

Active upper limb prostheses: A review on current state and upcoming breakthroughs

Original

Active upper limb prostheses: A review on current state and upcoming breakthroughs / Marinelli, A., Boccardo, N., Tessari, F., DI DOMENICO, D., Caserta, G., Canepa, M., Gini, G., Barresi, G., Laffranchi, M., De Michieli, L., Semprini, M.. - In: PROGRESS IN BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING. - ISSN 2516-1091. - ELETTRONICO. - 5:1(2023), pp. 1-33. [10.1088/2516-1091/acac57]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11583/2974121 since: 2023-01-18T09:25:55Z

Publisher:

IOP Publishing Ltd

Published

DOI:10.1088/2516-1091/acac57

Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

IOP postprint/Author's Accepted Manuscript

"This is the accepted manuscript version of an article accepted for publication in PROGRESS IN BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING. IOP Publishing Ltd is not responsible for any errors or omissions in this version of the manuscript or any version derived from it. The Version of Record is available online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/2516-1091/acac57>

(Article begins on next page)

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Active upper limb prostheses: A review on current state and upcoming breakthroughs

To cite this article before publication: Andrea Marinelli *et al* 2022 *Prog. Biomed. Eng.* in press <https://doi.org/10.1088/2516-1091/acac57>

Manuscript version: Accepted Manuscript

Accepted Manuscript is “the version of the article accepted for publication including all changes made as a result of the peer review process, and which may also include the addition to the article by IOP Publishing of a header, an article ID, a cover sheet and/or an ‘Accepted Manuscript’ watermark, but excluding any other editing, typesetting or other changes made by IOP Publishing and/or its licensors”

This Accepted Manuscript is © 2022 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 use copy and redistribute this article for non-commercial purposes only, provided that they adhere to all the terms of the licence <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/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 permissions 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.

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

Active Upper Limb Prostheses: A Review on Current State and Upcoming Breakthroughs

Andrea Marinelli^{1,2#}, Nicolò Boccardo^{1,5#}, Federico Tessari¹, Dario Di Domenico^{1,3}, Giulia Caserta¹, Michele Canepa^{1,5}, Giuseppina Gini⁴, Giacinto Barresi¹, Matteo Laffranchi¹, Lorenzo De Michieli¹⁵, Marianna Semprini¹⁵

¹RehabTechnology Lab, Italian Institute of Technology, Via Morego, 30, 16163 Genova GE, Italy

²Bioengineering Lab, University of Genova, DIBRIS, Genova, Italy

³Department of Electronics and Telecommunications, Politecnico di Torino, Turin 10124, Italy

⁴Department of Electronics, Computer Science and Bio-engineering, Politecnico di Milano, Piazza L. da Vinci, 31, I-20133 Milano MI, Italy

⁵The Open University Affiliated Research Centre at Istituto Italiano di Tecnologia (ARC@IIT), via Morego 30, 16163 Genova (Italy)

#Equal contribution

§Equal contribution

E-mail: andrea.marinelli@iit.it

Received xxxxxx

Accepted for publication xxxxxx

Published xxxxxx

Abstract

The journey of a prosthetic user is characterized by the opportunities and the limitations of a device that should enable activities of daily living (ADL). In particular, experiencing a bionic hand as a functional (and, advantageously, embodied) limb constitutes the premise for promoting the practice in using the device, mitigating the risk of its abandonment. In order to achieve such a result, different aspects need to be considered for making the artificial limb an effective solution to accomplish activities of daily living. According to such a perspective, this review aims at presenting the current issues and at envisioning the upcoming breakthroughs in upper limb prosthetic devices. We first define the sources of input and feedback involved in the system control (at user-level and device-level), alongside the related algorithms used in signal analysis. Moreover, the paper focuses on the user-centered design challenges and strategies that guide the implementation of novel solutions in this area in terms of technology acceptance, embodiment, and, in general, human-machine integration based on co-adaptive processes. We here provide the readers (belonging to the target communities of researchers, designers, developers, clinicians, industrial stakeholders, and end-users) with an overview of the state-of-the-art and the potential innovations in bionic hands features, hopefully promoting interdisciplinary efforts for solving current issues of ULPs. The integration of different perspectives should be the premise to a transdisciplinary intertwining leading to a truly holistic comprehension and improvement of the bionic hands design. Overall, this paper aims to move the boundaries in prosthetic innovation beyond the development of a tool and towards the engineering of human-centered artificial limbs.

Keywords: bionics, biosignals, closed-loop, embodiment, feedback, prosthetic hand, user experience




Figure 1. Graphical representation of a ULP system and its elements. The user level (left panel) includes: input data sent from subject to the prosthesis (Input Signals), artificial sensory feedback information delivered from the prosthesis to the user (Sensory Feedback), and external sources of interaction (External Factors), such as actuation coming from the unimpaired limb or environmental/accidental sources of feedback such as vision and sound. The device-level (right panel) includes the control commands used to drive the prosthesis and the feedback information collected by the end-effector. The user-device interface is characterized by a bidirectional exchange of information (overlap of the two panels).

1. Introduction

Over the past twenty years, poly-articulated upper limb prostheses (ULPs) have undertaken several technological and scientific developments to satisfy the different needs of the upper limb amputee community. Nonetheless, in a recent study, Salminger et al. (2020) observed overall abandonment rates of ULPs of about 44% in a population of mainly (92%) myoelectric prostheses users. They also highlighted how the past decade of developments still presents technological limiting factors that did not permit the restoration of the full functionalities of a missing limb, hence leading to a substantial increased rate of prosthesis abandonment. The main cause of such ineffectiveness mainly resides in a non-sufficiently patient-tailored design process (Salminger et al., 2020).

According to the American Orthotic & Prosthetic Association (AOPA, 2016), partial amputations, i.e. finger amputations, represent the majority of upper-limb losses (75.6%), while trans-radial and trans-humeral amputations constitute a percentage oscillating between 5 and 6%. Despite this, the level of impairment caused by trans-radial and trans-humeral amputations is greater than for partial amputations.

Without tracing back all the evolution of upper limb prostheses – the reader might find useful the reviews of Trent et al. (2019) and Ribeiro et al. (2019)). Trent et al. (2019) work focuses on a classification of the upper-limb prostheses architectures based on the type of adopted actuation, e.g., passive, body-powered or active. On the other hand, Ribeiro et al. (2019)'s research investigates the

most relevant control signals used for the man-machine interface.

This work focuses on trans-radial and trans-humeral devices, excluding partial amputations, and it details the latest and most technologically advanced solutions, namely poly-articulated myoelectric prostheses. Moreover, this review aims at presenting and analyzing the key elements of state-of-the-art upper limb prostheses in a user-centered and human-in-the-loop fashion and to provide guidelines for the development of such prostheses and the relative control algorithms, to possibly achieve solutions capable of promoting the systems use and overcoming the elevated abandonment rates observed so far. Overall, the reader could take advantage of this review as an analytical collection of solutions constituting a premise to provide the user with a seamless control experience.

2. Upper limb Prosthetics classification: a twofold perspective

An ULP system can be observed from two main points of views: its mechatronics, namely the combination of the mechanical and electronic components necessary for its operation, and the control strategies and algorithms implemented to orchestrate its functions. Research groups have therefore attempted to solve the prostheses abandonment problem by addressing different technological and scientific challenges, either focusing on mechatronic design, or on control strategies aimed at increasing the human-machine interaction and, in some cases, introducing feedback sources, as detailed in the next sections.




Figure 2. Graphical representation of information flow of a possible ULP architecture. Input flow (top panel): from user (input signals i.e., from EMG sensors) to prosthesis (control commands i.e., through power train). Feedback flow (bottom panel): from prosthesis (end-effector feedback i.e., from tactile force sensors) to user (sensory feedback i.e., through vibrotactile motors).

18105 ULP control can be divided into two synergistically 143
 19106 interacting sub-systems: the user-level and the device- 144
 20107 level, as depicted in Figure 1. The user-level includes the 145
 21108 patients and the most proximal device component 146
 22109 interacting with the user (i.e., the socket), while the device- 147
 23110 level extends from the socket to the ULP device. These two 148
 24111 sub-systems overlap at the socket level, which is involved 149
 25112 in a bidirectional flow of information. On one hand, it 150
 26113 receives inputs from the user (i.e. movement intentions) 151
 27114 and translates them into movement commands for the device; 152
 28115 on the other hand, it receives information (both 153
 29116 from the device and the environment) and communicates it 154
 30117 to the user through sensory feedback (Figure 1). 155
 31118 Importantly, the socket itself severely limits the user 156
 32119 comfort, and together with the prosthetic weight highly 157
 33120 contributes to the prosthetic abandonment. 158

35121 Even if the state-of-the-art in prosthetic research 159
 36122 encompasses studies based on psychological processes too, 160
 37123 commercial ULP systems have focused on restoring 161
 38124 functional capabilities by capitalizing on the device-level 162
 39125 only, therefore on mechatronic, and several solutions can 163
 40126 be found on the market for trans-radial level of 164
 41127 amputations. Commercially available systems merge basic 165
 42128 functionalities and aesthetic requirements, targeting the 166
 43129 clinical needs given by a certain kind of amputation, rather 167
 44130 than focusing on each patient's specific needs. 168

45131 Commercial solutions range from tri-digital hands, e.g., 169
 46132 **VaryPlus Speed**, **SensorHand Speed** by Ottobock 170
 47133 (Ottobock, 2020c) and **Motion Control (MC) Hand** by 171
 48134 Fillauer (Fillauer, 2021); through polyarticulated hand 172
 49135 under-actuated, e.g., **Michelangelo** by Ottobock 173
 50136 (Ottobock, 2020b); to fully actuated polyarticulated hand, 174
 51137 e.g., **BeBionic** by Ottobock (Ottobock, 2020a), **i-Limb** by 175
 52138 Ossur (Ossur, 2020b), **Vincent Hand** by Vincent Systems 176
 53139 (Systems, 2020), **TASKA** hand by Taska Prosthetics 177
 54140 (Taska, 2022), **BrainRobotics** Hand by BrainRobotics 178
 55141 (**BrainRobotics**, 2022) and **Ability Hand** by Psyonic 179
 56142 (Psyonic, 2022). 180

143 In the last decades, many research groups have focused 144
 145 on the mechatronic development of ULP devices, 146
 147 entrusting the intelligence of the device to the embedded 148
 149 mechanics in a very thorough design, structuring the 149
 150 development of the concept of under-actuation, such as the 151
 152 **Vanderbilt Multigrasp Hand** (Bennett et al., 2014), the 153
 154 **MIA Hand** (Controzzi et al., 2016), the **SoftHand Pro** 155
 156 (Godfrey et al., 2018), the **KIT Hand** (Weiner et al., 2018), 157
 158 and the **Hannes Hand** (Laffranchi et al., 2020). 159

152 On the other hand, there is a family of very dexterous 153
 154 devices, not yet market-ready, that mimic the complexity 154
 155 of the human hand, implementing a fully-actuated multi- 155
 156 degrees of freedom mechatronics, e.g. the **University of** 156
 157 **Bologna Hand** (Meattini et al., 2019) or the **Shadow Hand** 157
 158 (Company, 2020). 158

159 High level of amputations, as the trans-humeral ones, 159
 160 require prosthetic elbows, such as the **Dynamic Arm** 160
 161 (Ottobock, 2022a), the **Dynamic Arm Plus** (Ottobock, 161
 162 2022b), and the **ErgoArm** (Ottobock, 2022c) from 162
 163 Ottobock; the **Espire Elbow** (Classic, Classic Plus, Pro 163
 164 and Hybrid,) from Steeper Inc. (Steeper, 2022); and the 164
 165 **Fillauer Motion E2 Elbow** (Fillauer, 2022a) and the **Utah** 165
 166 **Arm 3** (Fillauer, 2022b) from Fillauer. In the research 166
 167 context, full robotic arms include the **DLR hand system** 167
 168 (Grebenstein et al., 2011), the **APL modular prosthetic** 168
 169 **limb** (Johannes et al., 2011), the **LUKE Arm** (Bionics, 169
 170 2022), the **Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago arm** 170
 171 (Lenzi et al., 2016), and **Edinburgh Modular Arm** 171
 172 **System** (Gow et al., 2001). 172

173 However, this great variety of products does not match 173
 174 with the elevated abandonment rates, demonstrating the 174
 175 lack of satisfaction of the patients' needs from a 175
 176 mechatronic perspective. In particular, structural and 176
 177 supporting part lack of adjustability of user size, allow 177
 178 limited kinematic and motion possibilities and more 178
 179 advanced systems present limited operational time (Harte 179
 180 et al., 2017). This leads to limited satisfaction and feeling 180
 181 of security. Moreover, these systems generally present poor 181
 personal and social acceptance because of limited

182 anthropomorphism, high weight and presence of acoustic
 183 disturbances during use (Harte et al., 2017), This suggests
 184 that ULP development should not only focus on the device
 185 level, but improvements at the user level could play a key
 186 role for truly meeting the user requirements and
 187 consequently obtain device acceptance. Motivated by this,
 188 in this review, we analyse all the possible approaches that
 189 could potentially address the user needs in terms of device
 190 controllability, robustness and hence embodiment and user
 191 experience. To this end, it is fundamental not only to focus
 192 on the functionality restoration but also on the sensory
 193 information recovery, which are fundamental to effectively
 194 control the device. All the described approaches range from
 195 improvements in decoding user intentions, hence analysing
 196 all possible input sources and their related control
 197 strategies, to inclusion of additional sources of feedback
 198 capable to restore the sensory information. These
 199 approaches tackle the issues related to poor device control
 200 because of lack of intuitiveness and sensory feedback.

201 Therefore, in this review we present current and
 202 emerging methods in ULP development, detailing various
 203 sources of input and feedback signals, as well as control
 204 strategies. We also highlight current challenges and open
 205 issues in the field, specifically focusing on the importance
 206 of user experience and involvement in the design and

207 development process. This is fundamental to promote
 208 patient-tailored approaches leading to the development of
 209 truly personalized devices, which are currently lacking. We
 210 finally provide an overview of the most promising
 211 approaches that if followed, may one day provide upper
 212 limb amputees with a true substitute of their missing arm.

3. Input and Feedback Signals for Prosthetic Control

215 Prosthetic control is regulated by a flow of signals, as
 216 depicted in Figure 2. *Input signal* runs from the user to the
 217 device and they are often of biological or
 218 electrophysiological nature, in which case are called
 219 *biosignals*. Signals flowing in the opposite direction
 220 convey information from the device to the user and are
 221 therefore defined as *sensory feedback* signals. Moreover,
 222 some *external factors* convey to the user additional source
 223 of feedback (i.e., incidental feedback), such as visual or
 224 auditory information that can be used to estimate the
 225 prosthesis state (Wilke et al., 2019, Sensinger and Dosen,
 226 2020, Gonzalez et al., 2021).

227 Input signals include all the sources of information that
 228 can be taken from the amputee and translated into motor
 229 commands for driving the prosthesis (e.g.,




Figure 3. Input sources for ULP.

electromyography - EMG), see section 3.1. Instead, sensory feedback information encompasses different *prosthetic sensing* solutions acquired either from the prosthetic device or from the environment, see section 3.2 that can be translated into sensory stimuli for the amputee (e.g., vibrotactile stimulation, see section 3.3). All types of signals can be classified according to their level of invasiveness, with consequent advantages and drawbacks.

3.1. Input Signals

In recent years, many research activities have focused on the extraction of useful information from the biological signals in order to suitably control upper limb prostheses. Traditionally, **the surface EMG** (sEMG) is the most widespread signal for prosthesis control but its use still faces many drawbacks (Kyranou et al., 2018). In the following, we describe various methods to employ EMG as input signal for ULP control and we also explain how other input sources can be exploited to obtain more dexterous prosthetic behavior, overcoming the limitations of current ULP systems.

Figure 3 collects input signals for ULP control that will be described in the following subsections, ranging from those used by commercial systems, up to those currently under investigation.

3.1.1. Biosignals

The term *biosignal* indicates every possible signal that can be detected and measured from biological beings, humans – in our case. Usually, the term is used for signals of electric nature (i.e., EMG), but actually every signal collected from the activity of different tissues or organs belonging to the human body, can be considered as a biosignal.

We here adopt this latter definition to group input sources that are described next. Given its large use both in research and commercial ULP devices, electromyography deserves a dedicated subsection, while other biosignals are grouped together. We also dedicate a whole subsection to brain-derived signals, which are especially used in brain-machine and brain-computer interfaces (BMIs, BCIs), but that are also showing potential use for ULP applications. Table I summarizes biosignals for ULP control that will be described in the following subsections.

Table I: biosignals used as input sources in prosthetic applications.

		Measured Property	Sensors' placement	PROs	CONs	Sensor Fusion	Examples
Electromyography (EMG)	Surface EMG	Muscle Electric Potentials	On the skin over targeted muscles 2–32, up to 192 sensors	Non-invasive, long-term use, a large number of people	Sweating, electrodes shift, Muscle fatigue, Electromagnetic noise	NIRS, IMU, FMG, SMG, MMG	(Merletti et al., 2010) up to 27 gestures
	Invasive EMG		Underneath the skin, on or inside targeted muscles 4-8 sensors	High signal/noise ratio, directly on the nerve, no shift with respect to the source	Invasive, infections		(Cipriani et al., 2014, Ortiz-Catalan et al., 2020)
Force-myography (FMG)		Change of muscle morphology measured on the skin surface	Over targeted muscle, over related tendons 8, up to 126 sensors	Physiologic, small size, high signal/noise ratio, flexible	Muscle fatigue, sensors shift, pre-load force, small spatial resolution, crosstalk	EMG	(Xiao and Menon, 2019) up to 8 gestures
Mechano-myography (MMG)		Muscle fiber oscillations using microphone or accelerometers	Over targeted muscle 6-20 sensors	low cost, no pre-amplification, no precise positioning, no skin impedance or sweat influence	Ambient acoustic noise, Adjacent muscle crosstalk, Sensor displacement	EMG, IMU	(Wilson and Vaidyanathan, 2017, Guo et al., 2017a, Castillo et al., 2020) up to 5 gestures
Sono-myography (SMG)		Change of muscle morphology	Over targeted muscle, over related tendons transducers of different shapes	Deep and superficial muscles, some models are cheap and energy-efficient	Probe shift, tissue impedance, no wireless, some models expensive and bulky	EMG	(Dhawan et al., 2019) up to 15 gestures

Near-Infrared Spectroscopy (NIRS)	Tissue oxygenation through the amount of scattered light	Over targeted muscle 2-4 sensors	Deep and superficial muscles, high spatial resolution, no electronic interference	Ambient light, Muscle fatigue, tissues heating	EMG, IMU	(Paleari et al., 2017) up to 9 gestures
Electrical Impedance Tomography (EIT)	Tissue impedance	Over targeted muscle, over related tendons 8, up to 64 sensors	No need precise positioning	Low time resolution, sweating, Electromagnetic noise, high consumption	-	(Zhang et al., 2016, Wu et al., 2018) up to 8 gestures
Capacitance sensing	Tissue capacitance	Over targeted muscle, over related tendons 3 receiver sensors	Non-invasive, low cost, deep and superficial muscles	Sweating, Electromagnetic noise, displacement, ambient temperature	-	(Cheng et al., 2013, Truong et al., 2018) up to 2 gestures
Magneto-myography	Magnetic fields generated by muscle	Over/inside targeted muscle 7 sensors	Not sensitive to sensor's shift and sweat	Magnetic interference, can be invasive, movement artifacts	-	(Zuo et al., 2020) concept
Peripheral Neural Interfaces (PNIs)	Electrical activity of the nerves	Microelectrode arrays placed on different fascicles within the median and ulnar nerves	Intuitive, direct maps of complex movements, high accuracy, robust	Invasive, difficult to separate EMG and PNI components, recording channels really closed each other	-	(Nguyen et al., 2020) up to 15 DoFs
Intracortical neural signals	Intracortical neural signals from the brain, action potentials of individual neuron	16-192 high-density channels electrodes inserted into the motor cortex tissue	Accurate and capable of collecting the most information-rich data, high spatial resolution	Very invasive, influenced by tissue reactions	-	(Hochberg et al., 2006, Hochberg et al., 2012, Collinger et al., 2013, Wodlinger et al., 2014) 7-10 DoFs
Electrocorticography (ECoG)	Electrical activity of brain's surface	32-128 high-density channels on sensorimotor regions	Less attenuated than EEG, good spatial resolution and wide frequency content	Surgical procedure and lack to measure single cell activity	-	(Wang et al., 2013, Fifer et al., 2013, Bleichner et al., 2016, Hotson et al., 2016) 4 gesture recognition and wrist movements
Electroencephalography (EEG)	Electrical activity of the brain	6-32 channels headsets	Not invasive, low cost, portable, stable, and very easy to use	Signal attenuated by the dura, the skull, and the scalp, loss of important information	-	(McFarland et al., 2010, Yang et al., 2012, Edelman et al., 2019, Fuentes-Gonzalez et al., 2021) single DoF

Functional Near-Infrared Spectroscopy (fNIRS)	Activity-related brain oxygenation, near-infrared led, and a photodetector measure the amount of IR light absorbed by the hemoglobin in the brain	10-200 channels of optodes	Non-invasive, simultaneous detection information under the skin, low cost	Few centimeters penetration of cortical tissue, not great accuracy, and system too cumbersome	- (Syed et al., 2020) 3 DoFs trans-humeral amputees
---	---	----------------------------	---	---	---

3.1.1.1. Electromyography

While cosmetics, electronic components and computational efforts have undergone a significant improvement, the control strategies currently used in prosthetic applications have not changed since their first appearance in the 1960s (Schmidl, 1965). The EMG has been one of the major sources to control upper limb prostheses (Merletti and Farina, 2016). These signals carry information about neuromuscular activity, and they are used to retrieve human intention. EMG is indeed a technique for studying the activation of the skeletal muscles through the recording of electrical potentials produced by muscle contraction (Hudgins et al., 1993). The theory behind the sEMG electrodes is that they form a chemical equilibrium between the detecting surface of the electrode and the skin of the body through electrolytic conduction, so that the current can flow into the electrode.

Multiple methods have been used to obtain the intended gesture from the processed EMG signals, all of which exploit the fact that the amputees can still generate different and repeatable muscular patterns related to each forearm movement with residual muscles of the stump. Low-density EMG is commonly used in prosthetic application, both in research and commercial context. Noteworthy, EMG signals can also be collected with invasive methods. The sEMG can be thus classified according to the level of

resolution and density of the sensors. In the following, we provide an overview of the different types of EMG-based biosignals.

Surface EMG

The sEMG can be classified according to the number of electrodes used (Figure 4). **Low-density EMG** generally refers to the use of a small (<10) number of EMG bipolar sensors, that can be either wet, i.e. contain an electrolytic substance that serves as interface between skin and electrodes, or dry (Jamal, 2012). Conversely, **high-density EMG** is typically composed by wet monopolar sensors spread on a planar patch, around 1cm apart, and with the ground reference generally placed on the wrist or on the elbow (Drost et al., 2006). Importantly, sEMG electrodes also differ in their electronic configuration, as they can be either preamplified or not (Zheng et al., 2021). Merletti and Muceli (2019) provided a guide with the best practice to acquire and manipulate EMG data according with the different aims, from signal analysis to motion prediction.

Prosthetic control with low-density EMG is generally obtained by using two bipolar electrodes placed on antagonist muscles. This configuration allows the control of the prosthetic system in a robust and simple way (Hudgins et al., 1993). However, the detection of complex and simultaneous movements of the phantom limb can be improved by using an array of EMG electrodes placed on the superficial skin of the residual forearm (COAPT, 2017, Dellacasa Bellingegni et al., 2017, Ottobock, 2019, Marinelli et al., 2020). The use of sEMG in prosthetic applications has become the most widespread source of information about voluntary movement (Schmidl, 1965) because of the direct correlation between EMG activity and subjects' intentions.

Differently from the low-density, the high-density sEMG (HD-sEMG) is based on a higher number of electrodes placed on a small portion of the body. Recently, a growing number of researchers has focused on the use of these electrodes aiming to increase the amount of collected data, although at the cost of a greater computational burden. HD-sEMG sensors have been used to discriminate muscular patterns related to different gestures. Their signals can be handled in various ways to retrieve unique




Figure 4. sEMG electrodes. A: bipolar dry sensors, Ottobock and IIT/INAIL (Marinelli et al., 2021) respectively. B: high-density wet sensors (OT Bioelettronica).

and repeatable information, as described in section 4. These sensors have to be positioned according to the distribution of the underlining muscle fibers and this configuration provides a low resolution map of the synergistic activation of the muscles during movement production (Winters, 1990, Sartori et al., 2018). For example, from contraction of the muscles under the acquisition grids, it is possible to extract bi-dimensional images, in which the EMG amplitude is mapped to a color scale. These maps can be thus handled by complex algorithms, as the ones used for objects detection in robotic navigation (Chen et al., 2020). The main limitation of the HD-sEMG, which currently bounds its application to a laboratory scenario, is the skin-electrode contact since it requires conductive gel to reduce the interface impedance. The wet area is mainly needed to reduce artifacts in the EMG signals since it is generally acquired in monopolar configuration. Another disadvantage of this technique consists in the fact that computation is time-consuming.

Overall, the main drawback of sEMG-based approaches is constituted by the influence that skin impedance, sweat, and electrode shift have on the stability of the input signals (De Luca, 1997). Additionally, muscle crosstalk and the difficulty to reach deep muscles further limit the quality of the collected signal. In the context of ULP, the use of sEMG can be further complicated by the fact that the amputation strongly affects muscles strength and organization and therefore signal quality, as discussed in section 6.4.

Invasive EMG and Surgical Procedures

The invasive approach has been exploited to explore the activity related to the production of movement for many years (Adrian and Bronk, 1929) and it is still investigated by many groups. However, the main drawback of this approach is constituted by the surgery and by the technological barriers still faced by the available equipment. On the other hand, **invasive electromyography** (iEMG) allows to measure single motor unit action potentials, enabling a higher selectivity and a better accuracy of the input signal, overcoming the limitations imposed by sEMG. There are several examples of iEMG, which vary in the type of electrodes and level of invasiveness, as detailed hereafter.

EMG can be invasively detected by inserting electrodes into the internal surface of muscles (Merletti and Farina, 2009). This invasive technique exploits two different percutaneous electrodes: **needles** and **fine wires** (Jamal, 2012, Rubin, 2019). The most used are *needle electrodes*. These electrodes are concentric, and their bare hollow needles contain an insulated fine wire into their cannula, which is exposed on the beveled tip, which is the active recording site. *Wire electrodes* are typically made of non-oxidizing and stiff materials with insulation, they can be

implanted more easily and are usually less painful than needle electrodes.

Since both these sensors are percutaneous, i.e., passing through unbroken skin and leaving an open passage between the internal structures of the body and the external world, the risk of infection is quite probable. For this reason, and because of their intrinsic discomfort due to the percutaneous wire that can easily break, their usage is limited to laboratory research (Hargrove et al., 2007, Cloutier and Yang, 2013a). A detailed description of invasive electrodes both to record biological signals and to deliver electrical stimulation can be found in Raspopovic et al. (2021a).

In the last decades, growing attention has been paid to the development of **intramuscular electrodes** that could be implanted under the skin of the subject to achieve the advantages of invasive sensors and simultaneously avoid the risks and inconvenience of percutaneous instruments. For example, Weir et al. (2008) developed an **implantable myoelectric sensor** (IMES), a system able to receive and process up to 32 implanted sensors with wireless telemetry. A transcutaneous magnetic link between the implanted electrodes and the external coil allows reverse telemetry, which transfer data from the sensors to the controller, commanding the control of the prosthesis, and forward telemetry to supply power and configuration settings to the electrodes. These sensors are designed for permanent long-term implantation without any kind of servicing requirement and have been tested on animals. Four months after the implantation of IMESs in the legs of three cats, the sensors were still functioning (Weir et al., 2008). Intramuscular electrodes have been used in prosthetic application to decode 12 different hand gestures from 4 healthy subjects (Cipriani et al., 2014). Moreover, it has been shown that the application of this invasive approach enhances the simultaneous control of multi-DoFs system (Smith et al., 2014).

Recently, the group of Ortiz-Catalan showed an invasive procedure for ULP control. They positioned EMG electrodes under the skin of amputated subjects and sutured them directly on the external surface of the muscles (Ortiz-Catalan et al., 2020). More precisely, sensors were sewn onto the epimysium of the two heads of the biceps' muscles and the long and lateral heads of the triceps muscles. These invasive electrodes were used in combination with an osseointegrated prosthesis, i.e. a system obtained following a very invasive surgical procedure, which allows to anchor the prosthesis to the remaining limb's bone (Ortiz-Catalan et al., 2020). In the context of ULP, osseointegration is offered for trans-humeral amputees, and the prosthesis is anchored to the humerus with two mechanical elements: the fixture, a screw made of titanium placed inside a hole made in the bone that becomes osseointegrated, and the

abutment, placed within the fixture and extending outside of the body in a percutaneous way, onto which the prosthesis is connected. This technique was tested on four osseointegrated patients.

