

## **Individual contralesional recruitment in the context of structural reserve in early motor reorganization after stroke**

Maike Mustin<sup>1</sup>, Lukas Hensel<sup>2</sup>, Gereon R. Fink<sup>2,3</sup>, Christian Grefkes<sup>1</sup>, Caroline Tscherpel<sup>1,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Medical Faculty, Goethe University Frankfurt, Department of Neurology, Frankfurt University Hospital, Frankfurt am Main, Germany

<sup>2</sup> Medical Faculty, University of Cologne, Department of Neurology, University Hospital Cologne, Cologne, Germany

<sup>3</sup> Cognitive Neuroscience, Institute of Neuroscience and Medicine (INM-3), Research Centre Jülich, Jülich, Germany

### **Corresponding author:**

Dr. Caroline Tscherpel  
Department of Neurology  
Frankfurt University Hospital  
Schleusenweg 2-16  
60590 Frankfurt am Main, Germany  
Phone: +49 69 6301 5769  
Email: [Tscherpel@med.uni-frankfurt.de](mailto:Tscherpel@med.uni-frankfurt.de)

**Running title:** TMS responsivity after stroke

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 The concept of structural reserve in stroke reorganization assumes that the  
3 relevance of the contralesional hemisphere strongly depends on the brain tissue  
4 spared by the lesion in the affected hemisphere. Recent studies, however, have  
5 indicated that the contralesional hemisphere's impact exhibits region-specific  
6 variability with concurrently existing maladaptive and supportive influences. This  
7 challenges traditional views, necessitating a nuanced investigation of contralesional  
8 motor areas and their interaction with ipsilesional networks.

9 Our study focused on the functional role of contralesional key motor areas and  
10 lesion-induced connectome disruption early after stroke.

11 Online TMS data of twenty-five stroke patients was analyzed to disentangle  
12 interindividual differences in the functional roles of contralesional primary motor  
13 cortex (M1), dorsal premotor cortex (dPMC), and anterior interparietal sulcus (aIPS)  
14 for motor function. Connectome-based lesion symptom mapping and corticospinal  
15 tract lesion quantification were used to investigate how TMS effects depend on  
16 ipsilesional structural network properties.

17 At group and individual levels, TMS interference with contralesional M1 and aIPS but  
18 not dPMC led to improved performance early after stroke. At the connectome level, a  
19 more disturbing role of contralesional M1 was related to a more severe disruption of  
20 the structural integrity of ipsilesional M1 in the affected motor network. In contrast, a  
21 detrimental influence of contralesional aIPS was linked to less disruption of the  
22 ipsilesional M1 connectivity.

23 Our findings indicate that contralesional areas distinctively interfere with motor  
24 performance early after stroke depending on ipsilesional structural integrity,

- 1 extending the concept of structural reserve to regional specificity in recovery of
- 2 function.

3 **KEYWORDS**

- 4 neuroplasticity, online TMS, disconnectivity, neuromodulation, lesion



## 1 INTRODUCTION

2 Stroke-induced alterations emerge from the local pathology, i.e. the ischemic lesion,  
3 over the lesioned hemisphere to contralesional areas, ultimately affecting network  
4 configurations and the functional processing in the entire brain (Krakauer et al., 2012;  
5 Ward, 2017). A phenomenon frequently observed in functional MRI studies in stroke  
6 is increased neural activity within contralesional motor areas during simple motor  
7 tasks (Ferris et al., 2018; Gerloff et al., 2005; Rehme et al., 2011). Furthermore,  
8 increased contralesional BOLD activity has been reported to be associated with  
9 better post-stroke motor function, suggesting its compensatory effect in the light of  
10 the vicariation hypothesis (Hallett et al., 2020; Rehme et al., 2012; Ward et al., 2003).  
11 However, there is also evidence for maladaptive contralesional effects, framing the  
12 concept of interhemispheric competition (Bütefisch et al., 2008; Grefkes et al., 2008).  
13 Accordingly, a decrease of inhibitory influences from the ipsilesional hemisphere is  
14 thought to result in a subsequent increase of contralesional neural activation and, in  
15 turn, enhanced inhibitory influences exerted by the contralesional hemisphere  
16 (Carrera and Tononi, 2014; Duque et al., 2005; Murase et al., 2004).

17 To reconcile contradicting findings concerning the role of contralesional areas, the  
18 concept of structural reserve considers contralesional network alterations depending  
19 on ipsilesional network characteristics (Murphy and Corbett, 2009; Pino et al., 2014).  
20 Correspondingly, whether the influence of the contralesional hemisphere is  
21 compensatory or maladaptive is supposed to depend on the amount of ipsilesional  
22 unaffected structures spared by the stroke lesion and, thus, remaining functioning of  
23 ipsilesional motor areas and corticospinal tract (CST) (Bertolucci et al., 2018;  
24 Cramer, 2008; Pino et al., 2014). In patients with a high structural reserve,  
25 competitive inhibition from the contralesional hemisphere is more prominent. In  
26 comparison, patients with reduced remaining resources in the ipsilesional

1 hemisphere may rely more on compensatory recruitment of contralesional areas  
2 (Brancaccio et al., 2022; Pino et al., 2014).

3 Online transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS)-interference probes the contribution  
4 of specific cortical regions to motor function post-stroke (Hallett, 2000; Kobayashi  
5 and Pascual-Leone, 2003). TMS studies have contributed to our understanding of the  
6 role of contralesional brain regions in stroke reorganization, indicating that the  
7 contralesional hemisphere's involvement exhibits regional and temporal variability.  
8 While early after stroke, the contralesional primary motor cortex (M1) exerts rather  
9 maladaptive influences (Bradnam et al., 2012; Volz et al., 2017), this effect may shift  
10 towards a more supportive interaction in later, i.e., chronic stages (Lotze et al., 2006;  
11 Takeuchi et al., 2008). For contralesional dorsal premotor cortex (dPMC), a relevant  
12 influence was identified only in the chronic stage - albeit uniformly supportive  
13 (Johansen-Berg et al., 2002; Tscherpel et al., 2020). Furthermore, the impact of  
14 posterior parietal areas, i.e., contralesional intraparietal sulcus (aIPS), seems less  
15 vulnerable to these temporal dynamics with a rather generally detrimental role for  
16 post-stroke motor function (Hensel et al., 2020; Tscherpel et al., 2020).

17 The interregional differences outlined above challenge the concept of structural  
18 reserve, as they instead indicate that contralesional recruitment depends on region-  
19 specific interactions with distinct ipsilesional network configurations. In other words,  
20 for impacting on the functional relevance of the contralesional hemisphere, the  
21 structural reserve may more likely be subject to the regional specificity of different  
22 contralesional areas.

23 Therefore, we aimed to elaborate on previously identified effects of contralesional  
24 M1, dPMC, and aIPS in a pooled sample of two methodically equivalent online TMS  
25 studies (Hensel et al., 2020; Tscherpel et al., 2020) in relation to ipsilesional

1 structural network resources. To delineate the structural reserve, i.e., the unaffected  
2 structures in the ipsilesional hemisphere and the CST, connectome lesion symptom  
3 mapping (CLSM) was employed to derive the lesion-induced disconnection severity  
4 of the ipsilesional motor network and the specific disintegration of ipsilesional M1  
5 within the ipsilesional motor network (Bowren et al., 2022; Griffis et al., 2021).  
6 Likewise, CST integrity was determined by probabilistic and z-axis corrected tract-  
7 specific lesion mapping(Feng et al., 2015; Zhu et al., 2010).

8 Given the region-specificity of TMS effects observed in previous studies, we  
9 hypothesized that distinct properties of the ipsilesional structural network pathology  
10 differentially contribute to the functional relevance of contralesional motor areas.

