

1 SPINAL CORD STIMULATION RESTORES SENSATION, IMPROVES FUNCTION, AND 2 REDUCES PHANTOM PAIN AFTER TRANSTIBIAL AMPUTATION

3
4 Ameya C. Nanivadekar^{1,2,3,*}, Rohit Bose^{1,2,3,*}, Bailey A. Petersen^{1,2,3,*}, Elizaveta V. Okorokova⁴,
5 Devapratim Sarma^{1,5}, Juhi Farooqui^{1,3}, Ashley N. Dalrymple^{1,5}, Isaiah Levy⁶, Eric R. Helm⁶,
6 Vincent J. Miele⁷, Michael L. Boninger^{1,2,3,6}, Marco Capogrosso^{1,2,3,7}, Sliman J. Bensmaia⁴,
7 Douglas J. Weber^{1,5}, Lee E. Fisher^{1,2,3,6,8}

8 ¹Rehab Neural Engineering Labs, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA

9 ²Department of Bioengineering, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA

10 ³Center for the Neural Basis of Cognition, Pittsburgh, PA

11 ⁴Department of Organismal Biology and Anatomy, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL

12 ⁵Department of Mechanical Engineering, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA

13 ⁶Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA

14 ⁷Department of Neurological Surgery, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA

15 ⁸Author to whom any correspondence should be addressed

16 *Authors contributed equally to this work

17

18 SUMMARY

19 In the United States, over 1.5 million people live with lower-limb amputation. Existing prosthetic
20 limbs do not restore somatosensory feedback from the limb, resulting in functional impairments
21 including balance deficits and an increased risk of falls. Further, these prostheses do not alleviate
22 the severe phantom limb pain that often follows amputation. Leveraging clinically available spinal
23 cord stimulation electrodes, we designed a system that restores somatosensation in the missing
24 limb, thereby improving balance and gait and reducing phantom limb pain. We show that spinal
25 cord stimulation can evoke sensations in the missing foot and that we can control the location and
26 intensity of those sensations. Further, by modulating stimulation intensity in real time based on
27 signals from a wireless pressure-sensitive shoe insole, subjects exhibit improvements in
28 functional measures of balance and gait stability. Finally, over the duration of the implant period,
29 subjects experienced a clinically meaningful decrease in phantom limb pain. These combined
30 results demonstrate that, with an electrode technology that is currently in widespread clinical use,
31 our approach has the potential to become an important intervention for lower-limb amputation.

32

33 MAIN

34 Every year, approximately 150,000 people in the United States undergo amputation of a lower
35 limb¹. Loss of a lower limb leads to chronic challenges including major mobility impairments and
36 emergence of chronic pain that appears to emanate from the missing limb (i.e. phantom limb pain,
37 PLP). Current clinical practice involves prescribing a prosthetic limb to improve functional mobility,

38 along with neuroleptic and opiate pharmaceuticals to treat PLP. Even with these interventions,
39 people with lower-limb amputation exhibit a high rate of falls, a lack of confidence during gait,
40 abnormal gait patterns, and persistent PLP. All these problems have been associated with the
41 disruption of somatosensory feedback from the missing limb. Tactile feedback from the sole of
42 the foot is critical for maintaining balance and postural stability² and the loss of somatosensory
43 feedback after an amputation causes a sensorimotor mismatch between attempted movements
44 and expected sensory feedback. This mismatch has been implicated in the development and
45 maintenance of PLP³. One potential way to address the sequelae of lower-limb amputation is to
46 restore somatosensation in the missing limb, thereby improving functional outcomes, and
47 reducing PLP.

48 Previous studies have demonstrated that electrical stimulation of peripheral nerves in the residual
49 limb can evoke sensations in the missing hand or foot⁴⁻⁶. Tactile feedback via peripheral nerve
50 stimulation has been shown to enhance control of the prosthesis and improve balance and gait<sup>7-
51 11</sup>. Additionally, anecdotal evidence suggests that chronic peripheral nerve stimulation reduces
52 PLP^{7,12-14}. To date, most studies to restore somatosensory feedback from the missing limb have
53 relied on complex surgical techniques to implant devices inside or around peripheral nerves or to
54 reroute those nerves to other regions of the body^{6,7,9,11,15,16}. While these approaches clearly
55 demonstrated the promise of electrical stimulation, their surgical complexity remains a barrier to
56 widespread clinical adoption. Evoking sensations via peripheral nerve stimulation may also be
57 challenging in individuals with severe peripheral neuropathy, a common co-morbidity for people
58 with amputations related to vascular disease and diabetes, which account for up to 82% of lower
59 limb amputations¹⁷. To our knowledge, no study to date has demonstrated restored
60 somatosensation in the amputated foot for people with diabetic amputation.

61 Here, we aimed to address these challenges by leveraging spinal cord stimulation (SCS), rather
62 than peripheral nerve stimulation, to restore somatosensory feedback from the missing lower limb.
63 SCS is an existing clinical technology that is implanted in as many as 50,000 people each year to
64 treat chronic pain¹⁸. The surgical procedures involved in the implantation of these devices and the
65 associated risks are well understood, and most major medical centers throughout developed
66 countries have physicians that routinely perform SCS implants¹⁹. Recently, we have shown that
67 cervical SCS can be used to restore somatosensation from the missing hand in people with upper-
68 limb amputation²⁰. Our goal in this study was to demonstrate that lumbar SCS could evoke
69 sensations in the missing foot, and that the restored somatosensory feedback could improve
70 functional use of the prosthesis and reduce PLP. Importantly, we aimed to demonstrate that we
71 could achieve these effects regardless of whether the amputation was traumatic or secondary to
72 diabetic peripheral neuropathy, which substantially increases the pool of people that might benefit
73 from these devices.

74 In three people with below-knee amputation (Table 1), we implanted commercially available SCS
75 leads in the thoracolumbar epidural space to stimulate the lateral lumbar spinal cord. We identified
76 electrode contacts that evoked sensation experienced on the missing foot and performed
77 psychophysical assessments to characterize those sensations. We developed a closed-loop
78 system (Figure 1) where SCS was modulated by pressure signals wirelessly recorded from an
79 insole in the shoe under the prosthetic limb. Using this system to deliver real-time somatosensory
80 feedback, we assessed balance and gait, as well as changes in PLP over the duration of the
81 multi-week implantation period. Our results indicate that lumbar SCS is a promising intervention
82 to restore sensations, improve function, and reduce PLP in lower limb amputees.




Figure 1: Schematic of the closed-loop SCS system used in this study. Electrical stimulation was delivered to the spinal cord via two or three 8- or 16-contact leads implanted percutaneously near the lateral lumbar spinal cord. The leads were tunneled through the skin and connected to an external stimulation system. (A) A sensorized insole was inserted into the shoe to measure pressure under the prosthetic foot, (B) the signals from this insole were used to modulate stimulation amplitude for SCS electrodes implanted in the lateral thoracolumbar epidural space, and (C) the stimulation evoked sensation that appeared to emanate from the missing limb. The purple line shows the location of evoked sensation in one subject and the red dotted line represents the end of the residual limb for this subject with left trans-tibial amputation.

