

1 **Running Title:** Reconnecting the Hand and Arm to the Brain: Efficacy of Neural Interfaces for Sensorimotor  
2 Restoration after Tetraplegia

3  
4 **Authors:** Eric Z. Herring MD <sup>1,3</sup>, Emily L. Graczyk PhD <sup>1,2,4</sup>, William D. Memberg MS <sup>1,2,4</sup>, Robert D. Adams <sup>4</sup>,  
5 Guadalupe Fernandez Baca-Vaca MD <sup>3</sup>, Brianna C. Hutchison <sup>2</sup>, John T. Krall <sup>2</sup>, Benjamin J. Alexander <sup>2</sup>, Emily  
6 C. Conlan <sup>2</sup>, Kenya E. Alfaro <sup>2</sup>, Preethi R. Bhat <sup>2</sup>, Aaron B. Ketting-Olivier <sup>2</sup>, Chase A. Haddix <sup>5</sup>, Dawn M. Taylor  
7 <sup>2,4,5</sup>, Dustin J. Tyler <sup>1,2</sup>, Robert F. Kirsch PhD <sup>1,2,4</sup> A. Bolu Ajiboye PhD <sup>1,2,4</sup> Jonathan P. Miller MD <sup>1,3,4</sup>

8  
9 <sup>1</sup> School of Medicine, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, USA.

10 <sup>2</sup> Department of Biomedical Engineering, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, USA.

11 <sup>3</sup> The Neurological Institute, University Hospitals Cleveland Medical Center, Cleveland, OH, USA.

12 <sup>4</sup> Louis Stokes Cleveland Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, FES Center of Excellence, Cleveland,  
13 Ohio, USA.

14 <sup>5</sup> Department of Neuroscience, Lerner Research Institute, The Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, Ohio, USA

15  
16 **Acknowledgments:** We would like to thank the University Hospitals Cleveland Medical Center (UHCMC)  
17 Plastic Surgery Team for their expertise during the implant surgeries, and the UHCMC Clinical Core Staff for  
18 continued clinical support of the study participant. We thank Dr. David Preston for his expertise with  
19 intraoperative ultrasound. Finally, we thank the study participant (RP1) and family for their continued dedication  
20 to this work.

21 **Funding:** This work and investigators were supported by grants from 1) the Congressionally Directed Medical  
22 Research Program (CDMRP) – Spinal Cord Injury Research Program (SCIRP), administered through the  
23 Department of Defense (Award # SC180308), 2) the Department of Veterans Affairs Merit Review Program  
24 (Award #5I01RX002654), and 3) the National Institute of Neurological Disorders (NIH/NINDS) R01 Program  
25 (Award #R01NS119160).

## 28 ABSTRACT

29 **Background:** Paralysis after spinal cord injury involves damage to pathways that connect neurons in the brain to  
30 peripheral nerves in the limbs. Re-establishing this communication using neural interfaces has the potential to  
31 bridge the gap and restore upper extremity function to people with high tetraplegia.

32 **Objective:** We report a novel approach for restoring upper extremity function using selective peripheral nerve  
33 stimulation controlled by intracortical microelectrode recordings from sensorimotor networks, along with  
34 restoration of tactile sensation of the hand using intracortical microstimulation.

35 **Methods:** A right-handed man with motor-complete C3-C4 tetraplegia was enrolled into the clinical trial. Six 64-  
36 channel intracortical microelectrode arrays were implanted into left hemisphere regions involved in upper  
37 extremity function, including primary motor and sensory cortices, inferior frontal gyrus, and anterior intraparietal  
38 area. Nine 16-channel extraneural peripheral nerve electrodes were implanted to allow targeted stimulation of  
39 right median, ulnar (2), radial, axillary, musculocutaneous, suprascapular, lateral pectoral, and long thoracic  
40 nerves, to produce selective muscle contractions on demand. Proof-of-concept studies were performed to  
41 demonstrate feasibility of a bidirectional brain-machine interface to restore function of the participant's own arm  
42 and hand.

43 **Results:** Multi-unit neural activity that correlated with intended motor action was successfully recorded from  
44 intracortical arrays. Microstimulation of electrodes in somatosensory cortex produced repeatable sensory percepts  
45 of individual fingers for restoration of touch sensation. Selective electrical activation of peripheral nerves  
46 produced antigravity muscle contractions. The system was well tolerated with no operative complications.

47 **Conclusion:** The combination of implanted cortical electrodes and nerve cuff electrodes has the potential to allow  
48 restoration of motor and sensory functions of the arm and hand after neurological injury.

