see *Methods*). All measures were obtained at the beginning and end of the training program.

Patients demonstrated positive improvements in the three core impairment and functional measures for multiple effectors (see table 3), namely the Fugl-Meyer Upper Extremity assessment for upper limb impairment, (FM-UE; +6.41 ±5.09, n = 17, p = 8.8e-5), Berg Balance Scale for generalized balance and transfer stability (BBS; +6.07 ±4.43, n = 15, p = 2.5e-2), and the Functional Gait assessment (FGA; +3.07 ±2.55, n = 15, p = 3.7e-4) for postural stability and walking. Amongst these, both the FM-UE and BBS

were above the Minimal Detectable Change (MDC) for chronic stroke (MDC = 3.2 and 4.66 points respectively; see 39, 40), whereas the FGA was not (MDC = 4.2 points; see 41). Finally, while there were positive improvements across most other captured measures for upper-limb, gait and balance, and physiology, these did not cross thresholds for either statistical significance or minimum detectable change (see supp. table S2). Overall, these positive improvements in standard clinical measures were complemented by 63% of respondents self-reporting subjective improvements in their physical abilities and well-being (supp. fig. S2C).

These results demonstrate that patients receiving a high-dose training program at home showed significant improvements in outcome measures related to full-body impairment and function, with these improvements supported by self-reported measures by patients.

Asynchronous training significantly reduces costs associated with delivery of high-dose training. Finally, we computed the personnel costs associated with delivery of a high-dose training program. Based on the current analysis, 39.7 hours of cumulative training dose was delivered to each patient (on average), with the majority being delivered asynchronously (82.2%). Therefore, direct therapist presence was only required to deliver 17.8% of the training dose, and thus the total therapist costs would amount to $338 USD for our program (median hourly salary for physical therapist = $47.94 USD; see 32).

Delivery of regular therapy hours does not incorporate technology assisted asynchronous training, and instead relies primarily on direct therapist presence, either through in-clinic visits or through the use of teleconferencing tools (42). Therefore, under a scenario where all training is delivered directly by a therapist, the costs of delivering 39.7 hours would amount to $1903 USD—a difference of $1565 USD when compared to our hybrid asynchronous / synchronous program.

In summary, depending on availability, therapists could be used to deliver the high number of training hours that are a prerequisite for improving patient outcomes. Here we demonstrate that incorporating asynchronous training as a key component of a home training program results in significantly reduced personnel costs compared to delivering the entirety of training dose with a therapist present.

Discussion

While the evidence for high-dose training in stroke rehabilitation is accumulating, the real challenge is in its implementation: how to deliver high-dose training effectively and in a resource-efficient way? Here we demonstrate that a gamified neurorehabilitation program can be used to successfully deliver high-dose full-body training to chronic stroke patients at home. Using a combination of therapist-directed telerehabilitation sessions (synchronous) and patients' training on their own (self-directed asynchronous training), we were able to achieve resource efficient dose delivery—the program required only a fraction of the therapist's time compared to traditional one-to-one in-person neurorehabilitation sessions. To our knowledge, this work is the first to demonstrate a significant decoupling of active training dose delivery from therapist presence.

Critically, however, this decoupling was not at the expense of clinical outcomes, with patients showing positive improvements in all measures related to gait, balance, and upper-limb function. To our knowledge, this is additionally the first demonstration of a high-dose telerehabilitation program resulting in improvements in full-body motor function, consistent with the reality that stroke typically results in multi-limb deficits spanning upper- and lower-limbs. These improvements furthermore translated into tangible benefits with 63% of patients reporting higher physical abilities and overall well-being.

The role of gamified technology to deliver high-dose training at home. A critical, yet unstated, issue in most neurorehabilitation studies is the lack of transparent reporting of actual training dose. A recent review identified the scale of the problem, with approximately only 13% of studies reporting on the actual training dose received by the experimental group (27). Indeed, when regular therapy is quantified, the actual time on task is observed to be a fraction of the scheduled time, and is significantly lower than training doses required for neural recovery (43). Furthermore, factors such as therapist experience play a role in the low training doses observed in regular neurorehabilitation (17).