83

84




Figure 2: SCS evokes percepts in the missing limb. (A) Examples of percepts evoked in the missing and residual limb from one session for each subject. Two different sensations (corresponding to stimulation through two different electrodes) are shown for each subject (top and bottom). The red dashed line indicates the level of the amputation. The colored area represents the location of the perceived sensation, with darker colors representing more frequent reports of sensation at that location across trials, normalized within each subject. (B) Dermatome activation by electrodes located at different vertebrae levels for Subject 3. Left: Expected dermatomal innervation in the leg, adapted from Melzak et al.²¹ Right: Horizontal bars indicate different dermatomes and the white ovals indicate the approximate electrode position that evoked sensations in those dermatomes, with respect to vertebrae level. (C) Rate of occurrence of sensations in the missing limb across weeks from one electrode in Subject 2. Darker shades indicate more frequent reports of evoked sensations in the foot.

85 Spinal Cord Stimulation Evokes Sensations in the Missing Foot

86 The first goal of this study was to characterize the location and perceptual qualities of sensations
 87 evoked by lumbosacral SCS. To map the location of evoked sensations, we delivered 1-sec long
 88 stimulation trains, and asked the subjects to draw the location of the perceived sensations on a
 89 graphic representation of the foot and legs. For all three subjects, SCS evoked sensations in the

90 missing limb, including the toes and heel (Figure 2A). The sensations were absent during the first
91 1-2 weeks of the study and appeared gradually thereafter (Figure 2C and Extended Data Figure
92 1). The sensations in the missing limb were always accompanied by sensations in the residual
93 limb, and higher stimulation amplitudes were required to evoke sensations in the missing limb
94 than in the residual limb alone (Extended Data Figure 2). The rostral-caudal arrangement of the
95 electrodes across different levels of the spinal cord elicited sensations that corresponded to the
96 dermatomal distribution²¹ (Figure 2B and Extended Data Figure 3).

97 The subjects also reported the perceived quality of the sensations using a list of descriptors
98 compiled from previous literature²². For analytical purposes, we grouped these descriptors as
99 sensations that subjects might experience commonly in their daily life (naturalistic) or rare, less
100 familiar sensations (paresthetic). All subjects reported a combination of natural and paresthetic
101 descriptors in different proportions (Extended Data Figure 4).

102 **Sensory magnitude can be systematically manipulated by varying stimulation amplitude**

103 A key step in designing a sensory prosthesis is to assess the dependence of the sensation on
104 stimulation parameters. With this in mind, we first established the stimulation intensity required to
105 evoke a conscious percept. To this end, we had the subjects perform a detection task in a two-
106 alternative forced choice paradigm. In brief, a 1-sec stimulation train at one of 5 to 10 amplitudes,
107 determined in preliminary experiments to be peri-liminal, was presented in one of two visually
108 cued stimulus intervals, and the subject's task was to report which interval contained the stimulus.
109 Each stimulus was presented at least 4 times and we tallied the proportion of times the subject
110 correctly identified the interval containing the stimulus for each amplitude (Figure 3A). The
111 detection threshold was the amplitude (estimated from the fitted logistic psychometric function) at
112 which the subject would correctly identify the stimulus interval 75% of the time. Detection
113 thresholds varied across electrodes and subjects from 0.6 to 4 mA but there were no large and
114 systematic differences across subjects (Figure 3B).

115 Next, we measured the subjects' sensitivity to changes in stimulation amplitude. To achieve this,
116 we had them perform an amplitude discrimination task. On each trial, the subject was presented
117 with two stimuli: (1) a standard whose amplitude was fixed within the block, and (2) a comparison,
118 whose value varied from trial to trial. After both presentations, the subject reported which of the
119 two felt stronger (Figure 3C). For each electrode and subject, we fitted a logistic psychometric
120 function and computed the just noticeable difference (JND), the change in amplitude required for
121 the subject to correctly identify the more intense stimulus 75% of the time. JNDs varied from 0.05
122 to 0.3 mA across subjects and electrodes (Figure 3D, Extended Data Figure 5). The range of
123 JNDs overlapped across subjects, though Subject 2 tended to have higher JNDs than the other
124 two subjects.

125 Finally, we wished to explicitly measure the relationship between stimulation amplitude and
126 perceived magnitude. To this end, we delivered stimuli that spanned a range of intensities and
127 had the subject report how intense the stimulus felt with the following instructions: (1) If they did
128 not feel the stimulus; they ascribed to it a rating of 0; (2) If one stimulus felt twice as strong as
129 another, it was to be ascribed a number that was twice as high (other examples were also
130 provided); (3) They could use any scale they wanted, and were encouraged to use decimals, if

131




Figure 3: Psychophysical assessments of evoked sensations. (A) Performance of Subject 1 on the detection task for one electrode, showing the proportion of times the stimulus interval was correctly selected as a function stimulus amplitude. The bold line shows a cumulative-normal curve fit to the data. (B) Psychometric functions for the subset of electrodes (N=7 across all subjects) in which psychophysical assessment of detection threshold was assessed, color-coded by subject. The dashed lines indicate the detection threshold for each electrode. (C) Performance of Subject 3 on the amplitude discrimination task with a standard amplitude of 2 mA for one electrode. The bold line shows the fitted psychometric function and the dashed lines indicate the range used to compute the just noticeable difference (JND) (in this case 0.08 mA), given by half the distance between the dotted lines. (D) Distribution of JNDs across the three subjects on a subset of electrodes (N=10 sessions from 1 electrode for Subject 1, N=14 sessions from 3 electrodes for Subject 2, and N=2 sessions from 2 electrodes for Subject 3). (E) Average normalized magnitude ratings as a function of stimulus amplitude for one electrode for Subject 2. The bold line indicates the linear fit to the data. The error bar denotes the standard deviation across repeated presentations of the same stimulus. (F) Scatter plot showing predicted magnitude estimated by a linear model for each electrode (N=3 sessions from 1 electrode for Subject 1, N=11 sessions from 4 electrodes for Subject 2 and N=4 sessions from 3 electrodes for Subject 3) and subject versus the actual stimulation magnitude. Points show average magnitude for each presented amplitude for each electrode, color-coded by subject. The dashed line represents the unity line.

133 necessary. Perceived magnitude increased nearly linearly with stimulation amplitude for all
134 subjects and electrodes (R^2 of the linear regression for Subject 1 was 0.978, Subject 2 was 0.854
135 and Subject 3 was 0.952, Figure 3E,F), as has been previously found with stimulation of the
136 peripheral nerves^{23–26} and of the somatosensory cortex²⁷. Because of this linear relationship
137 between the perceived intensity and stimulation amplitude, we used linear modulation of
138 stimulation amplitude in subsequent experiments assessing functional outcomes (see below).

139 **Spinal cord stimulation improves functional use of a prosthesis**

140 The second goal of this study was to demonstrate that restored somatosensation can improve
141 functional use of a prosthetic limb. To restore somatosensation during functional tasks, such as
142 standing and walking, we placed a wireless pressure-sensing insole (Moticon Insole 3, Munich,
143 Germany) under the prosthetic foot and used the output from that insole to control stimulation in
144 real-time. In Subjects 2 and 3, we selected an SCS electrode that reliably evoked sensation on
145 the plantar surface of the missing foot and used the pressure signal from the same location under
146 the prosthetic foot to control stimulation amplitude (Figure 1A). Due to time constraints, we could
147 not perform these experiments in Subject 1. We used clinical measures of balance and gait to
148 compare postural stability with and without restored somatosensory feedback.