49  
50 **Keywords:** Brain-Computer Interface, Functional Electrical Stimulation, Tetraplegia, Restorative Neurosurgery,  
51 Brain-Machine Interface, Neuroprosthesis, Neuromuscular Stimulation, Motor, Somatosensation

52  
53 **Abbreviations:** BMI=brain-machine interface, FES=functional electrical stimulation, SCI=spinal cord injury,  
54 ICMS=intracortical microstimulation, EMG=electromyography, AD=anterior deltoid, MD=medial deltoid,  
55 PD=posterior deltoid, UP=upper pectoral, LP=lower pectoral, BR=brachialis, BIC=biceps, BRR=brachioradialis,  
56 SUP=supinator, ECRL=extensor carpi radialis, EIP=extensor indicis proprius, EDC=extensor digitorum  
57 communis, APL=abductor pollicis longus, EPL=extensor pollicis longus, PT=pronator teres, FCR=flexor carpi  
58 radialis, FDP=flexor digitorum profundus, FDS=flexor digitorum superficialis, FPL=flexor pollicis longus,  
59 FCU=flexor carpi ulnaris, FDI=first dorsal interosseous, ADM=abductor digiti minimi, ADP=adductor pollicis,  
60 FPB=flexor pollicis brevis

## 62 INTRODUCTION

63 SCI affects over 250,000 people nationwide with over 12,000 new cases each year and less than a 1% full recovery  
64 rate<sup>1</sup>. In particular, 52% of all SCI occurs at high cervical levels, resulting in tetraplegia – loss of functional use  
65 of all four limbs – and leading to lower quality of life from the inability to independently perform standard  
66 activities-of-daily-living (ADL), such as grasping objects for drinking and self-feeding. Many assistive  
67 technologies have been developed that provide these individuals with improved abilities to interact with their  
68 environment<sup>2-4</sup>. However, control of these devices is limited by inadequate command signals for telling the device  
69 what to do, and hence restoration of dexterous function has been elusive. In the case of upper motor neuron  
70 injuries, nerves and muscles distal to the injury, with intact lower motor neurons, are physiologically normal and  
71 remain electrically excitable<sup>5</sup>, which opens the possibility of using electrical stimulation to reanimate the limb  
72 and restore function. Functional electrical stimulation (FES) involving direct stimulation of peripheral nerves and  
73 muscles allows for reanimation of paralyzed limbs. This approach has emerged as a powerful technique to allow  
74 restoration of function in people with chronic weakness or paralysis<sup>6-10</sup>.


75  
76 Prior studies into brain-machine interfaces (BMI) have successfully recorded neural activity from motor regions  
77 of the brain, and extracted features that can be decoded into multidimensional command signals<sup>11-16</sup>. The  
78 combination of BMIs (for a command signal) with FES (to allow movement of the individual's paralyzed limb)  
79 is an appealing solution since it bypasses the injury and restores function using the most intuitive control source  
80 and output system conceivable: the individual's own brain and limbs<sup>16,17</sup>. While these prior BMI-controlled FES  
81 studies demonstrated basic feasibility, the achievable functionality was limited in part by the lack of muscle  
82 selectivity and/or the limited strength of contractions generated by the FES electrode technology used<sup>16,17</sup>. In  
83 addition, prior systems did not attempt to provide sensory feedback about object interactions during BMI-  
84 controlled FES grasping. Touch feedback is critical for dexterous object manipulation, and will likely further  
85 enhance upper extremity function provided by the BMI-FES system, as has been observed with robotic upper  
86 extremity systems<sup>18-20</sup>. In this report, we describe the surgical approach to implantation of percutaneous multi-  
87 array intracortical BMI and peripheral nerve FES systems in the same individual with the goal of restoring brain-  
88 controlled upper extremity movements. We also present data demonstrating feasibility of each system component.  
89 When integrated into a bidirectional sensorimotor system, the ReHAB technology may provide some degree of  
90 functional independence to people living with paralysis of the upper extremities.

## 92 METHODS

### 93 ReHAB System Overview

94 The “Reconnecting the Hand and Arm to the Brain” (ReHAB) system creates a bidirectional computerized  
95 interface between sensorimotor regions of the brain and the peripheral nerves, circumventing the spinal injury to

96 create an alternative pathway for transmitting activity between the brain and periphery. A motor pathway records  
97 neural activity from electrodes distributed across motor regions of the brain, decodes this information to determine  
98 intended movements, and then stimulates sub-fascicular regions of peripheral nerves to actuate appropriate  
99 muscles. In parallel, a sensory pathway provides electrical stimulation to the somatosensory cortex, resulting in  
100 restored touch percepts. A system overview is shown in Figure 1.




102  
103 **Figure 1.** Schematic of the ReHAB system. Cortical arrays implanted in motor regions record brain activity  
104 associated with intended movements, which is translated into stimulation patterns sent to nerve cuff electrodes  
105 surrounding nerves in the contralateral upper limb. Connections between external neurostimulation hardware and  
106 the implanted nerve cuff electrodes are made via percutaneous leads exiting the body in the deltoid and cervical  
107 regions. Cortical arrays implanted in somatosensory cortex can record neural activity associated with touch  
108 stimuli applied to the hand, and/or elicit sensations of touch on the hand and arm due to stimulation applied  
109 through individual electrode contacts.

