Brain-Controlled Epidural Stimulation Restores Corticospinal Connectivity to Improve Upper-Limb Function in Chronic Tetraplegia

Atsushi Sasaki[1,2,3,†], Rizaldi Ahmad Fadli[1,4,†], Akiko Yuasa[1,2,5,6], Zachary Boogaart[1,4,7], Hiroki Saito[8,9], Nevena Musikic[1], Roberto de Freitas[10,11], Nicolo Macellari[10,11], Kevin C. Davis[1,4,7], Nilanjana Datta[1], Guilherme S. Piedade[2], Seth Tigchelaar[2], Michael E. Ivan[2], W. Dalton Dietrich[1,2,4], Naaz Desai[12], Vera Zivanovic[12], Milos R. Popovic[12,13,14], Elvira Pirondini[10,11,15], Jonathan Jagid[2], Abhishek Prasad[1,2,4], James D. Guest[1,2], Marco Capogrosso[10,11,15], Joacir Graciolli Cordeiro[2], Matija Milosevic[1,2,4,*]

[1]The Miami Project to Cure Paralysis, University of Miami Miller School of Medicine, FL, USA.
[2]Department of Neurological Surgery, University of Miami Miller School of Medicine, FL, USA.
[3]Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan.
[4]Department of Biomedical Engineering, University of Miami, FL, USA.
[5]Faculty of Medicine, Fujita Health University, Aichi, Japan.
[6]Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, Tokyo, Japan.
[7]Medical Scientist Training Program, University of Miami Miller School of Medicine, FL, USA.
[8]Department of Rehabilitation, Tokyo University of Technology, Tokyo, Japan.
[9]Center for Human Movement, Tokyo University of Technology, Tokyo, Japan.
[10]Rehab Neural Engineering Labs, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA.
[11]Department of Neurological Surgery, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA.
[12]KITE Research Institute – University Health Network, Toronto, ON, Canada.
[13]Institute of Biomedical Engineering, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada.
[14]CRANIA, University Health Network, Toronto, ON, Canada.
[15]Department of Bioengineering, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA.

[†]These two authors contributed equally to this work and are designated as co-first authors

***Corresponding author**:
Matija Milosevic, PhD
The Miami Project to Cure Paralysis
University of Miami Miller School of Medicine
1095 NW 14th Terrace
Miami, FL 33136, USA
Phone: 305-243-3572
Fax: 305-243-3913
E-mail: mmilosevic@med.miami.edu

Number of pages: 40
Number of figures: 8
Number of supplementary figures and tables: 6 figures and 6 tables

Abstract (175/175 words)
Spinal cord injury disrupts corticospinal transmission and impairs voluntary motor control. While epidural spinal cord stimulation (ESCS) can augment residual motor output, its capacity to drive long-term neuroplasticity remains unoptimized. Here, we present a first-in-human study showing that an implantable brain-computer interface (BCI) paired with cervical ESCS can potentiate corticospinal connectivity, leading to both immediate and sustained improvements in upper-limb motor function in an individual with chronic, motor-complete cervical SCI. The BCI system decodes motor intent from electrocorticography signals to deliver time-locked stimulation to spinal circuits during volitional movement attempts. This BCI-ESCS paradigm enhanced grip strength and object manipulation immediately and elicited greater increases in corticospinal excitability after a single session compared to tonic ESCS. Notably, a four-week BCI-ESCS therapy led to clinically meaningful improvements in voluntary hand function even without system assistance, with some gains persisting one-month post-therapy. These findings show that intention-driven neuromodulation efficiently induces corticospinal plasticity, offering a mechanistically driven neuromotor recovery approach. Overall, BCI-ESCS can restore volitional control even in an individual with severe paralysis once deemed at the recovery plateau.

Keywords: spinal cord injury, brain-computer interface, cervical epidural spinal cord stimulation, corticospinal plasticity, neurorehabilitation, tetraplegia, electrocorticography.

1. Introduction

Spinal cord injury (SCI) is a life-altering condition that disrupts motor and sensory pathways, leading to severe impairments in voluntary motor control. Among individuals with cervical SCI, tetraplegia significantly limits upper limb function, reducing independence and quality of life[1]. Approximately two-thirds of SCIs occur at the cervical level (63.4% at C1–C7), often resulting in tetraplegia and impairing upper limb control[2]. While individuals with incomplete injuries (American Spinal Injury Association Impairment Scale (AIS) B-D) retain some degree of sensorimotor function, those with complete injuries (AIS A) typically exhibit low to no voluntary movement below the lesion level with minimal recovery potential[3,4]. Despite extensive rehabilitation efforts, standard physical and occupational therapy often leads to limited motor recovery, necessitating novel neuromodulatory strategies to optimize residual connections and promote upper limb function restoration.

Epidural spinal cord stimulation (ESCS) has emerged as a promising tool for restoring motor function by reactivating spinal networks below the lesion. Early studies demonstrated that ESCS can facilitate volitional lower-limb movement in individuals with chronic paraplegia[5–9]. The potential of ESCS to restore upper limb function was later explored in non-human primates, where cervical ESCS was found to enhance voluntary reaching and grasping by modulating spinal motoneurons[10,11]. Lu et al.[12] provided human evidence that cervical ESCS can enhance voluntary hand function in individuals with chronic tetraplegia by engaging spinal circuits. More recently, Powell et al.[13] demonstrated that continuous cervical ESCS improves grip strength and movement kinematics in individuals with post-stroke hemiparesis. While these studies highlight the immediate assistive benefits of cervical ESCS, their ability to drive lasting corticospinal plasticity to support durable upper-limb recovery remains to be fully established.

Brain-computer interface (BCI) technology has emerged as a promising approach to restore volitional control in individuals with motor paralysis by decoding motor intent and providing real-time stimulation to enable upper limb muscle activation[14–16]. Unlike conventional tonic ESCS that applies stimulation continuously, BCI-controlled neuromodulation has the potential to precisely deliver stimulation based on the user's motor intent, reinforcing the link between cortical activity and spinal circuits[17,18]. Preclinical studies demonstrated that BCI-controlled neuromodulation can induce adaptive cortical changes to facilitate motor recovery in animal models[11,19,20], but the clinical translation of an implantable brain-spinal interface for upper limb function has yet to be realized. Here, we present a first-in-human study investigating the effects of implantable electrocorticography (ECoG)-based BCI-ESCS therapy with a focus on corticospinal connectivity and upper-limb motor recovery in an individual with chronic complete cervical SCI (AIS A). We hypothesized that BCI-ESCS therapy would facilitate corticospinal plasticity, leading to meaningful improvements in upper limb function despite a clinically complete paralysis diagnosis.

To evaluate the therapeutic potential of an implantable BCI-ESCS strategy, we investigated the neuromodulation effects on corticospinal excitability and upper limb motor function in an individual with chronic complete tetraplegia, with primary objectives to:

1) Assess the **assistive (immediate) effects** of BCI-ESCS and Tonic-ESCS on grip strength, reaching kinematics, and hand function tests.
2) Evaluate the **single-session effects** of BCI-ESCS and Tonic-ESCS therapy on corticospinal excitability through motor evoked potentials (MEPs), spinal excitability through posterior root muscle (PRM) reflexes, and hand dexterity through functional performance tests.
3) Determine the **longitudinal (therapeutic) effects** of a four-week BCI-ESCS intervention on corticospinal connectivity, reaching performance, and clinical hand function scores.

By integrating an ECoG-based BCI with epidural spinal stimulation, this study establishes a novel implantable BCI neuromodulation approach to restore corticospinal connectivity and upper-limb motor function in chronic complete SCI. The first-in-human application of BCI-ESCS aims to advance neural restoration by engaging targeted plasticity mechanisms to re-enable volitional control of the upper limb.

2. Results

2.1. Study design and experimental setup

This study is the first to report the effects of BCI-ESCS intervention on neural excitability and upper-limb motor function recovery in an individual with complete spinal cord injury (Fig.1). The participant was a male in his 20's with a chronic (11 years post-injury) AIS A injury at the C4–C5 level. The participant had undergone anterior cervical discectomy and fusion (C3–C5) in 2015 and later received an ECoG implant over the right-hand knob area of the motor cortex in 2018 as part of another clinical trial (NCT02564419)[21,22]. In the current study, ESCS was delivered via two percutaneous eight-contact leads implanted in the dorsal epidural space from vertebral levels C5–T1 caudal to the injury site to enable upper limb spinal circuit neuromodulation (Fig.1). The leads were positioned unilaterally on the right side over the dorsal roots to selectively activate right upper limb motor pools[13]. The BCI-ESCS therapy was delivered by detecting motor intent from implanted ECoG signals to trigger dorsal root spinal stimulation in real time during activity-based training. Stimulation parameters were individually optimized based on spinal mapping and functional responses (see Section 4.4 and Fig. 6). On select days, additional assessments were performed with Tonic-ESCS, a control condition in which continuous stimulation was applied throughout the duration of the session. These additional sessions also enabled comparison of assistive and short-term effects between stimulation modes.

BCI-ESCS therapeutic effects were assessed through three distinct analyses: 1) Assistive effects - Immediate functional benefits of BCI-ESCS compared to no stimulation and Tonic-ESCS condition; 2) Single-session effects - Changes in neurophysiological outcomes and upper-limb motor function after a single session of BCI-ESCS compared to Tonic-ESCS intervention; and 3) Longitudinal effects - Functional and neurophysiological changes following four weeks (28 days) of BCI-ESCS therapy.



Fig. 1: Implantable BCI-ESCS system for upper limb motor rehabilitation in chronic SCI | The brain-computer interface (BCI)- epidural spinal cord stimulation (ESCS) system integrates real-time decoding of motor intent with targeted spinal cord stimulation to restore upper limb function in individuals with chronic complete cervical spinal cord injury (C4–C5; AIS A). The participant attempts to imagine the intended movement, which

is detected through an implanted electrocorticography (ECoG) array placed over the precentral gyrus, as identified in preoperative MRI (from Cajigas et al.[21] with permission of Oxford University Press). The BCI system decodes cortical activity in real time and, upon detection of motor intent, triggers an external stimulator to deliver optimized ESCS via percutaneously implanted epidural leads. The spinal X-ray image confirms the placement of epidural electrodes over the C5–T1 spinal segments, with specific channels targeting functional tasks such as reaching (e.g., 3R) and grasping/pinching (e.g., 4R). This system is designed to enhance the corticospinal network by aligning cortical activity with spinal stimulation, promoting task-specific neuromodulation and functional recovery.

2.2. Assistive effects - Grip strength, reaching function, and hand motor function improve during BCI-ESCS and Tonic-ESCS

To assess the assistive effects of BCI-ESCS and Tonic-ESCS, we compared three conditions: no stimulation (no-stim), Tonic-ESCS (continuous stimulation), and BCI-ESCS (stimulation triggered by motor intent). During the first week post-implant, maximum grip force electromyography (EMG) activity was measured during gripping tasks for 5 seconds in different conditions. Both stimulation modalities increased grip force compared to no stimulation (no-stim: 0.5±0.1 N; Tonic-ESCS: 9.9±1.0 N; BCI-ESCS: 20.3±1.0 N) (Fig. 2a). Similarly, EMG recordings from the flexor carpi radialis (FCR) and extensor carpi radialis (ECR) muscles revealed minimal activity in the no stimulation condition, whereas both Tonic- and BCI-ESCS significantly increased volitional EMG activation (FCR, no-stim: 0.008±0.001 mV; Tonic-ESCS: 0.078±0.003 mV; BCI-ESCS: 0.155±0.017 mV; ECR, no-stim: 0.012±0.001 mV; Tonic-ESCS: 0.033±0.004 mV; BCI-ESCS: 0.085±0.017 mV). Notably, BCI-ESCS elicited the highest grip force and EMG activity, indicating a greater enhancement of volitional motor output compared to Tonic-ESCS (Fig. 2a).

