medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.23.24319539; this version posted December 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Targeted Muscle Reinnervation (TMR) or Regenerative Peripheral Nerve Interface (RPNI) for pain prevention in patients with limb amputation: a protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis

Jesús del Moral Preciado MD[1], David Gurpegui Gámiz MD[1,2], Bernardo Hontanilla Calatayud PhD MD[1]

[1] Department of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, Clínica Universidad de Navarra. Pamplona (Spain).

[2] Correspondence author. Email: dgurpegui@unav.es. Direction: Cirugía Plástica, Clínica Universidad de Navarra. Av. de Pío XII, 36, 31008 Pamplona, Navarra

ABSTRACT

Introduction

Regenerative Peripheral Nerve Interface (RPNI) and Targeted Muscle Reinnervation (TMR) are two reinnervation techniques which have shown clear superiority over classical amputation. It is mainly due to a lower incidence of painful neuromas, residual limb pain and phantom limb pain associated with these new procedures.

However, they have never been compared to each other. Neither has their effectiveness been evaluated based on patients demographics, age, sex, comorbidities (diabetes, coronary heart disease, peripheral arterial disease, chronic kidney disease, congestive heart failure), amputations cause, type of amputation, amputation level, previous surgeries and if there was or not previous nerve division into fascicles. Therefore, the objective of this systematic review and meta-analysis is to compile all the evidence to date and provide a comprehensive view of what each technique offers.

Methods and design

The review will be conducted according to this protocol, following the recommendations of the 'Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews'. A comprehensive electronic search will be performed in: Cochrane Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), Web of Science, Scopus, PubMed and MedRixb. This review will include randomized, quasi-randomized, and observational studies written in English and Spanish. We will use Covidence for assessing all titles and abstracts identified during the literature search. Two review authors will independently assess the trial eligibility, risk of bias and extract appropriate data points.

Ethics and dissemination

The proposed systematic review will collect and analyse data from published studies; therefore, it raises no ethical issues. The results of the review will be disseminated by publication in a peer-review journal and submitted for presentations at conferences.

Keywords: Systematic review, Meta-Analysis, Pain management, Neuroma, TMR, RPNI, Amputation.

PROSPERO registration number: CRD42024617299.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.23.24319539; this version posted December 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- This will be the first systematic review to include a comparison between RPNI and TMR.
- Through a comprehensive search and selection of high-quality articles, the best available evidence of RPNI and TMR against classical amputation will be gathered.
- Gray literature and unpublished studies will be sourced from MedRixb aiming to reduce the impact of a possible publication bias.
- Exclusion of non-English/Spanish papers may lead to language bias.

PICO QUESTION

Population

Any adults (aged over 18 years) and gender with a superior or inferior limb amputation.

Intervention

Targeted Muscle Reinnervation (TMR) or Regenerative Peripheral Nerve Interface (RPNI).

Comparators

Classical amputation.

TMR vs RPNI.

Outcomes

1) Incidence of neuroma, 2) Incidence of residual limb pain (RLP), 3) Severity of Pain 4) Incidence of phantom limb pain (PLP), and 5) Surgical complications (dehiscence, infection, haematoma and seroma).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.23.24319539; this version posted December 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

Description of the condition

Limb amputation has an estimated incidence of 185,000 persons each year in the United States (1). Moreover, while the prevalence calculated by The National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) was 1.2 million cases in 1996, in 2005, 1.6 million cases were observed, and it is expected that in 2050 there will be over 3.6 million individuals affected, thus demonstrating a tendency towards increasing prevalence (2). This significant increase is widely accepted to be caused by the ageing of the population and an increasing incidence of diabetes mellitus and vascular disease (2).

Significant morbidity and pain associated with the amputation are still present (3). Other associated complications are depressions as a reaction to the sudden disability (4), surgical site infection, increased risk of thromboembolism in patients subjected to a major amputation (5–8). As well as a significant risk of perioperative morbidity and mortality, generally in patients with vascular disease (9). In fact, the overall 5-year mortality rate in patients with any amputation ranged from 53% to 100% and from 52% to 80% for patients with major amputations, being age, renal disease, proximal amputation, diabetes, and peripheral vascular disease the risk factors. This indicates amputation as a possible prognostic severity marker (10).

Some demographic factors have shown a higher risk of incidence of amputations, Black and Latino patients being up to four (11), and one and a half (12) times respectively more likely to receive amputations when compared to white patients.