This latter example indicates that also surgical approaches can be taken to improve the quality of the collected EMG. A promising surgical technique that is performed in case of high-level amputation is *Targeted Muscle Reinnervation* (TMR). This method was developed by the group of Kuiken in the early 2000s and consists in transferring residual arm nerves to alternative muscle sites. Following reinnervation, these target muscles are able to produce EMG that can be collected and used to control prosthetic arms (Kuiken et al., 2009). This strategy works at the condition that each reinnervated muscle produces an EMG signal in response to only one transferred nerve, with the consequence that native nerves innervating the target muscle has to be cut during the surgical procedure to avoid unwanted EMG signals (Kuiken et al., 2017). In the last 15 years, TMR has allowed intuitive control of ULP to several subjects with high-level amputation for whom standard ULP devices allowed a poor restoration of motor functions (Kuiken et al., 2017). Importantly, given that it is performed on complex amputations, this technique is strongly tailored to each patient's physical and clinical status (Cheesborough et al., 2015, Mereu et al., 2021).

Recently, a new surgical method for improving EMG-based control has emerged: the *regenerative peripheral nerve interface* (RNPI) (Vu et al., 2020a). Just as TMR, its goal is to turn a muscle into a biological amplifier of the motor command, in order to improve the quality of the EMG signal recorded, processed and used to drive the prosthesis. To this end, RNPI exploits the regeneration capabilities of nerves and muscles, to implant a transected nerve into a free muscle graft. Following regeneration, revascularization and reinnervation by the transected nerve, the muscle graft effectively becomes a stable peripheral nerve bioamplifier, able to produce high-amplitude EMG signals (Urbanek et al., 2012). The potential of this novel interface has been tested by Vu et al. (2020b): they used EMG signals collected by intramuscular bipolar electrodes implanted into RNPIs obtained in amputated individuals, who could successfully perform real-time control of an artificial hand. Surprisingly, subjects were able to control the device with a high level of accuracy even 300 days post-implantation, without recalibration of the control algorithm.

Another surgical technique, not directly related to EMG signals but worth mentioning, is *cineplasty*, an old method revived in the last years with a new and more modern approach. This method was introduced for the first time by Vanghetti in 1899 and then replicated by Sauerbruch ten years later (Tropea et al., 2017). It consisted of the direct

mechanical linking of residual muscles and/or residual tendons of the affected limb to the prosthesis through external cables (i.e., Bowden cables). In 2001, Heckathorne and Childress (2001) implemented an evolution of this surgical solution for the control of 1 DOF ULP by exploiting exteriorized tendons directly linked to a force sensor.

3.1.1.2. Other biosignals

The limitations imposed by the use of EMG (either invasive or non-invasive), have led researchers to study new approaches, aiming at increasing algorithms robustness and accuracy. Some may be soon used in commercial prosthetic systems, while others represent promising research scenarios, but still far from real-life applications. We here describe some of these peripheral signals, both non-invasive and invasive.

For example, **forcemyography** (FMG) has been widely investigated in the past 20 years (Xiao and Menon, 2019) (Table I). This approach is based on force sensors able to record muscle stiffness around the forearm during different movements. The muscle deformation of the stump can be measured with various types of sensors, such as: force sensing resistors (Prakash et al., 2020), optical fiber transducers (Fujiwara et al., 2018), capacitance-based deformation sensors (Truong et al., 2018), Hall-effect based deformation sensors (Kenney et al., 1999), barometric sensors (Shull et al., 2019), thin arrays of adhesive stretchable deformation sensors (Jiang et al., 2019), or high density myo-pneumatic sensors for topographic maps of pressures and residual kinetic images of the stump (Phillips and Craelius, 2005, Radmand et al., 2016). The accuracy of the sensors may limit the robustness of FMG-based control. Therefore, FMG is often fused with other input sources, such as IMU (Ferigo et al., 2017) or EMG (Nowak et al., 2020). FMG is indeed complementary to EMG due to its capability to get information about extrinsic hand muscles placed in several layers underneath the skin, and therefore difficult to be detected with the EMG sensors. Moreover, with respect to EMG-based control strategies, FMG is not influenced by electrode shifting.

Another technique is **mechanomyography** (MMG), which measures the lateral oscillations, detected as low-frequency vibrations (in the range of 1-100 Hz), generated by deformation in muscle fibers actively involved in the contraction (Table I). This approach can be considered as the mechanical counterpart of EMG and it is also known as **acousticmyography**, **phonomyography** or **vibromyography**, depending on the type of sensor used. It can actually be based on different types of sensors, such as: low mass accelerometers (Farina et al., 2008, Youn and Kim, 2010), microphones (Meagher et al., 2020, Castillo et al., 2020), piezoelectric contact (Orizio et al., 2008, Tanaka

et al., 2011), force sensing resistors (Esposito et al., 2018), and laser distance sensors (Scalise et al., 2013). With respect to EMG, this technique shows some advantages: it is low cost, it does not require pre-amplification or precise positioning, and signals are not influenced by skin impedance or sweat. However, it is very susceptible to environmental noise and motion. Artifact removal can be implemented with the integration of an IMU, as proposed by (Wilson and Vaidyanathan, 2017) and (Woodward et al., 2017). MMG has also been used in combination with EMG signals (Guo et al., 2017a), achieving better control performance and robustness.

The **sonomyography** (SMG) measures muscle volume changes and thickness using reflected ultrasound waves (Table I). Wave amplitude depends on the acoustic impedance of the tissue, and it can be detected using ultrasound transducers. Currently, no portable prosthetic systems based on SMG have been developed, but the results obtained using this technique are very promising. For example, Dhawan et al. (2019) were able to detect eleven different movements in real-time placing the sensor on the stump of a trans-radial amputee, obtaining better results than using EMG signals alone. This non-invasive approach allows a faster user training and the detection of both superficial and deep muscles, but even a small shift of the sensor can change the cross-section view and bring to the failure of the control algorithm. SMG signals have been used in combination with EMG signals, leading to improved performances with respect to EMG alone (Xia et al., 2019, Engdahl et al., 2020a).

Near-Infrared Spectroscopy (NIRS) is a non-invasive technique measuring the level of oxygenation of active muscles under contraction (Table I). The detection unit consists of a near-infrared led emitter and a photodetector, placed on the skin surface. The emitted IR light is partly absorbed by the tissue, mostly by hemoglobin, and partly scattered back to the skin surface and detected by the photodetector. NIRS thus detects changes in the amount of IR light scattered back due to muscle contraction (Schneider et al., 2003). This technique has a high spatial resolution and is immune to electronic interference. However, tissue heating may take place after prolonged use. Recently, Paleari et al. (2017) developed a wireless NIRS unit for hand gesture recognition, indicating the potentiality of this technique for ULP control. NIRS has indeed been used in this context in conjunction with EMG (Guo et al., 2017b) and IMU (Zhao et al., 2019).

The **electrical impedance tomography** (EIT) measures the internal electrical impedance of the tissues in the cross-section plane covered by specific surface electrodes (Table I), which may range from 8 to 64 (Padilha Leitzke and Zangl, 2020). The measurement is executed by exciting a sine wave of electrical current (amplitudes ranging from 10

607 μA to 10 mA and frequencies from 10 kHz to 1 MHz
608 (Grushko et al., 2020)) and by recording the voltages
609 collected by surface electrodes. The detected changes in
610 phase and amplitude represent the distribution changes of
611 internal conductivity within the affected area, identifying
612 patterns of movement. Wearable systems for ULP control
613 have been developed, such as the ones proposed by Zhang
614 et al. (2016) capable to recognize hand gestures, and by Wu
615 et al. (2018), who also tested an EIT-based hand prosthesis
616 control system on healthy people, achieving an accuracy of
617 98.5% with a grouping of three gestures and an accuracy of
618 94.4% with two sets of five gestures. This non-invasive
619 method does not require a precise positioning of the
620 electrodes, it only needs changes in impedance to be large
621 enough. On the other hand, the current available systems
622 have slow measurement and long processing time, leading
623 to a high-power consumption. Moreover, the technique is
624 affected by surface electrodes issues, namely skin contact
625 conditions, electromagnetic interference, etc.

Capacitance sensing measures capacitance variations between two or more conductors (Table I). A capacitance exists when the two conductors are separated by a given distance d . In ULP context, electrodes may be placed on the prosthetic fingers, which work as capacitor plates. When a user performs a gesture, the skin deformation will cause a change in distance (d) between the conductors. This technique was used for hand gesture prediction in (Cheng et al., 2013) and in (Truong et al., 2018), using wearable systems. This technique is low cost, non-invasive, and it is capable to detect deep and complex signals, but it owns the standard disadvantages affecting surface electrodes, and it is susceptible to ambient temperature changes.

Magnetomyography is a promising approach aimed at measuring the magnetic fields produced by electrical currents propagating through muscles during contraction (Table I). This technique foresees the placement of magnetometers on the muscle, either non-invasively or beneath the skin, following a surgical procedure. The magnetometers convert the magnetic fields into measurable quantities, such as currents or voltages that can be used for the control of the prosthesis. Small implantable magnetometers have been proposed in Zuo et al. (2020), but they still need to be clinically tested. This technique is less sensitive to sensors' shift or sweat but may be strongly influenced by the environmental magnetic noise and the magnetic field of the Earth.

Peripheral neural interfaces (PNIs) measure the electrical activity of the motor peripheral with an invasive approach (Table I). There are three types of electrodes: extraneural, like CUFF or FINE, which embrace the nerve; intraneural, which run longitudinally (LIFE) or transversally (TIME or USEA) through the nerve; and regenerative, such as SIEVE or Microchannel, attached

660 between the two extremities of a severed nerve (del Valle
661 and Navarro, 2013, Raspopovic et al., 2021b). Nguyen et
662 al. (2020) enabled an amputee to control a 15 DOFs
663 prosthesis, by using four implanted LIFE arrays, two in the
664 medial nerve and two in the ulnar one. The negative aspects
665 of this method reside in its profound invasiveness and in
666 the acquisition of noisy signals.

3.1.1.3. Brain signals

668 The first neuroprosthetic application on humans was
669 reported by the group of Donoghue, who demonstrated that
670 tetraplegic individuals implanted with arrays of
671 microelectrodes over the motor cortex were able to
672 remotely control the movement of a cursor on a screen
673 (Hochberg et al., 2006). This clinical trial was soon
674 followed by another from the same group reporting the
675 control of reaching and grasping actions of a robotic arm
676 (Hochberg et al., 2012). The group of Schwartz also
677 showed similar results of an individual with tetraplegia
678 successfully controlling a 7 DoF robotic arm (Collinger et
679 al., 2013). In all these examples, **intracortical brain**
680 **signals** were used, i.e., action potentials of individual
681 neurons were detected with an array of electrodes inserted
682 into the brain, usually in the motor cortex (Table I).

683 Less invasive measurements of cortical currents using
684 **electrocorticography** (ECoG) have been widely used for
685 neuroprosthetic control in the lab. ECoG detects the
686 electrical activity of the brain with strips of electrodes laid
687 on the brain's surface, usually in the motor cortex area.
688 ECoG signals have been used for hand gesture recognition
689 (Bleichner et al., 2016), for the control of a virtual
690 prosthesis (Wang et al., 2013) and of a robotic limb (Fifer
691 et al., 2013), and also with a detached prosthesis with active
692 digits (Hotson et al., 2016).

693 ECoG provides an ideal trade-off between the
694 invasiveness of intracortical recordings and the poor spatial
695 resolution of **electroencephalography** (EEG) (Thakor et
696 al., 2014). However, whether non-invasively collected
697 signals convey enough motor information to control a
698 neuroprosthetic hand is still debated (Fukuma et al., 2016).

699 EEG measures the electrical activity of the brain with an
700 external helmet made of electrodes (Table I). In a ULP
701 application, a motor imagery task is typically used, and the
702 subject only needs to think about the movement. EEG
703 signals corresponding to the intention of the movement are
704 therefore used to drive the end-effector. Recently,
705 McDermott and coworkers were able to extract from EEG
706 recordings relevant brain states in real-time and indicated
707 such states as prospective therapeutic targets for motor
708 neurorehabilitation (McDermott et al.). Similarly, the
709 group of Wolpaw showed that paralyzed patients could use
710 EEG signals to control a cursor in 3-dimensional space
711 (McFarland et al., 2010), suggesting that noninvasive
712 EEG-based BCIs can be exploited for control of robotic

713 devices or neuroprostheses. EEG-based neuroimaging is
714 indeed emerging as a useful tool for robotic device control,
715 as demonstrated by Edelman et al. (2019).

716 Another promising technique is the **functional Near-**
717 **Infrared Spectroscopy** (fNIRS), which detects activity-
718 related brain oxygenation. The instrumentation is the same
719 used for NIRS, i.e., a near-infrared led, and a photodetector
720 are used to measure the amount of scattered back light and,
721 therefore, the amount of IR light absorbed by the
722 hemoglobin in the brain, which increases during brain
723 activity. In 2020, Syed et al. (2020) used these
724 hemodynamic brain responses to control a ULP for trans-
725 humeral amputees with 3 DOFs, gaining eight out of ten
726 classified movements in real-time.

727 These examples demonstrate that groundwork for brain
728 control of motor prosthetics has been laid. However, it has
729 been limited to the lab and mostly addresses paralyzed
730 patients. Nevertheless, there is a growing interest in brain-
731 derived measures for prosthetic applications and different
732 recording techniques have been investigated for ULP
733 control.

3.1.2. Other techniques under investigation

734 Besides the detection of physiological changes in
735 residual muscles of the stump or in the brain during
736 movements, described above, there are many other input
737 sources and techniques capable or with the potentiality to
738 control an upper limb prosthesis. Some of these are mainly
739 used in the research field and since they lack usability, they
740 do not find a real application in everyday life of amputees,
741 or they are conceived for patients without the possibility to
742 exploit other more convenient and intuitive sources (i.e.,
743 tetraplegic people). Some of them, instead, have been still
744 only proposed as proof-of-concept.

745 The most studied approach is based on the use of inertial
746 measurement units (IMUs). IMU sensors are cheap, small
747 and can therefore be easily embedded in the prosthesis.
748 They can increase the amount of data useful to successfully
749 discriminate between different gestures of ULP during
750 distinct phases of the reaching movement. These devices
751 exploit accelerometers, gyroscopes and magnetometers to
752 understand which is the actual altitude, position and
753 orientation of the prosthesis. These sensors deliver
754 information through quaternions and they are often used
755 together with EMG to improve the classifier robustness
756 (Georgi et al., 2015). Zhang et al. (2011) depicted the
757 possibility to manipulate objects and perform complex
758 tasks using both inertial measurement unit (IMU) and
759 EMG sensors. As a matter of fact, the accelerometers can
760 capture information that sEMG sensors cannot easily
761 detect, such as hand withdrawal or rotation (Chen et al.,
762 2007). It has been shown that the use of IMU sensor
763 coupled to EMG is more advantageous than increasing the
764 number of EMG sensors (Fougner et al., 2011). Similar

766 results have been achieved by Krasoulis et al. (2017), who
 767 have combined EMG and IMU to feed pattern recognition
 768 systems (see section 4.3.1). They demonstrated that this
 769 combination could significantly improve the real-time
 770 completion rates compared to the traditional methods,
 771 exclusively based on sEMG signals. Moreover, the data
 772 coming from IMU can be used alone to control a single
 773 module, usually the wrist or the elbow (Merad et al., 2018)
 774 or to realize other types of control for rehabilitation
 775 purposes, such as shadow control, in which the control
 776 policy consists in replicating the movement captured by the
 777 IMU sensors (Rapetti et al., 2020). These devices were also

778 placed on feet to directly control an ULP by implementing
 779 precise foot movements (Resnik et al., 2014). The adoption
 780 of IMU sensors is specifically promising in sensor fusion
 781 approaches, as discussed in section 3.1.3. Besides EMG
 782 signals, IMU data have been also combined with NIRS
 783 (Zhao et al., 2019) and MMG (Wilson and Vaidyanathan,
 784 2017, Woodward et al., 2017).

785 Table II summarizes the use of IMU and other input
 786 sources investigated for the control of ULP, many of which
 787 are described in (Grushko et al., 2020).
 788

Table II: Alternative input sources investigated for the control multi-DoF prosthesis devices.

Input source	Measured property	Sensors' placement	PROs	CONs	Sensor Fusion	Examples
IMU	Specific force, angular rate, orientation of the body	Up to 8 IMU sensors located on feet	Non-invasive, simple, low cost,	Problems during walking, not intuitive, unnatural	EMG, NIRS, MMG	(Resnik et al., 2014) DEKA Arm control
Myokinetic control	Change of muscle morphology trough magnetic fields	Permanent magnet markers implanted over targeted muscles and external three-axis magnetic field sensors placed in the socket	Intuitive control, force and position feedback	Magnetic interferences, misalignments between socket and initial position, invasive	-	(Tarantino et al., 2017, Clemente et al., 2019)
Voice	Throat vibration	Piezoelectric sensor on the throat	Ease of use sequence of movements	External noise, input sound level, unintuitive control	EMG	(Mainardi and Davalli, 2007)
	Voice commands	Microphone near mouth			IMU	(Alkhafaf et al., 2020)
Tongue	Pressures made by the tongue	Board of coils on the palate and activation unit on the tip of the tongue	Mobile, wireless, invisible	Unintuitive control, uncomfortable	EMG	(Johansen et al., 2016, Johansen et al., 2021)
Feet	Pressures made by the feet	Insole made of force sensing resistors	Simple Low cost	Unintuitive control, problem during walking, need of accurate calibration	IMU EMG	(Carrozza et al., 2007)
Optical myography (OMG)	Skin surface deformations caused by underlying muscle contraction	Single low-resolution camera and marker-based tracking methods	Simple Low cost	No space for camera in the socket, low robustness	-	(Nissler et al., 2016, Wu et al., 2019)

792 **3.1.3. Integrative sources** 797 work in parallel and together with the main ones,
 793 An integrative input source is not used as the main 798 integrating their information and implementing the so-
 794 responsible for the actual command of the prosthesis, but it 799 called *data-fusion* or *sensor-fusion* methods, see also
 795 is used to help and to facilitate its control, which usually 800 section 4.3.3. Table III summarizes integrative sources
 796 depends on EMG signals. The integrative input sources 801 found in the literature that have been used for ULP control.
 802

Table III: integrative sources of information used to improve prosthesis control.

Integrative input source	Instruments and measured information	Application	PROs	CONs	Fusion	Examples
Computer vision	Two cameras used to collect images and estimate depth	Estimation of size, distance and grasp type for a semi-autonomous control of the prosthesis	Ease of use fixing of errors without looking at the prosthesis automatic help in controlling the prosthesis	Expensive, cumbersome and uncomfortable	EMG IMU	(Markovic et al., 2014) Stereovision (depth?)
	Depth estimated by the colour intensity of the pixel collected by the camera					(Mouchoux et al., 2021) Depth and colour camera RGB
Eye movements	4 Superficial electrodes for the measuring of the corneo-retinal standing potentials between the front and the back of the human eye	Estimation of the position/length/width/orientation of a final target and preparation of the preshape and direction of the hand	Ease of use automatic help in controlling the prosthesis	Distinction with random eye movements, cumbersome and uncomfortable	EMG	(Hao et al., 2013) Electro-oculography
	Camera mounted on a pair of glasses measuring the reflection of infrared (IR) light from the eyeball					(Krausz et al., 2020) Eye tracking glasses
Optical sensor	Led-based optical sensor mounted on fingertips	Slip detection and eventual automatic suppression	Accurate, robust simple, low cost and power consumption	Poor detection with transparent surfaces	EMG	(Sani and Meek, 2011) LED motion detection sensor
	miniature reflective optic sensor that combines an Infrared LED and a phototransistor in the same package.					(Nakagawa-Silva et al., 2018) Reflective optic sensor
IMU	Accelerometers, Gyroscopes, Magnetometers	Decreased #sensors, better controllability, artifact detection	Non-invasive, simple, low cost, motion artifact deletion	Prone to error cumulate over time	EMG, NIRS, MMG	(Krasoulis et al., 2017, Krasoulis et al., 2019b) up to 6 gestures

805 3.2. Prosthetic Sensing

806 Natural movements occur with a bidirectional flow of
 807 neural information, i.e., motor commands on one direction
 808 and sensory feedback on the other. In prosthetic

1
2
3 809 applications, while many efforts have been spent to provide
4 810 signals carrying motor intentions, a less explored path is
5 811 the integration of **sense of touch** into the prosthesis
6 812 (Clemente et al., 2015). This lack is highly responsible for
7 813 the missing perception of the prosthesis as part of one's
8 814 own body and is also precluding a closed-loop control of
9 815 the prosthesis.

10 816 More recently, the scientific community has started
11 817 exploring different methods to equip prosthetic devices
12 818 with perception of *tactile* and *pressure* information
13 819 (Schmitz et al., 2008, Tee et al., 2012, Lucarotti et al., 2013,
14 820 Hammock et al., 2013, Taunyazov et al., 2021), although
15 821 often resulting in very complex, unreliable, or unpractically
16 822 cumbersome solutions. The few solutions tested on real
17 823 prosthetic setups impacted on their *anthropomorphism* and
18 824 *dexterity*.

20 825 To integrate *touch sensors* into robotic and prosthetic
21 826 devices (Figure 2, end-effector feedback) (Lucarotti et al.,
22 827 2013, Iskarous and Thakor, 2019, Dimante et al., 2020),
23 828 different technologies have been investigated and
24 829 employed (Ciancio et al., 2016), namely **capacitive**
25 830 (Maiolino et al., 2013, Jamali et al., 2015), **resistive**
26 831 (Beccai et al., 2005, Tee et al., 2012, Zainuddin et al.,
27 832 2015), **piezoelectric** (screen printed piezoelectric polymer,
28 833 PVDF) (Alameh et al., 2018), and **magnetic** sensors
29 834 (Ahmadi et al., 2011). Other examples include
30 835 technologies based on **electrical impedance** (Zainuddin et
31 836 al., 2015, Wu et al., 2018), **pressure** and **electrical**
32 837 **impedance** (Lin et al., 2009), **optical fibers** (Bragg fiber
33 838 (Massari et al., 2019)), **Micro-electro-mechanical**
34 839 **Systems** (MEMS, texture sensing (Mazzoni et al., 2020))
35 840 combined with **Spiking** based on Izhikevich neuron model
36 841 (Gunasekaran et al., 2019)) and **Optoelectronic** (Alfadhel
37 842 and Kosel, 2015).

38 843 Examples of the application of these sensors into
39 844 prosthetic devices include the **E-dermis** (piezoelectric
40 845 sensors integrated on the Bebionic's fingertips) (Osborn et
41 846 al., 2018), **E-skin** (integrating different types of sensors)
42 847 (Iskarous and Thakor, 2019), and **BioTac** (impedance
43 848 sensor integrated on the Shadow Hand (Robot, 2022))
44 849 (Fishel and Loeb, 2012).

45 850 Among commercial devices, the SensorHand Speed
46 851 (OttoBock, 2021) made by OttoBock is the only one
47 852 including tactile sensors based on resistive technology
48 853 (OttoBock, 2021).

49 854 Therefore, tactile sensation is the first step towards
50 855 novel and more efficient control strategies that do make use
51 856 of feedback information (Raspopovic et al., 2014). To this
52 857 end, artificial intelligence can be exploited to detect the

858 grasp of different objects from sensor data (Alameh et al.,
859 2020).

860 3.3. Sensory Feedback

861 Sensory feedback patterns are designed to enrich the
862 perceived responsiveness of the device and the subjective
863 experience of its use as a limb (Antfolk et al., 2013b,
864 Svensson et al., 2017, Raspopovic et al., 2021a). Such a
865 result derives from the elicitation of physiological and
866 psychological reactions that promote embodiment
867 processes (described in paragraph 5.1). Furthermore, such
868 stimulations (haptic feedback in many cutting-edge
869 devices) are designed as a fundamental component of
870 bidirectional human-machine interfaces empowering
871 prosthetic control (Navaraj et al., 2019). Establishing such
872 a closed-loop can trigger learning processes even for
873 artificial sensations (Cuberovic et al., 2019), pointing at
874 somatosensory plasticity processes. These phenomena
875 provide the user with an engaging guidance within a natural
876 interaction, facilitating the execution of prosthetic
877 maneuvers during calibration, training, and daily use.
878 Importantly, such an enhanced practice will ease the
879 production of consistent biosignals that will progressively
880 become easier to interpret as user commands.

881 However, current commercial prostheses generally do
882 not incorporate an explicit haptic feedback but the
883 incidental feedback, like visual and the sound cues, could
884 be exploited by the user to estimate the prosthesis state
885 (Wilke et al., 2019). For example, the acoustic feedback
886 provides a guidance on how to reach target during the
887 rehabilitation session, in this way the rehabilitation step can
888 be more interactive and engaging if appropriately designed
889 (never obnoxious, possibly plausible). Overall, the next
890 sub-sections will discuss the design of sensory feedback in
891 prosthetics, distinguishing invasive and non-invasive
892 stimulation modalities.

893 3.3.1. Non-invasive methods

894 Non-invasive feedback restoration for upper limb
895 amputees is a hot topic in the research community, and yet
896 it has not achieved broad clinical application (Sensinger
897 and Dosen, 2020). Many solutions have been proposed, but
898 the main problem lays in their poor robustness. (Ribeiro et
899 al., 2019) highlighted the most widespread types of non-
900 invasive feedback, described in Table IV.

903 Table IV Non-invasive methods for sensory feedback in ULP.

Feedback sense	Instruments and feedback information	Application	PROs	CONs	Examples
Touch (cutaneous stimulation)	Vibrational	Array over the forearm or over the arm	Non-invasive, robustness control, brief training period, intuitive, cheap, small	(Bark et al., 2014, Markovic et al., 2019) up to 3 DoFs or different force levels	Non-physiological, need calibration, coupled intensity and rotation frequency, position displacement
	Mechanotactile	Detected areas to reproduce real touch sensation, array over the arm	Non-invasive, intuitive, brief training period, decoupled intensity and frequency	(Antfolk et al., 2013a, Svensson et al., 2017, Tchिमिनo et al., 2021) different pressure level, touch sensation	Need spatial and intensity calibration, bulky, position displacement
	Electrical	Transcutaneous stimulation using bipolar electrodes, pressure, slip, proprioception	Array over the forearm or arm	No electrode displacement, low power consuming, high sensor skin contact, intensity or frequency modulation	(Jorgovanovic et al., 2014, Xu et al., 2015, Garenfeld et al., 2020) touch location, pressure, proprioception
Sound (Acoustic)	Acoustic speaker, proprioceptive movements	Laptop speaker to guide the training acquisition and improve the pattern recognition strategy	Low cost, no calibration, intuitive	-	(Gigli et al., 2020) multiple arm positions
Vision (Visual)	Camera on board, external camera	head-mounted displays, laptop displays, virtual reality, augmented reality	Increase perceptual experience, engagement, intuitive, promote training	Bulky, not portable, uncomfortable	(Clemente et al., 2016, Markovic et al., 2017, Sharma et al., 2018, Hazubski et al., 2020, Sun et al., 2021b) trajectory, force

The most investigated feedback relies on the sense of touch and therefore consists of cutaneous stimulation. This can be performed with different modalities namely, vibrational, mechanotactile or electrical stimulation.

The **vibrational feedback** is generally implemented with the addition of eccentric rotating motors placed in contact with the skin surface of the stump (Ribeiro et al., 2019). This method is generally employed to augment the robustness of the control system by providing the user with additional information regarding the position of the prosthetic device but it lacks intuitiveness, as the association between perceived sensation and the corresponding information has to be learned by the user. For example, in Bark et al. (2014), the motors were placed

in 4 distinct areas of the stump to guide the user through the desired trajectory while grasping object and the results showed a significant decrease in the root mean square angle error of their limb during the learning process. More recently, Markovic et al. (2019) proposed a joint-oriented feedback criterion consisting of three vibromotors placed on the arm to provide the information on which joint is currently activated by the user, thus restoring proprioceptive sensation. The experiment was performed by 12 able-body subjects and 2 amputees controlling 3 DoF prosthesis, and it was found that the myoelectric multi-amplitude control outperformed the pattern recognition method when the feedback was applied.

Differently from the vibrational, the **mechanotactile feedback** is based on the application of linear actuators on the skin and provides pressure sensation. Antfolk et al. (2013a) exploited this technique and proposed a multisite mechanotactile system to investigate the localization and discrimination threshold of pressure stimuli on the residual limbs of trans-radial amputees. They demonstrated that subjects were able to discriminate between different location of sensation and to differentiate between three different levels of pressure. This study demonstrated that it is possible to transfer tactile input from an artificial hand to the forearm skin after a brief training period. Recently, Svensson et al. (2017) used it to translate the interaction between a virtual reality environment and a virtual hand into user sensation. The authors showed that by placing the tactile actuators in correspondence with the areas of the skin involved in object manipulation, subjects were able to feel a real touch sensation that increased their sense of body ownership. For example, pressure applied to the prosthetic fingers was perceived as a tactile sensation on the skin (Svensson et al., 2017).

