

# 1 **Better therapeutic efficiency of omnidirectional than directional** 2 **subthalamic deep brain stimulation in Parkinson's disease**

3  
4 Maximilian Scherer<sup>1,2</sup>, Luka Milosevic<sup>1,2</sup>, Idil Cebi<sup>1,3</sup>, Patrick Bookjans<sup>1</sup>, Bastian Brunett<sup>1</sup>,  
5 Robert Guggenberger<sup>1</sup>, Daniel Weiss<sup>3</sup> and Alireza Gharabaghi<sup>1,4,5</sup> \*

6  
7 1. Institute for Neuromodulation and Neurotechnology, University Hospital and University  
8 of Tübingen, 72076 Tübingen, Germany

9 2. Clinical and Computational Neuroscience, Krembil Research Institute, University Health  
10 Network, M5T 2S8 11 Toronto, Canada.

11 3. Center for Neurology, Department for Neurodegenerative Diseases, and Hertie Institute  
12 for Clinical Brain Research, University of Tübingen, 72076 Tübingen, Germany

13 4. Center for Bionic Intelligence Tübingen Stuttgart (BITS), 72076 Tübingen, Germany

14 5. German Center for Mental Health (DZPG), 72076 Tübingen, Germany

15

16 \*Corresponding author: Prof. Alireza Gharabaghi. Address: Institute for Neuromodulation  
17 and Neurotechnology, University Hospital Tübingen, Otfried-Müller-Str. 45, 72076  
18 Tübingen, Germany. Email: [alireza.gharabaghi@uni-tuebingen.de](mailto:alireza.gharabaghi@uni-tuebingen.de)

19

## 20 **Abstract**

21

22 Background: Deep brain stimulation (DBS) using segmented electrode contacts allows for  
23 directionally steered stimulation (DS), while the conventional ring mode provides  
24 omnidirectional stimulation (OS). However, with regard to achieving better effects with the  
25 same stimulation intensity or equivalent effects with lower intensity, the comparative  
26 therapeutic efficiency of these approaches remains unclear.

27

28 Objective: To compare the therapeutic efficiency of subthalamic DBS using segmented and  
29 ring contacts in Parkinson's disease (PD) patients with akinetic-rigid symptoms.

30

31 Methods: A double-blind, randomized monopolar review was conducted with patients in the  
32 dopaminergic medication-off state at 10 weeks postoperatively on three upper ring  
33 contacts and three contacts of the upper segmented level. Impedance measurements  
34 were obtained, and the therapeutic threshold (current strength for complete biceps brachii  
35 muscle rigidity resolution) was estimated by increasing stimulation intensity in 0.2 mA  
36 increments.

37

38 Results: OS with ring contacts showed an improved therapeutic threshold compared to DS  
39 with segmented contacts. At 1.1 mA stimulation intensity, complete rigidity resolution was  
40 achieved in 90% of patients with the best ring contact, whereas only 40% achieved the  
41 same outcome with the best segmented contact. In addition, OS with ring contacts  
42 exhibited 50% lower impedance than DS with segmented contacts.

43

44 Conclusions: Incremental adjustments in current intensity during parameter titration  
45 generate valuable stimulus-response curves for assessing therapeutic efficiency. In clinical  
46 practice, the monopolar review should give priority to identifying the optimal ring level and  
47 therapeutic threshold. Segmented contacts should be carefully considered as a potential  
48 alternative when side effects limit the feasibility of other options.

49

50 Registration: ClinicalTrials.gov: NCT03548506

51

52 Key words: Deep brain stimulation; directional steering; segmented contacts; ring contacts;  
53 circular contacts; threshold.

54

## 55 **Introduction**

56

57 Fluctuations in dopaminergic response in patients with idiopathic Parkinson's disease (PD)  
58 are effectively addressed by deep brain stimulation (DBS) of the subthalamic nucleus  
59 (STN), which provides evidence-based and cost-effective treatment with superior clinical  
60 outcomes compared to the best medical treatment (Weaver et al., 2012; Schuepbach et  
61 al., 2013; Dams et al., 2016; Lhommée et al., 2018). Despite advancements in  
62 neurosurgical targeting, intraoperative techniques, awake procedures, and stimulation  
63 paradigms, a notable proportion of patients may still require revision surgery due to side  
64 effects or insufficient therapeutic benefits (Rosahl et al., 2002; Weiss et al., 2011; Millian et  
65 al., 2013; Southwell et al., 2016; Rolston et al., 2016; Naros et al., 2018; Milosevic et al.,  
66 2020).

67

68 The latest generation of DBS electrodes introduces a design modification in which the  
69 middle two ring contacts are both divided into three segments, enabling directional  
70 stimulation (DS) steering in addition to the circular or omnidirectional stimulation (OS) of  
71 the traditional ring mode (Contarino et al., 2014; Pollo et al., 2014; Steigerwald et al.,  
72 2016; Dembek et al., 2017; Schnitzler et al., 2021; Ramanathan et al., 2023; Debove et al.,  
73 2023). While simulation studies indicate that DS can reduce out-of-target stimulation and  
74 associated side effects, it may have limitations in achieving optimal therapeutic benefit  
75 when compensating for suboptimal electrode placements (Kramme et al., 2021). Recent  
76 empirical findings suggest that although DS can alleviate DBS side effects caused by  
77 misplaced electrodes, some patients may still require surgical revision (Mishra et al.,  
78 2023).

