

# Extra-Neural Signals From Severed Nerves Enable Intrinsic Hand Movements In Transhumeral Amputations

**Bahareh Ahkami**

Center for Bionics and Pain Research

**Enzo Mastinu**

Center for Bionics and Pain Research

**Eric Earley**

Center for Bionics and Pain Research

**Max Ortiz-Catalan** (✉ [maxo@chalmers.se](mailto:maxo@chalmers.se))

Center for Bionics and Pain Research

---

## Research Article

**Keywords:** myoelectric, finger, control, electrodes

**Posted Date:** November 12th, 2021

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1019449/v1>

**License:**   This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

---

# Abstract

Robotic prostheses controlled by myoelectric signals can restore limited but important hand function in individuals with upper limb amputation. The lack of individual finger control highlights the yet insurmountable gap to fully replace a biologic hand. Implanted electrodes around severed nerves have been used to elicit sensations perceived as arising from the missing limb, but using such extra-neural electrodes to record motor signals that allow for the decoding of phantom movements has remained elusive. Here, we showed the feasibility of using signals from non-penetrating neural electrodes to decode intrinsic hand and finger movements in individuals with above-elbow amputations. We found that information recorded with extra-neural electrodes alone was enough to decode phantom hand and individual finger movements with high accuracy, and as expected, the addition of myoelectric signals reduced classification errors both in offline and in real-time decoding.

## Introduction

Motorized upper limb prosthetic devices are preferably controlled using myoelectric signals from muscles remnant to the amputation. Unfortunately, the more proximal the amputation, the fewer muscles are available to command the robotic joints needed to restore full function. A few ways to overcome the lack of independent and dedicated myoelectric control sites are to utilize machine learning algorithms <sup>1</sup>, to reconstruct the stump anatomy <sup>2</sup>, and a combination of both <sup>3,4</sup>.

Algorithms to decode motor volition have been explored since the 1960's <sup>5</sup> and have further improved to include proportional <sup>6</sup> and simultaneous control of a few degrees of freedom <sup>7,8</sup>. More recently, myoelectric pattern recognition technologies have become commercially available and spreading in clinical use. The use of this technology have been shown beneficial even in patients with biological reconstruction <sup>3</sup>. Surgical techniques such as Targeted Muscle Reinnervation (TMR) allows for new myoelectric sites to become available to surface electromyography (EMG) recordings <sup>9</sup>. TMR consists of transferring nerves severed by the amputation to remnant muscles that no longer actuate the missing joint, and thus can be surgically denervated to then host the transferred nerve. An alternative way to utilize muscles as biological amplifiers of neural signals is to dissect the severed nerve into its constituent fascicles and then use a free muscle graft to provide an innervation target, also known as Regenerative Peripheral Nerve Interfaces (RPNI) <sup>10</sup>. However, the size of an RPNI is too small to be recorded from the surface of the skin creating the need for implanted electrodes <sup>4</sup>.

In addition to providing access to deeper or smaller muscles, implanted electrodes solve many of the issues related to the electrode-skin interface that plagues surface EMG recordings <sup>11</sup>. As early as 1982, De Luca *et al.* claimed the feasibility of recording neural signals from severed nerves in humans <sup>12</sup>, which was later confirmed in long-term amputations <sup>13,14</sup>. Intra-neural electrodes penetrating the blood-nerve barrier to access individual fascicles has since become the preferred method to record information within nerves in humans <sup>15-22</sup>. Direct neural recordings could be used to complement the information provided

to decoding algorithms to improve reliability and increase the number of discriminable movements. However, no clinical implementation of this strategy has been performed, arguably because intra-neural electrodes have yet to prove years of long-term stability in peripheral nerves. Whereas extra-neural electrodes have shown long-term stability, this has been done in applications related to stimulation rather than recordings<sup>23,24</sup>.

In this study, we examine the feasibility of recording motor neural signals using non-penetrating neural electrodes and the viability of said signals for decoding phantom motor volition. The most common type of extra-neural electrodes are cuffs that wrap around the nerve. Cuff electrodes have shown to be long-term stable<sup>23,24</sup> but mostly capture information from the peripheral fascicles, and thus it was important to verify if this could be a suitable neural interface for decoding motor volition of lost distal joints. In this study, we showed that it is possible to record enough neural information using cuff electrodes to allow for the discrimination of movements related to the missing hand, alone or in combination with myoelectric signals from remnant muscles in transhumeral amputations.

