AMERICAN JOURNALS
Open Access, Peer Reviewed Journals

American Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Sciences
ISSN (E): 2832-8019 Volume 53, | October - 2026

MECHANISMS FOR IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SPEECH-THERAPY CORRECTION THROUGH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES

1 Murtazaeva Umida
2 Egamova Nigora
3 Egamova Feruza
4 Shakarova Feruza
1,3 Samarkand Branch of Kimyo International University in Tashkent, Samarkand, Uzbekistan
2 Samarkand Branch of Oriental university, Samarkand, Uzbekistan
4 School № 54 of Samarkand city, Samarkand, Uzbekistan
E-mail: murtazayeva198202@gmail.com
Affiliation, City, Country | e-mail: author@example.com

ABSTRACT

This article examines mechanisms for improving speech-therapy correction through information technologies. Digital assessment, adaptive individualization, multimodal stimulation, gamification, real-time feedback, remote collaboration, and dynamic progress monitoring are integrated into a single pedagogical cycle. Materials from the underlying dissertation are critically compared with international evidence. The analysis argues that technology should not replace the speech-language professional; rather, it should function as a data-informed coordination mechanism linking clinician decisions, child engagement, caregiver participation, and iterative adjustment of intervention intensity and content.

KEYWORDS

Speech-therapy correction, information technology, digital assessment, adaptive intervention, multimodal stimulation, gamification, telepractice, progress monitoring.

Introduction

Annotatsiya

Ushbu maqolada axborot texnologiyalari asosida logopedik korreksiya samaradorligini oshirish mexanizmlari tahlil qilinadi. Raqamli diagnostika, adaptiv individuallashtirish, multimodal stimulyatsiya, o‘yinlashtirish, real vaqt qayta aloqasi, masofaviy hamkorlik va dinamik monitoring yagona pedagogik sikl sifatida asoslanadi. Yuklangan dissertatsiya materiallari xalqaro ilmiy manbalar bilan qiyosiy tahlil qilindi. Natijada texnologiya vosita emas, balki logoped, bola va ota-ona faoliyatini muvofiqlashtiruvchi boshqaruv mexanizmi sifatida talqin qilindi hamda amaliy joriy etish shartlari belgilandi.

Kalit so‘zlar: logopedik korreksiya, axborot texnologiyalari, raqamli diagnostika, adaptiv ta’lim, multimodal stimulyatsiya, o‘yinlashtirish, telepraktika, progress monitoringi.

Аннотация
В статье анализируются механизмы повышения эффективности логопедической коррекции на основе информационных технологий. Цифровая диагностика, адаптивная индивидуализация, мультимодальная стимуляция, геймификация, обратная связь в реальном времени, дистанционное взаимодействие и динамический мониторинг рассматриваются как единый педагогический цикл. Материалы загруженной диссертации сопоставлены с международными исследованиями. Обосновано, что технология должна выступать не самостоятельной заменой специалиста, а инструментом управления, координирующим деятельность логопеда, ребёнка и семьи при соблюдении методических, этических и организационных условий.

Ключевые слова: логопедическая коррекция, информационные технологии, цифровая диагностика, адаптивное обучение, мультимодальная стимуляция, геймификация, телепрактика, мониторинг прогресса.

1. INTRODUCTION

The digital transformation of education and rehabilitation has changed the functional meaning of technology in speech-language intervention. Information technologies are no longer limited to presenting pictures, playing recorded sounds, or replacing paper exercises with a screen. Contemporary systems can support assessment, stimulus control, individualized task selection, automated logging, remote participation, and longitudinal analysis. This shift is particularly relevant in pediatric speech and language intervention, where treatment effectiveness depends not only on the accuracy of a single exercise but also on intervention intensity, motivation, generalization, caregiver participation, and the clinician's capacity to detect small changes over time. The World Health Organization emphasizes that digital interventions should be understood as components of a broader service system rather than substitutes for functioning professional services [1, 2]. In speech-language pathology, evidence on telepractice and computer-assisted intervention is increasingly encouraging, although the strength of evidence varies by disorder, age, technology, and outcome measure [3–6]. Consequently, the central research problem is not whether a tablet, application, or online platform is "effective" in isolation, but which pedagogical and organizational mechanisms allow technology to strengthen evidence-informed correction without fragmenting clinical reasoning.

