

1 **Duration and reliability of the silent period in individuals with spinal cord injury**

2 **Running title:** Silent period in cervical SCI

3 Hannah Sfreddo^{a*}, Jaclyn R. Wecht^{a*}, Ola Alsalman^{a,b}, Yu-Kuang Wu^{a,b}, Noam Y. Harel^{a,b}

4

5 * These authors contributed equally to this work

6

7 ^a, James J. Peters VA Medical Center, 130 West Kingsbridge Road, Bronx, New York 10468

8 USA

9 ^b, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, 1 Gustave L. Levy Place, New York, New York

10 10029 USA

11

12 Corresponding Author:

13 Noam Y. Harel, MD, PhD

14 718-584-9000 x1742 (p); 888-299-1965 (f); noam.harel@mssm.edu

15

16 **Design:** Observational.

17 **Objectives:** We aim to better understand the silent period (SP), an inhibitory counterpart to the
18 well-known motor evoked potential (MEP) elicited by transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS), in
19 individuals with spinal cord injury (SCI).

20 **Setting:** Veterans Affairs Hospital in New York.

21 **Methods:** Electromyographic responses were measured in the target abductor pollicis brevis at
22 rest (TMS at 120% of resting motor threshold (RMT)) and during maximal effort (TMS at 110%
23 of RMT). Participants with chronic cervical SCI (n=9) and able-bodied volunteers (n=12)
24 underwent between 3-7 sessions of stimulation on separate days. The primary outcomes were
25 the magnitude and reliability of SP duration, resting and active MEP amplitudes, and RMT.

26 **Results:** SCI participants showed significantly lower MEP amplitudes compared to AB
27 participants. SCI SP duration was not significantly different from AB SP duration. SP duration
28 demonstrated reduced intra-participant variability within and across sessions compared with
29 MEP amplitudes. SCI participants also demonstrated a higher prevalence of SP 'interruptions'
30 compared to AB participants.

31 **Conclusions:** SP reflects a balance between corticospinal excitatory and inhibitory processes.
32 SP duration is more reliable within and across multiple sessions than MEP amplitude.

33

34 **Keywords:** Transcranial magnetic stimulation, motor evoked potential, silent period, spinal cord
35 injury, reliability

36

37 **1 Introduction**

38 The motor evoked potential (MEP) amplitude in response to transcranial magnetic stimulation
39 (TMS) is one of the most commonly used outcome measures for tracking neurophysiology of
40 the corticospinal system. Spinal cord injury (SCI) reduces MEP amplitude in muscles below the
41 injury, reflecting reduced excitatory transmission across the spinal lesion. In contrast,
42 corticospinal inhibitory processes are comparatively understudied after SCI. The silent period
43 (SP) occurs upon TMS administration to the motor cortex during volitional contraction of a target
44 muscle on either the ipsilateral or contralateral side of stimulation. In contralateral SP elicitation,
45 the resulting MEP is followed by a period of electromyographic (EMG) suppression (silent
46 period) usually lasting 100-300 milliseconds¹⁻³ (Figure 1). Whereas the ipsilateral SP depends
47 on corpus callosum-mediated interhemispheric inhibition, the contralateral SP reflects cortical
48 and corticospinal processes^{3,4}.

49
50 Spinal inhibitory mechanisms contribute to the first ~50 ms of the SP through hyperpolarization
51 and segmental recurrent inhibition of motor neurons^{1,3}. Interneuronal gamma-aminobutyric acid
52 (GABA)_B plays a major role in mediating intracortical inhibition of pyramidal motor cortex
53 neurons during the remainder of the SP^{2,5}. This is most clearly demonstrated by the elongation
54 of SP duration when baclofen, a specific GABA_B receptor agonist, is delivered intrathecally⁶.
55 However, studies of oral and intravenous baclofen have failed to demonstrate a significant effect
56 on SP duration^{5,7,8}.

57

58 Lesions of the nervous system may lengthen or shorten SP duration. Cerebral pathologies that
59 lengthen SP include stroke⁹, epilepsy¹⁰, and depression¹¹. Conversely, pathologies that shorten
60 SP include bipolar disorder¹² and chronic neuropathic pain¹³.

61
62 Few prior studies have investigated SP in the SCI population, with mixed results^{7,14–17}. It is not
63 yet fully elucidated whether SCI lengthens SP (perhaps due to decreased afferent feedback
64 from the periphery) or shortens SP (perhaps due to increased cortical or spinal segmental
65 excitability). Furthermore, the reliability of SP duration as an outcome metric in SCI relative to
66 the more commonly used MEP amplitude is hardly known¹⁸. To further characterize this
67 potentially important neurophysiological measure in the SCI population, we compared
68 magnitude and variability of hand muscle SP durations, MEP thresholds, and MEP amplitudes
69 in individuals with chronic cervical SCI and able-bodied volunteers across multiple testing
70 sessions.