## 111 **Study Participant**

112 A right-handed man in his 20s with C3-C4 AIS B tetraplegia from a diving accident five years prior was enrolled  
113 into the study. He had initially undergone a prolonged hospital course involving cervical decompression and  
114 stabilization surgery as well as a tracheostomy, but at the time of study enrollment was independent from the  
115 ventilator without tracheostomy. An Investigational Device Exemption (ClinicalTrials.gov ID: NCT03898804)  
116 was obtained from the FDA for use of intracortical and peripheral nerve electrodes for research purposes. The  
117 protocol was reviewed and approved by the University Hospitals Cleveland Medical Center Institutional Review  
118 Board. Informed consent was obtained for study enrollment and prior to all procedures.

## 120 **Cranial Electrode Implantation**

121 Six 8x8 (64-channel) iridium oxide microelectrode arrays (penetrating 1.5 mm into cortical tissue) were implanted  
122 into motor and sensory regions of the left (language dominant) hemisphere. Under awake anesthesia, a bicoronal  
123 incision with mobilization of the left temporalis muscle was used to maximize cranial exposure and minimize  
124 sacrificing surrounding blood supply. After a left frontoparietal craniotomy, frameless stereotaxis (StealthStation  
125 S8 Surgical Navigation System Medtronic PLC, Dublin, Ireland) was used to identify structures of interest, and  
126 the central sulcus at the face was confirmed using phase reversal. The hand area on the precentral gyrus was  
127 identified through anatomical landmarks<sup>21,22</sup>. The hand-related area of primary somatosensory cortex was then  
128 identified through awake sensory mapping, in which four of the five fingers were localized (Figure 2A-B). This  
129 information was used to allow placement of two arrays each in primary motor and sensory hand areas. Additional  
130 electrodes were implanted in anterior intraparietal area according to landmarks previously described<sup>23</sup> and in  
131 inferior frontal gyrus in areas confirmed to be away from language function using awake speech mapping (Figure  
132 2A-B). Each array was implanted using a high-speed pneumatic press and implantation of grounding wires as  
133 previously described<sup>16,24</sup>. The arrays were attached in pairs to three percutaneous pedestals (NeuroPort System,  
134 Blackrock Microsystems, Salt Lake City, UT) - one anterior and two posterior to the craniotomy. Connectors  
135 were spaced appropriately to allow attachment of headstages for intracortical recording and/or stimulation (Figure  
136 2C-D).



137

138 **Figure 2.** Surgical implantation of the cortical electrodes. (A) Awake stimulation mapping was performed to  
139 identify implant locations. Non-speech regions of inferior frontal gyrus (IFG) (striped dark blue) were identified  
140 posterior to regions that resulted in speech arrest during stimulation (dark blue). Hand regions of primary  
141 somatosensory cortex were located by reports of perceived sensations on individual fingers (red, orange, light  
142 blue, purple) during stimulation. Locations selected for the implanted arrays are indicated as black squares. (B)  
143 Locations of implanted electrodes on the brain, superimposed upon pre-operative structural MRI. S1 arrays  
144 targeted index and ring fingertip locations from (A). M1 arrays were placed directly across the central sulcus,  
145 targeting hand and arm area. The IFG array targeted the border of Area 44 and ventral premotor (PMv) cortices,  
146 and the AIP array targeted the medial junction of parietal and postcentral sulci. (C) CT image of array pedestal  
147 locations with associated cabling to implanted arrays. (D) Post-op image of healed array pedestal exit sites with  
148 and without caps (in place when system not in use).


149

150

## 151 **Peripheral Nerve Electrode Implantation**

152 In separate operations under general anesthesia, nine 16-channel composite flat interface nerve electrodes (C-  
153 FINEs) were implanted around nerves responsible for dexterous function of the right (dominant) upper extremity.  
154 The C-FINE is an extraneural electrode designed to reshape nerves in order to more selectively recruit interior  
155 fascicles<sup>25</sup>. Standard surgical approaches were used to provide exposure to the infraclavicular brachial plexus (for  
156 median, musculocutaneous, lateral pectoral, proximal ulnar, and long thoracic nerves), distal upper arm (distal  
157 ulnar nerve), and posterior upper arm/shoulder (radial, axillary, and suprascapular nerves). High frequency

158 ultrasound was used to identify and evaluate the exposed nerve segments, including size of the nerves, branch  
159 points, and number of fascicles. For each nerve, a 16-channel C-FINE was wrapped around the nerve and sutured  
160 closed<sup>26</sup> (Figure 3A), and individual contacts were stimulated intraoperatively to confirm muscle contractions.  
161 Percutaneous inline connectors (Figure 3B) were connected and tunneled to percutaneous exit sites located at the  
162 lateral deltoid and superclavicular regions (Figure 3C). Some of the percutaneous leads were truncated prior to  
163 externalization such that a total of 138 double-wound percutaneous leads passed through 71 exit sites, inclusive  
164 of a triceps intramuscular electrode inserted during a subsequent surgery to further enhance arm extension.  
165