## 1 MATERIAL AND METHODS

### 2 *Data Pooling*

3 A pooled dataset combining Tscherpel et al. (2020c) and Hensel et al. (2020) was  
4 used, sharing a comparable cohort and similar experimental design with respect to  
5 the performed finger-tapping task and online TMS interference. No statistical  
6 differences were observed between the pooled samples regarding demographics  
7 (age, sex), clinical data (days post-stroke, National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale  
8 (NIHSS)) or cortical excitability (RMT) (please see Supplementary Material I). A  
9 significant difference was found for the average tapping speed in the sham condition,  
10 resulting from a different predefined height reference (see below *Index finger-tapping*  
11 *task*) for the tapping movements (patients:  $F(2,22)=22.30$ ,  $p<.001$ ,  $\eta^2=0.11$ ; controls:  
12  $F(2,21)=41.23$ ,  $p<.001$ ,  $\eta^2=0.13$ ) and which was corrected via sham normalization  
13 (patients:  $F(2,22)=2.30$ ,  $p=0.143$ ); controls: ( $F(2,21)=0.13$ ,  $p=0.821$ ).

### 14 *Participants*

15 Twenty-five stroke patients (age= $67.7 \pm 11.6$  standard deviation (SD), range: 52-82  
16 years; 8 females; 2 left-handed) with unilateral mild to moderate motor impairment  
17 (NIHSS= $2.6 \pm 2.0$ ) were recruited from the Department of Neurology of the University  
18 Hospital of Cologne (Table 1) within the first days after stroke (days post-stroke= $3.96$   
19  $\pm 1.97$ ). The following inclusion criteria were applied in both studies (Hensel et al.,  
20 2020; Tscherpel et al., 2020): (i) 40-90 years of age , (ii) first-ever ischemic stroke  
21 with a unilateral lesion verified by diffusion-weighted MRI (DWI), (iii) study  
22 participation within <10 days post-stroke onset, (iv) unilateral upper limb motor  
23 deficit, (v) no contraindication to TMS (vi) no cerebral hemorrhage, (vii) no other  
24 neurological deficits, i.e., aphasia, apraxia, neglect, visual field deficits, (viii) no pre-



1 existing neurodegenerative or neuroinflammatory disease, (ix) no significant pre-  
2 existing musculoskeletal impairment, (x) MRI performed within <48 hours after stroke  
3 onset. Two patients of the original sample of Hensel et al. (2020) had to be excluded  
4 since the time point of MRI was not performed within the first 48 hours and thus not  
5 comparable with the rest of the cohort for the present research question.

6 23 healthy subjects which were matched to the patient cohort with respect to age,  
7 sex and handedness resulted from the two datasets (age=64.2 ± 8.1, range: 50-89  
8 years; p=0.23; 8 females, p=0.92; 1 left-handed). The One healthy subject had to be  
9 excluded due to extreme values exceeding two standard deviations of TMS effects,  
10 resulting in 22 data sets. Both studies were conducted under the Declaration of  
11 Helsinki and approved by the local ethics committee at the University Hospital of  
12 Cologne. Prior to the inclusion, all participants provided written informed consent.

### 13 *Experimental Design*

14 The single-blinded, sham-controlled experiment targeted three brain regions: the  
15 contralesional primary motor cortex (M1), dorsal premotor cortex (dPMC), and  
16 anterior intraparietal sulcus (aIPS) (Hensel et al., 2020; Tscherpel et al., 2020)  
17 (Figure 1). A placebo stimulation over vertex served as a control condition (Sham).  
18 Neuro-navigated 10Hz repetitive TMS (rTMS) was performed time-locked to a finger-  
19 tapping task (online TMS interference) to interfere with the ongoing brain activity and  
20 investigate the impact of the abovementioned areas of the extended motor network  
21 on task performance (Lefaucheur et al., 2020, 2017, 2014; Rossi et al., 2021, 2009).  
22 TMS was administered with 90% of the resting motor threshold (RMT). For a detailed  
23 description of the TMS protocol, RMT assessment, and TMS site definition, please  
24 see Supplementary Material II. The stimulation intensities used for TMS interference

1 did not differ between patients (51.0% maximum stimulator output (MSO)  $\pm$  12.3%)  
2 and healthy controls (50.4% MSO  $\pm$  13.8%,  $p=0.87$ ).

### 3 *Index finger-tapping task and 3D ultrasound movement kinematics*

4 Participants performed repetitive finger-tapping movements with their index finger in  
5 response to a visual cue (Figure 1). Both studies applied an alternating block design  
6 that rotated through the different target regions, i.e., contralesional M1, dPMC, and  
7 IPS. Motor performance was recorded using an ultrasound-based 3D kinematic  
8 system (Zebris CMS20 motion analyzer system) tracking the position of the index  
9 finger in the mediolateral, anteroposterior, and vertical planes, and subsequently  
10 analyzed offline (Hensel et al., 2020; Tscherpel et al., 2020). To assess the  
11 stimulation effect, we employed the relative difference (%) of the maximum finger  
12 tapping velocity between the stimulation site of interest, i.e., contralesional M1,  
13 dPMC, or aIPS, and the Sham stimulation for further analysis. Please see  
14 Supplementary Material III for a detailed description of task, recording, and analysis  
15 procedures.

### 16 *Lesion mapping*

17 For all included patients, standard MR images (1.5T MRI scanner, see  
18 Supplementary material IV for further specifications) were taken as part of the clinical  
19 diagnostic procedure within 48h after stroke onset. An individual lesion map was  
20 manually drawn for each patient based on the DWI image (see Supplementary  
21 Material IV for the preprocessing). Standard lesion characteristics were calculated,  
22 i.e., the number of affected voxels and lesion volume.

1 ***Voxel lesion symptom mapping***

2 We conducted a voxel lesion symptom mapping (VLSM) using the non-parametric mapping  
3 (NPM) software package (Rorden et al., 2007). Only voxels that were damaged in at least  
4 15% of the patients were included in the analysis. We corrected for multiple comparisons  
5 using the non-parametric permutation tests (1000 permutations) recommended for medium  
6 sample sizes (Medina et al., 2010). Further, we set a significance level of 0.05 FDR  
7 corrected as a threshold for voxel consideration.

8 *Tract-specific lesion mapping*

9 The structural integrity of the CST was quantified using a z-axis corrected  
10 probabilistic mapping procedure (Feng et al., 2015; Zhu et al., 2010), accounting for  
11 individual variations in brain anatomy and lesion location. Therefore, the calculation  
12 of the probabilistic CST lesion overlap (Chenot et al., 2019) was determined  
13 separately for each slice with an individual weighting factor according to the height of  
14 the lesion along the z-axis, adjusting for the width of the CST on the corresponding  
15 slice (Figure 2A). Maximum lesion extent was defined as the greatest extent of the  
16 infarct (number of voxels) within the CST relative to the full CST extent in the z-plane.  
17 The detailed implementation can be found in the Supplementary Material V.

