

1 **Title**

2 Communicative hand gestures as an implicit measure of artificial limb embodiment and daily
3 usage

4

5 **Authors**

6 Roni O. Maimon-Mor^{1,2}, Emeka Obasi¹, Jenny Lu³, Nour Odeh¹, Stephen Kirker⁴, Mairéad
7 MacSweeney^{1,5}, Susan Goldin-Meadow³, Tamar R. Makin¹

8

9 **Affiliations**

10 ¹Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience, University College London, London, UK

11 ²WIN Centre, Nuffield Department of Clinical Neuroscience, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

12 ³Department of Psychology, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, United States

13 ⁴Addenbrooke's Rehabilitation Clinic, Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Trust,
14 Cambridge, UK

15 ⁵Deafness, Cognition and Language Research Centre, University College London, London,
16 UK

17

18 **Abstract**

19 When people talk, they move their hands to enhance meaning. Here we ask whether people
20 spontaneously use their artificial limbs (prostheses) to gesture, and whether prosthesis
21 gesture behaviour relates to everyday prosthesis use and perceived embodiment. One-
22 handed participants with congenital and acquired hand loss and two-handed controls
23 participated in gesture-facilitating tasks, measured using acceleration monitors and further
24 validated with offline video coding. Everyday functional prosthesis use and perceived
25 prosthesis embodiment were assessed using questionnaires. Perhaps surprisingly, one- and
26 two-handed participants did not differ in the amount of gestures they produced. However,
27 they did differ in their gesture profile. One-handers performed more, and bigger, movements
28 with their intact hand while gesturing relative to their prosthesis, whereas two-handers
29 produced more equal movements across hands. Importantly, one-handers who incorporated
30 their prosthesis more into gesturing, that is — produced gestures that were more similar to
31 their two-handed counterparts — also showed more frequent prosthesis use in day-to-day
32 life. Although as a group, one-handers only marginally agreed that their prosthesis feels like
33 a body-part, people reporting positive embodiment also showed great prosthesis habits, both
34 for communication and daily function. We propose that measuring gesture behaviour in
35 prosthesis-users can be used as an implicit and objective clinical tool to monitor and assess
36 successful prosthesis adoption.


37 **NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

38

39 Introduction

40 Artificial limb technologies increasingly mirror the appearance and function of the human
41 body (Vujaklija, Farina, & Aszmann, 2016). The hope is that greater similarity between an
42 artificial limb and a natural hand will enable the users to perceive/relate to the prosthesis like
43 a part of their own body, in other words, achieve 'technological embodiment' (Makin, de
44 Vignemont, & Faisal, 2017). However, the relationship between successful prosthesis use
45 and perceived prosthesis embodiment has not yet been demonstrated. Despite the
46 technological progression, individuals with congenital and acquired missing upper-limb
47 (hereafter one-handers) continue to report low functionality and use of their prostheses, and
48 instead prefer to over-rely on their intact hand (Jang et al., 2011). In at least 30% of cases,
49 one-handers abandon their prostheses altogether (Engdahl et al., 2015), often after being
50 fitted with a customised prosthesis (Østlie et al., 2012), resulting in wasted resources.
51 Successful prosthesis use is difficult to predict, and often can only be determined by trial and
52 error over the course of months. A further challenge is in quantifying how one-handers use
53 their prostheses in day-to-day life, with research indicating that self-reports might be
54 misleading (Pareés et al., 2012). Previous studies have overly focused on prosthesis
55 dexterity (e.g., grasping and manipulating objects), which is not necessarily the best way to
56 capture prosthesis adoption (See Discussion). Here, we focus on the significant role that our
57 hands play in a core aspect of human life — communication.

58 Gestures have an important communicative role. Not only do they increase listeners'
59 comprehension of speech, but they can also convey information that is not expressed in
60 words (Goldin-Meadow, 2003; Goldin-Meadow & Alibali, 2013). Hand gestures are a
61 ubiquitous aspect of upper limb use; they are observed across languages and cultures
62 (Feyersein & De Lannoy, 1991), and even in congenitally blind individuals who have had no
63 gesturing model to copy or learn from (Iverson & Goldin-Meadow, 1998). Gestures may
64 therefore provide information about the extent to which individuals relate to their artificial
65 limbs as hands. In this study, we aimed to characterise the use of upper-limb prostheses in
66 gestures, using accelerometers, and investigate how prosthesis gesturing relates to
67 prosthesis use during everyday life and perceived prosthesis embodiment. One-handers
68 engaged in two tasks designed to probe gesticulation (Figure 1A) while being naïve to the
69 purpose of the study. Daily prosthesis-use and perceived sense of embodiment of the
70 prosthetic limb were measured using questionnaires. We hypothesised that better prosthesis
71 use in daily activities will relate to more positive prosthesis embodiment and more prosthesis
72 gesture.



73

74 **Figure 1.** (A) *Experimental paradigm.* Top left: example stimuli from the paired object task
75 and a frame from an animated video shown during the storytelling task. In the Paired
76 Objects task, participants were asked to describe images of object pairs that looked very
77 similar to one-another, specifically chosen to be difficult to convey using verbal description
78 alone (Lu & Goldin-Meadow, 2018). In the storytelling task, participants watched two short
79 animated video clips, then recalled and described them in as much detail as possible to a
80 (presumed to be) naïve listener (McNeill, 1992; McNeill & Levy, 1982). Bottom left: pre-
81 processed accelerometry data of an example one-handed participant gesturing with his arms
82 during the tasks. Dark red indicates measured acceleration of the intact hand, light red
83 indicates prosthesis. Right: An illustration of a one-handed participant wearing the watch-like
84 acceleration monitors used to measure gesticulation behaviour (B) *Number of movements*
85 *analysis.* No significant difference between one-handers and two-handers in the amount of
86 gestures performed per minute talking overall. However, we did find an interaction between
87 arm and group ($F_{(1,38)}=4.25$, $p=0.046$). One handers perform more movements with their
88 intact arm compared to their prosthesis ($t_{(24)}= 2.94$, $p=0.007$), while two-handers produced
89 an equal amount of movements with both arms ($t_{(14)}= 0.088$, $p=0.93$, $BF_{10}=0.263$).
90 Dom=Dominant arm, NDom=Nondominant arm, In=Intact arm, Pros= Prosthetic limb.

