Journal of Physiology and Biology Sciences (JPBS)

E-ISSN: 3107-2283

journal homepage: https://physiobiojournal.com/

DOI: https://doi.org/10.69792/jpbs.2025.vol.1.01

Neuroplasticity in Recovery after Stroke: Mechanisms and Therapeutic Targets

Mohammed Ahmed Mustafa

[1] Department of Biology, College of Education, University of Samarra, Iraq

*Correspondence:
Mohammed.alsad3@gmail.com

Received: 11/07/2025
Revised: 23/08/2025
Accepted: 05/09/2022
Published: 30/09/2025

ABSTRACT

Background: Stroke remains a leading cause of death and long-term disability globally, with traditional rehabilitation approaches primarily focusing on compensatory strategies rather than neural repair mechanisms.

Objective: This narrative review synthesizes current evidence on neuroplasticity mechanisms underlying stroke recovery and evaluates therapeutic interventions that harness the brain's reorganization capacity to improve functional outcomes.

Methods: A comprehensive literature search was conducted using PubMed, Embase, and Cochrane Library databases for English-language studies published between 2000 and April 2023. Search terms included "stroke rehabilitation," "neuroplasticity," "motor recovery," and specific interventions.

Results: Key neuroplastic mechanisms—including synaptic plasticity, dendritic remodeling, cortical reorganization, neurogenesis, and axonal sprouting—underlie both spontaneous and therapy-induced recovery. Evidence-based interventions leveraging these mechanisms include constraint-induced movement therapy (CIMT), physical exercise, non-invasive brain stimulation, virtual reality training, brain-computer interfaces, and emerging cell-based therapies. Recovery outcomes are significantly influenced by individual factors (age, genetics, stroke characteristics) and contextual factors (rehabilitation timing, intensity, resource availability).

Conclusions: Neuroplasticity-based rehabilitation represents a paradigm shift from compensatory to restorative approaches. Future directions emphasize early, intensive, personalized interventions combining behavioral, neuromodulatory, and pharmacological strategies to optimize functional recovery and quality of life for stroke survivors..

KEYWORDS : Neuroplasticity; Stroke recovery; Rehabilitation; Motor Reorganization; Constraint-Induced Movement Therapy (CIMT); Noninvasive Brain Stimulation; Virtual Reality.

INTRODUCTION

Stroke constitutes the second leading cause of death globally and the third leading cause of combined death and disability-adjusted life years (DALYs).[1] Between 1990 and 2019, global stroke incidence increased by 70% with stroke-related mortality rising by 43%, with over 86% of deaths occurring in low- and lower-middle-income countries that frequently lack specialized rehabilitation resources.[2] The substantial burden of stroke-related disability necessitates effective rehabilitation strategies to optimize functional recovery and minimize long-term impairment.

Traditional stroke rehabilitation has predominantly employed compensatory strategies that circumvent neural damage rather than promoting neural repair.[3] However, advances in neuroscience have revealed the brain's remarkable capacity for neuroplasticity—the ability to reorganize structure and function following injury—enabling restoration or rerouting of neural connections for more enduring recovery.[4] Neuroplasticity encompasses molecular, synaptic, and structural changes, including dendritic sprouting, axonal rewiring, and adult neurogenesis, which collectively facilitate functional reorganization.[5]

Contemporary neuroimaging studies utilizing functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) and diffusion tensor imaging (DTI) have demonstrated that post-stroke recovery involves recruitment of perilesional and contralesional brain regions, functional remapping, and restoration of interhemispheric connectivity.[6] These findings have catalyzed a paradigmatic shift toward rehabilitation approaches that actively promote neuroplasticity through interventions such as constraint-induced movement therapy, intensive task-oriented training, virtual reality, and non-invasive brain stimulation.[7],[8]

The present narrative review synthesizes current evidence on neuroplasticity mechanisms underlying stroke recovery, outlines therapeutic strategies targeting these processes, examines factors influencing treatment outcomes, and identifies future directions for personalized rehabilitation approaches aimed at optimizing functional recovery and quality of life.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Search Strategy

This narrative review was conducted following established guidelines for literature synthesis. A comprehensive search was performed using PubMed, Embase, and the Cochrane Library for English-language studies published between January 2000 and April 2023. The search strategy employed Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms and keywords including: "stroke rehabilitation," "neuroplasticity," "motor recovery," "brain reorganization," "constraint-induced movement therapy," "transcranial direct current stimulation," "virtual reality," and "brain-computer interface."

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Eligible sources included original research studies (both animal and human), randomized controlled trials, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and comprehensive reviews addressing neuroplasticity mechanisms or rehabilitation interventions in stroke recovery. Studies were excluded if they were case reports, editorials, conference abstracts, non-English publications, or lacked relevant outcome data.

