

1 Sensory stimulation enhances phantom limb perception and movement decoding

2 Luke E. Osborn^{1,2*}, Keqin Ding^{1†}, Mark A. Hays^{1†}, Rohit Bose³, Mark M. Iskarous¹, Andrei Dragomir^{3,4}, Zied
3 Tayeb⁵, György M. Lévy⁶, Christopher L. Hunt¹, Gordon Cheng⁵, Robert S. Armiger², Anastasios Bezerianos^{3,7},
4 Matthew S. Fifer², and Nitish V. Thakor^{1,3,8*}

5 ¹Department of Biomedical Engineering, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, 720 Rutland Ave, Baltimore, MD 21205, USA.

6 ²Research & Exploratory Development Department, Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory, 11100 Johns Hop-
7 kins Rd, Laurel, MD 20723, USA

8 ³N.1 Institute for Health, National University of Singapore, 28 Medical Dr. #05-COR, Singapore 117456, Singapore.

9 ⁴Department of Biomedical Engineering, University of Houston, 3517 Cullen Blvd, Houston, TX 77204, USA

10 ⁵Institute for Cognitive Systems, Technical University of Munich, Karlstraße 45/II, 80333 München, Germany.

11 ⁶Infinite Biomedical Technologies, 8 Market Pl #500, Baltimore, MD 21202, USA.

12 ⁷Department of Medical Physics, University of Patras, 265 04 Rio Patras, Greece.

13 ⁸Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Johns Hopkins University, 3400 N Charles St, Baltimore, MD 21218,
14 USA.

15
16 *email: luke.osborn@jhuapl.edu (L.E.O.); nitish@jhu.edu (N.V.T.), †these authors contributed equally
17

18 **Abstract:** *Objective.* A major challenge for controlling a prosthetic arm is communication between the device and
19 the user's phantom limb. We show the ability to enhance amputees' phantom limb perception and improve movement
20 decoding through targeted transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (tTENS).

21 *Approach.* Transcutaneous nerve stimulation experiments were performed with four amputee participants to map
22 phantom limb perception. We measured myoelectric signals during phantom hand movements before and after
23 amputees received sensory stimulation. Using electroencephalogram (EEG) monitoring, we measure the neural
24 activity in sensorimotor regions during phantom movements and stimulation. In one participant, we also tracked
25 sensory mapping over 2 years and movement decoding performance over 1 year.

26 *Main results.* Results show improvements in the amputees' ability to perceive and move the phantom hand as
27 a result of sensory stimulation, which leads to improved movement decoding. In the extended study with one
28 amputee, we found that sensory mapping remains stable over 2 years. Remarkably, sensory stimulation improves
29 within-day movement decoding while performance remains stable over 1 year. From the EEG, we observed cortical
30 correlates of sensorimotor integration and increased motor-related neural activity as a result of enhanced phantom
31 limb perception.

32 *Significance.* This work demonstrates that phantom limb perception influences prosthesis control and can benefit
33 from targeted nerve stimulation. These findings have implications for improving prosthesis usability and function
34 due to a heightened sense of the phantom hand.

35 1. Introduction

36 Sensory information, specifically touch and proprioception, are essential for palpating, exploring, and manipulating
37 objects in our surroundings [1]. Through sensory feedback and errors in our sensory predictions, we develop so-
38 phisticated internal models of sensorimotor integration [2], and we continue to update and strengthen our internal

39 sensorimotor models for controlling limb movement [3]. Recently, researchers showed that supplementary audi-
40 tory feedback can help improve internal models and performance in myoelectric control of a virtual prosthesis by
41 able-bodied subjects [4], further indicating the role of feedback in sensorimotor control loops.

42 For upper limb amputees, the sensorimotor loop is severely disrupted as a result of limb loss; however, perception of
43 the phantom limb persists for many [5]. Researchers made profound breakthroughs in providing naturalistic tactile
44 sensations back to amputees by stimulating peripheral nerves, both invasively [6–9] and noninvasively [10–12], in
45 the residual limb. Sensory feedback can provide perceptions of pressure [6, 7], enable discrimination of textures [8],
46 create perceptions of movement across the phantom hand [9], help in reducing phantom pain [13], and improve
47 prosthesis use at home [14]. Biomimetic stimulation models can enhance naturalness of the tactile sensation [15],
48 improve object manipulation [16], and be used to provide receptor specific information to enable sensations of
49 pressure or pain [12]. Kinesthetic illusions of phantom hand movement have also been produced using skin vibration
50 on amputees who had undergone targeted muscle reinnervation (TMR) surgery [17]. Despite these successes, there
51 is an unanswered question about the effect enhancing phantom hand perception has on the internal sensorimotor
52 models that control phantom hand movements. Specifically, it is unclear how phantom hand perception affects
53 motor function and resulting activation of muscles in the residual limb. Pattern recognition techniques aim to create
54 a natural and intuitive control strategy for upper limb amputees by decoding movement from electromyography
55 (EMG) signals in the residual limb [18]. Recently, proportional control of multiple degrees of freedom was achieved
56 with derived motor unit action potentials in TMR subjects [19] and direct control using surface EMG electrodes [20].

57 We postulate that an important component of myoelectric decoding is the ability to perceive and move the phantom
58 hand. Neural signals measured by EEG after TMR suggest that more natural cortical representations of the missing
59 limb can occur in the motor cortex as a result of the surgery [21]. Additionally, recent results show somatosensory
60 neural representation of the phantom limb exists even decades after amputation [22]. It is also known that movement
61 representations persist in the motor cortex even when an amputee cannot generate voluntarily movements with the
62 phantom hand, indicating that the lack of phantom control
63 is not equivalent to the loss of neural representation
64 [23]. Furthermore, evidence suggests that despite clas-
65 sical ideas of cortical reorganization after limb amputa-
66 tion, phantom limb representation of motor commands
67 and muscle synergies still persist in the primary mo-
68 tor cortex [24]. Interestingly, activation of neural activ-
69 ity from sensory feedback through electrical stimulation
70 occurred in both somatosensory and premotor regions
71 during evoked phantom limb sensations [25].

72 In this work, we hypothesize that providing sensory
73 stimulation to amputees can modulate the sensorimotor
74 loop and enhance phantom limb perception, improving
75 the ability to decode phantom hand movements using
76 EMG pattern recognition (Fig. 1). Our study presents




Fig. 1. Phantom limb perception and control. Upper limb amputees often perceive their phantom limb. Voluntary movements of the phantom limb can be captured and decoded from electromyography (EMG) signals in the residual limb. We demonstrate the role of targeted transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (tENS) to enhance phantom perception and improve movement decoding in a comprehensive investigation with 4 amputees.

77 a number of important observations. Firstly, we demonstrate that sensory stimulation improves perception of the
78 phantom hand. Secondly, we show that changes in phantom hand perception affect the ability to control phantom
79 movements and a prosthesis. Finally, using EEG signals we show that increased activation of sensorimotor regions
80 occur both during and after sensory stimulation and phantom limb activation.

