

Challenges and Opportunities for Robot-Mediated Neurorehabilitation

Recovery from stroke, and injury of the brain and spinal cord, is being aided by robots that guide or restrict patient movements during therapy.

By WILLIAM S. HARWIN, *Member IEEE*, JAMES L. PATTON, *Member IEEE*, AND V. REGGIE EDGERTON, *Member IEEE*

ABSTRACT | Robot-mediated neurorehabilitation is a rapidly advancing field that seeks to use advances in robotics, virtual realities, and haptic interfaces, coupled with theories in neuroscience and rehabilitation to define new methods for treating neurological injuries such as stroke, spinal cord injury, and traumatic brain injury. The field is nascent and much work is needed to identify efficient hardware, software, and control system designs alongside the most effective methods for delivering treatment in home and hospital settings. This paper identifies the need for robots in neurorehabilitation and identifies important goals that will allow this field to advance.

KEYWORDS | Haptic interfaces; neurological injury; neurorehabilitation; rehabilitation; robot; spinal cord injury; stroke; traumatic brain injury; virtual reality

I. INTRODUCTION

The use of robots for providing physiotherapy is a relatively new discipline within the area of medical robotics. It emerged from the idea of using robots to assist people with disabilities. For example, the Rancho Golden, developed in 1969, was a powered orthosis with six degrees of freedom to assist movements of individuals with polio [1]. The

transition to using robots to assist a therapist with a rehabilitation exercise was identified by several groups although Erlandson was possibly the first to publish a working implementation [2]. The adaption of the idea of robotic devices to assist in neurorehabilitation was first identified by Hogan at MIT [3], and it is in the area of neurorehabilitation where there is currently a high rate of expansion in the field. This rapid growth can be attributed to several factors, the first being the emergence of hardware for haptics and advanced robotics that could be made to operate safely within the human's workspace. The dramatic drop in the cost of computing along with the emergence of software to support real-time control further helps to reduce the costs of producing research prototypes and commercial products. This technological shift has been coupled with better knowledge of the rehabilitation process and the social need to provide high-quality treatment for an aging population.

The focus of this paper is on robotic assistance in neurorehabilitation. Although this usually means stroke rehabilitation, many of the arguments put forward are also appropriate for people with traumatic brain injury, spinal-cord injury, and other damage that might occur to the brain or spinal cord. Thus, these areas are included in our discussions. Likewise, the term "robot," which can be seen as pejorative by practitioners if incorrectly introduced, is considered interchangeable with the concept of a haptic interface. The only difference is that the latter is a more specific term relating to a robot used to guide or restrict the movements of a person who is in direct contact with the robot end effector. In most cases, the robot or haptic interface is not used in isolation and requires at least a computer interface and possibly also a virtual environment to establish the particular therapy.

Manuscript received July 15, 2005; revised May 30, 2006. This work was supported in part by Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA.

W. S. Harwin is with the Cybernetics Group, School of Systems Engineering, University of Reading, Reading RG6 6AY, U.K. (e-mail: W.S.Harwin@reading.ac.uk).

J. L. Patton is with the Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60611 USA (e-mail: j-patton@northwestern.edu).

V. R. Edgerton is with the Brain Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1761 USA (e-mail: vre@ucla.edu).

Digital Object Identifier: 10.1109/JPROC.2006.880671

II. IMPORTANCE OF PROBLEM OF STROKE

Cerebral vascular accidents, more commonly referred to as strokes, are an important problem in clinical medicine. They are a leading cause of disability within the developed world. A stroke is the consequence of cell death within the brain relating to either internal bleeding or a blockage in one of the two main supplying arteries. The term “ischemic stroke” accounts for 80% of cases and refers to the condition where an artery becomes blocked by an embolism or thrombosis; whereas, “hemorrhagic stroke” accounts for the remaining 20% and is caused by blood leaking into the brain. The consequence of either etiology is cell death, which results in a loss of brain function. Conditions such as brain tumors or traumatic brain injuries may have similar consequences to those of a stroke. These consequences include hemiplegia (on the side opposite to the injury), visual neglect, cognitive difficulties (relating to thinking, learning, concentrating, and decision making), and speech and language difficulties including dysarthria and aphasia. Although technology may contribute in other areas of neurorehabilitation, this paper will concentrate on the rehabilitation of movement disabilities.

Stroke statistics are available for the developed world. The rate is highest for men in Finland (2.9 per 1000) and in Japan (2.8 per 1000) [4]. In the U.K., the rate is between 1.25 and 1.6 per 1000. Incident rates in Germany and France are broadly similar to the U.K. [5]. In affluent areas of the U.S., the rate can be as low as 0.9 per 1000 [6].

Stroke is the third leading cause of death and the leading cause of severe disabilities in the developed world. The current assumptions are that about 3/4 of people who have had a stroke will survive for at least a year, but around 1/3 of survivors will have moderate to severe disabilities relating to movement, speech, concentration, and cognition [7].

Age is a strong factor in stroke with 88% of individuals who have had a stroke being over the age of 65. Indeed, beyond age 55, the likelihood of stroke doubles for every ten additional years of age. Other factors that deleteriously affect the risk of stroke include ethnicity, poor diet, tobacco usage, use of anticoagulant drugs, a previous stroke, or prior transient ischemic attack (TIA), also known as a ministroke [8].