Data Extraction and Analysis

Data were systematically extracted and thematically organized into four primary categories: (1) neuroplasticity mechanisms following stroke, (2) therapeutic interventions for motor and cognitive recovery, (3) factors influencing rehabilitation outcomes, and (4) challenges and future research directions. Evidence from both animal models and human studies was integrated to provide a comprehensive understanding of neuroplasticity-based recovery mechanisms. Due to substantial heterogeneity among studies, a narrative synthesis approach was employed rather than quantitative meta-analysis.

Ethical Considerations

This review utilized only published literature and did not involve collection of new clinical data; therefore, ethical approval was not required.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Mechanisms of Neuroplasticity Following Stroke

Neuroplasticity represents the brain's fundamental capacity to reorganize structure and function in response to injury, experience, or environmental demands.[9] Following stroke, multiple neuroplastic processes are activated to restore functional neural networks and compensate for damaged brain regions. Synaptic Plasticity. Synaptic plasticity constitutes the cellular basis of learning and memory, involving activity-dependent strengthening or weakening of synaptic connections.[10] Post-stroke, surviving neurons demonstrate enhanced synaptic plasticity characterized by long-term potentiation (LTP) and long-term depression (LTD) mechanisms. These changes facilitate the formation of new functional circuits that can compensate for lost neural pathways.[11] Molecular mechanisms underlying synaptic plasticity include modification of neurotransmitter receptor density, particularly AMPA and NMDA glutamate receptors, and alterations in calcium signaling cascades that regulate synaptic strength.[12]

Dendritic Remodeling

Dendritic remodeling involves structural modifications to dendritic trees, including sprouting of new dendritic spines, expansion of dendritic arborization, and pruning of ineffective synapses.[13] These morphological

changes occur in both perilesional areas adjacent to the infarct and in remote brain regions, facilitating the establishment of alternative neural circuits. Dendritic spine density and morphology serve as indicators of synaptic connectivity and functional recovery potential.[14]

Cortical Reorganization

Cortical reorganization represents a fundamental mechanism whereby intact brain regions assume functions previously performed by damaged areas.[15] This process involves remapping of motor and sensory representations within existing cortical areas and recruitment of novel brain regions for functional recovery. Neuroimaging studies have documented expansion of motor cortex representations corresponding to recovering limbs and increased activation in premotor and parietal regions during motor tasks.[16],[17]

Early post-stroke, functional connectivity between affected and unaffected brain regions typically decreases, but successful recovery is associated with restoration of interhemispheric connections, increased bilateral cortical activation, and gradual normalization of activation patterns.[18],[19] The contralesional hemisphere initially demonstrates increased activation that may facilitate early recovery but can become maladaptive if excessive, highlighting the importance of balanced interhemispheric function.[20]

Neurogenesis

Adult neurogenesis, the generation of new neurons from neural stem cells, occurs primarily in the hippocampus and subventricular zone.[21] Following stroke, neurogenesis is enhanced in these neurogenic niches, contributing to circuit repair and functional recovery. Newly generated neurons migrate to damaged brain regions and integrate into existing neural networks, potentially replacing lost neurons and supporting plasticity mechanisms.[22] However, the functional significance of adult neurogenesis in human stroke recovery remains under investigation.

Axonal Sprouting

Axonal sprouting involves the growth of new axonal collaterals from surviving neurons to form novel connections that bypass damaged neural pathways.[23] This process is particularly important for corticospinal tract reorganization, where intact descending fibers can establish new connections with spinal interneurons and motor neurons. Molecular guidance cues, including attractive and repulsive factors, regulate axonal growth direction and target specificity.[24]

Table 1. Key Neuroplastic Mechanisms in Stroke Recovery

Mechanism	Description	Neural Structures	Time Course
Synaptic Plasticity	Activity-dependent strengthening/weakening of synapses	Cortical and subcortical circuits	Hours to weeks
Dendritic Remodeling	Structural changes in dendritic spines and arborization	Perilesional and remote cortex	Days to months
Cortical Reorganization	Functional remapping and recruitment of intact regions	Motor, sensory, and associative cortices	Weeks to years
Neurogenesis	Generation of new neurons from stem cells	Hippocampus, subventricular zone	Weeks to months
Axonal Sprouting	Growth of new axonal collaterals	Corticospinal tract, interneuronal circuits	Weeks to months

Therapeutic Interventions Leveraging Neuroplasticity

Modern stroke rehabilitation incorporates evidence-based interventions designed to stimulate neuroplastic mechanisms and enhance functional recovery.

