Evaluation of a novel 5 day accelerated 1 Hz repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation protocol in major depression

Jean-Philippe Miron [1,2,3,4,*], Molly Hyde [4,ɣ], Linsay Fox [4,ɣ], Jack Sheen [2,4], Helena Voetterl [4,5], Farrokh Mansouri [2,4], Ryan Zhou [4], Sinjin Dees [6], Arsalan Mir-Moghtadaei [2,4], Daniel M. Blumberger [2,3,7], Zafiris J. Daskalakis [2,3,7,8], Fidel Vila-Rodriguez [9], Jonathan Downar [2,3]

[1] Centre Hospitalier de l'Université de Montréal (CHUM) et Centre de Recherche du CHUM (CRCHUM), Département de Psychiatrie, Faculté de Médecine, Université de Montréal, Montréal, QC, Canada;

[2] Institute of Medical Science, Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada;

[3] Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada;

[4] Krembil Research Institute, University Health Network, Toronto, ON, Canada;

[5] Department of Cognitive Neuroscience, Maastricht University, Maastricht, Limburg, Netherlands;

[6] Faculty of Engineering, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada;

[7] Temerty Centre for Therapeutic Brain Intervention at the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, Toronto, ON, Canada;

[8] Department of Psychiatry, University of California San Diego, San Diego, California, USA;

[9] Non-Invasive Neurostimulation Therapies Laboratory, Department of Psychiatry, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada.

[ɣ] Equal authorship

* Corresponding author

ABSTRACT WORD COUNT: XXX

MANUSCRIPT WORD COUNT: XXXX

BACKGROUND

Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) is an effective intervention in major depressive disorder (MDD) but requires daily travel to a treatment clinic over several weeks. Shorter rTMS courses retaining similar effectiveness would thus increase the practicality and scalability of the technique, and therefore its accessibility.

OBJECTIVE

We assessed the feasibility of a novel 5 day accelerated 1 Hz rTMS protocol. We hypothesized that this novel rTMS protocol would be safe and well-tolerated while shortening the overall treatment course.

METHODS

We conducted a prospective, single-arm, open-label feasibility study. Thirty (30) participants received a one-week (5 days) accelerated (8 sessions per day, 40 sessions total) course of 1 Hz rTMS (600 pulses per session, 50-minute intersession interval) over the right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (R-DLPFC) using a figure-of-eight coil at 120% of the resting motor threshold (rMT). Depression severity was assessed on the Beck Depression Inventory-II (BDI-II) and 17-item Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression (HRSD-17).

RESULTS

Response and remission rates 1 week after treatment were 33.3% and 13.3% respectively and increased to 43.3% and 30.0% at 4 weeks after treatment. No serious adverse events occurred. All participants reported manageable pain levels.

CONCLUSION

1 Hz rTMS administered 8 times daily for 5 days is safe and well-tolerated. Efficacy at the end of the course was similar to a standard daily course of 1 Hz rTMS, and there appears to be an additional delayed effect. Further validation in a randomized trial is required.

ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT04376697

INTRODUCTION

Major depressive disorder (MDD) is now the leading cause of disability worldwide, with lifetime suicide rates as high as 15%. [1,2] Even though antidepressant medication offers convenience and simplicity of administration, discontinuation rates are close to 50% at 3 months, resulting from side-effects and lack of clinical response. [3]

Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) is well established as an effective intervention in MDD, with an advantageous side-effect profile over medication. [4–6] Recent meta-analyses report response and remission rates of up to 50-55% and 30-35%, respectively. [4] Unfortunately, standard rTMS involves treatment courses over several weeks. This complicates treatment logistics for many patients who cannot take time away to attend daily clinic visits for this period of time.