So, it is clear that stroke is a concern for our society, especially given the demographics of a growing population of elderly people and by implication more people who are at risk of a stroke. In the U.S., the number of people over the age of 60 years will increase by 10 million (22%) over the next ten years [9]. Another pressure comes from the fact that survival rates from stroke are increasing due to the improvement in acute medical care. The cost of hospitalization of stroke also helps to make the case for robot assistance in neurorehabilitation of people following a stroke. The costs to the U.K. National Health Service of stroke are estimated to be over £2.3 billion per year,

and the cost is expected to rise in real terms by around 30% by the year 2030 [10]. Similar economic pressures prevail in the U.S., where there is an annual spending of \$30 billion on physical rehabilitation.

III. BACKGROUND AND THEORY OF NEUROREHABILITATION

A. Theoretical Background to Neural Control of Movement

Animal studies based on a transection of the spinal cord show that the spinal cord can learn a motor task, in particular, weight bearing rhythmic locomotion activities [11]. This postinjury stepping is a learned skill as it is only acquired when the animal is given treadmill training. It is apparent that the spinal cord as well as the brain has a role in controlling movement.

Observations on repetitive cyclic movements in lower limb studies show that there is some variation in the neuromechanical properties of each step, i.e., movement variability is a normal feature of the neural control strategy of the nervous system. For lower limb movement it is hypothesized that repetitive training increases the efficacy of a more selective group of synapses and circuits, which will reduce the variance and increase the probability of success in generating consecutive successful steps. The persistence of these changed probabilities reflecting improved synaptic efficacy in a more selected network of neurons seems to have multiple time courses, suggesting multiple mechanisms of learning and memory.

The situation in intentional movements typical of the upper limbs is more complex. It is clear that movement targets are acquired from a variety of sensory channels including vision and touch, and information from these sensory channels is used to update internal models. These models not only encode the state of the world but also the sensory consequences of any interactions. A decision to make a movement registers in the premotor cortex up to 250 ms before activity in the motor cortex [12], and it is hypothesized that an internal model is being prepared to predict the consequences of the movement [13].

Strokes that are linked to a movement impairment are usually due to thrombosis or aneurysm in the mid-cerebral artery located near the sensory-motor cortex. This explains the high involvement of motor disabilities following a stroke. Given the complexity of the movement process and the severity of the stroke, it is evident that movement can be impaired at multiple levels, and the results of the rehabilitation process do not always follow a clear path of recovery.

B. Theoretical Background on Neuroplasticity

A key concept that underpins all forms of neurologically directed physiotherapy is that of brain plasticity. Evidence from fMRI and transcranial magnetic stimulation

(TMS) [14], [15] has shown that the visual cortex of people who are blind is reorganized to process somasensory and tactile information such as reading and interpreting Braille. This conclusion is also confirmed by animal experiments [16] and shows that the transfer of activity is both intra- and inter-modality and that where there is a need for the brain to reorganize to adapt to new circumstances this reorganization is not necessarily confined to the understood maps of the Homunculus brain [17]. The fact that this reorganization occurs even in mature adult humans is a primary justification for neurorehabilitation following a stroke.

The mechanisms for this reorganization are still uncertain, although there is a body of evidence of some interesting effects associated with learning and memory. Among these is histological evidence that an increase in neuron activity leads to modifications of the number of synaptic connections and a greater level of dendritic branching. Also, effects such as long term potentiation (LTP) following neuron activity can be observed. This is the phenomenon whereby a neuronal cell becomes hypersensitive when there has been a recent history of firings and this increase in sensitivity can last several weeks. Although there is no objective evidence, it is suggested that encouraging LTP with an enriched environment might be a basis for neurorehabilitation [18].

A stroke causes neuron death to a focal area of neurons. Surrounding this area is an ischemic penumbra where the neurons are no longer functioning normally due to the lack of blood supplying both oxygen and ATP to the neuron. It is in this penumbra where the recovery of function is most likely to occur and the evidence is that because the blood supply has not returned to normal these penumbra neurons die and the clinical deficit that was observed just after the incident becomes fixed [19].

IV. ROBOTICS AND VIRTUAL REALITY IN REHABILITATION

Evidence for integrating stroke care to include early and appropriate rehabilitation is the reduction in mortality of about 20% and the reduction of mortality and severe disability by 30% [20]. A key challenge is how best to enhance the therapist's skills with robot technology. An appropriate concept is to consider the robot as an advanced tool under the therapist's direction. As such, the robot can best handle relatively simple therapies that are characterized by a repetitive and labor-intensive nature. Clinical decisions should be managed by the therapist and, when appropriate, planned and executed on the robot. This approach would be part of an integrated set of tools that would include simpler nonrobotic approaches such as intelligent sensing of therapy tools that could keep the therapist and patient informed about the progress of an individual exercise as well as the overall treatment. There is already a precedent for such tools in intensive care

nursing where staff use a range of highly complex tools to monitor and deliver care to their patients.

A. Technologies for Neurorehabilitation

When a robotic device is coupled with a three-dimensional graphic display, such as shown in Fig. 1, the sensorimotor system is able to engage all normal types of sensory-motor adaptation. The robotic actuator is typically a specially designed robot or a haptic interface, which while easily moved by the user, may also resist or apply forces. This process appeals directly to the person's proprioception (position and velocity of the limb) and to the sense of touch. Commercially available robotic devices are now available that provide haptic interaction with humans. These devices include the PHANToM (SensAble Technologies, U.S.), the Haptic Master (FCS robotics, The Netherlands), and the WAM arm (Barrett Technologies, U.S.). The addition of a graphic display that uses virtual reality (VR) enhances the sense of the interaction. Although stereoscopic vision (for example with shutter glasses) and head tracking may enhance the sense of realism of the interaction, the acceptance by the subjects along with the value to the neurorehabilitation process is relatively untested.