The most common aetiologies for lower limb loss are: 1) vascular pathology (mainly ischaemia due to peripheral artery disease or embolism, and diabetes mellitus), 2) trauma, 3) cancer, and 4) congenital abnormalities. On the other hand, aetiologies for upper extremity amputation in adults are 1) trauma, 2) ischaemia, 3) infection, and 4) malignancy (2,13,14).

Nerves are completely encased in an epineural sheath, which is made of well-organized fibrous connective tissue. Significant disruption of this sheath occurs during (the process of) an amputation, causing disorganized regeneration of the enclosed axons, and proliferation into scar and connective tissue, resulting in an amputation neuroma (15,16). This type of neuroma belongs to a class of tumours referred to as reactive tumours, which are considered as benign non-neoplastic nerve tumours. Although benign, they may be symptomatic, evolving into severe pathology, generating pain with numbness or paresthesias, decreasing quality of life, forcing medication and preventing prosthetic use (15–18).

Though benign, they can become symptomatic, transforming into severe pathologies by producing

Some authors have described a series of criteria to classify neuromas as symptomatic (16). See **Table 1.**

Table 1. Criteria for classifying neuromas as symptomatic
Mandatory criteria (must be all 3): 1. Pain with at least 3 of the following characteristics: burning, sharp, shooting, electric, paresthesias, numbness, cold intolerance. 2. Symptoms in a defined neural anatomic distribution. 3. History of nerve injury or suspected nerve injury.
Partial criteria (at least 1): 1. Positive Tinel Sign (for cutaneous nerve). 2. Positive response to local anaesthetic injection. 3. US or MRI confirmation of neuroma.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.23.24319539; this version posted December 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Although the incidence of symptomatic neuromas is not fully known, multiple studies have indicated that it is in a range between 4% and 49%. This varies depending on the affected limb, the height of the amputation, previous comorbidities, cause of surgery, and the patient's follow-up time. (16,18–23).

The pain associated with limb amputation is known as residual limb pain (RLP) or phantom limb pain (PLP). The mechanisms and pathophysiology of RLP and PLP are different and have not been fully elucidated. Peripheral mechanisms include spontaneous activity in dorsal root ganglion neurons and ectopic neural activity originating from afferent fibres in a neuroma (24,25), while central mechanisms include spinal cord sensitization and cortical reorganization (26–29). Both residual limb pain and phantom limb pain can occur independently or concurrently in the post-operative period. It is thought that RLP may result from neuromas in the stump and PLP may be more closely related to cortical reorganization (13,30).

PLP is defined as the perception of sensations, including pain, in an amputated limb or a part of the body that is no longer present. PLP is a common sequel of amputation, occurring in up to 60 to 80% of people with limb amputation in the early post-operative period, with the incidence decreasing with time following amputation. PLP incidence appears to be independent of age, sex, amputation level or side. Prevention by peripheral analgesia has not yielded consistent results (26,31–33).

RLP is defined as a type of pain felt in the part of a limb that remains after an amputation. Acute residual limb pain is a strong predictor of chronic residual limb pain, while age, sex, amputation level, aetiology and postsurgical pain medication quantity do not correlate with chronic residual limb pain (30,34,35).

The psychological impact of these two entities should not be overlooked. People with limb amputations usually experience increased anxiety, depressive symptoms, post-traumatic psychological stress symptoms and affective distress (36,37).

Description of the interventions

TMR is increasingly being used to treat symptomatic neuromas. In this procedure, severed motor nerves are transferred to the motor branches of nearby healthy muscle segments, which, after reinnervation, gain the capacity of contraction in response to neural control signals (38–40). Due to the creation of multiple additional control sites, the contraction of target muscles and the functional control of the prosthesis become easier and more intuitive. This way, it has been demonstrated that TMR presents clear benefits compared to classical amputation, although its ability to reduce the incidence of neuromas, as well as the treatment of PLP and RLP, is still being investigated (39–41).

Other authors, on the other hand, carry out this technique by rerouteing the severed nerve endings to nearby expendable motor nerve branches of functionally expendable muscles, providing a pathway for axonal growth to these nerves. This serves as biological amplifiers of neural information and limits the regeneration that leads to neuroma formation (42,43).

RPNI involves taking a free muscle graft from the amputated limb (either proximal or distal to the site of amputation) and encasing the muscle graft around the dissected nerve, allowing for greater control over nerve growth to motor end plates on the grafted tissue ((44–57)).

