

# Motion prediction using electromyography and sonomyography for an individual with transhumeral limb loss

Susannah Engdahl<sup>1¶</sup>, Ananya Dhawan<sup>1¶</sup>, György Lévy<sup>2</sup>, Ahmed Bashatah<sup>1</sup>, Rahul Kaliki<sup>2</sup>,  
Siddhartha Sikdar<sup>1,3\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Bioengineering, George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia, United States of America

<sup>2</sup> Infinite Biomedical Technologies, Baltimore, Maryland, United States of America

<sup>3</sup> Center for Adaptive Systems of Brain-Body Interactions, George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia, United States of America

\* Corresponding author

Email: [ssikdar@gmu.edu](mailto:ssikdar@gmu.edu) (SS)

¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.

## 1 **Abstract**

2           Controlling multi-articulated prosthetic hands with surface electromyography can be  
3 challenging for users. Sonomyography, or ultrasound-based sensing of muscle deformation,  
4 avoids some of the problems of electromyography and enables classification of multiple motion  
5 patterns in individuals with upper limb loss. Because sonomyography has been previously  
6 studied only in individuals with transradial limb loss, the purpose of this study was to assess the  
7 feasibility of an individual with transhumeral limb loss using this modality for motion  
8 classification. A secondary aim was to compare motion classification performance between  
9 electromyography and sonomyography. A single individual with transhumeral limb loss created  
10 two datasets containing 11 motions each (individual flexion of each finger, thumb abduction,  
11 power grasp, key grasp, tripod, point, pinch, wrist pronation). Electromyography or  
12 sonomyography signals associated with every motion were acquired and cross-validation  
13 accuracy was computed for each dataset. While all motions were usually predicted successfully  
14 with both electromyography and sonomyography, the cross-validation accuracies were typically  
15 higher for sonomyography. Although this was an exploratory study, the results suggest that  
16 controlling an upper limb prosthesis using sonomyography may be feasible for individuals with  
17 transhumeral limb loss.

## 18 19 **Introduction**

20           Abandonment of upper limb prostheses is common [1] and is largely attributable to user  
21 concerns regarding comfort and function [2,3]. In fact, one survey reported that 98% of  
22 individuals who have rejected a prosthesis believe they are just as or more functional without a

23 prosthesis, an opinion which is echoed by 60% of those who do wear a prosthesis frequently [2].  
24 Recent research efforts have focused on developing dexterous prosthetic hands and associated  
25 control strategies in an effort to improve user functionality, but the prosthetic terminal devices  
26 and componentry have improved much more rapidly than the ability to control the devices. Thus,  
27 robustly inferring volitional motor intent from the user remains challenging [4].

28         Conventional prosthesis control strategies rely on surface electromyography (EMG) to  
29 detect muscle activation in a user's residual limb. However, surface EMG signals typically have  
30 poor amplitude resolution and a low signal-to-noise ratio [5,6], as well as limited specificity  
31 between muscles due to cross-talk and co-activation [7–10]. Multi-articulated prosthetic hands  
32 commonly use dual-site surface EMG electrodes placed on an agonist-antagonist muscle pair in  
33 order to actuate the hand using a direct control strategy. Since direct control only enables  
34 opening and closing of the hand, switching between grasps must be initiated by a separate trigger  
35 such as a designated EMG signal pattern (e.g., co-contraction), physical gesture, or button press.  
36 These mode switching methods can be cumbersome and are strongly disliked by some users  
37 [11].

38         In an effort to mitigate some of these problems, pattern recognition algorithms are  
39 actively being developed in order to extract user intent from an array of surface EMG signals.  
40 Pattern recognition has shown some functional advantages in comparison to direct control  
41 [12,13]. However, one study found no difference in function or satisfaction between the systems  
42 for a two degree of freedom prosthesis [14] and others found that pattern recognition failed to  
43 improve outcomes for users of multi-degree of freedom prostheses [15,16]. These studies  
44 focused on gross wrist and hand movements, but dexterous control of individual finger  
45 movements is also possible with pattern recognition [17–20]. Despite these potential advantages

46 of pattern recognition, considerable training is often required for users to reliably produce the set  
47 of distinct EMG patterns required for this modality [21,22].

48         Rather than controlling a prosthesis through detection of muscular electrical activity, an  
49 alternative approach relies on ultrasound imaging to sense muscle deformation during voluntary  
50 movement. This method, known as sonomyography (SMG), avoids many of the limitations of  
51 EMG because it can spatially resolve individual muscles, even those deep inside the arm. This  
52 high spatial specificity means that muscular cross-talk does not contaminate the extracted control  
53 signals that can be used to drive movement of a prosthesis. Numerous studies have established  
54 SMG as a viable option for gesture recognition and prosthesis control [23–26]. In particular, our  
55 group has demonstrated the ability to classify five individual digit movements with 97%  
56 accuracy [27] and 15 complex grasps with 91% accuracy [28] in able-bodied individuals. There  
57 has been relatively little exploration of the use of SMG in individuals with upper limb loss [29–  
58 33], although we have reported an average classification accuracy of 96% for five grasps in this  
59 population [32] with minimal training required [33].

