

Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits

This content has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text.

Manuscript version: Accepted Manuscript

D'Alonzo et al

To cite this article before publication: D'Alonzo et al, 2017, J. Neural Eng., at press:

<https://doi.org/10.1088/1741-2552/aa81e2>

This Accepted Manuscript is: © 2017 IOP Publishing Ltd

During the embargo period (the 12 month period from the publication of the Version of Record of this article), the Accepted Manuscript is fully protected by copyright and cannot be reused or reposted elsewhere.

As the Version of Record of this article is going to be / has been published on a subscription basis, this Accepted Manuscript is available for reuse under a CC BY-NC-ND 3.0 licence after the 12 month embargo period.

After the embargo period, everyone is permitted to copy and redistribute this article for non-commercial purposes only, provided that they adhere to all the terms of the licence

<https://creativecommons.org/licences/by-nc-nd/3.0>

Although reasonable endeavours have been taken to obtain all necessary permissions from third parties to include their copyrighted content within this article, their full citation and copyright line may not be present in this Accepted Manuscript version. Before using any content from this article, please refer to the Version of Record on IOPscience once published for full citation and copyright details, as permission will likely be required. All third party content is fully copyright protected, unless specifically stated otherwise in the figure caption in the Version of Record.

When available, you can view the Version of Record for this article at:

<http://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1741-2552/aa81e2>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits


M D’Alonzo^{1*}, L F Engels^{1*}, M Controzzi¹, and C Cipriani¹

¹ The BioRobotics Institute, Scuola Superiore Sant’Anna, Viale R. Piaggio, 34, 56025 Pontedera (PI), Italy

* These authors contributed equally to this work.

Corresponding Author:

Christian Cipriani – email: christian.cipriani@santannapisa.it



Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits

Abstract

Objective Grasping and manipulation control critically depends on tactile feedback. Without this feedback, the ability for fine control of a prosthesis is limited in upper limb amputees. Early studies have shown that non-invasive electro-cutaneous stimulation (ES) can induce *referred sensations* that are spread to a wider and/or more distant area, with respect to the electrodes. Building on this, we sought to exploit this effect to provide somatotopically matched sensory feedback to people with partial hand (digital) amputations.

Approach For the first time, this work investigated the possibility of inducing referred sensations in the digits by activating the palmar nerves. Specifically, we electrically stimulated 18 sites on the palm of non-amputees to evaluate the effects of sites and stimulation parameters on modality, magnitude, and location of the evoked sensations. We performed similar tests with partial hand amputees by testing those sites that had most consistently elicited referred sensations in non-amputees.

Main Results We demonstrated referred sensations in non-amputees from all stimulation sites in one form or another. Specifically, the stimulation of 16 of the 18 sites gave rise to reliable referred sensations. Amputees experienced referred sensations to unimpaired digits, just like non-amputees, but we were unable to evoke referred sensations in their missing digits: none of them reported sensations that extended beyond the tip of the stump.

Significance The possibility of eliciting referred sensations on the digits may be exploited in haptic systems for providing touch sensations without obstructing the fingertips or their movements. The study also suggests that the phenomenon of referred sensations through ES may not be exploited for partial hand prostheses, and it invites researchers to explore alternative approaches. Finally, the results seem to confirm previous studies suggesting that the stumps in partial hand amputees partially acquire the role of the missing fingertips, physiologically and cognitively.

1. Introduction

Tactile sensory feedback plays a pivotal role in the motor control of grasping and manipulation (Edin *et al*

1 Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits

2
3 1992, Edin and Johansson 1995). The tactile receptors in the palmar areas of the hand inform us about hand-
4
5 object interactions and thus provide crucial information about the physical properties of the object and the
6
7 contact between object and hand. People with impaired or no tactile sensibility experience difficulties with many
8
9 daily life activities because the brain lacks the information required to properly plan and execute motor tasks, in
10
11 particular manipulation (Johansson and Flanagan 2009).
12
13

14 Losing a hand deprives individuals of their tactile sensibility. While an acceptable level of grasping function is
15
16 often (re-)gained through motorized prostheses, the restoration of tactile sensibility remains one of the open
17
18 challenges in this field. Such artificial sensory feedback can be provided invasively or non-invasively (for a
19
20 review, see Antfolk *et al* 2013b). Invasive feedback can be provided using surgically implanted electrodes,
21
22 targeting afferent nerve fibers within the residual limb (Ortiz-Catalan *et al* 2014, Raspopovic *et al* 2014, Tan *et*
23
24 *al* 2014, Davis *et al* 2016), and holds the potential of eliciting close-to-natural tactile sensations (Graczyk *et al*
25
26 2016). In contrast, non-invasive stimulation generally relies on the ability of the individual to learn and interpret
27
28 artificial sensory stimuli provided on the skin, although modality (e.g., pressure to pressure) and somatotopical
29
30 matching (e.g., utilizing phantom sensations) can shorten the learning process (Antfolk *et al* 2013a). However,
31
32 non-invasive feedback has the clear advantage of avoiding surgery. Among the non-invasive methods, vibro- or
33
34 electro-tactile feedback have been widely investigated in the past because of their high acceptance by the users,
35
36 low power consumption, small dimensions, and compatibility with the EMG signal (Solomonow *et al* 1978,
37
38 Kaczmarek *et al* 1991, Cipriani *et al* 2008, Antfolk *et al* 2013b, Dosen *et al* 2014). Notably, the studies
39
40 conducted so far have focused on complete hand amputation and, hence, have investigated ways to provide
41
42 tactile feedback of a missing hand – no study focused on partial hand amputations and providing feedback from
43
44 partial hand prostheses (see Uellendahl and Uellendahl 2012, Imbinto *et al* 2016 for reviews of partial hand
45
46 prostheses).
47
48
49

50 In this work, we used non-invasive electro-tactile or electro-cutaneous stimulation (ES), which involves the
51
52 flow of an electrical current between two electrodes (anode and cathode) placed on the skin. Typically, this
53
54 current travels locally and through the surface layers of the skin, thus activating cutaneous afferents close to the
55
56 electrodes (Anani *et al* 1977, Kaczmarek *et al* 1991). However, when the electrode is placed on a skin area close
57
58
59
60

1 Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits
2
3 to a nerve, the current can reach the sensory afferents deeper in the tissue, thus inducing sensations that are
4 spread to a wider and/or more distant area, the so called *referred sensations* (Geng *et al* 2012, D'Alonzo *et al*
5 2014). Referred sensations are usually perceived more distally with respect to the electrode site. This
6 phenomenon was described both for hand amputees and non-amputees (Geng *et al* 2012, Mulvey *et al* 2012,
7 Chai *et al* 2013, 2015, Forst *et al* 2015, Germany *et al* 2016). Non-amputee participants reported referred
8 sensations in the area of the digits/palm, particularly when the electrodes were placed on the ventral side of the
9 forearm, close to the ulnar or medial nerves (Geng *et al* 2012, Mulvey *et al* 2012, Forst *et al* 2015, Germany *et*
10 *al* 2016). The aforementioned studies agree that non-invasive ES could be a feasible way to provoke close-to-
11 natural, referred sensations (Geng *et al* 2012, Mulvey *et al* 2012, Forst *et al* 2015, Germany *et al* 2016). In
12 addition, it has been hypothesized that, with the use of multiple surface electrodes, the location of evoked
13 sensations could be controlled by varying the stimulation site. A given electrode or electrode pair could be used
14 as a channel to convey sensory information from one specific digit, and the user could perceive different digits
15 from different channels (Geng *et al* 2012).