The **electrical feedback** is based on transcutaneous stimulation. The elicited sensations range from perception of pressure (Jorgovanovic et al., 2014) to slip sensations (Xu et al., 2015), depending on the electrical parameters (i.e., current amplitude, pulse frequency, pulse width). One advantage of this approach with respect to the vibrotactile and mechanotactile ones is the lack of moving components avoiding problems of electrode displacement and, thus, improving the sensors-skin contact. Nevertheless, it is important to take into account that the noise introduced by the electric stimulation can corrupt the acquisition of muscular activity, causing errors if the ULP is myoelectrically controlled. Moreover, the perceptions are not strictly confined to the zone under the stimulating device but they can spread in a wider region if the area above a nerve is considered.

Another sensory modality exploited for feedback delivery is the acoustic one. Gigli et al. (2020) recently tested a novel acquisition protocol with additional **acoustic feedback** in 18 able-body participants to improve myoelectric control. The protocol consisted in dynamically acquiring EMG data in multiple arm positions while returning an acoustic signal to urge the participants to hover with the arm in specific regions of their peri-personal space. The results showed that the interaction between user and prosthesis during the data acquisition step was able to significantly improve myoelectric control. Auditory feedback has also been employed to convey artificial proprioceptive and exteroceptive information. Lundborg et al. (1999) and Gonzalez et al. (2012) employed auditory feedback by encoding the movement of different fingers into different sounds. The method demonstrated that the

inclusion of auditory feedback reduces the mental effort and increase the human-machine interaction; furthermore, better temporal performance and better grasping performance were obtained.

In the last years, there have been some examples exploiting vision to deliver sensory feedback. Indeed, **visual stimulation** can be provided as explicit feedback through screens during game-like exercises, helping the prosthetic user to learn how to control the device (e.g., adjusting trajectory or grasping force) (Markovic et al., 2018). However, adding sensory information to the prosthetic user's perceptual experience in real contexts requires solutions like Augmented Reality (AR, occurring when computer-generated items overlay a real setting) or Mixed Reality (MR, a term that represented different combinations of real and virtual items) (Milgram and Kishino, 1994, Speicher et al., 2019). AR and MR environments, implemented through wearable solutions like head-mounted displays, can support the actual control of a prosthetic device through visual feedback that does not occlude the real context (Clemente et al., 2016, Markovic et al., 2017, Hazubski et al., 2020). However, they can also be used for prosthetic use training (Anderson and Bischof, 2014, Sharma et al., 2018) – in such a case, Virtual Reality (VR, a fully computer-generated setting) can offer visual feedback too (Lamounier et al., 2010, Sun et al., 2021b), especially within game-based frameworks (Nissler et al., 2019) for engaging the users and motivating their activity.

3.3.2. Invasive methods

There are different technologies that can be employed to provide a sensation directly to the nerve (Cutrone and Micera, 2019, Raspopovic et al., 2021a). The most used employ **intrafascicular electrodes**, such as **transverse intrafascicular multichannel electrodes** (TIME) and **wire** and **thin-film longitudinal intrafascicular electrodes** (LIFE), which can both record muscle activity (e.g., iEMG) and stimulate nerves. Other solutions are characterized by the fact that the electrodes are placed around the nerves, such as **cuff electrodes** and **flat interface nerve electrodes** (FINE).

The first example of ULP with sensory stimulation dates back to 1979 and it was based on the remapping between pressure signals acquired by prosthesis sensors to an amplitude-frequency modulation. This consisted of a series of pulses delivered with a pulse rate proportional to the increment of the pinch force and provided through dry electrodes placed over the skin in correspondence of the median nerve, as described in Shannon (1979). Later, the group of Micera employed thin-film intrafascicular electrodes longitudinally implanted in peripheral nerves (tf-LIFE4) to deliver electrical stimulation. With this method, they were able to elicit sensation of missing hand in the fascicular projection territories of the corresponding

1

2

31038 nerves and to modulate the sensation by varying the pulse 1090
 41039 width and pulse frequency (Benvenuto et al., 2010). 1091
 51040 Importantly, this method avoids muscle crosstalk, 1092
 61041 fundamental for guaranteeing myoelectric control. More 1093
 71042 recently, new bioinspired paradigms have been suggested 1094
 81043 to better induce natural sensations (Raspovic et al., 1095
 91044 2021a). In particular, the study of Oddo et al. (2016) 1096
 101045 showed that it is possible to restore textural features 1097
 111046 recorded by an artificial fingertip. This device embedded a 1098
 121047 neuromorphic real-time mechano-neuro-transducer, 1099
 131048 which emulated the firing dynamics of SA1 cutaneous 1100
 141049 afferents. The emulated firing rate was converted into 1101
 151050 temporal pattern of electrical spikes that were delivered to 1102
 161051 the human median nerve via percutaneous 1103
 171052 microstimulation in one trans-radial amputee. 1104
 181053 Valle et al. (2018) suggested a ‘hybrid’ encoding 1105
 191054 strategy based on simultaneous biomimetic frequency and 1106
 201055 amplitude modulation. This kind of stimulation was 1107
 211056 perceived more natural with respect to classical stimulation 1108
 221057 protocol, enabling better performance in tasks requiring 1109
 231058 fine identification of the applied force. This paradigm was 1110
 241059 tested and validated during a virtual egg test (Valle et al., 1111
 251060 2018), where the subject needed to modulate the force 1112
 261061 applied to move sensorized blocks. This encoding strategy 1113
 271062 not only improves gross manual dexterity in functional task 1114
 281063 but also improved the prosthesis embodiment, reducing 1115
 291064 abnormal phantom limb perceptions. 1116
 301065 Similarly, Osborn et al. (2018) implemented a 1117
 311066 neuromorphic feedback paradigm based on Izhikevich 1118
 321067 neuron model to generate the current spike train to inject 1119
 331068 directly in the median and ulnar nerves, using beryllium 1120
 341069 copper (BeCu) probes. Their prosthesis proposes a 1121
 351070 neuromorphic multilayered artificial skin to perceive touch 1122
 361071 and pain. Their transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation 1123
 371072 (TENS) allows to elicit innocuous and noxious tactile 1124
 381073 perceptions in the phantom hand. The multilayered 1125
 391074 electronic dermis (e-dermis) produces receptor-like spiking 1126
 401075 neural activity that allows to discriminate object curvature, 1127
 411076 including sharpness in a more natural sensation spanning a 1128
 421077 range of tactile stimuli for prosthetic hands. The authors 1129
 431078 were able not only to restore finger touch discrimination 1130
 441079 and objects recognition, but also to provide a pain sensation 1131
 451080 when the prosthesis touched sharp objects. In particular, 1132
 461081 they found that pain sensation is generated by a stimulation 1133
 471082 of 15-20Hz. 1134
 481083 Tan et al. (2014) suggested that simple electronic cuff 1135
 491084 placed around nerves in the upper arm can directly activate 1136
 501085 the neural pathways responsible for hand sensations. This 1137
 511086 neural interface enabled the restoration of different 1138
 521087 sensations at many locations on the neuroprosthetic hand. 1139
 531088 Different stimulation patterns could transform the typical 1140
 541089 “tingling sensation” of electrical stimulation into multiple 1141

57

58

59

60

different natural sensations, enabling the amputees to perform fine motor tasks and improving the embodiment.

In George et al. (2019a) a biomimetic method was described to restore both force and haptic sensation. The sensory feedback was implemented to restore the force sensation and promote objects recognition: Utah Slanted Electrode Array (USEA) electrodes were used to deliver stimulation proportional to the variation of contact force exchanged between the prosthesis and the object during manipulation. Instead, the haptic sensation was based on the distribution of stimulation delivered during contact with the object with a fixed frequency and amplitude. The characteristic of this encoding scheme is based on electrical biphasic, charge – balanced of 200- or 320- μ s phase durations. The biomimetic model describes the instantaneous firing rate of the afferent population using the contact stimulus position, velocity, and acceleration simulating all tactile fibers to any spatiotemporal deformation of the skin and hand. This strategy allows the amputee to augment the active exploration experience and to discriminate object size and stiffness.

Liu et al. (2021b) have shown that primary afferents encode different stimulus features in distinct yet overlapping ways: scanning speed and contact force are encoded primarily in firing rates, whereas texture is encoded in the spatial distribution of the activated fibers, and in precisely timed spiking sequences. When multiple aspects of tactile stimuli vary at the same time, these different neural codes allow for information to be multiplexed in the responses of single neuron and populations of neurons. Exploiting this sensory architecture with invasive methods may lead to the development of prosthetic devices able to truly evoke natural sensations.

Another promising approach is **targeted sensory reinnervation (TSR)**, i.e. the sensory version of TMR, which consists in coupling a pressure sensor placed on the prosthetic device to surgically redirected cutaneous sensory nerves (Marasco et al., 2011). This technique strongly helps discrimination of objects size and stiffness during active exploration, especially if the tactile feedback is biomimetic (George et al., 2019b). Recently, Marasco et al. (2021) have developed a prosthetic system based on both targeted sensory and motor reinnervation. TSR was used to deliver both touch and kinesthetic feedback. The authors showed that the system was able to significantly improve device control and promote embodiment.

These results indicate that, in order to close the loop on user and provide useful sensation (regardless the specific feedback modality), an optimal feedback control policy is necessary (Sensinger and Dosen, 2020), as discussed in section 4.4.

4. Prosthetic Control Strategies and Algorithms

Although the focus of this section is on the active prosthesis, it is worth mentioning that an important portion of the amputees still uses body-powered prosthesis (Carey et al., 2015). These are cable-operated devices usually equipped with split hook or hand as terminal part (Millstein et al., 1986).

Ranging from standard control approaches (e.g., dual-site control (Scott and Parker, 1988)) to simultaneous control of multiple degrees of freedom (e.g., pattern recognition (Hahne et al., 2018)), the literature offers

movement intentions (Figure 5 C, yellow panel – layer 1). In the next sections, we describe these different levels of control and provide examples of the different strategies that can be used.

4.1. Low-level control: from control commands to motor actuation

The low-level control combines the well-known strategies implemented in the automation industry to operate autonomous machines, e.g., industrial robots. We will not detail the structure and mathematical formality of




Figure 5. Architecture of ULP control: actuation and feedback. Input signals collected from the user (A) are processed into the embedded processing unit (C) to generate control commands for the single joint control unit (D). Feedback information coming from the prosthesis or its interaction with the environment (E) are also processed in the embedded processing unit (C) to deliver sensory feedback (B). The embedded processing unit (C) can be set up by different layers: layer 1 (intention detection, yellow panel) is the software turning the input signals (A) sampled by master board into detected movement intentions, by means of specific control algorithms (e.g., machine learning or deep learning algorithms); layer 2 (human-robot interaction, green panel) is the software responsible of processing prosthesis position (joint and cartesian space control) and external information (tactile identification, E); layer 3 (encoding haptic feedback, blue panel) is the software responsible for encoding the information processed in layer 2 into sensory feedback. The output of the embedded processing unit are control commands (mediated by actuator drivers) both to move the device and to provide sensory feedback. This has a direct impact on the user experience (F) in terms of learning how to use the device (training) and of user-prosthesis integration (embodiment).

disparate solutions for ULP control depending on the type of input signal and the sensors density.

In general, prosthetic control is performed at different levels. The low level refers to **motor actuation** (Figure 5 D) and, more in general, to the control of the active degrees of freedom of the device; the medium level consists of the translation of **movement intentions** into joint references and gestures (Figure 5 C); the high-level control translates **input signals** collected from the user (Figure 5 A) into

these control architectures. However, if the readers are curious, a more complete and detailed analysis of robot lower-level control is provided by the comprehensive work of Siciliano et al. (2010).

In brief, at the base of these controls, there is always an active and controllable actuator, that for upper limb prosthetic solutions coincides – most of the times – with an electrical motor (either brushed or brushless) often coupled to a dedicated transmission system (e.g., a planetary gear)

1
2
31181 to reach the desired torque-speed characteristic. It is 1232
41182 possible to present the low-level control of upper limb 1233
51183 prostheses as the combination of three possible nested 1234
61184 controllers: the **current**, the **speed** and the **position** control 1235
71185 loops (Figure 5 D). 1236

81186 The *current control loop* takes care of reliably tracking 1237
91187 desired current trajectories. To be implemented, it requires 1238
101188 the presence of reliable and precise current measurement 1239
111189 sensors. The current control also provides a relatively good 1240
121190 force/torque control of the system, being the current 1241
131191 absorbed by the actuator directly proportional to the 1242
141192 generated output torque. On top of the current controller, it 1243
151193 is usually found a *speed control loop* to regulate the 1244
161194 rotational speed of the motor and, thus, the speed of the 1245
171195 actuated system. The combination of an external speed 1246
181196 controller with an internal current control guarantees the 1247
191197 possibility of safely operate the actuating unit in terms of 1248
201198 desired speeds and torques. Sometimes, on top or in 1249
21199 substitution to the speed controller, systems also 1250
221200 implement a *position control loop*. The position controller 1251
231201 guarantees the tracking of desired angular trajectories. It is 1252
241202 therefore preferable to use the speed controller if the goal 1253
251203 is to precisely track given trajectories in specific time 1254
261204 intervals. The implementation and application of speed and 1255
271205 position controllers can be performed either before (fast 1256
281206 shaft) or after (slow shaft) of the transmission system. The 1257
291207 decision depends on the availability of sensing devices 1258
301208 (e.g., angular sensors such as encoders or resolvers) to 1259
311209 measure the required physical quantities. 1260

321210 All these controllers are implemented in a negative 1261
331211 feedback architecture and typically controlled by means of 1262
341212 **PID** controllers, whose *proportional* (P), *integrative* (I) 1263
351213 and *derivative* (D) parameters are tuned to reach the desired 1264
361214 system response in terms of control reactivity (rise time and 1265
371215 settling time), precision (steady-state error and overshoot) 1266
381216 and stability. It is worth mentioning that a negative 1267
391217 feedback architecture is typically only bounded to the low- 1268
401218 level control of the prosthesis, while higher level 1269
411219 controllers and especially high-level control (see Section 1270
421220 4.3) are often treated in an open-loop fashion, where the 1271
431221 user directly generates the reference control signal without 1272
441222 any feedback verification. The generated reference 1273
451223 commands will then be directly sent to the low-level 1274
461224 controller. 1275

425 4.2. Mid-level control: from movement intention to 1277 430 control commands 1278 435 1279

440 The mid-level techniques (Figure 5 C, yellow panel – 1280
445 *layer 1*) aim to synthesize the **control commands** to 1281
450 suitably activate the electric motors of the multiple DoFs 1282
455 ULP (actuation drivers in Figure 5 C). These signals are the
460 input of the aforementioned low-level control.

A major classification of the mid-level control strategies for multi-DoFs robots divides them in two categories: joint-space and task-space (Cartesian) controllers (Siciliano et al., 2008, Corke and Khatib, 2011).

Joint-space control strategies directly feed the commands to each of the actuated joints, namely DoFs, of the upper-limb robotic device. It is a direct approach that does not require any particular mathematical manipulation. In such a scenario, the mid-level control receives information from the high-level (see Section 4.3), then it assigns specific commands to each low-level controller (see Section 4.1). The logic used to assign the control commands is strongly based on the kind of information coming from the high-level side. Nonetheless, it will most likely reduce to a set of independent commands for each of the actuated joints.

On the other side of the spectrum, we have **task-space based control strategies**. In this case, the control commands for each of the joints are the results of a mathematical manipulation that involves the transformation from the *Cartesian space* to the *joint space*. If the aim is to regulate the Cartesian trajectory, the controller will need to translate the Cartesian trajectories into joint angles, by means of a process known as inverse kinematics. If instead the aim is to regulate the Cartesian force, the controller will transform the Cartesian forces into joint forces (or torques) utilizing the process of inverse dynamics.

Both these approaches are well known to robotic applications and will not be treated in detail in this review. Nonetheless, the authors suggest the comprehensive works of Corke and Khatib (2011) and Siciliano et al. (2008) to get the fundamentals of the aforementioned approaches.

In general, Cartesian based controls are more intuitive for the external user, namely any subject interacting with the robot as an external tool. In fact, the robot behavior can be more naturally interpreted being the forces or the trajectories referred to the three-dimensional space we are used to deal with. However, from a computational and complexity point of view, task-space controllers require a bigger effort and introduce limitations to their application, e.g., singularities, redundancies. On the other hand, joint space control behavior is less intuitive to predict but it is easier and less complex to implement.

Which approach is better for upper-limb prosthetic devices is still unclear. However, it is important to notice that, even if Cartesian controls are more intuitive from an external perspective, they might appear more complex from an internal perspective, such as the one of a prosthesis user, where the motion of the arm is more likely imagined in terms of joint motions and not Cartesian ones.

4.3. High-level control: from input signals to movement intentions

This section summarizes the most assessed techniques for ULP control. Considering the prostheses available on the market but also the research activities, the main input source exploited to control such devices is the EMG. On the basis of the EMG type multiple control strategies can be employed, and the last decades of studies on active prostheses mainly focused on the control strategy design and development.

The most common control strategy is based on **dual site control** which consist in two electrodes placed in two antagonist muscles (Scott and Parker, 1988). This solution allows the control of the motor in two directions according to the muscle amplitude of the selected electrodes. The synthesized reference usually is proportional to the amplitude of the muscle signal in term of speed or force. With the introduction of multiple DoFs, a **co-contraction strategy** has been implemented to switch between controlled joints (Resnik et al., 2018). This allows the control of a single DoF at a time using two electrodes as in dual-site control. When both muscles are simultaneously contracted the control signal switches the joint to be controlled. This is a simple solution yet unnatural and lacking intuitiveness.

Another diffused strategy to control prosthesis with multiple active DoF is the **finite state machine** (FSM) (Moon et al., 2005). Commercially available ULPs implement this strategy to switch the position of the thumb to reproduce different types of grasp (Ottobock, 2020b, Ottobock, 2020a, Ossur, 2020b). For example, the Michelangelo hand allows to switch the thumb position when a signal of opening is triggered with the hand in a fully opened configuration (Ottobock, 2020b).

With the aim of increasing the number of controlled DoFs, many different methods were proposed, such as

1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353

muscle synergies, feature extraction (FE), multi-amplitude threshold control and machine learning methods. Muscle synergies capture muscle activation invariance during motor production and can be exploited as control variables for ULP, with aim of obtaining a biomimetic human-like behavior (d'Avella and Bizzi, 2005). The main idea is to extract motion primitives from muscle synergies and combine them to generate complex arm movements (Jiang et al., 2013, Liu et al., 2021a). Furui et al. (2019) propose a biomimetic control based on muscle synergies to extract motion primitives and combine them to generate complex movements. Feature extraction methods foresee the computation of some EMG-based metrics that reflect movement intentions (Guo et al., 2015). Multi-amplitude threshold methods work as dual-site control, but they associate different amplitudes of the input signal to different DoFs (Markovic et al., 2019). Although robust, these techniques are poorly used because they lack intuitiveness (Markovic et al., 2019). Machine learning methods will be described in the following paragraph.

4.3.1. Machine Learning Algorithms

Figure 6 illustrates the main machine learning methods employed for ULP control. These methods generally solve a pattern recognition problem in which, given the input signal, an output movement have to be identified.

The first PR-based control schemes arose around the second half of 1960s (Scheme and Englehart, 2011). In this configuration, the acquired EMG signals are elaborated by the controller to determine the action to be performed by the prosthesis. The five pillars of this computation process are: *pre-processing, data segmentation, feature extraction, classification, and post-processing*. Each step is briefly described in Table V.

Table V: Pattern recognition steps.

Pre-processing	During this phase, the incoming signals are firstly filtered to delete the interferences, such as acquisition noise and artifacts.
Data segmentation	This process divides the signals into time-windows, overlapping or adjacent (Parajuli et al., 2019).
Features extraction	It reduces the signal information into a set of representative features in time domain (e.g., variance, zero crossing, etc.), frequency domain (e.g., mean frequency, spectral properties, etc.) or time-frequency domain (e.g., the wavelength transform, an alternative to the traditional Fourier Transform useful for noise-removal and data compression (Hartwell et al., 2018)), as described in Boostani and Moradi (2003). Importantly, this part can greatly affect the computational costs.

Classification	This is the crucial step for the classifier, where the controllers recognize and classify the signals input information and generate an output for the actuators.
Post-processing	It has the main goal to reduce as much as possible the misclassification. An example is the majority vote strategy, in which the current output is calculated on the previously most recognized class. The majority vote scheme is used for eliminating spurious misclassifications caused by too short windows on which the most recurrent class is selected; it employs the previous classification results and evaluates the current output on the basis of the previously most recognized class (Englehart et al., 2003).

EMG-based pattern recognition controllers are now investigated by many groups and are even available in commercial prostheses (COAPT, 2017, Ottobock, 2019, i-biomed, 2021).

The PR-based controllers apply linear and non-linear methods to classify the EMG signal into a possible large number of movements. The two main families of classification methods used in this context are **regression** (Hahne et al., 2014) and **classification** techniques (Hudgins et al., 1993). While the former is usually simple to implement and train, the latter are generally more difficult to employ. The embedding of **neural networks** (NN) in an ULP strictly depends on the structure of the algorithm (number of layers and neurons), since complex architecture requires high computational effort (Hagan et al., 1997).

Statistical regression models usually produce good results in terms of high accuracy percentages. However, the out-of-laboratory results are particularly poor, because these techniques are extremely sensitive to changes of the input signals (Parajuli et al., 2019). Motivated by this issue, in the last decade, many groups focused on classification-based techniques to implement more reliable decoders. Importantly, training classifiers requires longer than training linear models, however, the formers can achieve better results during real-time execution. Different classifiers have been exploited in ULP control such as Support Vector Machine, Regularized Least Squares,

whereas the gold-standard is the Linear Discriminant Analysis (Scheme and Englehart, 2011, Cloutier and Yang, 2013b, Di Domenico et al., 2021). Among NN, the most common architecture is the **Multi-Layer Perceptron** (MLP) (Amrani et al., 2017, Shahzaib and Shakil, 2018). The MLP is a supervised ML technique, which exploits labeled data to train the algorithm. It is characterized by three types of layers: input, hidden and output layer. The first one contains the same number of neurons as the input signals (for example, features extracted from EMG signals), the second stage can have one or more layers where there are all the trainable neurons, while the last layer comprises all the output nodes representing the results (for example, classification likelihood of each class of movement). Neurons of a certain layer are fully connected to the neurons in the next layer via nonlinear activation functions. However, as for the regression algorithms, the performance results obtained in the lab are not easily replicated in the real-life scenario. Moreover, the complexity of the controlled prosthesis (e.g., the number of DoFs) corresponds to a higher number of neurons in the NN, with important consequence not only on the computational burden, but also on the memory consumption.

When considering an increase in the number of controllable DoFs, current pattern recognition approaches demonstrated poor performance (Piazza et al., 2020). As a matter of fact, to enhance the classification rate (i.e., number of correctly recognized movement) a greater content of information should be handled. The higher the amount of input data, the more complex would the ML algorithm be.

Therefore, HD-sEMG can be exploited to increase the amount of muscular information but this comes at the cost of higher computational burden. It has been proven that the use of this type of data can be helpful in increasing the robustness against electrode shift (Pan et al., 2015), allowing an improvement of the classification by exploiting spatial images of the muscular contractions (Geng et al., 2016), and for retrieving measures of motor unit potentials, which can be difficult to assess without invasive techniques (Merletti et al., 2008).




Figure 6: Division of machine learning approaches for ULP control.

Different techniques can be exploited to extract motor units' activity from the HD-sEMGs. The main used decomposition algorithm is the **blind source separation** (with the Convolution Kernel Compensation described by Holobar and Zazula (2007)) which seems to be the most suitable since it does not make any prior assumptions on the action potential shapes. The main problems related to this technique is the lack of a useful output for the prosthesis control, since the decomposition provides an extraction of principal features of the EMG signals. On the one hand, the algorithm returns reliable information about neural activity, but, on the other hand, it increases the computational burden required to the system. Indeed, the Holobar algorithm has been used together with ML algorithms to control robotic arm in real-time (Barsakcioglu and Farina, 2018).

Another approach includes the exploitation of ML algorithms where the input EMG signals are considered as numeric values and the definition of the output is based on a **Black Box technique**. Therefore, the mathematical tools contained in the Black Box do not take into account the biomechanics of the amputated limb and they are not specific for prosthetic applications.

It is relevant to feed the ML algorithm via a set of EMG signals (muscular patterns) specific for different prosthesis movements in such a way that the classifier does not misclassify. However, it is not always feasible to acquire the same signals for each movement due to different sources of errors (i.e., muscle fatigue, sweating, electrode misalignment). Indeed, more complex classifiers belonging to the **Deep Learning** (DL) field are exploited to make the control more robust. A possible application can be the use of **Convolutional Neural Network** (CNN), which exploits dimensionality reduction to extract complex features from the activation maps of the HD-sEMG without dramatically increasing the computation time (Olsson et al., 2019). This type of algorithm is also ideal for increasing the number of DoFs (and therefore the number of classes to be recognized) while keeping a quite high accuracy rate (Hartwell et al., 2018). Moreover, Zhai et al. (2017) has proved that the exploitation of CNN can help in removing issues of daily life noise, updating its feature map to include this new information, avoiding the need of periodical readjustment.

Adaptive technique based on **reinforcement learning** (Vasan and Pilarski, 2017, Wu et al., 2022) has been recently investigated, with the aim of facilitating the learning process of prosthetic use. This approach is promising as it points towards the development of a "human-prosthesis symbiosis in which human motor control and intelligent prosthesis control function as one system", as defined by the group of Huang et al. (2021).

Other DL algorithms take into account time series with feedback loops with prior hidden layers (Sun et al., 2021a). This architecture allows storing the history of the input signals by considering the information of previous time instants, also resulting in performance improvements with respect to simpler DL architectures (Amado Laezza, 2018).

Recently, novel DL strategies have also been proposed for ULP: **Recurrent Neural Networks** process temporal or sequential information; **Temporal Convolutional Networks** take advantage of a one-dimensional convolution layer running along the time dimension to learn the time dependence of a given input signal (Li et al., 2021); **Transformers** are attention-based architectures applied to HD-sEMG data (Montazerin et al., 2022, Burrello et al., 2022).

Overall, the main problem related to ML applied to the bionic field is the evident gap between the results observed in a closed safe environment, such as a laboratory, and in real daily life (Resnik, 2011).

4.3.2. Model-based approaches

To overcome the limitations of ML algorithms for ULP control, some groups investigated the model-based approach, which consists of an accurate description of the muscles and bones involved in the movements starting from the **Hill model** of muscle fiber (Winters, 1990). For example, the **neuromusculoskeletal model** extracts from the residual EMGs the activation dynamics of the limb (Pan et al., 2018, Zhao et al., 2022). The activation dynamics combined with the kinematics of the limb produces the contraction dynamics. This consists of the modification of fiber length involved in the motion along the specific DoFs. In particular, Sartori et al. (2018) implemented a control strategy based on the physiology and kinematics of a real hand and tested it with an amputated subject performing some complex grasping tasks. This approach needs a calibration step to scale the model to the subject specific activation EMGs. Results showed great stability over the noise introduced by sensors or movements artifacts. Moreover, the amputee was able to reproduce simultaneous multi-DoF gestures. The limitation of this approach is its susceptibility to electrode shift and fatigue condition that affects the EMG acquisition. The real-life scenario is yet to be tested, but preliminary results appear very promising (Sartori et al., 2018).

4.3.3. Sensor/Data-fusion and other techniques

For ULP control using different input sources together with or without EMG signals, other methods can be adopted. In case of force myography, the same algorithms used for EMG input can be applied. For example, machine learning techniques can be used to analyze and synthesize output starting from FMG input (Cho et al., 2016). The adoption of other input signals different from EMG clearly

1
2
3 requires the implementation of ad-hoc methods for their
4 processing. For example, voice control introduces audio
5 analysis method to detect and translate command into
6 prosthetic movements (Mainardi and Davalli, 2007,
7 Alkhafaf et al., 2020). Further, tongue control allows the
8 motion of the prosthesis using a wireless controller
9 resembling a dental retainer and providing the functionality
10 of a wireless joystick or keyboard (Johansen et al., 2016).
11 The high complexity of ULP control has led to the
12 development of sensor fusion approaches, in which input
13 signals of different nature are simultaneously collected and
14 then processed to estimate the intended movement more
15 reliably and accurately.

16 On low-density sEMG, we can find robust and semi-
17 autonomous control solutions based on custom multi-
18 amplitude algorithms, as those implemented on the
19 Michelangelo hand with CMAC control (Markovic et al.,
20 2019, Mouchoux et al., 2021). The adoption of IMU
21 sensors may lead to further improvements, such as the
22 automatic adaptation to unexpected external factors,
23 including sweat, muscle fatigue, mental stress, electrode
24 re-positioning and weather conditions. The state-of-the-art
25 algorithms have to cope with these challenging issues.
26 Therefore, the combination of EMG and IMU as input to a
27 classifier could provide useful localization information of
28 the hand position, which could delete possible false
29 positives, actively improving the obtained accuracy
30 (Krasoulis et al., 2017, Krasoulis et al., 2019b). Moreover,
31 it has been observed that integrating EMG, IMU and
32 artificial vision sensors could benefit both the classifier
33 accuracy and the increment of available DoFs (Mouchoux
34 et al., 2021). Other promising research advancements
35 demonstrated that mixing EMG with FMG could lead to an
36 improved multi-DoFs control as proposed by (Nowak et
37 al., 2020). Similarly, Jiang et al. (2020) proposed a sensor
38 fusion approach among EMG and FMG. Moreover, by
39 fusing FMG and IMU, other interesting results were
40 presented by (Ferigo et al., 2017). In addition, other
41 research activities treated NIRS fused with EMG (Guo et
42 al., 2017b) and IMU respectively (Zhao et al., 2019).