91

92 **Results**

93 We first examined the relationship between daily prosthesis use and perceived prosthesis
94 embodiment in our larger cohort of one-handed individuals ($n=44$; Tables 1 and S1). We
95 found a significant correlation between these two measures ($\rho_{(42)} = 0.53$, $p < 0.001$),
96 revealing that prosthesis use and prosthesis embodiment are closely linked (Figure 2D).
97 However, self-report questionnaire-based measures of embodiment are arguably crude and
98 prone to bias and inter-individual differences (e.g. in interpretation of the written
99 instructions). We therefore turned to a more implicit measure of embodiment—using the
100 hand to gesture.

101 *Number and magnitude of gesture movements with the prosthesis.* Looking first at overall
102 gesture behaviour, we found that one-handers and two-handers did not differ in the overall
103 number of movements per minute (as measured by accelerometry) that they produced with

104 their two arms during the gesture tasks (rmANOVA group effect: $F_{(1,38)}=0.045$ $p=0.83$; Figure
105 1B). However, we did find an interaction between arm and group ($F_{(1,38)}=4.25$, $p=0.046$):
106 While two-handers produced an equal amount of movements with both arms ($t_{(14)}= 0.088$,
107 $p=0.93$, $BF_{10}=0.263$), one-handers produced a greater number of movements with their
108 intact arm compared to their prosthetic arm ($t_{(24)}= 2.94$, $p=0.007$).

109 We next calculated the Median-Magnitude Ratio (MMR) (Bailey, Klaesner, & Lang, 2015;
110 Chadwell, Kenney, Thies, Galpin, & Head, 2016). This is a relative (laterality) measure, that
111 reflects how much each arm contributed to the overall size of gesture movements on a
112 second-by-second basis. Relative to the number of movements, this is a better validated
113 measure which does not depend on an arbitrary threshold to separate movements. The
114 MMR is therefore a more sensitive measure than gesture numbers, which we implemented
115 in all further analysis. We found that one-handers made bigger movements with their intact
116 arm than with their prosthesis arm (negative MMR) relative to controls, who showed similar
117 sized movements across the two arms ($U= 47$, $p < 0.001$; Figure 2A). Similar results were
118 also found using an alternative laterality measure of prosthesis use in gesture, one that is
119 sensitive to the presence of movement in each second but not to the magnitude of the
120 movement (see Figure S2A).

121 The laterality of gesture movement magnitude (MMR) correlated significantly with a laterality
122 measure extracted from offline video coding ($\rho_{(18)} = 0.76$, $p < 0.001$; Figure S1A; see
123 Supplementary methods and Figure S1B for further validation). Thus, although one-handers
124 gestured just as much as two-hander controls, the distribution of gestures across hands, and
125 the character of these gestures, differed: one-handers performed more and larger
126 movements with their intact arm than with their prosthesis arm; two-handers performed
127 relatively symmetrical movements with their two arms.

128 Our one-handed sample consists of two sub-groups, individuals with congenital limb loss
129 and amputees, who are known to adopt different adaptive strategies to compensate for their
130 missing limb (Makin et al., 2013). We therefore determined whether cause of limb loss has
131 an effect on prosthesis use during gesture. No significant effect was found when directly
132 comparing the laterality in magnitude (MMR) or amount (numbers of movements) across the
133 two arms of the two sub-groups (MMR: $U=59$, $p=0.4$; numbers of movements: $U=66$,
134 $p=0.64$). Another way in which one-handers differ is the type of prosthesis they use. Nine of
135 our participants used a cosmetic prosthesis, a passive hand-shaped apparatus; 16 used an
136 active prosthesis, either a mechanical hook ($n=3$) or myoelectric prosthesis ($n=13$). Again,
137 no significant effect was found when directly comparing between the laterality value of users
138 of the two prosthesis types (cosmetic and active; MMR: $U=71$, $p=0.98$; number of


139 movements: $U=69$, $p=0.89$). The type of prosthesis thus does not affect how it will be
140 incorporated into co-speech gesture.

141 *Prosthesis gesture and daily prosthesis use.* We next examined the relationship between
142 use of the prosthesis to gesture and use of the prosthesis for daily activities. We found that
143 prosthesis users who incorporated their prosthesis into their gestures in greater magnitude
144 (resulting in a higher MMR) also tended to have a higher prosthesis use score, based on
145 questionnaires probing functionality and wear frequency ($\rho_{(23)} = 0.55$, $p = 0.005$; Figure 2B;
146 see Figure S2B for similar results with the alternative measure). This effect is robust, and
147 remains significant when controlling for cause of limb-loss and prosthesis type (see
148 Supplementary results). Greater prosthesis use during daily life is thus associated with
149 greater use of the prosthesis while gesturing.

150 We next examined this link between prosthesis use in gestures and use in daily life in
151 relation to cause of amputation (congenital vs. acquired) and prosthesis type (passive vs.
152 active) using parametric statistics. To meet the requisite statistical assumptions, we removed
153 an outlier on the laterality measure (participant code: 'aa11') from the analysis. An ANCOVA
154 with sub-group and prosthesis type as fixed-effects and daily prosthesis use score as a
155 covariate revealed no significant sub-group effect on the laterality measure during gesture
156 (cause of limb loss: $F_{(1,20)}=0.8$, $p=0.38$; prosthesis type: $F_{(1,20)}<0.01$, $p=0.99$). Cause of limb
157 loss, or type of prosthesis, thus do not appear to play a key role in determining gesticulation
158 behaviour with the prosthesis. Importantly, the relationship between prosthesis gesturing (as
159 captured in the MMR) and daily prosthesis use remained significant in this analysis
160 ($F_{(1,20)}=13.97$, $p=0.001$), which highlights the robustness of the relationship between use of
161 the prosthesis to gesture and use of the prosthesis for daily activities. This additional
162 analysis further confirms that one-handers' gesture behaviour is strongly related to their level
163 of prosthesis use in daily activities and not to the cause of amputation or type of prosthesis
164 used.