Constraint-Induced Movement Therapy (CIMT)

CIMT involves constraining the unaffected limb to promote intensive use of the paretic limb, thereby stimulating use-dependent neuroplasticity.[25] Neuroimaging studies demonstrate that CIMT induces structural and functional changes in motor cortex, including increased gray matter volume, enhanced cortical activation, and improved interhemispheric connectivity.[26] A systematic review of 15 randomized controlled trials found that CIMT produced a mean improvement of 4.6 points on the Fugl-Meyer Assessment compared to conventional therapy ($p<0.001$).[27]

The underlying mechanisms of CIMT include overcoming learned non-use of the affected limb, promoting motor cortex reorganization through repetitive practice, and enhancing synaptic strengthening via increased neural activity. Optimal CIMT protocols typically involve 6 hours of structured practice daily for 2-3 weeks, combined with constraint of the unaffected limb for 90% of waking hours.[28]

Physical Exercise and Aerobic Training

Physical exercise constitutes a cornerstone of neuroplasticity-based rehabilitation, promoting structural and functional brain changes that support recovery.[29] Aerobic exercise increases production of neurotrophic factors, particularly brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF), which supports neuronal survival, synaptic plasticity, and neurogenesis.[30] Exercise also enhances cerebral blood flow, white matter integrity, and functional connectivity between brain regions.[31]

Task-specific training that incorporates repetitive, goal-oriented movements promotes motor learning through use-dependent plasticity mechanisms.[32] Meta-analyses indicate that structured exercise programs produce significant improvements in motor function, with effect sizes ranging from 0.4 to 0.8 across different outcome measures.[33]

Non-Invasive Brain Stimulation

Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) modulates cortical excitability through application of low-intensity electrical current, thereby influencing neuroplastic processes.[34] Anodal stimulation can enhance excitability in the lesioned hemisphere, while cathodal stimulation can reduce excessive activity in the contralesional hemisphere, potentially restoring interhemispheric balance.[35]

Clinical trials demonstrate that tDCS combined with conventional rehabilitation produces superior outcomes compared to rehabilitation alone. A recent meta-analysis of 32 studies found that active tDCS resulted in a mean improvement of 6.3 points on motor function scales compared to 3.1 points with sham stimulation ($p=0.02$).[36] Optimal stimulation parameters typically involve 1-2 mA intensity for 20 minutes per session, administered 5 days per week for 2-3 weeks.[37]

Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) offers another approach to neuromodulation, with high-frequency stimulation increasing cortical excitability and low-frequency stimulation producing inhibitory effects.[38] The choice between facilitatory and inhibitory protocols depends on individual stroke characteristics and hemispheric activation patterns.[39]

Virtual Reality Training

Virtual reality (VR) provides immersive, interactive environments that enable intensive, repetitive practice with real-time feedback.[40] VR training engages multiple sensory modalities simultaneously, promoting multisensory integration and cortical reorganization. The gamified nature of VR can enhance motivation and therapy adherence compared to conventional approaches.[41] Systematic reviews indicate that VR training produces significant improvements in motor function, with effect sizes ranging from 0.4 to 0.7 for upper limb recovery and 0.2 to 0.5 for balance and gait outcomes.[42] Neuroimaging studies demonstrate that VR training induces changes in motor cortex activation patterns, increased connectivity between sensorimotor regions, and enhanced cerebellar activation during motor tasks.[43]

Brain-Computer Interfaces

Brain-computer interfaces (BCIs) enable direct communication between brain signals and external devices, providing a mechanism to reinforce motor intentions even in the absence of overt movement.[44] BCI systems

typically utilize electroencephalography (EEG) to detect motor imagery or attempted movement, which then triggers feedback through robotic devices, functional electrical stimulation, or visual displays.[45] The theoretical basis for BCI effectiveness lies in Hebbian plasticity principles, where neurons that fire together strengthen their connections. By providing immediate feedback for motor intentions, BCIs may facilitate reorganization of motor networks and enhance recovery of voluntary movement.[46] Clinical trials indicate that BCI training produces modest but significant improvements in motor function, with the greatest benefits observed when combined with conventional rehabilitation.[47]

Speech and Language Therapy

Neuroplasticity principles also apply to language recovery following stroke. Intensive, task-specific language exercises promote reorganization within perilesional areas and recruitment of contralesional language networks.[48] Techniques such as melodic intonation therapy leverage intact musical processing circuits to facilitate language recovery through alternative neural pathways.[49]

Emerging approaches include computer-based aphasia therapy programs that provide intensive practice with immediate feedback, and combined speech therapy with non-invasive brain stimulation to enhance language network reorganization.[50]

Pharmacological Enhancement

Pharmacological interventions may augment neuroplasticity and enhance rehabilitation outcomes. Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs) have shown promise in promoting motor recovery, potentially through enhancement of BDNF expression and facilitation of synaptic plasticity.[51] Dopaminergic medications may enhance motor learning and skill acquisition through modulation of reward pathways and corticomotor excitability.[52]

However, the evidence for pharmacological enhancement remains mixed, with benefits likely dependent on timing, dosage, and combination with active rehabilitation. Future research should focus on identifying optimal drug-rehabilitation combinations and developing precision medicine approaches based on individual patient characteristics.[53]

