

1 TITLE

2 Uncovering clinical rehabilitation technology trends: field observations, mixed methods analysis,
3 and data visualization

4 AUTHORS

5 Courtney Celian, M/OT^a, Hannah Redd PT, DPT^a, Kevin Smaller, BS^a, Partha Ryali, PhD^{a,b}, James
6 L. Patton, PhD^{a,b}, David J. Reinkensmeyer, PhD^{c,d}, Miriam R. Rafferty, PT, DPT, PhD^{a,e,f}

7 ^a Shirley Ryan AbilityLab, Chicago, IL

8 ^b Department of Bioengineering, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL

9 ^c Henry Samueli School of Engineering Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering,
10 University of California, Irvine, Irvine, CA

11 ^d UC Irvine School of Medicine Department of Anatomy and Neurobiology University of
12 California, Irvine, Irvine, CA

13 ^e Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine Department of Physical Medicine and
14 Rehabilitation, Chicago, IL

15 ^f Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine Department of Psychiatry and
16 Behavioral Science University of Illinois Chicago, Chicago, IL

17 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

18 We thank the clinical staff at the Shirley Ryan AbilityLab (SRALab) for allowing us to perform the
19 field observations. We also thank the Robotics Lab and KTEAM at SRALab and the members of
20 the STARS RERC and COMET-RERC.org for their ongoing comments and advice.

21 This study was presented as a poster at Progress in Clinical Motor Control II Movement and
22 Rehabilitation Sciences conference at Northwestern University in Chicago, IL, on July 13th,
23 2023.

24 FINANCIAL SUPPORT

25 This work was supported by the National Institute on Disability, Independent Living, and
26 Rehabilitation Research [90REGE005, 90REGE0010], the National Institute on Aging
27 [P30AG059988], U.S. Department of Defense [W81XWH-20-1-0231], and the National Center
28 for Advancing Translational Sciences [UL1TROO1414]. These contents, however, do not
29 necessarily represent the policy or endorsement of any of the funding sources.

30 AUTHOR DISCLOSURES

31 David J. Reinkensmeyer has a financial interest in Hocoma A.G. and Flint Rehabilitation Devices
32 LLC, companies that develop and sell rehabilitation devices. The terms of these arrangements
33 have been reviewed and approved by the University of California, Irvine, in accordance with its
34 conflict-of-interest policies.

35 All other authors declare no competing interests.

36 CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

37 Miriam R. Rafferty, DPT, PhD

38 355 E Erie St. (19th floor) Chicago, IL 60611

39 Mrafferty@sralab.org

40 312-238-7233

41 CLINICAL TRIAL REGISTRATION NUMBER

42 This study was conducted in accordance with ethical principles and guidelines and was
43 approved by the Northwestern Institutional Review Board (STU00212079).
44

45 TITLE

46 Uncovering clinical rehabilitation technology trends: field observations, mixed methods
47 analysis, and data visualization.

48 ABSTRACT

49 **Objective:** To analyze real-world rehabilitation technology (RT) use, with a view toward
50 enhancing RT development and adoption.

51 **Design:** A convergent, mixed-methods study using direct field observations, semi-structured
52 templates, and summative content analysis.

53 **Setting:** Ten neurorehabilitation units in a single health system.

54 **Participants:** 3 research clinicians (1OT, 2PTs) observed ~60 OTs and 70 PTs in inpatient; ~18
55 OTs and 30 PTs in outpatient.

56 **Interventions:** Not applicable

57 **Main Outcome Measures:** Characteristics of RT, time spent setting up and using RT, and
58 clinician behaviors.

59 **Results:** 90 distinct devices across 15 different focus areas were inventoried. 329 RT-uses were
60 documented over 44 hours with 42% of inventoried devices used. RT was used more during
61 interventions (72%) than measurement (28%). Intervention devices used frequently were
62 balance/gait (39%), strength/endurance (30%), and transfer/mobility training (16%).

63 Measurement devices were frequently used to measure vitals (83%), followed by grip strength

64 (7%), and upper extremity function (5%). Device characteristics were predominately AC-
65 powered (56%), actuated (57%), monitor-less (53%), multi-use (68%), and required little
66 familiarization (57%). Set-up times were brief (mean \pm SD = 3.8 ± 4.21 and 0.8 ± 1.3 for
67 intervention and measurement, respectively); more time was spent with intervention RT
68 (25.6 ± 15) than measurement RT (7.3 ± 11.2). RT nearly always involved verbal instructions (72%)
69 with clinicians providing more feedback on performance (59.7%) than on results (30%).
70 Therapists' attention was split evenly between direct attention towards the patient during
71 clinician treatment (49.7%) and completing other tasks such as documentation (50%).

72 **Conclusions:** Even in a tech-friendly hospital, majority of available RT were observed un-used,
73 but identifying these usage patterns is crucial to predict eventual adoption of new designs from
74 earlier stages of RT development. An interactive data visualization page supplement is provided
75 to facilitate this study.