18 *Network-specific disconnectivity mapping*

19 A network-specific disconnectivity mapping approach was used to quantify the  
20 structural disruption within the ipsilesional motor network (Figure 2B). Using the

1 Lesion Quantification Toolkit (LQT)<sup>32</sup>, white matter disconnectivity matrices were  
2 created for each patient by projecting the individual lesion map onto the HCP-842  
3 human connectome atlas (Glasser et al., 2016). By means of a normative database  
4 of white matter tractography from healthy subjects, the LQT toolbox identifies and  
5 maps the white matter tracts passing through each lesion. By calculating the overlap  
6 between the lesion mask and tractography data, the toolbox produces a profile of  
7 disrupted white matter pathways specific to each lesion, i.e. a lesion-specific  
8 disconnectivity profile. This approach enabled the determination of the disruption of  
9 all fiber streamlines connecting cortical parcels (Schaefer et al., 2017), characterizing  
10 the lesion-induced damage of gray matter and white matter tracts. Here, a  
11 subdivision of an initial parcellation of 100 parcels (Schaefer et al., 2017) focusing on  
12 an extended motor network was utilized (see Supplementary Materials V for a list of  
13 included parcels)

14 A graph-theoretical approach was used to summarize the structural loss, focusing on  
15 the average node strength in the disconnectivity matrix. This approach measured the  
16 amount of disconnection between specific brain regions (parcels) within the  
17 ipsilesional motor network. This method allowed to quantify the disconnectivity of (i)  
18 the whole network, (ii) the ipsilesional motor network and (iii) particularly the  
19 ipsilesional M1's disconnectivity with the network (details in Supplementary Material  
20 V).

## 21 *Statistical Analyses*

22 Statistical analyses were performed using the SciPy Stats package (version 1.9.3) in  
23 Python (version 3.11). TMS effects were compared between stroke patients and  
24 healthy participants for each target region. In case of violation of normal distribution

1 non-parametric test was chosen. To account for the individual heterogeneity of the  
2 TMS effect, we assessed the distribution of subjects exhibiting a statistically relevant  
3 positive or negative response to TMS. Given that the data of both groups  
4 approximated left-skewed distributions centered close to zero and assuming a slight  
5 to moderate deviation from normal distribution, a response was considered  
6 statistically relevant when exceeding  $\pm 1.5$  standard errors of the aggregated mean  
7 (SEM) of the sham condition. The proportion of responders and non-responders in  
8 both groups was compared by Fisher's exact test.

9 In order to infer the association between the ipsilesional structural network alterations  
10 and the functional relevance of contralesional motor regions, Spearman correlations  
11 were performed linking the lesion and disconnectivity measures to region-specific  
12 TMS effects in TMS responsive patients. All statistical tests were two-tailed, a  
13 significance level of  $p < 0.05$  was considered statistically significant, and FDR-  
14 correction was used to control for multiple testing.



## 1 RESULTS

### 2 *TMS effects early after stroke*

3 Comparing the sham-normalized TMS-induced performance changes, significant  
4 group differences in tapping performance were found for contralesional M1 ( $Z=-2.26$ ,  
5  $p=0.026$ , FDR-corrected) and contralesional aIPS ( $Z=-2.06$ ,  $p=0.026$ , FDR-corrected)  
6 but not for dPMC ( $p=0.099$ ) stimulation, indicating a behavioral improvement upon  
7 TMS interference with the two former regions in stroke patients early after stroke  
8 (Figure 3).

9 We next analyzed the individual responses, i.e., motor performance improvement or  
10 deterioration upon TMS interference at an individual level. Accordingly, for  
11 ipsilesional M1, 11 out of 25 patients (44%) but only 2 out of 23 control subjects  
12 (8.7%) showed a positive response. For dPMC stimulation, 10 out of 25 patients  
13 (40%) demonstrated a positive response, and 3 out of 23 (13%) healthy participants.  
14 Finally, when interfering with aIPS activity, 12 out of 25 patients (48%) exhibited a  
15 positive effect, while only 3 out of 23 controls (13%) featured similar improvements.  
16 Correspondingly, Fisher's exact test revealed a significantly higher proportion of  
17 positive TMS responders in patients for M1 ( $T=0.12$ ,  $p=0.048$ ,  $OR=0.41$ , FDR-  
18 corrected) and aIPS stimulation ( $T=0.16$ ,  $p=0.048$ ,  $OR=0.39$ , FDR-corrected). In  
19 contrast, dPMC stimulation effects ( $p=0.050$ ) did not pass the statistical threshold  
20 (Figure 3). By contrast, there were no comparable effects for individual responses  
21 concerning the deterioration of motor performance. Hence, a TMS-induced motor  
22 improvement upon contralesional M1 and aIPS interference in patients at the group  
23 level was accompanied by a greater proportion of individual positive TMS responses  
24 in patients following contralesional M1 and aIPS stimulation.

1 *General lesion characteristics*

2 The lesion overlap indicated one peak located at the posterior limb of the internal  
3 capsule (MNI coordinates: -27, -13, 6) and one in the medioventral part of the pons  
4 (MNI coordinates: -4, -20, -30) (Figure 4A). However, lesion volume did not differ  
5 between TMS responders and non-responders ( $p>0.4$ ). Likewise, we did not find  
6 differences between the group of TMS responders and the rest of the patients for  
7 demographic, behavioral, or clinical data ( $p>0.3$ ).

8 *Impact of CST lesion load on TMS responsivity early after stroke*

9 We further investigated the relationship between CST integrity and TMS responses.  
10 Within the group of M1 responders, i.e., the proportion of patients featuring a  
11 significant behavioral improvement upon TMS interference with M1 at the individual  
12 level, a positive association between the TMS-induced improvement of motor  
13 performance upon contralesional M1 stimulation and the maximum CST lesion extent  
14 ( $r=0.76$ ,  $p=0.014$ , FDR-corrected;  $n=11$ ) was observed. Hence, a more substantial  
15 disruption of CST fibers was linked to a more detrimental effect of the contralesional  
16 M1 on motor performance early after stroke (Figure 5A).

17 In a linear regression model, a variance explanation of 75% for M1 responsiveness  
18 was achieved based on the combined influence of CST lesion extent and the initial  
19 upper limb deficit ( $R^2=0.75$ ,  $R^2_{\text{corr}}=0.61$ ,  $p=0.004$ ). In a hierarchical model considering  
20 both factors, only the involvement of CST was selected, explaining 67% of the  
21 variance ( $R^2=0.67$ ,  $R^2_{\text{corr}}=0.63$ ,  $p=0.002$ ), implying that the initial deficit might add to



1 the explanation of the contralesional M1 effect, the contribution of the CST lesion  
2 extent, however, was crucial.

3 In contrast, comparable effects could not be found for aIPS or dPMC stimulation,  
4 underpinning the specificity of the interaction of ipsilesional CST affection, motor  
5 deficit, and contralesional M1 involvement.

### 6 ***The relevance of lesion location for TMS responsivity early after stroke***

7 To evaluate the impact of lesion location on TMS responsivity as well as the size of  
8 interference effect with contralesional motor areas and, thus, their role for post-stroke  
9 motor function, binary and continuous VLSM analyses were conducted for each  
10 region of interest. Both yielded significant effects exclusively for M1 stimulation but  
11 not aIPS and dPMC (Figure 4C,D). Notably, lesions located in the posterior limb of  
12 the internal capsule at the border to the thalamus differentiated between M1  
13 responders and non-responders. Moreover, similar lesion locations were associated  
14 with a TMS-induced improvement in motor performance upon contralesional M1,  
15 suggesting a detrimental influence of contralesional M1 in case of lesion-induced  
16 disruption of the posterior limb of the internal capsule, which further underlines the  
17 association between M1 effect and CST integrity reported above. Interestingly, no  
18 effect was found for aIPS or dPMC, which suggests that the effects of these two  
19 regions may be based on more complex network effects that cannot be explained  
20 using local factors.

### 21 ***Structural reserve of the ipsilesional motor network early after stroke***

22 Based on the hypothesis of structural reserve, we finally tested the relationship  
23 between ipsilesional connectome integrity and the effect induced by TMS  
24 interference with the two contralesional motor areas of interest. Therefore, TMS

1   responsivity of contralesional M1 and aIPS, i.e., the significant improvement in task  
2   performance upon TMS interference with the respective region at the individual  
3   patient level, were related to both (i) the averaged node strength and (ii) the M1-  
4   specific node strength obtained from the disconnectivity matrix, i.e., the lesion-  
5   induced structural damage with respect to white matter tracts of the ipsilesional  
6   hemisphere.

