

1 **Title:**

2 Investigation of in-phase bilateral exercise effects on corticospinal plasticity in relapsing remitting  
3 multiple sclerosis: a multiple baseline design  
4

5 **Authors:**

6 Dimitris Sokratous<sup>1,2</sup>, Charalambos C. Charalambous<sup>3, 4</sup>, Eleni Zamba-Papanicolaou<sup>5</sup>, Kyriaki  
7 Michailidou<sup>6</sup>, Nikos Konstantinou<sup>1</sup>  
8

9 **Affiliations:**

10 <sup>1</sup> Department of Rehabilitation Sciences, Faculty of Health Sciences, Cyprus University of  
11 Technology, Limassol, Cyprus

12 <sup>2</sup> Physiotherapy Unit, Neurology Clinics, The Cyprus Institute of Neurology and Genetics,  
13 Nicosia, Cyprus

14 <sup>3</sup> Department of Basic and Clinical Sciences, Medical School, University of Nicosia, Nicosia,  
15 Cyprus

16 <sup>4</sup> Centre for Neuroscience and Integrative Brain Research (CENIBRE), University of Nicosia  
17 Medical School, Nicosia, Cyprus.

18 <sup>5</sup> Neuroepidemiology Department, The Cyprus Institute of Neurology and Genetics, Nicosia,  
19 Cyprus

20 <sup>6</sup> Biostatistics Unit, The Cyprus Institute of Neurology and Genetics, Nicosia, Cyprus  
21

22 **Corresponding Author:**

23 \* [sokratous.physio@gmail.com](mailto:sokratous.physio@gmail.com) (DS)  
24

25 **Authors' contributions:**

26 D.S., C.C.C., E.Z.P., and N.K., are responsible for the conception and the experimental design.

27 D.S., and K.M., are responsible to collect, analyse and interpret the data.

28 D.S., and N.K., are responsible to draft the manuscript.

29 N.K., C.C.C., and K.M., revised the manuscript critically for important intellectual content.  
30

31 [ClinicalTrials.gov NCT05367947](https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/study/NCT05367947).  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

## 47 **Abstract**

48 Relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis is the most common type of multiple sclerosis  
49 characterized by periods of relapses and generating various motor symptoms. These symptoms are  
50 associated with the corticospinal tract integrity, which is quantified by means of corticospinal  
51 plasticity which can be probed via transcranial magnetic stimulation and assessed with motor  
52 threshold, motor evoked potential and central motor conduction time. Several factors, such as  
53 exercise and interlimb coordination, can influence corticospinal plasticity. Previous work in  
54 healthy and in stroke patients showed that the greatest improvement in corticospinal plasticity  
55 occurred during in-phase bilateral arm exercises. Altered corticospinal plasticity due to bilateral  
56 cortical lesions is common in multiple sclerosis, yet, the impact of these type of exercises in this  
57 cohort is unclear. The aim of this concurrent multiple baseline design study is to investigate the  
58 effects of in-phase bilateral exercises on corticospinal plasticity and on clinical measures using  
59 transcranial magnetic stimulation and standardized clinical assessment, in five people with  
60 relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis. The intervention protocol will last for 12 consecutive weeks  
61 (30-60 minutes /session x 3 sessions/week) and include in-phase bilateral movements of the upper  
62 limbs, adapted to different sports activities and to functional training. To define functional relation  
63 between the intervention and the results on corticospinal plasticity (i.e., resting motor threshold,  
64 motor evoked potential amplitude, latency) and on clinical measures (i.e., balance, gait, bilateral  
65 hand dexterity and strength, cognitive function), we will perform a visual analysis followed by  
66 multilevel modelling and the single case educational design-specific mean difference in order to  
67 estimate the magnitude of the effect size across cases. We assume that possible effects from our  
68 study, will introduce a type of exercise that will be effective during the disease progression.

## 69 **Introduction**

70 Multiple sclerosis (MS) is the most common inflammatory demyelinating and  
71 neurodegenerative disease of the central nervous system (1). The global prevalence of MS during  
72 the last decade has increased by 30%, while the number of people suffering with MS worldwide  
73 is estimated at approximately 2.8 million(8). The low mean age of diagnosis (i.e., 32 years old),  
74 along with an average of seven years' shorter life expectancy (i.e., 74.7 years) compared to the  
75 general population (4–6), highlights the need for a lengthy support, resulting in increased financial  
76 burden (7). The direct cost from health care services and the indirect cost due to productivity loss  
77 because of physical inactivity of people with MS, indicates a huge financial burden on families,  
78 healthcare systems, and societies in general. Recent studies reported that the annual mean cost of  
79 health care systems for people with MS living in Europe is about €40,000 (8). Additionally, both  
80 MS patients and their caregivers, who usually are family members, are facing several  
81 psychological and social difficulties due to social isolation, poorer quality of life, reduced  
82 productivity and lower general health levels (9,10).

83 Relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis (RRMS), is the most common type of MS and is  
84 characterised by periods of relapses followed by partial or complete recovery (11). Inflammatory  
85 lesions are commonly found bilaterally in both white and grey matter of the central nervous system  
86 (12,13), resulting in diverse clinical condition and symptoms, that include motor and cognitive  
87 impairments, vision deficits, depression and fatigue (13–15). Those symptoms results in  
88 significantly low quality of life (16,17), which subsequently causes the need for a lifelong support  
89 and management of symptoms for most people with RRMS (18).

90 Motor symptoms in RRMS are associated with changes in corticospinal tract integrity and  
91 neuroplasticity (19–25). The corticospinal tract is one of the major motor descending pathways

92 providing voluntary motor function in humans (26). The neuroplasticity of the corticospinal tract,  
93 as defined by changes in neuron structure or function detected either directly from measures of  
94 individual neurons or inferred from measures taken across populations of neurons (27), is an  
95 essential factor that predicts clinical recovery in the post-relapse stage of people with RRMS  
96 (28,29). Corticospinal plasticity can be probed using Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation (TMS)  
97 (30,31) and characterized via certain TMS-specific neurophysiological measures including resting  
98 motor threshold, motor-evoked potential (MEP) amplitudes and the central motor conduction time  
99 (31). Motor threshold and MEP are the hallmark measures of corticospinal excitability in MS (32),  
100 whereas the central motor conduction time expresses the time taken for neural impulses to travel  
101 over the central nervous system on their way to the target muscle (33).

102 Corticospinal plasticity is exercise-dependent (34,35) and influenced by various factors  
103 (36,37), such as aerobic exercise (22,38–40), resistance training (22,40), as well as interlimb  
104 coordination (41,42). Previous studies that assessed corticospinal plasticity using TMS in healthy  
105 participants and in chronic stroke survivors, reported that interlimb coordination and especially in-  
106 phase bilateral movement has the strongest effect on corticospinal plasticity (43–46). These effects  
107 are thought to be due to the suppression of cortical inhibition (46,47) and the simultaneous  
108 activation of homologous representations of the motor cortices, which involves interhemispheric  
109 facilitation via transcallosal connection between the primary motor cortex and the supplementary  
110 motor area (48,49).