## Methods

### Participants

Three individuals with transhumeral amputation were enrolled in this study. Informed consent was obtained from all subjects prior to participation, in accordance with the provisions of the Declaration of Helsinki. All participants were implanted with the e-OPRA system (Integrum, Sweden) allowing for interfacing a prosthetic arm with the user's bone, muscles, and nerves<sup>26,30</sup>. Epimysial electrodes were implanted in the Biceps Brachii and Triceps Brachii muscles, and an implanted cuff electrode was placed around the median nerve for P3, and around the ulnar nerve for P1 and P2. This study was approved by the Swedish Regional Ethics Committee in Gothenburg (769-12).

### EMG and ENG recording system

A custom designed amplifier was used in this experiment. It consisted in 5 differential channels for the three contacts of each cuff electrodes (ENG) and the two epimysial electrodes (EMG). For the EMG channels, the gain was set to 500 V/V and the signal filtered with a 4<sup>th</sup> order Butterworth high-pass filter at 20 Hz and a 2<sup>nd</sup> order Butterworth low-pass filter at 1,000 Hz. For the ENG channels, the gain was set to 20,000 V/V and the signal filtered with a 4<sup>th</sup> order Butterworth high-pass filter at 20 Hz and a 2<sup>nd</sup> order Butterworth low-pass filter at 4,000 Hz. The amplified and filtered signal was then sampled at 8,000 Hz and digitized at a 16-bit resolution using analogue to digital conversion card (6212NI-DAQ, National Instruments, USA). The BioPatRec open-source platform was used for recording, decoding, and evaluation<sup>28</sup>.

## Target movements and recording sessions

All patient executed open hand, close hand, flex elbow, and extend elbow. On top of these movements, another set of finger movements was added to each participant according to the nerve in which the cuff electrode was implanted. e.g., ulnar or median nerve. The rationale was to select target movements related to fingers typically innervated by the particular nerve in which the cuff electrode was implanted. The participants with implanted cuff on the ulnar nerve (P1, P2) were assigned ring flex, little flex, little to thumb, and ring to thumb finger movements. The participant a cuff electrode implanted on the median nerve (P3) was assigned thumb flex, index flex, middle flex, index to thumb, and middle to thumb finger movements.

## Preprocessing and offline pattern recognition

We employed a well-known signal processing chain <sup>31</sup>, in which four popular time domain features (mean absolute value, slope changes, zero crossings and waveform length <sup>32</sup>) were extracted from overlapping time windows (200 ms with 50 ms increment). Forty percent of the feature vectors were used for training, 40 percent for test, and 20 percent for validation. The classifier was reiterated 10 times and the highest classification accuracy was considered. To compare the ENG and EMG content of information, the offline classification accuracy was calculated considering 1) the ENG channels alone, 2) the EMG channels alone, and 3) the combination of EMG and ENG channels.

## Training software interface

A training interface based on biofeedback was used in this study with dual purpose. Firstly, to get the participant accustomed to their particular set of target movements, and secondly, to incentivize movement distinction and channel independence. This training software provided real-time biofeedback by displaying the standard deviation of each acquired channel independently via bar plots while the participant performed the movements in sequence. In this way, the software provided real-time feedback on the relevance of each channel to each particular movement, underlying visual patterns of muscular synergies and ultimately facilitating the learning and adaptation process.

## Online pattern recognition

The viability of pattern recognition was assessed in real-time using a well-known virtual assessment test, namely the Motion Test <sup>28</sup>. The Motion Test requires the participants to perform target movements randomly prompted on a screen. The target movements were selected as a subset of the offline movements. This subset was defined individually for each participant by maximizing the Mahalanobis distance between the movements, omitting the movements with the most conflicts. The resulting subsets

were Ring flex, Little flex for P1; Ring to thumb, Little to thumb for P2; and Thumb flex, Index flex, Middle flex for P3.

Twenty correct predictions had to be achieved in total within five seconds to consider a task completed, changed from the original test which required 10 correct predictions<sup>28</sup>. The output metrics of the Motion Test were:

- Completion rate: the percentage of requested movements that were completed within the given timeout (5 seconds).
- Completion time: the time needed to achieve 20 correct predictions.
- Selection time: the time needed to produce the first correct prediction.
- Online predicted error: the ratio of the number of incorrect predictions and the total number of predictions within the completion time.

Each target movement was repeated 6 times per Motion Test. Real-time test was performed considering 1) the ENG channels alone, 2) the EMG channels alone, and 3) the combination of EMG and ENG channels.