To address this, accelerated rTMS (arTMS), where treatment is delivered multiple times daily, has been studied for over a decade. [7] Some evidence suggests that this approach allows comparable effectiveness to standard once-daily rTMS, while shortening treatment length. [8] Recently, high-dosage highly-accelerated and personalized intermittent theta-burst (iTBS) arTMS feasibility studies have reported remission rates of up to ~90%, while delivering treatment over only 5 days. [9,10]

However, arTMS has not been well studied for 1 Hz protocols. [11,12] On conventional once-daily regimens, 1 Hz has shown superiority over sham, with some studies also suggesting similar efficacy to HF. [4–6,11,13] 1 Hz also offers several potential advantages over HF, including less seizure risks [14,15], better tolerability [16], and the potential for implementation on simpler, lower-cost equipment [11,12], thus possibly increasing scalability and accessibility.

To address the aforementioned issues, we developed an accelerated low-frequency protocol applying 1 Hz stimulation sessions 8 times daily for 5 days. We hypothesized that the

novel protocol would be safe, well-tolerated, and effective, while reducing course length and accelerating clinical improvement.

METHODS

Participants

We conducted a prospective, single-arm, open-label feasibility study. Adult (18-85 years of age) outpatients were included for study participation if they 1) had a Mini International Neuropsychiatric Interview (MINI) confirmed MDD diagnosis (single or recurrent episode) and 2) maintained a stable medication regimen from 4 weeks before treatment start to the end of the study. Exclusion criteria were: 1) history of substance dependence or abuse within the last 3 months; 2) concomitant major unstable medical illness; 3) cardiac pacemaker or implanted medication pump; 4) active suicidal intent; 5) diagnosis of any personality disorder as assessed by a study investigator to be primary and causing greater impairment than MDD; 6) diagnosis of any psychotic disorder; 7) any significant neurological disorder or insult (including, but not limited to: any condition likely to be associated with increased intracranial pressure, space occupying brain lesion, any history of seizure confirmed diagnostically by neurological assessment [except those therapeutically induced by ECT], cerebral aneurysm, Parkinson's disease, Huntington's chorea, dementia, stroke, neurologically confirmed diagnosis of traumatic brain injury, or multiple sclerosis); 8) if participating in psychotherapy must have been in stable treatment for at least 3 months prior to entry into the study (with no anticipation of change in the frequency of therapeutic sessions, or the therapeutic focus over the duration of the study); 9) any clinically significant laboratory abnormality in the opinion of the investigator; 10) a dose of more than lorazepam 2 mg daily (or equivalent) currently (or in the last 4 weeks) or any dose of an anticonvulsant due to the potential to limit rTMS efficacy and 11) any non-correctable

clinically significant sensory impairment. All participants provided informed consent and this study was approved by the Research Ethics Board of the University Health Network.

Study design and procedures

rTMS was delivered through a MagPro R20 stimulator equipped with a MC-B70 coil (MagVenture, Farum, Denmark). Resting motor threshold (rMT) was determined according to standard techniques (pmid: 28541649). Treatment consisted of an arTMS course of 8 hourly sessions per day over 5 consecutive weekdays (Monday through Friday), thus totaling 40 sessions in five days. Each rTMS session consisted of low-frequency (LF) 1 Hz stimulation delivered over a 10 min period (1 single train, 600 pulses per session, 50-minute intersession interval) at 120% of rMT over the right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (R-DLPFC), localized according to a previously published heuristic approximating the F4 EEG site. [17]

Baseline assessment was completed during the week prior to arTMS initiation and consisted of a clinical assessment by trained research staff, cap fitting, and motor threshold calibration. Participants were reassessed 1 week and 4 weeks after treatment. Participants who missed any one of the treatment days or 4 or more sessions overall were withdrawn. Participants were asked not to change their medication regimen throughout the whole treatment, up until the 1-week reassessment.