111 Despite the broad literature on the effects of different types of exercises on the  
112 neuroplasticity in people with RRMS (39,50–52), it is unclear whether in-phase bilateral exercises  
113 can promote motor related neuroplastic changes in RRMS. In light of evidence that people with  
114 RRMS have bilateral cortical lesions (53) which cause bilateral changes of corticospinal tract

115 integrity (23,25), these findings raise the question about the effects of in-phase bilateral exercises  
116 on corticospinal plasticity. Such effects would provide strong evidence about whether exercise, in  
117 particular in-phase bilateral exercise, can influence the corticospinal plasticity in RRMS.

118         The aim of this study is to investigate whether a 12-week intervention protocol of in-phase  
119 bilateral exercises (independent variable) for the upper limbs, which are adapted to sports activities  
120 and to functional training, can significantly affect the corticospinal plasticity and subsequently the  
121 individual clinical condition of people with RRMS. Our primary hypothesis is that a significant  
122 improvement of corticospinal plasticity will be detected bilaterally, caused by the specific  
123 intervention protocol which includes in-phase bilateral exercises of the upper limbs in people with  
124 RRMS. We will assess the corticospinal plasticity bilaterally using TMS and calculate TMS-  
125 specific measures (45). Visual analysis will be conducted separately for each variable and results  
126 will be presented graphically according to the level, trend, and stability, to define functional  
127 relationships between the intervention protocol and the corticospinal plasticity. Also, quantitative  
128 analysis within cases will be conducted using Cohen's d, Hedges' g and piecewise regression  
129 analysis, as well as quantitative analysis will be performed between cases, using a multilevel  
130 modelling. To estimate the overall effect size, we will use the single case educational design, and  
131 the mean difference index (54).

132         Exploratory analyses in Stage 2 will investigate the effects of the specific exercises protocol  
133 on clinical symptoms using clinical assessment (i.e., gait, balance, strength, hand dexterity,  
134 cognitive function) and the Modified Fatigue Impact Scale (55). Visual and quantitative analysis  
135 will be conducted as described above.

136         The study follows a concurrent multiple baseline design across subjects (56), which  
137 involves five people with RRMS. The specific design has the advantage to verify the cause-effect

138 inference clearly by the staggered duration through separate baseline phases (57). Consequently,  
139 we assume that possible effects from our study will promote a novel approach in the field of  
140 neurorehabilitation and will introduce a type of exercise that will be effective during the disease  
141 progression.

142

## 143 **Materials and Methods**

144

### 145 **Participants**

146 All participants will be recruited from August to October 2022 and evaluated by an  
147 experienced neurologist at The Cyprus Institute of Neurology and Genetics. The inclusion criteria  
148 include 1) diagnosed with RRMS, 2) Expanded Disability Status Scale score between three and  
149 five (58), 3) aged between 30 and 70 years, 4) no relapse within 30 days and 5) Mini Mental State  
150 of Examination score between 24 and 30 (no cognitive impairment) (59). The exclusion criteria  
151 include 1) metal implants, 2) history of any disease affecting the central nervous system other than  
152 MS, 3) history of cardiovascular disease, 4) mental disorders, and 5) severe orthopaedic disorders,  
153 6) pregnancy, 7) visual deficit, 8) hearing impairments, 9) epileptic seizures and 10) spasticity  
154 level on upper or lower limbs more than 1+ (slight increase in muscle tone) according to Modified  
155 Ashworth Scale (60). Additionally, participants will be advised to continue their usual prescribed  
156 medication throughout the study duration, and they will be advised to continue their usual routine  
157 avoiding receiving any other exercise program during this study. Furthermore, all participants will  
158 read and sign a written informed consent while all procedures are approved and conducted in

159 accordance with the ethical guidelines of the Cyprus National Bioethics Committee before  
160 recruitment.

## 161 **Study design**

162 The study follows a concurrent multiple baseline design across subjects, without blinding  
163 and has been designed according to the ‘What Works Clearinghouse’ criteria for single case studies  
164 (56). According to Kratochwill et al. (56), three participants, with collection of three data points  
165 across different phases is the minimum number needed to meet the standard criteria, while four or  
166 more is recognized as more reliable. We aim to include five participants to ensure the reliability  
167 of the results in case of dropouts, as well as to record several data points across the baseline phase,  
168 five data points during the intervention phase and three data points in the follow up phase. During  
169 the experimental procedure, all participants will begin the study with the baseline phase at the  
170 same time while the intervention phase is introduced staggered across patients and time (Fig 1).  
171 The intervention will be introduced systematically in one patient while baseline data collection  
172 continues in the others without any intervention. The cause-effect inference can be clearly verified  
173 by the staggered duration through separate baseline phases (57). Subsequently, if the intervention  
174 (i.e., in-phase bilateral exercises) is the sole cause of improvement in participants’ conditions, the  
175 proposed outcome measures will not change for the participants that remain in the baseline phase  
176 but will be improved only for those in the intervention phase.

177

178 **Figure 1. Timeline and schematic representation of the study’s design.** Grey colour represents  
179 the intervention phase. Each row (A-E) represents a different participant. (c) clinical assessment.  
180 (n) neurophysiological assessment via TMS. (f) Modified Fatigue Impact Scale questionnaire.

181 Every cell represents a different week, so every procedure which is included (i.e., c, n, f) will be  
182 performed during the corresponding week but in different days.

183

## 184 **Baseline**

185 As depicted in Figure 1, all patients will begin the baseline phase simultaneously. Each  
186 patient will undergo a baseline phase of a different time duration, starting with three weeks for the  
187 first participant and gradually increasing by one week for each participant. During the baseline  
188 phase, each participant will be assessed on the Modified Fatigue Impact Scale (55) on the first  
189 week. The neurophysiological (primary outcome measures) and clinical (secondary outcome  
190 measures) assessments will be repeated each baseline week for all participants.

## 191 **Intervention**

192 Immediately after the end of each baseline phase, the intervention phase will begin  
193 staggered across participants and time accordingly (Fig 1). The intervention protocol consists of  
194 exercises based on in-phase bilateral movements of the upper limbs, which are adapted to different  
195 sport activities and to fitness functional exercises, organized in a circuit training considering the  
196 MS exercise recommendations (61). Since no established protocols have been previously reported,  
197 for the needs of our study a certified fitness instructor will design these protocols adapted to  
198 different sport activities. Specifically, each session will consist of one to three sets, consisting of  
199 10–15 repetitions of 9 different exercises targeting large muscle groups of the upper limbs  
200 (shoulder flexors, extensors, rotators, abductors and adductors, elbow flexors and extensors, hand  
201 and finger flexors and extensors). Additionally, three exercises will target large lower limb muscle  
202 groups (hip flexors, extensors, abductors and adductors, knee and ankle flexors and extensors) to  
203 be performed in between the upper limbs exercises to allow relaxation of the upper limb muscles.