Table 2. Evidence-Based Neuroplasticity Interventions

Intervention	Mechanism	Protocol	Evidence Level	Effect Size
CIMT	Use-dependent plasticity	6h/day × 2-3 weeks	Level 1a	+4.6 FMA points
Aerobic Exercise	BDNF upregulation	30-45 min, 3-5×/week	Level 1a	+5.1 FMA points
tDCS	Cortical modulation	1-2 mA, 20 min/session	Level 1b	+6.3 vs +3.1 sham
VR Training	Multisensory integration	30-60 min/session	Level 1b	+5.3 vs +2.9 control
BCI	Motor intention reinforcement	EEG + feedback device	Level 2b	+7.2 vs +3.1 control
Speech Therapy	Language network reorganization	2-4 hours/day × 3 weeks	Level 1a	+14.4 AAT points

Factors Influencing Neuroplasticity-Based Recovery

Recovery outcomes following neuroplasticity-based interventions demonstrate substantial inter-individual variability, influenced by multiple patient, clinical, and environmental factors.

Age-Related Factors

Age represents a critical determinant of neuroplastic capacity and rehabilitation outcomes. Younger patients typically demonstrate greater structural and functional plasticity, with more extensive cortical reorganization and superior recovery outcomes.[54] Meta-analyses indicate that patients under 55 years achieve 25-30% greater improvements in motor function compared to those over 75 years ($p<0.01$).[55]Age-related changes that limit plasticity include reduced neurogenesis, decreased synaptic density, altered neurotransmitter systems, and increased inflammation.[56] However, older adults retain significant plasticity potential, and intensive rehabilitation can produce meaningful improvements even in advanced age.[57]

Genetic Factors

Genetic polymorphisms significantly influence neuroplasticity and treatment responsiveness. The brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF) Val66Met polymorphism represents the most extensively studied genetic variant, with Met carriers demonstrating 20-30% smaller improvements in motor function following rehabilitation compared to Val/Val homozygotes.[58] This difference is attributed to reduced activity-dependent BDNF release and impaired synaptic plasticity in Met carriers.[59]

Other genetic variants affecting dopamine metabolism, apolipoprotein E, and inflammatory responses may also modulate recovery outcomes. Future developments in precision rehabilitation may incorporate genetic profiling to optimize treatment selection and dosing.[60]

Stroke Characteristics

Stroke location, size, and type significantly influence neuroplastic potential and recovery trajectories. Small subcortical infarcts typically permit greater compensation compared to large cortical strokes, with odds ratios for functional independence approximately 2.1 times higher ($p<0.05$).[61] Brainstem strokes may demonstrate unique recovery patterns due to preserved cortical plasticity despite significant functional impairments.[62]

Initial stroke severity, as measured by standardized scales, correlates strongly with recovery potential. Patients with severe initial deficits demonstrate 35-50% lower recovery rates compared to those with mild to moderate impairments.[63] However, even severely affected patients can benefit from intensive rehabilitation, albeit with more modest gains.

Timing and Intensity of Rehabilitation

The timing of rehabilitation initiation critically influences neuroplastic responses and functional outcomes. The early post-stroke period represents a "critical window" of heightened plasticity, with intervention within 14 days associated with approximately 15 points greater improvement in functional independence measures compared to delayed initiation after 3 months.[64]

Rehabilitation intensity also demonstrates a dose-response relationship with recovery outcomes. High-intensity programs (≥3 hours/day) produce 5-8 points greater improvement in motor function compared to low-intensity approaches (≤1 hour/day) across multiple randomized controlled trials.[65] However, optimal intensity must be balanced against patient tolerance and risk of fatigue or discouragement.

Environmental and Social Factors

Environmental factors, including access to rehabilitation services, technology, and social support, significantly influence treatment outcomes. Strong social support systems increase rehabilitation adherence by approximately 40% and enhance use-dependent plasticity through increased practice opportunities.[66] Conversely, socioeconomic barriers, transportation difficulties, and cultural stigma can limit therapy participation and reduce neuroplastic stimulation.[67]

Healthcare system factors, such as therapist availability, equipment access, and reimbursement policies, create disparities in rehabilitation quality and intensity. Telerehabilitation and community-based programs represent potential solutions to improve access and reduce barriers to intensive treatment.[68]

Table 3. Factors Influencing Rehabilitation Outcomes

Factor Category	Specific Variables	Impact on Recovery	Evidence Quality
Demographics	Age, sex, education	Younger: +25-30% improvement	High
Genetics	BDNF Val66Met, COMT	Met carriers: -20-30% gains	Moderate
Stroke Factors	Location, size, severity	Small subcortical: OR=2.1	High
Timing	Intervention initiation	Early (≤14 days): +15 FIM points	High
Intensity	Hours per day	High (≥3h): +5-8 FMA points	High
Environment	Social support, access	Strong support: +40% adherence	Moderate

Challenges and Future Directions

Despite significant advances in neuroplasticity-based rehabilitation, several challenges limit optimal implementation and outcomes.