At each clinical assessment before and after the course, participants completed the self-rated Beck Depression Inventory-II (BDI), and research staff administered the clinician-rated Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression 17-item (HRSD-17). During the course, at the beginning of each treatment day before rTMS initiation, participants also completed the BDI-II and were queried about any adverse events. Participants also completed the BDI-II immediately following their final rTMS session after the last treatment day (not done for HRSD-17). Self-rated pain intensity of the rTMS procedure was recorded on a verbal analog scale (VRS – from 0 [no pain]

to 10 [intolerable pain]). Moreover, serious adverse events and reasons for treatment discontinuation were recorded when such events occurred. Stimulation intensity was adaptively titrated upward, aiming to reach the target intensity of 120% rMT on the first session of treatment, without exceeding maximum tolerable pain. We recorded the number of sessions required to reach 120% rMT.

Outcomes

Outcomes of interest included score changes, percent improvement, and response and remission rates on the BDI-II. These were calculated after the end of their last day of treatment and at the 1- and 4-weeks follow-ups. These outcomes were also calculated at the 1- and 4-weeks follow-ups on the HRSD-17. Response was defined as score reductions of ≥50% from baseline. Remission was defined as a score of ≤12 [18] on the BDI-II and ≤7 on the HRSD-17. [19] Regarding suicidality, we assessed the number of participants who had achieved remission (number of participants who had started with a suicidality score greater than zero at baseline and who decreased to zero at reassessment). Suicidality scores were drawn from the suicide item on the BDI-II and HRSD-17.

RESULTS

From September 23, 2019 to February 13, 2020, 37 participants with MDD were screened for eligibility, 4 of whom were deemed ineligible or declined to participate; thus, 33 participants were enrolled and began treatment. Of these, 3 discontinued during treatment and were excluded from analysis: 2 participants lost interest and 1 participant was removed by the attending physician after reporting visual symptoms suggestive of possible retinal detachment on day 3 (subsequent diagnosis of migraine equivalent). Thus, 30 participants completed the entire study (**Figure 1**).

Table 1 provides the baseline characteristics. Mean age was 43.5 ± 13.9, with 43.3% (13/30) female participants. Mean age of depression onset was 21.4 ± 9.9 years old, with the average length of current episode 13.0 ± 12.7 months. 83.3% of patients were receiving psychopharmacotherapy during the trial, with 60.0% being on at least one antidepressant during the study. All patients had tried antidepressant medication in the past, with a mean of 7.9 ± 4.0 lifetime trials. Average Antidepressant Treatment History Form (ATHF) total score was 6.6 ± 5.0. The average number of trials on the ATHF in the current episode was 1.3 ± 1.2, with 24/30 (80.0%) having had at least one adequate antidepressant trial in their current depressive episode.

Safety and tolerability outcomes are presented in **Table 2**. No serious adverse events (AE) were reported. Overall, 53.3% of patients reported at least one occurrence of an AE at some point during treatment, the most commonly experienced being headache (33.3%). Pain ratings decreased from 3.5 ± 2.0 (first treatment) to 1.7 ± 1.6 (last treatment). Average rMT was 34.6 ± 7.0% of maximum stimulator output, resulting in a mean target stimulation intensity (120%) of 41.6 ± 8.5%. All patients were able to reach their target stimulation intensity, averaging 1.1 ± 0.5 sessions to do so.

BDI-II scores decreased overall from 35.2 (SD 9.2) at baseline down to 23.6 (10.5) after last treatment day, 24.0 (11.7) at 1 week, and 23.5 (13.3) at 4 weeks. Percent improvement was 32.2% (SD 27.0%) after last treatment day, 27.5% (32.3%) at 1 week, and 33.3% (33.3%) at 4 weeks. This translated into response rates of 30.0% (9/30) after last treatment day, 33.3% (10/30) at 1 week, and 43.3% (13/30) at 4 weeks; remission rates were 10.0% (3/30) after last treatment day, 13.3% (4/30) at 1 week, and 30.0% (9/30) at 4 weeks. Overall, responders showed rapid improvement during the accelerated course, having achieved response on average by the end of the last day, and continued to show slow but steady additional

improvement at the 1- and 4-weeks follow-ups (**Figure 2**). Outcomes for HRSD-17 are presented in **Table 3**.