204           The specific exercises will include sports activities of basic technical skills of basketball  
205 (e.g., different types of passing, catching and throwing the ball) and volleyball (e.g., different types  
206 of passing and receiving the ball), whereas the fitness exercises will include shoulder rows,  
207 shoulder lateral raises, elbow flexions, elbow extensions, as well as using the diagonal movements  
208 form proprioceptive neuromuscular facilitation technique (62) by the use of resistance elastic  
209 bands (51), as well as exercises with the patients' own body weight (e.g., pushups, TRX) (63). To  
210 maintain the interest of the participants, the exercise program will be modified throughout the  
211 course of the 12-week intervention period via changing the level of difficulty. For example, elastic  
212 bands with different resistance levels will be used, the number of repetitions and sets will vary  
213 along with the specific exercise and body position (e.g., from sitting to standing).

214           The intervention phase for each participant will consist of 12 consecutive weeks in which  
215 the proposed protocol will be performed three times per week, for 30-60 minutes each session,  
216 adapted to each participant's fatigue and fitness level. Each participant has to complete at least 27  
217 (75%) out of 36 sessions in order to be included in the data analysis (51). Every intervention  
218 session will consist of a five minutes' warm-up (i.e., whole body range of motion exercises),  
219 followed by the main sport activities and fitness exercise protocol as described above, and a cool  
220 down session for five minutes (i.e., passive stretching exercises of the muscle groups which are  
221 involved in the main part).

222           Additionally, starting from the third intervention week, we will perform five  
223 neurophysiological (see primary outcome measures) and five clinical assessments (see secondary  
224 outcome measures) (i.e., once a week), to collect five data points for every participant across the  
225 intervention phase. Moreover, each participant will also be asked to complete once the Modified  
226 Fatigue Impact Scale (see secondary measures) at the end of the intervention phase (51) (Fig 1).

## 227 **Follow-Up**

228 As depicted in Figure 1, every participant will undergo three follow-up assessments in total,  
229 after finishing the training protocol lasting from February to May 2022, so to explore possible  
230 long-lasting effects. Each follow-up assessment includes both neurophysiological and clinical  
231 measures (including Modified Impact Scale). We will perform the first follow-up assessment at  
232 the end of the fourth post-intervention week, the second one at the end of the eighth post-  
233 intervention week and we will perform the last follow-up assessment at the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> post-  
234 intervention week (Fig 1).

## 235 **Data Acquisition of Outcome Measures**

### 236 **Primary Outcome Measures**

237 We will assess the corticospinal plasticity using single pulse TMS in the neurophysiology  
238 lab of the Cyprus Institute of Neurology and Genetics. Using electromyography (EMG) signals,  
239 we will analyse bilateral cortical excitability and bilateral central motor conduction time to  
240 determine corticospinal plasticity and therefore to test the primary hypothesis. The resting motor  
241 threshold and the MEP amplitude of Abductor Pollicis Brevis muscle will define cortical  
242 excitability, while we will use the MEP latency to calculate the central motor conduction time (see  
243 below). During all neurophysiological assessments, participants will be in a relaxed sitting position  
244 in a comfortable chair with feet touching the floor and both arms will be placed on cushioned  
245 armrests and with the head rested on a cushion. To ensure methodological consistency, we will  
246 collect all data by performing the same methodological procedures for both conditions (i.e.,  
247 cortical excitability and central motor conduction time) bilaterally (one side per assessment),  
248 across participants and across all time points.

249

250 **EMG recording**

251 During both TMS and peripheral stimulation, surface EMG of the Abductor Pollicis Brevis  
252 muscle will be collected. We will follow a standard skin preparation (64) and surface disk  
253 electrodes placement procedures by attaching the electrodes over the end plate region of the  
254 Abductor Pollicis Brevis muscle (65). Specifically, the anode (red colour) electrode will be placed  
255 distally, whereas the cathode (black colour) electrode proximally. A ground reference electrode  
256 will be attached on the lateral condyle of the elbow, of the corresponding upper limb. Additionally,  
257 all signals will be filtered with the help of the KeyPoint Net Software Electromyography using a  
258 bandwidth of 2 Hz–10 kHz, 1mV/D for the MEP sensitivity with a single-pulse stimulation  
259 frequency.

260 **Peripheral stimulation**

261 In addition to MEP latency, calculating the central motor conduction time requires two  
262 peripheral derived measures, the F wave (i.e., late muscle response) and the M wave (i.e., direct  
263 muscle response) (66,67). Therefore, we will initially deliver peripheral stimulation on the median  
264 nerve at the wrist, approximately in 8 cm distance from the cathode electrode (65), while collecting  
265 EMG from the Abductor Pollicis Brevis muscle (68) of the corresponding upper limb. In order to  
266 determine possible changes in central motor conduction time, we will analyse F and M wave (69).

267 **TMS assessment**

268 Following TMS recommended guidelines concerning safety and experimental conditions  
269 (70,71), we will assess bilateral cortical excitability and bilateral central motor conduction time.  
270 We will apply TMS single pulses (72) via figure-eight coil (C-B60; inner diameter: 35mm, outer  
271 diameter: 75mm), connected to the MagPro R20 (MagVenture User Guide, United Kingdom  
272 edition, MagVenture A/S, Denmark). The coil will be oriented tangentially over the contralateral

273 motor area of the brain, relative to the target muscle (i.e., Abductor Pollicis Brevis), with a  
274 posterolateral handle pointing in approximately 45 degrees angle to the sagittal plane, as a result  
275 to induce current in a posterior-anterior direction in the brain (73).

276 For the TMS procedures, we will first find the optimal stimulation site (i.e., hot-spot), next  
277 we will determine the resting motor threshold, and then apply a bout of single pulses using  
278 suprathreshold stimulation. To determine hot-spot (i.e., the spot in which the largest response of  
279 the target muscle is elicited), we will deliver single pulses at low intensities (e.g., ~20% maximum  
280 stimulator output) and gradually increase it by 5%, maximum stimulator output until we will reach  
281 the intensity that will elicit three consecutive MEPs with peak-to-peak amplitude greater than  
282 50mV (74,75). Then, we will mark the position of the coil on the skull with a water-resistant ink,  
283 so to determine the resting motor threshold of the target muscle. Resting motor threshold is the  
284 minimum stimulation intensity needed to produce MEPs of the target muscle, which is defined by  
285 the hot-spot. To identify the resting motor threshold of the Abductor Pollicis Brevis muscle, we  
286 will employ an adaptive threshold-hunting method, the Motor Threshold Assessment Tool (MTAT  
287 2.0) (76) (available at <http://clinicalresearcher.org/software.htm>). The specific method has the  
288 advantage of speed without losing accuracy when compared to the relative-frequency methods  
289 based on the Rossini–Rothwell, although both methods have similar precision (77). Then, to  
290 quantify the MEP-derived measures of interest (i.e., MEP amplitude, latency), we will apply 25  
291 suprathreshold stimuli (78) at 120% of the resting motor threshold (79).

292

## 293 **Secondary Outcome Measures**

294 The secondary outcome measures will include all the clinical assessments, which will be  
295 performed in the physiotherapy unit of the Cyprus Institute of Neurology and Genetics. An

296 experienced physiotherapist will perform all clinical assessment with exact the same  
297 methodological procedures.

