Stroke recovery related changes in brain reactivity based on modulation of intracortical inhibition

Andéol Cadic-Melchior[1,2,*]; Sylvain Harquel[1,2,*], Takuya Morishita[1,2]; Lisa Fleury[1,2]; Adrien Witon[1,2,3], Martino Ceroni[1,2]; Julia Brügger[1,2], Nathalie Meyer[4]; Giorgia G. Evangelista[1,2]; Philip Egger[1,2]; Elena Beanato[1,2], Pauline Menoud[1,2], Dimitri Van de Ville[5,6], Silvestro Micera[7,8], Olaf Blanke[3,9], Bertrand Léger[10]; Jan Adolphsen[11]; Caroline Jagella[12]; Christophe Constantin[13]; Vincent Alvarez[13]; Philippe Vuadens[10]; Joseph-André Ghika[13]; Jean-Luc Turlan[10]; Andreas Mühl[10]; Diego San Millán[13]; Christophe Bonvin[13];Philipp J. Koch[1,2,14]; Maximilian J. Wessel[1,2,15]; and Friedhelm C. Hummel[1,2,16]

[*]Both authors contributed equally

[1] Defitech Chair of Clinical Neuroengineering, Neuro-X Institute (INX) and Brain Mind Institute (BMI), École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), 1202 Geneva, Switzerland
[2] Defitech Chair of Clinical Neuroengineering, INX and BMI, EPFL Valais, Clinique Romande de Réadaptation, 1950 Sion, Switzerland
[3] Health-IT, Centre de Service, Hôpital du Valais, 1950 Sion, Switzerland
[4] Laboratory of Cognitive Neuroscience, INX and BMI, EPFL, 1202 Geneva, Switzerland
[5] Medical Image Processing Laboratory, Institute of Bioengineering, EPFL, 1202 Geneva, Switzerland
[6] Department of Radiology and Medical Informatics, University of Geneva (UNIGE), 1205 Geneva, Switzerland
[7] The Biorobotics Institute and Department of Excellence in Robotics & AI, Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna, Pisa, Italy
[8] Bertarelli Foundation Chair in Translational Neuroengineering, Centre for Neuroprosthetics and Institute of Bioengineering, School of Engineering, Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne
[9] Department of Neurology, Geneva University Hospital (HUG), 1205 Geneva, Switzerland
[10] Clinique Romande de Réadaptation, 1950 Sion, Switzerland
[11] Mediclin Reha-Zentrum Plau am See, 19395 Plau am See, Germany
[12] Berner Klinik Montana, 3963 Crans-Montana, Switzerland
[13] Department of Neurology, Hôpital du Valais, 1950 Sion, Switzerland
[14] Department of Neurology, University of Lübeck, Lübeck, Germany
[15] Department of Neurology, Julius-Maximilians-University Würzburg, Würzburg, Germany
[16] Clinical Neuroscience, Geneva University Hospital, Geneva, Switzerland

Correspondence:
Prof. Dr. Friedhelm C. Hummel
Defitech Chair of Clinical Neuroengineering
Neuro-X Institute (INX) and Brain Mind Institute (BMI)
Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne
9 Chemin des Mines, 1202 Geneva, Switzerland
and
EPFL Valais, Clinique Romande de Réadaptation
Av. Grand-Champsec 90,
CH-1951 Sion
Email: friedhelm.hummel@epfl.ch
Telephone: +41 21 69 35 440

Abstract

The neuronal processes sustaining motor recovery after stroke are still largely unknown. Cortical excitation/inhibition dynamics have been suggested previously as a key mechanism occurring after a stroke. Their supportive or maladaptive role immediately after a stroke and during the process of recovery are still not completely understood; it is hypothesized that similar mechanisms (e.g., disinhibition) might yield differential functional roles depending on the stage after the stroke (e.g., acute vs. subacute vs. chronic) and the degree of deficit. Here, we used TMS-EEG to study brain reactivity, motor cortical excitability as well as intracortical inhibition and their impact on residual motor function and recovery longitudinally in a large cohort of stroke patients.

EEG responses evoked by TMS applied to the ipsilesional motor cortex (iMC) were acquired in 66 stroke patients in the acute (1-week), sub-acute (3-weeks) and chronic stage (3-months). Readouts of ipsilesional cortical reactivity, excitability and intracortical inhibition were drawn from TMS-evoked potentials and derived metrics. Residual function of the upper limb was quantified through a detailed motor evaluation.

A large proportion of patients, especially the most affected ones, exhibited large, simple TMS-evoked neuronal responses. Bayesian correlations revealed a link between higher excitability in iMC in the acute and stronger reduction of impairment determined by the upper extremity Fugl-Meyer (FM-UE) score in the early chronic stage. Furthermore, a decrease of this abnormally large response in the following months was related to better motor recovery. When investigating the underlying mechanisms with a focus on the intracortical GABAergic system, the present results revealed changes in intracortical inhibition in the first week after stroke that were associated with better recovery. Additionally, restoration of intracortical inhibition was present in patients, who recovered the most. Furthermore, the large component observed in a relevant part of the patients masks underlying mechanisms reflecting the importance of changes in intracortical inhibition for successful recovery.

The present results strongly support the view of a beneficial role of cortical disinhibition in the first week after a stroke that promotes neuronal plasticity and recovery. However, to sustain long-term motor recovery, cortical disinhibition needs to be transient with crucial restoration of normal levels of intracortical inhibition. TMS-EEG has the exciting potential to provide proxies to better understand underlying mechanisms of stroke revovery, to determine outcome

and to help to tailor interventional treatment strategies to each patient based on the brain reactivity status.

Introduction

Although more knowledge is continuously gained on the neurobiological processes occurring in the first weeks and months after a stroke, the mechanisms sustaining motor improvement are still not fully understood[1]. There is substantial evidence that stroke induces functional plasticity partly driven by alterations in neuronal excitability[2–4]. Indeed, in the first phase after a stroke, strong release of glutamate is excitotoxic and contributes to cell death, which is counteracted by the inhibitory neurotransmitter GABA through cell hyperpolarization[5]. In mice, this phase in which inhibition in the perilesional area is beneficial lasts approximately 3 days[6], while its duration in humans remains unknown[4]. In the longer term, the effects are eventually reversed, so that a shift in the cortical excitatory-inhibitory balance towards excitation becomes beneficial for plasticity[7,8]. The resulting increase in excitability has been associated to the induction of structural plasticity, such as axonal sprouting[9–11] and dendritic spine production[12,13] as well as functional reorganization in motor regions[14–16], which might constitute attempts to compensate for damaged structural and functional circuits[3].

Collectively, this evidence suggests that a change in the balance between GABA- and glutamatergic signaling could be one pivotal mechanism at the origin of neural plasticity[4,17], paving the way toward functional reorganization and recovery after a stroke. Moreover, the phenomena underlying enhanced functional plasticity, which are described above, only occur during a limited amount of time after stroke and different mechanisms might take over in the later stages. Taken together, this points strongly to the need of longitudinal investigations of the time course of these mechanisms to better understand the factors sustaining stroke recovery, to predict the outcome and to unveil potential targets for therapy tailored to the specific phase of the recovery process.