76 KEY WORDS

77 Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine; Rehabilitation; Occupational Therapy; Physical Therapy;
78 Technology; Diffusion of Innovation; Technology Transfer; Implementation Science;
79 Observational Study; Empirical Research; Qualitative Research; Quantitative Research

80 ABBREVIATIONS

81 Occupational Therapy (OT), Physical Therapy (PT), Rehabilitation Technology (RT)

82

83 INTRODUCTION

84 Rehabilitation technology (RT)⁴ is surprisingly under-used.⁵ Despite the significant funding and
85 years of multi-disciplinary efforts from researchers, developers, and clinicians; cutting-edge
86 tools for individual with disabilities-- such as virtual reality,⁶ robotics,⁷ and wearable sensors⁸--
87 rarely see widespread clinical use. The persistent challenge in rehabilitation sciences lies in the
88 disconnect between RT development and clinical use.^{5,8-13} Traditionally, research has focused
89 on efficacy and feasibility studies instead of the factors that influence real-world use of
90 technologies in clinical practice.¹³⁻¹⁶ Perhaps developers do not know enough about the end-
91 stage of this adoption process, leaving a gap to explore the success or failure of effective RT in
92 clinical practice.

93 To address this gap, we sought to understand the qualities of widely used technologies in
94 clinical treatment, and the factors that facilitate or hinder RT-use. In previous studies, barriers
95 and facilitators of RT into clinical practice have been explored primarily through self-reporting,
96 including surveys,^{11,17,18} interviews,^{11,17} focus groups,⁵ case studies,¹⁴ and vignettes.¹⁹ For
97 example, clinicians provided vignettes describing RT-use decisions during treatment sessions,
98 revealing that new RT is not seen as advantageous due to time and complexity.¹⁹ While these
99 self-reporting methods provide clarity into the implementation challenges and opportunities,
100 they do not fully capture the clinical experience.

101 Field observations, a form of ethnographic research that uses participant observation to
102 explore practices, provide valuable insights into the practical application of RT in real-world
103 settings.²⁰ In the case of RT, it serves as a valuable tool for investigating trends, adoption, and

104 challenges of RT-use in clinical treatment, allowing us to identify commonly used equipment,
105 quantify its use, and elucidate how it is used.

106 The goal of this manuscript is to enhance RT design and development by understanding
107 observed usage patterns in clinical settings. We did this by observing clinical RT-use and
108 inventorying RT available in inpatient and outpatient settings. We sought to describe (1) the
109 characteristics of RT associated with therapist use; (2) how much time therapists spend using
110 RT; and (3) therapists' behaviors surrounding RT-use. We intended to build on our previous
111 vignette study, aiming to understand clinicians' on-the-spot decision-making regarding the use
112 or non-use of RT.¹⁹

113 METHODS

114 Study Design

115 This study was conducted in accordance with ethical principles and guidelines, approved by the
116 Northwestern Institutional Review Board (STU00212079) with a waiver of informed consent
117 from observed patients or clinicians. Given the observational design of the study, no masking or
118 randomization was used. Clinicians followed routine clinical practice with no added treatments
119 or assessments. No patient information, protected health information, or identifiers were
120 documented. The director of the allied health facility authorized all observations. A flyer
121 containing information about the study was sent to the sites' managers via email to inform
122 their team of the researchers' presence during observation days.

123 **Context and sample**

124 The field observations and inventory were conducted in our rehabilitation health system, a
125 flagship translational research hospital designated as a national rehabilitation innovation
126 center.²¹ Thus, there is ample RT in all clinical spaces increasing therapist access and
127 opportunity for use. The health system includes adult inpatient treatment on 7 floors within the
128 flagship hospital, 5 outpatient interdisciplinary DayRehab[®] sites, and 3 outpatient neurologic
129 rehabilitation clinics. Data collection occurred in 10 patient units across 3 different settings:
130 adult inpatient treatment floors (7 inpatient units), one DayRehab[®] site (2 units) located
131 adjacent to the flagship hospital, and one outpatient site (1 unit) located within the flagship
132 hospital building. The study observed approximately 70 Physical Therapists (PTs), 60
133 Occupational Therapists (OTs), and 35 Speech Language Pathologists (SLPs) employed at the
134 inpatient rehabilitation facility; 13 PTs, 12 OTs, and 10 SLPs at the DayRehab[®] outpatient
135 location; 17 PTs, 6 OTs, and 4 SLPs employed in outpatient neurologic rehabilitation clinic. Even
136 though clinical treatment occurs in a variety of different areas around each setting (e.g.,
137 inpatient rooms, hospital hallways, private treatment rooms, and shared gym spaces) we
138 contained the observations and inventory to only shared gym spaces.