165 *Prosthesis gesture and perceived prosthesis embodiment.* We next examined the
166 relationship between gesture movements and prosthesis embodiment. Individuals varied in
167 their responses to the subjective embodiment statements, producing a range from -3
168 (strongly disagree) to 3 (strongly agree) where 0 is a neutral response. As a whole, one-
169 handed participants tended to marginally, although significantly, report that they experienced
170 embodiment of their prosthesis (mean = +0.75, difference from zero: $t_{(24)}=2.23$, $p=0.035$). We
171 found similar effects when we looked at the full study cohort (i.e., all of the participants
172 including those whose data were not included in the accelerometry part of the study); the full
173 cohort showed a trend towards positive embodiment ($n=44$, mean = 0.47; difference from
174 zero $t_{(43)}=1.685$, $p=0.099$). We divided the one-handed participants into two groups based on

175 whether they reported positive (score > 0) or neutral/negative (score ≤ 0) embodiment of
 176 their prosthesis. We then looked at the gesture laterality profiles, and found that one-
 177 handers who reported positive embodiment (n=15) used their prosthesis more when
 178 gesturing (i.e., higher MMR) than one-handers who reported neutral/negative embodiment
 179 ($U_{(23)} = 35$, $p = 0.03$; Figure 2C). When analysing the full range of embodiment scores, we
 180 found a trend towards a positive relationship between embodiment score and the laterality of
 181 gesture magnitude (MMR) ($\rho_{(23)} = 0.37$, $p = 0.07$; Figure S3): the more positively one-
 182 handers respond to embodiment statements regarding their prosthesis, the more
 183 symmetrical their gestures are. Subjective measures of perceived embodiment, thus, only
 184 marginally associate with spontaneous gesture. Therefore, it appears that the implicit
 185 measure of gesture laterality better captures day-to-day prosthesis use.
 186



187 **Figure 2.** (A) MMR values across groups; two-handers performed relatively equal size arm
 188 movements when gesturing, whereas one-handers were significantly lateralised towards
 189 their intact arm ($U = 47$, $p < 0.001$). (B) Increased daily usage (measured by questionnaires)
 190 associated with increased incorporation of the prosthesis into gestures (measured by MMR)
 191 ($\rho_{(23)} = 0.55$, $p = 0.005$) (C) MMR values across individuals who responded positively vs.
 192 neutral/negatively to prosthesis embodiment statements. Individuals who positively embody
 193 their prosthesis show increased incorporation of their prosthesis into gestures ($U = 35$, $p =$
 194 0.03). (D) Greater prosthesis usage is associated with greater perceived prosthesis

195 embodiment ($\rho_{(42)} = 0.53, p < 0.001$). In A&C solid coloured lines indicates the group mean
196 MMR. In B&D, the dashed lines in the histograms indicate the location of zero.

197

198 **Discussion:**

199 Here we demonstrate that prosthetic limbs are regularly used to produce co-speech
200 gestures, offering further demonstration of the ubiquity of gesture production in human
201 communication. Despite hand loss (either congenitally or through amputation later in life),
202 and independent of prosthesis type, one-handers gesture just as much as two-handers do.
203 However, the profiles of the gestures produced by one- vs. two-handers differed. One-
204 handers preferred to produce lateralised gestures, favouring their intact hand in amount and
205 magnitude, while two-handers preferred to produce symmetrical gestures that were equally
206 dispersed across both hands. Furthermore, one-handers who used their prosthesis more
207 while gesturing, and produced gestures more similar to their two-handed counterparts, also
208 tended to show more positive prosthesis embodiment and greater prosthesis use in day-to-
209 day life. To our knowledge, this is also the first time that a strong relationship has been
210 demonstrated between reported prosthesis embodiment and everyday prosthesis use.

211 Measuring prosthesis use is challenging both conceptually and practically. This challenge
212 stems from the variety of tasks involving hand function in daily life and the complexity of
213 defining what successful prosthesis use actually is: dexterity, wear time, satisfaction, or the
214 elusive and ill-defined sense of embodiment? Practically, current assessment tools either
215 involve self-report questionnaires, which can include large biases (Pareés et al., 2012); or
216 they involve a dexterity task that is highly influenced by the participant's motivation,
217 prosthesis type, and the specific way in which individuals make use of their prosthesis in
218 their daily lives. Here we provide a radically different hallmark for cognition of prosthesis
219 use—how do you (spontaneously) employ your hands to convey meaning when talking? We
220 believe that incorporating a prosthetic limb in gesture reflects a natural yet easily quantifiable
221 level of immersion of the prosthesis in the user's body and behaviour, which is one of the
222 ultimate goals of any human-machine interfaces.

223 Based on our findings, we propose that accelerometry-based gesticulation analysis of one-
224 handers could be used as a simple and objective clinical measure of prosthesis embodiment
225 and every-day use. Assessing gesticulation is quick (up to 10 minutes), requires no training,
226 can be used across prosthesis types, and provides a quantitative and objective measure
227 (see <https://osf.io/r3v8w/> for analysis code). As such, gesticulation may provide an ideal
228 point-of-care clinical assessment for tracking the efficacy of upper-limb rehabilitation over
229 time. Importantly, gesticulation can be measured implicitly, thus minimising user and
230 clinician biases. As gesticulation with a prosthesis requires minimal skill, it could be

231 measured in new users and tracked as they learn. Further research should determine
232 whether gesticulation during fitting/early training can predict prosthesis adoption, which is a
233 key issue in prosthesis rehabilitation.

