Research Output Journal of Engineering and Scientific Research 4(2): 87-94, 2025

ROJESR Publications Online ISSN: 1115-9790

https://rojournals.org/roj-engineering-and-scientific-research/ Print ISSN: 1115-6155

https://doi.org/10.59298/ROJESR/2025/4.2.8794

Robotics in Physical Therapy: Enhancing Patient Outcomes

Amina Nalongo J.

Faculty of Engineering Kampala International University Uganda

ABSTRACT

The integration of robotics into physical therapy represents a significant advancement in rehabilitation sciences, offering new pathways to enhance patient outcomes. This paper examines the evolution, benefits, challenges, and future directions of robotic systems in physical therapy. With a focus on upper extremity rehabilitation, robotic systems such as exoskeletons and virtual reality-integrated devices have demonstrated promising results in improving exercise adherence, therapy intensity, and functional recovery, especially in stroke patients. The review examines the design complexities of rehabilitation robots, including multi-degree-of-freedom mechanisms, user interaction challenges, and cost constraints. Case studies and clinical data support the effectiveness of robotic interventions while also emphasizing the importance of ethical considerations, safety standards, and user education. Although technical and financial challenges remain, ongoing innovations in robot-assisted therapy suggest a future where personalized, accessible, and efficient rehabilitation is increasingly feasible.

Keywords: Robotic Rehabilitation, Physical Therapy, Exoskeletons, Neurorehabilitation, Upper Limb Therapy, Patient Outcomes, Virtual Reality.

INTRODUCTION

The American Physical Therapy Association (APTA) defines physical therapy as treating bodily injury or dysfunction through therapeutic exercises, mobilization, heat, cold, water, light, electricity, sound, and radiation. Physical therapists use various approaches to prevent and eliminate movement dysfunction, enhancing individuals' physical abilities and quality of life. The goal is to help patients understand their condition and guide them in their recovery journey, using techniques like manual mobilization, soft tissue therapy, electrical modalities, and exercises. Robot-aided rehabilitation enriches the therapist's toolkit, but the therapist remains essential for successful rehabilitation. The robot should be 'invisible' in clinical settings to maintain the therapist-patient connection. A proficient therapist must identify the patient's prerequisites for treatment, ensuring that the robot is adaptable to human limbs. The effectiveness of robots with a high number of degrees of freedom (DOFs) in clinical settings is debated. While greater movement variety could be beneficial, it may complicate treatment and increase costs. Evaluating whether a robot should act on entire extremities rather than individual joints is crucial for optimizing therapeutic outcomes [1, 2].

Historical Overview of Physical Therapy

Robotic devices have gained traction in neurorehabilitation for the upper extremities over the past decade. Various robotic rehabilitation systems have been developed and are now undergoing clinical testing with stroke patients. Unlike lower limb rehabilitation, upper extremity robotic support remains primarily in clinical research, with no commercial prototypes available yet. The technologies used in these systems will be examined regarding physical therapy's needs. Clinical studies indicate positive outcomes from robot-assisted neuro-rehabilitation, with patient feedback highlighting a desire for robotic exercises, which are seen as more engaging. Increased acceptance could lead to these tools being integrated into therapy. Robots enable patients to train intensively to regain arm use, allowing therapists to concentrate on non-robot-replaceable treatment aspects. They also provide precise, continuous performance metrics, facilitating assessment of both therapy quality and quantity. A comparison will be made between the goals of physical therapy and robotic rehabilitation for upper extremities, alongside an overview of existing robotic prototypes. Rehabilitation robots are often more complex than industrial manipulators, as they must cater to a diverse range of patients with different needs. These systems demand high torque actuators and sophisticated spherical coordination. Additionally, user interaction during rehabilitation is unpredictable and is guided solely by the design and control principles of the device. By evaluating the key differences in rehabilitation robots concerning clinical needs and design, we can identify emerging design and control trends [3, 4].

