

# ProACT: An Augmented Reality Testbed for Intelligent Prosthetic Arms

Shivani Guptasarma, *Student member, IEEE*, and Monroe D. Kennedy III, *Member, IEEE*

**Abstract**—Upper-limb amputees face tremendous difficulty in operating dexterous powered prostheses. Previous work has shown that aspects of prosthetic hand, wrist, or elbow control can be improved through “intelligent” control, by combining movement-based or gaze-based intent estimation with low-level robotic autonomy. However, no such solutions exist for whole-arm control. Moreover, hardware platforms for advanced prosthetic control are expensive, and existing simulation platforms are not well-designed for integration with robotics software frameworks. We present the Prosthetic Arm Control Testbed (ProACT), a platform for evaluating intelligent control methods for prosthetic arms in an immersive (Augmented Reality) simulation setting. Using ProACT with non-amputee participants, we compare performance in a Box-and-Blocks Task using a virtual myoelectric prosthetic arm, with and without intent estimation. Our results show that methods using intent estimation improve both user satisfaction and the degree of success in the task. To the best of our knowledge, this constitutes the first study of semi-autonomous control for complex whole-arm prostheses, the first study including sequential task modeling in the context of wearable prosthetic arms, and the first testbed of its kind. Towards the goal of supporting future research in intelligent prosthetics, the system is built upon on existing open-source frameworks for robotics, and is available at <https://armlabstanford.github.io/proact>.

**Index Terms**—Assistive Robotics, Prosthesis, Augmented Reality, Human Enhancement.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Prosthetic arms are typically controlled via signals acquired through electromyography (EMG) from the residual limb [1], [2]. As the number of input signals is inherently limited, these devices either have limited mechanical functionality, or have more degrees-of-freedom (DoF) than can be simultaneously controlled by their users. Dissatisfaction with functionality is a major reason for rejection and abandonment [3], often within a month of use [4]. Rejection rates vary between 30–80%, and are the highest for limb loss near the shoulder [5], [6]. Many individuals with high-level and/or bilateral limb loss wish to use prosthetic arms, but find that, in their current state, these arms introduce more challenges than they alleviate [5], [7].

We acknowledge the support of this work by the Stanford Knight Hennessy Scholars, the Wu Tsai Human Performance Alliance at Stanford University and the Joe and Clara Tsai Foundation. We thank Gabriela Bravo Illanes and Subhechhha Paul for their valuable insights.

Both authors are with the Department of Mechanical Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305 USA ({shivani, monroek}@stanford.edu).

## A. Intelligent prosthetics

In order to provide intuitive high-DoF operation with the low-DoF EMG input available, other sources of information must be utilized to automate low-level functions [8]. In the present work, as in the literature, we use the term “intelligence” as a shorthand for such context-informed shared autonomy, as opposed to direct joint-level control.

The first intelligent control systems for transradial prostheses used computer vision and gaze tracking to identify the pose [9] and geometry [10], [11] of the target object, automating grasp preparation. Augmented Reality (AR) interfaces made the functioning of the device transparent to the user, who retained agency [12]. Later works used Inertial Measurement Units (IMUs) to track the residual limb [13]–[15] or the contralateral limb [16], and deep learning to predict joint angles [17]. In transhumeral prosthetics, intended elbow motion during reaching tasks has been estimated from the location of the reaching goal [18]–[20], or using correlations between shoulder and elbow joints [21]–[24]. These approaches elegantly leverage the movement of the residual limb.

Unfortunately, the problem of *whole-arm control*, as in the case of shoulder disarticulation or forequarter amputation, receives little attention in the engineering literature. Krausz *et al.* (2020) characterized the coordination between gaze and 14-channel EMG data from non-amputees, showing that gaze could be used with even a subset of EMG channels to predict grasping motions. Using shoulder adduction/abduction and biting motions as input, Togo *et al.* (2022) demonstrated intelligent control of a custom-built 4-DoF whole-arm prosthesis [30] using gaze tracking to identify the target, and computer vision to plan reach and grasp motions. However, neither of these works was followed by studies extending the proposed methods to the control of higher-DoF wearable arms. *Research on intelligent control methods for whole arms can benefit people with all levels of amputation.*

## B. Enhancing EMG inputs

Targeted Muscle Reinnervation (TMR) [31] surgically increases the number and quality of EMG signals available from the residual limb, bringing myoelectric control within the realm of possibility for whole-arm prosthesis control. However, when successful, it creates at most 2–4 independent channels of simultaneous control inputs [32]; for comparison, the most advanced anthropomorphic prosthesis, the Modular Prosthetic Limb (MPL) [33] has 26-DoF with 17 actuators.

TABLE I: Simulation platforms for prosthetic arms. In principle, all platforms are customizable for various levels of limb loss, however, only ArmSym mentions shoulder disarticulation, using a touchpad as proxy input for a 2-DoF device.

Name	Purpose	Virtual arm type	Control method	Display	Environment	Access
JHU/APL VIE [25]	Research	MPL	EMG	3D goggles	ODE, MATLAB	not available
JHU/APL miniVIE [26]	User training	MPL	EMG	Screen	MATLAB	open
MPI ArmSym [27]	Research	Barrett WAM	HTC Vive	Immersive VR	Unity/C#	open
HoloPHAM [28]	Training	MPL	EMG	Immersive AR	Unity	not available
Virtual BBT [29]	Training	Human avatar	EMG	Immersive VR	Unity	not available
ProACT (this work)	Research	MPL	EMG, gaze, motion planning	Immersive AR	ROS base, Unity interface	open

The feasibility of TMR also depends upon the conditions of limb loss, time elapsed, and surge training [34]. Thus, TMR alone cannot make whole-arm prosthetics intuitive to use, yet it is the most prominent development thus far in whole-arm control. *Intelligent control can benefit whole-arm prosthetics, both when TMR is possible and when it is not.*