166

167 **Figure 3.** Surgical implantation of Composite Flat Interface Nerve Electrodes (C-FINEs) and tunneling of  
168 externalized leads. (A) C-FINE around the exposed radial nerve (not yet sutured closed, arrow). (B) C-FINE on  
169 suprascapular nerve (arrow) and inline connector (arrowhead). (C) Inline connectors in nerve exposure incision  
170 (arrow) and tunneled externalized leads (arrowhead), which were subsequently individually tunneled to separate  
171 percutaneous exit sites. (D) X-ray of implanted nerve cuffs (outlined in red) and inline connectors (outlined in  
172 blue), with percutaneous exit sites (circled in yellow).

173

174

## 175 **Post-Op System Validation**

176 Surgical outcomes were assessed through monthly visits to inspect wound healing and potential side effects or  
177 complications. We characterized the chronic recording (all) and stimulation (S1 only) capabilities of the implanted  
178 microelectrode arrays. We also measured the number of individually recordable neurons and their signal-to-noise  
179 ratios to quantify the efficacy of the recordings over a one-year period. To assess whether the recorded neural  
180 activity modulated with different attempted movements, the study participant was shown movements of different  
181 body segments and asked to attempt to perform those movements on cue<sup>27,28</sup>. Neural signals were recorded and  
182 analyzed to determine if, and at what point, the attempted movements were differentiable based upon neural  
183 activity alone. To assess the efficacy of the S1 arrays at producing sensation, microstimulation of individual  
184 contacts was delivered as 100 Hz trains of biphasic, cathode-first, charge-balanced pulses of 200 microsecond  
185 duration and 80 microamp amplitude (Cerestim R96, Blackrock Neurotech, Salt Lake City, UT). Stimulation of  
186 individual contacts of each C-FINE was used to determine the pattern of muscle activations achievable, as well  
187 as the muscle recruitment order. Muscle recruitment was determined by analyzing normalized electromyography  
188 (EMG) signals recorded through fine wire electrodes inserted under Ultrasound guidance into target muscles.  
189 Finally, we examined the joint movement responses to varying pulse amplitude and pulse width of several C-  
190 FINE contacts, as well as how simultaneous stimulation of multiple C-FINE contacts could result in formation of  
191 functional hand grasps.

## 192 **RESULTS**


### 193 **Surgical Outcome**

194 All surgical procedures were well tolerated by the participant with no significant procedural or long-term  
195 complications. There was no significant discomfort associated with the cranial or peripheral exit sites. The  
196 participant did not experience any new motor, sensory, or speech deficits.

### 197 **Motor Recording**


198 Each channel on each microelectrode array could detect up to five individually-identifiable neurons, based upon  
199 their distinct wave shapes<sup>29,30</sup> (Figure 4A). Higher neuron yields were seen on both S1, medial M1, and IFG  
200 arrays, compared with lower yields on the lateral M1 and AIP arrays. There were significant changes over time  
201 in the number of isolatable single neurons on each array, with decreases in neuronal counts seen on arrays  
202 implanted in somatosensory and primary motor areas and increases seen in arrays implanted in anterior  
203 intraparietal and inferior frontal gyrus areas (Figure 4B). In contrast, the average signal-to-noise ratio remained  
204 consistent over time ( $p > 0.05$ , regression slope test) for all electrode arrays (Figure 4B). This data demonstrates  
205 the chronic health of the electrode-tissue interface remained stable up to one-year post-implantation.





**Figure 4.** Cortical recording of individual neurons and stability over time. (A) Neural yields of the implanted arrays. Each 8x8 plot represents an implanted 64-channel microelectrode array, with each box insert showing the neural yield from a single channel. Channels could record multiple isolatable neural spikes (represented as different colors, data shown from post-implant day 123). Higher yields were observed on S1, M1, and IFG arrays, with lower yield observed on the AIP array. (B) Measurements of the chronic health of the electrode-tissue interface. Top plot: Number of isolatable neurons on each pedestal ( $n=128$  channels per pedestal) over the first year of the study. Unit counts decreased over time on arrays implanted in S1 and M1, while they increased on the pedestal recording IFG and AIP (increases were mostly seen in IFG). The average signal-to-noise (SNR) ratio was relatively constant ( $p>0.05$ , regression slope test) across the one year of neural recordings (bottom plot).