234 **Methods**

235 **Participants**

236 44 one-handed individuals were recruited for this study: 21 unilateral acquired amputees
237 (mean age \pm std = 48.67 ± 12.9 , 18 male, 12 with intact right hand), and 23 individuals with
238 congenital unilateral upper-limb loss (age \pm std = 46.09 ± 11.22 , 11 male, 17 with intact right
239 hand; see Tables 1 and S1 for full demographic details). Nineteen individuals from the full
240 set of participants were excluded from the gesticulation-accelerometry analysis for the
241 following reasons: Issues with data storage (n=7); trans-humeral level limb-loss (n=4); did
242 not produce any co-speech gestures (n=3); did not participate in gesture task (n=2); rated
243 their typical weekly prosthesis use as 0 hours (n=2); aware of the purpose of the task before
244 participating (n=1). A total of 25 participants (10 acquired amputees and 15-congenital one-
245 handers) were included in the gesticulation-accelerometry study together with 15 age,
246 gender, and handedness matched two-handed controls (see Table 1). All participants filled
247 in the prosthesis-use and prosthesis embodiment questionnaires. There was no significant
248 difference between one-handers and two-handers in age ($t_{(38)} = 0.565$, $p = 0.58$). There was
249 also no significant difference between one- and two-handers in gender (Pearson chi-square
250 = 0.000, $p = 1$) and handedness during the study (intact hand in one-handers and dominant
251 hand in controls; Pearson chi-square = 0.03, $p = 1$).

252 Participants were recruited to the study based on the guidelines in our ethical approval UCL
253 (REC: 9937/001) and in accordance with the declaration of Helsinki. The following inclusion
254 criteria were taken into consideration during recruitment: (1) 18 to 70 years old, (2) MRI safe
255 (for the purpose of other tasks conducted in the scanner), (3) no previous history of mental
256 disorders, (4) regarding one-handers, owned at least one type of prosthesis during
257 recruitment, (5) for acquired amputees, amputation occurred at least 6 months before
258 recruitment. All participants gave full written informed consent for their participation, data
259 storage, and filming.

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

	One-handers — full cohort (N=44)	One-handers — subset in the gesticulation accelerometry study (N=25)	Two- handers (N=15)
Age (years) (mean ± std)	47.32 ± 11.98	46.96 ± 11.77	44.53 ± 14.36
Cause of limb-loss	23 Congenital limb deficiency	15 Congenital limb deficiency	
Years since amp (mean ± std)	21 Amputation in adulthood 17.33 ± 11.91 years ago	10 Amputation in adulthood 17.1 ± 12.65 years ago	n/a
Gender	29 M 15 F	15 M 10 F	10 M 5 F
Missing hand/ Non-dominant side	29 L 15 R	16 L 9 R	10 L 5 R
Prosthesis type*	14 Cos 13 Mech 15 Myo	9 Cos 3 Mech 13 Myo	n/a
Prosthesis wear time weekly hours (mean ± std)	65.83 ± 35.09 Range: 0-126	72.82 ± 29.83 Range: 6-112	n/a
PAL score (mean ± std)	0.43 ± 0.23 Range: 0-0.89	0.49 ± 0.21 Range: 0.07-0.89	n/a

267 **Table 1.** *Demographic information on participants.* Gender: M = male, F = female. Missing
268 hand in one-handers and non-dominant hand in two-handers: R = right hand, L = left hand;
269 Amp level = level of limb loss: Pros type = prosthesis type worn for the greatest time in a
270 typical week: Cos = cosmetic, Mech = mechanical, Myo = myo-electric. Pros wear time =
271 hours per week that prosthesis was typically worn. PAL score = functional ability with
272 prosthesis as determined by PAL questionnaire: 0 = minimum function, 1 = maximum
273 function. *Prosthesis type is not reported for 2 individuals who had a prosthesis they could
274 wear but do not use it at all.

275

276 **Tasks**

277 Participants engaged in two tasks in which they were presented with a series of short video
278 clips and images designed to probe gesticulation. The first was a storytelling task, which is a
279 well-established gesture elicitation task (McNeill, 1992; McNeill & Levy, 1982) in which
280 gestures are spontaneously produced during narrative discourse. Participants were shown
281 two video clips of the cartoon 'Tweety and Sylvester' (see Figure 1A). After each clip, a
282 listener, who the participants were informed was naïve to the videos, entered the room and

283 sat opposite the participant. Each participant was then required to recall and describe the
284 videos back to the listener in as much detail as possible.

285 The second task was the Paired Objects task. In each of the 4 trials, participants were
286 presented with images of two items and asked to describe them in as much detail as
287 possible to the listener. Each image displayed a pair of similar looking objects, specifically
288 chosen to be difficult to convey using verbal description alone, therefore optimal for eliciting
289 gestures (see Figure 1A). This method was developed by Lu & Goldin-Meadow in a study
290 which focused on the depiction of shape and size in deaf participants (Lu & Goldin-Meadow,
291 2018). In addition to the listener present in the room, the participants were informed that an
292 additional person will watch the video of their description and should be able to recognise
293 the images based on the description. This instruction was added to emphasise the need for
294 a thorough description. The listener was included as previous research suggests that
295 individuals gesture more when there is a visible listener, compared to no listener or a listener
296 hidden behind a screen (Alibali, Heath, & Myers, 2001). The stimuli were displayed on a
297 computer screen using a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation, each pair was on a separate
298 slide. When the participants indicated that they had finished describing the current pair, the
299 experimenter pressed a button to move to the next trial.

300 In both parts, participants were naïve to the purpose of the task as being aware that the task
301 was designed to elicit gesture could have interfered with their performance. Participants
302 were seated to face the camera, which was used to record the task..

303

304 **Gesture measurements**

305 To capture gesture behaviour, GENEActiv accelerometers (ActivinsightsLtd, Kimbolton,
306 Cambridgeshire, UK) and AX3 accelerometers (Axivity, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK) were
307 used. An accelerometer was placed on each of the participant's arms, on both wrists for
308 control participants, and on intact wrist and 'prosthesis wrist' for one-handed participants.
309 The participants were not informed of the function of the accelerometers prior to the task to
310 minimise any effect it may have had on performance. The accelerometers were set to record
311 tri-axial data with a sampling frequency of 100Hz and range of $\pm 8g$, as well as the time
312 stamp for each recorded signal. Raw acceleration data was extracted and pre-processed
313 using MATLAB (version R2017a; Mathworks, Natick, MA, USA). The data from the left and
314 right upper-limb/prosthesis were first synchronised with each other using the recorded time
315 stamps to account for any minor sampling frequency errors between each device. The data
316 was then plotted and visually inspected for any anomalous recordings, and the plot of the

317 data was synchronised with the video clip of the task to ensure that the correct portions of
318 data were analysed.