Those autologous free muscle grafts are designed to be small enough to have an easy revascularization and to provide living motor end plates suitable for reinnervation in approximately 1–3 months. It has a great potential for permitting the use of advanced neuroprosthetics or sensory feedback (44,58–62).

TMR is more demanding regarding identification and dissection, as well as needing a prolonged operative time. Some authors believe the morbidity of an autologous muscle graft harvest is lesser than that of the compromise of a motor branch in the residual limb. Furthermore, the risk of a mismatch in nerve calibres is a potential source for axonal escape, which may result in a symptomatic neuroma or into a loss of reinnervation (62–66). In both procedures, the nerve can reinnervate and remodel itself within a denervated muscle segment, which provides many targets for reinnervation and reduces the likelihood of disorganized axonal sprouting, subsequently decreasing the risk of symptomatic neuroma formation (15,39,44,50).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.23.24319539; this version posted December 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

It is important to mention that there have not been studies or systematic reviews which compare TMR vs RPNI, so these are only technical aspects, not evidence of superiority.

Objectives

Primary objectives:

- To determine the efficacy and safety of TMR and RPNI in treating patients with limb amputation.
- To compare which technique (TMR and RPNI) shows better results of efficacy and safety in treating patients with limb amputations.

Secondary objectives:

- To determine the efficacy and safety of TMR and RPNI across multiple relevant patient characteristics. These include demography of the patients, age, sex, comorbidities, amputation cause(s), amputation level, previous surgeries and if there was or not previous nerve division into fascicles.

METHODS

For this protocol, we have followed methodological guidance from the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (67) and we used the PRISMA-P checklist when writing our report (68,69). For the review, we will follow methodological guidance from the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (67) and MECIR (Methodological Expectations for Cochrane Intervention Reviews) (70), and report the review following PRISMA (71,72).

Criteria for considering studies for this review

Studies

This review will include all studies written in Spanish or English, randomized and non-randomized.

We will exclude case reports (detailed reports of an individual or handful of individuals), case series, qualitative studies (studies that collect and analyse non-numerical data) and narrative reviews.

Participants

We will consider for inclusion participants that are adults (aged over 18 years) of any gender, and with a superior or inferior limb amputation of any aetiology.

Interventions

We will include the following three comparisons.

- Targeted Muscle Reinnervation (TMR) versus classical amputation without further nerve considerations.
- Regenerative Peripheral Nerve Interface (RPNI) against classical amputation without further nerve considerations.
- Targeted Muscle Reinnervation versus regenerative Peripheral Nerve Interface.

Outcome measures

As no core outcome set has been established for effectiveness trials in amputation reinnervation, a list of outcomes was generated based on existing systematic reviews and primary observational studies identified through a preliminary search of the literature. The primary outcomes are neuroma incidence, phantom limb pain (PLP) incidence and severity and residual limb pain (RLP) incidence and severity. All surgical complications will be analysed as secondary outcomes (dehiscence, infection, haematoma, seroma, etc).

Search methods for identification of studies

We will search the following electronic databases:

- Web of Science (inception to present).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.23.24319539; this version posted December 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

- Scopus (inception to present).
- PubMed (inception to present).
- Cochrane Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) (inception to present).

To identify additional published, unpublished, and ongoing studies, we will:

- Check the reference lists of all relevant studies.
- Search in MedRxiv (inception to present)
- Contact authors, if appropriate.

Online supplemental material 1 demonstrates the complete search strategy.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Selection of studies

We will assess all titles and abstracts identified during the literature searches, using Covidence (73). Two review authors (JM, DG) will independently review the search results and identify reports by screening all remaining titles and abstracts, excluding those that do not meet inclusion criteria. Afterwards, we will retrieve the full text of the articles, and both review authors will independently screen them for relevance and extract data. We will reach out to the investigators to retrieve missing information when necessary. Any disagreements will be resolved by discussion with the third author (BH).

The reasons for exclusion will be documented and presented at the full-text stage under the title of 'Characteristics of excluded studies'.

Data extraction and management

The following data will be extracted from each study

- Administrative details: Study author(s), date of publication, year in which study was conducted and presence of conflict of interest.
- Study characteristics: Study registration, study design type and sample size.
- Participants: Age, demography, sex, number of patients randomized, number lost to follow-up/withdrawn, number analysed, previous surgeries and comorbidities.
- Interventions: Type of amputation, cause of amputation, level of amputation and if there was or not previous nerve division into fascicles.
- Outcomes: Incidence of neuroma, incidence of PLP, incidence of RLP, severity of pain and incidence of surgical complications.