We assessed whether the neural activity recorded from arrays in motor areas modulated to specific attempted movements. First, the participant was instructed to attempt to perform different hand grasps on cue, and the normalized multiunit spiking activity was recorded from arrays in motor-related areas. Each grasp pattern resulted in a different level of activation within individual electrodes (Figure 5A, sample electrode channel in IFG). This differential modulation to grasp pattern occurred about a second before the onset of the actual attempted movement and typically within a few hundred milliseconds after the cue. Second, the participant was asked to attempt to move eight different body parts. A classification algorithm correctly identified which body part was moved 79% of the time from recorded signals from the IFG array alone (Figure 5B). This diversity of body representations in what is conventionally thought of as ‘hand’ area is consistent with a previous study in the human hand knob area after paralysis<sup>28</sup>.



**Figure 5.** Modulation of neural signals to various attempted movements. (A) The participant attempted performing three different hand grasp patterns, which resulted in differentiable modulation in the neural activity. Shown is a sample electrode's normalized mean activity timecourse (solid lines) and standard error (shaded regions) to imagination of power, palmar, and lateral grasp patterns. Imagination of grasp patterns resulted in distinguishable cortical responses both during the visually cued premovement phase (-1500 to 0 ms) and the imagined movement phase (after 0 ms). (B) Using cross-validated linear discriminant analysis, attempted movements of eight different body parts could be accurately classified in 79% of the trials from the neural activity on the IFG array alone.

## Sensory Stimulation

Stimulation through individual electrodes in the two 8x8 arrays implanted in the primary somatosensory cortex reliably produced sensation of touch on the index, middle, and ring fingers (Figure 6). Perceived locations typically included the anterior surface of the fingertips, and many projected fields also included the posterior side of the distal phalange(s). The microelectrodes eliciting reliable sensation tended to be along the posterior edge of the arrays. The locations of sensation elicited by intracortical microstimulation in each region of cortex (Figure 6) matched the sensory locations reported during intraoperative stimulation mapping of the same region (Figure 2A). Sensations were reported to feel similar to 'pressure' applied to the skin or 'light squeezing' of the fingertip.



250

251 **Figure 6.** Sensory projected fields resulting from intracortical microstimulation applied to primary somatosensory  
252 cortex. Top left: the positions of the microelectrode arrays relative to the perceived locations reported during  
253 intraoperative mapping. Note that the locations reported were whole fingers rather than specific phalanges.  
254 Middle: The projected fields for each electrode in the medial (top) and lateral (bottom) arrays. The arrays are  
255 oriented to match their positions in the image of the cortex. Bottom right: Color legend for projected fields shown  
256 on the array diagrams. Each segment of the finger corresponds to a different shade. Grey electrodes may have  
257 elicited sensation in some trials, but the locations were not consistently reported for at least 60% of trials.

258


259

## 260 **Functional Electrical Stimulation**

261 Stimulation of each C-FINE contact resulted in activation of muscles innervated by the stimulated nerve. As  
262 stimulation levels for a given C-FINE contact increased, additional muscles were recruited. While many contacts  
263 within a given C-FINE recruited similar groups of muscles, the order of recruited muscles differed across contacts  
264 (Figure 7). Recruitment order was more similar for neighboring C-FINE contacts, and recruitment patterns across  
265 contacts demonstrate the spatial clustering of muscle-specific efferents within the nerve fascicles (Figure 7). For  
266 example, stimulation of the radial C-FINE resulted in activation of wrist (ECRL) and finger extensors (EDC and  
267 EIP), thumb actuators (EPL and APL), and elbow flexion (BRR) and wrist supination (SUP). BRR activation was

268 more prominent on contacts on the left half of the array while SUP activation was more prominent on the right  
 269 half, and all other muscle activations were more distributed. Ulnar nerve stimulation produced activation of thumb  
 270 flexion and adduction (FPB and ADP, predominantly on bottom half of the cuff), as well as index finger flexion  
 271 (FDI, also predominantly on bottom half of cuff), with other functions (pinky abduction – ADM, finger flexion –  
 272 FDP, and wrist flexion – FCU) distributed across the cuff contacts. The median nerve C-FINE produced wrist  
 273 flexion (FCR – predominantly top half), forearm pronation (PT – predominantly right half), with finger (FDS,  
 274 FDP) and thumb (FPL) flexion distributed across the contacts. Each of the musculocutaneous (biceps, brachialis),  
 275 lateral pectoralis (upper and lower pectoralis) and axillary (anterior, middle, and posterior deltoid) nerve cuffs  
 276 also produced spatially organized recruitment of their respective muscles.

277



278

279 **Figure 7.** Muscle recruitment order associated with stimulation of individual contacts in the C-FINES<sup>37</sup>. Muscles  
 280 represented by a given color act on that color’s associated body part (e.g. all blue muscles activate finger flexion  
 281 or extension) Several contacts exhibited spatial organization of muscle activation (e.g. left contacts of radial nerve  
 282 more readily recruited brachioradialis, bottom contacts of ulnar nerve more readily recruited thumb muscles (ADP  
 283 and FPB). Six of the eight implanted C-FINES resulted in activation of the expected set of muscles.