7   Accordingly, no significant associations were found between the more general  
8   ipsilesional motor network disconnectivity and the behavioral responsivity upon  
9   contralesional M1 or aIPS interference (all  $p$ -values  $> 0.4$ ).

10   By contrast, regarding the disruption of connections specific to ipsilesional M1,  
11   opposite dependencies were observed for TMS responsivity of contralesional M1 and  
12   aIPS: A positive association was found between the TMS-induced performance  
13   improvement upon contralesional M1 interference and the ipsilesional M1 network  
14   disruption ( $r=0.84$ ,  $p=0.002$ , FDR-corrected;  $n=11$ ), indicating that a detrimental  
15   influence of contralesional M1 on motor function early after stroke was found  
16   explicitly in case of more severe ipsilesional M1 network disruption, i.e., decreased  
17   structural reserve (Figure 5B). aIPS responsivity, i.e., improving motor performance  
18   upon interference with contralesional aIPS, however, was negatively related to  
19   ipsilesional M1 network disruption ( $r=0.65$ ,  $p=0.032$ , FDR-corrected;  $n=12$ ). Hence,  
20   more detrimental influences from contralesional aIPS were particularly found in  
21   patients with preserved connections between ipsilesional M1 and the ipsilesional  
22   motor network, i.e., greater structural reserve. Thus, albeit TMS interference with  
23   both contralesional M1 and contralesional aIPS induced concordant effects on  
24   behavioral outcomes, effects on the individual level and their distinct associations  
25   with ipsilesional network configurations emphasize the presence of divergent  
26   underlying mechanisms at the neural level.

1 When computing connectivity for ipsilesional aIPS, no significant effects were found  
2 neither for TMS effects evoked by contralesional aIPS nor contralesional M1  
3 stimulation ( $p$ -values $>0.7$ ), underlining the specificity of TMS effects for the  
4 ipsilesional M1 connectome. Furthermore, there was no correlation between M1-  
5 specific disconnectivity and maximum CST lesion load ( $r=0.38$ ,  $p=0.18$ ;  $n=11$ ),  
6 suggesting that these two parameters contain differential information about  
7 ipsilesional structural network pathology, such as the functionality of the CST as a  
8 descending neural pathway in contrast to cortico-cortical and cortico-subcortical  
9 interconnectivity.

## 10 **DISCUSSION**

11 We here show that TMS effects on contralesional M1 and contralesional aIPS activity  
12 are linked to the degree of network disruption caused by the ischemic lesion early  
13 after stroke. To this end, a pooled dataset from two methodologically similar online  
14 TMS studies (Hensel et al., 2020; Tscherpel et al., 2020) was utilized to elaborate on  
15 the variability of previous findings regarding the recruitment of the contralesional  
16 hemisphere early post-stroke. Based on the concept of structural reserve proposing  
17 the functional relevance of the contralesional hemisphere in dependence on  
18 remaining unaffected structures of the ipsilesional motor system, we used a lesion  
19 mapping approach and graph theoretical measures to individually characterize the  
20 structural damage, i.e., the lesion-induced disconnectivity. Correspondingly, the  
21 relationship between ipsilesional M1 disconnectivity and contralesional TMS effects  
22 was opposite for M1 and aIPS, even though at both the group and individual  
23 behavioral level, interference with either of the two areas led to an improvement of  
24 motor performance of the stroke-affected hand. This observation emphasizes that the  
25 individual functional contribution of the contralesional hemisphere to motor function

1 early after stroke can be demonstrated as a function of distinctive region-specific  
2 properties of the ipsilesional structural reserve spared by the lesion.

### 3 *Motor reorganization in the frontoparietal network early after stroke*

4 A frequently observed phenomenon post-stroke encompasses an increase of neural  
5 activity within the contralesional hemisphere during movements of the stroke-affected  
6 hand (Grefkes et al., 2008; Rehme et al., 2011). Early post-stroke, this heightened  
7 contralesional sensorimotor cortex activity is linked to better recovery (Rehme et al.,  
8 2011), evolving into a more lateralized activation in the ipsilesional hemisphere with  
9 improved motor function in the chronic phase (Grefkes and Fink, 2014; Rehme et al.,  
10 2011). Conversely, persistent bilateral activity in chronic stages is associated with  
11 less favorable recovery (Ward et al., 2003).

12 However, the existing literature portrays conflicting results on the functional  
13 implications of increased contralesional activation. While some studies indicate  
14 compensatory influences from the contralesional hemisphere, consistent with the  
15 hypothesis of vicariation (Rehme et al., 2012; Ward et al., 2003), others describe a  
16 detrimental impact of contralesional motor areas in line with the theory of  
17 interhemispheric competition (Buetefisch, 2015; Murase et al., 2004). Here, TMS  
18 studies have provided insights into the role of local brain activity in stroke recovery  
19 (Johansen-Berg et al., 2002; Lotze et al., 2006; Tscherpel et al., 2020; Werhahn et  
20 al., 2003), indicating the importance of region- and time-specific aspects in  
21 contralesional recruitment in motor recovery and reorganization (Tscherpel et al.,  
22 2020; Volz et al., 2017).

23 Contralesional M1's involvement varies over time, being maladaptive early post-  
24 stroke (Volz et al., 2017) but supportive in chronic stages (Lotze et al., 2006). In line

1 with that, we demonstrate that TMS interference led to an increase in finger-tapping  
2 velocity, indicating a detrimental role of contralesional M1 in motor reorganization  
3 early after stroke. Notably, in contrast to the results of both original publications,  
4 which could not find a significant involvement of contralesional M1 (Hensel et al.,  
5 2020; Tscherpel et al., 2020), the pooled analysis expands the results of both by  
6 pushing the effect above the threshold with a bigger sample size.

7 Addressing stroke as a network disorder calls for a more integrated view on  
8 interactions within the motor network encompassing premotor and posterior-parietal  
9 cortex. For example, several fMRI-studies have demonstrated altered neural activity  
10 of contralesional posterior parietal areas and its impact on the ipsilesional M1 in  
11 motor reorganization post-stroke (Koch et al., 2007; Rehme et al., 2011; Schulz et  
12 al., 2015). Accordingly, additional recruitment of ipsi- and contralesional parietal  
13 areas was associated with more significant motor impairment early post-stroke  
14 (Rehme et al., 2011). In contrast, better motor function during recovery was linked to  
15 an activity decrease in contralesional intraparietal cortex (Ward et al., 2003). TMS  
16 studies have previously described a detrimental influence of contralesional aIPS on  
17 motor function already in the first weeks after stroke and lasting into the chronic  
18 phase (Hensel et al., 2020; Tscherpel et al., 2020). Consistently, the current analysis  
19 corroborates these findings.