71
72

73 **2 Methods**

74 **2.1 Design** – This experiment was an exploratory post-hoc analysis of a larger study in which
75 we tested a novel configuration for non-invasive cervical transcutaneous spinal stimulation in
76 individuals with and without cervical SCI (clinicaltrials.gov NCT02469675)¹⁹. SCI participants
77 were eligible if they had traumatic or non-traumatic SCI between segments C2-C8 with any
78 evidence for partially retained movement of finger extension, finger flexion, or finger abduction
79 of either hand. Potential participants were excluded if they had risk factors for seizures or if they

80 had frequent episodes of autonomic dysreflexia. Participants provided informed consent before
81 initiating testing. All procedures were approved by the Institutional Review Board of the James
82 J. Peters VA Medical Center, Bronx, NY. All applicable institutional and governmental
83 regulations concerning the ethical participation of human volunteers were followed during this
84 research.

85

86 **2.3 General Procedure** – Neurological examination of motor and sensory function was
87 performed according to the International Standards for the Neurological Classification of Spinal
88 Cord Injury (ISNCSCI). Sessions were performed on separate days at a consistent time of day
89 per participant. Stimulation was delivered with participants in a seated upright position in an
90 adjustable TMS treatment chair (Magventure), or for one participant, in her own wheelchair. For
91 participants without neurological injury, TMS was targeted toward the dominant hand. For those
92 with SCI, TMS was targeted toward the hand with lower motor thresholds and more consistent
93 electrophysiological responses to central and peripheral stimulation. Arms and hands were
94 pronated and relaxed on a cushion placed in the participant's lap. Participants were not asked to
95 withhold their routine daily medications.

96

97 **2.4 Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation (TMS)** – A MagPro R30 or X100 system (Magventure,
98 Farum Denmark) with 80mm winged coil (D-B80) was used. The magnet was oriented at a 45-
99 degree angle from the sagittal plane, centered over the hand motor cortex hotspot for maximal
100 APB response. The first six participants wore reusable cloth headcaps upon which the hotspot
101 was labeled with a marker in relation to the vertex. Our laboratory obtained an optical-based

102 neural navigation system (Brainsight, Rogue Research, Montreal, Canada) that was used to
103 track hotspots for the final 15 participants. There was no significant difference in session-to-
104 session variability of any TMS measure with or without neural navigation. RMT was determined
105 as the percent of maximal stimulator output required to elicit an MEP in the APB muscle of at
106 least 50 μ V in 5 out of 10 repetitions.

107
108 **2.5 Electromyographic Data** – EMG of the target APB was recorded using surface sensors
109 with 300x preamplification, 15-2,000 Hz bandwidth, and internal grounding (Motion Lab Systems
110 Z03-002, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, USA). EMG was collected at a sample rate of 5,000 Hz via
111 digital acquisition board and customized LabVIEW software (National Instruments USB-6363,
112 Austin, Texas, USA). All EMG data were acquired and quantified using custom LabVIEW
113 scripts.

114
115 **2.6 Eliciting and Measuring the Silent Period (SP)** – While participants pinched a
116 dynamometer (Tracker Freedom, J-Tech, Salt Lake City, Utah, USA) between their thumb and
117 third finger using maximal effort, a single biphasic TMS pulse was delivered over the hand
118 motor cortex hotspot at 110% of each participant's RMT. The resulting MEP amplitude and SP
119 duration in the contralateral APB muscle were measured. Five to six replicates were performed
120 per session, with care taken to avoid fatigue between replicates. Participants completed 7
121 sessions on different days involving SP, apart from three individuals who withdrew from the
122 study before completion (one AB participant completed 6 sessions, one SCI participant
123 completed 3 sessions, and one SCI participant completed 2 sessions).

124 To quantify SP_{DUR} , SP onset was visually defined as the end of the TMS-induced MEP, and SP
125 offset was visually defined as the earliest resumption of pre-TMS EMG activity³ (Figure 1).

126 We defined an “SP interruption” as a spike in EMG activity surrounded by SP silence, where the
127 duration of interruption was less than 20 ms, and the absolute amplitude from one peak to the
128 adjacent trough was at least 25% of the largest amplitude found during the 100 ms preceding
129 the TMS impulse.

130 **2.7 Analysis – Outcomes:** The primary dependent variables were MEP amplitude (mV) at rest
131 (MEP_{REST}) and during SP elicitation (MEP_{ACTIVE}), SP duration (ms) (SP_{DUR}), and RMT (%
132 maximum stimulator output). SP interruptions were an exploratory outcome. For each
133 participant, within-session means were computed from the 5-6 replicates of each test, then
134 averaged across sessions. Before group comparisons, each outcome was first tested for
135 normality using the Shapiro-Wilks test. Normally distributed values (MEP_{ACTIVE} , SP_{DUR} , and
136 RMT) were compared between AB and SCI groups using independent-sample t-tests. Non-
137 normally distributed values (MEP_{REST}) were compared using an independent-samples Mann-
138 Whitney U test.