## Statistical analysis

Datasets were analysed using built-in statistics functions of MATLAB 2018b (MathWorks, USA). We quantified the effects of the participants, signal types, and movements on the outcome measures (classification error, selection time, completion time and completion rate). For this scope, a general linear model was defined with the following form:

$$\text{Outcome measure} \sim \text{Movement} + \text{Signal} + \text{Patient}$$

where *Movement* and *Signal* were categorical fixed factors, and *Patient* was a random factor. Then, pairwise comparisons were performed on the significant parameters of linear model to analyze differences between levels. Lastly, corrections for all comparisons were made with Holm-Bonferroni correction factors.

## Results

In three participants with transhumeral amputations (P1-3), electroneurographic (ENG) signals were recorded using a cuff electrode implanted in the median or ulnar nerves severed by the amputation and that had no muscular targets. In addition, EMG signals were recorded using epimysial electrodes implanted in the biceps and triceps muscles (Figure 1a-b). The cuff electrodes had a “mixed tripolar” contact configuration optimized for neural recordings<sup>25</sup>, in which three semi-independent channels were

available. Access to the implanted electrodes from outside of the body was made possible via a permanent percutaneous neuromusculoskeletal interface<sup>24,26</sup>.

Production of motor action potentials through a desired fascicle can be a difficult task when the end effector is missing, and thus no feedback is available to verify the success of the motor command. Participants were therefore trained on the execution of motor commands using real-time biofeedback prior to the recording session. Participants used a simple graphical user interface that showed the magnitude of each ENG signal in real-time, and for 15 minutes, to identify how motor commands could be executed to produce a discernible change signal strength (standard deviation). After this training session, participants were asked to execute four gross distal movements (hand open/close and elbow flexion/extension), and four or five finger movements related to the median or ulnar nerves (Figure 1c).

Offline classification of using Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA) showed that neural signals alone were enough to decoded 8 movements with an error of 17% ( $\pm 4.7\%$ ) and 22% ( $\pm 17.9\%$ ) for P1 and P2, respectively. P3 decoding error rate on 9 movements was 16% ( $\pm 5.07\%$ ). Using solely EMG information resulted in larger errors of 27% ( $\pm 15\%$ ) and 40% ( $\pm 23.7\%$ ) for P1 and P2, respectively, and this difference was marginal for P3 (13%  $\pm 9.03\%$ ). As expected, discrimination errors decreased considerably when both ENG and EMG signals were used together, down to 2% ( $\pm 4\%$ ), 17.5% ( $\pm 14.4\%$ ), and 4% ( $\pm 3.8\%$ ) for P1, P2, and P3, respectively (Figure 2).

It is known that offline accuracy does not necessarily correlate with real-time discriminability<sup>27</sup>, and therefore we conducted a real-time test in which the participants were asked to executed the different movements in random order. We employed the Motion Test as implemented in BioPatRec<sup>25</sup>, in which the subject must produce 20 correct classification within 5 seconds to consider a successful completion of the task. The Motion Test was performed on a subset of the original movements selected based on their Mahalanobis distance for a total of 4 (P1-2) and 5 (P3) movements. The real-time performance observed in all participants was similar that of the offline decoding, meaning that higher performance was achieved using ENG over EMG for P1 and P2, and marginal difference for P3 in most instances (Figure 3). Like the offline results, the real-time performance improved when both ENG and EMG were used together ( $p < 0.01$ ). The discrepancy between offline and real-time performance observed in the three participants was comparable to what is normally found in the literature<sup>27,28</sup>.

## Discussion

A major problem in artificial limb replacement is to effectively acquire and process neural signals to control artificial limbs. Here, extra-neural ENG data from three individuals with transhumeral amputation were used to demonstrate the feasibility of prosthetic control in both offline and online assessments. Our results indicate that neural signals can be recorded via cuff electrodes placed around nerves severed by an amputation (Figure 1). These recordings contain enough information to enable intrinsic hand movements in above elbow amputations (Figure 2) and can be used to control a multiarticulate hand. Although these findings seem to be unprecedented in literature and hold a promising venue for allowing

the control of distal joints, they are only indicative for our particular and relatively small population of participants. A different placement of the cuff electrodes might change the content of information and consequently the individual control possibilities. Further work in a larger patient population is necessary to generalize our results.

Our online results indicate that the combination of EMG and ENG is not necessarily always the most optimal solution for all the movements. Instead, selective separation of information sources to their anatomically relevant joints, or a dynamic combination of the two bioelectric sources, might be preferable depending on the target movements and participants.

Our study confirmed, in harmony with previous literature<sup>29</sup>, the importance of receiving real-time biofeedback when training phantom limb movements. An interface, as simple as vertical bars displaying dynamically the level of activation per channel, can be beneficial when exploring phantom movements which are not normally attempted in the daily activities of people with upper limb amputation. Our participants (re)learned how to perform and differentiate movements, and this has been crucial for the rest of the experiment. Investigating appropriate training routines is another area that requires further research.