Gathering information on the time course of the excitatory/inhibitory systems in vivo in humans after a stroke is challenging as only few non-invasive methods are currently available to determine these transmitter systems. By using Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation (TMS), one can assess the status of the cortico-spinal and intracortical excitability, and cortico-spinal tract (CST) integrity with the measure of Motor-Evoked Potentials (MEP) generated by stimulation of the primary motor cortex[18]. While the use of TMS have helped to investigate crucial mechanisms occurring after a stroke[19–22], a non-negligible subset of stroke patients presents a damaged CST that prevents the formation of MEP[23] and thus the use of TMS to extract information on their central and peripheral reactivity. Combining TMS and multichannel-

Electro-Encephalography (EEG) overcomes this limitation by offering the possibility to directly assess the neuronal properties of the lesioned motor regions, as well as the propagation of the evoked activity through functionally connected brain areas[24,25], by studying TMS-Evoked Potentials (TEPs), brain reactivity and derived metrics. Interestingly, growing evidence shows that TEPs are pertinent markers for cortical excitability[26,27], and are modulated by neurotransmitters concentration such as dopamine, glutamate, or GABA[28,29,30]. Therefore, TMS-EEG coupling is particularly suitable for the study of the central nervous system in stroke patients, also when severely affected[31].

TMS-EEG has been successfully applied in stroke. The initial component P30 was reported higher in stroke than in controls[32] and was related to poorer motor function[33]. Moreover, a new electrophysiological profile involving large and simple evoked activity in the most affected patients was suggested[34,35]. This activity showed a similar profile as responses evoked in sleep and unresponsive wakefulness syndrome patients[36]. GABA receptors are suggested to be the main actors involved in this electrophysiological pattern in sleep and unresponsive patients[36]. However, it is unknown if they are also at the origin of the responses seen in stroke. For that matter, using TMS-EEG offers the benefit of the indirect investigation of inhibitory mechanisms (GABA-ergic) by applying paired-pulse Short-interval Intracortical Inhibition (ppTMS-SICI) TMS paradigm[17,19,30,37–40].

Here, we evaluated longitudinally (acute to chronic) a cohort of stroke patients with TMS-EEG. Using complementary TMS-EEG readouts allowed to capture individuals' electrophysiological profiles and their association with motor function at each stage and during the process of motor recovery. Additionally, by using for the first time ppTMS-SICI in TMS-EEG in stroke patients, we investigated the influence of changes of the excitatory/inhibitory balance on the generation of abnormal responses observed in patients and its relationship with residual motor function, impairment and recovery.

Materials and methods

Patient population

66 stroke patients (Age: 68.2±13.2yo, 21 females) were enrolled in the study after being admitted at the cantonal hospital in Sion, Switzerland. Patients were recruited during the first week post-stroke, inclusion criteria included being older than 18yo, motor deficits of the upper limb and absence of contraindications for magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) or TMS. Patients with first-ever and recurrent strokes were included. With the aim of determining factors specific to recovery, the subset of patients including patients showing motor improvement from the acute stage (TP1) to the following stages was defined as the recovering group (RG, n=40). The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by Cantonal Ethics Committee Vaud, Switzerland (2018-01355), written informed consent was obtained.

- Please insert Table 1 around here -

- Please insert Figure 1 around here –

Protocol design

Patients were recruited during the first week after the stroke. They underwent three sessions of assessments, at one-week post-stroke, three weeks, three months (**Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable.**). Each session comprised structural and functional MRI, resting state EEG and TMS-EEG, as well as a comprehensive battery of cognitive and motor evaluations. For more details on the protocol and analysis, the reader might refer to Fleury *et al.*[41].

- Please insert Figure 2 around here –

Behavioral assessment

The behavioral evaluation battery comprised of the (i) Fugl-Meyer of the upper limb (FM-UL, max 60 points without reflexes) and each of its subscores: the upper extremity (FM-UE, max 32 points), the hand and the wrist[42]. For each hand, the following was assessed: (ii) the maximum fist, key and pinch force assessed in three trials and performed using a JAMAR®

hydraulic hand dynamometer[43]; (iii) the Box and Blocks[44] (BnB); (iv) the nine-hole peg[45] (9HP). For every motor score, with the exception of the Fugl-Meyer, a ratio between the performance of the affected and non-affected hand (affected/unaffected) was used for the analyses.

TMS-EEG recordings

Neuronavigation (Localite GmbH, Bonn, Germany) was used to control and record positions of the TMS coil, as well as the EEG electrodes' position with respect to each individual T1-weighted MPRAGE scan.

EEG recordings were acquired using a 64 passive electrodes EEG BrainCap-MR (BrainVision LLC, North Carolina, USA) with the reference electrode at FCz and the ground at AFz. The experiment was performed in a faraday cage (IAC Acoustics, Illinois, USA) to limit interference, such as power line. Electrode impedance was targeted below 5kOhm. Data were recorded with a sampling rate of 5000 Hz, a resolution of 0.5 µV, a high cutoff of 1000 Hz and DC as low cutoff.

Experimental procedure

At each TMS-EEG session, biphasic pulses were delivered over the FDI hotspot of the affected arm at an intensity evoking a MEP targeted between 0.5 to 1 mV (S1mV). If no visible MEP (<50µV) was elicited at maximal stimulator output, the intensity was defined from the unaffected hemisphere and the target set anatomically based on neuronavigation.

Two types of stimulation were applied: a single-pulse (SP) at the supra-motor threshold intensity fixed earlier or a paired-pulse (PP) comprised of a conditioning pulse at 80% of the resting Motor Threshold (rMT) followed by an SP set at the S1mV, with an inter-stimulus interval of 3 ms.

For each patient and timepoint, a maximum of 180 SP and 180 PP trials were applied in six separated blocks (mean 169, minimum 80). During each block, the order between conditions (SP or PP) was pseudo-randomized. Pulses were automatically delivered every 4 seconds with a random 25% jitter.

Data analysis

EEG data were analyzed on Matlab (MathWorks, Massachusetts, USA) with EEGLAB[46] and following an established pipeline[47] on the TESA toolbox. Epoch cut at -500 ms and +1000 ms

around stimulation were extracted and the data around the TMS pulse [-5,+20 ms] was removed. Two rounds of ICA were performed to remove the remaining TMS artefact and other artefacts, such as eye blinks or large muscle activity (mean number of ICA component removed: 8.5). Band-pass and band-stop filters (1-60Hz, 48-52Hz) and a re-reference to the average channel followed. If one ICA component exhibited a very localized activity of large amplitude, centered around the site of stimulation, and extremely consistent over trials, this component was flagged as "large component" (**Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable.**B). Two datasets were then created, with and without the large component. TMS evoked potentials (TEPs) were computed for each patient and timepoint by averaging the signal across trials and current methods to determine their complex characteristics were applied[26,34,48].

In that view, we computed the local mean field power (LMFP, **Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable.**A)[49] based on the five electrodes closest to the stimulation target over iMC (FC3-FC1-C3-C1-Cz or FC4-FC2-C4-C2-Cz depending on the lesioned hemisphere). To quantify early activity power, the LMFP was summed in the first 80 ms after the interpolated part.