139
140 Variability: Within-session coefficients of variation (CV) were computed for each participant from
141 the 5-6 replicates of each test, then averaged across sessions²⁰. Note that RMT was only
142 determined once per session, so it was not possible to determine within-session RMT variability.
143 Between-session CVs were computed from the session means of each test. CVs were then
144 averaged across participants within each group. As CV values were not normally distributed, the

145 non-parametric related-samples Friedman's two-way analysis of variance by ranks test was
146 applied to compare CVs across outcomes within each group. Significant values on Friedman's
147 test were analyzed post-hoc between pairs of outcomes using related-samples Wilcoxon signed
148 rank tests.

149
150 Interruptions: A chi-squared test was used to compare the frequency of participants with
151 interrupted SPs between groups. As interruption values were not normally distributed, the non-
152 parametric Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare number of interruptions per participant
153 between groups.

154
155 Due to testing multiple comparisons, a p value of <0.01 was used to determine significance.

156
157 Excel (Microsoft, Redmond, Washington, USA) and SPSS Version 25 (IBM, Armonk, New York,
158 USA) were used for all analyses.

159
160 Individual-level data is included as Supplementary Data 1 (by participant, averaged across
161 sessions) and Supplementary Data 2 (by participant per session).

162

163

164

165 **3 Results**

166 **3.1 Participants** – 21 individuals (12 AB and 9 SCI; 17 males, 4 females) participated in this
 167 study (Table 1). Participants ranged in age from 22 to 64 years old. Of the 9 SCI participants,
 168 eight had traumatic SCI, one had idiopathic transverse myelitis.

169

170 **Table 1A – SCI Demographics**

ID	Gender	Age	Etiology of Injury	DOI (Years)	LOI	ISNCSCI Grade	TMS Threshold (% MSO)
1	M	29	T	3	C8	C	45.9
2	M	52	T	17	C8	C	35.8
18	M	64	T	14	C4	D	59.4
23	M	57	T	12	C4	D	60.8
27	M	40	T	14	C4	D	69.7
28	M	42	T	16	C5	D	65.9
31	M	54	T	6	C5	C	52.7
34	F	52	T	16	C4	B	72.0
39	F	22	NT	1	C5	C	30.0
Totals	7M, 2F	45.8 (22-64)	8T, 1NT	11 (1-17)	C4-C8	1B, 4C, 4D	54.7 (30.0-72.0)

171

172 **Table 1B – AB Demographics**

ID	Gender	Age	TMS Threshold (% MSO)
5	M	25	35.1
8	M	27	34.1
9	M	44	35.9
11	F	22	38.2
12	F	23	30.6
14	M	44	32.6
15	M	45	44.4
16	M	24	52.3
22	M	58	53.9
25	M	55	41.9
36	M	23	32.6
38	M	22	53.0
Totals	10M, 2F	34.3 (22-58)	40.4 (30.6-53.9)

173 **Table 1. Participant demographics. A) SCI.** Etiology of Injury – traumatic (T) or not traumatic
 174 (NT); DOI – duration of injury; LOI – neurological level of injury; ISNCSCI – International
 175 Standards for the Neurological Classification of SCI; %MSO – percent of maximal stimulator
 176 output (average across sessions). **B) AB.**

177

178

179 **3.2 SP duration** – SCI participants had mean (SEM) SP duration of 111.40 (18.39) ms; range
180 46.90 – 216.17 ms, whereas AB participants had SP duration of 97.99 (9.88) ms; range 35.30 –
181 152.86 ms (non-significant, independent-sample t-test) (Table 2).

182 **3.3 Resting motor threshold** – SCI participants showed a tendency toward higher mean
183 (SEM) RMTs (54.69 (4.94)% maximum stimulator output; range 30.0 – 72.0) than AB
184 participants (40.37 (2.48)% maximum stimulator output, range 30.6 – 53.9) ($p=0.012$,
185 independent-sample t-test) (Table 2).

186 **3.4 MEP amplitudes** – SCI participants showed significantly lower mean (SEM) MEP_{REST}
187 amplitudes (0.148 (0.018) mV) than AB participants (0.462 (0.094) mV) ($p<0.0005$ independent-
188 samples Mann-Whitney U test). SCI participants showed significantly lower MEP_{ACTIVE}
189 amplitudes (0.700 (0.133) mV) than AB participants (2.305 (0.233) mV) ($p<0.0005$ independent-
190 sample t-test) (Table 2).