79

80 In this context, it is important to determine the potential of directional stimulation (DS) in  
81 enhancing the therapeutic efficiency of DBS in the majority of patients with well-placed  
82 electrode leads, where beneficial effects can be achieved without early side effects.  
83 However, there is still ambiguity whether DS allows for more efficient stimulation of the  
84 target structure by reducing the required stimulation intensity to achieve the desired clinical  
85 benefit compared to omnidirectional stimulation (OS) (Pollo et al., 2014; Contarino et al.,  
86 2014; Dembek et al., 2017; Schnitzler et al., 2021).

87

88 To address this open question, we performed precise stimulation amplitude titration with  
89 0.2 mA step sizes for ring and segmented contacts, resulting in high-resolution clinical

90 stimulation-response curves. This facilitated rigorous comparisons of DS and OS effects at  
91 various stimulation intensities, primarily establishing the threshold for resolving muscular  
92 rigidity in PD patients. Specifically, ten weeks after DBS lead implantation, a randomized,  
93 double-blind monopolar review was conducted on the three upper contact levels and the  
94 three parts of the upper segmented level. Impedance measurements were also obtained  
95 for each contact to assess potential clinical benefits in relation to power consumption and  
96 battery life.

97

98 Our hypothesis was that spatially focused DS of the STN would lead to more efficient  
99 resolution of upper limb rigidity compared to OS, i.e., better effects would be achieved with  
100 the same stimulation intensity or equivalent effects with lower intensity.

101

102

## 103 **Methods**

104

### 105 *Patients*

106 The akinetic-rigid PD patients of this study had participated in the SANTOP study  
107 (“Subthalamic Steering for Therapy Optimization in Parkinson’s Disease”;  
108 ClinicalTrials.gov: NCT03548506) that evaluated the long-term effects of omnidirectional  
109 vs. directional deep brain stimulation in a randomized, cross-over protocol six months after  
110 surgery; the respective results are reported elsewhere (Gharabaghi et al., 2023). Here, we  
111 report the findings of a monopolar review conducted ten weeks after surgery on two  
112 consecutive days, i.e., evaluating the three upper ring contacts (day 1) and the three  
113 segments of the upper segmented level (day 2). The complete data for analysis was  
114 available in seventeen of twenty-one participating PD patients, in whom the rigidity of the  
115 right biceps brachii muscle was assessed during DBS of the left subthalamic nucleus in  
116 the dopaminergic medication-off state. Furthermore, impedances were measured for all  
117 contacts in every patient.

118 Each patient underwent bilateral implantation of STN-DBS leads (6170, Abbott  
119 laboratories, Lake Bluff, Illinois, U.S.) on average 69 days prior to the evaluation. The  
120 implantation target was preoperatively identified via magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)  
121 and computer tomography (CT) images. Intraoperatively, successful implantation was  
122 validated by local field potential beta-peaks (Milosevic et al., 2020) or microelectrode  
123 recordings (Hutchison et al., 1998; Knieling et al., 2016). Postoperative CT images were  
124 co-registered with preoperative MRI to confirm accurate electrode implantation. Patients  
125 were examined several weeks after the DBS lead implantation to avoid micro-lesion  
126 effects (Granziera et al., 2008), and after overnight withdrawal from dopaminergic  
127 medication. Written informed consent was provided by all patients and the study was  
128 approved by the ethics committee of the Medical Faculty of Tübingen. Detailed information  
129 on patient demographics is provided in Table 1.

130

### 131 *Stimulation configuration*

132 The three upper ring contacts were evaluated in all seventeen patients. In addition, the  
133 three segments of the upper segmented level were investigated in sixteen patients, and of  
134 the lower segmented level in one patient. Stimulation was always applied at 130 Hz and  
135 60  $\mu$ s while increasing the stimulation intensity by 0.2 mA stepwise (see experimental  
136 protocol). Stimulation was applied to the left STN while assessing the rigidity of the right  
137 arm.

138

139

ID	Sex/ gender	Age (years)	Disease duration (years)	Time between surgery and examination (days)
1	m	60s	10-15	80-90
2	f	60s	10-15	60-70
3	m	50s	10-15	70-80
4	m	70s	10-15	70-80
5	m	50s	5-10	60-70
8	f	60s	10-15	60-70
10	f	70s	10-15	60-70
11	f	50s	15-20	60-70
13	m	70s	10-15	60-70
14	m	70s	5-10	60-70
15	m	60s	10-15	70-80
16	m	60s	15-20	60-70
17	f	50s	5-10	50-60
18	m	50s	5-10	60-70
19	m	60s	10-15	70-80
20	f	50s	5-10	60-70
21	m	60s	10-15	80-90

140

141 **Table 1: Patient information**

142

143 *Data acquisition and experimental protocol*

144 The patients were instructed to relax their arms and to remain awake. Each run lasted 90  
145 seconds and comprised two phases; a non-movement phase (30 s) and a continuous  
146 passive movement phase (60 s). During the continuous passive movement phase, an  
147 examiner moved the subject's arm at a frequency of 0.5 Hz (acoustically communicated to  
148 the examiner via headphones). At the end of each run, the examiner provided an estimate  
149 of the patient's rigidity according to the Unified Parkinson's Disease Ratings Scale (MDS-  
150 UPDRS) assessment. For later analyses, these scores were binarized to represent either  
151 a lack (UPDRS score of zero) or the presence of rigidity. In the first run, patients were  
152 evaluated at OFF stimulation. In the consecutive runs, stimulation was increased from 0.5  
153 mA to 2.5 mA in 0.2 mA increments on one stimulation contact before switching to another  
154 contact. The contacts were evaluated in randomized order. Before switching contacts, the  
155 paradigm was paused for two minutes to avoid stimulation-related carry-over effects (Levin  
156 et al., 2009). Above 2.5 mA, the evaluation was continued in 0.2 mA increments, albeit the  
157 evaluation was modified to identify side effects, i.e., without concurrent arm movements.