298 **1. Mini Balance Evaluation Systems Test.** It measures dynamic balance, functional  
299 mobility, and gait in neurological patients, including people with RRMS (80). The specific test  
300 consists of 14 items, including four of the six segments (anticipatory postural adjustments, sensory  
301 orientation, reactive postural control and dynamic gait) from the Balance Evaluation Systems Test.  
302 The Mini Balance Evaluation Systems Test should be scored out of 28 points to include 14 items  
303 that are scored from zero to two.

304 **2. Six Spot Step Test.** It is a timed walking test that involves kicking over a number of  
305 targets placed along a 5m-path in which rely to some extent on vision and cognition (81). The Six  
306 Spot Step Test is measured in the time domain replicating a complex range of sensorimotor  
307 functions, part of which are lower limb strength, spasticity, coordination, as well as balance. We  
308 will perform the specific test as it is described by Nieuwenhuis et al (2006) (81) and we will record  
309 the mean time of the four runs as the final test result (82).

310 **3. Action Research Arm Test.** It is a 19-item observational measure used by  
311 physiotherapists and other health care professionals to examine upper limb performance (i.e.,  
312 coordination, dexterity and functioning) (83). Items covering the Action Research Arm Test are  
313 categorized into four subscales (grasp, grip, pinch and gross movement) and arranged in order of  
314 decreasing difficulty, with the most difficult task examined first, followed by the least difficult  
315 task. The patient is sitting comfortable in front of a stable desk performing each task and the  
316 performance is rated on a four-point scale, ranging from 0 (no movement) to 3 (movement  
317 performed normally). We will record the total score for each upper limb separately as the final test  
318 result.

319           **4. Isometric Dynamometer.** We will assess the isometric muscle force of major muscle  
320 groups with the use of the muscle controller (Kinvent Biomechanique, Montpellier, France) which  
321 is a dynamometer used in the evaluation and rehabilitation of muscle strength that provides real  
322 time biofeedback (84). The patient lies (supine or prone) on a therapeutic bed and the  
323 physiotherapist, with the use of the muscle controller, holds against the patient's limb as the patient  
324 exerts a maximal force. The physiotherapist counters the force (make test) or tries to break the  
325 contraction (break test) and the data will be stored using the KFORCE APP (Kinvent  
326 Biomechanique, Montpellier, France). Shoulder flexors, extensors, rotators, horizontal adductors  
327 and abductors adductors and abductors, elbow flexors and extensors are the major muscle groups  
328 which will be evaluated. A separate value for each muscle group will be recorded in order to be  
329 used in the visual and statistical analysis.

330           **5. Symbol Digit Modalities Test.** We will employ the oral form which assesses the  
331 information processing speed (85). During the test, the participant will be given two minutes to  
332 orally match symbols with digits as quickly as possible. The key (specifying which symbols are  
333 assigned to which numbers) will be located at the top of a computer screen. The researcher will  
334 instruct the participants that each symbol is paired with a digit. Next, the participant will be  
335 instructed to perform the test by responding orally to each symbol. For example, the symbol “O”  
336 is matched with the number 6, so the correct response would be to say “six”. The researcher  
337 responsible for clinical assessments will record the participant’s responses directly on a computer  
338 screen. The score is obtained by subtracting the number of errors from the number of items  
339 completed in two minutes.

340           **6. Modified Fatigue Impact Scale.** It is a short questionnaire which requires the  
341 participants to describe the effects of fatigue during the past four weeks (55) (S1. Appendix 1).

342 The Modified Fatigue Impact Scale consists of 21 questions which are subjectively rated from “0”  
343 (low rate) to “4” (high rate) and it is also divided into three subscales (i.e., physical, cognitive, and  
344 psychosocial). We will record the total score of the test as the final test result. The higher the score  
345 is, the greater is the impact of fatigue in individual daily life. Although, to describe fatigue level  
346 the Fatigue Severity Scale is more commonly used, we decided not use it because it describes  
347 severe fatigue. Therefore, we will use the Modified Fatigue Impact Scale as the description of  
348 participants` attribution of functional restrictions to fatigue symptoms.

349

## 350 **Analysis plan**

351 To investigate possible effects of our protocol we will follow recommended guidelines  
352 (54), in which we will perform a separate analysis for each of the outcome measures, in all  
353 experimental phases (i.e., baseline, intervention and follow up). We will perform a visual analysis  
354 first, in order to determine whether there is a functional relationship between the intervention and  
355 the outcome measures, and secondly, we will perform a quantitative analysis methods to evaluate  
356 the magnitude of the intervention effect, provided there is evidence from the visual analysis (54).  
357 We will perform all neurophysiological and clinical assessments to each participant according to  
358 the number of data points during each phase (i.e., baseline, intervention, follow up) (Fig 1).

### 359 **TMS measures analysis**

360 Corticospinal plasticity will be determined through changes of the corticospinal excitability  
361 and the central motor conduction time. Hence, we will quantify bilateral resting motor threshold,  
362 MEP amplitude and latency, because each measure can assess different plastic changes across the  
363 neuromotor axis and they can be used as a proxy of corticospinal plasticity. Resting motor

364 threshold (% maximum stimulator output) states the general excitability of the neuromotor axis in  
365 the target muscle, amplitude (mV) expresses transynaptic activation of corticospinal neurons (86),  
366 while latency (ms) is the time between the TMS onset and the MEP onset, which refers to the  
367 integrity of the white matter fibers (87).

368 For both upper limbs, all neurophysiological measures (i.e., resting motor threshold, MEP  
369 amplitude, latency) will be first calculated from each MEP trace and then averaged to get a single  
370 value. These calculations will be done according to the different time points for each participant  
371 in the baseline phase, at five time points in the intervention phase and at three time points in the  
372 follow-up phase (Fig 1). In order to investigate possible changes in cortical excitability, we will  
373 measure resting motor threshold and peak-to-peak amplitude throughout assessing MEPs (88) of  
374 the Abductor Pollicis Brevis muscle, while measuring of latency will indicate possible changes in  
375 central motor conduction time. Any changes in all measures across time points, will indicate  
376 alterations in corticospinal plasticity (89). We will evaluate resting motor threshold using MTAT  
377 2.0 (76) (available at <http://clinicalresearcher.org/software.htm>) and to investigate possible  
378 changes in individual corticospinal plasticity of each participant, we will calculate bilaterally the  
379 difference between the mean values of each phase (73,90). On the other hand, from each stimulus  
380 response during the suprathreshold stimulation (i.e., 120% of resting motor threshold) (89), we  
381 will calculate offline the MEP peak-to-peak amplitude and latency. To define central motor  
382 conduction time (ms), we will subtract the peripheral conduction time ((F wave latency + M wave  
383 latency – 1)/2) from the central conduction time (MEP latency). The F wave is the muscle response  
384 elicited by activation of the alpha motor neuron, while the M wave is the direct response of the  
385 muscle (66). A prolonged central motor conduction time indicates damage of large fibres,  
386 demyelination of central motor pathways or slow summation of descending excitatory potentials

387 in the corticospinal tract evoked by TMS (66,69). To standardise all latencies (i.e., MEP, F and M  
388 wave), we will use a visual inspection from stimulation onset to response onset, performed from  
389 the same investigator so to ensure reliability of the study across all time points. To define possible  
390 changes in central motor conduction time, we will evaluate bilaterally the difference between the  
391 mean values of each phase.