Using technologies to deliver training (such as the current work) has two advantages here: *i*) namely as a means of sensitively and accurately quantifying the amount of training dose delivered, while *ii*) also providing a set of training activities that homogenizes the nature of training received by the patient. Such technologies therefore respond to a growing demand for better documentation and transparency of dose delivery in neurorehabilitation (44).

A key element of this program was the significant use of asynchronous training delivery to achieve high dose. While a promising approach, asynchronous training has the potential to compromise patient engagement and adherence (45). Our core mitigation strategy here was to ensure that the therapist was always in-the-loop, with the synchronous telerehabilitation sessions serving as both a means to review and update plan of care, but also to ensure patient engagement. Additionally, gamified activities, a wide variety of exercises, and user-friendly interfaces were identified as important components (46) and incorporated in the technology used by patients in this program. Our results demonstrate the success of these mitigation strategies, with patients able to self-administer over 80% of the total training dose and maintain consistent engagement throughout the program.

That patients remained engaged in the program suggests they could realize a principal advantage of training asynchronously: convenience. Patients were able to train anytime without being restricted by therapist availability. Indeed, here we found that when patients were given a high-level training goal (i.e., train 2 hrs/w) and supplied with tailored training programs delivered through gamified technologies, and provided with structured check-ins with their therapist, they utilized both weekdays and weekends to train, which is not possible with conventional in-person neurorehabilitation. Furthermore, patients tended to train with highly idiosyncratic training schedules. The most parsimonious explanation is that these idiosyncratic training schedules are driven by patients' unique work, life, and social schedules, and further underscore the advantages of an always available neurorehabilitation system at home.

Comparing approaches to deliver high-dose training. In previous studies, a variety of different approaches for delivering high-dose training have been investigated, ranging from boutique clinical programs delivered through one-to-one therapy, "one-to-many" training models, the use of robotic systems, and home-based training. While each of these approaches have their pros and

Table 3. Core clinical outcomes

		Potential range	Eval. before program start		Eval. at program end		Δ score		
	n	min-max	mean (sd)	range	mean (sd)	range	mean (sd)	*t*	*p*
FM-UE	17	0 - 66	31.71 (21.22)	8 - 65	38.12 (20.03)	14 - 66	+6.41 (5.09)	5.20	8.8e-5*
ARAT	17	0 - 57	19.00 (21.45)	0 - 57	21.53 (23.29)	1 - 57	+2.53 (4.20)	2.48	2.5e-2
BBS	15	0 - 56	38.67 (11.18)	14 - 55	44.73 (9.15)	20 - 56	+6.07 (4.43)	5.30	1.1e-4*
FGA	15	0 - 30	9.87 (6.03)	1 - 23	12.93 (6.20)	1 - 28	+3.07 (2.55)	4.66	3.7e-4*
5xStS	15	0 -	22.00 (10.89) sec	8 - 45	17.17 (7.21) sec	8 - 34	-4.83 (6.25) sec	-3.00	9.6e-3
6minWT	14	0 -	579.64 (324.83) ft	120 - 1175	635.00 (371.46) ft	130 - 1420	+55.36 (86.77) ft	2.39	3.3e-2

Statistical significance is presented as uncorrected values. Asterisks indicate significance after Bonferroni correction (for 12 comparisons). Scores for the complete set of 12 clinical outcomes are presented in supplementary materials (table S2). Abbreviations: FM-UE = Fugl-Meyer Upper Extremities assessment; BBS = Berg Balance Scale; FGA = Functional Gait Assessment; ARAT = Action Research Arm Test; 5xStS = 5 times Stand to Sit; 6minWT = 6-minute Walk Test. *t* values and associated significance for two-sided paired *t* tests. *indicates significance after corrections for multiple comparisons.

cons, few are truly scalable in a resource-constrained healthcare landscape.