284

285

286 Nerve stimulation patterns involving multiple contacts on multiple nerves resulted in functional movements of  
 287 reaching and grasping. Cortical signals related to the intended movement were decoded into a command signal,  
 288 which then governed the level of stimulation delivered to sets of contacts in the C-FINES (Figure 8). These  
 289 patterns of nerve stimulation were able to generate the intended movement in the participant’s own limb. For  
 290 example, a combined stimulation pattern of contacts on the median, radial, and ulnar nerves resulted in open/close  
 291 of a lateral hand grasp, and the desired hand aperture was controlled by modulating the stimulation pulse width  
 292 (Figure 8).

293

294



295

296

297

298

299

**Figure 8.** Simultaneous stimulation of sets of C-FINE contacts resulted in functional movements of the upper limb (hand shown here). Top: The desired hand state (x-axis) modulated the pulse width of electrical stimulation (y-axis) delivered to specific contacts on multiple nerves to produce the desired aperture. Bottom: Nerve stimulation resulted in varying degrees of opening (left) to closing (right) of the participant's own hand.

300

301

## DISCUSSION

302

303

304

305

In this report, we describe a system for brain-controlled stimulation of peripheral nerves to restore voluntary hand and arm movement in a person with chronic motor-complete tetraplegia. We also demonstrate feasibility of a sensory cortical interface that provides touch percepts of the fingertips that can be used for sensory feedback during brain-controlled restored movement.

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

The most important advantage of the ReHAB system compared to other BMI systems, which have provided control of computer cursors or robotic limbs, is that it restores movement of the user's own arm and hand using functional electrical stimulation (FES). FES has been used for many years to activate paralyzed muscles in people with neurological deficits<sup>6,7</sup>. In the lower extremity, FES systems have been used for standing, transfer, and walking applications<sup>9,10</sup>. In the upper extremity, FES systems have been shown to restore grasping functions to persons with cervical spinal cord injuries<sup>6,8,31</sup>. However, command options for telling the system what movements to make have been limited in the high tetraplegia population. The ReHAB system overcomes this challenge by using intracortical microelectrodes to provide a source of complex movement commands in this population.

316 An additional advancement in FES offered by the ReHAB system is the use of nerve cuff electrodes to activate  
317 motor efferents, rather than directly stimulating muscles with electrodes placed in individual muscles. Multi-  
318 contact cuffs can selectively activate different fascicles within a nerve<sup>26,31,32</sup>, and thereby selectively recruit one  
319 or more muscles innervated by a given nerve. Because a single cuff can recruit all muscles innervated by a given  
320 nerve, fewer interfaces need to be implanted to achieve full hand and arm function, thus reducing the necessary  
321 number of incisions and the complexity of the implantation procedure. In addition, since axons responsible for  
322 activation of synergistic muscles tend to be grouped into distinct nerves, peripheral nerve stimulation makes it  
323 possible to leverage the natural anatomic organization of the nerves to produce coordinated joint movements.  
324 Nerve stimulation can also achieve muscle activation at lower currents than direct muscle stimulation. By using  
325 multi-contact peripheral nerve stimulating electrodes rather than direct muscle stimulation, we were able to  
326 produce coordinated movement across a variety of muscles using relatively few electrode arrays and low  
327 stimulation intensities.

328  
329 The ReHAB system expands on prior FES studies by providing pathways for direct recording of brain signals to  
330 control the patterns of peripheral nerve stimulation to restore voluntary movement. In addition to the potential for  
331 high density of information transfer, recording directly from motor areas of the brain may tap into native motor  
332 intentions, thus producing more intuitive control. In contrast to implantation only in primary motor areas of the  
333 brain, there are many potential advantages to recording from multiple upstream and downstream sensorimotor  
334 regions. In nonhuman primates, recording from ventral premotor regions have demonstrated neural activity that  
335 tunes to goal-directed activity rather than the more body-centric activity seen in primary cortex<sup>33,34</sup>. Likewise, in  
336 monkey and human experiments, single neurons from the anterior intraparietal area have been found to be  
337 selective for a variety of imagined hand postures that can be used to control prosthetic hands<sup>23,35</sup>. Combination of  
338 information from multiple distinct brain regions may allow for more intuitive and reliable motor control, and we  
339 have established that implantation in multiple brain regions is safe and well tolerated.

340  
341 Finally, the ReHAB system combines brain-controlled arm movements with sensory feedback provided via  
342 microstimulation of primary somatosensory cortex. Sensory feedback is a critically important component of  
343 naturalistic movements of the upper extremity and could enhance object grasp and manipulation. Several prior  
344 studies have shown that focal brain stimulation can produce artificial sensory percepts and that these percepts can  
345 improve control of brain-controlled robotic limbs<sup>18,36</sup>, but prior systems have not combined this sensory feedback  
346 with brain-controlled FES. Notably, brain stimulation in our participant conveyed a naturalistic sense of touch on  
347 regions of the fingers critical for grasp function. Our results confirm that microelectrode stimulation can achieve  
348 sensory percepts at the level of individual fingertips, and demonstrate that sensory locations evoked by  
349 microelectrode stimulation are spatially congruous with those reported during intraoperative awake mapping.