60         However, all studies to date on individuals with upper limb loss using SMG have focused  
61 on a transradial population. It is unknown whether SMG can be successfully used for motion  
62 classification by individuals with more proximal limb loss. Since the muscles associated with  
63 wrist, hand, and finger control are primarily located in the forearm, absence of the forearm may  
64 preclude the use of SMG for classifying motion. Thus, the purpose of this exploratory study was  
65 to quantify the motion classification accuracy achievable by an individual with transhumeral  
66 limb loss using SMG. A secondary aim was to directly compare motion classification using  
67 EMG and SMG in order to understand the relative merits of each modality.

68

## 69 **Methods**

### 70 **Subject**

71           The subject underwent bilateral wrist disarticulation (right arm) and transhumeral (left  
72 arm) amputations nine years prior to this data collection. The subject reported use of a pattern  
73 recognition controlled prosthesis consisting of an externally-powered elbow, wrist and terminal  
74 device on a daily basis for over two years. Before that, the subject had used a direct controlled  
75 hybrid prosthesis (body-powered elbow, externally-powered wrist and terminal device) for six  
76 years. Both devices were attached to the transhumeral residual limb via a suspension socket.  
77 Although the subject had been exposed to SMG approximately one year prior to this data  
78 collection, he had only used it with his right arm and was naïve to its use with the arm affected  
79 by transhumeral amputation. The study protocol was approved by the George Mason University  
80 Institutional Review Board and the subject provided written informed consent prior to  
81 participating.

82

### 83 **Data acquisition with sonomyography**

84           All data were acquired from the subject's transhumeral residual limb. A Terason uSmart  
85 3200T ultrasound system (Terason, Burlington, MA) was used for the studies. A low-profile,  
86 high-frequency, linear 16HL7 ultrasound transducer was positioned on the subject's residual  
87 limb using a stretchable fabric cuff. Ultrasound image sequences were acquired at a sampling  
88 rate of 13.44 +/- 0.66 Hz and transferred to a PC in real-time using an Epiphan screen capture  
89 card (Epiphan Systems, Palo Alto, CA), where they were processed in MATLAB (MathWorks,  
90 Natick, MA) using custom algorithms. Note that the sampling rate was variable due to

91 limitations imposed by the integration of the screen capture card with MATLAB. However, this  
92 does not drastically impact our study as the classification procedure discussed herein does not  
93 rely on temporal information.

94 The subject created a single dataset containing a set of 11 motions (*index* finger flexion,  
95 *middle* finger flexion, *ring* finger flexion, *little* finger flexion, *thumb abduction*, *power grasp*, *key*  
96 *grasp*, *tripod*, *point*, *pinch*, *wrist pronation*). In addition, a *rest* state was defined when it was  
97 assumed the subject was not volitionally performing any of the motions and the residual  
98 musculature was in a neutral position. Following a previously described protocol [32], the  
99 subject performed each movement starting from a resting position and moving towards the  
100 motion end-state within one second according to an auditory cue. He then held the end state for  
101 one second, moved back to *rest* within one second, and remained at *rest* for another second.  
102 Thus, there were four phases per motion performance: *rest*, transition from *rest* to motion end-  
103 state, motion end-state, and transition from motion end-state to *rest*. Each motion performance  
104 was repeated five times, resulting in 11 separate 20-second sequences. A short break was  
105 provided between the collection of each sequence when the subject switched to a new motion.

106

## 107 **Data acquisition with electromyography**

108 All data were acquired from the subject's transhumeral residual limb. Raw EMG signals  
109 were gathered at a 1 kHz sampling rate with eight bipolar anodized titanium electrodes (Infinite  
110 Biomedical Technologies, Baltimore, MD) embedded within a custom transhumeral socket. The  
111 electrodes were amplified and filtered with a 20 - 500 Hz digital bandpass and 60 Hz digital  
112 notch filters. The subject created a single dataset containing the same set of 11 motions and

113 following the same temporal sequence described previously. The only difference was that visual  
114 cues, rather than auditory cues, were provided to prompt transitions between states.

115

## 116 **Data analysis**

117 The EMG and SMG sensing modalities produce very different data and were subjected to  
118 different pre-processing steps. The EMG data were split into 100 ms windows at every 10 ms  
119 interval. Five features were extracted from each of the windows: mean absolute value, variance,  
120 slope sign change count, waveform length, and number of zero crossings. The SMG data are  
121 acquired as a stream of individual ultrasound image frames. These ultrasound frames have a very  
122 large number of pixels and thus a very high dimensionality (1400x1000). To reduce the number  
123 of features, we first downscaled the images to one-tenth the original size (140x100), and then  
124 utilized principal component analysis to further reduce the dimensionality. We retained every  
125 basis vector that explained greater than 0.01% of the variance in the data, leading to a total  
126 explained variance of approximately 97%. Once the data were processed, each datapoint (time  
127 window for EMG, ultrasound image for SMG) was assigned a phase label based on the  
128 metronome cues. Thus, the datapoints were labeled as *rest* during the first second of motion  
129 performance, *transition to the motion end-state* during the next second, *motion end-state* during  
130 the third second, and *transition from the motion end-state* during the fourth second. This pattern  
131 of labelling was repeated for all five motion repetitions in the 20-second sequence.