81 **2. Methods**

82 Four male amputee participants with varying levels of prosthesis experience, ranging from none to over 8 yr, were
83 recruited for this study and participated in at least one experiment (Table S1). Two amputee participants (A01 and
84 A02) underwent elective amputations as a result of nerve injury, and three of the participants (A01, A03, and A04)
85 have transhumeral amputations. Participant A02 has a transradial amputation. A03 also has a right arm transradial
86 amputation but only uses a prosthesis on his left arm, which was the side used for the experiments in this study.
87 Participants A01-A03 performed phantom hand movement tasks before and after receiving sensory stimulation to
88 the phantom hand and took a user survey. A02 and A03 also participated in EEG recording experiments during
89 phantom hand movements. A02 participated in a long-term study over 2 years to track changes in phantom sensory
90 mapping and movement decoding performance. A04 participated in sensory mapping and the object movement task.
91 Amputee participation is summarized in Table S1. All experiments were approved by the Johns Hopkins Medicine
92 Institutional Review Boards. The amputees, who were recruited from previous studies or referrals, provided written
93 informed consent to participate in the experiments.

94 **2.1. Sensory stimulation**

95 Sensory mapping was done with tTENS using a monopolar 1 mm beryllium copper (BeCu) probe connected to
96 an isolated current stimulator (DS3, Digitimer Ltd., UK) to provide monophasic square wave pulses to underlying
97 peripheral nerves, activating the phantom hand. This approach was validated in our previous work [12, 26]. An
98 amplitude of 0.8 – 3.0 mA, frequency (f) of 2 – 4 Hz, and pulse width (pw) of 1 – 5 ms were used while mapping
99 the phantom hand [12, 26]. Anatomical and ink markers were used, along with photographs of the amputee's limbs,
100 to map the areas of the residual limb to the phantom hand. For all other stimulation experiments, we used 5 mm
101 disposable Ag/AgCl electrodes (Norotrode 20, Myotronics, USA) with $pw = 1$ ms and $f = 45$ Hz. Stimulation
102 parameters were based on our previous work [12, 26] and were reliably detected by every participant.

103 **2.2. EMG recording and movement decoding**

104 For participants A01 and A02, 8 channels of raw EMG signals were measured using 13E200 Myobock amplifiers
105 (Ottobock, Plymouth, MN) with bipolar Ag/AgCl electrodes placed uniformly around the circumference of the
106 residual limb. No specific muscle groups were targeted for electrode placement. Signals were recorded by an NI
107 USB-6009 (National Instruments, Austin, TX) at 1024 Hz with a 20 – 500 Hz digital bandpass and 60 Hz notch
108 filters.

109 Participant A03 used a custom socket manufactured by his prosthetist (Dankmeyer, Linthicum, MD). Eight bipolar
110 Ag/AgCl electrodes (Infinite Biomedical Technologies, Baltimore, MD) were embedded within the socket. The
111 bipolar electrodes in the custom socket were amplified and filtered with a 20 – 500 Hz digital bandpass and 60 Hz
112 digital notch filters.

113 EMG signal time domain features were extracted after 2 s of sustained movement using a 200 ms sliding window
114 with new feature vectors computed every 50 ms. The features used were mean absolute value, waveform length,
115 and variance (Supplementary Methods). Each movement cue was presented 3 times for 5 s and in a random order.
116 Data from Day 187 of the long-term study was used for A03's 9 class comparison because that was the first day
117 he performed the movement decoding experiment before and after sensory stimulation. Movement decoding on
118 Day 194 was done with 4 of the 8 electrodes in A03's custom socket due to hardware failure. Data from 1 round
119 of movements was discarded from each of A02's visits due to hardware malfunction. For simultaneous tTENS
120 with EMG recording from A02, grounding electrodes were placed on the residual limb to remove noise artifacts
121 (Supplementary Methods, Fig. S1). Movements were decoded using the extracted EMG features with an LDA
122 classifier. One-third of the EMG data was used as a holdout set from the training data for testing the classifier [18].
123 The classifier was trained and tested on data from the same day.

124 Participant A04 wore 2 EMG recording armbands (Myo, Thalmic Labs, CA), 8 stainless steel electrodes per band,
125 on his residual limb, which was his typical setup for controlling the prosthesis used in this experiment during his
126 daily activities. Filtered EMG data was collected from the armbands at 200 Hz. Training data was collected and
127 movements were decoded using an LDA classifier on a custom controller embedded in the prosthesis [27].

128 **2.3. EEG recording and analysis**

129 Ag/AgCl EEG electrodes were used for recording neural activity at 500 Hz sampling frequency (64-ch, SynAmps2,
130 Compumedics NeuroScan). Participant A02 and A03 took part in this experiment. Each participant was seated and
131 tTENS electrodes were placed to activate the areas of the phantom hand corresponding to median, ulnar, and radial
132 nerve innervation regions. Stimulation was for 2 s, followed by a 4 s delay with $\pm 25\%$ time jitter before the next
133 stimulation. The EEG data was band-pass filtered from 1 to 50 Hz and re-referenced to both mastoids. Automatic
134 Artifact Removal (AAR) was used to remove the muscle (canonical correlation approach, 5 s window size) and
135 ocular (blind source separation SOBI algorithm, 256 s window size) artifacts [28]. Independent component analysis
136 (ICA) was used to remove additional artifacts. Continuous EEG data was epoched from 1 s before the start of each
137 trial until 2 s after the stimulus presentation. All analysis was done using the EEGLAB toolbox in MATLAB [29].

138 The epoched EEG data was band-pass filtered from 8 Hz to 12 Hz to obtain the alpha band. We further epoched
139 the data from 450 – 850 ms after the stimulus presentation to remove early activation due to tTENS and visual
140 stimulation from analysis and focused on the motor-related activity in the brain. We evaluated the alpha band power
141 relative to the total power of all bands in all electrodes for each condition and each trial. For each participant,
142 phantom hand stimulation conditions (thumb and wrist for A02; thumb, pinky, and wrist for A03) were included for
143 the rest of the analysis.

144 **2.4. Experimental protocol**

145 Phantom Movements with Stimulation: We used a modified Virtual Integration Environment (VIE) (Johns Hopkins
146 University Applied Physics Lab (JHU/APL), Laurel, USA) in MATLAB to display movement cues. The subjects
147 were seated in front of a screen that displayed the movement classes. The skin of the residual limb was cleaned
148 with an alcohol wipe before tTENS and EMG electrode placement. The electrodes were allowed to settle for up to
149 10 min. After EMG data collection, the subject received tTENS. The sensory stimulation lasted between 30 – 60

150 min with continuous site activation for up to 10 s at a time. After tTENS, the participants performed another round
151 of EMG data collection. Anatomical markers and photographs were used to ensure the electrodes were positioned
152 in approximately the same location for A01 and A02. A03 used a customized socket, which ensured consistent
153 electrode placement. The experiment lasted up to 3 hr.