Regression quality scores (RQSs) were computed using the method presented in[26]. In short, the local TEPs xi(t) were derived for each timepoint i, each trial k (from 1 to n trials), and each patient, from +20 to +80 ms, to exclusively encompass the early components of the evoked activity. Then, linear regressions of the local TEPs xi(t) were performed for each timepoint i on single trials sjk(t) extracted from each timepoint j and trial k, so that:

$sjk(t)=\beta ijk*xi(t)+\varepsilon(t)$, $t\in[20, 80]$ms, with $(i, j)\in\{TP1, TP2, TP3\}$.

RQS was finally defined as the t-statistic associated to the local TEP xi factor, averaged across trials for each timepoint and patient.

The term "paired RQS" (pRQS) refers to pairs where i=j, i.e., where the regressed TEP xi and single trials sj are taken from the same timepoint. pRQS allows assessing reactivity level and response stability of a particular site[26]. At similar stimulation intensities, the higher the pRQS on M1 at timepoint i, the higher the reactivity and stability of M1 response on timepoint i is. On the other hand, the term "unpaired RQS" (uRQS) refers to pairs where $i\neq j$, i.e., where the TEP xi computed on timepoint i is regressed on single trials of another timepoint j. uRQS allows assessing the level of similarity between response dynamics of timepoint i and j. The higher the uRQS between timepoints i and j, the higher the similarity in response dynamics between timepoints i and j is.

In order to quantify the complexity of the signal, we measured the number of deflections in the first 200 ms of the local TEP from the electrode C3 or C4[34]. For that purpose, an automated detection of significant peaks was used. Using the *find_peaks* function from the *scipy* python toolbox, we calculated the average peak-to-peak amplitude from every detected peak in the 200 ms baseline before the TMS pulse. Any peak post-TMS higher than 2 standard deviations from this average was considered as significant.

- Please insert Figure 3 around here –

Statistics

All statistical analyses were performed using the JASP software (JASP Team (2022), Version 0.16.0.0). When referring to the level of evidence toward H_1 or H_0, we classified the Bayes factor (based on the cut-off values defined by Jeffreys[50]). In addition, the Bayesian 95% credible interval are reported for each computed parameter. The TMS-EEG readouts across timepoints were evaluated using Bayesian ANCOVAs. Each model comprised of the readout as dependent variable, the timepoints as fixed factors, the patients as random factors and the FM-UL and the supra-threshold TMS intensity as covariates. Additionally, at each timepoint we performed Bayesian correlations between each pair of TMS-EEG readouts and behavioral scores. As the distributions of the motor scores in our patient cohort were not normal, Kendall's nonparametric correlations were performed.

Evolution between timepoints was measured as a percentage of change ([(TPx–TPy)/TPy]*100, with x>y) for each behavioral score and electrophysiological readout. In order to evaluate the influence of the conditioning pulse in the paired-pulse paradigm, we calculated the arithmetic difference between PP and SP. In this way, SP refers to results in the single pulse condition, PP to results in the paired-pulse condition and SICI to results when looking at the subtraction scores.

Voxel lesion TEP mapping

Voxel lesion symptom mapping (VLSM) was performed in order to investigate the relationship between the different TMS-EEG readouts and lesion sites. This analysis was conducted using T1 MPRAGE lesion maps with the NiiStat toolbox (https://www.nitrc.org/projects/niistat/).

The number of permutations was fixed to 2000. Only voxels presented in at least 10% of the patients were considered. The analysis was restricted to regions of interest from the AAL[51] and CAT[52] atlases.

Results

Overall, TMS-EEG recordings were performed in 60 patients at TP1 (6.7 days post-stroke±2.3), 49 at TP2 (26.9±4.9 days) and 43 at TP3 (98.1±8.6 days). Not all patients completed every session due to time constraints with clinical evaluations, patient unavailability, Covid or the introduction of an exclusion factor, such as benzodiazepine intake. All the patients went through the protocol without reporting any adverse effects.

Cortical reactivity of stroke patients

While most of the patients, especially the mildly impaired, exhibited a complex response, some patients showed a larger and simpler reactivity pattern (**Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable.**A). As a means to assess the amplitude and stability of abnormal cortical reactivity, we calculated the LMFP and pRQS of the early response (<100 ms). The dynamical properties of this abnormal cortical reactivity pattern were assessed using both the calculation of the number of evoked deflections and the uRQS.

Motor cortical reactivity level, motor impairment and recovery

The Bayesian ANCOVA revealed strong evidence for an effect between the LMFP and the FM-UL (BF_{10} = 12), with larger power being associated with reduced upper limb scores (95% credible interval of the parameter: [-12.9, -3.7]). However, the level of statistical evidence was inconclusive regarding timepoints (BF_{10} = 0.98, **Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable.**A); there was an extreme evidence for an effect of the TMS intensity used ($BF_{10} = 2.10^4$) with higher LMFP linked with higher intensity used (95% credible interval: [6.6, 17.2]).

Furthermore, for the RG patients, higher LMFP in TP1 was related to a positive change of FM-hand and 9HP scores between TP1 and TP3 (Kendall's tau ∈ [0.14 0.64], BF_{10}=28, Kendall's tau ∈ [-0.6 -0.11], BF_{10}=12 respectively, see also **Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable.**A (middle)). However, the decrease in power between the two timepoints was associated with a better improvement of FM-UE (Kendall's tau ∈ [-0.67 -0.16, BF_{10}=31). Overall, an initial high LMFP associated with a greater decrease over time was seen in patients improving the most. The same relationship was found with only moderate evidence for H_1 when pooling all the patients.

As for response stability, pRQS revealed no evidence regarding an effect of timepoints, nor of FM scores (BF_{10} between 0.3 and 3), but extreme evidence of an effect of the TMS intensity

(BF_{10}>3.10^4). Thereby, higher intensities used to stimulate the cortex were linked with greater inter-trials stability.

TMS evoked dynamics of the motor cortex and motor impairment and recovery

Regarding the number of deflections in the early part of the evoked response, no effect was found for the factors timepoints, FM score or TMS intensity. Similarly, no evidence of relationships between the number of deflections and any of the motor scores was found. VLSM with the number of deflections in the acute stage revealed an association with the internal capsule, according to the CAT atlas (**Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable.**B). Thus, simpler responses, characterized by fewer deflections, were predominantly related with lesions in the CST.

ANOVA investigating the evoked dynamics in different timepoints, captured by uRQS, revealed extreme evidence for an interaction effect between the factors reference TEP and single trials activity (BF_{10}>1.10^8). Post-hoc tests showed strong evidence for a difference between timepoints when using the TEP from TP1 (TP1 vs. TP2, BF_{10}=44; TP1vs.TP3, BF_{10}=23) and no evidence for a difference or absence of difference between timepoints when using TEP from the other timepoints ($BF_{10} \in [0.24\ 1.3]$) (**Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable.**C). There was no further evidence for presence or absence of any other correlations between TMS-EEG readouts after a single pulse and motor scores.