132 Although the preprocessing was different for the two sensing strategies, the classification  
133 analysis for both the SMG and EMG datasets was performed using a linear discriminant analysis  
134 classifier. The classifier was constrained to have equal prior probabilities for each of the 12  
135 possible classes (11 motions and *rest*). Leave-one-out cross-validation was performed such that

136 one of the 55 motion performances (11 motions x 5 trials) were selected as a test set while the  
137 remaining 54 motion performances were used for training. This process was repeated for each of  
138 the 55 motion performances and a list of predictions for all data was compiled. Based on the  
139 phase labels, we then created confusion matrices and calculated the percent of correct predictions  
140 for each of the 4 phases, as well as the overall dataset.

141 For this work, we considered two different methods for training the classifier. Since we  
142 are primarily interested in evaluating the extent to which we can enable basic motion  
143 classification in individuals with transhumeral limb loss, we first trained the classifier using only  
144 data labelled as belonging to the *rest* and motion end-state phases where the user's performance  
145 is most stable. However, we are also interested in understanding the extent to which we can  
146 facilitate an intuitive control paradigm that mimics the natural control employed with intact  
147 limbs. Our previous work has shown that SMG may eventually enable proportional positional  
148 control of prostheses [32] that allows users to rely on their innate proprioceptive sensing [34] to  
149 drive their device in a way that is directly congruent with their level of muscle contraction.  
150 Therefore, evaluating whether the classifier can accurately detect partially completed grasps is a  
151 necessary step towards demonstrating the feasibility of achieving proportional positional control.  
152 Being able to successfully detect partially completed grasps would also permit earlier  
153 classification of hand gestures than if the user was required to fully complete the grasp, thus  
154 increasing the responsiveness of the prosthetic device. As such, we also trained the classifier  
155 using data from the transition phases when grasps are partially completed, in addition to the *rest*  
156 and motion end-state phases.

157 Although the subject received cues to transition between each phase in the data  
158 acquisition sequence, it is likely that there were some delays due to reaction time following each


159 cue. For example, they may have continued to remain at *rest* for a brief time even after receiving  
160 the cue to begin transitioning to the motion end-state. Thus, it is difficult to know whether a *rest*  
161 prediction during a transition phase is truly incorrect (i.e., misclassification of a motion state as  
162 *rest*) or correct (i.e., the subject was at *rest* and the classifier predicted *rest*). Because of this  
163 ambiguity, the classification performance is reported under both assumptions. The same  
164 classifier predictions were used to compute the classification accuracy in both scenarios. The  
165 only difference was that prediction of any motion during a transition phase as *rest* was counted  
166 as a failure when *rest* was considered incorrect, but was counted as a success when *rest* was  
167 considered correct. Together, the two scenarios provide both a conservative (*rest* considered  
168 incorrect) and best-case (*rest* considered correct) estimate of classification accuracy.

169

## 170 **Results**


### 171 **Training with steady state phases only**

172 Visual inspection of the predicted classifications throughout the entire data acquisition  
173 period indicates that the classifier usually predicted motion classes correctly for both modalities  
174 (Fig 1). However, the overall classification accuracy for all 11 motion classes plus *rest* was  
175 higher for SMG than EMG (Fig 2). This was true regardless of whether *rest* predictions during  
176 transitions were considered correct (EMG: 80.79%, SMG: 97.90%) or incorrect (EMG: 61.52%,  
177 SMG: 72.93%). Similarly, classification accuracy during the motion end-state phases (Fig 3) was  
178 higher for SMG (EMG: 75.08%, SMG: 94.04%). Classification accuracy during the *rest* phases  
179 was roughly equivalent between the two modalities (EMG: 96.25%, SMG: 98.34%).



180  
181 **Fig 1. Motion class predictions over time.** The temporal progression of motion class  
182 predictions is shown for all EMG time windows (A) and SMG image frames (B). Vertical lines  
183 represent metronome cues prompting a transition between phases. Each rest and motion end-state  
184 phase was followed by a one-second transition period during which the subject transitioned to  
185 the next phase. Rest predictions are indicated in grey, target motion predictions are indicated in  
186 blue, and predictions of any of the other 10 motions are indicated in orange.

187



188

189


190

191

192

**Fig 2. Overall confusion matrices.** Prediction accuracies are shown for EMG (A) and SMG (B). The integer values in each cell represent the total number of EMG time windows or SMG image frames that were classified.


It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).