This study also underlined the need for high-quality recording hardware and surgical implantation procedures that allow to attenuate crosstalk between neural and muscular signals. The low selectivity of extra-neural electrodes together with the impossibility to precisely place electrodes close to desired motor fibers presented serious challenges in this study. These limitations forced us to iterate over preliminary explorative sessions where, together with the participants, we sought for potentially controllable finger movements. This explains the variation of the target movements between participants, as well as an equivalent functional grasp in a real hand prosthesis. Ultimately, our intention was to prove the feasibility of utilizing ENG signal for decoding motor volition, and more pragmatically, to enrich the information content provided by EMG to enable intrinsic hand movements at the transhumeral amputation level.

## **Declarations**

## **Author contributions**

BA, EM, and MOC designed the study and developed the electronics needed to conduct the experiments. EE supported data and statistical analysis. MOC supervised the research and secured the funding. BA drafted the manuscript, and EM, EE, and MOC edited the manuscript.

## **Conflict of interest**

EM and MOC have consulted for a company that holds intellectual property rights on the osseointegrated implant used in this study. All other authors have no conflicts.

# References


1. Parajuli, N. *et al.* Real-time EMG based pattern recognition control for hand prostheses: A review on existing methods, challenges and future implementation. *Sensors* **19**, 4596 (2019).
2. Herr, H. M. *et al.* Reinventing Extremity Amputation in the Era of Functional Limb Restoration. *Ann. Surg.* **273**, (2021).
3. Hargrove, L. J., Miller, L. A., Turner, K. & Kuiken, T. A. Myoelectric Pattern Recognition Outperforms Direct Control for Transhumeral Amputees with Targeted Muscle Reinnervation: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 13840 (2017).
4. Ortiz-Catalan, M. Engineering and surgical advancements enable more cognitively integrated bionic arms. *Sci. Robot.* **6**, eabk3123 (2021).
5. Finley, F. R. & Wirta, R. W. Myocoder-computer study of electromyographic patterns. *Arch. Phys. Med. Rehabil.* **48**, 20–24 (1967).
6. Fougner, A., Stavadahl, Ø., Kyberd, P. J., Losier, Y. G. & Parker, P. A. Control of Upper Limb Prostheses: Terminology and Proportional Myoelectric Control—A Review. *IEEE Trans. Neural Syst. Rehabil. Eng.* **20**, 663–677 (2012).
7. Ortiz-Catalan, M., Håkansson, B. & Brånemark, R. Real-time and simultaneous control of artificial limbs based on pattern recognition algorithms. *IEEE Trans. Neural Syst. Rehabil. Eng.* **22**, 756–764 (2014).
8. Yatsenko, D., McDonnall, D. & Guillory, K. S. Simultaneous, proportional, multi-axis prosthesis control using multichannel surface EMG. in *EMBS 29th Annual Int. Conf. of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society* 6134–6137 (2007).
9. Kuiken, T. A. *et al.* Targeted muscle reinnervation for real-time myoelectric control of multifunction artificial arms. *JAMA - J. Am. Med. Assoc.* **301**, 619–628 (2009).
10. Vu, P. P. *et al.* A regenerative peripheral nerve interface allows real-time control of an artificial hand in upper limb amputees. *Sci. Transl. Med.* **12**, 1–12 (2020).
11. Ortiz-Catalan, M., Brånemark, R., Håkansson, B. & Delbeke, J. On the viability of implantable electrodes for the natural control of artificial limbs: Review and discussion. *Biomed. Eng. Online* **11**, 33 (2012).
12. De Luca, C. J. *et al.* Long-Term Neuroelectric Signal Recording from Severed Nerves. *IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng.* **BME-29**, 393–403 (1982).
13. Dhillon, G. S., Lawrence, S. M., Hutchinson, D. T. & Horch, K. W. Residual function in peripheral nerve stumps of amputees: Implications for neural control of artificial limbs. *J. Hand Surg. Am.* **29**, 605–615 (2004).