### C. Immersive AR platforms

Virtual environments are popular in training protocols for prosthesis users [35], as well as in testing new methods of control for both prosthetics [36] and robot teleoperation [37], [38]. Without procuring or fabricating hardware, researchers may study a wide range of devices and conditions in simulation using a single versatile setup, quickly and economically. Immersive platforms provide more realistic results pertaining to human interaction, as compared to visualizations on flat screens [39]. Virtual Reality (VR) systems such as ArmSym [27] and the Virtual Integration Environment or VIE [25] take advantage of this. The HoloPHAM platform [28] uses AR for direct EMG control training. Unlike VR, as mentioned in Section I-A, AR is useful even as a component of real prosthetic systems, relaying information sensed from the environment (such as object recognition), information sensed from the user (such as gaze), controller decisions, and menu options. *An AR evaluation platform for intelligent prostheses would integrate such features with the extensive software infrastructure that exists for robot control.* To the best of our knowledge (summarized in Table I), such a platform does not exist.

### D. Modeling of sequential tasks

While object-specific properties (such as those mentioned in Section I-A) might be sufficient for transradial prosthetics, where the reaching motion is performed by the residual limb, whole-arm control is more ambiguous. It is common in robotics to use the semantics of a sequential task to predict likely interactions. There exist models predicting interactions in realistic settings [40], as well as human-in-the-loop teleoperation experiments with simplified tasks that have explicitly defined rules [41]. *Modeling sequential tasks for action prediction is of great interest*, particularly for the control of whole-arm prosthetics; however, it does not seem to have been investigated in wearable prosthetic arms thus far.

### E. Problem Statement

The broader research question to be investigated is whether users of powered prosthetic arms – with all levels of amputation – can perform manipulation tasks better and more

comfortably, if direct control is augmented with the use of passively revealed cues from the user, sensing and interpretation of the scene and task context, autonomous control of some aspects of joint motion, and AR feedback. In order to address this question, an evaluation platform is needed which: (1) is cost-efficient, time-efficient, and versatile, accommodating studies of partial as well as complete limb loss, with amputee as well as non-amputee participants, (2) is reasonably physically accurate, (3) is reliable for behavioral studies (limiting distortion of participant behavior), (4) is accessible to robotics researchers (compatible with existing task and motion planning frameworks, computer vision libraries, intention prediction models etc. developed for robotics), and (5) is compatible with a variety of input modalities (EMG, joysticks, cameras, gaze trackers) and feedback modalities (tactile actuators, speakers, and a visual display).

### F. Contributions

We present the Prosthetic Arm Control Testbed (ProACT), integrating motion planning and control in Robot Operating System (ROS) [42] with EMG control and an immersive AR interface (Fig. (1)), in order to meet the requirements described in Section I-E. The contributions of this work are:

- 1) an open-source platform for the robotics and prosthetics research communities to study intelligent prostheses in immersive simulation,
- 2) a user study of intelligent control for a high-DoF wearable prosthetic arm, made possible by the above platform, and
- 3) the inclusion of sequential modeling of a task, as an exploratory component of the study.

Details of the design and implementation of the testbed and the user study are provided in Section II below. Results from the study are presented in Section III and discussed in Section IV, together with limitations and possible modifications. Section V summarizes conclusions from the present work and possible future applications.

## II. METHODS

The details of the platform are given in Section II-A. Section II-B explains the design of the evaluation task in light of existing tests. The control methods used in the study are described in Section II-C. Finally, Section II-D reports the design of the user study.

### A. System architecture

The platform (Fig. (1a)) is based on ROS Noetic, running on an Ubuntu 20.04 machine (Intel Core i9-12900K CPU, 64 GB



remain reachable, with the walls continuing to constrain reaching. (3) As real-time, realistic contact simulation is difficult, cylindrical blocks are used, where grasp shape is agnostic to approach direction. (4) Numbered blocks of two different colors are used. Color and number are used as a proxy for the semantics of a sequential task, with only the color being taken into account as described in Section II-C. Similarly to the mBBT and tBBT, participants are instructed to move the blocks in a specific order, but the initial configurations are counterbalanced over all possible arrangements. This is necessary because the difficulty of reaching different regions of the box varies widely and it is infeasible to get data for all blocks in all trials (as explained below).

**Modifications to format:** Various versions of the test require participants to sit [58] or stand [55], and score performance based on either the number of blocks moved in a fixed period of time [58] or the time taken to move all the blocks [55]. For the present context, these parameters were determined based on the following observations from pilot studies: First, when standing and moving freely, pilot participants were able to achieve nearly identical performance in all methods by using whole-body motion for reaching. Seating participants forces them to operate the MPL arm, making comparisons possible. Second, mistakes reflect the quality of control, but affect subsequent actions. Multiple trials are needed so that incidental mistakes do not result in the loss of all data for some participant-method combinations. Finally, the onset of fatigue has a strong effect on performance and time taken. Extended HMD use also leads to slight headaches, eye strain, heating of the device, and battery depletion. The HoloLens 2 battery lasts for two hours of continuous operation. Participants' skill in the task varies widely, some spending 5-10 minutes *per block* with the more difficult methods. Accounting for the demonstration and training phase, and the need for multiple trials with all methods within a single session of reasonable duration, the duration of each trial is limited to 5 minutes.

**Anthropometric adjustment:** The MPL is a large device. Scaling to participant height would require editing of not only geometric but inertial parameters, which is not realistic (real prosthetic arms have weight and dimensions determined by functionality, design and industrial standardization). Hence, rather than scale the arm or the BBT, the table height is set at 0.75 m below the participant's shoulder before starting each trial. This distance was determined during pilots, such that it would be possible to comfortably reach all the blocks.

