

1 **Targeted transcutaneous cervical spinal cord stimulation promotes**  
2 **upper limb recovery in spinal cord and peripheral nerve injury**

3 Santosh Chandrasekaran<sup>1</sup>, Nikunj A Bhagat<sup>1</sup>, Richard Ramdeo<sup>1</sup>, Pawan D Sharma<sup>2</sup>, Adam Stein<sup>6</sup>, Susan J  
4 Harkema<sup>2,3,4,5</sup> and Chad E Bouton<sup>1,7</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup>Neural Bypass and Brain Computer Interface Laboratory, Institute of Bioelectronic Medicine, Feinstein Institutes  
6 for Medical Research, Northwell Health, Manhasset, NY

7 <sup>2</sup>Kentucky Spinal Cord Injury Research Center, University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky

8 <sup>3</sup>Department of Bioengineering, University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky

9 <sup>4</sup>Frazier Rehabilitation Institute, University of Louisville Health, Louisville, Kentucky

10 <sup>5</sup>Department of Neurological Surgery, University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky

11 <sup>6</sup>Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Donald and Barbara Zucker School of Medicine at Hofstra  
12 Northwell, Manhasset, New York

13 <sup>7</sup>Department of Molecular Medicine, Donald and Barbara Zucker School of Medicine at Hofstra/Northwell,  
14 Manhasset, NY

15 **Corresponding authors:** Santosh Chandrasekaran, [schandraseka@northwell.edu](mailto:schandraseka@northwell.edu) and Chad E Bouton,  
16 [cbouton@northwell.edu](mailto:cbouton@northwell.edu)

## 17 **Abstract**

18 Long-term recovery of volitional control of the upper limb is a major unmet need in people with  
19 paralysis. Recently, it has been demonstrated that spinal cord stimulation, when paired with  
20 intense physical therapy, can restore volitional control of upper limb in spinal cord injury (SCI).  
21 Epidural stimulation of the spinal cord has traditionally been demonstrated to be highly  
22 effective in restoring movement, potentially due to the ability of targeted activation of specific  
23 motoneuron pools. However, transcutaneous spinal cord stimulation (tSCS) has recently shown  
24 equally promising results. In this study, we use a custom designed electrode patch and  
25 stimulator to enable targeted stimulation of specific spinal segments. We show that targeted  
26 transcutaneous stimulation of the cervical spinal cord can substantially and rapidly improve  
27 volitionally evoked muscle activity and force, even with minimal physical therapy, in two  
28 individuals with SCI. We also show, for the first time, the effectiveness of tSCS in restoring  
29 strength and dexterity in an individual with paralysis of the hand due to a peripheral injury.

## 30 **Introduction**

31 Spinal cord and peripheral injury can result in paralysis due to the disruption in the  
32 transmission of neural signals. More than half of spinal cord injuries (SCIs) occur at the cervical  
33 level (NSCISC and University of Alabama at Birmingham, 2021), and regaining voluntary control  
34 of the hand and arm is the highest priority in such cases (Anderson, 2004). However, the  
35 chances of regaining hand and arm function are exceedingly low beyond 12-18 months post  
36 injury (Fawcett et al., 2006).

37 Electrical stimulation of the lumbar spinal cord using epidurally placed electrodes has  
38 recently shown great promise in being able to evoke voluntary movements of the lower limb  
39 during stimulation after SCI, in rats (van den Brand et al., 2012), non-human primates  
40 (Capogrosso et al., 2016) and humans (Harkema et al., 2011; Angeli et al., 2014, 2018; Gill et al.,  
41 2018; Wagner et al., 2018). Additionally, when paired with intense motor training, lumbar  
42 epidural stimulation has also demonstrated persistent increase in voluntary control of the  
43 lower limbs even in the absence of stimulation (Rejc et al., 2017; Angeli et al., 2018; Wagner et  
44 al., 2018). Epidural stimulation has been shown to primarily engage the large-to-medium size  
45 sensory afferent fibers present in the dorsal column and roots of the spinal cord (Rattay et al.,  
46 2000). Local spinal circuits constitute of these afferent fibers forming synaptic connections with  
47 spinal interneurons and motoneurons. Pharmacological and computational experiments  
48 (Capogrosso et al., 2013) suggest that activation of the dorsal fibers increases the excitability of  
49 the local spinal circuitry including the efferent fibers. Expanding this idea further, recent studies  
50 have demonstrated that epidural stimulation targeted at the cervical spinal cord could activate  
51 (Greiner et al., 2020) and restore upper limb movement (Lu et al., 2016). Though extremely  
52 promising, the invasive nature of epidural stimulation is a major hurdle for clinical translation  
53 and long-term rehabilitation (James et al., 2018; Taccola et al., 2020).