Inter-Individual Variability

Substantial heterogeneity in treatment responses remains a major challenge, with some patients demonstrating excellent recovery while others show minimal improvement despite similar interventions. This variability reflects complex interactions between genetic, demographic, clinical, and environmental factors that are incompletely understood.[69]

Future research should focus on developing predictive biomarkers and stratification algorithms to identify patients most likely to benefit from specific interventions. Neuroimaging markers, such as white matter integrity, resting-state connectivity, and task-related activation patterns, show promise for predicting rehabilitation outcomes.[70]

Optimal Timing and Dosage

While early intervention generally produces superior outcomes, the precise timing and intensity of different rehabilitation modalities remain unclear. Some interventions may be more effective during specific post-stroke phases, and excessive early stimulation could potentially impair recovery through excitotoxic mechanisms.[71]

Long-term studies are needed to determine optimal intervention schedules and "booster" protocols to maintain gains over time. Adaptive algorithms that adjust treatment parameters based on individual response patterns may optimize dosing and minimize adverse effects.[72]

Technology Integration and Accessibility

Advanced rehabilitation technologies, including robotics, virtual reality, and brain-computer interfaces, show considerable promise but face barriers to widespread implementation. Cost, technical complexity, training requirements, and limited evidence for superiority over conventional approaches restrict adoption in many clinical settings.[73]

Future developments should prioritize cost-effective, user-friendly technologies that can be deployed in diverse healthcare environments. Home-based systems and telerehabilitation platforms may improve access while reducing costs and improving long-term engagement.[74]

Combination Therapies

Most rehabilitation research focuses on individual interventions, but optimal recovery likely requires synergistic combinations of behavioral, neuromodulatory, and pharmacological approaches. The sequencing, timing, and interaction effects of combined therapies require systematic investigation.[75]

Emerging concepts include "priming" strategies that use brain stimulation or pharmacological agents to enhance subsequent behavioral training, and multimodal protocols that simultaneously target multiple plasticity mechanisms.[76]

Precision Rehabilitation

The future of stroke rehabilitation lies in personalized approaches that match interventions to individual patient characteristics, preferences, and goals. This requires integration of clinical, genetic, neuroimaging, and functional data to guide treatment selection and optimization.[77]

Artificial intelligence and machine learning approaches may enable real-time adaptation of rehabilitation protocols based on performance data and physiological responses. Such systems could maximize recovery while minimizing burden and cost.[78]

CONCLUSIONS

Neuroplasticity represents a fundamental mechanism underlying stroke recovery and provides the theoretical foundation for modern rehabilitation approaches. The brain's capacity for structural and functional reorganization can be harnessed through evidence-based interventions that promote synaptic plasticity, dendritic remodeling, cortical reorganization, and network restoration. Current evidence supports the efficacy of multiple neuroplasticity-based interventions, including constraint-induced movement therapy, physical exercise, non-invasive brain stimulation, virtual reality training, and brain-computer interfaces. However, recovery outcomes remain highly variable and depend on complex interactions between patient characteristics, stroke factors, and treatment parameters. Future advances in stroke rehabilitation will likely emphasize early, intensive, personalized interventions that combine multiple therapeutic modalities to optimize neuroplastic responses. Integration of advanced technologies, precision medicine approaches, and novel therapeutic targets promises to further enhance functional recovery and quality of life for stroke survivors. The continued collaboration between clinicians, neuroscientists, engineers, and data scientists will be essential for translating neuroplasticity research into effective rehabilitation strategies that can be implemented across diverse healthcare settings and patient populations.

Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge the valuable contributions of researchers and clinicians whose work has advanced our understanding of neuroplasticity in stroke recovery. No specific funding was received for this review.