### C. Feedback and control

Two hand poses are pre-programmed as "open" and "closed", the closed pose being a precision circular grasp approaching the block diameter. The Gazebo grasp plugin [59] is used to rigidly attach objects to the fingertips based on proximity. Participants are made aware of this implementation. Distinct sounds are played through the HMD when contact is made or lost. The 5 hand gestures are mapped to the movements of the 7 joints of the MPL arm, and the opening and closing of the MPL hand. These movements are referred to below as HO (hand open), HC (hand close), WF (wrist flex),




Fig. 2: The four control methods (A-D) mapping EMG inputs to MPL motion.

WE (wrist extend) and NM (no motion). Four methods of control are compared (Fig. 2), spanning the spectrum between direct and assisted control.

**Direct joint control (A):** Controlling one joint at a time, the participant uses HO to cycle through the joints in the sequence: shoulder flexion/extension, shoulder adduction/abduction, shoulder internal/external rotation, elbow flexion/extension, wrist pronation/supination, wrist ulnar/radial deviation, and wrist flexion/extension. The name of the selected joint is displayed as a virtual text mesh. WF/WE move the selected joint in +/- directions, at pre-set speeds, by sending incremented joint goals to MoveIt joint trajectory controllers. HC toggles the state of the hand.

**Direct end-effector control (B):** Computing inverse kinematics with the Kinematics and Dynamics Library (KDL) [60], joint goals are assigned such that the end-effector (the most distal wrist link) moves along the selected direction in the 6-DoF task space, either translating along or rotating about one of the axes of a coordinate frame attached to the base of the MPL (the "tracked shoulder" frame in Fig. (1c), which is also displayed in front of the participant as in Fig. (1b), highlighting the selected direction). HO cycles through X, Y, Z translation and rotation DoFs. WF/WE move along the selected direction, and HC toggles the state of the hand.

In the general case, the Moore-Penrose inverse of the  $6 \times 7$  Jacobian matrix is used to find the joint-space goal:

$$\mathbf{q}_{t+1} = \mathbf{q}_t + \mathbf{J}^\# [\dot{\mathbf{x}} \quad \boldsymbol{\omega}]^\top \Delta t. \quad (1)$$

The starting configuration is non-singular. An upper limit on the condition number of  $\mathbf{J}$  is implemented to limit elbow extension. Any other instability caused by proximity to singularities is allowed as being characteristic of this method.

**Gaze-assisted control (C):** The participant's gaze (tracked by the HMD) is used to infer a target, as shown in Fig. (3), which is highlighted in AR. Participants use WF to "lock" the selection and WE to execute motion towards the selected object. For placing, a dark marker tracking gaze appears on the target side of the box. WF locks the position of the spot and WE executes motion towards it. Motion is based on trajectories generated by sample-based planners selected by the Open Motion Planning Library (OMPL), with asynchronous execution, so that NM immediately stops the motion. A new motion plan is attempted every time a change to WE is detected. If WE




Fig. 3: The image plane is defined as a plane normal to the gaze vector. Each block is assigned a probability based on its distance from the gaze target in the image plane, thus: a bivariate Gaussian function centered at the gaze target is evaluated at the centers of all blocks, and the resultant values normalized by their sum. This simplistic calculation is sufficient for our aims in this study.

is held, the existing plan is used. Participants are made aware that, if the base of the arm is moved during execution, a new planning action (NM-WE) might be required. The selection marker changes color upon locking and unlocking the gaze-based selection. When the goal is unreachable, the planner sets an intermediate goal.

**Context-assisted control (D):** A modification of method C; in addition to gaze, highlighting is biased by the color of the object. The above is a simplistic proxy for knowledge of the semantics and state of a task influencing the inference of user intent, in addition to cues gathered from the user’s own behavior. In general, let us consider the prediction of the probability of the action  $a_i$  being intended by the user, given cues  $g$  observed from the user (such as gaze) and the state of the environment or task  $s$  (in this case, the color of the block just dropped); we may perform Bayesian inference:

$$p(a_i|g, s) = \frac{p(g|a_i, s)p(a_i|s)}{p(g|s)}, \quad (2)$$

making the following simplifying assumptions/observations:

- 1) The denominator,  $p(g|s) = \sum_i p(g, a_i|s)$ , is the same for all  $i$  and will not affect the ranking of the actions (blocks to pick). This quantity can therefore be safely neglected.
- 2) The state of the task  $s$  affects  $g$  only through its effect on  $a_i$ , i.e., the probability distribution for the target of the gaze vector in the image plane is completely de-

TABLE II: Probability weighting  $p(a_i|s)$  for each block in Method D, conditioned on previous block color. The columns, left to right, are in the sequence specified for the task.

Previous block color	Red #1	Blue #1	Red #2	Blue #2
Red	0.125	0.375	0.125	0.375
Blue	0.375	0.125	0.375	0.125

TABLE III: Counterbalanced sequence of methods

Participant	1	2	3	4
1	A	C*	B	D
2	C	B	D*	A
3	A	D	B	C
4	D	B	C	A
5	B	D	A	C
6	D	A	C	B
7	B	C	A	D
8	C	A	D*	B*

The trials marked \* diverged from this plan as follows, due to technical issues, deterioration of EMG classification or difficulty training in certain trials: participant 1 repeated C after a gap of several days; participant 2 repeated D similarly; participant 8 performed trials with C and D in a separate session on the next day after A and B.

termined by the identity and location of the block to be picked, regardless of the state of the task. Therefore, if there are  $m$  states,  $p(g|a_i, s) = \frac{1}{m} p(g|a_i)$ . We assume that the probability distribution of gaze in the image plane assumes a normal form centered about the intended target block, hence,  $p(g|a_i) \propto e^{-\frac{x_i^2}{2\sigma^2}}$ , where  $x_i$  is the distance in the plane between the center of the block in question and the gaze target. 3) We assume the distribution of intention conditioned on state  $p(a_i|s)$  as shown in Table II<sup>2</sup>. Thus assigning a ranking to the blocks based on both gaze and state, the block ranked as having the highest probability of being the intended target at any given time is highlighted.