43 In conclusion, a data fusion aims at compensating some
44 of the main limiting factors of single input approaches
45 (such as EMG-based or others) as these latter suffer from
46 artifacts, electrodes shift, etc.

47 4.4. Control strategies for the Sensory Feedback and 48 Closed-Loop approaches

49 Recent developments in the prosthetic field have
50 focused attention on sensory feedback restoration. In
51 particular, many groups began studying how to provide the
52 user with information about the interaction between the
53 prosthetic system and the physical world. This information
54 needs to be collected (Figure 5 E), processed (Figure 5 C,

1582 green panel – layer 2) and encoded into control signals
1583 (Figure 5 C, blue panel – layer 3) for the feedback system
1584 (Figure 5 B, e.g., vibromotors, electrostimulation, etc.).

The control strategy implemented to encode this
information depends on the type of sensation to restore as,
for instance, tactile feedback (pressure, temperature, pain)
or proprioception feedback (gestures, joint movements). o
this aim, different solutions have been developed.

Mamidanna et al. (2021) focused their research activity
on the force feedback that the prosthesis applies to the
grasped objects by using vibromotors attached to the
forearm skin. To do that, an encoding scheme of the current
absorbed by the prosthetic motor was translated into
vibromotors amplitude. Other sensorized solutions have
been developed to directly translate the prosthesis
interaction to user sensation like artificial skin able to
translate the distribution of pressure and intensity to tactile
and pain sensations on users with invasive interfaces (Jiang
et al., 2019). Similarly, Markovic et al. (2019)
implemented a proprioceptive feedback translating
prosthesis movements into vibration orientation and shape
to be intuitively interpreted by users.

In addition to prosthetic feedback, some groups are
working on user feedback in terms of providing
information about how the prosthesis is controlled by
means of closed-loop approaches. For example,
Schweissfurth et al. (2016) have tested on amputees a ULP
system in which EMG input used to drive the prosthesis
was translated into intensity of vibromotors activation. In
this configuration, the amount of EMG activity detected is
directly proportional to prosthesis grasping strength and to
intensity of vibration amplitude. In another work, the
control commands generated by the user and translated into
joint angles were encoded as proprioceptive information
delivered through electrical stimulation (Garenfeld et al.,
2020). This allowed user to understand if the intended
control command was correctly detected by the algorithms.

Similarly, Tecnalia developed a ULP system with
sensory feedback by merging into a unique device EMG
acquisition and electrical stimulation (Štrbac et al., 2016).
Although this solution significantly reduced the problem of
encumbrance, it still faces some issues mainly related to the
artifacts that the stimulation produces on the EMG signal
and that cannot be removed using standard signal
processing algorithms (Li et al., 2019).

As for decoding of movement intention from input
signals, the interpretation of feedback information needs a
calibration procedure aimed at familiarizing the user with
the ULP device. In this context, it is fundamental to guide
the user to: (i) produce the correct input signal to perform
the desired movement, and (ii) to intuitively convert the
feedback signal into useful information for motor planning.

A user-centered approach can maximize and speed-up the learning process, as detailed in next section.

5. User-Centered Solutions in Upper Limb Prosthetics

As observed in previous sections, multiple efforts in research and development offer heterogeneous technological solutions to enable a proficient control of an ULP device. However, selecting a sub-set of these solutions is compulsory for implementing and validating them. Accordingly, this section will discuss user-centered solutions based on the technologies described in the previous paragraphs, highlighting the opportunity of overcoming a separation (often, an opposition) between (for instance) user-centered features and technical ones, or between ADL-related performance and biomimetic one. Nevertheless, we decided to proceed in the selection of each solution by pragmatically moving from one perspective towards the other.

Fundamentally important criteria for performing such a selection should come from the analysis of the prosthetic user experience (Figure 5 F). Indeed, special attention should be paid to the user needs in order to promote the daily use of prosthetic devices, a prerequisite for checking the validity of any technological solution presented in previous sections.

In particular, the prosthetic technology acceptance constitutes a dramatic issue in this domain. Overall, ULP technology acceptance (Longfellow, 2014) is tied to several interdependent functional factors related to ease of use (sensory feedback, control), dexterity (motion complexity, force output, actuation speed, manipulation), body integration (anthropomorphism, autonomy, weight), technology transfer (cost, reliability). Further factors embrace several domains, namely clinical (age, level of amputation, fitting timespan), cultural (education, social conditions, living environment, country development), and personal (psychological attitudes, subjective expectations, occupation, activity, environment).

Low acceptance can contribute to the abandonment of a prosthetic hand, erasing any chance of improvement in the control skills of the users (Castellini, 2020). Thus, it is important to promote an intrinsically motivated and continuous ULP practice, which must be experienced by the users as immediate and rewarding in order to achieve high degrees of technology acceptance (Rodgers et al., 2019) and integration (Shaw et al., 2018). The users must also feel engaged enough to surpass the impact of feeling social stigma or the doubts on the functional impact of the system on daily life. Intuitive patterns of system control play a critical role in this context to facilitate a spontaneous use of the system and to improve the user experience (Krasoulis et al., 2019a).

Obviously, the absence of appropriate acceptance, usability, and user engagement creates a barrier for the introduction (and the further development) of any technological improvement in prosthetics.

5.1. Towards User-Centered Upper Limb Prosthetics

In order to improve the ULP acceptance, different approaches can be adopted, especially in terms of user research (Figliolia et al., 2019). A review of Cordella et al. (2016) provided a rich set of guidelines for enhancing the prosthetic hand technology acceptance through the analysis of the user requirements, considering literature and case studies like Luchetti et al. (2015). Among these requirements: the capability to accomplish basic grasping actions during activities of daily living with minimal visuo-attentional focus, high dexterity, appropriate strength control; biomimetic features of sensory feedback and anthropomorphism; duration and reliability of the device and its component; technical features with impact on comfort like heat dissipation and motor noise reduction.

All features must be designed according to individual preferences. These preferences can depend on demographic factors, type and level of amputation, pain symptoms, and type of prosthesis (e.g., body-powered or myoelectric) (Biddiss and Chau, 2007, Biddiss et al., 2007, Davis and Onge, 2017, Uellendahl, 2017, Smail et al., 2020, Kerver et al., 2020). The amputees' preferences must also be investigated to design virtual and augmented environments for prosthetic use training (Garske et al., 2021b). If appropriately devised, game-like engaging exercises can motivate the user to train, feeding the prosthetic with consistent biosignals that efficiently represent different types of grasps, an advantageous condition for ML based control (Tabor et al., 2017). This can possibly happen with a successful generalization if the training is adequately designed with solutions like task switching (Heerschop et al., 2021). Overall, the training designers should focus not only on playfully engaging the user to train the muscles, but also on accurately representing prosthetic use tasks to enable the related skills transfer (Garske et al., 2021a). Furthermore, the parameters of meaningful and, possibly, ecological interactive settings can be experimentally controlled by the clinician or the researcher (Resnik et al., 2011, Bouwsema et al., 2014, Paljic, 2017, Markovic et al., 2017, Nissler et al., 2019, Phelan et al., 2021, Boschmann et al., 2021). In addition, interactive settings can be adjusted to the individual needs and reactions. To understand the individual needs in prosthetic use (training and daily activities), the improvement of user research methodologies themselves becomes a priority to promote effective co-creation frameworks. Recent works (Jones et al., 2021) described surveys and workshops to investigate the point of view of

1
2
3 1738 amputees and all stakeholders (clinicians, academics, 1791
4 1739 experts and managers in industry and charity), observing a 1792
5 1740 gap between laboratories and the real life of prosthetic 1793
6 1741 users (whose issues are typically misrepresented by media 1794
7 1742 too). Interestingly, initiatives like the Cybathlon 1795
8 1743 competitions for assistive and prosthetic technology users 1796
9 1744 are also devised for overcoming such a gap (Riener, 2016). 1797

10 1745 The users' involvement in iterative activities of design 1798
11 1746 and evaluation of products and of product services is highly 1799
12 1747 important (O'Sullivan et al., 2017). Such activities must 1800
13 1748 be planned for checking and improving the usability of 1801
14 1749 prostheses as medical devices according to the 1802
15 1750 international standards (Pelayo et al., 2021) and for 1803
16 1751 estimating the impact of user experience on the technology 1804
17 1752 acceptance (Longo, 2018, Lah et al., 2020). Obviously, 1805
18 1753 user-centered evaluation methodologies and metrics must 1806
19 1754 be adjusted to the specific case of ULPs (Resnik, 2011, 1807
20 1755 Zahabi et al., 2019), especially considering how their user 1808
21 1756 interface is not based just on buttons, plugs, and LEDS and 1809
22 1757 their behavior and feedback are eminently biomimetic in 1810
23 1758 hand-like manipulation tasks. 1811

24 1759 The functional resemblance of the ULP design to a real 1812
25 1760 hand is a wise strategy for promoting a positive interaction 1813
26 1761 between user and prosthesis. Such an approach (implicitly 1814
27 1762 and explicitly) aims at building artificial limbs that are 1815
28 1763 spontaneously used by the amputees as their own. Such a 1816
29 1764 "prosthetic ownership" experience is deeply investigated 1817
30 1765 within the domain of the embodiment research, crossing 1818
31 1766 disciplines like cognitive psychology and robotics 1819
32 1767 according to the roadmap in Beckerle et al. (2018). 1820

33 1768 The embodiment phenomenon can be constituted across 1820
34 1769 its components, i.e., self-location, ownership, and agency, 1821
35 1770 by the sensation that an artifact is integrated in one's body 1822
36 1771 scheme (Kilteni et al., 2012, Maimon Mor and Makin, 1823
37 1772 2020, Toet et al., 2020). Overall, the technology 1824
38 1773 embodiment promotes intuitive control with improved user 1825
39 1774 experience and acceptance (Makin et al., 2017, Nelson et 1826
40 1775 al., 2020, Toet et al., 2020). About ULPs, the embodiment 1827
41 1776 improves: (i) movement control (Grechuta et al., 2017), (ii) 1828
42 1777 object discrimination and manipulation (Tan et al., 2014), 1829
43 1778 (iii) manual accuracy and sensitivity. Furthermore these 1830
44 1779 processes contribute to: (iv) the reduction of the phantom- 1831
45 1780 limb pain (Page et al., 2018) and (v) the mitigation of the 1832
46 1781 risk of prosthesis abandonment (McDonnell et al., 1989, 1833
47 1782 Beckerle et al., 2019). 1834

48 1783 Obviously, we must ponder how to measure and to 1835
49 1784 stimulate the prosthetic embodiment. Overall, the 1836
50 1785 embodiment evaluation is typically entrusted to methods 1837
51 1786 (questionnaires, biosignal analysis, proprioceptive drift) 1838
52 1787 based on the Rubber Hand Illusion (RHI) studies 1839
53 1788 (Botvinick and Cohen, 1998, Tsakiris and Haggard, 2005, 1840
54 1789 Ehrsson et al., 2008, Romano et al., 2021). RHI can be also 1841
55 1790 implemented on its different versions - e.g., Virtual Hand 1842

Illusion (Pyasik et al., 2020, Beckerle, 2021) and Robotic Hand Illusion (Romano et al., 2015, Huynh et al., 2019). However, these methodologies are still debated in cognitive studies (Gallagher et al., 2021) which show the complexity of the processes underlying the embodiment itself.

Understanding such processes is required for designing appropriate strategies to enhance the embodiment of an artificial limb. First of all, it must be said that daily prosthetic practice, individual characteristics (like the cause of limb absence), and multisensory feedback congruency play fundamental roles in this process, which does not necessarily require cosmetic improvements or specific control patterns (body-powered or myoelectric) (Dornfeld et al., 2016, Engdahl et al., 2020b, Zbinden et al., 2021, Moore et al., 2021). Embodiment training strategies can also be explored in virtual and augmented settings (Barresi et al., 2021), even if the generalization of their effects to actual prostheses must be investigated. Importantly, establishing optimal techniques to promote the embodiment of an artificial limb is a way to fully engage the user in exploring the prosthetic device and its potential, further improving its embodiment too within a virtuous circle.

However, it is necessary to consider what technological challenges must be faced for achieving a truly "biomimetic" experience as the prosthetic embodiment to improve the use and the acceptance of an artificial limb.

5.2. Promoting Prosthetic Use and Acceptance through Improved Mechatronics and Control

To improve ULPs, two main classes of approaches can be taken: one focusing on mechatronic development and the other on control implementation. From the mechatronic side we suggest *optimized actuation, anthropomorphism, human-like grasping behaviour, and biomimetic performance* as key factors to take into account for promoting ULP use and acceptance, while from the control perspective we identify *robust control strategies and use of smart prostheses*. Moreover, we believe the inclusion of *multimodal sensory feedback* a fundamental prerequisite of next generation prostheses. Each approach contributes to approximate the prosthetic user experience and the user-prosthesis system performance to, respectively, the sensations provided by a natural limb and its spontaneous and effective usage. However, all approaches face issues that must be solved in order to obtain a robustly controlled prosthetic system easily accepted by the user. These approaches thus constitute research challenges, summarized in Table VI with their actual potential solutions.

Table VI: Current issues affecting ULP mechatronics and control.

	<i>Challenge Description</i>	<i>Current and Possible Solutions</i>
MECHATRONICS	<p>Optimized Actuation</p> <p>The actuation architecture (i.e., the number of actuators employed) influences the overall performance of the device in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • amount of possible gestures/configurations (therefore controllability and dexterity); • contribution to ULP weight; • grasping strength; • acoustic noise during actuation (i.e., reduction stage). 	<p>There are two possible strategies to optimize the actuation of ULPs.</p> <p>From a qualitative point of view, a fully actuated system might lead to independent control of each single joint thus allowing to replicate the full amount of gestures of a real hand. However, this solution is typically characterized by a heavier and bulkier or poorly performing system. Moreover, this configuration prevents the use of power motors to generate human-like grasping strength.</p> <p>On the other hand, an underactuated device might guarantee compactness, light weightiness and the possibility to achieve more efficient actuation and therefore higher performance, at the cost of passive uncontrolled degrees of freedom.</p> <p>Both actuation solutions are still affected by acoustic noise during prosthetic movements and this constitutes room for improvement for future development.</p>
	<p>Anthropomorphism</p> <p>Anthropomorphism also represents a key design feature for an ULP. In fact, users are more prone to adopt and utilize anthropomorphic devices that anatomically and functionally resemble their missing limb as much as possible (Varol et al., 2014).</p>	<p>In two useful reviews on mechanical and anthropomorphic aspects of prosthetic hands, Belter and colleagues proposed a list of guidelines to achieve, by mechanical and mechatronic means, the desired hand anthropomorphism in terms of size, weight, shape and kinematic capabilities (Belter and Dollar, 2011, Belter et al., 2013).</p> <p>The group of Metta proposed a systematic approach to benchmark different robotic and prosthetic hands in terms of shape, feature and performance, observing a continuous need for weight, payload and generic grasps improvement while maintaining an anthropomorphic appearance (Vazhapilli Sureshbabu et al., 2019).</p> <p>However, it should be mentioned that a minority of ULP users do not recognize anthropomorphism as priority, focusing their needs on functionality. In some cases, the ULP is deliberately unconventional and worn as a fashion gadget or stylized wearable art pieces (De Oliveira Barata, 2021).</p>
	<p>Human-like grasping behavior</p> <p>Human-like grasping behavior represents the aesthetic capability of the ULP to synergistically operate and adapt its configuration and to robustly perform different sets of grasping tasks.</p>	<p>Underactuated solutions greatly simplify the accomplishment of this due to their intrinsic capability of conforming to the object to be manipulated during grasp (Catalano et al., 2014, Weiner et al., 2018, Laffranchi et al., 2020). On the other hand, in systems with</p>

		such architecture, human-like behavior is limited exclusively to the grasping function.
	Biomimetic performance	
	The <i>biomimetic performance</i> is intended as the capacity of reaching the desired biomechanical force and speed requirements in the different activities of daily living.	Achieving the force and speed of the biological hand in an anthropomorphic prosthesis is an extremely challenging task. High integration density can be facilitated by adopting mechatronic architectures with high efficiency. This can be achieved by using once again underactuation, which centralizes the power source (motor) and minimizes the number of transmission components which dissipate mechanical power (Laffranchi et al., 2020).
CONTROL	Robust Control strategies	
	<p>The control strategy is a fundamental element to provide the ability of simultaneous actuation of multiple joints and to improve the activities of daily living (ADLs) of the amputees. It is strongly linked to the onboard mechatronics, and in particular the number of active joints plays an important role.</p> <p>In the case of fully actuated systems, the relationship between inputs and outputs is complex and unintuitive, due to the limited amount of input information, for example carried from the superficial EMG signal (i.e. extrinsic muscles, residual muscular activity) (Farina et al., 2004). Typically, control strategies on commercial devices are based on buttons (Ottobock, 2020a) or smartphone apps (Ossur, 2020a) to respectively configure the hand grasps and gestures.</p> <p>Considering an underactuated system, the relation between inputs and outputs for trans-radial case is typically based on the real residual muscle of the forearm. In this case, the research is focused on finding a connection between EMG and movements (Marinelli et al., 2020, Nguyen et al., 2021). Considering a trans-humeral or interscapular/ shoulder disarticulation, the loss of muscles related to the actuation of hand and wrists increases the complexity of relation between inputs and outputs, resulting in a less intuitive control.</p>	<p>Innovative solutions based on ML algorithms are routinely used for trans-radial amputation and have been proposed not only for underactuated but also for fully actuated ULPs to translate the user intentions into single finger movements (Nguyen et al., 2021). These methods are intuitive and functional, but they are still not widespread in the market due to their limited robustness over time, requiring frequent recalibration of the entire system (Marinelli et al., 2020). Possible solutions in this regard are constituted by maximizing the user experience during training (Del Vecchio et al., 2021), or by incremental learning strategies for device control that allows continual adaptation to the changes in the input signals (Gijsberts et al., 2014).</p> <p>For trans-humeral amputation, the target muscle reinnervation (TMR) is the most promising solution for simultaneous control of a multi-DoF prosthetic system (Mereu et al., 2021). Also in this case, ML algorithms represent an interesting approach to relate the muscular activity of the reinnervated limb into more intuitive and physiological movements.</p>
	Smart prostheses	
	Current prostheses lack of the possibility to automatically process an incoming stream of information, differently from the human hand that is equipped with automatic behavior in response to certain stimuli. For example, our hand immediately reacts when touching a burning heat source, even before we consciously perceive the thermal sensation. This kind of features can be a precious improvement of the current solutions in shared-control (Cipriani et al., 2008, Yang and Liu, 2021).	<p>It would be desirable to have a prosthesis able to take decisions in those situations that require an immediate response. This would free the user from the need of constantly monitoring prosthesis status, limiting the damaging events and allowing the user to operate the device only for voluntary motor production, consequently reducing the mental effort.</p> <p>Equipping the prosthesis with specific sensors and related processing can enable shared control solutions aimed at completing the action-perception coupling with the missing contribute of sensory information. We define this solution as</p>

	feedback-to-prosthesis. This can be obtained by sensors embedded on the prosthesis, which can measure the interactions between the device and the external world. This can be done exploiting different measurements ranging from the motor current (Ajoudani et al., 2013, Laffranchi et al., 2020, Deng et al., 2020), to tactile/pressure sensors (Tomo et al., 2018), Inertial measurement units (IMU) to understand the actual pose of the prosthesis (Krasoulis et al., 2019b), or artificial vision (Mouchoux et al., 2021) to understand which is the shape and orientation of the nearby objects.
FEEDBACK	Multimodal sensory feedback
	<p>The sensory feedback, namely the possibility to restore the feel of interaction with the external world, represents the last key element of ULPs. Current ULP systems rely solely on vision as feedback information. However, we cannot consider just visual (unimodal) feedback to catch the complexity of the human-machine-environment interactions. Multimodal sensory feedback is necessary to empower the prosthetic control training and to trigger the embodiment processes.</p> <p>Many groups are now exploring novel solution, both invasive and non-invasive, to provide sensory information about prosthetic movement. Regardless the specific methodology used, it is fundamental to achieve an intuitive or easily learnable strategy to associate the perceived feeling with a specific posture of the controlled device.</p> <p>The feedback-to-user can also be adjusted to the user through intelligent solutions, for instance through EMG biofeedback strategies based on the individual monitoring of the physiological input (Dosen et al., 2015).</p>

These technological approaches constitute the premise for many kinds of breakthrough in prosthetics. Obviously, we need to consider that tradeoff calculations must be made for selecting the most rational set of features that can be combined for providing a satisfying (without creating excessive expectations in users and any stakeholder) and (also economically) sustainable design of the devices. However, the features we described, and their user-centered synergies, can make us foresee the perspectives on bionic hands innovation that will be discussed in next section.

6. Perspectives on Tomorrow's Upper Limb Prosthetics

By analyzing the state-of-the-art techniques for ULP input (section 3.1) and feedback (section 3.2) signals, it emerges that there exist two parallel directions for future development, namely the non-invasive and invasive approaches. This is due to different reasons: first of all, because non-invasive solutions may provide the amputees with a plug and play device ready to be used for ADLs, while invasive solutions still need to overcome technological barriers before they can be routinely adopted by the majority of amputee population. Moreover, the specific choice of non-invasive vs invasive strategy is highly dependent on the level of amputation. For example, for trans-humeral amputees, TMR represents the most promising opportunity for restoration of lost functionality,

which could not be achieved with non-invasive approaches. In the following, we describe possible direction for future prosthetics. In particular, for non-invasive solution we suggest the use of multiple input sources and of sensory feedback. For invasive solution, we recommend strategies promoting a direct translation of user intentions into prosthetic movements. These directions are also outlined in Table VII.

6.1. Short-term non-invasive solutions

The most widespread technique for non-invasive control is based on sEMG. This technique has lots of advantages, such as low cost, direct correlation between muscle activation and movements, and intuitive control, as described in sections 3.1.1.1. Surface EMG and 4.3. Nevertheless, EMG-based systems lack of robustness, due to EMG susceptibility to artifacts of biological nature (sweating, hair, muscle fatigue), instrumental source (electromagnetic disturbances), intrinsic to the device (movement artifacts, electrode shift, variations in contraction depending on the orientation of the arm), or intrinsic to the control algorithm (optimization of the classifier).

For this reason, there is ample room for improvement in non-invasive approaches for ULP control. One research direction points towards the use of sensors fusion techniques, in which multiple input data is taken into account to estimate the movement intentions, as described

in section 4.3.3. However, the use of great number of sensors may be impractical for creating an embedded system for everyday applications. Future ULP should be equipped with multi-modal control based on minimal number of sensors (Jiang et al., 2012, Di Domenico et al., 2021). Moreover, recent studies are investigating the miniature technology to limit the encumbrance within the socket (Marinelli et al., 2021).

With the aim of improving ULP control, we pose that a fundamental element is the feedback. This will allow a closed-loop interaction between user and prosthesis, a essential prerequisite for promoting the integration of the prosthesis into the body scheme and for facilitating the controllability of the entire system. In this direction, many studies have pointed out the usefulness of vibrotactile stimulation for providing sensory feedback information (Sensinger and Dosen, 2020). This technique is cheap, easily integrated into a socket, and its modulation in

frequency and intensity allows to provide various information.

In the last years, wearable technology has largely expanded in many fields, influencing also prosthetics. For example, the CTRL Labs have realized a wearable wristband, which reads EMG signals and translates them into finger movements (Melcer et al., 2018), later improved by the Facebook Reality Labs by means of advanced ML algorithms (Basu, 2021). This technology could be exploited for prosthetic applications with a strong impact for ADLs usage.

Another promising approach consists in providing sensory information by stretching the skin of the stump. This can be done with a wearable haptic device producing rotational skin stretch according to the movement of the controlled device (Kayhan et al., 2018, Battaglia et al., 2019).

Table VII: Perspectives on Tomorrow's Upper Limb Prosthetics

Future perspectives	Short-term non-invasive solutions	Long-term invasive solutions
Increase of input sources	Multiple input data to estimate the movement intentions; data fusion.	Increase the number of myoelectric input sites; neuroprosthetics.
Restoration of sensory feedback	Build artificial feedback, i.e., proprioception and tactile sensations by use of vibrotactile feedback or skin stretching.	Restore natural sensation, i.e., proprioception (by kinesthetic illusion), spatial sensation and phantom limb cortical representation (by refer touch strategies).
Closed-loop	Implementation of a bidirectional communication between user and prosthesis to restore a link between motor and sensory counterparts.	
User-prosthesis co-adaptation	Promote learning with engaging/immersive training and rehabilitation protocols (from user to prosthesis).	
	Adaptive control, advanced PR algorithms (from prosthesis to user).	
	Co-adaptive feedback (feedback-to-user and feedback-to-prosthesis).	
Miniaturization	Miniature technology to limit the encumbrance within the socket.	
Modular architecture	Modular prosthetic system enabling the progressive replacement of the non-invasive input and feedback sources with implanted ones.	
Standardization of amputation and surgery procedures	Standardization of level of amputation to help designing sockets that are simultaneously comfortable, anthropomorphic, and spacious (to integrate the circuitry and the power system).	
	-	Chronic and reliable implants.

These examples show that innovative ULP solutions can be adopted for restoring lost functionality in the short-term using non-invasive approaches.

6.2. Long-term invasive solutions

The great advantage of invasive approaches is a direct bidirectional contact with the nervous system. This comes

at the cost of several issue related to the surgical procedure. Nevertheless, there are some promising approaches whose invasiveness drawbacks are counterbalanced by considerable improvements in device functionality, usability, and embodiment.

Moreover, although still far from clinical usage due to technological barriers, brain-based approaches seem a promising solution for prostheses of the future.

6.2.1. Peripheral bionics implants

Among the invasive approaches, surgical procedures aimed at augmenting the signal containing the motor commands have gained popularity in the last decades. Indeed, TMR is now routinely adopted in case of trans-humeral amputation, and it allows to increase the number of myoelectric input sites, which can be exploited for multi-DoFs control. Differently from invasive procedures for electrodes implantation, TMR is permanent, turning the reinnervated muscles into natural bioamplifiers of motor commands. It is also adopted for phantom limb pain reduction (Mereu et al., 2021).

Similarly, the more recent RNPI represents another promising technique for bioamplification of motor signals and its successful demonstration in experimental trials encourages their potential adoption in clinical practice (Vu et al., 2020b).

As for delivery of feedback information, invasive approaches represent the more intuitive and natural solution towards the retrieval of sensations, as demonstrated in (Osborn et al., 2018, Nguyen et al., 2021). However, the main limitation towards the diffusion of these techniques is represented by their invasiveness, i.e., poor compatibility of electrodes, risk of infection due to external cables, scar tissue formation on the nerve, etc.

6.2.2. Neuroprostheses

Ideally, a prosthetic limb should be a perfect replication of the natural limb, both in terms of control and perception, such as Luke Skywalker's arm in the Star Wars saga. In this scenario, control signals should directly derive from the brain and communicate the intended movement to the robotic device, while sensory information should be encoded into stimulation patterns delivered to the brain. The field of Neuroprosthetics, among other things, aims at addressing these fascinating goals and in the last 50 years several progresses have been made, indicating that these visionary scenarios might one day become true.

Fetz (1969) demonstrated that monkeys could voluntarily modulate the firing rates of neurons in the primary motor cortex, in the absence of movement. At the same time, Humphrey et al. (1970) were able to predict arm displacement from the activity recorded from small populations of neurons in the motor cortex. These exciting and pioneering works thus proved the possibility of controlling artificial devices with the mind and eventually led to a rapid flourishing of investigations aimed at interfacing the brain with machines. These studies culminated with the first demonstration by the group of Nicolelis, of a robotic arm controlled with signals produced

by an ensemble of neurons recorded from the motor cortex of a rat (Chapin et al., 1999). At the beginning of this century, brain-machine interfaces (BMIs) were thus born and scientists were therefore hoping that in few decades, fully functional bionic limbs would have been routinely adopted by amputees and paralyzed individuals (Nicolelis and Chapin, 2002). Sadly, this is not at all how the story ended. Indeed, more than 20 years after the first demonstrations of brain-controlled devices, we still do not have the technology nor the computational capabilities to effectively control artificial devices with cortical brain signals.

However, in the last few years, some groups have presented promising examples of paralyzed individuals with neural implants in the motor and premotor cortices controlling artificial limbs for several months/year, while other groups worked on non-invasive applications on neurological populations, as detailed in section 3.1.1.3. Although the target population of these studies is mostly composed by stroke or paralyzed patients, exploitation of results for prosthetics applications clearly emerges, i.e., the possibility to perform device control by reliably and timely accessing to the subject's motor intentions. These examples indeed demonstrate that groundwork for brain control of motor prosthetics has been laid. However, it has been limited to the lab and mostly addressing paralyzed patients, for whom there are currently not viable solutions to enable dexterous device control as for amputees, whose residual motor functions can be successfully leveraged for prosthetic control signals.