To assess upper limb coordination during the second week after the implant, we evaluated the participant's performance in a three-dimensional (3D) reaching task toward four target positions (left, right, center, and upward) with each stimulation condition (Fig. 2b). Movement smoothness improved for most targets under both Tonic- and BCI-ESCS compared to no stimulation, as reflected by a reduction in the number of velocity peaks[13] (Fig. 2c). A trend toward smoother movements was noted with Tonic-ESCS compared to BCI-ESCS. Reduced smoothness with BCI-ESCS may result from its real-time, intent-driven stimulation, which likely provides an abrupt initial assistive boost, leading to a rapid movement initiation. Further analysis of the initial direction angle, which quantifies the deviation from the optimal straight-line trajectory, during the 3D reaching task supported this hypothesis (Fig. 2c). The BCI-ESCS condition exhibited greater deviation from the optimal trajectory, suggesting that the initial phase of movement was more abrupt due to triggered stimulation responses.

To investigate upper limb coordination, we also conducted muscle synergy analysis using EMG data recorded from 16 muscles spanning the shoulder, upper arm, and forearm during reaching movements (Supplementary Information 1.1). Six synergies were identified under no stimulation, whereas seven synergies were detected under both Tonic- and BCI-ESCS, indicating the emergence of ESCS-specific muscle coordination patterns (Supplementary Fig. 3). These findings suggest that ESCS immediately modulates neuromuscular coordination, potentially contributing to enhanced motor control. Details on synergy patterns and their functional implications are provided in Supplementary Information 1.2.

Consistent with improvements in grip strength and reaching function, the Toronto Rehabilitation Institute-Hand Function Test (TRI-HFT) scores also showed immediate improvement under both BCI-ESCS and Tonic-ESCS (Fig. 2d). Notably, in the mobile phone task, the no stimulation condition yielded a score of 2 points, whereas both BCI-ESCS and Tonic-ESCS

improved the score to 4 points. Similarly, in the rectangular blocks task, improvements of 2–3 points were recorded with both BCI-ESCS and Tonic-ESCS across most weights and surface friction levels, except the 100 g high friction task, where no differences were observed. These improvements in clinical scores likely stem from improved grip strength and reaching function during ESCS, suggesting that both BCI-ESCS and Tonic-ESCS contribute to improved upper limb motor performance. However, no differences were observed between BCI-ESCS and Tonic-ESCS conditions immediately during the stimulation.

Overall, these findings demonstrate that both BCI-ESCS and Tonic-ESCS can immediately enhance the motor function of an individual with complete SCI.



*Some images removed by authors to comply with MedRxiv publication policies

Fig. 2: BCI-ESCS and Tonic-ESCS immediately improve motor function | a. Grip strength and electromyographic (EMG) activity during maximal voluntary contraction (MVC). Representative traces of grip

force and EMG activity recorded from the flexor carpi radialis (FCR) and extensor carpi radialis (ECR) muscles under no-stimulation (no-stim, black), Tonic-ESCS (yellow), and BCI-ESCS (blue) conditions. The right panel shows plots of peak grip force and root-mean-square (RMS) EMG amplitude, demonstrating a significant increase in motor output with BCI-ESCS compared to no stim and Tonic-ESCS. **b**. 3D reaching task setup. The participant performed reaching movements towards four target positions (left, center, right, and upward) from a fixed starting position. **c.** Kinematic analysis of 3D reaching movements. Trajectories of reaching movements under no stim (black), Tonic-ESCS (yellow), and BCI-ESCS (blue) are shown for each target direction. Bottom panels depict boxplots of velocity peaks and initial direction angle, indicating smoother movement execution (fewer velocity peaks) and greater deviation from the optimal trajectory (increased initial direction angle) under BCI-ESCS compared to Tonic-ESCS and no-stim. In each boxplot, the central line indicates the median, the box represents the interquartile range (25th to 75th percentile), and the whiskers extend to the full range of the data (minimum to maximum). Statistical inference was performed using a bootstrap method (n=10,000 resamples) for datasets with n=8 observations per condition. Asterisks indicate statistical significance and rejection of the null hypothesis of no difference with a 95% CI. **d.** Functional hand assessment using the Toronto Rehabilitation Institute Hand Function Test (TRI-HFT). Radar plots show performance across object manipulation and rectangular block tasks. Both stimulation conditions improved function relative to no stimulation.

2.3. Single-session BCI-ESCS, but not Tonic-ESCS, potentiates corticospinal connections

We examined the short-term neurophysiological and functional effects of a single-session BCI-ESCS and Tonic-ESCS therapy. The participant performed activity-based training with either BCI-ESCS or Tonic-ESCS for 28 minutes on separate days. Neurophysiological and motor performance assessments were conducted before and immediately after each session when stimulation was turned off (Fig. 3a). Corticospinal and spinal excitability were assessed as indicators of neurophysiological changes, while functional motor performance was evaluated using the nine-hole peg test (9HPT) and box and block test (BBT). The therapy, which focused on reaching, grasping, and pinching movements, was conducted with the guidance of a physical therapist. The training protocol was identical across conditions, ensuring consistency in task execution. Details of the therapy protocol are provided in the Methods section (see Section 4.6).

Corticospinal excitability was assessed by measuring MEPs from the ECR and FCR muscles, elicited via subdural ECoG electrode single-pulse motor cortex stimulation (MCS). Electrical pulses (450 µs, bipolar configuration) were delivered across a range of 4.0 to 10.5 V through the implanted pulse generator to obtain the MEP recruitment curve. Following Tonic-ESCS therapy, MEP amplitudes remained unchanged or significantly decreased (Fig. 3b). In contrast, BCI-ESCS therapy led to a significant potentiation of MEP amplitudes compared to pre-intervention levels. This facilitatory effect was consistently observed in both the ECR and FCR muscles (Fig. 3b), suggesting a generalized facilitation of corticospinal excitability induced by BCI-ESCS therapy, whereas Tonic-ESCS did not elicit similar potentiation.

Spinal excitability was assessed through PRM reflexes, elicited by paired-pulse ESCS. Reflex responses were recorded at increasing stimulation intensities, with three paired-pulse stimuli per level. PRM reflex analysis revealed no significant changes in spinal excitability following Tonic-ESCS therapy, although a slight reduction in ECR reflex threshold was noted (Fig. 3c). In contrast, BCI-ESCS therapy led to a decrease in reflex threshold and an increase in reflex amplitude, only in the FCR muscle. These findings align with the MEP results, further supporting the notion that BCI-ESCS therapy enhances both corticospinal and spinal excitability, whereas Tonic-ESCS elicits minimal effects on these pathways.

Despite the differences in neurophysiological responses, short-term motor performance improvements did not significantly differ between BCI-ESCS and Tonic-ESCS conditions. Performance on the 9HPT remained unchanged in both conditions. In the BBT, the number of

blocks increased from 4 to 6 following Tonic-ESCS therapy and from 2 to 4 following BCI-ESCS therapy.

Overall, these results indicate that a single session of BCI-ESCS, but not Tonic-ESCS, induces immediate potentiation in both corticospinal and spinal excitability, suggesting that volitionally coupled stimulation more effectively engages facilitation mechanisms. Even in the absence of immediate short-term performance differences, these findings point to advantages of BCI control to restore corticospinal integrity.



Fig. 3: Single-session BCI-ESCS therapy potentiates corticospinal connections | a. Experimental protocol. Assessments were conducted before (Pre) and immediately after (Post) intervention. The participant underwent a 28-minute functional therapy session with either Tonic-ESCS or BCI-ESCS, and neurophysiological and motor performance were evaluated. **b.** Corticospinal excitability measured via motor evoked potentials (MEPs). Left: Representative MEP waveforms from the extensor carpi radialis (ECR) and flexor carpi radialis (FCR) muscles before and after Tonic-ESCS (yellow) and BCI-ESCS (blue). Right: Boxplots of MEP amplitudes across

different stimulus intensities, showing a significant increase in corticospinal excitability following BCI-ESCS but no substantial changes or reductions following Tonic-ESCS. In each boxplot, the central line indicates the median, the box represents the interquartile range (25th to 75th percentile), and the whiskers extend to the full range of the data (minimum to maximum). Outliers are plotted individually as additional circles. Statistical inference was performed using a bootstrap method (n=10,000 resamples) for datasets with n=5 observations per condition. Asterisks indicate statistical significance and rejection of the null hypothesis of no difference with a 95% CI. **c.** Spinal excitability assessed via posterior root muscle (PRM) reflexes. Left: Representative PRM reflex waveforms in ECR and FCR before and after therapy. Right: Boxplots of PRM reflex amplitudes across different stimulus intensities showing a decrease in FCR reflex threshold and an increase in amplitude after BCI-ESCS, whereas Tonic-ESCS led to minor changes in ECR reflex threshold with no significant effect on amplitude.

2.4. Longitudinal effects - BCI-ESCS therapy enhances corticospinal excitability and voluntary motor function

Longitudinal therapeutic effects were investigated by evaluating the effects of a 28-day intervention using BCI-ESCS on the central nervous system excitability, voluntary motor performance, and clinical outcomes after the therapy period. Assessments were conducted at three time points: at baseline prior to ESCS implantation (Pre); post-intervention following the completion of BCI-ESCS therapy (Post); and at follow-up, one month after ESCS lead explantation (Follow-up) (Fig. 4a). BCI-ESCS therapy regimen consisted of 19 sessions over 28 days, with each therapy session lasting approximately 40 minutes (40.8±19.3 min). Three of those sessions consisted of Tonic-ESCS to evaluate assistive and short-term effects separately, allowing us to compare corticospinal excitability and short-term motor function outcomes to BCI-ESCS. The longitudinal intervention was focused on evaluating BCI-ESCS therapeutic efficacy on voluntary function following the completion of the therapy.

During the therapy, the participant performed BCI-triggered ESCS to activate the right-hand during motor tasks, including reaching, grasping, pronation, supination, and pinching. ESCS was activated in real-time upon BCI detection of motor intent, with assistance provided by the therapist as needed. Training progressed from basic movements to complex functional tasks, incorporating objects of varying size, weight, and texture to enhance motor engagement. As performance improved, tasks mimicking daily activities, such as drinking and eating, were introduced to facilitate functional recovery (Fig. 8d). Across all BCI-ESCS therapy sessions, the average BCI success rate, computed as the proportion of correctly detected motor attempts, was 83.8±4.2%, consistent with previous reports[23,24].

Corticospinal excitability, assessed using MEPs elicited by single-pulse MCS, significantly increased following long-term BCI-ESCS therapy in both the ECR and FCR muscles (Fig. 4b). However, this potentiation returned to baseline levels at Follow-up, suggesting that therapy facilitates corticospinal excitability, but the effects were not retained in Follow-up after completion of the therapy in an individual with motor complete SCI.

To further evaluate upper limb coordination, we analyzed 3D reaching task performance. After therapy, velocity peaks at the center, right, and upward targets significantly decreased, suggesting smoother movements even without stimulation (Fig. 4c). However, at Follow-up, velocity peaks for the right and upward targets returned to pre-therapy levels. In contrast, the initial direction angle increased after therapy and remained elevated at Follow-up. This suggests a persistent change of motor patterns, indicative of motor exploration and adaptation induced by BCI-ESCS therapy, which may contribute to long-term functional improvements. To assess neuromuscular coordination, we analyzed muscle synergy patterns during reaching movements. Before therapy, six synergies were identified, whereas seven synergies were detected post-therapy

(Supplementary Fig. 4), indicating increased neuromuscular coordination complexity. However, at Follow-up, the number of synergies returned to six, mirroring trends observed in reaching performance and MEP changes. These findings suggest that long-term BCI-ESCS therapy induces transient neuromuscular adaptations, which regress after therapy cessation. Additional details on synergy analysis are provided in Supplementary Information 1.3.

Finally, we evaluated clinical scores using the TRI-HFT and Graded Redefined Assessment of Strength, Sensibility, and Prehension (GRASSP). A summary of all TRI-HFT and GRASSP scores is provided in Supplementary Tables 1-2. These findings indicate that upper limb function significantly improved after therapy and was maintained one month after the intervention.