- Please insert Figure 4 around here –

Evaluation of motor intracortical inhibitory circuits activity

The paired-pulse paradigm allowed to assess intracortical inhibitory mechanisms ($GABA_A$-ergic). Furthermore, since some patients exhibited an abnormally large activity after TMS that might have hidden weaker neuronal activity, intracortical inhibition was also studied after removing this component.

Intracortical inhibitory circuits reactivity of the motor cortex and motor impairment and recovery

When investigating the GABAergic system's status, the relationship between acute cortical reactivity and motor recovery was increased. The Bayesian ANCOVA revealed very strong evidence for a link between acute LMFP in PP and improvement in FM hand and 9HP (tau ∈[0.15 0.55], BF_{10}=61; tau ∈ [-0.55 -0.14], BF_{10}=41) after 3 months for all patients. When considering only the RG, evidence for H_1 became extreme (respectively tau ∈ [0.24 0.72], BF_{10}=352; tau ∈ [-0.71 -0.22], BF_{10}=219) and extended to the FM wrist (tau ∈ [0.12 0.61], BF_{10}=16). It showed also stronger evidence for an effect of the FM-UL (BF_{10}=41) and lower, however still extreme, evidence for an effect of the TMS intensity (BF_{10}=1504). In order to evaluate the specific effects on cortical reactivity during the SICI paradigm, we evaluated differences between LMFP scores in SP and PP.

Finally, the analysis of the pRQS of PP condition still revealed no evidence for an effect of timepoints nor of FM scores (BF_{10}≈0.5), but extreme evidence – yet much weaker than for SP - for a link with TMS intensity (BF_{10}=4372). When analyzing SICI data, the evidence for a link with TMS intensity also dropped to an inconclusive level (BF_{10}=0.4). No evidence of relationships between the pRQS and any of the motor scores was found in any of the conditions.

TMS evoked dynamics of the inhibitory system in relation to motor impairment and recovery

Patients recovering more exhibited fewer deflections in the acute stage and a greater increase in the complexity of the evoked signal along time post stroke.

First, as opposed to the SP condition where no evidence of a relationship was found between the number of deflections and motor scores, the number of deflections evoked by a PP in the early chronic stage (TP3) was linked with the key force (Kendall's tau ∈ [0.1 0.52], BF_{10}=12). More deflections were associated with higher key force ratio between affected and non-affected hands. On top of this relation with motor function at TP3, the number of deflections in the acute stage (TP1) was also associated with motor improvement after 3 months post stroke. Indeed, deflections at TP1 were related with improvement in FM scores of the hand and wrist at T3 (respectively tau ∈ [-0.6 -0.19], BF_{10}=231; tau ∈ [-0.51 -0.1], BF_{10}=14) (**Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable.**A, left). Interestingly, greater improvement of FM hand was related with increase in the number of deflections between TP1 and TP3 (tau ∈ [0.15 0.60], BF_{10}=50) (**Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable.**A, right).

Second, as previously shown in the SP analysis, the uRQS analysis in PP demonstrated an atypical dynamical signature in TP1 compared with the following timepoints (interaction effect: $BF_{10}>6.10^7$; substantial to strong evidence for a difference between TPs only by taking TP1 as a reference TEP, $BF_{10} \in [9\ 12]$, $BF_{10} \in [0.2\ 0.9]$ otherwise).

Unmasked complementary intracortical inhibition mechanisms

The association between the intracortical inhibition effect on LMFP in the acute stage and motor improvement was only found when removing the large component. This component was detected in 34/60 (57%) datasets at TP1, 27/49 (55%) at TP2 and 17/43 (37%) at TP3. The analysis of SICI revealed interesting results for the RG, as follows. First, strong evidence was found for an effect between LMFP in PP at TP1 and fist force increase between TP1 and TP2 (tau $\in [0.1\ 0.56]$, $BF_{10}=11$). Moreover, there was strong evidence for an effect between LMFP in PP at TP1 and 9HP improvement between TP1 and TP3 (tau $\in [-0.6\ -0.12]$, $BF_{10}=15$).When investigating the dissimilarity between LMFP in SP and in SICI, removing the Large Component revealed a link between LMFP at T1 and increase in scores between TP1 and TP2 for the FM-UE and FM hand (tau $\in [0.1\ 0.55]$, $BF_{10}=12$; tau $\in [0.13\ 0.59]$, $BF_{10}=29$ respectively, **Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable.**B left). Similar evidence was found with improvement between TP1 and TP3 in pinch and key forces, 9HP as well as in FM hand and wrist (Pinch, tau $\in [0.1\ 0.61]$, $BF_{10}=10$; Key, tau $\in [0.1\ 0.61]$, $BF_{10}=10$; 9HP, tau $\in [-0.65\ -0.16]$, $BF_{10}=43$; FM hand, tau $\in [0.21\ 0.7]$, $BF_{10}=152$; FM wrist, tau $\in [0.11\ 0.61]$, $BF_{10}=14$) .

The evaluation of the effect of the SICI paradigm on response stability showed that greater motor improvement was associated with an initial abnormally stable response in PP compared to SP and with a return to a more stable response in SP than in PP in the following timepoints. In details, the ANCOVA revealed no evidence for a link with FM-UL or with TMS intensity through the different timepoints ($BF_{10} \approx 0.2$). However, we found moderate evidence supporting that the short-term (TP2-TP1) changes of the SP-PP difference was linked with better improvement in FM-UE at TP2 and TP3 (tau $\in [0.07\ 0.47]$, $BF_{10}=7.4$; tau $\in [0.09\ 0.54]$, $BF_{10}=8.7$ resp., **Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable.**B right), in grip force at TP3 (tau $\in [0.08\ 0.54]$, $BF_{10}=7$), and in pinch force at TP3 (tau $\in [0.08\ 0.55]$, $BF_{10}=7.7$), for every patient. The evidence was stronger and concerned a larger number of motor scales when focusing on the recovering group (RG): we found moderate to strong evidence supporting that short-term changes of the SP-PP difference were linked with better improvement in FM-UL at TP3 (tau $\in [0.1\ 0.68]$, $BF_{10}=8.8$), in FM-UE at TP2 and TP3 (tau $\in [0.1\ 0.59]$, $BF_{10}=9.6$; tau $\in [0.07\ 0.66]$,

BF_{10}=5.7 resp.), in FM wrist at TP3 (tau ∈ [0.06 0.65], BF_{10}=4.6), in key force at TP3 (tau ∈ [0.17 0.7], BF_{10}=13).

As for the uRQS, when comparing the dynamics at TP1 and TP2 in PP, strong evidence was found with long-term motor improvement at TP3 (FM hand, tau ∈ [-0.66 -0.07], BF_{10}=5.8; 9HP, tau ∈ [0.09 0.67], BF_{10}=7.3) (**Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable.**C). Stronger motor improvements between the acute stage and the following timepoints were linked with greater differences in the pattern of the PP-evoked activity along time.