In sum, brain control approaches are still far from clinical and personal applications, not only because of the poor controllability that they exert over the prosthetic device, but mainly because of the cumbersome apparatus they need for their collection and processing. However, the dream of brain-controlled devices has spread outside the academic labs and has contaminated also visionary entrepreneurs from venture capitals and tech giants, with the consequent birth of some important companies interested in brain-interfacing technology, such as Neuralink (Musk, 2021), Facebook Reality Labs (Zuckerberg, 2021), and Google DeepMind (Deepmind, 2021). In conclusion, cutting edge research that we are currently witnessing both in academic and non-academic contexts may thus soon push the envelope of Neuroprosthetics up to its diffusion in our everyday life, with important consequences also for amputees.

6.3. User-Prosthesis Co-Adaptation

Designing user-centered prosthetic devices and user-centered prosthetic trainings is necessary to guide an appropriate learning of the system, as explained in section 5.1. Indeed, motivating the user to exercise and to get

1

2

32050 practice in using the bionic hand constitute the main way 2103
 42051 to improve the prosthetic control. Such approach can 2104
 52052 facilitate and accelerate the co-adaptation between humans 2105
 62053 and machines, as described in the following. 2106

72054 Humans implicitly learn how to control devices, even if 2107
 82055 initially they must adopt explicit strategies. Indeed, it must 2108
 92056 be underlined that ULP control training is an important step 2109
 102057 of rehabilitation. In particular, the ability of generating 2110
 112058 distinct muscle contractions increase with time and 2111
 122059 exercise. The use of functional tasks, like Target 2112
 132060 Achievement Test (Simon et al., 2011) or activities of daily 2113
 142061 living, allows users to learn how to produce repeatable 2114
 152062 patterns of contraction to better control the prosthesis. 2115
 162063 However, the learning process can be long and sometimes 2116
 172064 stressful, as described in (Zecca et al., 2002). The 2117
 182065 development of more engaging training tasks and of a more 2118
 192066 immersive rehabilitation protocol could promote the 2119
 202067 learning process by increasing the engagement of the users 2120
 212068 (Roche et al., 2019). In this context, user-centered design 2121
 222069 can truly make a difference in the effectiveness of a training 2122
 232070 procedure, as better discuss in paragraph 5. 2123

242071 While humans have to learn ULP control, machines 2124
 252072 need to be trained with growing datasets for classifying the 2125
 262073 signals in terms of user's commands. For effective ULP 2126
 272074 control, PR-based algorithms currently represent the most 2127
 282075 effective solution, as they are able to recognize the human 2128
 292076 intentions on the basis of training data. An important aspect 2129
 302077 that can affect the accuracy of the classifiers is thus the way 2130
 312078 in which these data are collected. Indeed, the prosthesis 2131
 322079 control might not ensure good performances under 2132
 332080 different arm positions and several studies have been 2133
 342081 conducted on the evaluation of the impact of upper limb 2134
 352082 position during the data acquisition on classifier 2135
 362083 performance (Geng et al., 2017). For example, as far as 2136
 372084 EMG is concerned, muscle activation is not completely the 2137
 382085 same when performing a given movement under different 2138
 392086 elbow and shoulder configurations. The signals on which 2139
 402087 the algorithm is trained are thus different from the ones 2140
 412088 obtained in a daily living scenario. Indeed, the 2141
 422089 classification performances strictly depend on the labeled 2142
 432090 data assigned to the specific movement. Moreover, because 2143
 442091 the method used for the acquisition strongly affects the 2144
 452092 classification accuracy, it is important to collect data under 2145
 462093 the same conditions of ADLs, i.e. by wearing the 2146
 472094 prosthesis, in order to have the training signals as similar 2147
 482095 as possible to the online ones. Cipriani et al. (2011) 2148
 492096 highlighted that indeed EMG signals do not carry just 2149
 502097 information about the desired arm movement, but they also 2150
 512098 contain the muscular contribution to sustain the prosthesis 2151
 522099 weight. This aspect has to be taken into account in order to 2152
 532100 avoid misclassification and unwanted prosthetic 2153
 542101 movements, because as soon as the signals change, the 2154
 552102 classifier is no longer able to behave properly. 2155

58

59

60

To cope with these problems, a possible solution consists in the adaptation of the control algorithm while using the prosthesis. This is of paramount importance, since the biggest issue of ULP control lies in the variability of the sEMG input signal due to electrodes shift, muscle fatigue, sweat, etc. ML algorithms are highly performing after training, but deterioration of the input signal or subsequent doffing/donning of the prosthesis can lead to misclassifications. For these reasons, amputees must regularly perform the training from scratch of the algorithm, which typically takes long time (Phinyomark and Scheme, 2018). To address this issue, the incremental learning focuses on the adjustment of internal weights of the model without the need of re-training- (Gijsberts et al., 2014). In this way the training data is continuously updated, and the control system is capable to cope with possible sources of errors (i.e., unwanted changes in input signals).

A promising approach to innovate the ULP field is the adoption of co-adaptive features through bidirectional human-machine interfaces (De Santis, 2021). In this case, the human and the machine reciprocally adjust their activity in order to improve their task-specific joint performance as a human-machine system. Co-adaptive features constitute a convergence of user activity and machine activity (including feedback towards the user and the machine), i.e., an "agreement" between human and machine on the biosignals produced by the first and on their interpretation performed by the second. Co-adaptation can modulate both (human and machine) training processes within the same framework (DiGiovanna et al., 2008, Zbyszynski et al., 2019, Yeung et al., 2019, Igual Bañó, 2021). This is performed through the feedback of human and machine on each other, further supporting the opportunity of designing feedback-to-user and feedback-to-prosthesis. Such a research effort requires innovative approaches to training processes as interactions between human and machine. In the next we present two building blocks for a user-prosthesis co-adaptation: closed-loop sensorimotor systems and interactive training.

6.3.1. Toward closed-loop sensorimotor prosthesis

While great progress has been made in recognizing human motor intention and translating it into prosthesis joint movements, sensory feedback restoration is one of the many challenges that many research groups are still addressing (see section 3.2) (Farina et al., 2021). Obtaining a reliable and efficient way to artificially convey sensory information to prosthetic users would allow to develop smart devices able to truly mimic the behavior of human limbs, establishing the premise for a true co-adaptation between user and machine.

However, such a *sensorimotor* prosthesis would still need to face technological barriers for its development and

use in ADLs. For example, all the circuitry and components needed to operate the device (i.e., acquire signals for motor intention decoding and translate sensory information into stimulation patterns) should fit into the socket space. One possible solution to obtain an embedded device is to rely on a hybrid approach. For example, a non-invasive sensorimotor prosthesis could use EMG signals to extract motor intentions and vibrotactile feedback to deliver sensory information. This configuration requires the embedding of an ADC amplifier to acquire EMG data, and motor drivers to control vibromotors. All these components could be placed on the same board, overcoming the problem of electrical coupling.

However, although this design is very articulated, we believe that this is not the real end point for a fully-integrated prosthetic system capable of maximizing patient acceptance. It simply turns out to be a developmental test bench for what will be the next generation of prostheses on a longer temporal horizon, namely neuroprostheses. By creating a modular architecture, in fact, it will be possible to maintain the physical prosthetic system and to progressively replace the non-invasive input and feedback sources with implanted ones, namely: (i) the standard sensors for surface electromyography replaced by an intra-neural implant; (ii) the hardware for feedback delivery replaced by a chronic implant; and (iii) the hardware on which run the control strategies replaced by a smaller and more performing dedicated hardware able to process neuromorphic algorithms (e.g., ASIC).

The realization of bidirectional ULP systems able to restore both sensory and motor functions will open new research scenario for embodiment process and neuroplastic phenomena. Indeed, about neuroplasticity in amputees using bionic hands as prostheses, Di Pino et al. (2009) highlighted how the reorganization of the central nervous system after the usage of the device can be the source of indices of prosthetic effectiveness in functional recovery. Furthermore, the effects of the device on the central nervous system can make the prosthesis work as a neurorehabilitative solution mitigating aberrant plasticity phenomena and facilitating positive neural changes. Finally, novel human-machine interfaces should consider neuroplasticity principles for restoring the efferences and afferences of the central nervous system with the lost limb in order to exploit them for connecting a prosthesis.

The processes described above are an excellent expression of the technologies that can lead to a user-prosthesis co-adaptation. They care for providing the human with sensations matching the motor activity and the events occurring on or for the artificial limb, which needs to learn how to offer appropriate feedback to the user. Next paragraphs will describe how this can happen.

6.3.2. Innovation in Interactive Training

Establishing interactions between user and prosthesis requires a human-centered design of the technology “behavior”. Since the term co-adaptation implies that two or more entities are adjusting to each other, possibly learning through the interaction itself for reaching a goal that can be the improvement of the human-machine performance. The attention to the interactive aspects of learning and training was recommended in Castellini et al. (2016). In this context, intriguing opportunities come from theoretical frameworks in psychology like the constructivism to define and improve the paradigm of interactive ML in prosthetic training and control (Nowak et al., 2018, Bettoni and Castellini, 2021). Accordingly, a myocontrol system should learn and forget on demand, under request of each one of the components of the human-machine system. For instance, the users can label the violation of their expectations on the prosthesis interpretation of their commands, starting a novel data collection cycle. Additionally, the machine itself can highlight the need of collecting further data (especially from correct execution of a training exercise) through acoustic feedback to the user. Through this, the myocontrol models are updated.

Moreover, certain biosignal features could guide an automated labeling of the violation of the observer’s expectations without any explicit command, as in neuroprosthetic interfaces using Error-related Potentials (Chavarriaga et al., 2014). Such an advance (still explored in laboratories) could enable self-calibrating intention detection processes, leading to a true (and fruitful) human-machine symbiosis. Such symbiosis is based on the online processing of users’ neurocognitive states. The machine interprets such states for implicitly adjusting (without direct and declarative commands of the user) its activity to the individual current capabilities and preferences. Exploiting this process as a further example of the closed-loop previously envisioned, the human-machine system will become a fully functional unit able to enact manual and bimanual biomimetic behaviors (Chavarriaga et al., 2014).

However, when the practical applications of this kind of implicit learning will move outside the laboratories, its advantages should be evaluated in real-world cases of prosthetic learning. Currently, a human-machine explicit communication component in initial co-training sessions can highlight an active role of the users with positive impact on their self-efficacy and engagement. In this context, biofeedback strategies (self-regulation of perceptually represented physiological changes) in co-adaptive systems could be especially useful for easing the integration of both implicit and explicit aspects within the user-prosthesis co-training (even during daily recalibrations) (Kalamratsidou and Torres, 2017).

6.4. Amputation matters: the key role of the surgeon

A further reflection that emerges in order to maximize patient acceptance is related to the clinical situation immediately preceding amputation. In fact, although it is clear that in case of injury/accident the doctor/surgeon has to manage a situation of immediate danger in which the priority is to secure the patient trying to save "as much as possible of the injured limb", on the other hand, on the engineer side, the ideal would be to be able to standardize the level of amputation. In this case, in fact, it would be possible to avoid "extreme" situations in terms of amputation levels: a very distal amputation does not allow the orthopedic technician, and therefore also the engineer, to have enough space to integrate the circuitry and the power system inside the cavity between the internal and external lamination of the reservoir itself, on the other hand, a very proximal amputation does not allow the orthopedic technician to create a socket capable of allowing the patient's stump to support the weight (thus not even having enough residual muscles from which to extract the electromyographic signal) of the dedicated prosthetic system. Therefore, having the possibility, even in case of extreme danger, to be able to define a "standard" level of amputation in which the surgeon is able to have a slightly longer-term vision, would allow a greater number of patients to take advantage of these fantastic biomedical technologies. In fact, at present, many patients find themselves having to request an additional surgical operation, thus further compromising the patient's willingness to use these solutions.

7. Conclusions

In this manuscript, we have detailed and discussed several strategies to substitute and restore the functionality of human upper limb when missing. We specifically focused on input and feedback signals for bidirectional device control and on aspects regarding the user needs that should be addressed with a user-centered prosthetic design approach. We also stressed that in order to have a fully embodied prosthetic system it is essential to implement a synergistic collaboration of three components: mechatronics, control algorithm and the user perception. These have to be combined by a real rehabilitation process that is necessarily user-centered.

8. Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

9. Author Contributions

A.M., N.B., F.T., D.D.D., G.B., and M.S. conceived the study. N.B., A.M. and M.S. designed the figures. N.B. and A.M. prepared the figures. All the authors contributed to the writing, read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

10. Acknowledgments

The authors gracefully acknowledge Marco Freddolini and Simone Tanzarella for useful discussion on ULP input signals and their processing.

The Open University Affiliated Research Centre at Istituto Italiano di Tecnologia (ARC@IIT) is part of the Open University, Milton Keynes MK7 6AA, United Kingdom.

11. References

- ADRIAN, E. D. & BRONK, D. W. 1929. The discharge of impulses in motor nerve fibres: Part II. The frequency of discharge in reflex and voluntary contractions. *The Journal of physiology*, 67, 9-151.
- AHMADI, R., PACKIRISAMY, M., DARGAHI, J. & CECERE, R. 2011. Discretely loaded beam-type optical fiber tactile sensor for tissue manipulation and palpation in minimally invasive robotic surgery. *IEEE Sensors Journal*, 12, 22-32.
- AJLOUDANI, A., GODFREY, S. B., CATALANO, M., GRIOLI, G., TSAGARAKIS, N. G. & BICCHI, A. Teleimpedance control of a synergy-driven anthropomorphic hand. 2013 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems, 2013. IEEE, 1985-1991.
- ALAMEH, M., ABBASS, Y., IBRAHIM, A. & VALLE, M. 2020. Smart tactile sensing systems based on embedded CNN implementations. *Micromachines*, 11, 103.
- ALAMEH, M., SALEH, M., ANSOVINI, F., FARES, H., IBRAHIM, A., FRANCESCHI, M., SEMINARA, L., VALLE, M., DOSEN, S. & FARINA, D. Live demonstration: System based on electronic skin and cutaneous electrostimulation for sensory feedback in prosthetics. 2018 IEEE Biomedical Circuits and Systems Conference (BioCAS), 2018. IEEE, 1-1.
- ALFADHEL, A. & KOSEL, J. 2015. Magnetic nanocomposite cilia tactile sensor. *Advanced Materials*, 27, 7888-7892.
- ALKHAFAF, O. S., WALI, M. K. & AL-TIMEMY, A. H. Improved prosthetic hand control with synchronous use of voice recognition and inertial measurements. IOP Conference Series: Materials

1

2

32360

Science and Engineering, 2020. IOP Publishing, 2412
012088. 2413

42361

5

2362

AMADO LAEZZA, R. 2018. *Deep neural networks for* 2414
myoelectric pattern recognition-An 2415
implementation for multifunctional control. 2416

72363

8

92365

AMRANI, M. Z.-E.-A., DAOUDI, A., ACHOUR, N. & 2418
TAIR, M. Artificial neural networks based 2419
myoelectric control system for automatic 2420
assistance in hand rehabilitation. 2017 26th IEEE 2421
International Symposium on Robot and Human 2422
Interactive Communication (RO-MAN), 2017. 2423
IEEE, 968-973. 2424

10366

11367

12368

13369

14370

15371

10372

12373

18374

19375

ANDERSON, F. & BISCHOF, W. F. 2014. Augmented 2425
reality improves myoelectric prosthesis training. 2426
International Journal on Disability and Human 2427
Development, 13, 349-354. 2428

20376

21377

22378

23379

24380

25381

26382

27

28383

29384

30385

31386

32387

33388

34389

35390

ANTFOLK, C., CIPRIANI, C., CARROZZA, M. C., 2430
BALKENIUS, C., BJÖRKMAN, A., 2431
LUNDBORG, G., ROSÉN, B. & SEBELIUS, F. 2432
2013a. Transfer of tactile input from an artificial 2433
hand to the forearm: experiments in amputees and 2434
able-bodied volunteers. *Disability and* 2435
Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology, 8, 249-254.

ANTFOLK, C., D'ALONZO, M., ROSÉN, B., 2436
LUNDBORG, G., SEBELIUS, F. & CIPRIANI, 2437
C. 2013b. Sensory feedback in upper limb 2438
prosthetics. *Expert review of medical devices*, 10, 2439
45-54. 2440

AOPA, A. O. P. A. 2016. Where Science Meets Art. 2441
American Orthotic & Prosthetic Association 2442
(AOPA). 2443

36391

37392

38393

39394

40395

41396

42

43397

44398

45399

46400

47401

48402

49403

50404

51405

52406

53

54407

55408

56409

57410

58411

59

60

BARRESI, G., MARINELLI, A., CASERTA, G., DE 2444
ZAMBOTTI, M., TESSADORI, J., 2445
ANGIOLETTI, L., BOCCARDO, N., 2446
FREDDOLINI, M., MAZZANTI, D., 2447
DESHPANDE, N., ALBINO FRIGO, C., 2448
BALCONI, M., GRUPPIONI, E., 2449
LAFFRANCHI, M. & DE MICHELI, L. 2021. 2450
Exploring the Embodiment of a Virtual Hand in a 2451
Spatially Augmented Respiratory Biofeedback 2452
Setting. *frontiers in neurorobotics*. 2453
2454

BARSAKCIOGLU, D. Y. & FARINA, D. A real-time 2460
surface emg decomposition system for non- 2461
invasive human-machine interfaces. 2018 IEEE 2462
Biomedical Circuits and Systems Conference 2463
(BioCAS), 2018. IEEE, 1-4. 2464

BASU, T. 2021. *Facebook is making a bracelet that lets* 2412
you control computers with your brain [Online]. 2413
Available: 2414

https://www.technologyreview.com/2021/03/18/1021021/facebook-augmented-reality-wristband/?truid=6d1563793eef118b900759ed00bfef6f&utm_source=the_download&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=the_download_unpaid_engagement&utm_term=&utm_content=03-19-2021&mc_cid=f1e3644b4e&mc_eid=de470f7d14 [Accessed March 18, 2021].

BATTAGLIA, E., CLARK, J. P., BIANCHI, M., 2425
CATALANO, M. G., BICCHI, A. & 2426
O'MALLEY, M. K. 2019. Skin stretch haptic 2427
feedback to convey closure information in 2428
anthropomorphic, under-actuated upper limb soft 2429
prostheses. *IEEE Transactions on Haptics*, 12, 2430
508-520.

BECCAI, L., ROCCELLA, S., ARENA, A., VALVO, F., 2431
VALDASTRI, P., MENCIASSI, A., 2432
CARROZZA, M. C. & DARIO, P. 2005. Design 2433
and fabrication of a hybrid silicon three-axial 2434
force sensor for biomechanical applications. 2435
Sensors and Actuators A: Physical, 120, 370-382.

BECKERLE, P. 2021. *Virtual Hand Experience. Human- 2436
Robot Body Experience*. Springer. 2437

BECKERLE, P., CASTELLINI, C. & 2438
LENGGENHAGER, B. 2019. Robotic interfaces 2439
for cognitive psychology and embodiment 2440
research: a research roadmap. *Wiley 2441
Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, 10, 2442
e1486. 2443

BECKERLE, P., KÖIVA, R., KIRCHNER, E. A., 2444
BEKRATER-BODMANN, R., DOSEN, S., 2445
CHRIST, O., ABBINK, D. A., CASTELLINI, C. 2446
& LENGGENHAGER, B. 2018. Feel-good 2447
robotics: requirements on touch for embodiment 2448
in assistive robotics. *Frontiers in neurorobotics*, 2449
12, 84. 2450

BELTER, J. T. & DOLLAR, A. M. Performance 2451
characteristics of anthropomorphic prosthetic 2452
hands. 2011 IEEE International Conference on 2453
Rehabilitation Robotics, 2011. IEEE, 1-7. 2454

BELTER, J. T., SEGIL, J. L., DOLLAR, A. M. & WEIR, 2455
R. F. 2013. Mechanical design and performance 2456
specifications of anthropomorphic prosthetic 2457
hands: A review. *Journal of Rehabilitation 2458
Research & Development*, 50. 2459

BENNETT, D. A., DALLEY, S. A., TRUEX, D. & 2460
GOLDFARB, M. 2014. A multigrasp hand 2461
prosthesis for providing precision and conformal 2462
grasps. *IEEE/ASME Transactions on 2463
Mechatronics*, 20, 1697-1704. 2464

1
2

- 32465 BENVENUTO, A., RASPOPOVIC, S., HOFFMANN, K., 2517
42466 CARPANETO, J., CAVALLO, G., DI PINO, G., 2518
52467 GUGLIELMELLI, E., ROSSINI, L., ROSSINI, 2519
62468 P. & TOMBINI, M. Intrafascicular thin-film 2520
72469 multichannel electrodes for sensory feedback: 2521
82470 Evidences on a human amputee. 2010 Annual 2522
92471 International Conference of the IEEE Engineering 2523
10472 in Medicine and Biology, 2010. IEEE, 1800- 2524
11473 1803. 2525
- 12474 BETTONI, M. C. & CASTELLINI, C. 2021. Interaction in 2526
13475 assistive robotics: a radical constructivist design 2527
14476 framework. *Frontiers in Neurorobotics*, 15, 2528
15477 675657. 2529
- 162478 BIDDISS, E., BEATON, D. & CHAU, T. 2007. Consumer 2530
172479 design priorities for upper limb prosthetics. 2531
182480 *Disability and rehabilitation: Assistive 2532*
192481 *technology*, 2, 346-357. 2533
- 202482 BIDDISS, E. A. & CHAU, T. T. 2007. Upper limb 2534
21483 prosthesis use and abandonment: a survey of the 2535
22484 last 25 years. *Prosthetics and orthotics 2536*
23485 *international*, 31, 236-257. 2537
- 24486 BIONICS, M. 2022. *The LUKE Arm* [Online]. Available: 2538
25487 <https://www.mobiusbionics.com/> [Accessed]. 2539
- 262488 BLEICHNER, M. G., FREUDENBURG, Z. V., JANSMA, 2540
272489 J. M., AARNOUTSE, E. J., VANSTEENSEL, M. 2541
282490 J. & RAMSEY, N. F. 2016. Give me a sign: 2542
292491 decoding four complex hand gestures based on 2543
302492 high-density ECoG. *Brain Structure and 2544*
312493 *Function*, 221, 203-216. 2545
- 32494 BOOSTANI, R. & MORADI, M. H. 2003. Evaluation of 2546
33495 the forearm EMG signal features for the control of 2547
34496 a prosthetic hand. *Physiological measurement*. 2548
2549
- 35497 BOSCHMANN, A., NEUHAUS, D., VOGT, S., 2550
36498 KALTSCHMIDT, C., PLATZNER, M. & 2551
37499 DOSEN, S. 2021. Immersive augmented reality 2552
40500 system for the training of pattern classification 2553
41501 control with a myoelectric prosthesis. *Journal of 2554*
42502 *neuroengineering and rehabilitation*, 18, 1-15. 2555
- 432503 BOTVINICK, M. & COHEN, J. 1998. Rubber hands 2556
442504 'feel' touch that eyes see. *Nature*, 391, 756-756. 2557
452505
- 46505 BOUWSEMA, H., VAN DER SLUIS, C. K. & 2558
47506 BONGERS, R. M. 2014. Effect of feedback 2559
48507 during virtual training of grip force control with a 2560
49508 myoelectric prosthesis. *PLoS One*, 9, e98301. 2561
- 50509 **BRAINROBOTICS**. 2022. *BrainRobotics Hand* [Online]. 2562
51510 Available: 2563
52511 <https://brainrobotics.com/brainrobotics-hand/> 2564
53512 [Accessed]. 2565
- 542513 BURRELLO, A., MORGHET, F. B., SCHERER, M., 2566
552514 BENATTI, S., BENINI, L., MACII, E., 2567
562515 PONCINO, M. & PAGLIARI, D. J. Bioformers: 2568
572516 embedding transformers for ultra-low power 2569
58
59
60
- sEMG-based gesture recognition. 2022 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE), 2022. IEEE, 1443-1448.
- CAREY, S. L., LURA, D. J. & HIGHSMITH, M. J. 2015. Differences in myoelectric and body-powered upper-limb prostheses: Systematic literature review. *Journal of Rehabilitation Research & Development*, 52.
- CARROZZA, M. C., PERSICHETTI, A., LASCHI, C., VECCHI, F., LAZZARINI, R., VACALEBRI, P. & DARIO, P. 2007. A wearable biomechatronic interface for controlling robots with voluntary foot movements. *IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics*, 12, 1-11.
- CASTELLINI, C. 2020. Upper Limb Active Prosthetic systems—Overview. *Wearable Robotics*. Elsevier.
- CASTELLINI, C., BONGERS, R. M., NOWAK, M. & VAN DER SLUIS, C. K. 2016. Upper-limb prosthetic myocontrol: two recommendations. *Frontiers in neuroscience*, 9, 496.
- CASTILLO, C. S. M., WILSON, S., VAIDYANATHAN, R. & ATASHZAR, S. F. 2020. Wearable MMG-Plus-One Armband: Evaluation of Normal Force on Mechanomyography (MMG) to Enhance Human-Machine Interfacing. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, 29, 196-205.
- CATALANO, M. G., GRIOLI, G., FARNIOLI, E., SERIO, A., PIAZZA, C. & BICCHI, A. 2014. Adaptive synergies for the design and control of the Pisa/IIT SoftHand. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 33, 768-782.
- CHAPIN, J. K., MOXON, K. A., MARKOWITZ, R. S. & NICOLELIS, M. A. 1999. Real-time control of a robot arm using simultaneously recorded neurons in the motor cortex. *Nature neuroscience*, 2, 664-670.
- CHAVARRIAGA, R., SOBOLEWSKI, A. & MILLÁN, J. D. R. 2014. Errare machinale est: the use of error-related potentials in brain-machine interfaces. *Frontiers in neuroscience*, 8, 208.
- CHEESBOROUGH, J. E., SMITH, L. H., KUIKEN, T. A. & DUMANIAN, G. A. Targeted muscle reinnervation and advanced prosthetic arms. Seminars in plastic surgery, 2015. Thieme Medical Publishers, 062-072.
- CHEN, J., BI, S., ZHANG, G. & CAO, G. 2020. High-density surface EMG-based gesture recognition using a 3D convolutional neural network. *Sensors*, 20, 1201.