These haptic and graphic virtual environments offer several advantages. Properties of objects can be changed in an instant with no setup and breakdown time. This element of surprise is critical for studying how the sensorimotor system reacts and adapts to new situations. For rehabilitation, friction or mass can be suppressed, or mass can be separated from weight and the weight reduced during the early stages of recovery.

B. Upper Limb Rehabilitation Methods

Work by Hogan and Krebs on the design of a two-link robot, MIT-MANUS, along with its evaluation on a cohort of subjects recovering from a stroke was the first to make a major impact on upper limb neurorehabilitation [21]. MIT-MANUS is a high-quality manipulandum that works in the horizontal plane. However, it is evident that more degrees of freedom should be available to allow movement of the upper limbs against gravity.

Burgar *et al.* investigated bimanual motion using a 6-DoF PUMA 560 robot plus an additional force/torque sensor linking the robot to the subject [22]. This work prototyped several possible therapy modes including a mode known as mirror image motion enabler (MIME), whereby movements of the stroke-affected arm could be patterned to follow the motion of the person's unaffected arm. Johnson used this principle, along with a realization that a strong stimulus for motivation was to regain the ability to drive, to develop "Drivers SEAT" [23]. A modified steering wheel helps the stroke-affected arm in preference to the unaffected arm by measuring the relative force contributions from each. The principle was integrated into a simulation of driving to encourage both motor




Fig. 1. Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago virtual room (VRROOM) concept.

relearning and relearning of driving skills, thus providing a stimulating interactive environment.

Work by Reinkensmeyer [24] tested the potential of integrating the therapy with the measurement. This work looked specifically at factors affecting reach and attempted to extend the reaching movement with a 1 DoF device.

A European project entitled Gentle/s extended the therapies offered by the MIME system by offering the subject a choice of movement targets that were selected on the initiation of a particular movement [25]. The Gentle/s work also patterned movements to follow stereotypical movement patterns [26] as well as using an arm dewatering mechanism similar to those used in lower limb rehabilitation.

The hardware for upper limb therapy prototypes has tended to separate reach and grasp as two separate activities. This is primarily due to engineering decisions. Thus, for example, the Gentle/s project dropped plans for retraining grasp so that it could focus on arm pronation-supination [25]. This decision led to the precommercial Gentle/s prototype shown in Fig. 2. This is still primarily

the case, although several groups are now investigating integration of reach and grasp into a single device.

A variety of control methods is being developed, but all share the concept of guiding the stroke-affected movement to achieve a target or tracking path. The algorithms are highly varied and range from implementing virtual mass-spring-dampers and guiding the equilibrium point [26], to constraining movements to occur within a prescribed volume, and changing the dimensions of the volume depending on the subject's success and abilities [27].

C. Lower Limb Rehabilitation Methods

A technique known as partial body weight support usually forms the basis for lower limb neurorehabilitation [28], [29]. Although not necessarily robotic, it simplifies many aspects of introducing robot-mediated neurorehabilitation for the lower limbs. Partial body weight support usually requires that the patient wear a parachute-type harness that is connected to an overhead gantry and allows the therapy to happen with only a percentage of the person's true weight appearing as a force on the treadmill.



Fig. 2. Gentle/s commercial prototype for machine mediated neurorehabilitation.

Data collected by Visintin *et al.* [29] showed that after six weeks of exposure to partial body weight support therapy four times a week, subjects after a stroke performed better in their ability to balance, in their motor recovery, in their ability to walk, and in their endurance of walking.

The disadvantage of partial body weight support is that it requires greater involvement of the therapist, often requiring two to three therapists to assist with the movement of the feet. Since these are repetitive and physically demanding tasks for the therapists, it is an opportunity to introduce robotic-based solutions. The potential for valuable robotic assistance is further enhanced when considering the safety of the patient in a partial body weight support mechanism and the fact that an inexperienced therapist may be applying greater forces and giving fewer opportunities for the task to be completed unaided [30].

The robotic device must be able to guide the kinematics of the limbs during load-bearing stepping to generate the afferent patterns that normally occur and which, in turn, drive the spinal networks which generate the motor pattern. It appears that the control system needs to have

some learning capability. It must be designed so that it can assist on an “as needed” basis, much like highly skilled physical therapists perform when teaching a spinal cord-injured patient to relearn to walk. It is already apparent that complete, and stereo logically constant, assistance reduces the level of activation of the motor circuits that generate stepping. This apparent habituation and reduction in activity is not consistent with allowing these neural circuits to relearn. When exposed to a constant and invariant movement strategy, the neural control circuitry accommodates by becoming nonresponsive to the imposed motion.

Colombo *et al.* [31] have presented some supportive evidence for gait retraining in severe brain injury. Using an alternative arrangement to partial body weight support, this paper is based on an inclined table with an integrated robotic stepping mechanism that moves the feet in a gait-like cycle. The case study presented relates to a person with traumatic brain injury who was still unresponsive 14 months after injury. The subject received stepping retraining on inclined table treatment for five 20-min sessions for three weeks.




Fig. 3. PAM/POGO, two pneumatic robots used to assist gait retraining.

The results showed significant improvement of the muscle tone between baseline and end of the third week training as well as an improvement of alertness, head position control, and reaction to pain. The authors also noted better communication with the patient and better posture when seated in a wheel chair.