158 Due to the fact that the programming was performed by a third person, the patient and the  
159 examiner were unaware as to which stimulation contact was evaluated at which intensity.

160

#### 161 *Determining the therapeutic threshold*

162 The therapeutic threshold was identified for each ring/segmented contact in each patient. It  
163 was defined as the minimal stimulation intensity from which on rigidity remained  
164 completely resolved. Specifically, only consistent resolving of rigidity was considered to be  
165 the therapeutic threshold. For example, if rigidity was completely resolved at 0.9 mA and  
166 1.3 mA and all higher intensities, but was still present at intensities of 0.7 mA and 1.1 mA;  
167 the therapeutic threshold was determined at 1.3 mA.

168

#### 169 *Determining the side-effect threshold*

170 The side-effect threshold was also identified for each ring/segmented contact in each  
171 patient. It was defined as the lowest stimulation intensity which elicited side-effects such  
172 as muscle cramps or double vision.

173

#### 174 *Determining therapeutic window size*

175 The therapeutic window was determined as the difference between the lower (i.e.,  
176 therapeutic threshold) and upper (i.e., side-effect threshold) border of clinical efficacy.

177

#### 178 *Determining contact impedance*

179 The impedance values were measured intraoperatively, i.e., via the integrated functionality  
180 of the programming device, by attaching an external pulse generator at the end of the  
181 surgery. Low intensity bipolar stimulation was utilized to measure the impedance between  
182 individual contacts. The impedance of a specific contact was calculated as the average  
183 impedance between it and the other contacts.

184

#### 185 *Statistical evaluations*

186 For statistical evaluation, the contacts were classified on the basis of different categories:  
187 (i) according to level, i.e., ring 4 (most upper), ring 3 (second most upper), ring 2 (third  
188 most upper), frontal segment, medial segment, lateral segment; (ii) best, second best,  
189 worst ring/segment with regard to the therapeutic threshold; (iii) best, second best, worst  
190 ring/segment with regard to the side-effect threshold; (iv) best, second best, worst  
191 ring/segment with regard to the therapeutic window size (as the range between therapeutic  
192 threshold and side-effect threshold). The stimulation effect was quantified using a linear

193 mixed model. The measured clinical efficacy was modeled as the dependent variable. The  
194 other variables were modeled as independent variables: Stimulation intensity was included  
195 as a categorical fixed factor to estimate the effect of stimulation OFF versus a specific  
196 stimulation intensity; the patient ID was included as a categorical random factor to  
197 compensate for repeated measurements over individual patients.  
198 Patient-wise paired t-tests were applied to investigate the differences between the  
199 therapeutic thresholds, side effect thresholds and therapeutic window sizes of ring and  
200 segmented contacts. Multiple comparison correction (MCC) was applied using the  
201 Bonferroni method, an alpha value of 0.05 and a hypothesis count matching the count of  
202 all statistical evaluations presented in this work. The results are presented with a marker  
203 indicating either significance or non-significance after MCC.

204

#### 205 *Code and data accessibility*

206 Data and evaluation code will be shared by the first author upon request. The toolbox  
207 FiNN (Scherer et al., 2022) that was used to analyze the data is available on GitHub.

208


209



## 210 Results


211 The ratio of rigid trials decreased consistently with increasing stimulation intensity. This  
 212 result was independent of grouping of the contacts on the basis of different categories, i.e.,  
 213 according to the level (2, 3, or 4) of the stimulated electrode (Figure 1 A), therapeutic  
 214 window size (Figure 1 B, C), therapeutic threshold (Figure 2 A, B), and side-effect  
 215 threshold (Figure 2 C, D).

### Effects of stimulation on clinical efficacy - I



216  
 217 **Figure 1: Effects of stimulation on clinical efficacy – I.** Subfigure A shows the findings for  
 218 contacts grouped by level (spatial position), subfigure B for contacts grouped by  
 219 therapeutic window size and subfigure C for segmented contacts ranked by therapeutic  
 220 threshold in comparison to the corresponding ring mode of the same segments. White,  
 221 gray and black colors of the symbols indicate significant (after MCC), significant (before  
 222 MCC) and non-significant (i) reduction of rigid trials across all patients (plots on the left  
 223 side), and (ii) differences between contacts (green plots on the right side), respectively.  
 224 Specifically, 40% reduction of rigid trials at 0.7 mA with the best segmented contact  
 225 indicated that 40% of patients had complete resolving of rigidity at this specific contact and  
 226 intensity; a result that was significant after MCC in comparison to baseline without  
 227 stimulation. However, when comparing this effect to the effects of the other contacts at the  
 228 same stimulation intensity (see plots on the right side), no significant difference was found.