149 *Spinal cord stimulation improves standing balance*

150 To assess standing balance with and without sensory feedback, we used the Sensory
151 Organization Test (SOT), a clinical outcome measure that quantifies reliance on visual, vestibular,
152 or somatosensory feedback to maintain balance control. The SOT requires the subject to maintain
153 balance (Figure 4A) despite erroneous visual information from a visual surround that can sway
154 and/or erroneous somatosensory information from a support surface that can also sway. To
155 characterize reliance on vision, vestibular sense, and somatosensory feedback, the SOT
156 comprises six different conditions, which each condition obscuring different combinations of the
157 relevant sensory feedback. With somatosensory feedback restored via SCS, both Subjects 2 and
158 3 achieved improvements in SOT scores (Figure 4C), with greater improvements in the most
159 challenging conditions (platform sway with eyes closed and platform sway with visual surround
160 sway, Extended Data Figure 6). Notably, both participants experienced at least one “fall” without
161 stimulation, but neither subject fell with stimulation (Figure 4C). A “fall” denotes a failure to
162 complete the trial due to taking a step, falling in the harness, or grabbing the walls for support.
163 Performance was slightly worse with stimulation during the least challenging conditions (i.e., no
164 visual or support surface sway) with eyes open and eyes closed (Extended Data Figure 6),
165 although this difference was negligible (i.e., smaller than the minimum clinically important
166 difference). In Subject 2, we implemented a sham stimulation condition, in which stimulation
167 evoked sensation only in the residual limb and not in the missing foot. In this case, we saw
168 decreased performance from baseline for conditions 2 (static platform with eyes closed), 5,
169 (platform sway with eyes closed), and 6 (platform sway with visual surround sway) and the
170 decrease for condition 6 was larger than a minimum clinically important difference (Extended Data
171 Figure 6). Biomechanical analyses of center of gravity traces (COG, Figure 4D) revealed that both
172 participants exhibited statistically significant decreases in sway area (indicating greater stability)
173 with eyes closed condition and an unstable support surface during stimulation (Subject 2
174 decreased by 19.34 cm², Subject 3 decreased by 39.04 cm², $p < 0.001$, Figure 4D).

175

176




Figure 4. Closed-loop sensory feedback improves postural stability. (A) The Sensory Organization Test (SOT) comprises six conditions, defined by whether the visual surround (middle) and/or platform (right) are swaying while subjects have their eyes open or closed. (B) For analysis, the center of gravity (COG) is a projection of the pressure trace onto the force plate to indicate their center of mass (COM) movement throughout a trial. The equilibrium score is an indication of how well subjects maintain their COM within a normative 12.5° limit of anteroposterior sway. Beyond these limits, a fall can occur (red). (C) Falls occurred only during conditions without stimulation for both subjects (left) and both subjects exhibited an improvement in composite equilibrium score (right). This improvement was above the minimum detectable change for Subject 2 (*) and above the threshold for a clinically meaningful difference in Subject 3 (**). (D) Both subjects showed a statistically significant decrease in sway area, indicating greater stability, with stimulation (#).




Figure 5: Closed-loop sensory feedback improves gait stability. (A) Example of amplitude modulation with plantar pressure throughout the gait cycle. Stimulation was triggered above a threshold for the metatarsals (purple shading) and either maintained at a constant amplitude (for Subject 2) or amplitude was modulated linearly with pressure signals (for Subject 3). (B) The Functional Gait Assessment (FGA) increased in both subjects, and increased beyond the minimum detectable change (MDC >4 points, **) for Subject 3, who had a lower baseline score.

178 *Spinal cord stimulation improves gait stability*

179 To assess stability during gait, participants performed the Functional Gait Assessment (FGA), a
180 clinical measure of dynamic balance, commonly applied to detect reliance on visual and
181 somatosensory systems for maintaining balance during walking^{28,29}. This task consists of ten
182 items, including walking with eyes closed, walking with a narrow base of support, and walking
183 over obstacles. Restored somatosensation led to a clinically meaningful improvement (>4 points)
184 in FGA score for Subject 3 but not Subject 2 (Figure 5B). Notably, Subject 2 demonstrated
185 baseline performance 3.9 points below age-matched able-bodied controls, whereas the baseline
186 score for Subject 3 was 13.5 points below age-matched normative data²⁸.

187 **Spinal cord stimulation reduces phantom limb pain**

188 To assess the impact of stimulation on PLP, we examined subjects' reports of their current pain
189 level on a visual-analog scale. Subjects were instructed to report the pain level perceived
190 specifically in the missing limb for this assessment. As the study progressed, we observed a
191 clinically meaningful decrease in PLP score (defined as a 50% reduction from the baseline pain
192 score) for Subjects 1 and 3 (Fig. 6). While the PLP score for Subject 2 also decreased to 0.73
193 from 1.2 points, this improvement is considered sub-clinical because it is less than 1 point. For
194 both Subjects 1 and 3, the first clinically meaningful decrease in PLP coincided with the
195 emergence of electrically evoked sensations in the missing limb (i.e. week 3 and week 2,
196 respectively). For Subject 3, experiments were suspended over a one-week holiday (week 11), at




Figure 6: Spinal cord stimulation reduces phantom limb pain. Phantom limb pain intensity as reported weekly on a visual analog scale for Subject 1 and 2 (top row, implanted for 4 weeks) and Subject 3 (bottom row, implanted for 12 weeks). The dashed line indicates a clinically meaningful decrease in the pain score. For Subject 3, no experiments were conducted during week 11 (marked with a gray box).

197 which time pain scores increased sharply (3.65 times greater than week 10), consistent with the
198 hypothesis that SCS relieves PLP.

199 We also conducted the McGill Pain Questionnaire³⁰ once per week, to characterize the sensory
200 and affective dimensions of the subjects' pain. This questionnaire provides a holistic measure of
201 a patient's pain experience and can be used to infer overall patient well-being. All subjects were
202 instructed to rate their pain in the missing limb over the most recent week of the study (Extended
203 Data Figure 7). We observed a clinically meaningful decrease in the McGill Pain Questionnaire
204 scores (defined as a >5-point decrease) for Subject 1 (28 points) and Subject 2 (10 points) across
205 the 4-week implant phase. For Subject 3, across the 12-week implant, there was a reduction in
206 the pain scores until week 8 (15 points) followed by an increase from week 9 onwards, including
207 a 24 point increase that coincided with the break in testing during week 11. However, Subject 3
208 anecdotally reported a substantial reduction in PLP episodes.