### 392 **Clinical measures analysis**

393 For each clinical measure (i.e., balance, gait, cognitive function, bilateral hand dexterity  
394 and strength) and for the Modified Impact Scale we will calculate the values from each time point  
395 across all phases (i.e., baseline, intervention, follow-up) and then we will evaluate the average of  
396 them, so to get a single mean value for each measure and for each phase (mean baseline; mean  
397 intervention mean follow-up). To investigate the association between the intervention protocol and  
398 clinical condition, we will calculate the differences between phases' mean values (i.e., mean  
399 baseline; mean intervention; mean follow up), reflecting to the degree of change in clinical  
400 condition following in-phase bilateral exercises.

401

### 402 **Visual analysis**

403 Two assessors will systematically measure each outcome measure across time, inter-  
404 assessor agreement will be calculated on at least twenty percent of the data points in each  
405 condition. The minimum acceptable inter-assessor agreement will be set to 0.8 (56).

406 Initially, a visual analysis will be conducted and presented graphically in a spaghetti plot,  
407 in order to define whether there is a functional relation between the intervention and the outcome  
408 measures (54). During the visual analysis, six features of the research design graphed data will be  
409 examined: level, trend, stability, immediacy of the effect, overlap, and consistency. Over the

410 within-phase examination an evaluation of level, trend and stability will be examined. Level will  
411 be reported from the mean score of each dependent variable and trend will determine whether the  
412 data points are monotonically decreased or increased. Stability will be estimated based on the  
413 percentage of data points falling within 15% of the phase median, if this is higher than 80% then  
414 we assume that this criterion is met. Additionally, over the between-phase examination an  
415 evaluation of overlapping data among baseline and intervention phases, consistency of data  
416 patterns and immediacy of effect will be performed (54). The Percentage of Non-overlapping Data  
417 index will be used to quantify the proportion of data points in the intervention phase that do not  
418 overlap with the baseline phase (91) and the test statistic will be calculated using the Improvement  
419 Rate Difference as an effect size index. Immediacy of the effect will be examined by comparing  
420 changes in level between the last three data points of one phase and the three first data points of  
421 the next phase. Furthermore, consistency of data patterns involves the observation of the data from  
422 all phases within the same condition, with greater consistency expressing greater causal relation.  
423 Each feature will be assessed individually and collectively across to all participants and to all  
424 phases. Consequently, if the intervention protocol is the sole determinant of improvement, we  
425 expect to find indicators of improvement only at the intervention phase.

426

## 427 **Statistical analysis**

428 For each of the outcome variables that the visual analysis indicates a potential functional  
429 effect, a quantitative analysis will be performed to estimate the effect size. This analysis will be  
430 performed for each variable at which a significant trend is shown as described in the previous  
431 section. In order to estimate the individual-level effect sizes, we will use three different methods,  
432 as suggested by ‘What Works Clearinghouse’ (56), the standardized mean difference (Cohen’s d),

433 the standardized mean difference with correction for small sample sizes (Hedges'  $g$ ) and piecewise  
434 regression analysis which does not only reflect the immediate intervention effect, but also the  
435 intervention effect across time. Multilevel modelling, which is recommended by the 'What Works  
436 Clearinghouse' and the single case educational design, specific mean difference index will be used  
437 to estimate the magnitude of the effect across cases and compared to the effect obtained by the  
438 single level estimates (54).

439 For all the different neurophysiological parameters and clinical conditions, evaluated  
440 separately, the null hypothesis is that "there is no improvement from the proposed intervention",  
441 thus participants' responses are independent from the condition (baseline versus intervention)  
442 under which they were observed. The alternative hypothesis is that "the neurophysiological  
443 parameters and /or the clinical condition of the participants will be affected by the specific  
444 intervention", again assessed separately. We will reject the null hypothesis if the  $p$  value is smaller  
445 than 0.05. All tests will be two sided. Statistical analysis will be performed using the statistical  
446 software R (<https://www.r-project.org/>).

447

## 448 **References**

449

- 450 1. Lublin FD, Reingold SC. Defining the clinical course of multiple sclerosis: Results of an  
451 international survey. *Neurology*. 1996;46(4):907–11.
- 452 2. Moghaddam VK, Dickerson AS, Bazrafshan E, Seyedhasani SN. Socioeconomic  
453 determinants of global distribution of multiple sclerosis : an ecological investigation based  
454 on Global Burden of Disease data. 2021;1–11.
- 455 3. Walton C, King R, Rechtman L, Kaye W, Leray E, Marrie RA, et al. Rising prevalence of

- 456 multiple sclerosis worldwide : Insights from the Atlas of MS , third edition. :1–6.
- 457 4. Lunde HMB, Assmus J, Myhr KM, Bø L, Grytten N. Survival and cause of death in  
458 multiple sclerosis: A 60-year longitudinal population study. *J Neurol Neurosurg*  
459 *Psychiatry*. 2017;88(8):621–5.
- 460 5. Scalfari A, Knappertz V, Cutter G, Goodin DS, Ashton R, Ebers GC. Mortality in patients  
461 with multiple sclerosis. *Neurology*. 2013;81(2):184–92.
- 462 6. Kingwell E, Zhu F, Evans C, Duggan T, Oger J, Tremlett H. Causes that Contribute to the  
463 Excess Mortality Risk in Multiple Sclerosis: A Population-Based Study.  
464 *Neuroepidemiology*. 2020;54(2):131–9.
- 465 7. Dobson R, Giovannoni G. Multiple sclerosis – a review. *Eur J Neurol*. 2019;26(1):27–40.
- 466 8. Paz-Zulueta M, Parás-Bravo P, Cantarero-Prieto D, Blázquez-Fernández C, Oterino-  
467 Durán A. A literature review of cost-of-illness studies on the economic burden of multiple  
468 sclerosis. *Mult Scler Relat Disord* [Internet]. 2020;43(April):102162. Available from:  
469 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.msard.2020.102162>
- 470 9. Maguire R, Maguire P. Caregiver Burden in Multiple Sclerosis: Recent Trends and Future  
471 Directions. *Curr Neurol Neurosci Rep*. 2020;20(7).
- 472 10. Kouzoupis AB, Paparrigopoulos T, Soldatos M, Papadimitriou GN. The family of the  
473 multiple sclerosis patient: A psychosocial perspective. *Int Rev Psychiatry*. 2010;22(1):83–  
474 9.
- 475 11. Lublin FD, Reingold SC, Cohen JA, Cutter GR, Sørensen PS, Thompson AJ, et al.  
476 Defining the clinical course of multiple sclerosis: The 2013 revisions. *Neurology*.  
477 2014;83(3):278–86.
- 478 12. Lublin FD, Coetzee T, Cohen JA, Marrie RA, Thompson AJ. The 2013 clinical course