319 Movements along the 3 axes were combined [$\sqrt{x^2+y^2+z^2}$] and bandpass filtered using a 4th
320 order Butterworth filter between the frequencies 0.2Hz and 15Hz to remove high frequency
321 noise and gravitational artefact.

322 The filtered data was used to quantify gesture movements in two separate ways: (1) The
323 total number of movements performed with each arm was calculated using a sliding window
324 method, whereby an individual gesture was defined as each 400ms window of data in which
325 there was movement (defined as an acceleration value $\geq 0.2g$) that was preceded and
326 succeeded by a window of no movement ($< 0.2g$) (Makin et al., 2013). To account for
327 differences in recording times between participants, the total number of movements
328 performed per minute talking was calculated. (2) The median magnitude ratio (MMR) of the
329 accelerometry data was calculated to investigate how much each arm contributed to the
330 overall size of gesture movements performed during the task (Lang, Waddell, Klaesner, &
331 Bland, 2017) . This method has been previously used successfully to quantify every-day
332 behaviour in impaired individuals and specifically amputees (Bailey, Klaesner, & Lang, 2015;
333 Chadwell, Kenney, Thies, Galpin, & Head, 2016). Here, the data was down-sampled to 1Hz.
334 The data was then converted into an arbitrary unit known as 'counts', where in each epoch,
335 1 count = 0.001664g of acceleration. The magnitude ratio (MR) between the intact arm and
336 prosthesis was calculated for each second as [$MR = \ln \frac{\text{Prosthesis counts}}{\text{Intact counts}}$]. A value of 0
337 indicating equal movement of both arms, < 0 indicating greater size movements with the
338 intact/dominant arm relative to the prosthetic/non-dominant arm, and > 0 indicating greater
339 size movements with the prosthetic/non-dominant arm relative to the intact/dominant arm.
340 To demonstrate that our results are not specific to a measure based on magnitude, the use
341 ratio was also calculated. The use ratio quantifies the total duration of one arm's movement
342 with respect to the other (Lang et al., 2017). To calculate the use ratio, the number of
343 seconds that included a substantial movement (a value larger than 12 count= $\sim 0.02g$) of the
344 prosthetic/non-dominant arm was divided by the number of seconds that included a
345 substantial movement of the intact/dominant arm. A value between 0 and 1 indicates greater
346 use of the intact/dominant arm than the prosthetic/non-dominant arm; a value of 1 indicates
347 equal use between both arms; and a value larger than 1 indicates greater use of the
348 prosthetic/non-dominant arm than the intact/dominant arm.

349 Six participants (4 one-handers and 2 controls) only produced co-speech gestures in one of
350 the tasks. For these participants, only data from the task during which they gestured was
351 analysed; data from both tasks were analysed together for the remainder of the participants.

352 **Gesture measurements validation**

353 To validate the accelerometry data, the movement laterality for a subset of the participants
354 (n=20) was also calculated using offline video-coding of the Paired Objects task. Using the
355 ELAN software, (ELAN v5.7, The Language Archive, Nijmegen, The Netherlands) (Lausberg
356 & Slöetjes, 2008), separate gestures were manually coded and labelled based on their
357 laterality. Gestures were labelled as follows: involving the dominant/intact hand only;
358 involving the non-dominant/prosthesis hand only; or involving both hands/hand+prosthesis.
359 The end of a gesture was identified based on a change in hand position, a change in verbal
360 content, or by a return to resting position of the hands. For each participant and for each
361 task, the percentage of gestures for each laterality label was calculated. A laterality index
362 was then calculated as $[laterality = \frac{(Prosthesis+Both)-(Intact+Both)}{Intact+2*Both+Prosthesis}]$, giving a value between -1
363 and +1, with 1 indicating total lateralisation towards the prosthetic/non-dominant hand, 0
364 indicating equal movement of both hands, and -1 indicating total lateralisation towards the
365 intact/dominant hand. Coding reliability of the offline video-coding method was assessed by
366 having an additional experimenter analyse a subset of 20 participants, and comparing the
367 results between the two experimenters (see Supplementary figure S1B).

368

369 **Prosthesis Use Assessment**

370 Participants completed a questionnaire to assess the frequency and functionality of
371 prosthesis use, which were combined to create an overall prosthesis use score (as
372 previously used in (Maimon-Mor & Makin, 2020; Van Den Heiligenberg et al., 2018; van den
373 Heiligenberg, Yeung, Brugger, Culham, & Makin, 2017). To determine frequency of use,
374 participants were asked to indicate the typical number of hours per day, and days per week,
375 that they wear their prosthesis; these scores were then used to determine the typical number
376 of hours per week that the prosthesis was worn. To determine functionality of prosthesis
377 use, participants were asked to complete the prosthesis activity log (PAL) (Makin et al.,
378 2013), a modified version of the Motor Activity Log (MAL) questionnaire, which is commonly
379 used to assess arm functionality in those with upper-limb impairments (Uswatte, Taub,
380 Morris, Light, & Thompson, 2006). The PAL consists of a list of 27 daily activities (see
381 <https://osf.io/jfme8/>); participants must rate how often they incorporate their prosthesis to
382 complete each activity on a scale of “never” (0 points), “sometimes” (1 point) or “very often”
383 (2 points). The PAL score is then calculated as the participant’s score divided by the
384 maximum possible score, generating a value between 0 (no functionality) and 1 (maximum
385 functionality). Both prosthesis wear time and PAL were standardised using a Z-transform
386 and summed to create a use score that included both wear time and incorporation of the

387 prosthesis in activities of daily living. The two measurements (wear time and PAL) were
388 highly correlated (Spearman's $\rho=0.61$, $p=0.00001$).