193  
 194 **Fig 3. Confusion matrices for the motion end-state phases.** Prediction accuracies are shown  
 195 for EMG (A) and SMG (B). The integer values in each cell represent the total number of EMG  
 196 time windows or SMG image frames that were classified.  
 197


198 During the transition periods from *rest* to a motion end-state, classification accuracy was  
 199 higher for SMG (Fig 4) both when *rest* predictions were considered correct (EMG: 70.64%,  
 200 SMG: 100.00%) and incorrect (EMG: 15.48%, SMG: 67.37%). During the transition periods  
 201 from a motion end-state to *rest* (Fig 5), classification accuracy was higher for SMG only when

202 *rest* predictions were considered correct (EMG: 81.16%, SMG: 99.09%). If *rest* predictions were  
 203 considered incorrect, classification accuracy was higher for EMG (EMG: 59.31%, SMG:  
 204 18.93%). A summary of the classification accuracies for all phases is provided in Table 1.  
 205



206 **Fig 4. Confusion matrices for the transitions from rest to motion.** Prediction accuracies are  
 207 shown for EMG (A) and SMG (B). The integer values in each cell represent the total number of  
 208 EMG time windows or SMG image frames that were classified.  
 209  
 210

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).



211  
 212 **Fig 5. Confusion matrices for the transitions from motion to rest.** Prediction accuracies are  
 213 shown for EMG (A) and SMG (B). The integer values in each cell represent the total number of  
 214 EMG time windows or SMG image frames that were classified.  
 215

216

217

218


219 **Table 1. Classification accuracies when partially completed grasps were excluded from**  
220 **training.**

<b>Data acquisition phase</b>	<b>EMG</b>	<b>SMG</b>
<i>Rest</i>	96.25%	98.34%
<b>Motion end-state</b>	75.08%	94.04%
<i>Rest predictions during transitions considered correct</i>		
<b>Transition from rest to motion end-state</b>	70.64%	100.00%
<b>Transition from motion end-state to rest</b>	81.16%	99.09%
<b>All phases</b>	80.79%	97.90%
<i>Rest predictions during transitions considered incorrect</i>		
<b>Transition from rest to motion end-state</b>	15.48%	67.27%
<b>Transition from motion end-state to rest</b>	59.31%	18.93%
<b>All phases</b>	61.52%	72.93%

221

## 222 **Training with steady state and transition phases**


223 When partially completed grasps were included in the training, the classifier usually  
224 predicted motion classes correctly (Fig 6) but with higher overall accuracy for SMG than EMG  
225 (Fig 7). The accuracy was higher for SMG both when *rest* predictions during transitions were  
226 considered correct (EMG: 76.44%, SMG: 87.26%) and incorrect (EMG: 62.38%, SMG:  
227 79.63%). Classification accuracy was also higher for SMG during the motion end-state phases  
228 (Fig 8, EMG: 77.53%, SMG: 97.34%) but was higher for EMG during the *rest* phases (EMG:  
229 78.29%, SMG: 63.44%).



230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236

**Fig 6. Motion class predictions over time.** The temporal progression of motion class predictions is shown for all EMG time windows (A) and SMG image frames (B). Vertical lines represent metronome cues prompting a transition between phases. Each rest and motion end-state phase was followed by a one-second transition period during which the subject transitioned to the next phase. Rest predictions are indicated in grey, target motion predictions are indicated in blue, and predictions of any of the other 10 motions are indicated in orange.


237



238  
239  
240  
241  
242

**Fig 7. Overall confusion matrices.** Prediction accuracies are shown for EMG (A) and SMG (B). The integer values in each cell represent the total number of EMG time windows or SMG image frames that were classified.


It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).



243  
 244 **Fig 8. Confusion matrices for the motion end-state phases.** Prediction accuracies are shown  
 245 for EMG (A) and SMG (B). The integer values in each cell represent the total number of EMG  
 246 time windows or SMG image frames that were classified.  
 247


248 During transitions from *rest* to a motion end-state (Fig 9), classification accuracy was  
 249 higher for SMG if *rest* predictions were considered correct (EMG: 69.49%, SMG: 99.74%) or  
 250 incorrect (EMG: 27.50%, SMG: 85.05%). Classification accuracy was also higher for SMG

251 during transitions from a motion end-state to *rest* (Fig 10). This was true regardless of whether  
 252 *rest* predictions were considered correct (EMG: 80.46%, SMG: 99.87%) or incorrect (EMG:  
 253 66.19%, SMG: 80.16%). A summary of the classification accuracies for all phases is provided in  
 254 Table 2.



255 **Fig 9. Confusion matrices for the transitions from rest to motion.** Prediction accuracies are  
 256 shown for EMG (A) and SMG (B). The integer values in each cell represent the total number of  
 257 EMG time windows or SMG image frames that were classified.  
 258

259



260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

**Fig 10. Confusion matrices for the transitions from motion to rest.** Prediction accuracies are shown for EMG (A) and SMG (B). The integer values in each cell represent the total number of EMG time windows or SMG image frames that were classified.