209 DISCUSSION

210 In this study, we demonstrate that lateral lumbosacral SCS evokes sensations in the missing limb
211 in people with transtibial amputation, and that this restored somatosensation can improve balance
212 control, gait stability, and reduce PLP. Importantly, we showed these effects across a range of
213 subjects, including people with amputations that occurred long before enrollment in the study (up
214 to 7 years), a subject with traumatic amputation and two others with diabetic peripheral
215 neuropathy, and people with different levels of mobility. Critically, the implantable electrodes used
216 in this study were commercially available devices that are currently implanted in more than 50,000
217 people each year for the treatment of pain¹⁸. The devices were implanted via a percutaneous
218 approach in an outpatient surgical procedure, and future development and translation of our
219 approach can leverage the vast infrastructure of clinicians and surgical techniques that already

220 exist for SCS. While translation will still require substantial technical and clinical development, this
221 study demonstrates the feasibility of using SCS to restore somatosensation from the missing foot
222 with the potential to improve quality of life for people with lower-limb amputation.

223 In all subjects, we found that multiple SCS electrodes evoked sensations in the missing limb, and
224 each subject reported more than one sensation in different locations on the missing limb.
225 However, we also found that the sensations evoked in the missing limb always co-occurred with
226 sensations in the residual limb. Subject 1 and 2 reported simultaneous sensations in distinct areas
227 of the residual and missing limb, whereas Subject 3 reported contiguous sensations spanning the
228 residual and missing limb. In a previous study that focused on people with upper-limb amputation,
229 we observed similar coincidence of SCS-evoked sensations in the residual and missing limb in
230 only two out of four subjects, and the sensations on the residual limb tended to be more focal in
231 the arm than in the leg²⁰. This difference may reflect anatomical differences between the cervical
232 and lumbar regions of the spinal cord. Indeed, sensory neurons enter the cervical spinal cord at
233 a shallow angle, nearly perpendicular to the rostrocaudal axis, whereas they travel parallel to the
234 rostrocaudal axis for several spinal segments before entering the lumbar cord³¹. Accordingly,
235 afferents that innervate multiple regions of the legs are more densely packed in the lumbar region
236 than in the cervical region. Delivering charge in the epidural space using the large commercially
237 available SCS electrodes likely recruits more sensory afferents in the lumbar cord, increasing the
238 likelihood of activating neurons projecting from both missing and residual limb. Moving forward,
239 designing SCS leads with smaller and more densely packed electrodes may allow us to achieve
240 more selective stimulation and consequently, more focal sensations in the missing limb.

241 We also found that subjects did not report sensations in the missing limb until the second or third
242 week of the study. During the first 1-2 weeks, a majority of reported sensations were diffuse and
243 limited to the residual limb. Following this period, subjects consistently reported sensations in the
244 missing limb. Other studies using peripheral nerve stimulation to evoke sensation in the missing
245 foot have also reported that the incidence of sensations in the missing limb increases with time³².
246 This delayed emergence of sensations in the missing foot stands in contrast to our previous study,
247 in which subjects frequently reported sensations in the missing upper limb during intraoperative
248 testing of cervical SCS²⁰.

249 We found that the magnitude of electrically-evoked sensations can be systematically manipulated
250 by modulating the stimulation amplitude, as has been previously reported across a variety of
251 stimulation modalities and neural targets^{20,24}. JNDs ranged from around 0.05 to 0.3 mA across
252 subjects and leads (mean = 0.15 mA). The JNDs were independent of the reference amplitude
253 (Extended Data Figure 5), violating Weber's law, which states that the JND should be directly
254 proportional to reference amplitude [ref]. This is similar to results reported for both peripheral
255 nerve stimulation²⁴ and for intracortical microstimulation³³. Together, these results suggest that
256 approximately 20 discriminable steps can be achieved from threshold (typically less than 2 mA)
257 to maximum amplitude (4-6 mA). The dynamic range of SCS-based tactile feedback is thus
258 comparable to or wider than its counterparts in the peripheral nerve²⁴.

259 One of the goals of this study was to demonstrate that restored somatosensation could improve
260 standing balance and gait stability. We found that SCS-evoked somatosensory feedback
261 improved standing balance, particularly in the more challenging conditions (in which visual and
262 somatosensory feedback were altered), consistent with previous results using peripheral nerve
263 stimulation to restore sensation in the foot¹⁰. Furthermore, the reduction of falls in the SOT with
264 stimulation constitutes a critical improvement in balance control. Note that these substantial and

265 clinically meaningful improvements in balance were observed even though evoked sensations
266 extended from the missing limb onto the residual limb. While evoking focal sensations in the
267 missing limb is likely to further improve balance, our results suggest even non-focal sensations
268 projecting from both the missing and residual limb may be sufficient to improve function.

269 During gait, we saw a clinically meaningful improvement in the Functional Gait Assessment for
270 Subject 3. Notably, Subject 3 had a lower baseline score than Subject 2, allowing the possibility
271 for greater improvements with stimulation. Because this clinical assessment serves as a relatively
272 crude measure of dynamic balance control during ambulation, it may not be sensitive to changes
273 with sensory feedback and, like many other clinical measures, is subject to ceiling effects.
274 Additionally, we have recently demonstrated that spatiotemporal analysis of level walking is
275 insensitive to large differences in somatosensory ability across individuals with an amputation and
276 is similarly unlikely to be able to reveal subtle improvements with restored sensation³⁴. These
277 findings indicate that, while we see improvements with stimulation, we should identify more
278 sensitive and more challenging outcome measures to detect improvements in function with
279 restored somatosensory feedback. Additionally, evaluating fall risk itself over a longer time period
280 will be critical in future studies to demonstrate the clinical importance of restored somatosensation
281 after amputation.

282 In addition to functional improvements, we also found evidence that stimulation reduced PLP.
283 Subjects 1 and 3 showed a clinically significant decrease in PLP during the week in which they
284 first reported experiencing evoked sensations in the missing limb. This observation is similar to
285 the gradual decrease in PLP reported in other studies with lower-limb amputees and suggests
286 neuroplastic changes in the brain may follow evoked sensations in the missing limb⁸. Subject 3
287 also reported that PLP increased when testing was paused for a week. The recurrence of PLP
288 aligns with anecdotal evidence from traditional SCS studies which report that the wash-in and
289 wash-out period of SCS can be 3-7 days³⁵. Our observations build on growing evidence that
290 somatosensory neuroprosthetic systems are associated with a decrease in PLP^{7,11-14}.

291 Several important limitations remain to be addressed in future studies. First, the subject pool in
292 this study was small and heterogenous, including two people with diabetic neuropathy and
293 substantial mobility limitations and a third person with a traumatic amputation and a high degree
294 of active mobility. Further, the study was not blinded to either the subject or the investigators. It is
295 possible that subjects were motivated to better performance when they knew that we were
296 delivering stimulation. However, the use of the sham stimulation in Subject 2 suggests that
297 providing sensory feedback in the residual limb was insufficient to improve balance, and instead
298 sensation in the missing limb was important for this effect. While we demonstrated initial feasibility
299 of our approach, larger randomized controlled trials will be critical for demonstrating that SCS can
300 improve function and reduce PLP after lower-limb amputation. Second, the intervention in this
301 study involved a percutaneously implanted device tested over 29 or 90 days in a laboratory
302 setting. Future studies should include a fully implanted system, including an implantable pulse
303 generator wirelessly communicating with external sensors on the prosthesis, as well as long-term
304 testing of performance in real-world settings. Third, the stimulation delivered during this study
305 involved simple, constant frequency trains in which amplitude was modulated based on pressure
306 signals from an insole under the prosthetic foot. More complex trains of stimuli, such as biomimetic
307 patterns that more closely match the naturalistic patterns of activity in somatosensory afferents,
308 may produce more naturalistic sensations, yielding greater functional gains and possibly stronger
309 pain relief³⁶⁻³⁹.