## Effects of stimulation on clinical efficacy - II



229

230 **Figure 2: Effects of stimulation on clinical efficacy – II. Same as figure 1 but for contacts**  
 231 **classified by therapeutic threshold (subfigures A and B), and side-effect threshold**  
 232 **(subfigures C and D)**

233

234 In the following, we explain by way of example how the individual plots can be set in  
 235 relation to each other: When stimulating at an intensity of 0.7 mA, the ratio of rigid trials  
 236 was significantly reduced for one contact in comparison to baseline (i.e., without  
 237 stimulation); at this intensity, 40% of patients had complete resolving of rigidity when  
 238 stimulated via a laterally steering segmented contact (Figure 1 A). At the intensity of  
 239 0.7 mA, also 40% of patients had the best therapeutic window (Figure 1 B, C), the best  
 240 therapeutic threshold (Figure 2 A, B), and worst side-effect threshold (Figure 2 C, D). This  
 241 may suggest that, at 0.7 mA, laterally steering segments may present large therapeutic  
 242 windows via an improved therapeutic threshold. The stimulation effect of the laterally

243 steering contact plateaued from 2.1 mA onwards, and achieved complete resolving of  
244 rigidity in 80% of the patients. A comparison of these effects with the other contacts (both  
245 segmented and ring) at the same stimulation intensity did not reveal any significant  
246 differences (see respective plots on the right side of Figures 1 and 2).

247

248 When stimulated at 1.3 mA, all contacts (both ring and segmented) showed a significant  
249 reduction of rigidity in comparison to baseline (i.e., stimulation off); the second-highest ring  
250 contact led to the largest reduction of rigidity in comparison to baseline, plateaued from 2.1  
251 mA onwards, and achieved complete resolving of rigidity in 90% of the patients (Figure 1  
252 A). However, a comparison of these effects with the other contacts (both segmented and  
253 ring) at the same stimulation intensity did not reveal any significant differences (see  
254 respective plots on the right side of Figures 1 and 2).

255

256 Notably, the ring contact with the lowest therapeutic threshold achieved complete  
257 resolution of rigidity at 1.1 mA (and plateaued onwards) in 90% of the patients (Figure 2 A,  
258 left). This was significantly better than the segmented contact with the lowest therapeutic  
259 threshold, where 40% of the patients had complete resolving of rigidity (Figure 2 A, right).  
260 However, a further increase in stimulation intensity did not cause any significant difference  
261 between the best ring and the other contacts (apart from the worst segmented contact).

262

263 This suggests that there is an optimal stimulation intensity for complete resolution of rigor  
264 for the best ring contact. The best ring contact with the therapeutic threshold at 1.1 mA  
265 (Figure 2 A), was usually (but not always) the contact with the largest therapeutic window  
266 (Figure 1 B) and the highest side-effect threshold (Figure 2 C), but could not be attributed  
267 to a single electrode level (Figure 1 A).


268

269 With regard to the therapeutic threshold, a comparison between the segmented contacts  
270 and the corresponding ring mode (Figure 2 B) did not reveal any significant differences,  
271 thus indicating that the selection of the optimal ring along the implantation trajectory had a  
272 larger influence on rigidity than directional steering (Figure 2 A). This observation is  
273 supported by the comparison between the therapeutic windows of ring and segmented  
274 electrodes:


275

# Ring and segmented contacts

## A: Ring contacts



## B: Segmented contacts



276

277 **Figure 3:** Therapeutic window of ring and segmented contacts. A: The best ring contact  
278 provided a larger therapeutic window than the other two ring contacts. B: The therapeutic  
279 window of the segmented contacts and the corresponding ring contact, i.e., the sum of the  
280 three segments, did not differ significantly, except for the worst segment.

281

282 Specifically, with regard to the therapeutic window the best ring contact was significantly  
283 larger (Figure 3A) than the second best ( $p < 0.05$ ) and worst ring contact ( $p < 0.01$ ). A  
284 comparison between the segments and their corresponding ring mode with regard to the  
285 therapeutic window (Figure 3 B) showed a significant difference for the clinically worst  
286 segmented contact only ( $p < 0.05$ ).


287

288 The therapeutic window sizes were 2.3 mA (1.4 mA – 3.7 mA), 2.3 mA (1.3 mA – 3.6 mA),  
289 1.6 mA (1.8 mA – 3.4 mA) and 1.2 mA (2.0 mA – 3.2 mA), for the ring mode; best, second  
290 best and worst segmented contacts, respectively. Stimulating via segmented contacts did  
291 not improve the therapeutic window in comparison to the respective ring mode (Figure 3

292 B), but doubled the impedance ( $p < 0.001$ ; Figure 4). This indicates that directional  
293 stimulation did not improve the treatment-relevant stimulation thresholds and would, when  
294 applied, chronically necessitate higher power consumption than ring mode due to  
295 increased impedances.

296

## Average impedance of contacts



297

298 **Figure 4:** Average impedance of contacts. The impedance of segmented contacts was  
299 twice as high as for ring contacts, thus necessitating a higher energy delivery when the  
300 same stimulation parameters were applied.

301

302

303

## 304 **Discussion**

305 The present study yielded new insights with regard to the efficiency of different deep brain  
306 stimulation (DBS) approaches in treating muscular rigidity in Parkinson's disease (PD)  
307 patients. Contrary to previous research, it was determined that omnidirectional stimulation  
308 (OS) with ring contacts outperformed directional stimulation (DS) with segmented contacts,  
309 showing greater effects at the same intensity while consuming less energy.

310

### 311 *Therapeutic efficiency*

312 To determine therapeutic efficiency, a high-resolution threshold detection method involving  
313 small-stepped titration (0.2 mA) was employed during the DBS monopolar review ten  
314 weeks after implantation. This method was applied to both segmented and ring contacts,  
315 which had been previously investigated using larger step sizes of 0.5 mA (Steigerwald et  
316 al., 2016) or 1.0 mA (Dembeck et al., 2017) in other studies. This approach allowed for the  
317 identification of the optimal therapeutic threshold, representing the minimum electrical  
318 current required for maximum clinical effect.