154 For the long-term study, participant A03 performed periodic sensory mapping over 2 years (Day 1 - Day 738). A03
155 also performed 3 different phases of EMG data collection starting on Day 128 (labeled as Week 1 of the long-term
156 EMG data). Fourteen movement classes were used (Fig. 5C-F, including a rest class). During Phase I (Week 1-6),
157 A03 came in for an EMG recording session on average once per week. For Phase II (Week 8-10), he came in for
158 EMG recording sessions on 4 different days. There were 3 separate rounds of EMG data collection on each of
159 those days. EMG signals during the Pre-Stim condition were recorded for each movement and repeated 3 times.
160 Next, movement cues were shown while sensory stimulation was being given to the phantom hand (Fig. 5). A final
161 EMG recording session was performed without stimulation. There was up to a 30 min break between each of the 3
162 recording sessions. The total experiment lasted up to 3.5 hr each day. In Phase III (Week 12-48), A03 performed 4
163 follow-up EMG recording sessions. All EMG experiments were offline and participants didn't receive feedback on
164 EMG activity or decoding performance to prevent bias across the testing conditions.

165 Object Movement Task: Participant A04 used a modified VIE to interface with the pattern recognition software
166 and prosthesis controller. The Modular Prosthetic Limb (MPL) [27], developed by JHU/APL, was mounted to the
167 osseointegrated implant. A04 completed the object movement task before any sensory stimulation (Pre-Stim). A04
168 underwent tTENS sensory mapping and phantom hand activation for approximately 1.5 hr before completing the
169 object movement task again after the sensory stimulation (Post-Stim). A new LDA pattern recognition classifier
170 was trained before performing the object movement task for both the Pre-Stim and Post-Stim conditions. Movement
171 classes used were hand open, tripod grasp, elbow (flexion and extension), and wrist (pronation and supination).
172 Each movement class contained up to 5 s of training data. Each trial consisted of 5 repetitions of grabbing the
173 object, moving it approximately 60 cm, and then releasing it. Participant A04 performed 3 trials of the task in
174 both the Pre-Stim and Post-Stim conditions. No tactile feedback or tTENS was provided to A04 during the object
175 movement task. Time to complete the task was recorded for each trial. The participant successfully moved the object
176 every trial without dropping it.

177 Neural Recording: The participants were seated and shown visual movement cues with corresponding stimulation in
178 median, ulnar, and radial regions, respectively (Fig. 5). Participant A02 was shown hand open and close. Participant
179 A03 was shown tripod, index point, and wrist flexion. Baseline activity was recorded for up to 2 min. *Pre-Stim:* the
180 participant mimicked movement cues with his phantom hand. *Stim:* the participant received tTENS to activate the
181 phantom hand, but did not perform movements with his phantom hand. *Stim-Move:* the participant received sensory
182 stimulation while performing movements with his phantom hand. *Post-Stim:* the participant performed phantom
183 hand movements but with no sensory stimulation. For participant A02, each movement cue was presented 30 times
184 for all conditions. For participant A03, each movement cue was presented 10 times for the Pre-Stim condition and
185 20 times for all other conditions.

186 For all experiments, results from data collected over multiple trials of the same experiment were averaged together.




Fig. 2. Sensory mapping of amputee participants. (A) Participant A01 reported sensations of general tactile activation, primarily buzzing or vibration, along with sensations of temperature changes on the palmar side of the middle and ring fingers. (B) Participant A02 reported sensations of pressure in the activated regions. The thumb and index finger, along with the ulnar and palmar sides of the hand, were the primary regions of activation. (C) Participant A03 perceived sensations of pressure and occasional tingling in the thumb, pinky, and wrist regions of his phantom hand. (D) Participant A04 perceived sensations as pressure in his phantom hand. For all phantom hand sensory maps, regions of strongest to faintest activation are indicated by a gradient of solid to faded color. In general, stimulation sites on the residual limb are <5 mm in diameter but are made larger here for illustration.

187 Statistical p values were calculated using a two-tailed, two-sample t test and error bars represent the standard error
188 of the mean, unless otherwise specified. All analysis was performed using MATLAB (MathWorks, Natick, USA).

189 3. Results

190 3.1. Sensory stimulation enhances phantom hand perception

191 For each participant, we used sensory mapping to identify regions of phantom hand activation. Targeted transcuta-
192 neous electrical nerve stimulation (tTENS) was used to activate underlying peripheral nerves in the residual limb,
193 a method which was used in previous studies (Supplementary Discussion) [10, 12, 26]. Stimulation of the mapped
194 regions on the residual limb resulted in perceived sensation in the phantom hand. Each amputee's perception of
195 their phantom limb is different and tTENS activated different phantom regions (Fig. 2). Sensations were reported
196 primarily as tactile and included pressure, buzzing, vibration, and in the case of A01, a sensation of cold temperature
197 on the palmar side of the middle and ring fingers (Fig. 2A).

198 A user survey to gauge phantom hand perception, based on a previous study [30], was given to participants A01-A03
199 at the end of the day after a testing session (Fig. 3). In general, participants felt as if something was touching the
200 phantom hand during the sensory stimulation. Furthermore, all participants who took the survey felt as if they could
201 better perceive and, more importantly, move their phantom hand as a result of the nerve stimulation (Fig. 3).

202 Participant A01 took the survey once, A02 completed the survey twice in person and an additional time during a
203 follow-up phone interview, and A03 completed the survey twice. The survey was meant to gauge user perception
204 of the phantom hand and sensory stimulation. All users reported enhanced perception and control of the phantom
205 limb compared to normal baseline as a result of sensory stimulation. The statements were modeled after surveys
206 from a previous study [30]. Results from the survey targeted specifically at quantifying the enhanced perception
207 of the phantom limb as a result of sensory stimulation are shown in Fig. 3B. In general, participants felt as if
208 something was touching the phantom hand during the sensory stimulation (Fig. 3A). Furthermore, all participants




Fig. 3. Sensory stimulation improves phantom perception as reported by user surveys. **(A)** User survey aimed at understanding subjective perception of sensory stimulation. Mixed results for several statements across participants suggest the varying nature of perception due to sensory stimulation. However, all participants agreed that heightened perception were a result of sensory stimulation through electrical nerve stimulation. Participants A02 and A03 took the survey twice on different days after sensory stimulation and phantom hand movement matching experiments. Participant A02 completed the survey again during a follow-up phone interview. The results were averaged. A01 took the survey once. **(B)** Averaged user results from survey response specifically on phantom hand perception as a result of sensory stimulation. For all participants, sensory stimulation enhanced perception of the phantom hand and importantly also giving the perception of better control over phantom hand movements. **(C)** Statements from the user survey. **(D)** The survey was scored using a Likert Scale with answers to statements ranging from “Strongly agree” (+3) to “Strongly disagree” (-3).

209 who took the survey felt as if they could better perceive and move (Q10 and Q12, respectively) their phantom
 210 hand as a result of the nerve stimulation (Fig. 3C). A04 did not take the survey, but he did verbally confirm that
 211 the sensory stimulation produced enhanced phantom hand perception. It should be noted that our survey does not
 212 capture changes in prosthesis embodiment or agency. The survey provides subjective responses from the participants
 213 to better understand their perceptions of phantom sensations.