- 479 descriptors for multiple sclerosis: A clarification. *Neurology*. 2020;94(24):1088–92.
- 480 13. Kister I, Bacon TE, Chamot E, Salter AR, Cutter GR, Kalina JT, et al. Multiple Sclerosis  
481 Symptoms. 2013;(June 2011):146–57.
- 482 14. Norbye AD, Midgard R, Thrane G. Spasticity, gait, and balance in patients with multiple  
483 sclerosis: A cross-sectional study. *Physiother Res Int*. 2020;25(1):1–9.
- 484 15. Benedict RHB, Amato MP, Deluca J, Geurts JJG. Cognitive impairment in multiple  
485 sclerosis : clinical management , MRI , and therapeutic avenues. *Lancet Neurol* [Internet].  
486 2020;19(10):860–71. Available from: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422\(20\)30277-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(20)30277-5)
- 487 16. Frndak SE, Kordovski VM, Cookfair D, Rodgers JD, Weinstock-Guttman B, Benedict  
488 RHB. Disclosure of disease status among employed multiple sclerosis patients:  
489 Association with negative work events and accommodations. *Mult Scler J*.  
490 2015;21(2):225–34.
- 491 17. Strober L, Chiaravalloti N, Moore N, Deluca J. Unemployment in multiple sclerosis (MS):  
492 Utility of the MS Functional Composite and cognitive testing. *Mult Scler*.  
493 2014;20(1):112–5.
- 494 18. Fortune J, Norris M, Stennett A, Kilbride C, Lavelle G, Hendrie W, et al. Patterns and  
495 correlates of sedentary behaviour among people with multiple sclerosis: a cross-sectional  
496 study. *Sci Rep* [Internet]. 2021;11(1):1–10. Available from:  
497 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-99631-z>
- 498 19. Lipp I, Tomassini V. Neuroplasticity and motor rehabilitation in multiple sclerosis.  
499 2015;6(March):1–3.
- 500 20. Flachenecker P. Clinical implications of neuroplasticity - the role of rehabilitation in  
501 multiple sclerosis. *Front Neurol*. 2015;6(MAR):1–4.

- 502 21. Tomassini V, Matthews PM, Thompson AJ, Fuglø D, Geurts JJ, Johansen-berg H, et al.  
503 Neuroplasticity and functional recovery in multiple sclerosis. *Nat Publ Gr* [Internet].  
504 2012;8(11):635–46. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nrneurol.2012.179>
- 505 22. Tavazzi E, Cazzoli M, Pirastru A, Blasi V, Rovaris M, Bergsland N, et al. Neuroplasticity  
506 and Motor Rehabilitation in Multiple Sclerosis : A Systematic Review on MRI Markers of  
507 Functional and Structural Changes. 2021;15(October).
- 508 23. Pawlitzki M, Neumann J, Heidel J, Stadler E, Sweeney-reed C, Sailer M. Loss of  
509 corticospinal tract integrity in early MS disease stages. 2017;0.
- 510 24. Fritz NE, Keller J, Calabresi PA, Zackowski KM. *NeuroImage : Clinical Quantitative*  
511 *measures of walking and strength provide insight into brain corticospinal tract pathology*  
512 *in multiple sclerosis. NeuroImage Clin* [Internet]. 2017;14:490–8. Available from:  
513 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2017.02.006>
- 514 25. Bergsland N, Laganà MM, Tavazzi E, Caffini M, Tortorella P, Baglio F, et al.  
515 Corticospinal tract integrity is related to primary motor cortex thinning in relapsing-  
516 remitting multiple sclerosis. *Mult Scler*. 2015;21(14):1771–80.
- 517 26. Lemon RN. Descending pathways in motor control. *Annu Rev Neurosci*.  
518 2008;31(Cm):195–218.
- 519 27. Warraich Z, Kleim JA. Neural plasticity: The biological substrate for neurorehabilitation.  
520 *PM R* [Internet]. 2010;2(12 SUPPL):S208–19. Available from:  
521 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pmrj.2010.10.016>
- 522 28. Mori F, Kusayanagi H, Nicoletti CG, Weiss S, Marciani MG, Centonze D. Cortical  
523 plasticity predicts recovery from relapse in multiple sclerosis. *Mult Scler J*.  
524 2014;20(4):451–7.

- 525 29. Mori F, Rossi S, Piccinin S, Motta C, Mango D, Kusayanagi H, et al. Synaptic plasticity  
526 and PDGF signaling defects underlie clinical progression in multiple sclerosis. *J Neurosci*.  
527 2013;33(49):19112–9.
- 528 30. Pascual-Leone a, Tarazona F, Keenan J, Tormos JM, Hamilton R, Catala MD.  
529 Transcranial magnetic stimulation and neuroplasticity. *Neuropsychologia* [Internet].  
530 1999;37(2):207–17. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10080378>
- 531 31. Neva JL, Lakhani B, Brown KE, Wadden KP, Mang CS, Ledwell NHM, et al. Multiple  
532 measures of corticospinal excitability are associated with clinical features of multiple  
533 sclerosis. *Behav Brain Res* [Internet]. 2016;297:187–95. Available from:  
534 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2015.10.015>
- 535 32. Bestmann S, Krakauer JW. The uses and interpretations of the motor - evoked potential  
536 for understanding behaviour. 2015;679–89.
- 537 33. Udupa K, Chen R. Central motor conduction time [Internet]. 1st ed. Vol. 116, Handbook  
538 of Exploration and Environmental Geochemistry. Elsevier B.V.; 2013. 375–386 p.  
539 Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-53497-2.00031-0>
- 540 34. Zeller D, Classen J. Plasticity of the motor system in multiple sclerosis. *Neuroscience*  
541 [Internet]. 2014;283(June):222–30. Available from:  
542 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2014.05.043>
- 543 35. Zentgraf K, Helm F. Brain Changes in Response to Exercise - Methodologies for  
544 Identifying the Physiological Effects of Physical Exercise. 2020;II:815–31.
- 545 36. Prosperini L, Filippo M Di. Beyond clinical changes: Rehabilitation-induced  
546 neuroplasticity in MS. *Mult Scler J*. 2019;25(10):1348–62.
- 547 37. Moucha R, ã MPK. Cortical plasticity and rehabilitation. 2006;

- 548 38. Diechmann MD, Campbell E, Coulter E, Paul L, Dalgas U, Hvid LG. Effects of exercise  
549 training on neurotrophic factors and subsequent neuroprotection in persons with multiple  
550 sclerosis—a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Brain Sci.* 2021;11(11).
- 551 39. Sandroff BM, Jones CD, Baird JF, Motl RW. Systematic Review on Exercise Training as  
552 a Neuroplasticity-Inducing Behavior in Multiple Sclerosis. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.*  
553 2020;34(7):575–88.
- 554 40. Learmonth YC, Motl RW. Exercise Training for Multiple Sclerosis : A Narrative Review  
555 of History , Benefits , Safety , Guidelines , and Promotion. 2021;
- 556 41. Sun Y, Zehr EP. Training-induced neural plasticity and strength are amplified after stroke.  
557 *Exerc Sport Sci Rev.* 2019;47(4):223–9.
- 558 42. Garry MI, van Steenis RE, Summers JJ. Interlimb coordination following stroke. *Hum*  
559 *Mov Sci.* 2005;24(5–6):849–64.
- 560 43. Whittall J, McCombe Waller S, Sorkin JD, Forrester LW, Macko RF, Hanley DF, et al.  
561 Bilateral and unilateral arm training improve motor function through differing  
562 neuroplastic mechanisms: A single-blinded randomized controlled trial. *Neurorehabil*  
563 *Neural Repair.* 2011;25(2):118–29.
- 564 44. Smith AL, Richard Staines W. Cortical and behavioral adaptations in response to short-  
565 term inphase versus antiphase bimanual movement training. *Exp Brain Res.*  
566 2010;205(4):465–77.
- 567 45. Neva JL, Legon W, Staines WR. Primary motor cortex excitability is modulated with  
568 bimanual training. *Neurosci Lett [Internet].* 2012;514(2):147–51. Available from:  
569 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2012.02.075>
- 570 46. Stinear JW, Byblow WD. Disinhibition in the human motor cortex is enhanced by