- Please insert Figure 5 around here –

Discussion

The present results show that moderately to severely affected patients exhibited cortical disinhibition in the acute stage associated to the degree of recovery. Plus, motor recovery during the following months is paralleled by the restoration of normal levels of intracortical inhibition. The resulting stroke-related disruption in cortical reactivity was defined in the most affected patients by larger and simpler TMS-evoked potentials, most likely reflecting a hyperexcitability state of the ipsilesional motor cortex. This abnormal reactivity in the acute stage was, at least partly, mediated by the GABAergic system and was specific to the acute stage. The present work provides further insights on the post-stroke time course of brain reactivity, specifically cortical disinhibition and its relationship to motor recovery. The regulation of motor cortical excitability, expressed by the return toward normal intracortical inhibition, was associated with greater motor improvement at three weeks and three months after stroke.

Disinhibition of the ipsilesional motor cortex in the acute stage as a key mechanism for successful recovery

Recent animal work suggested that an hyperexcitability state and disinhibition occur between the first week and one-month post-stroke and plays an essential role for neuronal plasticity and recovery[53–55]. Indeed, in the acute stage, GABA-mediated ipsilesional intracortical inhibition is reduced compared to the unaffected hemisphere and to healthy controls[20]. Animal models[6,56,57] and human[58–60] studies suggest that this acute disinhibition is adaptive by enhancing ipsilesional neuronal excitability through reduction of cortical inhibition. This decrease of cortical inhibition is thought to promote plastic changes and reorganization to sustain recovery from the lost functions[17,61]. In humans, this hyperexcitability has been revealed on TMS-EEG especially in the most severely affected stroke patients[34], in other cortical injuries[35], but also in altered brain states[62]. The cortical signature of this hyperexcitability was characterised by an abnormally large and simple response in the electrodes next to the site of stimulation. In the present cohort, EEG-captured cortical activity elicited by TMS exhibited large heterogeneity among stroke patients (**Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable.**A). The most severely affected patients were characterised by previously described large and simple responses, while less impaired patients showed a response pattern closer to what can be observed in healthy individuals[63,64]. Although it has been suggested that this large early response could reflect an initial high excitability of the stimulated motor cortical area[65], the adaptive or maladaptive nature of this process remains largely unknown. In the present study, this increased neuronal

excitability in the acute stage was revealed by enhanced LMFPs and was associated with better recovery of the impaired hand function after 3 months, especially in the group of patients showing recovery. Similarly, after removal of the large component, higher pRQS values in the paired-pulse condition compared to the single pulse condition, represent an altered over-stable response state possibly corresponding to ineffective, reduced intracortical inhibition in the affected motor cortex.

Although Tscherpel *et al.*[34] also showed a relation between a large, simple and slow activity in the acute stage and motor recovery, the direction of the effect was opposite to the present results. However, it is worth noting that the two cohorts differed by the proportion of severely affected and of recovering patients. Thus, the link between simple and slow activity and worse improvement reported in the previous study could be explained by a greater proportion of severely affected patients with limited improvement (7 out of 25 remained at 0 in ARAT at 3-months post stroke). While the present cohort contained a higher proportion of mildly to moderately affected patients, with only 2 out of 66 having 0 in ARAT in the early chronic stage, it is possible that the mildly impaired patients exhibited the same physiological response to TMS, but showed more recovery due to their overall less impaired initial status. Moreover, the results in the present study were found exclusively for the subset of patients, who showed an increase in FM scores after the first week (RG), supporting the view that the motor status of the patients studied might play a substantial role in the relationship between cortical reactivity and motor recovery.

Furthermore, while the number of deflections of the single-pulse-evoked response was not associated with motor deficits nor recovery, probing of GABA-ergic inhibition (ppTMS-SICI) revealed a link between this readout of response complexity in the acute stage and improvement of motor functions. Moreover, the VLSM revealed that a lower number of evoked deflections in the acute stage was associated with the lesion load in the internal capsule, hosting the main outflow from motor cortical areas containing fibers from the corticospinal, corticorubral and corticopontine tracts[52] in line with current work[34]. Such disruption of fibers connecting the cortex to subcortical structures, the brainstem and the spinal cord, prevents propagation and integration of the evoked activity to distant brain areas, leading to simpler responses reflected by fewer deflections. Indeed, similar measures of complexity influenced by the number of deflections were described as driven by the propagation of information to distant areas via thalamo-cortical loops[66]. In this way, the diminished number of deflections after TMS might reflect the cortico-subcortical disconnection of the affected motor cortex. However, observing

a relationship after conditioning the GABAergic system and not only following single pulse stimulation suggests that these findings are not solely driven by corticospinal, but also, maybe mainly, by intracortical mechanisms. Informing on both local and global process, the number of deflections could thus be an indicator of network topology, particularly of segregation. Indeed, Wang *et al.*[67] showed that stroke patients exhibited a decrease in network segregation along recovery that follows the same pattern than the increase in number of deflections in the present work. Thus, one could speculate that a more random network, with information flowing to a broader range of areas, could be reflected by an increase in the number of deflections. Whether this reduction in the number of deflections is an adaptive mechanism or a result of a more segregated network properties due to the stroke remains to be investigated in upcoming studies.

Overall, our results point toward more cortical disinhibition in the most impaired patients in the acute stage. This disinhibition might be related to a loss of cortico-subcortical connectivity. Both mechanisms could be adaptive or proxies of the recovery as they were correlated with a greater motor improvement in the following weeks and months. Investigating the evolution of these readouts alongside recovery helped untangling their function.

Changes of intracortical inhibitory activity within ipsilesional motor cortex and motor recovery

Past work has hypothesized different roles for persistent disinhibition in the chronic stage. While Ding *et al*. speculated that this disinhibition could be detrimental for motor recovery[68], other studies showed that a persistent disinhibition in the chronic stage might support recovery through enhanced plasticity in patients with residual deficits[17,19,69]. The functional role of persistent disinhibition in the chronic stage is thus unclear and the present longitudinal data helped to address this question by investigating the relationship between the evolution of the present TMS-EEG readouts and motor recovery along time.

Several readouts showed an evolution associated with motor recovery and pointed toward a return toward normal values, similar to what can be found in healthy subjects. The hyperexcitability represented in the acute stage by the high LMFP was thus reduced in the early chronic stage for the patients recovering the most (**Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable.**A). Following the same trend, both RQS measures indicated that correlates of the intracortical inhibition systems' activity were increasing in the recovering patients (Figure 4 & 5). Indeed,

when probing the intracortical inhibition system in the RG only, greater evolution of the two readouts toward healthy values was associated with greater recovery of the distal hand function.

Additionally, both results from the RQS analyses brought information of the time course of this disinhibition to sustain motor recovery. The unpaired RQS analysis, representing the similarity of the evoked responses dynamics across timepoints, showed that the TEPs generated in the acute stage were significantly different from the one observed in the following timepoints (**Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable.**C). Furthermore, changes in the paired RQS between the first timepoint and two weeks later were also associated with recovery. This readout of the stability across trials was related to the extent of motor recovery up to three months (**Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable.**A). Taken together, these results highlight the strong link between a rapid functional reorganization of the ipsilesional GABAergic inhibition and long-term motor recovery. We suggest that the initial disinhibition phase in the acute stage, promoting plasticity, is replaced by a gradual restoration of a more pronounced intracortical inhibition in the following weeks to months in a 'back to normal' fashion. While revival of inhibition might bring back plastic changes to a regular level, it is nevertheless essential for skilled motor behaviour[70].