139 **Data Collection**

140 Two trained clinician research team members (CC, HR) made direct field observations² using a
141 semi-structured template in Excel^a, and inventoried each clinical treatment gym in all 10
142 patient units. This included a range of RT for gait (e.g., overhead gait tracks and treadmills),
143 assessment tools (e.g., upper extremity assessment kits, dynamometers), and general rehab

144 equipment (e.g., adjustable mat table and parallel bars). We excluded simple items such as
145 towels, canes, and walkers as they are used as tools in rehabilitation but not specifically
146 designed as RT for therapists. Data collected in the field observations included descriptive (e.g.,
147 RT observed used, instructions given to patient), categorical (e.g., clinician type), and
148 quantitative (e.g., time spent setting up RT) variables. Only descriptive variables (e.g., RT) were
149 recorded in the inventory. Table 1 contains operational definitions and examples of all
150 qualitative and quantitative data.

151 ***INSERT TABLE 1 HERE***

152 Analysis

153 A convergent, mixed methods design¹ used conventional reporting guidelines.²² Two coders
154 (CC,HR) refined descriptive variables through inductive coding, communicated regularly to
155 resolve discrepancies, and a third coder (MR) assisted in consensus building on the coding
156 strategy. We used qualitative content analysis, using a summative approach,³ to analyze the
157 descriptive variables; this resulted in the creation of multiple subcategories under the different
158 types of RT. We used descriptive statistics to analyze categorical data (e.g., clinician type,
159 feedback type, etc.), representing the results through counts and percents. Data integration
160 occurred through transforming qualitative data into quantitative, using content analysis.²³ We
161 analyzed time quantitatively as a continuous variable measured in minutes. We analyzed and
162 visualized data using Excel^a and R software^b, and used Python^c for exploratory data analysis to

163 investigate the most prevalent combination of RT characteristics used during clinical treatment,
164 and understand the plurality of RT.

165 RESULTS

166 Three trained research clinicians (1 OT, and 2 PTs) completed field observations intermittently
167 between January 2021 through September 2022. They observed for over 44 hours in 60 to 190-
168 minute increments throughout the day until reaching data saturation (defined as the lack of
169 new RT, or RT used in novel ways). The clinicians completed over 24 hours of observations in
170 the inpatient setting, over 10 hours in DayRehab[®], and over 9 hours completed in outpatient. In
171 total, they observed 329 RT-uses. They did not observe SLPs using RT in the shared gym space;
172 therefore, the analysis focuses on OTs and PTs.

173 Two trained research clinicians (1 OT, 1 PT) inventoried 286 RT across all settings; after
174 resolving duplicates, the total inventory revealed 90 distinct devices across 15 different focus
175 areas, with 42% (n=38) observed used (supplemental Table 1). Of all inventoried devices, 21%
176 (n=19) were categorized as gait and/or balance focused, with 36% (n=7) observed used; 13%
177 were for strengthening and/or endurance (n=12), with 75% (n=9) observed used. There are 6
178 device focus categories in which there are only 1 or 2 device models in the inventory (e.g.,
179 vitals, cognition). See supplementary information for a link to an interactive Sankey Diagram
180 that explores the relationships between the inventoried devices.

181 Field Observations

182 Inductive coding of the field observations revealed two RT-use activities: intervention and
183 measurement. Intervention involves actions by clinicians to create, promote, restore, maintain,
184 or modify function, while measurement assesses initial performance or outcomes.²⁴ Table 2
185 details categories and subcategories of observed RT, with counts and percentages.
186 Supplementary materials include an interactive pie chart and Sankey diagram illustrating the
187 proportion of RT characteristics in intervention and measurement RT from the field
188 observations (supplemental Sankey diagram 1).

189 ***INSERT TABLE 2 HERE***

190 Seventy-two percent of observed RT-use (n=237) were for interventions. Most of these
191 observed intervention RT had alternating current (AC) power (183, 78%), actuation (185,78%),
192 no monitor (162, 68%), multi-use (222, 94%), and required a short training period (1-2 hours)
193 for clinicians to establish competence (111, 47%). We observed PTs (173, 73%) using RT for
194 interventions more than OTs (n=56, 24%). These devices saw the most use during one-on-one
195 treatments (169, 71%). The most common type of intervention RT was balance and/or gait
196 (n=93, 39%) followed by strength and/or endurance training (n=70, 30%; fig. 1).

197 **INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE**

198 Measurement RT accounted for 28% (n=92) of observed RT-use. Most of these observed
199 measurement RT were battery-powered (81, 88%), unactuated (91,99%), had a monitor (81,

200 88%), had a single-use (90, 98%), and required only entry-level training (knowledge acquired in
201 OT and PT school) (78,85%) -- this was because vitals (76, 83%) was the most common
202 measurement type. We observed PTs (73,79%) using RT for measurement more than OTs
203 (14,15%). The second most common measurement type was grip strength (6, 7%) followed by
204 upper extremity function (5, 5%; fig. 2), both performed exclusively by OTs.