54           Meanwhile, non-invasive, persistent stimulation of the spinal cord using transcutaneous  
55 electrodes has been demonstrated to evoke voluntary movements in both upper (Freyvert et  
56 al., 2018; Gad et al., 2018; Inanici et al., 2021) and lower limbs (Sayenko et al., 2015, 2019).  
57 Moreover, recent evidence suggests that transcutaneous spinal cord stimulation (tSCS), like  
58 epidural stimulation, exerts its neuromodulatory effect on motoneurons trans-synaptically via  
59 activation of large-to-medium size sensory afferent fibers (Ladenbauer et al., 2010; Hofstoetter  
60 et al., 2018) and can also enhance supraspinal inputs (Guiho et al., 2021). Only recently, has it  
61 been shown that pairing tSCS at the cervical levels with intense motor training can result in  
62 sustained improvements in hand and arm function (Benavides et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020;  
63 Inanici et al., 2021). Taken together, tSCS can be a promising rehabilitative tool for people with  
64 SCI.

65           A few technical limitations limit the effectiveness of tSCS. The commercially available  
66 electrodes used for tSCS are relatively large, thereby limiting the precision in which stimulation  
67 can be delivered to cervical targets for evoking upper-limb activity. By virtue of being placed  
68 over the skin, the electrodes are also relatively far from the dorsal fibers of the spinal cord with  
69 layers of intervening connective and bony tissue including the dorsal aspects of the cervical  
70 vertebrae. This limits the effectiveness and specificity in the recruitment of the different  
71 motoneuron pools which could be a major drawback for tSCS, as epidural stimulation studies  
72 shown the importance of targeted stimulation (Wagner et al., 2018) in restoring voluntary  
73 muscle control.

74           We performed targeted transcutaneous stimulation of the cervical spinal cord paired  
75 with minimal physical therapy in two individuals classified as having a motor complete SCI and  
76 one individual with a peripheral nerve injury. Stimulation was targeted to specific cervical levels  
77 using a custom electronically configurable electrode array, with each electrode having a small  
78 form factor (10 mm x 10 mm). Modulating the spatial configuration of the stimulation  
79 electronically allowed us to extensively map the recruitment profile of the upper-limb muscles  
80 based on the location of stimulation. This enabled us to choose the precise location of  
81 stimulation to achieve maximal recruitment of the muscle group of interest. Even though  
82 participants received stimulation only once per week, we observed a rapid increase in both  
83 volitionally controlled muscle activity and effective force within a period of 5-6 weeks.  
84 However, the observed gains were restricted to muscles that generated at least a measurable  
85 amount of force at the beginning of therapy. In the subject with peripheral nerve injury leading  
86 to paralysis of the hand, we observed rapid increase in functionality of the affected digits.

87           Taken together, this study describes the advantages of using a highly configurable  
88 electrode array and even minimal physical therapy in restoring volitional control of upper-limb

89 movement using tSCS. Moreover, this is the first study to describe the benefits of tSCS in  
90 improving hand function in case of peripheral injury.

## 91 **Methods**

### 92 **Participants**

93 We performed transcutaneous stimulation of the cervical spinal cord in two individuals with  
94 tetraplegia resulting from C5 level motor complete spinal cord injuries and one individual with  
95 paralysis of the left hand due to peripheral nerve injury (median nerve at the wrist and  
96 suspected brachial plexus injury), but with an otherwise intact spinal cord. The details of the  
97 participants are summarized in Table 1. All procedures were approved by the Northwell Health  
98 Institutional Review Board. The study has been registered with ClinicalTrials.gov  
99 (NCT04755699).

Participant	Age Range	Gender	Injury type	Time since injury (yrs.)
CTS01	late 40s	F	Median nerve, Brachial plexus	4
CTS02	early 20s	M	SCI: C5 motor complete, ASIA A	2
CTS03	mid 30s	M	SCI: C5 motor complete, ASIA B	7

**Table 1 Study participants information.** Demographic and injury-related information for each participant.


### 100 **Experimental sessions**

101 Participants visited the lab for their sessions once per week. Their heart rate and blood  
102 pressure was measured at the beginning and end of each session. Electrodes were placed for  
103 recording bipolar EMG from the following muscles of the left arm and hand: biceps brachii  
104 (BIC), triceps brachii (TRI), flexor digitorum profundus (FDP), extensor digitorum communis  
105 (EDC) and abductor policis brevis (ABP). Force generated by the isometric flexion of the muscles  
106 of interest and EMG activity was simultaneously recorded at the start of the session. Since both  
107 the participants had no movement in their fingers, we focused on the volitional control of the  
108 tricep muscle for the participants with SCI. Meanwhile, as the participant with the brachial  
109 plexus injury (CTS01) had residual movement in the fingers of the left hand, we focused on the  
110 volitional control of the D1 interphalangeal (D1 IP) joint and lateral pinch. For evaluating the  
111 forces generated by the tricep muscle, the participants' arms were extended out in front of  
112 them, with the hand in a neutral position and a load cell placed under the ulnar head  
113 prominence at the wrist. The elbow was resting on the table and prevented from lifting up  
114 during the task. For measuring the D1 IP and lateral pinch forces, a custom rig was used as  
115 shown in Figure 1. The experimenter cued the participants to push against the force sensor for  
116 3-5 secs and then asked to relax for 3-5 secs. The task was performed in 2 sets of 5 trials each  
117 with a 60-90 secs of rest period between the sets. Verbal encouragement was provided to  
118 encourage the participants to generate maximal maintainable force.