319 Remarkably, at the lowest therapeutic threshold complete resolving of rigidity was  
320 achieved in 90% of patients using OS with the best ring contact, at a stimulation intensity  
321 of 1.1 mA. In contrast, DS with the segmented contact with the lowest therapeutic  
322 threshold achieved complete resolving of rigidity in only 40% of patients at the same  
323 stimulation intensity.

324

### 325 *Vertical vs. horizontal plane*

326 Additionally, the present study revealed that the therapeutic window (which also accounts  
327 for the side-effect threshold) of the best ring contact was significantly larger than that of the  
328 other ring contacts. Contrary to previous reports (Contarino et al., 2014; Pollo et al., 2014;  
329 Dembek et al., 2017; Schnitzler et al., 2021) however, we ascertained that stimulation with  
330 the segmented contact with the largest therapeutic window did not enhance the  
331 therapeutic window, unlike switching between different ring contacts.

332 While the choice of the ring contact had the largest effect on the therapeutic threshold,  
333 switching to segmented stimulation was associated with an unchanged or worsened  
334 therapeutic window size and side-effect threshold. Interestingly, the optimal ring contact  
335 could not be attributed to a specific electrode level, indicating that determining the best  
336 stimulation level along the vertical implantation trajectory was more crucial than identifying  
337 the best direction in the horizontal plane.

338

339

### 340 *Threshold detection*

341 The results of this study diverge from previous reports, suggesting that DS exhibits a  
342 larger therapeutic window than OS with ring contacts (Contarino et al., 2014; Pollo et al.,  
343 2014; Dembek et al., 2017; Schnitzler et al., 2021). These earlier studies associated DS  
344 with either an increased side-effect threshold (Contarino et al., 2014; Dembek et al., 2017)  
345 or a decreased therapeutic threshold (Pollo et al., 2014; Schnitzler et al., 2021). However,  
346 some studies observed no improvements in therapeutic threshold (Contarino et al., 2014;  
347 Dembek et al., 2017) or therapeutic window (Steigerwald et al., 2016; Debove et al., 2023)  
348 when comparing DS to OS. These contradictory findings in prior research may be partially  
349 attributed to differences in the applied stimulation titration step sizes for DS and OS.

350 Due to the higher surface current density of smaller segmented contacts in comparison to  
351 that of larger ring contacts, DS is more sensitive to stimulation amplitude adjustments. It  
352 requires smaller amplitude increments (0.1-0.3 mA) than the traditional 0.5 mA used for  
353 OS to achieve a similar threshold detection sensitivity. However, if such small-stepped  
354 assessment is employed for DS, it should also be applied to OS as there is no drawback  
355 from selecting small step sizes also for OS.

356 One of the studies reporting a difference in therapeutic threshold between DS and OS in  
357 PD patients did not specify the stimulation titration protocol (Schnitzler et al., 2021). The  
358 other study utilized titration step sizes of 0.1 mA for both DS and OS during intraoperative  
359 assessments (Pollo et al., 2014). In view of the fact that our study employed titration step  
360 sizes of 0.2 mA for both DS and OS, this approach appears to be sufficiently sensitive for  
361 identifying threshold differences during a postoperative monopolar review.

362

### 363 *Power consumption*

364 Furthermore, the smaller stimulating surface area and higher impedance of segmented  
365 contacts result in a higher total electrical energy being delivered (TEED) during stimulation  
366 compared to ring contacts (Merola et al., 2021). This increased energy consumption leads  
367 to more frequent battery replacements for non-rechargeable impulse generators (IPG),  
368 thereby posing an increased risk of morbidity due to the potential for surgical site infections  
369 (Fakhar et al., 2013; Ondo et al., 2007). The likelihood of infections rises as the number of  
370 IPG replacements increases (Pepper et al., 2013).

371 To address this issue, we measured the impedance of both ring and segmented contacts  
372 and ascertained that the impedance of segmented contacts was, on average, twice as  
373 high as that of ring contacts, which was consistent with earlier studies (Eleopra et al.,

374 2019). This higher impedance leads to increased power consumption by the IPG when ap-  
375 plied chronically, since more electrical energy is delivered (Koss et al., 2005).  
376 Consequently, to maintain battery longevity, it is necessary to achieve the same stimulation  
377 effects with a TEED equivalent to that of OS. This would require approximately 30% less  
378 stimulation intensity for DS than for OS (Rebelo et al., 2018). However, even when  
379 applying the same stimulation intensity, such as 1.1 mA, DS proved to be either equally or  
380 less effective than OS in resolving muscular rigidity.

381

### 382 *Limitations and considerations*

383 Despite our efforts to ensure a systematic comparison between DS and OS, this study has  
384 certain limitations. Firstly, although our sample size is larger than that of other single-  
385 center studies, it remains considerably smaller than a recent multicenter study (Schnitzler  
386 et al., 2021). However, one major strength of our study is the rigorous procedure employed  
387 for parameter titration in each patient, with small increments in current intensity for both  
388 stimulation conditions, resulting in consistent stimulus-response curves.