#### D. Study design

Eight right-handed non-amputees (ages 22-30; 5M, 3F) gave informed consent for a within-participants study under the oversight of an Institutional Review Board<sup>3</sup>. Each participant attempted 3 trials of the modified BBT described in Section II-B with each of the 4 methods. The sequence was counterbalanced (Table III), alternating direct (A, B) and assisted (C, D) methods, so that the assisted methods, with similar participant controls, were never used contiguously.

**Protocol:** After filling a short survey regarding their prior experience with human-robot interaction devices, participants received a standardized verbal description of the task. They trained and tested the EMG classifier using a simple custom game shown on a screen. Next, participants wore the HMD, and were seated on a chair, centering it relative to the box and as close to it as possible without intersection. They then received demonstrations for methods A, B and C. For A and B, they were allowed to try moving and switching through each DoF, as well as toggling the hand state, until they understood

<sup>2</sup>If the previous block was dropped prematurely and is being reattempted, or the participant is making a mistake, the system still allows them to select blocks of the same color by gazing directly at them.

<sup>3</sup>Protocol 65022, approved by the Administrative Panels for the Protection of Human Subjects at Stanford University, on February 29, 2024.

the operation conceptually<sup>4</sup>. For C, since instructions were dependent on the stages of the task, they were guided verbally through one pick and place. EMG training was repeated if necessary, before beginning trials. A 5-minute countdown timer was shown on a laptop screen placed in front. Participants were asked to prioritize completion rate (maximize number of blocks transferred before timeout), speed (minimize total time taken), and accuracy (minimize distance between actual and desired placement location), in that order. EMG training was repeated as necessary, if it deteriorated during trials.

**Surveys:** The commonly-used NASA-TLX [61] was avoided, considering that its length and repetition would encourage satisficing [62] in a tiring task [63], [64]. Instead, a custom 5-point, 3 question survey was given, querying the perceived ease, sense of agency and speed of performing the task. At the end of the experiment, participants ranked the methods based on the same questions and were asked which method they would choose if they could “play one last game with any one method”, and the reason for their choice.

### III. RESULTS

Analyses were planned for: (1) block outcomes (success rate in reaching targets), (2) pick duration and place duration when successful, and (3) placement accuracy (minimum distance achieved from target position over the course of the trial). Block outcomes dominated the results, with C and D outperforming A and B uniformly across participants. Due to the high failure rates, only sparse data were available from A and B for the remaining metrics. Therefore, quantitative results are presented for success rates, and the remaining results reported through visualizations.

#### A. Success

Each participant performed 12 trials, and therefore had the opportunity to interact with 48 blocks in total. Each block among these had exactly one of the outcomes shown in Fig. (4). There was considerable variation in performance across participants. We can make the following observations: First, from Fig. (4), the two methods with the highest number of successful transfers (out of  $3 \times 4$ ) are C and D, for every individual participant. Second, most participants had difficulty using B at first (5 of them had no success at all in the first trial with B), but improved in subsequent trials. Third, in the aggregated data from all participants (Table IV), the mean and median number of successes per trial (over  $8 \times 3$  trials, with 4 being the maximum success rate per trial) are both higher with C and D. The range and standard deviation are both smaller. Thus, C and D were more successful on average, and more uniformly so, even across participants. Finally, Fig. (5) shows the distribution of outcomes within each method, pooling all the blocks moved by all participants. For every failure outcome, fewer blocks had that outcome with C, D than with A, B. Method B had the highest number of blocks which

<sup>4</sup>Based on pilot studies which showed that participants found them tedious and confusing at first, performing a full pick and place with these methods would have extended the demonstration phase of the study to unpredictable lengths.




Fig. 4: The outcome shown for each individual block in the experiment.

TABLE IV: Trial success rates aggregated over participants.

Method	$\mu$	$\sigma$	Minimum	Maximum	Median
A	2.21	1.50	0	4	2.5
B	1.96	1.60	0	4	2.0
C	3.29	0.95	1	4	4.0
D	3.67	0.56	2	4	4.0

The mean  $\mu$ , standard deviation  $\sigma$ , median and range values presented are for the number of blocks (out of the 4 available in each trial) that were successfully moved to the target region, aggregated over the  $8 \times 3$  trials performed with each method

crossed the partition without reaching the target. The most blocks were dropped on the floor with A.

#### B. Transfer timings and accuracy

In every trial, participants had the freedom to operate the arm while moving its base (their shoulder), or to simply move the base without actively using the method. The pick and place actions were annotated with this information, based on the joint angle trajectories of the MPL. Pick duration was defined as the time from the release of the previous block (or start of the trial) until contact was made. Figure. (7a), shows the time taken for those picks which were stable enough for the block to eventually cross the partition (266 in number; although, for blocks grasped multiple times, the first time was used). The duration of a successful place action was defined as the time from grasping to release, under the conditions that (a) the block crossed the partition during this period, and (b) the target region (within 0.05 m of the target) was entered before the block was released. These durations (258 in number) are shown in Fig. (7b). Finally, for those blocks which successfully reached the target regions (266 in number, including those dropped




Fig. 5: Pooling participant data, the number of blocks for each outcome, shown sorted by method. 96 blocks were presented with each method. The percent of blocks that successfully reached their targets is noted for each method.

slightly outside and pushed), the minimum distance achieved from the target is plotted in Fig. (8).

All three plots reflect the stark disparity in success rates. Figure (7a) shows that with A and B, it was faster *not* to operate the arm than to attempt picking using the method, while C and D enabled picking of many more blocks at comparable rates. For placing, B, C and D share a common trend of participants opting not to use the method slightly more often than to use it. The accuracy of placing<sup>5</sup>, conditioned on success, shows no additional difference between methods (Fig. (8)). This is unsurprising, as accuracy was given lowest priority, and the target regions were displayed (Fig. (1b)).

