

1 MUSCLE-COMPUTER INTERFACE AND TDCS IN STROKE

2 Combining muscle-computer interface guided training
3 with bihemispheric tDCS improves upper limb function
4 in chronic stroke patients

5 Xue Zhang¹, PhD, Raf Meesen^{2, 3}, PhD, Stephan P. Swinnen², PhD, Hilde Feys⁴, PhD, Daniel

6 G. Woolley¹, PhD, Hsiao-Ju Cheng^{5†}, PhD and Nicole Wenderoth^{1, 5†} *PhD

7 ¹ Neural Control of Movement Laboratory, Department of Health Sciences and Technology, ETH Zurich,

8 Zurich, Switzerland

9 ² Movement Control & Neuroplasticity Research Group, Department of Movement Sciences, KU

10 Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

11 ³ REVAL Rehabilitation Research Center, Faculty of Rehabilitation Sciences, UHasselt, Belgium

12 ⁴ Research Group for Neurorehabilitation (eNRGy), Department of Rehabilitation Sciences, KU Leuven,

13 Leuven, Belgium

14 ⁵ Singapore-ETH Centre, Future Health Technologies Programme, CREATE campus, Singapore,

15 Singapore

16 † Shared last authors

17 *Correspondence: Prof. Nicole Wenderoth (nicole.wenderoth@hest.ethz.ch)

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke

18 **ABSTRACT**

19 Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) may facilitate neuroplasticity but with a limited effect
20 when administered while stroke patients are at rest. Muscle-computer interface (MCI) training is a
21 promising approach for training stroke patients even if they cannot produce overt movements.
22 However, using tDCS to enhance MCI training has not been investigated. We combined
23 bihemispheric tDCS with MCI training of the paretic wrist and examined the effectiveness of this
24 intervention in chronic stroke patients. A crossover, double-blind, randomized trial was conducted.
25 Twenty-six chronic stroke patients performed MCI wrist training for three consecutive days at home
26 while receiving either real tDCS or sham tDCS in counterbalanced order and separated by at least 8
27 months. The primary outcome measure was the Fugl-Meyer Assessment Upper Extremity Scale
28 (FMA-UE) which was measured one week before training, on the first training day, on the last
29 training day, and one week after training. There was no significant difference in the baseline FMA-UE
30 score between groups nor between intervention periods. Patients improved 3.850 ± 0.582 points in
31 FMA-UE score when receiving real tDCS, and 0.963 ± 0.725 points when receiving sham tDCS
32 ($p=0.003$). Additionally, patients also showed continuous improvement of their motor control of the
33 MCI tasks over the training days. Our study showed that the training paradigm could lead to
34 functional improvement in chronic stroke patients. We argue that an appropriate MCI training in
35 combination with bihemispheric tDCS could be a useful adjuvant for neurorehabilitation in stroke
36 patients.

37 **NEW & NOTEWORTHY**

38 Bihemispheric tDCS combined with a novel MCI training for motor control of wrist extensor can
39 improve both proximal and distal arm function in chronic stroke patients. The training regimen can
40 be personalized with adjustments made daily to accommodate the functional change throughout the
41 intervention. This demonstrates that bihemispheric tDCS with MCI training could complement
42 conventional post-stroke neurorehabilitation.

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke

43 **KEYWORDS**

44 electromyography, stroke, tDCS, wrist extension

45 INTRODUCTION

46

47 Approximately 80% of stroke survivors suffer various degrees of upper limb paresis ⁽¹⁾. Among
48 them, the loss of selective wrist muscle activation and wrist weakness is a highly disabling deficit
49 because it hinders finger control as well as unimanual and bimanual object manipulation ⁽²⁾.
50 Particularly, the lack of wrist extension during grasping can cause compensatory movement from the
51 trunk and arm which might have detrimental long-term effects ⁽³⁻⁵⁾. Therefore, interventions that
52 target the distal extensors of the hand during all phases of post-stroke upper limb rehabilitation are
53 warranted ^(6,7).

54 Over the past decades, transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) has been applied to
55 facilitate motor rehabilitation in stroke survivors. It involves the application of a weak electrical current
56 (1-2 mA) through the skull which alters corticomotor excitability ⁽⁸⁾. The effects of tDCS can last from
57 minutes to hours, depending on the length and intensity of stimulation ⁽⁹⁾. A previous multisession
58 study conducted on chronic patients demonstrated that the effects of tDCS could endure for up to 16
59 weeks ⁽¹⁰⁾. Bihemispheric tDCS simultaneously stimulates both hemispheres with anodal and cathodal
60 tDCS to excite and inhibit the ipsilesional and contralesional primary motor cortex (M1), respectively
61 ^(11, 12). It has been postulated that bihemispheric tDCS in association with motor training might be
62 critical for facilitating functional recovery after stroke ⁽¹³⁾. Our previous work showed that anodal tDCS
63 applied over M1 could increase corticomotor excitability of the wrist extensor during activation,
64 confirming that tDCS is effective in modulating neural activity in forearm muscles ⁽¹⁴⁾. Furthermore,
65 applying tDCS during active engagement in a specific training task could capitalize on the
66 neuroplasticity and synaptic changes that occur during active learning or performance, potentially
67 boosting the beneficial outcomes.

68 Different from tDCS which directly targets the central nervous system, a muscle-computer
69 interface (MCI) measures myoelectrical activity of a target muscle via electromyography (EMG) and

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke

70 uses that signal for guiding various sensorimotor tasks ⁽¹⁵⁻¹⁷⁾. Previous studies using MCI have shown
71 positive effects on reducing abnormal muscle co-activation and improving motor impairment in
72 chronic stroke patients ^(16, 18, 19). Our MCI tasks has the capability to provide real-time visual feedback
73 and specifically target the fine motor performance associated with distal function in the upper limb.
74 Another noteworthy aspect is the extensive applicability of MCI among most stroke patients, including
75 those who do not exhibit overt wrist movements. Among these patients, effective self-directed, active
76 training for the upper limb is notably limited. Earlier research by Beets et al. (2011) ⁽²⁰⁾ demonstrated
77 that active training resulted in superior motor performance compared to passive training. Moreover,
78 low-cost and portable MCI which can be administered at home might allow increasing training dose
79 compared to standard care ⁽²¹⁻²⁴⁾. MCI has been used together with virtual reality and
80 electroencephalography for post-stroke neurorehabilitation ⁽²¹⁾. However, to our knowledge, no
81 studies have considered combining tDCS with MCI to enhance the intervention effect on the wrist
82 function recovery in stroke patients.

83 Here, a novel MCI training task was developed to facilitate voluntary motor control of the wrist
84 extensor with salient and perceivable sensorimotor feedback even in the absence of overt movement.
85 In this proof-of-concept study, we tested the therapeutic potential of bihemispheric tDCS combined
86 with this novel MCI intervention in chronic stroke patients. We hypothesized that the combination of
87 tDCS and a highly specific MCI training will facilitate neuroplasticity and lead to functional
88 improvement in the upper limb among stroke patients.

89

90 MATERIALS AND METHODS

91

92 **Participants.** Twenty-six chronic stroke patients were recruited from two Belgian
93 rehabilitation centers (University Hospital Pellenberg, Jessa Hospital/ St. Ursula Herk-de-Stad
94 rehabilitation center, Table 1). 174 patients were screened for participation and included when they
95 met the following criteria: (1) age \geq 18 years, (2) first-ever stroke, (3) at least 6 months post-stroke,
96 (4) wrist component of the Fugl-Meyer Assessment Upper Extremity Scale (FMA_{wrist}) score \leq 8, (5) no
97 additional neurological or psychiatric disorders, (6) Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) score \geq
98 24, (7) Modified Ashworth Scale (MAS) score in the paretic wrist flexor \leq 3, (8) no contraindications to
99 tDCS, (9) willingness to participate. Prior to the experiment, 26 patients were randomly allocated to
100 receive either bihemispheric real or sham tDCS group. Patients were stratified according to their
101 FMA_{wrist} scores before randomization to ensure a similar distribution of motor function severity
102 between the groups – severe deficit group (FMA_{wrist} score \leq 4) and moderate deficit group (FMA_{wrist}
103 score $>$ 4). After a washout period of 12.42 ± 0.44 months (ranging from 8.47 to 16.73 months), 20
104 patients were crossed over and participated in a second intervention period that followed the identical
105 protocol as the first one, 6 patients dropped out ($n = 3$ from each group) mainly because of time
106 constraints (Figure 1). The study was approved by the medical ethics committee of KU Leuven
107 University Hospital according to the declaration of Helsinki. All patients gave written informed consent
108 prior to participation. This study was registered at ClinicalTrial.gov (identification number
109 NCT02210403).

