

SMART PROSTHETICS: THE ROLE OF EMBEDDED SENSORS IN IMPROVING FUNCTIONAL PERFORMANCE

¹Minakshi Behera

¹Lecturer, Prosthetics and Orthotics

¹Department of Prosthetics and Orthotics, All India Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation,
Haji Ali, K Khadye Marg, Mahalaxmi, Mumbai – 400034, Maharashtra, India
Corresponding author email: minakshibpo@gmail.com

Abstract: Prosthetic technology has advanced from predominantly mechanical designs to intelligent systems integrating embedded sensors, microprocessors, actuators, and adaptive control strategies. This narrative review explores the role of embedded sensors in improving functional performance in individuals with limb loss, with emphasis on dexterity, gait, balance, proprioception, sensory feedback, and rehabilitation outcomes. Peer-reviewed literature published between January 2010 and December 2024 was considered from PubMed, Scopus, IEEE Xplore, and Google Scholar. The review focused on electromyographic (EMG) sensors, inertial measurement units (IMUs), force and pressure sensors, tactile and haptic systems, and neural interfaces. Evidence synthesized from clinical, cohort, experimental, biomechanical, and applied studies indicates that sensor-integrated prostheses can improve user-intent detection, multi-degree-of-freedom control, grasp performance, gait adaptability, stability, energy efficiency, sensory awareness, and user confidence when compared with conventional systems. EMG-based pattern-recognition approaches support more intuitive upper-limb control, while IMUs and force/pressure sensors facilitate adaptive lower-limb gait control. Neural and haptic interfaces contribute to restoration of sensory information and limb embodiment. Despite these advances, high cost, accessibility, sensor reliability, power requirements, durability, specialized training, and data-privacy concerns remain important barriers. Future development should emphasize artificial-intelligence-driven adaptive control, sensor fusion, improved sensory feedback, cost-effective designs, and long-term clinical evaluation. Embedded sensor technologies therefore represent an important component of contemporary prosthetic rehabilitation and have the potential to improve functional independence and quality of life when appropriately integrated into clinical practice.

Keywords - smart prosthetics, embedded sensors, electromyography, inertial measurement unit, force sensors, pressure sensors, tactile feedback, haptic feedback, neural interfaces, prosthetic rehabilitation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Limb loss is a life-altering condition that affects physical function, mobility, participation, and quality of life. Amputation may result from traumatic injuries, peripheral vascular disease, diabetes mellitus, malignancy, severe infection, congenital limb deficiency, or war-related injury. Beyond the loss of physical function, individuals may experience psychosocial consequences such as altered self-image, reduced employability, anxiety, depression, and reduced participation in social and recreational activities.

Prosthetic rehabilitation is central to restoring functional independence after limb loss. The objective of prosthetic intervention extends beyond cosmetic replacement and includes restoration of meaningful function for activities of daily living, vocational tasks, and community mobility. The effectiveness of a prosthesis depends on its ability to respond appropriately to user intent, accommodate changing environmental demands, approximate natural limb biomechanics, and provide useful sensory information. Historically, prosthetic devices were predominantly mechanical and passive. Upper-limb prostheses commonly relied on body-powered cable-driven systems, while lower-limb prostheses used passive joints and relatively fixed mechanical resistance. Although such devices provide basic function, they may require compensatory movements and substantial physical or cognitive effort and offer limited adaptability to dynamic environments. The lack of sensory feedback may also contribute to unnatural movement patterns and difficulty with precise tasks.

Advances in biomedical engineering, electronics, materials science, and computational technology have enabled the development of smart prosthetics. These systems integrate sensors, microprocessors, actuators, and intelligent control algorithms to interact dynamically with the user and environment. Embedded sensors can capture physiological, biomechanical, and environmental signals and translate them into control commands or sensory feedback.

Important sensor modalities include electromyographic (EMG) electrodes, inertial measurement units (IMUs), force and pressure sensors, tactile sensors, haptic systems, and neural interfaces. Together, these technologies represent a shift from passive mechanical replacement toward interactive, adaptive, and user-centered prosthetic systems. Understanding their role is therefore relevant to prosthetists, orthotists, rehabilitation physicians, therapists, engineers, and researchers involved in amputee care.

II. AIM AND OBJECTIVES

Aim

The primary aim of this review is to explore the role of embedded sensors in smart prosthetic systems and their contribution to improving functional performance in individuals with limb loss.