310 This study marks an important step towards clinical translation of somatosensory
311 neuroprosthetics for people with lower-limb amputation. We demonstrated that SCS delivered via
312 commercially available electrodes, implanted through a common clinical procedure, could evoke
313 sensations in the missing foot in people with transtibial amputation. Importantly, this includes two
314 people with amputations related to diabetic peripheral neuropathy. We also demonstrated in two
315 subjects that these sensations, when controlled by a wireless insole in the shoe, improved
316 balance control and gait stability. Finally, we measured decreases in phantom limb pain in all
317 three subjects during their participation in the study. Building on these promising results, we
318 believe that SCS may be a clinically viable approach to restore sensation and improve quality of
319 life for people with transtibial amputation.

320 **METHODS**

321 Subjects

322 Three subjects with transtibial amputation (Table 1) were recruited for this study. Two subjects
323 had diabetes and peripheral neuropathy associated with the amputations, while one subject had
324 a traumatic amputation. All subjects were active users of a non-motorized prosthetic limb before
325 beginning the study. The two subjects with diabetes (Subjects 1 and 3) were limited community
326 ambulators and the subject with traumatic amputation was an active ambulator (exceeding
327 community ambulation skills, Subject 2). The study was approved by the University of Pittsburgh
328 Institutional Review Board and the extended duration implant in Subject 3 was performed under

Table 1. Study participant demographics and amputation data.

Subject	Age Range	Gender	Ambulation Level	Years since amputation	Side of amputation	Nature of amputation	Implant Duration (days)
1	56-60	M	Limited community	3	Left	Diabetic	28
2	56-60	M	Active	7	Left	Traumatic	28
3	61-65	W	Limited community	5	Left	Diabetic	84

329 an Investigational Device Exemption from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Both studies
330 (i.e. 29-day and 90-day implant periods) are registered at ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT03027947 and
331 NCT04547582). Subjects provided informed consent prior to participation.

332 *Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria*

333 Subjects 21-70 years old were included in the study if they had a unilateral transtibial amputation,
334 and were not excluded for partial amputation (e.g. one or more toes) on the contralateral limb.
335 Subjects were at least 6 months post-amputation at the time of SCS lead implantation, with no
336 serious comorbidities that could increase risk of participation. Women who were pregnant or
337 breast feeding, people taking anticoagulant drugs, and people with implanted metal not cleared
338 for MRI or implanted medical devices such as pacemakers, defibrillators, and infusion pumps
339 were excluded. Subjects were also excluded from the 90-day implant study if they had a
340 hemoglobin A1c level above 8.0 mg/dl, because of the increased infection risk associated with
341 this condition.

342 Electrode Implant

343 SCS leads were implanted percutaneously via a minimally invasive procedure, under local and/or
344 twilight anesthesia. Subjects were in the prone position while leads were inserted using into the
345 dorsal epidural space using a 14-gauge 4-inch epidural Tuohy needle, and the leads were steered
346 posterior laterally using a stylet under live fluoroscopic guidance. The connector from each lead
347 was externalized so that we could connect it to an external stimulator. We performed
348 intraoperative stimulation and subjects verbally reported the location of evoked sensations so we
349 could iteratively adjust the placement of the leads to evoke sensations in the missing limb or as
350 close to the end of the residual limb as possible. In Subject 1, two 16-contact leads (Infinion,
351 Boston Scientific) were implanted near the T12-L2 vertebral levels and a third 16-contact lead
352 was inserted through the sacral hiatus to target the cauda equina. The third lead did not produce
353 useful sensations in the missing limb, so this type of insertion was not repeated in subsequent
354 subjects. In Subject 2, two 16-contact leads (Infinion, Boston Scientific) were inserted near the
355 T12-L2 vertebral levels. In Subject 3, three 8-contact leads (Octrode, Abbott Medical) were
356 inserted near the T12-L2 levels. Lead migration was monitored by comparing intraoperative
357 fluoroscopic images to weekly X-rays for the first 4 weeks and then bi-monthly X-rays for the
358 following weeks in Subject 3. In Subject 1, leads were anchored with sutures to the superficial
359 layers of skin at the exit sites, and all three leads demonstrated substantial caudal migration
360 across weeks during the implant. Therefore, to better stabilize the electrode placements, in
361 Subjects 2 and 3 the leads were anchored to subcutaneous fascia via a small incision. With this
362 anchoring procedure, we saw minimal lead migration across weeks. At the end of the study, a
363 similar procedure was performed to remove all leads from the body.

364 Mapping Evoked Sensations

365 To map the location of evoked sensations, we stimulated each electrode contact using a 1-sec
366 long charge-balanced bi-phasic pulse train. We stimulated with amplitudes from 0.5 to 6 mA and
367 with frequencies from 1 to 1000 Hz. The pulse width was fixed at 200 μ s and the interphase
368 interval was set to 60 μ s. Stimulation was delivered using a custom-built circuit board and three
369 32-channel stimulators (Nano 2+Stim; Ripple, Inc)²⁰.

370 After each stimulation train, the subject reported the location and quality of the sensation using
371 our previously developed touchscreen interface⁴⁰. The quality of the sensation was described
372 using a predefined list of descriptors developed specifically for characterizing sensations evoked
373 by electrical stimulation²², including mechanical, movement, tingle, and temperature sensations.
374 For analytical purposes, we grouped these descriptors as sensations that subjects might
375 experience commonly in their daily life (naturalistic) or rare, less familiar sensations (paresthetic).
376 In total, 13 descriptors were used for naturalistic modalities (pulsing, pressure, touch, sharp, tap,
377 urge to move, vibration, flutter, itch, tickle, prick, cool, and warm) and 5 descriptors were used for
378 paresthetic modalities (electric current, tingle, buzz, shock, and numb).

379 Psychophysical analysis: Detection threshold estimation

380 We used a two-alternative forced choice task where the subjects were presented with two visually
381 cued 1-sec long blocks with a variable delay period: one with stimulation and one without
382 stimulation, assigned randomly. The subjects were instructed to select the block in which they felt
383 a sensation. The stimulus amplitudes were centered around the rough detection threshold we
384 observed from the mapping trials on that day. Overall, stimulus amplitudes ranged from 0.5 to 6
385 mA and each amplitude was repeated 4-10 times. The stimulation frequency remained constant

386 at 50 Hz for all trains. For each stimulus amplitude, we calculated the number of times the subject
387 responded correctly (accuracy rate). For electrodes with densely sampled stimulation amplitudes
388 (that differ by less than 0.1mA), the values were re-binned with 0.1 mA steps and the amplitudes
389 that were in the same interval bin were replaced by their mean. A logistic curve constrained
390 between 0.5 and 1 was fit to the accuracy rate for each subject and electrode, and the stimulus
391 amplitude corresponding to 75% accuracy rate was selected as the detection threshold.
392 Electrodes with insufficient repetitions per condition (<5) or poor logistic fit (goodness of fit of the
393 model is insignificant at 10%) were excluded from analysis. Overall, we tested two electrodes for
394 Subject 1, two electrodes for Subject 2 and three electrodes for Subject 3.