191

192 **Table 2**

Outcome	AB (n=12)	SCI (n=9)
RMT (% MSO)	40.37 (2.48)	54.69 (4.94)
SP_{DUR} (ms)	97.99 (9.88)	111.4 (18.39)
MEP_{REST}	0.462 (0.094)	0.148 (0.018)

(mV)*		
MEP_{ACTIVE}		
(mV) *	2.305 (0.233)	0.700 (0.133)

193 **Table 2 – Between-group comparisons.** Means across sessions (S.E.M.). RMT, resting motor
 194 threshold. % MSO, percent maximum stimulator output. SP_{DUR}, SP duration. ms, milliseconds.
 195 MEP_{REST}, amplitude of resting motor evoked potential. mV, millivolts. MEP_{ACTIVE}, amplitude of
 196 active motor evoked potential. *, statistically significant between-group difference.

197

198 **3.5 Intraindividual variability within sessions (Table 3, Figure 2A)** – In AB volunteers, the
 199 within-session CV (SEM) was 13.05 (1.40) for SP_{DUR}, 59.79 (4.49) for MEP_{REST}, and 21.83
 200 (1.78) for MEP_{ACTIVE} (p<0.0005 on related-samples Friedman’s two-way analysis of variance by
 201 ranks test). Post hoc pairwise comparisons showed that SP_{DUR} had significantly lower within-
 202 session CV than both MEP_{REST} (p=0.002 on related-samples Wilcoxon signed rank test) and
 203 MEP_{ACTIVE} (p=0.005 on related-samples Wilcoxon signed rank test). In SCI participants, the CV
 204 was 16.08 (2.56) for SP_{DUR}, 52.93 (6.18) for MEP_{REST}, and 28.38 (2.64) for MEP_{ACTIVE} (p<0.0005
 205 on related-samples Friedman’s two-way analysis of variance by ranks test). Post hoc pairwise
 206 comparisons showed that SP_{DUR} had significantly lower within-session CV than MEP_{REST}
 207 (p=0.008 on related-samples Wilcoxon signed rank test) but not MEP_{ACTIVE} (p=0.028 on related-
 208 samples Wilcoxon signed rank test). Thus, SP_{DUR} has lower within-session variability than MEP
 209 amplitudes in both able-bodied and SCI individuals. Variability did not significantly differ
 210 between AB and SCI groups.

211

212 **Table 3**

Outcome	Group	Within-session	Between-session
RMT	AB		6.96 (0.69)
	SCI		9.19 (1.21)
SP_{DUR}	AB	13.05 (1.40)	19.61 (2.67) ‡
	SCI	16.08 (2.56)	28.50 (5.30) ‡
MEP_{REST}	AB	59.79 (4.49) *	52.04 (6.32) *‡
	SCI	52.93 (6.18) *	45.08 (6.90)
MEP_{ACTIVE}	AB	21.83 (1.78) *	33.58 (4.12) ‡
	SCI	28.38 (2.64)	35.06 (3.63) ‡

213 **Table 3 – Outcome variability.** Coefficients of variation (S.E.M.) for AB and SCI groups. *,
 214 statistically significant difference between SP_{DUR} and other outcomes within each group. ‡,
 215 statistically significant difference between RMT and other outcomes within each group.

216

217 **3.6 Intraindividual variability across sessions (Table 3, Figure 2B)** – In AB volunteers, the
218 between-session CV was 19.61 (2.67) for SP_{DUR} , 52.04 (6.32) for MEP_{REST} , 33.58 (4.12) for
219 MEP_{ACTIVE} , and 6.96 (0.69) for RMT ($p < 0.0005$ on related-samples Friedman's two-way analysis
220 of variance by ranks test). Post hoc pairwise comparisons showed that SP_{DUR} had significantly
221 lower between-session CV than MEP_{REST} ($p = 0.002$ on related-samples Wilcoxon signed rank
222 test) but not MEP_{ACTIVE} ($p = 0.019$ on related-samples Wilcoxon signed rank test), and
223 significantly higher between-session CV than RMT ($p = 0.004$ on related-samples Wilcoxon
224 signed rank test). In SCI participants, the CV was 28.50 (5.30) for SP_{DUR} , 45.08 (6.90) for
225 MEP_{REST} , 35.06 (3.63) for MEP_{ACTIVE} , and 9.19 (1.21) for RMT ($p < 0.0005$ on related-samples
226 Friedman's two-way analysis of variance by ranks test). Post hoc pairwise comparisons showed
227 that SP_{DUR} had a non-significant trend toward lower between-session CV than MEP_{REST}
228 ($p = 0.086$ on related-samples Wilcoxon signed rank test), and no significant difference from
229 MEP_{ACTIVE} ($p = 0.314$ on related-samples Wilcoxon signed rank test). SP_{DUR} had a trend toward
230 higher between-session CV than RMT ($p = 0.015$ on related-samples Wilcoxon signed rank test)
231 in SCI participants. There was no difference in between-session CV between AB and SCI
232 participants. Thus, SP_{DUR} had significantly lower between-session variability than MEP
233 amplitudes in able-bodied but not SCI individuals. However, RMT values were clearly more
234 reliable across sessions than SP duration or MEP amplitudes.