Analysis will be performed with STATA 12 (74).

Risk of bias assessment in included studies

Screening, data extraction and assessment of the risk of bias of included studies will be done using validated tools and discussed below. Disagreements will be settled by consensus with a third author (BH). Risk of bias will be estimated using recommendations in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions, Version 6.5.

Assessment of the risk of bias in randomized trials will be estimated with the Risk of Bias 2 (RoB 2) tool (75).
Assessment of the risk of bias in a non-randomized study will be estimated with the Risk Of Bias In Non-randomized Studies of Interventions version 2 (ROBINS-I V2) tool (76).

Measures of treatment effect

Measures of treatment effect have been chosen following the recommendations of Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions, Version 6.5 (67).

Dichotomous outcomes will be synthesized and reported as an odds ratio (OR) with 95% confidence intervals (CI).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.23.24319539; this version posted December 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Continuous outcome data will be measured using mean difference with 95% confidence intervals.

Dealing with missing data

The researchers of the original studies will be contacted to request any missing data, such as sample sizes for analysis and actual numbers for outcomes presented in the figures. If this proves to be unfeasible, the data will be excluded.

Assessment of heterogeneity and data analysis

The data will be firstly assessed for heterogeneity by visual appraisal of the presented forest plots, and the I^2 index will be used to quantitatively evaluate heterogeneity among included studies in each forest plot (77). Afterward, a meta-analysis will be performed with DerSimonian–Laird method and random effects model (78).
If sufficient studies are available, we will undertake the following subgroup analyses as follows:

- Sex.
- Demography (ethnicity).
- Cause of amputation is of great relevance as it is associated with the patient's risk of mortality, the severity of the situation, other complications, etc.
- Type of amputation.
- Amputation level.
- Presence of comorbidities (diabetes, coronary heart disease, peripheral arterial disease, chronic kidney disease or congestive heart failure).
- Previous surgeries.
- Previous nerve division into fascicles (it reduces the formation of aberrant reinnervation and promotes proper reinnervation).

A cumulative meta-analysis will also be performed based on the year in which each study was conducted (79).
For studying the age of participants, the original databases from the included studies will be requested to the authors if this information is not readily available. A meta-regression will be performed with the current data or with the full patient databases, depending on whether the age of fifty percent or more of the individual participants is known or not.

Assessment of reporting/publication biases

We will conduct a systematic, comprehensive search of the literature for both published and unpublished studies to minimize the risk of publication bias.

If 10 or more studies are available. We will explore reporting bias graphically using a funnel plot, and statistically by using the Egger's test to assess the symmetry of the funnel plot. Trim and fill analysis will be performed to further assess the possible publication bias.

Sensitivity analysis

We will conduct sensitivity analyses to explore the methodological quality of studies, check whether studies with a high risk of bias (in at least two domains) overestimate the effect of treatment and to assess the robustness of our findings.

Summary of findings and assessment of the certainty of the evidence

We will use the GRADE approach, as outlined in the GRADE Handbook, to assess the certainty of evidence regarding the clinical irrelevant outcomes outlined earlier in this document (80).

Ethics and dissemination

No ethical approval is needed for this review, as we will use data from previously published studies. We will spread our research in national and international medical congresses and any other non-conflicting means of publication.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Dr. Miguél Ruiz Canela (Professor of Preventive Medicine and Public Health, University of Navarra) for his assistance advising us in the methods section and Dra. Montserrat Royo Taberner (Subject Librarian of the Faculty of Medicine, University Clinic of Navarra) for her assistance.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.23.24319539; this version posted December 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

1. Owings MF, Kozak LJ. Ambulatory and inpatient procedures in the United States, 1996. Vital Health Stat 13. 1998 Nov;(139):1–119.

2. Ziegler-Graham K, MacKenzie EJ, Ephraim PL, Travison TG, Brookmeyer R. Estimating the Prevalence of Limb Loss in the United States: 2005 to 2050. Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation. 2008 Mar;89(3):422–9.

3. Ebrahimzadeh MH, Hariri S. Long-Term Outcomes of Unilateral Transtibial Amputations. Military Medicine. 2009 Jun;174(6):593–7.