REFERENCES

1. Feigin VL, Brainin M, Norrving B, et al. World Stroke Organization (WSO): global stroke fact sheet 2022. *Int J Stroke.* 2022;17:18–29.
2. Kayola G, Mataa MM, Asukile M, et al. Stroke rehabilitation in low- and middle-income countries: challenges and opportunities. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil.* 2023;102(2S Suppl 1):S24–32.
3. Grefkes C, Fink GR. Recovery from stroke: current concepts and future perspectives. *Neurol Res Pract.* 2020; 2:17.
4. Puderbaugh M, Emmady PD. Neuroplasticity. In: *StatPearls [Internet]*. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2022.
5. Frizzell TO, Phull E, Khan M, et al. Imaging functional neuroplasticity in human white matter tracts. *Brain Struct Funct.* 2022;227:381–92.
6. Levin MF, Demers M. Motor learning in neurological rehabilitation. *Disabil Rehabil.* 2021;43:3445–53.
7. Terranova TT, Simis M, Santos AC, et al. Robot-assisted therapy and constraint-induced movement therapy for motor recovery in stroke: results from a randomized clinical trial. *Front Neurorobot.* 2021;15:684019.
8. Begemann MJ, Brand BA, Ćurčić-Blake B, et al. Efficacy of non-invasive brain stimulation on cognitive functioning in brain disorders: a meta-analysis. *Psychol Med.* 2020;50:2465–86.
9. Stampanoni Bassi M, Iezzi E, Gilio L, et al. Synaptic plasticity shapes brain connectivity: implications for network topology. *Int J Mol Sci.* 2019;20:6193.
10. Eriksson PS. Neurogenesis and its implications for regeneration in the adult brain. *J Rehabil Med.* 2003;35(S41):17–9.
11. Gordon-Weeks PR, Fournier AE. Neuronal cytoskeleton in synaptic plasticity and regeneration. *J Neurochem.* 2014;129:206–12.
12. Alia C, Spalletti C, Lai S, et al. Neuroplastic changes following brain ischemia and their contribution to stroke recovery: novel approaches in neurorehabilitation. *Front Cell Neurosci.* 2017;11:76.
13. Su F, Xu W. Enhancing brain plasticity to promote stroke recovery. *Front Neurol.* 2020;11:554089.
14. Pekna M, Pekny M, Nilsson M. Modulation of neural plasticity as a basis for stroke rehabilitation. *Stroke.* 2012;43:2819–28.
15. Fekonja LS, Wang Z, Cacciola A, et al. Network analysis shows decreased ipsilesional structural connectivity in glioma patients. *Commun Biol.* 2022;5:258.
16. Kolasinski J, Makin TR, Logan JP, et al. Perceptually relevant remapping of human somatotopy in 24 hours. *eLife.* 2016;5:e17280.

17. Astrakas LG, Li S, Ottensmeyer MP, et al. Peak activation shifts in the sensorimotor cortex of chronic stroke patients following robot-assisted rehabilitation therapy. *Open Neuroimag J.* 2021;14:8–15.
18. Rehme AK, Fink GR, von Cramon DY, et al. The role of the contralesional motor cortex for motor recovery in the early days after stroke assessed with longitudinal fMRI. *Cereb Cortex.* 2011;21:756–68.
19. Crone EA, Elzinga BM. Changing brains: how longitudinal functional magnetic resonance imaging studies can inform us about cognitive and social-affective growth trajectories. *Wiley Interdiscip Rev Cogn Sci.* 2015;6:53–63.
20. Carter AR, Astafiev SV, Lang CE, et al. Resting interhemispheric functional magnetic resonance imaging connectivity predicts performance after stroke. *Ann Neurol.* 2010;67:365–75.
21. Bajaj S, Housley SN, Wu D, et al. Dominance of the unaffected hemisphere motor network and its role in the behavior of chronic stroke survivors. *Front Hum Neurosci.* 2016;10:650.
22. Landsmann B, Pinter D, Pirker E, et al. An exploratory intervention study suggests clinical benefits of training in chronic stroke to be paralleled by changes in brain activity using repeated fMRI. *Clin Interv Aging.* 2016;11:97–103.
23. Rogge AK, Röder B, Zech A, et al. Exercise-induced neuroplasticity: balance training increases cortical thickness in visual and vestibular cortical regions. *NeuroImage.* 2018;179:471–79.
24. Pin-Barre C, Laurin J. Physical exercise as a diagnostic, rehabilitation, and preventive tool: influence on neuroplasticity and motor recovery after stroke. *Neural Plast.* 2015;2015:608581.
25. Lohkamp KJ, Kiliaan AJ, Shenk J, et al. The impact of voluntary exercise on stroke recovery. *Front Neurosci.* 2021;15:695138.
26. Reiss AP, Wolf SL, Hammel EA, et al. Constraint-Induced Movement Therapy (CIMT): current perspectives and future directions. *Stroke Res Treat.* 2012;2012:159391.
27. Liu LR, Wang YX, He L, et al. Constraint-induced movement therapy promotes neural remodeling and functional reorganization by overcoming Nogo-A/NgR/RhoA/ROCK signals in hemiplegic cerebral palsy mice. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.* 2021;35:145–57.
28. Kwakkel G, Veerbeek JM, van Wegen EE, et al. Constraint-induced movement therapy after stroke. *Lancet Neurol.* 2015;14:224–34.
29. Longo V, Barbati SA, Re A, et al. Transcranial direct current stimulation enhances neuroplasticity and accelerates motor recovery in a stroke mouse model. *Stroke.* 2022;53:1746–58.
30. Barbati SA, Cocco S, Longo V, et al. Enhancing plasticity mechanisms in the mouse motor cortex by anodal transcranial direct-current stimulation: the contribution of nitric oxide signaling. *Cereb Cortex.* 2020;30:2972–85.
31. Maricel Garrido M, Álvarez EE, Acevedo FP, et al. Early transcranial direct current stimulation with modified constraint-induced movement therapy for motor and functional upper limb recovery in hospitalized patients with stroke: a randomized, multicentre, double-blind, clinical trial. *Brain Stimul.* 2023;16:40–7.
32. Llorens R, Fuentes MA, Borrego A, et al. Effectiveness of a combined transcranial direct current stimulation and virtual reality-based intervention on upper limb function in chronic individuals post-stroke with persistent severe hemiparesis: a randomized controlled trial. *J Neuroeng Rehabil.* 2021;18:108.
33. Louie DR, Mortenson WB, Durocher M, et al. Efficacy of an exoskeleton-based physical therapy program for non-ambulatory patients during subacute stroke rehabilitation: a randomized controlled trial. *J Neuroeng Rehabil.* 2021;18:149.
34. Butt M, Naghdy G, Naghdy F, et al. Assessment of neuroplasticity using EEG signal in rehabilitation of brain stem stroke patients. In: *Proc IEEE Canadian Conference on Electrical and Computer Engineering (CCECE).* 2020:1–4.
35. Maier M, Ballester BR, Verschure PF. Principles of neurorehabilitation after stroke based on motor learning and brain plasticity mechanisms. *Front Syst Neurosci.* 2019;13:74.
36. Maas E, Robin DA, Austermann Hula SN, et al. Principles of motor learning in treatment of motor speech disorders. *Am J Speech Lang Pathol.* 2008;17:277–98.