In recognition of the benefits of robotic-based lower limb therapies several prototypes and commercial devices have emerged that provide robot step assistance. These include the pelvic assist manipulator (PAM) and pneumatically operated gait orthosis (POGO), pneumatic robots that compliantly assist in gait training shown in Fig. 3. PAM can assist in 5 DoF of pelvic motion, while POGO can assist in hip and knee flexion/extension [32]. The devices can be used in a back-driveable mode to record a desired stepping pattern that is manually specified by human trainers, then replay the pattern with compliant assistance. During compliant replay, the devices automatically synchronize the timing of the replayed motions to the inherent variations in the patient's step timing, thereby maintaining an appropriate phase relationship with the patient. For spinal cord injuries the robot-assisted stepping assistance must occur bilaterally, whereas for strokes it is most likely to be needed unilaterally. Similar commercial

devices also exist such as the Lokomat (HocomaAG, Switzerland), where similar bilateral robotic elements are used to assist movement of the subject's leg while providing partial body weight support via a harness.

As in work on upper limbs, the idea is to reduce the dependence on the robotic mechanism as far as possible to encourage motor relearning by the patient. One possible control mechanism is to define a target trajectory gait and then subject the limb to a force or torque field to return it to this trajectory only when the limb state is outside a prescribed boundary [33]. When compared to upper limb retraining, gait retraining has more repeatable cyclic operations which favors simpler control concepts. In contrast, the engineering of lower limb rehabilitation devices needs to be more considerate of the dynamics of gait, and the forces applied to the legs and feet need to be larger; although, this engineering problem is simplified by using the partial body weight support mechanisms.

D. Perturbation Methods

One important advantage of virtual systems is that they can distort reality. One study used altered visual feedback to "trick" the nervous system into perceiving higher stiffness than was actually presented [34]. Another tricked the nervous system to increase strength [35]. Still another used prisms that shifted the visual field to the right to cause adaptation in stroke survivors with hemispatial neglect, triggering the recovery process [36]. Clearly, there is an advantage to such distortions of reality. Preliminary results point to a single unifying theory suggesting that errors induce movement adaptation, and judicious manipulation of an error can lead to lasting desired changes.

Some preliminary studies show that stroke survivors respond to error augmentation [37]. In this paper, stroke survivors experienced training forces that either amplified or reduced their hand path errors. Significant trajectory improvements occurred only when the training forces magnified the original errors and not when the training forces reduced the errors or were absent. Hence, causing adaptation by using error-augmentation training may be an effective way to promote functional motor recovery for brain-injured individuals.

Other studies confirm the hypothesis that error augmentation leads to enhanced learning. Subjects learning how to counteract a force disturbance in a walking study increased their rate of learning by approximately 26% when a disturbance was transiently amplified [38]. In another study, artificially giving smaller feedback on force production has caused subjects to apply larger forces to compensate [39]. Several studies have shown how the nervous system can be *tricked* by giving altered sensory feedback [34], [40]–[43].

Conversely, suppression of visual feedback may slow the adaptive process [44]. However, not all kinds of augmented feedback on practice conditions have proven to be

therapeutically beneficial after a stroke [45]. It may be that there are limits to the amount of error augmentation that is useful [46], [47].

V. MEASUREMENTS OF SUCCESS

A. Clinical Measures

To get a new treatment accepted in practice requires evidence sufficient to convince the practitioner and the associated hospital management that the results will be effective. In the U.K., one arbiter of decisions to introduce new techniques is the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE). A recommendation about a new technology is based on a review of clinical and economic evidence, with a randomized controlled clinical study being the preferred instrument. A recommendation is based on the effectiveness of the intervention and the economic impact—“does it represent value for money?” The health economy in the U.S. is influenced both by government and private regulatory bodies, ranging from the Food and Drug Administration, and the Department of Veterans’ Affairs, to individual insurance organizations.

These evidence-based medicines require measurements with clinically accepted measures. A number of these exist that are relevant to the field of stroke rehabilitation (see <http://www.strokecenter.org/trials/scales/>) and these attempt to measure attributes such as consciousness, levels of pain, dexterity, mobility, spasticity, ability to perform daily tasks, etc. Most clinical measures are based on subjective judgements, for example the Fugl–Meyer assessment is a widely accepted scale that attempts to measure motor function following a stroke [48]. However, it is a general score and is based on rating attributes as 0–2 made by the clinician. Each attribute is then added together to produce either a subscale measure (for example motor recovery, balance, upper limb recovery, sensation, range of motion, sensation, pain) or a total score with a maximum of 124. The difficulty is then one of relating the recovery process to a subjective measure that is highly susceptible to noise. This is compounded by the relatively small numbers in any robotic-based clinical study. A study in a drug trial with $n = 500$ is small, whereas a rehabilitation trial with $n = 50$ is large, simply because of the cost of acquiring the data [49]. Considerations for the design of a randomized controlled trial of a complex intervention such as rehabilitation are discussed in [49].

B. Robot-Based Measures

Rehabilitation robots are atypical in that it is possible to use the same tool both to gather information for diagnosis and be a part of the intervention. Experiments assessing movement often yield a large set of time-dependent multidimensional vectors which can be analyzed. Some of these devices can measure position, velocity, and acceleration of the body with increasing precision, thus providing

important functional data. In recent decades, several studies have utilized robot technology in order to model the control exerted by the brain on upper extremity movement alone [44], [50], [51]. A number of hypotheses have been tested such as: what are the relevant control variables (stiffness, force, position)?; how does the motor control system adapt to a novel environment (internal models, memory consolidation etc.)?; and how are multiple degrees of freedom controlled?

Examples of some common but nonstandardized measures of performance are: time to reach a target, the value, number and time of occurrence of velocity peaks, the sum of jerk over the movement (the second derivative of velocity), and the average or summed interface force with the robot [52]. With the variety of measures available, it is necessary to validate these for their ability to measure an underlying phenomena, the sensitivity to that phenomena, and the relevance of the phenomena to the recovery process.