Table 1. General information of patients.

	AGE RANGE	SEX	TIME POST STROKE (MO)	AFFECTED SIDE	STROKE TYPE	STROKE LOCATION	OLDFIELD SCORE	FMA _{WRIST} †	FMA-UE †	STIMULATION ORDER
P1	51-55	F	17	L	H	SC+C	100	0	13	Sham-Real
P2	51-55	M	61	R	I	C	0	0	19	Sham-Real
P3	71-75	M	28	L	I	C	100	0	26	Real-Sham
P4	61-65	M	7	L	I	C	100	0	26	Real-Sham
P5	71-75	F	30	L	I	C	100	0	27	Real-Sham
P6*	46-50	F	8	R	I	C	100	1	40	Sham
P7	71-75	M	84	R	H	SC	100	2	20	Sham-Real
P8	66-70	F	13	R	I	SC	100	2	30	Real-Sham
P9*	51-55	F	13	R	I	C	100	2	34	Real
P10	61-65	F	34	R	I	C	100	3	29	Sham-Real
P11*	66-70	M	10	L	I	SC	100	3	34	Sham
P12	66-70	F	44	L	I	C	100	3	41	Real-Sham
P13	56-60	M	31	L	H	C	100	4	34	Sham-Real
P14	66-70	M	22	L	I	C	90	4	42	Sham-Real
P15	61-65	M	6	R	H	SC	100	4.5	42.5	Real-Sham
P16	71-75	M	95	R	I	C	100	5	32	Real-Sham
P17	71-75	F	23	L	I	C	100	5	40	Real-Sham
P18	61-65	F	85	L	I	C	100	5	45	Real-Sham
P19*	66-70	M	6	L	H	SC	-100	5	50	Real
P20	61-65	M	25	R	I	C	100	6	58	Sham-Real

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

0

1

2

3

P21*	56-60	F	51	R	I	C	100	6	59	Real
P22	66-70	M	31	R	I	SC	100	6.5	54.5	Real-Sham
P23	41-45	F	58	L	H	SC+C	90	7	39	Sham-Real
P24*	21-25	M	36	R	I	C	80	7	52	Sham
P25	61-65	M	22	L	I	SC	100	7.5	54.5	Sham-Real
P26	56-60	M	31	R	H	SC	100	8	63	Sham-Real
MEAN	61±2	15	33±5	13	7 (27%)	16 (61%)	87±8.4	4±0.5	39±3	10(38%) S-R
±SE		(58%)		(50%)	H	C				10(38%) R-S
OR		M		L	19 (73%)	8 (31%)				3(12%) Real
N(%)		11		13	I	SC				3(12%) Sham
		(42%)		(50%)		2 (8%)				
		F		R		SC+C				


C: Cortical; **P:** Patients; **ys:** Year; **mo:** Month; **FMA-UE:** Fugl-Meyer Assessment Upper Extremity Scale; **FMA_{wrist}:** Wrist component of the FMA-UE; **F:**

Female; **M:** Male; **R:** Right; **L:** Left; **H:** Hemorrhagic; **I:** Ischemic; **SC:** Subcortical; **SE:** Standard Error.

* Patients only participated in the first study period; † Averaged score at baseline by two independent assessors.

ae

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke




136 **Figure 1.** Consort flow chart for patients' recruitment. FMA_{wrist}: Fugl-Meyer Assessment wrist
137 component.

138 **Study design.** The study was a randomized, double-blinded, sham-controlled, crossover
139 clinical trial. In each study period, there were five testing days, (i) a familiarization day, (ii) three
140 consecutive training days – one week after familiarization, (iii) a retention day – one week after the
141 last training day (Figure 2A). On the familiarization day, patients were informed of the protocol and
142 provided informed consent. Cognitive level, handedness, and depression status were determined by
143 related questionnaires. On the motor task training days, patients were trained on isometric and
144 dynamic versions of a wrist extension motor task. Each training day consisted of three motor training
145 components: pre-isometric task, dynamic task, and post-isometric task. The isometric task, the first

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke

146 and last three blocks of the dynamic task were performed without tDCS. The main training component
147 of the dynamic task (10 blocks) was performed for 30 min with the concurrent application of real/sham
148 tDCS (Figure 2B). Visual analogue scales (VAS, range 0-10) measuring pain/discomfort in the wrist,
149 fatigue and attention level were completed at the start and end of each training day. A VAS score
150 measuring perceived discomfort of tDCS was also included at the end of each training day. The
151 functional assessments and a brief retention test for both versions of the motor task were performed
152 approximately 7 days after training day 3 (Figure 2A, B). During the whole experiment, patients and
153 experimenters were blinded as to whether real or sham tDCS was applied. Patients were trained at a
154 similar time of the day and both study periods were performed at the patient's home with the
155 experimenters' presence. Notably, the training performed during the experiment was in addition to
156 the patient's regular physiotherapy^(25, 26) .

157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167



168 **Figure 2.** A. Overall study protocol; B. Training protocol for a single training day and the retention test; C. Electrodes placement and electric field modelling;
169 D. Training setup for the MCI tasks and the feedback screen.

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke

170 1. Functional assessments

171 Patients' upper limb function was tested with FMA-UE ⁽²⁷⁾. Spasticity of the paretic wrist flexor
172 was assessed using the Modified Ashworth Scale (MAS) ⁽²⁸⁾ and muscle strength of the affected wrist
173 extensor was measured with the Medical Research Council scale (MRC) ^(25, 26). Furthermore, the active
174 extension angle of the affected wrist was measured manually with a goniometer. All assessments were
175 administered by two independent assessors, e.g., one assessor performed the test and both assessors
176 scored independently, on the familiarization day (Fam), at the beginning of the first training day (Day
177 1), at the end of the last training day (Day 3), and on the retention day (Rt). The scores of these
178 functional assessments were averaged between the two assessors and they were blind as to whether
179 patients received real or sham tDCS.

180 2. Questionnaires

181 The Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) ⁽²⁹⁾ determined patients' cognitive status,
182 handedness tested with the Oldfield questionnaire ⁽³⁰⁾, and depression assessed with the geriatric
183 depression scale (GDS) ⁽³¹⁾. Furthermore, perception of general attention, discomfort related to tDCS
184 application, pain in the paretic wrist, and overall fatigue level were measured using visual analog
185 scales (VAS) ⁽³²⁾. A self-reported number of standard physiotherapy treatment sessions (one standard
186 physiotherapy session equals 30 mins PT and/or OT treatment in a Belgian physiotherapy clinic) per
187 week before and during the experiment was documented.

188 ***Intervention.***

189 1. Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS)

190 Bihemispheric tDCS (DC Stimulator Plus, NeuroConn GmbH, Germany) was delivered for 30
191 min with the anode placed over the ipsilesional M1 and the cathode over the contralesional M1
192 (corresponding to C3 and C4 of the 10-20 system) via saline-soaked sponges (5×7 cm) while patients

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke

193 were performing the MCI training. For real tDCS, the current was ramped up over 30 s to 2 mA (0.08
194 mA / cm²) maintained for 30 min, and then ramped down over 30 s. Electric field modelling of our
195 tDCS protocol was conducted in SimNIBS 2.1 (Figure 2C) and confirmed that the left and right
196 sensorimotor areas were stimulated by our montage. For sham stimulation, the current was ramped
197 up for 30 s, maintained at 2 mA for 1 min, and then ramped down over 30 s. This procedure of applying
198 sham tDCS evokes a similar sensation as real tDCS (e.g., itching, tickling) without applying effective
199 brain stimulation and ensures that our blinding was successful (tDCS related discomfort rating was
200 documented after each training session).

201 2. Muscle-computer interface and motor tasks

202 During motor training, patients were seated behind a table with their paretic arm resting on
203 their lap and supported by a cushion. Their shoulder was in a neutral position with the elbow slightly
204 flexed and the forearm pronated. Visual feedback was provided on a laptop positioned about 70 cm
205 in front of the patient (Figure 2D). Two disposable Ag-AgCl surface electrodes (Blue Sensor P-00-S,
206 Ambu, Denmark) were placed in a belly-tendon montage on musculus extensor carpi radialis (ECR) of
207 the paretic arm with the reference electrode placed on the lateral epicondyle (Figure 2D).
208 Electromyography data were sampled at 5000 Hz (CED Power 1401, Cambridge Electronic Design, UK),
209 amplified, band-pass filtered (5-1000 Hz), used for online feedback in the training tasks, and
210 additionally stored on a portable computer for offline analysis.