For example, high-dose approaches that require one-on-one in-clinic therapy sessions are prohibitively expensive, are often limited to urban facilities, and struggle to scale (i.e., treat more patients) without significant staffing (5). Offering one-to-many training can mitigate the staffing and cost concerns, but such training is typically limited to urban facilities and will often impose restrictions on patient scheduling. Finally, supplementing regular therapy with robotic systems imposes high equipment and maintenance costs (47), and the complexity of these devices generally means they are constrained to supervised in-clinic use only (48). Our home program was designed specifically as a potential alleviation to these accessibility, cost, staffing and scheduling barriers.

In comparison, while home-based programs are an attractive alternative to high-dose delivery, the exact nature of the program seems to be an important consideration. Specifically, while programs that rely solely on training in response to passive exercise videos may be inexpensive they often struggle with poor therapy adherence rates, and an inability to customize care plan to patient deficits. On the other hand, while traditional telerehabilitation benefits from direct therapist and patient contact, it is solely dependent on therapist availability (45). This makes it difficult to scale, particularly given the projected shortage of skilled therapy staff (21).

What remains attractive, however, are home-based programs that use a hybrid combination of asynchronous & synchronous training. By using gamified and monitoring technologies to enable asynchronous training, these programs are able to overcome many of the known challenges for the approaches described above. A key component of such programs is their reduced dependency on therapist availability through the use of asynchronous training. Yet, despite the many potential benefits of such programs, quality data on the implementation is surprisingly scarce. Recent studies have demonstrated the efficacy of providing high-dose training at home (approximately 40 hours; see 28, 29), however the full value of these programs were not realized in these studies; there was significant requirements on therapist availability compared to our program (50:50 synchronous/asynchronous split) with no accompanying cost analysis. The work here extends these results and demonstrates that technology-enabled asynchronous training allows for high training doses to be delivered with very limited demands on therapist availability (82% of training was asynchronous). Despite limited therapist presence in the program, patient engagement and satisfaction remained high. The work here goes further to document and report costs associated with program delivery and represent a fraction of the resource costs associated with delivering equivalent high-dose training through scaling up traditional one-to-one neurorehabilitation. The program presented here, in particular technology-enabled asynchronous training, thus represents an attractive option to augment traditional neurorehabilitation to deliver high-dose training.

Integrating asynchronous training into standard-of-care. For home-based neurorehabilitation programs to gain widespread adoption, it is critical that they integrate into and complement current workflows for standard-of-care neurorehabilitation. Here we offer two pragmatic suggestions. For patients that routinely receive in-person outpatient rehabilitation (typically 1-3 times per week), part of the in-person sessions can be used to review, discuss and update the plan of care at home. Thus, at home, these patients can train asynchronously using gamified technologies based on the goals set during their in-person visits. In contrast, for patients in more rural settings where distances between the home and outpatient clinics are large, in-person visits can be reduced in lieu of synchronous telerehabilitation training, again complemented by patients training asynchronously using gamified technologies. Indeed, following the COVID pandemic, synchronous telerehabilitation in the US remains a billable service due to public health emergency extensions (49), while new Current Procedural Codes (CPT) billing codes have been established by the Center of Medicare & Medicaid Services to provide reimbursement pathways

for technologies that enable asynchronous neurorehabilitation services (50, 51).

Despite the attractiveness of a high-dose neurorehabilitation at home, a few caveats should be considered, particularly for therapists. With such programs, there is a tangible concern that the combination of home-based and asynchronous training, together reduce the importance of therapists in neurorehabilitation. We unequivocally disagree with this notion. Therapists are and will remain essential for building collaborative relationships with patients that are critical for engagement and recovery (52). Specifically for home-based neurorehabilitation, therapists are critical for developing, communicating, and updating training programs and ensure patient engagement and recovery. To this end, it is essential that the technologies that enable synchronous and asynchronous telerehabilitation at home are designed with therapists needs in mind (e.g. providing seamless user experience, providing clear and actionable data on patients training performance and recovery, providing ability to use video or wearable technologies to physical assessments). Care should be taken so that therapists used to hands-on care do not suffer from fatigue and burnout due to inherent demands of teleconferencing calls (53).