In addition to the use of robotic devices for teaching or relearning, they should provide ongoing feedback on how much and what kind of work is being performed by the robot versus the subject. Theoretically, it is feasible for the individual to monitor his or her level of performance based on measures made by the machine and hence track recovery. Thus, the robotic device should have sensors to detect critical but yet undefined mechanical and perhaps physiological events, as well as the capability of mechanically controlling the robot.

VI. FUTURE PROSPECTS

A. Engineering Challenges

The field of machine-mediated neurorehabilitation has challenges both in engineering and clinical practice. On the engineering side of the equation there is a need for more integrated solutions. A discussion with interested therapists will quickly indicate that the range and complexity of limb movements that could be coordinated outstrips the practicalities of any of today’s robots. Given that the therapy must be done in an environment that is safe for the patient and therapist, it is unlikely that any single hardware solution will be accepted. Therefore, realistically, a number of robotic solutions will be required, ideally with similar protocols and interfaces so that the patient and therapist can transfer between machines without concern. Designing these solutions would also be simplified if it were clear what the best form of machine mediated therapies were. These answers will only come iteratively as machines are designed, tested clinically, and the results published.

B. Novel Measures

The measurement of success is highly unspecific if based on clinical measures alone, so along with this

iterative design of therapies and machines must come realistic quantitative measurements of the underlying recovery process. There are some excellent opportunities for basing these measurement techniques on the current generation of robotic technology (including haptic interface and manipulandum technologies). It would seem that methods can be developed based on perturbing the limb either when stationary or during movement and using system identification techniques along with knowledge of the fundamental neural delays to identify intrinsic and reflex components as outlined in Kearney [53] and used extensively by Mirbagheri [54] and others.

C. Acute Phase Rehabilitation

Ideally, machine-mediated neurorehabilitation should be available to a person within a few days of the initial injury. When a person is in the acute phase of stroke they will be occupying a hospital bed so the initial equipment must be operable within that environment. Concerns such as access to the patient, should they need emergency treatment such as cardiac resuscitation, needs to be designed into a device that should be available to a possibly unresponsive patient. The equipment needed when the patient visits the rehabilitation gymnasium either as an inpatient or outpatient can necessarily be more specific for limbs and movements, and although not necessarily spacious, these areas are less constrained than the bed-side machines.

D. Home Rehabilitation

Finally, the concept of allowing the patient to continue rehabilitation at home is attractive to the patient who is keen to return to familiar surroundings and economically sensible to the hospital who would like to increase throughput! But, it is important that the patient is not abandoned at home with the equipment. Home rehabilitation is often self-directed with little professional feedback and used so private insurers such as Medicare can encourage a reduced length of hospital stay and less therapy. Ironically, recent research strongly supports the delivery of more intensive therapy in some cases [55]. Techniques in telerehabilitation will need to be addressed to ensure that the machine-mediated therapies are appropriate to the patient at their particular stage of recovery. There will be a need for the equipment to be returned to a loan pool when the patient is no longer gaining benefit.

E. Funding

As with many nascent research areas, there is a need for further funding [56], [57] if long-term health cost savings are to be realized and the quality of life of the senior members of our society is to be improved. As a discipline, the area is beginning to receive attention from commercial companies but it is an area where investment is conservative as companies are aware of the problems of translating research into product.

A pioneering company in the field of upper limb neurorehabilitation is Interactive Motion, USA. Their technology is based on the MIT-MANUS robot and has established systems in the U.S. and the U.K. with an expectation of a greater mass of clinical evidence to follow. Several companies are investigating the market for lower limb rehabilitation, again with the expectation of amassing greater clinical evidence on best clinical practice.

However, public funding is still needed from governments and charities to advance the technology and to ensure independence of clinical results. This money is also needed to bridge the so called “funding gap” that occurs between the demonstration of a promising new technique and the acceptance of the technique by mainstream healthcare providers.

In the U.S., the National Institute for Disabilities and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR) currently funds a rehabilitation engineering research center on the topic, and project grants have been successfully funded by the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Veterans’ Affairs. In Europe, the European Commission has funded collaborative projects in the area and local governments have sponsored work at a lower level. However, it is a concern that the progress in the field may not be recognized by funding agencies at this critical point when more research and better collaboration should be fostered.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we give a brief outline of machine-mediated neurorehabilitation as an important emerging field in clinical medicine. We have highlighted some of the engineering problems and potential solutions that will result in effective treatments. One area for research emphasized in this paper is the challenge of measuring recovery in the patient when they are undergoing machine-mediated therapies and we propose that perturbation methods can be used both to gain a better insight into the recovery process and also to improve the effectiveness of the treatment. This paper is highly focused on motor recovery in the upper and lower limbs, but it should be remembered that the patient may have other stroke-related impairments. Stroke rehabilitation is moving towards more integrated processes and using concepts in robotics will facilitate this integration. Stroke rehabilitation is moving towards more integrated processes and using concepts in robotics will facilitate this integration. ■