211 At the beginning of each testing day, the baseline and maximal EMG level of musculus
212 extensor carpi radialis (ECR) in the paretic arm were recorded (Mespec 8000, Mega Electronic, UK)
213 and quantified by the root mean square (RMS) of the signal. Patients were asked to perform 3 maximal
214 isometric wrist extensions for 3 s each. The maximum EMG level was determined as the highest EMG
215 value the patient could maintain for 1 s. The baseline EMG level was set as the lowest value when the
216 patient was relaxed.

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke

217 Patients were required to control a cursor displayed on a computer screen with the EMG
218 activity of their paretic arm's wrist extensor. The cursor position was proportional to the level of EMG
219 activity. On the feedback screen the cursor appeared at the very left of the screen when the EMG level
220 was at baseline (home position). The cursor position at the far right of the screen corresponded to 60
221 % of the maximal EMG level. The screen was divided into 100 virtual units (VU). There were four
222 different target zones: 15-35, 35-55, 55-75, and 75-95 VU, corresponding to mean activities of 15, 27,
223 39, and 51 % of the maximal EMG level, respectively (Figure 2D). There were two types of motor tasks:
224 isometric and dynamic tasks. Isometric tasks involve static contractions of muscles without joint
225 movement, activating slow-twitch muscle fibers. They can improve muscular endurance. On the other
226 hand, dynamic tasks involve moving muscles through their range of motion, engaging both slow-
227 twitch and fast-twitch muscle fibers. Both types of tasks are essential for improving functional
228 movements. During the **isometric task**, one target was presented on the screen. The target would
229 correspond to one of four different EMG activity levels. Patients were instructed to move the cursor
230 to the target and keep it as stable as possible within the target zone for as long as possible, max
231 recording time was 15 s. Each of the four targets was acquired three times.

232 During the **dynamic task**, patients had to move the cursor repeatedly between the home
233 position and one of several different target zones similar to the work of Reis et al. (2009)⁽³³⁾: Once the
234 cursor was in a given target zone for more than 1s, the cursor changed colour and shape to indicate
235 that the target was successfully acquired. The patient then relaxed their wrist and the cursor returned
236 to the home position before the next target zone appeared on the screen. If patients were unable to
237 acquire a target within 5 s, the cursor changed colour and shape to indicate that the patient should
238 relax. These targets were recorded as errors and the next target appeared once the cursor returned
239 to the home position. Patients were encouraged to successfully acquire as many targets as possible
240 within 60 s. There was a 2-minute break after each 1-minute training block to avoid fatigue. Three
241 dynamic task training blocks were performed without applying tDCS at the familiarization session,

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke

242 before (Pre) and after (Post) the main training blocks of each day, and during the retention test (Figure
243 2B). The dynamic task was also executed during the training with 30 min real/sham tDCS that consisted
244 of 10 1-minute blocks of dynamic task training followed by 2-minute rest.

245 **Data analysis and statistics.** All statistical comparisons were performed in IBM SPSS Statistics,
246 Version 27.0 (IBM Corp, Armonk, NY, USA) with the significance level set to 0.05. The normal
247 distribution of the data was assessed by Shapiro-Wilk tests. The proportion of total variability
248 attributable to the factor concerned was reported as the value of partial eta-squared (η_p^2), where η_p^2
249 = 0.01 indicates a small effect; $\eta_p^2 = 0.06$ indicates a medium effect; $\eta_p^2 = 0.14$ indicates a large effect.

250 1. Primary endpoint

251 FMA-UE and FMA_{Wrist} scores were subjected to an analysis of covariance for repeated
252 measurements (rmANCOVA) with the factors TIME (Fam, Day1, Day3, and Rt), STIMULATION (real
253 versus sham tDCS), and ORDER (real-sham, sham-real) as a covariate of no interest. Greenhouse-
254 Geisser correction was used to adjust for lack of sphericity in a rmANCOVA. The identical procedures
255 were applied to active wrist extension angle, MAS, and MRC scores.

256 For patients who completed both periods (n = 20), the training induced change (Δ) of FMA-UE
257 and FMA_{Wrist} scores were calculated separately for the real and sham tDCS periods by calculating the
258 difference between the scores measured at Retention and baseline. Baseline FMA score was
259 calculated by averaging FMA scores measured at Familiarization and Day 1. Both Δ FMA-UE and
260 Δ FMA_{Wrist} were compared between real and sham tDCS periods using a rmANCOVA with the within-
261 subject factor STIMULATION (real versus sham tDCS) and additionally ORDER (real-sham, sham-real)
262 as a covariate of no interest. The Greenhouse-Geisser correction was used to adjust for lack of
263 sphericity in a rmANCOVA.

264 2. Secondary task-specific measurements

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke

265 The analysis of the task-specific data was restricted to the 20 patients that completed both
266 periods. First, we estimated how consistently the ECR was activated during the isometric training task
267 by calculating the coefficient of variation (CV) from the mean and standard deviation (SD) of the EMG
268 signal for each trial:

$$269 \quad CV = \frac{SD(EMG)}{mean(EMG)}$$

270 CV was averaged across trials for each target. Since the data was not normally distributed, we
271 applied a log transformation.

272 For the data obtained from the dynamic task, performance was calculated as the number of
273 correct targets achieved within each training block.

274 Log-transformed CV and the number of correct targets were analyzed using a rmANCOVA with
275 the within-subject factors PREPOST (pre-, post-training), DAY (day 1 to 3), STIMULATION (real versus
276 sham tDCS), and additionally the ORDER (real-sham, sham-real) as a covariate of no interest. The
277 Greenhouse-Geisser correction was used to adjust for lack of sphericity in a rmANCOVA. In order to
278 detect the performance difference in retention tests between real and sham tDCS periods, we used
279 rmANCOVA with within-subject factors TIME, STIMULATION, and additionally the ORDER of tDCS to
280 compare the Pre training of day 3 versus the retention test for the isometric task, due to strong within
281 day training effect; and the Post training of day 3 versus the retention test for the dynamic task to
282 check the continued training effect. Furthermore, paired sample t-test between real versus sham tDCS
283 was performed for Pre training performance of the isometric and dynamic task on day 1.

284 3. Control Parameters

285 Additional factors such as physiotherapy treatment frequency, MMSE score and GDS score,
286 discomfort/pain score for tDCS were compared between the real and sham tDCS periods by using

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke

287 Wilcoxon signed-rank tests. rmANCOVAs with the factors PREPOST (pre-, post-training), DAY (day 1 to
288 3), STIMULATION (real versus sham tDCS), and ORDER (real-sham, sham-real) was used to evaluate
289 the VAS scores obtained for fatigue, attention, and pain in the wrist. All data were expressed as mean
290 \pm standard error (SE).

291 **RESULTS**

292 All 26 patients completed the first training period, and 20 patients completed the entire
293 experimental protocol. No adverse effects of the intervention were observed or reported by any
294 patient.

295 ***Primary End Point: FMA-UE assessment.***

296 In both training periods, FMA-UE scores were well matched between the real and sham tDCS
297 groups at Familiarization (period 1: FMA-UE_{real} = 39.0 ± 3.1, FMA-UE_{sham} = 38.3 ± 4.3, $p = 0.867$; period
298 2: FMA-UE_{real} = 37.0 ± 6.1, FMA-UE_{sham} = 36.2 ± 3.3, $p = 0.927$). Furthermore, FMA-UE scores were
299 stable from Familiarization to Day 1 in both groups and training periods (Day 1 period 1: FMA-UE_{real} =
300 39.1 ± 3.2, FMA-UE_{sham} = 38.5 ± 4.4; Day 1 period 2: FMA-UE_{real} = 37.4 ± 5.8, FMA-UE_{sham} = 35.9 ± 3.3,
301 all Familiarization vs Day 1 comparisons: $p > 0.458$, Table 2).