268 **Table 2. Classification accuracies when partially completed grasps were included in**  
269 **training.**

Data acquisition phase	EMG	SMG
<i>Rest</i>	78.29%	63.44%
<b>Motion end-state</b>	77.53%	97.34%
<i>Rest predictions during transitions considered correct</i>		
<b>Transition from rest to motion end-state</b>	69.49%	99.74%
<b>Transition from motion end-state to rest</b>	80.46%	99.87%
<b>All phases</b>	76.44%	87.26%
<i>Rest predictions during transitions considered incorrect</i>		
<b>Transition from rest to motion end-state</b>	27.50%	85.05%
<b>Transition from motion end-state to rest</b>	66.19%	80.16%
<b>All phases</b>	62.38%	79.63%

270

## 271 Discussion

272 This work provides the first documentation of successful motion classification in an  
273 individual with transhumeral limb loss using SMG. Notably, the subject was able to accomplish  
274 both individual finger movements and complex grasps. Recognizing finger motions with EMG is  
275 challenging since the muscles responsible for finger movement are largely contained within the  
276 intermediate and deep compartments of the forearm, meaning that the electrical activity is  
277 attenuated by the overlying tissue [20]. SMG appears to be more well-suited for classifying  
278 individual digit motion given its ability to detect deformation in both superficial and deep  
279 muscles [27,35,36]. Nonetheless, classifying individual finger motion could be problematic in  
280 individuals with transhumeral limb loss given the complete absence of forearm musculature.

281 Our subject's ability to successfully classify both individual finger movements and  
282 complex grasps using SMG may be a consequence of procedures used during his amputation  
283 surgery. The surgeons removed necrotic tissue and deinnervated some muscles in the residual  
284 limb. We hypothesize that these muscles may have spontaneously reinnervated during recovery,  
285 although this hypothesis could not be directly tested and only indirect inference is possible. The  
286 surgery was not performed with the expectation that reinnervation would occur. Therefore, if our

287 hypothesis is true, this case could be evidence of spontaneously-occurring muscle reinnervation  
288 [37]. As a planned surgical procedure, targeted muscle reinnervation has shown great promise  
289 for restoring wrist, hand, and finger control to patients with proximal limb loss (e.g., [13]).  
290 During surgery, severed nerves that previously controlled arm and hand function are transferred  
291 to muscles in the residual limb that no longer serve a biomechanical purpose. Thus, an attempt to  
292 move the missing arm or hand will result in contraction of the reinnervated muscles. The  
293 individual can then generate a wider variety of distinct muscle contractions than if the muscles  
294 had not been transferred. Since our subject shows similar diversity in his residual limb  
295 movement when performing the 11 gestures used in this study, we hypothesize that spontaneous  
296 reinnervation may have occurred.

297 If spontaneous reinnervation was indeed responsible for our subject's robust  
298 classification performance, it is possible that other individuals who have undergone more  
299 traditional transhumeral amputations would be unable to achieve similar levels of success. A  
300 larger group of individuals with transhumeral limb loss must be studied to determine whether  
301 SMG can be a viable control strategy for this population. It would also be interesting to consider  
302 the use of SMG as an alternative to EMG pattern recognition in those who have formally  
303 undergone targeted muscle reinnervation.

304 A secondary aim of this work was to directly compare motion classification using EMG  
305 and SMG in order to understand the relative merits of each modality. In general, the motion  
306 classification accuracy was higher for SMG than EMG. This was true regardless of whether  
307 partially completed grasps were excluded or included during training. There were only two  
308 exceptions. First, the classification accuracy was higher for EMG during transitions from a  
309 motion end-state to *rest* if *rest* predictions were assumed to be incorrect and training was

310 performed without partially completed grasps. Second, the classification accuracy was higher for  
311 EMG during *rest* if training was performed with partially completed grasps.

312         Within each modality, the effect of including partially completed grasps was inconsistent  
313 between phases. During motion end-state phases, classification accuracy was similar within each  
314 modality whether or not partially completed grasps were included during training. However,  
315 including partially completed grasps during training reduced classification accuracy for *rest*  
316 phases, especially for SMG. Classification accuracies during transitions were similar within each  
317 modality regardless of whether partially completed grasps were included during training, but  
318 only if *rest* was considered a correct prediction. If *rest* was considered incorrect, including  
319 partially completed grasps increased classification accuracy within each modality.

320         Taken together, these findings indicate that including partially completed grasps during  
321 training does not necessarily improve classification accuracy and also comes at the expense of  
322 deterioration in *rest* prediction accuracy. This reduction in accuracy might occur because low-  
323 level muscle activity can be classified as movement if partially completed grasps are included in  
324 training. If only *rest* and motion end-states were included in training, then low-level muscle  
325 activity would more likely be classified as *rest* until it became pronounced enough to resemble a  
326 motion end-state. This issue could be exacerbated by the high spatial specificity of SMG, which  
327 enables the detection of minute muscular deformations. Additionally, muscular *rest* states are not  
328 constant since the muscles retain some residual deformation even after a contraction is  
329 completed. However, inclusion of partial grasps during training did not reduce prediction  
330 accuracy during transitions.