119 **Transcutaneous spinal cord stimulation**

120 Stimulation was provided using a custom-built stimulator and electrode array. The electrode  
121 array consisted of gold or silver-plated square contacts (10 mm x 10 mm) arranged in an 8 x 5  
122 pattern with a 1 mm inter-electrode separation. To target specific cervical segments, an  
123 electrode configuration of 1 x 3 was used wherein 3 adjacent contacts within a single row,  
124 spanning the midline, were used. The electrode array was affixed to the back of the neck using  
125 a rectangular piece of proprietary hydrogel. To ensure consistency in placement of the array  
126 between sessions, we used the inion of the external occipital protuberance as a landmark.  
127 Distances measured from the inion were used to place the electrode array and identify the  
128 location of stimulation. Two 5 x 10 cm rectangular self-adhesive hydrogel electrodes (Axelgaard  
129 Manufacturing Co., Ltd., USA) placed along the midline over the lumbar spinal cord served as  
130 return electrodes.

131 Stimulation consisted of a 10 kHz multiphasic sinusoidal waveform that was 1 ms long for  
132 generating recruitment profiles. The waveform length was reduced to 0.5 ms during therapy to  
133 reduce neck muscle activation and increase participant comfort. The stimulation frequency was



**Figure 1. Experiment setup.** A) Schematic showing the location of a 1 x 3 activated electrode configuration superimposed over the human spinal cord showing the dorsal column and roots. B) The custom electronically configurable electrode array placed over the cervical spinal cord of a study participant with a 1 x 3 configuration of activated electrodes (green LEDs). C) Setup for measuring tricep force. The ulnar protrusion of the wrist is placed over the 25 lb load cell during the task (red dashed square). D-E) Using the custom-built rig with a 10 lb load cell (gray puck) for measuring the force using D1 interphalangeal joint and lateral pinch, respectively in case of participant CTS01.

134 chosen to be 3 Hz for characterizing recruitment curves and 30 Hz during therapy.

### 135 **EMG signal processing**

136 We simultaneously recorded bipolar EMG from the following muscles of the left arm and hand:  
137 biceps brachii (BIC), triceps brachii (TRI), flexor digitorum profundus (FDP), extensor digitorum  
138 communis (EDC) and abductor policis brevis (ABP). We used pre-gelled Ag/AgCl electrodes, a  
139 differential amplifier (AD6221), and a signal digitizer (PicoScope® Model 4824A). The sampling  
140 rate used was 10 MHz while characterizing the recruitment profile of the upper limb muscles  
141 and 10-20 kHz during task performance. For characterizing the area-under-the curve (AUC), the



142 EMG signal was filtered using a 60Hz IIR comb filter and Butterworth bandpass filter between  
143 10-1000 Hz using a digital filter in MATLAB.

#### 144 **Recruitment profile**

145 Stimulation consisted of a 1ms-long multiphasic pulse of the 10 kHz sinusoidal waveform at a  
146 stimulation frequency of 3 Hz delivered using an electronically-selected configuration of three  
147 contacts within a single row spanning the midline. Stimulation amplitudes tested ranged from  
148 100 mA to up to 225 mA in intervals of approximately 25 mA. This was repeated for each of the  
149 eight rows of electrodes on the array. EMG was sampled at 10 MHz. The Picoscope 6 acquisition  
150 software was used to trigger acquisition of a 100 ms-long EMG signal following each stimulation  
151 pulse. For each stimulation amplitude and at each electrode row, we recorded such an EMG  
152 signal from 20-30 repetitions of the stimulation pulse. All the data was imported into MATLAB  
153 for further analysis. From each of the EMG signals recorded, we isolated a snippet starting from  
154 5 ms and ending at 55ms after the stimulation artifact. We measured the peak-to-peak  
155 amplitude (P2P) for this snippet if the maximum amplitude of the snippet was greater than 5  
156 times the standard deviation of baseline signal of that recording channel. For each muscle, the  
157 P2P amplitudes were normalized to the maximal P2P amplitude recorded across all amplitudes  
158 and electrode rows.