Outcomes regarding suicidality are shown in **Table 4**. At baseline, 70.0% (21/30) of total participants reported a score of at least 1 on the suicidality item of the BDI-II. On the last day of treatment, 47.6% (10/21) of these had achieved remission on the BDI-II, 52.4% (11/21) at 1 week, and 42.9% (9/21) at 4 weeks. No patients reported active suicidal intent at any point during the study.

DISCUSSION

The past three decades have seen the rise of rTMS as an effective and well-tolerated treatment in MDD. Still, conventional once-daily rTMS regimens require frequent visits over 4-6 weeks, thus carrying a travel burden to patients and caregivers. Accelerated protocols, if effective, would reduce travel burden, and offer potential applicability in inpatient or emergency settings.

Most accelerated studies to date have employed either high-frequency or intermittent theta-burst stimulation. [7,8,10,20,21] However, 1 Hz right DLPFC protocols are better-tolerated and have shown similar efficacy to high-frequency left DLPFC protocols in a recent 300-person study on a once-daily regimen [22], leaving open the question of whether 1 Hz protocols may also be accelerated in a similar fashion. To date, we are only aware of 2 trials having studied 1 Hz arTMS specifically: an initial one was completed in a small patient cohort (N = 7) and used a limited number of sessions (18 over 10 days). [23] More recently, our group published another 1 Hz arTMS trial, where 48 participants received 6 daily sessions of 1 Hz arTMS over 5 days (30 sessions total). [12] In this study, which employed a ring-shaped rather than figure-8 coil over F4, we reported modest response and remission rates of 25.0% and 16.7% on the BDI-II 1 week after treatment.

Compared to that study, we modified our 1 Hz protocol to increase the number of pulses and daily sessions, in order to potentially maximize treatment effects, switched to a standard figure-8 coil to increase generalizability, and also reassessed at 4 weeks post-treatment without any maintenance or continuation treatment to study if treatment effect could be maintained through time. As in our previous study, response rates at 1 week after treatment were lower than what is usually reported in meta-analyses of standard once-daily rTMS trials [5,24], even though the responders subgroup had achieved response on average by the last day of treatment (**Figure 2**). This changed 4 weeks after treatment, where there was a noticeable increase in responders and remitters, reaching 43.3% and 30.0% respectively. This sets our number of responders close to and our number of remitters in the same territory as to what has been reported in large meta-analyses. [4] As can be seen in **Figure 2**, a linear trend exists in responders, with additional improvements seen at every time points. This suggests a delayed effect, akin to what was reported in some arTMS trials. [7,25,26] Thus, accumulating evidence points toward the idea that it is possible to shorten rTMS treatment and eventually reach similar improvement rates as standard once-daily rTMS, however without being able to "accelerate" the effect *per se* in all eventual responders.

The treatment course also helped relieve suicidality in participants who presented a positive score at baseline, with close to 50% remission by the end of the last day of treatment, and over 50% at the 1-week follow-up, beyond overall depression response and remission rates. This suggests an anti-suicidal effect of rTMS that may be partially independent of mood improvement in of itself, akin to what has been reported elsewhere. [27–32] Rapid anti-suicidal effects of rTMS could prove an important area of study, especially in emergency care and inpatient settings where quick relief is needed.

This study has several limitations. Firstly, this was an open-label feasibility study without a sham control arm designed to obtain pilot data for an eventual RCT, where estimates of