- 571 synchronous upper limb movements. *J Physiol*. 2002;543(1):307–16.
- 572 47. Liepert J, Mingers D, Heesen C, Bäumer T, Weiller C. Motor cortex excitability and  
573 fatigue in multiple sclerosis: A transcranial magnetic stimulation study. *Mult Scler*.  
574 2005;11(3):316–21.
- 575 48. Toyokura M, Muro I, Komiya T, Obara M. Activation of pre-supplementary motor area  
576 (SMA) and SMA proper during unimanual and bimanual complex sequences: An analysis  
577 using functional magnetic resonance imaging. *J Neuroimaging*. 2002;12(2):172–8.
- 578 49. Staines WR, McIlroy WE, Graham SJ, Black SE. Bilateral movement enhances  
579 ipsilesional cortical activity in acute stroke: A pilot functional MRI study [4] (multiple  
580 letters). *Neurology*. 2001;57(9):1740–1.
- 581 50. Reina-Gutiérrez S, Cavero-Redondo I, Martínez-Vizcaíno V, Núñez de Arenas-Arroyo S,  
582 López-Muñoz P, Álvarez-Bueno C, et al. The type of exercise most beneficial for quality  
583 of life in people with multiple sclerosis: A network meta-analysis. *Ann Phys Rehabil Med*.  
584 2022;65(3).
- 585 51. Akbar N, Sandroff BM, Wylie GR, Strober LB, Smith A, Goverover Y, et al. Progressive  
586 resistance exercise training and changes in resting-state functional connectivity of the  
587 caudate in persons with multiple sclerosis and severe fatigue: A proof-of-concept study.  
588 *Neuropsychol Rehabil* [Internet]. 2020;30(1):54–66. Available from:  
589 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09602011.2018.1449758>
- 590 52. Proschinger S, Kuhwand P, Rademacher A, Walzik D, Warnke C, Zimmer P, et al. Fitness  
591 , physical activity , and exercise in multiple sclerosis : a systematic review on current  
592 evidence for interactions with disease activity and progression. *J Neurol* [Internet].  
593 2022;(January). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00415-021-10935-6>

- 594 53. Calabrese M, Filippi M, Gallo P. Cortical lesions in multiple sclerosis. *Nat Rev Neurol*  
595 [Internet]. 2010;6(8):438–44. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nrneurol.2010.93>
- 596 54. Lobo MA, Moeyaert M, Cunha AB, Babik I. Single-case design, analysis, and quality  
597 assessment for intervention research. *J Neurol Phys Ther*. 2017;41(3):187–97.
- 598 55. Fisk JD, Ritvo PG, Ross L, Haase DA, Marrie TJ, Schlech WF. Measuring the functional  
599 impact of fatigue: Initial validation of the fatigue impact scale. *Clin Infect Dis*.  
600 1994;18:S79–83.
- 601 56. Kratochwill, T. R. Hitchcock, J. Horner, R. H. Levin, J. R. Odom, S. L. Rindskopf, D. M  
602 Shadish WR. Single-Case Design Technical Documentation. Work Clear website  
603 [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/wwc\\_scd.pdf](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/wwc_scd.pdf). 2010;(December):2010.
- 604 57. Zhan S, Ottenbacher KJ. Single subject research designs for disability research. *Disabil*  
605 *Rehabil*. 2001;23(1):1–8.
- 606 58. Kurtzke JF, Kurtzke JF. Rating neurologic impairment in multiple sclerosis : An expanded  
607 disability status scale ( EDSS ). 1983;
- 608 59. Folstein MF, Folstein SE, McHugh PR. “Mini-mental state”. A practical method for  
609 grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *J Psychiatr Res*. 1975;12(3):189–  
610 98.
- 611 60. Meseguer-Henarejos AB, SÁNCHEZ-MECA J, López-Pina JA, CARLES-HERNÁNDEZ  
612 R. Inter-and intra-rater reliability of the Modified Ashworth Scale: A systematic review  
613 and meta-analysis. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med*. 2018;54(4):576–90.
- 614 61. Kalb R, Brown TR, Coote S, Costello K, Dalgas U, Garmon E, et al. Exercise and lifestyle  
615 physical activity recommendations for people with multiple sclerosis throughout the  
616 disease course. *Mult Scler J*. 2020;26(12):1459–69.

- 617 62. Adler SS, Beckers D, Buck M. PNF in Practice. PNF Pract. 2000;
- 618 63. Abbaspoor E, Zolfaghari M, Ahmadi B, Khodaei K. The effect of combined functional  
619 training on BDNF, IGF-1, and their association with health-related fitness in the multiple  
620 sclerosis women. Growth Horm IGF Res [Internet]. 2020;52(March):101320. Available  
621 from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ghir.2020.101320>
- 622 64. Hermens HJ, Freriks B, Hermens HJ, Freriks B. Future Applications of Surface  
623 ElectroMyoGraphy. 1999;(September):4–5.
- 624 65. Hidasi E, Diószeghy P, Csépany T, Mechler F, Bereczki D. Peripheral nerves are  
625 progressively involved in multiple sclerosis - A hypothesis from a pilot study of  
626 temperature sensitized electroneurographic screening. Med Hypotheses [Internet].  
627 2009;72(5):562–6. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mehy.2008.07.066>
- 628 66. Hallett M. Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation: A Primer. Neuron. 2007;55(2):187–99.
- 629 67. McNeil CJ, Butler JE, Taylor JL, Gandevia SC. Testing the excitability of human  
630 motoneurons. Front Hum Neurosci. 2013;7(APR 2013):1–9.
- 631 68. Fisher MA. F-waves - Physiology and clinical uses. ScientificWorldJournal. 2007;7:144–  
632 60.
- 633 69. Zimnowodzki S, Butrum M, Kimura J, Stålberg E, Mahajan S, Gao L. Emergence of F-  
634 waves after repetitive nerve stimulation. Clin Neurophysiol Pract [Internet]. 2020;5:100–  
635 3. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cnp.2020.04.002>
- 636 70. Groppa S, Oliviero A, Eisen A, Quartarone A, Cohen LG, Mall V, et al. A practical guide  
637 to diagnostic transcranial magnetic stimulation: Report of an IFCN committee. Clin  
638 Neurophysiol [Internet]. 2012;123(5):858–82. Available from:  
639 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2012.01.010>