Finally, the number of deflections in the paired pulse condition followed the same return to more complex pattern in the recovering group. It could imply that, in reverse to what we saw in the acute stage, the brain would benefit from better interconnected structures with less segregation in the chronic stage. This would further support the findings from Wang *et al.* relating motor recovery with an increased inter-hemispheric connectivity and an increased regional centrality of the ipsilesional motor cortex[67]. Therefore, the present findings may reveal both local and distal reestablishment of inhibiting mechanisms, necessary for the fine tuning of (recovered) motor functions.

Similarly, removal of the large component seen in a large proportion of the patients unveiled additional and valuable information on the time course of intracortical inhibition, raising the question on the exact physiological nature of this large activity and of the remaining signal.

Unmasking complementary intracortical inhibition mechanisms by removing atypical large evoked activity

Hyperexcitability of the lesioned motor system in the most impacted patients induced responses with a large amplitude. We hypothesized that such large responses might mask further

underlying effects represented by neuronal activity of smaller amplitude. Indeed, the EEG signal on the electrodes level is a compound recording from spatially and anatomically different neuronal population, which could be masked by a dominant activity from a specific population. Thus, we aimed to determine whether the removal of these large responses would provide further insights unveiling correlates of important brain activity. By doing so, we captured activity during the second round of ICA and unmasked complementary information on the possible actors responsible for the changes of intracortical inhibition along recovery.

We hypothesized that such large activity might predominantly originate from large layer V (L5) pyramidal cells, since both, the recording and stimulation techniques used, are biased toward this neuronal population[18,71,72]. On one hand, these cells are known to generate the strongest electrical activity, both at microscale, when measuring the current dipole moment[71], and at mesoscale, where scalp EEG signal is known to be the integration of the synchronous post-synaptic activity of large population of such aligned neurons[73]. On the other hand, TMS is known to simultaneously activate different neural populations (pyramidal cells and interneurons) within the stimulated area, with pyramidal V neurons being more prone to be activated. First, their specific shape and spatial orientation within the gyrus makes them more sensitive to the electrical field induced by TMS[18,72]. Second, a recent study by Chameh *et al*.[74] using in vitro whole-cell recordings from cortical layer 2 to 5 of the human cortex showed that L5 pyramidal cells were the most excitable neurons. Therefore, TMS-EEG coupling might be oversensitive to L5 pyramidal neurons population and removing this large activity might have revealed activity from neurons within superficial layers eliciting weaker electrical potentials, such as inhibitory interneurons (Figure 6). In fact, when removing this large component, we discovered new relationships between TMS-EEG readouts and motor functions only in the paired-pulse condition, fueling the hypothesis of a GABAergic origin of the effects described. Although the exact actors responsible for this component remains to be precisely investigated, our results provide a first clue on the possible dissociation between distinct neuronal processes with the means of TMS-EEG.

- Please insert Figure 6 around here –

On the use of TMS-EEG in stroke

While evaluating the exact modulation of each neurotransmitters' activity occurring after stroke requires invasive procedures in animal models, it is however possible to investigate the inhibitory system in patients in vivo with the use of methods, such as GABA-edited magnetic resonance spectroscopy (MRS)[75,76] or established paired pulse TMS protocols, e.g., the short-interval intracortical inhibition (SICI) protocol[20]. However, spectroscopy focuses solely on extracellular concentration of GABA, has a low temporal resolution and hence cannot determine fast dynamic mechanisms. On the other hand, classical TMS-based SICI evaluation requires a preserved cortico-spinal tract (CST) to evoke measurable MEPs that are the primary read-out. The combination of TMS and EEG by means of neuronavigated TMS-EEG provides the opportunity to determine intracortical GABAergic inhibition in stroke patients with excellent temporal and good spatial resolution[77]. Furthermore, it allows to evaluate patients with damage to the CST prohibiting the generation of a MEP[65].

Limitations

Despite having an extensive number of patients, presenting a wide range of lesions type and motor deficits, the majority of the patients included here are on the rather moderate side of motor impairment.

Secondly, the specific impact of lesion tissue, size and locations on electrical current propagation of TMS-evoked activity is not fully understood. However, the abnormal large activity has been observed here in a substantial proportion of the patients. Thus, it is unlikely that the large component was mostly induced by abnormal current propagation.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this work offers new insights on the longitudinal changes of cortical excitability and local intracortical inhibition in the affected motor cortex. The present results strongly support the critical impact of intracortical disinhibition evolving in the acute stage on residual motor function and recovery, and the importance of the restoration of intracortical inhibition of the lesioned motor cortex to sustain long-term motor recovery. Furthermore, this study demonstrates that TMS-EEG provides an excellent opportunity to determine the reactivity of the brain after a stroke and to reveal cortical mechanisms of recovery from motor deficits even in patients without relevant corticospinal connections due to the lesion. This knowledge will be the basis for developing TMS-EEG towards a clinical tool to phenotype patients and to develop biomarkers related to recovery and treatment response.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by ‘Personalized Health and Related Technologies (PHRT-#2017-205)’ of the ETH Domain, the Defitech Foundation (Strike-the-Stroke project, Morges, Switzerland) and the Wyss Center for Bio and Neuroengineering (WP030; Geneva, Switzerland).

We acknowledge access to the facilities and expertise of the Center for Biomedical Imaging, a Swiss research center of excellence and of the MRI and Neuromodulation facilities of the Human Neuroscience Platform of the Foundation Campus Biotech Geneva and access to the Neuroimaging and clinical facilities of the Hopital Valais de Sion (HVS, Sion) and the Clinique romande de reeducation (CRR, Sion).

We thank Silvia Avanzi for her excellent support during the recruitment and data acquisition process.

Competing interests

The authors report no competing interests.

Data availability

The data related to this article and all the custom scripts and JASP files are available upon reasonable request to the corresponding author.