#### 159 **Results**

160 Our results demonstrate that targeted transcutaneous spinal cord stimulation paired with  
161 minimal exercise training resulted in a substantial and sustained increase in muscle activity and  
162 strength in specific upper-limb muscles in two patients with motor complete cervical SCI and  
163 one participant with a peripheral injury. All three participants received stimulation for up to 1hr  
164 once per week. Blood pressure and heart rate monitoring at the start and end of each session  
165 showed no adverse effects of the stimulation.


#### 166 **Recruitment of upper limb muscles through targeted tSCS**

167 We characterized the recruitment profile of the different motor pools innervating the  
168 upper limb muscles. To determine the effect of the location of stimulation along the rostro-  
169 caudal axis on the recruitment of the upper limb muscles, we sequentially delivered stimulation  
170 through the different rows of electrodes of the array (Figure 2A-C). Simultaneously, we  
171 recorded EMG activity from 5 muscles of the left arm and hand. Stimulation amplitude was  
172 increased and the corresponding increase in EMG amplitude was used as a measure of  
173 recruitment. We hypothesized that the recruitment pattern through transcutaneous  
174 stimulation would reflect the rostrocaudal segment-wise distribution of the upper limb motor  
175 nuclei in the cervical spinal cord. The recruitment profiles showed a distinct and consistent  
176 shape in all participants. Almost all the muscles exhibited the best recruitment when  
177 stimulation was delivered around the C5-C6 level. Stimulating using rostral electrodes primarily

178 activated the biceps (Figure 2D, G and E, H), except in CTS03. Activation of the triceps invariably  
179 was strongest when stimulation was localized around the C5-C6 level. Stimulation using  
180 electrodes positioned more caudally resulted in decreased recruitment across all muscles. C8-  
181 T1 level stimulation showed recruitment of FDP and APB in participant CTS03 (Figure 2C, F and  
182 I). In participant CTS01, APB showed only weak recruitment irrespective of the location of  
183 stimulation, possibly due to the suspected brachial plexus injury. The fact that two participants  
184 had a spinal cord injury and metallic implants in the cervical vertebrae did not result in an  
185 obvious difference in the recruitment profile of the upper-limb motor pools is noteworthy.  
186 Additionally, we also determined the threshold of activation for each of the upper limb  
187 muscles. The thresholds of activation showed similar results as the recruitment profiles with  
188 biceps and/or triceps muscles having a low threshold of activation during rostral stimulation.




189



**Figure 2. Muscle recruitment profile during cervical tSCS. A-C)** X-ray images in the sagittal plane with radio-opaque markers on the neck (white dots) for the three participants. The topmost marker identifies theinion of the external occipital protuberance. The second and third markers identify points 7 cm and 9.2 cm respectively, from the inion signifying the first and third rows of a putative electrode array whose first row of electrodes was aligned at 7cm from the inion. The last marker identifies the location of the last row of the putative electrode array at 15.7 cm from the inion. The cervical labels mark the exit point of the respective dorsal roots. **D-F)** Mean activation of the 5 muscles across all stimulation amplitudes mediated by tSCS through each of the 8 electrode rows. **G-I)** Stimulation amplitude that resulted in maximal activation of each of the 5 muscles.

### 190 **Increased muscle activity and force generated with tSCS**

191 To study the effect of tSCS on muscle force and activity, we asked the participants to perform  
192 specific activities using custom-made rigs. The rigs were designed to measure the force  
193 generated during the activity. We focused on specific muscles for each of the participants. For  
194 the participant with the brachial plexus injury, we focused on the muscles of the thumb. We  
195 observed a 715% increase in the force generated during the flexion of D1 IP joint (Figure 3A).  
196 This was accompanied by an increase in EMG activity of the left APB muscle (Figure 3B). We did  
197 not observe any major increase in the lateral pinch force during this period. For participants  
198 CTS02 and CTS03, we observed an increase of up to 1295% and 1118%, respectively, in the




**Figure 3. Increase in muscle activity and force after tSCS. A)** The force generated by the left D1 IP joint in case of participant CTS01. **B)** The AUC of the EMG activity recorded from the left APB muscle during the task of mforce generation using the D1 IP joint. **C)** The force generated by the left tricep muscle in case of participant CTS02 (blue) and CTS03 (orange). **D)** The AUC of the EMG activity recorded from the left tricep muscle during the task of force generation using the left tricep muscle.

199 force generated by the left tricep muscle (Figure 3C). We also observed a corresponding  
200 increase in EMG activity for the tricep muscle (Figure 3D).