235
236 **3.7 SP Interruptions** – 3 out of 12 AB participants and 8 out of 9 SCI participants showed
237 interrupted SPs ($p = 0.004$; Pearson chi-square test). Per session, AB volunteers showed 0.089
238 (0.71) interruptions, while SCI volunteers showed 1.781 (0.787) interruptions ($p = 0.001$ on

239 independent-samples Mann-Whitney U test) (Figure 3). From the perspective of individual SP
240 trials, there were five interrupted CSPs out of 467 total CSP events (1.07%) in AB participants,
241 and 52 interrupted CSPs out of 242 total CSP events (21.5%) in SCI participants.

242

243

244 **4 Discussion**

245 The current study measured corticospinal excitatory and inhibitory pathways as reflected
246 by MEP amplitude and SP duration, respectively, in individuals with and without SCI. Our data
247 confirm the well-known finding that SCI individuals have higher TMS motor thresholds and lower
248 MEP amplitudes than able-bodied volunteers, indicating reduced excitability of the motor cortex,
249 reduced corticospinal transmission, reduced excitability of local spinal circuitry, or any
250 combination thereof. Due to large variability *between* individuals, we found no significant
251 difference in SP duration between SCI and able-bodied participants. Importantly, variability
252 *within* individuals of SP duration is lower than variability of MEP amplitude, suggesting that SP
253 duration may be a useful outcome measure with higher signal-to-noise ratio.

254 Appropriate movement requires inhibitory neural feedback as well as neural excitation.
255 Consequently, imbalance between neural excitation and inhibition may contribute to the failure
256 in restoration of useful motor function after SCI. Whereas MEP amplitude is usually regarded as
257 an excitatory readout and SP duration as an inhibitory readout, both measures reflect a complex
258 relationship between excitatory and inhibitory neurophysiology and clinical pathophysiology. A
259 prolonged SP has been reported in a number of cerebral pathologies such as stroke⁹,

260 epilepsy¹⁰, and depression¹¹. On the other hand, shortened SP duration has been reported in
261 bipolar disorder¹², Parkinson's²¹, Alzheimer's disease²², and chronic neuropathic pain¹³.

262 Thus, lesions affecting the cortex, corticospinal tract, or segmental spinal circuits may
263 affect SP duration in opposing fashion. Further complicating the interpretation of SP duration, a
264 variety of experimental factors affect SP. In our study, we examined SP duration in the context
265 of a maximal-effort pincer grip between the thumb and third finger, with a relatively low TMS
266 intensity (110% of RMT). SP duration correlates positively with increases in TMS intensity, but
267 does not correlate with level of volitional contraction^{3,23}. SP duration is also highly task
268 dependent. In young adults, the fractionated task of abducting the index finger demonstrated
269 longer SP duration than a task involving pincer grip between the thumb and index finger, which
270 demonstrated longer SP duration than a task involving power grip²⁴. This suggests an inverse
271 correlation between SP duration and the number of muscles used for a task⁴. Another study in
272 healthy adults showed that increasing amounts of sensory afferent input shortened SP
273 duration²⁵. These studies demonstrated the importance of afferent feedback in downwardly
274 modulating SP duration, presumably by inhibiting the cortical GABAergic interneurons that
275 mediate SP¹⁵. Thus, SCI would be expected to prolong SP duration due to reduced afferent
276 feedback through the lesioned cord.

277 Our study did not show a significant difference in SP duration between SCI and AB
278 participants. We speculate that the relatively low TMS intensity used in our study contributed to
279 shorter SP duration and increased variability between individuals, reducing sensitivity to detect
280 differences²⁰. Prior investigation of SP in the SCI population has been limited. In six participants
281 after thoracolumbar SCI, SP duration in hand muscles above the lesion increased (APB muscle,

282 “gentle” pincer effort; TMS intensity at 140-180% RMT), MEP amplitudes decreased, and
283 cortical motor map representations shifted¹⁴. The altered cortical maps in this study, as well as
284 the observed changes in muscles rostral to the spinal lesion level, suggested that these
285 neurophysiological changes after SCI were cortical in origin.

286 Likewise, a study of 16 participants with chronic cervical SCI relative to 18 uninjured
287 controls showed prolonged SP duration (FDI muscle, 25% effort, TMS intensity set to produce
288 similar MEP amplitude across participants) after SCI, regardless of oral baclofen intake⁷. The
289 difference in SP duration seen by Barry and colleagues was observed when evoked by TMS but
290 not when evoked by transcranial electrical stimulation (TES) – since TMS activates corticospinal
291 neurons indirectly through cortical interneurons, this discrepancy between TMS and TES
292 pointed to cortical mechanisms for SP elongation after SCI. A study of nine males with chronic
293 cervical SCI observed prolonged SP (extensor digitalis communis muscle, 10% effort, TMS
294 intensity at 110% AMT), increased motor thresholds, and shifted cortical maps relative to
295 uninjured controls¹⁶. Participants with greater spinal cord atrophy in that study showed relatively
296 greater changes in SP and motor thresholds, suggesting that corticospinal transmission and
297 local cord circuitry contributed to the observed neurophysiological changes.