For the right hand, the therapy target, the TRI-HFT 10 object score increased from Pre (19 points) to Post (28 points), with retained gains at Follow-up (30 points), showing notable improvements in pop can, mobile phone, paper, and credit card tasks (Fig. 4d). Notably, in the mobile phone task, the score increased from 2 points at Pre to 6 points at Post, with retained improvement at Follow-up. Similarly, in the credit card task, the score increased from 1 point at Pre to 4 points at Post and Follow-up. In these tasks, significant improvements were observed in the use of wrist flexion, pronation/supination, coordination, and grasp and pinch strength. The TRI-HFT-rectangular blocks score also improved from Pre (19 points) to Post (36 points) and remained at Follow-up (36 points) (Fig. 4d).

We compared these results with a control dataset of six individuals with chronic SCI who underwent 40 sessions of conventional activity-based therapy over 16 weeks (see Methods 4.8). The mean gains in these control individuals were 3.33±4.89 points in the 10-object and 5.17±9.97 points in the rectangular blocks task. Importantly, our participant's improvements exceeded the control group distribution, highlighting significant improvements with one month of BCI-ESCS therapy compared to conventional activity-based therapy (Fig. 4d). Overall, the combined score of both hands exhibited significant functional recovery, with TRI-HFT improvements exceeding the minimal detectable change (MDC) of 9.1 points in 10 objects and 9.2 points in the rectangular objects task for both hands[25].

Similarly, GRASSP scores revealed notable improvements, particularly in the Quantitative prehension of water bottle, jam jar, and coin tasks (Fig. 4e). The 4-point gain at Post in GRASSP-Quantitative prehension surpassed the MDC of 3 points for SCI individuals[26], which was largely maintained at Follow-up.

The BCI-ESCS therapy did not adversely affect the participant's neurological classification (ISNCSCI, Supplementary Table 3), independence (SCIM, Supplementary Table 4), quality of life (QoL-BDS, Supplementary Table 5), or pain levels (ISCIPBDS, Supplementary Table 6), supporting the safety of the intervention.



Fig. 4: Long-term BCI-ESCS therapy enhances corticospinal excitability and upper-limb motor performance | a. Experimental protocol. Assessments were conducted at Pre (baseline, before ESCS implantation), Post (after 4 weeks of BCI-ESCS therapy), and Follow-up (4 weeks after ESCS explantation) to evaluate the longitudinal effects of BCI-ESCS therapy. **b.** Corticospinal excitability measured via motor evoked potentials (MEPs). Left: Representative MEP waveforms from the extensor carpi radialis (ECR) and flexor carpi radialis (FCR) muscles at different stimulus intensities before and after therapy. Right: Boxplots of MEP amplitudes, showing significant increases in corticospinal excitability after BCI-ESCS therapy, with values returning to Pre at Follow-up. **c.** Reaching kinematics. Reaching trajectories for Pre, Post, and Follow-up assessments, showing movement refinement after therapy. Boxplots of velocity peaks and initial direction angles, indicating smoother movement (fewer velocity peaks) and persistent recalibration of movement trajectories. **d.** TRI-HFT performance. Radar plots show improvements in the 10-object manipulation task and the rectangular block tasks after therapy, with gains sustained at Follow-up. Box plots compare participant's scores to those of a control cohort who underwent conventional therapy only. **e.** GRASSP (Quantitative Prehension Test). Radar plots indicate improvements in water bottle, jam jar, and coin tasks at Post, with most enhancements sustained at Follow-up. In each box plot, the central line indicates the median, the box represents the interquartile range (25th to 75th percentile), and the whiskers extend to the full range of the data (minimum to maximum). Outliers are plotted individually as additional circles. Statistical inference was performed using a bootstrap method (n=10,000 resamples) for datasets with n=5 (MEP), n=8 (reaching kinematics), or n=6 (TRI-HFT) observations

per condition. Asterisks indicate statistical significance and rejection of the null hypothesis of no difference with a 95% CI.

3. Discussion

This first-in-human study demonstrates that intention-driven ESCS can promote both immediate and sustained therapeutic improvements in upper-limb motor function, even in an individual with chronic, complete cervical SCI (AIS A). By integrating real-time detection of cortical motor intent with targeted cervical neuromodulation, BCI-ESCS not only provided online assistive effects during stimulation but also induced offline neuroplastic changes in corticospinal excitability and functional performance that persisted beyond stimulation. These findings establish the feasibility and therapeutic efficacy of an implantable BCI-ESCS system as a neuromodulation approach for the restoration of upper-limb volitional control in individuals with severe paralysis.

In chronic complete SCI, corticospinal transmission is profoundly disrupted, and voluntary movement is typically absent below the injury level[27]. Nonetheless, our results demonstrated that both BCI-triggered and tonic cervical ESCS immediately improved upper limb motor function in a participant with chronic complete tetraplegia, confirming the previous work demonstrating the assistive effects of tonic spinal stimulation in incomplete SCI[12] and post-stroke individuals[13]. Grip strength, 3D reaching smoothness, and object manipulation all showed clear enhancement under stimulation compared to the no-stimulation condition, highlighting the capacity of ESCS to amplify volitional motor output even in the absence of overt descending control[5,6,12,13]. These assistive effects are now better understood at a mechanistic level. ESCS does not directly activate motoneurons but instead recruits primary afferents in the dorsal roots, which synapse onto motoneurons and interneurons within the spinal cord[10,17,17,28,29]. This transsynaptic activation of spinal circuits elevates the membrane potential of spinal motoneurons and interneurons, bringing them closer to the firing threshold[5,10,30,31]. As a result, these neurons become more responsive to any residual descending cortical input, effectively lowering the activation threshold for volitional control. This mechanism, referred to as the "assistive effect" of spinal cord stimulation[13], does not require full integrity of corticospinal tracts, but instead amplifies sub-threshold cortical inputs that would otherwise be insufficient to produce functional movement.

Consistently, BCI-ESCS elicited a robust assistive effect on grip strength, supporting the hypothesis that intent-driven stimulation also effectively reinforces residual cortical drive. By coupling ESCS to motor imagery events detected through an ECoG-based BCI, the user's volitional drive is synchronized with the stimulation, thereby maximizing the immediate excitability of spinal circuits as reflected by the enhanced maximal force generation (Fig. 2a) and initial direction angle (Fig. 2c). This strategy mirrors previous approaches in non-human primates and other clinical BCI systems that could successfully improve motor output via closed-loop intent-driven stimulation[14,18–20,32,33]. Although tonic and BCI-triggered ESCS both engage the same afferent pathways, the temporal sequencing of BCI-ESCS also enhances cortical and spinal coupling, providing enhanced corticospinal facilitation, which is essential for recovery of voluntary motor function after SCI[34–37].

Therefore, beyond providing immediate assistance, the BCI-ESCS approach induced robust and rapid enhancements in corticospinal excitability, reflected by significant potentiation of MEPs in both the ECR and FCR muscles following a single session (Fig. 3a) and after four weeks of therapy (Fig. 4a). This finding is especially significant given that tonic ESCS does not potentiate or even inhibit the MEPs, suggesting that the continuous mode of stimulation is suboptimal to engage activity-dependent plasticity mechanisms. These findings are consistent with prior findings showing that intention-driven neuromodulation enhances neuroplasticity effectively[23,24,38]. The

effects support the hypothesis that BCI-ESCS engages Hebbian-like plasticity, whereby temporally coordinated cortical and spinal activation reinforces synaptic efficacy across spared corticospinal connections[39,40]. While our system does not control millisecond-level timing required for single-pulse paired associative stimulation that leverages spike-timing-dependent plasticity (STDP)[30,41], we demonstrate that repeated temporally synchronized activation of the motor cortex and subsequent exogenous spinal circuit activation provide conditions to drive activity-dependent synaptic plasticity to elicit long-term potentiation (LTP)-like excitability of the corticospinal tract[33]. Specifically, repeated coupling of endogenous cortical activity with stimulation-induced excitation of spinal interneurons may promote synaptic strengthening, increase excitatory drive within spinal circuits, and promote latent descending pathways. These mechanisms are consistent with the findings in rodent models, where brain-controlled stimulation induced more robust motor recovery following spinal contusions compared to continuous stimulation[40].

Potentiated MEPs across the four weeks of BCI-ESCS therapy suggest a cumulative, training-induced effect, which likely contributed to function restoration[35]. While direct evidence of anatomical change could not be investigated in humans, recent studies indicate that long-term activity-dependent stimulation can also promote circuit reorganization and even potentially axonal sprouting[42], raising the possibility that both synaptic and structural plasticity contributed to the effects we observed. These physiological improvements in corticospinal excitability translated to meaningful improvements in functional upper-limb motor performance, with both TRI-HFT and GRASSP scores exceeding the MDC (Fig. 4d, e). Notably, the participant improved in both object manipulation and block lifting subtests of the TRI-HFT, and these gains were partially retained at the one-month follow-up despite the absence of ongoing stimulation, suggesting partial consolidation of function. These gains were achieved over only 19 BCI-ESCS sessions across 4 weeks and significantly surpassed the mean and upper bound of improvements reported in a control group that underwent 40 sessions of conventional activity-based therapy over 16 weeks (Fig. 4d). The participant also o expressed positive sentiment around moving his upper extremities and the desire for a more permanent solution, providing an encouraging first account of this novel therapeutic approach. This enhanced efficiency underscores the therapeutic advantage of volitional neuromodulation, wherein stimulation is temporally aligned with motor intent, thus reinforcing task-specific descending pathways. The functional gains we demonstrated in an individual with motor complete (AIS A) SCI may also exceed those of individuals with incomplete SCI after multi-week tonic stimulation protocols[12,43–45]. While direct comparisons between BCI-ESCS and tonic stimulation remain to be fully established, BCI-ESCS elicits enhanced potentiation of corticospinal excitability compared to the tonic stimulation mode (Fig. 3b). Although a controlled comparison between BCI-ESCS and tonic stimulation is warranted in future investigations, clinically meaningful improvements achieved here in a participant with motor-complete SCI underscore the efficacy of intent-driven neuromodulation.

In summary, this study provides compelling early evidence that intent-driven spinal stimulation can unlock latent plasticity and promote motor recovery in even the most severe forms of SCI. The key conclusions are:

- The **assistive effects** of BCI-ESCS resulted in immediate improvement in motor function, consistent to tonic ESCS.
- The **single-session effects** of BCI-ESCS led to facilitated corticospinal excitability, whereas tonic ESCS did not, underscoring the importance of volitional engagement and temporally coordinated stimulation in enhancing neuromodulatory efficacy.

- The **longitudinal effects** of four-week BCI-ESCS therapy produced potentiation of corticospinal excitability and improvements in motor function exceeded those achieved with conventional activity-based therapy with both TRI-HFT and GRASSP scores above the MDC, highlighting the utility of BCI-ESCS as a paradigm for neuromotor recovery.

Extending the duration of this therapy may further enhance recovery, potentially enabling improvements in independence and quality of life beyond the four-week intervention period. Further technical improvements to the BCI system, including enhanced decoding accuracy, wireless integration, and increased channel resolution, may improve performance and user experience. Moreover, the future clinical utility of BCI-ESCS may be substantially enhanced by combining it with complementary therapeutic strategies. Combinatorial approaches that integrate neuromodulation with activity-based training and pharmacological agents such as 4-aminopyridine have recently demonstrated synergistic potential to improve functional recovery following SCI[46]. Similarly, cell-based therapies that promote tissue repair and axonal regeneration following SCI[47] may be further potentiated by spinal neuromodulation to support enhanced functional restoration. Therefore, combining activity-dependent stimulation with regenerative interventions may provide a multimodal framework for promoting axon regeneration and circuit reorganization following SCI[42]. Overall, our BCI-ESCS neuromodulation approach represents a shift in the role of brain-computer interfaces, from assistive prosthetic approaches to therapeutic tools that could effectively harness volitional intent to drive synaptic neural plasticity. This mechanistically distinct approach enables targeted, activity-dependent neuromodulation that promotes functional recovery even following chronic complete SCI, offering a promising new direction for restorative neurorehabilitation.

4. Methods

4.1. Trial and participant information

The study was approved by the University of Miami Institutional Review Board (IRB) (IRB 20190536) and conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. The experimental protocol for this study is registered on ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT06533969).