The Role of Robotics in Rehabilitation

The role of robotics in rehabilitation involves using virtual reality (VR) for neurorehabilitation, focusing on upper extremity recovery in chronic stroke patients. Robotic devices provide mechanical guidance and assistance for effective rehabilitation, easing the burden on medical teams. However, these systems cannot deliver the necessary multi-sensory feedback. Thus, a custom robotic device interfaces with a VR scenario tailored for forearm rehabilitation. Technologies like the Lokomat exoskeleton, MIT-MANUS, and Hocoma Armeo Spring demonstrate various functionalities to enhance rehabilitation practices. Despite this, compliance with robot-assisted rehabilitation techniques remains suboptimal. Physical disabilities greatly affect patients and their families, increasing the risk of depression. Evidence indicates that improving physical independence can lead to better cognitive function and mood, which positively impacts rehabilitation outcomes. Active participation in physical therapy is crucial for success. A meta-analysis of 69 studies with 9729 participants shows that compliant design and robot movements are vital for engagement in rehabilitation. Combining psychological strategies with robotic physiotherapy aims to improve human-robot interaction and treatment results. Fostering trust in rehabilitation robotics is essential for increasing patients' acceptance and positive attitudes towards prescribed training [5, 6].

Types of Robotic Systems Used in Therapy

Robotic systems for rehabilitation involve various subjects, components, and methods. They aid in restoring the 3-dimensional movement of limbs with complex articulated designs featuring at least three degrees of freedom. Conventional exoskeletons typically cover upper limb joints, allowing motion only in specific directions. A lighter, less complex 2-degree-of-freedom hypocycloid mechanism has been developed, though it offers limited motion space. Robotic systems are crucial for executing prescribed tasks in physiotherapy, transitioning from 3D to planar motion to allow for a broader exercise range and reduced infrastructure costs. Control algorithms are used to maintain the desired motions, utilizing force-reflection to balance user input with robot motion. However, this requires a complex kinematic structure, such as a serial-parallel or hybrid mechanism. The robot must accurately measure the motion of afflicted limbs in terms of position and orientation for effective control. Additionally, methods for upper limb robot manipulators focusing on body-centered 6D position control have been proposed, though less effort has been directed toward coordinated measurements. This has led to discrepancies between actual and model predictions. Controlling impaired limb motion in therapy robots remains challenging. Previous work aims to achieve fingertip-centered motion through 4-dof or 5-dof techniques using multiple markers, employing learning-based or hybrid methods for better control over robotic platforms during tasks [7, 8].

Benefits Of Robotic Assistance

Robotic assistance in physiotherapy significantly enhances patient behaviors and outcomes. The use of robotic systems improves patient adherence, exercise intensity, and health results. A study of 22 stroke patients over 80 hours demonstrated increased exercise duration, velocity, and attendance rates. Both physiotherapists and patients provided positive feedback about the effectiveness of robotic methods, which allow for reduced patient-therapist contact while maintaining care quality. Physiotherapists can better monitor and prevent exercise errors, with robotic systems guiding and measuring exercises objectively. This new approach is becoming the treatment of choice for enhanced therapies. Robotic devices can be classified as “passive,” “active,” or “passive-active,” and can take forms such as “whole arm,” “forearm,” or “exoskeleton.” They serve various treatment areas, from paraplegics to orthopedics, improving rehabilitation outcomes. Additionally, robotic systems bolster patient interactions and exercise specificity, enhancing treatment compliance. Patients can engage in home exercises while therapists manage multiple cases in clinics, utilizing technologies like head-mounted displays or game-like virtual realities for interactive rehabilitation. This leads to improved patient behaviors and remarkable outcomes, enabling well-trained patients to reintegrate into society, even after using robotic systems in isolating environments [9, 10].