## 201 GRASSP assessments

202 To evaluate the clinical significance of the progress showed by each participant, we also  
203 performed standard clinical assessments, namely the GRASSP test. GRASSP strength test  
204 showed only minor increases in the movements assessed, especially in the participants with SCI  
205 including the tricep muscle which was specifically targeted in this study (Figure 4A). GRASSP  
206 sensibility test showed decreases in sensation threshold at many locations in the hand in all



**Figure 4. GRASSP assessments. A)** GRASSP strength change from baseline **B)** GRASSP sensibility change from baseline. Circles show 1- to 3-point increase in sensory perception as defined by the GRASSP sensibility scale. **C)** GRASSP prehension change in nut threading task for CTS01.

207 participants (Figure 4B). For the participant with the brachial plexus injury, most of the  
208 improvement was observed in the thumb as well as the ulnar side of the hand. GRASSP strength  
209 showed increases in D1 IP and D5 abduction movements (Figure 4A). GRASSP sensibility  
210 showed up to a 3-point increase in sensation at the pinky tip (Figure 4B).

211 The nut threading task included in the GRASSP prehension tests showed an improvement in  
212 performing the right grasp (Figure 5A) and also a decrease in the time taken to perform the task  
213 (Figure 5B). Participants also shared their anecdotal descriptions of the effect of receiving tSCS.  
214 These mainly described increased control in moving their arms and being able to give “stronger  
215 hugs.”



**Figure 5. GRASSP Prehension Test – Nut threading. A)** Snapshots showing improvement in grasping behavior from before tSCS therapy (first row) and week 42 of therapy (second row). **B)** Scatter plot shows the improvement in the time required to perform the task.

## 216 Discussion

217 In this study, we observed a substantial increase in volitionally generated force and EMG  
218 activity in specific muscles after paralysis from SCS in two individuals and peripheral injury in  
219 another individual (suspected brachial plexus injury). All three participants showed these  
220 changes within a short period of receiving tSCS. Interestingly, the improvements were  
221 restricted to the muscles that showed at least some measurable amount of force at the  
222 beginning of therapy. For instance, neither of the participants with SCI registered any force  
223 during finger flexion. We did not observe any improvement in the forces and EMG activity  
224 generated during finger flexion in either participant with SCI even when the activity was  
225 performed over many weeks while receiving tSCS. This could be due to tSCS not being targeted  
226 to the cervical levels that would have activated flexor motoneuron pools.

227 Our results are comparable to those demonstrated by other studies involving cervical tSCS in  
228 people with SCI (Inanici et al., 2021). However, our design involved minimal physical therapy  
229 and consisted of only one, 1-2 h long session per week. Importantly, our stimulation was  
230 targeted to achieve maximal recruitment of the muscle group of interest. This suggests that  
231 targeted tSCS could improve the efficacy of spinal cord activation and achieve restoration of  
232 volitional control even with minimal physical therapy.

233 The electrode configuration we used in this study was a 1 x 3 configuration spanning the spinal  
234 cord midline. The effectiveness of such an electrode configuration in recruitment of specific  
235 motorneuron pools has been demonstrated in able-bodied individuals (Gerasimenko et al.,  
236 2015; Krenn et al., 2015). It is highly likely that this configuration resulted in the stimulation of  
237 the dorsal column fibers thereby activating motor nuclei in off-target cervical levels and thus,  
238 reducing specificity. Activation of the dorsal roots via lateralized stimulation could result in  
239 greater selectivity in the motoneuron pools being activated. However, an earlier study with  
240 lateralized stimulation showed an increase in side-specific activation and not across spinal  
241 levels (Calvert et al., 2019). Previous studies have explored the idea of targeting stimulation  
242 above and below the injury level with the aim of enhancing the activity of the descending

243 inputs as well as local circuitry below the site of injury. With a high cervical location of SCI (C5)  
244 for the participants in this study, most of the stimulation was restricted to being targeted at or  
245 below the injury level. In fact, stimulation targeted at higher cervical levels was perceived as  
246 uncomfortable by the participants. This demonstrates that tSCS can be tailored to suit patient  
247 comfort, target only those cervical levels innervating the muscle of interest, and still result in  
248 significant motor improvements.

249 Furthermore, we used a custom electrode array that could be electronically configured. This  
250 allowed efficient mapping and can support dynamic spatial pattern switching. In future studies,  
251 this feature can be combined with brain-computer interfaces (BCIs) to switch spatial patterns  
252 based on information decoded from intracortical activity (Bouton et al., 2016). Such automated  
253 configuration of targeted tSCS based on user movement intentions could improve the usability  
254 of this technology by people with SCI while performing activities of daily living.

255 It was interesting to observe improvement in somatosensory perception in regions innervated  
256 by spinal roots from below the injury level in both participants with SCI. To our knowledge, this  
257 is the first study to document improvements in sensation in people with SCI or peripheral injury  
258 after receiving tSCS. Stimulating dorsal roots of the spinal cord has been demonstrated to relay  
259 somatotopically relevant sensory information (Chandrasekaran et al., 2020). Meanwhile,  
260 restoring somatosensation through intracortical stimulation has been repeatedly demonstrated  
261 in humans as well (Flesher et al., 2016; Chandrasekaran et al., 2021; Fifer et al., 2021). It would  
262 be interesting to explore the benefits on pairing intracortical stimulation and tSCS for the long-  
263 term rehabilitation of somatosensation in SCI.