effectiveness may be more modest. Also, we did not reassess patients between weeks 1 and 4 after treatment, which would have allowed us to establish a more precise trajectory of improvement. In the future, weekly or bi-weekly BDI-II data collection during the follow-up period would be warranted. Also, patients were asked not to change their medication regimen up until the 1-week follow-up, with the 4 weeks follow-up having been planned as a naturalistic outcome reassessment, without expectation of a possible delayed improvement, that we ended up observing. We therefore cannot rule out that the delayed improvement might have been due to medication changes in some patients. Medication stability up until the 4-weeks follow-up point would therefore need to be part of a future RCT protocol in order to allow separate outcome analyses of patients who changed their medication before the end of the study. Furthermore, given the reports of improvement beyond the 4-week mark [25], additional follow-ups should be planned in future studies. We also used a limited number of pulses (600 per session), which is 50% lower than what was viewed as maximally efficacious for 1 Hz stimulation in a meta-analysis. [13] The rationale behind this was to keep rTMS sessions in the range of ~10 min, comparable to the 1800-pule iTBS protocol used in a recent high-dose highly-accelerated rTMS study. [10] Additionally, even though our number of daily sessions (8) was high compared to other arTMS trials, it was still lower than the 10x daily treatment employed in that same study. So far, we are not aware of any specific rationale behind that number and thus decided to use the maximum number of sessions that would fit into a normal technician workday, without the need for overtime or overlapping teams working on different schedules. Finally, we did not require participants to meet the usual requirement of treatment-resistant depression (TRD) in our trial. However, the majority (80%) of participants had failed at least one adequate antidepressant trial in their current depressive episode. There was also no minimum threshold regarding depression severity on the mood scales for study inclusion, but average baseline scores on the BDI-II were in the severe range.

In conclusion, this feasibility study suggests that a significant proportion of patients may respond rapidly to 1 Hz rTMS, when administered on an accelerated regimen of 8 times daily for 5 days on a standard figure-8 coil. Further optimization of the treatment delivery may be warranted, such as increasing the number of pulses per session or the number of sessions per day. Delayed effects may be emergent in some patients on this regimen. Because of the excellent safety and tolerability and lower equipment cost for 1 Hz stimulation, an important question for future work will be whether accelerated 1 Hz regimens can match the efficacy of high-frequency or iTBS protocols delivered on the same schedule. A future randomized controlled trial directly comparing these two forms of arTMS will be important and could potentially improve the ability of patients to access accelerated rTMS in a wider variety of care settings. Finally, such accelerated protocols, shortening treatment courses and thus decreasing the overall number of patients visits to an rTMS clinic, might be a welcomed improvement in our new COVID-19 post-pandemic era.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare no financial interests relative to this work. **JPM** reports research grants from the Brain & Behavior Research Foundation NARSAD Young Investigator Award and salary support for his graduate studies from the Branch Out Neurological Foundation. **MH, LF, HV**, **JS, FM**, **RZ, SD**, and **AM** do not report any conflict of interest. **DMB** receives research support from CIHR, NIH, Brain Canada and the Temerty Family through the CAMH Foundation and the Campbell Family Research Institute. He received research support and in-kind equipment support for an investigator-initiated study from Brainsway Ltd. He is the site principal investigator for three sponsor-initiated studies for Brainsway Ltd. He also receives in-kind equipment support from Magventure for investigator-initiated research. He received medication supplies for an investigator-initiated trial from Indivior. **ZJD** has received research and equipment in-kind support for an investigator-initiated study through Brainsway Inc and Magventure Inc. His work was supported by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), the National Institutes of Mental Health (NIMH) and the Temerty Family and Grant Family and through the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (CAMH) Foundation and the Campbell Institute. **FVR** reports grants from Canadian Institutes of Health Research, grants from Brain Canada, grants from Vancouver Coastal Health Research Institute, grants from Michael Smith Foundation for Health Research, personal fees from Janssen Pharmaceuticals, in-kind equipment for investigator-initiated research from Magventure. **JD** reports research grants from CIHR, the National Institute of Mental Health, Brain Canada, the Canadian Biomarker Integration Network in Depression, the Ontario Brain Institute, the Weston Foundation, the Klarman Family Foundation, the Arrell Family Foundation, and the Buchan Family Foundation, travel stipends from Lundbeck and ANT Neuro, in-kind equipment support for investigator-initiated trials from MagVenture, and is an advisor for BrainCheck, TMS Neuro Solutions, and Restorative Brain Clinics.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

JPM would like to thank the **Brain & Behavior Research Foundation** and the **Branch Out Neurological Foundation** for their financial support of this project. We would like to thank Terri Cairo, Julian Kwok, Meaghan Todd, Nuno Ferreira, Thomas Russell and Eileen Lam for their involvement and organizational support throughout this project.