331         Although the reduction in *rest* prediction accuracy may appear undesirable, we do not  
332 believe it will be overly problematic. We intend to use SMG to implement proportional

333 positional control strategies [32], in which the finger positions on a prosthetic hand are mapped  
334 proportionally to the amount of muscle deformation in a user's residual limb. In this paradigm,  
335 misclassifying some *rest* states as motion may be tolerable since each motion prediction would  
336 be accompanied by a predicted motion completion level. Thus, misclassification of *rest* as a  
337 partially completed motion could be considered a more reasonable trade-off than misclassifying  
338 *rest* as a fully completed motion, which would occur if proportional control is not enabled.  
339 However, if this trade-off proves to be intolerable from a user's perspective, other approaches  
340 may be considered to improve the stability of the *rest* predictions while retaining the benefits of  
341 SMG-based control (namely, robust classification of motion end-states and the ability to enable  
342 proportional positional control). One possibility could be the implementation of a hybrid control  
343 system in which EMG signals serve as the input for a binary classifier to predict *rest* or motion.  
344 Once a deviation from *rest* is detected, then SMG could be used for classifying the intended  
345 grasp and completion level.

346         One limitation that should be acknowledged about this study is that only a single  
347 participant was involved, so the findings should not be generalized without additional study in a  
348 larger population of individuals with transhumeral limb loss. Additionally, the modality used for  
349 prompting the subject's transitions between motion and *rest* states was inconsistent (i.e., auditory  
350 cues for SMG, visual cues for EMG). The visual cues were used as a matter of convenience, as  
351 the subject collected the EMG data from himself. Reaction times for auditory cues are typically  
352 shorter than those for visual cues [38,39], with a commonly-reported difference of approximately  
353 40 ms [40]. We do not believe a difference of this magnitude would have any bearing on the  
354 results. Furthermore, both the EMG and SMG data were collected under ideal settings with no  
355 external sources of noise that would likely arise during real-world prosthesis use (e.g., changes in

356 skin impedance from perspiration, shifts in the relative positions of the residual limb and sensors  
357 due to arm movement or socket loading). These problems are known to occur with our subject's  
358 clinically prescribed EMG prosthesis, so he typically has only six motion classes enabled.  
359 Predicting 11 motion classes would be extremely difficult for him under normal circumstances.  
360 Although we are currently undertaking work to formally assess the use of SMG to control  
361 prostheses in real-world settings, we anticipate that similar issues may arise that would reduce  
362 the number of achievable motion classes. Additionally, it should be reiterated that the SMG data  
363 were obtained using a clinical ultrasound system with an array transducer. In the future, we plan  
364 to use single-element transducers with low-power electronics that could be integrated into a  
365 standalone prosthesis socket. Although our prior work suggests that classification accuracy is not  
366 reduced with a sparse sensing strategy [41], this has not yet been confirmed in individuals with  
367 limb loss. Finally, the sampling rate for EMG was considerably higher than for SMG, so more  
368 frames of EMG data were available to train the classifier. However, the use of a smaller training  
369 data set for SMG did not appear to have a detrimental effect, as the classification accuracy was  
370 higher for SMG than EMG in most circumstances.

371

## 372 **Conclusion**

373 This exploratory study demonstrated that prediction of 11 hand and finger motions was  
374 possible for an individual with transhumeral limb loss using SMG. Despite the individual's lack  
375 of a forearm, he was able to generate distinctive muscle activation patterns in his upper arm that  
376 could be successfully detected and classified using both SMG and EMG. The classification  
377 accuracy was typically higher for SMG than EMG, regardless of the method used to train the

378 classifier. These findings suggest that SMG may eventually be a viable prosthesis control  
379 strategy, even for individuals with transhumeral limb loss.

380

## 381 **Acknowledgements**

382 The authors would like to thank Dr. Jaimie Shores for sharing his expertise regarding  
383 amputation procedures and targeted muscle reinnervation.

384

## 385 **References**

- 386 1. Biddiss EA, Chau TT. Upper limb prosthesis use and abandonment: a survey of the last 25  
387 years. *Prosthet Orthot Int*. 2007;31(3):236–57.
- 388 2. Biddiss E, Chau T. Upper-limb prosthetics: critical factors in device abandonment. *Am J*  
389 *Phys Med Rehabil*. 2007;86(12):977–87.
- 390 3. Smail LC, Neal C, Wilkins C, Packham TL. Comfort and function remain key factors in  
391 upper limb prosthetic abandonment: findings of a scoping review. *Disabil Rehabil Assist*  
392 *Technol*. 2020 Mar 19;1–10.
- 393 4. Vu PP, Chestek CA, Nason SR, Kung TA, Kemp SWP, Cederna PS. The future of upper  
394 extremity rehabilitation robotics: research and practice. *Muscle Nerve*. 2020 Jun  
395 1;61(6):708–18.
- 396 5. Clancy E, Morin EL, Merletti R. Sampling, noise-reduction and amplitude estimation issues  
397 in surface electromyography. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol*. 2002;12(1):1.
- 398 6. Graimann B, Dietl H. Introduction to upper limb prosthetics. In: Farina D, Jensen W, Akay  
399 M, editors. *Introduction to Neural Engineering for Motor Rehabilitation*. Hoboken, NJ:  
400 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.; 2013. p. 267–90.
- 401 7. Kong YK, Hallbeck MS, Jung MC. Crosstalk effect on surface electromyogram of the  
402 forearm flexors during a static grip task. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol*. 2010;20(6):1223–9.
- 403 8. van Duinen H, Gandevia SC, Taylor JL. Voluntary activation of the different compartments  
404 of the flexor digitorum profundus. *J Neurophysiol*. 2010;104(6):3213–21.
- 405 9. van Duinen H, Yu WS, Gandevia SC. Limited ability to extend the digits of the human  
406 hand independently with extensor digitorum. *J Physiol*. 2009;587(20):4799–810.