Participant information. One individual participated in this study after providing written informed consent. The participant was a male in his 20's with a history of traumatic C4–C5 SCI (AIS A), who had undergone anterior cervical discectomy and fusion (C3–C5) in 2015. In 2018, the participant first underwent implantation of an ECoG-based BCI device over the motor cortex as part of a separate clinical trial (NCT02564419)[21,22].

The participant was recruited based on the following inclusion criteria: medically stable adult (>18 years old) with chronic (>6 months) traumatic SCI at the C4–C6 level and some residual motor function. Exclusion criteria for the study included contraindications to spinal cord stimulation (e.g., wounds near the stimulation site, muscle denervation, unmanaged autonomic dysreflexia, recent botulinum toxin injections), contraindications to cortical stimulation (e.g., history of epilepsy/seizures), or surgical ineligibility for ESCS (e.g., unfavorable spinal anatomy, anticoagulation therapy, neurological conditions unrelated to SCI, pregnancy).

Study design and data reported. This single-case pilot study aimed to assess the efficacy of BCI-ESCS therapy in enhancing upper-limb motor function in chronic SCI. A total of 19 therapy sessions were completed over four weeks (28 days) following ESCS lead implantation. Each therapy session lasted approximately 40 minutes and included at least three motor tasks, each performed for 10 to 30 minutes (Fig. 8). Over the four-week period, the participant completed a total of 16 BCI-ESCS sessions and 3 Tonic-ESCS sessions enabling comparison of different

stimulating modes with a major focus on longitudinal therapeutic effects. The study outcomes focused on evaluating assistive effects (stimulation on/off), short-term effects (pre-post single session), and longitudinal therapeutic effects (recovery of voluntary function).

During therapy sessions, we investigated the assistive and short-term effects of BCI-ESCS compared to Tonic-ESCS therapy. The assistive effects were assessed on separate days for each condition by evaluating motor function under three different stimulation conditions: no stimulation, Tonic-ESCS, and BCI-ESCS. Assessments included maximum grip force, selected TRI-HFT subtests involving the manipulation of a mug, mobile phone, dice, and rectangular blocks, as well as performance in a 3D reaching task.

The short-term effects were assessed over two sessions for each condition. To evaluate these effects, neurophysiological assessments, including corticospinal excitability measured through motor evoked potentials (MEPs) and spinal excitability measured through posterior root muscle (PRM) reflexes, were conducted before and after a 28-minute session of either BCI-ESCS or Tonic-ESCS therapy. Additionally, functional motor performance was evaluated using the 9HPT and the BBT due to their sensitivity to subtle motor changes over short timeframes.

To assess longitudinal effects, evaluations were conducted at three time points: prior to implantation (Pre), after the therapy period (Post), and one month following lead explant (Follow-up). The primary outcome measure was functional improvement assessed using the TRI-HFT. Secondary outcomes included changes in the GRASSP scores, neurophysiological measures of corticospinal excitability, kinematics and muscle synergies during a 3D reaching task, qualitative assessments of pain, quality of life (QoL), and levels of independence. Additionally, spasticity was evaluated before each therapy session, and the International Standards for Neurological Classification of Spinal Cord Injury (ISNCSCI) was administered at baseline for participant screening and at follow-up for efficacy evaluation.

4.2. Surgical procedure

Prior to surgery, the participant underwent pre-operative screening, including laboratory tests, imaging, prophylactic antibiotics, and a thorough discussion with the research and medical teams over the risks involved. Pre-operative imaging included a non-contrast computed tomography (CT) scan of the head, cervical, and thoracic spine. The ESCS system required temporary surgical placement of two eight-contact percutaneous leads (PN 977A260, Medtronic) in the epidural space of the spinal cord for less than 30 days, after which the same surgical team removed the leads. During surgery, the participant was placed under general anesthesia, and a head fixation device stabilized the participant's head and neck. A short cephalocaudal incision was made along the upper thoracic spine midline, and an epidural needle was inserted into the interlaminar space, as confirmed by intraoperative fluoroscopy. Both leads were placed unilaterally on the right side, with the most rostral tips of the leads placed just caudal to the level of injury, just below the C5 vertebrae, with the lateral lead more rostral than the medial lead by one contact (Fig. 1). Lead positioning was guided by intraoperative fluoroscopy and electrophysiological feedback of muscle action potentials, ensuring selective recruitment of ipsilateral motor pools[13]. During this monitoring, the lead was temporarily connected to the intraoperative monitoring system (Natus XLTEK Protektor 32) via 60 cm extensions (PN 3708160, Medtronic), which were removed after testing. The leads were then anchored to the fascia and tunneled subcutaneously to a distant counter incision where the extension leads were externalized for use in later stimulation procedures coupled with neural signal recordings. Percutaneous leads were removed 28 days after

implantation under monitored anesthesia care by reopening the cephalocaudal incision and releasing the anchors.

4.3. Electromyography acquisition system

Post-operatively, EMG signals were recorded from the right deltoid (DEL), biceps brachii (BB), triceps brachii (TB), ECR, FCR, abductor digiti minimi (ADM), abductor pollicis brevis (APB), and first dorsal interosseous (FDI) muscles. The skin was prepared using disposable razor blades and alcohol swabs before placing bipolar surface EMG electrodes (Ag/AgCl, H124SG, Kendall) over each muscle belly, as well as ground electrodes over the ulnar styloid process and the lateral epicondyle. All signals were amplified (×1,000), band-pass filtered (15–1,000 Hz) using bio-amplifiers (D360R, Digitimer), and digitized (4,000 Hz) with an analog-to-digital converter (Power 1401, Cambridge Electronic Design). EMG activity was recorded during the ESCS spinal mapping session (Section 4.4) and neurophysiological assessment (Section 4.10).

4.4. Epidural spinal cord stimulation (ESCS) system

ESCS was administered using a constant current electrical stimulator (DS8R, Digitimer), as well as a multiplexer (D188, Digitimer) and a custom-built control unit to regulate the pulse timing, amplitude, and output channel selection[13] (Fig. 5 bottom). To interface the stimulator with the percutaneous lead, the system was connected to an accessory kit (355531, Medtronic) via a Medusa electrode cable (Threshold NeuroDiagnostics). The percutaneous lead served as cathode electrodes, and a 2x4" anode electrode (Natus) was placed over the left (contralateral) iliac crest. Each stimulation pulse was set as a symmetrical biphasic waveform with a 200 µs pulse width and 10 µs interphase interval (Fig. 6).



Fig. 5: BCI-ESCS system integration | Schematic representation of the brain-computer interface (BCI)-controlled epidural spinal cord stimulation (ESCS) system, illustrating the interaction between implanted and external components. The implanted system consists of an electrocorticography (ECoG) array connected to an implantable pulse generator (IPG), which records cortical activity. Separately, percutaneous epidural leads are implanted in the cervical spinal cord to deliver ESCS. Neural signals from the ECoG array are transmitted wirelessly via an external antenna through electromagnetic induction to a sensing programmer telemetry module, which relays the data to a PC for real-time BCI decoding. Upon detection of motor intent, a control unit processes the decoded signals and triggers the electrical stimulator via a channel selector, directing current through the

percutaneous leads to selectively activate optimized channels. Stimulation parameters are managed through a separate PC interface, allowing precise control of pulse timing and amplitude. This implantable BCI-ESCS system enables real-time, intention-driven spinal modulation to restore volitional upper limb movement in individuals with SCI.

Segment-level muscle recruitment. Within the first few days post-implant, a spinal mapping session was conducted to determine segment-level muscle recruitment. Muscle recruitment curves were generated by applying paired-pulse stimulation with a 50-ms interstimulus interval[48,49]. For each contact, stimulation intensity was gradually increased from 0 mA until evoked responses were observed in all right-hand muscles or any contralateral (left) effects. Stimulation intensity did not exceed 6.2 mA. From the recruitment curves, we identified contacts and stimulation intensities that produced selective muscle activation via the innervation of primary afferent fibers (Fig. 6 and Supplementary Fig. 1), as indicated by post-activation depression in the second responses[48,49]. These identified contacts and intensities served as references for subsequent therapy sessions. In the second week post-implantation, spinal mapping and cervical X-rays were repeated to ensure the accuracy of segment-level muscle recruitment.



Fig. 6: ESCS lead placement and spinal mapping for muscle recruitment | a. Lead placement: Post-operative X-ray images showing the positioning of the percutaneous epidural spinal cord stimulation (ESCS) leads at the cervical spinal cord. The leads were implanted over the dorsal roots at C6–T1 to selectively target upper-limb muscles. **b.** ESCS mapping: Recruitment curves were obtained by applying paired-pulse stimulation (interstimulus interval [ISI]: 50 ms) at increasing intensities (0–6.2 mA) to each contact. EMG recordings were used to assess evoked muscle responses. Recruitment curves for contacts 3R and 4R illustrate muscle-specific activation patterns, with the second response showing post-activation depression, confirming activation via primary afferent fibers. **c.** Optimal ESCS settings for continuous stimulation: Stimulation parameters were optimized to selectively modulate reaching, grasping, and pinching movements, with stimulation intensities

ranging from 1.3 to 3.4 mA at 80 Hz and a biphasic pulse width of 200 µs. These settings ensured targeted muscle activation while minimizing unintended co-contraction.

ESCS optimization for therapy sessions. For each therapy task, ESCS configurations were optimized to maximize support during volitional movements while preventing involuntary muscle twitching. Based on the segment-level muscle recruitment, stimulation contacts that innervated the upper arm were selected for reaching tasks and contacts that innervated the forearm and fingers were selected for grasping and pinching tasks (Fig. 6). At the beginning of each therapy session, stimulation contacts were adjusted to ensure optimal neuromodulation, and alternative contacts were used if necessary to enhance motor performance (Supplementary Fig. 2). For each selected contact, stimulation frequencies ranging from 40–100 Hz were tested[13], with 80 Hz identified as optimal for maximizing assistive benefits. Stimulation intensities were set slightly below the motor threshold and were marginally adjusted throughout therapy, ranging from 1.3 to 3.4 mA, ensuring precise neuromodulation while avoiding excessive muscle activation.

4.5. BCI system

ECoG acquisition system. Cortical activity was recorded using two four-contact electrodes (Resume II Leads, Medtronic) implanted over the sensorimotor cortex's hand knob region during previous clinical trials[21,22] (Fig. 7). These electrodes were subcutaneously connected to an implanted pulse generator (Activa PC+S, Medtronic), enabling the recording of two time-series channels (Fig. 5 upper part). The acquisition system applied a 0.5–100 Hz band-pass pre-amplifier filter and sampled data at 200 Hz, with an internal buffer of 400 ms[50].

BCI decoding. The BCI system was adapted from previous studies[23,24,51–53] to detect motor imagery of hand movements (Fig. 7) by analyzing real-time changes in ECoG signal power. This signal was then used to trigger continuous ESCS during activity-based therapy (see Section 4.6).

Before therapy (baseline), a BCI calibration session was conducted to determine the optimal channel and frequency. During this session, the participant performed 10 motor imagery trials for each of the following movements: reaching, grasping, supination, pronation, lateral pinching, and pulp pinching. From these 60 total trials, time-frequency spectrograms were generated to identify the optimal ECoG channel and frequency range based on the strongest event-related desynchronization (ERD) during motor imagery tasks[23,24,51,52] (Fig. 7). For real-time decoding during BCI-ESCS therapy, the system utilized the calibrated channel (Ch 0 and Ch 3) and frequency (8-14 Hz) (Fig. 7). The BCI system acquired ECoG signals from the selected channel and applied a band-pass filter within the calibrated frequency range. The root-mean-square (RMS) value of the filtered signal was computed every 100 ms and subsequently smoothed using a 1-second moving average window to obtain the signal power. To trigger continuous ESCS, the BCI system monitored the ECoG signal power within a 15-second window after the participant was instructed to imagine the corresponding task (i.e., Go cue, Fig. 7). If the signal power remained below a predefined threshold[23,24,51–53] for at least one second, the BCI system triggered ESCS to assist the participant in performing the corresponding activity-based therapy task. Conversely, if motor imagery was not detected, ESCS was not triggered, and the participant remained at rest before proceeding to the next task.