205 **INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE**

206 Exploratory Data Analysis

207 We conducted exploratory data analysis to identify prevalent combinations of RT
208 characteristics. We excluded non-novel RT, like the adjustable mat table (49, 15%) and
209 adjustable parallel bars (24, 7%), to prevent bias.

210 For intervention RT, the dominant combination of characteristics included AC power, actuation,
211 no display monitor, multi-use, requiring short training for competency, used during
212 interventions targeting balance and/or gait, and used by PTs (40, 24%). These include body
213 weight supported treadmills (n=38), overhead gait tracks with electric harness (n=2), and ceiling
214 lifts (n=1). Excluding these, the second most common combination included unpowered,
215 unactuated, no display monitor, multi-use, requiring short training for competency, used during
216 interventions targeting balance and/or gait, and used by PTs (18,11%). The only devices in this
217 category were manual over-head gait tracks (n=18).

218 For measurement RT, the dominant combination of characteristics included battery power, no
219 actuation, with display monitor, tailored for single-use purpose, necessitating entry-level

220 competency, and used by PTs (70, 97%). But vital signs monitoring machines accounted for all
221 instances of the indicated measurement characteristics. Excluding vital signs, the dominant
222 combination shifted to unpowered, unactuated, no monitor, tailored for single-use purpose,
223 required short training for competency, and used by OTs (6,40%). These instances
224 encompassed kits assessing upper extremity function, manual dexterity, and pinch/grip
225 strength.

226 Time

227 Figure 3 displays setup and total time spent with RT. Setup time was skewed, with a median of
228 1.2 minutes and a mean of 2.9 ± 4.3 minutes. 84% of observations were of RT that took less than
229 5 minutes to setup, and 47% of RT took less than 1 minute to setup. In 5.4% of the
230 observations, OTs and PTs used RT that took 10-36 minutes to set up. The RT that took the
231 longest setup time were a mobile arm support that a patient purchased, and a clinician installed
232 on the patient's wheelchair (36 minutes), and an exoskeleton device (32 minutes). The average
233 total time spent with RT (including setup and breakdown) was 20.5 ± 16.3 minutes. Clinicians
234 spent more time setting up and using intervention RT (setup mean 3.8 ± 4.21 minutes; total time
235 mean 25.6 ± 15 minutes) compared to measurement RT (setup mean 0.8 ± 1.3 minutes; total time
236 mean 7.3 ± 11.2 minutes).

237

INSERT FIGURE 3 HERE

238 Therapists' Behaviors

239 We investigated clinicians' instructions and patients' experience levels with RT. Predominately,
240 therapists used verbal instructions (313, 72%) when using RT, followed by a combination of
241 verbal and demonstrated instruction (46, 14%). Most patients were repeated RT users (294,
242 89%) rather than first-time users (35, 10.6%). First-time users received verbal instructions or a
243 mix of verbal and physical instruction (e.g., demonstration, physical cues, physical assistance).
244 Among the patients with no instructions (16, 4.9%) all were repeat users, using vitals machines
245 or exercise equipment.

246 We documented clinicians' feedback types as either knowledge of performance (task quality or
247 movement patterns), or knowledge of results (outcomes), based on a commonly-used
248 distinction in motor learning research.²⁵⁻²⁷ Instances of no feedback were rare (4, 1.2%).
249 Clinicians primarily provided knowledge of performance (197, 59.7%) compared to knowledge
250 of results (99, 30%) or a combination of both (30, 9%).

251 Our findings revealed that clinicians were evenly divided between providing one-on-one direct
252 attention (164, 49.7%) and multi-tasking (166, 50.3%) when treating patients with RT.

253 DISCUSSION

254 We aimed to understand RT usage patterns such as the characteristics of RT, time spent on
255 setup and total use, and therapists' behaviors.

256 **Rehabilitation Technology Characteristics**

257 Clinicians embraced smart, actuated (185, 78%), and AC-powered (183, 77%) intervention RT,
258 often observed during balance and/or gait training (93, 39%), including body weight supported
259 treadmills (n=38), used by physical therapists (173, 73%). The preference may stem from the
260 safety and efficacy benefits of body weight support technology in gait training.¹⁵

261 The inventory revealed a diverse range of RT for balance and/or gait training, but fewer than
262 half were observed in used. Despite evidence to support split-belt treadmill training,^{28,29} and
263 emerging research advocating for exoskeletons,³⁰ both devices were rarely observed in use. The
264 “relative advantage” barrier, identified in our previous work, persists as there is no clear
265 advantage of novel RT over existing alternatives,^{19,31} and clinicians favor familiar devices such as
266 body-weight supported treadmills and over-head gait tracks due to their proven effectiveness.
267 This preference is mirrored in the hospital system, with each inpatient floor and setting
268 equipped with at least one body weight supported treadmill and gait track; split-belt treadmills
269 and exoskeletons are limited to 1-2 in the entire system. This highlights the need for developers
270 of RT to align their devices with clinician practices, workflow, and practice guidelines. Novel RT
271 needs to demonstrate a clear benefit over the existing equipment.