389 Furthermore, to streamline the assessments and minimize examination time for the  
390 patients, we made several concessions that may have reduced the sensitivity of the  
391 evaluation. Stimulation intensities were increased in step sizes of 0.2 mA instead of 0.1  
392 mA (Pollo et al., 2014). The assessment of rigidity was limited to a maximum intensity of  
393 2.5 mA, as we anticipated reaching the therapeutic threshold at this stimulation intensity. In  
394 addition, evaluations of segmented electrodes were restricted to one level.

395 Moreover, the examinations conducted in this study focused solely on the resolving of  
396 rigidity and the acute side effects induced by stimulation. Potential effects, both positive  
397 and negative, of DBS on other motor or non-motor symptoms such as cognition were not  
398 investigated. Finally, the findings presented in acute assessments need to be  
399 complemented by long-term clinical evaluations to establish reliable comparisons between  
400 OS and DS (Gharabaghi et al., 2023).

401

### 402 *Conclusion*

403 By employing incremental increases in stimulation amplitude in steps of 0.2 mA during the  
404 monopolar review, it becomes feasible to discern the disparities in therapeutic threshold  
405 between OS and DS. Our findings demonstrate that the therapeutic threshold is more  
406 dependent on ring contact level selection than steering through segmented contacts.  
407 Notably, at a stimulation intensity of 1.1 mA, complete resolution of rigidity was achieved in  
408 90% of patients with the best ring contact while concurrently necessitating lower power



409 consumption than DS. Based on the presented insights, we suggest that the monopolar  
410 review should prioritize the identification of the optimal ring level and therapeutic threshold.  
411 Segmented contacts should only be cautiously considered as an exceptional recourse  
412 when side effects preclude alternative options.

413

#### 414 ***Credit authorship contribution statement***

415 Maximilian Scherer: Methodology, Formal analysis, Writing – original draft.

416 Luka Milosevic: Formal analysis, Writing – review & editing.

417 Idil Cebi: Investigation, Writing – review & editing.

418 Patrick Bookjans: Investigation, Writing – review & editing.

419 Bastian Brunnett: Investigation, Writing – review & editing.

420 Robert Guggenberger: Formal analysis, Writing – review & editing.

421 Daniel Weiss: Conceptualization, Writing – review & editing.

422 Alireza Gharabaghi: Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Project administration, Writing  
423 – original draft.

424

#### 425 ***Funding***

426 This investigator-initiated trial was supported by Abbott / St. Jude Medical (SANTOP). The  
427 funding had no impact on the study design, on the collection, analysis and interpretation of  
428 data, on the writing of the report or on the decision to submit the article for publication.

429

#### 430 ***Acknowledgements***

431 A.G. was supported by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF).

432 M.S. was supported by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. D.W. was supported by  
433 the German Research Council (WE5375/1-3) and the Michael J Fox Foundation. We  
434 acknowledge support by the Open Access Publishing Fund of the University of Tübingen.

435

#### 436 ***Declarations of competing interests***

437 A.G. was supported by research grants from Medtronic, Abbott, Boston Scientific, all of  
438 which were unrelated to this work. D. W. was supported by travel grants, speaker  
439 honoraria and research grants from Abbott, Abbvie, Bial, Boston Scientific, Medtronic,  
440 Kyowa Kirin, Stadapharm, all of which were unrelated to this work.

## 441 Literature

- Contarino, M.F., Bour, L.J., Verhagen, R., Lourens, M.A.J., de Bie, R.M.A., van den Munckhof, P., Schuurman, P.R., 2014. Directional steering. *Neurology* 83, 1163. <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000000823>
- Dams, J., Balzer-Geldsetzer, M., Siebert, U., Deuschl, G., Schuepbach, W.M.M., Krack, P., Timmermann, L., Schnitzler, A., Reese, J.-P., Dodel, R., EARLYSTIM-investigators, 2016. Cost-effectiveness of neurostimulation in Parkinson's disease with early motor complications. *Mov Disord* 31, 1183–1191. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mds.26740>
- Debove, I., Petermann, K., Nowacki, A., Nguyen, T.-A.K., Tinkhauser, G., Michelis, J.P., Muellner, J., Amstutz, D., Bargiotas, P., Fichtner, J., Schlaepfli, J.A., Krack, P., Schuepbach, M., Pollo, C., Lachenmayer, M.L., 2023. Deep Brain Stimulation: When to Test Directional? *Mov Disord Clin Pract* 10, 434–439. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mdc3.13667>
- Dembek, T.A., Reker, P., Visser-Vandewalle, V., Wirths, J., Treuer, H., Klehr, M., Roediger, J., Dafsari, H.S., Barbe, M.T., Timmermann, L., 2017. Directional DBS increases side-effect thresholds—A prospective, double-blind trial. *Movement Disorders* 32, 1380–1388. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mds.27093>
- Eleopra, R., Rinaldo, S., Devigili, G., Lettieri, C., Mondani, M., D'Auria, S., Piacentino, M., Pilleri, M., 2019. Brain impedance variation of directional leads implanted in subthalamic nuclei of Parkinsonian patients. *Clinical Neurophysiology* 130, 1562–1569. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2019.06.001>
- Fakhar, K., Hastings, E., Butson, C.R., Foote, K.D., Zeilman, P., Okun, M.S., 2013. Management of Deep Brain Stimulator Battery Failure: Battery Estimators, Charge Density, and Importance of Clinical Symptoms. *PLOS ONE* 8, e58665. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0058665>
- Gharabaghi A, Cebi I, Scherer M, Bookjans P, Brunnett B, Milosevic L, Weiss D, 2023. Long-term effects of directional deep brain stimulation in Parkinson's disease: a randomized clinical trial on motor and non-motor symptoms. medRxiv. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.30.23297793>
- Granziera, C., Pollo, C., Russmann, H., Staedler, C., Ghika, J., Villemure, J.-G., Burkhard, P.R., Vingerhoets, F.J.G., 2008. Sub-acute delayed failure of subthalamic DBS in Parkinson's disease: The role of micro-lesion effect. *Parkinsonism & Related Disorders* 14, 109–113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.parkreldis.2007.06.013>
- Hutchison, W.D., Allan, R.J., Opitz, H., Levy, R., Dostrovsky, J.O., Lang, A.E., Lozano, A.M., 1998. Neurophysiological identification of the subthalamic nucleus in surgery