Challenges In Implementing Robotics

The introduction of robotic systems into rehabilitation has shown great promise in augmenting traditional therapy and helping to ease the global shortage of therapists. However, many challenges still need to be addressed for successful integration into physiotherapy practice. This plenary talk aims to outline the promises that robotic systems offer for rehabilitation, scenarios where they will be of use, the challenges posed by the current robotic systems, and touch on future directions and research opportunities. Robotic systems for rehabilitation will likely take over simple and repetitive tasks currently done by therapists. Concentrating these tasks into systems that already have the necessary infrastructure will free up therapists to spend the limited time they have with patients on high-value, personalized tasks. This should improve the efficiency and effectiveness of rehabilitation services. Many advances in robotic systems for rehabilitation have been made in laboratory settings; however, very few have made it to real-world user environments. The systems are incredibly expensive and complicated, making it difficult to provide necessary support and maintenance. The Robopysio project aims to develop a robust robotic system for rehabilitation that uses low-cost and widely available consumer components and is straightforward to deploy, install, and maintain. The system will be comprised of a blend of pneumatic actuators, standard webcam cameras, and a soft robotic finger that can be fitted onto any standard physiotherapy tool [11, 12].

Case Studies of Robotic Applications

To highlight the significance of incorporating robotic systems within the field of physical therapy, the unique application of two robotic devices to enhance recovery is presented. The first example illustrates the usage of a robotic exoskeleton to provide functional exercises to achieve after-stroke upper-limb therapy at home and satisfactory exercise compliance and satisfaction. The second example utilizes a robotic-supported physiotherapy framework with a handheld device to recover forearm motions in a virtual environment through engaging and individualized exercises. Despite well-founded efficacy corroborated by scientific evaluation evidence, many rehabilitation exoskeletons are restricted to hospitals due to impracticality in ease of usage. The main considerations regarding usability involve portability, infrastructure-free operation, self-guidance, and maintenance-free, which can be addressed by robotic technologies. The previously considered areas regarding walking honorable applications where the targets of recovery are dumb body parts over complex motor synergies. A high-degree-of-freedom powered redundancy-compliant exoskeleton is developed as two parallel modules mounted on forearm linkages for individualized index finger training, where the assisted motion is determined directly from the state of human motions. Four robot-assisted exercises are devised for training functional finger flexion/extension to grasp and release a cup with applications in daily life, medication. Therapies provided by the robot encourage the patients to complete optimally trained motions in a motion-friendly environment, and the human motion states are exploited by 6 joint values monitored from encoders. The primary challenge arises in low-cost systems for robustness against imprecision of measurement, modelling, and the bitterness of noise. A modified Kalman filter estimates the joint angles of the exoskeleton and generates designed trajectories of the training exercises via a Jacobian-based inverse kinematic solution. Utilizing wrist-twisting motions, a mechanic-free one-stage forward-kinematic mapping increases the training observing dimensionality, paired with a path optimization method [13, 14].

Future Trends in Robotic Therapy

The field of robotic physical therapy is continually advancing, with research focused on creating treatments that provide better outcomes at a lower cost. As funding for progressive programs continues to decline due to limited resources, the need for increased productivity will grow. New robotic devices and control techniques are needed to take better advantage of the capabilities of existing technology. Multi-joint upper-limb robot assistive systems must be developed that cater to a wider demographic option, and assemble components and subsystems that can be easily integrated into existing research setups. These trends are partly a result of social developments, since the backdrop of modern healthcare systems is rapidly changing. In the USA, some of the largest and most powerful insurance companies have started to impose huge deductibles for the patient and restrict claims on stroke rehabilitation to a sequence of 45-minute daily sessions a few times a week for six weeks. This change in availability for treatment time places pressure on clinical setups to maximize patient throughput. While robots to actuate rehabilitation exercises can increase the effectiveness of the procedure, there is an increasing need to develop exercises that can be performed in an unattended fashion. Robotic devices used for physical therapy must adapt in sophistication for patient users. Research will need to commence on techniques for increasing safety during resistance exercises and the development of semi-active rehabilitation devices. The present objective is to assist patients who can maintain partial or complete functional mobility through resistance training of affected muscles, rather than on passive rehabilitation devices. Research and design becoming less complicated can help in lowering the cost of these devices. As a result, these devices could be deployed in homes or care facilities where treatment is not feasible [15, 16].