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31 Building on these findings, we sought to exploit the effects of referred sensations to provide somatotopically
32 matched sensory feedback to users of partial hand prostheses. Such a system could be capable of evoking
33 referred sensations in the missing digits by stimulating branches of nerves that physiologically innervated them
34 through electrodes placed on the proximal part of the hand (i.e., the palm). Hence, in this work, at first we
35 stimulated different sites on the palm of non-amputee participants to evaluate the effects of sites and stimulation
36 parameters on modality, magnitude, and location of the evoked sensation. This study allowed to identify a
37 number of stimulation sites that could induce clearly perceivable and consistent referred sensations on the digits.
38 These promising findings prompted us to perform similar tests with partial hand amputees. Specifically, we
39 tested those sites that had most consistently elicited referred sensations in non-amputee participants.
40 Unfortunately, though, we were unable to evoke referred sensations in the missing digits in partial hand
41 amputees through ES: none of the amputees reported sensations that extended beyond the tip of the stump.
42 Hence, this study suggests that the phenomenon of referred sensations through ES may not be exploited for
43 partial hand prostheses and it invites researchers to explore alternative approaches.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits

2 Materials and Methods

2.1. Equipment

To deliver ES to our study participants, we used disposable, self-adhesive, pre-gelled Ag/AgCl electrodes (diameter = 10 mm) (GS26, Bio-medical Instruments, Clinton Township, MI) connected to a custom electro-tactile stimulator, which was controlled by a host PC (Figure 1). The electrodes were fixed on the palm of the participants. The stimulator produced bursts of current-controlled rectangular monophasic pulses. The amplitude of the current was controlled by hardware. Pulse widths (PWs), frequency of the rectangular pulses, and the duration of the pulse bursts were adjusted by a custom application running on the PC. The device could provide PWs ranging between 0.1 and 2.8 ms and frequencies from 1 up to 250 Hz.



Figure 1 Experimental setup. (a) Electro-tactile stimulator connected to a subset of stimulation electrodes. The inset shows the detailed placement of the stimulation electrodes on the palm of one non-amputee participant. (b) Representative placement of the electrodes on one amputee participant.

2.2. Participants

A group of ten non-amputee participants [participants *P1 - P10*, 5 males; age 28 ± 4 years (mean \pm standard deviation), one left-handed (*P2*)] and five individuals with partial hand amputation (participants *A1 - A5*, Table 1) volunteered in the experiments. Informed consent in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki was obtained from each participant before conducting the experiments. This study was approved by the local ethics committee of the Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna, Pisa, Italy (approval no. 1 of February 24th 2016). The experiments were carried out in accordance with the approved guidelines.

The partial hand amputees were recruited by phone from a list of upper limb amputees available at Scuola

Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits

Superiore Sant'Anna. Inclusion criteria were: partial hand amputation, not taking any medication, and being otherwise physically and mentally healthy. Due to these broad criteria, the group of amputees was relatively unselected: the time after amputation, occurrence of phantom digits, and use of a prosthesis varied greatly in the group. Before the experiments started, we interviewed participants to establish whether they experienced any phantom sensations or displayed a phantom map¹. Participants A3 and A4 reported rare phantom sensations in the year preceding the experiment. The other participants had never experienced phantom sensations. None of the participants displayed a phantom map.

Table 1 Details of Participants With Partial Hand Amputation.

Participant ID (gender, age)	Dominant hand	Time since amputation	Cause	Prosthesis used	Missing phalanges	Phantom sensations/map
A1 (f, 26)	Left-handed	9 months	Bacteria	Cosmetic	L: 1-D, 2-I, 3-D	No/No
A2 (m, 35)	Left-handed	21 years	Trauma	None	L: 2-I	No/No
A3 (f, 40)	Left-handed	10 years	Trauma	Cosmetic	L: 2-D, 3-D	Rare/No
A4 (m, 46)	Right-handed	2 years	Trauma	Cosmetic	R: 3-I	Rare/No
A5 (m, 48)	Right-handed	42 years	Trauma	None	R: 5-I	No/No

Legend. L/R: Left or Right amputation. 1-5: Digits (from thumb, to little finger). D/I/P: Phalanges (Distal, Intermediate, Proximal).

2.3. Pilot study with non-amputees

Prior to testing partial hand amputees, we evaluated 18 different stimulation sites on the palm of the left hand with non-amputee volunteers. The selection of the sites was guided by the anatomic configuration of the nerves and the space available on the hand with respect to the dimension of the electrodes. Specifically, the sites were placed on the skin areas directly above the path of the branches of the medial and ulnar nerves (Figure 2, Table 2). For our tests, we selected a fixed distance between the stimulation sites along the digit axes, because the dimensions of the palms of our participants were comparable (length 9.8-10.7 cm, width 7.5-8.2 cm [min-max]).

¹ Many amputees experience tactile phantom sensations when their residual limb is touched. The sites on the stump that elicit such sensations are called phantom map (Ramachandran and Hirstein 1998).

Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits

We presumed that stimulating the nerve branches that lead to each digit would elicit referred sensations in that digit. Consequently, to stimulate the four fingers, the electrodes were placed 6, 20 and 34 mm below the palmar digital creases, along the axis of the corresponding finger (Figure 2(a)). For the thumb, further sites were evaluated in the area of the thenar eminence, between the palmar digital crease of the thumb and the thenar crease. Three sites were centered at 6, 20 and 34 mm below the palmar thumb crease and along the axis of thumb, and another three were parallel to the axis of the thumb, 15 mm medially. We asked the participants to keep their hand relaxed while we marked the stimulation sites with a pen and throughout the experiment to prevent movement of the skin over the deeper tissue.




Figure 2 Stimulation sites and reference electrode. (a) Illustration depicting the placement of the stimulation (black circles) and reference (solid green circle) electrodes on the hand with respect to the major nerve branches. (b) Hand section at the level of the reference electrode (ultrasound imaging). Ultrasound imaging was used to guide the placement of the reference electrode, midway between the medial and ulnar nerves.

An additional electrode was placed medially between the pisiform and the tubercle of the scaphoid and approximately 1 cm further distal (towards the palm; on the base of the third metacarpal). This electrode was used as reference (anode) for assessing the 18 stimulation sites (cathodes). We placed the reference electrode midway between the medial and ulnar nerve to minimize any potential anodal block. We checked the validity of

Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits the placement of the reference electrode in this position by ultrasound inspection (MyLabFive, Esaote SpA, Italy) (Figure 2(b)).

Table 2 Summary of stimulation sites and presumed target areas for referred stimulation.

Stimulation sites	Target area for the referred sensation
A, B, G, H, M, N	Thumb
C, I, O	Index digit
D, J, P	Middle digit
E, K, Q	Ring digit
F, L, R	Little digit

Throughout the experiment, the participants sat comfortably on a chair in front of a table, with their left arm in a supine position on an ergonomic padded armrest (Figure 1(a)). We began the experiment by placing the electrodes on the selected sites (Figure 1). Then, for each site, we used an adaptive psychophysical procedure (a stair case procedure with adaptive step size²) to approximate the rheobase, and we assessed the perceived sensations using twice that value. We chose a stimulation frequency of 100 Hz as in previous studies (Chai *et al* 2013, 2015, 2017, Wang *et al* 2013, D'Alonzo *et al* 2014, Zhang *et al* 2015, Štrbac *et al* 2016, Xu *et al* 2016). This frequency has been reported to lead to a well-localized, more continuous sensation resembling constant pressure compared to lower ones. Frequencies above 100 Hz were not taken into consideration because they produce a continuous, stable sensation exclusively described as “tingling” (Saunders 1977).