272 While intervention RT outnumbered measurement RT, more measurement devices in the
273 inventory were observed in use with the most used measurement RT being vital machines and
274 grip strength dynamometers. Vitals measurement is essential for PTs to monitor patient safety
275 in all conditions, and aerobic intervention efficacy; plus, they are faster and more accurate than
276 taking manual measurements.³² Grip strength dynamometers are easy to use, provide more

277 precise measurement than the alternative manual muscle testing, and have established
278 psychometric properties in nearly all conditions.^{33,34} Two important features of these successful
279 measurement RT are their adaptability to different populations and their relative advantage
280 over prior gold standard measures of the vitals and strength domains.³¹ Developers are likely to
281 succeed by enhancing precision in current clinical metrics, instead of expending resources on
282 the creation of novel measurement criteria.

283 Time Constraints

284 Observed RT typically requires less than a day's worth of additional training, and clinicians did
285 not invest a lot of time in setting up RT. This aligns with our earlier work: the time it takes to
286 learn and set up RT is an important factor in its uptake.¹⁹ Clinicians exhibit a stronger
287 preference for RT that is integrated into their entry-level academic training,¹⁹ and constraints
288 on learning during work hours, coupled with the desire to optimize patient treatment time,
289 discourage extensive setup.¹³ We advise developers to consider training and setup time in RT
290 development, even for devices with high efficacy and effectiveness. While greater efficacy
291 might encourage more time investment, our field observations offer a benchmark for designing
292 user-friendly RT.

293 Therapists' Behaviors

294 Feedback plays a crucial role in motor learning, and clinicians' choice of feedback can influence
295 how much patients learn.²⁵ Our observations revealed a preference among clinicians for
296 providing knowledge of performance rather than knowledge of results when using RT. These
297 findings align with current stroke research suggesting that knowledge of performance results in

298 superior motor learning compared to knowledge of results^{26,27} and highlight therapists'
299 attention to movement quality. Future research should investigate if clinician feedback type
300 differs in the presence or absence of RT, or examine the correlation of specific types of
301 feedback (directed vs guided cuing) on patient outcomes. Ultimately, personalized feedback
302 types and frequencies may be necessary based on the patient's condition.²⁷

303 Adhering to documentation standards dictated by insurance and legal requirements^{35,36} often
304 imposes an administrative burden contributing to clinician burnout.³⁷ Allowing patients to
305 independently work with a device under clinical oversight provides therapists with valuable
306 hands-free moments for efficient documentation. Our observations indicate no clear
307 preference towards multi-tasking during RT use, suggesting potential RT solutions that facilitate
308 engaging with patients or multi-tasking between other administrative demands and patient
309 care.

310 Study Limitations

311 Interpretations of the results can serve different purposes: they can reveal characteristics of RT
312 associated with common use, which might guide RT designers, or highlight potential biases
313 associated with lack of use, which might inform implementation innovators. Restricting our
314 data collection to only the treatment gyms is a limitation, since there are devices located in
315 managers' offices, patient rooms, and on research floors. This leads to underreporting of RT-use
316 during clinical treatment and limits the scope of the RT inventory. The 90 available technologies
317 in the inventory are likely larger than many smaller rehabilitation settings but were still
318 insufficient in size for advanced statistical modeling. We based the categorization of RT on

319 observed use rather than the inventory, which has the potential of introducing bias. It is
320 important to note that we completed our RT categorization at one organization, and it is not
321 exhaustive; thus, it may not encompass the full spectrum of clinical treatment. Finally, our
322 reliance on observation with little interactions with the clinicians makes it difficult to
323 extrapolate the underlying reasons for specific clinical behaviors. These limitations highlight the
324 need for further research on motivations behind RT choices within the health system.

325 CONCLUSIONS

326 This mixed methods field observation study in a technology-focused hospital revealed that
327 majority of available RT was not observed used. We observed intervention RT used twice as
328 frequently as measurement RT, with a focus on gait/balance training and strengthening. The
329 measurement RT that is used is primarily for vitals followed by grip strength. These results
330 highlight the ongoing struggle to integrate new RT in clinical practice: successful cases are rare
331 and involve well-established technologies like treadmills, exercise bicycles, and grip strength
332 sensors. The limited use of technology for measurement is notable. Also, used RT tend to have
333 brief set-up times (less than 4 minutes), and, when using them, clinicians typically provide a lot
334 of feedback, focusing on performance (e.g., movement quality) rather than results. In about
335 half of use cases, clinicians leverage the time the patient is interacting with technology to work
336 on documentation.