395 Psychophysical analysis: Just noticeable differences

396 We used a similar two-alternative forced choice task to determine the just noticeable difference
397 for the evoked sensations (i.e. the minimum detectable change in stimulation amplitude). On each
398 trial, the subject was presented with two stimuli: (1) a standard whose amplitude was fixed within
399 the set, and (2) a comparison, whose value varied from trial to trial. The subject was asked to
400 report which of the two stimuli felt more intense. Standard amplitudes across different sets ranged
401 from 1-3.5 mA for Subject 1, 1.2-4.55 mA for Subject 2, and 2-4.74 mA for Subject 3. Comparison
402 amplitudes ranged from 50 to 150% of the standard amplitude in that set. The frequency and
403 pulse width of both standard and comparison stimuli remained constant (50 Hz, 0.2 ms). In each
404 set, each stimulus pair was presented at least 5 times, and both the order of stimuli within the pair
405 and the order of the pairs were varied pseudo randomly.

406 A logistic function was fit to the percentage of times the comparison interval was selected by the
407 subject to obtain psychometric curves for each standard amplitude. Then, the just noticeable
408 difference (JND) was calculated as the change in amplitude that led to 75% accuracy according
409 to the psychometric curve. We tested for 10 sessions from 1 electrode for Subject 1, 14 sessions
410 from 3 electrodes for Subject 2, and 2 sessions from 2 electrodes for Subject 3. Sets with poor
411 psychometric fits (goodness of fit of the model is insignificant at 10%) were omitted from the
412 analysis.

413 Psychophysical analysis: Perceived stimulation intensity

414 To understand the relationship between the stimulus amplitude and the perceived intensity of the
415 sensation, we conducted a magnitude estimation experiment. On each trial, a 1-sec long pulse
416 train was delivered, and the subject was asked to state a number whose magnitude corresponded
417 to the magnitude of the evoked sensation. Subjects were instructed to use their own scale
418 including decimals. If a stimulus was imperceptible, it was ascribed to the number 0. If one
419 stimulus felt twice as intense as another, it was given a number that was twice as large. The
420 tested amplitudes ranged from 0.5 to 6 mA and were restricted to amplitudes above detection
421 threshold for each channel. The maximum amplitude delivered was below the pain/discomfort
422 threshold for each subject. Each test amplitude was presented at least 5 times.

423 Ratings of sensation magnitude were normalized by the mean rating of their respective set and
424 linear regression was fit to the observed data for each channel separately. The residuals of
425 regression models were tested for normality with Kolmogorov-Smirnov test to justify linear fit. We
426 tested for 3 sessions from 1 electrode for Subject 1, 11 sessions from 4 electrodes for Subject 2,
427 and 4 sessions from 3 electrodes for Subject 3.

428

429 Closed-loop stimulation for functional tasks

430 To use these evoked sensations for real-time feedback in a functional task, such as gait or
431 balance, data from wireless plantar pressure sensing insoles (Moticon Insole 3, Munich,
432 Germany) was used to trigger stimulation of the spinal cord in real-time. For Subjects 2 and 3,
433 one electrode that evoked sensations in the missing limb was selected to provide real-time
434 feedback of plantar pressure. In both participants, the evoked sensations were in the toes and
435 metatarsals (Figure 1). Because of time constraints, Subject 1 did not participate in this portion of
436 the study. Plantar pressure above a minimum threshold triggered stimulation in the same region
437 as the mapped sensation. Subject 2 experienced sustained quadriceps contractions for stimuli
438 above 2.5 mA. Because of the small range of stimulation amplitudes available between threshold
439 and these contractions (2.25-2.5 mA), for Subject 2 we utilized constant amplitude stimulation for,
440 in which stimulation turned on when insole pressure was above a threshold and turned off when
441 below that threshold. For Subject 3, plantar pressure linearly modulated stimulation amplitude; as
442 she put more weight on her metatarsals, she felt a more intense sensation (Figure 5A). Stimulation
443 frequency (50 Hz Subject 1, 90 Hz Subject 2) and pulse width (200 μ s for both subjects) were
444 kept constant and amplitude was updated every 20 ms.

445 Functional assessments

446 The Sensory Organization Test (SOT) was used to determine changes in balance ability using
447 the NeuroCom Equitest system (Figure 3A). The SOT is a clinical measure of reliance on visual,
448 vestibular, and somatosensory systems for balance using six conditions where either the surround
449 or platform sway. Three 20-second trials were completed per condition. The SOT was completed
450 pre-implant without stimulation and repeated later with stimulation. Center of pressure (COP)
451 traces were recorded from the support surface at 100 Hz, filtered with a low-pass fourth-order
452 Butterworth filter, and analyzed for biomechanical and clinical measures of posturography.
453 Standard posturography measures were calculated, including excursion, sway velocity, 95%
454 confidence interval ellipse of sway area, sample, and approximate entropy⁴¹. The primary clinical
455 outcome measure for each condition is the equilibrium score, a measure of the participant's ability
456 to stay within a normative 12.5° of anteroposterior sway (Figure 3B).

457 During walking, the Functional Gait Assessment (FGA) and kinematics of walking on a level
458 surface were evaluated. The FGA is a 10-item test of dynamic balance, including challenging
459 items like walking with eyes closed, walking with a narrow base of support, and walking
460 backwards²⁸. Each item is scored on a scale from 0 to 3 points, where 3 indicates no impairment
461 and 0 indicates an inability to complete the task. Gait kinematics were recorded with a 16-camera
462 OptiTrack motion analysis system (Natural Point, OR, USA). Sixteen reflective markers were
463 placed on anatomical landmarks according to the OptiTrack "Conventional Lower Body" model.
464 Motion capture data were collected at 100 Hz and filtered using a 4th order low-pass Butterworth
465 filter at 12 Hz. Participants were instructed to walk at their self-selected speed across a 6-meter
466 walkway. For Subject 2, 14 trials of walking without stimulation and with stimulation were
467 analyzed. For Subject 3, 28 trials without stimulation and with stimulation were compared.

468 For clinical measures, published standards for clinically meaningful difference (CMD) or minimum
469 detectable change (MDC) were used to compare baseline and stimulation trials⁴²⁻⁴⁴. For
470 biomechanical measures of balance and gait, comparisons between outcomes were performed
471 using permutation testing, a non-parametric method often used for smaller sample sizes⁴⁵. We
472 completed 10,000 permutations of both baseline and with-stimulation groups and the difference

473 in means of biomechanical data across trials was determined. The p-value in permutation testing
474 is the count of permutations in which the observed difference in means is above the actual
475 difference in means. An alpha of 0.05 was used for all statistical analyses.

476 Phantom Limb Pain

477 To quantify phantom limb pain, we asked the subjects to report their current pain level on a visual
478 analog scale (VAS) at the beginning of each testing day. The scale ranged from 0 to 10 where 0
479 indicated no pain and 10 indicated the worst pain imaginable. VAS scores were averaged over
480 each week. Typically, a 50% decrease (and at least a 1-point decrease) in VAS score is
481 considered clinically meaningful.