298 On the contrary, a study of three individuals with cervical SCI showed loss of SP in two
299 of three hand muscles and all three foot muscles (50% effort, TMS intensity at 100% of
300 stimulator output)¹⁷. The authors speculated that SP loss derived from abnormal ascending
301 sensory activity leading to cortical hyperexcitability, and/or increased local spinal neuronal
302 excitability.

303 Our findings of decreased coefficients of variation in SP duration relative to MEP
304 amplitude support the contention that SP duration may be a more reliable TMS metric than MEP
305 amplitude. One other study measured MEPs and SP across time in individuals with chronic
306 incomplete tetraplegia¹⁸. In that study, SP duration had relatively high reliability for both stronger
307 and weaker muscles, whereas MEP amplitude had medium reliability for stronger muscles and
308 poor reliability for weaker muscles. Studies in able-bodied participants provide further evidence
309 that SP duration is more reliable across sessions than between individuals²⁰. Importantly,
310 resting motor threshold, which is determined at the beginning of any experimental TMS session,
311 showed the least between-session variability of the measures we examined. Resting motor
312 threshold demonstrated the lowest variability of multiple TMS measures in a study of elderly
313 individuals with and without stroke²⁶. It remains to be determined whether motor threshold is
314 more sensitive than other measures to detecting changes after interventions aimed to increase
315 central neural transmission in people with SCI.

316 We observed an overwhelmingly higher prevalence of SP ‘interruption’ frequency in SCI
317 relative to AB participants. These short (<20 ms) periods of EMG activity in the midst of the SP
318 appear similar to ‘late excitatory potentials (LEP)’ noted by Wilson et al²⁷ and ‘breakthrough
319 EMG activity’ discussed by Hupfeld et al⁴. Intra-SP EMG activity has been hypothesized to
320 originate from two sources: muscle spindle-gamma motoneuron reflex activity in response to
321 muscle lengthening during the SP; and transient cortical disinhibition²⁷. Caudal to the lesion,
322 increased spindle-mediated reflex activity is well documented after SCI. At the lesion,
323 fasciculations of individual motor units represent spontaneous hyperexcitable discharges in

324 upper extremity muscles commonly seen after cervical SCI²⁸. Therefore, it is not surprising that
325 SCI participants demonstrated a much higher SP interruption rate than AB participants.

326 Our study has several important limitations: Due to time constraints, only 5-6 SP trials
327 were collected per session, less than the roughly 20 trials needed to maximize reliability of most
328 TMS measures^{4,29}. The SCI group was older than the control group. A majority of past studies
329 suggest that age negatively correlates with SP duration, which would mean that the results of
330 this study may underestimate the true difference in SP duration between SCI and non-SCI
331 groups⁴. Individuals in the SCI group were more likely to be taking oral baclofen or other neural
332 inhibitory medications. However, unlike intrathecal baclofen, oral baclofen has not clearly been
333 shown to affect SP duration^{7,8}. Furthermore, individuals with SCI have obviously lower ability to
334 contract target muscles than non-SCI participants during SP elicitation. However, this would be
335 the case whether at maximal effort or at any set percentage of an individual's volitional effort,
336 and muscle contraction intensity does not play a major role in SP duration regardless^{3,23}. TMS
337 intensity during SP measurements was at 110% of resting motor threshold – most studies have
338 used higher TMS intensities, which is a key factor in longer SP duration and may reduce
339 intersession variability^{3,20,23}.

340

341 **Conclusion**

342 In individuals with chronic cervical SCI relative to able-bodied controls, we confirmed the
343 well-known findings that SCI individuals have lower TMS evoked potential amplitudes and a
344 tendency toward higher TMS motor thresholds. We did not observe significantly longer SP
345 duration in SCI individuals. Importantly, we observed significantly lower within-person variability

346 of SP duration than within-person variability of TMS response amplitude, suggesting that SP
347 duration may be a useful outcome measure with higher signal-to-noise ratio. Ongoing and future
348 studies in our lab will further investigate silent periods induced by either cortical or cutaneous
349 stimulation³⁰ to correlate EMG with electroencephalographic features and shed more
350 mechanistic insight into these phenomena.

351

352 **Data Archiving:** Individual-level data is included as Supplementary Data 1 (by participant,
353 averaged across sessions) and Supplementary Data 2 (by participant per session). All
354 deidentified data is freely available to any investigator upon request.

355

356 **Statement of Ethics:** All procedures were approved by the Institutional Review Board of the
357 James J. Peters VA Medical Center, Bronx, NY (HAR-15-001). We certify that all applicable
358 institutional and governmental regulations concerning the ethical participation of human
359 volunteers were followed during the course of this research.