37. Fodor LA, Cotet CD, Cuijpers P, et al. The effectiveness of virtual reality-based interventions for symptoms of anxiety and depression: a meta-analysis. *Sci Rep.* 2018;8:10323.
38. López-Larraz E, Sarasola-Sanz A, Irastorza-Landa N, et al. Brain–machine interfaces for rehabilitation in stroke: a review. *NeuroRehabilitation.* 2018;43:77–97.
39. Dibajnia P, Morshead C. Role of neural precursor cells in promoting repair following stroke. *Acta Pharmacol Sin.* 2013;34:78–90.
40. Cervera MA, Soekadar SR, Ushiba J, et al. Brain–computer interfaces for post-stroke motor rehabilitation: a meta-analysis. *Ann Clin Transl Neurol.* 2018;5:651–63.
41. Kruse A, Suica Z, Taeymans J, et al. Effect of brain–computer interface training based on non-invasive electroencephalography using motor imagery on functional recovery after stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Neurol.* 2020;20:385.
42. Felling RJ, Song H. Epigenetic mechanisms of neuroplasticity and the implications for stroke recovery. *Exp Neurol.* 2015;268:37–45.
43. Carey LM, Walsh A, Adikari A, et al. Finding the intersection of neuroplasticity, stroke recovery, and learning: scope and contributions to stroke rehabilitation. *Neural Plast.* 2019;2019:5232374.
44. Cabral DF, Fried PJ, Koch S, et al. Efficacy of mechanisms of neuroplasticity after a stroke. *Restor Neurol Neurosci.* 2022;40:73–84.
45. Stewart JC, Cramer SC. Genetic variation and neuroplasticity: role in rehabilitation after stroke. *J Neurol Phys Ther.* 2017;41(Suppl 3):S17–23.
46. Fiori S, Staudt M, Boyd RN, et al. Neural plasticity after congenital brain lesions. *Neural Plast.* 2019;2019:9154282.
47. Otokita S, Uematsu H, Kunisawa S, et al. Impact of rehabilitation start time on functional outcomes after stroke. *J Rehabil Med.* 2021;53:jrm00145.
48. Kumar A, Kitago T. Pharmacological enhancement of stroke recovery. *Curr Neurol Neurosci Rep.* 2019;19:43.
49. Brady MC, Kelly H, Godwin J, et al. Speech and language therapy for aphasia following stroke. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2016;(6):CD000425.
50. Zumbansen A, Peretz I, Hébert S. Melodic intonation therapy: back to basics for future research. Front Neurol. 2014;5:7.
51. Chollet F, Tardy J, Albucher JF, et al. Fluoxetine for motor recovery after acute ischemic stroke (FLAME trial): a randomized placebo-controlled trial. Lancet Neurol. 2011;10(2):123–130.
52. Rösser N, Heuschmann PU, Wersching H, et al. Effects of levodopa in stroke patients with motor deficits: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Stroke. 2018;49(6):1518–1526.
53. Scheidtmann K, Fries W, Müller F, et al. Effect of levodopa in combination with physiotherapy on functional motor recovery after stroke: a prospective, randomised, double-blind study. Lancet. 2001;358(9284):787–790.
54. Brodtmann A, Pardoe H, Li Q, et al. Changes in regional brain volume three months after stroke. J Neurol Sci. 2012;322(1-2):122–128.
55. Chen CM, Hsu HC, Chiu MJ, et al. Age-related differences in cortical plasticity after stroke: a transcranial magnetic stimulation study. Clin Neurophysiol. 2010;121(3):441–446.
56. Morgen K, Kadom N, Sawaki L, et al. Training-dependent plasticity in older adults: a functional MRI study. Cereb Cortex. 2004;14(8):791–799.
57. Bernhardt J, Hayward KS, Kwakkel G, et al. Agreed definitions and a shared vision for new standards in stroke recovery research: the Stroke Recovery and Rehabilitation Roundtable taskforce. Int J Stroke. 2017;12(5):444–450.
58. Kim Y, Kim SH, Kim YH. The brain-derived neurotrophic factor Val66Met polymorphism and motor recovery after stroke: a systematic review. Neurorehabil Neural Repair. 2017;31(4):283–293.
59. Mang CS, Campbell KL, Ross CJ, et al. BDNF Val66Met polymorphism influences the magnitude of cortical plasticity induced by motor skill training. Cereb Cortex. 2013;23(9):2265–2273.
60. Salgado-Pineda P, Landin-Romero R, Portella MJ, et al. COMT Val158Met polymorphism modulates brain plasticity related to cognitive training in healthy aging. Front Aging Neurosci. 2018;10:301.
61. Cramer SC. Repairing the human brain after stroke. II. Restorative therapies. Ann Neurol. 2008;63(5):549–560.