REFERENCES

1. Friedrich MJ. Depression Is the Leading Cause of Disability Around the World. Jama 2017;317(15):1517.

2. Lam RW, McIntosh D, Wang J, et al. Canadian Network for Mood and Anxiety Treatments (CANMAT) 2016 Clinical Guidelines for the Management of Adults with Major Depressive Disorder. Can J Psychiatry 2016;61(9):510–523.

3. Kennedy SH, Lam RW, McIntyre RS, et al. Canadian Network for Mood and Anxiety Treatments (CANMAT) 2016 Clinical Guidelines for the Management of Adults with Major Depressive Disorder. Can J Psychiatry 2016;61(9):540–560.

4. Milev RV, Giacobbe P, Kennedy SH, et al. Canadian Network for Mood and Anxiety Treatments (CANMAT) 2016 Clinical Guidelines for the Management of Adults with Major Depressive Disorder. Can J Psychiatry 2016;61(9):561–575.

5. Lefaucheur J-P, Aleman A, Baeken C, et al. Evidence-based guidelines on the therapeutic use of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS): An update (2014–2018). Clin Neurophysiol 2020;131(2):474–528.

6. Brunoni AR, Chaimani A, Moffa AH, et al. Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation for the Acute Treatment of Major Depressive Episodes. Jama Psychiat 2017;74(2):143–10.

7. Holtzheimer PE, McDonald WM, Mufti M, et al. Accelerated repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for treatment-resistant depression. Depress Anxiety 2010;27(10):960–963.

8. Fitzgerald PB, Hoy KE, Elliot D, et al. Accelerated repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation in the treatment of depression. Neuropsychopharmacol 2018;43(7):1–8.

9. Williams NR, Sudheimer KD, Bentzley BS, et al. High-dose spaced theta-burst TMS as a rapid-acting antidepressant in highly refractory depression. Brain 2018;141(3):e18–e18.

10. Cole EJ, Stimpson KH, Bentzley BS, et al. Stanford Accelerated Intelligent Neuromodulation Therapy for Treatment-Resistant Depression. Am J Psychiatry 2020;appiajp201919070720.

11. Miron J-P, Sheen J, Mansouri F, et al. The Role of Low-Frequency Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation in Major Depression: A Call to Increase the Evidence Base. Brain Stimul. Epub ahead of print 2020. DOI: 10.1016/j.brs.2020.06.013.

12. Miron J-P, Voetterl H, Fox L, et al. Evaluation of a Novel Therapeutic Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation Technique Optimized for Increased Accessibility in Major Depression. Medrxiv 2020;2020.06.15.20132092.

13. Berlim MT, Eynde FV den, Daskalakis ZJ. Clinically Meaningful Efficacy and Acceptability of Low-Frequency Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation (rTMS) for Treating Primary Major Depression: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized, Double-Blind and Sham-Controlled Trials. Neuropsychopharmacol 2012;38(4):543–551.

14. Sun W, Mao W, Meng X, et al. Low-frequency repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for the treatment of refractory partial epilepsy: A controlled clinical study: rTMS for the Treatment of Refractory Partial Epilepsy. Epilepsia 2012;53(10):1782–1789.

15. Vila-Rodriguez FF, Dobek CE, Blumberger DM, et al. Risk of seizures in transcranial magnetic stimulation: a clinical review to inform consent process focused on bupropion. Neuropsych Dis Treat 2015;Volume 112975–2987.