- 407 10. McIsaac TL, Fuglevand AJ. Motor-unit synchrony within and across compartments of the  
408 human flexor digitorum superficialis. *J Neurophysiol.* 2007;97(1):550–6.
- 409 11. Hargrove LJ, Scheme EJ, Englehart KB, Hudgins BS. Multiple binary classifications via  
410 linear discriminant analysis for improved controllability of a powered prosthesis. *IEEE*  
411 *Trans Neural Syst Rehabil Eng.* 2010;18(1):49–57.
- 412 12. Kuiken TA, Miller LA, Turner K, Hargrove LJ. A Comparison of Pattern Recognition  
413 Control and Direct Control of a Multiple Degree-of-Freedom Transradial Prosthesis. *IEEE J*  
414 *Transl Eng Health Med.* 2016;4:1–8.
- 415 13. Hargrove LJ, Miller LA, Turner K, Kuiken TA. Myoelectric Pattern Recognition  
416 Outperforms Direct Control for Transhumeral Amputees with Targeted Muscle  
417 Reinnervation: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *Sci Rep.* 2017 Oct 23;7(1):13840.
- 418 14. Resnik L, Huang HH, Winslow A, Crouch DL, Zhang F, Wolk N. Evaluation of EMG  
419 pattern recognition for upper limb prosthesis control: a case study in comparison with direct  
420 myoelectric control. *J NeuroEngineering Rehabil.* 2018;15(1):23.
- 421 15. Resnik LJ, Acluche F, Borgia M, Cancio J, Latlief G, Phillips S, et al. EMG pattern  
422 recognition compared to foot control of the DEKA Arm. *PLOS One.*  
423 2018;13(10):e0204854.
- 424 16. Resnik L, Acluche F, Borgia M, Latlief G, Phillips S. EMG Pattern Recognition Control of  
425 the DEKA Arm: Impact on User Ratings of Satisfaction and Usability. *IEEE J Transl Eng*  
426 *Health Med.* 2019;7:2100113.
- 427 17. Tenore FV, Ramos A, Fahmy A, Acharya S, Etienne-Cummings R, Thakor NV. Decoding  
428 of individuated finger movements using surface electromyography. *IEEE Trans Biomed*  
429 *Eng.* 2009 May;56(5):1427–34.
- 430 18. Cipriani C, Antfolk C, Controzzi M, Lundborg G, Rosen B, Carrozza MC, et al. Online  
431 myoelectric control of a dexterous hand prosthesis by transradial amputees. *IEEE Trans*  
432 *Neural Syst Rehabil Eng.* 2011;19(3):260–70.
- 433 19. Khushaba RN, Kodagoda S, Takruri M, Dissanayake G. Toward improved control of  
434 prosthetic fingers using surface electromyogram (EMG) signals. *Expert Syst Appl.*  
435 2012;39(12):10731–8.
- 436 20. Al-Timemy AH, Bugmann G, Escudero J, Outram N. Classification of finger movements  
437 for the dexterous hand prosthesis control with surface electromyography. *IEEE J Biomed*  
438 *Health Inform.* 2013;17(3):608–18.
- 439 21. Franzke AW, Kristoffersen MB, Bongers RM, Murgia A, Pobatschnig B, Unglaube F, et al.  
440 Users' and therapists' perceptions of myoelectric multi-function upper limb prostheses with  
441 conventional and pattern recognition control. *PLOS One.* 2019;14(8):e0220899.