The assessment of the perceived sensations was performed on the stimulation sites using a fixed current intensity (amplitude = 2 x rheobase) to provide a stimulation that was easily perceived but not painful. For each site, we evaluated the qualities of the stimulation at different PW, starting at 100 μ s and increasing to a maximum of 700 μ s in steps of 100 μ s. Immediately after a stimulus was applied, each participant verbally reported the perceived sensation regarding location, type, and magnitude. The participants were asked to identify the place where they felt the stimulation as precisely as possible. Similar to Geng and colleagues (2012), we

² The rheobase was approximated using a frequency of 100 Hz and a PW of 1.5 ms following the guidelines by Forst *et al* (2015). Starting from a subthreshold current amplitude (0.5 mA), the intensity was increased by 1 mA until the subject reported a sensation. Then, the current was decreased, with a reduction in step-size of 50% at each reversal until it was within a specified tolerance (0.25 mA). After that point, the procedure was stopped after four reversals and the last value was considered the approximate rheobase.

Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits provided a list of terms to describe the type of induced sensation. The list included “tingling”, “vibration”, “pricking”, “itching”, “pressure”, “movement”, “cold”, “warmth”, “pain”, “touch”, “pinching” and “tickling”; participants could use more than one term to describe any given stimulation. The magnitude of a sensation was rated on an 11-point scale (0 - “no sensation”, 10 - “upper limit of a sensation or pain”) (Geng *et al* 2012). For each stimulation site, the evaluation was concluded if the intensity reached 10, or if a hand muscle contracted; the corresponding PW values were recorded (PW_{max}). If a participant showed a contraction at a certain PW (e.g. 700 μ s), the previous PW was considered the PW_{max} (e.g. 600 μ s).

The stimulation sites were assessed in a random order across participants. Each stimulus was repeated as often as demanded by the participants to rate each quality. Moreover, the participant could rest as long as desired between each stimulation. We used Min-Max scaling to normalize the scores of each participant for inter-participant comparison.

2.4. Study with amputees

The procedure to evaluate the evoked sensations in partial hand amputees was identical to the one for non-amputees. However, to focus our analysis on sensations referred onto the amputated digits, we exclusively explored those sites that had provided a sensation in the target areas in non-amputee participants. Hence, we assessed those sites of the stimulation matrix that were on the same axis as the amputated digits, as well as other close sites that had elicited sensations on the target digit in the first experiment (Table 3). As the dimensions of the amputees’ hands were similar to those of the non-amputees, we did not change the distances between stimulation sites.

Table 3 Summary of stimulation sites for amputee participants.

Participant	Tested hand	Stimulation sites
A1	Left	A, B, C, D, E, G, H, I, J, K, O, P, and Q
A2	Left	B, C, D, H, I, J, O, and P
A3	Left	B, C, D, E, H, I, J, K, O, P, and Q
A4	Right	C, D, E, I, J, K, O, P, and Q
A5	Right	E, F, K, L, Q, and R

Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits

2.5. Analysis

The outcomes were analyzed as follows. First, a one-way repeated measures ANOVA, followed by pair-wise comparisons using Bonferroni adjustment, was used to assess differences regarding rheobase and PW_{max} across the stimulation sites in the group of non-amputee participants (after normality check using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test). Then, the data on the perceived sites of sensation were grouped according to whether the sensation was felt at the level of the stimulation sites (usually under or around the stimulation electrode, but also on larger areas of the palm), or on the digit(s), and, in the latter case, on which phalanx or phalanges (i.e., proximal, intermediate, or distal). Furthermore, the relationship between normalized subjective intensity and PW was identified on each site. Eventual significant differences in the normalized perceived intensities across stimulation sites were assessed by means of a two-way ANOVA (factors: stimulation sites, PW values). Finally, a repeated measures ANOVA (factors: sites of stimulation, group) was used to compare rheobase, PW_{max} , and normalized perceived intensity between amputees and non-amputees. An unpaired t-test was employed to compare the percentage of occurrence of each term used to describe the sensation between amputees and non-amputees. For all statistical tests, a p-value of 0.05 was used as the threshold for significance.

3. Results

3.1. Findings on non-amputee participants

3.1.1. Rheobase and PW_{max} . The rheobase values ranged from 1 to 2.75 mA with a mean of 1.47 ± 0.26 (standard deviation) mA (Figure S1(a) and Table S1 in the Supplementary Materials). These values were significantly different among electrode sites (one-way repeated measures ANOVA – $F(17,153) = 3.04$, $p < 0.001$), with generally lower thresholds for locations closer to the reference electrode compared to those further away. The PW_{max} ranged between 0 and 700 μs , with a significant difference among the stimulation sites (one-way repeated measures ANOVA – $F(17,153) = 5.53$, $p < 0.001$) (Figure S1(a) and Table S1 in Supplementary Materials). Notably, some participants already demonstrated contractions in the hand at 100 μs PW at sites M, N and H (5, 4, and 2 participants, respectively), resulting in a PW_{max} of 0 for those sites.

Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits

1
2
3 3.1.2. *Sites of referred sensation.* The stimulation sites closer to the long fingers (i.e., sites C, D, E, and F)
4 could more easily elicit sensations restricted to the target finger than the more proximal sites (Figures 3 and 4).
5
6 On the sites 20 and 34 mm proximal from the palmar creases (i.e., sites I, J, K, L, O, P, Q and R), sensations
7 occurred more frequently at the level of the stimulation sites (Figure 3). Stimulation on the most proximal sites
8 usually evoked sensations that involved the site of stimulation, the presumed target finger, and other adjacent
9 fingers. The sites on the thenar eminence fared worse at providing sensations to the target (thumb), but it was
10 still possible for sites A, B, G, and H. On the contrary, sites M and N never elicited sensations restricted solely to
11 the thumb.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 In general, an increase in PW (and thus in injected current) increased the perceived area of the sensation, albeit
21 in several different ways (Figure 3). For instance, an increasing PW moved the sensation from the target digit
22 alone, to the target digit and the stimulation site (e.g. site D), or to the target digit and adjacent sites (e.g., site C).
23
24 In other circumstances, the sensation moved from the stimulation site alone to the target digit and adjacent sites
25 (e.g., G). Similarly, in ~30% of the trials where more than one PW value was tested for the same site, the
26 location of the referred sensation on a single digit grew from a smaller to a larger area (e.g., from one phalanx to
27 all three phalanges) with increasing PWs (most frequently in the index) (Figure 5).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 In more detail, the analysis of the perceived location of the stimulus showed that almost every participant had
37 stable referred sensations in each digit from at least one site. In other words, it was possible to identify at least
38 one site, for each digit, that elicited a referred sensation on that digit consistently (i.e., in the whole range of
39 tested PW values) (Figure 4(a)). The only exceptions were the thumb for P7, the ring finger for P4, and the little
40 finger for P6 and P9. Sites M and N were the only ones that did not provide a stable sensation on a digit in any
41 participant. Conversely, the stimulation sites that provoked stable digit sensations in a larger sample of
42 participants were: sites A and H for the thumb (7 and 6 participants, respectively); C and O for the index finger
43 (10 and 9, respectively); D and P for the middle finger (7 and 8, respectively); E and Q for the ring finger (5 and
44 6, respectively); and R for the little finger (8). Some sites (A, B, Q, and K) elicited stable referred sensations not
45 in their presumed target but in adjacent digits in some participants. The stimulation sites and PWs that optimally
46 elicited referred sensations on each digit (across non-amputee participants) were: H for the thumb (PW 100 μ s),
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits

C for the index (PW 200 μ s), D for the middle (PW 300 μ s), E for the ring (PW 400 μ s), and F for the little finger (PW 400 μ s) (Figure 4(b)).