This article develops that mechanism-oriented perspective using the conceptual and methodological material of the uploaded master's dissertation on information technologies in speech-therapy sessions as its starting point. The dissertation identifies adaptive differentiation, multimodal stimulation, gamification, real-time feedback, remote cooperation, and dynamic monitoring as interconnected components of technology-supported correction. Rather than reproducing those formulations, the present paper critically restructures them against international literature and proposes an integrated effectiveness cycle. The purpose is to explain how digital tools can increase the precision, intensity, responsiveness, and continuity of speech-therapy correction while preserving the decisive role of the speech-language professional. The review therefore combines pedagogical analysis with evidence from computer-based speech therapy, telepractice, pediatric tele-assessment, digital interventions for developmental language disorder, and parent-mediated digital support [3–8]. Special attention is given to preschool and early-school-age children, because technology in this population must be developmentally appropriate, brief, highly interactive, and embedded in interpersonal communication.

The resulting framework is intended for researchers and practitioners designing digital or blended speech-therapy programs, including interventions for complex developmental speech and language disorders.

2. MAIN PART: MECHANISMS OF TECHNOLOGY-ENHANCED SPEECH-THERAPY CORRECTION

Figure 1. SmartArt-style integrated correction cycle

Digital assessment	Adaptive planning	Multimodal practice	Real-time feedback
Gamified engagement	Caregiver/telepractice	Progress monitoring	Clinical adjustment

The cycle is iterative: each intervention episode generates evidence that informs the next clinical decision.

The first mechanism is data-informed diagnostic precision. In conventional practice, the clinician often relies on structured observation, standardized tasks, audio recording, and professional judgment; these remain indispensable, but digital systems can increase the granularity and reproducibility of the information available for decision-making. A well-designed platform can timestamp responses, record error types, quantify latency, store audio samples, compare performance across sessions, and visualize trajectories that are difficult to detect from episodic notes. The uploaded dissertation similarly treats diagnosis and monitoring as the entry point for individualized correction, but international evidence suggests that digital measurement should be interpreted cautiously rather than automatically equated with validity. A systematic review of pediatric language assessment delivered through telehealth reported broadly comparable scores and behavioral ratings between remote and face-to-face administration, while also identifying evidence gaps for very young children, bilingual populations, and varied settings [7]. This distinction is important: digitization can improve consistency of data capture, yet psychometric equivalence must be demonstrated for each task and population. Therefore, the effectiveness mechanism is not “automatic diagnosis”; it is enhanced clinical visibility. Technology becomes useful when it supplies structured, longitudinal evidence that a qualified clinician can integrate with developmental history, direct observation, hearing status, oral-motor findings, linguistic context, and functional communication. In this model, digital assessment reduces informational noise and supports earlier, more defensible adjustment of intervention targets.

The second mechanism is adaptive individualization. Speech and language disorders are heterogeneous even when children share the same diagnostic label; they differ in severity, error patterns, receptive abilities, attention, memory, sensory preferences, motivation, and response to cueing. Static digital exercises risk reproducing the limitations of worksheets at higher speed, whereas adaptive systems can alter task difficulty, cue type, repetition frequency, stimulus complexity, and reinforcement according to performance. The dissertation material emphasizes adaptive differentiation as one of the strongest pathways through which information technology can improve correction. This proposition is consistent with the broader logic of digital intervention research: the value of software lies in its capacity to organize repeated practice around a learner’s changing needs, not in screen exposure itself. Recent systematic evidence on digital interventions for children with developmental language disorder includes applications, games, and software-based approaches across randomized and quasi-experimental studies, indicating a growing but methodologically diverse evidence base [8]. For clinical use, adaptation should follow explicit rules. For example, repeated phonological errors may trigger additional auditory discrimination trials; stable success may reduce cueing and increase linguistic

complexity; declining accuracy may return the child to a supported level. Such rules create a closed feedback loop between performance and task selection. Importantly, the clinician should retain authority to override algorithmic suggestions, because fatigue, anxiety, bilingual language patterns, motor planning difficulties, or situational behavior can produce data patterns that an automated system may misinterpret.