Fig. 7: BCI calibration and real-time decoding for BCI-ESCS therapy | a. BCI calibration process. The participant performed 60 trials of randomized motor imagery tasks, including reaching, palmar grasp, pronation, tip pinch, lateral pinch, and supination. ECoG signals were recorded from implanted electrodes, and offline analysis was conducted to determine the optimal ECoG channel and frequency range based on event-related desynchronization (ERD). Channel selection was performed by comparing activation patterns across electrodes, and the frequency range (8-14 Hz) was selected based on the strongest task-related ERD. **b.** Real-time BCI decoding during therapy. Raw ECoG signals from the selected channels (Ch 0 and Ch 3) were processed in real-time using a band-pass filter (calibrated frequency) and converted into a root-mean-square (RMS) value every 100 ms. A 1-second moving average smoothing was applied to track signal power. If the ECoG power remained below a predefined ERD threshold for at least one second within a 15-second window, the BCI system triggered ESCS to support the intended movement.

4.6. BCI-ESCS therapy protocol

The therapy was conducted by a physical therapist and two BCI-ESCS operators, focusing on restoring right-hand upper limb function through activity-based training with BCI-triggered ESCS. The physical therapist guided the participant through a series of motor tasks, while the BCI system continuously monitored motor imagery and triggered ESCS in real-time to facilitate volitional movement.

At the start of each task, a visual cue corresponding to the intended movement (e.g., reaching, grasping, pronation, supination, lateral pinching, and pulp pinching) was presented on a monitor (Fig. 8). Upon receiving the "Go" cue, the participant attempted the motor imagery. When motor imagery was detected (see Section 4.5), the BCI system triggered ESCS, providing stimulation to enhance movement execution. If necessary, the therapist provided minimal assistance to the upper limb, thereby enabling the participant to move in the intended direction with voluntary effort and less compensation. The average real-time BCI success rate across different sessions, computed as the proportion of correctly detected motor attempts, was 83.8±4.2%.

To progressively enhance motor function, task difficulty was adjusted throughout the intervention. Initially, the participant engaged in simple isolated movements (e.g., reaching or grasping). As performance improved, more complex combination tasks (e.g., reaching and grasping simultaneously) were introduced (Fig. 8d). Training was further enriched using objects

of varying weight, size, and texture (e.g., cups, blocks, balls) to enhance sensorimotor engagement. Additionally, task parameters such as movement height and distance were modified to challenge motor control. In later stages of therapy, the participant practiced functional movements relevant to daily living, such as mimicking drinking or eating, to promote practical skill acquisition.



*Some images removed by authors to comply with MedRxiv publication policies

Fig. 8: BCI-ESCS therapy setup and task progression over long-term intervention | **a.** Therapy setup: The participant sat in a wheelchair facing a monitor displaying visual cues corresponding to the instructed motor tasks. Upon receiving the "Go" cue, the participant attempted the motor imagery while the BCI system detected motor intention and triggered ESCS in real time. The stimulation remained active throughout the task execution phase. **b.** Examples of therapy tasks. The participant engaged in functional hand and arm movements, including grasping, reaching, pinching, and combined movements such as grasp + reach and grasp + supination, mimicking real-life functional tasks. **c.** Task distribution across all therapy sessions. Throughout the four weeks (28-day) therapy period, the participant performed a variety of motor tasks, including simple isolated movements (e.g., reaching, grasping, pronation, supination, lateral pinching, pulp pinching) and complex combination movements (e.g., grasp + reach, grasp + supination, supination + pronation). Simple movements accounted for 69% of total tasks, while combination movements comprised 31%, reflecting a progressive increase in task complexity aimed at improving functional motor coordination. **d.** Progression of therapy task complexity over time. The proportion of combination tasks increased throughout the four-week therapy period. Initially, simple tasks dominated the sessions (86% early on), but as therapy progressed, the participant performed a greater proportion of complex combination tasks, reaching 59% by the final sessions.

4.7. Tonic-ESCS as a control for assistive and short-term effects

Tonic-ESCS was implemented as a control condition to evaluate the assistive and short-term (single session) effects of BCI-ESCS therapy. During the Tonic-ESCS condition, stimulation was delivered continuously (without the BCI trigger) throughout the session. Stimulation parameters were optimized before each task, following the same procedure as in the BCI-ESCS condition, ensuring that stimulation facilitated movement without causing excessive involuntary muscle activation.

To minimize variability, for short-term effects, the BCI-ESCS and Tonic-ESCS conditions contained equal therapy tasks and durations under the guidance of a physical therapist.

4.8. Clinical assessments

Toronto Rehabilitation Institute-Hand Function Test (TRI-HFT). The TRI-HFT is a standardized assessment of unilateral gross motor function of the upper extremity, with an emphasis on pinch and palmar grasp. It consists of two components: (1) object manipulation, in which individuals are evaluated on their ability to manipulate ten everyday objects and a set of rectangular blocks, and (2) grip strength assessment, comprising three sub-tests to measure lateral grip and palmar grasp strength[54]. We used a 3D-printed version of the TRI-HFT and focused primarily on the object manipulation component, which has been validated in individuals with SCI[55]. Each object is scored on a scale from 0 to 7, with higher scores reflecting greater hand function.

To assess the effects of our four-week BCI-ESCS intervention, we compared TRI-HFT outcomes to control data from six individuals with chronic SCI (n=2: complete and n=4: incomplete SCI; all C4–C7 neurological level injuries with 5.7±3.1 years since injury) who underwent conventional activity-based therapy without neuromodulation at the Rehabilitation Engineering Laboratory (KITE Research Institute - University Health Network). The training protocol and partial dataset are described by Kapadia et al.[56], where participants completed 40 one-hour therapy sessions over 16 weeks. In contrast, the individual in our current study completed 19 sessions of approximately 40-minute BCI-ESCS therapy combined with comparable activity-based rehabilitation. The control comparison evaluated whether the TRI-HFT improvements in our participant with a motor-complete SCI exceeded those observed in the control group.

Graded Redefined Assessment of Strength, Sensibility and Prehension (GRASSP). The GRASSP is a comprehensive and sensitive measure of the upper limb impairment and function in the cervical SCI population, which was used to assess three domains of recovery: sensation, strength, and prehension[57,58].

The International Standards of Neurological Classification of Spinal Cord Injury (ISNCSCI). The ISNCSCI is a standardized classification tool for SCI used to systematically assess sensory and motor levels of injury to determine the neurological level of the injury and severity (i.e., completeness) of the SCI[59].

4.9. 3D reaching assessment: kinematics and muscle coordination

Reaching task. The participant was asked to reach forward to four targets (center, left, right, and upward targets) with varying heights and lateral positions. The center target was positioned 40 cm horizontally from the body, aligned with the right shoulder. Left and right targets were horizontally placed 20 cm to the left and right of the center, while the upward target was placed vertically 20 cm above the center. A single reaching cycle was defined as the hand moving from the initial position to the target (reaching phase) and returning to the initial position (pull phase).

The reaching task was repeated eight times per target before the next target was assigned in randomized order. These reaching movements differed from those used during the training sessions, minimizing the likelihood of task learning effects. We compared reaching kinematics and muscle synergies before and after four weeks of therapy sessions (i.e., longitudinal effects), and during the use of BCI-ESCS and Tonic-ESCS (i.e., assistive effects).

Kinematics. Marker trajectory data of right-hand movement were acquired and sampled at 100 Hz using a twelve-camera motion capture system (Vicon Vero, Oxford, UK). Four reflective markers were placed at each target and a marker was placed at the ulnar styloid to track the wrist trajectory. The kinematic analysis focused on reaching trajectories, velocity peak, maximum speed (mm/s), and initial direction angle for each target. Reaching trajectories were calculated in two-dimensional planes based on target direction, with the horizontal plane used for the center, left, and right targets, and the vertical plane used for the upward target. For velocity peak, we focused on the primary movement direction for each target: forward direction (y-axis) for the center target, lateral direction (x-axis) for the left and right targets, and vertical direction (z-axis) for the upward target. This approach ensures that the primary movement component is analyzed while systematically covering all three dimensions (X, Y, and Z).

Velocity peaks were analyzed as a measure of movement smoothness using the *findpeaks* function in MATLAB. This metric quantified the total number of local maxima and minima in the velocity profile during both the reaching and pulling phases. Movements with a higher number of velocity peaks indicated less smooth movement, characterized by frequent accelerations and decelerations[13]. To identify these peaks, a prominence threshold of 10% of the velocity profile's range was applied. This threshold filtered out minor noise and ensured that only significant variations in velocity were captured. These metrics were analyzed for all targets to characterize participants' motor control strategies and performance. The initial direction angle was calculated based on the vector difference between the initial hand position and the target position. The angle was determined using the dot product between the vector from the onset position to the target and the vector from the onset position to the point of peak velocity of the forward reaching cycle. The calculation was performed in MATLAB using the *acos* function to determine the angle in radians, which was then converted to degrees, ensuring an objective assessment of the initial movement direction relative to the intended trajectory.

4.10. Neurophysiological assessment: corticospinal, and spinal excitability

Corticospinal excitability. We measured corticospinal excitability using motor evoked potentials (MEPs) of the ECR and FCR muscles elicited via subdural ECoG electrode single-pulse motor cortex stimulation (MCS) while the participant remained at rest. A voltage-regulated generator (Activa PC+S, Medtronic) delivered 450 µs long pulses in bipolar configuration, with contact 9 as the anode and contact 10 as the cathode. This contact configuration was selected based on our preliminary investigation, as it elicited MEPs in the FCR and ECR muscles at the lowest stimulation intensity compared to other combinations. We recorded MEPs using stimulation intensities ranging from 4.0 to 10.5 V, with five stimuli per intensity. Corticospinal excitability was assessed at the baseline (Pre), after the therapy sessions (Post), and more than one month after the lead explant (Follow-up) for the longitudinal effects, as well as before and after short-term interventions of BCI-ESCS and Tonic-ESCS.

Spinal excitability. We evaluated posterior root muscle (PRM) reflexes of the ECR and FCR muscles elicited by paired-pulse ESCS with the 4R contact, which simultaneously induced responses in both muscles at the lowest stimulation intensity compared to other contacts. The PRM

reflexes represent the transsynaptic activation by Ia sensory fibers[48,49]. We recorded PRM reflexes at gradually increasing intensity, with three paired-pulse stimuli delivered at each intensity. Spinal excitability was assessed before and after short-term interventions of BCI-ESCS and Tonic-ESCS.

4.11. Qualitative assessments: pain, quality of life, and independence assessments

The International Spinal Cord Injury Pain Basic Data Set (ISCIPBDS) version 2.0. The ISCIPDS version 2.0 was developed to collect a minimal amount of standardized information necessary for determining interference of pain with physical and emotional function and sleep, probable pain diagnosis, location, intensity and duration[60].

The International Spinal Cord Injury Quality of Life Basic Data Set (QoL-BDS) version 2.0. The QoL-BDS version 2.0 consists of four items for individuals to rate their satisfaction with life as a whole, physical health, psychological health, and social life[61,62].

Spinal Cord Independence Measure-Self Care (SCIM-SC) III. The SCIM III is the comprehensive ability rating scale for individuals with spinal cord injury that consists of three principal areas of daily living function: self-care, respiration and sphincter management, and mobility[63,64]. This study specifically focused on the domain of self-care, which includes feeding, bathing, dressing, and grooming.

4.12. Hand dexterity assessments

Nine-hole Peg Test (9HPT). The 9HPT was used to assess finger dexterity following neurological injury[65,66]. The participant was instructed to pick up the pegs one at a time and place them in the holes until filled as quickly and accurately as possible. Since the participant could not complete the test, the number of pegs successfully placed in 50 seconds was counted. In addition, we used the wooden 9HPT in the GRASSP prehension[57,58] to accurately assess finger dexterity.

Box and Block Test (BBT). The BBT measures manual dexterity by counting the number of wooden blocks (2.5 cm each) that a participant can transport from one side of a box to the other within 60 seconds, typically in individuals with central paresis[67,68]. Participants are instructed to place their hand on the table beside the box. Upon the examiner's cue to begin, they reach into the box and move one block at a time across a central partition to the opposite side, repeating the action as many times as possible within the allotted time. Only blocks that fully cross the divider are counted toward the final score, and only one block may be moved at a time.

