

1 **Main Manuscript for**

2 **NeurOne: High-performance Motor Unit-Computer Interface for the**
3 **Paralyzed**

4

5 **Authors:**

6 Dominik I. Braun¹, Daniela Souza de Oliveira¹, Patricia Bayer¹, Matthias Ponfick², Thomas Mehari
7 Kinfe³, Alessandro Del Vecchio¹

8 **Author affiliation:**

9 ¹ Department Artificial Intelligence in Biomedical Engineering, Friedrich-Alexander-Universität
10 Erlangen-Nürnberg, 91052 Erlangen, Germany.

11 ² Querschnittszentrum Rummelsberg, Krankenhaus Rummelsberg GmbH, 90592
12 Schwarzenbruck, Germany.

13 ³ Department Neurological Surgery, Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, 91054
14 Erlangen, Germany.

15 **Corresponding author:** Alessandro Del Vecchio

16 **Email:** alessandro.del.vecchio@fau.de

17 **Competing Interest Statement:** Disclose any competing interests here.

18 **This PDF file includes:**

19 Main Text
20 Figures 1 to 6
21 Tables 1 to 1
22

23 **Abstract**

24 We have recently demonstrated that humans with motor-and-sensory complete cervical spinal cord
25 injury (SCI) can modulate the activity of spared motor neurons that control the movements of
26 paralyzed muscles. These motor neurons still receive highly functional cortical inputs that
27 proportionally control flexion and extension movements of the paralyzed hand digits. In this study,
28 we report a series of longitudinal experiments in which subjects with motor complete SCI received
29 motor unit feedback from NeurOne. NeurOne is a software that realizes super-fast digitalization of
30 motor neuron spiking activity (32 frames/s) and control of these neural ensembles through a
31 physiological motor unit twitch model that enables intuitive brain-computer interactions closely
32 matching the voluntary force modulation of healthy hand digits. We asked the subjects (n=3, 3-4
33 laboratory visits) to match a target displayed on a monitor through a cursor that was controlled by
34 the modulation of the recruitment and rate coding of the spared motor units using a motor unit
35 twitch model. The attempted movements of the paralyzed hands involved grasping and hand digit
36 extension/flexion. The target cursor was scaled in a way that the subjects could increase or
37 decrease feedback by either recruiting or derecruiting motor units, or by modulating the
38 instantaneous discharge rate. The subjects learned to control the motor unit output with high levels
39 of accuracy across different target intensities up to the maximal achievable discharge rate. Indeed,
40 the high-performance motor output was surprisingly stable in a similar way as healthy subjects
41 modulated the muscle force output recorded by a dynamometer. Therefore, NeurOne enables
42 tetraplegic individuals an intuitive control of the paralyzed muscles through a digital neuromuscular
43 system.

44 **Significance Statement**

45 Our study demonstrates the remarkable ability of individuals with complete cervical spinal cord
46 injuries to modulate spared motor neurons and control paralyzed muscles. Utilizing NeurOne, a
47 software, we enabled intuitive brain-computer interactions by digitalizing motor neuron spiking
48 activity and employing a motor unit twitch model. Through this interface, tetraplegic individuals
49 achieved high levels of accuracy and proportional control which closely resembled motor function
50 in intact humans. NeurOne provides a promising digital neuromuscular interface, empowering
51 individuals to control assistive devices super-fast and intuitive. This study signifies an important
52 advancement in enhancing motor function and improving the quality of life for those with spinal cord
53 injuries.

54 55 **Main Text**

56 57 **Introduction**

58 The human hand is a remarkable structure with a complex set of movements that allow us to
59 perform various tasks with ease. The control of hand movements is governed by a network of neural
60 pathways that originate from the brain and the spinal cord and involve upper and lower motor
61 neurons that control muscle forces. Electromyography (EMG) measures the electrical activity
62 generated by muscle fibers during muscle contraction, with surface EMG (sEMG) being a non-
63 invasive technique that can provide a comprehensive picture of motor unit activity across space
64 and time (1, 2). Recent advancements in sEMG, particularly high-density sEMG (HD-sEMG), have
65 allowed for accurate extraction of individual motor units using techniques such as convolutive
66 kernel compensation (CKC) and fast independent component analysis (FastICA) (3–9). The
67 characteristics of motor units have been investigated in both isometric and dynamic movements of
68 the hand (4, 8, 10–13), with some studies showing the identification of unique motor units specific
69 to certain movement patterns (14). Real-time decomposition of sEMG signals into motor unit firings,
70 also known as online decomposition, has been successfully applied using convolutive blind source
71 separation (BSS) techniques and gated recurrent units (GRU) (15–19).

72 For individuals with neuromuscular diseases or paralysis resulting in hand immobility, visual
73 feedback of their hand movement intention is not possible. However, real-time identification of the
74 firing motor unit activity from HD-sEMG signals might provide a solution for this lack of control. Ting
75 et al. demonstrated that an individual with motor complete SCI still had functional motor neurons

76 that can be extracted through the decomposition of HD-sEMG signals (20, 21). Similarly, we found
77 unique motor units in eight motor complete SCI patients with a lesion at level C5-C6 who attempted
78 predetermined hand movements (22). These patients were also able to track a visual cue on a
79 monitor by modulating the discharge rate of the identified motor units in real-time (22).

80 Here, we present NeurOne, a software that provides paralyzed individuals with fast and accurate
81 motor neuron feedback. As motor neurons represent the last neural code of movement that is then
82 translated into muscle force, this interface enables direct control of the movements that were once
83 paralyzed without the need of remapping to new motor dimensions. The software uses an online
84 decomposition method that extracts motor unit action potentials from HD-sEMG signals through
85 convolutive BSS embedded with a super-fast digitalization of the spiking activity (>30Hz), and a
86 motor unit twitch model with physiological delay for the user-in-the-loop computer interaction.
87 Although there are algorithms already capable of identifying the motor unit activity (15, 23, 24),
88 these have very low time resolutions (<10 Hz) and do not include a realistic motor unit twitch model
89 and therefore are not intuitive. More importantly, these previous algorithms have not been
90 developed for paralyzed individuals which requires software with high user-in-the-loop capabilities,
91 as demonstrated in the paragraphs below. The software is used by asking individuals with
92 paralyzed hands to attempt various dynamic hand movements guided by a virtual hand to ensure
93 that the HD-sEMG signals are synchronized. The HD-sEMG signals (128 electrodes) are measured
94 from the surface of the forearm, and the extracted motor unit action potentials are used to decode
95 the signals at a rate of 32 Hz, providing real-time feedback on task-related motor unit firings. After
96 identifying the motor unit spike trains, NeurOne generates a task-related cumulative motor unit
97 spike train, which is convolved with a physiological optimized motor unit twitch model to provide
98 smooth feedback. To evaluate the accuracy of NeurOne, participants are asked to follow a
99 requested trajectory that involves ramps with different activation levels. The accuracy is then
100 calculated using the Pearson correlation coefficient (PCC) r and the root-mean-square error $RMSE$
101 normalized to the respective activation level. We evaluated the accuracy on a subset of three
102 patients with chronic cervical SCI who visited the laboratory over the course of up to two months.
103 After just one day of training sessions, these patients could reliably track a visual cue on a monitor
104 at a large range of neural activation levels. The feedback provided by NeurOne reached a
105 coefficient of variation cv similar to the variability of the measured force in healthy subjects during
106 the plateaus of ramp trajectories in different hand and lower limb muscles.


107 This innovative software offers a potential solution for individuals with paralysis resulting in hand
108 immobility, providing them with a new level of control in a minimally invasive way. By allowing
109 paralyzed individuals to use their remaining motor neurons to control their hand movements
110 through real-time feedback, NeurOne offers a promising avenue for restoring mobility and
111 independence.

112 **Results**

113 *Interfacing Motor Units in SCI*

114 We present a novel technique for non-invasive interfacing of the spinal motor neurons in individuals
115 with motor and sensor-complete cervical SCI. Our method involves the application of BSS on HD-
116 sEMG recordings to identify individual motor unit firings in real-time and rendering of the neural
117 activity through a super-fast decomposition and integration of visuomotor feedback through a motor
118 unit twitch model. The HD-sEMG electrodes are placed on the extensor digitorum and flexor
119 digitorum superficialis muscle in the forearm to measure muscle activity, as these muscles are
120 involved in almost all digit movements of the human hand.

121 We integrated our non-invasive motor unit interface based on convolutive BSS into our software
122 NeurOne, which allows users to interact with physiological latency with the spared neural activity



123 **Figure 1.** Overview of the experimental protocol used in individuals with spinal cord injury (SCI). A) We recorded high-density surface electromyographic (HD-sEMG) signals from the forearms of participants with SCI by applying two electrode
124 grids with 64 channels each on top of the extensor digitorum and flexor digitorum superficialis muscles. These signals
125 represent an estimate of the activity of the spared motor units that controls hand movements. We used a multichannel
126 amplifier to collect the HD-sEMG signals and stream them to a computer that runs NeurOne. NeurOne decomposes the
127 streamed HD-sEMG signals into individual motor unit firings. B) NeurOne used in the study where either offline or online
128 decomposition on the acquired HD-sEMG signals from the forearm of the participant was performed. By attempting specific
129 hand movements such as power grasp or pinch, the participants were instructed to follow a trajectory displayed on a screen
130 during the online session. The neural feedback for the hand movements was calculated by NeurOne and displayed to the
131 participant through a cursor on a monitor. C) An online session of participant S3, where the participant followed a requested
132 trajectory (red line) by modulating the motor unit activity (blue line). The participants attempted to control the movement of
133 the paralyzed hand, and the feedback from NeurOne allowed real-time adjustments of the spared motor commands to
134 achieve the desired trajectory. D) NeurOne calculates the feedback by convolving the task-related cumulative motor unit
135

136 spike train decomposed by NeurOne with a physiological optimized motor unit twitch model. This approach provides smooth
137 and super-fast feedback that helped the participants adjusting the movements in real-time.

138 $(32 \frac{\text{frames}}{\text{s}})$. This latency enables visuomotor feedback without the perception of any delay for the
139 user. Figure 1 shows the overview of NeurOne describing the pipeline for decoding motor unit
140 spiking activity and the closed-loop user interaction display where SCI subjects followed predefined
141 trajectories with a cursor controlled by their smoothed motor neuron spiking activity during hand
142 digit movements. NeurOne decoded individual motor unit firings in real-time by decomposing the
143 measured HD-sEMG signals on the forearm (Figure 1A).


144 We performed longitudinal tests on three individuals diagnosed with complete SCI affecting motor
145 and sensory functions in four separate sessions, over a period of two weeks, except for participant
146 2, who could only complete three sessions. For this participant, the first two sessions occurred
147 within a week, while the final session took place two months later. The subjects present no
148 movement in their hand, and they have no visible feedback when asked to attempt tasks. Here, we
149 demonstrate that the feedback provided by NeurOne can bypass the injury and allow SCI
150 individuals to reliably interact with a computer by attempting hand movements.

151 In each session, we performed a short warm-up in which the subjects were asked to follow a virtual
152 hand displayed on a screen. Subsequently, we recorded 20 seconds of contractions to find the
153 separation matrices (the motor unit filters), which are used in the BSS iterative process to calculate
154 the source signals from the observations and from which the motor unit action potentials are
155 calculated through spike-triggered-averaging. During the online part, we applied these filters such
156 that the subjects could follow the requested trajectory with high accuracy (Fig. 2B). One online
157 session of participant S6 is displayed in Figure 1C. The feedback is represented through the blue
158 line while the requested trajectory is shown in red.