Finally, for patients, although home-based asynchronous training offers significant benefits, it may not be suitable for everyone. While the majority of patients (68%) in this program expressed satisfaction with home-based training, some patients have historically preferred in-person therapy (54, 55). Furthermore, challenges including limited physical space, privacy concerns, and the need for technical proficiency are major barriers to widespread adoption of in-home technology (54). With respect to this last item, the relatively young average age of our cohort might suggest higher technical literacy and fewer cognitive impairments. Deficits in vision, communication, cognition, or a heightened fall risk may also significantly impact the effectiveness of predominantly asynchronous therapy programs and raise safety concerns (56, 57). Overall, these points only serve to highlight the critical role of therapists in properly selecting and recommending home-based neurorehabilitation only to appropriate patients.

Conclusion. This work introduces a scalable model for delivering high-dose training to stroke patients, effectively addressing therapist shortages with an asynchronous and gamified technology-driven approach. This work, to our knowledge, is the first demonstration of the full potential value of hybrid asynchronous and synchronous high-dose neurorehabilitation programs at home. The program described here is potentially an attractive option to bridge the gap between accumulating scientific evidence and medical guidelines around the need for high-dose training, and the reality of traditional neurorehabilitation today.

Supplementary material

Accompanying supplemental material is available on the medRxiv preprint server.

1 JD Steinmetz, et al., Global, regional, and national burden of disorders affecting the nervous system, 1990–2021: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2021. *The Lancet Neurol.* **23**, 344–381 (2024) Publisher: Elsevier.

2 KR Lohse, CE Lang, LA Boyd, Is more better? Using meta-data to explore dose-response relationships in stroke rehabilitation. *Stroke; a journal cerebral circulation* **45**, 2053–2058 (2014).

3 JM Veerbeek, et al., What Is the Evidence for Physical Therapy Poststroke? A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *PLOS ONE* **9**, e87987 (2014) Publisher: Public Library of Science.

4 G Kwakkel, et al., Effects of Augmented Exercise Therapy Time After Stroke. *Stroke* **35**, 2529–2539 (2004) Publisher: American Heart Association.

5 NS Ward, F Brander, K Kelly, Intensive upper limb neurorehabilitation in chronic stroke: outcomes from the Queen Square programme. *J. Neurol. Neurosurg. & Psychiatry* **90**, 498–506 (2019).

6 TD Klassen, et al., Higher Doses Improve Walking Recovery During Stroke Inpatient Rehabilitation. *Stroke* **51**, 2639–2648 (2020) Publisher: American Heart Association.

7 SA Billinger, et al., Physical Activity and Exercise Recommendations for Stroke Survivors: A Statement for Healthcare Professionals From the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association. *Stroke* **45**, 2532–2553 (2014).

8 A Bhalla, L Clark, R Fisher, M James, eds., National Clinical Guideline for Stroke for the United Kingdom and Ireland (2023).

9 A Pollock, et al., Interventions for improving upper limb function after stroke. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* (2014).

10 JJ Daly, et al., Long-Dose Intensive Therapy Is Necessary for Strong, Clinically Significant, Upper Limb Functional Gains and Retained Gains in Severe/Moderate Chronic Stroke. *Neurorehabilitation Neural Repair* **33**, 523–537 (2019).

11 JW Krakauer, et al., Comparing a Novel Neuroanimation Experience to Conventional Therapy for High-Dose Intensive Upper-Limb Training in Subacute Stroke: The SMARTS2 Randomized Trial. *Neurorehabilitation Neural Repair* (2021).

12 C Winstein, B Kim, S Kim, C Martinez, N Schweighofer, Dosage Matters. *Stroke* **50**, 1831–1837 (2019) Publisher: American Heart Association.

13 J Bernhardt, H Dewey, A Thrift, G Donnan, Inactive and Alone: Physical Activity Within the First 14 Days of Acute Stroke Unit Care. *Stroke* **35**, 1005–1009 (2004).

14 T West, J Bernhardt, Physical Activity Patterns of Acute Stroke Patients Managed in a Rehabilitation Focused Stroke Unit. *BioMed Res. Int.* **2013**, 438679 (2013) _eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1155/2013/438679.

15 KJ Waddell, RL Birkenmeier, JL Moore, TG Hornby, CE Lang, Feasibility of High-Repetition, Task-Specific Training for Individuals With Upper-Extremity Paresis. *The Am. J. Occup. Ther.* **68**, 444–453 (2014).