### C. Questionnaire responses

Participants do not seem to have perceived any significant difference between C and D, but unambiguously preferred them over A and B (Fig (6), Table V).




Fig. 6: Survey rating results after each method.

<sup>5</sup>Blocks which crossed the partition but did not reach the target (more often in A and B), are excluded here.

TABLE V: Final survey responses ranking methods.

P	Ease	Agency	Speed	Choice
1	D > C > A > B	D > A > C > B	D > A > C > B	D
2	C > D > B > A	C > D > B > A	C > D > B > A	C
3	D > C > A > B	D > C > A > B	D > C > A > B	D
4	D > C > B > A	D > C > B > A	D > C > B > A	D
5	D > C > B > A	D > C > B > A	C > D > B > A	D
6	D = C > A > B	D = C > A > B	D = C > A > B	D
7	C > D > B > A	C > B > D > A	D > C > B > A	B
8	D > C > A > B	D > C > A > B	D > C > A > B	D

## IV. DISCUSSION

The large variation among participants seen in the above results is a typical feature of user studies with assistive technology, which is encouraging to see in this new platform. The excellent performance of Participant 1 (P1) across all methods demonstrates that the task was designed to be possible to complete within the allotted time; at the same time, the remaining participants exhibit a wide range of skill: P8 had a relatively poor success rate, close to 50%, across methods, while P2 and P5 showed a large improvement in performance between methods A and D (Fig. (4)).

The testbed highlights the strengths of the new methods – pick times are reduced and made more consistent – which allowed participants to achieve higher success rates, while place times were not improved, and in some cases, actually increased. Anecdotally, this can be explained by the specific implementation of the placing method in C and D. Multiple participants reported difficulty in making the gaze-tracking marker appear on the target side, during the first placing action of trials. If they either succeeded, or decided to use body movement instead, then subsequent transfers were completed quickly. By using the testbed to highlight this failure of the methods being prototyped, we are able to identify an area of future work. We are also able to identify that the primary bottleneck for successful transfers in this task is not placing, but reaching to pick, which requires more precise control (Fig. (7)), explaining why the methods which improve picking lead to unambiguously higher success rates.

It is for a similar reason that the differences between C and D are not obvious from this study; reaching to pick, and not selecting the object to be picked, was the major challenge, which both methods alleviated similarly. In future work, we shall investigate cluttered scenes, in which mere proximity of the center of gaze to different objects might be insufficient.

The nature of the BBT allowed P1 to achieve very fast transfers through skilled movement of the upper body as a whole. While all participants were informed that they were free to move thus, and in fact, would need to do so in order to reach all blocks, only one was able to use body movement to such an extent and with such skill. Had all participants adopted this strategy, no significant results might have been obtained. This motivates future studies based on a more spatially complex task, where objects would not lie on the same plane, and the intended direction of their displacement would not be along a single axis.

The small sample size of this study and the disparate success rates precluded statistical analyses of performance metrics and survey responses, but results suggest that, given the notable




Fig. 7: (a) Pick and (b) place durations, excluding extreme outliers (lower is better; details in Section III-B). The numbers of actions performed without/with each provided method are noted along the “Method” axis.

random effect of participant skill, mixed-effects models would be most appropriate for larger datasets in the future, with Friedman tests for the pseudo-quantitative components.

No deception was used in this study; participants were possibly biased in favor of C and D, perhaps slightly favoring D. It is difficult to judge whether the minor improvement with D relative to C in success rates may be attributed to any assumed superiority. However, as D occurs before and after C the same number of times, learning and fatigue can both be ruled out as explanations. The effect of modeling sequential tasks merits further investigation with a richer dataset.

Six of eight participants selected D as the method they would most prefer if attempting an additional trial. P2 selected C, which is explained by the deterioration of EMG acquisition in the first iteration of D (Table III). P7 selected B, explaining that, even though it was more difficult than C/D, it made him feel the most satisfied on success, because he felt in control. This is especially interesting in light of the fact that during trial with B, P7 had declared a general weakness in spatial reasoning, which was most challenged by end-effector control. Understandably, P7 alone ranked B above D on the question of agency. P1 ranked A as second in agency and perceived speed, which may be explained by the technical issue in the first iteration of C. Aside from these, all participants ranked C and D as the top two in all three metrics: ease, agency, and perceived speed. The choice to move the arm along the

planned trajectory *only as long as EMG input was actively provided* seems to have been sufficient to provide a sense of agency to most participants.

More interestingly, in the comparison between A and B, exactly half of the participants preferred A over B and vice-versa. At first glance, this may appear to show some natural variation in preferences. However, examining Tables (III, V) in conjunction reveals that each participant preferred whichever of these two methods they had performed first; very likely a fatigue effect. It is encouraging that in the light of such a strong effect, the improvements offered by C and D (which were encountered in alternation, as shown in Table III) overwhelmed the effect of fatigue to keep them at the top of nearly all rankings.

## V. CONCLUSION

While considerable future work with greater powered samples, as well as amputee populations, is required in the future, the present work demonstrates the following:

- 1) Gaze-based intent estimation and low-level autonomy improve the performance and comfort of users of high-DoF prosthetic arms in complex manipulation tasks.
- 2) The ProACT testbed is useful in prototyping evaluation tasks as well as control/feedback methods, identifying specific features of methods (and phases of tasks) which




Fig. 8: Average of the minimum distance of block from target. The numbers of place actions performed without/with each provided method are noted along the “Method” axis.

contribute positively or negatively to performance, and studying variation within and across participants.

Due to the open-source nature of much of the latest robotics infrastructure, as well as ProACT itself, it is easy to incorporate more sophisticated methods of intent prediction, and test them in the context of more challenging tasks, a different level of limb loss, or other wearable robotic manipulators.