Figure 3 Distribution of the perceived location of sensation with varying PW. The sensations were perceived on the thumb (t) and fingers (index (i), middle (m), ring (r), and little (l)) and at the level of the stimulation sites on the palm (s). Green bars indicate sensations localized only on the presumed target digits, light green represents sensations on the presumed target and at the level of the stimulation sites, blue shows sensations localized on a finger that is not the presumed target, light blue indicates sensations on a non-target digit and at

Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits

the stimulation site, red bars indicate sensations localized only on the stimulation areas, and yellow indicates all other cases. For the sake of simplicity and brevity, only results for 100, 300 and 500 μs PW are shown to provide an overview of the distribution of the sensation location with increasing PWs. The y-axis denotes how many participants reported a given location of sensation for each of the three PWs. Each participant reported a location once per PW per site. Some participants experienced muscle contractions or pain, so the bars do not always reach '10' (the total number of participants).




Figure 4 Stimulation sites that elicited a referred sensation on the digits in non-amputee participants. (a) Each hand represents one participant. Each color indicates a different stimulated digit, filled circles indicate sites in which a large range of PWs elicited referred sensations (100 μs to ≥500 μs); empty circles denote sites, which elicited sensations for a lower range of PWs (100 μs to <500 μs). (b) Stimulation sites that showed the best ability to evoke sensations in the target alone and in the target and the stimulation site, at the optimal PW noted below each pie chart. It further shows the other sites that the sensation was referred to.

Accepted

Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits




Figure 5 Spread of the sensation with increasing PW The figure shows an example of how the reported area of sensation grew with increasing PW in one participant. The presented electrode sites were chosen because they proved to generally fare best at providing referred sensations to the target digits. H: gray, C: green, D: yellow, E: orange, F: blue; the numbers denote the PWs in μs at which the stimulation was felt in the indicated areas.

3.1.3. Types and intensity of sensations. The participants most frequently described the sensations as “tingling” ($63 \pm 29\%$), “vibration” ($48 \pm 30\%$), “tickling” ($17 \pm 27\%$), “pricking” ($16 \pm 13\%$), and “pressure” ($6 \pm 13\%$). These terms describe the vast majority ($> 96\%$) of all reported sensations; “warmth”, “pinching”, and “movement” were each reported in around 1% of the trials, while “itching” and “touch” only occurred in 0.5% of all trials (6 times and once, respectively). “Pain” and “cold” were never used to describe the sensations (Figure 6(a) and Figure S3 in Supplementary Materials).

The relationship between the PW and the normalized subjective intensity proved positive (monotonically increasing) for all sites (Figure S2(a) in Supplementary Materials). The statistical analysis (two-way ANOVA) demonstrated that the normalized subjective intensities were significantly different across the stimulation sites ($F(17,863) = 12.46, p < 0.001$) and PWs ($F(6,863) = 379.24, p < 0.001$).

Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits




Figure 6 Distribution of the percentage of described sensations (mean \pm standard error). (a) Non-amputee participants. (b) Amputee participants. Since the participants could describe each sensation with more than one term, the percentages do not add up to 100.

3.2 Findings on amputee participants

The rheobase values of the amputee participants ranged from 1.25 to 2.00 mA. The PW_{max} values of participants A2 and A3 ranged between 100 and 500 μ s, whereas for the other three participants, these values were, on average, higher, ranging between 400 and 700 μ s (see Figure S1(b) and Table S1 in Supplementary Materials).

All amputee participants reported, for some sites and a limited range of PWs, that the evoked sensation spread up to the tip of the stump of the amputated digit (Figure 7). However, sites that elicited such referred sensations in the whole range of tested PW values could only be identified for participants A1, A3, and A5 (Figure 8). Remarkably, when stimulating the sites targeting the missing digits, the referred sensation **never extended beyond the residuum** in any of the participants.

The relationship between the PW and the normalized subjective intensity proved positive (monotonically increasing) for all sites, as in non-amputee participants (Figure S2(b) in Supplementary Materials). However, these outcomes are highly variable due to the small sample size. Akin to the non-amputees, the statistical analysis of the normalized subjective intensity showed a significant difference among PW values ($F(6,166) = 49.6, p < 0.001$) and stimulation sites ($F(12,166) = 8.82, p < 0.001$). With regards to the elicited sensations, the occurrence of “tingling” was by far the most common ($75 \pm 20\%$) in amputee participants. Other frequently

1 Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits
2
3 evoked sensations were: “tickling” ($20 \pm 38\%$), “pricking” ($22 \pm 31\%$), “pressure” ($18 \pm 31\%$), and “vibration”
4
5 ($16 \pm 17\%$) (Figure 6(b)). These results are similar to those of the non-amputee group, except that “vibration”
6
7 occurred less frequently in amputees. A significant difference in the perceived sensations between amputees and
8
9 non-amputees could, however, not be shown. More generally, the statistical analysis did not highlight a
10
11 significant difference between amputees and non-amputees for any of the stimulation parameters. The
12
13 sensations for each amputee participant are detailed as follows.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits




Figure 7 Distribution of the perceived sensation locations for each electrode site for the amputee participants. Red circles denote the location of perceived stimulation on the stimulation area, green ellipses on the target digit, and blue ellipses on other digits. The range of PWs for each site is indicated by the numbers next to it (1-7 → 100-700 μ s). The rheobase and PW_{max} for each site is also shown.

Participant A1 (three amputations): the sensation was felt on the residual thumb for stimulation of sites A, B,

1 Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits

2
3 and G. In all cases, the sensation on the residual thumb coincided with a sensation on the stimulation site and on
4
5 other sites (for site B, it was referred to the residual index finger) (Figure 7). Only sites A and B consistently
6
7 elicited sensations on the residual thumb in a large range of PWs (100 – 700 μ s) (Figure 8). For sites B, C, and
8
9 O, the evoked sensation was felt on the residual index finger, but again, in all cases, the sensation was
10
11 accompanied by a sensation on the stimulation areas (Figure 7). Site C was the only one which provided a
12
13 consistent sensation on the residual index finger in a large range of PWs (100 – 700 μ s) (Figure 8). Sensations
14
15 on the residual middle finger were reported for stimulations of sites D, J, P, and Q, yet, only for J, the sensation
16
17 was restricted to the residual finger (PW range: 100 – 700 μ s) (Figures 7 and 8). The main sensation elicited was
18
19 “tingling” (all 13 stimulation sites), but also sensations of “pricking” (2) and “vibration” (2) were evoked.
20
21 Notably, sites P, E, K, and Q provided referred sensations on the (unimpaired) ring finger in large ranges of PWs
22
23 (Figures 7 and 8), similar to the non-amputee participants.
24
25

26
27 **Participant A2** (one amputation): only site C evoked sensations localized on the residual index finger
28
29 (Figure 7). The other sites elicited sensations limited to the stimulation areas. The prevalent elicited sensations
30
31 were “tickling” (7 sites out of 8), “pricking” (6), “tingling” (5), “pressure” (5), and “movement” (3).
32
33

34
35 **Participant A3** (two amputations) reported sensations on the residual index finger when sites B, C, H, I, O,
36
37 and P were stimulated. For these sites, the sensation was paired with sensations in at least one other site: for sites
38
39 B, H, and O the sensation occurred on other digits, and for sites C, H, I, and P it occurred on the stimulation sites
40
41 (Figure 7). However, only site I elicited a stable sensation on the residual index finger for a large range of PWs
42
43 (100 – 500 μ s) (Figure 8). For sites D, J, and O, the evoked sensation was perceived on the stump of the middle
44
45 finger. Again, in all three cases, the sensation on the residual middle finger was coupled with a sensation in other
46
47 sites: other digits in the case of sites J and O, and the stimulation areas in the case of sites D and J (Figure 7).
48
49 The elicited sensations were “tingling” (9 sites out of 11), “pressure” (3), “pricking” (2), “movement” (1), and
50
51 “vibration” (1). Sites E, K, and Q provided referred sensations on the (unimpaired) ring and little (E and K)
52
53 fingers (Figure 7).
54

55
56 **Participant A4** (one amputation) reported a sensation localized on the residual middle finger for site D. This
57
58 sensation was, however, concurrent with a sensation on the stimulation site and only occurred for one PW value
59
60

Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits

(600 μ s) (Figure 7). Overall, the elicited sensations were “tingling” (5 sites out of 9), “vibration” (4) and “tickling” (1). Sites E and O provided referred sensations to the (unimpaired) ring and index fingers.