350

## 351 **Limitations**

352 There are several important limitations to this approach. First, only upper motor neuron injuries can be addressed  
353 using peripheral nerve stimulation, since denervation atrophy associated with peripheral nerve injury (including  
354 at the level of spinal cord injury) will preclude muscle activation. Second, it is necessary that the brain cortex be  
355 intact for recording of motor function, which prevents application when pathology involves damage to motor  
356 neurons (such as stroke) or progressive neurodegenerative conditions. Finally, this report involves a single  
357 participant, so additional studies will be necessary to determine whether the findings are generalizable.

358

## 359 **CONCLUSION**

360 Brain-controlled peripheral nerve stimulation has the potential to allow restoration of arm and hand function after  
361 neurological injury. Use of a system like this to control the upper extremity may allow restoration of naturalistic  
362 movements, and future research may allow use of the reanimated upper extremity to perform simple activities of  
363 daily living.

364

## 365 **REFERENCES**

- 366 1. NSCISC. Spinal cord injury. Facts and figures at a glance. *J. Spinal Cord Med.* **36**, 1–2 (2013).
- 367 2. Lathem, P. A., Gregorio, T. L. & Garber, S. L. High level quadriplegia: An occupational therapy  
368 challenge. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy* vol. 39 705–714 (1985).
- 369 3. Huo, X. & Ghovanloo, M. Evaluation of a wireless wearable tongue-computer interface by individuals  
370 with high-level spinal cord injuries. *J. Neural Eng.* **7**, 26008 (2010).
- 371 4. Handa, Y., Handa, T., Nakatsuchi, Y., Yagi, R. & Hoshimiya, N. [A voice-controlled functional  
372 electrical stimulation system for the paralyzed hand]. *Iyodenshi. To Seitai Kogaku.* **23**, 292–298 (1985).
- 373 5. Peckham, P. H. & Knutson, J. S. Functional electrical stimulation for neuromuscular applications. *Annu.*  
374 *Rev. Biomed. Eng.* **7**, 327–60 (2005).
- 375 6. Peckham, P. H., Mortimer, J. T. & Marsolais, E. B. Controlled prehension and release in the C5  
376 quadriplegic elicited by functional electrical stimulation of the paralyzed forearm musculature. *Ann.*  
377 *Biomed. Eng.* **8**, 369–388 (1980).
- 378 7. Peckham, P. H. & Knutson, J. S. Functional Electrical Stimulation for Neuromuscular Applications.  
379 *Annu. Rev. Biomed. Eng.* **7**, 327–360 (2005).
- 380 8. Kilgore, K. L. *et al.* An implanted upper-extremity neuroprosthesis. Follow-up of five patients. *J. Bone*  
381 *Joint Surg. Am.* **79**, 533–541 (1997).
- 382 9. Marsolais, E. B. & Kobetic, R. Functional walking in paralyzed patients by means of electrical  
383 stimulation. *Clin. Orthop. Relat. Res.* 30–36 (1983).