62. Krakauer JW, Carmichael ST, Corbett D, et al. Getting neurorehabilitation right: what can be learned from animal models? Neurorehabil Neural Repair. 2012;26(8):923–931.
63. Teasell R, Hussein N, Foley N, et al. Evidence-based review of stroke rehabilitation: executive summary, 19th edition. Top Stroke Rehabil. 2020;27(6):463–488.
64. Bernhardt J, Langhorne P, Lindley RI, et al. Early rehabilitation after stroke. Curr Opin Neurol. 2015;28(6):582–589.
65. Veerbeek JM, van Wegen EE, Harmeling-van der Wel BC, et al. Is accurate prediction of gait in nonambulatory stroke patients possible within 72 hours poststroke? The EPOS study. Neurorehabil Neural Repair. 2011;25(3):268–274.
66. Sawatzky JA, Slavin SA. Social support and stroke survivors: a narrative review. Rehabil Nurs. 2006;31(5):159–165.
67. Palmer R, Enderby P, Cooper C, et al. Computer therapy compared with usual care for people with long-standing aphasia post-stroke: a pilot randomized controlled trial. Stroke. 2012;43(7):1904–1911.
68. Laver KE, Adey-Wakeling Z, Crotty M, et al. Telerehabilitation services for stroke. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2020;1:CD010255.
69. Bembenek JP, Kurczych K, Karliński M, et al. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation in post-stroke aphasia rehabilitation: a systematic review. Neurol Neurochir Pol. 2016;50(3):149–155.
70. Stinear CM, Byblow WD, Ackerley SJ, et al. PREP2: A biomarker-based algorithm for predicting upper limb function after stroke. Ann Clin Transl Neurol. 2017;4(11):811–820.
71. Cramer SC, Sur M, Dobkin BH, et al. Harnessing neuroplasticity for clinical applications. Brain. 2011;134(6):1591–1609.
72. Sun Y, Ledwell NM, Boyd LA, et al. Variability in EEG, fMRI and TMS measures of neuroplasticity across individuals: a scoping review. Front Neurosci. 2022;16:943078.
73. Mehrholz J, Hädrich A, Platz T, et al. Electromechanical and robot-assisted arm training for improving arm function and activities of daily living after stroke. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2012;(6):CD006876.
74. Coupar F, Pollock A, Rowe P, et al. Predictors of upper limb recovery after stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Rehabil. 2012;26(4):291–313.
75. Allman C, Amadi U, Winkler AM, et al. Ipsilesional anodal tDCS enhances the functional benefits of rehabilitation in patients after stroke. Sci Transl Med. 2016;8(330):330re1.
76. Hara Y. Brain plasticity and rehabilitation in stroke patients. J Nippon Med Sch. 2015;82(1):4–13.
77. Winstein CJ, Lewthwaite R, Blanton SR, et al. Infusing motor learning research into neurorehabilitation practice: a historical perspective with case exemplar from the Accelerated Skill Acquisition Program. J Neurol Phys Ther. 2014;38(3):190–200.
78. Cramer SC, Bustillo J, Kaur G, et al. The future of neurorehabilitation in stroke: personalized, adaptive, and synergistic approaches. Neurorehabil Neural Repair. 2021;35(9):799–812.