- 640 71. Rossini PM, Burke D, Chen R, Cohen LG, Daskalakis Z, Di Iorio R, et al. Non-invasive  
641 electrical and magnetic stimulation of the brain, spinal cord, roots and peripheral nerves:  
642 Basic principles and procedures for routine clinical and research application: An updated  
643 report from an I.F.C.N. Committee. Clin Neurophysiol [Internet]. 2015;126(6):1071–107.  
644 Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2015.02.001>
- 645 72. Pascual-Leone A, Dang N, Cohen LG, Brasil-Neto JP, Cammarota A, Hallett M.  
646 Modulation of muscle responses evoked by transcranial magnetic stimulation during the  
647 acquisition of new fine motor skills. J Neurophysiol. 1995;74(3):1037–45.
- 648 73. Balloff C, Penner I-K, Ma M, Georgiades I, Scala L, Troullinakis N, et al. The degree of  
649 cortical plasticity correlates with cognitive performance in patients with Multiple  
650 Sclerosis. Brain Stimul [Internet]. 2022;15(2):403–13. Available from:  
651 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2022.02.007>
- 652 74. Charalambous CC, Dean JC, Adkins DAL, Hanlon CA, Bowden MG. Characterizing the  
653 corticomotor connectivity of the bilateral ankle muscles during rest and isometric  
654 contraction in healthy adults. J Electromyogr Kinesiol [Internet]. 2018;41(February):9–18.  
655 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelekin.2018.04.009>
- 656 75. Rossini PM, Barker AT, Berardelli A, Caramia MD, Caruso G, Cracco RQ, et al. Non-  
657 invasive electrical and magnetic stimulation of the brain, spinal cord, roots and peripheral  
658 nerves: Basic principles and procedures for routine clinical and research application: An  
659 updated report from an I.F.C.N. Committee. Clin Neurophysiol. 1994;91(2):79–92.
- 660 76. Awiszus F. TMS and threshold hunting [Internet]. Vol. 56. Elsevier B.V.; 2003. 13–23 p.  
661 Available from: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1567-424X\(09\)70205-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1567-424X(09)70205-3)
- 662 77. Silbert BI, Patterson HI, Pevcic DD, Windnagel KA, Thickbroom GW. Clinical

- 663 Neurophysiology A comparison of relative-frequency and threshold-hunting methods to  
664 determine stimulus intensity in transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Clin Neurophysiol*  
665 [Internet]. 2013;124(4):708–12. Available from:  
666 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2012.09.018>
- 667 78. Goldsworthy MR, Hordacre B, Ridding MC. Minimum number of trials required for  
668 within- and between-session reliability of TMS measures of corticospinal excitability.  
669 *Neuroscience* [Internet]. 2016;320:205–9. Available from:  
670 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2016.02.012>
- 671 79. Snow NJ, Wadden KP, Chaves AR, Ploughman M. Review Article Transcranial Magnetic  
672 Stimulation as a Potential Biomarker in Multiple Sclerosis : A Systematic Review with  
673 Recommendations for Future Research. 2019;2019.
- 674 80. Franchignoni F, Horak F, Godi M, Nardone A, Giordano A. Using psychometric  
675 techniques to improve the balance evaluation systems test: The mini-bestest. *J Rehabil*  
676 *Med*. 2010;42(4):323–31.
- 677 81. Nieuwenhuis MM, Tongeren H Van, Sørensen PS, Ravnborg M. The Six Spot Step Test :  
678 a new measurement for walking ability in multiple sclerosis. 2006;(September 2005).
- 679 82. Callesen J, Richter C, Kristensen C, Sunesen I, Næsby M, Dalgas U, et al. Test–retest  
680 agreement and reliability of the Six Spot Step Test in persons with multiple sclerosis. *Mult*  
681 *Scler J*. 2019;25(2):286–94.
- 682 83. Carpinella I, Cattaneo D, Ferrarin M. Quantitative assessment of upper limb motor  
683 function in Multiple Sclerosis using an instrumented Action Research Arm Test. *J*  
684 *Neuroeng Rehabil*. 2014;11(1):1–16.
- 685 84. Andrews AW, Thomas MW, Bohannon RW. Normative values for isometric muscle force

- 686 measurements obtained with hand-held dynamometers. *Phys Ther.* 1996;76(3):248–59.
- 687 85. Benedict RHB, Deluca J, Phillips G, LaRocca N, Hudson LD, Rudick R. Validity of the  
688 Symbol Digit Modalities Test as a cognition performance outcome measure for multiple  
689 sclerosis. *Mult Scler.* 2017;23(5):721–33.
- 690 86. Ziemann U, Reis J, Schwenkreis P, Rosanova M, Strafella A, Badawy R, et al. TMS and  
691 drugs revisited 2014. *Clin Neurophysiol [Internet].* 2015;126(10):1847–68. Available  
692 from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2014.08.028>
- 693 87. Hess CW, Mills KR, Murray NM. Responses in small hand muscles from magnetic  
694 stimulation of the human brain. *J Physiol.* 1987;388(1):397–419.
- 695 88. Vanteemar S, Sreeraj S, Uvais<sup>2</sup> NA, Mohanty<sup>3</sup> S, Kumar<sup>3</sup> S, Department. Indian nursing  
696 students' attitudes toward mental illness and persons with mental illness. *Ind Psychiatry J.*  
697 2019;195–201.
- 698 89. Paulus W, Peterchev A V., Ridding M. Transcranial electric and magnetic stimulation:  
699 Technique and paradigms. *Handb Clin Neurol.* 2013;116(0):329–42.
- 700 90. Stampanoni Bassi M, Buttari F, Maffei P, De Paolis N, Sancesario A, Gilio L, et al.  
701 Practice-dependent motor cortex plasticity is reduced in non-disabled multiple sclerosis  
702 patients. *Clin Neurophysiol [Internet].* 2020;131(2):566–73. Available from:  
703 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2019.10.023>
- 704 91. Heyvaert M, Onghena P. Analysis of single-case data: Randomisation tests for measures  
705 of effect size. *Neuropsychol Rehabil.* 2014;24(3–4):507–27.

706

707

708

709            **Supporting Information**

710    **S1. Appendix 1. Modified Fatigue Impact Scale.**

711    **S2. Appendix 2. SPIRIT checklist**

712    **S3. Appendix 3. Study protocol**

	BASELINE			INTERVENTION														FOLLOW-UP													
Participant A	c n f	c n f	c n f			c n f	n f				c n f				c n f				c n f												
Participant B	c n f	c n f	c n f	c n f			c n f	n f				c n f				c n f				c n f											
Participant C	c n f	c n f	c n f	c n f	c n f			c n f	n f				c n f				c n f				c n f										
Participant D	c n f	c n f	c n f	c n f	c n f	c n f			c n f	n f				c n f				c n f				c n f									
Participant E	c n f	c n f	c n f	c n f	c n f	c n f	c n f			c n f	n f				c n f				c n f				c n f								
Weeks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31

Figure