159 To calculate the feedback, i.e., the smoothed motor neuron spiking activity, we identified all motor
160 unit spike trains involved in an individual hand digit movement, summed the spike trains across all
161 motor units, and convolved the firing activity (series of zeros and ones) with an artificial motor unit
162 twitch model (Figure 1D). The digital twitch embedded in NeurOne simulates the muscle twitch in
163 a human muscle and has a latent period, a contraction phase, and a relaxation phase. Our
164 approach to feedback calculation enabled high accuracy in tracking the requested trajectory (see
165 paragraph below). We implemented the decomposition and rendering of motor unit activity by
166 utilizing the high-performance graphical processing unit that enabled the display of the motor unit
167 feedback and spike trains with real-time resolution $(32 \frac{\text{frames}}{\text{s}})$. We then evaluated the performance
168 of our feedback across the different experiments and in comparison, to intact healthy individuals,
169 which are described below. Metrics across groups are described as mean±standard deviation.

170 *Accuracy of the neural feedback*

171 All three participants with sensory and motor complete SCI were able to follow the requested
172 trajectory with high levels of accuracy by modulating task-related motor units. The attempted tasks
173 involved power grasp (hereafter grasp) for all participants and pinch grasp (hereafter pinch,
174 S1)/index flexion/extension (hereafter index, S2 and S3) depending on the subject. Figure 2A
175 shows the participants in the experimental environment with the applied HD-sEMG electrode grids.
176 Across the first three sessions the Pearson correlation coefficient r (PCC) and the root-mean-
177 squared error RMSE are calculated for each task and for the ramps of different levels of activations
178 (LoA) individually for each ramp/feedback pair. The level of activation (hereafter referred simply to
179 activation) refers to the extent of motor unit activation, i.e., motor unit discharge rate, relative to the
180 maximal activation observed during the offline recording. Figure 2B shows the whole recording of
181 the online session with the highest average correlation r and lowest average error RMSE per
182 activation for each participant. The neural feedback trajectory calculated by NeurOne is displayed
183 in blue and the requested trajectory in the red. The neural feedback trajectories of each participant
184 follow the requested trajectory with some deviation. The average correlation r ($r_1=0.909\pm0.028$,
185 $r_2=0.866\pm0.034$, $r_3=0.860\pm0.072$; $p_{1,2}, r=0.248$, $p_{1,3}, r=0.173$, $p_{2,3}, r=0.974$) and error RMSE
186 ($\text{RMSE}_1=0.231\pm0.031$, $\text{RMSE}_2=0.280\pm0.081$, $\text{RMSE}_3=0.228\pm0.042$; $p_{1,2}, \text{RMSE}=0.243$, $p_{1,3}$,
187 $\text{RMSE}=0.995$, $p_{2,3}, \text{RMSE}=0.208$) throughout their best session for participants S1-S3 were similar,
188 suggesting that NeurOne provides high proportionality using motor unit spiking activity.



189 **Figure 2.** Performance of the participants in the study. A) The three participants in the study during a session. Two electrode
 190 grids, each having 64 electrodes are placed on the skin of the forearm of the paralyzed hand. After performing a warm-up
 191 and recording 20 seconds of high-density surface electromyography (HD-sEMG) the online session is performed. B) The
 192 best online attempted movements throughout all sessions (a total of nine sessions per task spanning over three training
 193 days) where the participants followed a requested trajectory (red line) consisting of eight ramps by their task-related motor
 194 unit activity (blue line). The accuracy of the performance is calculated through the Pearson correlation coefficient r and the
 195 root-mean-square error $RMSE$ per activation. C) Correlation and error were calculated individually for each ramp/feedback
 196 pair throughout the first three training sessions for all participants shown for each task and differed between the activations
 197 of 20% and 60%. Ramp/feedback pairs that had a correlation below $r<0.5$ were discarded as they were marked as not
 198 followed. The correlation r and error $RMSE$ demonstrated largely consistent patterns between different activation levels and
 199 tasks. However, it is noteworthy that participant S1 was the only participant showing significant differences between lower
 200 and higher activations in both metrics.

201 We found a difference between the average $RMSE$ of the lower (20% of maximum) and higher
 202 (60% of maximum) activations for participants S1 and S2. Specifically, for S1, we observed a
 203 significant difference ($p=0.037$) in the average $RMSE$ between lower ($RMSE_{1,20}=0.208\pm 0.027$) and
 204 higher ($RMSE_{1,60}=0.254\pm 0.013$) activations. Similarly, for S2, a significant contrast in average
 205 $RMSE$ values was evident ($RMSE_{2,20}=0.344\pm 0.061$ vs. $RMSE_{2,60}=0.216\pm 0.032$), with a p-value of
 206 0.017. These results indicate that accuracy in following ramps is more difficult with lower activations
 207 than with higher activations.

208 Despite these $RMSE$ variations, there were no significant differences in correlation r for both S1
 209 and S2. The correlation values remained consistent for S1 ($r_{1,20}=0.904\pm 0.037$ and $r_{1,60}=0.914\pm 0.011$, with p-value of 0.684) and S2 ($r_{2,20}=0.853\pm 0.023$ and $r_{2,60}=0.879\pm 0.037$, with p-
 210 value of 0.335). In the case of participant S3, we found no significant difference between activation
 211

212 levels for both correlation r ($r_{3, 20}=0.824\pm0.071$ and $r_{3, 60}=0.897\pm0.052$) and error $RMSE$ ($RMSE_{3, 20}=0.214\pm0.027$ and $RMSE_{3, 60}=0.338\pm0.009$), with p-values of 0.203 and 0.257, respectively.

214 Figure 2C illustrates the overall performance across sessions. All participants displayed a robust
215 linear relationship between task performance and activation levels, with an average correlation
216 coefficient exceeding $r>0.785$. The correlation was significantly higher at higher activation levels
217 ($r_{20}=0.769\pm0.056$, $r_{60}=0.806\pm0.075$, $p=0.024$). Notably, participant S1 exhibited a strong linear
218 relation in both activation levels and tasks ($r_{1, 20, pinch}=0.853\pm0.051$, $r_{1, 60, pinch}=0.867\pm0.051$, $r_{1, 60, grasp}=0.867\pm0.090$), except for the grasp task at 20% maximum activation ($r_{1, 20, grasp}=0.783\pm0.077$), which was significantly lower (p-values in respect to grasp at 20% activation: $p_{grasp, 60}=1.7e-4$, $p_{pinch, 20}=1.1e-3$, $p_{pinch, 60}=4.7e-5$). In contrast, participants S2 ($r_{2, 20, grasp}=0.696\pm0.158$, $r_{2, 20, index}=0.684\pm0.106$, $r_{2, 60, grasp}=0.724\pm0.146$, $r_{2, 60, index}=0.681\pm0.140$) and S3 ($r_{3, 20, grasp}=0.802\pm0.097$, $r_{3, 20, index}=0.795\pm0.079$, $r_{3, 60, grasp}=0.851\pm0.091$, $r_{3, 60, index}=0.847\pm0.063$) did not exhibit significant differences in their correlations between the two different activations and tasks.

225 Regarding error, lower activation levels had generally higher error values, while higher activation
226 levels had lower error values ($RMSE_{20}=0.369\pm0.059$, $RMSE_{60}=0.304\pm0.047$, $p=5.3e-7$). Notably,
227 participant S3 demonstrated the lowest error for lower activation levels ($RMSE_{3, 20}=0.288\pm0.076$)
228 and a similar error to participant S1 for higher activation levels ($RMSE_{1, 60}=0.269\pm0.069$; $RMSE_{3, 60}=0.274\pm0.055$). Participant S2 showed similar error values to participant S1 for lower activation levels ($RMSE_{1, 20}=0.415\pm0.172$; $RMSE_{2, 20}=0.406\pm0.074$). However, participant S2 exhibited the highest error for the highest activation levels ($RMSE_{2, 60}=0.365\pm0.094$).


232 Participants S2 and S3 consistently maintained errors in following the requested trajectory, with no
233 significant differences between higher and lower activations and tasks. However, participant S1,
234 showed a significant difference between lower and higher activations and tasks ($p_{grasp60}=0.004$, $p_{grasp20, pinch20}=0.927$, $p_{grasp20, pinch60}=5.42e-6$, $p_{grasp60, pinch20}=0.018$, $p_{grasp60, pinch60}=0.455$, $p_{pinch20, pinch60}=2.92e-5$). Moreover, this participant had the lowest overall error for the pinch task at 60% maximum activation ($RMSE_{1, 60, pinch}=0.246\pm0.034$) but also the highest overall error for the grasp task at lower activation levels ($RMSE_{1, 20, grasp}=0.426\pm0.159$) indicating that the lower activations were more difficult to follow for this participant.

240 Additionally, when examining the interquartile range IQR across all tasks and activations for
241 correlation, participant S1 demonstrated the lowest IQR ($IQR_{1, r}=0.082\pm0.009$), indicating a high
242 level of consistency. Participant S3 followed with a slightly higher IQR ($IQR_{3, r}=0.112\pm0.031$). In
243 contrast, participant S2 exhibited a considerably larger range than the other two participants in
244 correlation ($IQR_{2, r}=0.223\pm0.068$). As for the calculated error $RMSE$ between the ramp and
245 feedback, participant S1 had the highest average range across all tasks and activations ($IQR_{1, RMSE}=0.166\pm0.110$). However, this was mainly influenced by the higher ranges for error $RMSE$ at lower activations ($IQR_{1, RMSE, 20}=0.245$; $IQR_{1, RMSE, 60}=0.078$) emphasising the significant differences between lower and higher activations for participant S1. On the other hand, participant S3 displayed the lowest range across all metrics, tasks, and activations ($IQR_{3, RMSE}=0.088$; $IQR_{3, r}=0.112$). Interestingly, for participant S3, the range for lower activations was smaller compared to higher activations ($IQR_{3, RMSE, 20}=0.101$, $IQR_{3, RMSE, 60}=0.081$, $IQR_{3, r, 20}=0.135$, $IQR_{3, r, 60}=0.089$).

252 These findings illuminate the consistency and variability in participants' performance across tasks
253 and activation levels, offering valuable insights into individual dissimilarities and patterns of
254 response. Moreover, we observed a consistent and robust training effect for all subjects. Within
255 just a few days of using NeurOne, the participants exhibited remarkable improvement, accurately
256 tracking a prescribed trajectory, as described below.