16 KS Hayward, SG Brauer, Dose of arm activity training during acute and subacute rehabilitation post stroke: a systematic review of the literature. *Clin. Rehabil.* **29**, 1234–1243 (2015).

17 CE Lang, JR MacDonald, C Gnip, Counting repetitions: an observational study of outpatient therapy for people with hemiparesis post-stroke. *J. neurologic physical therapy: JNPT* **31**, 3–10 (2007).

18 TJ Kimberley, S Samargia, LG Moore, JK Shakya, CE Lang, Comparison of amounts and types of practice during rehabilitation for traumatic brain injury and stroke. *J. Rehabil. Res. Dev.* **47**, 851–862 (2010).

19 VL Feigin, et al., Pragmatic solutions to reduce the global burden of stroke: a World Stroke Organization–Lancet Neurology Commission. *The Lancet Neurol.* **22**, 1160–1206 (2023) Publisher: Elsevier.

20 CE Lang, KR Lohse, RL Birkenmeier, Dose and timing in neurorehabilitation: prescribing motor therapy after stroke. *Curr. Opin. Neurol.* **28**, 549 (2015).

21 DH Jannenga, The State of Rehab Therapy (2023).

22 D Putrino, JW Krakauer, Neurotechnology's Prospects for Bringing About Meaningful Reductions in Neurological Impairment. *Neurorehabilitation Neural Repair* p. 154596832211373 (2022).

23 KE Laver, et al., Telerehabilitation services for stroke. *The Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* **2020**, CD010255 (2020).

24 MJ Wuennemann, et al., Dose and staffing comparison study of upper limb device-assisted therapy. *NeuroRehabilitation* **46**, 287–297 (2020) Publisher: IOS Press.

25 C English, SL Hillier, EA Lynch, Circuit class therapy for improving mobility after stroke. *The Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* **6**, CD007513 (2017).

26 SL Wolf, et al., The HAAPI (Home Arm Assistance Progression Initiative) Trial: A Novel Robotics Delivery Approach in Stroke Rehabilitation. *Neurorehabilitation Neural Repair* **29**, 958–968 (2015) Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc STM.

27 KR Lohse, A Pathania, R Wegman, LA Boyd, CE Lang, On the Reporting of Experimental and Control Therapies in Stroke Rehabilitation Trials: A Systematic Review. *Arch. Phys. Medicine Rehabil.* **99**, 1424–1432 (2018) Publisher: Elsevier.

28 SC Cramer, et al., Efficacy of Home-Based Telerehabilitation vs In-Clinic Therapy for Adults After Stroke: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Neurol.* **76**, 1079 (2019).

29 D Edwards, et al., Telerehabilitation Initiated Early in Post-Stroke Recovery: A Feasibility Study. *Neurorehabilitation Neural Repair* p. 154596832311596 (2023).

30 VA Swanson, et al., Optimized Home Rehabilitation Technology Reduces Upper Extremity Impairment Compared to a Conventional Home Exercise Program: A Randomized, Controlled, Single-Blind Trial in Subacute Stroke. *Neurorehabilitation neural repair* **37**, 53–65 (2023) Number: 1 Place: United States.

31 MG Lansberg, et al., Home-based virtual reality therapy for hand recovery after stroke. *PM & R : journal injury, function, rehabilitation* **14**, 320–328 (2022) Number: 3 Place: United States.