## VI. REFERENCES

- [1] L. McLean and R. N. Scott, “The Early History of Myoelectric Control of Prosthetic Limbs (1945–1970),” in *Powered Upper Limb Prostheses: Control, Implementation and Clinical Application*, A. Muzumdar, Ed. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 2004, pp. 1–15.
- [2] P. Geethanjali, “Myoelectric control of prosthetic hands: State-of-the-art review,” *Medical Devices (Auckland, N.Z.)*, vol. 9, pp. 247–255, Jul. 2016.
- [3] M. Yamamoto, K. C. Chung, J. Sterbenz, M. J. Shauver, H. Tanaka, T. Nakamura, J. Oba, T. Chin, and H. Hirata, “Cross-sectional International Multicenter Study on Quality of Life and Reasons for Abandonment of Upper Limb Prostheses,” *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery Global Open*, vol. 7, no. 5, p. e2205, May 2019.
- [4] S. Salminger, H. Stino, L. H. Pichler, C. Gstoettner, A. Sturma, J. A. Mayer, M. Szivak, and O. C. Aszmann, “Current rates of prosthetic usage in upper-limb amputees – have innovations had an impact on device acceptance?” *Disability and Rehabilitation*, vol. 44, no. 14, pp. 3708–3713, Jul. 2022.
- [5] National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Division, Health and Medicine and Services, Board on Health Care and of Impairments, Committee on the Use of Selected Assistive Products and Technologies in Eliminating or Reducing the Effects and Flaubert, Jennifer Lalitha and Spicer, Carol Mason and Jette, Alan M., “Upper-Extremity Prostheses,” in *The Promise of Assistive Technology to Enhance Activity and Work Participation*. National Academies Press (US), May 2017.
- [6] E. A. Biddiss and T. T. Chau, “Upper limb prosthesis use and abandonment: A survey of the last 25 years,” *Prosthetics and Orthotics International*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 236–257, Sep. 2007. [Online]. Available: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1080/03093640600994581>
- [7] E. Biddiss and T. Chau, “Upper-Limb Prosthetics: Critical Factors in Device Abandonment,” *American Journal of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation*, vol. 86, no. 12, p. 977, Dec. 2007.
- [8] I. D. Swain and J. M. Nightingale, “An adaptive control system for a complete hand/arm prosthesis,” *Journal of Biomedical Engineering*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 163–166, Jul. 1980.
- [9] S. Došen and D. B. Popović, “Transradial prosthesis: Artificial vision for control of prehension,” *Artificial Organs*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 37–48, 2011. [Online]. Available: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1525-1594.2010.01040.x>
- [10] M. Marković, S. Došen, C. Cipriani, D. Popović, and D. Farina, “Stereovision and augmented reality for closed-loop control of grasping in hand prostheses,” *Journal of Neural Engineering*, vol. 11, no. 4, 2014.
- [11] M. Marković, S. Došen, D. Popović, B. Graimann, and D. Farina, “Sensor fusion and computer vision for context-aware control of a multi degree-of-freedom prosthesis,” *Journal of Neural Engineering*, vol. 12, no. 6, 2015, publisher: IOP Publishing.
- [12] S. Guptasarma and M. Kennedy III, “Considerations for the Control Design of Augmentative Robots,” Presented at the IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems Workshop on Building and Evaluating Ethical Robotic Systems, Number 1, Prague, Czech Rep, Oct 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.19336>
- [13] D. A. Bennett and M. Goldfarb, “Imu-based wrist rotation control of a transradial myoelectric prosthesis,” *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 419–427, 2018.
- [14] J. Mouchoux, S. Carisi, S. Dosen, D. Farina, A. Schilling, and M. Marković, “Artificial Perception and Semiautonomous Control in Myoelectric Hand Prostheses Increases Performance and Decreases Effort,” *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 37, pp. 1298–1312, Aug. 2021.
- [15] J. Starke, P. Weiner, M. Crell, and T. Asfour, “Semi-autonomous control of prosthetic hands based on multimodal sensing, human grasp demonstration and user intention,” *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 154, p. 104123, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921889022000689>
- [16] R. Volkmar, S. Došen, J. Gonzalez-Vargas, M. Baum, and M. Marković, “Improving bimanual interaction with a prosthesis using semi-autonomous control,” *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, vol. 16, no. 1, p. 140, Dec. 2019, publisher: BioMed Central Ltd. [Online]. Available: <https://jneuroengrehab.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12984-019-0617-6>
- [17] M. Karrenbach, D. Boe, A. Sie, R. Bennett, and E. Rombokas, “Improving Automatic Control of Upper-Limb Prosthesis Wrists Using Gaze-Centered Eye Tracking and Deep Learning,” *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 30, pp. 340–349, 2022.
- [18] H. Martin, J. Donaw, R. Kelly, Y. Jung, and J.-H. Kim, “A novel approach of prosthetic arm control using computer vision, biosignals, and motion capture,” in *2014 IEEE Symposium on Computational Intelligence in Robotic Rehabilitation and Assistive Technologies (CIR2AT)*, Dec. 2014, pp. 26–30.
- [19] R. Garcia-Rosas, D. Oetomo, C. Manzie, Y. Tan, and P. Choong, “Task-space Synergies for Reaching using Upper-limb Prostheses,” *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 28, no. 12, pp. 2966–2977, Dec. 2020, arXiv: 2002.08018. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2002.08018>
- [20] E. A. Segas, V. Leconte, E. Doat, D. Cattaert, and A. D. Ruyg, “Movement-Based Prosthesis Control With Angular Trajectory Is Getting Closer to Natural Arm Coordination,” Apr. 2024.
- [21] R. R. Kaliki, R. Davoodi, and G. E. Loeb, “Evaluation of a noninvasive command scheme for upper-limb prostheses in a virtual reality reach and grasp task,” *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, vol. 60, no. 3, pp. 792–802, 2013.
- [22] M. Merad, E. de Montalivet, A. Touillet, N. Martinet, A. Roby-Brami, and N. Jarrassé, “Can we achieve intuitive prosthetic elbow control based on healthy upper limb motor strategies?” *Frontiers in Neurobotics*, vol. 12, p. 1, Feb. 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnbot.2018.00001/full>
- [23] M. H. Ahmed, K. Kutsuzawa, and M. Hayashibe, “Transhumeral Arm