257 *Improvement of neural feedback*

258 Figure 3 illustrates the progress made by the participants during the three training sessions across
259 three consecutive days that spanned over 2 weeks for participants S2 and S3. For participant 1 the
260 first two training sessions spanned over 1 week while the last session had to be conducted two
261 months later. Figure 3A displays the best (highest average correlation across all ramp/feedback
262 pairs) online session for participant S2 for the index finger on each training day. On the first day,



263 **Figure 3.** The effectiveness of the proposed neural feedback system in improving the accuracy of tracking a requested
 264 trajectory with a cursor. NeurOne was tested on three participants (S1, S2, and S3) over three training days spanning
 265 between seven days (S2) up to 2 months (S1). A) shows the improvement in proportional control of motor unit activity over
 266 time for participant S2. On the first day of training, no proportional control was observed, as feedback was activated even
 267 when not requested. However, by the second day, the participant was able to activate motor unit activity only when it was
 268 requested. On the third day, the participant was able to modulate the feedback with high proportionality and low error. B)
 269 presents the correlation and error values between the best feedback and requested trajectory for each training day for
 270 participant S2, as calculated from the best correlated feedback/ramp pair in the online recording. The plot demonstrates
 271 that the correlation improves over the course of the training days. C) Boxplots of the Pearson correlation coefficient r and
 272 root-mean-square error $RMSE$ per activation for each participant at 60% of the maximum activation for one task. All
 273 participants showed a significant increase in the correlation r ($\Delta r_1=147.6\%$, $p_1=1.33e-6$; $\Delta r_2=275.6\%$, $p_2=8.16e-4$;
 274 $\Delta r_3=172.9\%$, $p_3=2.44e-3$ for participants S1, S2 and S3 respectively) and a significant decrease in the error from day 1 to
 275 day 3 ($\Delta RMSE_1=45.6\%$, $p_1=3.54e-5$; $\Delta RMSE_2=25.6\%$, $p_2=0.011$; $\Delta RMSE_3=37.6\%$, $p_3=2.72e-3$ for participants S1, S2 and
 276 S3 respectively). Participants S1 and S3 achieved consistent accuracy in following the trajectories, as the range in
 277 performance at individual ramps decreased ($\Delta r_1=94.8\%$, $\Delta RMSE_1=64.3\%$; $\Delta r_3=98.6\%$, $\Delta RMSE_3=66.9\%$) over the training
 278 sessions. In contrast, participant S2 showed an increase in the range, but the median values were higher for the correlation
 279 and lower for the error on day 3 than on the other days.

280 participant S2 had an average correlation $r_1=0.054\pm 0.351$ and error $RMSE_1=0.574\pm 0.154$ across
 281 all feedback/ramp pairs of this session. Moreover, the normalized activation levels from the neural
 282 feedback remained almost constant throughout the recording. By the second day, the neural
 283 feedback during the resting phase had become silent, and while the feedback at the requested
 284 activation of 60% did not reach 60%, the activation level for those ramps was higher than for the
 285 ramps at 20% of maximum activation. We speculate that the subjects learned to silence the motor
 286 units with tonic activity (firing when no task was displayed on the monitor) that were observed on
 287 day 1. The average correlation of $r_2=0.477\pm 0.108$ and error of $RMSE_2=0.448\pm 0.041$ was
 288 significantly improved. On the third day, participant S2 was able to modulate the feedback at the
 289 requested activation level, and the feedback trajectory tended to overshoot the requested activation


290 Although the neural feedback was still active during the resting phase, the activation was much
291 lower than during the actual ramps. During the best performance of the index finger task, the
292 participant had an average correlation of $r_3=0.759\pm0.109$ and an error of $RMSE_3=0.372\pm0.104$
293 across all feedback/ramp pairs of this session. Across the days, participant S2 was able to improve
294 the proportional control of the cursor by more than 1,400% and reduced the error by 35.2%. Figure
295 3B shows the requested activation level plotted against the feedback calculated by NeurOne and
296 displays the differences between the days more clearly. For each day, a ramp/feedback pair with
297 the highest correlation value was selected for both 20% and 60% activations. The feedback at 20%
298 of maximum activity is colored red, while the feedback at the requested activation level of 60% is
299 colored yellow. The activations at 20% on day 1 showed a negative correlation of $r_{1,20}=-0.20$ for
300 20% and $r_{1,60}=-0.14$ for 60% of the maximum activation. By day 2, the correlation for the target
301 activation level of 20% reached $r_{2,20}=0.68$ and for 60% the correlation had the value $r_{2,60}=0.34$. By
302 day 3, the correlation for both activation levels reached $r_{3,20}=0.78$ for 20% and $r_{3,60}=0.88$ for 60%
303 of the maximum activation level.

304 Across three days of training, all participants demonstrated a higher correlation and lower error in
305 at least one task when the activation level was set to 60%. Figure 3C illustrates the performance
306 of the ramp/feedback pairs, which revealed that on the first day, each participant had a lower
307 correlation ($r_{1,day1}=0.626\pm0.141$; $r_{2,day1}=0.246\pm0.215$; $r_{3,day1}=0.525\pm0.284$) and higher error
308 ($RMSE_{1,day1}=0.362\pm0.063$; $RMSE_{2,day1}=0.479\pm0.042$; $RMSE_{3,day1}=0.402\pm0.105$). On the third day,
309 all participants showed a significant increase in correlation values ($r_{1,day3}=0.924\pm0.016$, $p=1.33e-$
310 6 ; $r_{2,day3}=0.678\pm0.208$, $p=8.16e-4$; $r_{3,day3}=0.908\pm0.003$, $p=2.44e-3$) and a decrease in error values
311 ($RMSE_{1,day3}=0.197\pm0.028$, $p=3.54e-5$; $RMSE_{2,day3}=0.357\pm0.094$, $p=0.011$; $RMSE_{3,}$
312 $day3=0.251\pm0.032$, $p=2.72e-3$). Compared to participant S2, participants S1 and S3 achieved high
313 correlation values by the second day ($r_{1,day2}=0.899\pm0.042$, $p_1=9.67e-7$; $r_{3,day2}=0.861\pm0.047$,
314 $p_3=7.82e-4$). However, the error was not reduced for participant S1 ($RMSE_{1,day2}=0.353\pm0.066$,
315 $p=0.938$). Overall, there was an increase of 147.6%, 275.6%, and 172.9% in the correlation and a
316 decrease of 45.6%, 25.6%, and 37.6% in the error for participants S1, S2, and S3, respectively.

317 Furthermore, the interquartile range *IQR* in the results decreased for participants S1 and S3 from
318 day 1 to day 3. For participant S1, the range in correlation decreased by 94.8% ($IQR_{1,day1}, r=0.192$
319 to $IQR_{1,day3}, r=0.010$) and in error by 64.3% ($IQR_{1,day1}, RMSE=0.098$ to $IQR_{1,day3}, RMSE=0.035$).
320 Although the range decreased significantly for correlation after one day of training, the error was
321 only reduced on the third day. For participant S3, the range for correlation and error decreased
322 after the first day ($IQR_{3,day1}, r=0.369$ to $IQR_{3,day2}, r=0.053$; $IQR_{3,day1}, RMSE=0.163$ to $IQR_{3,day2},$
323 $RMSE=0.054$). From day 1 to day 3, the interquartile range *IQR* in correlation decreased by 98.6%
324 ($IQR_{3,day3}, r=0.005$) and in error by 66.9% ($IQR_{3,day3}, RMSE=0.054$). However, only participant S2
325 showed an increase in range and correlation values, but the error values decreased. This was
326 particularly evident in the error range, which was similar on the first two days ($IQR_{2,day1}, RMSE=0.040$
327 to $IQR_{2,day2}, RMSE=0.044$), but increased by 400% on the last training day ($IQR_{2,day3}, RMSE=0.160$).
328 Regarding the correlation, there was a decrease of 32.8% in the range between the first two days
329 ($IQR_{2,day1}, r=0.244$ to $IQR_{2,day2}, r=0.164$), but on the last training day, the correlation range was
330 significantly increased ($IQR_{2,day3}, r=0.284$).

331 *Validation of NeurOne*

332 Figure 4 depicts the software architecture of NeurOne, including the feedback calculation process
333 for achieving seamless and ultra-fast feedback delivery to the user. The interface to the
334 amplification device, which records the HD-sEMG signals, enables the streaming of $32 \frac{\text{frames}}{\text{s}}$ with
335 a sampling frequency of 2048 Hz (64 data samples per frame) for a total of 408 channels. Offline
336 decomposition of a 20-second recorded HD-sEMG signal (49,960 data samples per channel) was
337 completed in $3:05\pm0:10$ minutes. During online decomposition, the measured time difference
338 between two frames was $t_{\Delta\text{frame}}=31.3\pm0.42$ ms, resulting in an average of $31.9 \frac{\text{frames}}{\text{s}}$. The measured
339 time to calculate the feedback was $t_{\text{calc}}=3.07\pm0.7$ ms. Updating the plot windows for the spike trains
340 and feedback took $t_{\text{plot}}=4.33\pm0.7$ ms after the frames were received. Participants in the study did
341 not report any delay between the attempted task and the displayed feedback.



342 **Figure 4.** Overview of NeurOne's software architecture and the feedback calculation process displayed to the participants.
 343 A) The software is utilizing the PySide6 Python module and uses a QuattrocentoInterface (based on QTcpSocket) to
 344 communicate with the amplification device software *OT Biolab Light*. This data is then sent to the main window of NeurOne,
 345 which handles the graphical user interface (GUI), motor unit spike train plots, and data processing. NeurOne can perform
 346 either offline or online decomposition of incoming data. The spike trains of all motor units, including those of the main and
 347 sub-tasks, are displayed in the main window using the SpikeTrainPlot widget, while the calculated feedback is plotted in a
 348 separate FeedbackPlot window (based on QMainWindow), making it possible to display the monitor specifically for the
 349 participant in a dual monitor setup. NeurOne can also display the high-density surface electromyographic signals in real-
 350 time using the EMGPlot window (based on QMainWindow). NeurOne also provides the functionality of streaming the
 351 calculated feedback through an object of the OutputStream class (based on QUdpSocket), which maps the feedback of the
 352 selected task on the involved fingers to control a virtual hand or mechatronic systems. B) The feedback calculation that
 353 enables fast and smooth feedback for controlling the cursor to track the requested trajectory. The identified spike trains of
 354 the task-related motor units are summed up into a cumulative spike train, which is then convolved with a motor unit twitch
 355 model. The induced feedback from this frame is then added to the calculated feedback from previous frames. From the
 356 resulting summed feedback, the first 64 samples, i.e., 31.25 ms (red-dotted line), are taken as the feedback frame. The
 357 average of the feedback frame is mapped on the cursor. C) Main window of NeurOne's GUI that displays the identified


358 motor unit spike trains in real-time (left) and the feedback window that is displayed to the participants of the study (right).
359 NeurOne's main window allows users to choose tasks, electrode configurations, online and offline parts. In the case of the
360 online part, users can select one main task from which the feedback is displayed in the feedback window and additional
361 sub-tasks. The real-time decoded motor unit spike trains are displayed in the main window, with tasks being colored
362 differently. The feedback window, displayed to the participants in the study, provides task instructions and displays the
363 cursor (red dot) representing the current feedback frame and its history (red line) while the user is asked to follow the
364 requested trajectory (black line) by attempting the pinch task.
365

366 Figure 5 illustrates the validation process of the feedback calculation algorithm integrated in
367 NeurOne. As previously described, this algorithm uses a motor unit twitch model to smooth the
368 discharge rates of motor unit firings. To validate this approach, the convolutive feedback method
369 was applied to decomposed motor unit spike trains of 22 healthy individuals acquired by previously
370 conducted experiments (10 subjects in the first (10, 25) and 12 subjects in the second experiment
371 (26, 27)) in an offline analysis. In the second experiment of the study (first experiment with healthy
372 individuals), the force exerted by the index finger during an isometric contraction was measured
373 using a mechanical apparatus, while HD-sEMG signals were recorded from the third dorsal
374 interosseous (FDI) muscle using a 64 channel electrode grid (Figure 5A/B). The second experiment
375 (second experiment with healthy subjects) involved the measurement of HD-sEMG and force
376 during isometric ankle dorsiflexion. Two HD-sEMG electrode grids with 64 channels each were
377 placed on the skin above the musculus tibialis anterior (TA). The force was measured using an
378 ankle dynamometer.
379

380 In both experiments, the healthy individuals were instructed to follow a predetermined force
381 trajectory. For the experiment with the FDI, the requested force trajectory was represented by
382 twelve ramps with a target activation level of 10% of their maximum voluntary contraction (MVC),
383 presented in Figure 5C. The MVC was determined prior to the study and one isometric ramp
384 contraction in the requested trajectory had a duration of 14 seconds. The second experiment with
385 the ankle dorsiflexion had a target force of 35% MVC with incline and decline of 5%/s and involved
386 only one ramp.