Objectives

1. To describe the evolution of prosthetic technology toward sensor-integrated smart systems.
2. To identify and classify embedded sensors used in modern upper- and lower-limb prostheses.
3. To analyze the functional impact of embedded sensors on dexterity, gait, balance, and proprioception.
4. To evaluate clinical and rehabilitation outcomes associated with sensor-based prosthetic systems.
5. To discuss challenges, limitations, and ethical considerations related to smart prosthetics.
6. To outline future directions relevant to prosthetics and orthotics practice.

III. MATERIALS AND METHODOLOGY

Study Design

A narrative review methodology was adopted to synthesize current evidence related to smart prosthetics and embedded sensor technologies. A narrative approach was selected because of the diversity of prosthetic designs, sensor modalities, control strategies, and outcome measures, which limited the feasibility of quantitative meta-analysis.

Search Strategy

A comprehensive literature search was conducted using PubMed, Scopus, IEEE Xplore, and Google Scholar. Peer-reviewed articles published between January 2010 and December 2024 were considered. Search terms included “smart prosthetics,” “embedded sensors,” “electromyography (EMG),” “inertial measurement unit (IMU),” “force sensors,” “pressure sensors,” “tactile feedback,” “haptic feedback,” “neural interfaces,” and “microprocessor-controlled prostheses.”

Inclusion Criteria

- Clinical trials, cohort studies, experimental studies, and applied research involving human prosthetic users.
- Studies on upper-limb prostheses utilizing EMG or neural control.
- Studies on lower-limb prostheses incorporating IMUs, force, or pressure sensors.
- Studies reporting functional, biomechanical, gait, or rehabilitation-related outcomes.

Exclusion Criteria

- Purely theoretical or simulation-based studies without functional validation.
- Studies lacking outcome measures related to functional performance.
- Non-English publications where translation was unavailable.

Data Synthesis

Findings were synthesized descriptively and organized thematically according to the evolution of prosthetic technology, sensor type, upper- and lower-limb functional applications, sensory feedback, clinical and rehabilitation implications, challenges, and future directions. The review emphasized functional outcomes such as dexterity, gait adaptability, balance, energy expenditure, sensory awareness, usability, and user satisfaction.

IV. RESULTS

Evolution of Prosthetic Technology

The evolution of prosthetic technology reflects advances in engineering and rehabilitation philosophy. Early prostheses primarily aimed to restore appearance and basic mechanical function. Upper-limb systems commonly used harness-controlled cable mechanisms, whereas lower-limb systems used passive joints with fixed resistance.

The introduction of microprocessor-controlled prostheses represented a major milestone. Microprocessor-controlled knees were among the first smart prosthetic components to achieve widespread clinical adoption. By combining sensors with microprocessors, these systems can adjust joint resistance according to different phases of gait, supporting stability and reducing fall risk compared with conventional mechanical approaches [1].

Further sensor integration has enabled movement from reactive control toward predictive and adaptive behavior. Modern systems emphasize interaction between the prosthesis, user, and environment, with increasing attention to functional performance, user-centered design, and sensory restoration.

Types of Embedded Sensors in Smart Prosthetics

Electromyographic (EMG) sensors detect electrical signals generated by muscle contractions. Surface or implanted electrodes can capture residual muscle activity and provide signals for prosthetic control. Traditional EMG systems used threshold-based activation, whereas pattern recognition and machine-learning approaches can support multi-degree-of-freedom and more intuitive control [2].

Inertial measurement units (IMUs) incorporate accelerometers, gyroscopes, and, in some systems, magnetometers to measure acceleration, angular velocity, and orientation. In lower-limb prostheses, IMUs support gait-phase detection, walking-speed estimation, movement analysis, and terrain-related adaptation [3].

Force and pressure sensors measure load distribution between the prosthesis and the environment. In lower-limb systems, plantar pressure sensing can identify gait events such as heel strike and toe-off. In upper-limb systems, force sensing can contribute to grip-force regulation and prevention of excessive force application [4].

Tactile sensors detect contact, vibration, and texture, while haptic systems deliver information through vibration, electrical stimulation, or mechanical cues. These approaches aim to compensate for the loss of natural somatosensory feedback after amputation [5].