20 Several studies have shown that the functional connectivity and activation patterns of  
21 contralesional dPMC, critical in the frontoparietal network post-stroke, are associated  
22 with motor impairment and recovery after stroke (Bestmann et al., 2010; Johansen-  
23 Berg et al., 2002). Specifically, increased activity and connectivity between  
24 contralesional dPMC and ipsilesional motor regions have been observed in patients  
25 with better motor recovery, suggesting a compensatory mechanism in the chronic

1 phase after stroke (Fridman, 2004; Hensel et al., 2023). These findings are  
2 consistent with TMS studies, which have similarly reported a positive influence  
3 restricted to the chronic stage of stroke recovery (Tscherpel et al., 2020). In line with  
4 that, our analysis did not reveal a significant difference in motor performance  
5 between patients and healthy controls following TMS interference early post-stroke

### 6 *Integrity of the ipsilesional CST and contralesional TMS responsivity*

7 TMS responses exhibited substantial variability with only around 50% of patients  
8 demonstrating a significant improvement under stimulation (Bai et al., 2022; Chen et  
9 al., 2014; Hildesheim et al., 2022). However, response variability is not exclusive to  
10 TMS but echoes a common pattern of neuromodulating techniques, where responses  
11 can vary widely among individuals. For example, the therapeutic outcomes of deep  
12 brain stimulation (DBS) present a similar level of heterogeneity (Hitti et al., 2020;  
13 Martinez-Ramirez et al., 2018). This has led to an increased focus on connectomic  
14 approaches incorporating structural and functional connectivity into treatment  
15 planning, enabling personalized therapies (Harita et al., 2022; Hollunder et al., 2022;  
16 Menardi et al., 2022; Rajamani et al., 2022). Moreover, also in healthy individuals,  
17 TMS-induced neural activity has been shown to be predominantly predicted by the  
18 structural integrity of the stimulated network, further highlighting the significance of a  
19 network perspective (Momi et al., 2023).

20 Despite two decades of intensive research on brain reorganization following stroke,  
21 data on the functional role of particular brain areas concerning functional or structural  
22 network changes in the acute stage after stroke remain scarce. Methodological  
23 advances like connectome-based lesion-symptom mapping (CSLM) enable a novel

1 new way of estimating the structural network by projecting lesion maps onto  
2 structural standard atlases (Bowren et al., 2022; Griffis et al., 2021).

3 Moreover, efforts have been undertaken to explain the heterogeneous influences of  
4 the contralesional hemisphere on motor reorganization and recovery within the  
5 bimodal balance–recovery model and the concept of structural reserve (Pino et al.,  
6 2014). According to the theoretical framework of structural reserve, a more profound  
7 loss of ipsilesional network structures results in a compensatory recruitment of  
8 contralesional areas facilitating motor recovery. By contrast, the contralesional  
9 hemisphere exerts a predominantly detrimental impact on a less affected ipsilesional  
10 network. In this context, it has to be acknowledged that the current cohort exhibited  
11 mild to moderate impairments resulting from rather limited lesions to motor-related  
12 fibers in the ipsilesional hemisphere. Therefore, given the relatively preserved  
13 ipsilesional structural resources, it could be anticipated that these patients  
14 demonstrate a greater vulnerability to disturbing contralesional influences according  
15 to the concept of structural reserve.

16 However, the interregional functional differences within the contralesional  
17 hemisphere described above render the notion plausible that structural reserve has  
18 to be considered with equivalent regional specificity.

19 Thus, we further elaborated on the associations between behaviorally overlapping  
20 reactivity to TMS interference on contralesional M1 and aIPS and ipsilesional  
21 network structures spared by the lesion. Motor deficits after stroke highly depend on  
22 the lesion-induced severity of the CST damage (Brouwer and Ashby, 1990; Lotze et  
23 al., 2006; Zhu et al., 2010). However, the significance of CST integrity in the context  
24 of contralesional involvement has yielded conflicting findings in the literature. While  
25 some studies have reported a positive link between ipsilesional CST integrity and

1 contralesional recruitment (DeVetten et al., 2010; Lemon, 2008), others have shown  
2 no significant relationship or even a negative association (Bestmann et al., 2010;  
3 Stinear et al., 2007). By assessing the functional involvement of the contralesional  
4 hemisphere with online TMS interference, our results indicate a positive relationship  
5 between ipsilesional CST lesion extent and motor performance improvement upon  
6 contralesional M1 interference as an index for a disturbing influence in early motor  
7 reorganization. In contrast to the hypothesis of structural reserve, the current results  
8 suggest that – at least for the ipsilesional CST and in the present sample of mildly to  
9 moderately affected patients with a generally higher structural reserve - the  
10 ipsilesional hemisphere is susceptible to maladaptive influences of contralesional M1  
11 in case of less CST integrity. Specifically, this association was observed solely for the  
12 contralesional M1 effect and was absent for aIPS. These findings are further  
13 underlined by the results of the VLSM analysis. Correspondingly, lesions within the  
14 CST, i.e. the posterior limb of the internal capsule at the border to the thalamus,  
15 distinguished between M1 responsiveness and non-responsiveness and similar  
16 lesion locations were also associated with the extent of M1 effect but explicitly not for  
17 aIPS.

### 18 *Contralesional significance in the context of ipsilesional network configurations*

19 Previous studies have emphasized the role of interhemispheric structural  
20 connections in facilitating the interaction between ipsi- and contralesional structures  
21 to enhance motor recovery (Lotze et al., 2006; Ward, 2006). We here underpin the  
22 importance of the ipsilesional motor network in the context of structural reserve and  
23 contralesional influences. Our findings revealed distinct and opposite relationships  
24 between the reserve of the ipsilesional network and the effect of contralesional M1  
25 and aIPS for post-stroke motor performance. Specifically, we found a correlation



1 between ipsilesional M1 disconnectivity and a more disturbing influence of  
2 contralesional M1. Likewise, more extensive lesions to the ipsilesional CST were  
3 associated with a more disruptive influence of contralesional M1. These converging  
4 findings strongly challenge the concept of structural reserve in terms of supportive  
5 contralesional influences. Instead, contralesional aIPS exerted a supportive influence  
6 for motor performance in patients with stronger ipsilesional M1 disconnectivity,  
7 supporting the hypothesis of structural reserve. These opposite effects concerning  
8 the influences originating from contralesional areas and their link to ipsilesional  
9 network properties vote for including regional specificity in the concept of structural  
10 reserve.

11 Concurrently, the findings emphasize the limitations of simplistic models in  
12 comprehensively capturing the complexity of the hemispheric interplay during  
13 reorganization after stroke. They further highlight the demand for a more nuanced  
14 understanding and individualizable models of the relationship between different  
15 contralesional motor regions and their unique contributions to motor recovery.

## 16 **CONCLUSION**

17 In conclusion, the present study's findings extend the concept of structural reserve by  
18 adding the factor region to explain the heterogeneous patterns of contralesional  
19 recruitment observed after stroke. Our data emphasize the significance of  
20 considering region-specific variations in contralesional recruitment within the context  
21 of the structural reserve of the ipsilesional motor network. This highlights the  
22 nuanced influence of distinct motor regions and underscores the need for a more

- 1 personalized approach to understand the mechanisms of motor reorganization after
- 2 stroke.

1     **DATA AVAILABILITY**

2     The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding  
3     author, CT, upon reasonable request.

4     **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

5     GRF and CG were funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German  
6     Research Foundation) – Project-ID 431549029 – SFB 1451 (project C05). We thank Jana  
7     Freytag, Stella Ritter, and Katharina Lemberg for technical assistance.

8     **COMPETING INTERESTS**


9     The authors report no competing interests.

## FIGURES


### A Finger tapping



### B Block design




### C TMS sites




**Figure 1.** Experimental setup.

**A** During applying 10Hz online TMS interference, all subjects performed a simple finger-tapping task in response to a visual cue. **B** The experiment was set up in a pseudo-randomized block design addressing each target region thrice. Each trial consisted of alternating tapping and rest intervals. **C** The three contralesional target regions comprise the primary motor cortex (M1), the dorsal premotor cortex (dPMC), and the anterior intraparietal sulcus (aIPS). The parieto-occipital vertex served as a control condition (Sham).



**Figure 2.** Lesion symptom mapping.


A A probabilistic mapping procedure was utilized to assess the structural integrity of the corticospinal tract corrected for the width of the corticospinal tract on the z-axis. This method involved characterizing the extent of the lesion for each height of the tract and weighting it by the individual width at the level of each respective slice. B White matter disconnectivity topographies were created by projecting the individual brain lesion on the HCP-842 human connectome atlas. Based on this overlap between lesion mask and tractography data, a matrix of estimated fiber tract damage was estimated and, thus, derived a lesion-specific disconnectivity profile for each patient.