387 The HD-sEMG signals recorded in both experiments were decomposed into motor unit spike trains,
388 and the three most active motor units were selected for the validation process. NeurOne's feedback
389 was derived from analyzing the cumulative spike train of a specific subset of identified motor units,
390 which was then compared with the recorded force signal (Figure 5D). To simulate the number of
391 identified motor units in real-time experiments involving SCI, we carefully selected a subpool of
392 motor units consisting of the three motor units with the highest number of firings during the
393 contraction phase. The coefficient of variation cv of NeurOne's feedback was evaluated to
394 determine its similarity to the coefficient of variation cv of the measured force signal. Therefore, the
395 steady parts of the reference signal and NeurOne's feedback were extracted and normalized on
396 the mean of their respective steady part. The coefficient of variation cv of the force signal in one
397 ramp of the first experiment (FDI) was found to be $cv_{force}=0.044$, while the coefficient of variation cv
398 of NeurOne's feedback was $cv_{NeurOne}=0.078$.
399

400 Figure 5E presents an overview of the average coefficient of variation values obtained from the
401 protocol ramps of experiment 2 (FDI) and 3 (TA). While the coefficient of variation value for the
402 reference signal in experiment 2 (FDI) was generally lower than the coefficient of variation from
403 NeurOne's feedback calculation, three healthy participants showed almost similar coefficients of
404 variation values ($cv_{P7, force}=0.031\pm 0.005$, $cv_{P7, NeurOne}=0.038\pm 0.010$, $p=0.079$; $cv_{P9, force}=0.034\pm 0.005$,
405 $cv_{P9, NeurOne}=0.042\pm 0.016$, $p=0.105$; $cv_{P10, force}=0.060\pm 0.022$, $cv_{P10, NeurOne}=0.122\pm 0.056$, $p=0.072$).
406 Participant P4 exhibited an even lower coefficient of variation value with NeurOne's feedback than
407 with the recorded reference signal ($cv_{P4, force}=0.045\pm 0.007$, $cv_{P4, NeurOne}=0.033\pm 0.007$, $p=6.58e-4$).
408 In experiment 3 (TA) all subjects had a slightly higher coefficient of variation for the calculated
409 motor unit feedback (NeurOne). Three subjects (P12, P18 and P20), however, showed an almost
410 similar coefficient of variation cv to force ($cv_{P12, force}=0.022$, $cv_{P12, NeurOne}=0.024$; $cv_{P18, force}=0.016$,
411 $cv_{P18, NeurOne}=0.022$; $cv_{P20, force}=0.023$, $cv_{P20, NeurOne}=0.028$). However, some subjects (P11, P13-15,
412 P19, P21-22) had a much higher coefficient of variation cv for the motor unit feedback of NeurOne
413 compared to the measured force ($cv_{P11, force}=0.024$, $cv_{P11, NeurOne}=0.047$; $cv_{P13, force}=0.020$, $cv_{P13,$
414 $NeurOne}=0.041$; $cv_{P14, force}=0.037$, $cv_{P14, NeurOne}=0.061$, $cv_{P15, force}=0.018$, $cv_{P15, NeurOne}=0.044$; $cv_{P19,$



415 **Figure 5.** Procedure used to validate the feedback calculation method of NeurOne. A) Two experiments were conducted
 416 that involved placing high-density surface electromyography (HD-sEMG) electrode grids consisting of 64 channels on the
 417 first dorsal interosseous (FDI) muscle (left) and the musculus tibialis anterior (TA, rechts) of 23 healthy subjects (10 and 12
 418 in experiment 2 and 3 respectively). At the same time, the isometric force produced during index finger abduction (FDI) and
 419 ankle dorsiflexion (TA) was measured through a mechanical apparatus. B) A recorded HD-sEMG signal during a ramp
 420 contraction of experiment 2 (14 seconds) was analyzed and decomposed into motor unit spike trains. C) The subjects were
 421 instructed to follow a specific trajectory with their generated force, consisting of twelve ramps with a target activation level
 422 of 10% of maximum voluntary contraction (MVC). The requested trajectory is displayed with the red line and the force
 423 feedback measured with the blue line (displayed for experiment 2). D) The cumulative spike train of the three motor units
 424 (green) from the recorded HD-sEMG signal during a ramp contraction of the index finger abduction task were used in the
 425 feedback calculation approach of NeurOne. Additionally, the requested trajectory (red), the force signal (blue), and the
 426 feedback calculated by NeurOne (green) are displayed. Four seconds of the plateau part of the ramp (between the vertical
 427 dotted red lines) were extracted for each signal and experiment and normalized on its mean. Furthermore, the coefficient
 428 of variation cv was calculated for the presented ramp plateau. E) The mean and standard deviation of the coefficient of
 429 variation cv were calculated for each participant of experiment 2 (FDI, P1-10) and 3 (TA, P11-22) across all ramps. The
 430 coefficient of variation cv was displayed for the output of NeurOne's feedback calculation method (blue bars) and the
 431 recorded force signals (yellow bars) for the healthy subjects. F) Average coefficient of correlation cv across all participants
 432 for experiment 2 and 3.

433 $force=0.008$, $CV_{P19, NeurOne}=0.023$; $CV_{P21, force}=0.022$, $CV_{P21, NeurOne}=0.050$; $CV_{P22, force}=0.012$, $CV_{P22,$
434 $NeurOne}=0.038$). Across all healthy subjects during the index finger abduction task, the coefficient of
435 variation value was $CV_{FDI, NeurOne}=0.066\pm 0.030$ for the feedback calculation method implemented in
436 NeurOne. In comparison, the coefficient of variation cv for force ($CV_{FDI, Force}=0.037\pm 0.005$) was
437 significantly lower ($\Delta cv=44\%$, $p=3.51e-3$) and exhibited greater consistency with a narrower range
438 across subjects. This contrasted with the coefficient of variation cv observed during ankle
439 dorsiflexion, which was generally lower than during the index finger abduction task. Noteworthy,
440 when utilizing NeurOne, the coefficient of variation cv ($CV_{TA, NeurOne}=0.038\pm 0.012$) achieved a similar
441 value with no significant differences compared to the force during experiment 2 ($p=0.10$) and
442 experiment 3 ($CV_{TA, Force}=0.021\pm 0.008$, $p=0.120$). These findings suggest the effectiveness of
443 NeurOne in providing comparable results to force measurements in both experiments.

444 These small discrepancies between the measured force and the rendered force by NeurOne are
445 related to numerous factors which include a small number of motor units that were used for the
446 analysis, offline experiments, and other nonlinear characteristics of motor neuron to muscle force
447 generation. However, the differences in actual force and digitally rendered force by NeurOne were
448 very small and negligible (Figure 5 D-F).

449 Discussion

450 In this study, we introduce NeurOne, a non-invasive and intuitive software that provides users with
451 immediate neural feedback on the spared motor unit activity, which enabled three SCI individuals
452 to train and control the spared neural activity after many years of motor complete paralysis. We
453 presented the framework behind NeurOne which consists of two main parts. We then evaluated
454 NeurOne on longitudinal experiments and proved that this framework enables SCI individuals to
455 control a cursor on a screen in a similar way as intact healthy individuals modulate the isometric
456 force output.

457 The first part of the framework is the offline decomposition that tries to find suitable filters that
458 extract the source signals, i.e., the motor unit firings convolved with their motor unit action
459 potentials. The offline decomposition method, which was adapted for NeurOne, a convolutive blind
460 source separation algorithm, is extensively tested and validated against iEMG by different
461 researchers (4, 15, 19). The decomposition method is performed fully automatically and requires
462 only 3 minutes and 5 seconds ($3:05\pm 0:10$) to complete. This makes it considerably faster than
463 comparable solutions (15).

464 The online decomposition with the intuitive motor unit interface for the paralyzed is the second and
465 novel part of NeurOne. It applies the found filters from the offline decomposition, i.e., the separation
466 matrix W , the motor unit action potentials and the maximum value of the calculated feedback of the
467 cumulative offline spike train on the streamed HD-sEMG frame. After identifying the motor unit
468 firings, the task-related cumulative spike train is used to calculate a smooth and super-fast
469 feedback by convolving it with a motor unit twitch model.

470 Our study demonstrated that NeurOne provides highly effective feedback, enabling participants
471 with paralyzed hands to accurately follow a requested trajectory with strong proportionality
472 (correlations of $r=0.91/0.87/0.86$) and minimal error ($RMSE=0.23/0.28/0.23$ for participants S1/2/3)
473 across an entire online recording consisting of eight ramps during attempted hand movements.
474 Note that during these movements the subjects show no movements of the hands (see Ting et al.
475 and Oliveira et al. for more details on this finding (21, 22)). Furthermore, our results revealed that
476 NeurOne was capable of motivating and engaging participants to track the requested trajectory
477 more accurately over the course of multiple training days. For example, participant S2 showed a
478 substantial improvement in proportionality ($r=0.05$ to $r=0.76$) and a reduction in error ($RMSE=0.57$
479 to $RMSE=0.37$) for the index task over three training days. It should be noted that the reported
480 correlation and error values are averaged across all eight consecutive ramps in an online recording,
481 and therefore do not imply that participants were unable to follow any ramp in the first online
482 sessions. Variability in correlation and error exhibited greater variation during the initial training
483 sessions. This suggests that as participants became more familiar with the system, their ability to
484 consistently and accurately track trajectories improved. This training phenomenon highlights the

485 promising utility of NeurOne, which has a direct connection to spinal motor neurons, in the field of
486 neural rehabilitation for people with paralysis.

487 Consistency in control signals is crucial for the effective use of NeurOne, particularly in applications
488 involving mechatronic systems such as exoskeletons or prostheses. Individuals with
489 neuromuscular conditions or paralyzed limbs need a control system that feels natural, and NeurOne
490 can provide smooth and fast feedback that can be modulated proportionally to different activation
491 levels within the same time window. The participants achieved an almost similar (no significant
492 differences for participants S2 and S3, participant S1 has a significant difference for the grasp task
493 at the lower activation) correlation for both activations across tasks (above $r > 0.79$ in average)
494 indicating a strong proportionality between the voluntary motor unit spiking activity and the
495 requested trajectory. Especially in applications where high durability is crucial, a strong
496 proportionality between voluntary motor unit spiking activity and target level, along with low error,
497 becomes vital. This is because maintaining a constantly high activation level would lead to
498 exhaustion and muscle soreness.

499 However, there are also limitations to the proposed feedback calculation, particularly regarding the
500 normalization of feedback. The MVC is typically used for this purpose but cannot be calculated
501 using force sensors in patients with SCI who are not able to produce force with their hands. To
502 address this, we engaged participants as much as possible during the offline phase through
503 dynamic contractions and used the maximum value of the calculated offline feedback as the MVC
504 for normalization. However, there are differences between the online and offline spike detection
505 methods used in our study, which we plan to address in future studies by using consistent detection
506 methods.