- Reaching Motion Prediction through Deep Reinforcement Learning-Based Synthetic Motion Cloning,” *Biomimetics*, vol. 8, no. 4, p. 367, Aug. 2023.
- [24] M. H. Ahmed, J. Chai, S. Shimoda, and M. Hayashibe, “Synergy-Space Recurrent Neural Network for Transferable Forearm Motion Prediction from Residual Limb Motion,” *Sensors*, vol. 23, no. 9, p. 4188, Jan. 2023.
- [25] R. S. Armiger, F. V. Tenore, W. E. Bishop, J. D. Beaty, M. M. Bridges, J. M. Burck, R. J. Vogelstein, and S. D. Harshbarger, “A Real-Time Virtual Integration Environment,” *JOHNS HOPKINS APL TECHNICAL DIGEST*, vol. 30, no. 3, 2011.
- [26] R. Armiger, “BitBucket - Robert Armiger/Prosthetics/MiniVIE,” <https://bitbucket.org/rarmiger/minivie/src/master/>, 2024.
- [27] S. Bustamante, J. Peters, B. Schölkopf, M. Grosse-Wentrup, and V. Jayaram, “ArmSym: A Virtual Human–Robot Interaction Laboratory for Assistive Robotics,” *IEEE Transactions on Human-Machine Systems*, vol. 51, no. 6, pp. 568–577, Dec. 2021.
- [28] J. Baskar, “HoloPHAM: An Augmented Reality Training System For Upper Limb Myoelectric Prosthesis Users,” Ph.D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, Oct. 2017.
- [29] N. A. Hashim, N. A. A. Razak, and N. A. A. Osman, “Comparison of Conventional and Virtual Reality Box and Blocks Tests in Upper Limb Amputees: A Case-Control Study,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 76983–76990, 2021.
- [30] S. Togo, K. Matsumoto, S. Kimizuka, Y. Jiang, and H. Yokoi, “Semi-Automated Control System for Reaching Movements in EMG Shoulder Disarticulation Prosthesis Based on Mixed Reality Device,” *IEEE Open Journal of Engineering in Medicine and Biology*, vol. 2, pp. 55–64, 2021.
- [31] T. A. Kuiken, L. A. Miller, R. D. Lipschutz, B. A. Lock, K. Stubblefield, P. D. Marasco, P. Zhou, and G. A. Dumanian, “Targeted reinnervation for enhanced prosthetic arm function in a woman with a proximal amputation: a case study,” *Lancet*, vol. 369, no. 9559, pp. 371–380, 2007.
- [32] J. Cheesborough, L. Smith, T. Kuiken, and G. Dumanian, “Targeted Muscle Reinnervation and Advanced Prosthetic Arms,” *Seminars in Plastic Surgery*, vol. 29, no. 01, pp. 062–072, Feb. 2015. [Online]. Available: <http://www.thieme-connect.de/DOI/DOI?10.1055/s-0035-1544166>
- [33] M. S. Johannes, E. L. Faulring, K. D. Katyal, M. P. Para, J. B. Helder, A. Makhlin, T. Moyer, D. Wahl, J. Solberg, S. Clark, R. S. Armiger, T. Lontz, K. Geberth, C. W. Moran, B. A. Wester, T. V. Doren, and J. J. Santos-Munne, “Chapter 21 - The Modular Prosthetic Limb,” in *Wearable Robotics*, J. Rosen and P. W. Ferguson, Eds. Academic Press, 2020, pp. 393–444.
- [34] J. M. Felder, S. Pripotnev, I. Ducic, R. Skladman, A. Y. Ha, and M. A. Pet, “Failed Targeted Muscle Reinnervation: Findings at Revision Surgery and Concepts for Success,” *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery Global Open*, vol. 10, no. 4, p. e4229, Apr. 2022.
- [35] B. N. Perry, R. S. Armiger, K. E. Yu, A. A. Alattar, C. W. Moran, M. Wolde, K. McFarland, P. F. Pasquina, and J. W. Tsao, “Virtual Integration Environment as an Advanced Prosthetic Limb Training Platform,” *Frontiers in Neurology*, vol. 9, p. 785, Oct. 2018.
- [36] A. M. Simon, B. A. Lock, and K. A. Stubblefield, “Patient training for functional use of pattern recognition–controlled prostheses,” *Journal of prosthetics and orthotics : JPO*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 56–64, Apr. 2012.
- [37] A. M. Hertz, E. I. George, C. M. Vaccaro, and T. C. Brand, “Head-to-Head Comparison of Three Virtual-Reality Robotic Surgery Simulators,” *JSLs : Journal of the Society of Laparoendoscopic Surgeons*, vol. 22, no. 1, p. e2017.00081, 2018.
- [38] P. Adami, P. B. Rodrigues, P. J. Woods, B. Becerik-Gerber, L. Soibelman, Y. Copur-Gencturk, and G. Lucas, “Effectiveness of VR-based training on improving construction workers’ knowledge, skills, and safety behavior in robotic teleoperation,” *Advanced Engineering Informatics*, vol. 50, p. 101431, Oct. 2021.
- [39] D. Hepperle and M. Wölfel, “Similarities and Differences between Immersive Virtual Reality, Real World, and Computer Screens: A Systematic Scoping Review in Human Behavior Studies,” *Multimodal Technologies and Interaction*, vol. 7, no. 6, p. 56, Jun. 2023.
- [40] I. Rodin, A. Furnari, D. Mavroedis, and G. M. Farinella, “Predicting the Future from First Person (Egocentric) Vision: A Survey,” Jul. 2021.
- [41] S. Fuchs and A. Belardinelli, “Gaze-Based Intention Estimation for Shared Autonomy in Pick-and-Place Tasks,” *Frontiers in Neurobotics*, vol. 15, p. 647930, Apr. 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnbot.2021.647930/full>
- [42] M. Quigley, “ROS: an open-source Robot Operating System,” in *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, 2009. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:6324125>