**Figure 3.** Group comparisons between stroke patients and healthy control subjects and individual data points.

**A** A significant difference in finger-tapping velocity between stroke patients and healthy control subjects was found for the stimulation of contralesional M1 and aIPS. Accordingly, patients early after stroke demonstrated an improvement in tapping performance upon contralesional online TMS interference. An equivalent group difference concerning dPMC could not be detected in the present sample. **B** It was demonstrated that the group of stroke patients comprised a significantly higher proportion of positive responders for the M1 and


aIPS stimulation but not for dPMC. Patient data are shown in color while healthy controls are shown in gray.




**Figure 4.** Distributions and effects of lesion location.

A The lesion overlap of all patients indicated two peaks: one in the posterior limb of the internal capsule and one in the medioventral part of the pons. B The tract overlap showed a dominant overlap with CST. Please note that lighter colors represent a higher incidence of overlap. C VLSM result for the difference between responders and non-responders upon M1 stimulation. D The VLSM analysis per target region indicated that lesion involving the CST, specifically the posterior limb of the internal capsule influencing the TMS response of contralesional M1. Of note, these relationships were not found for contralesional aIPS or dPMC effects, indicating that those may be rather driven by more complex, e.g., network effects rather than by local factors.

### A Correlation between CST damage and M1 TMS effect



### B Contrary correlations between the M1/aIPS TMS Effect and the M1 disconnectivity



**Figure 5.** Relationship between ipsilesional network alterations and responsiveness to contralesional TMS.

A A positive relationship between the degree of ipsilesional CST lesion load and TMS responsiveness to contralesional M1 stimulation was found. B A positive association was found linking the amount of contralesional M1 response to the degree of disconnectivity of the ipsilesional M1. A negative correlation was identified between the contralesional aIPS responses and ipsilesional M1 disconnectivity.



## REFERENCES

- Bai, Z., Zhang, J., Fong, K.N.K., 2022. Effects of transcranial magnetic stimulation in modulating cortical excitability in patients with stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J. Neuroeng. Rehabilitation* 19, 24. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12984-022-00999-4>
- Bertolucci, F., Chisari, C., Fregni, F., 2018. The potential dual role of transcallosal inhibition in post-stroke motor recovery. *Restor. Neurol. Neurosci.* 36, 83–97. <https://doi.org/10.3233/rnn-170778>
- Bestmann, S., Swayne, O., Blankenburg, F., Ruff, C.C., Teo, J., Weiskopf, N., Driver, J., Rothwell, J.C., Ward, N.S., 2010. The role of contralesional dorsal premotor cortex after stroke as studied with concurrent TMS-fMRI. *J Neurosci* 30, 11926–11937. <https://doi.org/10.1523/jneurosci.5642-09.2010>
- Bowren, M., Bruss, J., Manzel, K., Edwards, D., Liu, C., Corbetta, M., Tranel, D., Boes, A.D., 2022. Post-stroke outcomes predicted from multivariate lesion-behaviour and lesion network mapping. *Brain* 145, 1338–1353. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awac010>
- Bradnam, L.V., Stinear, C.M., Barber, P.A., Byblow, W.D., 2012. Contralesional hemisphere control of the proximal paretic upper limb following stroke. *Cereb Cortex* 22, 2662–2671. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhr344>
- Brancaccio, A., Tabarelli, D., Belardinelli, P., 2022. A New Framework to Interpret Individual Inter-Hemispheric Compensatory Communication after Stroke. *J. Pers. Med.* 12, 59. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jpm12010059>
- Brouwer, B., Ashby, P., 1990. Corticospinal projections to upper and lower limb spinal motoneurons in man. *Electroencephalogr. Clin. Neurophysiol.* 76, 509–519. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-4694\(90\)90002-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-4694(90)90002-2)
- Bütefisch, C.M., 2015. Role of the Contralesional Hemisphere in Post-Stroke Recovery of Upper Extremity Motor Function. *Front Neurol* 6, 63–10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fneur.2015.00214>
- Bütefisch, C.M., Weßling, M., Netz, J., Seitz, R.J., Hömberg, V., 2008. Relationship Between Interhemispheric Inhibition and Motor Cortex Excitability in Subacute Stroke Patients. *Neurorehabilit. Neural Repair* 22, 4–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1545968307301769>
- Carrera, E., Tononi, G., 2014. Diaschisis: past, present, future. *Brain* 137, 2408–2422. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awu101>
- Chen, M.-H., Huang, L.-L., Lee, C.-F., Hsieh, C.-L., Lin, Y.-C., Liu, H., Chen, M.-I., Lu, W.-S., 2014. A controlled pilot trial of two commercial video games for rehabilitation of arm function after stroke. *Clin. Rehabilitation* 29, 674–682. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0269215514554115>
- Chenot, Q., Tzourio-Mazoyer, N., Rheault, F., Descoteaux, M., Crivello, F., Zago, L., Mellet, E., Jobard, G., Joliot, M., Mazoyer, B., Petit, L., 2019. A population-based atlas of the human pyramidal tract in 410 healthy participants. *Brain Struct. Funct.* 224, 599–612. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00429-018-1798-7>
- Cramer, S.C., 2008. Repairing the human brain after stroke: I. Mechanisms of spontaneous recovery. *Ann. Neurol.* 63, 272–287. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.21393>

- DeVetten, G., Coutts, S.B., Hill, M.D., Goyal, M., Eesa, M., O'Brien, B., Demchuk, A.M., Kirton, A., groups, M. and V. study, 2010. Acute Corticospinal Tract Wallerian Degeneration Is Associated With Stroke Outcome. *Stroke* 41, 751–756. <https://doi.org/10.1161/strokeaha.109.573287>
- Duque, J., Hummel, F., Celnik, P., Murase, N., Mazzocchio, R., Cohen, L.G., 2005. Transcallosal inhibition in chronic subcortical stroke. *Neuroimage* 28, 940–946. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2005.06.033>
- Feng, W., Wang, J., Chhatbar, P.Y., Doughty, C., Landsittel, D., Lioutas, V., Kautz, S.A., Schlaug, G., 2015. Corticospinal tract lesion load: An imaging biomarker for stroke motor outcomes. *Ann Neurol* 78, 860–870. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.24510>
- Ferris, J.K., Neva, J.L., Francisco, B.A., Boyd, L.A., 2018. Bilateral Motor Cortex Plasticity in Individuals With Chronic Stroke, Induced by Paired Associative Stimulation. *Neurorehabilit. Neural Repair* 32, 671–681. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1545968318785043>
- Fridman, E.A., 2004. Reorganization of the human ipsilesional premotor cortex after stroke. *Brain* 127, 747–758. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awh082>
- Gerloff, C., Bushara, K., Sailer, A., Wassermann, E.M., Chen, R., Matsuoka, T., Waldvogel, D., Wittenberg, G.F., Ishii, K., Cohen, L.G., Hallett, M., 2005. Multimodal imaging of brain reorganization in motor areas of the contralesional hemisphere of well recovered patients after capsular stroke. *Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiology Electromyogr Mot Control* 129, 791–808. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0924-980x\(95\)93143-h](https://doi.org/10.1016/0924-980x(95)93143-h)
- Glasser, M.F., Coalson, T.S., Robinson, E.C., Hacker, C.D., Harwell, J., Yacoub, E., Ugurbil, K., Andersson, J., Beckmann, C.F., Jenkinson, M., Smith, S.M., Essen, D.C.V., 2016. A multi-modal parcellation of human cerebral cortex. *Nature* 536, 171–178. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature18933>
- Grefkes, C., Fink, G.R., 2014. Connectivity-based approaches in stroke and recovery of function. *Lancet Neurology* 13, 206–216. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1474-4422\(13\)70264-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1474-4422(13)70264-3)
- Grefkes, C., Nowak, D.A., Eickhoff, S.B., Dafotakis, M., Küst, J., Karbe, H., Fink, G.R., 2008. Cortical connectivity after subcortical stroke assessed with functional magnetic resonance imaging. *Ann Neurol* 63, 236–246. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.21228>
- Griffis, J.C., Metcalf, N.V., Corbetta, M., Shulman, G.L., 2021. Lesion Quantification Toolkit: A MATLAB software tool for estimating grey matter damage and white matter disconnections in patients with focal brain lesions. *Neuroimage Clin* 30, 102639. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2021.102639>
- Hallett, M., 2000. Transcranial magnetic stimulation and the human brain. *Nature* 406, 147–150. <https://doi.org/10.1038/35018000>
- Hallett, M., Haan, W. de, Deco, G., Dengler, R., Iorio, R.D., Gallea, C., Gerloff, C., Grefkes, C., Helmich, R.C., Kringelbach, M.L., Miraglia, F., Rektor, I., Strýček, O., Vecchio, F., Volz, L.J., Wu, T., Rossini, P.M., 2020. Human brain connectivity: Clinical applications for clinical neurophysiology. *Clin. Neurophysiol.* 131, 1621–1651. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2020.03.031>
- Harita, S., Momi, D., Mazza, F., Griffiths, J.D., 2022. Mapping Inter-individual Functional Connectivity Variability in TMS Targets for Major Depressive Disorder. *Front. Psychiatry* 13, 902089. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2022.902089>