389 To validate the prosthesis usage questionnaire score, 21 participants completed the
390 prosthesis use questionnaire twice, with 1-2 years between each measurement. Since the
391 combined usage score is a sum of z-score transformation based on the specific dataset, we
392 calculate the reliability of PAL and wear-time frequency separately. The PAL score was
393 found to have excellent reliability with an ICC value of .81 (two- way random-model, absolute
394 agreement type) and 95% confidence interval of single measures = .58 –.919 [F(20,20) =
395 10.60 , $p < .001$]. For the wear time frequency, which is an ordinal 6-item non-symmetrical
396 scale, we used Kendall's tau-b correlation coefficient, showing a strong correlation in wear
397 time scores ($\tau(19)=0.605$, $p=0.003$). These analyses confirm that both measures have good
398 consistency, and are a reliable measure for prosthesis use.

399

400 **Prosthesis Embodiment Assessment**

401 The participants completed a 13-statement questionnaire to assess the extent of prosthesis
402 embodiment (see <https://osf.io/jfme8/>). The statements were primarily adopted from a
403 questionnaire used in rubber hand illusion studies, in which the embodiment of a rubber
404 hand was investigated; "rubber hand" was replaced with "prosthesis" (Longo, Schüür,
405 Kammers, Tsakiris, & Haggard, 2008). Questions were divided into the following factors:
406 Body Ownership (embodiment), Agency, Body Image, and Somatosensory. The subset of
407 embodiment statements used here are: "*it seems like the prosthesis belongs to me*", "*it*
408 *seems like the prosthesis is my hand*", "*it seems like the prosthesis is part of my body*", "*it*
409 *feels like my prosthesis is a foreign body*", "*it feels like my prosthesis is fused with my body*".
410 We did not analyse the results from the other control questions as we did not have a strong
411 a priori hypothesis relating to these phenomena. We will make our full data available as an
412 open source following publication. The participants rated each of these statements on a
413 Likert scale from -3 (strongly disagree) to +3 (strongly agree). The prosthesis embodiment
414 score was calculated using the average score from these five statements, taking the
415 opposite (negative) value of the 'foreign body' statement.

416

417 **Statistical analysis**

418 Statistical analysis was performed using IBM SPSS Statistics for Macintosh (Version 25) and
419 JASP (Version 0.11.1). Tests for normality were carried out using a Shapiro-Wilk test, and
420 statistical analysis was carried out using a repeated measures ANOVA for number of

421 movements of each arm and non-parametric tests for MMR (Mann-Whitney). All correlations
422 were performed using two-tailed Spearman correlation. An analysis of covariance
423 (ANCOVA) with prosthesis use as a covariate was used to test the contribution of cause of
424 limb-loss and type of prosthesis used. We further calculated the two-way random single
425 measures of intraclass correlations (ICCs), allowing us to assess consistency of the PAL
426 measurement. We also used a Kendall's tau-b correlation to assess the consistency of wear-
427 time frequency.

428

429 **Acknowledgments**

430 This work was supported by a Wellcome Trust Senior Research Fellowship (215575/Z/19/Z),
431 and an ERC Starting Grant (715022 EmbodiedTech) and a Sir Henry Dale Fellowship jointly
432 funded by the Wellcome Trust and the Royal Society (104128/Z/14/Z), awarded to T.R.M.
433 M.MacS is funded by a Wellcome Trust Fellowship [100229/Z/12/Z]. We thank Harriet
434 Dempsey Jones and Fiona van den Heiligenberg for developing the embodiment
435 questionnaires and to Hunter Schone, Mischa Dhar and Victoria Root for data collection. We
436 thank Opcare for help in participants recruitment, and our participants and their families for
437 their ongoing support of our research.

438

439 **References**


- 440 Alibali, M. W., Heath, D. C., & Myers, H. J. (2001). Effects of Visibility between Speaker and
441 Listener on Gesture Production: Some Gestures Are Meant to Be Seen. *Journal of*
442 *Memory and Language*, 44(2), 169–188. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.2000.2752>
- 443 Bailey, R. R., Klaesner, J. W., & Lang, C. E. (2015). Quantifying Real-World Upper-Limb
444 Activity in Nondisabled Adults and Adults With Chronic Stroke. *Neurorehabilitation and*
445 *Neural Repair*, 29(10), 969–978. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1545968315583720>
- 446 Chadwell, A., Kenney, L., Thies, S., Galpin, A., & Head, J. (2016). The reality of myoelectric
447 prostheses: Understanding what makes these devices difficult for some users to
448 control. *Frontiers in Neurobotics*, 10(AUG). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbot.2016.00007>
- 449 Engdahl, S. M., Christie, B. P., Kelly, B., Davis, A., Chestek, C. A., & Gates, D. H. (2015).
450 Surveying the interest of individuals with upper limb loss in novel prosthetic control
451 techniques. *Journal of Neuroengineering and Rehabilitation*, 12(1), 53.
452 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12984-015-0044-2>
- 453 Feyersein, P., & De Lannoy, J. D. (1991). *Gestures and Speech: psychological investigation.*