264 We believe this is the first study that performed tSCS in case of a peripheral injury (Lopez and  
265 Sdrulla, 2021) with the aim of restoring volitional control of hand movement. The rapid and  
266 significant improvement observed in the hand function in this case signifies major implications  
267 for a broader range of conditions affecting the central and peripheral nervous systems,  
268 including traumatic injuries and stroke.

269 **Acknowledgements**

270 We would like to thank our participants for their extraordinary commitment to this study, their  
271 patience with the experiments, and the deep insights provided by them, the clinicians and  
272 researchers at Feinstein Institutes for Medical Research. We would like to extend our deepest  
273 gratitude to Dan Scjubba, MD, David Bonda, MD and Karen Black, MD at Northwell Health for  
274 helping arrange the imaging sessions.

275 **Funding**

276 This study was funded through support provided by Feinstein Institutes for Medical Research at  
277 Northwell Health.

278 **Author Contributions**

279 SC, NAB and CEB designed the study. SC, NAB, RR and CEB performed the experiments and SC  
280 analyzed the data. PDS and SJH provided critical feedback and input. All authors contributed  
281 towards interpreting the results of the experiments. SC and CEB finished the initial draft of the  
282 manuscript and all authors provided critical review, edits and approval of the final manuscript.

283 **Competing Interest Statement**

284 CEB has financial interests in Sanguistat, LLC and Neuvotion, Inc. and multiple patents in the  
285 neurostimulation field. The remaining authors have no conflicting financial interests.



## 286 References

- 287 Anderson KD (2004) Targeting Recovery: Priorities of the Spinal Cord-Injured Population. *Journal*  
288 *of Neurotrauma* 21:1371–1383.
- 289 Angeli CA, Boakye M, Morton RA, Vogt J, Benton K, Chen Y, Ferreira CK, Harkema SJ (2018)  
290 Recovery of Over-Ground Walking after Chronic Motor Complete Spinal Cord Injury. *New*  
291 *England Journal of Medicine* 379:1244–1250.
- 292 Angeli CA, Edgerton VR, Gerasimenko YP, Harkema SJ (2014) Altering spinal cord excitability  
293 enables voluntary movements after chronic complete paralysis in humans. *Brain* 137:1394–  
294 1409 Available at: [https://academic.oup.com/brain/article-](https://academic.oup.com/brain/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/brain/awu038)  
295 [lookup/doi/10.1093/brain/awu038](https://academic.oup.com/brain/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/brain/awu038) [Accessed June 25, 2019].
- 296 Benavides FD, Jo HJ, Lundell H, Reggie V, Perez MA (2020) Cortical and Subcortical Effects of  
297 Transcutaneous Spinal Cord Stimulation in Humans with Tetraplegia.
- 298 Bouton CE, Shaikhouni A, Annetta N v., Bockbrader MA, FriedenberG DA, Nielson DM, Sharma G,  
299 Sederberg PB, Glenn BC, Mysiw WJ, Morgan AG, Deogaonkar M, Rezai AR (2016) Restoring  
300 cortical control of functional movement in a human with quadriplegia. *Nature* 533:247–250.
- 301 Calvert JS, Manson GA, Grahn PJ, Sayenko DG (2019) Preferential activation of spinal  
302 sensorimotor networks via lateralized transcutaneous spinal stimulation in neurologically  
303 intact humans. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 122:2111–2118 Available at: [www.jn.org](http://www.jn.org)  
304 [Accessed February 14, 2022].
- 305 Capogrosso M et al. (2016) A brain–spine interface alleviating gait deficits after spinal cord injury  
306 in primates. *Nature* 539:284–288 Available at:  
307 <http://www.nature.com/articles/nature20118> [Accessed June 26, 2019].
- 308 Capogrosso M, Wenger N, Raspopovic S, Musienko P, Beauparlant J, Luciani LB, Courtine G,  
309 Micera S (2013) A computational model for epidural electrical stimulation of spinal  
310 sensorimotor circuits. *The Journal of neuroscience : the official journal of the Society for*  
311 *Neuroscience* 33:19326–19340.
- 312 Chandrasekaran S, Bickel S, Herrero JL, Kim J won, Markowitz N, Espinal E, Bhagat NA, Ramdeo R,  
313 Xu J, Glasser MF, Bouton CE, Mehta AD (2021) Evoking highly focal percepts in the fingertips  
314 through targeted stimulation of sulcal regions of the brain for sensory restoration. *Brain*  
315 *Stimulation* 14:1184–1196.
- 316 Chandrasekaran S, Nanivadekar AC, McKernan G, Helm ER, Boninger ML, Collinger JL, Gaunt RA,  
317 Fisher LE (2020) Sensory restoration by epidural stimulation of the lateral spinal cord in  
318 upper-limb amputees. *eLife* 9:1–26.