1

2

- 32568 CHEN, X., ZHANG, X., ZHAO, Z.-Y., YANG, J.-H., 2620
 42569 LANTZ, V. & WANG, K.-Q. Hand gesture 2621
 52570 recognition research based on surface EMG 2622
 62571 sensors and 2D-accelerometers. 2007 11th IEEE 2623
 72572 International Symposium on Wearable 2624
 82573 Computers, 2007. IEEE, 11-14. 2625
- 92574 CHENG, J., AMFT, O., BAHLE, G. & LUKOWICZ, P. 2626
 102575 2013. Designing sensitive wearable capacitive 2627
 112576 sensors for activity recognition. *IEEE Sensors* 2628
 122577 *Journal*, 13, 3935-3947. 2629
- 132578 CHO, E., CHEN, R., MERHI, L.-K., XIAO, Z., 2630
 142579 POUSETT, B. & MENON, C. 2016. Force 2631
 152580 myography to control robotic upper extremity 2632
 162581 prostheses: a feasibility study. *Frontiers in* 2633
 172582 *bioengineering and biotechnology*, 4, 18. 2634
- 192583 CIANCIO, A. L., CORDELLA, F., BARONE, R., 2635
 202584 ROMEO, R. A., BELLINGEGNI, A. D., 2636
 212585 SACCHETTI, R., DAVALLI, A., DI PINO, G., 2637
 222586 RANIERI, F. & DI LAZZARO, V. 2016. Control 2638
 232587 of prosthetic hands via the peripheral nervous 2639
 242588 system. *Frontiers in neuroscience*, 10, 116. 2640
- 252589 CIPRIANI, C., SASSU, R., CONTROZZI, M. & 2641
 262590 CARROZZA, M. C. Influence of the weight 2642
 272591 actions of the hand prosthesis on the performance 2643
 282592 of pattern recognition based myoelectric control: 2644
 292593 preliminary study. 2011 Annual International 2645
 302594 Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine 2646
 312595 and Biology Society, 2011. IEEE, 1620-1623. 2647
- 322596 CIPRIANI, C., SEGIL, J. L., BIRDWELL, J. A. & FF 2648
 332597 WEIR, R. F. 2014. Dexterous control of a 2649
 342598 prosthetic hand using fine-wire intramuscular 2650
 352599 electrodes in targeted extrinsic muscles. *IEEE*
 362600 *Transactions on Neural Systems and* 2651
 372601 *Rehabilitation Engineering*, 22, 828-836. 2652
- 382602 CIPRIANI, C., ZACCONE, F., MICERA, S. & 2653
 392603 CARROZZA, M. C. 2008. On the shared control 2654
 402604 of an EMG-controlled prosthetic hand: analysis of 2655
 412605 user-prosthesis interaction. *IEEE Transactions*
 422606 *on Robotics*, 24, 170-184. 2656
- 432607 CLEMENTE, F., D'ALONZO, M., CONTROZZI, M., 2657
 442608 EDIN, B. B. & CIPRIANI, C. 2015. Non- 2658
 452609 invasive, temporally discrete feedback of object 2660
 462610 contact and release improves grasp control of 2661
 472611 closed-loop myoelectric transradial prostheses. 2662
 482612 *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and* 2663
 492613 *Rehabilitation Engineering*, 24, 1314-1322. 2664
- 512614 CLEMENTE, F., DOSEN, S., LONINI, L., MARKOVIC, 2665
 522615 M., FARINA, D. & CIPRIANI, C. 2016. Humans 2666
 532616 can integrate augmented reality feedback in their 2667
 542617 sensorimotor control of a robotic hand. *IEEE* 2668
 552618 *Transactions on Human-Machine Systems*, 47, 2669
 562619 583-589. 2670
- CLEMENTE, F., IANNICIELLO, V., GHERARDINI, M.
 & CIPRIANI, C. 2019. Development of an
 embedded myokinetic prosthetic hand controller.
Sensors, 19, 3137.
- CLOUTIER, A. & YANG, J. Control of hand prostheses:
 A literature review. International Design
 Engineering Technical Conferences and
 Computers and Information in Engineering
 Conference, 2013a. American Society of
 Mechanical Engineers, V06AT07A016.
- CLOUTIER, A. & YANG, J. 2013b. Design, control, and
 sensory feedback of externally powered hand
 prostheses: a literature review. *Critical Reviews™*
in Biomedical Engineering, 41.
- COAPT 2017. COAPT - Complete control handbook.
- COLLINGER, J. L., WODLINGER, B., DOWNEY, J. E.,
 WANG, W., TYLER-KABARA, E. C., WEBER,
 D. J., MCMORLAND, A. J., VELLISTE, M.,
 BONINGER, M. L. & SCHWARTZ, A. B. 2013.
 High-performance neuroprosthetic control by an
 individual with tetraplegia. *The Lancet*, 381, 557-
 564.
- COMPANY, S. R. 2020. *Shadow Robot* [Online].
 Available: <https://www.shadowrobot.com/>
 [Accessed].
- CONTROZZI, M., CLEMENTE, F., BARONE, D.,
 GHIONZOLI, A. & CIPRIANI, C. 2016. The
 SSSA-MyHand: a dexterous lightweight
 myoelectric hand prosthesis. *IEEE Transactions*
on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation
Engineering, 25, 459-468.
- CORDELLA, F., CIANCIO, A. L., SACCHETTI, R.,
 DAVALLI, A., CUTTI, A. G.,
 GUGLIELMELLI, E. & ZOLLO, L. 2016.
 Literature review on needs of upper limb
 prosthesis users. *Frontiers in neuroscience*, 10,
 209.
- CORKE, P. I. & KHATIB, O. 2011. *Robotics, vision and*
control: fundamental algorithms in MATLAB,
 Springer.
- CUBEROVIC, I., GILL, A., RESNIK, L. J., TYLER, D. J.
 & GRACZYK, E. L. 2019. Learning of artificial
 sensation through long-term home use of a
 sensory-enabled prosthesis. *Frontiers in*
neuroscience, 13, 853.
- CUTRONE, A. & MICERA, S. 2019. Implantable neural
 interfaces and wearable tactile systems for
 bidirectional neuroprosthetics systems. *Advanced*
healthcare materials, 8, 1801345.
- D'AVELLA, A. & BIZZI, E. 2005. Shared and specific
 muscle synergies in natural motor behaviors.

57

58

59

60

- 1
2
3 2671 *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 2722
4 2672 102, 3076-3081. 2723 *International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS 2021)*.
- 5 2673 DAVIS, C. & ONGE, M. S. Myoelectric and body- 2724
6 2674 powered upper-limb prostheses: the users' 2725
7 2675 perspective. *JPO: Journal of Prosthetics and* 2726
8 2676 *Orthotics*, 2017. LWW, P30-P34. 2727
9 2677 DE LUCA, C. J. 1997. The use of surface 2728
10 2678 electromyography in biomechanics. *Journal of* 2729
11 2679 *applied biomechanics*, 13, 135-163. 2730
- 12 2680 DE OLIVEIRA BARATA, S. 2021. *The Alternative Limb* 2731
13 2681 *Project* [Online]. Available: 2732
14 2682 <https://thealternativelimbproject.com/> 2733
15 2683 [Accessed]. 2734
- 16 2684 DE SANTIS, D. 2021. A framework for optimizing co- 2735
17 2685 adaptation in body-machine interfaces. *Frontiers* 2736
18 2686 *in Neurorobotics*, 15, 40. 2737
19 2687 DEEPMIND. 2021. *DeepMind* [Online]. Available: 2738
20 2688 <https://www.deepmind.com/> [Accessed]. 2739
- 21 2689 DEL VALLE, J. & NAVARRO, X. 2013. Interfaces with 2740
22 2690 the peripheral nerve for the control of 2741
23 2691 neuroprostheses. *International review of* 2742
24 2692 *neurobiology*, 109, 63-83. 2743
- 25 2693 DEL VECCHIO, A., CASTELLINI, C. & BECKERLE, P. 2744
26 2694 2021. Peripheral Neuroergonomics – An Elegant 2745
27 2695 Way to Improve Human-Robot Interaction? 2746
28 2696 *Frontiers in Neurorobotics*, 15. 2747
- 29 2697 DELLACASA BELLINGEGNI, A., GRUPPIONI, E., 2748
30 2698 COLAZZO, G., DAVALLI, A., SACCHETTI, 2749
31 2699 R., GUGLIELMELLI, E. & ZOLLO, L. 2017. 2750
32 2700 NLR, MLP, SVM, and LDA: a comparative 2751
33 2701 analysis on EMG data from people with trans- 2752
34 2702 radial amputation. *J Neuroeng Rehabil.* 2753
- 35 2703 DENG, H., XU, X., ZHUO, W. & ZHANG, Y. 2020. 2754
36 2704 Current-sensor-based contact stiffness detection 2755
37 2705 for prosthetic hands. *IEEE Access*, 8, 29456- 2756
38 2706 29466. 2757
- 39 2707 DHAWAN, A. S., MUKHERJEE, B., PATWARDHAN, 2758
40 2708 S., AKHLAGHI, N., DIAO, G., LEVAY, G., 2759
41 2709 HOLLEY, R., JOINER, W. M., HARRIS-LOVE, 2760
42 2710 M. & SIKDAR, S. 2019. Proprioceptive 2761
43 2711 Sonomyographic Control: A novel method for 2762
44 2712 intuitive and proportional control of multiple 2763
45 2713 degrees-of-freedom for individuals with upper 2764
46 2714 extremity limb loss. *Scientific reports*, 9, 1-15. 2765
- 47 2715 DI DOMENICO, D., MARINELLI, A., BOCCARDO, N., 2766
48 2716 SEMPRINI, M., LOMBARDI, L., CANEPA, M., 2767
49 2717 STEDMAN, S., DELLACASA BELLINGEGNI, 2768
50 2718 A., CHIAPPALONE, M., GRUPPIONI, E., 2769
51 2719 LAFFRANCHI, M. & DE MICHIELI, L. 2021. 2770
52 2720 Hannes Prosthesis Control Based on Regression 2771
53 2721 Machine Learning Algorithms. *2021 IEEE/RSJ* 2772
54 2721 2773
- 55 2722 DIGIOVANNA, J., MAHMOUDI, B., FORTES, J., 2774
56 2723 PRINCIPE, J. C. & SANCHEZ, J. C. 2008. 2775
57 2724 Coadaptive brain-machine interface via 2776
58 2725 reinforcement learning. *IEEE transactions on* 2777
59 2726 *biomedical engineering*, 56, 54-64. 2778
- 60 2727 DIMANTE, D., LOGINA, I., SINISI, M. & KRŪMIŅA, 2779
2728 A. Sensory Feedback in Upper Limb Prostheses. 2780
2729 Proceedings of the Latvian Academy of Sciences. 2781
2730 Section B. Natural, Exact, and Applied Sciences., 2782
2731 2020. 308-317. 2783
- 2732 DORNFELD, C., SWANSTON, M., CASSELLA, J., 2784
2733 BEASLEY, C., GREEN, J., MOSHAYEV, Y. & 2785
2734 WININGER, M. 2016. Is the Prosthetic 2786
2735 Homologue Necessary for Embodiment? 2787
2736 *Frontiers in neurorobotics*, 10, 21. 2788
- 2737 DOSEN, S., MARKOVIC, M., SOMER, K., 2789
2738 GRAIMANN, B. & FARINA, D. 2015. EMG 2790
2739 Biofeedback for online predictive control of 2791
2740 grasping force in a myoelectric prosthesis. 2792
2741 *Journal of neuroengineering and rehabilitation*, 2793
2742 12, 1-13. 2794
- 2743 DROST, G., STEGEMAN, D. F., VAN ENGELEN, B. G. 2795
2744 & ZWARTS, M. J. 2006. Clinical applications of 2796
2745 high-density surface EMG: a systematic review. 2797
2746 *Journal of Electromyography and Kinesiology*, 2798
2747 16, 586-602. 2799
- 2748 EDELMAN, B. J., MENG, J., SUMA, D., ZURN, C., 2800
2749 NAGARAJAN, E., BAXTER, B., CLINE, C. C. 2801
2750 & HE, B. 2019. Noninvasive neuroimaging 2802
2751 enhances continuous neural tracking for robotic 2803
2752 device control. *Science robotics*, 4. 2804
- 2753 EHRSSON, H. H., ROSÉN, B., STOCKSELIUS, A., 2805
2754 RAGNÖ, C., KÖHLER, P. & LUNDBORG, G. 2806
2755 2008. Upper limb amputees can be induced to 2807
2756 experience a rubber hand as their own. *Brain*, 131, 2808
2757 3443-3452. 2809
- 2758 ENGDAHL, S., DHAWAN, A., LÉVAY, G., 2810
2759 BASHATAH, A., KALIKI, R. & SIKDAR, S. 2811
2760 2020a. Motion prediction using 2812
2761 electromyography and sonomyography for an 2813
2762 individual with transhumeral limb loss. *medRxiv*. 2814
- 2763 ENGDAHL, S. M., MEEHAN, S. K. & GATES, D. H. 2815
2764 2020b. Differential experiences of embodiment 2816
2765 between body-powered and myoelectric 2817
2766 prosthesis users. *Scientific reports*, 10, 1-10. 2818

- 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
- ENGLEHART, K., HUDGINS, B. & CHAN, A. D. 2003. Continuous multifunction myoelectric control using pattern recognition. *Technology and Disability*, 15, 95-103.
- ESPOSITO, D., ANDREOZZI, E., FRATINI, A., GARGIULO, G. D., SAVINO, S., NIOLA, V. & BIFULCO, P. 2018. A piezoresistive sensor to measure muscle contraction and mechanomyography. *Sensors*, 18, 2553.
- FARINA, D., LI, X. & MADELEINE, P. 2008. Motor unit acceleration maps and interference mechanomyographic distribution. *Journal of biomechanics*, 41, 2843-2849.
- FARINA, D., MERLETTI, R. & ENOKA, R. M. 2004. The extraction of neural strategies from the surface EMG. *Journal of applied physiology*, 96, 1486-1495.
- FARINA, D., VUJAKLIJA, I., BRÅNEMARK, R., BULL, A. M., DIETL, H., GRAIMANN, B., HARGROVE, L. J., HOFFMANN, K.-P., HUANG, H. H. & INGVARSSON, T. 2021. Toward higher-performance bionic limbs for wider clinical use. *Nature Biomedical Engineering*, 1-13.
- FERIGO, D., MERHI, L.-K., POUSETT, B., XIAO, Z. G. & MENON, C. 2017. A case study of a force-myography controlled bionic hand mitigating limb position effect. *Journal of Bionic Engineering*, 14, 692-705.
- FETZ, E. E. 1969. Operant conditioning of cortical unit activity. *Science*, 163, 955-958.
- FIFER, M. S., HOTSON, G., WESTER, B. A., MCMULLEN, D. P., WANG, Y., JOHANNES, M. S., KATYAL, K. D., HELDER, J. B., PARA, M. P. & VOGELSTEIN, R. J. 2013. Simultaneous neural control of simple reaching and grasping with the modular prosthetic limb using intracranial EEG. *IEEE transactions on neural systems and rehabilitation engineering*, 22, 695-705.
- FIGLIOLIA, A., MEDOLA, F., SANDNES, F., RODRIGUES, A. C. T. & PASCHOARELLI, L. C. Avoiding product abandonment through user centered design: a case study involving the development of a 3D printed customized upper limb prosthesis. *International Conference on Applied Human Factors and Ergonomics*, 2019. Springer, 289-297.
- FILLAUER. 2021. *Motion Control Hand* [Online]. Available: <https://fillauer.com/products/motion-control-hand/> [Accessed].
- FILLAUER. 2022a. *Motion E2 Elbow* [Online]. Available: <https://fillauer.com/products/motion-e2-elbow/> [Accessed].
- FILLAUER. 2022b. *Utah Arm 3* [Online]. Available: <https://fillauer.com/products/utah-arm-3/> [Accessed].
- FISHEL, J. A. & LOEB, G. E. Sensing tactile microvibrations with the BioTac—Comparison with human sensitivity. 2012 4th IEEE RAS & EMBS international conference on biomedical robotics and biomechatronics (BioRob), 2012. IEEE, 1122-1127.
- FOUGNER, A., SCHEME, E., CHAN, A. D., ENGLEHART, K. & STAVDAHL, Ø. A multi-modal approach for hand motion classification using surface EMG and accelerometers. 2011 Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society, 2011. IEEE, 4247-4250.
- FUENTES-GONZALEZ, J., INFANTE-ALARCÓN, A., ASANZA, V. & LOAYZA, F. R. A 3d-printed eeg based prosthetic arm. 2020 IEEE International Conference on E-health Networking, Application & Services (HEALTHCOM), 2021. IEEE, 1-5.
- FUJIWARA, E., WU, Y. T., SUZUKI, C. K., DE ANDRADE, D. T. G., NETO, A. R. & ROHMER, E. Optical fiber force myography sensor for applications in prosthetic hand control. 2018 IEEE 15th International Workshop on Advanced Motion Control (AMC), 2018. IEEE, 342-347.
- FUKUMA, R., YANAGISAWA, T., SAITOH, Y., HOSOMI, K., KISHIMA, H., SHIMIZU, T., SUGATA, H., YOKOI, H., HIRATA, M. & KAMITANI, Y. 2016. Real-time control of a neuroprosthetic hand by magnetoencephalographic signals from paralysed patients. *Scientific reports*, 6, 1-14.
- FURUI, A., ETO, S., NAKAGAKI, K., SHIMADA, K., NAKAMURA, G., MASUDA, A., CHIN, T. & TSUJI, T. 2019. A myoelectric prosthetic hand with muscle synergy-based motion determination and impedance model-based biomimetic control. *Science Robotics*, 4, eaaw6339.
- GALLAGHER, M., COLZI, C. & SEDDA, A. 2021. Dissociation of proprioceptive drift and feelings of ownership in the somatic rubber hand illusion. *Acta Psychologica*, 212, 103192.
- GARENFELD, M. A., MORTENSEN, C. K., STRBAC, M., DIDERIKSEN, J. L. & DOSEN, S. 2020. Amplitude versus spatially modulated electrotactile feedback for myoelectric control of

- 1
2
32877 two degrees of freedom. *Journal of Neural Engineering*, 17, 046034. 2929
42878 2930
5 2879 GARSKE, C. A., DYSON, M., DUPAN, S., MORGAN, 2931
6 2880 G. & NAZARPOUR, K. 2021a. Serious Games 2932
7 2881 Are Not Serious Enough for Myoelectric 2933
8 2882 Prosthetics. *JMIR serious games*, 9, e28079. 2934
9 2883 GARSKE, C. A., DYSON, M., DUPAN, S. & 2935
10 2884 NAZARPOUR, K. 2021b. Perception of Game- 2936
11 2885 Based Rehabilitation in Upper Limb Prosthetic 2937
12 2886 Training: Survey of Users and Researchers. *JMIR* 2938
13 2887 *serious games*, 9, e23710. 2939
14 2888 GENG, W., DU, Y., JIN, W., WEI, W., HU, Y. & LI, J. 2940
15 2889 2016. Gesture recognition by instantaneous 2941
16 2890 surface EMG images. *Scientific reports*, 6, 1-8. 2942
17 2891 GENG, Y., SAMUEL, O. W., WEI, Y. & LI, G. 2017. 2943
18 2892 Improving the robustness of real-time myoelectric 2944
19 2893 pattern recognition against arm position changes 2945
20 2894 in transradial amputees. *BioMed research* 2946
21 2895 *international*, 2017. 2947
22 2896 GEORGE, J. A., KLUGER, D. T., DAVIS, T. S., 2948
23 2897 WENDELKEN, S. M., OKOROKOVA, E., HE, 2949
24 2898 Q., DUNCAN, C. C., HUTCHINSON, D. T., 2950
25 2899 THUMSER, Z. C. & BECKLER, D. 2019a. 2951
26 2900 Biomimetic sensory feedback through peripheral 2952
27 2901 nerve stimulation improves dexterous use of a 2953
28 2902 bionic hand. *Science Robotics*, 4. 2954
29 2903 GEORGE, J. A., KLUGER, D. T., DAVIS, T. S., 2955
30 2904 WENDELKEN, S. M., OKOROKOVA, E., HE, 2956
31 2905 Q., DUNCAN, C. C., HUTCHINSON, D. T., 2957
32 2906 THUMSER, Z. C. & BECKLER, D. 2019b. 2958
33 2907 Biomimetic sensory feedback through peripheral 2959
34 2908 nerve stimulation improves dexterous use of a 2960
35 2909 bionic hand. *Science Robotics*, 4, eaax2352. 2961
36 2910 GEORGI, M., AMMA, C. & SCHULTZ, T. Recognizing 2962
37 2911 Hand and Finger Gestures with IMU based 2963
38 2912 Motion and EMG based Muscle Activity Sensing. 2964
39 2913 *Biosignals*, 2015. Citeseer, 99-108. 2965
40 2914 GIGLI, A., BRUSAMENTO, D., MEATTINI, R., 2966
41 2915 MELCHIORRI, C. & CASTELLINI, C. 2020. 2967
42 2916 Feedback-aided data acquisition improves 2968
43 2917 myoelectric control of a prosthetic hand. *Journal* 2969
44 2918 *of Neural Engineering*, 17, 056047. 2970
45 2919 GIJSBERTS, A., BOHRA, R., SIERRA GONZÁLEZ, D., 2971
46 2920 WERNER, A., NOWAK, M., CAPUTO, B., 2972
47 2921 ROA, M. A. & CASTELLINI, C. 2014. Stable 2973
48 2922 myoelectric control of a hand prosthesis using 2974
49 2923 non-linear incremental learning. *Frontiers in* 2975
50 2924 *neurorobotics*, 8, 8. 2976
51 2925 GODFREY, S. B., ZHAO, K. D., THEUER, A., 2977
52 2926 CATALANO, M. G., BIANCHI, M., 2978
53 2927 BREIGHNER, R., BHASKARAN, D., 2979
54 2928 LENNON, R., GRIOLI, G. & SANTELLO, M.
55
56
57
58
59
60
2018. The SoftHand Pro: Functional evaluation of a novel, flexible, and robust myoelectric prosthesis. *PLoS one*, 13, e0205653.
- GONZALEZ, J., SOMA, H., SEKINE, M. & YU, W. 2012. Psycho-physiological assessment of a prosthetic hand sensory feedback system based on an auditory display: a preliminary study. *Journal of neuroengineering and rehabilitation*, 9, 1-14.
- GONZALEZ, M. A., LEE, C., KANG, J., GILLESPIE, R. B. & GATES, D. H. 2021. Getting a Grip on the Impact of Incidental Feedback From Body-Powered and Myoelectric Prostheses. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, 29, 1905-1912.
- GOW, D., DOUGLAS, W., GEGGIE, C., MONTEITH, E. & STEWART, D. 2001. The development of the Edinburgh modular arm system. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part H: Journal of Engineering in Medicine*, 215, 291-298.
- GREBENSTEIN, M., ALBU-SCHÄFFER, A., BAHLS, T., CHALON, M., EIBERGER, O., FRIEDL, W., GRUBER, R., HADDADIN, S., HAGN, U. & HASLINGER, R. The DLR hand arm system. 2011 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation, 2011. IEEE, 3175-3182.
- GRECHUTA, K., GUGA, J., MAFFEI, G., BALLESTER, B. R. & VERSCHURE, P. F. 2017. Visuo-tactile integration modulates motor performance in a perceptual decision-making task. *Scientific reports*, 7, 1-13.
- GRUSHKO, S., SPURNÝ, T. & ČERNÝ, M. 2020. Control Methods for Transradial Prostheses Based on Remnant Muscle Activity and Its Relationship with Proprioceptive Feedback. *Sensors*, 20, 4883.
- GUNASEKARAN, H., SPIGLER, G., MAZZONI, A., CATALDO, E. & ODDO, C. M. 2019. Convergence of regular spiking and intrinsically bursting Izhikevich neuron models as a function of discretization time with Euler method. *Neurocomputing*, 350, 237-247.
- GUO, S., PANG, M., GAO, B., HIRATA, H. & ISHIHARA, H. 2015. Comparison of sEMG-based feature extraction and motion classification methods for upper-limb movement. *sensors*, 15, 9022-9038.
- GUO, W., SHENG, X., LIU, H. & ZHU, X. 2017a. Mechanomyography assisted myoelectric sensing for upper-extremity prostheses: A hybrid approach. *IEEE Sensors Journal*, 17, 3100-3108.

1

2

- 32980 GUO, W., SHENG, X., LIU, H. & ZHU, X. 2017b. Toward
42981 an enhanced human-machine interface for upper-
52982 limb prosthesis control with combined EMG and
62983 NIRS signals. *IEEE Transactions on Human-
72984 Machine Systems*, 47, 564-575. 3031
- 82985 HAGAN, M. T., DEMUTH, H. B. & BEALE, M. 1997. 3032
92986 *Neural network design*, PWS Publishing Co. 3033
10 3034
- 112987 HAHNE, J. M., BIESSMANN, F., JIANG, N., 3035
122988 REHBAUM, H., FARINA, D., MEINECKE, F. 3036
132989 C., MÜLLER, K.-R. & PARRA, L. C. 2014. 3037
142990 Linear and nonlinear regression techniques for 3038
152991 simultaneous and proportional myoelectric 3039
162992 control. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems
172993 and Rehabilitation Engineering*, 22, 269-279. 3040
- 182994 HAHNE, J. M., SCHWEISFURTH, M. A., KOPPE, M. &
192995 FARINA, D. 2018. Simultaneous control of 3041
202996 multiple functions of bionic hand prostheses: 3042
212997 Performance and robustness in end users. *Science
222998 Robotics*, 3. 3043
3044
- 232999 HAMMOCK, M. L., CHORTOS, A., TEE, B. C. K., TOK,
243000 J. B. H. & BAO, Z. 2013. 25th anniversary article:
253001 the evolution of electronic skin (e-skin): a brief
263002 history, design considerations, and recent
273003 progress. *Advanced materials*, 25, 5997-6038. 3045
- 283004 HAO, Y., CONTROZZI, M., CIPRIANI, C., POPOVIC,
293005 D. B., YANG, X., CHEN, W., ZHENG, X. &
303006 CARROZZA, M. C. 2013. Controlling hand-
313007 assistive devices: utilizing electrooculography as
323008 a substitute for vision. *IEEE Robotics &
333009 Automation Magazine*, 20, 40-52. 3046
- 343010 HARGROVE, L. J., ENGLEHART, K. & HUDGINS, B.
353011 2007. A comparison of surface and intramuscular
363012 myoelectric signal classification. *IEEE
373013 transactions on biomedical engineering*, 54, 847-
383014 853. 3047
- 393015 HARTE, R., GLYNN, L., RODRÍGUEZ-MOLINERO, A.,
403016 BAKER, P. M., SCHARF, T., QUINLAN, L. R.
413017 & ÓLAIGHIN, G. 2017. A human-centered
423018 design methodology to enhance the usability,
433019 human factors, and user experience of connected
443020 health systems: a three-phase methodology. *JMIR
453021 human factors*, 4, e5443. 3048
- 463022 HARTWELL, A., KADIRKAMANATHAN, V. &
473023 ANDERSON, S. R. Compact deep neural
483024 networks for computationally efficient gesture
493025 classification from electromyography signals. 3049
503026 2018 7th IEEE International Conference on
513027 Biomedical Robotics and Biomechatronics
523028 (Biorob), 2018. IEEE, 891-896. 3050
- 533029 HAZUBSKI, S., HOPPE, H. & OTTE, A. 2020. Hand
543030 prosthetic controlled via augmented reality. 3051
55 3052
56 3053
57 3054
58 3055
59 3056
60 3057
- HECKATHORNE, C. W. & CHILDRESS, D. S. 2001.
Cineplasty as a control input for externally
powered prosthetic components. *Journal of
Rehabilitation Research & Development*, 38. 3058
- HEERSCHOP, A., VAN DER SLUIS, C. K. &
BONGERS, R. M. 2021. Transfer of mode
switching performance: from training to upper-
limb prosthesis use. *Journal of neuroengineering
and rehabilitation*, 18, 1-16. 3059
- HOCHBERG, L. R., BACHER, D., JAROSIEWICZ, B.,
MASSE, N. Y., SIMERAL, J. D., VOGEL, J.,
HADDADIN, S., LIU, J., CASH, S. S. & VAN
DER SMAGT, P. 2012. Reach and grasp by
people with tetraplegia using a neurally controlled
robotic arm. *Nature*, 485, 372-375. 3060
- HOCHBERG, L. R., SERRUYA, M. D., FRIEHS, G. M.,
MUKAND, J. A., SALEH, M., CAPLAN, A. H.,
BRANNER, A., CHEN, D., PENN, R. D. &
DONOGHUE, J. P. 2006. Neuronal ensemble
control of prosthetic devices by a human with
tetraplegia. *Nature*, 442, 164-171. 3061
- HOLOBAR, A. & ZAZULA, D. 2007. Multichannel blind
source separation using convolution kernel
compensation. *IEEE Transactions on Signal
Processing*, 55, 4487-4496. 3062
- HOTSON, G., MCMULLEN, D. P., FIFER, M. S.,
JOHANNES, M. S., KATYAL, K. D., PARA, M.
P., ARMIGER, R., ANDERSON, W. S.,
THAKOR, N. V. & WESTER, B. A. 2016.
Individual finger control of a modular prosthetic
limb using high-density electrocorticography in a
human subject. *Journal of neural engineering*, 13,
026017. 3063
- HUANG, H. H., SI, J., BRANDT, A. & LI, M. 2021.
Taking both sides: seeking symbiosis between
intelligent prostheses and human motor control
during locomotion. *Current Opinion in
Biomedical Engineering*, 20, 100314. 3064
- HUDGINS, B., PARKER, P. & SCOTT, R. N. 1993. A
new strategy for multifunction myoelectric
control. *IEEE transactions on biomedical
engineering*, 40, 82-94. 3065
- HUMPHREY, D. R., SCHMIDT, E. & THOMPSON, W.
1970. Predicting measures of motor performance
from multiple cortical spike trains. *Science*, 170,
758-762. 3066
- HUYNH, T. V., BEKRATER-BODMANN, R.,
FRÖHNER, J., VOGT, J. & BECKERLE, P.
2019. Robotic hand illusion with tactile feedback:
Unravelling the relative contribution of
visuotactile and visuomotor input to the
representation of body parts in space. *PloS one*,
14, e0210058. 3067

- 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
- I-BIOMED. 2021. *Sense Pattern Recognition system* [Online]. Available: <https://www.i-biomed.com/sense.html> [Accessed].
- IGUAL BAÑÓ, C. 2021. *Co-adaptive myoelectric control for upper limb prostheses*. Universitat Politècnica de València.
- ISKAROUS, M. M. & THAKOR, N. V. 2019. E-skins: Biomimetic sensing and encoding for upper limb prostheses. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 107, 2052-2064.
- JAMAL, M. Z. 2012. Signal acquisition using surface EMG and circuit design considerations for robotic prosthesis. *Computational Intelligence in Electromyography Analysis-A Perspective on Current Applications and Future Challenges*, 18, 427-448.
- JAMALI, N., MAGGIALI, M., GIOVANNINI, F., METTA, G. & NATALE, L. A new design of a fingertip for the iCub hand. 2015 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS), 2015. IEEE, 2705-2710.
- JIANG, N., DOSEN, S., MULLER, K.-R. & FARINA, D. 2012. Myoelectric control of artificial limbs—is there a need to change focus?[In the spotlight]. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 29, 152-150.
- JIANG, N., REHBAUM, H., VUJAKLIJA, I., GRAIMANN, B. & FARINA, D. 2013. Intuitive, online, simultaneous, and proportional myoelectric control over two degrees-of-freedom in upper limb amputees. *IEEE transactions on neural systems and rehabilitation engineering*, 22, 501-510.
- JIANG, S., GAO, Q., LIU, H. & SHULL, P. B. 2020. A novel, co-located EMG-FMG-sensing wearable armband for hand gesture recognition. *Sensors and Actuators A: Physical*, 301, 111738.
- JIANG, S., LI, L., XU, H., XU, J., GU, G. & SHULL, P. B. 2019. Stretchable e-skin patch for gesture recognition on the back of the hand. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 67, 647-657.
- JOHANNES, M. S., BIGELOW, J. D., BURCK, J. M., HARSHBARGER, S. D., KOZLOWSKI, M. V. & VAN DOREN, T. 2011. An overview of the developmental process for the modular prosthetic limb. *Johns Hopkins APL Technical Digest*, 30, 207-216.
- JOHANSEN, D., CIPRIANI, C., POPOVIĆ, D. B. & STRUIJK, L. N. 2016. Control of a robotic hand using a tongue control system—A prosthesis application. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 63, 1368-1376.
- JOHANSEN, D., POPOVIĆ, D. B., DOSEN, S. & STRUIJK, L. N. A. 2021. Hybrid Tongue-Myoelectric Control Improves Functional Use of a Robotic Hand Prosthesis. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 68, 2011-2020.
- JONES, H., DUPAN, S., DYSON, M., KRASOULIS, A., KENNEY, L., DONOVAN-HALL, M., MEMARZADEH, K., DAY, S., COUTINHO, M. & NAZARPOUR, K. 2021. Co-creation and user perspectives for upper limb prosthetics. *Frontiers in Neurobotics*.
- JORGOVANOVIC, N., DOSEN, S., DJOZIC, D. J., KRAJOSKI, G. & FARINA, D. 2014. Virtual grasping: closed-loop force control using electrotactile feedback. *Computational and mathematical methods in medicine*, 2014.
- KALAMPRATSIDOU, V. & TORRES, E. B. Body-brain-avator interface: a tool to study sensory-motor integration and neuroplasticity. Fourth International Symposium on Movement and Computing, MOCO, 2017.
- KAYHAN, O., NENNIUGLU, A. K. & SAMUR, E. A skin stretch factor for sensory substitution of wrist proprioception. 2018 IEEE Haptics Symposium (HAPTICS), 2018. IEEE, 26-31.
- KENNEY, L. P., LISITSA, I., BOWKER, P., HEATH, G. H. & HOWARD, D. 1999. Dimensional change in muscle as a control signal for powered upper limb prostheses: a pilot study. *Med Eng Phys*, 21, 589-97.
- KERVER, N., VAN TWILLERT, S., MAAS, B. & VAN DER SLUIS, C. K. 2020. User-relevant factors determining prosthesis choice in persons with major unilateral upper limb defects: A meta-synthesis of qualitative literature and focus group results. *PloS one*, 15, e0234342.
- KILTENI, K., GROTEN, R. & SLATER, M. 2012. The sense of embodiment in virtual reality. *Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments*, 21, 373-387.
- KRASOULIS, A., KYRANOU, I., ERDEN, M. S., NAZARPOUR, K. & VIJAYAKUMAR, S. 2017. Improved prosthetic hand control with concurrent use of myoelectric and inertial measurements. *Journal of neuroengineering and rehabilitation*, 14, 1-14.
- KRASOULIS, A., VIJAYAKUMAR, S. & NAZARPOUR, K. 2019a. Effect of user practice on prosthetic finger control with an intuitive myoelectric decoder. *Frontiers in neuroscience*, 13, 891.