507 The speed of the feedback calculation and presentation emphasizes the importance of timely
508 feedback for individuals with SCI, as they do not have visible feedback of their muscle contractions.
509 Moving average filters are often employed to smooth the discharge rate of motor units for offline
510 and real-time presentation (15, 22). However, using such filters involves buffering the data, leading
511 to delays in feedback presentation. In related works, this delay goes up to 500 ms due to the need
512 to wait for four frames of data at a streaming frequency of 8 Hz (15). Additionally, the low streaming
513 frequency results in a delayed feedback presentation, with the plot being updated only eight times
514 per second.

515 NeurOne addresses these limitations by offering a high streaming frequency of 32 Hz, which is
516 significantly higher than any previous real-time decomposition approaches (15–17, 19), and
517 introduces significant latencies to the user. The proposed feedback calculation method using a
518 motor unit twitch model does not require waiting for a specific amount of time, thereby eliminating
519 the delay in feedback presentation (15).

520 To validate NeurOne's feedback method based on the digital motor unit twitch model, a comparison
521 in the variability of the signal, i.e., the coefficient of variation cv during the plateau phase of isometric
522 ramp contractions in healthy subjects was conducted. In general, the coefficient of variation cv
523 of the force signals was lower than for smoothed motor unit spiking activity. One reason for the higher
524 variability observed in the participants is that force feedback was used as a reference to track the
525 ramp trajectory on a screen, which allowed participants to gauge the steadiness of the force signal.
526 Moreover, the number of motor units used was limited to the three most active motor units imitating
527 the number of motor units that were found in individuals with SCI. Together with a high variability
528 in the number of motor units identified per subject in the decomposition process, this is a limiting
529 factor in a fair comparison with force measurement as in force generation are up to hundreds of
530 motor units involved. Another factor that may contribute to higher variability in NeurOne's feedback
531 is the challenge of reliably identifying small motor units that are generally better in precise and
532 smooth movements compared to bigger motor units. However, the small motor units are often
533 suppressed by bigger motor units because of their bigger motor unit action potentials making it
534 difficult for current decomposition methods to decompose the small motor units (4, 5, 8). Despite
535 these differences, the variability of NeurOne and the measured torque level was negligible, which
536 confirms the high robustness of the method for digitalizing motor units in SCI.

537 Nevertheless, a few subjects displayed a similar coefficient of variation cv , with one subject (P4)
538 showing even lower variability. This finding is remarkable, given that the human muscle twitch is
539 optimized for smooth control, resulting in low variability in measured force. This suggests that
540 NeurOne's feedback is also able to provide real-time smoothness and can be applied to control
541 assistive devices.

542 An alternative and frequently employed method to control assistive devices, as opposed to the
543 motor unit twitch model, is the integration of a musculoskeletal model. However, it's important to
544 note a difference in the torque output bandwidth between musculoskeletal models and actuators of
545 mechatronic systems. Actuators exhibit a broader torque bandwidth when compared to
546 musculoskeletal models. Therefore, through the normalization of NeurOne's output, we can
547 efficiently utilize the complete motor bandwidth, leading to improved performance.

548 **Conclusion**

549 In this study, we demonstrated the efficacy of NeurOne, a noninvasive and intuitive software that
550 provides immediate neural feedback on the spared motor unit activity of individuals with SCI.
551 Developed with the specific goal of improving the lives of individuals who have paralyzed hands,
552 NeurOne can help them gain greater control over assistive devices and facilitate communication.
553 By providing real-time, high-speed, and smooth neural feedback, NeurOne enables individuals with
554 long-term complete motor paralysis to gain real-time control of their motor unit activity and
555 accurately track a requested trajectory with a cursor. Our findings suggest that the accuracy of
556 tracking can be improved through training, indicating the potential for NeurOne to enhance the
557 rehabilitation process. In addition, we performed offline analysis to validate NeurOne's feedback by
558 applying it to motor unit spike trains that were decomposed with a high level of accuracy during
559 isometric index finger abduction and ankle dorsiflexion tasks in healthy participants. We observed
560 that NeurOne's feedback achieved a level of variability during the plateau phase of the ramps that
561 was partially similar to the generated force. The smoothness and accuracy of the smoothed motor
562 unit discharge rate through NeurOne support the possibility of using this software for assistive
563 device control such as exoskeletons. Overall, our results highlight the promising potential of
564 NeurOne to revolutionize the way individuals with paralysis interact with the world around them and
565 improve their quality of life.

566 **Materials and Methods**

567 This study involved the recruitment of three participants diagnosed with chronic motor complete
568 SCI for experiment 1 (SCI subjects). The study employed the following criteria to select participants:
569 (1) injury level ranging from C4-C6, (2) age between 18 and 60 years old, and (3) absence of
570 voluntary movement of one hand or both hands. Participant S3 exhibited voluntary hand movement
571 in their left hand. An overview of the paralyzed participants is shown in Table 1.

572 **Table 1.** Characteristics of recruited participants in the study

Subject	Age range (years)	Gender	Injury level	AIS	Sensory level*	Wrist movement	Time since injury (years)
S1	31-35	M	C5	B	C5	yes	9.1
S2	36-40	F	C5	A	C5	yes	24.2
S3	56-60	M	C5	A	T3	no	6.9

573 * The sensory level corresponds to lowest level with normal sensory function.

574

575 22 healthy subjects were recruited for experiment 2 (*index finger abduction*, 10 subjects) and
576 experiment 3 (*ankle dorsiflexion*, 12 subjects). All procedures were conducted in accordance with
577 the Declaration of Helsinki and were approved by the Ethical Committees of Friedrich-Alexander-
578 Universität (approval no. 22-138-Bm, experiment 1), Imperial College London (approval no.
579 18IC4685, experiment 2) and University Rome 'Foro Italico' (approval no. 44 680, experiment 3).

580 Prior to participation, all subjects provided written informed consent. Some data from this study
581 have been previously published (10, 25–27).

582 *Experiment 1 (spinal cord injury)*

583 The first experiment comprised multiple sessions for each participant, with S2 and S3 undergoing
584 training on four separate days and S1 on three days. The last session for S1 occurred two months
585 after the previous sessions, which were conducted within a two-week timeframe. During the
586 sessions, we trained participants to enhance their neural control over two distinct tasks, utilizing an
587 online decomposition approach to analyze a HD-sEMG signal obtained from the placement of 128
588 HD-sEMG electrodes on the forearm's skin. The training tasks consisted of a power grasp, which
589 involved the flexion and extension of the whole hand, and a pinch grasp that required the
590 involvement of the thumb and index finger (for S1) or single-digit movement of the index finger (for
591 S2 and S3). Participant 3 only attempted the training with the power grasp task in the first session.

592 Prior to commencing the training, participants underwent a one-minute warm-up in which they
593 followed a virtual hand attempting the task in a relatively slow (0.5 Hz), sinusoidal pattern displayed
594 on a monitor. Subsequently, we recorded a 20-second signal during which participants were asked
595 to attempt the requested task dynamically, i.e., flexion and extension in repetition. The task was
596 attempted dynamically during the recording because the decomposition had a higher accuracy at
597 finding motor units compared to isometric tasks. The recorded signal was then decomposed offline
598 to determine the unique motor unit action potentials and separation matrix W for the online phase.
599 If decomposition was not finding filters or the filters were insufficient, decomposition results of the
600 same tasks in previous sessions were selected.

601 Once offline decomposition was completed, we initiated the online phase, which comprised three
602 sets, with each set including eight trajectories, and a one-minute break between sets. The
603 trajectories consisted of ramps with increasing (three seconds) and decreasing (three seconds)
604 flanks, as well as a plateau (five seconds). A ten-second resting phase separated each ramp. The
605 first four ramps had an activation level of 20%, while the subsequent four ramps had an activation
606 level of 60%. This difference in activation levels was intended to determine whether participants
607 with paralyzed hands can voluntarily modulate their motor unit activity to match two significantly
608 different target levels. Moreover, by having the ramps reach two different activation levels, we were
609 able to test the proportionality at different modulating rates. The relatively long sloping parts with a
610 duration of three seconds ensured a large period of proportional tracking. The total duration of one
611 set was 2:48 minutes.

612 In each session for each task, the protocol included a warm-up period followed by the offline
613 decomposition phase and the online training segment. Between the completion of one task and the
614 commencement of another, a larger break of three minutes was provided. Altogether, the training
615 per day took approximately 40-45 minutes.

616 *Experiment 2 (index finger abduction)*

617 The full details of this experiment have been described previously (10, 25). We also provided a
618 brief explanation of the methods here. A chair, table, and computer monitor constituted the
619 experimental setup, where participants (nine men and one woman) assumed a comfortable seated
620 position. Their dominant hand was supported by a custom apparatus, with the forearm immobilized
621 and positioned between pronation and supination. The index finger and thumb were aligned along
622 the forearm's longitudinal axis, and a monitor situated 60 cm away displayed the applied force.
623 Force measurements of the index finger and thumb were captured using a three-axis force
624 transducer (Nano25, ATI Industrial Automation), which underwent digitization at 2048 Hz (USB-
625 6225, National Instruments) and underwent low-pass filtering at a cutoff frequency of 15 Hz. HD-
626 sEMG signals were obtained from the first dorsal interosseous (FDI) and thenar muscles (flexor
627 pollicis brevis and abductor pollicis brevis) using flexible electrode grids featuring 13x5 electrodes
628 with a 4 mm interelectrode spacing and amplified with a multichannel amplifier (Quattrocento, OT
629 Bioelettronica; 16-bit A/D converter, bandwidth 10-500 Hz). Next, the HD-sEMG signals were

630 processed using a well-established BSS algorithm to decompose them into individual motor unit
631 spike trains (5, 6).

632 Participants engaged in force-matching tasks, involving simultaneous abduction of the index finger
633 and flexion of the thumb, for a duration of 60 seconds. Visual feedback was provided via a moving
634 dot cursor on the monitor, with the x-axis representing thumb force and the y-axis representing
635 index finger force. Participants were instructed to maintain the force signal within 10% of the target
636 for each applied force.

637 Prior to the tasks, MVC recordings were performed, and two 60-second trials were conducted with
638 30 seconds of rest between them. The experimental design aimed to explore the extent of common
639 synaptic inputs among sets of motor neurons, requiring participants to exert forces in the same
640 sagittal plane for both muscle sets, necessitating approximately 10 minutes of practice.

641 *Experiment 3 (ankle dorsiflexion)*

642 The full details for this experiment have been described previously (26, 27). We also provided a
643 brief explanation of the methods here. The experimental setup consisted of a custom-made ankle
644 ergometer (OT Bioelettronica, Turin, Italy) fixed to an examination table using adjustable straps.
645 Twelve recreationally active young men participated in the study, with their dominant leg secured
646 to the ergometer using straps (approximately 3 cm width) at the foot, ankle, and knee. Force signals
647 were recorded using a force transducer (CCT Transducer s.a., Turin, Italy), amplified (200 x), and
648 sampled at 2048 Hz using an external A/D converter (Quattrocento, OT Bioelettronica, Turin, Italy).
649 Visual feedback was provided via a custom LabVIEW software (LabVIEW 8.0; National
650 Instruments, Austin, TX, USA) displayed on a monitor positioned 1 m away from the participants.
651 HD-sEMG signals were recorded from the TA muscle using two semi-disposable adhesive grids,
652 each with 64 electrodes (13x5 electrodes with an IED of 8 mm, OT Bioelettronica). The signals
653 were sampled at 2048 Hz, bandpass filtered (10-500 Hz), and digitally converted using a 16-bit A/D
654 converter. The HD-sEMG signals were then similar to experiment 2 processed using a well-
655 established BSS algorithm to decompose them into individual motor unit spike trains (5, 6).