- 319 Fawcett JW et al. (2006) Guidelines for the conduct of clinical trials for spinal cord injury as  
320 developed by the ICCP panel: spontaneous recovery after spinal cord injury and statistical  
321 power needed for therapeutic clinical trials. *Spinal Cord* 2007 45:3 45:190–205 Available at:  
322 <https://www.nature.com/articles/3102007> [Accessed December 5, 2021].
- 323 Fifer MS, McMullen DP, Osborn LE, Thomas TM, Christie BP, Nickl RW, Candrea DN, Pohlmeier  
324 EA, Thompson MC, Anaya MA, Schellekens W, Ramsey NF, Bensmaia SJ, Anderson WS,  
325 Wester BA, Crone NE, Celnik PA, Cantarero GL, Tenore F v (2021) Intracortical  
326 Somatosensory Stimulation to Elicit Fingertip Sensations in an Individual With Spinal Cord  
327 Injury. *Neurology*:10.1212/WNL.0000000000013173.
- 328 Flesher SN, Collinger JL, Foldes ST, Weiss JM, Downey JE, Tyler-Kabara EC, Bensmaia SJ, Schwartz  
329 AB, Boninger ML, Gaunt RA (2016) Intracortical microstimulation of human somatosensory  
330 cortex. *Science Translational Medicine* 8.
- 331 Freyvert Y, Yong NA, Morikawa E, Zdunowski S, Sarino ME, Gerasimenko Y, Edgerton VR, Lu DC  
332 (2018) Engaging cervical spinal circuitry with non-invasive spinal stimulation and buspirone  
333 to restore hand function in chronic motor complete patients. *Scientific Reports* 8:15546  
334 Available at: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-018-33123-5>.
- 335 Gad P, Lee S, Terrafranca N, Zhong H, Turner A, Gerasimenko Y, Edgerton VR (2018) Non-invasive  
336 activation of cervical spinal networks after severe paralysis. *Journal of Neurotrauma*  
337 35:2145–2158 Available at:  
338 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6119225/pdf/neu.2017.5461.pdf>.
- 339 Gerasimenko Y, Gorodnichev R, Moshonkina T, Sayenko D, Gad P, Reggie Edgerton V (2015)  
340 Transcutaneous electrical spinal-cord stimulation in humans. *Annals of Physical and  
341 Rehabilitation Medicine* 58:225–231.
- 342 Gill ML, Grahn PJ, Calvert JS, Linde MB, Lavrov IA, Strommen JA, Beck LA, Sayenko DG, van  
343 Straaten MG, Drubach DI, Veith DD, Thoreson AR, Lopez C, Gerasimenko YP, Edgerton VR,  
344 Lee KH, Zhao KD (2018) Neuromodulation of lumbosacral spinal networks enables  
345 independent stepping after complete paraplegia. *Nature Medicine* 2018 24:11 24:1677–  
346 1682 Available at: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41591-018-0175-7> [Accessed  
347 February 7, 2022].
- 348 Greiner N, Barra B, Schiavone G, James N, Fallegger F, Borgognon S, Lacour S, Bloch J, Courtine G,  
349 Capogrosso M (2020) Recruitment of Upper-Limb Motoneurons with Epidural Electrical  
350 Stimulation of the Primate Cervical Spinal Cord. *bioRxiv*:2020.02.17.952796 Available at:  
351 <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.02.17.952796v1>.
- 352 Guiho T, Baker SN, Jackson A (2021) Epidural and transcutaneous spinal cord stimulation  
353 facilitates descending inputs to upper-limb motoneurons in monkeys. *Journal of Neural  
354 Engineering* 18:046011.