214 3.2. Sensory stimulation improves movement decoding

215 Because sensory stimulation provides a heightened sense of the phantom hand (Fig. 3), we investigated the effect of
 216 this enhanced perception on the ability to make dexterous grasps with the phantom hand. Hand and wrist movements
 217 were visually presented to three of the participants (Fig. 4A, Fig. S2), who then attempted to mimic the movement
 218 with their phantom hand. Each amputee performed the hand and wrist movements before receiving any sensory
 219 stimulation (Pre-Stim). After EMG collection, regions of the phantom hand were activated via rTENS to provide
 220 general tactile sensation (see Methods).

221 For participants A01-A03, the stimulation sites activated regions that covered the thumb, index, palm, and ulnar sides




Fig. 4. EMG performance of amputee subjects. (A) Five hand movements (rest, open, close, tripod, index point) and four wrist movements (pronation, supination, flexion, extension) were presented, one at a time, to the amputee participant, who attempted to match the movement with his phantom hand. (B) EMG decoding accuracy from the 9 movement classes before (Pre-Stim) and after (Post-Stim) sensory stimulation. (C) Percentage change in performance accuracy for all participants (absolute changes in Fig. S2). Relative performance increased at least 35% (A01) and up to 95% (A02) from baseline as a result of enhanced phantom limb perception. (D) The combined performance of all participants, normalized to the maximum individual performance, increased after sensory stimulation.

222 of the phantom hand (Fig. 2). The sensory stimulation session lasted up to 30 min and was followed by another
 223 round of EMG data collection (Post-Stim). The accuracy of the EMG movement classification is shown in Fig.
 224 4B-D. Linear discriminant analysis (LDA), a standard EMG pattern recognition algorithm [18], was used to classify
 225 the movements. Results indicate at least a 35% increase in baseline EMG pattern recognition performance for all
 226 three participants (Fig. 4B-C). Improvements occur for all participants, but $p < 0.05$ only in the case of A03. Overall,
 227 the averaged normalized decoding performance across all participants increased as a result of sensory stimulation
 228 (Fig. 4D).

229 3.3. Long-term sensory stimulation and EMG decoding

230 To better understand the influence of enhanced sensory perception on EMG pattern recognition performance, partic-
 231 ipant A03 took part in an extended study over 2 years. The primary regions of perceived activation were the thumb
 232 and index finger, the ulnar side, and the wrist of the phantom hand. These regions remained stable; that is, they did
 233 not migrate over the course of the study (Fig. 5A, Fig. S3). The structural similarity (SSIM) index [31] was cal-
 234 culated for each region across all the days and shows good similarity (> 0.75) in all cases (Fig. 5B, Supplementary
 235 Methods). With every stimulation session, the participant verbally indicated an enhanced perception of his phantom
 236 hand during sensory stimulation. This subjective response was based on the daily baseline phantom hand perception
 237 before any stimulation experiments began.

238 We investigated the effects of sensory stimulation on movement decoding performance compared to long-term per-
 239 formance over 1 year. The participant identified different regions of activation that best corresponded to particular
 240 movements of his phantom hand (Fig. 5C-F). The combinations of sensation in targeted regions of the phantom hand
 241 with movement classes were made based on what the amputee determined as being relevant phantom hand regions
 242 during attempted phantom movements. For example, during the index point and precision close hand movements the
 243 participant said he moved the thumb and index fingers but his main focus was on closing his pinky and ring fingers.

244 A custom prosthetic socket with embedded electrodes was used to ensure consistent electrode placement during
 245 each EMG recording session (Fig. S3). The long-term experiment was broken up into three phases. Phase I was 6
 246 weeks long (Week 1-6) to establish a baseline in performance. Phase II (Week 8-10) was a 3 week period of sensory
 247 stimulation with EMG recordings. Phase III (Week 12-48) was a 37 week follow-up set of sessions to evaluate




Fig. 5. Long-term sensory mapping and movements. (A) Sensory mapping from tTENS of the ulnar, median, and radial regions was performed on participant A03 over a 2 year period. Activation maps of his phantom hand remained stable over the duration of the study with the primary regions of sensation being on his thumb and index finger, pinky, and wrist. (B) Structural similarity (SSIM) indices of sensory maps for each region show high similarity (>0.75) across the extended study. (C-F), The participant associated activation of certain regions of his phantom hand to different grasp patterns. (C) Activation in the median and ulnar regions of his phantom hand were most closely associated with opening, closing, and the lateral key grasp. (D) Thumb and index finger, (E) ulnar, and (F) wrist region activations were associated with corresponding hand and wrist movements. No stimulation was provided during the rest class. (G) EMG pattern recognition performance was measured over nearly 1 year. An initial set of baseline data was collected in Phase I (Week 1-6), followed by a 3 week period of sensory stimulation through tTENS (Phase II, Week 8-10). Phase III (Week 12-48) consisted of sessions over a 37 week period. The subject was experienced with pattern recognition and showed a fairly consistent level of performance with a non-significant increase over time likely a result of continued prosthesis use ($p>0.05$, Fig. S4). (H) The stimulation phase shows improvements in EMG movement decoding of the 14 classes as a result of enhanced phantom limb perception (individual classes in Fig. S4). EMG signal recordings were taken for each movement class before (Pre-Stim) and after (Post-Stim) stimulation.

248 any lasting effects of the sensory feedback on the internal sensorimotor loop used by the amputee for moving his
 249 phantom hand (Fig. 5G). There were a total of 14 movement classes (Fig. 5C-F, 8 hand, including rest, and 6
 250 wrist movements). During Phase II, EMG signals were recorded during each movement class before (Pre-Stim) and
 251 after (Post-Stim) stimulation. The EMG pattern recognition accuracy remained fairly stable for the 6 week period
 252 of Phase I with slightly more variation during Phase III. The sensory information provided to the phantom hand
 253 resulted in within-day improved movement decoding in most cases during Phase II (Fig. 5H) and with significant
 254 improvements in tripod and radial deviation movements; however, the effect did not appear to persist into Phase III
 255 (Fig. S4). The long-term changes during Phase III match the overall trend from the beginning of Phase I, indicating
 256 that short-term improvements from sensory reinforcement did not translate beyond individual days (Fig. 5G).

257 3.4. Movement decoding improves during sensory stimulation

258 We also investigated the effects of sensory stimulation during active movement. Participant A02 identified thumb
 259 and wrist areas of his phantom hand that, when activated, corresponded with specific movements (Fig. 6A). Move-
 260 ment decoding was performed on EMG signals recorded before (Pre-Stim), during (Stim), and after (Post-Stim)
 261 stimulation. Results show an obvious improvement in classifying attempted phantom hand movements during tri-
 262 als with sensory activation, whereas only a slight improvement is observed for trials after stimulation (Fig. 6B).
 263 The stimulation noise artifact was removed from the myoelectric signal using a hardware grounding approach (Sup-
 264 plementary Methods). A classwise comparison shows improvement in some movements during and after sensory
 265 stimulation but a decrease in others (Fig. S5).