4.13. Spasticity assessment

Modified Ashworth Scale (MAS). The MAS was conducted to evaluate muscle spasticity, using a rating of muscle resistance on a 0–4 ordinal scale[69], before and after each ESCS therapy session. Assessments were performed on the right upper limb, targeting both extensor and flexor muscle groups of the shoulder, elbow, wrist, and fingers. These repeated evaluations enabled close monitoring of potential spasticity changes related to the intervention.

4.14. Safety

The study was designed to prioritize participant safety, with continuous monitoring by a multidisciplinary team of neurosurgeons, physical therapists, and medical staff. Post-operatively, we conducted daily wound care. A standard post-operative dressing was applied over the cephalocaudal incision, which was sealed with surgical glue, and changed at least five times per week. A silver-infused antimicrobial barrier wound dressing (Silverlon Island Dressing ID-46)

was applied over the extensions that exited from the participant's back and changed approximately every three days[13]. There was no evidence of infection at the lead exit sites.

All adverse events were recorded, reported to the IRB, and managed by the medical team. There were no serious adverse events reported during the study, and none were related to the BCI-ESCS intervention. The participant experienced a urinary tract infection during the study that was promptly treated and determined by the study team and the IRB to be unrelated to study procedures. We also did not observe any autonomic dysreflexia episodes, and overall vital signs (blood pressure, heart rate, and oxygen saturation) remained stable throughout the study. A post-session drop in blood pressure was observed during the early therapy sessions (Supplementary Fig. 5), which was determined by the study team to be most likely due to changes in posture during prolonged upright sitting. Furthermore, improvement in motor function (INSCSCI in Supplementary Table 3, TRI-HFT in Supplementary Table 1, and GRASSP scores in Supplementary Table 2) suggests the absence of neurological deterioration. Spasticity (Supplementary Fig. 6) and pain levels (Supplementary Table 6) also remained stable, with no signs of deterioration or relief, suggesting that the intervention did not negatively influence these outcomes.

4.15. Statistics

Statistical comparisons were performed using the bootstrap method[13]. With 10,000 bootstrap iterations, we obtained a distribution of mean differences, and a 95% confidence interval (CI) was derived[13]. Statistical significance was determined by rejecting the null hypothesis of no mean difference if the 95% CI did not include zero. Where multiple comparisons were conducted, Bonferroni correction was applied to adjust the alpha threshold accordingly. Bootstrap statistical analysis was only performed for datasets with at least five data points.

Acknowledgments
We are grateful to Letitia Fisher for her valuable contributions as the clinical coordinator and Nelson Rodriguez for assistance with graphic design. We thank Deena Cilien, DPT and Cristina Segredo, DPT for their expert physical therapy support and for conducting key clinical assessments throughout the study. We also thank Felipe Monteiro, MD for surgical support and Luigi Borda for assistance with the technical design. We extend our sincere gratitude to the research participant for their time, dedication, and insightful contributions throughout the study. This study was supported by The Miami Project to Cure Paralysis and the Buoniconti Foundation.

Author contributions
A.S., R.A.F., M.C., and M.M. conceived the research.
M.M. and W.D.D. secured the funding.
A.S., R.A.F., A.Y., Z.B., H.S., and M.M. designed the experiments, procedures, and assessments.
Z.B., K.D., Ni.D., G.S.P., S.T., M.E.I., J.J., A.P., J.D.G., and J.G.C. implemented and evaluated the neurosurgical procedures and participants' clinical management protocols.
R.A.F., Z.B., R.deF., Ni.M., E.P., M.C., J.G.C., and M.M. designed and performed the intraoperative monitoring.
A.S., R.A.F., A.Y., Z.B., H.S., and Ne.M. performed the experiments.
A.S., R.A.F., A.Y., Z.B., H.S., and Ne.M. analyzed the data.
A.S. and R.A.F. performed the statistical data analyses.
A.S., R.A.F., A.Y., and Z.B. created the figures.
Na.D., V.Z., and M.R.P. contributed the control experiment data and performed the procedures.
A.S., R.A.F., A.Y., Z.B., H.S., Ne.M., and M.M. wrote the manuscript, and all authors contributed to its editing.

Competing interests
M.E.I. is a consultant to Medtronic, and J.D.G. is a consultant to ONWARD Medical; Neither of these consulting roles are directly related to the work presented in this study. M.R.P. is a co-founder, director, and shareholder in MyndTec Inc., and is also a co-founder and consultant for NovaKonexus. W.D.D. is a co-founder and managing member of InflamaCORE, LLC, and has licensed patents on inflammasome proteins as biomarkers of injury and disease, as well as on targeting inflammasome proteins for therapeutic purposes. W.D.D. is also a Scientific Advisory Board Member of ZyVersa Therapeutics. M.C. holds several patents on spinal cord stimulation for motor recovery and is a shareholder of Reach Neuro Inc., a company developing spinal cord stimulation for post-stroke motor recovery. The remaining authors have no conflicts of interest, financial or otherwise.

Supplementary Information



Supplementary Fig. 1: Spinal mapping for optimizing ESCS contacts | Spinal mapping results for optimizing epidural spinal cord stimulation (ESCS) contacts. Stimulation was applied at different contacts along the epidural electrode array, and muscle responses were recorded from multiple upper-limb muscles, including the deltoid (DEL), biceps brachii (BB), triceps brachii (TB), extensor carpi radialis (ECR), flexor carpi radialis (FCR), abductor digiti minimi (ADM), abductor pollicis brevis (APB), and first dorsal interosseous (FDI). The left panels illustrate the electrode positions corresponding to each tested contact, while the middle panels show representative response amplitudes (mV) across different stimulation intensities. The right panels depict muscle activation patterns across various ESCS configurations. Muscle responses were elicited by paired-pulse ESCS, confirming stimulation of the dorsal roots rather than direct motor axon activation. These spinal mapping results were used to determine the optimal ESCS contacts for neuromodulation and motor engagement during BCI-ESCS therapy.



Supplementary Fig. 2: Timeline of stimulation contact adjustments throughout BCI-ESCS therapy | At the beginning of each therapy session, stimulation contacts were adjusted to ensure optimal neuromodulation for each movement task. Alternative contacts were selected when necessary to enhance motor performance. The figure illustrates the stimulation contacts used for different motor tasks across therapy sessions, with color-coded markers representing specific electrode configurations.

Supplementary Information 1.1. Muscle synergy analysis during 3D reaching for assistive and longitudinal effects

Coordinated movements, such as upper limb reaching, rely on the precise and timely coactivation of multiple muscles to ensure accurate and controlled limb motion. Muscle synergies were extracted using nonnegative matrix factorization (NNMF), a dimensionality reduction technique to investigate the muscle coordination patterns underlying these movements[13]. Electromyography (EMG) data were collected from participants during the reaching task, capturing muscle activity from multiple upper limb muscles.

EMG activity was recorded using a wireless EMG system (Trigno Wireless System; Delsys, Boston, MA). The EMG signals were band-pass filtered (20–450 Hz) and sampled at 2,148 Hz. Sensors were attached to the following muscles on the right side of the body: infraspinatus (IF), supraspinatus (SSP), lower trapezius (LT), middle trapezius (MT), deltoid anterior (DA), deltoid middle (DM), deltoid posterior (DP), serratus anterior (SA), pectoralis major clavicular head (PC), biceps brachii long head (BCL), triceps brachii long head (TLO), brachioradialis (BR), pronator teres (PT), flexor carpi ulnaris (FCU), and extensor carpi radialis (ECR).

In post-processing, EMG signals were high-pass filtered at 40 Hz, rectified, low-pass filtered at 10 Hz, and normalized to the average of the maximum EMG values across all trials for each muscle[70]. Trials were concatenated sequentially to form an $m \times t$ data matrix, where m represents the number of muscles (i.e., 16 muscle groups), and t represents the total number of time points, calculated as the product of trials and time bins. Each trial included 100 time bins for the reaching phase and 100 time bins for the pulling phase, totaling 200 time bins. Each of the four targets was repeated for eight trials, resulting in a total of 32 trials. Thus, the complete dataset consisted of $t = 6{,}400$ time bins (32 trials × 200 bins per trial).

Muscle synergies were identified from the EMG matrices (M) using NNMF, which decomposes the EMG signals into two components: a synergy vector, representing the contribution of each muscle to the synergy, and a temporal activation pattern, describing the time course of each synergy during the movement, as shown in the following equation:

$$M = W \cdot C + e$$

where M ($m \times t$ matrix) is a linear combination of a synergy vector W ($m \times n$ matrix, where n is the number of muscle synergies) and C ($n \times t$ matrix, representing temporal activation patterns), and e matrix is the residual error matrix. To determine the number of muscle synergies, NNMF was applied to extract each possible synergy from 1 to 16 for each dataset. The variance accounted for (VAF) by the reconstructed EMG was calculated at each iteration to determine the optimal number of muscle synergies using the following equation:

$$VAF = 100 \times (1 - SSE/SST)$$

where SSE was the sum of the squared residuals and SST was the sum of the squared EMG data[71]. Since NNMF utilizes the random initialization of W matrix and C matrix, the algorithm can become trapped in suboptimal local minima. Therefore, each synergy extraction was repeated 50 times, and the iteration with the highest VAF was selected[70].

The contributions of individual muscles to each synergy were quantified using the synergy vector. Temporal activation patterns of the synergies were analyzed to examine the timing and amplitude of muscle coordination during the task. All repetitions of the task were included in the analysis to ensure robust and representative results.

Supplementary Information 1.2. Assistive effects of BCI-ESCS therapy: reaching muscle synergy

We extracted muscle synergies under three conditions (Supplementary Fig. 3). The results showed that under both Tonic-ESCS and BCI-ESCS, the number of synergies was higher (seven synergies) compared to no stimulation (six synergies), indicating a broader movement repertoire when stimulation was applied. For example, shoulder-related synergies that involved a relatively large number of shoulder muscles (suggesting increased co-contraction) in the no-stimulation condition (Syn 4) were fractionated into Syn 3 (SSP and UT) and Syn 4 (IF and MT) in both Tonic-ESCS and BCI-ESCS conditions, which specialized in shoulder elevation and external rotation, respectively. Similarly, wrist-related synergies in the no-stimulation condition (Syn 6) were fractionated into Syn 6 (BR and ECR) and Syn 7 (FCU and PT) in both stimulation conditions, with Syn 6 specializing in wrist extension/elbow flexion and Syn 7 specializing in wrist flexion/pronation. These findings indicate that stimulation induced synergies with more functionally distinct roles.

Furthermore, in the BCI-ESCS condition, an additional muscle synergy involving the LT emerged. This suggests that BCI-triggered stimulation specifically facilitated the activation of scapular stabilizers, providing greater scapular control during reaching movements. The increase in the number of synergies and the emergence of more functionally distinct muscle patterns may provide an advantage for executing various reaching movements more effectively, reducing reliance on excessive activation of a single synergy However, this enhancement also revealed that the closed-loop interaction between cortical motor intent detected via BCI and immediate ESCS delivery resulted in an abrupt assistive boost in muscle activation, which led to increased velocity peaks and greater deviation in initial movement direction angles in BCI-ESCS condition in comparison to other condition (Fig. 2).



Supplementary Fig. 3: Assistive effects of BCI-ESCS and Tonic-ESCS on muscle synergy during reaching movements | Muscle synergies were extracted under three conditions: no stimulation (no-stim), Tonic-ESCS, and BCI-ESCS. Left panel: Synergy vectors showing muscle contributions. Right panel: Temporal activation patterns during reaching toward left, center, right, and upward targets. Both Tonic-ESCS and BCI-ESCS increased the number of synergies from six (no stimulation) to seven, suggesting a broader movement repertoire with stimulation. Shoulder and wrist-related synergies observed in the no-stimulation condition were fractionated into more functionally distinct synergies under both stimulation conditions, indicating improved coordination. Additionally, BCI-ESCS uniquely facilitated scapular stabilizer activation (LT), suggesting enhanced shoulder control. These findings indicate that stimulation-assisted reaching promotes more adaptive motor control strategies, with BCI-ESCS potentially offering greater benefits for upper limb coordination.
Muscle abbreviations: BCL: biceps (long head), BR: brachioradialis, DA: anterior deltoid, DM: middle deltoid, DP: posterior deltoid, ECR: extensor carpi radialis longus, FCU: flexor carpi ulnaris, IF: infraspinatus, LT: lower trapezius, MT: middle trapezius, PC: pectoralis, PT: pronator teres, SA: serratus anterior, SSP: supraspinatus, TLO: triceps (long head), UT: upper trapezius.