- for Parkinson's disease. *Annals of Neurology* 44, 622–628.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.410440407>
- Knieling, S., Sridharan, K.S., Belardinelli, P., Naros, G., Weiss, D., Mormann, F., Gharabaghi, A., 2016. An Unsupervised Online Spike-Sorting Framework. *Int J Neural Syst* 26, 1550042. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0129065715500422>
- Koss, A.M., Alterman, R.L., Tagliati, M., Shils, J.L., 2005. Calculating total electrical energy delivered by deep brain stimulation systems. *Annals of Neurology* 58, 168–168.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.20525>
- Kramme, J., Dembek, T.A., Treuer, H., Dafsari, H.S., Barbe, M.T., Wirths, J., Visser-Vandewalle, V., 2020. Potentials and Limitations of Directional Deep Brain Stimulation: A Simulation Approach. *Stereotactic and Functional Neurosurgery* 99, 65–74. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000509781>
- Levin, J., Krafczyk, S., Valkovič, P., Eggert, T., Claassen, J., Bötzel, K., 2009. Objective measurement of muscle rigidity in parkinsonian patients treated with subthalamic stimulation. *Movement Disorders* 24, 57–63. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mds.22291>
- Lhommée, E., Wojtecki, L., Czernecki, V., Witt, K., Maier, F., Tonder, L., Timmermann, L., Hälbig, T.D., Pineau, F., Durif, F., Witjas, T., Pinsker, M., Mehdorn, M., Sixel-Döring, F., Kupsch, A., Krüger, R., Elben, S., Chabardès, S., Thobois, S., Brefel-Courbon, C., Ory-Magne, F., Regis, J.-M., Maltête, D., Sauvaget, A., Rau, J., Schnitzler, A., Schüpbach, M., Schade-Brittinger, C., Deuschl, G., Houeto, J.-L., Krack, P., EARLYSTIM study group, 2018. Behavioural outcomes of subthalamic stimulation and medical therapy versus medical therapy alone for Parkinson's disease with early motor complications (EARLYSTIM trial): secondary analysis of an open-label randomised trial. *Lancet Neurol* 17, 223–231. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422\(18\)30035-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(18)30035-8)
- Merola, A., Singh, J., Reeves, K., Changizi, B., Goetz, S., Rossi, L., Pallavaram, S., Carcieri, S., Harel, N., Shaikhouni, A., Sammartino, F., Krishna, V., Verhagen, L., Dalm, B., 2021. New Frontiers for Deep Brain Stimulation: Directionality, Sensing Technologies, Remote Programming, Robotic Stereotactic Assistance, Asleep Procedures, and Connectomics. *Frontiers in Neurology* 12.
- Milian, M., Luerding, R., Ploppa, A., Decker, K., Psaras, T., Tatagiba, M., Gharabaghi, A., Feigl, G.C., 2013. "Imagine your neighbor mows the lawn": a pilot study of psychological sequelae due to awake craniotomy: clinical article. *J Neurosurg* 118, 1288–1295. <https://doi.org/10.3171/2013.2.JNS121254>

- Milosevic, L., Scherer, M., Cebi, I., Guggenberger, R., Machetanz, K., Naros, G., Weiss, D., Gharabaghi, A., 2020. Online Mapping With the Deep Brain Stimulation Lead: A Novel Targeting Tool in Parkinson's Disease. *Movement Disorders* 35, 1574–1586. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mds.28093>
- Mishra, A., Unadkat, P., McBriar, J.D., Schulder, M., Ramdhani, R.A., 2023. An Institutional Experience of Directional Deep Brain Stimulation and a Review of the Literature. *Neuromodulation* S1094-7159(22)01408–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurom.2022.12.008>
- Naros, G., Grimm, F., Weiss, D., Gharabaghi, A., 2018. Directional communication during movement execution interferes with tremor in Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord* 33, 251–261. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mds.27221>
- Ondo, W.G., Meilak, C., Vuong, K.D., 2007. Predictors of battery life for the Activa® Soletra 7426 Neurostimulator. *Parkinsonism & Related Disorders* 13, 240–242. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.parkreldis.2006.11.002>
- Pepper, J., Zrinzo, L., Mirza, B., Foltynie, T., Limousin, P., Hariz, M., 2013. The Risk of Hardware Infection in Deep Brain Stimulation Surgery Is Greater at Impulse Generator Replacement than at the Primary Procedure. *SFN* 91, 56–65. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000343202>
- Pollo, C., Kaelin-Lang, A., Oertel, M.F., Stieglitz, L., Taub, E., Fuhr, P., Lozano, A.M., Raabe, A., Schüpbach, M., 2014. Directional deep brain stimulation: an intraoperative double-blind pilot study. *Brain* 137, 2015–2026. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awu102>
- Ramanathan, P.V., Salas-Vega, S., Shenai, M.B., 2023. Directional Deep Brain Stimulation-A Step in the Right Direction? A Systematic Review of the Clinical and Therapeutic Efficacy of Directional Deep Brain Stimulation in Parkinson Disease. *World Neurosurg* 170, 54-63.e1. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wneu.2022.11.085>
- Rebelo, P., Green, A.L., Aziz, T.Z., Kent, A., Schafer, D., Venkatesan, L., Cheeran, B., 2018. Thalamic Directional Deep Brain Stimulation for tremor: Spend less, get more. *Brain Stimulation* 11, 600–606. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2017.12.015>
- Rolston, J.D., Englot, D.J., Starr, P.A., Larson, P.S., 2016. An unexpectedly high rate of revisions and removals in deep brain stimulation surgery: analysis of multiple databases. *Parkinsonism & related disorders* 33, 72–77.
- Rosahl, S.K., Gharabaghi, A., Liebig, T., Feste, C.D., Tatagiba, M., Samii, M., 2002. Skin markers for surgical planning for intradural lesions of the thoracic spine. Technical note. *Surg Neurol* 58, 346–348. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0090-3019\(02\)00863-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0090-3019(02)00863-7)