Fig. 6. Movement decoding and prosthesis function improve after sensory stimulation. (A) A02 identified several wrist movements and corresponding phantom regions to receive sensation. (B) Movement decoding was done with EMG pattern recognition for trials before (Pre-Stim), during (Stim), and after (Post-Stim) stimulation to A02's phantom hand. There was an increase in movement decoding during (Stim) and after (Post-Stim) stimulation, but the improvement is greater during the Stim condition. (C) Participant A04 used his osseointegrated prosthesis with EMG pattern recognition control for the functional task. (D) The object movement task consisted of grabbing, moving, and releasing an object using EMG pattern recognition prosthesis control. (E) The task completion time decreased after sensory activation of A04's phantom hand (Post-Stim) as compared to the Pre-Stim task completion times.

266 3.5. Prosthesis control improves after sensory stimulation

267 We also tested the functional difference of an object grasping task with a prosthesis before and after sensory ac-
 268 tivation of the phantom hand in a fourth amputee participant. A04, who has an osseointegrated implant [32] and
 269 TMR, controlled a prosthesis using EMG pattern recognition (Fig. 6C). The participant underwent sensory mapping
 270 (Fig. 2d) and performed the object movement task before and after sensory activation of his phantom hand. The
 271 participant grabbed, moved, and released a compact disc using a tripod grasp (Fig. 6D). The average task completion
 272 time decreased in the Post-Stim condition ($p=0.37$, Fig. 6E). A04 did not take the user survey or participate in the
 273 EMG movement decoding experiments; however, the participant did verbally confirm that the sensory stimulation
 274 produced enhanced phantom hand perception.

275 3.6. Sensory stimulation increases EEG activity in sensorimotor regions

276 EEG signals were recorded to capture the neural activity in sensorimotor regions during sensory stimulation and
 277 phantom hand movement in participants A02 and A03. The alpha band (8 – 12 Hz) is relevant for sensorimotor-
 278 related activity [33, 34] and was used to evaluate the influence of sensory stimulation on phantom hand movement
 279 related neural activity.

280 The relative alpha power, the alpha power relative to the sum of power of all frequency bands, from the EEG was
 281 estimated for phantom hand movement before stimulation (Pre-Stim), during tTENS with no movement (Stim),
 282 during tTENS with movement (Stim-Move), and phantom hand movement after stimulation (Post-Stim) (Fig. 7A-




Fig. 7. Neural activity in sensorimotor regions. Participants A02 and A03 received visual cues and performed the corresponding hand movements during tTENS (Fig. S6). Sensory stimulation was given through tTENS and recordings for each condition (Pre-Stim, Stim, Stim-Move, Post-Stim) were performed in order with <10 min between conditions. **(A-D)** A02's relative alpha power neural activation maps for movements before any sensory stimulation (Pre-Stim), stimulation with no phantom hand movements (Stim), movements with sensory stimulation (Stim-Move), and phantom hand movements (Post-Stim). The movements were hand open and close. Each grip corresponded to stimulation of different regions of the phantom hand (Fig. S7). **(E-F)** A02's relative alpha power in the central and centro-parietal electrodes, respectively. For all conditions n = 60. **(G-J)** A03's relative alpha power neural activation maps across the various conditions. The movements were tripod, index point, and wrist flexion. Each grip corresponded to stimulation of different regions of the phantom hand (Fig. S7). For Pre-Stim n=30 and for all other conditions n=60. **(K-L)** A03's relative alpha power in the central and centro-parietal electrodes, respectively. There were noticeable changes in general neural (Fig. S8) and alpha band activity as a result of stimulation and these changes persisted during the Post-Stim condition.

283 D, G-J). Hand open and close were shown to participant A02 and tripod, index point, and wrist flexion movements
284 were shown to participant A03. These classes were chosen by the participants because the classes were most closely
285 associated with the tTENS phantom hand sensory mapping results. Furthermore, the classes and stimulation sites
286 align with locations used by A03 in the long-term study (Fig. 5). Stimulation was applied to elicit activation of the
287 phantom hand regions to correspond with the appropriate movement. There was higher activation in the central and
288 centro-parietal regions during the Stim-Move condition compared to the Pre-Stim condition (Fig. 7C,I). In the Post-
289 Stim condition, the effect of the stimulation persisted and changes in neural activity were observed in the central and
290 the centro-parietal regions (Fig. 7D,J). We also compared the alpha power in individual central and centro-parietal
291 electrodes across the conditions in both amputees (Fig. 7E-F,K-L). One-way ANOVA followed by post-hoc analysis
292 was performed for each of the electrodes. In both participants, significant increases in the relative alpha power was
293 observed for phantom hand movement during the Stim-Move and Post-Stim conditions compared to the Pre-Stim
294 condition. Interestingly, the largest change in relative alpha power in the neural signal occurred in the ipsilateral
295 hemisphere of A02, relative to the phantom hand. A03's neural activity showed changes in both the contralateral
296 and ipsilateral hemispheres.

297 **4. Discussion**

298 **4.1. Sensory stimulation improves perception**

299 Our results show activation and enhanced perception of the phantom limb from tTENS (Fig. 2). Typically this
300 technique is used to provide tactile sensations to the phantom hand [10, 12, 26]. Interestingly, the heightened sense
301 of the phantom limb also seems to relate to changes in muscle activity during movements. The amputees felt as if
302 the sensations were more or less natural, reported primarily as being a pressure or buzzing, and originating from
303 their phantom hand. It is unclear if A01's thermal sensation was a result of dominant thermal-specific afferents or a
304 residual effect of the recent amputation. A01 described his phantom hand as a "foggy" and buzzing sensation as a
305 result of the recent amputation. In the survey, the amputees indicated stronger perception of the phantom hand as a
306 result of stimulation, which enabled a greater ability to move their phantom hand despite its absence (Fig. 3).

307 Remarkably, over 2 years the stimulation sites and perceived activated regions in the phantom hand remained rela-
308 tively stable for subject A03 (Fig. 5A-B, and Fig. S3). Despite an amputation over 7 years prior to the study, the
309 sensory nerves in the residual limb still provided meaningful sensations of touch back to the user indicating corti-
310 cal representation of the phantom hand as well as intact neural pathways. Although there are slight differences in
311 activated sensory maps each day, the activated phantom regions themselves did not migrate and retained structural
312 similarity over time (Fig. 5B), suggesting no major changes in the area of perceived activation. The fact that the
313 sensory maps did not significantly change suggests that phantom limb representation remains many years after injury
314 even without constant sensory stimulation.

315 **4.2. Phantom limb perception improves movement decoding**

316 Our results suggest that the internal sensorimotor pathway is affected by stimulation and enhanced phantom limb
317 perception (Fig. 4). A crucial aspect of controlling the phantom hand, and in turn a prosthesis, is the internal
318 perception of the phantom limb. Sensory feedback can be used to convey tactile information back to amputees
319 [6–8, 12, 14–16]; however, we show that phantom hand perception is fundamentally linked to motor performance

320 even in the absence of object manipulation.

321 Our results suggest that sensory stimulation influences real-time myoelectric pattern recognition and that enhanced
322 phantom perception temporarily improves movement decoding, regardless of experience level (Fig. 5 and 6). By
323 working closely with patients A02 and A03, we identified the most relevant regions of the phantom hand to enhance
324 perception during certain movements. A03 believed it would be difficult to achieve reliable control of more than 9
325 movement classes as a non-TMR transhumeral prosthesis user. To see how much improvement was possible due to
326 strengthening the internal sensorimotor control loop of the amputee, we expanded the number of classes to 14 (Fig.
327 5C-F).