Supplementary Information 1.3. Longitudinal effects of BCI-ESCS therapy: reaching muscle synergy

Consistent with the observed assistive effects, BCI-ESCS therapy introduced muscle synergies with more functionally distinct roles, even without stimulation (Supplementary Fig. 4). The increase in the number of muscle synergies (from 6 to 7) highlights that therapy specifically facilitated shoulder-related synergies. For example, during the center-target task, which showed significant improvements in peak velocity, the temporal activation pattern exhibited increased engagement of Syn 1, involving shoulder muscles, particularly DA, DM, and DP. Additionally, similar to the assistive effects observed previously, shoulder-related synergies involving multiple muscles pre-therapy (Syn 4) were fractionated into distinct synergies post-therapy: Syn 3 (SSP and UT) and Syn 4 (IF and MT), reflecting enhanced coordination between scapular and shoulder muscles. Furthermore, an additional synergy involving LT, a primary scapular upward rotator, emerged exclusively post-therapy. This synergy contributed to movements in all directions, likely facilitating improved shoulder function and smoother movements. However, at the follow-up session, this additional synergy was no longer observed, which may explain why some kinematic outcomes reverted toward baseline levels.



Supplementary Fig. 4: Longitudinal effects of BCI-ESCS therapy on reaching muscle synergy | Muscle synergies were extracted before therapy (Pre), after four weeks of BCI-ESCS therapy (Post), and one month

after lead explantation (Follow-up). Left panel: Synergy vectors showing muscle contributions. Right panel: Temporal activation patterns during reaching toward different targets. BCI-ESCS therapy increased the number of muscle synergies (from 6 to 7), reflecting enhanced facilitation of shoulder-related synergies even without stimulation. During the center-target task, improved peak velocity was associated with increased activation of shoulder muscles (DA, DM, DP) in Syn 1. Shoulder-related synergies observed pre-therapy (Syn 4) were fractionated post-therapy into Syn 3 (SSP, UT) and Syn 4 (IF, MT), indicating improved scapular-shoulder coordination. Additionally, a novel synergy involving LT, a primary scapular upward rotator, emerged exclusively post-therapy, contributing to smoother and more coordinated reaching movements. However, at the follow-up, the LT synergy was no longer observed, potentially explaining the reversion of some kinematic outcomes toward baseline levels. Muscle abbreviations: BCL: biceps (long head), BR: brachioradialis, DA: anterior deltoid, DM: middle deltoid, DP: posterior deltoid, ECR: extensor carpi radialis longus, FCU: flexor carpi ulnaris, IF: infraspinatus, LT: lower trapezius, MT: middle trapezius, PC: pectoralis, PT: pronator teres, SA: serratus anterior, SSP: supraspinatus, TLO: triceps (long head), UT: upper trapezius.



Supplementary Fig. 5: Stability of vital signs during the study period | Vital signs were measured before and after each BCI-ESCS therapy session and averaged across four-time windows: Early (days 6–11), Mid 1 (days 12–14), Mid 2 (days 15–23), and Late (days 24–28). Shown are heart rate (blue), oxygen saturation (SpO_2; green), systolic blood pressure (BP; magenta), and diastolic BP (orange). Across all time points, SpO_2 remained stable, while modest decreases in heart rate and blood pressure were observed following stimulation. Data are shown as mean ± standard deviation.



Supplementary Fig. 6: Longitudinal assessment of upper limb spasticity using the Modified Ashworth Scale (MAS) | Spasticity was evaluated using the Modified Ashworth Scale (MAS), which rates muscle resistance to passive movement on a 0–4 ordinal scale. Assessments were conducted before and after each ESCS therapy session on the right upper limb, targeting flexor and extensor muscles of the shoulder, elbow, wrist, and fingers. For visualization, MAS scores were averaged across sessions within four time periods: Early (days 6–11), Mid 1 (days 12–14), Mid 2 (days 15–23), and Late (days 24–28). Spasticity remained stable throughout the intervention, with no evidence of increased muscle tone. Data are shown as mean ± standard deviation across evaluations for each muscle group.

Supplementary Table 1: Longitudinal effects of BCI-ESCS therapy, Toronto Rehabilitation Institute–Hand Function Test (TRI-HFT). The assessments were conducted at Pre (baseline, before ESCS implantation), Post (after 4 weeks of BCI-ESCS therapy), and Follow-up (4 weeks after ESCS explantation).

Object manipulation		Pre		Post		Follow up	
		R	L	R	L	R	L
Ten objects							
1. Mug		4	4	4	4	4	4
2. Paper		1	1	2	1	4	1
3. Book		1	1	1	1	1	1
4. Ziplock bag		2	2	2	2	2	2
5. Pop can		1	2	2	2	2	2
6. Dice		4	2	4	2	4	2
7. Sponge		1	1	1	1	1	1
8. Credit card		1	1	4	1	4	4
9. Mobile phone		2	2	6	6	6	4
10. Pencil		2	2	2	2	2	2
Subtotal (70)		19	18	28	22	30	23
Subtotal R+L (140)		37		50		53	
Rectangular blocks							
Weight	Surface friction level						
100 g	high	4	4	4	4	4	4
	middle	1	4	4	4	4	4
	low	2	4	4	4	4	4
200 g	high	2	4	4	4	4	4
	middle	2	4	4	4	4	4
	low	2	2	4	4	4	4
300 g	high	2	2	4	4	4	4
	middle	2	2	4	4	4	4
	low	2	2	4	2	4	2
Subtotal (63)		19	28	36	34	36	34
Subtotal R+L (127)		47		70		70	

Supplementary Table 2: Longitudinal effects of BCI-ESCS therapy, Graded Redefined Assessment of Strength, Sensibility and Prehension (GRASSP). The assessments were conducted at Pre (baseline, before ESCS implantation), Post (after 4 weeks of BCI-ESCS therapy), and Follow-up (4 weeks after ESCS explantation).

	Pre		Post		Follow up	
	R	L	R	L	R	L
Strength	7	10	8	9	8	9
Sensory- Dosal	0	0	0	3	0	1
Sensory- Palmar	1	4	2	0	0	0
Prehension-Qualitative	2	2	2	1	2	1
Prehension-Quantitative	2	6	6	5	5	5
Total	12	22	18	18	15	16

Supplementary Table 3: Longitudinal effects of BCI-ESCS therapy, International Standards for Neurological Classification of Spinal Cord Injury (ISNCSCI). The assessments were conducted at Pre (baseline, before ESCS implantation), Post (after 4 weeks of BCI-ESCS therapy), and Follow-up (4 weeks after ESCS explantation).

	Pre		Post	
	Right	Left	Right	Left
Motor				
C5 Elbow flexors	4	4	4	5
C6 Wrist extensors	0	0	0	1
C7 Elbow extensors	0	0	2	2
C8 Finger flexors	0	0	0	0
T1 Finger abductors	0	0	0	1
Total	4	4	6	9
Zone of partial preservation				
Sensory	T9	T10	T10	T11
Motor	C5	C5	C7	T1

Supplementary Table 4: **Longitudinal effects of BCI-ESCS therapy, Spinal Cord Independence Measure Version III self-care.** The assessments were conducted at Pre (baseline, before ESCS implantation), Post (after 4 weeks of BCI-ESCS therapy), and Follow-up (4 weeks after ESCS explantation).

		Pre	Post	Follow-up
Feeding		2	2	2
Bathing	Upper body	1	1	1
	Lower body	0	0	0
Dressing	Upper body	0	0	0
	Lower body	0	0	0
Grooming		1	1	1
Total		4	4	4

Supplementary Table 5: **Longitudinal effects of BCI-ESCS therapy, International Spinal Cord Injury Quality of Life Basic Data Set version 2.0.** The assessments were conducted at Pre (baseline, before ESCS implantation), Post (after 4 weeks of BCI-ESCS therapy), and Follow-up (4 weeks after ESCS explantation).

	Pre	Post	Follow-up
Life as a whole	9	9	9
Physical health	8	8	9
Psychological health	9	10	10
Social life	9	10	10

Supplementary Table 6: Longitudinal effects of BCI-ESCS therapy, International Spinal Cord Injury Pain Basic Data Set Version 2.0. The assessments were conducted at Pre (baseline, before ESCS implantation), Post (after 4 weeks of BCI-ESCS therapy), and Follow-up (4 weeks after ESCS explantation).

	Pre	Post	Follow-up
Have you had any pain during the last seven days including today?	Yes	Yes	Yes
How many different pain problems did you have?	4	2	2
Pain interference			
1. In general, how much has pain interfered with your day-to-day activities in the last week?	0	0	0
2. In general, how much has pain interfered with your overall mood in the last week?	1	0	1
3. In general, how much has pain interfered with your ability to get a good night's sleep in the last week?	0	0	0

References

1. Anderson, K. D. Targeting Recovery: Priorities of the Spinal Cord-Injured Population. *Journal of Neurotrauma* **21**, 1371–1383 (2004).
2. Thompson, C., Mutch, J., Parent, S. & Mac-Thiong, J.-M. The changing demographics of traumatic spinal cord injury: An 11-year study of 831 patients. *The Journal of Spinal Cord Medicine* **38**, 214–223 (2015).
3. Tanadini, L. G. *et al.* Identifying Homogeneous Subgroups in Neurological Disorders: Unbiased Recursive Partitioning in Cervical Complete Spinal Cord Injury. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* **28**, 507–515 (2014).
4. Kirshblum, S. & Waring, W. Updates for the International Standards for Neurological Classification of Spinal Cord Injury. *Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Clinics of North America* **25**, 505–517 (2014).
5. Harkema, S. *et al.* Effect of epidural stimulation of the lumbosacral spinal cord on voluntary movement, standing, and assisted stepping after motor complete paraplegia: a case study. *The Lancet* **377**, 1938–1947 (2011).
6. Angeli, C. A., Edgerton, V. R., Gerasimenko, Y. P. & Harkema, S. J. Altering spinal cord excitability enables voluntary movements after chronic complete paralysis in humans. *Brain* **137**, 1394–1409 (2014).
7. Wagner, F. B. *et al.* Targeted neurotechnology restores walking in humans with spinal cord injury. *Nature* **563**, 65–71 (2018).
8. Gill, M. L. *et al.* Neuromodulation of lumbosacral spinal networks enables independent stepping after complete paraplegia. *Nat Med* **24**, 1677–1682 (2018).
9. Romeni, S. *et al.* High-frequency epidural electrical stimulation reduces spasticity and facilitates walking recovery in patients with spinal cord injury. *Sci. Transl. Med.* **17**, eadp9607 (2025).
10. Greiner, N. *et al.* Recruitment of upper-limb motoneurons with epidural electrical stimulation of the cervical spinal cord. *Nat Commun* **12**, 435 (2021).
11. Barra, B. *et al.* Epidural electrical stimulation of the cervical dorsal roots restores voluntary upper limb control in paralyzed monkeys. *Nature Neuroscience* **25**, 924–934 (2022).
12. Lu, D. C. *et al.* Engaging Cervical Spinal Cord Networks to Reenable Volitional Control of Hand Function in Tetraplegic Patients. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* **30**, 951–962 (2016).
13. Powell, M. P. *et al.* Epidural stimulation of the cervical spinal cord for post-stroke upper-limb paresis. *Nat Med* **29**, 689–699 (2023).
14. Ajiboye, A. B. *et al.* Restoration of reaching and grasping movements through brain-controlled muscle stimulation in a person with tetraplegia: a proof-of-concept demonstration. *The Lancet* **389**, 1821–1830 (2017).
15. Bouton, C. E. *et al.* Restoring cortical control of functional movement in a human with quadriplegia. *Nature* **533**, 247–250 (2016).
16. Ethier, C., Oby, E. R., Bauman, M. J. & Miller, L. E. Restoration of grasp following paralysis through brain-controlled stimulation of muscles. *Nature* **485**, 368–371 (2012).
17. Capogrosso, M. *et al.* A brain–spine interface alleviating gait deficits after spinal cord injury in primates. *Nature* **539**, 284–288 (2016).
18. Lorach, H. *et al.* Walking naturally after spinal cord injury using a brain–spine interface. *Nature* **618**, 126–133 (2023).
19. Samejima, S. *et al.* Brain-Computer-Spinal Interface Restores Upper Limb Function After Spinal Cord Injury. *IEEE Trans. Neural Syst. Rehabil. Eng.* **29**, 1233–1242 (2021).