- 384 10. Triolo, R. J. *et al.* Longitudinal Performance of a Surgically Implanted Neuroprosthesis for Lower-  
385 Extremity Exercise, Standing, and Transfers After Spinal Cord Injury. *Arch. Phys. Med. Rehabil.* **93**,  
386 896–904 (2012).
- 387 11. Kim, S.-P., Simeral, J. D., Hochberg, L. R., Donoghue, J. P. & Black, M. J. Neural control of computer  
388 cursor velocity by decoding motor cortical spiking activity in humans with tetraplegia. *J Neural Eng* **5**,  
389 455–476 (2008).
- 390 12. Kim, S.-P. P. *et al.* Point-and-click cursor control with an intracortical neural interface system by humans  
391 with tetraplegia. *IEEE Trans. Neural Syst. Rehabil. Eng.* **19**, 193–203 (2011).
- 392 13. Jarosiewicz, B. *et al.* Virtual typing by people with tetraplegia using a stabilized, self-calibrating  
393 intracortical brain-computer interface. *Sci. Transl. Med.* **7**, 1–11 (2015).
- 394 14. Hochberg, L. R. *et al.* Reach and grasp by people with tetraplegia using a neurally controlled robotic arm.  
395 *Nature* **485**, 372–375 (2012).
- 396 15. Collinger, J. L. *et al.* High-performance neuroprosthetic control by an individual with tetraplegia. *Lancet*  
397 **381**, 557–564 (2013).
- 398 16. Ajiboye, A. B. *et al.* Restoration of reaching and grasping movements through brain-controlled muscle  
399 stimulation in a person with tetraplegia : a proof-of-concept demonstration. *Lancet* **6736**, (2017).
- 400 17. Bouton, C. E. *et al.* Restoring cortical control of functional movement in a human with quadriplegia.  
401 *Nature* 1–13 (2016) doi:10.1038/nature17435.
- 402 18. Flesher, S. N. *et al.* Intracortical microstimulation of human somatosensory cortex. *Sci. Transl. Medicine*  
403 1–11 (2016) doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.aaf8083.
- 404 19. Flesher, S. N. *et al.* A brain-computer interface that evokes tactile sensations improves robotic arm  
405 control. *Science (80-. )*. **372**, 831–836 (2021).
- 406 20. Fifer, M. S. *et al.* Intracortical Somatosensory Stimulation to Elicit Fingertip Sensations in an Individual  
407 With Spinal Cord Injury. *Neurology* **98**, e679 LP-e687 (2022).
- 408 21. Maynard, E. M., Nordhausen, C. T. & Normann, R. A. The Utah Intracortical Electrode Array : a  
409 recording structure for potential brain-computer interfaces. **102**, 228–239 (1997).
- 410 22. Yousry, T. A. *et al.* Localization of the motor hand area to a knob on the precentral gyrus. A new  
411 landmark. *Brain* **120**, 141–157 (1997).
- 412 23. Klaes, C. *et al.* Hand shape representations in the human posterior parietal cortex. *J. Neurosci.* **35**,  
413 15466–15476 (2015).
- 414 24. Rousche, P. J. & Normann, R. A. A Method for Pneumatically Inserting an Array of Penetrating  
415 Electrodes into Cortical Tissue. **20**, 413–422 (1992).
- 416 25. Freeberg, M. J., Stone, M. A., Triolo, R. J. & Tyler, D. J. The design of and chronic tissue response to a  
417 composite nerve electrode with patterned stiffness. *J. Neural Eng.* **14**, aa6632 (2017).



- 418 26. Freeberg, M. J. *et al.* Intraoperative Responses May Predict Chronic Performance of Composite Flat  
419 Interface Nerve Electrodes on Human Femoral Nerves. *IEEE Trans. Neural Syst. Rehabil. Eng.* **27**,  
420 2317–2327 (2019).
- 421 27. Ajiboye, A. B., Simeral, J. D., Donoghue, J. P., Hochberg, L. R. & Kirsch, R. F. Prediction of imagined  
422 single-joint movements in a person with high-level tetraplegia. *IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng.* **59**, 2755–65  
423 (2012).
- 424 28. Willett, F. R. *et al.* Hand Knob Area of Premotor Cortex Represents the Whole Body in a Compositional  
425 Way. *Cell* **181**, 396-409.e26 (2020).
- 426 29. Lewicki, M. S. A review of methods for spike sorting: the detection and classification of neural action  
427 potentials. *Netw. Comput. Neural Syst.* **9**, R53 (1998).
- 428 30. Caro-Martín, C. R., Delgado-García, J. M., Gruart, A. & Sánchez-Campusano, R. Spike sorting based on  
429 shape, phase, and distribution features, and K-TOPS clustering with validity and error indices. *Sci. Rep.*  
430 **8**, 17796 (2018).
- 431 31. Memberg, W. D. *et al.* Implanted Neuroprosthesis for Restoring Arm and Hand Function in People With  
432 High Level Tetraplegia. *Arch. Phys. Med. Rehabil.* **95**, 1201–11 (2014).
- 433 32. Christie, B. P. *et al.* Long-term stability of stimulating spiral nerve cuff electrodes on human peripheral  
434 nerves. *J. Neuroeng. Rehabil.* **14**, 1–12 (2017).
- 435 33. Rizzolatti, G., Cattaneo, L., Fabbri-Destro, M. & Rozzi, S. Cortical mechanisms underlying the  
436 organization of goal-directed actions and mirror neuron-based action understanding. *Physiol. Rev.* **94**,  
437 655–706 (2014).
- 438 34. Côté, S. L., Hamadjida, A., Quessy, S. & Dancause, N. Contrasting Modulatory Effects from the Dorsal  
439 and Ventral Premotor Cortex on Primary Motor Cortex Outputs. *J. Neurosci. Off. J. Soc. Neurosci.* **37**,  
440 5960–5973 (2017).
- 441 35. Murata, A., Gallese, V., Luppino, G., Kaseda, M. & Sakata, H. Selectivity for the shape, size, and  
442 orientation of objects for grasping in neurons of monkey parietal area AIP. *J. Neurophysiol.* **83**, 2580–  
443 2601 (2000).
- 444 36. Salas, M. A. *et al.* Proprioceptive and cutaneous sensations in humans elicited by intracortical  
445 microstimulation. *Elife* **7**, 1–11 (2018).
- 446 37. Brill, N. A. *et al.* Evaluation of high-density, multi-contact nerve cuffs for activation of grasp muscles in  
447 monkeys. *J. Neural Eng.* **15**, (2018).