4. Bhuvaneswar CG, Epstein LA, Stern TA. Reactions to Amputation: Recognition and Treatment: (Rounds in the General Hospital). Prim Care Companion J Clin Psychiatry. 2007 Aug 15;09(04):303–8.

5. Lastória S, Rollo HA, Yoshida WB, Giannini M, Moura R, Maffei FHA. Prophylaxis of deep-vein thrombosis after lower extremity amputation: Comparison of low molecular weight heparin with unfractionated heparin. Acta Cir Bras. 2006 Jun;21(3):184–6.

6. Huang ME, Johns JS, White J, Sanford K. Venous thromboembolism in a rehabilitation setting after major lower-extremity amputation. Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation. 2005 Jan;86(1):73–8.

7. Burke B, Kumar R, Vickers V, Grant E, Scremin E. Deep Vein Thrombosis After Lower Limb Amputation: American Journal of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation. 2000 Mar;79(2):145–9.

8. Yeager RA, Moneta GL, Edwards JM, Taylor LM, McConnell DB, Porter JM. Deep vein thrombosis associated with lower extremity amputation. Journal of Vascular Surgery. 1995 Nov;22(5):612–5.

9. Fang ZB, Hu FY, Arya S, Gillespie TW, Rajani RR. Preoperative frailty is predictive of complications after major lower extremity amputation. Journal of Vascular Surgery. 2017 Mar;65(3):804–11.

10. Thorud JC, Plemmons B, Buckley CJ, Shibuya N, Jupiter DC. Mortality After Nontraumatic Major Amputation Among Patients With Diabetes and Peripheral Vascular Disease: A Systematic Review. The Journal of Foot and Ankle Surgery. 2016 May;55(3):591–9.

11. Fisher ES, Goodman DC, Chandra A. Disparities in Health and Health Care Among Medicare Beneficiaries: A Brief Report of the Dartmouth Atlas Project. Lebanon (NH): The Dartmouth Institute for Health Policy and Clinical Practice; 2008 Jun 20. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK586760/. In.

12. Bancks MP, Kershaw K, Carson AP, Gordon-Larsen P, Schreiner PJ, Carnethon MR. Association of Modifiable Risk Factors in Young Adulthood With Racial Disparity in Incident Type 2 Diabetes During Middle Adulthood. JAMA. 2017 Dec 26;318(24):2457.

13. Wu CL, Tella P, Staats PS, Vaslav R, Kazim DA, Wesselmann U, et al. Analgesic Effects of Intravenous Lidocaine and Morphine on Postamputation Pain. Anesthesiology. 2002 Apr 1;96(4):841–8.

14. Heikkinen M, Saarinen J, Suominen VP, Virkkunen J, Salenius J. Lower limb amputations: Differences between the genders and long-term survival. Prosthetics & Orthotics International. 2007 Sep;31(3):277–86.

15. Nelson AW. The painful neuroma: The regenerating axon versus the epineural sheath. Journal of Surgical Research. 1977 Sep;23(3):215–21.

16. Arnold DMJ, Wilkens SC, Coert JH, Chen NC, Ducic I, Eberlin KR. Diagnostic Criteria for Symptomatic Neuroma. Ann Plast Surg. 2019 Apr;82(4):420–7.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.23.24319539; this version posted December 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

17. Serrano Falcón C, Serrano Falcón M del M, Ruiz Villaverde R, Linares Solano J, Serrano Ortega S. Amputation neuromas after neck surgery. Dermatol Online J. 2005 Aug 1;11(2):24.

18. Vlot MA, Wilkens SC, Chen NC, Eberlin KR. Symptomatic Neuroma Following Initial Amputation for Traumatic Digital Amputation. The Journal of Hand Surgery. 2018 Jan;43(1):86.e1-86.e8.

19. Huang YJ, Assi PE, Drolet BC, Al Kassis S, Bastas G, Chaker S, et al. A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis on the Incidence of Patients With Lower-Limb Amputations Who Developed Symptomatic Neuromata in the Residual Limb. Ann Plast Surg. 2022 May;88(5):574–80.

20. Penna A, Konstantatos AH, Cranwell W, Paul E, Bruscino□Raiola F. Incidence and associations of painful neuroma in a contemporary cohort of lower□limb amputees. ANZ Journal of Surgery. 2018 May;88(5):491–6.

21. Fisher GT, Boswick JA. Neuroma Formation following Digital Amputations: The Journal of Trauma: Injury, Infection, and Critical Care. 1983 Feb;23(2):136–42.