- Hensel, L., Lange, F., Tscherpel, C., Viswanathan, S., Freytag, J., Volz, L.J., Eickhoff, S.B., Fink, G.R., Grefkes, C., 2023. Recovered grasping performance after stroke depends on interhemispheric frontoparietal connectivity. *Brain* 146, 1006–1020. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awac157>
- Hensel, L., Tscherpel, C., Freytag, J., Ritter, S., Rehme, A.K., Volz, L.J., Eickhoff, S.B., Fink, G.R., Grefkes, C., 2020. Connectivity-Related Roles of Contralateral Brain Regions for Motor Performance Early after Stroke. *Cereb Cortex* 31, 993–1007. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhaa270>
- Hildesheim, F.E., Silver, A.N., Dominguez-Vargas, A.-U., Andrushko, J.W., Edwards, J.D., Dancause, N., Thiel, A., 2022. Predicting Individual Treatment Response to rTMS for Motor Recovery After Stroke: A Review and the CanStim Perspective. *Front. Rehabilitation Sci.* 3, 795335. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fresc.2022.795335>
- Hitti, F.L., Ramayya, A.G., McShane, B.J., Yang, A.I., Vaughan, K.A., Baltuch, G.H., 2020. Long-term outcomes following deep brain stimulation for Parkinson's disease. *J. Neurosurg.* 132, 205–210. <https://doi.org/10.3171/2018.8.jns182081>
- Hollunder, B., Rajamani, N., Siddiqi, S.H., Finke, C., Kühn, A.A., Mayberg, H.S., Fox, M.D., Neudorfer, C., Horn, A., 2022. Toward personalized medicine in connectomic deep brain stimulation. *Prog. Neurobiol.* 210, 102211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pneurobio.2021.102211>
- Johansen-Berg, H., Rushworth, M.F.S., Bogdanovic, M.D., Kischka, U., Wimalaratna, S., Matthews, P.M., 2002. The role of ipsilateral premotor cortex in hand movement after stroke. *Proc National Acad Sci* 99, 14518–14523. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.222536799>
- Kobayashi, M., Pascual-Leone, A., 2003. Transcranial magnetic stimulation in neurology. *Lancet Neurol.* 2, 145–156. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1474-4422\(03\)00321-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1474-4422(03)00321-1)
- Koch, G., Olmo, M.F.D., Cheeran, B., Ruge, D., Schippling, S., Caltagirone, C., Rothwell, J.C., 2007. Focal stimulation of the posterior parietal cortex increases the excitability of the ipsilateral motor cortex. *J Neurosci* 27, 6815–6822. <https://doi.org/10.1523/jneurosci.0598-07.2007>
- Krakauer, J.W., Carmichael, S.T., Corbett, D., Wittenberg, G.F., 2012. Getting Neurorehabilitation Right. *Neurorehab Neural Re* 26, 923–931. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1545968312440745>
- Lefaucheur, J.-P., Aleman, A., Baeken, C., Benninger, D.H., Brunelin, J., Lazzaro, V.D., Filipovic, S.R., Grefkes, C., Hasan, A., Hummel, F.C., Jääskeläinen, S.K., Langguth, B., Leocani, L., Londero, A., Nardone, R., Nguyen, J.-P., Nyffeler, T., Oliveira-Maia, A.J., Oliviero, A., Padberg, F., Palm, U., Paulus, W., Poulet, E., Quartarone, A., Rachid, F., Rektorová, I., Rossi, S., Sahlsten, H., Schecklmann, M., Szekely, D., Ziemann, U., 2020. Evidence-based guidelines on the therapeutic use of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS): An update (2014–2018). *Clin Neurophysiol* 131, 474–528. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2019.11.002>
- Lefaucheur, J.-P., André-Obadia, N., Antal, A., Ayache, S.S., Baeken, C., Benninger, D.H., Cantello, R.M., Cincotta, M., Carvalho, M. de, Ridder, D.D., Devanne, H., Lazzaro, V.D., Filipovic, S.R., Hummel, F.C., Jääskeläinen, S.K., Kimiskidis, V.K., Koch, G., Langguth, B., Nyffeler, T., Oliviero, A., Padberg, F., Poulet, E., Rossi, S., Rossini, P.M., Rothwell, J.C., Schönfeldt-Lecuona, C., Siebner, H.R., Slotema, C.W., Stagg, C.J., Valls-Sole, J., Ziemann, U., Paulus, W., Garcia-Larrea, L., 2014. Evidence-based guidelines on