337

338 REFERENCES

- 339 1. Creswell JW, Plano Clark VL. *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Third
340 Edition. ed. SAGE; 2018:xxvii, 492 pages.
- 341 2. Fix GM, Kim B, Ruben MA, McCullough MB. Direct observation methods: a practical
342 guide for health researchers. *PEC Innovation*. December
343 2022;1(100036)doi:10.1016/j.pecinn.2022.100036
- 344 3. Hsieh HF, Shannon SE. Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qual Health*
345 *Res*. Nov 2005;15(9):1277-1288. doi:10.1177/1049732305276687
- 346 4. Rehabilitation Act. Amended 2015, 29 U.S.Code 32 §705 (1973).
- 347 5. Mitchell J, Shirota C, Clanchy K. Factors that influence the adoption of rehabilitation
348 technologies: a multi-disciplinary qualitative exploration. *Journal of Neuroengineering and*
349 *Rehabilitation*. Jun 20 2023;20(1)doi:ARTN 80
350 10.1186/s12984-023-01194-9
- 351 6. Cano Porras D, Sharon H, Inzelberg R, Ziv-Ner Y, Zeilig G, Plotnik M. Advanced virtual
352 reality-based rehabilitation of balance and gait in clinical practice. *Ther Adv Chronic Dis*.
353 2019;10:2040622319868379. doi:10.1177/2040622319868379
- 354 7. Reinkensmeyer DJ. JNER at 15 years: analysis of the state of neuroengineering and
355 rehabilitation. *J Neuroeng Rehabil*. Oct 30 2019;16(1):144. doi:10.1186/s12984-019-0610-0
- 356 8. Lang CE, Barth J, Holleran CL, Konrad JD, Bland MD. Implementation of Wearable
357 Sensing Technology for Movement: Pushing Forward into the Routine Physical Rehabilitation
358 Care Field. *Sensors-Basel*. Oct 2020;20(20)doi:ARTN 5744

359 10.3390/s20205744

360 9. Louie DR, Bird ML, Menon C, Eng JJ. Perspectives on the prospective development of
361 stroke-specific lower extremity wearable monitoring technology: a qualitative focus group
362 study with physical therapists and individuals with stroke. *Journal of Neuroengineering and*
363 *Rehabilitation*. Feb 25 2020;17(1)doi:ARTN 31

364 10.1186/s12984-020-00666-6

365 10. Lin DJ, Finklestein SP, Cramer SC. New Directions in Treatments Targeting Stroke
366 Recovery. *Stroke*. Dec 2018;49(12):3107-3114. doi:10.1161/Strokeaha.118.021359

367 11. Postol N, Barton J, Wakely L, Bivard A, Spratt NJ, Marquez J. "Are we there yet?"
368 expectations and experiences with lower limb robotic exoskeletons: a qualitative evaluation of
369 the therapist perspective. *Disabil Rehabil*. Mar 1 2023;doi:10.1080/09638288.2023.2183992

370 12. Lenfant C. Shattuck lecture--clinical research to clinical practice--lost in translation? *N*
371 *Engl J Med*. Aug 28 2003;349(9):868-74. doi:10.1056/NEJMsa035507

372 13. Bauer MS, Damschroder L, Hagedorn H, Smith J, Kilbourne AM. An introduction to
373 implementation science for the non-specialist. *BMC Psychol*. Sep 16 2015;3(1):32.
374 doi:10.1186/s40359-015-0089-9

375 14. Lane JP, Leahy JA, Bauer SM. Accomplishing technology transfer: case-based lessons of
376 what works and what does not. *Assist Technol*. Summer 2003;15(1):69-88.
377 doi:10.1080/10400435.2003.10131891

378 15. Lane JP. Understanding Technology Transfer. *Assist Technol*. 1999;11(1):5-19.
379 doi:10.1080/10400435.1999.10131981

- 380 16. Lane JP, Flagg JL. Translating three states of knowledge--discovery, invention, and
381 innovation. *Implement Sci.* Feb 1 2010;5:9. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-5-9
- 382 17. Liu LL, Cruz AM, Rincon AR, Buttar V, Ranson Q, Goertzen D. What factors determine
383 therapists' acceptance of new technologies for rehabilitation - a study using the Unified Theory
384 of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT). *Disabil Rehabil.* 2015;37(5):447-455.
385 doi:10.3109/09638288.2014.923529
- 386 18. Hughes AM, Burridge JH, Demain SH, et al. Translation of evidence-based Assistive
387 Technologies into stroke rehabilitation: users' perceptions of the barriers and opportunities.
388 *Bmc Health Serv Res.* Mar 12 2014;14doi:Artn 124
389 10.1186/1472-6963-14-124
- 390 19. Celian C, Swanson V, Shah M, et al. A day in the life: a qualitative study of clinical
391 decision-making and uptake of neurorehabilitation technology. *J Neuroeng Rehabil.* Jul 28
392 2021;18(1):121. doi:10.1186/s12984-021-00911-6
- 393 20. Savage J. Ethnography and health care. *BMJ.* Dec 2 2000;321(7273):1400-2.
394 doi:10.1136/bmj.321.7273.1400
- 395 21. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve access to rehabilitation
396 innovation centers under the Medicare program., 2834, Senate, 117th Congress sess (2023).
397 01/05/2023. <https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/senate-bill/2834>
- 398 22. Lee SD, Iott B, Banaszak-Holl J, et al. Application of Mixed Methods in Health Services
399 Management Research: A Systematic Review. *Med Care Res Rev.* Jun 2022;79(3):331-344.
400 doi:10.1177/10775587211030393