482 Subjects also completed the McGill Pain Questionnaire (MPQ) once per week to describe their
483 pain over the previous week. The MPQ is a multi-dimensional survey of the affective, evaluative,
484 and other experiences of pain and requires the subject to select from ranked lists of descriptor
485 words (such as dull, sore, hurting, aching, heavy) about their pain. Subjects also select a value
486 ranging 0-5 to describe the intensity of their pain. The total score from this instrument is intended
487 to reflect both the intensity and the disruptive nature of pain, and a 5-point decrease is considered
488 clinically meaningful.

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496 References

- 497 1. Sexton, A. T. & Fleming, L. L. Lower extremity amputations. in *Medical Management of the*
498 *Surgical Patient: A Textbook of Perioperative Medicine* (eds. Walker, H. K., Lubin, M. F.,
499 Spell, N. O., Smith, R. B. & Dodson, T. F.) 741–743 (Cambridge University Press, 2006).
500 doi:DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511544590.119.
- 501 2. Viseux, F. J. F. The sensory role of the sole of the foot: Review and update on clinical
502 perspectives. *Neurophysiol. Clin.* **50**, 55–68 (2020).
- 503 3. Petersen, B. A., Nanivadekar, A. C., Chandrasekaran, S. & Fisher, L. E. Phantom limb
504 pain: peripheral neuromodulatory and neuroprosthetic approaches to treatment. *Muscle*
505 *Nerve* **59**, 154–167 (2019).
- 506 4. Valle, G. *et al.* Mechanisms of neuro-robotic prosthesis operation in leg amputees. *Sci.*
507 *Adv.* **7**, eabd8354 (2021).
- 508 5. Petrini, F. M. *et al.* Enhancing functional abilities and cognitive integration of the lower limb
509 prosthesis. *Sci. Transl. Med.* **11**, eaav8939 (2019).
- 510 6. Charkhkar, H. *et al.* High-density peripheral nerve cuffs restore natural sensation to
511 individuals with lower-limb amputations. *J. Neural Eng.* **15**, 056002 (2018).
- 512 7. Petrini, F. M. *et al.* Sensory feedback restoration in leg amputees improves walking speed,
513 metabolic cost and phantom pain. *Nat. Med.* **25**, 1356–1363 (2019).
- 514 8. Raspopovic, S. *et al.* Restoring natural sensory feedback in real-time bidirectional hand
515 prostheses. *Sci. Transl. Med.* **6**, 222ra19 (2014).
- 516 9. Dhillon, G. S. & Horch, K. W. Direct neural sensory feedback and control of a prosthetic
517 arm. *IEEE Trans. Neural Syst. Rehabil. Eng.* **13**, 468–472 (2005).
- 518 10. Charkhkar, H., Christie, B. P. & Triolo, R. J. Sensory neuroprosthesis improves postural
519 stability during Sensory Organization Test in lower-limb amputees. *Sci. Rep.* **10**, 6984
520 (2020).
- 521 11. Ortiz-Catalan, M., Hakansson, B. & Branemark, R. An osseointegrated human-machine
522 gateway for long-term sensory feedback and motor control of artificial limbs. *Sci. Transl.*
523 *Med.* **6**, 257re6-257re6 (2014).
- 524 12. Horch, K., Meek, S., Taylor, T. G. & Hutchinson, D. T. Object discrimination with an artificial
525 hand using electrical stimulation of peripheral tactile and proprioceptive pathways with
526 intrafascicular electrodes. *IEEE Trans. Neural Syst. Rehabil. Eng.* **19**, 483–489 (2011).
- 527 13. Tan, D. W. *et al.* A neural interface provides long-term stable natural touch perception. *Sci.*
528 *Transl. Med.* **6**, 257ra138-257ra138 (2014).
- 529 14. Davis, T. S. *et al.* Restoring motor control and sensory feedback in people with upper
530 extremity amputations using arrays of 96 microelectrodes implanted in the median and
531 ulnar nerves. *J. Neural Eng.* **13**, 036001 (2016).
- 532 15. Marasco, P. D., Schultz, A. E. & Kuiken, T. A. Sensory capacity of reinnervated skin after
533 redirection of amputated upper limb nerves to the chest. *Brain* **132**, 1441–1448 (2009).
- 534 16. Rossini, P. M. *et al.* Double nerve intraneural interface implant on a human amputee for
535 robotic hand control. *Clin. Neurophysiol.* **121**, 777–783 (2010).


- 536 17. Dillingham, T. R., Pezzin, L. E. & MacKenzie, E. J. B. T.-S. M. J. Limb amputation and limb
537 deficiency: epidemiology and recent trends in the United States. **95**, 875+ (2002).
- 538 18. Kumar, K. & Rizvi, S. Historical and Present State of Neuromodulation in Chronic Pain.
539 *Curr. Pain Headache Rep.* **18**, 387 (2014).
- 540 19. Fanciullo, G. J., Rose, R. J., Lunt, P. G., Whalen, P. K. & Ross, E. The State of Implantable
541 Pain Therapies in the United States: A Nationwide Survey of Academic Teaching
542 Programs. *Anesth. Analg.* **88**, (1999).
- 543 20. Chandrasekaran, S. *et al.* Sensory restoration by epidural stimulation of the lateral spinal
544 cord in upper-limb amputees. *Elife* **9**, e54349 (2020).
- 545 21. Lee, M. W. L., McPhee, R. W. & Stringer, M. D. An evidence-based approach to human
546 dermatomes. *Clin. Anat. Off. J. Am. Assoc. Clin. Anat. Br. Assoc. Clin. Anat.* **21**, 363–373
547 (2008).
- 548 22. Kim, L. H., McLeod, R. S. & Kiss, Z. H. T. A new psychometric questionnaire for reporting
549 of somatosensory percepts. *J. Neural Eng.* **15**, 13002 (2018).
- 550 23. Raspopovic, S. *et al.* Restoring Natural Sensory Feedback in Real-Time Bidirectional Hand
551 Protheses. *Sci. Transl. Med.* **6**, 222ra19-222ra19 (2014).
- 552 24. Graczyk, E. L. *et al.* The neural basis of perceived intensity in natural and artificial touch.
553 *Sci. Transl. Med.* **8**, 1–11 (2016).
- 554 25. Page, D. M. *et al.* Discriminability of multiple cutaneous and proprioceptive hand percepts
555 evoked by intraneural stimulation with Utah slanted electrode arrays in human amputees.
556 *J. Neuroeng. Rehabil.* **18**, 12 (2021).
- 557 26. Mastinu, E. *et al.* Grip control and motor coordination with implanted and surface electrodes
558 while grasping with an osseointegrated prosthetic hand. *J. Neuroeng. Rehabil.* **16**, 49
559 (2019).
- 560 27. Flesher, S. N. *et al.* Intracortical microstimulation of human somatosensory cortex. *Sci.*
561 *Transl. Med.* **8**, 361ra141-361ra141 (2016).
- 562 28. Wrisley, D. M. & Kumar, N. A. Functional Gait Assessment: Concurrent, Discriminative,
563 and Predictive Validity in Community-Dwelling Older Adults. *Phys. Ther.* **90**, 761–773
564 (2010).
- 565 29. Koehler-McNicholas, S. R., Danzl, L., Cataldo, A. Y. & Oddsson, L. I. E. Neuromodulation
566 to improve gait and balance function using a sensory neuroprosthesis in people who report
567 insensate feet – A randomized control cross-over study. *PLoS One* **14**, e0216212 (2019).
- 568 30. Melzack, R. The McGill Pain Questionnaire: major properties and scoring methods. *Pain*
569 **1**, 277–299 (1975).
- 570 31. Cho, T. A. Spinal cord functional anatomy. *Contin. Lifelong Learn. Neurol.* **21**, 13–35
571 (2015).
- 572 32. Charkhkar, H. *et al.* High-density peripheral nerve cuffs restore natural sensation to
573 individuals with lower-limb amputations. *J. Neural Eng.* **15**, 056002 (2018).
- 574 33. Kim, S. *et al.* Behavioral assessment of sensitivity to intracortical microstimulation of
575 primate somatosensory cortex. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **112**, 15202–15207 (2015).