Participant A5 (one amputation): only site L elicited sensations on the residual little finger and only for PW values higher than 400 μ s (Figure 7). The elicited sensation coincided with a sensation in the stimulation area and was described as “tingling” for all tested stimulation sites (6 sites). Notably, sites E, K, and Q provided consistent referred sensations on the (unimpaired) ring finger in a large range of PWs (100 – 700 μ s) (Figures 7 and 8), similar to our non-amputee participants.




Figure 8 Stimulation sites that elicited consistent referred sensations across PW in amputee participants. Each hand represents one participant. Each color indicates a different stimulated digit, double colored circles indicate referred sensation on two digits (sites P, Q for A1 and site B for A3), filled circles indicate a large range of PW that elicited referred sensations (100 to \geq 500 μ s). Empty circles denote sites, which elicited sensations in a lower range of PW (100 μ s to $<$ 500 μ s) or only for 100 μ s. Notably, none of the sites could elicit sensations that projected beyond the amputation stump.

4 Discussion

In this work, we sought to investigate the possibility of eliciting referred sensations in the digits by electrically stimulating afferent nerve fibers through surface electrodes on the palm. While we could clearly demonstrate referred sensations in non-amputee participants, we were unable to demonstrate similar effects on the amputated digits of individuals with partial hand amputation. The reported sensations never extended beyond the tip of the stump. Hence, this work suggests that ES on the palm cannot elicit sensation referred to the missing digits in partial hand amputees.

Building on previous findings (Anani *et al* 1977, Kaczmarek *et al* 1991, Geng *et al* 2012, D'Alonzo *et al* 2014), this work demonstrated, for the first time, referred sensations from multiple sites on the palm in non-

1 Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits
2
3 amputee participants. Stimulation sites closer to the long fingers more easily evoked (referred) sensations
4
5 restricted to the target fingers, while stimulating intermediate and proximal sites usually elicited sensations also
6
7 on the palmar areas. However, proximal sites evoked sensations on the fingers more often than intermediate ones
8
9 (Figure 3). These outcomes seem explained by the anatomy of the hand and its variability across participants.
10
11 The nerves that innervate the fingers branch off just proximal to the metacarpophalangeal joints, and
12
13 accordingly, the most distal sites have a higher chance of stimulating each finger individually. Likewise, higher
14
15 PWs increase the current density and thus the spread of the current (Forrester and Petrofsky 2004), which in turn
16
17 increases the probability of sensations on more than one location. Furthermore, as the intermediate sites were
18
19 localized above the ligaments of the metacarpophalangeal joints, and thus on a tissue layer thicker than that
20
21 under the proximal sites, the injected current less likely reached the nerves beneath. While stimulation of the
22
23 targeted fingers is an important goal, activating broader sensation sites through higher PWs, as shown in ~30%
24
25 of our trials, can also be useful (viz. in the prospect of prosthesis feedback). Similar correlations between PW
26
27 and the number of stimulated nerve fascicles have also been reported in previous studies with implanted
28
29 electrodes (Ortiz-Catalan *et al* 2014, Graczyk *et al* 2016).
30
31
32

33
34 Studies with invasive nerve stimulation also report monotonically increasing subjective intensity ratings with
35
36 increasing PW (Tan *et al* 2014, Graczyk *et al* 2016). However, due to the different stimulation methods, we
37
38 tested a much larger range of PWs (100 to 700 μs vs. 80/100-170/180 μs) with much larger step size (100 μs vs.
39
40 14-20 μs). Consequently, while agreeing with the trend reported in these papers, a direct comparison to the
41
42 results of intraneural stimulation experiments should be very carefully assessed.
43

44
45 Stimulating the thumb, in contrast, proved difficult, as contractions of the thenar muscles frequently thwarted
46
47 the analysis of referred sensations, even at low PWs. The reason why site H fared best at eliciting referred
48
49 sensations restricted to the thumb is probably anatomical, viz. that site H was located directly over the nerve
50
51 branches innervating the thumb. Site M, however, was the furthest away from the nerve branches and
52
53 consequently almost never elicited sensations in the thumb.
54

55
56 The referred sensations elicited in non-amputee participants, unexpectedly, could not be replicated in the
57
58 missing digits of partial hand amputees, as the sensations never projected beyond the tip of the stump. In the
59
60

1 Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits
2
3 unimpaired digits, however, referred sensations could be elicited, just as in the non-amputee group. This
4
5 outcome is surprising because it diverges, to the best of our knowledge, from all studies conducted so far on this
6
7 topic.
8

9
10 In their studies, albeit methodologically different from ours, Chai *et al.* and Liu *et al.* demonstrated sensations
11 referred to the fingers in amputees (Chai *et al* 2013, 2015, Liu *et al* 2015). However, in their works, the ES was
12 provided to the forearm of transradial amputees, hence both stimulation site and level of amputation were
13 different compared to our study. Chai *et al* (2015), and Mulvey *et al* (2013), stimulated the phantom map
14 directly, which make their studies even less comparable with ours. In fact, none of our participants presented
15 phantom maps, so we could not assess them. Our results also contrast previous findings where transradial
16 amputees were stimulated using peripheral nerve electrodes, and specific tactile sensations (e.g., “touch” and
17 “pressure”) could be evoked in the fingertips (Ortiz-Catalan *et al* 2014, Raspopovic *et al* 2014, Tan *et al* 2014,
18 Davis *et al* 2016). These results suggest that all central nervous connections, the “core topography”, for
19 interpreting sensations from the fingers of the amputated hand remain intact (Makin and Bensmaia 2017). This is
20 further supported by the finding that phantom sensations of the missing limb could be (re-)elicited even decades
21 after amputation (Ramachandran and Hirstein 1998). Our study, carried out with substantially differing methods
22 (direct neural vs. surface stimulation, transradial vs. digit amputation) indicate that these findings may not be
23 transferred to partial hand amputees when using surface ES.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 It is difficult to compare digit and hand amputation, as the difference in scale and impact on the individual is
41 very large: cortical reorganization and peripheral nerve re-growth are substantially different in the two cases
42 (e.g., Florence and Kaas 1995, Manger *et al* 1996, Oelschläger *et al* 2014). Regarding this physiological aspect,
43 Merzenich *et al* (1984) demonstrated cortical reorganization after digit amputation in adult owl monkeys. They
44 found that if a finger stump remains, its representation can expand to the size of the intact digit. It should be
45 mentioned, though, that the residual nerves of the amputated digit were tied with sutures to prevent regeneration,
46 whereas in digital amputations in humans, the nerve is allowed to regenerate proximal to the amputation (after
47 traction neurectomy) (World Health Organization 2003, Brunicardi *et al* 2014, Ovadia and Askari 2015).
48 Although suturing the nerves presumably alters the cortical representation of the stump due to prevention of re-
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits
2
3 growth of the damaged peripheral nerves (Inbal *et al* 1987, Braune and Schady 1993, Manger *et al* 1996,
4
5 Björkman *et al* 2012), the expansion of the representation of the stump in the cortex was indeed later confirmed.
6
7 Manger, Woods and Jones (1996) showed that in macaque monkeys the cortical receptive fields of digit stumps
8
9 approached in size those normally seen at an intact fingertip, and additionally reported that the innervation of the
10
11 skin in the stump was only slightly lower than that of an intact distal phalanx (the peripheral nerves had not been
12
13 sutured). Also, the ramification of the nerves at the tip of the stump resembled in form that of the adjacent intact
14
15 fingertips. Hence, these findings suggest that the stump partially acquires the role of the missing fingertip
16
17 physiologically. In their recent opinion paper, Makin and Bensmaia (2017) argued that cortical reorganization
18
19 does not necessarily correlate with novel functional representation, and that cortical plasticity in the adult brain
20
21 is not strong enough to result in functional changes after extreme deafferentiation, such as hand amputation. Our
22
23 hypothesis does not oppose this interpretation and rather argues that the loss of a (part of a) digit may in fact be
24
25 small enough to bring about functional changes. Cortical plasticity would not have to connect entirely diverse
26
27 regions (such as face and hand) but rather enable a small shift of functional representation from the fingertip to
28
29 the tip of the stump.
30
31