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank J. Osborn and T. Kanade for their organization of the International Advanced Robotics Programme meeting on Medical and Rehabilitation Robotics, in May 2004, from which many new ideas have emerged.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Harwin, T. Rahman, and R. Foulds, "A review of design issues in rehabilitation robotics with reference to North American research," *IEEE J. Rehab. Eng.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 3–13, Mar. 1995.
- [2] R. Erlandson, "Applications of robotic/mechatronic systems in special education, rehabilitation therapy, and vocational training: A paradigm shift," *IEEE Trans. Rehab. Eng.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 22–34, Mar. 1995.
- [3] N. Hogan, H. Krebs, J. Charnnarong, P. Srikrishna, and A. Sharon, "MIT—MANUS A workstation for manual therapy and training II," in *Proc. SPIE Conf. Telemanipulator Technol.*, 1992, pp. 28–34.
- [4] C. D. A. Wolfe, A. G. Rudd, R. Howard, C. Coshall, J. Stewart, E. Lawrence, C. Hajat, and T. Hillen. (2002). Incidence and case fatality rates of stroke subtypes in a multiethnic population: The south London stroke register. *J. Neurol. Neurosurg. Psychiatry*. [Online]. 72, pp. 211–216. Available: jnp.bmjournals.com
- [5] P. Thorvaldsen, K. Asplund, K. Kuulasmaa, A.-M. Rajakangas, and M. Schroll. (1995). Stroke incidence, case fatality, and mortality in the WHOMONICA project. *Stroke*. [Online]. 26(3), pp. 361–367. Available: <http://stroke.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/abstract/26/3/361>
- [6] J. A. Stewart, R. Dundas, R. S. Howard, A. G. Rudd, and C. D. A. Wolfe. (1999). Ethnic differences in incidence of stroke: Prospective study with stroke register. *BMJ*. [Online]. 318(7189), pp. 967–971. Available: <http://bmj.bmjournals.com/cgi/content/abstract/318/7189/967>
- [7] Merck Res. Lab. (1997). Merck Manual Geriatrics, Whithouse Saton, NJ. [Online]. Available: <http://www.merck.com/mrkshared/mmg/home.jsp>
- [8] Stroke Association, Stroke Statistics Fact Sheet. (2006, Apr.). [Online]. Available: <http://www.stroke.org.uk/>
- [9] A. Goldstein and B. Damon. (1993, Sep.). *We the American Elderly*. U.S. Census Bureau. [Online]. Available: <http://www.census.gov/apsd/wepeople/we-9.pdf>
- [10] P. Sandercock, E. Berge, M. Dennis, J. Forbes, P. Hand, J. Kwan et al., *A systematic review of the effectiveness, cost-effectiveness and barriers to implementation of thrombolytic and neuroprotective therapy for acute ischaemic stroke in the NHS*. *Health Technol. Assess.* 2002, vol. 6, no. 26.
- [11] W. K. Timoszyk, R. D. de Leon, N. London, R. Joynes, K. Minakata, R. R. Roy, V. R. Edgerton, and D. J. Reinkensmeyer. (2004). Comparison of virtual and physical treadmill environments for training stepping after spinal cord injury. *Robotica*. [Online]. 21(1), pp. 25–32. Available: <http://titles.cambridge.org/journals/>
- [12] N. Nishitani and R. Hari. (2000). Temporal dynamics of cortical representation for action. *PNAS*. [Online]. 97(2), pp. 913–918. Available: <http://www.pnas.org/cgi/content/abstract/97/2/913>
- [13] R. C. Miall and D. M. Wolpert, "Forward models for physiological motor control," *Neural Netw.*, vol. 9, no. 8, pp. 1265–1279, 1996.
- [14] T. Kujala, K. Alho, and R. Naatanen, "Cross-modal reorganization of human cortical functions," *Trends Neurosci.*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 115–120, 2000.
- [15] J. Eyre, "Understanding brain damage and neurological recovery," in *Restoring Neurological Function: Putting the Neurosciences to Work in Neurorehabilitation*. Washington, DC: Acad. Med. Sci., Mar. 2004, ch. D, pp. 35–38, No. 1-03401-0. [Online]. Available: http://www.acmedsci.ac.uk/p_neurofunc.pdf
- [16] D. Bavelier and H. Neville, "Cross-modal plasticity: Where and how?" *Nature Rev. Neurosci.*, vol. 3, pp. 443–452, 2000.
- [17] W. Penfield and T. Rasmussen, *The Cerebral Cortex of Man. A Clinical Study of Localisation of Function*. New York: Macmillan, 1950.
- [18] B. B. Johansson. (2000). Brain plasticity and stroke rehabilitation: The Willis lecture. *Stroke*. [Online]. 31(1), pp. 223–230. Available: <http://stroke.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/abstract/31/1/223>
- [19] S. Dunnett, "Neuroprotection and plasticity," in *Restoring Neurological Function: Putting the Neurosciences to Work in Neurorehabilitation*. Washington, DC: Acad. Med. Sci., Mar. 2004, ch. I, pp. 47–50, 1-03401-07-0. [Online]. Available: http://www.acmedsci.ac.uk/p_neurofunc.pdf
- [20] C. Warlow, C. Sudlow, M. Dennis, J. Wardlaw, and P. Sandercock, "Stroke" *Lancet*, vol. 362, pp. 1211–1224, 2003.
- [21] S. E. Fasoli, H. I. Krebs, J. Stein, W. R. Frontera, R. Hughes, and N. Hogan, "Robotic therapy for chronic motor impairments after stroke: Follow-up results," *Archives Physical Medicine Rehab.*, vol. 85, pp. 1106–1111, 2004.
- [22] C. Bugar, P. Lum, P. Shor, and H. Vander Loos, "Development of robots for rehabilitation therapy: The Palo Alto VA/Stanford experience," *J. Rehab. Res. Development*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 663–673, 2000.
- [23] M. Johnson, H. V. der Loos, C. Bugar, P. Shor, and L. Leifer, "Design and evaluation of driver's seat: A car steering simulation environment for upper limb stroke therapy," *Robotica*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 13–23, Jan. 2003.
- [24] D. Reinkensmeyer, B. Schmit, and W. Rymer, "Mechatronic assessment of arm impairment after chronic brain injury," in *Biomechanics*. Twente: Univ. Twente Inst. Biomed. Technol., 1999, pp. 61–65.
- [25] R. Loureiro, F. Amirabdollahian, M. Topping, B. Driessen, and W. Harwin, "Upperlimb mediated stroke therapy—GENTLE/s approach," *Special Issue on Rehabilitation Robotics, J. Autonomous Robots*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 35–51, Jul. 2003. New York: Kluwer Academic.
- [26] F. Amirabdollahian, R. Loureiro, and W. Harwin, "Minimum jerk trajectory control for rehabilitation and haptic applications," in *Proc. 2002 IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics Automation*, Washington, DC, May 2002, pp. 3380–3385. [Online]. Available: <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/iel5/7916/21828/01014233.pdf>
- [27] J. Liu, J. Emken, S. Cramer, and D. Reinkensmeyer, "Learning to perform a novel movement pattern using haptic guidance: Slow learning, rapid forgetting, and attractor paths," in *Proc. IEEE 9th Int. Conf. Rehabilitation Robotics*, 2005, pp. 37–40.
- [28] S. Hesse, C. Bertelt, M. T. Jahnke, A. Schaffrin, P. Baake, M. Malezic, and K. H. Mauritz, "Treadmill training with partial body weight support compared with physiotherapy in nonambulatory hemiparetic patients," *Stroke*, vol. 26, pp. 976–981, Jun. 1995.
- [29] M. Visintin, H. Barbeau, N. Korner-Bitensky, and N. E. Mayo. (1998). A new approach to retrain gait in stroke patients through body weight support and treadmill stimulation. *Stroke*, pp. 1122–1128. [Online]. Available: <http://stroke.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/abstract/29/6/1122>
- [30] J. A. Galvez, G. Kerdanyan, S. Maneeekobkunwong, R. Weber, M. Scott, S. J. Harkema, and D. J. Reinkensmeyer, "Measuring human trainers skill for the design of better robot control algorithms for gait training after spinal cord injury," in *Proc. IEEE 9th Int. Conf. Rehabilitation Robotics*, 2005, pp. 231–234.
- [31] G. Colombo, R. Schreier, A. Mayr, H. Plewa, and R. Rupp, "Novel tilt table with integrated robotic stepping mechanism: Design principles and clinical application," in *Proc. IEEE 9th Int. Conf. Rehabilitation Robotics*, 2005, pp. 227–230.
- [32] J. Galvez and D. Reinkensmeyer, "Robotics for gait training after spinal cord injury," *Topics Spinal Cord Injury Rehab.*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 18–33, 2005.
- [33] L. Cai, A. Fong, C. Otoshi, Y. Liang, J. Cham, H. Zhong, R. Roy, V. Edgerton, and J. Burdick, "Effects of consistency versus variability in robotically controlled training of stepping in adult spinal mice," in *Proc. IEEE 9th Int. Conf. Rehabilitation Robotics*, 2005, pp. 575–579.
- [34] M. A. Srinivasan and R. H. La Motte, "Tactual discrimination of softness," *J Neurophysiol.*, vol. 73, pp. 88–101, 1995.
- [35] B. Brewer, R. Klatzky, and Y. Matsuoka, "Feedback distortion to increase strength and mobility," in *Proc. 8th Int. Conf. Rehabilitation Robotics (ICORR 2003)*, KAIST, Korea, Apr. 2003, pp. 258–261.
- [36] Y. Rossetti, G. Rode et al., "Prism adaptation to a rightward optical deviation rehabilitates left hemiparetic neglect," *Nature*, vol. 395, no. 6698, pp. 166–169, 1998.
- [37] J. L. Patton, M. E. Phillips-Stoykov et al., "Evaluation of robotic training forces that either enhance or reduce error in chronic hemiparetic stroke survivors," *Experimental Brain Res.*, 2005.
- [38] J. L. Emken and D. J. Reinkensmeyer, "Robot-enhanced motor learning: Accelerating internal model formation during locomotion by transient dynamic amplification," *IEEE Trans. Neural Syst. Rehab. Eng.*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 33–39, Mar. 2005.
- [39] B. Brewer, M. Fagan, R. Klatzky, and Y. Matsuoka, "Perceptual limits for a robotic rehabilitation environment using visual feedback distortion," *IEEE Trans. Neural Syst. Rehab. Eng.*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 1–11, Mar. 2005.
- [40] J. R. Flanagan and A. K. Rao, "Trajectory adaptation to a nonlinear visuomotor transformation: Evidence of motion planning in visually perceived space," *J. Neurophysiol.*, vol. 74, no. 5, pp. 2174–2178, 1995.
- [41] G. Robles-De-La-Torre and V. Hayward, "Force can overcome object geometry in the perception of shape through active touch," *Nature*, vol. 412, pp. 445–448, 2001.
- [42] B. Brewer, R. Klatzky, and Y. Matsuoka, "Effects of visual feedback distortion for the elderly and the motor-impaired in a robotic rehabilitation environment," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics Automation (ICRA)*, 2004, pp. 2080–2085.
- [43] K. P. Kording and D. M. Wolpert, "Bayesian integration in sensorimotor learning," *Nature*, vol. 427, no. 6971, pp. 244–247, 2004.
- [44] J. L. Patton and F. A. Mussa-Ivaldi, "Robot-assisted adaptive training: Custom force fields for teaching movement patterns,"

- IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng.*, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 636–646, Apr. 2004.
- [45] C. J. Winstein, A. S. Merians *et al.*, “Motor learning after unilateral brain damage,” *Neuropsychologia*, vol. 37, no. 8, pp. 975–987, 1999.
- [46] K. P. Kording and D. M. Wolpert, “The loss function of sensorimotor learning,” in *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA*, vol. 101, no. 26, 2004, pp. 9839–9842.
- [47] Y. Wei, P. Bajaj, and R. P. J. Scheidt, “A real-time haptic/graphic demonstration of how error augmentation can enhance learning,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics Automation (ICRA)*, 2005.
- [48] P. Duncan, M. Propst, and S. Nelson, “Reliability of the Fugl-Meyer assessment of sensorimotor recovery following cerebrovascular accident,” *Physical Therapy*, vol. 63, no. 10, pp. 1606–1610, 1983.
- [49] M. Campbell, R. Fitzpatrick, A. Haines, A. L. Kinmonth, P. Sandercock, D. Spiegelhalter, and P. Tyrer. (2000). Framework for design and evaluation of complex interventions to improve health. *BMJ*. [Online]. 321(7262), pp. 694–696. Available: <http://bmj.bmjournals.com>
- [50] M. Arbib, Ed. *Handbook of Brain Theory and Neural Networks*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995.
- [51] S. Goodbody and D. Wolpert, “Temporal and amplitude generalization in motor learning,” *J. Neurophysiol.*, vol. 79, pp. 1825–1838, 1998.
- [52] F. Amirabdollahian, “An investigation of robot-mediate therapies and therapy effects on the recovery of upper limb post-stroke,” Ph.D. dissertation, Univ. Reading, Reading, U.K., Sep. 2003.
- [53] R. Kearney, R. Stein, and L. Parameswaran, “Identification of intrinsic and reflex contributions to human ankle stiffness dynamics,” *IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng.*, vol. 44, no. 6, pp. 493–504, Jun. 1997.
- [54] M. Mirbagheri, C. Tsao, E. Pelosin, and W. Rymer, “Therapeutic effects of robotic-assisted locomotor training on neuromuscular properties,” in *Proc. IEEE 9th Int. Conf. Rehabilitation Robotics*, 2005, pp. 561–564.
- [55] E. Taub, G. Uswatte *et al.*, “Constraint-induced movement therapy: A new family of techniques with broad application to physical rehabilitation—A clinical review,” *J. Rehab. Res. Development*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 237–251, 1999.
- [56] T. Kanade and J. Osborn. (2004, May). Report of the NSF/International Advanced Robotics Program (IARP) workshop on medical robotics. Nat. Sci. Found., Hidden Valley, PA. [Online]. Available: <http://www.nsf.gov/eng/roboticsorg/IARPMedicalRobotics-WorkshopReport.htm>
- [57] A. Wing and W. Harwin, “Rehabilitation engineering,” in *Restoring Neurological Function: Putting the Neurosciences to Work in Neurorehabilitation*. Washington, DC: Acad. Medical Sciences, Mar. 2004, ch. M, pp. 58–59, No. 1-903401-07-0. [Online]. Available: http://www.acmedsci.ac.uk/p_neurofunc.pdf