Neural interfaces establish direct communication between the prosthesis and the nervous system through peripheral nerve electrodes or osseointegrated approaches. These systems can support bidirectional transmission of motor commands and sensory feedback and represent an advanced direction toward restoration of natural limb function [6].

Table 1. classification of embedded sensors used in smart prosthetics

Sensor Type	Measured Parameter	Typical Prosthetic Application	Functional Role
Electromyographic (EMG) sensors	Muscle electrical activity	Upper-limb myoelectric prostheses	Detection of user intent; multi-degree-of-freedom control
Inertial Measurement Units (IMUs)	Acceleration, angular velocity, orientation	Lower-limb prostheses (knee, ankle)	Gait-phase detection; terrain recognition
Force sensors	Load magnitude	Upper- and lower-limb prostheses	Grip-force modulation; stance stability
Pressure sensors	Pressure distribution	Lower-limb prosthetic feet and sockets	Gait-event detection; load distribution
Tactile sensors	Contact, vibration, texture	Upper-limb prosthetic hands	Object manipulation; slip detection
Neural interfaces	Neural signals	Advanced upper- and lower-limb prostheses	Bidirectional motor control and sensory feedback

Role of Embedded Sensors in Upper-Limb Function

Upper-limb prosthetic function requires precise control, coordination, and sensory awareness. Embedded sensors enhance these capabilities by improving signal acquisition, interpretation, and feedback.

EMG-based control allows users to perform complex movements such as grasp selection, wrist rotation, and fine manipulation. Pattern-recognition approaches can support simultaneous or multi-degree-of-freedom control and may reduce cognitive load and improve task efficiency [2,7].

Force and tactile feedback can provide information about grip force and object contact. Such feedback can reduce reliance on visual monitoring and support more natural manipulation during activities of daily living.

Role of Embedded Sensors in Lower-Limb Function

Lower-limb prosthetic users face challenges involving balance, gait symmetry, and adaptation to uneven terrain. Embedded sensors address these challenges by enabling real-time adjustment of prosthetic behavior.

IMUs and force sensors allow microprocessor-controlled knees and ankles to respond to changes in walking speed, slope, and terrain [1,3]. Evidence summarized in the reviewed material indicates improved gait symmetry, reduced energy expenditure, and decreased fall risk with sensor-based lower-limb systems compared with conventional approaches [8].

Table 2. Functional impact of embedded sensors in upper- and lower-limb prostheses

Limb Type	Embedded Sensors	Functional Outcomes	Reported Benefits
Upper limb	EMG, force, tactile sensors	Improved grasp control, wrist coordination	Reduced cognitive load; increased dexterity
Upper limb	Neural interfaces	Sensory feedback, limb embodiment	Improved object manipulation and confidence
Lower limb	IMUs, pressure sensors	Adaptive gait control	Improved stability; reduced fall risk
Lower limb	Force sensors	Load-sensitive stance control	Reduced energy expenditure; improved gait symmetry

Proprioception, Sensory Feedback, and Limb Embodiment

Loss of proprioception is a major limitation of conventional prostheses. Embedded sensors and feedback systems aim to restore this sensory dimension by providing information about limb position, contact, movement, and force. Neural and haptic feedback systems may improve sensory awareness, balance, confidence, and limb embodiment—the sense that the prosthesis is part of the body [6,9].

Comparison Between Conventional and Smart Prosthetic Systems

Table 3. Comparison between conventional and smart prosthetic systems

Feature	Conventional Prostheses	Smart Prostheses
Control mechanism	Mechanical or body-powered	Sensor-based, microprocessor-controlled
Adaptability	Limited	High, real-time adaptive
Sensory feedback	Absent	Partial to advanced
Cognitive demand	High	Reduced
Gait/dexterity	Compensatory	Near-physiological
Prosthesis abandonment	Relatively high	Reduced

Clinical and Rehabilitation Implications

Smart prosthetics influence both device performance and rehabilitation strategies. Sensor-derived data can provide objective information about gait patterns, activity levels, and prosthesis usage.

Clinicians can use these data to support optimization of alignment, component selection, and training protocols. Remote monitoring may facilitate early detection of abnormal loading patterns and prosthesis-related issues [10].