16. Kaur M, Michael JA, Fitzgibbon BM, et al. Low-frequency rTMS is better tolerated than high-frequency rTMS in healthy people: Empirical evidence from a single session study. J Psychiatr Res 2019;113(Front. Psychiatry 9 2018):79–82.

17. Mir-Moghtadaei A, Dunlop K, Mansouri F, et al. Scalp-based heuristics for locating the nodes of the salience network for use in neurostimulation. pP479.

18. Riedel M, Möller H-J, Obermeier M, et al. Response and remission criteria in major depression--a validation of current practice. J Psychiatr Res 2010;44(15):1063–1068.

19. Zimmerman M, Posternak MA, Chelminski I. Derivation of a definition of remission on the Montgomery–Asberg depression rating scale corresponding to the definition of remission on the Hamilton rating scale for depression. J Psychiatr Res 2004;38(6):577–582.

20. LOO CK, MITCHELL PB, McFARQUHAR TF, et al. A sham-controlled trial of the efficacy and safety of twice-daily rTMS in major depression. Psychol Med 2007;37(3):341–349.

21. Baeken C, Vanderhasselt M-A, Remue J, et al. Intensive HF-rTMS treatment in refractory medication-resistant unipolar depressed patients. J Affect Disorders 2013;151(2):625–631.

22. Fitzgerald PB, Hoy KE, Reynolds J, et al. A pragmatic randomized controlled trial exploring the relationship between pulse number and response to repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation treatment in depression. Brain Stimul. Epub ahead of print 2019. DOI: 10.1016/j.brs.2019.09.001.

23. Tor P-C, Galvez V, Goldstein J, et al. Pilot Study of Accelerated Low-Frequency Right-Sided Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation for Treatment-Resistant Depression. J Ect 2016;32(3):180–182.

24. Miron J-P, Voetterl H, Mansouri F, et al. A case series of a novel 1 Hz right-sided dorsolateral prefrontal cortex rTMS protocol in major depression. Brain Stimul 2019;13(2):372–374.

25. Sonmez AI, Camsari DD, Nandakumar AL, et al. Accelerated TMS for Depression: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Psychiat Res 2019;273(Biol. Psychiatry 47 2000):770–781.

26. Duprat R, Desmyter S, Raedt RD, et al. Accelerated intermittent theta burst stimulation treatment in medication-resistant major depression_ A fast road to remission? J Affect Disorders 2016;200(C):6–14.

27. Serafini G, Canepa G, Aguglia A, et al. Effects of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on suicidal behavior: A systematic review. Prog Neuro-psychopharmacology Biological Psychiatry 2020;109981.

28. Abdelnaim MA, Langguth B, Deppe M, et al. Anti-Suicidal Efficacy of Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation in Depressive Patients: A Retrospective Analysis of a Large Sample. Frontiers Psychiatry 2020;10929.

29. George MS, Raman R, Benedek DM, et al. A Two-site Pilot Randomized 3 Day Trial of High Dose Left Prefrontal Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation (rTMS) for Suicidal Inpatients. Brain Stimul 2014;7(3):421–431.

30. Croarkin PE, Nakonezny PA, Deng Z-D, et al. High-frequency repetitive TMS for suicidal ideation in adolescents with depression. J Affect Disorders 2018;239282–290.

31. Weissman CR, Blumberger DM, Brown PE, et al. Bilateral Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation Decreases Suicidal Ideation in Depression. J Clin Psychiatry;79(3):. Epub ahead of print 2018. DOI: 10.4088/jcp.17m11692.

32. Bozzay ML, Primack J, Barredo J, et al. Transcranial magnetic stimulation to reduce suicidality – A review and naturalistic outcomes. J Psychiatr Res. Epub ahead of print 2020. DOI: 10.1016/j.jpsychires.2020.03.016.