656 Participants underwent a standardized warm-up, consisting of eight isometric contractions of the
657 dorsiflexors at varying intensities ($4 \times 50\%$, $3 \times 70\%$, $1 \times 90\%$), separated by 15–30 seconds. After
658 the warm-up, they performed three or four MVCs with 30 seconds of rest in between. The highest
659 MVC force determined the maximal voluntary force (MVF) used to set target forces (35%, 50%,
660 and 70% of MVF) for subsequent submaximal contractions. Participants later performed
661 trapezoidal contractions, gradually increasing to the target force, maintaining it for 10 seconds, and
662 then linearly decreasing back to the resting force at the same rate. Two trials were conducted for
663 each target force in randomized order and 3–5-minute rest intervals.

664 *Evaluation of experiment 1 (spinal cord injury)*

665 The analysis of the training sessions was carried out using Python 3.11, where each ramp/feedback
666 trajectory pair of the online recordings was partitioned and evaluated individually. The trajectories
667 were then categorized into 20% and 60% activation levels for further analysis. To evaluate the
668 accuracy of each ramp/feedback trajectory pair, two metrics were used, namely Pearson correlation
669 r and root-mean-square error $RMSE$. Pearson correlation measures the correlation between the
670 requested (ramp) and actual (feedback) trajectories, indicating the degree of proportionality
671 between the two. Additionally, the error provides a measure of accuracy by assessing the distance
672 between the requested and actual trajectories.

673 To enable comparison between participants, the initial three sessions were selected from
674 participants S2 and S3, resulting in 36 ramp/feedback pairs for each task and activation level. To
675 demonstrate the overall performance of participants during the online sessions (Figure 2C),
676 ramp/feedback pairs with a correlation value below 50% were discarded. Boxplots were then used
677 to plot the ramp/feedback pairs for each task, activation level, and participant, with the box
678 representing the IQR and the median displayed as a red line. The whiskers extending from the box
679 represent the minimum and maximum values of the data that fall within 1.5 times the IQR from the
680 first and third quartile, respectively. The range of the data was described by reporting the IQR, as

681 well as the mean and standard deviation of the ramp/feedback pairs. The mean and standard
682 deviation were also calculated across all ramp/feedback pairs within the online recording, which
683 included eight ramp/feedback pairs.

684 To evaluate training improvement, only ramp/feedback pairs with a positive correlation were
685 considered. Similar to the general performance, the Pearson correlation coefficient r and the root-
686 mean-squared error $RMSE$ were used to describe the accuracy of the tracking. For each training
687 day, twelve ramp/feedback pairs were evaluated. The best online recordings of participant S2 were
688 selected based on the highest correlation values across the entire online recording. Mean and
689 standard deviation were reported for the entire online recording, and the ramp/feedback pairs
690 selected for the correlation plots (Figure 3B) were based on the highest correlation values within
691 the online recording.

692 *Evaluation of experiment 2 (index finger abduction) and 3 (ankle dorsiflexion)*

693 The decomposed motor unit pulses and the measured reference signal (i.e., the force) of the
694 healthy participants were used to validate the feedback calculation approach proposed in our study.
695 To do this, we calculated the coefficient of variation cv , which is the ratio of the standard deviation
696 $\sigma(x)$ to the mean of the reference signal x during the steady plateau of the trajectory:

$$697 \quad cv = \frac{\sigma(x)}{\mu(x)}.$$

698 Additionally, we calculated the feedback offline, instead of online as in experiment 1, by convolving
699 the decomposed spike trains of the three most firing motor units with the motor unit twitch model.
700 Three motor units were selected as this is the average number of motor units identified in our study
701 in people with SCI. Afterwards, we extracted the steady part and calculated the coefficient of
702 variation cv . For each participant, we calculated the mean and standard deviation for feedback and
703 reference signal (force) across the ramps (twelve ramps per subject for experiment 2 and the best
704 ramp at 35 % MVC for the subjects in experiment 3). In experiment 2 the ramps that didn't show
705 three individual motor units spiking during the plateau phase were discarded.

706 *High-density surface electromyography recording*

707 During all sessions of experiment 1, we placed two HD-sEMG electrode grids, each containing 64
708 electrodes, on the shaved and cleaned skin of the forearm. The electrode grids utilized in our
709 investigation were square in shape, with an 8x8 configuration of electrodes, and an interelectrode
710 distance (IED) of 10mm (GR10MM0808, OT Bioelettronica, Turin, Italy). To ensure consistent
711 electrode placement, we positioned one electrode grid above the extensor digitorum and the
712 second above the flexor digitorum superficialis, both aligned with the ulna bone. To further enhance
713 reproducibility, we recorded the exact electrode positions by capturing images. To affix the
714 electrode grids to the skin, we used bi-adhesive foam layered between the grids and the skin, filled
715 with conductive paste (SpesMedica, Battipaglia, Italy), and secured them to the forearm using tape.

716 The HD-sEMG signals were recorded using a multichannel amplifier with 16-bit A/D conversion
717 (Quattrocento, OT Bioelettronica). We used the OT Biolab Light software (OT Bioelettronica) to
718 record the signals in monopolar mode, with a sampling frequency of 2048 Hz, and filtered by a
719 bandpass of 10-500 Hz. 408 channels were streamed in real-time using a Transmission Control
720 Protocol/Internet Protocol (TCP/IP) with a streaming frequency of 32 Hz. However, only the 128
721 channels holding the HD-sEMG signals were extracted and used from the streamed data.

722 *Online decomposition*

723 The first part of the online decomposition process aiming at the decoding of HD-sEMG signals into
724 individual firings of motor units in real-time, involved an offline decomposition. The offline
725 decomposition is necessary to determine the filters that will be applied during the second part of
726 the process in real-time. Therefore, we conducted a recording of a dynamic task (grasp or
727 pinch/index finger flexion/extension) and decomposed the recorded HD-sEMG signals.

728 The approach of the decomposition (offline and online) is based on the theoretical model of
729 measured HD-sEMG signals. The HD-sEMG signal is a convolutive mixture of motor unit spike
730 trains and action potentials. In matrix form it is described as:

$$731 \quad x(k) = \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} H(l)s(k-l) + n(k),$$

$$732 \quad k = 0, \dots, D_R$$

733 where $x(k) = [x_1(k), x_2(k), \dots, x_m(k)]^T$ is the vector comprising all recorded observations (HD-sEMG
734 channels) m and $s(k) = [s_1(k), s_2(k), \dots, s_n(k)]^T$ is the vector comprising the spike trains of all motor
735 units n . Matrix $H(l)$ has the size $m \times n$ for each sample l and carries the information of the motor
736 unit action potentials. L is the duration of the action potentials. Furthermore, $H(l)$ is assumed to be
737 constant during the recording of observations. The additive noise vector $n(k) = [n_1(k), n_2(k), \dots,$
738 $n_m(k)]^T$ comprises the noise for each observation. D_R is the duration of the recording of the
739 observations. By applying BSS techniques to this mixed model, the sources, i.e., the individual
740 motor units, can be decomposed. For those algorithms, we assume that the identified sources are
741 not fully correlated and are either sparse or independent (4). The algorithm that we were using for
742 the offline decomposition of the HD-sEMG was based on the proposed convolutive BSS approach
743 of Negro et al. (4). To reduce the noise in the observations we applied a Butterworth bandpass filter
744 (20-500 Hz) to remove noisy frequencies where the observations are not significantly represented
745 and a 50 Hz notch filter to remove power line interference. Following the filtering, we performed
746 convolutive sphering as described by Negro et al. (4). The convolutive sphering method involves
747 extension, centering, and whitening of the HD-sEMG signal. We used an extension factor of $R=10$
748 as we were looking for $n=32$ sources by using $m=128$ channels and an estimated action potential
749 length of $L=40$ samples by following the general equation for the extension factor R (4):

$$750 \quad R = \frac{n}{m} L.$$

751 The convolutive sphering is followed by applying FastICA, which is a fixed-point iteration algorithm
752 that maximizes the number of uniquely identified sources, i.e., the mixture of the motor unit spike
753 trains convolved with its action potential, by using Gram-Schmidt Orthogonalization. Through
754 FastICA, a separation matrix W is obtained and by multiplying it with the extended HD-sEMG signal
755 $\hat{x}(k)$ it results in the source signals $s(k)$:


$$756 \quad s(k) = W\hat{x}(k)$$

757 A silhouette score-based K-means driven approach is used to detect spikes from identified sources.
758 The sources are squared, resulting in innervation pulse trains (IPTs). The peaks of the IPTs are
759 divided into two classes: high peaks and small peaks. The small peaks, representing noise, are
760 discarded. High peaks with a silhouette score of 0.9, indicating the distance between spike and
761 noise, are considered as firing a motor unit.

762 Apart from the optimized separation matrix W obtained through FastICA, other results from the
763 offline decomposition are also used in the online part. By calculating the spike triggered average
764 (STA) for each source, we can find the motor unit action potentials to use in the real-time
765 decomposition as templates for template matching.

766 To normalize the feedback calculated during the online part, a reference value is required. Without
767 normalization, an estimation of the activation is not possible. Therefore, feedback using the offline
768 spike trains is calculated. The feedback is the convolution of the cumulative spike train of all motor
769 units that are found with an artificial motor unit twitch, which is simulating a muscle twitch during
770 neural input-based contraction in humans. The real-time detection of spikes from individual motor
771 units constitutes the second part of the online decomposition, and the pipeline is described in Figure
772 6. The observations $x(k)$ in this phase consists of the streamed HD-sEMG frame (128 channels \times
773 64 samples), which is extended and centered similar to the offline decomposition but not whitened

774 due to high computational costs. The extended observations $\hat{x}(k)$ are then multiplied with the
 775 separation matrix W determined during the respective task in the offline decomposition to obtain
 776 the identified sources in real-time (Figure 6A). In order to detect spikes in the current frame, the
 777 sources are subject to thresholding with a threshold value T set at 10 times the noise level, which
 778 is calculated in the first frame during rest by taking the average of each source signal in this frame
 779 (Figure 6B). However, thresholding alone may not be sufficient for reliable spike detection due to
 780 the lack of filtering of noise through a Butterworth bandpass filter in real-time compared to offline
 781 decomposition. To enhance the algorithm's reliability, we used template matching (Figure 6C). In
 782 template matching, spike triggered action potentials of each source were correlated to the motor
 783 unit action potential extracted during offline decomposition. If the correlation between the template
 784 and the signal exceeds 0.6, the spike was accepted as valid. Subsequently, the spikes in the current
 785 frame are convolved with the artificial motor unit twitch used in the offline part. However, since the
 786 twitch length is significantly longer than the actual frame, the leftover signal is buffered for the next
 787 frames to prevent an unstable feedback signal. The feedback from the previous frames is then
 788 shifted and added to the convolutive result in each iteration.