20. Kato, K., Sawada, M. & Nishimura, Y. Bypassing stroke-damaged neural pathways via a neural interface induces targeted cortical adaptation. *Nat Commun* **10**, 4699 (2019).
21. Cajigas, I. *et al.* Implantable brain–computer interface for neuroprosthetic-enabled volitional hand grasp restoration in spinal cord injury. *Brain Communications* **3**, fcab248 (2021).
22. Davis, K. C. *et al.* 5-year follow-up of a fully implanted brain–computer interface in a spinal cord injury patient. *J. Neural Eng.* **22**, 026050 (2025).
23. Fadli, R. A. *et al.* Effectiveness of motor and prefrontal cortical areas for brain-controlled functional electrical stimulation neuromodulation. *Journal of Neural Engineering* **20**, 056022 (2023).
24. Suzuki, Y. *et al.* Evidence That Brain-Controlled Functional Electrical Stimulation Could Elicit Targeted Corticospinal Facilitation of Hand Muscles in Healthy Young Adults. *Neuromodulation* **26**, 1612–1621 (2023).
25. Anderson, K. D. *et al.* Multi-center, single-blind randomized controlled trial comparing functional electrical stimulation therapy to conventional therapy in incomplete tetraplegia. *Front. Rehabilit. Sci.* **3**, 995244 (2022).
26. Kalsi-Ryan, S. *et al.* Responsiveness, Sensitivity, and Minimally Detectable Difference of the Graded and Redefined Assessment of Strength, Sensibility, and Prehension, Version 1.0. *Journal of Neurotrauma* **33**, 307–314 (2016).
27. Oudega, M. & Perez, M. A. Corticospinal reorganization after spinal cord injury: Corticospinal tract and SCI. *The Journal of Physiology* **590**, 3647–3663 (2012).
28. Capogrosso, M. *et al.* A Computational Model for Epidural Electrical Stimulation of Spinal Sensorimotor Circuits. *Journal of Neuroscience* **33**, 19326–19340 (2013).
29. Rattay, F., Minassian, K. & Dimitrijevic, M. Epidural electrical stimulation of posterior structures of the human lumbosacral cord: 2. quantitative analysis by computer modeling. *Spinal Cord* **38**, 473–489 (2000).
30. Guiho, T., Baker, S. N. & Jackson, A. Epidural and transcutaneous spinal cord stimulation facilitates descending inputs to upper-limb motoneurons in monkeys. *J. Neural Eng.* **18**, 046011 (2021).
31. Balaguer, J.-M. *et al.* Supraspinal control of motoneurons after paralysis enabled by spinal cord stimulation.
32. Nishimura, Y., Perlmutter, S. I. & Fetz, E. E. Restoration of upper limb movement via artificial corticospinal and musculospinal connections in a monkey with spinal cord injury. *Front. Neural Circuits* **7**, (2013).
33. Biasiucci, A. *et al.* Brain-actuated functional electrical stimulation elicits lasting arm motor recovery after stroke. *Nat Commun* **9**, 2421 (2018).
34. Balbinot, G. *et al.* Segmental motor recovery after cervical spinal cord injury relates to density and integrity of corticospinal tract projections. *Nat Commun* **14**, 723 (2023).
35. Jo, H. J. & Perez, M. A. Corticospinal-motor neuronal plasticity promotes exercise-mediated recovery in humans with spinal cord injury. *Brain* **143**, 1368–1382 (2020).
36. Sangari, S. & Perez, M. A. Distinct Corticospinal and Reticulospinal Contributions to Voluntary Control of Elbow Flexor and Extensor Muscles in Humans with Tetraplegia. *J. Neurosci.* **40**, 8831–8841 (2020).
37. Bunday, K. L. & Perez, M. A. Motor Recovery after Spinal Cord Injury Enhanced by Strengthening Corticospinal Synaptic Transmission. *Current Biology* **22**, 2355–2361 (2012).

38. Osuagwu, B. C. A., Wallace, L., Fraser, M. & Vuckovic, A. Rehabilitation of hand in subacute tetraplegic patients based on brain computer interface and functional electrical stimulation: a randomised pilot study. *Journal of Neural Engineering* **13**, 065002 (2016).
39. Jackson, A. & Zimmermann, J. B. Neural interfaces for the brain and spinal cord—restoring motor function. *Nat Rev Neurol* **8**, 690–699 (2012).
40. Bonizzato, M. *et al.* Brain-controlled modulation of spinal circuits improves recovery from spinal cord injury. *Nat Commun* **9**, 3015 (2018).
41. Markram, H. A history of spike-timing-dependent plasticity. *Front. Syn. Neurosci.* **3**, (2011).
42. Zheng, B. & Tuszynski, M. H. Regulation of axonal regeneration after mammalian spinal cord injury. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* **24**, 396–413 (2023).
43. Gad, P. *et al.* Non-Invasive Activation of Cervical Spinal Networks after Severe Paralysis. *Journal of Neurotrauma* **35**, 2145–2158 (2018).
44. Inanici, F., Brighton, L. N., Samejima, S., Hofstetter, C. P. & Moritz, C. T. Transcutaneous Spinal Cord Stimulation Restores Hand and Arm Function After Spinal Cord Injury. *IEEE Trans. Neural Syst. Rehabil. Eng.* **29**, 310–319 (2021).
45. Moritz, C. *et al.* Non-invasive spinal cord electrical stimulation for arm and hand function in chronic tetraplegia: a safety and efficacy trial. *Nat Med* **30**, 1276–1283 (2024).
46. Chen, B. *et al.* Combinatorial approaches increasing neuronal activity accelerate recovery after spinal cord injury. *Brain* **148**, 1911–1923 (2025).
47. Ribeiro, B. F. *et al.* Cell therapies for spinal cord injury: a review of the clinical trials and cell-type therapeutic potential. *Brain* **146**, 2672–2693 (2023).
48. Milosevic, M., Masugi, Y., Sasaki, A., Sayenko, D. G. & Nakazawa, K. On the reflex mechanisms of cervical transcutaneous spinal cord stimulation in human subjects. *Journal of Neurophysiology* **121**, 1672–1679 (2019).
49. de Freitas, R. M. *et al.* Selectivity and excitability of upper-limb muscle activation during cervical transcutaneous spinal cord stimulation in humans. *Journal of Applied Physiology* **131**, 746–759 (2021).
50. Cajigas, I. *et al.* Brain-Computer interface control of stepping from invasive electrocorticography upper-limb motor imagery in a patient with quadriplegia. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* **16**, 1077416 (2023).
51. Jovanovic, L. I. *et al.* Brain–computer interface-triggered functional electrical stimulation therapy for rehabilitation of reaching and grasping after spinal cord injury: a feasibility study. *Spinal Cord Series and Cases* **7**, 24 (2021).
52. Jovanovic, L. I., Popovic ,Milos R. & and Marquez-Chin, C. KITE-BCI: A brain-computer interface system for functional electrical stimulation therapy. *The Journal of Spinal Cord Medicine* **44**, S203–S214 (2021).
53. Márquez-Chin, C., Popovic ,Milos R., Sanin ,Egor, Chen ,Robert & and Lozano, A. M. Real-time two-dimensional asynchronous control of a computer cursor with a single subdural electrode. *The Journal of Spinal Cord Medicine* **35**, 382–391 (2012).
54. Kapadia, N., Zivanovic, V., Verrier, M. & Popovic, M. Toronto Rehabilitation Institute–Hand Function Test: Assessment of Gross Motor Function in Individuals With Spinal Cord Injury. *Topics in Spinal Cord Injury Rehabilitation* **18**, 167–186 (2012).
55. Kapadia, N. *et al.* Preliminary evaluation of the reliability and validity of the 3D printed Toronto Rehabilitation Institute-Hand Function Test in individuals with spinal cord injury. *The Journal of Spinal Cord Medicine* **44**, S225–S233 (2021).

56. Kapadia, N., Zivanovic, V. & Popovic, M. Restoring Voluntary Grasping Function in Individuals with Incomplete Chronic Spinal Cord Injury: Pilot Study. *Topics in Spinal Cord Injury Rehabilitation* **19**, 279–287 (2013).
57. Kalsi-Ryan, S. *et al.* The Graded Redefined Assessment of Strength Sensibility and Prehension: Reliability and Validity. *Journal of Neurotrauma* **29**, 905–914 (2012).
58. Kalsi-Ryan, S., Curt, A., Fehlings, M. & Verrier, M. Assessment of the Hand in Tetraplegia Using the Graded Redefined Assessment of Strength, Sensibility and Prehension (GRASSP): Impairment Versus Function. *Topics in Spinal Cord Injury Rehabilitation* **14**, 34–46 (2009).
59. Kirshblum, S. C. *et al.* International standards for neurological classification of spinal cord injury (Revised 2011). *The Journal of Spinal Cord Medicine* **34**, 535–546 (2011).
60. Widerström-Noga, E. *et al.* The International Spinal Cord Injury Pain Basic Data Set (version 2.0). *Spinal Cord* **52**, 282–286 (2014).
61. Charlifue, S. *et al.* International Spinal Cord Injury Quality of Life Basic Data Set. *Spinal Cord* **50**, 672–675 (2012).
62. Post, M. W. M. *et al.* Rasch Analysis of the International Quality of Life Basic Data Set Version 2.0. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation* **103**, 2120–2130 (2022).
63. Catz, A. *et al.* A multicenter international study on the Spinal Cord Independence Measure, version III: Rasch psychometric validation. *Spinal Cord* **45**, 275–291 (2007).
64. Bluvshtein, V. *et al.* SCIM III is reliable and valid in a separate analysis for traumatic spinal cord lesions. *Spinal Cord* **49**, 292–296 (2011).
65. Earhart, G. M. *et al.* The 9-Hole Peg Test of Upper Extremity Function: Average Values, Test-Retest Reliability, and Factors Contributing to Performance in People With Parkinson Disease. *Journal of Neurologic Physical Therapy* **35**, (2011).
66. Feys, P. *et al.* The Nine-Hole Peg Test as a manual dexterity performance measure for multiple sclerosis. *Mult Scler* **23**, 711–720 (2017).
67. Mathiowetz, V., Federman, S. & Wiemer, D. Box and Block Test of Manual Dexterity: Norms for 6–19 Year Olds. *Can J Occup Ther* **52**, 241–245 (1985).
68. Oliveira, C. S. *et al.* Use of the Box and Block Test for the evaluation of manual dexterity in individuals with central nervous system disorders: A systematic review. *mtprehabjournal* 1–7 (2016).
69. Akpinar, P. *et al.* Reliability of the Modified Ashworth Scale and Modified Tardieu Scale in patients with spinal cord injuries. *Spinal Cord* **55**, 944–949 (2017).
70. Saito, H., Yokoyama, H., Sasaki, A., Kato, T. & Nakazawa, K. Evidence for basic units of upper limb muscle synergies underlying a variety of complex human manipulations. *Journal of Neurophysiology* **127**, 958–968 (2022).
71. Torres-Oviedo, G., Macpherson, J. M. & Ting, L. H. Muscle Synergy Organization Is Robust Across a Variety of Postural Perturbations. *Journal of Neurophysiology* **96**, 1530–1546 (2006).