32
33 The cognitive aspect of digit amputation is consistent with this hypothesis. Behavioral studies by
34
35 Ramachandran and colleagues showed that the individual's (innate) body image is transitory and profoundly
36
37 malleable by different stimuli (Ramachandran and Hirstein 1998, Ramachandran and Rogers-Ramachandran
38
39 2000, McGeoch and Ramachandran 2012). Accordingly, a small amputation, such as that of a part of a finger,
40
41 may be much easier to reconcile with one's body image than the loss of a hand. The occurrence of phantom
42
43 sensation after digit amputation may be an indicator for this hypothesis but, regrettably, limited and conflicting
44
45 information is available on the matter. Chu (2000) reported that the majority of finger amputees involved in his
46
47 study (~60%) experienced (occasional) phantom sensations, with larger prevalence in those with proximal
48
49 amputations compared to distal amputations (~70% vs. ~50%). Notably, phantom sensations were generally
50
51 present in subjects with recent amputations (on average ~7 months) and generally absent in those with older
52
53 amputations (~4 years). Similar correlations were reported by others (Henderson and Smyth 1948, Schley *et al*
54
55 2008); nonetheless, there is no consensus on this topic. In fact, Karle and colleagues (2002) reported lower
56
57
58
59
60

1 Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits
2
3 prevalence of phantom pain in digit amputees (19%) compared to individuals with more proximal amputations
4
5 (50-80%, Oelschläger *et al* 2014) – a finding later confirmed by Lotze (2016). If pain is correlated with
6
7 sensation, as hypothesized by several investigators (Kooijman *et al* 2000, Makin *et al* 2013), the prevalence of
8
9 digit amputees with sensations would be much lower in the study by Karle and colleagues (2002) than that
10
11 reported by Chu (2000). None of the participants in our study had frequent or vivid phantom sensations; whether
12
13 this had to do with time since amputation is unknown. Hence, our results remain to be validated in digit
14
15 amputees with phantom sensations; if a stable phantom does exist, it might be possible to evoke a referred
16
17 sensation on it. In short, the inconclusive account shows clearly that there is need to investigate phantom
18
19 phenomena (pain and sensations) in digit amputees on a larger scale.
20
21

22
23 Additionally, the literature on the differing impact of hand and digit amputation on the central nervous system
24
25 is scarce, sometimes contradictory, and its results are often based on experiments with non-human primates and
26
27 may thus not be applicable to humans (e.g., Rasmusson 1988, Calford and Tweedale 1991, Florence and Kaas
28
29 1995, Florence *et al* 1998, Weiss *et al* 2000, Kambi *et al* 2014, Li *et al* 2014). All that seems to be known so far
30
31 is that digit amputation leads to significantly smaller deafferented areas in S1 compared to amputations of the
32
33 whole hand (Oelschläger *et al* 2014). Besides this, there are no brain imaging studies comparing human partial
34
35 hand and transradial amputees that would shed light on the exact differences in cortical representation of the
36
37 stumps. If indeed a peripheral and/or central difference between digit and hand amputees is responsible for our
38
39 divergent findings, it would be interesting to determine the exact borders of the two phenomena, i.e., at which
40
41 level of stimulation/amputation of the limb (e.g., digit vs. transcarpal vs. wrist disarticulation) the sensation can
42
43 be referred to the phantom digits. It would further be valuable to see whether direct stimulation of the nerves can
44
45 refer sensation to the phantom fingers in digit amputees, e.g., through microstimulation experiments.
46
47

48
49 As regards the employed current limits, the rheobase values proved consistent with the previous work of Forst
50
51 *et al* (2015). Lower threshold values were obtained for locations closer to the reference electrode compared to
52
53 those further away, as previously reported (Forrester and Petrofsky 2004). Unlike Chai and colleagues (Chai *et*
54
55 *al* 2013, 2015) we did not find a statistically different stimulation threshold between amputees and non-
56
57 amputees. However, this difference may again be attributed to a different methodological approach: we
58
59
60

1 Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits
2
3 stimulated sites on healthy skin, while Chai and colleagues stimulated sites on the stump. It is known that stump
4
5 skins may have atypical innervation and atypical amounts or distribution of soft tissue due to the trauma, the
6
7 surgery, and/or as the result of stump coning, which likely affected the stimulation thresholds.
8

9
10 In accordance with other publications, the provoked sensations were most frequently described as “tingling”
11
12 or “vibration” by our participants (Vallbo *et al* 1984, Geng *et al* 2012, Tan *et al* 2014, 2015, Forst *et al* 2015,
13
14 Graczyk *et al* 2016). Furthermore, thermoreception (“warmth” and “cold”) may occur so rarely because A δ and
15
16 C fibers (pain, thermoreception) are smaller and have a higher stimulation threshold compared to A α and A β
17
18 fibers (proprioception and tactile perception) (Micera and Navarro 2009) and might, thus, be less likely to
19
20 become sufficiently activated.
21

22
23 As mentioned above, our group of amputees was not homogenous in terms of the level of amputation, the time
24
25 since amputation, and the amputation etiology (Table 1). The number of amputees was also lower than the non-
26
27 amputee control group since it was difficult to find individuals with this level of amputation that were willing to
28
29 participate in our experiments. Furthermore, hydration of the participants was not controlled and could have
30
31 affected skin conductance, though we believe this would not affect our results significantly, as the stimulation
32
33 thresholds were determined for each stimulation site individually. Also, pre-gelled electrodes are usually less
34
35 affected by this issue than dry electrodes.
36