References

1. Stinear CM, Lang CE, Zeiler S, Byblow WD. Advances and challenges in stroke rehabilitation. *Lancet Neurol*. 2020;19(4):348-360. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(19)30415-6

2. Carmichael ST. Brain Excitability in Stroke: The Yin and Yang of Stroke Progression. *Arch Neurol*. 2012;69(2):161. doi:10.1001/archneurol.2011.1175

3. Murphy TH, Corbett D. Plasticity during stroke recovery: from synapse to behaviour. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2009;10(12):861-872. doi:10.1038/nrn2735

4. Ward NS. Restoring brain function after stroke — bridging the gap between animals and humans. *Nat Rev Neurol*. 2017;13(4):244-255. doi:10.1038/nrneurol.2017.34

5. Lai TW, Zhang S, Wang YT. Excitotoxicity and stroke: Identifying novel targets for neuroprotection. *Prog Neurobiol*. 2014;115:157-188. doi:10.1016/j.pneurobio.2013.11.006

6. Clarkson AN, Huang BS, MacIsaac SE, Mody I, Carmichael ST. Reducing excessive GABA-mediated tonic inhibition promotes functional recovery after stroke. *Nature*. 2010;468(7321):305-309. doi:10.1038/nature09511

7. Bavelier D, Levi DM, Li RW, Dan Y, Hensch TK. Removing Brakes on Adult Brain Plasticity: From Molecular to Behavioral Interventions. *J Neurosci*. 2010;30(45):14964-14971. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4812-10.2010

8. Joy MT, Carmichael ST. Encouraging an excitable brain state: mechanisms of brain repair in stroke. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2021;22(1):38-53. doi:10.1038/s41583-020-00396-7

9. Carmichael ST. Plasticity of Cortical Projections after Stroke. *The Neuroscientist*. 2003;9(1):64-75. doi:10.1177/1073858402239592

10. Lee JK. Nogo Receptor Antagonism Promotes Stroke Recovery by Enhancing Axonal Plasticity. *J Neurosci*. 2004;24(27):6209-6217. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1643-04.2004

11. Carmichael ST, Wei L, Rovainen CM, Woolsey TA. New Patterns of Intracortical Projections after Focal Cortical Stroke. *Neurobiol Dis*. 2001;8(5):910-922. doi:10.1006/nbdi.2001.0425

12. Brown CE, Li P, Boyd JD, Delaney KR, Murphy TH. Extensive Turnover of Dendritic Spines and Vascular Remodeling in Cortical Tissues Recovering from Stroke. *J Neurosci*. 2007;27(15):4101-4109. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4295-06.2007

13. Brown CE, Aminoltejari K, Erb H, Winship IR, Murphy TH. In Vivo Voltage-Sensitive Dye Imaging in Adult Mice Reveals That Somatosensory Maps Lost to Stroke Are Replaced over Weeks by New Structural and Functional Circuits with Prolonged Modes of Activation within Both the Peri-Infarct Zone and Distant Sites. *J Neurosci*. 2009;29(6):1719-1734. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4249-08.2009

14. Bundy DT, Nudo RJ. Preclinical Studies of Neuroplasticity Following Experimental Brain Injury: An Update. *Stroke*. 2019;50(9):2626-2633. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.119.023550

15. Harrison TC, Silasi G, Boyd JD, Murphy TH. Displacement of Sensory Maps and Disorganization of Motor Cortex After Targeted Stroke in Mice. *Stroke*. 2013;44(8):2300-2306. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.113.001272

16. Cramer SC, Crafton KR. Somatotopy and movement representation sites following cortical stroke. *Exp Brain Res*. 2006;168(1-2):25-32. doi:10.1007/s00221-005-0082-2

17. Liuzzi G, Horniss V, Lechner P, et al. Development of movement-related intracortical inhibition in acute to chronic subcortical stroke. *Neurology*. 2014;82(3):198-205. doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000000028

18. Siebner HR, Funke K, Aberra AS, et al. Transcranial magnetic stimulation of the brain: What is stimulated? – A consensus and critical position paper. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2022;140:59-97. doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2022.04.022

19. Hummel FC, Steven B, Hoppe J, et al. Deficient intracortical inhibition (SICI) during movement preparation after chronic stroke. *Neurology*. 2009;72(20):1766-1772. doi:10.1212/WNL.0b013e3181a609c5

20. McDonnell MN, Stinear CM. TMS measures of motor cortex function after stroke: A meta-analysis. *Brain Stimulat*. 2017;10(4):721-734. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2017.03.008

21. Smith MC, Stinear CM. Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) in stroke: Ready for clinical practice? *J Clin Neurosci*. 2016;31:10-14. doi:10.1016/j.jocn.2016.01.034

22. Talelli P, Greenwood RJ, Rothwell JC. Arm function after stroke: Neurophysiological correlates and recovery mechanisms assessed by transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2006;117(8):1641-1659. doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2006.01.016

23. Sato S, Bergmann TO, Borich MR. Opportunities for concurrent transcranial magnetic stimulation and electroencephalography to characterize cortical activity in stroke. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2015;9. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2015.00250

24. Ilmoniemi RJ, Virtanen J, Ruohonen J, et al. Neuronal responses to magnetic stimulation reveal cortical reactivity and connectivity: *NeuroReport*. 1997;8(16):3537-3540. doi:10.1097/00001756-199711100-00024

25. Bortoletto M, Veniero D, Thut G, Miniussi C. The contribution of TMS–EEG coregistration in the exploration of the human cortical connectome. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 2015;49:114-124. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2014.12.014

26. Raffin E, Harquel S, Passera B, Chauvin A, Bougerol T, David O. Probing regional cortical excitability via input–output properties using transcranial magnetic stimulation and electroencephalography coupling. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2020;41(10):2741-2761. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.24975

27. Rogasch NC, Fitzgerald PB. Assessing cortical network properties using TMS-EEG. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2013;34(7):1652-1669. doi:10.1002/hbm.22016

28. Casula EP, Stampanoni Bassi M, Pellicciari MC, et al. Subthalamic stimulation and levodopa modulate cortical reactivity in Parkinson's patients. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord*. 2017;34:31-37. doi:10.1016/j.parkreldis.2016.10.009

29. Casarotto S, Turco F, Comanducci A, et al. Excitability of the supplementary motor area in Parkinson's disease depends on subcortical damage. *Brain Stimulat*. 2019;12(1):152-160. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2018.10.011

30. Darmani G, Ziemann U. Pharmacophysiology of TMS-evoked EEG potentials: A mini-review. *Brain Stimulat*. 2019;12(3):829-831. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2019.02.021

31. Keser Z, Buchl SC, Seven NA, et al. Electroencephalogram (EEG) With or Without Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation (TMS) as Biomarkers for Post-stroke Recovery: A Narrative Review. *Front Neurol*. 2022;13:827866. doi:10.3389/fneur.2022.827866

32. Hordacre B, Goldsworthy MR, Welsby E, Graetz L, Ballinger S, Hillier S. Resting State Functional Connectivity Is Associated With Motor Pathway Integrity and Upper-Limb Behavior in Chronic Stroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2020;34(6):547-557. doi:10.1177/1545968320921824

33. Gray WA, Palmer JA, Wolf SL, Borich MR. Abnormal EEG Responses to TMS During the Cortical Silent Period Are Associated With Hand Function in Chronic Stroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2017;31(7):666-676. doi:10.1177/1545968317712470

34. Tscherpel C, Dern S, Hensel L, Ziemann U, Fink GR, Grefkes C. Brain responsivity provides an individual readout for motor recovery after stroke. *Brain*. Published online May 6, 2020:awaa127. doi:10.1093/brain/awaa127

35. Sarasso S, D'Ambrosio S, Fecchio M, et al. Local sleep-like cortical reactivity in the awake brain after focal injury. *Brain*. 2020;143(12):3672-3684. doi:10.1093/brain/awaa338