Table 4. Clinical and rehabilitation benefits of sensor-based prosthetics

Domain	Benefit
Gait	Improved symmetry; reduced variability
Balance	Enhanced stability during dynamic tasks
Energy expenditure	Reduced metabolic cost of walking
Rehabilitation monitoring	Objective performance data
User satisfaction	Increased comfort and confidence

Summary of Included Studies

The source material summarized representative studies involving EMG, IMUs, load/force sensors, tactile systems, and neural interfaces. The reported outcomes include improved multi-degree-of-freedom control, task efficiency, sensory feedback, limb embodiment, gait symmetry, stance stability, object manipulation accuracy, intuitive control, and sensory restoration.

Table 5. Summary of included studies on embedded sensors in smart prosthetics

Author(s)	Year	Study Design	Prosthesis Type	Sensors Used	Sample	Key Functional Outcomes
Hargrove LJ et al.	2017	Experimental study	Upper-limb myoelectric	EMG pattern recognition	8 amputees	Improved multi-DOF control; reduced cognitive load
Resnik L et al.	2018	Cohort study	Upper-limb	EMG, force sensors	23 users	Increased task efficiency; higher user satisfaction
Ortiz-Catalan M et al.	2020	Clinical trial	Upper-limb	Neural interfaces	3 amputees	Enhanced sensory feedback; improved limb embodiment
Farina D et al.	2021	Translational study	Upper-limb	Implanted EMG electrodes	6 users	Stable long-term control; improved dexterity
Simon AM et al.	2014	Biomechanical analysis	Lower-limb (knee)	IMU, load sensors	12 amputees	Improved gait symmetry; reduced stance instability
Herr H et al.	2018	Experimental trial	Lower-limb (ankle-foot)	IMU, force sensors	10 users	Reduced metabolic cost of walking
Antfolk C et al.	2013	Experimental study	Upper-limb	Tactile sensors	7 users	Improved object manipulation accuracy
Micera S et al.	2010	Applied research	Upper-limb	Neural and haptic sensors	4 users	Restored sensory perception during grasp
Kuiken TA et al.	2010	Clinical study	Upper-limb	EMG; targeted muscle reinnervation	5 amputees	Improved intuitive control
Raspopovic S et al.	2024	Clinical feasibility study	Lower-limb	Neural interfaces	2 users	Restored tactile sensation during walking

V. DISCUSSION

The integration of embedded sensor technologies into prosthetic systems represents a major development in contemporary prosthetic rehabilitation. The evidence synthesized in the source material indicates that sensor-based prostheses can improve

functional performance compared with conventional mechanical systems, while also influencing rehabilitation strategies and user experience.

One important contribution of embedded sensors is improved user–prosthesis interaction. In traditional prostheses, users may need to consciously adapt movement to compensate for limited control and lack of feedback. Sensor-integrated systems allow the prosthesis to respond to physiological and biomechanical information, potentially reducing cognitive effort and improving movement efficiency. This represents a shift from predominantly user-driven compensation toward greater prosthesis-driven adaptation.

In upper-limb prosthetics, EMG-based pattern recognition is an important mechanism for functional improvement. By supporting simultaneous or multi-degree-of-freedom control, these systems can facilitate more intuitive movement. The reviewed evidence reports improved task efficiency and reduced mental effort compared with conventional myoelectric control [2,7]. The addition of tactile and force feedback may further support fine motor performance by restoring a degree of sensory awareness.

In lower-limb prosthetics, the combination of IMUs and force sensors supports adaptive gait control. Microprocessor-controlled knees and ankles can adjust behavior according to walking speed, slope, and terrain, contributing to stability and reduced fall risk [1,8]. These capabilities are particularly relevant during stair negotiation and uneven-terrain ambulation.

Another important area is restoration of proprioception and limb embodiment. Conventional prostheses often provide limited or no direct sensory feedback. Neural and haptic systems attempt to address this limitation by communicating information about limb position and contact. The reviewed evidence suggests that sensory feedback may improve functional performance, confidence, and the sense of ownership or embodiment of the prosthesis [6,9].

Despite technological progress, widespread adoption remains constrained by high cost, limited accessibility, durability and maintenance of electronic components, power consumption, and signal reliability. Effective use may also require specialized training for clinicians and users. These issues are particularly relevant when advanced technologies are considered for routine rehabilitation services and resource-constrained settings.