- 401 23. Fetters MD, Rubinstein EB. The 3 Cs of Content, Context, and Concepts: A Practical
402 Approach to Recording Unstructured Field Observations. *Ann Fam Med*. Nov 2019;17(6):554-
403 560. doi:10.1370/afm.2453
- 404 24. Occupational Therapy Practice Framework: Domain and Process-Fourth Edition. *Am J*
405 *Occup Ther*. Aug 1 2020;74(Supplement_2):7412410010p1-7412410010p87.
406 doi:10.5014/ajot.2020.74S2001
- 407 25. Maier M, Ballester BR, Verschure P. Principles of Neurorehabilitation After Stroke Based
408 on Motor Learning and Brain Plasticity Mechanisms. *Front Syst Neurosci*. 2019;13:74.
409 doi:10.3389/fnsys.2019.00074
- 410 26. Subramanian SK, Massie CL, Malcolm MP, Levin MF. Does Provision of Extrinsic
411 Feedback Result in Improved Motor Learning in the Upper Limb Poststroke? A Systematic
412 Review of the Evidence. *Neurorehab Neural Re*. Feb 2010;24(2):113-124.
413 doi:10.1177/1545968309349941
- 414 27. Levin MF, Demers M. Motor learning in neurological rehabilitation. *Disabil Rehabil*. Dec
415 2021;43(24):3445-3453. doi:10.1080/09638288.2020.1752317
- 416 28. Reisman DS, McLean H, Keller J, Danks KA, Bastian AJ. Repeated split-belt treadmill
417 training improves poststroke step length asymmetry. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. Jun
418 2013;27(5):460-8. doi:10.1177/1545968312474118
- 419 29. Seuthe J, D'Cruz N, Ginis P, et al. Split-belt treadmill walking in patients with Parkinson's
420 disease: A systematic review. *Gait Posture*. Mar 2019;69:187-194.
421 doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2019.01.032

- 422 30. Hohl K, Giffhorn M, Jackson S, Jayaraman A. A framework for clinical utilization of
423 robotic exoskeletons in rehabilitation. *J Neuroeng Rehabil.* Oct 29 2022;19(1):115.
424 doi:10.1186/s12984-022-01083-7
- 425 31. Damschroder LJ, Reardon CM, Widerquist MAO, Lowery J. The updated Consolidated
426 Framework for Implementation Research based on user feedback. *Implement Sci.* Oct 29
427 2022;17(1):75. doi:10.1186/s13012-022-01245-0
- 428 32. Myers MG, Godwin M, Dawes M, et al. Conventional versus automated measurement of
429 blood pressure in primary care patients with systolic hypertension: randomised parallel design
430 controlled trial. *BMJ.* Feb 7 2011;342:d286. doi:10.1136/bmj.d286
- 431 33. Ekstrand E, Lexell J, Brogardh C. Grip strength is a representative measure of muscle
432 weakness in the upper extremity after stroke. *Top Stroke Rehabil.* Dec 2016;23(6):400-405.
433 doi:10.1080/10749357.2016.1168591
- 434 34. Peterson MD, Collins S, Meier HCS, Brahmsteadt A, Faul JD. Grip strength is inversely
435 associated with DNA methylation age acceleration. *J Cachexia Sarcopeni.* Feb 2023;14:108-115.
436 doi:10.1002/jcsm.13110
- 437 35. Guidelines for Documentation of Occupational Therapy. *Am J Occup Ther.* Nov/Dec
438 2018;72(Supplement_2):7212410010p1-7212410010p7. doi:10.5014/ajot.2018.72S203
- 439 36. Revised by the Commission on P, Casto SC, Davis C, et al. Standards of Practice for
440 Occupational Therapy. *Am J Occup Ther.* Nov 1
441 2022;75(Supplement_3)doi:10.5014/ajot.2021.75S3004
- 442 37. Association APT. The Impact of Administrative Burden on Physical Therapist Services.
443 Infographic. 2023. <https://www.apta.org/advocacy/issues/administrative-burden/infographic>

444 **SUPPLIERS**

445 a. Excel spreadsheet by Microsoft.