360

361 **Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

362

363 **Author Contributions:**

364 HJS: Data acquisition; data interpretation; manuscript drafting and revision

365 JRW: Data acquisition; data interpretation; manuscript drafting and revision

366 OA: Data interpretation; manuscript revision

367 YKW: Data acquisition; data interpretation; manuscript revision

368 NYH: Study conception and design; data interpretation; manuscript drafting and revision.

369

370 **Sources of Funding:** New York State Department of Health C30599. Craig H. Neilsen

371 Foundation 457648.

372

373

374 **References**

- 375 1. Fuhr, P., Agostino, R. & Hallett, M. Spinal motor neuron excitability during the silent
376 period after cortical stimulation. *Electroencephalogr. Clin. Neurophysiol. Evoked*
377 *Potentials* **81**, 257–262 (1991).
- 378 2. Poston, B., Kukke, S. N., Paine, R. W., Francis, S. & Hallett, M. Cortical silent period
379 duration and its implications for surround inhibition of a hand muscle. *Eur. J. Neurosci.*
380 **36**, 2964–2971 (2012).
- 381 3. Inghilleri, M., Berardelli, A., Cruccu, G. & Manfredi, M. Silent period evoked by
382 transcranial stimulation of the human cortex and cervicomedullary junction. *J. Physiol.*
383 **466**, 521–534 (1993).
- 384 4. Hupfeld, K. E., Swanson, C. W., Fling, B. W. & Seidler, R. D. TMS-induced silent periods:
385 A review of methods and call for consistency. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods* **346**,
386 (2020).
- 387 5. Inghilleri, M., Berardelli, A., Marchetti, P. & Manfredi, M. Effects of diazepam, baclofen
388 and thiopental on the silent period evoked by transcranial magnetic stimulation in
389 humans. *Exp. Brain Res.* **109**, 467–472 (1996).
- 390 6. Stetkarova, I. & Kofler, M. Differential effect of baclofen on cortical and spinal inhibitory
391 circuits. *Clin. Neurophysiol.* **124**, 339–345 (2013).
- 392 7. Barry, M. D., Bunday, K. L., Chen, R. & Perez, M. A. Selective effects of baclofen on use-
393 dependent modulation of GABAB inhibition after tetraplegia. *J. Neurosci.* **33**, 12898–907
394 (2013).

- 395 8. McDonnell, M. N., Orekhov, Y. & Ziemann, U. The role of GABAB receptors in
396 intracortical inhibition in the human motor cortex. *Exp. Brain Res.* **173**, 86–93 (2006).
- 397 9. Braune, H. J. & Fritz, C. Transcranial magnetic stimulation-evoked inhibition of voluntary
398 muscle activity (silent period) is impaired in patients with ischemic hemispheric lesion.
399 *Stroke* **26**, 550–553 (1995).
- 400 10. Macdonell, R. A. *et al.* Prolonged cortical silent period after transcranial magnetic
401 stimulation in generalized epilepsy. *Neurology* **57**, 706–8 (2001).
- 402 11. Steele, J. D., Glabus, M. F., Shajahan, P. M. & Ebmeier, K. P. Increased cortical
403 inhibition in depression: A prolonged silent period with transcranial magnetic stimulation
404 (TMS). *Psychol. Med.* **30**, 565–570 (2000).
- 405 12. Levinson, A. J., Young, L. T., Fitzgerald, P. B. & Daskalakis, Z. J. Cortical inhibitory
406 dysfunction in bipolar disorder: A study using transcranial magnetic stimulation. *J. Clin.*
407 *Psychopharmacol.* **27**, 493–497 (2007).
- 408 13. Lefaucheur, J. P., Drouot, X., Ménard-Lefaucheur, I., Keravel, Y. & Nguyen, J. P. Motor
409 cortex rTMS restores defective intracortical inhibition in chronic neuropathic pain.
410 *Neurology* **67**, 1568–1574 (2006).
- 411 14. Lotze, M., Laubis-Herrmann, U. & Topka, H. Combination of TMS and fMRI reveals a
412 specific pattern of reorganization in M1 in patients after complete spinal cord injury.
413 *Restor Neurol Neurosci* **24**, 97–107 (2006).
- 414 15. Nardone, R. *et al.* Motor cortex excitability changes following a lesion in the posterior
415 columns of the cervical spinal cord. *Neurosci. Lett.* **434**, 119–123 (2008).
- 416 16. Freund, P., Rothwell, J. C., Craggs, M., Thompson, A. J. & Bestmann, S. Corticomotor