Ethical Considerations

The introduction of robots into rehabilitation practices raises several ethical issues related to their design and usage. Privacy, model transparency, cybersecurity, and risk mitigation are some of the primary concerns. On the other hand, robots' possible repercussions on health professionals and patients must be addressed. Educating health professionals and caregivers on the appropriate and ethical use of robotic systems is essential. The ethical considerations related to human-robot interaction are relevant in all physical therapy applications. In rehabilitation, the danger of robots being disposed to injure patients was discussed; fine biomechanical technology can guarantee the robot's safety, but humans could provide the innate ability to act appropriately in unforeseen circumstances. As technology has become more complicated with the adoption of artificial intelligence, ethical issues have practically escalated. For example, robots are being programmed to learn by themselves and are capable of examining patient data and devising and applying treatment protocols. However, this potentially raises issues about data privacy. Moreover, the problematic framework is unfamiliar to users, including health professionals and patients, who may be hesitant to trust robots and feel anxious and powerless regarding their inputs. Similar ethical concerns have also arisen in disability compensation and health systems biases. As more conferences have been organized, and as academic publications are needed to better define these ethical issues in rehabilitation, assistance, and rehabilitation/assistance robotics, it can already be anticipated that in the following years ethical aspects of rehabilitation, assistance, and rehabilitation/assistance robotics will attract increasing attention [17, 18].

Regulatory and Safety Standards

Ensuring the safety of robotic devices in rehabilitation is challenging due to the lack of reliable benchmarks. To demonstrate safe behavior, worst-case scenarios were recreated and their risks estimated. The low values of risk components confirm the ongoing maintenance of a safety zone. While extensive literature exists on robotic design safety, rehabilitation robotics remains under-explored. The primary focus of assessing robotic safety is the reliability of the systems, and this approach was broadened to encompass risk assessment for rehabilitation devices. As robotic technology advances, stakeholders must identify and manage associated risks. A methodology for safeguarding robots was developed, focusing on three areas: hazard reduction during design, adherence to regulatory guidelines, and enhancing operators' skills. The development of effective rehabilitation robots has progressed significantly; however, clinical safety concerns remain. The risk assessment methodologies proposed can boost clinicians' confidence in the safe use of these devices, recommending mitigation strategies during design and development. Adapting these methods to new devices is beneficial as robotic solutions evolve to meet rehabilitation demands. Furthermore, standardizing safety regulations across clinics is essential for equitable access to rehabilitation robots. The usability study's design will help refine safety and usability assessments, minimizing risks to patients and staff and addressing the future needs of rehabilitation robots amid changing clinical landscapes [19, 20].

Collaboration Between Engineers and Therapists

Effective rehabilitation relies on collaboration between engineers and therapists. Engineers develop robotic solutions, while therapists play a crucial role during therapy sessions and in reprogramming robots. In Pediatric Physiotherapy at the Southern Health and Social Care Trust, understanding each other's perspectives is vital for successful collaboration and effective robotic interventions. While robotic devices have primarily been used in research, their permanent clinical deployment is still under discussion, highlighting the need for more focus on human engagement in design. Robotic technology can enhance rehabilitation by improving strength and motion through exercise. These systems assist in regular training for lower and upper limbs, yielding positive outcomes in clinics. However, compliance with robotic rehabilitation techniques remains suboptimal due to insufficient patient engagement. Physical disabilities can heavily burden patients, leading to issues like depression and cognitive problems. Evidence shows that enhancing physical independence can boost cognition and mood, making it essential to actively involve patients in physical therapy for successful rehabilitation outcomes [21, 22].