22. Van Der Avoort DJJC, Hovius SER, Selles RW, Van Neck JW, Coert JH. The incidence of symptomatic neuroma in amputation and neurorrhaphy patients. Journal of Plastic, Reconstructive & Aesthetic Surgery. 2013 Oct;66(10):1330–4.

23. Geraghty TJ, Jones LE. Painful neuromata following upper limb amputation. Prosthetics & Orthotics International. 1996 Dec;20(3):176–81.

24. Kooijman CM, Dijkstra PU, Geertzen JHB, Elzinga A, Van Der Schans CP. Phantom pain and phantom sensations in upper limb amputees: an epidemiological study. Pain. 2000 Jul;87(1):33–41.

25. Akopian AN, Sivilotti L, Wood JN. A tetrodotoxin-resistant voltage-gated sodium channel expressed by sensory neurons. Nature. 1996 Jan;379(6562):257–62.

26. Nikolajsen L, Jensen TS. Phantom limb pain. British Journal of Anaesthesia. 2001 Jul;87(1):107–16.

27. Coward K, Plumpton C, Facer P, Birch R, Carlstedt T, Tate S, et al. Immunolocalization of SNS/PN3 and NaN/SNS2 sodium channels in human pain states. Pain. 2000 Mar 1;85(1):41–50.

28. Ramachandran V. The perception of phantom limbs. The D. O. Hebb lecture. Brain. 1998 Sep 1;121(9):1603–30.

29. Woolf CJ, Thompson SWN. The induction and maintenance of central sensitization is dependent on N -methyl-d-aspartic acid receptor activation; implications for the treatment of post-injury pain hypersensitivity states. Pain. 1991 Mar;44(3):293–9.

30. Stover G, Prahlow N. Residual limb pain: An evidence-based review. Zasler N, editor. NRE. 2020 Nov 13;47(3):315–25.

31. Flor H. Phantom-limb pain: characteristics, causes, and treatment. The Lancet Neurology. 2002 Jul;1(3):182–9.

32. Nathanson M. Phantom limbs as reported by S. Weir Mitchell. Neurology. 1988 Mar;38(3):504–504.

33. Jackson MA, Simpson KH. Pain after amputation. Continuing Education in Anaesthesia Critical Care & Pain. 2004 Feb;4(1):20–3.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.23.24319539; this version posted December 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

34. Ehde DM, Czerniecki JM, Smith DG, Campbell KM, Edwards WT, Jensen MP, et al. Chronic phantom sensations, phantom pain, residual limb pain, and other regional pain after lower limb amputation. Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation. 2000 Aug;81(8):1039–44.

35. Hanley MA, Jensen MP, Smith DG, Ehde DM, Edwards WT, Robinson LR. Preamputation Pain and Acute Pain Predict Chronic Pain After Lower Extremity Amputation. The Journal of Pain. 2007 Feb;8(2):102–9.

36. Desmond DM, MacLachlan M. Affective Distress and Amputation-Related Pain Among Older Men with Long-Term, Traumatic Limb Amputations. Journal of Pain and Symptom Management. 2006 Apr;31(4):362–8.

37. Buchheit T, Van De Ven T, John Hsia HL, McDuffie M, MacLeod DB, White W, et al. Pain Phenotypes and Associated Clinical Risk Factors Following Traumatic Amputation: Results from Veterans Integrated Pain Evaluation Research (VIPER): Pain Phenotypes and Associated Clinical Risk Factors. Pain Med. 2015 Jul;n/a-n/a.

38. Kuiken TA, Dumanian GA, Lipschutz RD, Miller LA, Stubblefield KA. The use of targeted muscle reinnervation for improved myoelectric prosthesis control in a bilateral shoulder disarticulation amputee. Prosthetics & Orthotics International. 2004 Dec;28(3):245–53.

39. Cheesborough J, Smith L, Kuiken T, Dumanian G. Targeted Muscle Reinnervation and Advanced Prosthetic Arms. Seminars in Plastic Surgery. 2015 Feb 4;29(01):062–72.

40. Kuiken TA, Barlow AK, Hargrove LJ, Dumanian GA. Targeted Muscle Reinnervation for the Upper and Lower Extremity. Techniques in Orthopaedics. 2017 Jun;32(2):109–16.

41. Henderson JT, Koenig ZA, Climov M, Gelman J. Demystifying Targeted Muscle Reinnervation: A Systematic Review of Nerve Transfers for the Lower Extremity. Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery - Global Open. 2023 Mar;11(3):e4894.