- 442 22. Resnik LJ, Acluche F, Klinger SL. User experience of controlling the DEKA Arm with  
443 EMG pattern recognition. *PLOS One*. 2018;13(9):e0203987.
- 444 23. Shi J, Chang Q, Zheng Y-P. Feasibility of controlling prosthetic hand using  
445 sonomyography signal in real time: preliminary study. *J Rehabil Res Dev*. 2010;
- 446 24. Chen X, Zheng Y-P, Guo J-Y, Shi J. Sonomyography (SMG) Control for Powered  
447 Prosthetic Hand: A Study with Normal Subjects. *Ultrasound Med Biol*. 2010;36(7):1076–  
448 88.
- 449 25. Yang X, Chen Z, Hettiarachchi N, Yan J, Liu H. A Wearable Ultrasound System for  
450 Sensing Muscular Morphological Deformations. *IEEE Trans Syst Man Cybern Syst*.  
451 2019;1–10.
- 452 26. Yang X, Yan J, Fang Y, Zhou D, Liu H. Simultaneous prediction of wrist/hand motion via  
453 wearable ultrasound sensing. *IEEE Trans Neural Syst Rehabil Eng*. 2020;
- 454 27. Sikdar S, Rangwala H, Eastlake E, Hunt I, Nelson A, Devanathan J, et al. Novel method for  
455 predicting dexterous individual finger movements by imaging muscle activity using a  
456 wearable ultrasonic system. *IEEE Trans Neural Syst Rehabil Eng*. 2014;22(1):69–76.
- 457 28. Akhlaghi N, Baker CA, Lahlou M, Zafar H, Murthy KG, Rangwala HS, et al. Real-time  
458 Classification of Hand Motions using Ultrasound Imaging of Forearm Muscles. *IEEE Trans*  
459 *Biomed Eng*. 2016;63(8):1687–98.
- 460 29. Zheng YP, Chan MMF, Shi J, Chen X, Huang QH. Sonomyography: Monitoring  
461 morphological changes of forearm muscles in actions with the feasibility for the control of  
462 powered prosthesis. *Med Eng Phys*. 2006;28(5):405–15.
- 463 30. Hettiarachchi N, Ju Z, Liu H. A New Wearable Ultrasound Muscle Activity Sensing  
464 System for Dexterous Prosthetic Control. In: 2015 IEEE International Conference on  
465 Systems, Man, and Cybernetics. 2015. p. 1415–20.
- 466 31. Baker CA, Akhlaghi N, Rangwala H, Kosecka J, Sikdar S. Real-time, ultrasound-based  
467 control of a virtual hand by a trans-radial amputee. In: Conference Proceedings of the IEEE  
468 Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society. 2016. p. 3219–22.
- 469 32. Dhawan AS, Mukherjee B, Patwardhan S, Akhlaghi N, Diao G, Levay G, et al.  
470 Proprioceptive Sonomyographic Control: A novel method for intuitive and proportional  
471 control of multiple degrees-of-freedom for individuals with upper extremity limb loss. *Sci*  
472 *Rep*. 2019;9(1):9499.
- 473 33. Engdahl S, Dhawan A, Bashatah A, Diao G, Mukherjee B, Monroe B, et al. Individuals  
474 With Upper Limb Loss Require Minimal Training to Achieve Robust Motion Classification  
475 Using Sonomyography [Internet]. *Research Square [Preprint]*; 2020 [cited 2020 Nov 9].  
476 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-65415/v1>

- 477 34. Patwardhan S, Dhawan AS, Mukherjee B, Alzamani M, Joiner WM, Sikdar S. Evaluation  
478 of the Role of Proprioception During Proportional Position Control Using Sonomyography:  
479 Applications in Prosthetic Control. In: 2019 IEEE 16th International Conference on  
480 Rehabilitation Robotics (ICORR). 2019. p. 830–6.
- 481 35. Yang X, Sun X, Zhou D, Li Y, Liu H. Towards Wearable A-Mode Ultrasound Sensing for  
482 Real-Time Finger Motion Recognition. *IEEE Trans Neural Syst Rehabil Eng*.  
483 2018;26(6):1199–208.
- 484 36. Huang Y, Yang X, Li Y, Zhou D, He K, Liu H. Ultrasound-Based Sensing Models for  
485 Finger Motion Classification. *IEEE J Biomed Health Inform*. 2018 Sep;22(5):1395–405.
- 486 37. Kuiken TA, Li G, Lock BA, Lipschutz RD, Miller LA, Stubblefield KA, et al. Targeted  
487 muscle reinnervation for real-time myoelectric control of multifunction artificial arms. *J*  
488 *Am Med Assoc*. 2009;301(6):619–28.
- 489 38. Jose S, Gideon Praveen K. Comparison between auditory and visual simple reaction times.  
490 *Neurosci Med*. 2010;2010.
- 491 39. Jain A, Bansal R, Kumar A, Singh KD. A comparative study of visual and auditory reaction  
492 times on the basis of gender and physical activity levels of medical first year students. *Int J*  
493 *Appl Basic Med Res*. 2015;5(2):124–7.
- 494 40. Elliott R. Simple visual and simple auditory reaction time: A comparison. *Psychon Sci*.  
495 1968;10(10):335–6.
- 496 41. Akhlaghi N, Dhawan A, Khan A, Mukherjee B, Diao G, Truong C, et al. Sparsity Analysis  
497 of a Sonomyographic Muscle-Computer Interface. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng*.  
498 2019;67(3):688–96.

499

## 500 **Supporting Information**

501 **S1 Dataset. Full datasets collected using SMG and EMG.**