Patient-Centered Design in Robotics

While aesthetic design in robotic systems has value, research in rehabilitation robots emphasizes patient involvement. Such robots enhance patient-physiotherapist interactions and are custom-designed for specific rehabilitation tasks. Investigating the patient's role in robot design reveals broader design issues beyond task effectiveness, such as the significance of body movements. Attention to visual or auditory information provided by the robot is crucial for practicing robots in clinical settings. Findings indicate new design considerations concerning patient experience, attentiveness, and participation levels. The demand for assistive agents to assess each patient's attentiveness and tailor guidance is pressing. Providing timely feedback can boost positive emotions and motivation. Therefore, human–robot interaction must incorporate user-centered design alongside theoretical studies regarding communication modalities, expressive behaviors, and feedback systems. Improving design elements to enhance usability from the patient's perspective is vital for better interaction with rehabilitation robots. Overall satisfaction and perceived usefulness significantly influence a patient's view of usability. While aesthetic exploration is important, creating a patient-friendly robotic system that supports relationships with the robot is a valuable objective. Focusing on usability within rehabilitation robotics significantly enhances the care quality that such robots can deliver [23, 24].

Impact of Robotics on Therapy Outcomes

Functional imaging studies and neurophysiological mapping of the recovery process following early therapy of limb impairment due to stroke offer some insights. These studies converge to indicate that, following successful motor recovery, there is an increase in the size of the motor and sensory areas in the lesioned hemisphere dedicated to the impaired limb, which indicates recruitment of preexisting neural circuitry. Importantly, motor recovery is also associated with a far from simple reorganization in nontensioned regions that translates into a more complex and differentiated response to motor task execution, including both hemispheres and preexisting recruitment of a prefrontal motor network bilaterally. Prompted by mutual paradigm development, ongoing studies are now corroborating these results at the level of cortical dynamics within populations of neurons during motor task execution using a combination of fMRI and MEG. Such studies should ultimately indicate which modes of therapy are more effective and whether particular therapy interventions have unique neuroplastic effects. Therapy disciplines and environments for the elderly, most notably those with impaired mobility and balance, have been developed focusing on certain needs associated with aging and chronic disease. One such therapy setting is the intervention of robots in the home environment. This is an important area for future work because robot intervention in the home offers the possibility of transferring the practice of functional activities into the real-life setting. They are the safest and most affordable general-purpose manipulators in practice today. Acceptance of robotic therapies demands that robots be safe in their physical interaction with humans. One way to do this is to make slow, weak, and compliant robots. This, however, compromises their ability to assist. A more appealing angle is the idea of robots that can be taught skills to mimic the therapeutic role of human caregivers. An additional important dimension of future efforts is that robotic therapies can enhance multisensory perception, further improving the realism of the therapy environment [25, 26].

Training Programs for Therapists

Robots have gradually been adopted in rehabilitation, but human therapists will rightly remain an essential element in recovery from disability. Machines are tested on robots that move and behave as a therapist might. While this is technically feasible, the focus is more on motion than intent. Machines are limited to producing motion according to inputs, not on intent within a changing feedback framework. Thus, even compliant robots that appear to physically obey human commands based on physical interaction remain extremely limited in their predictive abilities. One of the earliest considerations of human-like teleoperation machines in the 1970s was paralleled by intelligent domain-neutral planning and prediction simulations. The progress in this direction thus far can be compared with present-day robotic approaches to these questions. Current research approaches to mechanically controlling both human intent and externally applied therapeutic motion remain largely application-specific. For physical rehabilitation, experimenter-in-the-loop planning and programming software exist, but they are not designed to simulate robustly adjustable physiotherapy with compliant physical assistance either given to or evaded by the patient. However, machines are being developed to assist and train teachers to provide psycho-educational feedback adaptive to the state of the child. Machines are even being tested as companions to the elderly disabled, which presents open-ended questions about diverse behavior and the nature of human-like therapeutic machines. Tele-operational machines for physical therapy under closed-loop human compliance run into complex sensibility and therapist-induced plasticity that the therapist must discover. Understanding and mimicking human-like physical, social, and emotive teleoperation action as systems capable of autonomous movement are relatively uninvestigated fundamental aspects of cognition and cognition interface with the physical world [27-30].