789 **Figure 6.** This figure depicts the online decomposition method that is utilized in our software, NeurOne. The process involves
 790 three steps. A) First, the source signals are identified in real-time by applying the separation matrix W , which was discovered
 791 in the offline stage on the extended and centered high-density surface electromyographic (HD-sEMG) signals of the current
 792 frame. B) Next, a spike detection technique is applied to the identified sources. This method detects the peak in the
 793 innervation pulse trains (IPTs), which are the squared source signals of this frame. If the peak of the IPT is greater than 10
 794 times the noise level, it is designated as a possible spike. C) Finally, template matching is conducted to verify whether the
 795 possible spike is a motor unit firing or not. To achieve this, a window is implemented around this possible spike in the source
 796 signal and then correlated with the motor unit action potential that was identified in the offline stage. If the correlation
 797 coefficient $r_{\text{threshold}} > 0.60$, the spike is identified as a motor unit firing.

798 Graphical user interface

799 NeurOne is a software that provides a GUI for real-time display of identified motor unit firings and
 800 neural feedback. Figure 4A shows the architecture of the back-end of NeurOne. NeurOne is written
 801 in Python 3.10 and utilizes the PySide6 module which provides access to the complete Qt 6.0+
 802 framework. The RealTimeDecomposition class, which is a child class of QMainWindow, integrates
 803 the GUI and the back-end, and manages the flow of data within NeurOne for processing and
 804 plotting.

805 The study, in which NeurOne was used, involved recording and amplifying HD-sEMG signals from
 806 the participant's forearm using a multichannel amplification system (Quattrocento, OT
 807 Bioelettronica, Italy). The communication between the recording software (OT Biolab Light) and
 808 NeurOne was established via TCP/IP network communication using the QuattrocentoInterface
 809 class. Depending on the selected part (offline or online decomposition), the input frame is either
 810 directly decomposed in real-time or buffered for offline analysis after recording. The online

811 processed HD-sEMG frame, which is the motor unit spike train, is displayed in the SpikeTrainPlot
812 widget. Furthermore, the feedback is calculated by the convolution of the motor unit spike trains
813 with the motor unit twitch model (Figure 4B) and displayed in the FeedbackPlot window. These
814 visualizations are based on the VispyPlotWidget class, which uses the graphical processing unit
815 (GPU) to render the data. This is enabled by the VisPy library in Python. Furthermore, the EMGPlot
816 is a separate window that can be opened and configured to display the streamed HD-sEMG signals
817 and is based on the VispyPlotWidget too. Additionally, NeurOne uses the OutputStream class to
818 open a UDP socket to stream the calculated feedback as a control signal to control a virtual hand
819 or assistive devices. After the offline and online recordings, the results are stored in a NumPy file
820 (.npy extension) along with a timestamp and subject identifier for subsequent data processing.
821 NeurOne's GUI is shown in Figure 4C. The user can connect to the HD-sEMG measurement
822 system, display streamed data in real-time, and start the neural interface to follow requested
823 trajectories with the feedback cursor. Furthermore, the selection of the offline or the online part is
824 enabled through radio buttons. The user can configure the HD-sEMG by selecting respective
825 channel ports that are connected to the electrodes placed on the forearm and repeat the offline
826 part until the identified filters are reliable and provide great accuracy in the online part. Tasks
827 available to the user are grasp and pinch as well as index flexion/extension. In the online part, the
828 user can choose filters for the main task by choosing the respective folder in the operating system's
829 filesystem. The main task determines which task the subject should attempt to follow the requested
830 trajectories. Additionally, sub-tasks may be selected, whose motor unit firings are displayed
831 alongside the main task, but without real-time display of the feedback. The requested trajectory
832 that is used for the online protocol has four ramps with a low activation of 20% followed by four
833 high ramps with an activation of 60%. The requested trajectory and the corresponding feedback
834 trajectory were displayed on the FeedbackPlot window, which was located on a second monitor in
835 front of the participants.
836 The evaluation of the computing and plotting time was done on a mobile laptop (XMG NEO 15 E21,
837 Ryzen 9 5900HX, NVIDIA RTX 3080 mobile, 32 GB Ram), on which 15 motor units were recorded
838 and visualized during the measurement. The display of spike trains and feedback had a window of
839 5 seconds and 128 channels of HD-sEMG were decomposed.

840 *Statistical Analysis*

841 In this study, we conducted statistical analyses to investigate significant differences in the
842 measured results using one-way ANOVA type 2 (for more than two groups) with the `anova_lm`
843 function from the Python package Statsmodel and t-test (for two groups) with the `ttest_ind` function
844 from the Python package Scipy.

845 We employed the significance level $\alpha=0.05$ to determine whether there are significant differences
846 between groups. P-values below the significance level indicate the rejection of the null
847 hypothesis, highlighting observable significant differences. Conversely, p-values above the
848 significance level indicate no difference in the data. To identify specific group differences after the
849 one-way ANOVA, we conducted a pairwise Tukey test using the `pairwise_tukeyhsd` function from
850 the Python package Statsmodel. In Experiment 1, we applied the statistical analysis to detect
851 differences between lower and higher activations and between different tasks. The correlation
852 coefficient r and error $RMSE$ were used individually as dependent variables to assess their
853 significance. Additionally, the analysis was used to highlight significant improvements over the
854 training days. In Experiment 2, the statistical analysis aimed to identify significant differences
855 between the coefficient of correlation cv (dependent variable) of the feedback calculated using the
856 method implemented in NeurOne and the recorded force. Moreover, we conducted a statistical
857 analysis across all participants in Experiments 2 and 3 to investigate significant differences in the
858 variability of force and motor unit feedback.

859 **Acknowledgments**

860

861 This study was partly funded by d.hip (Digital Health Innovation Platform), a cooperation between
862 Siemens Healthineers, Medical Valley, University Hospital Erlangen, and Friedrich-Alexander
863 University Erlangen-Nuremberg, and the German Aerospace Center (DLR) as part of the
864 MYOREHAB project.

865

866 **Data Availability**

867 All data produced in the present study are available upon reasonable request to the authors. An
868 executable of NeurOne can be found [here](#)¹.

¹Link: <https://github.com/NsquaredLab/NeurOne>

869 **References**

870


- 871 1. R. Merletti, S. Muceli, Tutorial. Surface EMG detection in space and time: Best practices.
872 *Journal of Electromyography and Kinesiology* **49**, 102363 (2019).
- 873 2. R. Merletti, G. L. Cerone, Tutorial. Surface EMG detection, conditioning and pre-
874 processing: Best practices. *Journal of Electromyography and Kinesiology* **54** (2020).
- 875 3. M. Chen, P. Zhou, A Novel Framework Based on FastICA for High Density Surface EMG
876 Decomposition. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering* **24**,
877 117–127 (2016).
- 878 4. F. Negro, S. Muceli, A. M. Castronovo, A. Holobar, D. Farina, Multi-channel intramuscular
879 and surface EMG decomposition by convolutive blind source separation. *J Neural Eng* **13**
880 (2016).
- 881 5. A. Holobar, D. Farina, Blind source identification from the multichannel surface
882 electromyogram. *Physiol Meas* **35**, R143–R165 (2014).
- 883 6. A. Holobar, D. Zazula, Multichannel Blind Source Separation Using Convolution Kernel
884 Compensation. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **55**, 4487–4496 (2007).
- 885 7. A. Holobar, D. Zazula, “Gradient Convolution Kernel Compensation Applied to Surface
886 Electromyograms” in *Independent Component Analysis and Signal Separation*, (Springer
887 Berlin Heidelberg, 2007), pp. 617–624.
- 888 8. D. Farina, A. Holobar, Characterization of Human Motor Units From Surface EMG
889 Decomposition. *Proceedings of the IEEE* **104**, 353–373 (2016).
- 890 9. A. Del Vecchio, *et al.*, Tutorial: Analysis of motor unit discharge characteristics from high-
891 density surface EMG signals. *Journal of Electromyography and Kinesiology* **53** (2020).
- 892 10. A. Del Vecchio, *et al.*, The Forces Generated by Agonist Muscles during Isometric
893 Contractions Arise from Motor Unit Synergies. *The Journal of Neuroscience* **43**, 2860–
894 2873 (2023).
- 895 11. D. S. de Oliveira, *et al.*, Neural decoding from surface high-density EMG signals: influence
896 of anatomy and synchronization on the number of identified motor units. *J Neural Eng*
897 **19**, 046029 (2022).
- 898 12. A. Del Vecchio, *et al.*, You are as fast as your motor neurons: speed of recruitment and
899 maximal discharge of motor neurons determine the maximal rate of force development
900 in humans. *Journal of Physiology* **597**, 2445–2456 (2019).
- 901 13. V. Glaser, A. Holobar, Motor Unit Identification From High-Density Surface
902 Electromyograms in Repeated Dynamic Muscle Contractions. *IEEE Transactions on Neural*
903 *Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering* **27**, 66–75 (2019).
- 904 14. A. L. Cakici, *et al.*, A Generalized Framework for the Study of Spinal Motor Neurons
905 Controlling the Human Hand During Dynamic Movements in *2022 44th Annual*

- 906 *International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine & Biology Society (EMBC),*
907 (IEEE, 2022), pp. 4115–4118.
- 908 15. J. Rossato, *et al.*, I-Spin live: An open-source software based on blind-source separation
909 for decoding the activity of spinal alpha motor neurons in real-time. *bioRxiv*,
910 2023.04.14.536933 (2023).
- 911 16. A. K. Clarke, *et al.*, Deep Learning for Robust Decomposition of High-Density Surface EMG
912 Signals. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng* **68**, 526–534 (2021).
- 913 17. E. Formento, P. Botros, J. M. Carmena, Skilled independent control of individual motor
914 units via a non-invasive neuromuscular machine interface. *J Neural Eng* **18** (2021).
- 915 18. C. Chen, S. Ma, X. Sheng, D. Farina, X. Zhu, Adaptive Real-Time Identification of Motor
916 Unit Discharges From Non-Stationary High-Density Surface Electromyographic Signals.
917 *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng* **67**, 3501–3509 (2020).
- 918 19. D. Y. Barsakcioglu, M. Bracklein, A. Holobar, D. Farina, Control of Spinal Motoneurons by
919 Feedback From a Non-Invasive Real-Time Interface. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng* **68**, 926–935
920 (2021).
- 921 20. J. Ting, *et al.*, A wearable neural interface for detecting and decoding attempted hand
922 movements in a person with tetraplegia in *2019 41st Annual International Conference of*
923 *the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC)*, (IEEE, 2019), pp. 1930–
924 1933.
- 925 21. J. E. Ting, *et al.*, Sensing and decoding the neural drive to paralyzed muscles during
926 attempted movements of a person with tetraplegia using a sleeve array. *J Neurophysiol*
927 **127**, 2104–2118 (2021).
- 928 22. D. Souza Oliveira, *et al.*, You Will Grasp Again: A Direct Spinal Cord/Computer Interface
929 with the Spared Motor Neurons Restores the Dexterous Control of the Paralyzed Hand
930 after Chronic Spinal Cord Injury (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.09.22279611>.
- 931 23. V. Glaser, A. Holobar, D. Zazula, Real-Time Motor Unit Identification From High-Density
932 Surface EMG. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering* **21**,
933 949–958 (2013).
- 934 24. D. Y. Barsakcioglu, D. Farina, A real-time surface EMG decomposition system for non-
935 invasive human-machine interfaces in *2018 IEEE Biomedical Circuits and Systems*
936 *Conference (BioCAS)*, (IEEE, 2018), pp. 1–4.
- 937 25. C. M. Germer, A. Del Vecchio, F. Negro, D. Farina, L. A. Elias, Neurophysiological
938 correlates of force control improvement induced by sinusoidal vibrotactile stimulation. *J*
939 *Neural Eng* **17**, 016043 (2020).
- 940 26. A. Del Vecchio, D. Farina, Interfacing the neural output of the spinal cord: Robust and
941 reliable longitudinal identification of motor neurons in humans in *Journal of Neural*
942 *Engineering*, (Institute of Physics Publishing, 2020).