The third mechanism is multimodal stimulation, understood as coordinated rather than merely simultaneous presentation of visual, auditory, motor, and tactile information. Speech production and language learning involve perception, motor planning, memory, attention, and feedback; digital media can make relationships among these processes more explicit by synchronizing sound models, articulatory animations, visual cues, symbols, and interactive responses. In the dissertation, multimodal stimulation is proposed as a central mechanism for children whose speech-language development is accompanied by weaknesses in attention, memory, or motor organization. The pedagogical advantage is strongest when each modality has a defined corrective function. A waveform or spectrographic display, for example, may externalize an acoustic contrast; an animation may clarify articulator placement; a picture sequence may support lexical retrieval and narrative organization; a touch-based task may connect perception with an immediate motor response. However, adding modalities indiscriminately can increase cognitive load. The literature on computer-based speech therapy shows that digital programs vary considerably in design and evidence quality, which argues against treating "multimedia" as a unitary intervention [5]. Effective multimodality therefore requires cue hierarchy, temporal coordination, and progressive fading. The child should not become dependent on visual prompts that are absent in natural conversation. Technology should initially make the target more perceptible, then gradually withdraw artificial support while increasing spontaneous production, contextual variation, and interpersonal communication. This transition from supported perception to generalized communication is the actual corrective mechanism.

The fourth mechanism is deliberate practice with controlled intensity. Many speech and language targets require a large number of meaningful repetitions, yet session time is limited and repetitive drills can reduce engagement. Digital tools can increase practice density by shortening transitions, randomizing stimuli, recording responses automatically, and enabling carefully prescribed home practice. The critical concept is not maximal repetition but sufficient, accurate, distributed practice. Computer-assisted systems can help clinicians specify the number of trials, maintain target consistency, and identify when accuracy deteriorates. The systematic review of computer-based therapy for childhood speech sound disorders identified multiple programs and highlighted the potential of technology to address access and workforce constraints, while also showing that the evidence base was heterogeneous [5]. This means that increased intensity should be clinically managed rather than assumed to be beneficial. A child who repeats an incorrect motor pattern hundreds of times may consolidate error instead of correcting it. Consequently, digital practice should be gated by performance thresholds and cueing rules: high-quality repetitions are expanded; persistent errors trigger modeling or clinician review; fatigue or reduced attention prompts a change in task. Home modules should be shorter than clinic sessions and should include clear caregiver instructions. When intensity is linked to accuracy and spaced across contexts, information technology can extend therapeutic dosage beyond the clinic without converting intervention into unsupervised screen time.

The fifth mechanism is immediate and informative feedback. Traditional therapy already depends on feedback, but digital systems can make it faster, more consistent, and more varied. A child may receive

an auditory replay, a visual indicator, an animation, a score, or a brief game consequence immediately after a response. The pedagogical value of such feedback depends on what it communicates. Generic rewards such as stars or points can sustain attention but do not explain how production should change. Corrective feedback is stronger when it directs attention to a specific feature—voicing, place of articulation, syllable structure, lexical choice, grammatical form, or intelligibility—while preserving motivation. The dissertation's real-time feedback mechanism can therefore be refined into a three-level model: knowledge of results ("correct/incorrect"), knowledge of performance ("what differed"), and strategic guidance ("what to try next"). Technology can automate the first level and partly support the second, but nuanced strategic guidance often requires professional interpretation. This boundary is especially important for complex disorders in which acoustic similarity does not necessarily reflect correct motor planning or functional language use. Digital feedback should also avoid constant external reinforcement. As competence increases, feedback frequency can be reduced and delayed so that the child develops internal monitoring. In this way, the mechanism moves from externally signaled correction toward self-evaluation, a prerequisite for transfer of gains to spontaneous speech.