Technological Innovations in Robotics

Recently, many assistive technologies have been created to meet specific patient needs, alongside the engineering community's work on rehabilitation robots' basic structures and mechanisms. These technologies include robotic systems delivering human-like motions and forces, and exoskeletons for various movements. A new paradigm of "cognitive" rehabilitation technologies is also emerging, featuring intelligent systems integrated with virtual reality (VR), neuroscience, and robotics for more adaptable rehabilitation therapies that focus on advanced brain functions in movement learning and error correction. Intelligent techniques are utilized across cognitive psychiatry, with robotic and VR games combined with intelligent software for cognitive and attention training. Alongside the advancement of interactive neuro-rehabilitation technologies, issues surrounding safety and accessibility warrant attention. Safety measures in hardware, control techniques, and government regulations regarding robot-aided rehabilitation are discussed. Accessibility of VR-enabled rehabilitation environments for diverse patient needs is highlighted, along with initiatives aimed at socio-cognitive engagement and cross-cultural content. Future trends include research on tele-therapy-enabled home rehabilitation robots and socially-situated rehabilitation VR. This review analyzes rehabilitation technologies potentially useful in physiotherapy practice, weighing technological and clinical aspects. The studies' clinical and physiotherapy objectives were critical for this systematic review, along with the rehabilitation devices' technology. Four categories of rehabilitation technologies were identified: Robotics, VR, Assistive technology, and Smartphone applications [31-35].

CONCLUSION

Robotics in physical therapy has transitioned from experimental prototypes to increasingly practical tools in clinical and home settings. These systems offer notable benefits, including increased treatment intensity, enhanced patient engagement, and improved functional recovery. However, their widespread adoption hinges on overcoming substantial barriers such as high costs, technological complexity, and user skepticism. Ethical concerns and safety standards must also evolve alongside robotic capabilities to ensure responsible and effective care. Future developments should prioritize affordability, portability, intuitive use, and the integration of artificial intelligence for adaptive, individualized treatment. By addressing these challenges, robotics can play a transformative role in rehabilitative medicine, supporting both patients and therapists in achieving optimal health outcomes.

REFERENCES

1. Fareh R, Elsabe A, Baziyad M, Kawser T, Brahmi B, Rahman MH. Will your next therapist be a robot?—A review of the advancements in robotic upper extremity rehabilitation. Sensors. 2023 May 25;23(11):5054. mdpi.com
2. Banyai AD, Brişan C. Robotics in physical rehabilitation: Systematic Review. InHealthcare 2024 Aug 29 (Vol. 12, No. 17, p. 1720). MDPI.
3. Lobo P, Morais P, Murray P, Vilaça JL. Trends and Innovations in Wearable Technology for Motor Rehabilitation, Prediction, and Monitoring: A Comprehensive Review. Sensors. 2024 Dec 13;24(24):7973.
4. Shoaib M, Asadi E, Cheong J, Bab-Hadiashar A. Cable driven rehabilitation robots: Comparison of applications and control strategies. IEEE Access. 2021 Aug 3;9:110396-420.
5. Atashzar SF, Carriere J, Tavakoli M. How can intelligent robots and smart mechatronic modules facilitate remote assessment, assistance, and rehabilitation for isolated adults with neuro-musculoskeletal conditions?. Frontiers in Robotics and AI. 2021 Apr 12;8:610529.
6. Ju F, Wang Y, Xie B, Mi Y, Zhao M, Cao J. The use of sports rehabilitation robotics to assist in the recovery of physical abilities in elderly patients with degenerative diseases: A literature review. InHealthcare 2023 Jan 21 (Vol. 11, No. 3, p. 326). MDPI.
7. Dontha JD. THE INTEGRATION OF AUTOMATION IN PHYSIOTHERAPY: A REVIEW OF EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES AND THEIR IMPACT ON REHABILITATION. Cuestiones de Fisioterapia. 2025 Feb 20;54(4):6698-705.
8. Eze VH, Ugwu Chinyere N, Ogenyi Fabian C. Blockchain Technology in Clinical Trials. Research Output Journal of Biological and Applied Science. 2024;3(1):40-5.
9. Prendergast JM, Balvert S, Driessen T, Seth A, Peternel L. Biomechanics aware collaborative robot system for delivery of safe physical therapy in shoulder rehabilitation. IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters. 2021 Jul 16;6(4):7177-84. tudelft.nl