302 In those 20 patients who participated in both training periods, we determined the effect of
303 real versus sham tDCS. Training with real tDCS led to significantly larger changes in FMA-UE scores
304 from Familiarization to Retention than training with sham tDCS. This was confirmed by a significant
305 TIME × STIMULATION interaction ($F_{(3, 54)} = 5.050$, $p = 0.008$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.219$) (Figure 3A FMA-UE). Δ FMA-
306 UE revealed an average increase of 3.85 ± 0.6 points for real tDCS training and 0.96 ± 0.7 points for
307 sham tDCS training which reached significance ($F_{(1, 18)} = 11.399$, $p = 0.003$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.388$, Figure 3B left
308 panel). Note that 14 out of 20 individuals (70%) followed the group trend.

TABLE 2. PATIENT'S FMA-UE AND FMA_{WRIST} SCORE

FMA-UE (FMA _{WRIST})											
PATIENT ID	Stimulation order	Real tDCS					Sham tDCS				
		Fam	Pre	Post	RT	Change	Fam	Pre	Post	RT	Change
P1	S-R	16 (0.5)	16.5 (0)	16 (0)	18 (0)	1.75 (-0.25)	13 (0)	14 (0)	16 (0.5)	16 (0)	2.5 (0)
P2	S-R	12 (0)	14 (0)	16 (2)	15 (1.5)	2 (1.5)	19 (0)	19 (0)	19 (0)	19 (0)	0 (0)
P3	R-S	26 (0)	26 (0)	29 (0)	30 (0)	4 (0)	24 (0)	23 (0.5)	21 (0.5)	20.5 (0)	-3 (-0.3)
P4	R-S	26 (0)	27 (0)	31 (1)	34.5 (3.5)	8 (3.5)	34 (5)	33 (4)	35 (5)	32.5 (3)	-1 (-1.5)
P5	R-S	27 (0)	26 (0)	32 (2)	31.5 (1.5)	5 (1.5)	20.5 (0)	22 (0)	24 (0.5)	22.5 (0.5)	1.25 (0.5)
P7	S-R	22 (3)	24.5 (2)	26 (3.5)	29.5 (5)	6.25 (2.5)	20 (2)	23 (2)	22 (3)	24 (3)	2.5 (1)
P8	R-S	30 (2)	26.5 (2.5)	31 (3)	31 (3)	2.75 (0.75)	35 (2.5)	36 (2.5)	37 (4)	33.5 (2.5)	-2 (0)
P10	S-R	29.5 (2)	28 (2)	30 (2)	33.5 (3)	4.75 (1)	29 (3)	29 (4)	36 (4)	35 (4)	6 (0.5)
P12	R-S	41 (3)	41.5 (3)	47 (5)	43.5 (5)	2.25 (2)	42 (4)	36.5 (3)	37 (2.5)	42 (3.5)	2.75 (0)
P13	S-R	26 (3)	27.5 (2.5)	29 (2.5)	27.5 (3)	0.75 (0.25)	34 (4)	30.5 (4)	32 (4)	31 (4)	-1.3 (0)
P14	S-R	43.5 (6)	45.5 (6.5)	47.5 (7)	49.5 (7)	5 (0.75)	42 (4)	43 (5)	43 (5)	45 (5)	2.5 (0.5)
P15	R-S	42.5 (4.5)	41 (4)	46 (7)	46 (7)	4.25 (2.75)	37.5 (3)	37 (3)	40 (3.5)	38.5 (3.5)	1.25 (0.5)
P16	R-S	32 (5)	33 (4)	40 (6)	40 (6)	7.5 (1.5)	26.5 (4)	28.5 (2.5)	29 (4)	26.5 (2.5)	-1 (-0.8)
P17	R-S	40 (5)	44 (4)	48.5 (6.5)	49 (6.5)	7 (2)	41.5 (3.5)	42 (5.5)	42 (6.5)	50.5 (7)	8.75 (2.5)
P18	R-S	45 (5)	42 (4)	43 (6)	48.5 (6.5)	5 (2)	46 (5.5)	44 (6)	52 (8)	48 (8.5)	3 (2.75)
P20	S-R	59.5 (7)	60 (7)	60 (7)	60 (7.5)	0.25 (0.5)	58 (6)	57 (6)	57 (6)	57 (7)	-0.5 (1)
P22	R-S	54.5 (6.5)	56 (7)	58 (8)	62 (8)	6.75 (1.25)	55 (6.5)	57.5 (7.5)	57 (8)	55 (7)	-1.3 (0)
P23	S-R	37 (6)	35.5 (5)	39.5 (7.5)	40.5 (8.5)	4.25 (3)	39 (7)	37 (6)	39 (6)	32 (5)	-6 (-1.5)
P25	S-R	60.5 (8.5)	58.5 (8.5)	61 (9)	58.5 (9)	-1 (0.5)	54.5 (7.5)	59 (8)	61 (8.5)	60 (8)	3.25 (0.25)
P26	S-R	64 (8)	64 (8)	64 (8)	64.5 (8.5)	0.5 (0.5)	63 (8)	63 (8)	62 (7)	64.5 (8.5)	1.5 (0.5)

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke


MEAN FMA-UE±SE		36.7±3.3	36.9±3.3	39.7±3.2	40.6±3.2	3.9±0.6	36.7±3.1	36.7±3.1	38±3.2	37.7±3.3	1.0±0.7
MEAN FMA_{WRIST}±SE		3.8±0.6	3.5±0.6	4.7±0.7	5.0±0.6	1.4±0.2	3.8±0.6	3.9±0.6	4.3±0.6	4.1±0.6	0.3±0.2
DROPOUTS											
P9	R	34 (2)	34 (2)	39 (4)	44 (5)	10 (3)					
P19	R	50 (5)	52 (5)	55 (7)	61 (8)	10 (3)					
P21	R	59 (6)	59 (6)	64 (8)	63 (7)	4 (1)					
P6	S						40 (1)	37 (2)	38 (3)	38.5 (3)	0 (1.5)
P11	S						34 (3)	34 (3)	36 (3)	33 (2)	-1 (-1)
P24	S						52 (7)	54.5 (7)	53 (7)	56 (6)	2.75 (-1)
MEAN FMA-UE±SE		47.7±7.3	48.3±7.5	52.7±7.3	56±6.0	8.0±2.0	42.0±5.3	41.8±6.4	42.0±5.4	42.5±6.9	0.6±1.1
MEAN FMA_{WRIST}±SE		4.3±1.2	4.3±1.2	6.3±1.2	6.7±0.9	2.3±0.7	3.7±1.8	4.0±1.5	4.3±1.3	3.7±1.2	-0.2±0.8

309

310 **FMA-UE**: Fugl-Meyer Assessment Upper Extremity Scale; **FMA_{wrist}**: Wrist component of the FMA-UE; **R**: Real tDCS; **S**: Sham tDCS; **SE**: standard error.

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke

311



322 **Figure 3.** A. FMA-UE full and subsection score progress following training. A significant gain from
 323 Familiarization to Retention during the real tDCS (blue lines) session in FMA-UE and the wrist subsection
 324 score, but not in the subsections of the arm (without wrist and hand) nor hand when compared to sham
 325 tDCS session (green lines). B. Individual FMA-UE and wrist score change from Baseline to Retention
 326 following real and sham tDCS. Mean group changes are shown with red dotted lines.

327 Analysis of the FMA_{Wrist} score revealed a similar beneficial effect of real tDCS, as there was a
 328 significant TIME × STIMULATION interaction ($F_{(3, 54)} = 6.197$, corrected $p = 0.005$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.256$, Figure 3A
 329 FMA_{Wrist}). The FMA_{Wrist} showed larger gains after the real tDCS training (1.38 ± 0.23 points) than after the

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke

330 sham tDCS training (0.30 ± 0.23 points). Sixteen out of twenty patients (80%) followed the group trend
331 ($F_{(1, 18)} = 9.455$, $p = 0.007$, Figure 3B right panel).

332 Interestingly, we found that the FMA sub-scores for hand function tended to improve more for
333 real than sham tDCS, even though this trend did not reach statistical significance ($F_{(3, 54)} = 2.021$, corrected
334 $p = 0.149$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.101$, Figure 2A FMA_{Hand}). When wrist and hand items were excluded from the FMA scores,
335 there were only minor, insignificant differences between the real and sham tDCS conditions ($F_{(3, 54)} = 1.202$,
336 corrected $p = 0.318$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.063$, Figure 2A FMA_{Arm}). Thus, combining real tDCS with MCI training that
337 targets the control of wrist extension causes positive effects which are functionally and anatomically
338 specific.