- the therapeutic use of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS). *Clin Neurophysiol* 125, 2150–2206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2014.05.021>
- Lefaucheur, J.-P., Antal, A., Ayache, S.S., Benninger, D.H., Brunelin, J., Cogiamanian, F., Cotelli, M., Ridder, D.D., Ferrucci, R., Langguth, B., Marangolo, P., Mylius, V., Nitsche, M.A., Padberg, F., Palm, U., Poulet, E., Priori, A., Rossi, S., Schecklmann, M., Vanneste, S., Ziemann, U., Garcia-Larrea, L., Paulus, W., 2017. Evidence-based guidelines on the therapeutic use of transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS). *Clin Neurophysiol* 128, 56–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2016.10.087>
- Lemon, R.N., 2008. Descending Pathways in Motor Control. *Annu Rev Neurosci* 31, 195–218. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.neuro.31.060407.125547>
- Lotze, M., Markert, J., Sauseng, P., Hoppe, J., Plewnia, C., Gerloff, C., 2006. The role of multiple contralesional motor areas for complex hand movements after internal capsular lesion. *J Neurosci* 26, 6096–6102. <https://doi.org/10.1523/jneurosci.4564-05.2006>
- Martinez-Ramirez, D., Jimenez-Shahed, J., Leckman, J.F., Porta, M., Servello, D., Meng, F.-G., Kuhn, J., Huys, D., Baldermann, J.C., Foltynie, T., Hariz, M.I., Joyce, E.M., Zrinzo, L., Kefalopoulou, Z., Silburn, P., Coyne, T., Mogilner, A.Y., Pourfar, M.H., Khandhar, S.M., Auyeung, M., Ostrem, J.L., Visser-Vandewalle, V., Welter, M.-L., Mallet, L., Karachi, C., Houeto, J.L., Klassen, B.T., Ackermans, L., Kaido, T., Temel, Y., Gross, R.E., Walker, H.C., Lozano, A.M., Walter, B.L., Mari, Z., Anderson, W.S., Changizi, B.K., Moro, E., Zauber, S.E., Schrock, L.E., Zhang, J.-G., Hu, W., Rizer, K., Monari, E.H., Foote, K.D., Malaty, I.A., Deeb, W., Gunduz, A., Okun, M.S., 2018. Efficacy and Safety of Deep Brain Stimulation in Tourette Syndrome: The International Tourette Syndrome Deep Brain Stimulation Public Database and Registry. *JAMA Neurol.* 75, 353. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaneurol.2017.4317>
- Medina, J., Kimberg, D.Y., Chatterjee, A., Coslett, H.B., 2010. Inappropriate usage of the Brunner–Munzel test in recent voxel-based lesion-symptom mapping studies. *Neuropsychologia* 48, 341–343. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2009.09.016>
- Menardi, A., Momi, D., Vallesi, A., Barabási, A.-L., Towlson, E.K., Santarnecchi, E., 2022. Maximizing brain networks engagement via individualized connectome-wide target search. *Brain Stimul.* 15, 1418–1431. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2022.09.011>
- Momi, D., Wang, Z., Griffiths, J.D., 2023. TMS-evoked responses are driven by recurrent large-scale network dynamics. *eLife* 12, e83232. <https://doi.org/10.7554/elife.83232>
- Murase, N., Duque, J., Mazzocchio, R., Cohen, L.G., 2004. Influence of interhemispheric interactions on motor function in chronic stroke. *Can J Neurological Sci J Can Des Sci Neurologiques* 55, 400–409. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0317167100000196>
- Murphy, T.H., Corbett, D., 2009. Plasticity during stroke recovery: from synapse to behaviour. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 10, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2735>
- Pino, G.D., Pellegrino, G., Assenza, G., Capone, F., Ferreri, F., Formica, D., Ranieri, F., Tombini, M., Ziemann, U., Rothwell, J.C., Lazzaro, V.D., 2014. Modulation of brain plasticity in stroke: a novel model for neurorehabilitation. *Nat Rev Neurol* 10, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrneurol.2014.162>
- Rajamani, N., Horn, A., Hollunder, B., 2022. Connectomic Deep Brain Stimulation 527–542. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-821861-7.00009-9>

- Rehme, A.K., Eickhoff, S.B., Rottschy, C., Fink, G.R., Grefkes, C., 2012. Activation likelihood estimation meta-analysis of motor-related neural activity after stroke. *Neuroimage* 59, 2771–2782. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.10.023>
- Rehme, A.K., Fink, G.R., Cramon, D.Y. von, Grefkes, C., 2011. The role of the contralesional motor cortex for motor recovery in the early days after stroke assessed with longitudinal fMRI. *Cereb Cortex* 21, 756–768. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhq140>
- Rorden, C., Bonilha, L., Nichols, T.E., 2007. Rank-order versus mean based statistics for neuroimaging. *Neuroimage* 35, 1531–1537. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2006.12.043>
- Rossi, S., Antal, A., Bestmann, S., Bikson, M., Brewer, C., Brockmüller, J., Carpenter, L.L., Cincotta, M., Chen, R., Daskalakis, J.D., Lazzaro, V.D., Fox, M.D., George, M.S., Gilbert, D., Kimiskidis, V.K., Koch, G., Ilmoniemi, R.J., Lefaucheur, J.P., Leocani, L., Lisanby, S.H., Miniussi, C., Padberg, F., Pascual-Leone, A., Paulus, W., Peterchev, A.V., Quartarone, A., Rotenberg, A., Rothwell, J., Rossini, P.M., Santarnecchi, E., Shafi, M.M., Siebner, H.R., Ugawa, Y., Wassermann, E.M., Zangen, A., Ziemann, U., Hallett, M., 2020. T. basis of this article began with a C.S. from the I.W. on "Present, Future of TMS: Safety, Ethical Guidelines", Siena, October 17-20, 2018, updating through April, 2021. Safety and recommendations for TMS use in healthy subjects and patient populations, with updates on training, ethical and regulatory issues: Expert Guidelines. *Clin. Neurophysiol.* 132, 269–306. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2020.10.003>
- Rossi, S., Hallett, M., Rossini, P.M., Pascual-Leone, A., 2009. Safety, ethical considerations, and application guidelines for the use of transcranial magnetic stimulation in clinical practice and research. *Clin Neurophysiol* 120, 2008–2039. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2009.08.016>
- Schaefer, A., Kong, R., Gordon, E.M., Laumann, T.O., Zuo, X.-N., Holmes, A.J., Eickhoff, S.B., Yeo, B.T.T., 2017. Local-Global Parcellation of the Human Cerebral Cortex from Intrinsic Functional Connectivity MRI. *Cereb Cortex* 28, 3095–3114. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhx179>
- Schulz, R., Koch, P., Zimerman, M., Wessel, M., Bönstrup, M., Thomalla, G., Cheng, B., Gerloff, C., Hummel, F.C., 2015. Parietofrontal motor pathways and their association with motor function after stroke. *Plos One* 138, 1949–1960. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0052727>
- Stinear, C.M., Barber, P.A., Smale, P.R., Coxon, J.P., Fleming, M.K., Byblow, W.D., 2007. Functional potential in chronic stroke patients depends on corticospinal tract integrity. *Brain* 130, 170–180. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awl333>
- Takeuchi, N., Tada, T., Toshima, M., Chuma, T., Matsuo, Y., Ikoma, K., 2008. Inhibition of the unaffected motor cortex by 1 Hz repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation enhances motor performance and training effect of the paretic hand in patients with chronic stroke. *J. Rehabilitation Med.* 40, 298–303. <https://doi.org/10.2340/16501977-0181>
- Tscherpel, C., Hensel, L., Lemberg, K., Vollmer, M., Volz, L.J., Fink, G.R., Grefkes, C., 2020. The differential roles of contralesional frontoparietal areas in cortical reorganization after stroke. *Brain Stimul.* 13, 614–624. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2020.01.016>

- Volz, L.J., Vollmer, M., Michely, J., Fink, G.R., Rothwell, J.C., Grefkes, C., 2017. Time-dependent functional role of the contralesional motor cortex after stroke. *Neuroimage Clin* 16, 165–174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2017.07.024>
- Ward, N.S., 2017. Restoring brain function after stroke - bridging the gap between animals and humans. *Nat Rev Neurol* 13, 244–255. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrneurol.2017.34>
- Ward, N.S., 2006. Motor system activation after subcortical stroke depends on corticospinal system integrity. *Brain* 129, 809–819. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awl002>
- Ward, N.S., Brown, M.M., Thompson, A.J., Frackowiak, R.S.J., 2003. Neural correlates of motor recovery after stroke: a longitudinal fMRI study. *Brain* 126, 2476–2496. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awg245>
- Werhahn, K.J., Conforto, A.B., Kadom, N., Hallett, M., Cohen, L.G., 2003. Contribution of the ipsilateral motor cortex to recovery after chronic stroke. *Ann Neurol* 54, 464–472. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.10686>
- Zhu, L.L., Lindenberg, R., Alexander, M.P., Schlaug, G., 2010. Lesion Load of the Corticospinal Tract Predicts Motor Impairment in Chronic Stroke. *Stroke* 41, 910–915. <https://doi.org/10.1161/strokeaha.109.577023>