943 27. A. Del Vecchio, *et al.*, The increase in muscle force after 4 weeks of strength training is
944 mediated by adaptations in motor unit recruitment and rate coding. *Journal of*
945 *Physiology* **597**, 1873–1887 (2019).

946
947


948 **Figures and Tables**
949




Please contact
corresponding
author for
original figure

950 **Figure 1.** Overview of the experimental protocol used in individuals with spinal cord injury (SCI).
951 A) We recorded high-density surface electromyographic (HD-sEMG) signals from the forearms of
952 participants with SCI by applying two electrode grids with 64 channels each on top of the extensor
953 digitorum and flexor digitorum superficialis muscles. These signals represent an estimate of the
954 activity of the spared motor units that controls hand movements. We used a multichannel amplifier
955 to collect the HD-sEMG signals and stream them to a computer that runs NeurOne. NeurOne
956 decomposes the streamed HD-sEMG signals into individual motor unit firings. B) NeurOne used in
957 the study where either offline or online decomposition on the acquired HD-sEMG signals from the
958 forearm of the participant was performed. By attempting specific hand movements such as power
959 grasp or pinch, the participants were instructed to follow a trajectory displayed on a screen during
960 the online session. The neural feedback for the hand movements was calculated by NeurOne and
961 displayed to the participant through a cursor on a monitor. C) An online session of participant S3,


962 where the participant followed a requested trajectory (red line) by modulating the motor unit activity
963 (blue line). The participants attempted to control the movement of the paralyzed hand, and the
964 feedback from NeurOne allowed real-time adjustments of the spared motor commands to achieve
965 the desired trajectory. D) NeurOne calculates the feedback by convolving the task-related
966 cumulative motor unit spike train decomposed by NeurOne with a physiological optimized motor
967 unit twitch model. This approach provides smooth and super-fast feedback that helped the
968 participants adjusting the movements in real-time.



969 **Figure 2.** Performance of the participants in the study. A) The three participants in the study during
970 a session. Two electrode grids, each having 64 electrodes are placed on the skin of the forearm of
971 the paralyzed hand. After performing a warm-up and recording 20 seconds of high-density surface
972 electromyography (HD-sEMG) the online session is performed. B) The best online attempted
973 movements throughout all sessions (a total of nine sessions per task spanning over three training
974 days) where the participants followed a requested trajectory (red line) consisting of eight ramps by
975 their task-related motor unit activity (blue line). The accuracy of the performance is calculated
976 through the Pearson correlation coefficient r and the root-mean-square error $RMSE$ per activation.
977 C) Correlation and error were calculated individually for each ramp/feedback pair throughout the
978 first three training sessions for all participants shown for each task and differed between the
979 activations of 20% and 60%. Ramp/feedback pairs that had a correlation below $r < 0.5$ were
980 discarded as they were marked as not followed. The correlation r and error $RMSE$ demonstrated
981 largely consistent patterns between different activation levels and tasks. However, it is noteworthy
982 that participant S1 was the only participant showing significant differences between lower and
983 higher activations in both metrics.




984 **Figure 3.** The effectiveness of the proposed neural feedback system in improving the accuracy of
 985 tracking a requested trajectory with a cursor. NeurOne was tested on three participants (S1, S2,
 986 and S3) over three training days spanning between seven days (S2) up to 2 months (S1). A) shows
 987 the improvement in proportional control of motor unit activity over time for participant S2. On the
 988 first day of training, no proportional control was observed, as feedback was activated even when
 989 not requested. However, by the second day, the participant was able to activate motor unit activity
 990 only when it was requested. On the third day, the participant was able to modulate the feedback
 991 with high proportionality and low error. B) presents the correlation and error values between the
 992 best feedback and requested trajectory for each training day for participant S2, as calculated from
 993 the best correlated feedback/ramp pair in the online recording. The plot demonstrates that the
 994 correlation improves over the course of the training days. C) Boxplots of the Pearson correlation
 995 coefficient r and root-mean-square error $RMSE$ per activation for each participant at 60% of the
 996 maximum activation for one task. All participants showed a significant increase in the correlation r
 997 ($\Delta r_1=147.6\%$, $p_1=1.33e-6$; $\Delta r_2=275.6\%$, $p_2=8.16e-4$; $\Delta r_3=172.9\%$, $p_3=2.44e-3$ for participants S1,
 998 S2 and S3 respectively) and a significant decrease in the error from day 1 to day 3
 999 ($\Delta RMSE_1=45.6\%$, $p_1=3.54e-5$; $\Delta RMSE_2=25.6\%$, $p_2=0.011$; $\Delta RMSE_3=37.6\%$, $p_3=2.72e-3$
 1000 for participants S1, S2 and S3 respectively). Participants S1 and S3 achieved consistent accuracy in
 1001 following the trajectories, as the range in performance at individual ramps decreased ($\Delta r_1=94.8\%$,
 1002 $\Delta RMSE_1=64.3\%$; $\Delta r_3=98.6\%$, $\Delta RMSE_3=66.9\%$) over the training sessions. In contrast, participant
 1003 S2 showed an increase in the range, but the median values were higher for the correlation and
 1004 lower for the error on day 3 than on the other days.




1005 **Figure 4.** Overview of NeurOne's software architecture and the feedback calculation process
 1006 displayed to the participants. A) The software is utilizing the PySide6 Python module and uses a
 1007 QuattrocentoInterface (based on QTcpSocket) to communicate with the amplification device
 1008 software *OT Biolab Light*. This data is then sent to the main window of NeurOne, which handles
 1009 the graphical user interface (GUI), motor unit spike train plots, and data processing. NeurOne can
 1010 perform either offline or online decomposition of incoming data. The spike trains of all motor units,
 1011 including those of the main and sub-tasks, are displayed in the main window using the
 1012 SpikeTrainPlot widget, while the calculated feedback is plotted in a separate FeedbackPlot
 1013 window (based on QMainWindow), making it possible to display the monitor specifically for the
 1014 participant in a dual monitor setup. NeurOne can also display the high-density surface
 1015 electromyographic signals in real-time using the EMGPlot window (based on QMainWindow).
 1016 NeurOne also provides the functionality of streaming the calculated feedback through an object of
 1017 the OutputStream class (based on QUdpSocket), which maps the feedback of the selected task

1018 on the involved fingers to control a virtual hand or mechatronic systems. B) The feedback
1019 calculation that enables fast and smooth feedback for controlling the cursor to track the requested
1020 trajectory. The identified spike trains of the task-related motor units are summed up into a
1021 cumulative spike train, which is then convolved with a motor unit twitch model. The induced
1022 feedback from this frame is then added to the calculated feedback from previous frames. From
1023 the resulting summed feedback, the first 64 samples, i.e., 31.25 ms (red-dotted line), are taken as
1024 the feedback frame. The average of the feedback frame is mapped on the cursor. C) Main
1025 window of NeurOne's GUI that displays the identified motor unit spike trains in real-time (left) and
1026 the feedback window that is displayed to the participants of the study (right). NeurOne's main
1027 window allows users to choose tasks, electrode configurations, online and offline parts. In the
1028 case of the online part, users can select one main task from which the feedback is displayed in
1029 the feedback window and additional sub-tasks. The real-time decoded motor unit spike trains are
1030 displayed in the main window, with tasks being colored differently. The feedback window,
1031 displayed to the participants in the study, provides task instructions and displays the cursor (red
1032 dot) representing the current feedback frame and its history (red line) while the user is asked to
1033 follow the requested trajectory (black line) by attempting the pinch task.



1034 **Figure 5.** Procedure used to validate the feedback calculation method of NeurOne. A) Two
 1035 experiments were conducted that involved placing high-density surface electromyography (HD-
 1036 sEMG) electrode grids consisting of 64 channels on the first dorsal interosseous (FDI) muscle (left)
 1037 and the musculus tibialis anterior (TA, rechts) of 23 healthy subjects (10 and 12 in experiment 2
 1038 and 3 respectively). At the same time, the isometric force produced during index finger abduction
 1039 (FDI) and ankle dorsiflexion (TA) was measured through a mechanical apparatus. B) A recorded
 1040 HD-sEMG signal during a ramp contraction of experiment 2 (14 seconds) was analyzed and
 1041 decomposed into motor unit spike trains. C) The subjects were instructed to follow a specific
 1042 trajectory with their generated force, consisting of twelve ramps with a target activation level of 10%
 1043 of maximum voluntary contraction (MVC). The requested trajectory is displayed with the red line
 1044 and the force feedback measured with the blue line (displayed for experiment 2). D) The cumulative
 1045 spike train of the three motor units (green) from the recorded HD-sEMG signal during a ramp
 1046 contraction of the index finger abduction task were used in the feedback calculation approach of
 1047 NeurOne. Additionally, the requested trajectory (red), the force signal (blue), and the feedback

1048 calculated by NeurOne (green) are displayed. Four seconds of the plateau part of the ramp
1049 (between the vertical dotted red lines) were extracted for each signal and experiment and
1050 normalized on its mean. Furthermore, the coefficient of variation cv was calculated for the
1051 presented ramp plateau. E) The mean and standard deviation of the coefficient of variation cv were
1052 calculated for each participant of experiment 2 (FDI, P1-10) and 3 (TA, P11-22) across all ramps.
1053 The coefficient of variation cv was displayed for the output of NeurOne's feedback calculation
1054 method (blue bars) and the recorded force signals (yellow bars) for the healthy subjects. F) Average
1055 coefficient of correlation cv across all participants for experiment 2 and 3.



1056 **Figure 6.** This figure depicts the online decomposition method that is utilized in our software,
1057 NeurOne. The process involves three steps. A) First, the source signals are identified in real-time
1058 by applying the separation matrix W , which was discovered in the offline stage on the extended
1059 and centered high-density surface electromyographic (HD-sEMG) signals of the current frame. B)
1060 Next, a spike detection technique is applied to the identified sources. This method detects the
1061 peak in the innervation pulse trains (IPTs), which are the squared source signals of this frame. If
1062 the peak of the IPT is greater than 10 times the noise level, it is designated as a possible spike.
1063 C) Finally, template matching is conducted to verify whether the possible spike is a motor unit
1064 firing or not. To achieve this, a window is implemented around this possible spike in the source
1065 signal and then correlated with the motor unit action potential that was identified in the offline
1066 stage. If the correlation coefficient $r_{\text{threshold}} > 0.60$, the spike is identified as a motor unit firing.

1067 **Table 1.** Characteristics of recruited participants in the study

Subject	Age range (years)	Gender	Injury level	AIS	Sensory level*	Wrist movement	Time since injury (years)
S1	31-35	M	C5	B	C5	yes	9.1
S2	36-40	F	C5	A	C5	yes	24.2
S3	56-60	M	C5	A	T3	no	6.9

1068 * The sensory level corresponds to lowest level with normal sensory function.