339 Similar patterns of the FMA-UE and FMA_{wrist} score changes were found in the dropout patients.
340 There were no significant difference in FMA-UE scores between the dropouts ($n = 3$ from each group of
341 period 1) and non-dropouts (real tDCS group: $F_{(1, 11)} = 1.436$, $p = 0.256$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.115$; sham tDCS group: $F_{(1, 11)}$
342 $= 0.160$, $p = 0.697$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.014$). Among the patients received real tDCS, there was no significant interaction
343 between TIME \times dropout/non-dropout ($F_{(3, 33)} = 0.104$, $p = 0.957$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.009$); similar result was observed
344 among the patients received sham tDCS ($F_{(3, 33)} = 0.135$, $p = 0.938$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.012$). Similar results were found
345 in the FMA-UE_{wrist} scores. There was neither significant interaction between TIME \times dropout/non-dropout
346 ($F_{(3, 33)} = 0.512$, $p = 0.676$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.045$) among the patients receive real tDCS, nor among the patients
347 received sham tDCS ($F_{(3, 33)} = 0.702$, $p = 0.558$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.060$, Figure 4).


348

349

350

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke

351



357 **Figure 4.** FMA-UE and FMA_{Wrist} score changes between the dropout patients and the non-dropout
 358 patients. Dotted lines represent dropouts, solid lines represent non-dropouts. Blue lines show the real
 359 tDCS training results, green lines show the sham tDCS training results.

360 Furthermore, the improvement in FMA-UE scores following the real tDCS stimulation did not
 361 correlate with the severity of upper extremity dysfunction assessed at baseline (Pearson correlation $r^2 = -$
 362 0.258 , $p = 0.271$). Additionally, neither the improvement in FMA_{Wrist} scores correlate with the baseline
 363 FMA_{Wrist} (Pearson correlation $r^2 = -0.096$, $p = 0.686$). This suggests that the current intervention can be
 364 applied with equal effectiveness to all patients with different levels of impairment in the upper limb.

365 **Secondary task-specific measurements.**

366 1. Isometric training

367 We tested whether our MCI training had a significant effect on the consistency of EMG activity
 368 produced with the ECR during an isometric task as quantified by the CV. Isometric task performance
 369 between real and sham tDCS periods prior to the training was similar ($t_{[19]} = 0.066$, $p = 0.948$). CV values

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke

370 were generally larger at the PRE than the POST measure of each day ($F_{(1, 18)} = 21.249, p < 0.001, \eta_p^2 = 0.541,$
371 Figure 5A). However, this PRE-POST effect did not significantly interact with real versus sham tDCS
372 stimulation ($F_{(1, 18)} = 0.090, p = 0.768, \eta_p^2 = 0.005$). When CV values were averaged between PRE and POST,
373 decreases from Day 1 to Day 3 were significantly larger for the real tDCS training period than the sham
374 tDCS training period as confirmed by a significant DAY \times STIMULATION interaction ($F_{(2, 36)} = 3.689, p =$
375 $0.036, \eta_p^2 = 0.170,$ Figure 5A, solid line). However, no significant differences were found between real tDCS
376 versus sham tDCS training when comparing Day 3 Pre to the retention test ($F_{(1, 18)} = 0.936, p > 0.346, \eta_p^2$
377 $= 0.049,$ Figure 5A), indicating these day-to-day changes in CV were temporary. Both real and sham tDCS
378 groups showed similar CV values during the retention test.

379 2. Dynamic training

380 Dynamic task performance between real and sham tDCS periods was similar during the Pre
381 sessions on training day 1 ($t_{[19]} = 0.483, p = 0.635$).

382 The dynamic task performance improved during both training periods but more so when the
383 training was combined with real tDCS as confirmed by a significant interaction between DAY \times
384 STIMULATION ($F_{(2, 36)} = 3.629, p = 0.044, \eta_p^2 = 0.168,$ Figure 5B). Task performance was partly retained from
385 day 3 to the retention test with overall performance being better during the real tDCS session than the
386 sham tDCS session (STIMULATION main effect showed a trend towards significance, $F_{(1, 18)} = 3.579, p =$
387 $0.075, \eta_p^2 = 0.166$). Additionally, there was a slight performance decline from day 3 to the retention test
388 in both sessions which, however, did not reach significance ($F_{(1, 18)} = 2.762, p = 0.114, \eta_p^2 = 0.133$) nor did
389 the interaction effect ($F_{(1, 18)} = 0.205, p = 0.656, \eta_p^2 = 0.011$).

390

391

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke

392

Motor tasks training results

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411




Figure 5. Comparison between real tDCS sessions (blue) and sham tDCS sessions (green). At the beginning of each session (Day1 Pre), both tasks performance was well matched. Blue and green lines presenting the trend lines over three training days. **A.** A significant interaction between stimulation type and day was observed with more reduction of CV in the real tDCS session. Day 3 Pre was compared to Retention test, and we did not observe a significant difference between the stimulation types. **B.** A significant interaction between stimulation type and day was found with more improved performance in the real tDCS session. Day 3 Post was compared to Retention test, and no significant difference between the stimulation types was observed.

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke

412 Control parameters

413 There were no significant differences in physiotherapy treatment frequency, MMSE score and
414 GDS score between the training periods. Furthermore, self-reported VAS score for discomfort/pain of
415 tDCS was similar between real and sham tDCS training periods (Table 3).

416 **Table 3.** Physiotherapy frequency, MMSE score, GDS score and Self-reported VAS score for
417 discomfort/pain of tDCS.

	Physiotherapy frequency (sessions during intervention)	MMSE score	GDS score	Discomfort/pain rating for tDCS		
				Day 1	Day 2	Day 3
Real tDCS	0.8±0.2	28.0±0.4	9.0±1.5	2.4±0.6	2.0±0.5	1.6±0.4
Sham tDCS	0.7±0.2	28.0±0.4	9.7±1.4	1.5±0.4	1.2±0.3	1.6±0.3
Z value	-0.31	-0.21	-0.14	-.1.73	-1.50	-0.57
p value	0.76	0.83	0.89	0.08	0.13	0.57

418

419 Patients reported a higher level of fatigue at the end compared to the beginning of a training day
420 (Table 4) as indicated by a significant TIME effect ($F_{(1, 18)} = 42.997, p < 0.001, \eta_p^2 = 0.705$). However, the
421 general fatigue level decreased significantly over days, suggesting that participants adapted to the training
422 regime (significant DAY main effect: $F_{(2, 36)} = 5.306, p = 0.013, \eta_p^2 = 0.228$). There was neither a
423 STIMULATION main effect ($F_{(1, 18)} = 0.055, p = 0.818, \eta_p^2 = 0.003$) nor an interaction including STIMULATION
424 ($p \geq 0.146$).

425 The self-reported attention score did significantly increase over the training days ($F_{(2, 36)} = 7.742,$
426 $p = 0.002, \eta_p^2 = 0.301$, Table 4), indicating that patients were more engaged in the motor tasks.

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke

427 Finally, patients' pain ratings for the paretic wrist were generally low as they were in a chronic phase and
428 not experiencing pain. For perceived pain during the training, there were neither significant differences
429 between the real and sham tDCS training ($F_{(1, 18)} = 2.236$, $p = 1.52$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.110$), nor an interaction between
430 STIMULATION and DAY ($F_{(2, 36)} = 0.378$, $p = 0.621$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.021$, Table 4).

431 **Table 4.** Self-reported VAS score for overall fatigue level, general attention level and pain in the wrist.

Real tDCS training						
	Day1		Day2		Day 3	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Fatigue	2.330.74	4.78±0.61	0.85±0.34	3.10±0.43	1.35±0.44	3.10±0.48
Attention	6.80±0.37	6.63±0.38	7.70±0.33	7.88±0.30	7.93±0.37	7.40±0.42
Pain in the wrist	0.55±0.29	0.40±0.22	0.25±0.20	0.50±0.26	0.20±0.20	0.83±0.33
Sham tDCS training						
Fatigue	1.73±0.43	4.13±0.59	1.25±0.42	4.05±0.57	1.00±0.40	3.98±0.56
Attention	7.25±0.49	7.38±0.50	7.28±0.40	7.68±0.46	7.75±0.46	7.93±0.40
Pain in the wrist	1.15±0.47	0.83±0.37	0.78±0.36	0.60±0.25	0.58±0.24	1.00±0.38

432

433 **Other functional assessments.**

434 MRC scores significantly increased over the training course ($F_{(3, 54)} = 6.900$, $p = 0.002$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.277$);
435 however, neither the STIMULATION main effect ($F_{(1, 18)} = 0.230$, $p = 0.637$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.013$) nor the TIME ×
436 STIMULATION interaction ($F_{(3, 54)} = 0.441$, $p = 0.689$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.024$) was significant, indicating that MCI tasks
437 training in general led to wrist muscle strength gain, but not specific to tDCS conditions.

438 Additionally, the active wrist extension angle in the paretic wrist increased significantly over the
439 training course TIME ($F_{(3, 51)} = 14.941$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.468$, Table 5). Although a larger increase was
440 observed after the real tDCS training, it was not significant when compared to the sham tDCS training

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke

441 (STIMULATION main effect: $F_{(1, 17)} = 0.124$, $p = 0.729$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.007$, TIME \times STIMULATION interaction: $F_{(3, 54)}$
 442 = 1.539, $p = 0.230$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.083$, Table 5). This suggested that our training may enhance the specific wrist
 443 extension function. However, it was unclear whether this improvement is dependent on the tDCS
 444 stimulation. Note, due to equipment preparing problem, we did not collect the active wrist extension
 445 angle data from first patient's first training period.

446 Finally, there was no significant change of MAS spasticity scores in the wrist over the training
 447 course (DAY main effect: $F_{(3, 54)} = 0.440$, $p = 0.689$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.024$), nor due to the tDCS intervention
 448 (STIMULATION main effect: $F_{(1, 18)} = 0.947$, $p = 0.343$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.050$, TIME \times STIMULATION interaction: $F_{(3, 54)}$
 449 = 0.934, $p = 0.419$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.049$, Table 5), indicating our training has no effect on changing spasticity level
 450 of the wrist in chronic stroke patients.

451 **Table 5.** Profiles of MRC, active wrist extension angle and MAS score. All scores were measured from the
 452 paretic wrist. MRC was measured for wrist extensor; MAS was measured for wrist flexor.

Real tDCS training				
	<i>Fam</i>	<i>Day1</i>	<i>Day3</i>	<i>Rt</i>
MRC	3.05±0.25	3.06±0.24	3.28±0.22	3.33±0.21
Active wrist extension angle	38.16±6.24	38.55±6.33	45.92±5.81	43.68±5.58
MAS	0.78±0.20	1.03±0.20	1.03±0.21	0.90±0.22
Sham tDCS training				
MRC	2.99±0.25	3.05±0.26	3.18±0.25	3.18±0.25
Active wrist extension angle	41.50±6.12	43.25±6.23	46.38±6.30	44.50±6.16
MAS	1.13±0.20	1.08±0.23	1.08±0.20	1.08±0.19

453 DISCUSSION

454 In this double-blind, sham-controlled, cross-over clinical study, we tested the feasibility of a novel
455 intervention using bihemispheric tDCS in combination with MCI tasks for upper limb rehabilitation in
456 chronic stroke patients. We observed significant improvement in upper limb motor function after applying
457 our three-day training paradigm. Our findings suggest that tDCS combined with MCI motor tasks targeting
458 the paretic wrist was beneficial for reducing impairment in the wrist. Such a training also demonstrated a
459 transfer effect on both proximal and distal parts of the arm, leading to a significant change on FMA-UE
460 and FMA-UE wrist subsection score. This suggests that tDCS can be used as an adjuvant to facilitate
461 sensorimotor recovery after stroke when it is combined with a task that challenges patients to control
462 their voluntary drive to the target muscle groups.

463 ***MCI training in stroke rehabilitation.*** Our motor tasks were based on EMG activity in the paretic
464 wrist extensor. Two types of MCI tasks were introduced in this study: isometric and dynamic. The isometric
465 task required patients to perform an isometric contraction of the muscle in a static position and is mainly
466 beneficial for improving steady muscle control. Wrist stability is especially essential for severe stroke
467 patients to regain hand function, such as grasping ^(6, 7). In contrast, the dynamic task requires more
468 dynamic, visually-guided fine control of the wrist muscle and places greater emphasis on dynamic force
469 control which could provide better support for finger control and object manipulation ⁽²⁾. Training on both
470 the isometric and dynamic tasks was necessary for obtaining a functional improvement.

471 In our study, patients received online visual feedback indicating the level of EMG activity in the
472 paretic wrist extensor which provided salient feedback regarding their motor state. We chose this
473 approach because MCI training enables voluntary control of the wrist muscles even in patients with only
474 minimal EMG activities. Notably, the training was inherently progressive because maximal muscle activity
475 levels were measured at the beginning of each testing day. In this study, we were especially interested in
476 moderately and severely impaired chronic patients, more than half of the patients (15/26 patients FMA-

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke

477 UE scored <40) were classified as severe and moderate⁽³⁴⁾). We only recruited patients with a maximum
478 FMA_{Wrist} score of 8 out of 10. We allocated a similar number of severely (FMA_{Wrist} ≤ 4) and moderately
479 (FMA_{Wrist} > 4) impaired patients in two training groups and all patients could perform the training. To
480 further investigate the influence of wrist impairment level on functional improvement, we conducted a
481 correlation analysis between the improvement of functional score and the initial functional level and did
482 not observe a correlation. This suggests that our MCI training can be applied to a large range of stroke
483 patients. Our findings are in line with previous literature which applied MCI training to the elbow joint^{(19,}
484 ²⁴⁾ and showed effects on improving upper limb function and range of motion. Our study supports the use
485 of MCI training to the wrist joint to improve both proximal and distal arm function. Demonstrating the
486 immediate beneficial effect of wrist extension training via MCI in stroke patients increases their
487 motivation towards rehabilitation.

488 How does the MCI approach promote improved functional recovery? To produce well-controlled
489 voluntary muscle activity, the brain requires salient and reliable feedback. Computational work postulates
490 that the brain plans, executes, and corrects movements following the intended sensory consequences of
491 the action⁽³⁵⁾. Even though the brain can predict the expected sensory consequences based on an
492 efference copy of the motor command, this prediction needs to be updated via sensory afferents,
493 particularly when dexterous control is required. This basic sensorimotor loop is often impaired in severely
494 to moderately affected stroke patients, either because of damage to the sensory system or because
495 muscle activity of the paretic hand is too weak to produce salient afferent feedback. Thus, enhancing task-
496 relevant sensory signals via EMG feedback allows stroke patients to regain control over their sensorimotor
497 system which is the basis for effective rehabilitation training. The specific task demands for actively
498 performing isometric and dynamic MCI tasks may have contributed to brain functional network
499 reorganization and reconfiguration, leading to motor recovery in chronic stroke patients⁽³⁶⁾. In fact, we
500 observed not only patients' FMA score had a significant increase, but also improvement in MRC rating and

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke

501 active wrist extension angle. These findings indicating that our MCI tasks are effective and have potential
502 to use as an effective tool for stroke rehabilitation.

503 ***TDCS facilitates functional recovery of upper limb function in chronic stroke patients.*** Although
504 motor performance in the paretic upper limb improved in both intervention periods, the addition of
505 bihemispheric tDCS (anode over the ipsilesional hemisphere) led to greater functional improvement in
506 most patients. Combining MCI training of the wrist extensor with tDCS resulted on average in a gain of
507 3.85 ± 0.58 points on the FMA-UE score (from baseline to retention). By contrast, performing the same
508 training with sham stimulation resulted in a significantly lower gain of 0.96 ± 0.72 points on FMA-UE. The
509 FMA-UE increase in the real tDCS period was a large effect as indicated by $\eta_p^2 = 0.219$ with observed power
510 of 0.898. Although the gain in the real tDCS group did not exceed the minimally clinically important
511 difference (5.25 points according to Page et al., 2012 (37)), we observed that the majority of the patients
512 (70%) showed more increased FMA-UE score in the real tDCS period when compared to the sham tDCS
513 period. This is a remarkable finding given that the patients participated only in three training sessions and
514 that it focused selectively on the wrist extensor^(38, 39).

515 A meta-analysis estimated a medium effect of tDCS on reducing motor impairment of stroke
516 patients when applied together with rehabilitation training⁽⁴⁰⁾. Our study found that applying tDCS
517 together with MCI training targeting wrist extension generated a large effect. This might have resulted
518 from the cross-over design which, on the one hand, reduces individual differences in response to tDCS⁽⁴¹⁾.
519 On the other hand, however, we observed a bigger effect of tDCS when applied during the first than during
520 the second intervention period, despite a long wash-out period of 8-12 months. This is consistent with
521 previous findings that the most prominent functional gains were found after the first bihemispheric tDCS
522 intervention⁽⁴²⁾. TDCS also had a beneficial effect on secondary outcome measurements. In the isometric
523 MCI training, CV decreased due to practice and this effect was significantly larger when patients received

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke

524 real tDCS. This suggests that the training improved force modulation, a function encoded in M1 for which
525 tDCS is beneficial ^(33, 43-45). There was a small effect of tDCS on the dynamic task which is in line with a
526 previously reported beneficial effect of tDCS on motor learning ⁽⁴¹⁾. Our finding supports that tDCS has a
527 positive effect on strength and precision control in chronic stroke patients ^(46, 47).

528 **Limitations of our study.** Our motor training was provided for three consecutive days, and the
529 retention test was only performed at one-week post-training. To reach optimal functional improvement,
530 a longer intervention protocol should be implemented, and multiple retention tests should be added.
531 Moreover, the daily training structure and duration were fixed. It was challenging for some patients
532 especially the severely impaired patients to undergo the whole training. The tDCS montage in our study
533 is less focal, new types of montages have been proposed such as HD-tDCS and CE-tDCS ⁽⁴⁸⁾, future studies
534 could consider the lesion location and design customized tDCS montage in order to archive the optimal
535 results. Furthermore, this proof-of-concept study investigated a rather small sample, proper randomised
536 controlled clinical trials are needed. Lastly, we only used the FMA-UE as a functional measurement, future
537 studies might need to include more clinical tests, such as Action Research Arm Test (ART) and Box and
538 Block Test (BBT).

539 **Conclusion.** Combining bihemispheric tDCS and MCI that provides salient sensory feedback for
540 muscle-specific motor training resulted in improvement in upper limb motor recovery in chronic stroke
541 patients. Importantly, our experimental setup was feasible for stroke patients with various motor
542 impairment severity levels.

543

544

545

546 DATA AVAILABILITY

547 Data for this study are openly available on the Open Science Framework.

548 https://osf.io/nr8pe/?view_only=

549 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

550 We would like to thank all participants for their participation in this study. Xue Zhang was a pre-
551 doctoral fellow of the Flanders Fund for Scientific Research. This research was supported by the Flanders
552 Fund for Scientific Research (Project G. 0758.10) and the Future Health Technologies programme which
553 was established collaboratively between ETH Zurich and the National Research Foundation Singapore.
554 The programme is supported by the National Research Foundation, Prime Minister's Office, Singapore
555 under its Campus for Research Excellence and Technological Enterprise (CREATE) programme.

556 GRANTS

557 Flanders Fund for Scientific Research, Project G. 0758.10 and National Research Foundation Singapore.

558 DISCLOSURES

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

561 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

562 X.Zhang, R. Meesen, N.Wenderoth: Conceived and designed research

563 X.Zhang & D.Woolley: performed experiments.

564 X.Zhang, D. Woolley, H.Cheng: analyzed data,

565 X.Zhang, H.Cheng, N. Wenderoth interpreted results of experiments,

566 X.Zhang & H.Cheng: prepared figures

567 X.Zhang & D.Woolley drafted manuscript.

568 X.Zhang, R.Meesen, S.Swinnen, H.Feys, H.Cheng, N.Wenderoth edited and revised manuscript,

569 X.Zhang, R.Meesen, S.Swinnen, H.Feys, D. Woolley, H.Cheng, N.Wenderoth approved final version of
570 manuscript.

571 REFERENCES

- 572 1. **Kolominsky-Rabas PL, Weber M, Gefeller O, Neundoerfer B, and Heuschmann PU.**
573 Epidemiology of ischemic stroke subtypes according to TOAST criteria: incidence, recurrence, and long-
574 term survival in ischemic stroke subtypes: a population-based study. *Stroke; a journal of cerebral*
575 *circulation* 32: 2735-2740, 2001.
- 576 2. **Nijland RH, van Wegen EE, Harmeling-van der Wel BC, Kwakkel G, and Early Prediction**
577 **of Functional Outcome After Stroke I.** Accuracy of physical therapists' early predictions of upper-limb
578 function in hospital stroke units: the EPOS Study. *Physical therapy* 93: 460-469, 2013.
- 579 3. **Raghavan P, Santello M, Gordon AM, and Krakauer JW.** Compensatory motor control after
580 stroke: an alternative joint strategy for object-dependent shaping of hand posture. *J Neurophysiol* 103:
581 3034-3043, 2010.
- 582 4. **Raghavan P.** Upper limb motor impairment after stroke. *Phys Med Rehabil Clin N Am* 26: 599-
583 610, 2015.
- 584 5. **Franck JA, Smeets R, and Seelen HAM.** Changes in actual arm-hand use in stroke patients during
585 and after clinical rehabilitation involving a well-defined arm-hand rehabilitation program: A prospective
586 cohort study. *PLoS One* 14: e0214651, 2019.
- 587 6. **Lambelet C, Lyu M, Woolley D, Gassert R, and Wenderoth N.** The eWrist - A wearable wrist
588 exoskeleton with sEMG-based force control for stroke rehabilitation. In: *2017 International conference on*
589 *Rehabilitation Robotics (ICORR)*. London, UK: IEEE, 2017.
- 590 7. **Lambelet C, Temiraliuly D, Siegenthaler M, Wirth M, Woolley DG, Lamercy O, Gassert R,**
591 **and Wenderoth N.** Characterization and wearability evaluation of a fully portable wrist exoskeleton for
592 unsupervised training after stroke. *J Neuroeng Rehabil* 17: 132, 2020.
- 593 8. **Nitsche MA, and Paulus W.** Excitability changes induced in the human motor cortex by weak
594 transcranial direct current stimulation. *The Journal of physiology* 527 Pt 3: 633-639, 2000.
- 595 9. **Nitsche MA, and Paulus W.** Sustained excitability elevations induced by transcranial DC motor
596 cortex stimulation in humans. *Neurology* 57: 1899-1901, 2001.
- 597 10. **Vestito L, Rosellini S, Mantero M, and Bandini F.** Long-term effects of transcranial direct-
598 current stimulation in chronic post-stroke aphasia: A pilot study. *Front Hum Neurosci* 8: 785, 2014.
- 599 11. **Alisar DC, Ozen S, and Sozay S.** Effects of bihemispheric transcranial direct current stimulation
600 on upper extremity function in stroke patients: A randomized double-blind sham-controlled study. *J Stroke*
601 *Cerebrovasc Dis* 29: 104454, 2020.
- 602 12. **Mordillo-Mateos L, Turpin-Fenoll L, Millan-Pascual J, Nunez-Perez N, Panyavin I, Gomez-**
603 **Arguelles JM, Botia-Paniagua E, Foffani G, Lang N, and Oliviero A.** Effects of simultaneous bilateral
604 tDCS of the human motor cortex. *Brain Stimul* 5: 214-222, 2012.
- 605 13. **Hummel FC, and Cohen LG.** Non-invasive brain stimulation: a new strategy to improve
606 neurorehabilitation after stroke? *Lancet neurology* 5: 708-712, 2006.