37
38 To conclude, our results suggest that it may not be possible to elicit sensations referred to the missing
39
40 phalanges of partial hand amputees through ES. Hence, we invite studies in which the sample size is increased to
41
42 verify our findings and which include partial-hand amputees with strong phantom sensations. As mentioned
43
44 above, further experiments with transmetacarpal and wrist disarticulated amputees will shed light on the exact
45
46 level at which the sensations may stop being referred to the amputated digit. Based on our findings, we invite
47
48 researchers working in the area of partial hand prostheses to explore and focus on alternative sensory feedback
49
50 approaches. Nonetheless, we could clearly demonstrate that it is possible to evoke sensations in the fingertips of
51
52 non-amputees by stimulating the palm of the hand. If this effect can be shown to be stable even during hand and
53
54 arm movements, it could be used for haptic systems (in virtual or augmented reality, teleoperation, or
55
56 rehabilitation), to provide sensation on the digits without obstructing the contact area of the fingertips or limiting
57
58
59
60

1 Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits
2
3 their movement.
4
5
6
7

8 Acknowledgments

9
10 This work is supported by INAIL (the Italian national workers' compensation) under the PPR3 project. The
11 authors would like to thank all who participated in the experiments. The authors declare no competing interests.
12
13
14

15 References

- 16
17
18 Anani A B, Ikeda K and Körner L M 1977 Human ability to discriminate various parameters in afferent
19 electrical nerve stimulation with particular reference to prostheses sensory feedback *Med. Biol. Eng*
20 *Compu.* **15**363–73
21
22 Antfolk C, D'Alonzo M, Controzzi M, Lundborg G, Rosen B, Sebelius F and Cipriani C 2013a Artificial
23 redirection of sensation from prosthetic fingers to the phantom hand map on transradial amputees:
24 Vibrotactile versus mechanotactile sensory feedback *IEEE Trans. Neural Syst. Rehabil. Eng.* **21** 112–20
25
26 Antfolk C, D'Alonzo M, Rosén B, Lundborg G, Sebelius F and Cipriani C 2013b Sensory feedback in upper
27 limb prosthetics. *Expert Rev. Med. Devices* **10** 45–54
28
29 Björkman A, Weibull A, Olsrud J, Henrik Ehrsson H, Rosén B and Björkman-Burtscher I M 2012 Phantom digit
30 somatotopy: A functional magnetic resonance imaging study in forearm amputees *Eur. J. Neurosci.* **36**
31 2098–106
32
33 Braune S and Schady W 1993 Changes in sensation after nerve injury or amputation: the role of central factors *J.*
34 *Neurol. Neurosurg Psychiatry* **56**393–9
35
36 Brunicaudi F, Andersen D, Billiar T, Dunn D, Hunter J G, Matthews J and Pollock R E 2014 *Schwartz's*
37 *Principles of Surgery* (McGraw Hill Professional)
38
39 Calford M B and Tweedale R 1991 Immediate expansion of receptive fields of neurons in area 3b of macaque
40 monkeys after digit denervation. *Somatosens. Mot. Res.* **8**249–60
41
42 Chai G H, Li S, Sui X H, Mei Z, He L W, Zhong C L, Wang J W, Zhang D G, Zhu X Y and Lan N 2013
43 Phantom finger perception evoked with transcutaneous electrical stimulation for sensory feedback of
44 prosthetic hand *Int. IEEE/EMBS Conf. Neural Eng NER*271–4
45
46 Chai G, Sui X, Li S, He L and Lan N 2015 Characterization of evoked tactile sensation in forearm amputees
47 with transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation *J. Neural Eng* **12**
48
49 Chai G, Zhang D and Zhu X 2017 Developing Non-somatotopic Phantom Finger Sensation to Comparable
50 Levels of Somatotopic Sensation through User Training with Electrotactile Stimulation *IEEE Trans.*
51 *Neural Syst. Rehabil. Eng.* **25**469–80
52
53 Chu N S 2000 Phantom finger phenomena and the effects of toe-to-finger transplantation. *Neurorehabil. Neural*
54 *Repair* **14**277–85
55
56 Cipriani C, Zaccone F, Micera S and Carrozza M C 2008 On the Shared Control of an EMG-Controlled
57 Prosthetic Hand: Analysis of User-Prosthesis Interaction *IEEE Trans. Robot.* **24**170–84
58
59
60

1 Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits

2
3 D'Alonzo M, Dosen S, Cipriani C and Farina D 2014 HyVE: Hybrid vibro-electrotactile stimulation for sensory
4 feedback and substitution in rehabilitation *IEEE Trans. Neural Syst. Rehabil. Eng.* **22**290–301

5
6 Davis T S, Wark H A C, Hutchinson D T, Warren D J, O'Neill K, Scheinblum T, Clark G A, Normann R A and
7 Greger B 2016 Restoring motor control and sensory feedback in people with upper extremity amputations
8 using arrays of 96 microelectrodes implanted in the median and ulnar nerves *J. Neural Eng.* **13**36001

9
10 Dosen S, Schaeffer M-C and Farina D 2014 Time-division multiplexing for myoelectric closed-loop control
11 using electrotactile feedback. *J. Neuroeng Rehabil.* **11**

12
13 Edin B B and Johansson N 1995 Skin strain patterns provide kinaesthetic information to the human central
14 nervous system. *J. Physiol.* **487**,1 243–51

15
16 Edin B B, Westling G and Johansson R S 1992 Independent control of human finger-tip forces at individual
17 digits during precision lifting. *J. Physiol.* **450** 547–64

18
19 Florence S L and Kaas J H 1995 Large-scale reorganization at multiple levels of the somatosensory pathway
20 follows therapeutic amputation of the hand in monkeys. *J. Neurosci.* **15**8083–95

21
22 Florence S L, Taub H B and Kaas J H 1998 Large-Scale Sprouting of Cortical Connections After Peripheral
23 Injury in Adult Macaque Monkeys *Science (80-)*. **282**1117–21

24
25 Forrester B J and Petrofsky J S 2004 Effect of electrode size, shape, and placement during electrical stimulation
26 *J. Appl. Res.* **4**346–54

27
28 Forst J C, Blok D C, Slopsema J P, Boss J M, Heyboer L A, Tobias C M and Polasek K H 2015 Surface
29 electrical stimulation to evoke referred sensation. *J. Rehabil. Res. Dev.* **52**397–406

30
31 Geng B, Yoshida K, Petrini L and Jensen W 2012 Evaluation of sensation evoked by electrocutaneous
32 stimulation on forearm in nondisabled subjects *J. Rehabil. Res. Dev.* **49**297–308

33
34 Germany E I, Pino E J, Member S and Aqueveque P E 2016 Myoelectric Intuitive Control and Transcutaneous
35 Electrical Stimulation of the Forearm for Vibrotactile Sensation Feedback Applied to a {3D} Printed
36 Prosthetic Hand *38th Int. Conf. IEEE Eng Med. Biol. Soc.* 5046–50

37
38 Graczyk E L, Schiefer M A, Saal H P, Delaye B P, Bensmaia S J and Tyler D J 2016 The neural basis of
39 perceived intensity in natural and artificial touch *Sci. Transl. Med.* **14**21–11

40
41 Henderson W R and Smyth G E 1948 Phantom limbs. *J. Neurol. Neurosurg Psychiatry* **11** 88–112

42
43 Imbinto I, Peccia C, Controzzi M, Cutti A and Cipriani C 2016 Treatment of the Partial Hand Amputation: An
44 Engineering Perspective *IEEE Rev. Biomed. Eng.* **3333**

45
46 Inbal R, Rousso M, Ashur H, Wall P D and Devor M 1987 Collateral sprouting in skin and sensory recovery
47 after nerve injury in man *Pain* **28**141–54

48
49 Johansson R S and Flanagan J R 2009 Coding and use of tactile signals from the fingertips in object
50 manipulation tasks. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **10** 345–59