328 Participant A03 had previous experience with myoelectric pattern recognition and did not show significant improve-
329 ment as a result of additional training over Phase I of the long-term study (Fig. 5G); however, there were significant
330 improvements during the sessions with sensory stimulation to the phantom hand (Phase II, Fig. 5H). These results in-
331 dicate that the heightened sense of the phantom hand immediately strengthens the sensorimotor loop of the amputee,
332 but this improvement does not extend across days if the stimulation does not persist. Periodic sensory reinforcement
333 provides short-term benefit, but the ability to perform the movements was similar during both Phases I and III, with
334 a slight upward trend throughout the study, indicating no long-term impact and likely a result of continued prosthesis
335 use by A03 (Fig. 5G). Long-term improvements may be realized through continued sensory reinforcement over a
336 longer period.

337 The link between phantom perception and control is evident from the results, and it is supported by prior work that
338 shows motor cortex excitability can increase with sensory activation [35]. According to participant A03, enhanced
339 sensation of the phantom hand from tTENS can take up to several hours to subside after which the phantom hand per-
340 ception returns to the baseline state. The temporary influence of tTENS aligns well with our observed improvements
341 in motor control being limited to within a single day. The subsiding effect of the sensory stimulation and movement
342 decoding improvements limited to a single day further supports the idea that recurring sensory stimulation sessions
343 could help create more permanent improvement. It is possible that a more targeted prosthesis training paradigm,
344 making use of combined phantom motor control and sensory stimulation, would lead to long-term improvements
345 in prosthesis performance. It should be noted that we did not compare non-phantom hand sensory stimulation
346 conditions to investigate if the improved movement decoding effect is also present during other types of sensory
347 activation to the body. Regardless, the results suggest a relationship between phantom perception and movement
348 decoding, which may prove valuable for improving prosthesis control. We also showed a slight improvement in
349 task completion time after sensory activation of the phantom hand during prosthesis control in an object movement
350 task (Fig. 6E), which further supports the idea of phantom hand perception playing an important role in functional
351 prosthesis control.

352 **4.3. Sensory stimulation activates sensorimotor regions**

353 Our neurological studies based on EEG activation present evidence for sensory-motor integration in amputees. The
354 central and centro-parietal electrodes cover the primary motor and somatosensory cortices, which are areas known to
355 be activated during sensory processing and motor-related tasks [36, 37]. In stroke patients, median nerve activation
356 using TENS is also known to increase motor cortex excitability and motor function [35]. Based on our results, we

357 inferred that tTENS does not just act as a tactile stimulus but also improves the perceived control of the phantom
358 hand by the amputee. This inference is supported by the improvements in movement decoding (Fig. 4, 5, 6) and
359 aligns with previous results suggesting the role of central and parietal EEG activation in phantom limb vividness [38].
360 Previous studies have also demonstrated central and somatosensory cortical region EEG activation [10, 12, 39] and
361 enhanced connectivity [40] from noninvasive sensory feedback; however, here we also observed that the sensory
362 stimulation effect persisted during the Post-Stim condition. It should be noted that the above observations were
363 made for all the stimulation sites (median, ulnar and radial). We did not observe significant differences between
364 them owing to the lower spatial resolution of EEG. Nevertheless, EEG-based classification of A03's stimulation
365 sites was possible with relatively high accuracy (Fig. S6).

366 We believe that during the Post-Stim condition the activation of the primary somatosensory cortex showed tactile
367 working memory aiding the amputee in better perception of the phantom hand movements even without the feedback
368 stimulus. Prior work showed that the primary sensory cortex (both contralateral and ipsilateral) acts as a center for
369 online sensory processing as well as a transient storage site for tactile information [41, 42]. It's possible that sensory
370 stimulation to the phantom hand aids the amputees to make movement because the tactile working memory plays a
371 valuable role in aiding the movement and perception both during and after the sensory stimulation.

372 Interestingly, the most significant neural changes in A02 occurred in the ipsilateral hemisphere during tTENS (Fig.
373 7B-D). While the traditional notion is that sensorimotor activity is in the contralateral hemisphere, previous work
374 showed decoding motor commands from ipsilateral brain activity in the sensorimotor region [43]. The potential roles
375 of ipsilateral activity suggested in the past include contributing to finger representation and voluntary execution of
376 a movement [44] and maintaining an efference copy and muscle posture of the ipsilateral limb [45]. Another possi-
377 bility of stronger ipsilateral activation could be to the absence of contralateral inhibition due to cortical adjustments
378 after injury and amputation [46]. Because we know both hemispheres are used for tactile information storage, it's
379 likely that short-term tactile working memory was utilized [41, 42].

380 Furthermore, the laterality differences observed in amputees A02 and A03 could be the result of time since ampu-
381 tation, individual variability in amputation, and experiences in tTENS and myoelectric control. Participant A02 had
382 15 years between paralysis from nerve injury and elective amputation (Table S1). Though the extent of peripheral
383 sensory input loss effects in cortical behavior is not completely understood, cortical functional organizational dif-
384 ferences could also contribute to the differences observed in A02 and A03. Participant A03 received an extended
385 period of sensory mapping (Fig. 5A,B). Studying the long-term cortical effects of sensory stimulation can offer
386 more insights to cortical behavior when sensory information is reintroduced to amputees. In targeted muscle and
387 sensory reinnervation (TMSR) recipients, the strength in activation of primary motor and somatosensory regions
388 shows similarity with that in intact limb controls [47].

389 Despite disrupted sensorimotor pathways after limb amputation, there is bilateral activation during electrical sensory
390 stimulation [39] and phantom movements [48]. Such cortical plasticity mechanisms are not completely understood,
391 but deeper insight could be obtained from studying the causal interactions between the two hemispheres focusing on
392 the sensorimotor loop. Our observations on enhanced phantom perception influencing control and neural activation
393 support the idea that phantom hand representation in the cortex persists after amputation [22, 24]. More research

394 is needed to develop methods sustain movement decoding improvement beyond a single day; however, our EEG
395 results offer insight on the role of sensory feedback in phantom hand perception and control.

396 **5. Conclusion**

397 We show that improving perception of the phantom hand in amputees can improve the ability to produce and control
398 phantom hand movements. This improvement in phantom hand control can be captured and decoded through surface
399 EMG. Sensory stimulation of the phantom hand appears to provide short-term (within a single day) improvements
400 in movement decoding. Nerve stimulation can provide tactile feedback for amputees, but here we show that sensory
401 stimulation of the phantom hand is also fundamentally linked to phantom hand control. Through EEG signals, we
402 confirm that the sensory activation of the phantom hand influences relevant neural motor activity. Interestingly, the
403 enhanced neural motor activity persists even after sensory stimulation is removed, which helps explain the movement
404 decoding improvements after short phantom hand sensory stimulation sessions. When tracked over 2 years, we saw
405 that the sensory regions of the phantom hand did not change, which demonstrates long-term stability in amputee
406 sensory maps even many years after amputation. Movement decoding performance over 1 year did not substantially
407 change; however, performance was affected on the same day as targeted phantom hand sensory stimulation. Our
408 findings offer insight on how phantom hand perception can be modulate through sensory activation for improving
409 motor control, prosthesis function, and rehabilitation after amputation.