- [43] T. Erez, Y. Tassa, and E. Todorov, “Simulation tools for model-based robotics: Comparison of Bullet, Havok, MuJoCo, ODE and PhysX,” in *2015 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, May 2015, pp. 4397–4404.
- [44] M. Bischoff, “GitHub - siemens/ros-sharp,” Feb. 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/siemens/ros-sharp/releases/tag/1.7.0>
- [45] E. Eddy, E. Campbell, A. Phinyomark, S. Bateman, and E. Scheme, “LibEMG: An Open Source Library to Facilitate the Exploration of Myoelectric Control,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 87380–87397, 2023.
- [46] AnonSubmissions123, “GitHub - LibEMG/LibEMG\_Snake\_Showcase,” [https://github.com/LibEMG/LibEMG\\_Snake\\_Showcase](https://github.com/LibEMG/LibEMG_Snake_Showcase), 2023.
- [47] N. Koenig, “GitHub - osrf/gazebo\_models/mpl\_right\_arm,” [https://github.com/osrf/gazebo\\_models/tree/master/mpl\\_right\\_arm](https://github.com/osrf/gazebo_models/tree/master/mpl_right_arm), 2015.
- [48] F. S. Cromwell, *Occupational therapist’s manual for basic skills assessment or primary pre-vocational evaluation*. Fair Oaks Print. Company, 1960.
- [49] S. Hwang and C.-S. Song, “Relationship between manual dexterity and the unified parkinson’s disease rating scale-motor exam,” *Journal of Physical Therapy Science*, vol. 28, no. 12, pp. 3403–3406, Dec. 2016.
- [50] K.-J. Liang, H.-L. Chen, J.-Y. Shieh, and T.-N. Wang, “Measurement properties of the box and block test in children with unilateral cerebral palsy,” *Scientific Reports*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 20955, Oct. 2021.
- [51] V. Zapata-Figueroa and F. Ortiz-Corredor, “Assessment of Manual Abilities Using the Box and Block Test in Children with Bilateral Cerebral Palsy,” *Occupational Therapy International*, vol. 2022, p. 9980523, Feb. 2022.
- [52] M. L. Canny, J. M. Thompson, and M. J. Wheeler, “Reliability of the Box and Block Test of Manual Dexterity for Use With Patients With Fibromyalgia,” *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, vol. 63, no. 4, pp. 506–510, Jul. 2009.
- [53] T. A. Kuiken, L. A. Miller, R. D. Lipschutz, B. A. Lock, K. Stubblefield, P. D. Marasco, P. Zhou, and G. A. Dumanian, “Targeted reinnervation for enhanced prosthetic arm function in a woman with a proximal amputation: A case study,” *The Lancet*, vol. 369, no. 9559, pp. 371–380, Feb. 2007.
- [54] J. S. Hebert and J. Lewicke, “Case report of modified Box and Blocks test with motion capture to measure prosthetic function,” *Journal of Rehabilitation Research and Development*, vol. 49, no. 8, pp. 1163–1174, 2012.
- [55] K. Kontson, I. Marcus, B. Myklebust, and E. Civallico, “Targeted box and blocks test: Normative data and comparison to standard tests,” *PLoS ONE*, vol. 12, no. 5, p. e0177965, May 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5438168/>
- [56] G. Everard, Y. Otmene-Tolba, Z. Rosselli, T. Pellissier, K. Ajana, S. Dehem, E. Auvinet, M. G. Edwards, J. Lebleu, and T. Lejeune, “Concurrent validity of an immersive virtual reality version of the Box and Block Test to assess manual dexterity among patients with stroke,” *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, vol. 19, no. 1, p. 7, Jan. 2022.
- [57] E. D. Oña, A. Cuesta-Gomez, J. A. Garcia, W. Raffae, P. Sánchez-Herrera, R. Cano-de-la-Cuerda, and A. Jardón, “Evaluating A VR-based Box and Blocks Test for Automatic Assessment of Manual Dexterity: A Preliminary Study in Parkinson’s Disease,” in *2019 IEEE 7th International Conference on Serious Games and Applications for Health (SeGAH)*, Aug. 2019, pp. 1–6.
- [58] V. Mathiowetz, G. Volland, N. Kashman, and K. Weber, “Adult norms for the Box and Block Test of manual dexterity,” *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy: Official Publication of the American Occupational Therapy Association*, vol. 39, no. 6, pp. 386–391, Jun. 1985.
- [59] J. Buehler, “GitHub - JenniferBuehler/gazebo-pkgs: A collection of tools and plugins for Gazebo,” <https://github.com/JenniferBuehler/gazebo-pkgs>, 2021.
- [60] R. Smits, “KDL: Kinematics and Dynamics Library,” <http://www.orooco.org/kdl>.
- [61] S. G. Hart and L. E. Staveland, “Development of NASA-TLX (Task Load Index): Results of Empirical and Theoretical Research,” *Advances in Psychology*, vol. 52, pp. 139–183, 1988.
- [62] J. A. Krosnick, S. Narayan, and W. R. Smith, “Satisficing in surveys: Initial evidence,” *New Directions for Evaluation*, vol. 1996, no. 70, pp. 29–44, 1996.
- [63] B. C. Choi and A. W. Pak, “A Catalog of Biases in Questionnaires,” *Preventing Chronic Disease*, vol. 2, no. 1, p. A13, Dec. 2004.
- [64] T. Hamby and W. Taylor, “Survey Satisficing Inflates Reliability and Validity Measures,” *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, vol. 76, no. 6, pp. 912–932, Dec. 2016.