51
52 Kaczmarek K A, Webster J G, Bach-y-Rita P and Tompkins W J 1991 Electrotactile and vibrotactile displays for
53 sensory substitution systems *IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng.* **38**1–16

54
55 Kambi N, Halder P, Rajan R, Arora V, Chand P, Arora M and Jain N 2014 Large-scale reorganization of the
56 somatosensory cortex following spinal cord injuries is due to brainstem plasticity. *Nat. Commun.* **5**

57
58 Karle B, Wittemann M and Germann G 2002 Funktion und Patientenzufriedenheit nach Strahlamputation versus
59 subkapitaler Grundgliedamputation des Zeigefingers *Handchirurgie Mikrochirurgie Plast. Chir.* **34**30–5

60
Kooijman C M, Dijkstra P U, Geertzen J H B, Elzinga A and Van Der Schans C P 2000 Phantom pain and

- Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits
- phantom sensations in upper limb amputees: An epidemiological study *Pain* **87**33–41
- Li C X, Chappell T D, Ramshur J T and Waters R S 2014 Forelimb amputation-induced reorganization in the ventral posterior lateral nucleus (VPL) provides a substrate for large-scale cortical reorganization in rat forepaw barrel subfield (FBS) *Brain Res.* **1583**89–108
- Liu X X, Chai G H, Qu H E and Lan N 2015 A sensory feedback system for prosthetic hand based on evoked tactile sensation *Proc. Annu. Int. Conf. IEEE Eng. Med. Biol. Soc. EMBS* 2493–6
- Lotze M 2016 Maladaptive Plastizität bei chronischen und neuropathischen Schmerzen *Schmerz* **30** 127–33
- Makin T R and Bensmaia S J 2017 Stability of Sensory Topographies in Adult Cortex *Trends Cogn. Sci.* **21** 195–204
- Makin T R, Scholz J, Filippini N, Henderson Slater D, Tracey I and Johansen-Berg H 2013 Phantom pain is associated with preserved structure and function in the former hand area *Nat. Commun.* **4**1570
- Manger P R, Woods T M and Jones E G 1996 Plasticity of the Somatosensory Cortical Map in Macaque Monkeys after Chronic Partial Amputation of a Digit *Proc. R. Soc. BBiol. Sc.* **263**933–9
- McGeoch P D and Ramachandran V S 2012 The appearance of new phantom fingers post- amputation in a phocomelus *NeuroCase Neural Basis Cogn.* **18**95–7
- Merzenich M M, Nelson R J, Stryker M P, Cynader M S, Schoppmann A and Zook J M 1984 Somatosensory Cortical Map Changes Following Digit Amputation in Adult Monkeys *J. Comp. Neurol.* **224**591–605
- Micera S and Navarro X 2009 Bidirectional Interfaces with the Peripheral Nervous System *Int. Rev. Neurobiol.* **86**23–38
- Mulvey M R, Fawcner H J, Radford H E and Johnson M I 2012 Perceptual embodiment of prosthetic limbs by transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation *Neurostimulation* **15**42–7
- Mulvey M R, Radford H E, Fawcner H J, Hirst L, Neumann V and Johnson M I 2013 Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation for Phantom Pain and Stump Pain in Adult Amputees *Pain Pract.* **13**289–96
- Oelschläger M, Pfannmöller J, Langner I and Lotze M 2014 Usage of the middle finger shapes reorganization of the primary somatosensory cortex in patients with index finger amputation *Restor. Neurol. Neurosci.* **32** 507–15
- Ortiz-Catalan M, Hakansson B and Branemark R 2014 An osseointegrated human-machine gateway for long-term sensory feedback and motor control of artificial limbs *Sci. Transl. Med.* **6**
- Ovadia S A and Askari M 2015 Upper extremity amputations and prosthetics *Semin. Plast. Surg* **29**55–61
- Ramachandran V S and Hirstein W 1998 The perception of phantom limbs. The D. O. Hebb lecture *Brain* **121** 1603–30
- Ramachandran V S and Rogers-Ramachandran D 2000 Phantom limbs and neural plasticity *Arch. Neurol.* **57** 317–20
- Rasmusson D D 1988 Projections of digit afferents to the cuneate nucleus in the raccoon before and after partial deafferentation *J Comp Neurol* **277** 549–56
- Raspopovic S, Capogrosso M, Petrini F M, Bonizzato M, Rigosa J, Di Pino G, Carpaneto J, Controzzi M, Boretius T, Fernandez E, Granata G, Oddo C M, Citi L, Ciancio A L, Cipriani C, Carrozza M C, Jensen W, Guglielmelli E, Stieglitz T, Rossini P M and Micera S 2014 Restoring Natural Sensory Feedback in Real-Time Bidirectional Hand Prostheses *Sci. Transl. Med.* **6**22ra19
- Saunders F A 1977 Recommended procedures for electrocutaneous displays *Functional Electrical Simulation:*

Electro-cutaneous stimulation on the palm elicits referred sensations on intact but not on amputated digits

Applications in Neural Prosthesis ed F T Hambrecht and J B Reswick (Marcel Dekker) pp 303–9

Schley M T, Wilms P, Toepfner S, Schaller H-P, Schmelz M, Konrad C J and Birbaumer N 2008 Painful and Nonpainful Phantom and Stump Sensations in Acute Traumatic Amputees *J. Trauma Inj. Infect. Crit. Care* **65**858–64

Solomonow M, Raplee L and Lyman J 1978 Electrotactile two point discrimination as a function of frequency, pulse width and pulse time delay *Ann. Biomed. Eng.* **6**117–25

Štrbac M, Belić M, Isaković M, Kojić V, Bijelić G, Popović I, Radotić M, Došen S, Marković M, Farina D and Keller T 2016 Integrated and flexible multichannel interface for electrotactile stimulation *J. Neural Eng.* **13**

Tan D, Schiefer M, Keith M W, Anderson R and Tyler D J 2015 Stability and selectivity of a chronic, multi-contact cuff electrode for sensory stimulation in human amputees *J. Neural Eng.* **12**

Tan D W, Schiefer M A, Keith M W, Anderson J R, Tyler J and Tyler D J 2014 A neural interface provides long-term stable natural touch perception *Sci. Transl. Med.* **6**

Uellendahl J E and Uellendahl E N 2012 Experience Fitting Partial Hand Protheses with Externally Powered Fingers *Gasping Four. Adv. Powered Up. Limb Prosthetics* 15–27

Vallbo Å B, Olsson K Å, Westberg K G and Clark F J 1984 Microstimulation of single tactile afferents from the human hand *Brain* **107**727–49

Wang T, Li S, Chai G and Lan N 2013 Perceptual attributes of cutaneous electrical stimulation to provide sensory information for prosthetic limb *2013 IEEE 3rd Int. Conf. Inf. Sci. Technol. ICISr 2013* 22–5

Weiss T, Miltner W H R, Huonker R, Friedel R, Schmidt I and Taub E 2000 Rapid functional plasticity of the somatosensory cortex after finger amputation *Exp. Brain Res.* **134**199–203

Word Health Organization 2003 Surgical Care at the District Hospital

Xu H, Zhang D, Huegel J C, Xu W and Zhu X 2016 Effects of Different Tactile Feedback on Myoelectric Closed-Loop Control for Grasping Based on Electrotactile Stimulation *IEEE Trans. Neural Syst. Rehabil. Eng.* **24**827–36

Zhang D, Xu H, Shull P B, Liu J and Zhu X 2015 Somatotopical feedback versus non-somatotopical feedback for phantom digit sensation on amputees using electrotactile stimulation. *J. Neuroeng Rehabil.* **12**44

Accepted Manuscript