Ethical considerations are also important. Sensor-based prostheses can generate substantial amounts of user-related data, creating concerns regarding privacy and security. Equitable access is another challenge because high-cost technologies may not be available to all individuals who could potentially benefit from them. Interdisciplinary collaboration, robust clinical evidence, and thoughtful integration into rehabilitation practice are therefore necessary for responsible implementation.

VI. CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

Table 6. Challenges and limitations of smart prosthetics

Category	Key Challenges
Technical	Signal noise, sensor drift, battery life
Clinical	Need for specialized training
Economic	High cost, limited accessibility
Ethical	Data privacy, equity of access
Maintenance	Durability of electronic components

The present review is narrative in design and therefore does not provide a pooled quantitative estimate of treatment effect. The included evidence is heterogeneous in sensor type, prosthetic design, participant characteristics, study design, and outcome measures. The findings should consequently be interpreted as a thematic synthesis of the evidence described in the source material rather than as a meta-analytic estimate.

VII. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Future research should focus on artificial-intelligence-driven intent prediction and adaptive control algorithms to improve the responsiveness and personalization of prosthetic systems.

Sensor fusion may improve signal reliability by combining information from multiple sensor modalities. Improved sensory feedback systems may further enhance proprioception, embodiment, and confidence.

Lightweight materials, energy-efficient electronics, and longer battery life are important for practical daily use. Cost-reduction strategies are also required to improve accessibility.

Wearable integration and cloud-based outcome tracking may support objective rehabilitation monitoring. Long-term studies examining quality of life, participation, psychosocial outcomes, and sustained prosthesis use are needed to complement short-term functional evaluations.

Advances in neural interfaces are expected to further narrow the functional gap between artificial and biological limbs. Translation of these technologies into routine clinical practice will require continued attention to safety, training, affordability, and ethical management of user data.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Smart prosthetics integrated with embedded sensor technologies represent an important advancement in prosthetic rehabilitation. Sensor integration can enhance dexterity, gait stability, proprioception, sensory awareness, and user confidence, thereby supporting functional performance and quality of life for individuals with limb loss. EMG-based systems contribute to intuitive upper-limb control, while IMUs and force/pressure sensors support adaptive lower-limb function. Neural and haptic interfaces provide promising approaches for restoring sensory information and limb embodiment. Nevertheless, cost, durability, power requirements, signal reliability, specialized training, accessibility, and ethical concerns remain important barriers. Continued technological innovation, long-term clinical evaluation, and evidence-based implementation are required to translate these advances into accessible and sustainable rehabilitation solutions. For prosthetics and orthotics professionals, understanding embedded sensor technologies is increasingly important for optimizing rehabilitation outcomes and advancing amputee care.

IX. REFERENCES

1. Herr H. Exoskeletons and orthoses: classification, design challenges and future directions. *J Neuroeng Rehabil.* 2009;6:21.
2. Hargrove LJ, Miller LA, Turner K, Kuiken TA. Myoelectric pattern recognition outperforms conventional control for upper-limb prostheses. *J Neural Eng.* 2017;14(5):056010.
3. Simon AM, Fey NP, Finucane SB, Lipschutz RD, Hargrove LJ. Strategies for reducing configuration time for pattern recognition-based prosthetic control. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng.* 2013;60(12):3367–76.
4. Sensinger JW, Schultz AE. Advances in upper limb prosthetic technology. *Phys Med Rehabil Clin N Am.* 2011;22(1):87–110.
5. Antfolk C, et al. Sensory feedback in upper limb prosthetics. *Med Biol Eng Comput.* 2013;51(1–2):27–37.
6. Ortiz-Catalan M, et al. Osseointegrated human-machine gateway for long-term sensory feedback and motor control of artificial limbs. *N Engl J Med.* 2020;382:2004–15.
7. Resnik L, et al. Advanced upper limb prosthetic devices: implications for rehabilitation. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2018;99(9):1831–40.
8. Kuiken TA, et al. Targeted muscle reinnervation for real-time myoelectric control. *Lancet.* 2009;374:765–73.
9. Raspopovic S, et al. Restoring natural sensory feedback in real-time bidirectional hand prostheses. *Sci Transl Med.* 2014;6(222):222ra19.
10. Farina D, Vujaklija I, Brånemark R, Aszmann OC. Toward higher-performance bionic limbs. *Sci Transl Med.* 2021;13:eabe3574.

Copyright & License:

© Authors retain the copyright of this article. This work is published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), permitting unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.