42. Ryan DJ, Ayalon O, Hacquebord J. Targeted Muscle Reinnervation (TMR) and Other Considerations in Upper Extremity Amputation. Bull Hosp Jt Dis (2013). 2022 Mar;80(1):25–30.

43. Janes LE, Fracol ME, Dumanian GA, Ko JH. Targeted Muscle Reinnervation for the Treatment of Neuroma. Hand Clinics. 2021 Aug;37(3):345–59.

44. Hooper RC, Cederna PS, Brown DL, Haase SC, Waljee JF, Egeland BM, et al. Regenerative Peripheral Nerve Interfaces for the Management of Symptomatic Hand and Digital Neuromas. Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery - Global Open. 2020 Jun;8(6):e2792.

45. Kubiak CA, Kemp SWP, Cederna PS. Regenerative Peripheral Nerve Interface for Management of Postamputation Neuroma. JAMA Surg. 2018 Jul 1;153(7):681.

46. FitzGerald JJ, Lago N, Benmerah S, Serra J, Watling CP, Cameron RE, et al. A regenerative microchannel neural interface for recording from and stimulating peripheral axons *in vivo*. J Neural Eng. 2012 Feb 1;9(1):016010.

47. Micera S, Carpaneto J, Raspopovic S. Control of Hand Prostheses Using Peripheral Information. IEEE Rev Biomed Eng. 2010;3:48–68.

48. Svientek SR, Ursu DC, Cederna PS, Kemp SWP. Fabrication of the Composite Regenerative Peripheral Nerve Interface (C-RPNI) in the Adult Rat. JoVE. 2020 Feb 25;(156):60841.

49. Kung TA, Bueno RA, Alkhalefah GK, Langhals NB, Urbanchek MG, Cederna PS. Innovations in Prosthetic Interfaces for the Upper Extremity: Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery. 2013 Dec;132(6):1515–23.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.23.24319539; this version posted December 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

50. Kung TA, Langhals NB, Martin DC, Johnson PJ, Cederna PS, Urbanchek MG. Regenerative Peripheral Nerve Interface Viability and Signal Transduction with an Implanted Electrode. Plastic & Reconstructive Surgery. 2014 Jun;133(6):1380–94.

51. Vu PP, Vaskov AK, Irwin ZT, Henning PT, Lueders DR, Laidlaw AT, et al. A regenerative peripheral nerve interface allows real-time control of an artificial hand in upper limb amputees. Sci Transl Med. 2020 Mar 4;12(533):eaay2857.

52. Sando I, Leach M, Woo S, Moon J, Cederna P, Langhals N, et al. Regenerative Peripheral Nerve Interface for Prostheses Control: Electrode Comparison. J reconstr Microsurg. 2015 Oct 26;32(03):194–9.

53. Irwin ZT, Schroeder KE, Vu PP, Tat DM, Bullard AJ, Woo SL, et al. Chronic recording of hand prosthesis control signals via a regenerative peripheral nerve interface in a rhesus macaque. J Neural Eng. 2016 Aug 1;13(4):046007.

54. Vu PP, Irwin ZT, Bullard AJ, Ambani SW, Sando IC, Urbanchek MG, et al. Closed-Loop Continuous Hand Control via Chronic Recording of Regenerative Peripheral Nerve Interfaces. IEEE Trans Neural Syst Rehabil Eng. 2018 Feb;26(2):515–26.

55. Vaskov AK, Vu PP, North N, Davis AJ, Kung TA, Gates DH, et al. Surgically Implanted Electrodes Enable Real-Time Finger and Grasp Pattern Recognition for Prosthetic Hands. IEEE Trans Robot. 2022 Oct;38(5):2841–57.

56. Urbanchek MG, Kung TA, Frost CM, Martin DC, Larkin LM, Wollstein A, et al. Development of a Regenerative Peripheral Nerve Interface for Control of a Neuroprosthetic Limb. BioMed Research International. 2016;2016:1–8.

57. Dhillon GS, Horch KW. Direct neural sensory feedback and control of a prosthetic arm. IEEE Trans Neural Syst Rehabil Eng. 2005 Dec;13(4):468–72.

58. Kubiak CA, Adidharma W, Kung TA, Kemp SWP, Cederna PS, Vemuri C. “Decreasing Postamputation Pain with the Regenerative Peripheral Nerve Interface (RPNI)”. Annals of Vascular Surgery. 2022 Feb;79:421–6.