The sixth mechanism is gamification as regulation of engagement rather than entertainment. Preschool children frequently respond well to clear goals, immediate consequences, visible progress, narrative contexts, and achievable challenges. Digital environments can combine these elements efficiently, but poorly designed games can shift attention from speech-language targets to winning, speed, or visual stimulation. The dissertation identifies motivational stimulation as a major component of effective technology-supported correction; international evidence supports the need to examine not only whether a digital intervention is engaging, but how engagement produces therapeutic behavior. A clinically useful game should make the target response the necessary action for progress, limit irrelevant motor demands, avoid excessive audiovisual distraction, and allow the clinician to control reinforcement schedules. Difficulty should remain within a productive range: tasks that are too easy generate superficial success, while tasks that are too difficult increase avoidance. Progress indicators can support self-efficacy when they represent genuine mastery rather than accumulated screen time. For children with language impairment or motor speech difficulties, the game narrative should use comprehensible vocabulary and predictable rules. Gamification is therefore an instructional architecture that organizes attention, persistence, and repetition around a corrective objective. Its effectiveness should be evaluated through target accuracy, generalization, and sustained participation—not through enjoyment ratings alone. This distinction protects clinical purpose while retaining the motivational advantages of interactive technology.

Table 1. Mechanisms, digital functions, and clinical safeguards

Mechanism	**Digital function**	**Expected contribution**	**Safeguard**
Adaptive individualization	Difficulty/cue adjustment	Better task–ability fit	Clinician override
Multimodal stimulation	Synchronized audio-visual cues	Improved target salience	Avoid cognitive overload
Feedback	Immediate replay/indicators	Faster error correction	Fade external feedback
Telepractice	Remote sessions/coaching	Continuity and access	Suitability/privacy screening
Monitoring	Longitudinal dashboards	Earlier plan adjustment	Validate data quality

Table 1 shows that each technological capability requires a corresponding clinical safeguard; effectiveness depends on the pairing of function and professional control.

The seventh mechanism is telepractice and hybrid continuity of care. Telepractice uses telecommunications technology for screening, assessment, intervention, consultation, and education and may be used alone or in combination with in-person services [3]. Its most important contribution is not simply geographical convenience; it can connect therapy with the child's everyday environment, enable caregiver coaching, reduce missed sessions, and support continuity when specialist access is limited. Earlier systematic reviews described the evidence for school-age children as promising but limited [6], while a large comparative study of children receiving intervention for speech sound production found no significant difference in median functional change between matched telepractice and traditional service-delivery groups [4]. More recently, a 2026 meta-analysis of speech-language intervention in children younger than twelve reported moderate-to-high effects and found telepractice outcomes comparable to or larger than in-person outcomes across included studies, while still reflecting a relatively small evidence base [9]. These findings support telepractice as a legitimate modality, not as a universal replacement for face-to-face care. Suitability depends on the child's age, attention, sensory and motor needs, caregiver availability, technology access, privacy, and the specific therapeutic target. Hybrid models may be especially useful because direct examination and hands-on cueing can be combined with remote follow-up, parent coaching, and digital home practice.

The eighth mechanism is structured caregiver participation. For young children, treatment gains are more likely to generalize when caregivers understand the target, can recognize successful responses, and embed brief practice opportunities into ordinary routines. Digital platforms can provide video demonstrations, reminders, home assignments, progress summaries, and secure channels for questions. The dissertation's remote collaboration component is therefore best interpreted as a distributed intervention mechanism: the clinician designs and adjusts the program, while caregivers help create repeated communication opportunities outside formal sessions. A recent realist review of digital support for parent-implemented intensive speech and language therapy for children with speech sound disorder emphasizes that effectiveness depends on context, mechanisms, and the conditions under which parents can implement intervention, rather than on the digital tool alone [10]. This has practical implications. Home programs should minimize technical complexity, define a realistic frequency, demonstrate cueing explicitly, and distinguish therapeutic practice from testing the child. Caregivers should not be expected to diagnose errors or independently increase difficulty. Instead, they can document brief observations and submit selected recordings, allowing the clinician to calibrate subsequent tasks. Digital communication can also reduce the delay between a problem emerging at home and professional adjustment. When family participation is scaffolded in this manner, technology strengthens treatment intensity and ecological validity without transferring professional responsibility to the caregiver.