Age, years	43.5 (13.9)
Women	43.3%
Education, years	17.1 (3.8)
Left-handed	3.3%
Age of onset, years	21.4 (9.9)
Length of current depressive episode, months	13.0 (12.7)
Comorbid anxiety	70.0%
Baseline BDI-II	35.2 (9.2)
Baseline HRSD-17	19.8 (4.5)
Receiving psychopharmacotherapy during treatment	83.3%
Antidepressant	60.0%
Antidepressant combination	10.0%
Antipsychotic augmentation	16.7%
Psychostimulant augmentation	30.0%
Benzodiazepine	16.7%
Number of past antidepressant trials, lifetime	7.9 (4.0)
ATHF total score	6.6 (5.0)
ATHF number of trials, current episode	1.3 (1.2)
ATHF highest score	3.3 (1.4)

Data are mean (SD) or number of participants (% of total). BDI-II = Beck Depression Inventory-II, HRSD-17 = 17-item Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression, ATHF = Antidepressant Treatment History Form.

Table 1: Baseline demographic and clinical characteristics (n = 30).

Serious AE	0/30 (0.0%)
AE total	16/30 (53.3%)
Headache	10/30 (33.3%)
Fatigue	6/30 (20.0%)
Nausea	8/30 (26.7%)
Insomnia	8/30 (26.7%)
Dizziness	5/30 (16.7%)
Jaw pain	2/30 (6.7%)
First treatment pain VRS	3.5 (2.0)
Last treatment pain VRS	1.7 (1.6)
Number of participants (n=48) reporting adverse events (AE - %). For pain, data mean (SD). VRS = Verbal Rating Scale.	

Table 2: Adverse events.

BDI-II	
Score baseline	35.2 (9.2)
Score change after last treatment day	23.6 (10.5)
Score change 1 week after treatment	24.0 (11.7)
Score change 4 weeks after treatment	23.5 (13.3)
Percent improvement after last treatment day	32.2% (27.0%)
Percent improvement 1 week after treatment	27.5% (32.3%)
Percent improvement 4 weeks after treatment	33.3% (33.3%)
Response after last treatment day	30.0% (9/30)
Response 1 week after treatment	33.3% (10/30)
Response 4 weeks after treatment	43.3% (13/30)
Remission after last treatment day	10.0% (3/30)
Remission 1 week after treatment	13.3% (4/30)
Remission 4 weeks after treatment	30.0% (9/30)
HRSD-17	
Score baseline	19.8 (4.5)
Score change 1 week after treatment	12.9 (6.7)
Score change 4 weeks after treatment	12.2 (7.6)
Percent improvement 1 week after treatment	37.0% (25.8%)
Percent improvement 4 weeks after treatment	40.0% (31.5%)
Response 1 week after treatment	36.7% (11/30)
Response 4 weeks after treatment	43.3% (13/30)
Remission 1 week after treatment	16.7% (5/30)
Remission 4 weeks after treatment	33.3% (10/30)
Data are mean (SD). For remission and response rates, data are % of participants assessed (N). BDI-II = Beck Depression Inventory-II, HRSD-17 = 17-item Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression.	

Table 3: Changes in depression severity scores, percent improvement and response and remission rates throughout the study.

BDI-II	
Remission last treatment day	10/21 (47.6%)
Remission 1 week after treatment	11/21 (52.4%)
Remission 4 weeks after treatment	9/21 (42.9%)
HRSD-17	
Remission 1 week after treatment	16/24 (66.7%)
Remission 4 weeks after treatment	14/24 (58.3%)

Data are n (% of participants assessed). Suicidality item is #9 on the BDI-II and #3 on the HRSD-17. BDI-II = Beck Depression Inventory-II, HRSD-17 = 17-item Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression.

Table 4: Remission rates regarding suicidality.



Figure 1: Trial CONSORT flow diagram.



Figure 2: Trajectories of improvement on the BDI-II. Responders showed rapid improvement during the accelerated course, having achieved response on average by the end of the last day, and continued to show slow but steady additional improvement at the 1- and 4-weeks follow-ups. Use of background shading delineates the arTMS course. BDI-II = the Beck Depression Inventory – II, arTMS = accelerated repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation.