

# Exploring Motor Imagery as a Therapeutic Intervention for Parkinson's Disease Patients: A Scoping Review

1 **Maxime Michel<sup>1</sup>, Elena Terragno<sup>1</sup>, Matthieu Bereau<sup>2</sup>, Eloi Magnin<sup>2</sup>, Nicolas Gueugneau<sup>3\*</sup>,**  
2 **Antonio Vinicius Soares<sup>1,2,4</sup>, Yoshimasa Sagawa<sup>1,2</sup>**

3

4 <sup>1</sup>Department of Rehabilitation Science, University of Franche-Comte, F-25000, Besançon, France.

5 <sup>2</sup>Integrative and Clinical Neurosciences UMR 1322 INSERM, University of Franche-Comte,  
6 Besançon, France.

7 <sup>3</sup>ERCOS Group, ELLIADD Laboratory EA4661, UTBM University of Franche-Comte University,  
8 F-25000, Besançon, France.

9 <sup>4</sup>University of Joinville Region, Joinville, Brazil.

## 10 \* Correspondence:

11 Corresponding Author: Nicolas Gueugneau

12 nicolas.gueugneau@univ-fcomte.fr

13 **Keywords: Parkinson's Disease, Motor Imagery Therapy, Mental Practice, Neurorehabilitation.**

## 14 Abstract

15 **Background:** Motor Imagery (MI) has emerged as a promising therapeutic approach in the  
16 rehabilitation of individuals with Parkinson's Disease (PD). MI entails mentally rehearsing motor  
17 actions without physically executing them. This cognitive process has garnered attention due to its  
18 potential benefits in aiding motor function recovery in PD patients. Its role in complementing  
19 traditional treatment approaches is likely to reverberate throughout clinical practice. This study strives  
20 to provide a comprehensive examination several MI protocols designed for individuals with PD. The  
21 focus was to underscore the outcomes observed across motor symptoms, balance, gait, and quality of  
22 life. **Methods:** A literature search was carried out in the following databases: Medline, Embase,  
23 Cochrane, and PEDro, from the first publication to February 2024. Study with at least one keyword in  
24 relation to PD and MI in the title were included. **Results:** Of the 262 studies 53 were included. Twelve  
25 RCTs with a mean PEDro score of 6.6/10 and 41 descriptive and non-RCT studies. Among the RCTs,  
26 there were almost exclusively MI on balance, gait, and lower limbs exercise. They found an 85.2%  
27 improvement for the experimental group on the TUG with a cognitive task ( $p < 0.02$ ), 5.8% on the TUG  
28 ( $p < 0.05$ ), a 5.1% improvement in walking speed ( $p < 0.05$ ), other variables did not show significant  
29 improvement. For the descriptive and non-RCTs studies, there were various tasks and outcomes for  
30 the lower and upper limbs. It was shown that there was no difference in execution time in MI between  
31 patients with PD and HS, while in ME patients with PD were slower. For the upper limb, several tasks  
32 were proposed, such as thumb opposition, joystick movements and writing tasks with variable results.  
33 RCTs were more focused on balance, lower limb and walking, there was no specific outcome for the  
34 upper limb and speech. The heterogeneity of the tasks and outcomes across all included studies is also  
35 a limitation. **Conclusion:** To summarize, the current research on walking disorders in PD shows  
36 promise, but further investigations are crucial, particularly with an emphasis on upper limb function  
37 and speech. A need exists for studies with larger sample sizes, utilizing precise methodologies, and  
38 specifically targeting these areas to enhance our comprehension of the potential advantages of MI in  
39 the context of comprehensive PD rehabilitation.

## 40 1 Introduction

41 Parkinson's disease (PD) is the second most common neurodegenerative disorder after Alzheimer's  
42 disease and a major cause of disability in the elderly. The prevalence of patients with PD is expected  
43 to double between 2015 and 2030, particularly due to the aging of the population (1). Indeed, age is  
44 the main risk factor for this pathology (2). PD is caused by loss of dopaminergic neurons and causes  
45 motor and non-motor symptoms (2,3). The three notable motor symptoms are akinesia, rest tremor  
46 and rigidity (2-10) whereas the non-motor symptoms include sleep disorders, depression, and digestive  
47 disorders (11). PD affects sensorimotor functions as walking, balance, posture and have a negative  
48 impact on patient's independency and societal participation (12).

49 Different treatments exist in PD, such as pharmacological treatments based on dopamine and its  
50 derived which is the most common one (4). While levodopa is widely recognised as the most effective  
51 medication for treating the motor symptoms, there are other medications such as monoamine oxidase  
52 type B inhibitors, amantadine, anticholinergics,  $\beta$ -blockers, or dopamine agonists. Its utilisation is  
53 conditioned by the symptoms expressed by the patient (13). Although this treatment is the most used,  
54 side effects as dyskinesias and motor complications can be observed (14). This is one of the main  
55 reasons as other forms of symptomatic treatment were researched. Among non-pharmacological  
56 treatments, physiotherapy has shown beneficial effects in the management of PD (5). Recent studies  
57 have been showing positive effects on motor symptoms (5), quality of life (15), walking and balance  
58 (5,16,17).

59 Among the physiotherapy's techniques, motor imagery (MI) was proposed more than 30 years ago as  
60 a potential tool of rehabilitation (18). It is defined as a mental process where a person make a mental  
61 simulation of a motor act without making any movement (7,8). This approach relies on the premise  
62 that MI and actual motor execution elicit activation in overlapping brain areas (19). Consequently,  
63 enhancing the engagement of motor regions in the brain (9) is a central objective of this technique.

64 The MI, a recently developed approach for the rehabilitation of patients with PD, is supported and  
65 promoted for implementation in rehabilitation protocols as a promising approach (6,20,21). Some  
66 studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of MI combined to physiotherapy on patients with PD  
67 (6,22). The MI can be performed from first person or a third person's perspective (7,23), and can be  
68 used for different modalities such as upper limb, lower limb, walking, and others. Also, there are  
69 numerous protocols with distinct sensorimotor tasks. (24-29): e.g. goal-directed task and Box and  
70 Block Test (BBT) (26), MI of walking along a straight course (24), MI of walking forward, backward

71 and turning (25). Considering these different modalities of MI, the choice of the best MI protocol for  
72 a clinical application seems difficult; how a MI protocol should be conducted and how benefits should  
73 be expected. Only one study proposes a framework for motivational interviewing MI aimed at aiding  
74 physiotherapists in integrating MI into their clinical practice (27). Aligned with the imperative to  
75 optimize the clinical use of MI as a rehabilitation tool MI, this scoping review sought to achieve two  
76 primary objectives. Firstly, it aimed to provide a comprehensive summary of the diverse protocols of  
77 MI designed for patients with Parkinson's Disease (PD), with the goal of offering guidance and  
78 facilitating their application in clinical practice. Secondly, the review aimed to highlight the key  
79 findings observed in these studies concerning motor symptoms, balance, gait, and quality of life.

## 80 **2 Materials and Methods**

81 This review was conducted in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review  
82 and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) guidelines (Annex I). According  
83 with our previous research, to date, there is no scoping review existing on this subject.

### 84 **2.1 Data sources and searches**

85 Prospective research was carried out on four different databases: MEDLINE (PubMed), Embase,  
86 Cochrane (Cochrane library) and PEDro from the first publication until February 2024. To select  
87 relevant articles, the follow keywords and operators were used: "Parkinson disease"\* OR "Parkinson  
88 Disease" OR "Parkinson's disease"\* AND "motor imagery"\* OR "motor imagery practice"\* OR  
89 "mental practice"\*. To improve exhaustiveness of potential articles included, the search was conducted  
90 with Medical Subject Heading (MeSH) terms and non-MeSH terms (identified by an asterisk).

### 91 **2.2 Study selection**

92 Firstly, all articles with at least one keyword in relation to PD and MI in the title were included in this  
93 phase. Duplicated articles were removed.

94 The eligibility criteria (Figure 1) for this phase of selection were applied to titles and abstracts of the  
95 articles. Exclusion criteria were articles that are neither in English nor in French, feasibility and pilot  
96 study, conference abstract, articles that do not focus on the specific effectiveness of MI. Full text was  
97 directly reviewed with eligibility criteria when abstract did not provide sufficient information. Then,  
98 eligibility criteria were applied to full text.

99

## 100           **2.3 Data extraction and quality assessment**

101 For this review, articles were selected and read by two reviewers (MM and ET). Disagreements in this  
102 phase were resolved by consulting a third evaluator (YS).

103 Methodological quality of the randomised controlled studies (RCTs) was assessed with PEDro scale.  
104 This is an 11-item scale. It is used to assessed external validity (criterion 1), internal validity (criterion  
105 2 to 9) and interpretability of the findings (criterion 10 and 11) of a clinical trial or group comparison  
106 study. The PEDro scale scored in 10 points (0 very poor methodological quality 10 excellent  
107 methodological quality).

## 108           **2.4 Data synthesis and analysis**

109 Reviewers extracted the following key data for each article: type of study, population characteristics,  
110 inclusion/exclusion criteria, intervention/protocol, variable of interest and PEDro score. Mean ( $\pm$ SD)  
111 values for all variables, *p* values and modification in percentage (comparisons among interventions,  
112 groups) were collected.

# 113   **3 RESULTS AND COMMENTS**

## 114           **3.1 Selection of articles**

115 Figure 2 presents the article selection process of this review. From the 4 databases combined, 262  
116 articles were identified. Fifty-three of these articles were included, with 12 RCTs and 41 non-RCTs  
117 and descriptive studies.

118 Methodological quality as assessed by the mean PEDro score for RCTs was 6.6/10, only one was  
119 lowest than 3/10 (30). Eligibility criteria, random allocation, baseline intragroup similarity and between  
120 group statistical comparison were respected for all studies. Subjects and therapists blinding were not  
121 respected for all RCTs.

## 122           **3.2 RCT: effects of MI intervention**

### 123           **3.2.1 Participants characteristics**

124 The characteristics of RCTs are presented in Table 1. Participant's characteristics were based on  
125 diagnosis of PD. The mean (SD) number of participants per study was 29.9 ( $\pm$ 10.5) with a mean age  
126 of 66.2 ( $\pm$ 8.3) years old. Groups were composed on average of 30.7% women and 69.3% men. Mean  
127 (SD) Hoehn and Yahr (H&Y) score was 2.2 (0.5) with the off-phase score taken when it was specified.

128 Most studies had as inclusion criteria a H&Y score  $\leq 3$  (23-25,31,32,34-38) except for Sarasso et al.  
129 (33) who included patients with a H&Y score  $\leq 4$ . One study (31) did not report eligibility criteria  
130 related to an H&Y score and one study (31) excluded patients with H&Y score  $>3$ . For the exclusion  
131 criteria, in most studies, patients with neuromuscular, psychiatric, or neurological pathologies other  
132 than PD were excluded.

### 133 **3.2.2 Protocols**

134 Regarding the 12 RCTs, the mean protocol duration was 7 weeks, ranging from a single session to 12  
135 weeks with a mean number of sessions per weeks of 3 (range: 1–7). Duration of the interventions was  
136 specified for 7 studies, with a mean duration of 55 minutes for experimental group (range: 35–80) and  
137 52 minutes for control group (range: 25–80). All studies performed a pre-intervention and post-  
138 intervention assessments and 3 studies (28,30,32) included a follow-up intervention ranging from one  
139 week to 8 weeks after the end of the protocol. Concerning the types of exercises, eight studies (22-  
140 24,28–30,32,33) used a MI protocol of gait and balance exercises or gait exercises only. One study  
141 (34) included a protocol of MI of a single step. Two studies (32,36) used a guided neurofeedback  
142 protocol with MI.

### 143 **3.2.3 Outcomes**

144 In terms of motor symptoms, two studies (32,36) used Movement Disorder Society (MDS) Unified  
145 Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (UPDRS) as primary outcomes. They compared part III of UPDRS.  
146 Regarding the assessment of quality of life, only 4 studies (23, 24, 31,36) assessed this parameter using  
147 the Parkinson's Disease Questionnaire-39 (PDQ-39). Walking and balance abilities were assessed  
148 including walking speed, step length, Timed Up and Go (TUG), Dynamic Gait Index (DGI), Functional  
149 Gait Assessment (FGA), 10-Meter Walk Test (10MWT), 2-minute endurance walking test, sit-to-stand,  
150 balance test (23-25, 31, 33-37). TUG test was used in 6 studies as outcomes (25, 31,33-35, 37). Six  
151 studies focused on balance (23-25, 33-35). Lower limb range of motion (ROM) was also assessed in  
152 two studies, one (35) focusing on hip and other (36) evaluated hip, knee and ankle. No specific upper  
153 limb or speech outcomes have been assessed.

### 154 **3.2.4 Results of RCT**

155 Intergroup significant differences range were very large among the 12 studies, 10 showed a significant  
156 difference between groups at post intervention (Table 2).

157 Regarding the studies with a **gait and balance MI exercises**, Sarasso et al. (33) found a significant  
158 improvement in TUG with a cognitive task (primary outcome) compared to control group. An  
159 improvement of 122% ( $p<0.001$ ) was found in the week 6, and 48.3% ( $p=0.02$ ) in the week 14.  
160 Santiago et al. (35) also found an improvement in TUG for the experimental group (5.8%;  $p<0.05$ ).  
161 Sarasso et al. (33) showed an improvement of 388.05% ( $p=0.020$ ) at week 14 for the experimental  
162 group for the Mini Balance Evaluation System Test as well as an improvement of 1417.1% ( $p=0.03$ )  
163 for the Activities-specific Balance Confidence Scale. Mahmoud et al. (32) focused on concentration  
164 parameters. The level of attention and concentration was significantly improved by 70.6% ( $p<0.000$ ).  
165 The reaction time of the previous test was also improved by 55% ( $p<0.000$ ). Two other variables on  
166 figural memory were improved (range: 42–65%;  $p<0.000$ ). Fayez and Elwishi (36) found a significant  
167 difference for hip, knee, and ankle ROM in the experimental group (range: 13.7–17.7%;  $p<0.013$ –  
168 0.037). For the spatiotemporal parameters, Fayez and Elwishi (36) showed a significant improvement  
169 in walking speed by 7.4% ( $p<0.000$ ), step length by 9.1% ( $p=0.002$ ) and FGA by 16% ( $p<0.016$ ) in  
170 the experimental group. Santiago et al. (35) showed a significant improvement in walking speed (2.8%;  
171  $p<0.05$ ) in the experimental group. Sarasso et al. (33) showed an improvement of 400% at week 14 for  
172 the 10MWT. Monteiro et al. (37) studied **MI on only one step execution** and they showed a significant  
173 difference for the TUG test at 14 week (difference not specified;  $p=0.05$ ).

174 Regarding the MI exercises studied (**neurofeedback protocol, gait and balance, step**) no significant  
175 differences was found between experimental and control group for the follow outcomes: TUG, hip  
176 ROM, step length, 10MWT, MDS-UPDRS score, endurance walking, gross motor combined, physical  
177 performance test, PDQ-39, DGI, FGA, Falls Efficacy Scale International, Functional Reach Test, total  
178 stance time (25,31,33–35,37,38).

179 Another interesting result was found by Sarasso et al. (2023), where the MI was assessed using  
180 Kinesthetic-and-Visual-Imagery Questionnaire (KVIQ) and a MI functional MRI (fMRI) task. During  
181 fMRI, subjects were asked to watch first-person perspective videos representing gait/balance tasks and  
182 mentally simulate their execution. At baseline patients were compared with 23 healthy controls. They  
183 showed that observation and MI training (AOT-MI) in PD patients promoting the functional plasticity  
184 of brain areas involved in MI processes and gait/balance control (22).

185 There are no results for upper limb and speech as no specific outcomes were assessed.

### 186 **3.3 Non-RCTs and descriptive studies: assessment of MI and main results**

187 The results of the following studies should be interpreted with caution as we focused only on their  
188 main results. As far as possible, we have organised the results according to this logic: firstly, the  
189 difference between patients with PD and healthy subjects (HS) in terms of MI (PD/HS-MI); secondly,  
190 the difference between patients with PD and HS in terms of ME (PD/HS-ME); and finally, the  
191 difference between ME and MI (MI/ME) for a same group of patients. The characteristics of the  
192 descriptive and non-RCTs studies are in Table 3 and the main results in Table 4.

#### 193 **3.3.1 Participants characteristics**

194 Most of these studies (39-41), patients with PD were compared with HS of the same age. The mean  
195 (SD) number of participants per study was 30 ( $\pm 18$ ) and participants had a mean age of 61 ( $\pm 8$ ) years  
196 old. Groups were composed on average of 35.5% of women and 64.5% of men. For patients with PD,  
197 the main inclusion criteria were a diagnosis of idiopathic PD (10 studies specified that the diagnosis  
198 was made with the UK brain bank criteria) and the H&Y score. Twenty-one out of 41 studies did not  
199 mention inclusion criteria. Four studies included patients with other neurological conditions such as  
200 stroke, multiple sclerosis, Huntington's disease (39–42).

201 Regarding the inclusion criteria for MI, the Kinesthetic and Visual Imagery Questionnaire (KVIQ)  
202 which evaluates the ability of subjects to imagine from a first-person perspective by assessing the  
203 clarity of the image (visual: V subscale) and the intensity of the sensations (kinesthetic: K subscale)  
204 was used.

#### 205 **3.3.2 Protocols**

206 We have grouped the studies according to whether they concerned the lower limb, the upper limb or  
207 language-related MI exercises. Subgroups were made within these categories.

208 Eight studies concerned the lower limb through MI of walking. Among these studies the protocols were  
209 heterogeneous. Five studies tested MI walking in a straight line with different distances ranging from  
210 2 to 15 m; 2 studies tested MI walking in a straight line, turning, turning back; and 1 study tested  
211 walking on an obstacle path.

212 Upper limb was involved in 16 studies. Three studies tested a thumb opposition task; 2 studies tested  
213 a hand gripping; 3 studies tested a joystick movement; and 8 studies tested various upper limb tasks  
214 with 8 different interventions.

215 Language-related tasks were used in only one study. Finally, other studies did not fit into the 3 above  
216 mentioned categories. Eight studies performed laterality judgement tasks; 5 studies used MI tests and  
217 questionnaires; 2 tested neurofeedback; and 1 study test whole body MI.

218 Not all studies have evaluated patients with PD under the same conditions. Eleven studies evaluated  
219 patients in their off phase, 10 in the on phase, 6 in both phases and 14 did not mention this information.

### 220 **3.3.3 Outcomes for lower limb**

221 Of these studies, 2 assessed walking in clinical conditions (40,41); 6 assessed brain activity with  
222 regional Cerebral Blood Flow (rCBF) using a Positron Emission Tomography (PET) scans (45,46) as  
223 well as using functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging (fMRI) (25,44–46); execution time was also  
224 used (7 studies) during different tasks (28,43–45,47-49).

### 225 **3.3.4 Outcomes for upper limb**

226 In the thumb-opposition studies, Dominey et al. (50) evaluated the execution time for MI and ME.  
227 Avanzino et al. (51) evaluated the timing error rate. Cunnington et al. (52) performed this task under  
228 PET scan and compared the rCBF. Leiguarda et al. (53) evaluated the firing rate of the globus pallidus  
229 internus using microelectrode recording.

230 For hand gripping, muscle activation by electromyography (EMG) and monopolar local field potentials  
231 were evaluated (41,54).

232 All joystick movement studies were done under PET scan (55–57). In addition, 2 of them evaluated  
233 the execution time (55,56).

234 For studies with varied upper limb tasks, the evaluations were also heterogeneous. The execution time  
235 was evaluated in 3 studies (39,40,58); KVIQ was assessed in one study (56); F-waves were assessed  
236 by EMG (59,60); the amplitude of motor evoked potential by transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS)  
237 (60,61); movement-related potentials by electroencephalogram (62); and local field potentials by  
238 electrode recording (63).

### 239 **3.3.5 Outcomes for verbal task**

240 Péran et al. (64) used the number of correct responses as well as fMRI as means of assessment.



241 **3.3.6 Outcomes for laterality judgment**

242 Reaction time and error rate were measured for all these studies. MEP amplitude was assessed using  
243 TMS (65). fMRI was used in 2 studies (66,67).

244 **3.3.7 Outcomes for MI tests and questionnaire**

245 Several tests were used in the different studies. The score of these studies was used as an outcome.  
246 There were the KVIQ, Motor Imagery Questionnaires (MIQ-R), Gait Imagery Questionnaire (GIQ),  
247 Chaotic Motor Imagery Assessment. The execution time was also measured for the BBT (29,68).

248 **3.3.8 Outcomes for neurofeedback intervention**

249 In these non-RCTs studies, fMRI and UPDRS scores were used (69,70).

250 **3.3.9 Outcomes for MI of whole body**

251 The rCBF was assessed using PET scan (71).

252 **3.3.10 Main results for lower limb (8 studies: 257 participants)**

253 Firstly regarding execution time of walking in MI, 3 studies showed that there was no significant  
254 difference between PD/HS-MI (28,44,47). Cohen et al. (43) also found no significant difference  
255 between patients with PD with and without freezing of gait (FOG).

256 Secondly, still concerning execution time of walking but for PD/HS-ME, Peterson et al. (28) showed  
257 that patients with PD are slower than HS ( $p < 0.001$ ). It has been shown that patients with FOG were  
258 slower than patients without FOG in normal walking ( $p = 0.03$ ) as well as walking through a narrow  
259 doorway ( $p < 0.0001$ ) (43,44).

260 Maillet et al. (45) showed that patients with PD in off phase had significantly different durations during  
261 MI of walking (MI and ME data combined) compared to HS ( $p < 0.03$ ) while in the on phase (MI and  
262 ME data combined) there was no significant difference when compared to HS. Weiss et al. (46)  
263 assessed the difference between active and inactive transcranial stimulation in patients. When  
264 stimulation was active and for ME condition, patients walked 51% further ( $p < 0.001$ ), 57% faster  
265 ( $p < 0.001$ ) and took 30% longer steps ( $p < 0.001$ ).

266 Now regarding brain activity, Maillet et al. (45) showed that MI of walking in patients with PD  
267 compared to HS increased brain activation in premotor-parietal cortices and pontomesencephalic

268 tegmentum and decreased brain activation in motor and frontal associative areas, basal ganglia,  
269 thalamus and cerebellum. Maidan et al. (49) found that patients with PD compared to HS had higher  
270 activation in the frontal, parietal, temporal, and occipital lobes during MI of usual walking ( $p<0.039$ ).  
271 Huang et al. (48) showed that during MI of walking, patients with PD without FOG compared to  
272 controls had more brain activity in bilateral supplementary area, right superior temporal, and right  
273 medial superior frontal gyrus ( $p<0.041$ ). Weiss et al. (46) showed that with or without deep brain  
274 stimulation in subthalamic nucleus, MI of walking induced activity in the supplementary motor area  
275 and the right superior parietal lobule against a rest condition ( $p<0.05$ ). In terms of the difference in  
276 FOG, Snijders et al. (47) showed that FOG patients increased brain activity on fMRI in the  
277 mesencephalic locomotor region during MI of gait compared to non-FOG patients ( $p<0.05$ ).

### 278 **3.3.11 Main results for thumb-opposition task (4 studies: 52 participants)**

279 Dominey et al. study (50) showed that patients with PD were 69.8% slower compared to HS in  
280 execution time of thumb-opposition task (MI and ME data combined) ( $p<0.000$ ). Avanzino et al. (48)  
281 found that when the task was performed in a 0.5 Hz timing and the auditory cue was removed, patients  
282 with PD made more errors when continuing the task in both MI ( $p=0.04$ ) and ME ( $p=0.045$ ) conditions,  
283 which was not the case for a 1.5 Hz timing. In Cunnington et al. study (52), the degree of activation in  
284 the supplementary motor area was normal in patients with PD when they were both in the “off” and  
285 “on” medication states during MI compared to rest ( $p<0.000$ ).

### 286 **3.3.12 Main results for hand gripping task (2 studies: 32 participants)**

287 Kobelt et al. (41) measured muscle activity by EMG and showed significant activation of the deltoideus  
288 pars clavicularis ( $p=0.001$ ) and biceps brachii ( $p=0.007$ ) during hand gripping task in MI as compared  
289 to a resting state. There was, however, no significant difference in activation between MI and rest in  
290 the extensor digitorum and flexor carpi radialis muscles. Fischer et al. (54) recorded local field  
291 potentials with TMS. They showed that beta activity decreased significantly for MI at the two highest  
292 force levels compared to rest (range:  $p<0.01$ – $0.05$ ) as well as for ME at all force levels ( $p<0.001$ );  
293 gamma activity increased significantly at MI at the two highest force levels again compared to rest  
294 (range:  $p<0.01$ – $0.05$ ) as well as for ME at all force levels (range:  $p<0.01$ – $0.05$ ).

### 295 **3.3.13 Main results for joystick movement (3 studies: 35 participants)**

296 Thobois et al. (55) observed that patients with PD were slower with their more affected side than with  
297 the other side to perform the joystick movement task in both MI and ME conditions (range: 10.8–13.7

298 %,  $p < 0.05$ ). In another study by Thobois et al. (56), were no significant difference in execution time  
299 between MI and ME. Samuel et al. (57) showed that when performing the task, patients with PD  
300 compared to HS had in MI a less activity in dorsolateral and mesial frontal cortex ( $p < 0.01$ ); and in ME  
301 a less activity in right dorsolateral frontal cortex and basal ganglia ( $p < 0.01$ ). The ability to retain  
302 movements previously made in MI as well as in ME was not different between PD and HS groups (57).

### 303 **3.3.14 Main results for varied upper limb tasks (8 studies: 265 participants)**

304 Yágüez et al. (39) conducted a pre- post clinical trial in patients with PD. They investigated writing  
305 movement and execution time to perform ideograms. The intervention was first a practice phase in MI  
306 and then a phase in ME. No difference was found for large ideograms between pre- and post-training  
307 in terms of movement duration and tangential velocity. However, a difference in execution time was  
308 found between baseline and post-ME practice sessions ( $p = 0.014$ ) as well as between post-MI and post-  
309 ME session with, in both cases an improvement after the ME practice phase ( $p = 0.031$ ).

310 Sabaté et al. (40) showed that sequential finger movements took 70% ( $p < 0.001$ ) longer in MI and 80%  
311 ( $p < 0.001$ ) longer in ME for patients with PD when compared to HS. Regarding the difference between  
312 MI and ME in patients with PD, Sabaté et al. (58) found a significant difference in favour of ME in  
313 execution time for a fast cyclic ( $p < 0.001$ ) and for a slow continuous movement tasks ( $p < 0.001$ ); but  
314 no significant difference for a slow cyclic movement task. Bek et al. (59) compared the KVIQ score  
315 before and after MI instructions and no significant changes were observed between patients with PD  
316 and HS. Gündüz et al. (60) measured F-waves during thumb abduction. They showed that the average  
317 amplitude of F-waves significantly increased during MI and ME compared to rest conditions in both  
318 patients with PD non-apraxia ( $P = 0.005$ ) and HS ( $P = 0.028$ ) groups. Tremblay et al. (61) measured the  
319 MEP amplitude of two hand muscles in the resting state and during the MI of a scissor cutting task. No  
320 significant change was detected between conditions in patients with PD while a significant difference  
321 was found in HS ( $p < 0.05$ ).

### 322 **3.3.15 Main results for verbal task (1 study: 10 participants)**

323 Péran et al. (64) compared 3 tasks in patients with PD: *object naming*, *action word* related to the object  
324 and *mental simulation* of the action with the object. They found that in comparison to object naming,  
325 mental simulation demonstrated a greater level of activation in the prefrontal cortex bilaterally and in  
326 the parietal-occipital junction bilaterally ( $p < 0.001$ ).

### 327 **3.3.16 Main results for laterality judgment task (8 studies: 293 participants)**

328 The laterality judgement tasks are all task is known to engage an implicit MI process. Four studies  
329 (50,72–74) divided the participants into groups according to the most affected side. Amick et al. (72)  
330 found that patients with PD right-sided symptoms group made more errors than HS in judging laterality  
331 ( $p=0.01$ ), but the left-sided symptoms group did not show a significant difference in error rates  
332 compared to the HS group. The results of Conson et al. (73) showed that patients with PD had a higher  
333 reaction time to determine the laterality of a body that corresponded to their most affected side  
334 compared to the other side (range:  $p<0.006$ – $0.028$ ). However, no significant difference was found in  
335 terms of reaction time and accuracy between patients with right-sided symptoms and patients with left-  
336 sided symptoms (73). In the Dominey et al. (50), patients with PD were slower compared to HS to  
337 determine letter symmetry and hand laterality by 19.3% ( $p<0.0001$ ). Scarpina et al. (74) and Helmich  
338 et al. (67), in a similar protocol, did not find significant difference in reaction time and accuracy among  
339 patients with PD with right-sided symptoms, patients with PD with left-sided symptoms and HS;  
340 between patients with PD with right-sided symptoms and HS; and between patients with PD with and  
341 without tremor and HS. Additionally, patients with PD with tremors demonstrated higher levels of  
342 imagery-related activity in the somatosensory area 3a when compared to both patients with PD without  
343 tremors and HS ( $p<0.01$ ) (67).

### 344 **3.3.17 Main results for MI tests and questionnaire (5 studies: 232 participants)**

345 Heremans et al. (29,68) found that patients with PD were slower on the BBT in MI and ME compared  
346 to HS (range: 16.7–30.4%;  $p<0.01$ – $0.02$ ). Regarding the influence of cues in BBT, there was no  
347 significant difference in execution time between MI with cues and ME, whereas MI without cues was  
348 slower than ME ( $p<0.05$ ).

349 Several studies used MI tests and questionnaires. There was no significant difference between patients  
350 with PD and HS for the MIQ-R, KVIQ-20, CMIA, GIQ. Heremans et al. (68) and Peterson et al. (75)  
351 investigated KVIQ in patients with PD phase on, off, and HS and no significant was found among  
352 groups. For the GIQ no significant difference was found between patients with PD with FOG and  
353 without FOG (73).

354 Perspective preference during MI was assessed with KVIQ visual subscale (indicating clarity of the  
355 image). Patients with PD choose in 71.5% internal perspective (corresponds to a first-person view), in  
356 26.3% external perspective (corresponds to a third-person view), in 0.4% both and in 2.3% no

357 perspective could be chosen. Now with KVIQ kinaesthetic subscale (indicating intensity of the  
358 sensations), patients with PD choose in 73.3% internal, in 25.2% external, in 0.3% both and 1.4% no  
359 perspective could be chosen (41).

### 360 **3.3.18 Main results for neuro-feedback intervention (2 studies: 28 participants)**

361 Tinaz et al. (69) used MI tasks that allowed positive neurofeedback activation. Subramanian et al. (70),  
362 showed a significant improvement of 37% ( $p=0.042$ ) on the UPDRS score between pre- and post-  
363 intervention in the experimental group while the control group showed no significant difference. Tinaz  
364 et al. (69), showed no significant difference in patients with PD between pre- and post-intervention on  
365 the MDS-UDPRS-III score.

### 366 **3.3.19 Main results for MI of whole body (1 study: 22 participants)**

367 Mori et al. (71) measured rCBF between patients with PD and HS during standing position. During  
368 MI, no significant difference was shown between groups. In contrast, during ME, patients with PD  
369 against HS showed a significant increase in the right cerebellar vermis and left paracentral gyrus, and  
370 a significant decrease in the bilateral middle frontal gyrus.

## 371 **4 Discussion**

372 Motor Imagery has been used in sport and performance activities and has attracted considerable interest  
373 since the 1980s (76). This technique has been adapted to PD patient's rehabilitation with promising  
374 results, although there are still a small number of RCTs studies published (22-25, 31-38). Among the  
375 included studies (53 studies), there were few RCTs (12 studies) with an average PEDro score of 6.6,  
376 which can be considered as medium to high quality. The protocols as well as the outcomes measured  
377 were heterogeneous and there were no RCTs with specific outcomes for upper limbs or speech other  
378 than the UPDRS score. The population of RCTs and descriptive studies was quite young with a low  
379 severity level (i.e., H&Y score). Indeed, the most RCTs excluded patients with a score greater than 3.  
380 It is therefore not possible to conclude on the applicability of MI in patients with PD who have a higher  
381 severity. MI should therefore be used as early as possible before cognitive impairment prevents its use.  
382 Taking these aspects into account, the results should be treated with caution as methodological biases  
383 need to be resolved before conclusions can be drawn.

384 In complement of RCTs, we also investigated descriptive and non-RCTs to determine how MI have  
385 been used in the PD population. It is noted that for MI of walking, there was no difference between

386 subjects with PD and HS, whereas, as expected, in ME patients with PD were slower than HS. This  
387 would suggest that patients with PD have relatively poor sensorimotor prediction capacities, as the  
388 tight relation between the duration of ME and MI (i.e. isochrony) seems broken (77). It is also found  
389 that patients with PD have similar scores to HS in MI questionnaires (such as KVIQ, MIQ-R, GIQ),  
390 which means that they can practice MI. The presence of cues (visual and auditory) was also found to  
391 improve the abilities of patients with PD in MI. There were various tasks for the upper limbs in this  
392 section including BBT, thumb opposition tasks which means that many tasks can be adapted and need  
393 to be investigated for the upper limb.

394 Collectively, it can therefore be said that MI of walking can be used along a corridor of varying distance  
395 with execution time as a measurement method. Walking speed as well as TUG can be interesting  
396 outcomes to be assessed at regular intervals to monitor progress. Then, for the upper limb, global and  
397 patient-specific tasks can be investigated by measuring the execution time. UPDRS score allows task  
398 monitoring for the upper and lower limb. Motor symptoms, assessed by the UPDRS, showed no  
399 significant difference between the two groups in RCTs. However, part 3 of the UPDRS includes items  
400 for both the upper and lower limbs and we have seen that the RCTs were targeted at the lower limbs.  
401 As MI protocol did not encompass all aspects evaluated in the UPDRS, this may explain the fact that  
402 there was no change (78).

403 Even though we did not set date limits we could not include many studies. Indeed, this is a recent topic  
404 of interest as, the first study included here was published in 1997 and, the first RCT included in this  
405 review dates from 2007. Among the studies excluded, 21 were ongoing clinical trials and whose results  
406 were not yet published, so we can see that there is an interest in this topic and that there will be more  
407 data in the next few years, which conditioning the update of this review in the next years.

408 Our contribution to this study was to guide and facilitate the use of MI in clinical practice, as well as  
409 to highlight the main results observed in these studies in terms of improvements in motor symptoms,  
410 balance, gait, and quality of life. Indeed, MI is a technique that does not require any equipment, it is  
411 easy and safe to set up and just requires a learning phase beforehand. In a context where the prevalence  
412 of PD is increasing it is important to empower patients and give them tools that they can use at home  
413 by completing other treatments.

414 The main limitation of this study was the fact that, for the descriptive and non-RCT studies, only the  
415 main tasks and outcomes of MI were analysed. Although the diversity of tasks and results were

416 observed, we focused on the tasks with the best results, perhaps other interesting elements could be  
417 explored. Another limitation is that the most important studies included in this review (RTCs) excluded  
418 the most severe PD. Therefore, it is not known whether the recommendations raised here can be useful  
419 for more seriously ill patients.

420 Despite the limited number of RTCs focusing on MI in patients with PD, combined with diverse  
421 protocols, outcomes, and potential biases, the findings offer a promising outlook, especially in  
422 addressing walking and balance impairments. However, research on upper limb function or speech  
423 remains scant. Future studies in this area must involve larger participant cohorts and adopt more  
424 specific protocols tailored to the unique challenges posed by upper limb impairments. The criteria for  
425 assessing outcomes related to walking and balance align with recommendations from the French  
426 National Authority for Health, providing a valuable standard for evaluating MI interventions in PD.

427 In conclusion, it is crucial to acknowledge that this scoping review underscores the necessity for further  
428 research and updates in the coming years. The ongoing RCTs registered in clinical trial databases  
429 highlight the evolving landscape of MI interventions for PD, suggesting that a comprehensive and  
430 updated systematic review will be vital to capture the latest advancements and insights in this field.

#### 431 **Data availability statement**

432 The original contributions presented in this study are included in this article/supplementary material,  
433 further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding authors.

#### 434 **Author contributions**

435 **MM, and ET:** Formal Analysis, Methodology, Project administration, Writing – original draft. **MB,**  
436 **EM, and NG:** Data curation, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Resources, Supervision, Writing –  
437 original draft. **AVS, and YS:** Resources, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review &  
438 editing.

#### 439 **Funding**

440 This work was supported by the “ANER” program, from Région Bourgogne Franche Comté (contract  
441 ANER PARK-IMAGE, 2021Y-08279).

442

443 **Conflict of interest**

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

446 **References**

- 447 1. Elbaz A, Carcaillon L, Kab S, Moisan F. Epidemiology of Parkinson's disease. *Rev Neurol (Paris)*.  
448 2016 Jan;172(1):14-26. doi: 10.1016/j.neurol.2015.09.012. Epub 2015 Dec 21. PMID: 26718594.
- 449 2. Balestrino R, Schapira AHV. Parkinson disease. *Eur J Neurol*. 2020 Jan;27(1):27-42. doi:  
450 10.1111/ene.14108. Epub 2019 Nov 27. PMID: 31631455.
- 451 3. Sveinbjornsdottir S. The clinical symptoms of parkinson's disease. *J Neurochem*. 2016 Oct;139  
452 Suppl 1:318-324. doi: 10.1111/jnc.13691. Epub 2016 Jul 11. PMID: 27401947.
- 453 4. Jagadeesan AJ, Murugesan R, Vimala Devi S, Meera M, Madhumala G, Vishwanathan Padmaja M,  
454 Ramesh A, Banerjee A, Sushmitha S, Khokhlov AN, Marotta F, Pathak S. Current trends in etiology,  
455 prognosis and therapeutic aspects of Parkinson's disease: a review. *Acta Biomed*. 2017 Oct  
456 23;88(3):249-262. doi: 10.23750/abm.v88i3.6063. PMID: 29083328; PMCID: PMC6142835.
- 457 5. Radder DLM, Lígia Silva de Lima A, Domingos J, Keus SHJ, van Nimwegen M, Bloem BR, de  
458 Vries NM. Physiotherapy in Parkinson's Disease: A Meta-Analysis of Present Treatment Modalities.  
459 *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2020 Oct;34(10):871-880. doi: 10.1177/1545968320952799. Epub 2020  
460 Sep 11. PMID: 32917125; PMCID: PMC7564288.
- 461 6. Abbruzzese G, Avanzino L, Marchese R, Pelosin E. Action observation and motor imagery:  
462 Innovative cognitive tools in the rehabilitation of Parkinson's disease. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*.  
463 2020 Oct;34(10):871-880. doi: 10.1177/1545968320952799. Epub 2020 Sep 11. PMID: 32917125;  
464 PMCID: PMC7564288.
- 465 7. Hanakawa T. Organizing motor imageries. *Neurosci Res*. 2016 Mar;104:56-63. doi:  
466 10.1016/j.neures.2015.11.003. Epub 2015 Nov 19. PMID: 26602980.
- 467 8. MacIntyre TE, Madan CR, Moran AP, Collet C, Guillot A. Motor imagery, performance and motor  
468 rehabilitation. *Prog Brain Res*. 2018;240:141-159. doi: 10.1016/bs.pbr.2018.09.010. Epub 2018 Oct  
469 24. PMID: 30390828.



- 470 9. Jeannerod M. The representing brain: Neural correlates of motor intention and imagery. *Behavioral*  
471 *and Brain Sciences*. 1994;17(2):187–202. doi:10.1017/S0140525X00034026
- 472 10. Moustafa AA, Chakravarthy S, Phillips JR, Gupta A, Keri S, Polner B, Frank MJ, Jahanshahi M.  
473 Motor symptoms in Parkinson's disease: A unified framework. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 2016  
474 Sep;68:727-740. doi: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2016.07.010. Epub 2016 Jul 12. PMID: 27422450.
- 475 11. Schapira AHV, Chaudhuri KR, Jenner P. Non-motor features of Parkinson disease. *Nat Rev*  
476 *Neurosci*. 2017 Jul;18(7):435-450. doi: 10.1038/nrn.2017.62. Epub 2017 Jun 8. Erratum in: *Nat Rev*  
477 *Neurosci*. 2017 Aug;18(8):509. PMID: 28592904.
- 478 12. Armstrong MJ, Okun MS. Diagnosis and treatment of Parkinson disease: A Review. *JAMA*. 2020  
479 Feb 11;323(6):548-560. doi: 10.1001/jama.2019.22360. PMID: 32044947.
- 480 13. Connolly BS, Lang AE. Pharmacological treatment of Parkinson disease: A review. *JAMA*. 2014  
481 Apr 23-30;311(16):1670-83. doi: 10.1001/jama.2014.3654. PMID: 24756517.
- 482 14. Espay AJ, Morgante F, Merola A, Fasano A, Marsili L, Fox SH, Bezard E, Picconi B, Calabresi P,  
483 Lang AE. Levodopa-induced dyskinesia in Parkinson disease: Current and evolving concepts. *Ann*  
484 *Neurol*. 2018 Dec;84(6):797-811. doi: 10.1002/ana.25364. Epub 2018 Nov 30. PMID: 30357892.
- 485 15. Chen K, Tan Y, Lu Y, Wu J, Liu X, Zhao Y. Effect of exercise on quality of life in parkinson's  
486 disease: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Parkinsons Dis*. 2020 Jul 9;2020:3257623. doi:  
487 10.1155/2020/3257623. PMID: 32695306; PMCID: PMC7368221.
- 488 16. van der Kolk NM, King LA. Effects of exercise on mobility in people with Parkinson's disease.  
489 *Mov Disord*. 2013 Sep 15;28(11):1587-96. doi: 10.1002/mds.25658. PMID: 24132847.
- 490 17. Tomlinson CL, Patel S, Meek C, Herd CP, Clarke CE, Stowe R, Shah L, Sackley CM, Deane KH,  
491 Wheatley K, Ives N. Physiotherapy versus placebo or no intervention in Parkinson's disease. *Cochrane*  
492 *Database Syst Rev*. 2013 Sep 10;2013(9):CD002817. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD002817.pub4. PMID:  
493 24018704; PMCID: PMC7120224.
- 494 18. Warner L, McNeill ME. Mental imagery and its potential for physical therapy. *Phys Ther*. 1988  
495 Apr;68(4):516-21. doi: 10.1093/ptj/68.4.516. PMID: 3281175.

- 496 19. Loporto M, McAllister C, Williams J, Hardwick R, Holmes P. Investigating central mechanisms  
497 underlying the effects of action observation and imagery through transcranial magnetic stimulation. *J*  
498 *Mot Behav.* 2011;43(5):361-73. doi: 10.1080/00222895.2011.604655. Epub 2011 Aug 23. PMID:  
499 21861627.
- 500 20. Abbruzzese G, Marchese R, Avanzino L, Pelosin E. Rehabilitation for Parkinson's disease: Current  
501 outlook and future challenges. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord.* 2016 Jan;22 Suppl 1:S60-4. doi:  
502 10.1016/j.parkreldis.2015.09.005. Epub 2015 Sep 3. PMID: 26360239.
- 503 21. Mirelman A, Maidan I, Deutsch JE. Virtual reality and motor imagery: promising tools for  
504 assessment and therapy in Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord.* 2013 Sep 15;28(11):1597-608. doi:  
505 10.1002/mds.25670. PMID: 24132848.
- 506 22. Sarasso E, Gardoni A, Zenere L, Canu E, Basaia S, Pelosin E, Volontè MA, Filippi M, Agosta F.  
507 Action observation and motor imagery improve motor imagery abilities in patients with Parkinson's  
508 disease - A functional MRI study. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord.* 2023 Nov;116:105858. doi:  
509 10.1016/j.parkreldis.2023.105858. Epub 2023 Sep 22. PMID: 37774517.
- 510 23. Bezerra PT, Santiago LM, Silva IA, Souza AA, Pegado CL, Damascena CM, Ribeiro TS, Lindquist  
511 AR. Action observation and motor imagery have no effect on balance and freezing of gait in  
512 Parkinson's disease: a randomized controlled trial. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med.* 2022 Oct;58(5):715-722.  
513 doi: 10.23736/S1973-9087.22.07313-0. Epub 2022 Sep 1. PMID: 36052889; PMCID: PMC10019482.
- 514 24. Kashif M, Ahmad A, Bandpei MAM, Gilani SA, Hanif A, Iram H. Combined effects of virtual  
515 reality techniques and motor imagery on balance, motor function and activities of daily living in  
516 patients with Parkinson's disease: a randomized controlled trial. *BMC Geriatr.* 2022 Apr 30;22(1):381.  
517 doi: 10.1186/s12877-022-03035-1. PMID: 35488213; PMCID: PMC9055773.
- 518 25. Tamir R, Dickstein R, Huberman M. Integration of motor imagery and physical practice in group  
519 treatment applied to subjects with Parkinson's disease. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.* 2007 Jan-  
520 Feb;21(1):68-75. doi: 10.1177/1545968306292608. PMID: 17172556.
- 521 26. Humphries S, Holler J, Crawford TJ, Herrera E, Poliakoff E. A third-person perspective on co-  
522 speech action gestures in Parkinson's disease. *Cortex.* 2016 May;78:44-54. doi:  
523 10.1016/j.cortex.2016.02.009. Epub 2016 Feb 27. PMID: 26995225; PMCID: PMC4865523.

- 524 27. Nascimento IAPDS, Santiago LMM, de Souza AA, Pegado CL, Ribeiro TS, Lindquist ARR.  
525 Effects of motor imagery training of Parkinson's disease: a protocol for a randomized clinical trial.  
526 *Trials*. 2019 Nov 9;20(1):626. doi: 10.1186/s13063-019-3694-8. PMID: 31706325; PMCID:  
527 PMC6842520.
- 528 28. Peterson DS, Pickett KA, Duncan RP, Perlmutter JS, Earhart GM. Brain activity during complex  
529 imagined gait tasks in Parkinson disease. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2014 May;125(5):995-1005. doi:  
530 10.1016/j.clinph.2013.10.008. Epub 2013 Nov 5. PMID: 24210997; PMCID: PMC3981914.
- 531 29. Heremans E, Nieuwboer A, Feys P, Vercruyse S, Vandenberghe W, Sharma N, Helsen WF.  
532 External cueing improves motor imagery quality in patients with Parkinson disease. *Neurorehabil  
533 Neural Repair*. 2012 Jan;26(1):27-35. doi: 10.1177/1545968311411055. Epub 2011 Jul 21. PMID:  
534 21778409.
- 535 30. Malouin F, Jackson PL, Richards CL. Towards the integration of mental practice in rehabilitation  
536 programs. A critical review. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2013 Sep 19;7:576. doi:  
537 10.3389/fnhum.2013.00576. PMID: 24065903; PMCID: PMC3776942.
- 538 31. Braun S, Beurskens A, Kleynen M, Schols J, Wade D. Rehabilitation with mental practice has  
539 similar effects on mobility as rehabilitation with relaxation in people with Parkinson's disease: a  
540 multicentre randomised trial. *J Physiother*. 2011;57(1):27-34. doi: 10.1016/S1836-9553(11)70004-2.  
541 PMID: 21402327.
- 542 32. Mahmoud LSED, Abu Shady NAER, Hafez ES. Motor imagery training with augmented cues of  
543 motor learning on cognitive functions in patients with Parkinsonism. *International Journal of Therapy  
544 and Rehabilitation*. 2018;25(1):13-9. doi:10.12968/ijtr.2018.25.1.13
- 545 33. Sarasso E, Agosta F, Piramide N, Gardoni A, Canu E, Leocadi M, Castelnovo V, Basaia S,  
546 Tettamanti A, Volontè MA, Filippi M. Action Observation and Motor Imagery Improve Dual Task in  
547 Parkinson's Disease: A Clinical/fMRI Study. *Mov Disord*. 2021 Nov;36(11):2569-2582. doi:  
548 10.1002/mds.28717. Epub 2021 Jul 19. PMID: 34286884.
- 549 34. Tinaz S, Kamel S, Aravala SS, Elfil M, Bayoumi A, Patel A, Scheinost D, Sinha R, Hampson M.  
550 Neurofeedback-guided kinesthetic motor imagery training in Parkinson's disease: Randomized trial.  
551 *Neuroimage Clin*. 2022;34:102980. doi: 10.1016/j.nicl.2022.102980. Epub 2022 Mar 2. PMID:  
552 35247729; PMCID: PMC8897714.

- 553 35. Santiago LM, de Oliveira DA, de Macêdo Ferreira LG, de Brito Pinto HY, Spaniol AP, de Lucena  
554 Trigueiro LC, Ribeiro TS, de Sousa AV, Piemonte ME, Lindquist AR. Immediate effects of adding  
555 mental practice to physical practice on the gait of individuals with Parkinson's disease: Randomized  
556 clinical trial. *NeuroRehabilitation*. 2015;37(2):263-71. doi: 10.3233/NRE-151259. PMID: 26484518.
- 557 36. Fayez E, Elwishi A. Effect of Locomotor Imagery Training Added to Physical Therapy Program  
558 on Gait Performance in Parkinson Patients: A Randomized Controlled Study. *Egypt J Neurol Psychiat*  
559 *Neurosurg*. 2013;50:31-7.
- 560 37. Monteiro D, da Silva LP, de Sá PO, de Oliveira AR, Coriolano MWS, Lins OG. Mental practice  
561 after physiotherapy maintains functional mobility of people with Parkinson's disease. *Fisioter Pesqui*.  
562 2018;25(1):65-73. doi: 10.1590/1809-2950/17192425012018
- 563 38. Subramanian L, Morris MB, Brosnan M, Turner DL, Morris HR, Linden DE. Functional Magnetic  
564 Resonance Imaging Neurofeedback-guided Motor Imagery Training and Motor Training for  
565 Parkinson's Disease: Randomized Trial. *Front Behav Neurosci*. 2016 Jun 8;10:111. doi:  
566 10.3389/fnbeh.2016.00111. PMID: 27375451; PMCID: PMC4896907.
- 567 39. Yágüez L, Canavan AG, Lange HW, Hömberg V. Motor learning by imagery is differentially  
568 affected in Parkinson's and Huntington's diseases. *Behav Brain Res*. 1999 Jul;102(1-2):115-27. doi:  
569 10.1016/s0166-4328(99)00005-4. PMID: 10403020.
- 570 40. Sabaté M, González B, Rodríguez M. Adapting movement planning to motor impairments: the  
571 motor-scanning system. *Neuropsychologia*. 2007 Jan 28;45(2):378-86. doi:  
572 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2006.06.025. Epub 2006 Aug 17. PMID: 16914174.
- 573 41. Kobelt M, Wirth B, Schuster-Amft C. Muscle Activation During Grasping With and Without Motor  
574 Imagery in Healthy Volunteers and Patients After Stroke or With Parkinson's Disease. *Front Psychol*.  
575 2018 Apr 24;9:597. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00597. PMID: 29740377; PMCID: PMC5928445.
- 576 42. Gäumann S, Gerber RS, Suica Z, Wandel J, Schuster-Amft C. A different point of view: the  
577 evaluation of motor imagery perspectives in patients with sensorimotor impairments in a longitudinal  
578 study. *BMC Neurol*. 2021 Jul 27;21(1):297. doi: 10.1186/s12883-021-02266-w. PMID: 34315411;  
579 PMCID: PMC8314460.

- 580 43. Cohen RG, Chao A, Nutt JG, Horak FB. Freezing of gait is associated with a mismatch between  
581 motor imagery and motor execution in narrow doorways, not with failure to judge doorway passability.  
582 *Neuropsychologia*. 2011 Dec;49(14):3981-8. doi: 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2011.10.014. Epub  
583 2011 Oct 20. PMID: 22027173; PMCID: PMC3260879.
- 584 44. Ehgoetz Martens KA, Ellard CG, Almeida QJ. A closer look at mechanisms underlying perceptual  
585 differences in Parkinson's freezers and non-freezers. *Neuroscience*. 2014 Aug 22;274:162-9. doi:  
586 10.1016/j.neuroscience.2014.05.022. Epub 2014 May 21. PMID: 24857710.
- 587 45. Maillet A, Thobois S, Fraix V, Redouté J, Le Bars D, Lavenne F, Derost P, Durif F, Bloem BR,  
588 Krack P, Pollak P, Debû B. Neural substrates of levodopa-responsive gait disorders and freezing in  
589 advanced Parkinson's disease: a kinesthetic imagery approach. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2015 Mar;36(3):959-  
590 80. doi: 10.1002/hbm.22679. Epub 2014 Nov 19. PMID: 25411130; PMCID: PMC6869751.
- 591 46. Weiss PH, Herzog J, Pötter-Nerger M, Falk D, Herzog H, Deuschl G, Volkmann J, Fink GR.  
592 Subthalamic nucleus stimulation improves Parkinsonian gait via brainstem locomotor centers. *Mov*  
593 *Disord*. 2015 Jul;30(8):1121-5. doi: 10.1002/mds.26229. Epub 2015 Apr 25. PMID: 25914247.
- 594 47. Snijders AH, Leunissen I, Bakker M, Overeem S, Helmich RC, Bloem BR, Toni I. Gait-related  
595 cerebral alterations in patients with Parkinson's disease with freezing of gait. *Brain*. 2011 Jan;134(Pt  
596 1):59-72. doi: 10.1093/brain/awq324. Epub 2010 Dec 1. PMID: 21126990.
- 597 48. Huang HC, Chen CM, Lu MK, Liu BL, Li CI, Chen JC, Wang GJ, Lin HC, Duann JR, Tsai CH.  
598 Gait-Related Brain Activation During Motor Imagery of Complex and Simple Ambulation in  
599 Parkinson's Disease With Freezing of Gait. *Front Aging Neurosci*. 2021 Sep 22;13:731332. doi:  
600 10.3389/fnagi.2021.731332. PMID: 34630069; PMCID: PMC8492994.
- 601 49. Maidan I, Rosenberg-Katz K, Jacob Y, Giladi N, Deutsch JE, Hausdorff JM, Mirelman A. Altered  
602 brain activation in complex walking conditions in patients with Parkinson's disease. *Parkinsonism*  
603 *Relat Disord*. 2016 Apr;25:91-6. doi: 10.1016/j.parkreldis.2016.01.025. Epub 2016 Feb 2. PMID:  
604 26861167.
- 605 50. Dominey P, Decety J, Broussolle E, Chazot G, Jeannerod M. Motor imagery of a lateralized  
606 sequential task is asymmetrically slowed in hemi-Parkinson's patients. *Neuropsychologia*. 1995  
607 Jun;33(6):727-41. doi: 10.1016/0028-3932(95)00008-q. PMID: 7675164.

- 608 51. Avanzino L, Pelosin E, Martino D, Abbruzzese G. Motor timing deficits in sequential movements  
609 in Parkinson disease are related to action planning: a motor imagery study. *PLoS One*. 2013 Sep  
610 23;8(9):e75454. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0075454. PMID: 24086534; PMCID: PMC3781049.
- 611 52. Cunnington R, Egan GF, O'Sullivan JD, Hughes AJ, Bradshaw JL, Colebatch JG. Motor imagery  
612 in Parkinson's disease: a PET study. *Mov Disord*. 2001 Sep;16(5):849-57. doi: 10.1002/mds.1181.  
613 PMID: 11746614.
- 614 53. Leiguarda R, Cerquetti D, Tenca E, Merello M. Globus pallidus internus firing rate modification  
615 after motor-imagination in three Parkinson's disease patients. *J Neural Transm (Vienna)*. 2009  
616 Apr;116(4):451-5. doi: 10.1007/s00702-009-0203-3. Epub 2009 Mar 10. PMID: 19280115.
- 617 54. Fischer P, Pogosyan A, Cheeran B, Green AL, Aziz TZ, Hyam J, Little S, Foltynie T, Limousin P,  
618 Zrinzo L, Hariz M, Samuel M, Ashkan K, Brown P, Tan H. Subthalamic nucleus beta and gamma  
619 activity is modulated depending on the level of imagined grip force. *Exp Neurol*. 2017 Jul;293:53-61.  
620 doi: 10.1016/j.expneurol.2017.03.015. Epub 2017 Mar 22. PMID: 28342747; PMCID: PMC5429975.
- 621 55. Thobois S, Dominey PF, Decety J, Pollak PP, Gregoire MC, Le Bars PD, Broussolle E. Motor  
622 imagery in normal subjects and in asymmetrical Parkinson's disease: a PET study. *Neurology*. 2000  
623 Oct 10;55(7):996-1002. doi: 10.1212/wnl.55.7.996. PMID: 11061258.
- 624 56. Thobois S, Dominey P, Fraix V, Mertens P, Guenot M, Zimmer L, Pollak P, Benabid AL,  
625 Broussolle E. Effects of subthalamic nucleus stimulation on actual and imagined movement in  
626 Parkinson's disease : a PET study. *J Neurol*. 2002 Dec;249(12):1689-98. doi: 10.1007/s00415-002-  
627 0906-y. PMID: 12529791.
- 628 57. Samuel M, Ceballos-Baumann AO, Boecker H, Brooks DJ. Motor imagery in normal subjects and  
629 Parkinson's disease patients: an H215O PET study. *Neuroreport*. 2001 Mar 26;12(4):821-8. doi:  
630 10.1097/00001756-200103260-00040. PMID: 11277590.
- 631 58. Sabaté M, Llanos C, Rodríguez M. Integration of auditory and kinesthetic information in motion:  
632 alterations in Parkinson's disease. *Neuropsychology*. 2008 Jul;22(4):462-8. doi: 10.1037/0894-  
633 4105.22.4.462. PMID: 18590358.

- 634 59. Bek J, Gowen E, Vogt S, Crawford TJ, Poliakoff E. Combined action observation and motor  
635 imagery influences hand movement amplitude in Parkinson's disease. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord*. 2019  
636 Apr;61:126-131. doi: 10.1016/j.parkreldis.2018.11.001. Epub 2018 Nov 9. PMID: 30470657.
- 637 60. Gündüz A, Kiziltan ME. F-wave and motor-evoked potentials during motor imagery and  
638 observation in apraxia of Parkinson disease. *Muscle Nerve*. 2015 Dec;52(6):1072-7. doi:  
639 10.1002/mus.24663. Epub 2015 Sep 24. PMID: 25809124.
- 640 61. Tremblay F, Léonard G, Tremblay L. Corticomotor facilitation associated with observation and  
641 imagery of hand actions is impaired in Parkinson's disease. *Exp Brain Res*. 2008 Feb;185(2):249-57.  
642 doi: 10.1007/s00221-007-1150-6. Epub 2007 Oct 10. PMID: 17926025.
- 643 62. Cunnington R, Iansak R, Johnson KA, Bradshaw JL. Movement-related potentials in Parkinson's  
644 disease. Motor imagery and movement preparation. *Brain*. 1997 Aug;120 ( Pt 8):1339-53. doi:  
645 10.1093/brain/120.8.1339. PMID: 9278627.
- 646 63. Kühn AA, Doyle L, Pogosyan A, Yarrow K, Kupsch A, Schneider GH, Hariz MI, Trottenberg T,  
647 Brown P. Modulation of beta oscillations in the subthalamic area during motor imagery in Parkinson's  
648 disease. *Brain*. 2006 Mar;129(Pt 3):695-706. doi: 10.1093/brain/awh715. Epub 2005 Dec 19. PMID:  
649 16364953.
- 650 64. Péran P, Nemmi F, Méligne D, Cardebat D, Peppe A, Rascol O, Caltagirone C, Demonet JF,  
651 Sabatini U. Effect of levodopa on both verbal and motor representations of action in Parkinson's  
652 disease: a fMRI study. *Brain Lang*. 2013 Jun;125(3):324-9. doi: 10.1016/j.bandl.2012.06.001. Epub  
653 2012 Jul 25. PMID: 22841350.
- 654 65. van Nuenen BF, Helmich RC, Buenen N, van de Warrenburg BP, Bloem BR, Toni I. Compensatory  
655 activity in the extrastriate body area of Parkinson's disease patients. *J Neurosci*. 2012 Jul  
656 11;32(28):9546-53. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0335-12.2012. PMID: 22787040; PMCID:  
657 PMC6622256.
- 658 66. Helmich RC, de Lange FP, Bloem BR, Toni I. Cerebral compensation during motor imagery in  
659 Parkinson's disease. *Neuropsychologia*. 2007 Jun 11;45(10):2201-15. doi:  
660 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2007.02.024. Epub 2007 Mar 7. PMID: 17448507.

- 661 67. Helmich RC, Bloem BR, Toni I. Motor imagery evokes increased somatosensory activity in  
662 Parkinson's disease patients with tremor. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 2012 Aug;33(8):1763-79. doi:  
663 10.1002/hbm.21318. Epub 2011 Jun 14. PMID: 21674693; PMCID: PMC6869863.
- 664 68. Heremans E, Feys P, Nieuwboer A, Vercruysse S, Vandenberghe W, Sharma N, Helsen W. Motor  
665 imagery ability in patients with early- and mid-stage Parkinson disease. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.*  
666 2011 Feb;25(2):168-77. doi: 10.1177/1545968310370750. PMID: 21239707.
- 667 69. Tinaz S, Para K, Vives-Rodriguez A, Martinez-Kaigi V, Nalamada K, Sezgin M, Scheinost D,  
668 Hampson M, Louis ED, Constable RT. Insula as the Interface Between Body Awareness and  
669 Movement: A Neurofeedback-Guided Kinesthetic Motor Imagery Study in Parkinson's Disease. *Front*  
670 *Hum Neurosci.* 2018 Dec 7;12:496. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2018.00496. PMID: 30581383; PMCID:  
671 PMC6292989.
- 672 70. Subramanian L, Hindle JV, Johnston S, Roberts MV, Husain M, Goebel R, Linden D. Real-time  
673 functional magnetic resonance imaging neurofeedback for treatment of Parkinson's disease. *J Neurosci.*  
674 2011 Nov 9;31(45):16309-17. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3498-11.2011. PMID: 22072682; PMCID:  
675 PMC6633236.
- 676 71. Mori Y, Yoshikawa E, Futatsubashi M, Ouchi Y. Neural correlates of standing imagery and  
677 execution in Parkinsonian patients: The relevance to striatal dopamine dysfunction. *PLoS One.* 2020  
678 Oct 28;15(10):e0240998. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0240998. PMID: 33112886; PMCID:  
679 PMC7592757.
- 680 72. Amick MM, Schendan HE, Ganis G, Cronin-Golomb A. Frontostriatal circuits are necessary for  
681 visuomotor transformation: mental rotation in Parkinson's disease. *Neuropsychologia.* 2006;44(3):339-  
682 49. doi: 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2005.06.002. Epub 2005 Aug 2. PMID: 16061263.
- 683 73. Conson M, Trojano L, Vitale C, Mazzarella E, Allocca R, Barone P, Grossi D, Santangelo G. The  
684 role of embodied simulation in mental transformation of whole-body images: evidence from  
685 Parkinson's disease. *Hum Mov Sci.* 2014 Feb;33:343-53. doi: 10.1016/j.humov.2013.10.006. Epub  
686 2013 Nov 26. PMID: 24290611.
- 687 74. Scarpina F, Magnani FG, Tagini S, Priano L, Mauro A, Sedda A. Mental representation of the body  
688 in action in Parkinson's disease. *Exp Brain Res.* 2019 Oct;237(10):2505-2521. doi: 10.1007/s00221-  
689 019-05608-w. Epub 2019 Jul 20. PMID: 31327026.



690 75. Peterson DS, Pickett KA, Earhart GM. Effects of levodopa on vividness of motor imagery in  
691 Parkinson disease. *J Parkinsons Dis.* 2012;2(2):127-33. doi: 10.3233/JPD-2012-12077. PMID:  
692 23939437; PMCID: PMC3744123.

693 76. Feltz DL, Landers DM. The effects of mental practice on motor skill learning and performance: A  
694 meta-analysis. *Journal of Sport Psychology.* 1983;5(1):25-57.

695 77. Gueugneau N, Schweighofer N, Papaxanthis C. Daily update of motor predictions by physical  
696 activity. *Sci Rep.* 2015 Dec 3;5:17933. doi: 10.1038/srep17933. PMID: 26632341; PMCID:  
697 PMC4668580.

698 78. Goetz CG, Tilley BC, Shaftman SR, Stebbins GT, Fahn S, Martinez-Martin P, Poewe W, Sampaio  
699 C, Stern MB, Dodel R, Dubois B, Holloway R, Jankovic J, Kulisevsky J, Lang AE, Lees A, Leurgans  
700 S, LeWitt PA, Nyenhuis D, Olanow CW, Rascol O, Schrag A, Teresi JA, van Hilten JJ, LaPelle N;  
701 Movement Disorder Society UPDRS Revision Task Force. Movement Disorder Society-sponsored  
702 revision of the Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (MDS-UPDRS): scale presentation and  
703 clinimetric testing results. *Mov Disord.* 2008 Nov 15;23(15):2129-70. doi: 10.1002/mds.22340. PMID:  
704 19025984.

705

706

707

708

709

710

711

712

713

714

## *Supplementary Material*

715 Figure 1. Eligibility criteria

716

717

718

### **Design**

- Randomised controlled trials
- Nonrandomised controlled trials
- Observational descriptive study

719

720

721

### **Participants**

- Patients with a clinical diagnosis of Parkinson's disease

722

723

### **Intervention**

- Motor imagery intervention

724

725

### **Outcome measures**

- No precision

726

727

### **Comparisons**

- Motor imagery versus no intervention or sham intervention
- Motor imagery plus other intervention versus other intervention only
- Motor imagery versus physical therapy intervention
- Motor imagery for patients with Parkinson's disease versus healthy subjects

728

729

730

731

732

733

734

735

736

737

738

739

740 Figure 2. Flow of studies for the review

741

742

743

744

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

753

754

755

756

757

758

759

760


761

762

763

764

765



**Table 1. Characteristics of the randomised controlled trials**

Articles	Type of study	Participants: nb (nb per gender), mean (SD) age, mean (SD) UPDRS stage, mean (SD) H&Y score, treatment	Inclusion criteria (diagnosis, age, H&Y scale, MMSE score, others)	Exclusion criteria	Protocol (task, sessions [No. and W], frequency, intensity)	Evaluation (No., date, and outcomes)	PEDro score
Sarasso et al. (2023)	RCT	Experimental group: 10 PD patients (5♀), 67.6 (6.4) y, H&Y OFF 5/4/3, UPDRS III 33.1 (11.9)  Control group: 12 PD patients (5♀), 64.1 (8.9) y, H&Y OFF 5/4/4, UPDRS III 33.8 (10.5)	Idiopathic PD, H&Y score ≤3. Mini-mental score examination (MMSE) score (greater than or equal to 24)	Medical illnesses or substance abuse that could interfere with cognition; any (other) major systemic, psychiatric, neurological, visual, and musculoskeletal disturbances or other causes of walking inability; contraindications to undergoing MRI examination; and brain damage at routine MRI, including lacunae and extensive cerebrovascular disorders	Experimental group: Performed DUAL-TASK + AOT-MI (four gait/balance exercises each session were proposed with the following modality: 2 min of task observation → 5 min of task execution → 2 min of task imagination → 5 min of task execution) Control group: DUAL-TASK performed the same number of exercises combined with watching landscape videos instead of observation/imagination  For both groups: 1 h each session, 3 d/wk for 6 wks	Primary clinical outcome: Kinesthetic and Visual Imagery Questionnaire (KVIQ) version 10, and brain MRI scans	7
Bezerra et al. (2022)	RCT	Experimental group: 21 PD patients (7♀), 64.6 (9.3) y, H&Y OFF 2.0 (2.0-3.0), UPDRS II 23.0 (15.5-32.5), UPDRS III 13.0 (9.0-18.5)  Control group: 18 PD patients (7♀), 60.7 (6.8) y, H&Y OFF 2.5 (2.0-3.0), UPDRS II 27.5 (18.0-41.2), UPDRS III 14.0 (10.0-23.0)	Idiopathic PD, H&Y scores 1.5 to 3; regular use of antiparkinsonian medication; walk independently for at least 10 meters without any orthosis or gait aid; no cognitive deficit according to the Mini-Mental state Examination (cutoff of 18 points for illiterate and 24 for those with school education)	Musculoskeletal or cardiorespiratory impairments affecting gait; and absence of other associated neurological diseases	Experimental group: Performed 12 sessions of AO, MI, and gait training.  Control group: Watched PD-related educational videos and performed 12 sessions of gait training.  For both groups: 1 h each session, 3 d/wk for 4 wks	Primary clinical outcome: MiniBESTest: Mini Balance Evaluation Systems Test; FOG-Q: freezing of Gait Questionnaire.	8
Kashif et al. (2022)	RCT	Experimental group: 22 PD patients (9♀), 63.9 (4.6) y, H&Y OFF 2.1 (0.7), UPDRS II 22.0 (4.6), UPDRS III 32.5 (4.0)  Control group: 22 PD patients (10♀), 2.3 (4.6) y, H&Y OFF 2.6 (0.7), UPDRS II 21.5 (3.9), UPDRS III 31.9 (4.6)	Idiopathic PD, severity ranging from stage I to stage III on the modified H and Y scale, intact cognition according to their mini-mental score examination (MMSE) score (greater than or equal to 24)	Other neurological presentation, orthopaedic pathology, visual anomalies, cardiovascular issues, severe dyskinesia or “on-off” phases, a history of surgery for PD, a history of virtual games used for treatment in the last three months, and virtual game phobia	Experimental group: Physiotherapy + virtual reality (Nintendo Wii) + motor imagery Control group: Physiotherapy  60 min/d	Primary clinical outcome: MDS-UPDRS part II and III Secondary clinical outcome: Balance confidence and balance	7

					For both groups: 3 d/wk, for 12 wks with follow-up to 16 wks		
Tinaz et al. 2022	RCT	Experimental group: 22 PD patients (12♀), 66.2 (8.1) y, MDS-UPDRS III 32.3 (8.1), H&Y OFF 2.0 (0.2), NI Control group: 22 PD patients (12♀), 65.7 (8.8) y, MDS-UPDRS III 34.5 (9.6), H&Y OFF 2.1 (0.3), NI	Idiopathic Parkinson's disease (according to UK Brain Bank criteria) Age ≥ 40 y Stable dopaminergic treatment during the study	H&Y scale >stage 3 Not fully independent Neurological or psychiatric disorder Medical condition that might affect central nervous system History of alcohol or illicit drug abuse Head injury resulting in loss of consciousness MoCA < 21 Contraindications for MRI Poor homework compliance (<50%)	Experimental group: neurofeedback kinaesthetic MI (walking, balance exercises, calisthenics) Control group: visual imagery exercises  For both groups: 4W, every day  Tested in off-state	2 at W0 and after training Primary clinical outcome: MDS-UPDRS part III Secondary clinical outcome: 2 min endurance walking, TUG, 5 times sit-to-stand, 360-degree turning, physical performance test Primary imaging outcome: change in right insula-dmFC functional connectivity strength	5
Sarasso et al. 2021	RCT	Experimental group: 13 (5♀), 67.5 (6.1) y, MDS-UPDRS II 10.38 (5.55), H&Y ON 2.33 (0.5)/OFF 2.44 (0.5), NI Control group: 12 (4♀), 63.8 (9.2) y, MDS-UPDRS II 12.58 (5.14), H&Y ON 2.38 (0.5)/OFF 2.5 (0.5), NI	H&Y score ≤4 Postural instability and gait disorders phenotype Stable dopaminergic medication for at least 4 weeks, w/out any changes during observation period No dementia, MMSE ≥24 No significant head tremor	Medical illnesses or substance abuse that could interfere w/ cognition Other major systemic, psychiatric, neurological, visual, and musculoskeletal disturbances or other causes of walking inability Contraindications to undergoing MRI examination Brain damage at routine MRI including lacunae and extensive cerebrovascular disorders	Experimental group: gait/balance training with dual task exercises added with AOT-MI therapy Control group: gait/balance training with dual task exercises and watching landscapes  For both groups: 6W, 3/W, 1 hour  Tested in on-state	3 at W0, W6 and W14  TUG with cognitive (primary outcome) TUG TUG with manual dual task MiniBESTest ABC scale 10MWT PDQ-39 NFoG-Q	7
Mahmoud et al. 2018	RCT	Experimental group: 15 (4♀), NI, levodopa medication Control group: 15 (5♀), NI, levodopa medication	Idiopathic Parkinsonism with cognitive dysfunctions (confirmed with RehaCom) Age: between 50 and 65 years Modified H&Y scale: stage 1 to 3 Male and female Disease duration from 3 to 5 years Taking levodopa medication	Other symptoms of Parkinsonism Modified H&Y scale: stage 4 to 5 Damaged eyesight who could not recognise objects on a computer screen	Experimental group: MI with cues, relaxation, and breathing exercises, sit to stand task and exercises in standing position and the control group task Control group: mental cognitive exercises including memory recall, maths exercises, mental arithmetic, dual tasking  For both groups: 6W, 3/W, 1 hour  Tested in on-state	2 at pre-training and post-training  Attention and concentration level (RehaCom assessment tool) Reaction time (RehaCom assessment tool) Figural memory level and missed pictures	3

Monteiro et al. 2018	RCT	<p>Experimental group: 7 (0♀), 64 (7) y, UPDRS NS, H&amp;Y OFF 2 (1), treatment NI</p> <p>Control group: 7 (2♀), 62 (12) y, UPDRS NS, H&amp;Y OFF 2 (0.5), treatment NI</p> <p>Initially 22 patients with PD received intervention but they were 8 follow-up losses</p>	<p>Age between 45 to 72 years</p> <p>H&amp;Y scale: stage 1 to 3</p> <p>Both genders</p>	<p>Other neurological diseases</p> <p>Decompensated systemic diseases</p> <p>Reduced cognitive level</p> <p>Unable to perform MI during KVIQ-20</p>	<p>All patients before randomization: motor physiotherapy</p> <p>Experimental group: MI practice of a step and home exercises with handbook</p> <p>Control group: home exercises with handbook</p> <p>All patients before randomization: 15 sessions of 40 minutes, 2/W</p> <p>MI practice: 10 sessions of 5-10 min, 2/W</p> <p>Home exercises with handbook: 12W, 3/W, 50 min</p> <p>Tested in on-state</p>	<p>3 at baseline (evaluation), after motor physiotherapy (reevaluation 1), after mental practice (reevaluation 2)</p> <p>TUG</p> <p>DGI</p> <p>FES-I Brazil</p>	7
----------------------	-----	---	--	---	--	---	---

Articles	Type of study	Participants: nb (nb per gender), mean (SD) age, mean (SD) UPDRS stage, mean (SD) H&Y score, treatment	Inclusion criteria (diagnosis, age, H&Y scale, MMSE score, others)	Exclusion criteria	Protocol (task, sessions [No. and W], frequency, intensity)	Evaluation (No., date, and outcomes)	PEDro score
Subramanian et al. 2016	RCT	Experimental group 15 (1♀), 67 (9) y, MDS-UPDRS-MS 23.3 (9.4), H&Y 1.6 (0.6), levodopa and equivalent medication Control group 15 (3♀), 63 (11) y, MDS-UPDRS-MS 26.7 (12.6), H&Y 1.7 (0.5), levodopa and equivalent medication	Diagnosis of PD H&Y scale: stage 1 to 3 No dementia or significant comorbidity and fulfilled safety requirements for MRI	NI	Experimental group: Homework employing MI + supervised motor training with virtual reality gaming Control group: supervised motor training on gaming device  Experimental group: MI homework 4W, 7/W, 10min + supervised training 3/W, 25min and 6W, 1/W, 10min of MI homework + supervised training 1/W, 25min Control group: 4W, 3/W, 25min and 6W, 1/W, 25 min	2 at W-1 and 1 week after intervention Primary outcome: Off medication MDS-UPDRS-MS  3 at W0, W4 and W10 Secondary outcome: On medication MDS-UPDRS-MS MDS-UPDRS-motor aspects of daily living MDS-UPDRS-non motor aspects of daily living MDS-UPDRS-summer score PDQ-39	6
Santiago et al. 2015	RCT	Experimental group: 10 (NS), 61.30 (9.95) y, UPDRS-III 27.60 (10.04), H&Y 2.75 (range: 2-3), pharmacological treatment Control group: 10 (NS), 61.40 (9.05) y, UPDRS-III 20.90 (14.85), H&Y 2.25 (range:2-3), pharmacological treatment	Modified H&Y: stage 2 to 3 Taking antiparkinsonian medication Walking independently without any orthosis or gait-assistive device for at least 10 meters Not have undergone stereotaxic surgery	NI	Experimental group: 1 session of MI + physiotherapy gait protocol Control group: physiotherapy gait protocol	4 at baseline, 10 minutes, 1 day, 7 days after training  Primary outcomes: stride length, total stance time Secondary outcomes: hip ROM, velocity, TUG	8
Fayez et Elwishy 2013	RCT	Experimental group: 13 (NS), 72 (3.5) y, UPDRS NS, H&Y 2.2 (0.3), pharmacological treatment Control group: 13 (NS), 71 (4.2) y, UPDRS NS, H&Y 2.3 (0.3), pharmacological treatment	H&Y scale: stage 1.5 to 3 MMSE ≥ 26 Stable pharmacological treatment	Neuromuscular problems that affected their motor performance Vestibular dysfunction H&Y scale ≥ stage 4	Experimental group: physiotherapy + MI of gait Control group: physiotherapy + watching documentaries. Both groups: 4W, 3/W Physiotherapy: callisthenic exercises (15-20min), practice of specific functions for lower and upper limb (15-20 min) and relaxation exercises MI of gait and documentaries: 25-30 minutes	2 W0 and W4 Step length, Walking velocity Excursions in sagittal plane of the ankle, knee, hip joints FGA	7
Braun et al. 2011	RCT	Experimental group: 25 (8♀), 70 (8) y, UPDRS NI, H&Y (range: 1-4), NI Control group: 22 (7♀), 69 (8) y, UPDRS NI, H&Y (range: 1-4), NI	Clinically diagnosed adults with Parkinson's disease Being able to engage in mental practice (clinical judgment of the treating therapist, support from family, MMSE score)	Other conditions such as stroke Rheumatic diseases Dementia prior to the onset of Parkinson's disease and sufficient to cause persistent pre-morbid disability	Experimental group: physiotherapy + MI of locomotor tasks adapted for each participant Control group: physiotherapy + relaxation (sham intervention)  For both groups: 6W Physiotherapy: 1h or 2 times 30 min MI: 20 min or 2 times 10 min	3 at W0, W6 and W12  VAS for gait improvement (0 'poor' and 10 'excellent') TUG 10MWT	8

Tamir et al. 2007	RCT	Experimental group: 12 (4♀), 67.4 (9.7) y, UPDRS NI, H&Y 2.29 (0.4), pharmacological treatment Control group: 11 (4♀), 67.4 (9.1) y, UPDRS NI, H&Y 2.31 (0.4), pharmacological treatment	Community-dwelling individuals with PD H&Y scale: stages 1.5 to 3 MMSE ≥ 26 points	Presence of neuromuscular or skeletal comorbidities that affected their motor performance H&Y scale: stage 4 Ailments that prevented from making moderate physical efforts	Experimental group: physiotherapy + MI practice Control group: physiotherapy only  For both groups: 12W, 2/W, 1h Physiotherapy: callisthenic exercises (15-20 min), practice of specific functions for lower limb and upper limb (15-20 min), relaxation exercises MI practice: integrated in physiotherapy, either preceded the motor task or followed it Tested in on-state	2 at 1 day before and at the end of the intervention  TUG Standing up and lying down Turning in place 360 deg Tandem stance Functional reach test Shoulder tug UPDRS Clock drawing Stroop test	6
-------------------	-----	---	--	--	---	--	---

**Abbreviations:** ♀, woman/women; ♂, man/men; 10MWT, 10-Meter Walking Test; ABC, Activities Balance Confidence; AOT, Action observation therapy; DGI, Dynamix Gait Index; FES-I, Falls Efficacy Scale International; FGA, Functional Gait Assessment; H&Y, Hoehn and Yahr; HS, healthy subjects; KVIQ-20, Kinesthetic and Visual Imagery Questionnaire-20; MDS-UPDRS(-MS), Movement Disorder Society-Unified Parkinson Disease Rating Scale-(Motor Scale); MI, motor imagery; MiniBESTest, Mini Balance Evaluation Systems Test; MMSE, Mini Mental State Examination; MoCA, Montreal Cognitive Assessment; NFOG-Q, New Freezing of Gait Questionnaire; NI, non-informed data; PD, Parkinson disease; PDQ-39, Parkinson's Disease Questionnaire-39 items; SD, standard deviation; TUG, Timed Up and Go; W, week(s) ;Y, years; ROM, range of motion; VAS, visual analogue scale;



**Table 2. Results of randomised controlled trials**

Articles	Techniques used	Outcomes (pre intervention comparison, post intervention comparison)	p value
Sarasso et al. (2023)	Experimental group DUAL-TASK + AOT-MI  vs.  Control group: DUAL-TASK	Experimental group: pre intervention KVIQ 57.3 (19.5) vs Control group: pre intervention KVIQ 53.8 (24.8)  Experimental group: pre intervention brain MRI scans vs Control group: pre intervention brain MRI scans  Experimental group: post intervention KVIQ 70.0 (32.2) vs Control group: post intervention KVIQ 59.0 (34.9)  Experimental group: post intervention brain MRI scans vs Control group: post intervention brain MRI scans	N.S. N.A.  p<0.001 p<0.001
Bezerra et al. (2022)	Experimental group: AO, MI, and gait training  vs.  Control group: Watched PD-related educational videos and gait training	Experimental group: pre intervention MiniBESTest 24.2 (1.4) vs Control group: pre intervention MiniBESTest 23.6 (1.3)  Experimental group: pre intervention FOG-Q 9.3 (1.6) vs Control group: pre intervention FOG-Q 9.8 (1.5)  Experimental group: post intervention MiniBESTest 25.7 (1.4) vs Control group: post intervention MiniBESTest 24.2 (1.3)  Experimental group: post intervention FOG-Q 8.8 (1.6) vs post intervention FOG-Q 8.7 (1.5)  Intergroup comparison difference  * Only to MiniBESTest: domain – reactive postural control	N.S. N.S.  p<0.001 p<0.001  * p=0.010
Kashif et al. (2022)	Experimental group: Physiotherapy + virtual reality (Nintendo Wii) + motor imagery  vs.	Experimental group: pre intervention UPDRS II 22.0 (4.6) vs Control group: pre intervention UPDRS II 21.5 (3.9)  Experimental group: pre intervention UPDRS III 32.5 (4.0) vs Control group: pre intervention UPDRS III 31.9 (4.6)  Experimental group: pre intervention Balance confidence – ABCS 59.6 (5.9) vs Control group: pre intervention Balance confidence – ABCS 59.3 (8.9)  Experimental group: Balance – BBS pre intervention 39.0 (3.2) vs. Control group: pre intervention 40.2 (4.6)	N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S.  p<0.001

	Control group: Physiotherapy	Experimental group: post intervention UPDRS II 17.1 (4.4) vs Control group: post intervention UPDRS II 20.0 (3.8)  Experimental group: post intervention UPDRS III 23.0 (8.3) vs post intervention UPDRS III 28.2 (6.1)  Experimental group: post intervention Balance confidence – ABCS 59.6 (5.9) vs Control group: post intervention Balance confidence – ABCS 59.3 (8.9)  Experimental group: Balance – BBS post intervention 39.0 (3.2) vs. Control group: post intervention 40.2 (4.6)	p<0.001  p<0.001  p<0.001
Tinaz et al. 2022	Experimental group: NF guided kinesthetic MI  vs.  Control group: visual Imagery training	MDS-UPDRS III, experimental group pre intervention 32.3 (8.1) vs. control group pre intervention 34.5 (9.6) Endurance walking, experimental group pre intervention 162.6 (30.7) m vs. control group pre intervention 152.7 (26.1) m Gross motor combined, experimental group pre intervention 23.7 (4.7) s vs. control group pre intervention 24.4 (4.9) s Physical performance Test, experimental group pre intervention 25.1 (3.3) vs. control group pre intervention 24.2 (3.0)  MDS-UPDRS III, experimental group post intervention 31.3 (9.8) vs control group post intervention 35.1 (10.8) Endurance walking, experimental group post intervention 171.3 (33.2) m vs. control group post intervention 160.7 (25.5) m Gross motor combined, experimental group post intervention 22.3 (5.1) s vs. control group post intervention 24.1 (5.2) s Physical performance Test, experimental group post intervention 26.1 (3.5) vs. control group post intervention 24.7 (3.5)	N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S.  N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S.
Sarasso et al. 2021	Experimental group: dual-task+ AOT-MI  vs.  Control group: dual task only	TUG-COG delta W0-W6, experimental group -8.17 (12.75) s vs. control group -3.68 (7.18) s TUG delta W0-W6, experimental group -2.11 (1.69) s vs. control group -2.08 (2.64) s TUG-MAN delta W0-W6, experimental group -2.11 (2.61) s vs. control group -3.42 (6.67) s MiniBESTest delta W0-W6, experimental group 2.92 (2.02) vs. control group 0.33 (2.53) ABCscale delta W0-W6, experimental group 11.43 (9.11) vs. control group 2.53 (8.78) 10MWT-confortable speed delta W0-W6, experimental group -1.01 (1.11) vs. control group -0.18 (0.97) PDQ-39 delta W0-W6, experimental group -4.61 (5.70) vs. control group -0.62 (8.44)  TUG-COG delta W0-W14, experimental group -6.29 (9.94) s vs. control group -4.24 (7.94) s TUG delta W0-W14, experimental group -2.04 (1.69) s vs. control group -2.82 (2.92) s TUG-MAN delta W0-W14, experimental group -1.70 (2.18) s vs. control group -3.45 (5.75) s MiniBESTest delta W0-W14, experimental group 3.27 (2.72) vs. control group 0.67 (3.55) ABCscale delta W0-W14, experimental group 11.53 (11.78) vs. control group 0.76 (9.76) 10MWT-confortable speed delta W0-W14, experimental group -1.65 (2.01) vs. control group -0.33 (0.73) PDQ-39 delta W0-W14, experimental group -4.14 (6.77) vs. control group -4.28 (5.72)	p<0.001 p=1.000 p=0.210 p=0.010 p=0.010 p=0.045 p=0.380  p=0.020 p=1.000 p=0.150 p=0.020 p=0.030 p=0.002 p=0.410
Mahmoud et al. 2018	Experimental group: MI with augmented cues + specifically designed intervention  vs.  Control group: specifically designed intervention	Attention and concentration level: experimental group pre 7.46 vs. control group pre 7.8 Reaction time in attention and concentration: experimental group pre 9096.4 msec vs. control group pre 9178.46 msec Figural memory level: experimental group pre 5.53 vs. control group pre 5.06 Missed pictures for figural memory: experimental group pre 9.06 vs. control group pre 8.86  Attention and concentration level: experimental group post 17.06 vs. control group post 10 Reaction time in attention and concentration: experimental group post 3085.06 msec vs. control group post 6949 msec Figural memory level: experimental group post 10 vs. control group post 7.06 Missed pictures for figural memory: experimental group post 2.13 vs. control group post 6.13	p=0.550 p=0.900 p=0.460 p=0.830  p<0.001  p<0.001  p<0.001

			p<0.001
Monteiro et al. 2018	<p>Experimental group: MI + home exercise guidelines handbook</p> <p>vs.</p> <p>Control group: handbook activities only</p>	<p>TUG evaluation, experimental group vs. control group , no data available  DGI evaluation, experimental group vs. control group , no data available  FES-I evaluation, experimental group vs. control group , no data available</p> <p>TUG reevaluation 1, experimental group vs. control group, no data available  DGI reevaluation 1, experimental group vs. control group, no data available  FES-I reevaluation 1, experimental group vs. control group, no data available</p> <p>TUG reevaluation 2, experimental group vs. control group, no data available  DGI reevaluation 2, experimental group vs. control group, no data available  FES-I reevaluation 2, experimental group vs. control group, no data available</p>	<p>N.S.  N.S.  N.S.</p> <p>N.S.  N.S.  N.S.</p> <p>p=0.050  N.S.  N.S.</p>

Articles	Techniques used	Outcomes (pre intervention comparison, post intervention comparison)	p value
Subramanian et al. 2016	Experimental group: homework employing MI + motor training with virtual reality vs. Control group: motor training with virtual reality gaming device	Primary outcome (Off medication) MDS-UPDRS-MS, experimental group pre-post -4.5 (3.3) vs. control group pre-post -1.8 (8.3) Secondary outcome (On medication) MDS-UPDRS-MS, experimental group pre-post -4.9 (3.8) vs. control group pre-post -5.4 (4.9) MDS-UPDRS-M-DL, experimental group pre-post -1.7 (2.3) vs. control group pre-post -1.5 (2.8) MDS-UPDRS-NM-DL, experimental group pre-post -2.8 (2.9) vs. control group pre-post -0.9 (3.9) MDS-UPDRS-SS, experimental group pre-post -9.2 (9.7) vs. control group pre-post -7.9 (8.4) PDQ-39, experimental group pre-post -2.4 (4.8) vs. control group pre-post -3.6 (6.5)	p=0.73  p=0.86 p=0.86 p=0.73 p=0.86 p=0.93
Santiago et al. 2015	Experimental group: MI added to physiotherapy vs. Control group: physiotherapy	Stride length: experimental group pre 11.1 (0.1) m vs. control group pre 1.17 (0.1) m Total stance time: experimental group pre 1.37 (0.06) s vs. control group pre 1.47 (0.06) s Hip ROM: experimental group pre 33.9 (1.6) ° vs. control group pre 36.6 (1.6) ° Velocity: experimental group pre 1.05 (0.06) m/s vs. control group pre 1.06 (0.06) m/s TUG: experimental group pre 12.6 (1.0) vs. control group pre 13.1 (1.2)  Stride length: experimental group post 1.17 (0.05) m vs. control group post 1.18 (0.05) m Total stance time: experimental group post 1.34 (0.06) s vs. control group post 1.45 (0.06) s Hip ROM: experimental group post 36.1 (1.7) ° vs. control group post 38.2 (1.7) ° Velocity: experimental group post 1.12 (0.07) m/s vs. control group post 1.09 (0.7) m/s TUG: experimental group post 11.3 (0.8) vs. control group post 12.0 (0.9)	p<0.050 N.S. p<0.050 p<0.050 p<0.050
Fayez et Elwishi 2013	Experimental group: MI of gait + physiotherapy vs. Control group: physiotherapy	Speed: experimental group pre 0.74 (0.02) m/s vs. control group pre 0.75 (0.03) m/s Step length: experimental group pre 0.50 (0.07) m vs. control group pre 0.51 (0.05) m Hip ROM: experimental group pre 39.5 (6) ° vs. control group pre 39.3 (5.7) ° Knee ROM: experimental group pre 45.7 (7.1) ° vs. control group pre 47.7 (5.4) ° Ankle ROM: experimental group pre 19.2 (5.5) ° vs. control group pre 20.4 (4.8) ° FGA: experimental group pre 15.5 (3) vs. control group pre 16.2 (2.8)  Speed: experimental group post 0.87 (0.02) m/s vs. control group post 0.81 (0.03) m/s Step length: experimental group post 0.60 (0.03) m vs. control group post 0.55 (0.05) m Hip ROM: experimental group post 54.7 (7.2) ° vs. control group post 48.1 (6.1) ° Knee ROM: experimental group post 60.7 (9.3) ° vs. control group post 52.5 (6) ° Ankle ROM: experimental group post 29.2 (5.4) ° vs. control group post 24.8 (4.6) ° FGA: experimental group post 21.8 (3.2) vs. control group post 18.8 (2.8)	p = 0.6066 p = 0.8430 p = 0.9154 p = 0.4400 p = 0.5696 p = 0.5476  p = 0.000 p = 0.003 p = 0.020 p = 0.013 p = 0.037 p = 0.016
Braun et al. 2011	Experimental group: physiotherapy + MI vs. Control group: physiotherapy + relaxation (used as sham intervention)	VAS walking (participant rating): experimental group pre 5.0 (2.2) cm vs. control group pre 6.5 (2.1) cm TUG: experimental group pre 14.6 (9.6) sec vs. control group pre 15.7 (16.5) sec 10MWT: experimental group pre 10.3 (3.6) sec vs. control group pre 11.0 (5.1) sec  VAS walking (participant rating) : experimental group post 5.5 (2.1) cm vs. control group post 6.9 (1.7) cm TUG: experimental group post 18.1 (31.6) sec vs. control group post 9.5 (1.5) sec 10MWT: experimental group post 11.8 (12.6) sec vs. control group post 8.3 (1.5) sec	N.S. N.S. N.S.  N.S. N.S. N.S.
Tamir et al. 2007	Experimental group: MI + physiotherapy	Functional reach: experimental group post vs control group post, no data available UPDRS 1: experimental group pre-post vs control group pre-post, no data available UPDRS 2: experimental group pre-post vs control group pre-post, no data available UPDRS 3: experimental group pre-post vs control group pre-post, no data available	N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S.

vs. Control group: physiotherapy	UPDRS 6: experimental group pre-post vs control group pre-post, no data available Clock drawing: experimental group post vs control group post, no data available	N.S. N.S.
-------------------------------------	--	--------------

**Abbreviations:** 10MWT, 10-Meter Walking Test; ABC, Activities Balance Confidence; AOT, Action observation therapy; COG, cognitive; DGI, Dynamix Gait Index; FES-I, Falls Efficacy Scale International; FGA, Functional Gait Assessment; M-DL, motor aspects of daily living; MAN, manual task; MDS-UPDRS(-MS), Movement Disorder Society-Unified Parkinson Disease Rating Scale-(Motor Scale); MI, motor imagery; MiniBESTest, Mini Balance Evaluation Systems Test; N.S., not significant; NA, non-applicable ;NF, neurofeedback; NM-DL, non-motor aspects of daily living; PDQ-39, Parkinson’s Disease Questionnaire-39 items; ROM, range of motion; RT, randomized trial; SS, summer score; TUG, Timed Up and Go; VAS, visual analogue scale;

**Table 3. Characteristics of non-randomised controlled trials and descriptive studies**

Assessment	Type	Articles	Type of study	Participants: nb (nb per gender), mean (SD) age, mean (SD) UPDRS stage, mean (SD) H&Y score, treatment	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria	Task	Evaluation
Clinical assessment	MI of walking	Cohen et al. 2011	Descriptive study	Experimental groups: - PD-FOG: 11 (2♀), 68 (8) y, UPDRS 44.9 (15.1), H&Y 3.0 (0.8), NI - PD-nonFOG: 13 (3♀), 67 (6) y, UPDRS 32.2 (7.6), H&Y 2.1 (0.5), NI Control group: 10 HS (0 ♀), 67 (7) y	NI	Dementia or other neurological diseases Vestibular disorders Musculoskeletal gait impairment Inability to stand and walk for 20 min	Passability experiment: Judged if they could get through a door without rotating their torso  Imagery experiment: Part A: ME and MI of walking to a line behind a sliding door (repeated with several opening sizes of the sliding door) Part B: constant door opening but subjects started at different distances from the door. Experiment was done in ME and MI  Tested in "off" state	Passability experiment: passability estimation (% of body width) Imagery experiment: execution time
		Ehgoetz Martens et al. 2014	Descriptive study	PD-nonFOG group: 15 (3♀), 71 (9.4) y, UPDRS-III 24.3 (7.3), H&Y NI, treatment NI PD-FOG group: 9 (0♀), 73 (4.2) y, UPDRS-III 30.9 (9.9), H&Y NI, treatment NI	NI	Visual disturbances impairing distance acuity (Snellen Eye Chart >20/50) Poor contrast sensitivity (Peli-Robson chart <18/42) Gait impairments preventing individuals from walking 10 m unassisted Modified MMSE <70/100 Spatial working memory impairments	Experiment 1: pointing judgment and walking judgment towards a target placed between 2.5 and 7 m and then removed  Experiment 2: walking to a target located between 3 and 6 meters and MI of this test  Tested in "on" state	Experiment 1: magnitude of error Experiment 2: execution time
fMRI		Huang et al. 2021	Descriptive study	PD-nonFOG group: 14 (42.9%♀), 69.8 (7.8) y, UPDRS 37.9 (18.0), UPDRS-III 24.4 (14.1), H&Y 2.2 (0.5), treatment NI PD-FOG group: 20 (40%♀), 66.0 (6.2) y, UPDRS 51.3 (20.1), UPDRS-III 30.4 (15.2), H&Y 3.1 (0.7), treatment NI Control group: 15 HS (66.7%♀), 63.4 (7.0) y	NI	NI	Video-guided MI of turning, straight walking with and without freezing Patients watched the video and had to mentally imagined themselves performing the action currently played  Tested in "off" state	BOLD response

		Maidan et al. 2016	Descriptive study	<p>Experimental group: 20 (6♀), 72.9 (1.6) y, UPDRS-III 29.8 (2.4), H&amp;Y NI, dopaminergic treatment</p> <p>Control group: 20 HS (10♀), 69.7 (1.3) y</p>	<p>For all participants: Age &gt; 60 years Able to walk 5 min unassisted Stable medication for the past month</p> <p>For patients with PD: Idiopathic PD (according to UK Brain Bank criteria) H&amp;Y scale: stage 2-3 Taking anti-Parkinsonian medication</p>	<p>Psychiatric disorders MMSE &lt; 24 History of stroke, traumatic brain injury or chronic neurological disorders Orthopaedic disorders that may affect gait</p>	<p>1) MI of walking on a clear virtual path presented 2) MI of walking on a virtual path displayed with obstacles 3) Plan a path on a map displayed in front of them, then MI of walking while navigating control task: watching the same virtual scenes without MI of walking 45 sec for each walking tasks, 4 times</p> <p>Tested in "off" state</p>	Neural brain activation
--	--	--------------------	-------------------	--	---	--	--	-------------------------

Assessment	Type	Articles	Type of study	Participants: nb (nb per gender), mean (SD) age, mean (SD) UPDRS stage, mean (SD) H&Y score, treatment	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria	Task	Evaluation
fMRI	MI of walking	Peterson et al. 2014	Descriptive study	Experimental group: 19 (8♀), 64.9 (7.6) y, UPDRS 31.2 (10), H&Y 2.34 (0.33), levodopa (3 PD without treatment) Control group: 20 HS (15♀), 66.6 (7.6) y	Idiopathic PD Averaged > 3 on both the visual and kinesthetic components of KVIQ-20 Included regardless of freezing status	Lower limb injuries Contraindications for MRI Neurological problems other than PD or cognitive dysfunction	Following task in MI and ME: forward walking, backward walking, turning to the left, turning to the right, standing quietly Motor imaging tasks are performed in an fMRI	Execution time BOLD with of region of interest
		Snijders et al. 2011	Descriptive study	Experimental group: 24 (9♀) (12 FOG, 12 nonFOG), 60.2 (8.9) y, UPDRS-III FOG 34.6 (9.6)/nonFOG 28.6 (12.2), H&Y NI, dopaminergic medication Control group: 21 HS (9♀), 57 (9.1) y	NI	Marked resting tremor Vividness of MIQ score > 200	2 tasks: MI of gait and a matched visual imagery control task (imagine seeing a disc moving along a path) For both task 2 widths (narrow, broad), 5 different distances (2, 4, 6, 8, 10m) ME of walking along the path with 2 widths, 5 different distances  2 sessions of 25 min for MI of gait and visual imagery task  Tested in "off" state (12hours without medication)	Execution time (imagery task) Gait data (step length, gait asymmetry) ROI analysis for fMRI
PET scan		Maillet et al. 2015	Descriptive study	Experimental group: 8 (4♀), 63.3 (6.3) y, UPDRS-III off 37.8 (8.7)/on 14.9 (5.7), H&Y 3.4 (0.5), dopaminergic treatment Control group: 8 HS (4♀), 62.9 (6.7) y	Gait score items of UPDRS-III improved by at least 1 point on compared to off KVIQ-k score ≥30/50	For all participants: MMSE < 27/30 Frontal assessment battery score < 14/18 For patients with PD: Mattis dementia rating scale score < 130/144 Orthopaedic or psychiatric disorders Marked resting tremor Neurosurgery	Behavioural session: MI of walking (distance of 6 and 10m on a line of 27cm and 9cm wide), MI of walking on this line and visual imagery (imagine a blue puck moving on this line) PET session: MI of walking (distance of 6m and 10m on a line of 27cm wide), visual imagery (imagine a blue puck moving on the 6m*27cm or 10m*27cm) and control task (press a button after a beep)  Tested in "on" and "off" state	Behavioural session: KVIQ score, execution time PET session: execution time, rCBF
	Weiss et al. 2015	Descriptive study	Experimental group: 10 (NI), UPDRS-III STN-DBS ON 14.7 (4.8)/STN-DBS OFF 39.1 (7.1), H&Y NI, STN-DBS treatment	NI	NI	Actual gait: 2 times walking during 90s on a 15m route, walking on an 8m-long wallpaper for stride length Stance: 90s standing on a 40x40cm square MI: imagine walking on a 15m route 30s, 60s, 90s Imagery stance: imagine stance for 90s PET scan: 3 times each 4 conditions (STN-DBS ON/OFF, imagery of walking/stance)  Tested in "off" state	MI of walking distance Walking distance Stride length Velocity PET activation with rCBF	



Behavioural assessment	Thumb opposition	Avanzino et al. 2013	Descriptive study	Experimental group: 14 (6♀), 68.78 (8.71) y, UPDRS-III (range: 5-37), H&Y (range: 1-2.5), dopaminergic treatment Control group: 12 HS (5♀), 64.15 (10.88) y	Diagnosis of PD according to the UK Parkinson's Disease Society Brain Bank criteria H&Y scale: stages 1-3 Stable dopaminergic medication regimen	History of any neurological disease other than PD Ongoing functional brain surgery treatment MMSE corrected score < 24 Visual or hearing impairment Severe orthopaedic problems of the upper limb	Sequential opposition of thumb to index, medium, ring and little fingers Two tasks: - 1) the execution task: tap in synchrony (SYNC) with a metronome cue and when the tone stops they had to continue performing the sequential opposition (CONT-EXE) 2) the MI task which starts with a phase with the metronome and then when the tone stops participants were requested to imagine finger tapping at the same rhythm (CONT-MI) Each phase (with metronome and without) lasted 45 seconds, two blocks for each task  Tested in "on" state	Temporal error Interval reproduction accuracy index
------------------------	------------------	----------------------	-------------------	--	--	---	--	--

Assessment	Type	Articles	Type of study	Participants: nb (nb per gender), mean (SD) age, mean (SD) UPDRS stage, mean (SD) H&Y score, treatment	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria	Task	Evaluation
PET scan	Thumb opposition	Cunnington et al. 2001	Descriptive study	Experimental group: 6 (2♀), 66.0 (7.5) y, UPDRS NI, H&Y (range: 3-4), pharmacological treatment Control group: 3 HS (1♀), 60.7 (3.8) y	NI	NI	Task: finger-to-thumb opposition movement at 1Hz for 50 seconds 16 PET scans per subjects (for PD patients, 8 were in off-state and 8 were in on-state) Each PET scan in 2 conditions: MI or rest	Relative rCBF
Electrode recording		Leiguarda et al. 2009	Descriptive study	Experimental group: 3 (NI), median: 50 (range: 15) y, UPDRS NI, H&Y 4, treatment NI	Idiopathic PD according to UKPDS Brain Bank criteria Severe motor fluctuations	NI	Task: thumb to index opposition, flexion/extension of all fingers simultaneously, flexion/extension of elbow, flexion/extension of the ankle 3 conditions: rest (30 sec), MI (30 sec for each movement), ME (30 sec for each movement)	Firing rate of globus pallidus internus (microelectrode recording)
EMG	Hand gripping	Kobelt et al. 2018	Descriptive study	Patients with PD: 5 (NI), 65.4 (6.0) y, UPDRS NI, H&Y NI, treatment NI Patients with stroke: 7 (NI), 53.7 (16.3) y Healthy participants: 10 (NI), 45.4 (15.4) y	For all participants: Age > 18 years, male and female, be able to sit on a normal chair with eyes closed, be able to do grasping and arm lifting task alone, have given written consent For patients with PD: idiopathic PD, no deep brain stimulation treatment For HS: no neurological or psychological disorders	Additional neurological, psychological, or psychiatric disorders Severe cardiovascular of pulmonary diseases Severe pain Severe upper limb deformation of joints with arthritic origin Impairments in cognition and communication	Task: Hand grasping and arm lifting task with most affected hand in patients with stroke and PD and dominant hand for healthy participants. 3 conditions: MI, ME, and rest  3 blocks with 3 times each condition	EMG of deltoideus pars clavicularis, biceps brachii, extensor digitorum, flexor carpi radialis
Electrode recording		Fischer et al. 2017	Descriptive study	Experimental group: 10 (3♀), 61.3 (7) y, UPDRS-III off 43.5 (21.9)/on 17.9 (11.7), H&Y NI, surgical treatment	NI	NI	First part: gripping task at 15, 50 or 85% of the maximum sustainable force 3 blocks in each condition with each block contained 3-5 trials for each hand and force level  Second part: MI task of gripping 3 blocks with 3 trials per hand and force level for each block	Monopolar Local Field Potentials (LFP) Gamma-beta power changes
PET scan	Joystick movement	Samuel et al. 2001	Descriptive study	Experimental group: 6 (NI), 62 (6) y, UPDRS off 24 (13), H&Y NI, pharmacological treatment Control group: 6 HS (3♀), 55 (4) y	NI	NI	Task: joystick movement 3 conditions: rest, MI, ME In condition 1 + 2, relaxed hand loosely around joystick  Tested in "off" state (12hours without medication)	Task performance (recall the last 4 movements) during MI and ME PET activation with rCBF
		Thobois et al. 2000	Descriptive study	Experimental group: 8 right-handed patients (3♀), 49.4 (5.3) y, UPDRS-III "off" 18.7 (6), H&Y 2 (0.5), dopaminergic treatment (6) or drug naïve (2)	Idiopathic PD (according to UK Brain Bank criteria) Positive and sustained response to dopaminergic treatment Asymmetric parkinsonian	NI	Task: sequential movement with a joystick 3 conditions: MI, ME, and rest 90 seconds/condition	Execution time PET activation with rCBF

			Control group: 8 right-handed (5♀), 54 (12.8) y	syndrome affecting predominantly right hemibody Prominent akinetic-rigid signs without tremor		
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

Assessment	Type	Articles	Type of study	Participants: nb (nb per gender), mean (SD) age, mean (SD) UPDRS stage, mean (SD) H&Y score, treatment	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria	Task	Evaluation
PET scan	Joystick movement	Thobois et al. 2002	Descriptive study	Experimental group: 7 (1♀), 56.3 (11.4) y, UPDRS "on" 15.2 (8.5)/ "off" 46.2 (15), H&Y NI, chronic electrical stimulation of the STN	NI	NI	Task: moving a joystick with right hand in 3 sequential directions 6 conditions for PET scan: rest without stimulation, rest with effective unilateral left stimulation, ME without stimulation, ME with effective unilateral left stimulation, MI without stimulation, MI with unilateral left stimulation  2 times each condition  Tested in "off" state (12hours without medication)	Execution time STN rCBF changes during MI and ME
Clinical assessment	Various tasks of the upper limb	Yáñez et al. 1999	Clinical trial	Patients with Parkinson's disease group: 12 (6♀), 67.0 (10.3) y, UPDRS NI, H&Y (range 1-3), pharmacological treatment Patients with Huntington's disease group: 11 (5♀), 47.6 (10.0) y	NI	NI	Imagery training: imagine printed ideograms, imagine drawing them Physical practice: 4 sheets of drawing the ideograms	3 measurements (drawing ideograms): baseline, after imagery, after physical practice Kinematic parameters: movement duration, tangential velocity Accuracy: heights, widths
		Sabaté et al. 2007	Descriptive study	Young-healthy group: 9 HS (NI), range: 20-38 y Mature-healthy group: 9 HS (NI), range: 40-65 y Patients with stroke group (3 years): 10 (NI), range: 44-66 y Patients with stroke group (32 weeks): 15 (NI), range: 41-72 y Patients with PD group: 8 (NI), range 54-64 y Patients with cerebellar stroke group: 8 (NI), range: 52-68 y Patients with osseous impairments group: 9 (NI), range: 17-42 y They were all right-handed	Being in good health	Obesity (>20% of ideal weight) Smokers	Task: sequence of 8 finger movements in a specific order Conditions: MI and ME 8 different sequences repeated 10 times for each hand	Execution time to perform each motor sequence 10 times Virtual delay
		Sabaté et al. 2008	Descriptive study	Patients with PD group: 10 (NI), range: 54-64 y, UPDRS NI, H&Y 1.8 (2.2), levodopa treatment Young healthy group: 15 (NI), range 24-49 y Mature-healthy group: 10 (NI), range: 50-72 y	NI	NI	3 tasks: 1) Slow cyclic movement: flexion-extension of index finger at 40 movements per minute 2) Fast cyclic movement: same as 1) but as fast as possible 3) Continuous movement: turning a crank  Conditions: tasks being realized in ME and MI and auditory cues were added at times	Task frequency Execution time

								Tested in "on" and "off" state	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--------------------------------	--

Assessment	Type	Articles	Type of study	Participants: nb (nb per gender), mean (SD) age, mean (SD) UPDRS stage, mean (SD) H&Y score, treatment	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria	Task	Evaluation
Clinical assessment Behavioural assessment	Various tasks of the upper limb	Bek et al. 2019	Descriptive study	Experimental group: 24 (9♀), 63.5 (6.34) y, UPDRS-III 38.4 (11.33), H&Y (range: 1-3), dopaminergic treatment for all except one Control group: 24 (13♀), 68.33 (5.38) y	NI	NI	AO: observation of a video and patients were asked to imitate the action (moving their finger from one place to another) AO+MI: while watching, patients had to imagine what they would feel if they were the ones doing the movements  4 blocks of 30 trials each First two blocks were AO and second two blocks were AO+MI Tested in "on" state	Task-specific rating of visual and kinesthetic imagery with short version of KVIQ (one after AO and one after AO+MI) Mean vertical amplitude
		Gündüz et al. 2015	Descriptive study	PD with apraxia group: 8 (3♀), 62.7 (13.4) y, UPDRS-III 13.8 (7.3), H&Y 1.9 (0.3), NI PD non-apraxia group: 11 (1♀), 55.2 (9.6) y, UPDRS-III 9.5 (3.5), H&Y 1.6 (0.5), NI Control group: 8 HS (2♀), 55.2 (8.6) y	NI	Disorders that could change the results of electrophysiological investigations Contraindication to electrophysiological investigations suspicion of dementia	Task: thumb abduction with both arms 4 conditions: rest, MI, observation of an actor, ME 20 recordings  Tested "under optimal dopaminergic treatment"	F-wave: amplitudes, onset latencies, persistence MEP responses: peak-to-peak amplitudes, onset latencies
Imaging assessment (EMG, EEG, TMS)		Tremblay et al. 2008	Descriptive study	Experimental group: 11 right-handed patients (5♀), 68.6 (5.8) y, UPDRS-III 23.4 (5.1), H&Y 2.4 (0.5), treatment NI Control group: 11 HS right-handed (8♀), 66.2 (4.9) y	NI	NI	4 video sequences of 10s each: REST task: relax with eyes closed OBS task: observe a sequence of scissoring action IMAG task: close eyes, mentally simulate scissoring action IMIT task: imitate the action  10 time each video  Tested in "on" state	MEP of FDI and ADM muscles in scissoring action Variation in MEP amplitude Variation in MEP latency VAS (0 - 10 cm): ease in imagining the action
		Cunnington et al. 1997	Descriptive study	Experimental group: 14 (0♀), 67.6 (10.5) y, UPDRS NI, H&Y 2.1 (0.9), pharmacological treatment Control group: 10 HS (0♀), 64.0 (8.9) y	NI	NI	Sequential button-pressing task 3 conditions: ME, MI, watching cues	Movement related potentials: early-component onset-time, early slope, peak amplitude, peak time
		Electrode recording	Kühn et al. 2006	Descriptive study	Experimental group: 8 (3♀), 57 (3) y, UPDRS on 12 (6.1)/off 38.1 (8.6), H&Y NI, dopaminergic treatment, STN surgery Subgroup of the experimental group: 5 patients	NI	NI	Experimental task: MI and ME of a warning-go reaction time task, subjects had to do a wrist extension Control task for the subgroup: imagine the face of a relative  Tested in "off" state

fMRI	Verbal task	Péran et al. 2013	Descriptive study	Experimental group: 10 (NI), 60.3 (7.8) y, UPDRS off 30.1 (18.1)/on 15.7 (9.4), H&Y NI, dopamine agonists (levodopa)	Diagnosis of PD by a staff neurologist (according to UK Parkinson's disease Brain Bank criteria) No history of other neurological or psychiatric disease	MMSE <25	3 tasks with a set of objects drawing: object naming (ObjN), generation of an action word that could be realized with the object (GenA), mental simulation of this action (MSoA)  Tested in "on" and "off" state	Number of correct responses for ObjN + GenA BOLD for fMRI analysis
------	-------------	-------------------	-------------------	--	---	----------	--	---

Assessment	Type	Articles	Type of study	Participants: nb (nb per gender), mean (SD) age, mean (SD) UPDRS stage, mean (SD) H&Y score, treatment	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria	Task	Evaluation
Behavioural assessment	Laterality judgment	Amick et al. 2006	Descriptive study	<p>Experiment 1A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- LPD: 15 (8♀), 66.0 (11.0) y, UPDRS NI, H&amp;Y (range: 1.5-3), pharmacological treatment</li> <li>- RPD: 12 (5♀), 59.9 (6.9) y, UPDRS NI, H&amp;Y (range: 1.5-3), pharmacological treatment</li> <li>- Control group: 13 HS (5♀), 62.7 (9.9) y</li> </ul> <p>Experiment 1B: a subset of 1A participants</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- LPD: 7 (4♀), 61.7 (9.3) y, UPDRS NI, H&amp;Y (Mdn = 2), NI</li> <li>- RPD: 6 (4♀), 60.8 (10.5) y, UPDRS NI, H&amp;Y (Mdn = 2.5), NI</li> <li>- Control group: 6 HS (4♀), 62.3 (6.5) y</li> </ul>	NI	NI	<p>Experiment 1A: judging whether a pair of hands or objects are of the same laterality or not</p> <p>Experiment 1B: identical methods except they performed only hand task and the hand to be mentally rotated was in the left visual field</p> <p>Tested in "on" state</p>	<p>Primary outcome: number of errors</p> <p>Secondary outcome: response time</p>

		Conson et al. 2014	Descriptive study	<p>Experimental group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- LPD group: 14 (6♀), 62.9 (4.7) y, UPDRS-III 12.9 (4.1), H&amp;Y 1.9 (0.6), pharmacological treatment</li> <li>- RPD group: 15 (4♀), 66 (8.6) y, UPDRS-III 15.4 (5.6), H&amp;Y 1.7 (0.6), pharmacological treatment</li> <li>Control group: 30 HS (10♀), 49.7 (7.3) y</li> </ul>	<p>Diagnosis of idiopathic PD according to United Kingdom Parkinson's Disease Society brain bank</p> <p>Clinical and history evidence of asymmetric motor disturbances</p> <p>Lack of PD-associated dementia (PDD) as diagnosed according to an algorithm for clinical diagnosis of PDD</p> <p>Lack of major depression</p>	<p>For patients with PD: PD patients with a total age- and educational-adjusted score MMSE (Italian version) &lt;23.8</p> <p>For HS: Diagnosis of PD or any other neurologic or psychiatric disorder</p> <p>Clinically evident dementia or major depression</p> <p>MMSE score below the normal cut-off</p>	<p>Laterality judgment experiment, 3 tasks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Patients had to tell whether the left or right hand of a human figure was marked, the human figure being front (task 1) or back (task 2)</li> <li>- Patients performed a letter laterality judgment task (task 3)</li> </ul> <p>Each task included 48 trials</p> <p>Tested in "on" state</p>	<p>Reaction times</p> <p>Accuracy</p>
		Dominey et al. 1995	Descriptive study	<p>Experimental group: 7 (3♀), 56.3 (8.0) y, UPDRS NI, H&amp;Y (range: 1.5-2.5), pharmacological treatment, right side most affected</p> <p>Control group: 7 HS (2♀), 54.4 (11.7) y</p>	<p>Parkinson' disease with predominant akinesia and no tremor</p> <p>Mainly unilateral motor signs</p>	NI	<p>3 tasks in this experiment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Touch the pad of each finger with the pad of the thumb alternately</li> <li>Three conditions for the task: motor task with visual control, motor task without visual control and MI</li> <li>12 combinations possible (left hand or right hand x 3 conditions x repeated 3 or 5 times) performed 5 times ==&gt; 60 trials</li> </ol> <p>2.A) Judged if the letter presented was a mirror or normally oriented letter</p> <p>32 trials in total (2 conditions x eight angles x two letters)</p> <p>2.B) Determined if the hand presented is right or left hand</p> <p>3) imagined the upper case letter corresponding to the lower case letter presented and judged whether it is made of a straight line or has a curved line.</p> <p>8 letters "straight" and 8 letters "curved" presented twice for 32 trials in total</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Execution time for each sequence</li> <li>2.A/B) Reaction times</li> <li>3) Percentage of correct response and reaction time</li> </ol>



Assessment	Type	Articles	Type of study	Participants: nb (nb per gender), mean (SD) age, mean (SD) UPDRS stage, mean (SD) H&Y score, treatment	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria	Task	Evaluation
Behavioural assessment	Laterality judgment	Scarpina et al. 2019	Descriptive study	Experimental group: - RPD group: 10 (7♀), 65 (7) y, UPDRS-III 29.3 (11.1), H&Y NI, treatment NI - LPD group: 10 (5♀), 61 (8) y, UPDRS-III 33 (14.93), H&Y NI, treatment NI Control group: 20 HS (9♀), 59 (8) y	NI	Other neurological conditions Presence of psychiatric syndromes or drug and alcohol abuse	2 tasks and their control tasks: - Hand laterality task (HLT) - Control: mirror letter discrimination task - Mental motor chronometry (MMC) task in MI and ME: index and thumb opposition, thumb extension, middle finger crossed in the index, extension of index and little finger - Control: mental bars movement task  Tested in "on" phase	Reaction time (RT) Accuracy Correlation between execution time for MI and execution time for ME
		Frak et al. 2004	Descriptive study	Experimental group: 8 (4♀), 59 (4.49) y, UPDRS NI, H&Y stage 3, L-dopa treatment Control group: 8 HS (3♀), 58 (5.08) y	NI	NI	Cylinder task: take a cylinder (with thumb and index) and pour water into another cylinder, then imagine and judging the feasibility of the grip presented Minimum 20 repetitions and 8 orientations for feasibility 50 times each  Letter rotation task: judged whether a letter was in canonical or mirror form 42 stimuli 2 times each	Cylinder task: preferred orientation of opposition axis, feasibility level and response time Letter rotation task: response time and accuracy
TMS		Van Nueunen et al. 2012	Descriptive study	Experimental group: 11 (5♀), 52.0 (7.8) y, UPDRS left side 1.1 (1.3)/UPDRS right side 7.6 (3.1), H&Y 1.4 (0.5), NI Control group: 12 HS (6♀), 61.3 (6.4) y	Idiopathic PD (according to UK Brain Bank criteria) Right-lateralized symptoms	MMSE <24 Other neurological disease Exclusion criteria for transcranial magnetic stimulation (epilepsy, pacemaker, implanted metal parts, cardiac arrhythmias)	Hand drawing laterality judgment task 4 postures for patients: both hands with palm up; left hand palm up, right hand palm down; left hand palm down, right hand palm up; both hands palm down. Posture is "matching" when side of the hand and laterality corresponded Before each experimental session, subjects followed either a cTBS protocol over the right EBA or over the left PMd  2 sessions of 32 blocks with 12 trials/block each  Tested in "off" state	3 measurements sessions: baseline, after cTBS PMd, after cTBS EBA Reaction time Error rates Corticospinal excitability: MEP
fMRI		Helmich et al. 2007	Descriptive study	Main experiment: PD patients group: 19 (16♀), 53.2 (9.1) y, UPDRS-right 13.5 (5.0)/left 4.6 (2.8), H&Y 2.1 (0.5), treatment NI  Control experiment: PD patients group (a part of the above mentioned patients): 12 (4♀), 56.2 (10.0) y, UPDRS NI, H&Y NI, treatment NI Control group of right handed:	For patients with PD: Idiopathic Parkinson's disease (according to the UK Brain Bank criteria) Right-lateralized symptoms	Moderate-severe tremor MMSE < 24 Other neurological diseases General exclusion criteria for MRI scanning	Main experiment: laterality judgment task of line drawing of right and left hands Patients had to change their arm position at each block 30 blocks of 16 trials each  Control experiment: laterality judgment task of realistic photos of right and left hands Patients had to adopt one of the 4 postures requested at the beginning of each block 44 blocks of 8 trials each	Reaction time Error rate fMRI: cerebral activation - beta values

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Elderly: 10 HS (4♀), 57.0 (6.2) y</li> <li>- Young: 15 HS (8♀), 26.7 (3.3) y</li> </ul>			Tested in "off" state	
--	--	--	--	--	--	-----------------------	--

Assessment	Type	Articles	Type of study	Participants: nb (nb per gender), mean (SD) age, mean (SD) UPDRS stage, mean (SD) H&Y score, treatment	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria	Task	Evaluation
fMRI	Laterality judgment	Helmich et al. 2012	Descriptive study	Tremulous patients with PD group: 18 (8♀), 56.7 (10.0) y, UPDRS-III 27.2 (8.1), H&Y 2 (0.3) Nontremor patients with PD group: 20 (4♀), 59.1 (9.4) y UPDRS-III 27.9 (9), H&Y 2.1 (0.2) 12 without treatment and the rest with dopamine Control group: 19 HS (7♀), 58.6 (7.9) y	For patients with PD: Idiopathic PD diagnosed according to the UK Brain Bank criteria Either clear presence or absence of resting tremor - Tremulous PD --> UPDRS resting tremor score ≥2 for at least one hand during and an obvious history of resting tremor. - Nontremor PD --> UPDRS resting tremor score = 0 for each hand and no history of resting tremor	Clinical signs of dementia Other neurological diseases General exclusion criteria for MRI scanning	Laterality judgment task: right or left feet and hands in 4 different rotations and 2 different views 2 sessions of 30 min  Tested in "off" state	Reaction times Error rates fMRI: cerebral activation - beta values
Clinical assessment Behavioural assessment	Test and questionnaire	Heremans et al. 2012	Descriptive study	Experimental group: 14 (5♀), 59.1 (9.6) y, UPDRS 22.1 (11.5), H&Y 2.0 (0.8), pharmacological treatment Control group: 14 HS (6♀), 61.1 (6.6) y	NI	MMSE <24 Severe tremor Neurological comorbidity Unpredictable motor fluctuations Eye movement abnormalities Severe orthopaedic problems of the upper limb Treatment with deep brain stimulation	GDAT: 3 conditions (ME, MI, rest) with 3 modalities (visual cues, auditory cues, no cues) 3 times each condition for all modalities  Adapted BBT: 4 conditions (ME, MI with visual cues, MI with auditory cues, MI without cues) 3 times each condition  Tested in "on" state	Electrooculography: eye movement time, number, amplitude Mental chronometry (for BBT only) VAS: 7-point scale: 1 = very hard, 7=very easy
		Heremans et al. 2011	Descriptive study	Experimental group: 14 (5♀), 59.1 (9.6) y, UPDRS 22.1 (11.5), H&Y 2.0 (0.8), pharmacological treatment Control group: 14 HS (6♀), 61.1 (6.6) y	NI	MMSE <24 Severe tremor Neurological comorbidity Unpredictable motor fluctuations Severe orthopaedic problems of the upper limb Treatment with deep brain stimulation	MIQ-R: questionnaire KVIQ: questionnaire CMIA: component 1 - hand rotation, component 2 - finger-thumb opposition accuracy, component 3 - finger-thumb opposition speed Adapted BBT: patients first performed the test and then imagined it, test perform Tested in "on" state	Score of MIQ-R, KVIQ, CMIA Duration of ME and MI for BBT
		Pickett et al. 2012	Descriptive study	Experimental group: 28 PD (11♀), 71 (8.9) y, UPDRS NI, H&Y NI, treatment NI Control group: 33 HS (16♀), 69.9 (10.7) y Experimental group was divided in freezer + and freezer -	Diagnosis of idiopathic PD from a neurologist Independent ambulatory ability MMSE ≥ 24 Normal or corrected vision and hearing Absence of orthopaedic problem, neurologic disorder, psychiatric	NI	KVIQ, gait imagery questionnaire (4-item questionnaire) Forward walking task  Tested in "off" state (12hours without medication)	Score for KVIQ and GIQ Gait velocity

				condition, or another comorbidity.			
--	--	--	--	------------------------------------	--	--	--

Assessment	Type	Articles	Type of study	Participants: nb (nb per gender), mean (SD) age, mean (SD) UPDRS stage, mean (SD) H&Y score, treatment	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria	Task	Evaluation
Clinical assessment	Test and questionnaire	Gäumann et al. 2021	Longitudinal study	Patients with stroke: 25 (9♀), 63.3 (13.5) y Patients with multiple sclerosis: 25 (16♀), 51.0 (11.9) y Patients with Parkinson's disease: 5 (0♀), 70.4 (3.3) y, NI	Diagnosis of stroke, or multiple sclerosis or Parkinson's disease Age >18 years MoCA > 19 Being able to sit stable on an armless chair Being able to read and understand German	Persistent pain	MI ability: Body Rotation Task (BRT), Mental Chronometry (MC), KVIQ-20 MI perspective selection: patients were asked if they preferred an internal or external view based on the picture they were shown which were KVIQ items  4 measurement sessions in 2 weeks	Primary outcome: spontaneous MI perspective (internal, external)
		Peterson et al. 2012	Descriptive study	Experimental group: 28 (11♀), 71 (8.9) y, MDS-UPDRS-III on 26.6 (9.8)/off 37.6 (9.9), H&Y on 2.2 (0.4)/off 2.4 (0.3), levodopa treatment Control group: 32 HS (16♀), 70.3 (10.6) y	Diagnosis given by certified neurologist	Severe orthopaedic problems of upper/lower limbs Deep brain stimulation Other neurological disorder	KVIQ-20  Tested in "on" and "off" state	Score of KVIQ-20
fMRI	Neurofeedback	Subramanian et al. 2011	Controlled trial	10 PD patients (4♀), range: 39-75 y, UPDRS NI, H&Y stage I-III, dopaminergic medication Experimental group: 5 Control group: 5	No history of psychiatric or other neurological problems No family history of PD	NI	Experimental group: MI strategy that proved useful for activating SMA during the initial assessment Control group: MI they used during the initial assessment Session 1: 2-6M, 7/W, no duration specified Session 2: 2W, 7/W, no duration specified	3 at W0, after session 1 and after session 2 Behavioural analysis: UPDRS, Finger-tapping test fMRI analysis EMG analysis
		Tinaz et al. 2018	Non-RCT	Heartbeat counting task group: 10 (5♀), 62.6 (10.8), MDS-UPDRS 53.9 (12.3)/ Part III 33.3 (8.3), H&Y 2.1 (0.1), stable treatment Neurofeedback group: 8 (4♀), 66.0 (8.5) y, MDS-UPDRS 44.8 (5.4)/ Part III 32.1 (6.6), H&Y 2.0 (0), levodopa	Diagnosis of idiopathic PD according to United Kingdom Parkinson's Disease Society Brain Bank Clinical Diagnosis Criteria H&Y scale: ≤ stage 2.5 Stable dopaminergic medication	Not fully independent Neurological or psychiatric disorder Medical condition that might affect the central nervous system History of alcohol or illicit drug abuse Head injury resulting in loss of consciousness MoCA < 21 Contraindications for MRI	Heartbeat group: no task Neurofeedback group task: mindfulness body scan exercise and practice MI strategies that generated positive feedback during the initial testing. 3W, every day, 10-15min  Heartbeat group were tested in off-state Neurofeedback group were tested after their first dose of medication	For neurofeedback group: 2 at baseline and after training MDS-UPDRS part III Insula-dorsomedial frontal cortex functional connectivity (fMRI activity)  For heartbeat group: fMRI activity during heartbeat counting
PET scan	MI of whole body	Mori et al. 2020	Descriptive study	Experimental group: 10 (7♀), 57.1 (6.2) y, UPDRS-III 10.2 (2.3), H&Y 1.8 (0.4), naive TTT Control group: 12 HS (7♀), 9 right-handed and 3 left-handed, 51.2 (9.2) y	NI	For patients with PD: History of any kind of dopamine therapy For HS: Regular intake of medicines History of psychiatric or neurological diseases	Supine position: 1) Stare at a marker of a human silhouette 2) MI of standing upright Standing position: 3) Stare at a target	rCBF

						Contraindications to MRI and PET scanning		
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

**Abbreviations:** ♀, woman/women; ♂, man/men; ADM, abductor digiti minimi; AO, action observation; BBT, box and block test; BOLD, blood oxygen level-dependent; CMIA, Chaotic Motor Imagery Assessment; cTBS, continuous theta burst stimulation; EBA, Extrastriate Body Area; FDI, first dorsal interosseous; FOG, freezing of gait; GDAT, goal-directed aiming task; GIQ, gait imagery questionnaire; H&Y, Hoehn and Yahr; HS, healthy subjects; KVIQ-20, Kinesthetic and Visual Imagery Questionnaire-20; KVIQ-k, Kinesthetic and Visual Imagery Questionnaire-kinesthetic; LDP, left Parkinson dominant; MDS-UPDRS, Movement Disorder Society-Unified Parkinson Disease Rating Scale; ME, motor execution; MEP, motor evoked potentials; MI, motor imagery; MIQ-R, Movement Imagery Questionnaire-revised; MMSE, Mini Mental State Examination; MoCA, Montreal Cognitive Assessment; I, non-informed data; PD, Parkinson disease, dorsal premotor cortex; rCBF, regional cerebral blood flow; RDP, right Parkinson dominant; ROI, region of interest; STN-DBS, subthalamic nucleus deep brain stimulation; UPDRS (III), Unified Parkinson Disease Rating Scale (part 3); VAS, visual analogue scale; y, years.

**Table 4. Main results of non-randomised controlled trials and descriptive studies**

Assessment	Type	Articles	Evaluation	Main outcomes (comparison between groups, comparison between conditions)	p value
Clinical assessment	MI of walking	Cohen et al. 2011	Passability experiment: passability estimation (% of body width) Imagery experiment: execution time	Passability estimation: PD-FOG vs. control group, no data available Passability estimation: PD-nonFOG vs. control group, no data available Passability estimation: PD-nonFOG vs. PD-FOG, no data available Execution time of walking in MI and ME across different door widths: PD-FOG vs. PD-nonFOG vs. control group, no data available Execution time of walking in MI and ME from different distances: PD-FOG vs. PD-nonFOG vs. control group, no data available Execution time of walking in ME by narrow doorway: PD-FOG vs. control group, no data available Execution time of walking in ME by narrow doorway: PD-FOG vs. PD-nonFOG, no data available	p=0.01 p=0.03 N.S. N.S. N.S. p<0.0001 p<0.0001
		Ehgoetz Martens et al. 2014	Experiment 1: magnitude of error Experiment 2: execution time	Absolute error of pointing and walking judgment: PD-FOG group vs. PD-nonFOG group, no data available  Execution time for ME of walking: PD-nonFOG group vs. PD-FOG group, no data available Execution time for MI task: PD-nonFOG group vs. PD-FOG group, no data available	p=0.013  p=0.03 N.S.
fMRI		Huang et al. 2021	BOLD response	BOLD response during MI of normal gait of bilateral SMA, right superior temporal, right medial superior frontal gyrus: PD-nonFOG group vs. control group, no data available BOLD response during MI of FOG gait of bilateral frontal lobe, left superior temporal lobe, right insula: PD-FOG vs. PD-nonFOG, no data available	p<0.041 p<0.049
		Maidan et al. 2016	Neural brain activation	Activation in frontal, parietal, temporal, occipital lobes during MI of walking on usual path compared to watching: experimental group vs. control group, no data available Activation in frontal, occipital lobes during MI of obstacle walking compared to watching: experimental group vs. control group, no data available Activation in left parietal, right frontal lobes during MI of walking while navigating compared to watching: experimental group vs. control group, no data available	p<0.039 p<0.086 p=0.047
		Peterson et al. 2014	Execution time BOLD with of region of interest	Execution time, ME of tasks, experimental group vs. control group, no data available Execution time, MI of tasks, experimental group vs. control group, no data available Brain activity in left globus pallidus, experimental group vs. control group, no data available	p<0.001 N.S. p<0.001
		Snijders et al. 2011	Execution time (imagery task) Gait data (step length, gait asymmetry) ROI analysis for fMRI	Normalized step-length, experimental group 0.71 (0.08) vs. control group 0.78 (0.08) Normalized step-length, FOG 0.66 (0.15) vs. nonFOG 0.73 (0.07) Gait asymmetry, experimental group 0.036 (0.027) vs. control group 0.015 (0.011) Gait asymmetry, FOG 0.040 (0.027) vs. nonFOG 0.033 (0.029) Execution time on MI tasks, experimental group vs. control group, no data available Execution time on MI tasks, FOG vs. nonFOG, no data available fMRI activity in mesencephalic locomotor region, FOG vs. nonFOG, no data available	p=0.009 p=0.17 p=0.003 p=0.5 p=0.35 p=0.07 p<0.05
PET scan		Maillet et al. 2015	Behavioural session: KVIQ score, execution time PET session: execution time, regional cerebral blood flow (rCBF)	Behavioural session: Execution time of walking in MI and ME in all condition: experimental group off vs. control group, no data available Execution time of walking in MI and ME in all condition (except 6m*9cm): experimental group on vs. control group, no data available  PET session: rCBF during MI of walking compared to control task in left caudal SMA, lateral PMC, right dACC, SPL, pontomesencephalic area: experimental group off vs. control group, no data available	p<0.03 N.S.    p<0.001

			rCBF during MI of walking compared to control task in pre-SMA, DLPFC, left dACC, right M1, S1, lateral PMC, insula, thalamus, putamen, cerebellum, red nucleus: experimental group off vs. control group, no data available	p<0.001
	Weiss et al. 2015	MI of walking distance Walking distance Stride length Velocity PET activation with rCBF	Walking distance: STN-DBS ON 94.7 (15.4) m vs. STN-DBS OFF 62.6 (27.2) m Gait velocity: STN-DBS ON 1.1 (0.2) m/s vs. STN-DBS OFF 0.7 (0.3) m/s Mean stride length: STN-DBS ON 56.2 (8.8) cm vs. STN-DBS OFF 43.2 (14.9) cm Correlation between MI of walking distance and MI execution time while STN-DBS OFF: 30s 24.6 (11.8) m vs. 60s 36.6 (23.2) m vs. 90s 49.2 (27.0) m Correlation between MI of walking distance and MI execution time while STN-DBS ON: 30s 42.0 (25.8) m vs. 60s 62.3 (23.5) m vs. 90s 84.8 (37.0) m MI of walking distance 30s, 60s, 90s: STN-DBS ON vs. STN-DBS OFF, no data available Neural activity increase in SMA, right SPL: imagery of gait vs. imagine stance, no data available	p<0.001 p<0.001 p<0.001 p<0.05 p<0.01 p<0.05 p<0.05



Assessment	Type	Articles	Evaluation	Main outcomes (comparison between groups, comparison between conditions)	p value
Behavioural assessment	Thumb opposition	Avanzino et al. 2013	Temporal error Interval reproduction accuracy index	Temporal error during SYNC 0.5Hz: experimental group vs. control group, no data available Temporal error during CONT-EXE 0.5Hz: experimental group vs. control group, <i>no data available</i> Temporal error during CONT-MI 0.5Hz: experimental group vs. control group, <i>no data available</i> Temporal error during all conditions 1.5Hz: experimental group vs. control group, no data available Interval reproduction accuracy index during SYNC 0.5Hz: experimental group vs. control group, no data available Interval reproduction accuracy index during CONT-EXE 0.5Hz: experimental group vs. control group, no data available Interval reproduction accuracy index during CONT-MI 0.5Hz: experimental group vs. control group, no data available Interval reproduction accuracy index during all conditions 1.5Hz: experimental group vs. control group, no data available	p=0.79 p=0.045 p=0.04 N.S. p=0.47 p=0.045 p=0.026 N.S.
PET scan		Cunnington et al. 2001	Relative rCBF	rrCBF, Parkinson's disease "off" state: Medial frontal gyrus (SMA): imagine 62.9 vs. rest 60.6 rrCBF, Parkinson's disease "off" state: Right lateral premotor: imagine 60.4 vs. rest 58.7 rrCBF, Parkinson's disease "off" state: Right inferior parietal lobule: imagine 55.2 vs. rest 53.1  rrCBF, Parkinson's disease "on" state: Medial frontal gyrus (SMA): imagine 61.9 vs. rest 59.7 rrCBF, Parkinson's disease "on" state: Right inferior parietal lobule: imagine 49.6 vs. rest 47.5	p<0.0001 p<0.0001 p<0.0001  p<0.0001 p<0.0001
Electrode recording		Leiguarda et al. 2009	Firing rate of globus pallidus internus	Firing rate: rest 77.82 Hz vs. MI 39.37 Hz Firing rate: rest 77.82 Hz vs. movement execution 55.50 Hz	p=0.043 p=0.068
EMG	Hand gripping	Kobelt et al. 2018	EMG of deltoideus pars clavicularis, biceps brachii, extensor digitorum, flexor carpi radialis	EMG showed activation during MI in 2 of 5 patients with PD EMG, deltoideus pars clavicularis activation: MI vs. rest, no data available EMG, biceps brachii activation: MI vs. rest, no data available EMG, extensor digitorum activation: MI vs. rest, no data available EMG, flexor carpi radialis activation: MI vs. rest, no data available	NA p=0.001 p=0.007 N.S. N.S.
Electrode recording		Fischer et al. 2017	Monopolar Local Field Potentials (LFP) Gamma-beta power changes	Beta change in early window during imagined grips, low force level vs. rest, no data available Beta change in early window during executed grips, low force level vs. rest, no data available Beta change in early window during imagined grips, medium force level vs. rest, no data available Beta change in early window during executed grips, medium force level vs. rest, no data available Beta change in early window during imagined grips, high force level vs. rest, no data available Beta change in early window during executed grips, high force level vs. rest, no data available Gamma change in early window during imagined grips, low force level vs. rest, no data available Gamma change in early window during executed grips, low force level vs. rest, no data available Gamma change in early window during imagined grips, medium force level vs. rest, no data available Gamma change in early window during executed grips, medium force level vs. rest, no data available Gamma change in early window during imagined grips, high force level vs. rest, no data available Gamma change in early window during executed grips, high force level vs. rest, no data available	N.S. p=0.001 p=0.01 p=0.001 p=0.05 p=0.001 N.S. p=0.05 p=0.05 p=0.01 p=0.01 p=0.05
PET scan	Joystick movement	Samuel et al. 2001	Task performance (recall the last 4 movements) in MI/ME PET activation with rCBF	Median number of recalled imagery movements, experimental group 3.7 (range: 3-4) vs. control group 3.7 (range: 3-4) Median number of recalled executed movements, experimental group 3.2 (range: 0-4) vs. control group 3.3 (range: 0-4) Response time, experimental group 0.85 (0.3) s vs. control group 0.46 (0.1) s Activity during MI task in dorsolateral and mesial frontal cortex, experimental group vs. control group, no data available Activity during ME task in right dorsolateral frontal cortex and basal ganglia, experimental group vs. control group, no data available	p=0.50 p=0.43 p=0.01 p<0.01 p<0.01

		Thobois et al. 2000	Execution time PET activation with rCBF	<p>Execution time, MI of experimental group, left hand 5245 (1840) ms vs. right hand 5882 (1863) ms  Execution time, ME of experimental group, left hand 5109 (1278) ms vs. right hand 5925 (1734) ms</p> <p>Experimental group, rCBF increase in bilateral superior parietal lobe/left anterior cingulate cortex/left lateral premotor cortex/left inferior frontal gyrus/left DLPFC/occipital cortex, MI of left hand vs. rest, no data available  Experimental group, rCBF increase in left lateral premotor cortex/SMA/bilateral superior parietal lobe/DLPFC/right primary motor cortex, MI of right hand vs. rest, no data available</p> <p>Control group, rCBF increase in bilateral superior parietal lobe/supplementary motor area/left lateral premotor cortex/inferior frontal gyrus/dorsolateral prefrontal cortex/right cerebellar hemisphere, MI of left hand vs. rest, no data available  Control group, rCBF increase in left primary motor cortex/lateral premotor cortex/SMA, DLPFC/superior parietal lobe/right cerebellar hemisphere, MI of right hand vs. rest, no data available</p>	<p>p&lt;0.05  p&lt;0.05</p> <p>p&lt;0.05  p&lt;0.05</p> <p>p&lt;0.05  p&lt;0.05</p>
--	--	------------------------	---	--	---

Assessment	Type	Articles	Evaluation	Main outcomes (comparison between groups, comparison between conditions)	p value
PET scan	Joystick movement	Thobois et al. 2002	Execution time STN rCBF changes during MI and ME	Execution time, ME vs. MI, no data available Execution time, STN on 4.74s vs. STN off 5.76s  rCBF activation in left primary motor cortex and SMA without stimulation, ME vs. rest, no data available rCBF activation in dorsolateral prefrontal cortex and SMA without stimulation, MI vs. rest, no data available rCBF activity increased in bilateral prefrontal cortex, left thalamus and putamen with stimulation, ME with stimulation vs. ME without stimulation, no data available rCBF activity decreased in right primary motor cortex, inferior parietal lobe and SMA with stimulation, ME with stimulation vs. ME without stimulation, no data available rCBF activity increased in bilateral dorsolateral prefrontal cortex, left thalamus and putamen, MI with stimulation vs. MI without stimulation, no data available rCBF activity decreased in left SMA and primary motor cortex, MI with stimulation vs. MI without stimulation, no data available	p=0.23 p=0.068  p<0.05 p<0.05  p<0.05  p<0.05 p<0.05
Clinical assessment	Various tasks of the upper limb	Yágüez et al. 1999	3 measurements (drawing ideograms): baseline, after imagery, after physical practice Kinematic parameters: execution time, tangential velocity Accuracy: heights, widths	Small ideograms, PD patients movement duration: baseline vs. post-imagery, no data available Small ideograms, PD patients movement duration: post-imagery vs. post-practice, no data available Small ideograms, PD patients movement duration: baseline vs. post-practice, no data available Large ideograms, PD patients movement duration: baseline vs. post-imagery, no data available Large ideograms, PD patients movement duration: post-imagery vs. post-practice, no data available Large ideograms, PD patients movement duration: baseline vs. post-practice, no data available Height and width of small and large ideograms for PD patients: baseline vs. post-imagery, no data available	N.S. p=0.031 p=0.014 N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S.
		Sabaté et al. 2007	Execution time to perform each sequence 10 times Virtual delay	Execution time for ME: patients with PD group vs. mature-healthy group, no data available Execution time for MI: patients with PD group vs. mature-healthy group, no data available Virtual delay: patients with PD group vs. mature-healthy group, no data available	p<0.001 p<0.001 N.S.
		Sabaté et al. 2008	Task frequency Execution time	Execution time for slow cyclic task, ME vs. MI, no data available Execution time for fast cyclic task, ME vs. MI, no data available Execution time for slow continuous movement task, ME vs. MI, no data available	p=0.39 p<0.001 p<0.001
Clinical assessment Behavioural assessment		Bek et al. 2019	Task-specific rating of visual and kinaesthetic imagery with short version of KVIQ (one after AO and one after AO+MI) Mean vertical amplitude	Mean vertical amplitude after AO: experimental group vs. control group, no data available Mean vertical amplitude after AO+MI: experimental group vs. control group, no data available Task-specific rating of visual and kinaesthetic imagery before MI instructions: experimental group vs. control group, no data available Task-specific rating of visual and kinaesthetic imagery after MI instructions: experimental group vs. control group, no data available	p=0.088 p=0.066 N.S. N.S.
Imaging assessments (EMG, EEG, TMS)		Gündüz et al. 2015	F-wave: amplitudes, onset latencies, persistence MEP responses: peak-to-	Mean amplitude F-waves in control group, imagination vs. rest, no data available Mean amplitude F-waves in PD non-apraxia group, imagination vs. rest, no data available Mean amplitude F-waves in PD with apraxia group, imagination vs. rest, no data available	p=0.028 p=0.005 N.S.

		peak amplitudes, onset latencies		
	Tremblay et al. 2008	MEP of FDI and ADM muscles in scissoring action Variation in MEP amplitude Variation in MEP latency VAS (0 - 10 cm): ease in imagining the action	VAS: experimental group 6.5 (0.7) cm vs. control group 7.1 (0.6) cm FDI MEP amplitude in experimental group: REST vs. IMAG, no data available FDI MEP amplitude in control group: REST vs. IMAG, no data available ADM MEP amplitude in experimental group: REST vs. IMAG, no data available ADM MEP amplitude in control group: REST vs. IMAG, no data available FDI MEP latency in experimental group: REST vs. IMAG, no data available FDI MEP latency in control group: REST vs. IMAG, no data available ADM MEP latency in experimental group: REST vs. IMAG, no data available ADM MEP latency in control group: REST vs. IMAG, no data available	p=0.5 N.S. p<0.01 N.S. p<0.05 N.S. N.S. N.S. p<0.01

Assessment	Type	Articles	Evaluation	Main outcomes (comparison between groups, comparison between conditions)	p value
Imaging assessment (EMG, EEG, TMS)	Various tasks of the upper limb	Cunnington et al. 1997	Movement related potentials (MRP): early-component onset-time, early slope, peak amplitude, peak time	MRP onset times at position Cz: experimental group 1.64 (0.54) s vs. control group 1.70 (0.49) s MRP early slope: experimental group vs. control group, no data available MRP peak amplitude: experimental group vs. control group, no data available MRP peak times: experimental group 75 (195) ms vs. control group 109 (187) ms	N.S. p<0.001 p<0.05 N.S.
Electrode recording		Kühn et al. 2006	Subthalamic nucleus local field potential activity in beta frequency	Mean beta ERD change from baseline following auditory cue: ME 44.6 (6.4) % vs. MI 36.7 (4.5) % Mean beta ERD change from baseline: ME vs. control task, no data available Mean beta ERD change from baseline: MI vs. control task, no data available	p=0.131 p<0.01 p<0.001
fMRI	Verbal task	Péran et al. 2013	Number of correct responses for ObjN + GenA BOLD for fMRI analysis	Brain activation in prefrontal cortex bilaterally and in the parietal–occipital junction bilaterally, ObjN vs. MSoA, no data available	p<0.001
Behavioural assessment	Laterality judgment	Amick et al. 2006	Primary outcome: number of errors Secondary outcome: response time	Experiment 1A: Hand errors: RPD vs. control group, no data available Hand errors: LPD vs. control group, no data available Objects errors and RT: RPD vs. LPD vs. control group, no data available  Experiment 1B: Hand errors: LPD vs. control group, no data available Hand errors: LPD vs. RPD, no data available	p=0.01 p=0.9 N.S.  p=0.01 p=0.02
		Conson et al. 2014	Reaction times Accuracy	Accuracy: LPD group vs. RPD group vs. control group, no data available Reaction times: LPD group vs. RPD group vs. control group, no data available Reaction times for all groups: left marked front-facing-bodies vs. right marked front-facing-bodies, no data available Reaction times for LPD group: left marked back-facing-bodies vs. right marked back-facing-bodies, no data available Reaction times for RPD group: right marked back-facing-bodies vs. left marked back-facing-bodies, no data available Reaction times for control group: left marked back-facing-bodies vs. right marked back-facing-bodies, no data available	p=0.485 p=0.950 N.S. p=0.006 p=0.028 N.S.
		Dominey et al. 1995	1) Execution time for each sequence  2.A/B) Reaction time (RT)  3) Percentage of correct response and reaction time	Experiment 1: Execution time: experimental group 29.73 sec vs. control group 17.51 sec Execution time: both groups right hand 25.16 sec vs. both groups left hand 22.10 sec Execution time: experimental group right hand 32.87 sec vs. experimental group left hand 26.60 sec Execution time: control group right hand 17.44 vs. control group left hand 17.59  Experiment 2: RT: experimental group 1925 msec vs. control group 1614 msec  Experiment 3: Percentage of correct response: experimental group vs. control group, no data available RT: experimental group vs. control group, no data available	p<0.0001 p=0.05 NI NI  p<0.0001  N.S. N.S.

		Scarpina et al. 2019	<p>Reaction time (RT)</p> <p>Accuracy</p> <p>Correlation between execution time for MI and execution time for ME</p>	<p>RT (z-score), hand laterality task, right group 0.17 (0.66) vs. left group 0.14 (0.78) vs. control group 0.08 (0.76)</p> <p>Accuracy, hand laterality task, right group 68.75 (23.01) vs. left group 74.58 (25.72) vs. control group 76.14 (19.11)</p> <p>RT (z-score), mental letter discrimination task, right group -0.038 (0.78) vs. left group -0.013 (0.81) vs. control group -0.022 (0.89)</p> <p>Accuracy, mental letter discrimination task, right group 68.75 (23.01) vs. left group 74.58 (25.72) vs. control group 76.14 (19.11)</p> <p>Accuracy, mental letter discrimination task, right group 68.75 (23.01) vs. control group 76.14 (19.11)</p> <p>Execution time (z-score), mental bars movement task, right group vs. control group, no data available</p> <p>Execution time (z-score), mental bars movement task, left group vs. control group, no data available</p> <p>Execution time (z-score), mental bars movement task, right group vs. left group, no data available</p>	<p>p=0.78</p> <p>p=0.53</p> <p>p=0.96</p> <p>p=0.019</p> <p>p=0.028</p> <p>p=0.019</p> <p>p=0.58</p> <p>p=0.13</p>
--	--	-------------------------	--	--	--

Assessment	Type	Articles	Evaluation	Main outcomes (comparison between groups, comparison between conditions)	p value
		Frak et al. 2004	Cylinder task: preferred orientation of opposition axis, feasibility level and response time (RT) Letter rotation task: response time (RT) and accuracy	Cylinder task, RT: experimental group 1779 (425) ms vs. control group 1648 (458) ms Letter rotation task, RT: experimental group vs. control group, no data available Letter rotation task, number of errors: experimental group vs. control group, no data available	p>0.5 p>0.8 p>0.6
		Van Nueunen et al. 2012	3 measurements sessions: baseline, after cTBS PMd, after cTBS EBA Reaction time (RT) Error rates Corticospinal excitability: MEP	Baseline error rates: experimental group 3.3 (1.1) % vs. control group 2.3 (0.7) % Baseline reaction times: experimental group 1194 (97) ms vs. control group 1257 (81) ms Difference in RT between matching and non-matching posture in experimental group, baseline vs. EBA-cTBS, no data available Difference in RT between matching and non-matching posture in control group, baseline vs. PMD-cTBS, no data available	p=0.688 p=0.619 p=0.029 N.S.
		Helmich et al. 2007	Reaction time Error rate fMRI: cerebral activation - beta values	Cerebral activity of EBA and OPC, rotation-related effects, right-hand vs. left hand, no data available Main experiment Reaction times: left hand 1549 (102) ms vs. right hand 1527 (97) ms Error rates: left hand 7 (1) % vs. right hand 8 (1) % Control experiment Reaction times: PD patients group 1547 (126) ms vs. elderly 1178 (123) ms vs. young 1006 (76) ms Error rates: PD patients group 11 (2) % vs. elderly 4 (2) % vs. young 4 (1) %	p<0.05  N.S. N.S.  p=0.002 p=0.008
		Helmich et al. 2012	Reaction times Error rates fMRI: cerebral activation - beta values	Cerebral activity in B3a, tremulous PD vs. control group and non-tremor PD patients, no data available Reaction times: tremulous PD patients vs. non-tremor PD patients vs. control group, no data available Error rates: tremulous PD patients 11.7 (7.9) % vs. non-tremor PD patients 14.0 (9.6) % vs. control group 7.7 (6.1) %	p<0.01 p=0.87 N.S.
		Heremans et al. 2012	Electrooculography: eye movement time, number, amplitude Mental chronometry (for BBT only) VAS: 7-point scale: 1 = very hard, 7=very easy	Eye movement time during GDAT: experimental group 369 (164) ms vs. control group 271 (141) ms Eye movement time during GDAT in rest condition: experimental group vs. control group, no data available Mental chronometry during BBT: experimental group 28.4 (6.5) s vs. control group 23.2 (4.9) s Mental chronometry during BBT for all subjects: ME vs. MI with visual cues, no data available Mental chronometry during BBT for all subjects: ME vs. MI without cues, no data available VAS during GDAT for all subjects: no cues vs. visual cues and auditory cues, no data available VAS during BBT: for all subjects: no cues vs. visual cues and auditory cues, no data available	p<0.05 N.S. p<0.02 N.S. p<0.05 p=0.03 p=0.03
		Heremans et al. 2011	Score of MIQ-R, KVIQ-20, CMIA Duration of ME and MI for BBT	MIQ-R, total score: experimental group 4.8 (1.7) vs. control group 5.6 (1.4) KVIQ-20, total score: experimental group 2.5 (1.1) vs. control group 2.0 (2.1) CMIA component 1, total accuracy: experimental group 83.9 (9.6) % vs. control group 84.7 (9.0) % CMIA component 2, total score: experimental group 2.8 (0.7) vs. control group 2.9 (0.3) CMIA component 3, execution time in ME: experimental group 58.4 (14.3) s vs. control group 66.1 (15.4) s CMIA component 3, execution time in MI: experimental group 55.9 (21.8) s vs. control group 63.1 (18.5) s	N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S.

			BBT, execution time in ME: experimental group 25.7 (4.2) s vs. control group 19.7 (2.7) s BBT, execution time in MI: experimental group 32.2 (8.6) s vs. control group 27.6 (6.3) s	p<0.01 p<0.01
	Pickett et al. 2012	Score for KVIQ and GIQ Gait velocity	GIQ subsections, experimental group vs. control group, no data available Correlation between GIQ total score and disease duration in experimental group, no data available Correlation between GIQ total score and age in experimental group, no data available Correlation between GIQ total score and Hoehn & Yahr in experimental group, no data available Correlation between GIQ total score and MDS-UPDRS motor section score in experimental group, no data available GIQ score, freezer+ group vs. freezer- group, no data available Correlation between gait velocity and imagery score on GIQ in experimental group, no data available Correlation between gait velocity and imagery score on KVIQ in experimental group, no data available	N.S. p = 0.17 p = 0.015 p = 0.466 p = 0.17 N.S. p=0.94 p=0.90



Assessment	Type	Articles	Evaluation	Main outcomes (comparison between groups, comparison between conditions)	p value
		Gäumann et al. 2021	Primary outcome: spontaneous MI perspective (internal, external)	Mean perspective preference during KVIQ visual subscale: internal 71.5% vs. external 26.3% vs. both 0.4% vs. not possible 2.3% Mean perspective preference during KVIQ kinaesthetic subscale: internal 73.3% vs. external 25.2% vs. both 0.3% vs. not possible 1.4%	NI NI
		Peterson et al. 2012	Score of KVIQ-20	KVIQ-20, experimental group "on" 68.1 (23.3) vs. experimental group "off" 65.8 (22.0) KVIQ-20, experimental group "off" 65.8 (22.0) vs. control group 72.2 (20.6) KVIQ-20, experimental group "on" 68.1 (23.3) vs. control group 72.2 (20.6)	p=0.15 p=0.25 p=0.46
		Subramanian et al. 2011	3 at W0, after session 1 and after session 2 Behavioural analysis: UPDRS, Finger-tapping test fMRI analysis EMG analysis	UPDRS, experimental group pre 14.2 vs. experimental group post 9 UPDRS, control group pre 15 vs. control group post 13.4 Finger tapping test on affected hand, experimental group pre 210.6 vs. experimental group post 266.2 Finger tapping test on affected hand, control group pre 177 vs. control group post 178.2 SMA fMRI activity in localizer block, experimental group vs. control group, no data available SMA fMRI activity in experimental group, neurofeedback vs. control testing, no data available SMA fMRI activity in control group, neurofeedback vs. control testing, no data available	p=0.042 p=0.336 p=0.043 p=0.686 p=0.262 p>0.5 p=0.043
		Tinaz et al. 2018	For neurofeedback group: 2 at baseline and after training MDS-UPDRS part III Insula-dorsomedial frontal cortex functional connectivity (fMRI activity)  For heartbeat group: fMRI activity during heartbeat counting	MDS-UPDRS-III, neurofeedback group pre 32.1 (6.6) vs. neurofeedback group post 31.8 (4.5) fMRI activity in right insula and dorsomedial frontal cortex in heartbeat group, no data available Insula dorsomedial frontal cortex connectivity (z-score), neurofeedback group pre-0.15 (0.36) vs. neurofeedback group after post 0.19 (0.27)	p=0.871 p≤0.046 p=0.009
	MI of whole body	Mori et al. 2020	rCBF	rCBF responses during standing position in right cerebellar vermis and left paracentral gyrus, experimental group vs. control group, no data available rCBF responses during standing position in bilateral middle frontal gyrus, experimental group vs. control group, no data available rCBF responses during MI of standing, experimental group vs. control group, no data available	p<0.05 p<0.05 N.S.

**Abbreviations:** 10MWT, 10-Meter Walking Test; ADM, abductor digiti minimi; AO, action observation; BBT, box and block test; BOLD, blood oxygen level dependent; CMIA, Chaotic Motor Imagery Assessment; cTBS, continuous theta burst stimulation; DLFPC, dorsolateral prefrontal cortex; EBA, Extrastriate Body Area; ERD, event related desynchronization; FDI, first dorsal interosseous; FOG, freezing of gait; GDAT, goal-directed aiming task; GIQ, gait imagery questionnaire; KVIQ-20, Kinesthetic and Visual Imagery Questionnaire-20; LDP, left Parkinson dominant; MDS-UPDRS, Movement Disorder Society-Unified Parkinson Disease Rating Scale; MEP, motor evoked potentials; MI, motor imagery; MIQ-R, Movement Imagery Questionnaire-revised; N.S., not significant; NA, non-applicable; NI, non-informed data; OPC, occipito-parietal cortex; PD, Parkinson disease; rCBF, regional cerebral blood flow; RDP, right Parkinson dominant; ROI, region of interest; SMA, supplementary motor area; SPL, superior parietal lobule; STN-DBS, subthalamic nucleus deep brain stimulation; UPDRS, Unified Parkinson Disease Rating Scale; VAS, visual analogue scale.

3

4

5