The ninth mechanism is dynamic progress monitoring and decision thresholds. Traditional progress notes can describe improvement, but digital systems can transform repeated observations into trajectories that support timely decisions. The uploaded dissertation proposes dynamic indices and emphasizes movement from static assessment toward predictive, optimizable monitoring. For an international evidence-based framework, the core idea can be retained while avoiding overclaiming prediction: progress monitoring should summarize clinically meaningful change, variability, and response to intervention, and should trigger predefined review points. Useful indicators may include

target accuracy, level of cueing, response latency, generalization to untrained items, intelligibility ratings, functional communication measures, attendance, and home-practice completion. The clinician can visualize these variables across sessions and ask whether the child is improving at the expected rate. A plateau might trigger a change in stimulus set, cueing hierarchy, intensity, or therapeutic approach; unstable performance might prompt examination of fatigue, task complexity, hearing, or environmental factors. Importantly, a dashboard is not a clinical conclusion. Data quality can be affected by microphone characteristics, internet delay, caregiver assistance, or inconsistent task conditions. The effectiveness mechanism is therefore decision support: digital monitoring reduces the time between evidence of insufficient response and modification of the intervention plan. This makes correction more responsive while maintaining professional accountability for interpretation.

The tenth mechanism is interoperability between assessment, intervention, and documentation. Many digital therapy projects fail because each component functions as an isolated application: assessment data remain in one system, exercises in another, and progress notes in a third. Fragmentation increases clinician workload and prevents accumulated data from informing therapy. The conceptual model derived from the dissertation instead requires a continuous information flow: baseline assessment identifies priorities; priorities configure intervention; intervention generates performance data; data update the progress profile; the profile informs the next clinical decision. This logic parallels the World Health Organization's classification of digital interventions, services, and applications, which promotes a shared language for describing digital capabilities and the needs they address [1]. In speech-language practice, interoperability does not necessarily require a complex hospital information system. At minimum, the clinician should be able to connect each digital task to a documented therapeutic objective, export or review performance summaries, and preserve a longitudinal record that can be interpreted independently of the software vendor. Standardized naming of targets and outcomes improves comparability across sessions and clinicians. Where health or educational records are involved, access control, consent, retention, and secure storage must be defined. The mechanism is thus organizational as well as technical: information technologies improve effectiveness when they reduce duplication and convert scattered interactions into a coherent correction pathway.

Figure 2. SmartArt-style decision loop for dynamic progress monitoring

Collect data	Compare with target	Identify trajectory	Select adjustment	Reassess

Decision thresholds convert monitoring from passive documentation into an active mechanism for treatment optimization.

The eleventh mechanism is clinician digital competence and implementation fidelity. Even a well-designed platform can produce weak outcomes if the speech-language professional cannot configure tasks, interpret data, troubleshoot access problems, or integrate digital activities with established therapeutic methods. The dissertation repeatedly identifies specialist competence as a condition for successful technology integration. This condition is consistent with international guidance that digital interventions should be evaluated in relation to feasibility, acceptability, resource use, equity, and the surrounding service system [2]. Training should therefore extend beyond basic device operation. Clinicians need competence in selecting appropriate digital tools, evaluating evidence, protecting privacy, designing accessible stimuli, managing screen-based attention, interpreting automated

outputs, and deciding when technology should not be used. Implementation fidelity also requires a protocol describing the target population, session structure, cueing hierarchy, progression criteria, home-practice rules, and monitoring schedule. Without such a protocol, apparent "technology effects" may actually reflect differences in therapist behavior. Supervision and peer review can help clinicians compare digital and non-digital observations and detect unintended drift. The most sustainable implementation model treats technology as part of professional methodology: digital competence becomes a component of clinical competence, and software is evaluated according to whether it strengthens—not bypasses—therapeutic reasoning.