- 355 Harkema S, Gerasimenko Y, Hodes J, Burdick J, Angeli C, Chen Y, Ferreira C, Willhite A, Rejc E,  
356 Grossman RG, Edgerton VR (2011) Effect of epidural stimulation of the lumbosacral spinal  
357 cord on voluntary movement, standing, and assisted stepping after motor complete  
358 paraplegia: A case study. *The Lancet* 377:1938–1947 Available at:  
359 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(11\)60547-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60547-3) [Accessed June 25, 2019].
- 360 Hofstoetter US, Freundl B, Binder H, Minassian K (2018) Common neural structures activated by  
361 epidural and transcutaneous lumbar spinal cord stimulation: Elicitation of posterior root-  
362 muscle reflexes. *PloS one* 13 Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29381748/>  
363 [Accessed December 21, 2021].
- 364 Inanici F, Brighton LN, Samejima S, Hofstetter CP, Moritz CT (2021) Transcutaneous Spinal Cord  
365 Stimulation Restores Hand and Arm Function after Spinal Cord Injury. *IEEE Transactions on*  
366 *Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering* 29:310–319.
- 367 James ND, McMahon SB, Field-Fote EC, Bradbury EJ (2018) Neuromodulation in the restoration  
368 of function after spinal cord injury. *The Lancet Neurology* 17:905–917.
- 369 Krenn M, Hofstoetter US, Danner SM, Minassian K, Mayr W (2015) Multi-Electrode Array for  
370 Transcutaneous Lumbar Posterior Root Stimulation. *Artificial Organs* 39:834–840 Available  
371 at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/aor.12616> [Accessed February 14,  
372 2022].
- 373 Ladenbauer J, Minassian K, Hofstoetter US, Dimitrijevic MR, Rattay F (2010) Stimulation of the  
374 human lumbar spinal cord with implanted and surface electrodes: A computer simulation  
375 study. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering* 18:637–645.
- 376 Lopez L, Sdrulla AD (2021) Success with dorsal root entry zone lesioning after a failed trial of  
377 spinal cord stimulation in a patient with pain due to brachial plexus avulsion. *PAIN Reports*  
378 6:e973.
- 379 Lu DC, Edgerton VR, Modaber M, Auyong N, Morikawa E, Zdunowski S, Sarino ME, Sarrafzadeh  
380 M, Nuwer MR, Roy RR, Gerasimenko Y (2016) Engaging Cervical Spinal Cord Networks to  
381 Reenable Volitional Control of Hand Function in Tetraplegic Patients. *Neurorehabilitation*  
382 *and Neural Repair* 30:951–962 Available at:  
383 <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1545968316644344> [Accessed December 6,  
384 2021].
- 385 NSCISC, University of Alabama at Birmingham (2021) National Spinal Cord Injury Statistical  
386 Center, Facts and Figures at a Glance. Available at: [www.msctc.org/sci/model-system-](http://www.msctc.org/sci/model-system-centers)  
387 [centers](http://www.msctc.org/sci/model-system-centers). [Accessed December 15, 2021].
- 388 Rattay F, Minassian K, Dimitrijevic MR (2000) Epidural electrical stimulation of posterior  
389 structures of the human lumbosacral cord: 2. quantitative analysis by computer modeling.  
390 *Spinal cord* 38:473–489.

- 391 Rejc E, Angeli CA, Atkinson D, Harkema SJ (2017) Motor recovery after activity-based training  
392 with spinal cord epidural stimulation in a chronic motor complete paraplegic. *Scientific*  
393 *Reports* 7:1–12.
- 394 Sayenko DG, Atkinson DA, Dy CJ, Gurley KM, Smith VL, Angeli C, Harkema SJ, Edgerton VR,  
395 Gerasimenko YP (2015) Spinal segment-specific transcutaneous stimulation differentially  
396 shapes activation pattern among motor pools in humans. *Journal of Applied Physiology*  
397 118:1364–1374.
- 398 Sayenko DG, Rath M, Ferguson AR, Burdick JW, Havton LA, Edgerton VR, Gerasimenko YP (2019)  
399 Self-Assisted Standing Enabled by Non-Invasive Spinal Stimulation after Spinal Cord Injury.  
400 *Journal of Neurotrauma* 36:1435–1450.
- 401 Taccola G, Barber S, Horner PJ, Bazo HAC, Sayenko D (2020) Complications of epidural spinal  
402 stimulation: lessons from the past and alternatives for the future. *Spinal cord* 58:1049–  
403 1059.
- 404 van den Brand R, Heutschi J, Barraud Q, DiGiovanna J, Bartholdi K, Huerlimann M, Friedli L,  
405 Vollenweider I, Moraud EM, Duis S, Dominici N, Micera S, Musienko P, Courtine G (2012)  
406 Restoring voluntary control of locomotion after paralyzing spinal cord injury. *Science*  
407 336:1182–1185 Available at: <https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.1217416>  
408 [Accessed December 6, 2021].
- 409 Wagner FB et al. (2018) Targeted neurotechnology restores walking in humans with spinal cord  
410 injury. *Nature* 2018 563:7729 563:65–71 Available at:  
411 <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-018-0649-2> [Accessed December 5, 2021].
- 412 Zhang F, Momeni K, Ramanujam A, Ravi M, Carnahan J, Kirshblum S, Forrest GF (2020) Cervical  
413 Spinal Cord Transcutaneous Stimulation Improves Upper Extremity and Hand Function in  
414 People with Complete Tetraplegia: A Case Study. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and*  
415 *Rehabilitation Engineering* 28:3167–3174.
- 416