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

William S. Harwin (Member, IEEE) received the M.Sc. degree in bioengineering from the University of Strathclyde, Strathclyde, U.K., in 1983, and the Ph.D. degree in engineering from the University of Cambridge, Cambridge, U.K., in 1991.

Between 1990 and 1995, he was the Research Director of the Rehabilitation Robotics Laboratory at the Alfred I duPont Institute, with appointments at the University of Delaware and Drexel University. He joined the Cybernetics Department of the University of Reading, Reading, U.K., in January 1996 and is now a Reader in Interactive Systems and head of the Interactive Systems Research Group. His research interests include haptic interfaces, technologies for neurorehabilitation, and the human system.

Dr. Harwin is a member of the Institute of Physics and Engineering in Medicine as well as the IEE.



James L. Patton (Member, IEEE) was born in Ann Arbor MI, in 1965, but grew up in Racine, WI. He received two B.S. degrees in mechanical engineering and engineering science/bioengineering from the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, in 1989, and the M.S. degree in theoretical mechanics from Michigan State University, Lansing, in 1993, and the Ph.D. degree in biomedical engineering from Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, in 1988.

He worked on robotics in nuclear medicine and with Ford Motor Company before turning his attention to the control of human movement. He is Associate Director of the Center for Rehabilitation Robotics and part of the Sensory Motor Performance Program at the Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago and Northwestern University. His research draws on the fields of robotics, automatic control, neurophysiology, physical therapy and human movement science. His work has focused on haptics, modeling the human-machine interface, robotic teaching, and robotic facilitation of recovery from a brain injury.

Dr. Patton is a member of the Society for Neuroscience, the IEEE RAS and the IEEE EMBS. He was the chair of the 2005 IEEE International Conference on Rehabilitation Robotics (ICORR).



V. Reggie Edgerton (Member, IEEE) received the Ph.D. degree from Michigan State University, Ann Arbor.

He has been at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), since 1968, where he is Director of the Neuromuscular Research Laboratory within the Department of Physiological Science and the Brain Research Institute. His research interests include understanding how the nervous system controls movement. One objective is to understand and formalize some generalized principles for motor control. More specifically, studies are designed to further understand how the spinal cord controls posture and locomotion. The principal experimental model being used to accomplish this goal is spinal cord injury and in most cases this involves complete spinalcord injury. However, other experimental paradigms used to study the plasticity of the neuromuscular system in absence of weight bearing are spaceflight, suspension of the legs to prevent weight bearing, as well as normal *in vivo* neuromuscular performance in the 1 G environment. The highest priority within the laboratory is to understand the plasticity potential of the spinal cord and musculature with respect to the ability to recover functional posture and locomotion following spinal cord injury and other neuromotor disorders. These problems are being addressed at the *in vivo* level using mice, rats, nonhuman primates, and in humans. The laboratory also develops robotic devices to analyze movement and to train spinal cord-injured animals to relearn how to stand or to step.