- 576 34. Petersen, B., Sparto, P. J. & Fisher, L. E. Clinical measures of balance and gait cannot
577 differentiate somatosensory impairments in people with lower-limb amputation. *medRxiv*
578 (2022).
- 579 35. Jones, M. G. *et al.* Neuromodulation using ultra low frequency current waveform reversibly
580 blocks axonal conduction and chronic pain. *Sci. Transl. Med.* **13**, eabg9890 (2021).
- 581 36. Saal, H. P. & Bensmaia, S. J. Biomimetic approaches to bionic touch through a peripheral
582 nerve interface. *Neuropsychologia* **79**, 344–353 (2015).
- 583 37. Okorokova, E. V, He, Q. & Bensmaia, S. J. Biomimetic encoding model for restoring touch
584 in bionic hands through a nerve interface. *J. Neural Eng.* **15**, 66033 (2018).
- 585 38. Valle, G. *et al.* Biomimetic Intra-neural Sensory Feedback Enhances Sensation
586 Naturalness, Tactile Sensitivity, and Manual Dexterity in a Bidirectional Prosthesis. *Neuron*
587 **100**, 37-45.e7 (2018).
- 588 39. A., G. J. *et al.* Biomimetic sensory feedback through peripheral nerve stimulation improves
589 dexterous use of a bionic hand. *Sci. Robot.* **4**, eaax2352 (2019).
- 590 40. Nanivadekar, A., Chandrasekaran, S., Gaunt, R. & Fisher, L. RNEL PerceptMapper. (2020)
591 doi:10.5281/ZENODO.3939658.
- 592 41. Prieto, T. E., Myklebust, J. B., Hoffmann, R. G., Lovett, E. G. & Myklebust, B. M. Measures
593 of postural steadiness: differences between healthy young and elderly adults. *IEEE Trans.*
594 *Biomed. Eng.* **43**, 956–966 (1996).
- 595 42. Cripps, A., Livingston, S. C. & DeSantis, B. M. The Test- Retest Reliability and Minimal
596 Detectable Change of the Sensory Organization Test and Head- Shake Sensory
597 Organization Test. in (2016).
- 598 43. Wrisley, D. M., Marchetti, G. F., Kuharsky, D. K. & Whitney, S. L. Reliability, Internal
599 Consistency, and Validity of Data Obtained With the Functional Gait Assessment. *Phys.*
600 *Ther.* **84**, 906–918 (2004).
- 601 44. Beninato, M., Fernandes, A. & Plummer, L. S. Minimal Clinically Important Difference of
602 the Functional Gait Assessment in Older Adults. *Phys. Ther.* **94**, 1594–1603 (2014).
- 603 45. Pesarin, F. & Salmaso, L. The permutation testing approach: a review. *Statistica* **70**, 481–
604 509 (2010).

605

606

607 **Extended Data**




Extended Data Figure 1: Heatmaps showing the rate of occurrence of sensations in the missing limb across weeks. Darker shades indicate higher rate of occurrence of sensations in that location. No testing was done on week 11 for Subject 3.

608


609

610



Extended Data Figure 2: Comparison of the threshold amplitude that evoked sensation in missing limb (with co-activation in the residual limb) and the threshold amplitude that evoked sensation only in the residual limb. The threshold amplitude for each testing day was determined by increasing the stimulation amplitude in 0.5 or 1 mA steps and asking the subjects to report the location where they perceived the evoked sensation. Error bars show the standard deviation across multiple days.

611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622



Extended Data Figure 3: Dermatome activation by electrodes located at different vertebrae levels for Subject 2 and Subject 3. The left image shows the expected dermatome innervation in the leg. In the right, the horizontal bars indicate different dermatomes²¹ and the white ovals indicate the approximate electrode position that evoked sensations in that dermatome with respect to the vertebrae level. Subject 1 had substantial lead migration across weeks, making it challenging to precisely define the location of the electrodes with respect to vertebrae levels, so we have not included those results.

623

624

625

626


627

628

629

630


631




Extended Data Figure 4: Percept quality of evoked sensations in the missing limb. The subjects were given a list of 13 natural descriptors and 5 paresthetic descriptors to describe the quality of the sensation. The top panel shows the frequency of each descriptor for the two evoked sensations for each subject shown in Figure 2a. For all reported sensations, we stimulated each electrode with a 1-sec long pulse train. The bottom panel shows the total number of descriptors used to describe the sensations each week.

632


633



Extended Data Figure 5: Additional results from psychophysical discrimination assessment. (A) Variation of Weber fraction for different electrodes in Subject 1 and 2 as a function of the reference amplitude in the discrimination task. (B) Variation of JND for the same electrodes in Subjects 1 and 2 as a function of the reference amplitude. Subject 3 was discarded from these analyses due to insufficient data points.



Extended Data Figure 6: Full results of Sensory Organization Test (SOT). (A) Subject 2 performed the SOT without stimulation (light blue) with sham stimulation (i.e., stimulation in the residual limb only, gray) and with stimulation (stimulation in the prosthetic foot, dark blue). Sham stimulation substantially decreased performance for three of six conditions (with greater than minimum detectable change [MDC, 3.98]), suggesting that stimulation on the residual limb alone was not sufficient to improve performance. Subject 3 performed the SOT without stimulation (light magenta) and with stimulation (dark magenta). Both Subject 2 and Subject 3 exhibited improved performance on conditions with platform sway and eyes closed (+5.12 Subject 2, +9.60 Subject 3) and with visual surround sway (+4.04 Subject 2, +13.39 Subject 3). Both subjects, however, exhibited decreased performance with stimulation during static standing with eyes closed (-6.25 Subject 2, -4.32 Subject 3). Additionally, Subject 3 had worse performance on static standing with eyes open with stimulation (-4.13). Change in median values reported. * represents a MDC, ** represents a clinically meaningful difference (>8.0).



Extended Data Figure 7: (A) Weekly McGill Pain Questionnaire results. (B) McGill Pain Questionnaire score before the implant and 1-month post-explant. The pre-implant score for Subject 2 was not recorded and we did not perform testing on week 11 for Subject 3 (indicated by the dashed line).