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke

- 607 14. **Zhang X, Woolley DG, Swinnen SP, Feys H, Meesen R, and Wenderoth N.** Changes in
608 corticomotor excitability and intracortical inhibition of the primary motor cortex forearm area induced by
609 anodal tDCS. *PLoS One* 9: e101496, 2014.
- 610 15. **Chowdhury A, Ramadas R, and Karmakar S.** Muscle computer interface: A review. In:
611 *ICoRD'13*2013, p. 411-421.
- 612 16. **Wright ZA, Rymer WZ, and Slutzky MW.** Reducing abnormal muscle coactivation after stroke
613 using a myoelectric-computer interface: A pilot study. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* 28: 443-451, 2014.
- 614 17. **Saponas TS, Tan DS, Morris D, and Balakrishnan R.** Demonstrating the feasibility of using
615 forearm electromyography for muscle-computer interfaces. In: *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on*
616 *Human Factors in Computing Systems*. Florence, Italy: Association for Computing Machinery, 2008, p.
617 515–524.
- 618 18. **Wright ZA, Rymer WZ, and Slutzky MW.** Myoelectric computer interfaces to reduce co-
619 contraction after stroke. *Annu Int Conf IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc* 2012: 879-882, 2012.
- 620 19. **Mugler EM, Tomic G, Singh A, Hameed S, Lindberg EW, Gaide J, Alqadi M, Robinson E,**
621 **Dalzotto K, Limoli C, Jacobson T, Lee J, and Slutzky MW.** Myoelectric computer interface training for
622 reducing co-activation and enhancing arm movement in chronic stroke survivors: A randomized trial.
623 *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* 33: 284-295, 2019.
- 624 20. **Beets IA, Mace M, Meesen RL, Cuyper K, Levin O, and Swinnen SP.** Active versus passive
625 training of a complex bimanual task: Is prescriptive proprioceptive information sufficient for inducing
626 motor learning? *PLoS One* 7: e37687, 2012.
- 627 21. **Marin-Pardo O, Laine CM, Rennie M, Ito KL, Finley J, and Liew SL.** A virtual reality muscle-
628 computer interface for neurorehabilitation in chronic stroke: A pilot study. *Sensors (Basel)* 20: 2020.
- 629 22. **Dewantoro TB, Sigit R, Yuniarti H, Prawitri YD, Pamudyaningrum FA, and Awal MI.**
630 Implementation of Myo armband on mobile application for post-stroke patient hand rehabilitation. In:
631 *International Conference on Electrical Engineering Computer Science and Informatics (EECSI)*. Malang,
632 Indonesia: Institute of Advanced Engineering and Science, 2019.
- 633 23. **Hasan HN.** A wearable rehabilitation system to assist partially hand paralyzed patients in repetitive
634 exercises. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* 1279: 012040, 2019.
- 635 24. **Hung N-T, Paul V, Prakash P, Kovach T, Tacy G, Tomic G, Park S, Jacobson T, Jampol A,**
636 **Patel P, Chappel A, King E, and Slutzky MW.** Wearable myoelectric interface enables high-dose, home-
637 based training in severely impaired chronic stroke survivors. *Annals of Clinical and Translational*
638 *Neurology* 8: 1895-1905, 2021.
- 639 25. **Council MR.** *Aids to the Examination of the Peripheral Nervous System*. London, UK: Pengragon
640 House, 1975.
- 641 26. **James MA.** Use of the Medical Research Council muscle strength grading system in the upper
642 extremity. *J Hand Surg Am* 32: 154-156, 2007.

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke

- 643 27. **Rech KD, Salazar AP, Marchese RR, Schifino G, Cimolin V, and Pagnussat AS.** Fugl-Meyer
644 assessment scores are related with kinematic measures in people with chronic hemiparesis after stroke. *J*
645 *Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis* 29: 2020.
- 646 28. **Li F, Wu Y, and Li X.** Test-retest reliability and inter-rater reliability of the Modified Tardieu
647 Scale and the Modified Ashworth Scale in hemiplegic patients with stroke. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med* 50: 9-
648 15, 2014.
- 649 29. **Folstein MF, Folstein SE, and McHugh PR.** "Mini-mental state". A practical method for grading
650 the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *J Psychiatr Res* 12: 189-198, 1975.
- 651 30. **Oldfield RC.** The assessment and analysis of handedness: The Edinburgh inventory. *Neuropsychologia* 9: 97-113, 1971.
- 653 31. **Sheikh JI, and Yesavage JA.** Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS): Recent evidence and
654 development of a shorter version. *Clinical Gerontologist: The Journal of Aging and Mental Health* 5: 165-
655 173, 1986.
- 656 32. **Reips UD, and Funke F.** Interval-level measurement with visual analogue scales in Internet-based
657 research: VAS Generator. *Behavior research methods* 40: 699-704, 2008.
- 658 33. **Reis J, Schambra HM, Cohen LG, Buch ER, Fritsch B, Zarahn E, Celnik PA, and Krakauer**
659 **JW.** Noninvasive cortical stimulation enhances motor skill acquisition over multiple days through an effect
660 on consolidation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 106: 1590-1595, 2009.
- 661 34. **Woytowicz EJ, Rietschel JC, Goodman RN, Conroy SS, Sorkin JD, Whitall J, and McCombe**
662 **Waller S.** Determining levels of upper extremity movement impairment by applying a cluster analysis to
663 the Fugl-Meyer Assessment of the Upper Extremity in chronic stroke. *Archives of Physical Medicine and*
664 *Rehabilitation* 98: 456-462, 2017.
- 665 35. **Franklin DW, and Wolpert DM.** Computational mechanisms of sensorimotor control. *Neuron* 72:
666 425-442, 2011.
- 667 36. **Cheng HJ, Ng KK, Qian X, Ji F, Lu ZK, Teo WP, Hong X, Nasrallah FA, Ang KK, Chuang**
668 **KH, Guan C, Yu H, Chew E, and Zhou JH.** Task-related brain functional network reconfigurations relate
669 to motor recovery in chronic subcortical stroke. *Sci Rep* 11: 8442, 2021.
- 670 37. **Page SJ, Fulk GD, and Boyne P.** Clinically important differences for the upper-extremity Fugl-
671 Meyer Scale in people with minimal to moderate impairment due to chronic stroke. *Phys Ther* 92: 791-798,
672 2012.
- 673 38. **Hesse S, Werner C, Schonhardt EM, Bardeleben A, Jenrich W, and Kirker SG.** Combined
674 transcranial direct current stimulation and robot-assisted arm training in subacute stroke patients: a pilot
675 study. *Restorative neurology and neuroscience* 25: 9-15, 2007.
- 676 39. **Hesse S, Waldner A, Mehrholz J, Tomelleri C, Pohl M, and Werner C.** Combined transcranial
677 direct current stimulation and robot-assisted arm training in subacute stroke patients: an exploratory,
678 randomized multicenter trial. *Neurorehabilitation and neural repair* 25: 838-846, 2011.

Muscle computer interface and tDCS in stroke

- 679 40. **Kang N, Summers JJ, and Cauraugh JH.** Transcranial direct current stimulation facilitates motor
680 learning post-stroke: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery*
681 *& Psychiatry* 87: 345, 2016.
- 682 41. **Lefebvre S, and Liew S-L.** Anatomical parameters of tDCS to modulate the motor system after
683 stroke: A review. *Frontiers in Neurology* 8: 2017.
- 684 42. **Lindenberg R, Zhu LL, and Schlaug G.** Combined central and peripheral stimulation to facilitate
685 motor recovery after stroke: the effect of number of sessions on outcome. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* 26:
686 479-483, 2012.
- 687 43. **Saucedo Marquez CM, Zhang X, Swinnen SP, Meesen R, and Wenderoth N.** Task-specific
688 effect of transcranial direct current stimulation on motor learning. *Front Hum Neurosci* 7: 333, 2013.
- 689 44. **Reis J, Fischer JT, Prichard G, Weiller C, Cohen LG, and Fritsch B.** Time- but Not Sleep-
690 Dependent Consolidation of tDCS-Enhanced Visuomotor Skills. *Cerebral cortex* 2013.
- 691 45. **Waters-Metenier S, Husain M, Wiestler T, and Diedrichsen J.** Bihemispheric transcranial direct
692 current stimulation enhances effector-independent representations of motor synergy and sequence learning.
693 *The Journal of neuroscience : the official journal of the Society for Neuroscience* 34: 1037-1050, 2014.
- 694 46. **Bolognini N, Vallar G, Casati C, Latif LA, El-Nazer R, Williams J, Banco E, Macea DD, Tesio**
695 **L, Chessa C, and Fregni F.** Neurophysiological and behavioral effects of tDCS combined with constraint-
696 induced movement therapy in poststroke patients. *Neurorehabilitation and neural repair* 25: 819-829, 2011.
- 697 47. **Lefebvre S, Thonnard JL, Laloux P, Peeters A, Jamart J, and Vandermeeren Y.** Single session
698 of dual-tDCS transiently improves precision grip and dexterity of the paretic hand after stroke.
699 *Neurorehabilitation and neural repair* 28: 100-110, 2014.
- 700 48. **Bortoletto M, Rodella C, Salvador R, Miranda PC, and Miniussi C.** Reduced current spread by
701 concentric electrodes in transcranial electrical stimulation (tES). *Brain Stimul* 9: 525-528, 2016.

702