- 417 representation to a human forearm muscle changes following cervical spinal cord injury.
418 *Eur. J. Neurosci.* **34**, 1–8 (2011).
- 419 17. Shimizu, T., Hino, T., Komori, T. & Hirai, S. Loss of the muscle silent period evoked by
420 transcranial magnetic stimulation of the motor cortex in patients with cervical cord lesions.
421 *Neurosci. Lett.* **286**, 199–202 (2000).
- 422 18. Potter-Baker, K. A. *et al.* Reliability of TMS metrics in patients with chronic incomplete
423 spinal cord injury. *Spinal Cord* **54**, 980–990 (2016).
- 424 19. Wu, Y.-K. *et al.* Posteroanterior cervical transcutaneous spinal stimulation targets ventral
425 and dorsal nerve roots. *Clin. Neurophysiol. International Federation of Clinical*
426 *Neurophysiology* **131**, 451–460 (2020).
- 427 20. Orth, M. & Rothwell, J. C. The cortical silent period: Intrinsic variability and relation to the
428 waveform of the transcranial magnetic stimulation pulse. *Clin. Neurophysiol.* **115**, 1076–
429 1082 (2004).
- 430 21. Nakashima, K., Wang, Y., Shimoda, M., Sakuma, K. & Takahashi, K. Shortened silent
431 period produced by magnetic cortical stimulation in patients with Parkinson's disease. *J.*
432 *Neurol. Sci.* **130**, 209–214 (1995).
- 433 22. Alagona, G. *et al.* Transcranial magnetic stimulation in Alzheimer disease: Motor cortex
434 excitability and cognitive severity. *Neurosci. Lett.* **314**, 57–60 (2001).
- 435 23. Kojima, S. *et al.* Modulation of the cortical silent period elicited by single- and paired-
436 pulse transcranial magnetic stimulation. *BMC Neurosci.* **14**, (2013).
- 437 24. Tinazzi, M. *et al.* Task-dependent modulation of excitatory and inhibitory functions within
438 the human primary motor cortex. *Exp. Brain Res.* **150**, 222–229 (2003).

- 439 25. Hess, A. *et al.* Task-dependent modulation of inhibitory actions within the primary motor
440 cortex. *Exp. Brain Res.* **124**, 321–330 (1999).
- 441 26. Schambra, H. M. *et al.* The reliability of repeated TMS measures in older adults and in
442 patients with subacute and chronic stroke. *Front. Cell. Neurosci.* **9**, (2015).
- 443 27. Wilson, S. A., Thickbroom, G. W. & Mastaglia, F. L. An investigation of the late excitatory
444 potential in the hand following magnetic stimulation of the motor cortex.
445 *Electroencephalogr. Clin. Neurophysiol. Electromyogr.* **97**, 55–62 (1995).
- 446 28. Grapperon, A. M. & Attarian, S. Disorders of motor neurons manifested by hyperactivity.
447 *Revue Neurologique* **173**, 345–351 (2017).
- 448 29. Nguyen, D. T. A., Rissanen, S. M., Julkunen, P., Kallioniemi, E. & Karjalainen, P. A.
449 Principal Component Regression on Motor Evoked Potential in Single-Pulse Transcranial
450 Magnetic Stimulation. *IEEE Trans. Neural Syst. Rehabil. Eng.* **27**, 1521–1528 (2019).
- 451 30. Tadokoro, N. *et al.* Discrepancy between functional recovery and cutaneous silent period
452 change in surgically treated degenerative cervical myelopathy: a prospective pilot study.
453 *Spinal Cord* **57**, 1076–1083 (2019).
- 454

455 **Legends**

456

457 **Figure 1 – Schematic and examples of silent period. A)** TMS is delivered (red arrow) to the
458 hand motor cortex while the participant performs a volitional isometric pinch with the
459 contralateral hand. The resulting MEP (black arrow) is followed by an EMG silent period before
460 the resumption of baseline volitional EMG activity. **B) Representative silent period in able-**
461 **bodied volunteer. C) Representative silent period in SCI participant.** Note lower EMG
462 amplitudes and presence of ‘interruption’ (green arrow). APB, abductor pollicis brevis.

463

464 **Figure 2 – Outcome variability. A)** Within-session coefficient of variation for each group. **B)**
465 Between-session coefficient of variation for each group. Error bars represent S.E.M. *,
466 significantly different from SP duration; ‡, significantly different from RMT.

467

468 **Figure 3 – SP interruptions by group and participant.** The average number of interruptions
469 per session for each participant. Error bars represent S.D.

470

471 **Supplementary Data 1 – Participant-level data averaged across sessions.**

472 InterssNum, number of interruptions per session; CVSPdurIntra, intrasession coefficient of
473 variation for SP_{DUR}; CVMEPrestIntra, intrasession coefficient of variation for MEP_{REST};

474 CVMEPactiveIntra, intrasession coefficient of variation for MEP_{ACTIVE}; CVRMTInter, intersession
475 coefficient of variation for RMT; CVSPdurInter, intersession coefficient of variation for SP_{DUR};

476 CVMEPrestInter, intersession coefficient of variation for MEP_{REST} ; CVMEPactiveInter,
477 intersession coefficient of variation for MEP_{ACTIVE} .

478



479 **Supplementary Data 2 – Participant-level data listed per session.**

480

481

482

483

A**B****C**