1

2

- 33187 KRASOULIS, A., VIJAYAKUMAR, S. & 3239
 43188 NAZARPOUR, K. 2019b. Multi-grip 3240
 53189 classification-based prosthesis control with two 3241
 63190 EMG-IMU sensors. *IEEE Transactions on Neural* 3242
 73191 *Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, 28, 508- 3243
 83192 518. 3244
- 93193 KRAUSZ, N. E., LAMOTTE, D., BATZIANOULIS, I., 3245
 103194 HARGROVE, L. J., MICERA, S. & BILLARD, 3246
 113195 A. 2020. Intent Prediction Based on 3247
 123196 Biomechanical Coordination of EMG and Vision- 3248
 133197 Filtered Gaze for End-Point Control of an Arm 3249
 143198 Prosthesis. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems* 3250
 153199 *and Rehabilitation Engineering*, 28, 1471-1480. 3251
- 163200 KUIKEN, T. A., BARLOW, A. K., HARGROVE, L. & 3252
 173201 DUMANIAN, G. A. 2017. Targeted muscle 3253
 183202 reinnervation for the upper and lower extremity. 3254
 193203 *Techniques in orthopaedics (Rockville, Md.)*, 32, 3255
 203204 109. 3256
- 213205 KUIKEN, T. A., LI, G., LOCK, B. A., LIPSCHUTZ, R. 3257
 223206 D., MILLER, L. A., STUBBLEFIELD, K. A. & 3258
 233207 ENGLEHART, K. B. 2009. Targeted muscle 3259
 243208 reinnervation for real-time myoelectric control of 3260
 253209 multifunction artificial arms. *Jama*, 301, 619-628. 3261
- 263210 KYRANOU, I., VIJAYAKUMAR, S. & ERDEN, M. S. 3262
 273211 2018. Causes of performance degradation in non- 3263
 283212 invasive electromyographic pattern recognition in 3264
 293213 upper limb prostheses. *Frontiers in* 3265
 303214 *neurorobotics*. 3266
- 313215 LAFFRANCHI, M., BOCCARDO, N., TRAVERSO, S., 3267
 323216 LOMBARDI, L., CANEPA, M., LINCE, A., 3268
 333217 SEMPRINI, M., SAGLIA, J. A., NACERI, A., 3269
 343218 SACCHETTI, R., GRUPPIONI, E. & DE 3270
 353219 MICHELIELI, L. 2020. The Hannes hand prosthesis 3271
 363220 replicates the key biological properties of the 3272
 373221 human hand. *Science Robotics*. 3273
- 383222 LAH, U., LEWIS, J. R. & ŠUMAK, B. 2020. Perceived 3274
 393223 usability and the modified technology acceptance 3275
 403224 model. *International Journal of Human- 3276
 413225 Computer Interaction*, 36, 1216-1230. 3277
- 423226 LAMOUNIER, E., LOPES, K., CARDOSO, A., 3278
 433227 ANDRADE, A. & SOARES, A. On the use of 3279
 443228 virtual and augmented reality for upper limb 3280
 453229 prostheses training and simulation. 2010 Annual 3281
 463230 International Conference of the IEEE Engineering 3282
 473231 in Medicine and Biology, 2010. IEEE, 2451- 3283
 483232 2454. 3284
- 493233 LENZI, T., LIPSEY, J. & SENSINGER, J. W. 2016. The 3285
 503234 RIC Arm—a small anthropomorphic 3286
 513235 transhumeral prosthesis. *IEEE/ASME* 3287
 523236 *Transactions on Mechatronics*, 21, 2660-2671. 3288
- 533237 LI, W., SHI, P. & YU, H. 2021. Gesture recognition using 3289
 543238 surface electromyography and deep learning for 3290
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
- prostheses hand: state-of-the-art, challenges, and future. *Frontiers in neuroscience*, 15, 621885.
- LI, Y., CHEN, J. & YANG, Y. 2019. A method for suppressing electrical stimulation artifacts from electromyography. *International journal of neural systems*, 29, 1850054.
- LIN, C. H., ERICKSON, T. W., FISHEL, J. A., WETTELS, N. & LOEB, G. E. Signal processing and fabrication of a biomimetic tactile sensor array with thermal, force and microvibration modalities. 2009 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Biomimetics (ROBIO), 2009. IEEE, 129-134.
- LIU, G., WANG, L. & WANG, J. 2021a. A novel energy-motion model for continuous sEMG decoding: from muscle energy to motor pattern. *Journal of Neural Engineering*, 18, 016019.
- LIU, M., BATISTA, A., BENSMAIA, S. & WEBER, D. J. 2021b. Information about contact force and surface texture is mixed in the firing rates of cutaneous afferent neurons. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 125, 496-508.
- LONGFELLOW, H. W. 2014. Upper-limb prostheses, acceptance, and acceptance factors. *Improving the design of upper-limb robotic prostheses using biomechanical properties and sensorimotor control principles*, 5.
- LONGO, L. 2018. Experienced mental workload, perception of usability, their interaction and impact on task performance. *PloS one*, 13, e0199661.
- LUCAROTTI, C., ODDO, C. M., VITIELLO, N. & CARROZZA, M. C. 2013. Synthetic and bio-artificial tactile sensing: A review. *Sensors*, 13, 1435-1466.
- LUCHETTI, M., CUTTI, A. G., VERNI, G., SACCHETTI, R. & ROSSI, N. 2015. Impact of Michelangelo prosthetic hand: Findings from a crossover longitudinal study. *Journal of Rehabilitation Research & Development*, 52.
- LUNDBORG, G., ROSÉN, B. & LINDBERG, S. 1999. Hearing as substitution for sensation: a new principle for artificial sensibility. *The Journal of hand surgery*, 24, 219-224.
- MAIMON MOR, R. O. & MAKIN, T. R. 2020. Is an artificial limb embodied as a hand? Brain decoding in prosthetic limb users. *Plos Biology*, 18, e3000729.
- MAINARDI, E. & DAVALLI, A. Controlling a prosthetic arm with a throat microphone. 2007 29th Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering

- 1
2
33290 in Medicine and Biology Society, 2007. IEEE, 3342
43291 3035-3039. 3343
- 5
63292 MAIOLINO, P., MAGGIALI, M., CANNATA, G., 3344
73293 METTA, G. & NATALE, L. 2013. A flexible and 3345
83294 robust large scale capacitive tactile system for 3346
93295 robots. *IEEE Sensors Journal*, 13, 3910-3917. 3347
- 10296 MAKIN, T. R., DE VIGNEMONT, F. & FAISAL, A. A. 3348
11297 2017. Neurocognitive barriers to the embodiment 3349
12298 of technology. *Nature Biomedical Engineering*, 1, 3350
13299 1-3. 3351
- 14300 MAMIDANNA, P., DIDERIKSEN, J. L. & DOSEN, S. 3352
15301 2021. The impact of objective functions on 3353
16302 control policies in closed-loop control of grasping 3354
17303 force with a myoelectric prosthesis. *Journal of* 3355
18304 *Neural Engineering*, 18, 056036. 3356
- 19305 MARASCO, P. D., HEBERT, J. S., SENSINGER, J. W., 3357
20306 BECKLER, D. T., THUMSER, Z. C., 3358
21307 SHEHATA, A. W., WILLIAMS, H. E. & 3359
22308 WILSON, K. R. 2021. Neurobotic fusion of 3360
23309 prosthetic touch, kinesthesia, and movement in 3361
24310 bionic upper limbs promotes intrinsic brain 3362
25311 behaviors. *Science Robotics*, 6, eabf3368. 3363
- 26312 MARASCO, P. D., KIM, K., COLGATE, J. E., PESHKIN, 3364
27313 M. A. & KUIKEN, T. A. 2011. Robotic touch 3365
28314 shifts perception of embodiment to a prosthesis in 3366
29315 targeted reinnervation amputees. *Brain*, 134, 747- 3367
30316 758. 3368
- 31317 MARINELLI, A., BOCCARDO, N., SEMPRINI, M., 3369
32318 SUCCI, A., CANEPA, M., STEDMAN, S., 3370
33319 LOMBARDI, L., BELLINGEGNI, A. D., 3371
34320 CHIAPPALONE, M. & GRUPPIONI, E. 3372
35321 Miniature EMG Sensors for Prosthetic 3373
36322 Applications. 2021 10th International 3374
37323 IEEE/EMBS Conference on Neural Engineering 3375
38324 (NER), 2021. IEEE, 1022-1025. 3376
- 39325 MARINELLI, A., SEMPRINI, M., CANEPA, M., 3377
40326 LOMBARDI, L., STEDMAN, S., DELLACASA 3378
41327 BELLINGEGNI, A., CHIAPPALONE, M., 3379
42328 LAFFRANCHI, M., GRUPPIONI, E. & DE 3380
43329 MICHIELI, L. Performance Evaluation of Pattern 3381
44330 Recognition Algorithms for Upper Limb 3382
45331 Prosthetic Applications. 8th IEEE RAS/EMBS 3383
46332 International Conference for Biomedical Robotics 3384
47333 and Biomechatronics (BioRob), 2020. IEEE. 3385
- 48334 MARKOVIC, M., DOSEN, S., CIPRIANI, C., POPOVIC, 3386
49335 D. & FARINA, D. 2014. Stereovision and 3387
50336 augmented reality for closed-loop control of 3388
51337 grasping in hand prostheses. *Journal of neural* 3389
52338 *engineering*, 11, 046001. 3390
- 53339 MARKOVIC, M., KARNAL, H., GRAIMANN, B., 3391
54340 FARINA, D. & DOSEN, S. 2017. GLIMPSE: 3392
55341 Google Glass interface for sensory feedback in 3393
56341 3394
- 57
58
59
60
- myoelectric hand prostheses. *Journal of neural engineering*, 14, 036007.
- MARKOVIC, M., SCHWEISFURTH, M. A., ENGELS, L. F., FARINA, D. & DOSEN, S. 2018. Myocontrol is closed-loop control: incidental feedback is sufficient for scaling the prosthesis force in routine grasping. *Journal of neuroengineering and rehabilitation*, 15, 1-11.
- MARKOVIC, M., VAREL, M., SCHWEISFURTH, M. A., SCHILLING, A. F. & DOSEN, S. 2019. Closed-loop multi-amplitude control for robust and dexterous performance of myoelectric prosthesis. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, 28, 498-507.
- MASSARI, L., ODDO, C. M., SINIBALDI, E., DETRY, R., BOWKETT, J. & CARPENTER, K. C. 2019. Tactile sensing and control of robotic manipulator integrating fiber Bragg grating strain-sensor. *Frontiers in neurobotics*, 13, 8.
- MAZZONI, A., ODDO, C. M., VALLE, G., CAMBONI, D., STRAUSS, I., BARBARO, M., BARABINO, G., PUDDU, R., CARBONI, C. & BISONI, L. 2020. Morphological neural computation restores discrimination of naturalistic textures in trans-radial amputees. *Scientific reports*, 10, 1-14.
- MCDERMOTT, E. J., METSOMAA, J., BELARDINELLI, P., GROSSE-WENTRUP, M., ZIEMANN, U. & ZRENNER, C. Predicting motor behavior: an EEG signal processing pipeline to detect relevant brain states with potential therapeutic relevance for VR-based neurorehabilitation.
- MCDONNELL, P. M., SCOTT, R. N., DICKISON, J., THERIAULT, R. A. & WOOD, B. 1989. Do artificial limbs become part of the user? New evidence. *Journal of rehabilitation research and development*, 26, 17-24.
- MCFARLAND, D. J., SARNACKI, W. A. & WOLPAW, J. R. 2010. Electroencephalographic (EEG) control of three-dimensional movement. *Journal of neural engineering*, 7, 036007.
- MEAGHER, C., FRANCO, E., TURK, R., WILSON, S., STEADMAN, N., MCNICHOLAS, L., VAIDYANATHAN, R., BURRIDGE, J. & STOKES, M. 2020. New advances in mechanomyography sensor technology and signal processing: Validity and intrarater reliability of recordings from muscle. *Journal of rehabilitation and assistive technologies engineering*, 7, 2055668320916116.
- MEATTINI, R., BIAGIOTTI, L., PALLI, G., DE GREGORIO, D. & MELCHIORRI, C. A Control Architecture for Grasp Strength Regulation in

1

2

33395

Myocontrolled Robotic Hands Using Vibrotactile 3446

43396

Feedback: Preliminary Results. 2019 IEEE 16th 3447

53397

International Conference on Rehabilitation 3448

63398

Robotics (ICORR), 2019. IEEE, 1272-1277. 3449

73399

MELCER, E. F., ASTOLFI, M. T., REMALEY, M., 3450

83400

BERENZWEIG, A. & GIURGICA-TIRON, T. 3451

93401

CTRL-labs: Hand activity estimation and real- 3452

103402

time control from neuromuscular signals. 3453

113403

Extended Abstracts of the 2018 CHI Conference 3454

123404

on Human Factors in Computing Systems, 2018. 3455

133405

1-4. 3456

143406

MERAD, M., DE MONTALIVET, É., TOUILLET, A., 3457

153407

MARTINET, N., ROBY-BRAMI, A. & 3458

163408

JARRASSÉ, N. 2018. Can we achieve intuitive 3459

173409

prosthetic elbow control based on healthy upper 3460

183410

limb motor strategies? *Frontiers in neurorobotics*, 3461

193411

12, 1. 3462

203412

MEREU, F., LEONE, F., GENTILE, C., CORDELLA, F., 3463

213413

GRUPPIONI, E. & ZOLLO, L. 2021. Control 3464

223414

Strategies and Performance Assessment of Upper- 3465

233415

Limb TMR Prostheses: A Review. *Sensors*, 21, 3466

243416

1953. 3467

253417

MERLETTI, R., AVENTAGGIATO, M., BOTTER, A., 3468

263418

HOLOBAR, A., MARATEB, H. & VIEIRA, T. 3469

273419

M. 2010. Advances in surface EMG: recent 3470

283420

progress in detection and processing techniques. 3471

293421

Critical Reviews™ in Biomedical Engineering, 3472

303422

38. 3473

313423

MERLETTI, R. & FARINA, D. 2009. Analysis of 3474

323424

intramuscular electromyogram signals. 3475

333425

Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society 3476

343426

A: *Mathematical, Physical and Engineering* 3477

353427

Sciences, 367, 357-368. 3478

363428

MERLETTI, R. & FARINA, D. 2016. Surface 3479

373429

electromyography for man-machine interfacing in 3480

383430

rehabilitation technologies. 3481

393431

MERLETTI, R., HOLOBAR, A. & FARINA, D. 2008. 3482

403432

Analysis of motor units with high-density surface 3483

413433

electromyography. *Journal of electromyography* 3484

423434

and *kinesiology*, 18, 879-890. 3485

433435

MERLETTI, R. & MUCELI, S. 2019. Tutorial. Surface 3486

443436

EMG detection in space and time: Best practices. 3487

453437

Journal of Electromyography and Kinesiology, 3488

463438

49, 102363. 3489

473439

MILGRAM, P. & KISHINO, F. 1994. A taxonomy of 3490

483440

mixed reality visual displays. *IEICE* 3491

493441

TRANSACTIONS on Information and Systems, 3492

503442

77, 1321-1329. 3493

513443

MILLSTEIN, S., HEGER, H. & HUNTER, G. 1986. 3494

523444

Prosthetic use in adult upper limb amputees: a 3495

533445

comparison of the body powered and electrically 3496

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

powered prostheses. *Prosthetics and orthotics international*, 10, 27-34.

MONTAZERIN, M., ZABIHI, S., RAHIMIAN, E., MOHAMMADI, A. & NADERKHANI, F. 2022. ViT-HGR: Vision Transformer-based Hand Gesture Recognition from High Density Surface EMG Signals. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.10060*.

MOON, I., LEE, M., CHU, J. & MUN, M. Wearable EMG-based HCI for electric-powered wheelchair users with motor disabilities. Proceedings of the 2005 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation, 2005. IEEE, 2649-2654.

MOORE, C. H., CORBIN, S. F., MAYR, R., SHOCKLEY, K., SILVA, P. L. & LORENZ, T. 2021. Grasping Embodiment: Haptic Feedback for Artificial Limbs. *Frontiers in Neurorobotics*, 15, 66.

MOUCHOUX, J., CARISI, S., DOSEN, S., FARINA, D., SCHILLING, A. F. & MARKOVIC, M. 2021. Artificial Perception and Semiautonomous Control in Myoelectric Hand Prostheses Increases Performance and Decreases Effort. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*.

MUSK, E. 2021. *Neuralink* [Online]. Available: <https://neuralink.com/> [Accessed].

NAKAGAWA-SILVA, A., SUNKESULA, S. P. R., PRACH, A., CABIBIHAN, J.-J., THAKOR, N. V. & SOARES, A. B. Slip suppression in prosthetic hands using a reflective optical sensor and MPI controller. 2018 IEEE Biomedical Circuits and Systems Conference (BioCAS), 2018. IEEE, 1-4.

NAVARAJ, W. T., NASSAR, H. & DAHIYA, R. Prosthetic hand with biomimetic tactile sensing and force feedback. 2019 IEEE International Symposium on Circuits and Systems (ISCAS), 2019. IEEE, 1-4.

NELSON, E. C., SOOLS, A. M., VOLLENBROEK-HUTTEN, M. M., VERHAGEN, T. & NOORDZIJ, M. L. 2020. Embodiment of Wearable Technology: Qualitative Longitudinal Study. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, 8, e16973.

NGUYEN, A. T., DREALAN, M. W., LUU, D. K., JIANG, M., XU, J., CHENG, J., ZHAO, Q., KEEFER, E. W. & YANG, Z. 2021. A Portable, Self-Contained Neuroprosthetic Hand with Deep Learning-Based Finger Control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.13452*.

NGUYEN, A. T., XU, J., JIANG, M., LUU, D. K., WU, T., TAM, W.-K., ZHAO, W., DREALAN, M. W., OVERSTREET, C. K. & ZHAO, Q. 2020. A bioelectric neural interface towards intuitive

- 1
2
33497 prosthetic control for amputees. *Journal of neural engineering*, 17, 066001. 3548
43498 3549
- 5
63499 NICOLELIS, M. A. & CHAPIN, J. K. 2002. Controlling 3550
73500 robots with the mind. *Scientific American*, 287, 3551
83501 46-53. 3552
93502 3553
103503 NISSELER, C., MOURIKI, N. & CASTELLINI, C. 2016. 3554
113504 Optical myography: detecting finger movements 3555
123505 by looking at the forearm. *Frontiers in 3556
neurorobotics*, 10, 3. 3557
- 133506 NISSELER, C., NOWAK, M., CONNAN, M., BÜTTNER, 3558
143507 S., VOGEL, J., KOSSYK, I., MÁRTON, Z.-C. & 3559
153508 CASTELLINI, C. 2019. VITA—An everyday 3560
163509 virtual reality setup for prosthetics and upper-limb 3561
173510 rehabilitation. *Journal of neural engineering*, 16, 3562
183511 026039. 3562
- 193512 NOWAK, M., CASTELLINI, C. & MASSIRONI, C. 2018. 3563
203513 Applying radical constructivism to machine 3564
213514 learning: a pilot study in assistive robotics. 3565
223515 *Constructivist Foundations*, 13, 250-262. 3566
233516 3567
- 243516 NOWAK, M., EIBAND, T., RAMÍREZ, E. R. & 3568
253517 CASTELLINI, C. 2020. Action interference in 3569
263518 simultaneous and proportional myocontrol: 3570
273519 Comparing force-and electromyography. *Journal 3571
of neural engineering*, 17, 026011. 3572
- 293521 O'SULLIVAN, L., POWER, V., DE EYTO, A. & ORTIZ, 3573
303522 J. 2017. User centered design and usability of 3574
313523 bionic devices. *Converging Clinical and 3575
323524 Engineering Research on Neurorehabilitation II*. 3576
333525 Springer. 3577
- 343526 ODDO, C. M., RASPOPOVIC, S., ARTONI, F., 3578
353527 MAZZONI, A., SPIGLER, G., PETRINI, F., 3579
363528 GIAMBATTISTELLI, F., VECCHIO, F., 3580
373529 MIRAGLIA, F. & ZOLLO, L. 2016. Intra-neural 3581
383530 stimulation elicits discrimination of textural 3582
393531 features by artificial fingertip in intact and 3583
403532 amputee humans. *elife*, 5, e09148. 3584
- 413533 OLSSON, A. E., SAGER, P., ANDERSSON, E., 3585
423534 BJÖRKMAN, A., MALEŠEVIĆ, N. & 3586
433535 ANTFOLK, C. 2019. Extraction of multi-labelled 3587
443536 movement information from the raw HD-sEMG 3588
453537 image with time-domain depth. *Scientific reports*, 3589
463538 9, 1-10. 3590
- 473539 ORIZIO, C., SOLOMONOW, M., DIEMONT, B. & 3591
483540 GOBBO, M. 2008. Muscle-joint unit transfer 3592
493541 function derived from torque and surface 3593
503542 mechanomyogram in humans using different 3594
513543 stimulation protocols. *Journal of neuroscience 3595
523544 methods*, 173, 59-66. 3596
- 533545 ORTIZ-CATALAN, M., MASTINU, E., SASSU, P., 3597
543546 ASZMANN, O. & BRÅNEMARK, R. 2020. Self- 3598
553547 contained neuromusculoskeletal arm prostheses. 3599
- New England Journal of Medicine*, 382, 1732-1738.
- OSBORN, L. E., DRAGOMIR, A., BETTHAUSER, J. L., HUNT, C. L., NGUYEN, H. H., KALIKI, R. R. & THAKOR, N. V. 2018. Prosthesis with neuromorphic multilayered e-dermis perceives touch and pain. *Science robotics*, 3.
- OSSUR. 2020a. *i-Limb Apps* [Online]. Available: <https://www.ossur.com/it-it/ossur-per-i-professionisti/apps-ossur/i-limb-mobile-apps> [Accessed].
- OSSUR. 2020b. *i-Limb® Ultra titanium* [Online]. Available: <https://www.ossur.com/it-it/protesi/arto-superiore/i-limb-ultra-titanium> [Accessed].
- OTTOBOCK. 2019. *Myo Plus pattern recognition* [Online]. Available: <https://www.ottobock.it/protesizzazioni/arto-superiore/panoramica-delle-soluzioni/myo-plus-pattern-recognition/> [Accessed].
- OTTOBOCK. 2020a. *Bebionic hand* [Online]. Available: <https://www.ottobock.it/protesizzazioni/prodotti-dalla-a-alla-z/mano-bebionic/> [Accessed].
- OTTOBOCK. 2020b. *Michelangelo hand* [Online]. Available: <https://www.ottobock.it/soluzioni-protesiche/arto-superiore/panoramica-delle-soluzioni/sistema-axon-bus-con-mano-michelangelo/> [Accessed].
- OTTOBOCK. 2020c. *MyoHand VariPlus Speed* [Online]. Available: <https://shop.ottobock.us/Prosthetics/Upper-Limb-Prosthetics/Myo-Hands-and-Components/Myo-Terminal-Devices/MyoHand-VariPlus-Speed/p/8E38~59> [Accessed].
- OTTOBOCK. 2021. *SensorHand Speed* [Online]. Available: <https://shop.ottobock.us/Prosthetics/Upper-Limb-Prosthetics/Myo-Hands-and-Components/Myo-Terminal-Devices/SensorHand-Speed/p/8E39~58> [Accessed].
- OTTOBOCK. 2022a. *DynamicArm* [Online]. Available: <https://shop.ottobock.us/Prosthetics/Upper-Limb-Prosthetics/Myoelectric-Elbows/DynamicArm-Elbow/c/2125> [Accessed].
- OTTOBOCK. 2022b. *DynamicArm Plus* [Online]. Available: <https://shop.ottobock.us/Prosthetics/Upper-Limb-Prosthetics/Myoelectric-Elbows/DynamicArm-Plus-Elbow/c/2126> [Accessed].