446 b. R Statistical Software; R Foundation for Statistical Computing.

447 c. Python Software Foundation (Libraries Used: Pandas).

448


449 FIGURE LEGENDS


450 **Figure 1: Intervention RT (n=237) subcategories.** Devices for balance and gait (n=93, 39%) were the
451 most common interventions observed, followed by devices for strengthening and/or endurance (n=70,
452 30%), and transfers and/or mobility (n=37, 16%).

453 **Figure 2: Measurement RT (n=92) subcategories.** Vitals (n=76, 83%) dominated the observed
454 measurements, followed by grip strength (n=6, 7%) and upper extremity function (n=5, 5%).

455 **Figure 3: Setup time (panel A) and total time (panel B) spent with RT devices among OTs and PTs**
456 **during observed sessions.** More time is spent setting up and using RT for intervention than
457 measurement (*p<0.001).

458








Table 1: Qualitative and quantitative data collected in field observations and inventory. Table includes the type of data collected, distinguishes each variable, and provides an example.

Data	Type	Variable	Example
Qualitative	Descriptive leading to inductive coding	Name of the device inventoried, or observed used by clinician	Treadmills, Mobile Arm Supports, Vital Machines
		Assign a category behind purpose of device use	Measurement of UE/LE/Vitals, Intervention for-strength/endurance
		Description of task or therapeutic activity	Standing, walking, biking, blood pressure measurement
		General observational notes in free text	<i>“Therapist retrieves equipment for next task during patient's rest breaks”</i>
	Initially descriptive, leading to coding became categorical as the observations	Therapist feedback provided to patient when using device	Knowledge of results, Knowledge of performance

	continued		
	Categorical	Clinician being observed	OT, PT, SLP
		Group type	One-on-One, Double, Group (≥3)
		If the patient is a first-time user to the device based on observation of interaction and instructions	Yes, No, or unclear
		Type of cues and instruction provided by therapist	Verbal, demonstration
		Therapist's ongoing attention to patient using device, versus therapist multi-tasking during treatment	Point of care documentation, direct care
		Hospital floor/unit where therapy took place	25 th Floor Inpatient hospital, DayRehab [®] , Outpatient
Quantitative	Continuous	Length of time to setup, train, and/or instruct patient on device use	Time

Table 2: Characteristics of clinicians, treatments, and rehabilitation technologies (RT) observed used in field observations. Table includes definitions, counts, and percentages by category and sub-category, separated by type and total.

Category	Sub-Category	Definition	Intervention RT (237, 72%)	Measurement RT (92, 28%)	Total (329)
Clinician Type	OT	Occupational Therapists	56 (24%)	14 (15%)	70 (21%)
	PT	Physical Therapists	173 (73%)	73 (79%)	246 (75%)
	Not Documented	--	8 (3%)	5 (5%)	13 (4%)
Treatment Type	One On One	Clinician working with 1 patient	169 (71%)	78 (85%)	247 (76%)
	Double	Clinician working with 2 patients simultaneously	20 (8%)	1 (1%)	21 (6%)
	Group	Clinician working with 3 or more patients simultaneously	13 (5%)	1 (1%)	14 (4%)
	Not Documented	--	35 (15%)	12 (13%)	47 (14%)
Power Source	Electrical Power	Powered by alternating current (e.g., wall plug/electricity)	183 (77%)	1 (1%)	184 (56%)

	Battery Powered	RT powered by a battery source, also includes rechargeable batteries; or does not remain plugged into a wall outlet to be powered	19 (8%)	81 (88%)	100 (30%)
	Unpowered	No source of power; or uses cables, pulleys, or pneumatics to operate	35 (15%)	10 (11%)	45 (14%)
Smart RT	Actuated	Powered RT, motor, moves	185 (78%)	1 (1%)	186 (57%)
	Unactuated	Typically unpowered, does not move	52 (22%)	91 (99%)	143 (43%)
Display	Monitor	Visual display screen	75 (32%)	81 (88%)	156 (47%)
	No Monitor	No visual display screen	162 (68%)	11 (12%)	173 (53%)
Versatility	Multi-Use Tool	RT that can be used for multiple types of interventions, and/or measurements.	222 (94%)	2 (2%)	224 (68%)
	Single-Use Tool	RT that serves only one function	15 (6%)	90 (98%)	105 (32%)
Training Level	Entry-Level	Taught in clinical schools, no additional training beyond OT/PT degree	109 (46%)	78 (85%)	187 (57%)
	Short	1-2 hours of additional training	111 (47%)	10 (11%)	121 (37%)

	Complex	≥ 1 day of additional training, or requires certification to achieve competency	17 (7%)	4 (4%)	21 (6%)
--	---------	---	---------	--------	---------