- 454 New York: Cambridge University Press.
- 455 Goldin-Meadow, S. (2003). *Hearing gesture: How our hands help us think*. Cambridge, MA.:
456 Harvard University Press.
- 457 Goldin-Meadow, S., & Alibali, M. W. (2013). Gesture's Role in Speaking, Learning, and
458 Creating Language. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64(1), 257–283.
459 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143802>
- 460 Iverson, J. M., & Goldin-Meadow, S. (1998). Why people gesture when they speak. *Nature*,
461 396(6708), 228. <https://doi.org/10.1038/24300>
- 462 Jang, C. H., Yang, H. S., Yang, H. E., Lee, S. Y., Kwon, J. W., Yun, B. D., ... Jeong, H. W.
463 (2011). A Survey on Activities of Daily Living and Occupations of Upper Extremity
464 Amputees. *Annals of Rehabilitation Medicine*, 35, 907.
465 <https://doi.org/10.5535/arm.2011.35.6.907>
- 466 Lang, C. E., Waddell, K. J., Klaesner, J. W., & Bland, M. D. (2017). A Method for Quantifying
467 Upper Limb Performance in Daily Life Using Accelerometers. *Journal of Visualized*
468 *Experiments*, (122), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.3791/55673>
- 469 Lausberg, H., & Slöetjes, H. (2008). Gesture coding with the NGCS - ELAN system.
470 *Proceedings of Measuring Behavior 2008, 2008*, 176–177.
- 471 Longo, M. R., Schüür, F., Kammers, M. P. M., Tsakiris, M., & Haggard, P. (2008). What is
472 embodiment? A psychometric approach. *Cognition*, 107(3), 978–998.
473 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2007.12.004>
- 474 Lu, J. C., & Goldin-Meadow, S. (2018). Creating Images With the Stroke of a Hand:
475 Depiction of Size and Shape in Sign Language. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9(July).
476 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01276>
- 477 Maimon-Mor, R. O., & Makin, T. R. (2020). Is an artificial limb embodied as a hand? Brain
478 decoding in prosthetic limb users. *Under Review*.
- 479 Makin, T. R., Cramer, A. O., Scholz, J., Hahamy, A., Henderson Slater, D., Tracey, I., &
480 Johansen-Berg, H. (2013). Deprivation-related and use-dependent plasticity go hand in
481 hand. *ELife*, 2013, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.01273.01273>
- 482 Makin, T. R., de Vignemont, F., & Faisal, A. A. (2017). Neurocognitive barriers to the
483 embodiment of technology. *Nature Biomedical Engineering*, 1(1), 0014.
484 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41551-016-0014>
- 485 McNeill, D. (1992). *Hand and mind: What gestures reveal about thought*. Chicago and
486 London: The University of Chicago Press.


- 487 McNeill, D., & Levy, E. T. (1982). Conceptual Representations in Language Activity and
488 Gesture. In R. J. Jarvella & W. Klein (Eds.), *Speech, Place, and Action* (pp. 271–295).
489 Wiley.
- 490 Østlie, K., Lesjø, I. M., Franklin, R. J., Garfelt, B., Skjeldal, O. H., & Magnus, P. (2012).
491 Prosthesis rejection in acquired major upper-limb amputees: a population-based
492 survey. *Disability and Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology*, 7(4), 294–303.
493 <https://doi.org/10.3109/17483107.2011.635405>
- 494 Pareés, I., Saifee, T. A., Kassavetis, P., Kojovic, M., Rubio-Agusti, I., Rothwell, J. C., ...
495 Edwards, M. J. (2012). Believing is perceiving: Mismatch between self-report and
496 actigraphy in psychogenic tremor. *Brain*, 135(1), 117–123.
497 <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awr292>
- 498 Uswatte, G., Taub, E., Morris, D., Light, K., & Thompson, P. A. (2006). The Motor Activity
499 Log-28: assessing daily use of the hemiparetic arm after stroke. *Neurology*, 67(7),
500 1189–1194. <https://doi.org/10.1212/01.wnl.0000238164.90657.c2>
- 501 Van Den Heiligenberg, F. M. Z., Orlov, T., MacDonald, S. N., Duff, E. P., Henderson Slater,
502 D., Beckmann, C. F., ... Makin, T. R. (2018). Artificial limb representation in amputees.
503 *Brain*, 141(5), 1422–1433. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awy054>
- 504 van den Heiligenberg, F. M. Z., Yeung, N., Brugger, P., Culham, J. C., & Makin, T. R.
505 (2017). Adaptable Categorization of Hands and Tools in Prosthesis Users.
506 *Psychological Science*, 28(3), 395–398. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797616685869>
- 507 Vujaklija, I., Farina, D., & Aszmann, O. C. (2016). New developments in prosthetic arm
508 systems. *Orthopedic Research and Reviews*, 8, 31–39.
509 <https://doi.org/10.2147/ORR.S71468>
- 510

CO05*	27		F											
CO07*	35		M											
CO08*	34		F											
CO10*	70		M											
CO12*	18		F											
CO13*	67		M											
CO14*	50		M											
CO15*	51		F											
CO16*	36		F											
CO17*	41		M											
CO18*	33		M											
CO19*	45		M											
CO21*	54		M											


Table S1. Demographic details of the participants involved in the study. Participant: AA = acquired amputee, AC = congenital one-hander, CO = two-handed control; participants marked with an asterisk were included in the gesticulation task. Y since amp = years since amputation. Gender: M = male, F = female. Amp Side = side of limb loss or non-dominant side: L = left, R = right. Amp level = level of limb loss: TR = trans-radial, TH = trans-humeral. Pros type = preferred type of prosthesis: Cos = cosmetic, Mech = mechanical, Myo = myo-electric. PLS = phantom limb sensation. PLP = phantom limb pain. SP = stump pain. Chronic PLS, PLP and SP were calculated by dividing maximum intensity of pain (0-100) by frequency (1 = all the time, 2 = daily, 3 = weekly, 4 = several times per month, and 5 = once or less per month). Pros Time = typical number of hours prosthesis worn per week. PAL = functional ability with prosthesis as determined by PAL questionnaire (0 = minimum function, 1 = maximum function). US = prosthesis usage score: +3 = maximum usage, -3 = minimum usage. EM = prosthesis embodiment score; +3 = maximum agreement with embodiment statements, -3 = maximum disagreement with embodiment statements.



Supplementary Figure S1. *Measurement validation using Offline video coding.* (A) Correlation between the laterality index calculated from offline video coding, on a subset of participants, and the MMR ($\rho_{(18)} = 0.76$, $p < 0.001$). (B) Test-retest reliability of the offline video coding method. The laterality measure was validated by an additional experimenter. The measurement was found to be stable across the two separate experimenters ($\rho_{(16)} = 0.96$, $p < 0.001$).