410 **Acknowledgments**

411 This work was supported by Space@Hopkins, the National Institutes of Health (T32EB003383), the National Sci-
412 ence Foundation (1849417), and the JHU/APL postdoctoral fellowship. The VIE was developed at JHU/APL under
413 the Revolutionizing Prosthetics program (Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, N66001-10-C-4056).

414 **Author contributions**

415 L.E.O., K.D., M.A.H., G.M.L., and C.L.H. developed hardware and software for the experiments. L.E.O., M.A.H.,
416 K.D., and M.M.I. conducted experiments. L.E.O. and N.V.T. designed the experiments. L.E.O., M.A.H., R.B.,
417 K.D., M.M.I., A.D., Z.T., A.B., and N.V.T. analyzed the data. N.V.T. supervised all experiments, data analysis, and
418 interpretation of the results. All authors contributed to writing the paper.

419 **Competing interests**

420 N.V.T. is co-founder of Infinite Biomedical Technologies. This relationship has been disclosed and is managed
421 by Johns Hopkins University. G.M.L. is an employee of Infinite Biomedical Technologies and was one of the ex-
422 periment volunteers. He authorized the release of his name as a research volunteer through the JHMI IRB Health
423 Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) privacy release form. He did not handle data, perform analy-
424 sis, or interpret results from any experiment. All other authors declare no competing interests.

425 **ORCID iD**

426 Luke E. Osborn: 0000-0003-2985-6294

427 Keqin Ding: 0000-0002-0680-673X

428 Rohit Bose: 0000-0003-3966-4464

429 Mark M. Iskarous: 0000-0003-4208-3943
430 Andrei Dragomir: 0000-0003-2815-6958
431 Zied Tayeb: 0000-0003-3257-0211
432 Gorden Cheng: 0000-0003-0770-8717
433 Robert S. Armiger: 0000-0002-3437-1884
434 Anastasios Bezerianos: 0000-0002-8199-6000
435 Matthew S. Fifer: 0000-0003-3425-7552
436 Nitish V. Thakor: 0000-0002-9981-9395

437 **References**

- 438 [1] Johansson R S and Flanagan J R 2009 Coding and use of tactile signals from the fingertips in object manipula-
439 tion tasks *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **10** 345–359
- 440 [2] Wolpert D, Ghahramani Z and Jordan M 1995 An internal model for sensorimotor integration *Science* **269**
441 1880–1882
- 442 [3] Shadmehr R, Smith M A and Krakauer J W 2010 Error correction, sensory prediction, and adaptation in motor
443 control *Annual Review of Neuroscience* **33** 89–108
- 444 [4] Shehata A W, Engels L F, Controzzi M, Cipriani C, Scheme E J and Sensinger J W 2018 Improving internal
445 model strength and performance of prosthetic hands using augmented feedback *Journal of NeuroEngineering*
446 *and Rehabilitation* **15** 70
- 447 [5] Ramachandran V S and Hirstein W 1998 The perception of phantom limbs *Brain* **121** 1603–1630
- 448 [6] Raspopovic S *et al* 2014 Restoring natural sensory feedback in real-time bidirectional hand prostheses *Science*
449 *Translational Medicine* **6** 222ra19
- 450 [7] Tan D W, Schiefer M A, Keith M W, Anderson J R, Tyler J and Tyler D J 2014 A neural interface provides
451 long-term stable natural touch perception *Science Translational Medicine* **6** 257ra138
- 452 [8] Oddo C M *et al* 2016 Intraneural stimulation elicits discrimination of textural features by artificial fingertip in
453 intact and amputee humans *eLife* **5** e09148
- 454 [9] Wendelken S *et al* 2017 Restoration of motor control and proprioceptive and cutaneous sensation in humans
455 with prior upper-limb amputation via multiple utah slanted electrode arrays (useas) implanted in residual pe-
456 ripheral arm nerves *Journal of Neuroengineering and Rehabilitation* **14** 121
- 457 [10] D’Anna E *et al* 2017 A somatotopic bidirectional hand prosthesis with transcutaneous electrical nerve stimu-
458 lation based sensory feedback *Scientific Reports* **7** 10930
- 459 [11] Shin H, Watkins Z, Huang H H, Zhu Y and Hu X 2018 Evoked haptic sensations in the hand via non-invasive
460 proximal nerve stimulation *Journal of Neural Engineering* **15** 046005
- 461 [12] Osborn L E *et al* 2018 Prosthesis with neuromorphic multilayered e-dermis perceives touch and pain *Science*

462 *Robotics* **3** eaat3818

- 463 [13] Page D M *et al* 2018 Motor control and sensory feedback enhance prosthesis embodiment and reduce phantom
464 pain after long-term hand amputation *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* **12** 352
- 465 [14] Graczyk E L, Resnik L, Schiefer M A, Schmitt M S and Tyler D J 2018 Home use of a neural-connected sensory
466 prosthesis provides the functional and psychosocial experience of having a hand again *Scientific Reports* **8** 9866
- 467 [15] Valle G *et al* 2018 Biomimetic intraneural sensory feedback enhances sensation naturalness, tactile sensitivity,
468 and manual dexterity in a bidirectional prosthesis *Neuron* **100** 37 – 45.e7
- 469 [16] George J A *et al* 2019 Biomimetic sensory feedback through peripheral nerve stimulation improves dexterous
470 use of a bionic hand *Science Robotics* **4**
- 471 [17] Marasco P D *et al* 2018 Illusory movement perception improves motor control for prosthetic hands *Science*
472 *Translational Medicine* **10** eaao6990
- 473 [18] Scheme E and Englehart K 2011 Electromyogram pattern recognition for control of powered upper-limb pros-
474 theses: State of the art and challenges for clinical use *Journal of Rehabilitation Research and Development* **48**
475 643–659
- 476 [19] Farina D *et al* 2017 Man/machine interface based on the discharge timings of spinal motor neurons after
477 targeted muscle reinnervation *Nature Biomedical Engineering* **1** 0025
- 478 [20] Hahne J M, Schweisfurth M A, Koppe M and Farina D 2018 Simultaneous control of multiple functions of
479 bionic hand prostheses: Performance and robustness in end users *Science Robotics* **3** eaat3630
- 480 [21] Chen A, Yao J, Kuiken T A and Dewald J P A 2013 Cortical motor activity and reorganization following
481 upper-limb amputation and subsequent targeted reinnervation *NeuroImage: Clinical* **3** 498 – 506
- 482 [22] Kikkert S *et al* 2016 Revealing the neural fingerprints of a missing hand *eLife* **5** e15292
- 483 [23] Mercier C, Reilly K T, Vargas C D, Aballea A and Sirigu A 2006 Mapping phantom movement representations
484 in the motor cortex of amputees *Brain* **129** 2202–2210
- 485 [24] Reilly K T and Sirigu A 2008 The motor cortex and its role in phantom limb phenomena *The Neuroscientist*
486 **14** 195–202
- 487 [25] Andoh J, Diers M, Milde C, Frobel C, Kleinböhl D and Flor H 2017 Neural correlates of evoked phantom limb
488 sensations *Biological Psychology* **126** 89 – 97
- 489 [26] Osborn L *et al* 2017 Targeted transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation for phantom limb sensory feedback
490 *IEEE Biomedical Circuits and Systems (BioCAS)* pp 1–4
- 491 [27] Johannes M S *et al* 2020 The modular prosthetic limb *Wearable Robotics* ed Rosen J and Ferguson P W
492 (Academic Press) chap 21, pp 393 – 444 1st ed
- 493 [28] Gómez-Herrero G 2007 Automatic artifact removal (aar) toolbox v1. 3 (release 09.12. 2007) for matlab URL