10. Palermo E, Hayes DR, Russo EF, Calabrò RS, Pacilli A, Filoni S. Translational effects of robot-mediated therapy in subacute stroke patients: an experimental evaluation of upper limb motor recovery. PeerJ. 2018 Sep 4;6:e5544.
11. Ugwu OP, Alum EU, Ugwu JN, Eze VH, Ugwu CN, Ogenyi FC, Okon MB. Harnessing technology for infectious disease response in conflict zones: Challenges, innovations, and policy implications. Medicine. 2024 Jul 12;103(28):e38834.
12. Padilla-Castañeda MA, Sotgiu E, Barsotti M, Frisoli A, Orsini P, Martiradonna A, Laddaga C, Bergamasco M. An Orthopaedic Robotic-Assisted Rehabilitation Method of the Forearm in Virtual Reality Physiotherapy. Journal of healthcare engineering. 2018;2018(1):7438609.
13. Pan M, Yuan C, Liang X, Dong T, Liu T, Zhang J, Zou J, Yang H, Bowen C. Soft actuators and robotic devices for rehabilitation and assistance. Advanced Intelligent Systems. 2022 Apr;4(4):2100140. wiley.com
14. Bessler J, Prange-Lasonder GB, Schaake L, Saenz JF, Bidard C, Fassi I, Valori M, Lassen AB, Buurke JH. Safety assessment of rehabilitation robots: A review identifying safety skills and current knowledge gaps. Frontiers in Robotics and AI. 2021 Mar 22;8:602878. frontiersin.org
15. Li L, Fu Q, Tyson S, Preston N, Weightman A. A scoping review of design requirements for a home-based upper limb rehabilitation robot for stroke. Topics in stroke rehabilitation. 2022 Aug 18;29(6):449-63. tandfonline.com
16. Manjunatha H, Pareek S, Jujjavarapu SS, Ghobadi M, Kesavadas T, Esfahani ET. Upper limb home-based robotic rehabilitation during COVID-19 outbreak. Frontiers in Robotics and AI. 2021 May 24;8:612834. frontiersin.org
17. Morris L, Diteesawat RS, Rahman N, Turton A, Cramp M, Rossiter J. The-state-of-the-art of soft robotics to assist mobility: a review of physiotherapist and patient identified limitations of current lower-limb exoskeletons and the potential soft-robotic solutions. Journal of neuroengineering and rehabilitation. 2023 Jan 30;20(1):18. springer.com
18. Akbari A, Haghverd F, Behbahani S. Robotic home-based rehabilitation systems design: from a literature review to a conceptual framework for community-based remote therapy during COVID-19 pandemic. Frontiers in Robotics and AI. 2021 Jun 22;8:612331.
19. Betriana F, Tanioka R, Gunawan J, Locsin RC. Healthcare robots and human generations: Consequences for nursing and healthcare. Collegian. 2022 Oct 1;29(5):767-73.
20. Fosch-Villaronga E, Drukarch H. On Healthcare Robots: Concepts, definitions, and considerations for healthcare robot governance. arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.03468. 2021. [PDF]
21. Yuan F, Klavon E, Liu Z, Lopez RP, Zhao X. A systematic review of robotic rehabilitation for cognitive training. Frontiers in Robotics and AI. 2021 May 11;8:605715. frontiersin.org
22. Bhardwaj S, Khan AA, Muzammil M. Lower limb rehabilitation robotics: The current understanding and technology. Work. 2021 Jul 16;69(3):775-93.
23. Bradley D, Acosta-Marquez C, Hawley M, Brownsell S, Enderby P, Mawson S. NeXOS–The design, development and evaluation of a rehabilitation system for the lower limbs. Mechatronics. 2009 Mar 1;19(2):247-57.
24. Zhong B, Niu W, Broadbent E, McDaid A, Lee TM, Zhang M. Bringing psychological strategies to robot-assisted physiotherapy for enhanced treatment efficacy. Frontiers in neuroscience. 2019 Sep 18;13:984.
25. Ugwu CN, Ugwu OP, Alum EU, Eze VH, Basajja M, Ugwu JN, Ogenyi FC, Ejemot-Nwadiaro RI, Okon MB, Egba SI, Uti DE. Medical preparedness for bioterrorism and chemical warfare: A public health integration review. Medicine. 2025 May 2;104(18):e42289.
26. Feingold-Polak R, Barzel O, Levy-Tzedek S. A robot goes to rehab: a novel gamified system for long-term stroke rehabilitation using a socially assistive robot—methodology and usability testing. Journal of neuroengineering and rehabilitation. 2021 Dec;18:1-8. springer.com
27. Rodrigues JC, Menezes P, Restivo MT. An augmented reality interface to control a collaborative robot in rehab: A preliminary usability evaluation. Frontiers in Digital Health. 2023 Feb 13;5:1078511.
28. Kim H, Lee IK. Studying the effects of congruence of auditory and visual stimuli on virtual reality experiences. IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics. 2022 Feb 15;28(5):2080-90.
29. Ugwu CN, Ugwu OP, Alum EU, Eze VH, Basajja M, Ugwu JN, Ogenyi FC, Ejemot-Nwadiaro RI, Okon MB, Egba SI, Uti DE. Sustainable development goals (SDGs) and resilient healthcare