32 BoLS U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Outlook Handbook (2024).

33 RC Team, R: The R Project for Statistical Computing (2023).

34 G Grolemund, H Wickham, Dates and Times Made Easy with lubridate. *J. Stat. Softw.* **40**, 1–25 (2011).

35 H Wickham, et al., dplyr: A Grammar of Data Manipulation (2023).
36 H Wickham, ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis (2016).
37 J McCabe, M Monkiewicz, J Holcomb, S Pundik, JJ Daly, Comparison of Robotics, Functional Electrical Stimulation, and Motor Learning Methods for Treatment of Persistent Upper Extremity Dysfunction After Stroke: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Arch. Phys. Medicine Rehabil.* **96**, 981–990 (2015).
38 L Dodakian, et al., A Home-Based Telerehabilitation Program for Patients With Stroke. *Neurorehabilitation Neural Repair* **31**, 923–933 (2017).
39 J See, et al., A Standardized Approach to the Fugl-Meyer Assessment and Its Implications for Clinical Trials. *Neurorehabilitation Neural Repair* **27**, 732–741 (2013) Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc STM.
40 V Hiengkaew, K Jitaree, P Chaiyawat, Minimal Detectable Changes of the Berg Balance Scale, Fugl-Meyer Assessment Scale, Timed "Up & Go" Test, Gait Speeds, and 2-Minute Walk Test in Individuals With Chronic Stroke With Different Degrees of Ankle Plantarflexor Tone. *Arch. Phys. Medicine Rehabil.* **93**, 1201–1208 (2012).
41 JH Lin, MJ Hsu, HW Hsu, HC Wu, CL Hsieh, Psychometric Comparisons of 3 Functional Ambulation Measures for Patients With Stroke. *Stroke* **41**, 2021–2025 (2010).
42 C for Medicare & Medical Servicces, COVID-19 Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) on Medicare Fee-for-Service (FFS) Billing (2023).
43 CE Lang, et al., Observation of amounts of movement practice provided during stroke rehabilitation. *Arch. physical medicine rehabilitation* **90**, 1692–1698 (2009).
44 KS Hayward, et al., Advancing Stroke Recovery Through Improved Articulation of Nonpharmacological Intervention Dose. *Stroke* **52**, 761–769 (2021) Publisher: American Heart Association.
45 S Sharififar, et al., Telerehabilitation service impact on physical function and adherence compared to face-to-face rehabilitation in patients with stroke: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PM@AND@R* **15**, 1654–1672 (2023) _eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/pmrj.12988.
46 K Threapleton, A Drummond, P Standen, Virtual rehabilitation: What are the practical barriers for home-based research? *Digit. health* **2**, 2055207616641302 (2016).
47 S Klobucká, R Klobucký, K Valovičová, P Šiarnik, B Kollár, Cost-effectiveness analysis of robot-assisted gait training in patients with bilateral spastic cerebral palsy. *Cost Eff. Resour. Allocation* **21**, 60 (2023).
48 M Klaic, et al., Application of the extended technology acceptance model to explore clinician likelihood to use robotics in rehabilitation. *Disabil. Rehabil. Assist. Technol.* **19**, 52–59 (2022) Publisher: Taylor & Francis _eprint: https://doi.org/10.1080/17483107.2022.2060356.
49 117th Congress of the Unites States of America, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023 (2022).
50 ML Network, Telehealth Services Fact Sheet (2024).
51 C for Medicare & Medical Servicces, CMS-1784-F (2023).
52 K Kelly, F Brander, A Strawson, N Ward, K Hayward, Pushing the limits of recovery in chronic stroke survivors: a descriptive qualitative study of users perceptions of the Queen Square Upper Limb Neurorehabilitation Programme. *BMJ Open* **10**, e036481 (2020).
53 K Laver, M Walker, N Ward, Telerehabilitation for Stroke is Here to Stay. But at What Cost? *Neurorehabilitation Neural Repair* **36**, 331–334 (2022) Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc STM.
54 Y Chen, et al., Home-based Technologies for Stroke Rehabilitation: A Systematic Review. *Int. journal medical informatics* **123**, 11–22 (2019).
55 J Tosto-Mancuso, et al., Gamified Neurorehabilitation Strategies for Post-stroke Motor Recovery: Challenges and Advantages. *Curr. Neurol. Neurosci. Reports* **22**, 183–195 (2022).
56 AJ Hill, D Theodoros, T Russell, E Ward, Using telerehabilitation to assess apraxia of speech in adults. *Int. J. Lang. & Commun. Disord.* **44**, 731–747 (2009).
57 DG Theodoros, Telerehabilitation for service delivery in speech-language pathology. *J. Telemedicine Telecare* **14**, 221–224 (2008) PMID: 18632993.