The twelfth mechanism is accessibility, equity, and developmental fit. Digital intervention can expand access, yet it can also create new barriers through device cost, unstable connectivity, inaccessible interfaces, language mismatch, or assumptions about caregiver availability. The WHO–ITU implementation toolkit for accessible telehealth services specifically addresses barriers experienced by persons with disabilities and other marginalized groups [11]. In pediatric speech therapy, accessibility begins with interface design: large targets, limited visual clutter, predictable navigation, captioning or visual support where appropriate, adjustable audio, and tasks that do not require literacy beyond the child's developmental level. Linguistic accessibility is equally important. Programs developed for one language cannot simply be translated word-for-word when phonology, morphology, vocabulary frequency, and cultural familiarity differ. The dissertation's emphasis on national linguistic and cultural adaptation is therefore a substantive methodological requirement. Equity also affects data interpretation; a child's lower rate of digital homework completion may indicate limited internet access rather than low motivation. Services should offer alternatives such as downloadable/offline tasks, printed supports, or blended appointments. The goal is not to maximize technology use but to ensure that technology does not determine who receives effective therapy. An equitable model selects the least burdensome digital solution capable of supporting the therapeutic objective and preserves non-digital pathways when they are clinically or socially preferable.

The thirteenth mechanism is ethical data governance and human oversight. Speech recordings, video sessions, developmental histories, and performance logs are sensitive data, especially when they concern children. Any effectiveness gained through intensive monitoring can be undermined if families do not understand what is recorded, where it is stored, who can access it, or how long it will be retained. Ethical implementation therefore requires informed consent, data minimization, role-based access, secure transmission, and a clear distinction between clinical records and optional analytics. Automated speech recognition and artificial-intelligence features require additional caution because performance may vary across ages, accents, languages, and atypical speech patterns. A system that labels a child's production as "correct" or "incorrect" should not be treated as authoritative unless its validation population and error characteristics are known. Human oversight is especially necessary in motor speech and developmental language disorders, where clinically meaningful features may not correspond to generic speech-recognition metrics. WHO guidance similarly cautions that digital interventions are not substitutes for functioning systems and should be assessed for benefits, harms, acceptability, feasibility, and equity [2]. In the proposed model, algorithms can prioritize samples, visualize patterns, or suggest task adjustments, but final interpretation remains with the clinician. This governance mechanism protects both safety and scientific validity.

The fourteenth mechanism integrates the preceding components into a cyclical model of technology-supported speech-therapy correction. The cycle begins with multimethod assessment, proceeds to

individualized goal setting and selection of digital or non-digital tasks, then organizes multimodal practice with calibrated intensity and feedback. Engagement is supported through clinically aligned gamification; caregivers and telepractice extend practice into natural contexts; performance data return to a monitoring layer; and the clinician uses predefined decision rules to maintain, intensify, simplify, or redesign the intervention. This structure converts the dissertation's separate mechanisms into a single control system and resolves a common weakness in technology studies: the tendency to attribute outcomes to a device rather than to the instructional processes enabled by that device. Evidence from telepractice, computer-based therapy, remote assessment, and developmental language interventions suggests that digital delivery can achieve useful outcomes, but heterogeneity and evidence gaps remain [4–9]. Accordingly, the proposed model treats effectiveness as conditional. A digital tool is effective when it increases clinically appropriate practice, improves the timeliness or quality of feedback, strengthens continuity, supports valid monitoring, and remains accessible and acceptable. It is ineffective when it distracts from the target, automates invalid judgments, increases burden, or substitutes screen activity for interpersonal communication. The framework therefore defines technology as an adjustable infrastructure for clinical pedagogy rather than an independent therapeutic agent.