59. Ives GC, Kung TA, Nghiem BT, Ursu DC, Brown DL, Cederna PS, et al. Current State of the Surgical Treatment of Terminal Neuromas. NEUROSURGERY. 2018 Sep;83(3):354–64.

60. Ursu D, Nedic A, Urbanchek M, Cederna P, Gillespie RB. Adjacent regenerative peripheral nerve interfaces produce phase-antagonist signals during voluntary walking in rats. J NeuroEngineering Rehabil. 2017 Dec;14(1):33.

61. Anand S, Desai V, Alsmadi N, Kanneganti A, Nguyen DHT, Tran M, et al. Asymmetric Sensory-Motor Regeneration of Transected Peripheral Nerves Using Molecular Guidance Cues. Sci Rep. 2017 Oct 30;7(1):14323.

62. Leach GA, Dean RA, Kumar NG, Tsai C, Chiarappa FE, Cederna PS, et al. Regenerative Peripheral Nerve Interface Surgery: Anatomic and Technical Guide. Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery - Global Open. 2023 Jul;11(7):e5127.

63. Cohen S, Hsu. Postamputation pain: epidemiology, mechanisms, and treatment. JPR. 2013 Feb;121.

64. Valerio I, Schulz SA, West J, Westenberg RF, Eberlin KR. Targeted Muscle Reinnervation Combined with a Vascularized Pedicled Regenerative Peripheral Nerve Interface. Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery - Global Open. 2020 Mar;8(3):e2689.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.23.24319539; this version posted December 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

65. Wimalawansa SM, Lygrisse D, Anderson SR, Eberlin KR, Westenberg R, Schulz S, et al. Targeted Muscle Reinnervation in Partial Hand Amputations. Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery - Global Open. 2021 May 28;9(5):e3542.

66. Lee E, Wong AL, Pinni S, Von Guionneau N, Harris TGW, Kothari R, et al. Improving Nerve Coaptation Outcomes in Targeted Muscle Reinnervation: A Novel Bioengineered Device. Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery - Global Open. 2021 Oct 20;9(10S):99–100.

67. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA (editors). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.5 (updated August 2024). Cochrane, 2024. Available from www.training.cochrane.org/handbook.

68. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647–g7647.

69. PRISMA-P Group, Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. Syst Rev. 2015 Dec;4(1):1.

70. Higgins JPT, Lasserson T, Chandler J, Tovey D, Thomas J, Flemyng E, Churchill R. Methodological Expectations of Cochrane Intervention Reviews. Cochrane: London, Version February 2021. https://community.cochrane.org/mecir-manual.

71. Page MJ, Moher D, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. PRISMA 2020 explanation and elaboration: updated guidance and exemplars for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ. 2021 Mar 29;n160.

72. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ. 2021 Mar 29;n71.

73. Covidence systematic review software, Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia. Available at www.covidence.org.

74. StataCorp. 2011. Stata: Release 12. Statistical Software. College Station, TX: StataCorp LP.

75. Higgins JPT, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Sterne JAC. Chapter 8: Assessing risk of bias in a randomized trial [last updated October 2019]. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA (editors). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.5. Cochrane, 2024. In.

76. Ref ID: ROBINS-I V2 Ref type: Other Authors: ROBINS-I V2 Development Group English title: ROBINS-I V2 Journal/book/source: https://www.riskofbias.info/welcome/robins-i-v2 Date of publication: (accessed 12 December 2024) [add appropriate date].

77. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. Rating the quality of evidence—inconsistency. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. 2011 Dec;64(12):1294–302.

78. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials revisited. Contemporary Clinical Trials. 2015 Nov;45:139–45.

79. Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JPT, Rothstein HR. Introduction to Meta□Analysis [Internet]. 1st ed. Wiley; 2009 [cited 2024 Nov 29]. Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/book/10.1002/9780470743386

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.23.24319539; this version posted December 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

80. Schünemann HJ, Oxman AD, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Jaeschke R, Vist GE, et al. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations for diagnostic tests and strategies. BMJ. 2008 May 17;336(7653):1106–10.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.23.24319539; this version posted December 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

FOOTNOTES

Author statement

DG is the guarantor of the review, JM and DG initiated the review, drafted and finalised the background, objectives and methods sections. All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflicts of interests

None declared.

Patient consent for publication

Not required.