- Scherer, M., Milosevic, L., Guggenberger, R., Maus, V., Naros, G., Grimm, F., Bucurenciu, I., Steinhoff, B.J., Weber, Y.G., Lerche, H., Weiss, D., Rona, S., Gharabaghi, A., 2020. Desynchronization of temporal lobe theta-band activity during effective anterior thalamus deep brain stimulation in epilepsy. *NeuroImage* 218, 116967. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.116967>
- Scherer, M., Wang, T., Guggenberger, R., Milosevic, L., Gharabaghi, A., 2022. FiNN: A toolbox for neurophysiological network analysis. *Network Neuroscience* 1–34. [https://doi.org/10.1162/netn\\_a\\_00265](https://doi.org/10.1162/netn_a_00265)
- Schnitzler, A., Mir, P., Brodsky, M.A., Verhagen, Leonard, Groppa, S., Alvarez, R., Evans, A., Blazquez, M., Nagel, S., Pilitsis, J.G., Pötter-Nerger, M., Tse, W., Almeida, L., Tomycz, N., Jimenez-Shahed, J., Libionka, W., Carrillo, F., Hartmann, C.J., Groiss, S.J., Glaser, M., Defresne, F., Karst, E., Cheeran, B., Vesper, J., Schnitzler, A., Vesper, J., Mir, P., Verhagen, Leonardo, Tomycz, N., Hartmann, C.J., Groppa, S., Alvarez, R., Pilitsis, J., Pötter-Nerger, M., Groiss, S.J., Brodsky, M.A., 2022. Directional Deep Brain Stimulation for Parkinson’s Disease: Results of an International Crossover Study With Randomized, Double-Blind Primary Endpoint. *Neuromodulation* 25, 817–828. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ner.13407>
- Schuepbach, W. m. m., Rau, J., Knudsen, K., Volkman, J., Krack, P., Timmermann, L., Hälbig, T. d., Hesekamp, H., Navarro, S. m., Meier, N., Falk, D., Mehdorn, M., Paschen, S., Maarouf, M., Barbe, M. t., Fink, G. r., Kupsch, A., Gruber, D., Schneider, G.-H., Seigneuret, E., Kistner, A., Chaynes, P., Ory-Magne, F., Brefel Courbon, C., Vesper, J., Schnitzler, A., Wojtecki, L., Houeto, J.-L., Bataille, B., Maltête, D., Damier, P., Raoul, S., Sixel-Doering, F., Hellwig, D., Gharabaghi, A., Krüger, R., Pinski, M. o., Amtage, F., Régis, J.-M., Witjas, T., Thobois, S., Mertens, P., Kloss, M., Hartmann, A., Oertel, W. h., Post, B., Speelman, H., Agid, Y., Schade-Brittinger, C., Deuschl, G., 2013. Neurostimulation for Parkinson’s Disease with Early Motor Complications. *N Engl J Med* 368, 610–622. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1205158>
- Southwell, D.G., Narvid, J.A., Martin, A.J., Qasim, S.E., Starr, P.A., Larson, P.S., 2016. Comparison of Deep Brain Stimulation Lead Targeting Accuracy and Procedure Duration between 1.5- and 3-Tesla Interventional Magnetic Resonance Imaging Systems: An Initial 12-Month Experience. *Stereotactic and Functional Neurosurgery* 94, 102–107. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000443407>
- Steigerwald, F., Müller, L., Johannes, S., Matthies, C., Volkman, J., 2016. Directional deep brain stimulation of the subthalamic nucleus: A pilot study using a novel

neurostimulation device. *Movement Disorders* 31, 1240–1243.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/mds.26669>

Weaver, F.M., Follett, K.A., Stern, M., Luo, P., Harris, C.L., Hur, K., Marks, W.J., Rothlind, J., Sagher, O., Moy, C., Pahwa, R., Burchiel, K., Hogarth, P., Lai, E.C., Duda, J.E., Holloway, K., Samii, A., Horn, S., Bronstein, J.M., Stoner, G., Starr, P.A., Simpson, R., Baltuch, G., Salles, A.D., Huang, G.D., Reda, D.J., 2012. Randomized trial of deep brain stimulation for Parkinson disease: Thirty-six-month outcomes. *Neurology* 79, 55–65. <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e31825dcdc1>