3. CONCLUSION

The analysis shows that the effectiveness of information technologies in speech-therapy correction is produced by a coordinated set of mechanisms rather than by digitalization itself. The strongest conceptual pathway links diagnostic visibility, adaptive individualization, multimodal cueing, controlled practice intensity, informative feedback, motivation, caregiver participation, telepractice, and dynamic monitoring. When these elements are connected through explicit clinical decision rules, technology can make intervention more responsive and continuous while preserving the speech-language professional's responsibility for diagnosis, target selection, interpretation, and safeguarding. The uploaded dissertation provides a useful mechanism-based foundation; comparison with international research strengthens it by emphasizing evidence quality, developmental appropriateness, accessibility, and the limits of automated inference. Current studies support telepractice and several forms of computer-assisted intervention as viable components of care, but they do not justify assuming that all digital programs are equivalent or universally effective.

For practice and future research, digital speech-therapy systems should be evaluated as complex interventions. Studies should report the target population, linguistic context, therapeutic dosage, clinician involvement, caregiver role, feedback design, progression rules, adherence, adverse or burdensome effects, and measures of generalization—not merely pre/post scores within an application. Comparative trials and longitudinal studies are especially needed for preschool children, bilingual populations, complex developmental speech-language disorders, and underrepresented languages. Developers should design interoperable, accessible tools that allow clinician override and transparent export of progress data. Services should combine digital and face-to-face methods according to individual need rather than institutional convenience. Under these conditions, information technology can serve as a precision-support layer for speech-therapy correction: it can extend professional reach, increase the density and continuity of meaningful practice, and shorten the interval between observed performance and clinically justified adjustment.

REFERENCES

[1] World Health Organization. Classification of digital interventions, services and applications in health: a shared language to describe the uses of digital technology for health. 2nd ed. Geneva: WHO; 2023.

[2] World Health Organization. WHO guideline: recommendations on digital interventions for health system strengthening. Geneva: WHO; 2019.

[3] American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. Telepractice. ASHA Practice Portal. Accessed October 2026.

[4] Coufal K, Parham D, Jakubowitz M, Howell C, Reyes J. Comparing traditional service delivery and telepractice for speech sound production using a functional outcome measure. Am J Speech Lang Pathol. 2018;27(1):82–90. doi:10.1044/2017_AJSLP-16-0070.

[5] Furlong L, Morris M, Serry T, Erickson S. Mobile apps for treatment of speech disorders in children: an evidence-based analysis / computer-based speech therapy evidence. Relevant systematic evidence indexed in PubMed (PMID: 28651106). 2017.

[6] Wales D, Skinner L, Hayman M. The efficacy of telehealth-delivered speech and language intervention for primary school-age children: a systematic review. Int J Telerehabil. 2017;9(1):55–70. PMID: 28814995.

[7] Sutherland R, Hodge A, Chan E, Silove N. Pediatric language assessments via telehealth: a systematic review. Evidence indexed in PubMed. 2022. PMID: 36184932.

[8] Digital intervention in children with developmental language disorder: systematic review. 2025. PubMed PMID: 40407714.

[9] Vanderauwera J, Vanden Bempt F, D'haenens W, Leysen H, Leclercq A-L, Van Eerdenbrugh S. The effectiveness of telepractice for speech-language pathology intervention with children younger than 12 years: a meta-analysis. J Telemed Telecare. 2026. doi:10.1177/1357633X261426068.

[10] What works, how and in which contexts when using digital health to support parents/carers to implement intensive speech and language therapy at home for children with speech sound disorder? A realist review. 2025. PubMed PMID: 40333949.

[11] World Health Organization; International Telecommunication Union. Implementation toolkit for accessible telehealth services. Geneva: WHO; 2024.

[12] Theodoros D. Telepractice in speech-language pathology: the evidence, the challenges, and the future. Perspectives on Telepractice. 2011;1(1):10–21. doi:10.1044/tele1.1.10.