Supplementary Figure S2. *Results of analysis with alternative gesture measure: Use ratio* (A) Use ratio across groups; two-handers performed movements with both hands equally when gesturing, while one-handers were significantly lateralised towards their intact hand ($U_{(38)} = 54$, $p < 0.001$). Solid coloured vertical lines indicate the group mean (B) Increased daily usage associated with increased incorporation of the prosthesis into gestures as measured by the use ratio ($\rho_{(23)} = 0.55$, $p = 0.004$).



Supplementary Figure S3. Embodiment and gesture behaviour. Greater perceived embodiment was loosely associated with increased incorporation of the prosthesis into gestures as measured by MMR ($\rho_{(23)} = 0.37$, $p = 0.07$).

References

- Alibali, M. W., Heath, D. C., & Myers, H. J. (2001). Effects of Visibility between Speaker and Listener on Gesture Production: Some Gestures Are Meant to Be Seen. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 44(2), 169–188. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.2000.2752>
- Bailey, R. R., Klaesner, J. W., & Lang, C. E. (2015). Quantifying Real-World Upper-Limb Activity in Nondisabled Adults and Adults With Chronic Stroke. *Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair*, 29(10), 969–978. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1545968315583720>
- Chadwell, A., Kenney, L., Thies, S., Galpin, A., & Head, J. (2016). The reality of myoelectric prostheses: Understanding what makes these devices difficult for some users to control. *Frontiers in Neurobotics*, 10(AUG). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbot.2016.00007>
- Engdahl, S. M., Christie, B. P., Kelly, B., Davis, A., Chestek, C. A., & Gates, D. H. (2015). Surveying the interest of individuals with upper limb loss in novel prosthetic control techniques. *Journal of Neuroengineering and Rehabilitation*, 12(1), 53. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12984-015-0044-2>
- Feyerseim, P., & De Lannoy, J. D. (1991). *Gestures and Speech: psychological investigation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Goldin-Meadow, S. (2003). *Hearing gesture: How our hands help us think*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.
- Goldin-Meadow, S., & Alibali, M. W. (2013). Gesture's Role in Speaking, Learning, and Creating Language. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64(1), 257–283.

<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143802>

- Iverson, J. M., & Goldin-Meadow, S. (1998). Why people gesture when they speak. *Nature*, 396(6708), 228. <https://doi.org/10.1038/24300>
- Jang, C. H., Yang, H. S., Yang, H. E., Lee, S. Y., Kwon, J. W., Yun, B. D., ... Jeong, H. W. (2011). A Survey on Activities of Daily Living and Occupations of Upper Extremity Amputees. *Annals of Rehabilitation Medicine*, 35, 907. <https://doi.org/10.5535/arm.2011.35.6.907>
- Lang, C. E., Waddell, K. J., Klaesner, J. W., & Bland, M. D. (2017). A Method for Quantifying Upper Limb Performance in Daily Life Using Accelerometers. *Journal of Visualized Experiments*, (122), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.3791/55673>
- Lausberg, H., & Slöetjes, H. (2008). Gesture coding with the NGCS - ELAN system. *Proceedings of Measuring Behavior 2008, 2008*, 176–177.
- Longo, M. R., Schüür, F., Kammers, M. P. M., Tsakiris, M., & Haggard, P. (2008). What is embodiment? A psychometric approach. *Cognition*, 107(3), 978–998. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2007.12.004>
- Lu, J. C., & Goldin-Meadow, S. (2018). Creating Images With the Stroke of a Hand: Depiction of Size and Shape in Sign Language. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9(July). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01276>
- Maimon-Mor, R. O., & Makin, T. R. (2020). Is an artificial limb embodied as a hand? Brain decoding in prosthetic limb users. *Under Review*.
- Makin, T. R., Cramer, A. O., Scholz, J., Hahamy, A., Henderson Slater, D., Tracey, I., & Johansen-Berg, H. (2013). Deprivation-related and use-dependent plasticity go hand in hand. *ELife*, 2013, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.01273.01273>
- Makin, T. R., de Vignemont, F., & Faisal, A. A. (2017). Neurocognitive barriers to the embodiment of technology. *Nature Biomedical Engineering*, 1(1), 0014. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41551-016-0014>
- McNeill, D. (1992). *Hand and mind: What gestures reveal about thought*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- McNeill, D., & Levy, E. T. (1982). Conceptual Representations in Language Activity and Gesture. In R. J. Jarvella & W. Klein (Eds.), *Speech, Place, and Action* (pp. 271–295). Wiley.
- Østlie, K., Lesjø, I. M., Franklin, R. J., Garfelt, B., Skjeldal, O. H., & Magnus, P. (2012). Prosthesis rejection in acquired major upper-limb amputees: a population-based

survey. *Disability and Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology*, 7(4), 294–303.

<https://doi.org/10.3109/17483107.2011.635405>

Pareés, I., Saifee, T. A., Kassavetis, P., Kojovic, M., Rubio-Agusti, I., Rothwell, J. C., ...

Edwards, M. J. (2012). Believing is perceiving: Mismatch between self-report and

actigraphy in psychogenic tremor. *Brain*, 135(1), 117–123.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awr292>

Uswatte, G., Taub, E., Morris, D., Light, K., & Thompson, P. A. (2006). The Motor Activity

Log-28: assessing daily use of the hemiparetic arm after stroke. *Neurology*, 67(7),

1189–1194. <https://doi.org/10.1212/01.wnl.0000238164.90657.c2>

Van Den Heiligenberg, F. M. Z., Orlov, T., MacDonald, S. N., Duff, E. P., Henderson Slater,

D., Beckmann, C. F., ... Makin, T. R. (2018). Artificial limb representation in amputees.

Brain, 141(5), 1422–1433. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awy054>

van den Heiligenberg, F. M. Z., Yeung, N., Brugger, P., Culham, J. C., & Makin, T. R.

(2017). Adaptable Categorization of Hands and Tools in Prosthesis Users.

Psychological Science, 28(3), 395–398. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797616685869>

Vujaklija, I., Farina, D., & Aszmann, O. C. (2016). New developments in prosthetic arm

systems. *Orthopedic Research and Reviews*, 8, 31–39.

<https://doi.org/10.2147/ORR.S71468>