systems: Addressing medicine and public health challenges in conflict zones. Medicine. 2025 Feb 14;104(7):e41535.
30. Cerritelli F, Chiera M, Abbro M, Megale V, Esteves J, Gallace A, Manzotti A. The challenges and perspectives of the integration between virtual and augmented reality and manual therapies. Frontiers in neurology. 2021 Jun 30;12:700211. frontiersin.org
31. Liu C, Lu J, Yang H, Guo K. Current state of robotics in hand rehabilitation after stroke: A systematic review. Applied Sciences. 2022 Apr 29;12(9):4540.
32. Dong M, Zhou Y, Li J, Rong X, Fan W, Zhou X, Kong Y. State of the art in parallel ankle rehabilitation robot: a systematic review. Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation. 2021 Dec;18:1-5. springer.com
33. Paul-Chima UO, Ugwu CN, Alum EU. Integrated approaches in nutraceutical delivery systems: optimizing ADME dynamics for enhanced therapeutic potency and clinical impact. RPS Pharmacy and Pharmacology Reports. 2024 Oct;3(4):rqae024.
34. e Siqueira TB, Parraça J, Sousa JP. Available rehabilitation technology with the potential to be incorporated into the clinical practice of physiotherapists: A systematic review. Health Science Reports. 2024 Apr;7(4):e1920.
35. Riener R, Nef T, Colombo G. Robot-aided neurorehabilitation of the upper extremities. Medical and biological engineering and computing. 2005 Feb;43:2-10.

CITE AS: Amina Nalongo J. (2025). Robotics in Physical Therapy: Enhancing Patient Outcomes. **Research Output Journal of Engineering and Scientific Research 4(2): 87-94.** **https://doi.org/10.59298/ROJESR/2025/4.2.8794**