494 <http://germangh.github.io/aar/aardoc/aar.html>

- 495 [29] Delorme A and Makeig S 2004 Eeglab: an open source toolbox for analysis of single-trial eeg dynamics
496 including independent component analysis *Journal of Neuroscience Methods* **134** 9 – 21 ISSN 0165-0270
- 497 [30] Schiefer M, Tan D, Sidek S M and Tyler D J 2016 Sensory feedback by peripheral nerve stimulation im-
498 proves task performance in individuals with upper limb loss using a myoelectric prosthesis *Journal of Neural*
499 *Engineering* **13** 016001
- 500 [31] Wang Z, Bovik A C, Sheikh H R and Simoncelli E P 2004 Image quality assessment: from error visibility to
501 structural similarity *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* **13** 600–612
- 502 [32] Jönsson S, Caine-Winterberger K and Brånemark R 2011 Osseointegration amputation prostheses on the upper
503 limbs: methods, prosthetics and rehabilitation *Prosthetics and Orthotics International* **35** 190–200
- 504 [33] Neuper C, Scherer R, Reiner M and Pfurtscheller G 2005 Imagery of motor actions: Differential effects of
505 kinesthetic and visual–motor mode of imagery in single-trial eeg *Cognitive Brain Research* **25** 668 – 677
- 506 [34] Neuper C, Scherer R, Wriessnegger S and Pfurtscheller G 2009 Motor imagery and action observation: Modu-
507 lation of sensorimotor brain rhythms during mental control of a brain–computer interface *Clinical Neurophys-*
508 *iology* **120** 239 – 247 ISSN 1388-2457
- 509 [35] Conforto A B *et al* 2010 Effects of somatosensory stimulation on motor function after subacute stroke *Neu-*
510 *rorehabilitation and Neural Repair* **24** 263–272
- 511 [36] Porro C A *et al* 1996 Primary motor and sensory cortex activation during motor performance and motor im-
512 agery: A functional magnetic resonance imaging study *Journal of Neuroscience* **16** 7688–7698
- 513 [37] Pfurtscheller G and Neuper C 1997 Motor imagery activates primary sensorimotor area in humans *Neuro-*
514 *science Letters* **239** 65 – 68
- 515 [38] Lyu Y, Guo X, Bekrater-Bodmann R, Flor H and Tong S 2016 Phantom limb perception interferes with motor
516 imagery after unilateral upper-limb amputation *Scientific reports* **6** 21100
- 517 [39] Yao J, Chen A, Kuiken T, Carmona C and Dewald J 2015 Sensory cortical re-mapping following upper-limb
518 amputation and subsequent targeted reinnervation: A case report *NeuroImage: Clinical* **8** 329 – 336 ISSN
519 2213-1582
- 520 [40] Ding K *et al* 2020 Towards machine to brain interfaces: Sensory stimulation enhances sensorimotor dynamic
521 functional connectivity in upper limb amputees *Journal of Neural Engineering*
- 522 [41] Harris J A, Miniussi C, Harris I M and Diamond M E 2002 Transient storage of a tactile memory trace in
523 primary somatosensory cortex *Journal of Neuroscience* **22** 8720–8725
- 524 [42] Zhao D, Zhou Y D, Bodner M and Ku Y 2018 The causal role of the prefrontal cortex and somatosensory
525 cortex in tactile working memory *Cerebral Cortex* **28** 3468–3477

- 526 [43] Hotson G *et al* 2014 Coarse electrocorticographic decoding of ipsilateral reach in patients with brain lesions
527 *PloS One* **9** e115236
- 528 [44] Berlot E, Prichard G, O'Reilly J, Ejaz N and Diedrichsen J 2019 Ipsilateral finger representations in the senso-
529 rimotor cortex are driven by active movement processes, not passive sensory input *Journal of Neurophysiology*
530 **121** 418–426
- 531 [45] Bundy D T and Leuthardt E C 2019 The cortical physiology of ipsilateral limb movements *Trends in Neuro-*
532 *sciences* **42** 825 – 839
- 533 [46] Hordacre B, Bradnam L V, Barr C, Patritti B L and Crotty M 2015 Intracortical inhibition is modulated by
534 phase of prosthetic rehabilitation in transtibial amputees *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* **9** 276
- 535 [47] Serino A *et al* 2017 Upper limb cortical maps in amputees with targeted muscle and sensory reinnervation
536 *Brain* **140** 2993–3011
- 537 [48] Lundborg G, Waites A, Björkman A, Rosén B and Larsson E M 2006 Functional magnetic resonance imaging
538 shows cortical activation on sensory stimulation of an osseointegrated prosthetic thumb. *Scandinavian Journal*
539 *of Plastic Surgery and Hand Surgery* **40** 234–239
- 540 [49] Kuiken T A, Marasco P D, Lock B A, Harden R N and Dewald J P A 2007 Redirection of cutaneous sensation
541 from the hand to the chest skin of human amputees with targeted reinnervation *Proceedings of the National*
542 *Academy of Sciences USA* **104** 20061–20066
- 543 [50] Hebert J S *et al* 2014 Novel targeted sensory reinnervation technique to restore functional hand sensation after
544 transhumeral amputation *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering* **22** 765–773
- 545 [51] Rognini G *et al* 2018 Multisensory bionic limb to achieve prosthesis embodiment and reduce distorted phantom
546 limb perceptions *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry* **0** 1–3
- 547 [52] Englehart K and Hudgins B 2003 A robust, real-time control scheme for multifunction myoelectric control
548 *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering* **50** 848–854
- 549 [53] Betthausen J *et al* 2018 Limb position tolerant pattern recognition for myoelectric prosthesis control with
550 adaptive sparse representations from extreme learning *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering* **65** 770–
551 778
- 552 [54] Grosse-Wentrup M and Buss M 2008 Multiclass common spatial patterns and information theoretic feature
553 extraction *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering* **55** 1991–2000
- 554 [55] Pudil P, Novovičová J and Kittler J 1994 Floating search methods in feature selection *Pattern Recognition*
555 *Letters* **15** 1119 – 1125 ISSN 0167-8655
- 556 [56] Tayeb Z *et al* 2018 Gumpy: a python toolbox suitable for hybrid brain–computer interfaces *Journal of Neural*
557 *Engineering* **15** 065003