- 1
2
3
3599 OTTOBOCK. 2022c. *ErgoArm* [Online]. Available: 3652
43600 [https://shop.ottobock.us/Prosthetics/Upper-](https://shop.ottobock.us/Prosthetics/Upper-3653)
53601 [Limb-Prosthetics/Myoelectric-Elbows/ErgoArm-](https://shop.ottobock.us/Prosthetics/Upper-3654)
63602 [Elbow/c/2127](https://shop.ottobock.us/Prosthetics/Upper-3655) [Accessed]. 3655
- 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
- 3603 PADILHA LEITZKE, J. & ZANGL, H. 2020. A review on 3656
3604 electrical impedance tomography spectroscopy. 3657
3605 *Sensors*, 20, 5160. 3658
- 3606 PAGE, D. M., GEORGE, J. A., KLUGER, D. T., 3659
3607 DUNCAN, C., WENDELKEN, S., DAVIS, T., 3660
3608 HUTCHINSON, D. T. & CLARK, G. A. 2018. 3661
3609 Motor control and sensory feedback enhance 3662
3610 prosthesis embodiment and reduce phantom pain 3663
3611 after long-term hand amputation. *Frontiers in* 3664
3612 *human neuroscience*, 12, 352. 3665
- 3613 PALEARI, M., LUCIANI, R. & ARIANO, P. Towards 3666
3614 NIRS-based hand movement recognition. 2017 3667
3615 International Conference on Rehabilitation 3668
3616 Robotics (ICORR), 2017. IEEE, 1506-1511. 3669
- 3617 PALJIC, A. Ecological validity of virtual reality: three use 3670
3618 cases. International Conference on Image 3671
3619 Analysis and Processing, 2017. Springer, 301- 3672
3620 310. 3673
- 3621 PAN, L., CROUCH, D. L. & HUANG, H. 2018. 3674
3622 Myoelectric control based on a generic 3675
3623 musculoskeletal model: Toward a multi-user 3676
3624 neural-machine interface. *IEEE Transactions on* 3677
3625 *Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, 3678
3626 26, 1435-1442. 3679
- 3627 PAN, L., ZHANG, D., JIANG, N., SHENG, X. & ZHU, X. 3680
3628 2015. Improving robustness against electrode 3681
3629 shift of high density EMG for myoelectric control 3682
3630 through common spatial patterns. *Journal of* 3683
3631 *neuroengineering and rehabilitation*, 12, 1-16. 3684
- 3632 PARAJULI, N., SREENIVASAN, N., BIFULCO, P., 3685
3633 CESARELLI, M., SAVINO, S., NIOLA, V., 3686
3634 ESPOSITO, D., HAMILTON, T. J., NAIK, G. R. 3687
3635 & GUNAWARDANA, U. 2019. Real-time EMG 3688
3636 based pattern recognition control for hand 3689
3637 prostheses: a review on existing methods, 3690
3638 challenges and future implementation. *Sensors*, 3691
3639 19, 4596. 3692
- 3640 PELAYO, S., MARCILLY, R. & BELLANDI, T. 2021. 3693
3641 Human factors engineering for medical devices: 3694
3642 European regulation and current issues. 3695
3643 *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 3696
3644 33, 31-36. 3697
- 3645 PHELAN, I., ARDEN, M., MATSANGIDOU, M., 3698
3646 CARRION-PLAZA, A. & LINDLEY, S. 3699
3647 Designing a Virtual Reality Myoelectric 3699
3648 Prosthesis Training System for Amputees. 3700
3649 Extended Abstracts of the 2021 CHI Conference 3701
3650 on Human Factors in Computing Systems, 2021. 3702
3651 1-7.
- PHILLIPS, S. L. & CRAELIUS, W. 2005. Residual kinetic 3703
imaging: a versatile interface for prosthetic 3704
control. *Robotica*, 23, 277-282.
- PHINYOMARK, A. & SCHEME, E. 2018. EMG pattern 3705
recognition in the era of big data and deep 3706
learning. *Big Data and Cognitive Computing*, 2, 3707
21.
- PIAZZA, C., ROSSI, M., CATALANO, M. G., BICCHI, 3708
A. & HARGROVE, L. J. 2020. Evaluation of a 3709
Simultaneous Myoelectric Control Strategy for a 3710
Multi-DoF Transradial Prosthesis. *IEEE* 3711
Transactions on Neural Systems and 3712
Rehabilitation Engineering.
- PRAKASH, A., SAHI, A. K., SHARMA, N. & SHARMA, 3713
S. 2020. Force myography controlled 3714
multifunctional hand prosthesis for upper-limb 3715
amputees. *Biomedical Signal Processing and* 3716
Control, 62, 102122.
- PSYONIC. 2022. *Ability Hand* [Online]. Available: 3717
<https://www.psyonic.io/ability-hand> [Accessed]. 3718
- PYASIK, M., TIERI, G. & PIA, L. 2020. Visual 3719
appearance of the virtual hand affects 3720
embodiment in the virtual hand illusion. *Scientific* 3721
reports, 10, 1-11.
- RADMAND, A., SCHEME, E. & ENGLEHART, K. 2016. 3722
High-density force myography: A possible 3723
alternative for upper-limb prosthetic control. 3724
Journal of Rehabilitation Research & 3725
Development, 53.
- RAPETTI, L., TIRUPACHURI, Y., DARVISH, K., 3726
DAFARRA, S., NAVA, G., LATELLA, C. & 3727
PUCCI, D. 2020. Model-based real-time motion 3728
tracking using dynamical inverse kinematics. 3729
Algorithms, 13, 266.
- RASPOPOVIC, S., CAPOGROSSO, M., PETRINI, F. M., 3730
BONIZZATO, M., RIGOSA, J., DI PINO, G., 3731
CARPANETO, J., CONTROZZI, M., 3732
BORETIUS, T. & FERNANDEZ, E. 2014. 3733
Restoring natural sensory feedback in real-time 3734
bidirectional hand prostheses. *Science* 3735
translational medicine, 6, 222ra19-222ra19.
- RASPOPOVIC, S., VALLE, G. & PETRINI, F. M. 2021a. 3736
Sensory feedback for limb prostheses in 3737
amputees. *Nature Materials*, 1-15.
- RASPOPOVIC, S., VALLE, G. & PETRINI, F. M. 2021b. 3738
Sensory feedback for limb prostheses in 3739
amputees. *Nature Materials*, 20, 925-939.
- RESNIK, L. 2011. Development and testing of new upper- 3740
limb prosthetic devices: research designs for 3741
usability testing. *Journal of Rehabilitation* 3742
Research & Development, 48.

1
2

- 3703 RESNIK, L., ETTER, K., KLINGER, S. L. & KAMBE, C. 2011. Using virtual reality environment to facilitate training with advanced upper-limb prosthesis. *Journal of Rehabilitation Research & Development*, 48.
- 3708 RESNIK, L., HUANG, H. H., WINSLOW, A., CROUCH, D. L., ZHANG, F. & WOLK, N. 2018. Evaluation of EMG pattern recognition for upper limb prosthesis control: a case study in comparison with direct myoelectric control. *Journal of neuroengineering and rehabilitation*, 15, 1-13.
- 3714 RESNIK, L., KLINGER, S. L., ETTER, K. & FANTINI, C. 2014. Controlling a multi-degree of freedom upper limb prosthesis using foot controls: user experience. *Disability and Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology*, 9, 318-329.
- 3719 RIBEIRO, J., MOTA, F., CAVALCANTE, T., NOGUEIRA, I., GONDIM, V., ALBUQUERQUE, V. & ALEXANDRIA, A. 2019. Analysis of man-machine interfaces in upper-limb prosthesis: A review. *Robotics*, 8, 16.
- 3724 RIENER, R. 2016. The Cybathlon promotes the development of assistive technology for people with physical disabilities. *Journal of neuroengineering and rehabilitation*, 13, 1-4.
- 3728 ROBOT, S. 2022. *Shadow Dexterous Hand Series* [Online]. Available: <https://www.shadowrobot.com/dexterous-hand-series/> [Accessed].
- 3732 ROCHE, A. D., LAKEY, B., MENDEZ, I., VUJAKLIJA, I., FARINA, D. & ASZMANN, O. C. 2019. Clinical Perspectives in Upper Limb Prostheses: An Update. *Current Surgery Reports*.
- 3736 RODGERS, M. M., ALON, G., PAI, V. M. & CONROY, R. S. 2019. Wearable technologies for active living and rehabilitation: current research challenges and future opportunities. *Journal of rehabilitation and assistive technologies engineering*, 6, 2055668319839607.
- 3742 ROMANO, D., CAFFA, E., HERNANDEZ-ARIETA, A., BRUGGER, P. & MARAVITA, A. 2015. The robot hand illusion: Inducing proprioceptive drift through visuo-motor congruency. *Neuropsychologia*, 70, 414-420.
- 3747 ROMANO, D., MARAVITA, A. & PERUGINI, M. 2021. Psychometric properties of the embodiment scale for the rubber hand illusion and its relation with individual differences. *Scientific reports*, 11, 1-16.
- 3752 RUBIN, D. I. 2019. Needle electromyography: Basic concepts. *Handbook of clinical neurology*, 160, 243-256.
- 3755 SALMINGER, S., STINO, H., PICHLER, L. H., GSTOETTNER, C., STURMA, A., MAYER, J. A., SZIVAK, M. & ASZMANN, O. C. 2020. Current rates of prosthetic usage in upper-limb amputees—have innovations had an impact on device acceptance? *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 1-12.
- 3758 SANI, H. N. & MEEK, S. G. Characterizing the performance of an optical slip sensor for grip control in a prosthesis. 2011 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems, 2011. IEEE, 1927-1932.
- 3760 SARTORI, M., DURANDAU, G., DOŠEN, S. & FARINA, D. 2018. Robust simultaneous myoelectric control of multiple degrees of freedom in wrist-hand prostheses by real-time neuromusculoskeletal modeling. *Journal of neural engineering*, 15, 066026.
- 3762 SCALISE, L., CASACCIA, S., MARCHIONNI, P., ERCOLI, I. & EP, T. 2013. Laser doppler myography (LDMi): A novel non-contact measurement method for the muscle activity. *Laser therapy*, 22, 261-268.
- 3764 SCHEME, E. & ENGLEHART, K. 2011. Electromyogram pattern recognition for control of powered upper-limb prostheses: state of the art and challenges for clinical use. *Journal of Rehabilitation Research & Development*, 48.
- 3766 SCHMIDL, H. 1965. The inail myoelectric b/e prosthesis. *Orthotics and Prosthetics*, 19, 298-303.
- 3768 SCHMITZ, A., MAGGIALI, M., RANDAZZO, M., NATALE, L. & METTA, G. A prototype fingertip with high spatial resolution pressure sensing for the robot iCub. Humanoids 2008-8th IEEE-RAS International Conference on Humanoid Robots, 2008. IEEE, 423-428.
- 3770 SCHNEIDER, D. M., RIPPLINGER, C. M., GILBERTSON, K., KATTI, R. & SCHROEDER, M. J. 2003. Optically-based control of a prosthetic device. *Florida: Key Biscayne*.
- 3772 SCHWEISFURTH, M. A., MARKOVIC, M., DOSEN, S., TEICH, F., GRAIMANN, B. & FARINA, D. 2016. Electrotactile EMG feedback improves the control of prosthesis grasping force. *Journal of neural engineering*, 13, 056010.
- 3774 SCOTT, R. & PARKER, P. 1988. Myoelectric prostheses: state of the art. *Journal of medical engineering & technology*, 12, 143-151.
- 3776 SENSINGER, J. W. & DOSEN, S. 2020. A review of sensory feedback in upper-limb prostheses from the perspective of human motor control. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 14.

58
59
60

- 1
2
3 3807 SHAHZAIB, M. & SHAKIL, S. Hand electromyography 3858 [limb-prosthetics/espire%E2%84%A2-elbow/](#)
4 3808 circuit and signals classification using artificial 3859 [Accessed].
5 3809 neural network. 2018 14th International
6 3810 Conference on Emerging Technologies (ICET),
7 3811 2018. IEEE, 1-6. 3860 ŠTRBAC, M., BELIĆ, M., ISAKOVIĆ, M., KOJIĆ, V.,
8 3812 SHANNON, G. 1979. A myoelectrically-controlled 3863 BIJELIĆ, G., POPOVIĆ, I., RADOTIĆ, M.,
9 3813 prosthesis with sensory feedback. *Medical and* 3864 DOŠEN, S., MARKOVIĆ, M. & FARINA, D.
10 3814 *Biological Engineering and Computing*, 17, 73- 3865 2016. Integrated and flexible multichannel
11 3815 80. 3866 interface for electrotactile stimulation. *Journal of*
12 3816 SHARMA, A., HUNT, C. L., MAHESHWARI, A., 3867 *neural engineering*, 13, 046014.
13 3817 OSBORN, L., LÉVAY, G., KALIKI, R. R., 3868
14 3818 SOARES, A. B. & THAKOR, N. A mixed-reality 3869
15 3819 training environment for upper limb prosthesis 3870
16 3820 control. 2018 IEEE Biomedical Circuits and 3871
17 3821 Systems Conference (BioCAS), 2018. IEEE, 1-4. 3872 SUN, T., HU, Q., GULATI, P. & ATASHZAR, S. F.
18 3822 SHAW, H., ELLIS, D. A. & ZIEGLER, F. V. 2018. The 3873 2021a. Temporal dilation of deep LSTM for agile
19 3823 Technology Integration Model (TIM). Predicting 3874 decoding of sEMG: Application in prediction of
20 3824 the continued use of technology. *Computers in* 3875 Upper-Limb motor intention in NeuroRobotics.
21 3825 *Human Behavior*, 83, 204-214. 3876 *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 6, 6212-
22 3826 SHULL, P. B., JIANG, S., ZHU, Y. & ZHU, X. 2019. 3877 6219.
23 3827 Hand Gesture Recognition and Finger Angle 3878
24 3828 Estimation via Wrist-Worn Modified Barometric 3879
25 3829 Pressure Sensing. *IEEE Transactions on Neural* 3880
26 3830 *Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, 27, 724- 3881
27 3831 732. 3882 SUN, Y., L. HUNT, C., NIU, W., LI, Z., CYRINO, G.,
28 3832 SICILIANO, B., KHATIB, O. & KRÖGER, T. 2008. 3883 CAVALCANTE, R., LAMOUNIER, E., B.
29 3833 *Springer handbook of robotics*, Springer. 3884 SOARES, A. & V. THAKOR, N. A Comparison
30 3834 SICILIANO, B., SCIAVICCO, L., VILLANI, L. & 3885 between Virtual Reality and Augmented Reality
31 3835 ORIOLO, G. 2010. *Robotics: modelling, planning* 3886 on Upper-limb Prosthesis Control. 2021
32 3836 *and control*, Springer Science & Business Media. 3887 International Symposium on Electrical,
33 3837 SIMON, A. M., HARGROVE, L. J., LOCK, B. A. & 3888 Electronics and Information Engineering, 2021b.
34 3838 KUIKEN, T. A. 2011. The target achievement 3889 521-528.
35 3839 control test: Evaluating real-time myoelectric 3890 SVENSSON, P., WIJK, U., BJÖRKMAN, A. &
36 3840 pattern recognition control of a multifunctional 3891 ANTFOLK, C. 2017. A review of invasive and
37 3841 upper-limb prosthesis. *Journal of rehabilitation* 3892 non-invasive sensory feedback in upper limb
38 3842 *research and development*. 3893 prostheses. *Expert review of medical devices*, 14,
39 3843 SMAIL, L. C., NEAL, C., WILKINS, C. & PACKHAM, 3894 439-447.
40 3844 T. L. 2020. Comfort and function remain key 3895 SYED, U., KAUSAR, Z. & YOUSAF, N. 2020. Control of
41 3845 factors in upper limb prosthetic abandonment: 3896 a Prosthetic Arm using fNIRS, A Neural-Machine
42 3846 findings of a scoping review. *Disability and* 3897 Interface.
43 3847 *rehabilitation: Assistive technology*, 1-10. 3898
44 3848 SMITH, L. H., KUIKEN, T. A. & HARGROVE, L. J. 3899 SYSTEMS, V. 2020. *Vincent hand* [Online]. Available:
45 3849 2014. Real-time simultaneous and proportional 3900 <https://www.vincentsystems.de/> [Accessed].
46 3850 myoelectric control using intramuscular EMG. 3901
47 3851 *Journal of neural engineering*, 11, 066013. 3902
48 3852 SPEICHER, M., HALL, B. D. & NEBELING, M. What is 3903
49 3853 mixed reality? Proceedings of the 2019 CHI 3904
50 3854 Conference on Human Factors in Computing 3905
51 3855 Systems, 2019. 1-15. 3906
52 3856 STEEPER. 2022. *Espire Elbow* [Online]. Available: 3907
53 3857 <https://www.steepergroup.com/prosthetics/upper-> 3908
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1

2

- 3909 TASKA. 2022. *Taska Hand Gen 2* [Online]. Available: 3960
 43910 [https://www.taskaprosthetics.com/it/prodotti/task](https://www.taskaprosthetics.com/it/prodotti/taska-hand/) 3961
 53911 [a-hand/](https://www.taskaprosthetics.com/it/prodotti/taska-hand/) [Accessed]. 3962
 63912 TAUNYAZOV, T., SONG, L. S., LIM, E., SEE, H. H., 3963
 73913 LEE, D., TEE, B. C. & SOH, H. Extended Tactile 3964
 83914 Perception: Vibration Sensing through Tools and 3965
 93915 Grasped Objects. 2021 IEEE/RSJ International 3966
 103916 Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems 3967
 113917 (IROS), 2021. IEEE, 1755-1762. 3968
 123918 TCHIMINO, J., MARKOVIĆ, M., DIDERIKSEN, J. & 3969
 133919 DOSEN, S. 2021. The effect of calibration 3970
 143920 parameters on the control of a myoelectric hand 3971
 153921 prosthesis using EMG feedback. *Journal of* 3972
 163922 *Neural Engineering*. 3973
 18923 TEE, B. C., WANG, C., ALLEN, R. & BAO, Z. 2012. An 3974
 19924 electrically and mechanically self-healing 3975
 20925 composite with pressure-and flexion-sensitive 3976
 21926 properties for electronic skin applications. *Nature* 3977
 22927 *nanotechnology*, 7, 825-832. 3978
 23928 THAKOR, N. V., FIFER, M. S., HOTSON, G., BENZ, H. 3979
 24929 L., NEWMAN, G. I., MILSAP, G. W. & CRONE, 3980
 25930 N. E. Neuroprosthetic limb control with 3981
 26931 electrocorticography: approaches and challenges. 3982
 27932 2014 36th Annual International Conference of the 3983
 28933 IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology 3984
 29934 Society, 2014. IEEE, 5212-5215. 3985
 30935 TOET, A., KULING, I. A., KROM, B. N. & VAN ERP, J. 3986
 31936 B. 2020. Toward enhanced teleoperation through 3987
 32937 embodiment. *Front. Robot. AI* 7: 14. doi: 3988
 33938 10.3389/frobt. 3989
 34939 TRENT, L., INTINTOLI, M., PRIGGE, P., BOLLINGER, 3990
 35940 C., WALTERS, L. S., CONYERS, D., 3991
 36941 MIGUELEZ, J. & RYAN, T. 2019. A narrative 3992
 37942 review: current upper limb prosthetic options and 3993
 38943 design. *Disability and Rehabilitation: Assistive* 3994
 39944 *Technology*. 3995
 43945 TROPEA, P., MAZZONI, A., MICERA, S. & CORBO, M. 3996
 42946 2017. Giuliano Vanghetti and the innovation of 3997
 43947 "cineplastic operations". *Neurology*, 89, 1627- 3998
 44948 1632. 3999
 45949 TRUONG, H., ZHANG, S., MUNCUK, U., NGUYEN, P., 4000
 46950 BUI, N., NGUYEN, A., LV, Q., CHOWDHURY, 4001
 47951 K., DINH, T. & VU, T. Capband: Battery-free 4002
 48952 successive capacitance sensing wristband for 4003
 49953 hand gesture recognition. Proceedings of the 16th 4004
 50954 ACM Conference on Embedded Networked 4005
 51955 Sensor Systems, 2018. 54-67. 4006
 52956 TSAKIRIS, M. & HAGGARD, P. 2005. The rubber hand 4007
 53957 illusion revisited: visuotactile integration and self- 4008
 54958 attribution. *Journal of Experimental Psychology:* 4009
 55959 *Human Perception and Performance*, 31, 80. 4010
 56960 4011
 UELLEND AHL, J. Myoelectric versus body-powered 3960
 upper-limb prostheses: a clinical perspective. 3961
 JPO: Journal of Prosthetics and Orthotics, 2017. 3962
 LWV, P25-P29. 3963
 URBANCHEK, M. G., BAGHMANLI, Z., MOON, J. D., 3964
 SUGG, K. B., LANGHALS, N. B. & CEDERNA, 3965
 P. S. 2012. Quantification of regenerative 3966
 peripheral nerve interface signal transmission. 3967
Plastic and reconstructive surgery, 130, 55-56. 3968
 VALLE, G., MAZZONI, A., IBERITE, F., D'ANNA, E., 3969
 STRAUSS, I., GRANATA, G., CONTROZZI, 3970
 M., CLEMENTE, F., ROGNINI, G. & 3971
 CIPRIANI, C. 2018. Biomimetic intraneural 3972
 sensory feedback enhances sensation naturalness, 3973
 tactile sensitivity, and manual dexterity in a 3974
 bidirectional prosthesis. *Neuron*, 100, 37-45. e7. 3975
 VAROL, H. A., DALLEY, S. A., WISTE, T. E. & 3976
 GOLDFARB, M. 2014. Biomimicry and the 3977
 design of multigrasp transradial prostheses. *The* 3978
Human Hand as an Inspiration for Robot Hand 3979
Development. Springer. 3980
 VASAN, G. & PILARSKI, P. M. Learning from 3981
 demonstration: Teaching a myoelectric prosthesis 3982
 with an intact limb via reinforcement learning. 3983
 2017 International Conference on Rehabilitation 3984
 Robotics (ICORR), 2017. IEEE, 1457-1464. 3985
 VAZHAPILLI SURESHBABU, A., METTA, G. & 3986
 PARMIGGIANI, A. 2019. A Systematic 3987
 Approach to Evaluating and Benchmarking 3988
 Robotic Hands—The FFP Index. *Robotics*, 8, 7. 3989
 VU, P. P., CHESTEK, C. A., NASON, S. R., KUNG, T. 3990
 A., KEMP, S. W. & CEDERNA, P. S. 2020a. The 3991
 future of upper extremity rehabilitation robotics: 3992
 research and practice. *Muscle & nerve*, 61, 708- 3993
 718. 3994
 VU, P. P., VASKOV, A. K., IRWIN, Z. T., HENNING, P. 3995
 T., LUEDERS, D. R., LAIDLAW, A. T., DAVIS, 3996
 A. J., NU, C. S., GATES, D. H. & GILLESPIE, 3997
 R. B. 2020b. A regenerative peripheral nerve 3998
 interface allows real-time control of an artificial 3999
 hand in upper limb amputees. *Science* 4000
translational medicine, 12. 4001
 WANG, W., COLLINGER, J. L., DEGENHART, A. D., 4002
 TYLER-KABARA, E. C., SCHWARTZ, A. B., 4003
 MORAN, D. W., WEBER, D. J., WODLINGER, 4004
 B., VINJAMURI, R. K. & ASHMORE, R. C. 4005
 2013. An electrocorticographic brain interface in 4006
 an individual with tetraplegia. *PloS one*, 8, 4007
 e55344. 4008
 WEINER, P., STARKE, J., HUNDHAUSEN, F., BEIL, J. 4009
 & ASFOUR, T. The KIT prosthetic hand: design 4010
 and control. 2018 IEEE/RSJ International 4011

1

2

34012

Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS), 2018. IEEE, 3328-3334. 4063
4064

44013

5

4014

WEIR, R. F., TROYK, P. R., DEMICHELE, G. A., 4065

64015

KERNS, D. A., SCHORSCH, J. F. & MAAS, H. 4066

74016

2008. Implantable myoelectric sensors (IMESs) 4067

84017

for intramuscular electromyogram recording. 4068

94018

IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering, 4069

104019

56, 159-171. 4070

114020

WILKE, M. A., NIETHAMMER, C., MEYER, B., 4071

124021

FARINA, D. & DOSEN, S. 2019. Psychometric 4072

134022

characterization of incidental feedback sources 4073

144023

during grasping with a hand prosthesis. *Journal of* 4074

154024

neuroengineering and rehabilitation, 16, 1-13. 4075

164025

WILSON, S. & VAIDYANATHAN, R. Upper-limb 4076

174026

prosthetic control using wearable multichannel 4077

184027

mechanomyography. 2017 International 4078

194028

Conference on Rehabilitation Robotics (ICORR), 4079

204029

2017. IEEE, 1293-1298. 4080

214030

WINTERS, J. M. 1990. Hill-based muscle models: a 4081

224031

systems engineering perspective. *Multiple muscle* 4082

234032

systems. Springer. 4083

244033

WODLINGER, B., DOWNEY, J., TYLER-KABARA, E., 4084

254034

SCHWARTZ, A., BONINGER, M. & 4085

264035

COLLINGER, J. 2014. Ten-dimensional 4086

274036

anthropomorphic arm control in a human brain- 4087

284037

machine interface: difficulties, solutions, and 4088

294038

limitations. *Journal of neural engineering*, 12, 4089

304039

016011. 4090

314040

WOODWARD, R. B., SHEFELBINE, S. J. & 4091

324041

VAIDYANATHAN, R. 2017. Pervasive 4092

334042

monitoring of motion and muscle activation: 4093

344043

Inertial and mechanomyography fusion. 4094

354044

IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics, 22, 4095

364045

2022-2033. 4096

374046

WU, R., LI, M., YAO, Z., LIU, W., SI, J. & HUANG, H. 4097

384047

2022. Reinforcement learning impedance control 4098

394048

of a robotic prosthesis to coordinate with human 4099

404049

intact knee motion. *IEEE Robotics and* 4100

414050

Automation Letters, 7, 7014-7020. 4101

424051

WU, Y., JIANG, D., LIU, X., BAYFORD, R. & 4102

434052

DEMOSTHENOUS, A. 2018. A human-machine 4103

444053

interface using electrical impedance tomography 4104

454054

for hand prosthesis control. *IEEE transactions on* 4105

464055

biomedical circuits and systems, 12, 1322-1333. 4106

474056

WU, Y. T., FUJIWARA, E. & SUZUKI, C. K. 2019. 4107

484057

Evaluation of optical myography sensor as 4108

494058

predictor of hand postures. *IEEE Sensors Journal*, 4109

504059

19, 5299-5306. 4110

514060

XIA, W., ZHOU, Y., YANG, X., HE, K. & LIU, H. 2019. 4111

524061

Toward Portable Hybrid Surface 4112

534062

Electromyography/A-Mode Ultrasound Sensing 4113

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

for Human-Machine Interface. *IEEE Sensors Journal*, 19, 5219-5228.

XIAO, Z. G. & MENON, C. 2019. A review of force myography research and development. *Sensors*, 19, 4557.

XU, H., ZHANG, D., HUEGEL, J. C., XU, W. & ZHU, X. 2015. Effects of different tactile feedback on myoelectric closed-loop control for grasping based on electrotactile stimulation. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, 24, 827-836.

YANG, D. & LIU, H. 2021. Human-machine shared control: New avenue to dexterous prosthetic hand manipulation. *Science China Technological Sciences*, 64, 767-773.

YANG, J., SINGH, H., HINES, E. L., SCHLAGHECKEN, F., ILIESCU, D. D., LEESON, M. S. & STOCKS, N. G. 2012. Channel selection and classification of electroencephalogram signals: an artificial neural network and genetic algorithm-based approach. *Artificial intelligence in medicine*, 55, 117-126.

YEUNG, D., FARINA, D. & VUJAKLIJA, I. 2019. Directional forgetting for stable co-adaptation in myoelectric control. *Sensors*, 19, 2203.

YOUN, W. & KIM, J. 2010. Estimation of elbow flexion force during isometric muscle contraction from mechanomyography and electromyography. *Medical & biological engineering & computing*, 48, 1149-1157.

ZAHABI, M., WHITE, M. M., ZHANG, W., WINSLOW, A. T., ZHANG, F., HUANG, H. & KABER, D. B. 2019. Application of cognitive task performance modeling for assessing usability of transradial prostheses. *IEEE Transactions on Human-Machine Systems*, 49, 381-387.

ZAINUDDIN, N. A., ANUAR, N. F., MANSUR, A. L., FAUZI, N. I. M., HANIM, W. F. & HERMAN, S. H. 2015. Resistive-based sensor system for prosthetic fingers application. *Procedia Computer Science*, 76, 323-329.

ZBINDEN, J., LENDARO, E. & ORTIZ-CATALAN, M. 2021. Prosthetic embodiment: Review and perspective on definitions, measures, and experimental paradigms.

ZBYSZYNSKI, M., DI DONATO, B. & TANAKA, A. 2019. The effect of co-adaptive learning & feedback in interactive machine learning.

ZECCA, M., MICERA, S., CARROZZA, M. C. & DARIO, P. 2002. Control of multifunctional prosthetic hands by processing the

- 1
2
34114 electromyographic signal. *Critical Reviews™ in* 4159
44115 *Biomedical Engineering*, 30.
- 5
64116 ZHAI, X., JELFS, B., CHAN, R. H. & TIN, C. 2017. Self- 4160
74117 recalibrating surface EMG pattern recognition for
84118 neuroprosthesis control based on convolutional 4161
94119 neural network. *Frontiers in neuroscience*, 11,
104120 379. 4162
- 114121 ZHANG, X., CHEN, X., LI, Y., LANTZ, V., WANG, K.
124122 & YANG, J. 2011. A framework for hand gesture 4163
134123 recognition based on accelerometer and EMG
144124 sensors. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and* 4164
154125 *Cybernetics-Part A: Systems and Humans*, 41,
164126 1064-1076. 4165
- 174127 ZHANG, Y., XIAO, R. & HARRISON, C. Advancing
184128 hand gesture recognition with high resolution
194129 electrical impedance tomography. Proceedings of
204130 the 29th Annual Symposium on User Interface
214131 Software and Technology, 2016. 843-850.
- 224132 ZHAO, J., YU, Y., WANG, X., MA, S., SHENG, X. &
234133 ZHU, X. 2022. A musculoskeletal model driven
244134 by muscle synergy-derived excitations for hand
254135 and wrist movements. *Journal of Neural*
264136 *Engineering*.
- 274137 ZHAO, T., LIU, J., WANG, Y., LIU, H. & CHEN, Y.
284138 2019. Towards Low-cost Sign Language Gesture
294139 Recognition Leveraging Wearables. *IEEE*
304140 *Transactions on Mobile Computing*, 20, 1685-
314141 1701.
- 324142 ZHENG, M., CROUCH, M. S. & EGGLESTON, M. S.
334143 2021. Surface Electromyography as a Natural
344144 Human-Machine Interface: A Review. *arXiv*
354145 *preprint arXiv:2101.04658*.
- 364146 ZUCKERBERG, M. 2021. *Facebook Reality Labs*
374147 [Online]. Available: <https://tech.fb.com/ar-vr/>
384148 [Accessed].
- 394149 ZUO, S., HEIDARI, H., FARINA, D. & NAZARPOUR,
404150 K. 2020. Miniaturized magnetic sensors for
414151 implantable magnetomyography. *Advanced*
424152 *Materials Technologies*, 5, 2000185.
- 43
44
454153
46
474154
48
49
504155
51
524156
53
544157
55
564158
57
58
59
60