14. Jia, X. *et al.* Residual Motor Signal in Long-Term Human Severed Peripheral Nerves and Feasibility of Neural Signal-Controlled Artificial Limb. *J. Hand Surg. Am.* **32**, 657–666 (2007).
15. George, J. A., Davis, T. S., Brinton, M. R. & Clark, G. A. Intuitive neuromyoelectric control of a dexterous bionic arm using a modified Kalman filter. *J. Neurosci. Methods* **330**, 108462 (2020).
16. Rossini, P. M. *et al.* Clinical Neurophysiology Double nerve intraneural interface implant on a human amputee for robotic hand control. *Clin. Neurophysiol.* **121**, 777–783 (2010).
17. Cracchiolo, M. *et al.* Decoding of grasping tasks from intraneural recordings in trans-radial amputee. *J. Neural Eng.* **17**, 26–34 (2020).
18. Davis, T. S. *et al.* Restoring motor control and sensory feedback in people with upper extremity amputations using arrays of 96 microelectrodes implanted in the median and ulnar nerves. *J. Neural Eng.* **13**, 036001 (2016).
19. Wendelken, S. *et al.* Restoration of motor control and proprioceptive and cutaneous sensation in humans with prior upper-limb amputation via multiple Utah Slanted Electrode Arrays (USEAs) implanted in residual peripheral arm nerves. *J. Neuroeng. Rehabil.* **14**, 121 (2017).
20. Page, D. M. *et al.* Motor Control and Sensory Feedback Enhance Prosthesis Embodiment and Reduce Phantom Pain After Long-Term Hand Amputation. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* **12**, 1–16 (2018).
21. George, J. A. *et al.* Biomimetic sensory feedback through peripheral nerve stimulation improves dexterous use of a bionic hand. *Sci. Robot.* **4**, eaax2352 (2019).
22. Micera, S. *et al.* Decoding information from neural signals recorded using intraneural electrodes: Toward the development of a neurocontrolled hand prosthesis. *Proc. IEEE* **98**, 407–417 (2010).
23. Christie, B. P. *et al.* Long-term stability of stimulating spiral nerve cuff electrodes on human peripheral nerves. *J. Neuroeng. Rehabil.* **14**, 70 (2017).
24. Ortiz-Catalan, M., Mastinu, E., Sassu, P., Aszmann, O. & Brånemark, R. Self-Contained Neuromusculoskeletal Arm Prostheses. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **382**, 1732–1738 (2020).
25. Ortiz-Catalan, M., Brånemark, R. & Hakansson, B. Evaluation of classifier topologies for the real-time classification of simultaneous limb motions. in *Conf. Proc. IEEE Eng. Med. Biol. Soc.* **2013**, 6651–6654 (2013).
26. Ortiz-Catalan, M., Håkansson, B. & Brånemark, R. An osseointegrated human-machine gateway for long-term sensory feedback and motor control of artificial limbs. *Sci. Transl. Med.* **6**, 257re6 (2014).
27. Ortiz-Catalan, M., Rouhani, F., Brånemark, R. & Hakansson, B. Offline accuracy: A potentially misleading metric in myoelectric pattern recognition for prosthetic control. *Proc. Annu. Int. Conf. IEEE*

*Eng. Med. Biol. Soc. EMBS* **2015-Novem**, 1140–1143 (2015).


28. Ortiz-Catalan, M., Brånemark, R. & Håkansson, B. BioPatRec: A modular research platform for the control of artificial limbs based on pattern recognition algorithms. *Source Code Biol. Med.* **8**, 11 (2013).
29. de Montalivet, E. *et al.* Guiding the Training of Users With a Pattern Similarity Biofeedback to Improve the Performance of Myoelectric Pattern Recognition. *IEEE Trans. Neural Syst. Rehabil. Eng.* **28**, 1731–1741 (2020).
30. Ortiz-Catalan, M., Mastinu, E., Sassu, P., Aszmann, O. & Brånemark, R. Self-Contained Neuromusculoskeletal Arm Prostheses. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **382**, 1732–1738 (2020).
31. Englehart, K. & Hudgins, B. A Robust, Real-Time Control Scheme for Multifunction Myoelectric Control. *IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng.* **50**, 848–854 (2003).
32. Hudgins, B., Parker, P. & Scott, R. N. A new strategy for multifunction myoelectric control. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng* **40**, 82–94 (1993).

## Figures




**Figure 1**

(a) Implanted muscular electrodes (b) Extra-neural electrodes around the nerve (cuff), (c) Hand gestures attempted by the subjects in their phantom hands.



**Figure 2**

Offline decoding error on three participants (8 movements for P1-2 and 9 movements for P3) over the three different scenarios: 1) ENG alone 2) EMG alone, and 3) EMG + ENG.



**Figure 3**

Online pattern recognition results from the Motion Test performed by the three participants (P1-3) over three different scenarios: 1) ENG alone (green ), 2) EMG alone (red ), and 3) the combination of EMG and ENG (blue ). The outcomes are Completion Rate, Median of Classification Error, Median of reported Completion Time, and Median of Selection Time. Finger movements include Ring flex, Little flex, for P1, Ring to thumb, Little to thumb for P2 and Thumb flex, Index flex, and Middle flex for P3.