36. Rosanova M, Fecchio M, Casarotto S, et al. Sleep-like cortical OFF-periods disrupt causality and complexity in the brain of unresponsive wakefulness syndrome patients. *Nat Commun*. 2018;9(1):4427. doi:10.1038/s41467-018-06871-1

37. Cash RFH, Noda Y, Zomorrodi R, et al. Characterization of Glutamatergic and GABAA-Mediated Neurotransmission in Motor and Dorsolateral Prefrontal Cortex Using Paired-Pulse TMS–EEG. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2017;42(2):502-511. doi:10.1038/npp.2016.133

38. Ferreri F, Pasqualetti P, Määttä S, et al. Human brain connectivity during single and paired pulse transcranial magnetic stimulation. *NeuroImage*. 2011;54(1):90-102. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.07.056

39. Paus T, Sipila PK, Strafella AP. Synchronization of Neuronal Activity in the Human Primary Motor Cortex by Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation: An EEG Study. *J Neurophysiol*. 2001;86(4):1983-1990. doi:10.1152/jn.2001.86.4.1983

40. Ziemann U, Reis J, Schwenkreis P, et al. TMS and drugs revisited 2014. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2015;126(10):1847-1868. doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2014.08.028

41. Fleury L, Koch P, Wessel M, et al. Towards individualized Medicine in Stroke – the TiMeS project: protocol of longitudinal, multi-modal, multi-domain study in stroke. *Front Neurol*. Published online May 19, 2022. doi:10.3389/fneur.2022.939640

42. Fugl-Meyer AR, Jääskö L, Leyman I, Olsson S, Steglind S. The post-stroke hemiplegic patient. 1. a method for evaluation of physical performance. *Scand J Rehabil Med*. 1975;7(1):13-31.

43. Mathiowetz V, Weber K, Volland G, Kashman N. Reliability and validity of grip and pinch strength evaluations. *J Hand Surg*. 1984;9(2):222-226. doi:10.1016/S0363-5023(84)80146-X

44. Mathiowetz V, Volland G, Kashman N, Weber K. Adult Norms for the Box and Block Test of Manual Dexterity. *Am J Occup Ther*. 1985;39(6):386-391. doi:10.5014/ajot.39.6.386

45. Mathiowetz V, Weber K, Kashman N, Volland G. Adult Norms for the Nine Hole Peg Test of Finger Dexterity. *Occup Ther J Res*. 1985;5(1):24-38. doi:10.1177/153944928500500102

46. Delorme A, Makeig S. EEGLAB: an open source toolbox for analysis of single-trial EEG dynamics including independent component analysis. *J Neurosci Methods*. 2004;134(1):9-21. doi:10.1016/j.jneumeth.2003.10.009

47. Rogasch NC, Sullivan C, Thomson RH, et al. Analysing concurrent transcranial magnetic stimulation and electroencephalographic data: A review and introduction to the open-source TESA software. *NeuroImage*. 2017;147:934-951. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.10.031

48. Bridwell DA, Cavanagh JF, Collins AGE, et al. Moving Beyond ERP Components: A Selective Review of Approaches to Integrate EEG and Behavior. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2018;12:106. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2018.00106

49. Casarotto S, Canali P, Rosanova M, et al. Assessing the Effects of Electroconvulsive Therapy on Cortical Excitability by Means of Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation and Electroencephalography. *Brain Topogr*. 2013;26(2):326-337. doi:10.1007/s10548-012-0256-8

50. Jeffreys H. *Theory of Probability*. 3rd ed. Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press; 1998.

51. Tzourio-Mazoyer N, Landeau B, Papathanassiou D, et al. Automated Anatomical Labeling of Activations in SPM Using a Macroscopic Anatomical Parcellation of the MNI MRI Single-Subject Brain. *NeuroImage*. 2002;15(1):273-289. doi:10.1006/nimg.2001.0978

52. Catani M, Thiebautdeschotten M. A diffusion tensor imaging tractography atlas for virtual in vivo dissections. *Cortex*. 2008;44(8):1105-1132. doi:10.1016/j.cortex.2008.05.004

53. Winship IR, Murphy TH. In Vivo Calcium Imaging Reveals Functional Rewiring of Single Somatosensory Neurons after Stroke. *J Neurosci*. 2008;28(26):6592-6606. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0622-08.2008

54. Rabiller G, He JW, Nishijima Y, Wong A, Liu J. Perturbation of Brain Oscillations after Ischemic Stroke: A Potential Biomarker for Post-Stroke Function and Therapy. *Int J Mol Sci*. 2015;16(10):25605-25640. doi:10.3390/ijms161025605

55. Schiene K, Bruehl C, Zilles K, et al. Neuronal Hyperexcitability and Reduction of GABA $_A$ -Receptor Expression in the Surround of Cerebral Photothrombosis. *J Cereb Blood Flow Metab*. 1996;16(5):906-914. doi:10.1097/00004647-199609000-00014

56. Lake EM, Chaudhuri J, Thomason L, et al. The Effects of Delayed Reduction of Tonic Inhibition on Ischemic Lesion and Sensorimotor Function. *J Cereb Blood Flow Metab*. 2015;35(10):1601-1609. doi:10.1038/jcbfm.2015.86

57. Caracciolo L, Marosi M, Mazzitelli J, et al. CREB controls cortical circuit plasticity and functional recovery after stroke. *Nat Commun*. 2018;9(1):2250. doi:10.1038/s41467-018-04445-9

58. Di Pino G, Pellegrino G, Assenza G, et al. Modulation of brain plasticity in stroke: a novel model for neurorehabilitation. *Nat Rev Neurol*. 2014;10(10):597-608. doi:10.1038/nrneurol.2014.162

59. Carmichael ST. Emergent properties of neural repair: elemental biology to therapeutic concepts: Neural Repair. *Ann Neurol*. 2016;79(6):895-906. doi:10.1002/ana.24653

60. Kang N, Summers JJ, Cauraugh JH. Transcranial direct current stimulation facilitates motor learning post-stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2016;87(4):345-355. doi:10.1136/jnnp-2015-311242

61. Heise KF, Niehoff M, Feldheim JF, Liuzzi G, Gerloff C, Hummel FC. Differential behavioral and physiological effects of anodal transcranial direct current stimulation in healthy adults of younger and older age. *Front Aging Neurosci*. 2014;6. doi:10.3389/fnagi.2014.00146

62. Comolatti R, Pigorini A, Casarotto S, et al. A fast and general method to empirically estimate the complexity of brain responses to transcranial and intracranial stimulations. *Brain Stimulat*. 2019;12(5):1280-1289. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2019.05.013

63. Bonato C, Miniussi C, Rossini PM. Transcranial magnetic stimulation and cortical evoked potentials: A TMS/EEG co-registration study. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2006;117(8):1699-1707. doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2006.05.006

64. Biabani M, Fornito A, Mutanen TP, Morrow J, Rogasch NC. Characterizing and minimizing the contribution of sensory inputs to TMS-evoked potentials. *Brain Stimulat*. 2019;12(6):1537-1552. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2019.07.009

65. Tremblay S, Rogasch NC, Premoli I, et al. Clinical utility and prospective of TMS–EEG. *Clin Neurophysiol*. Published online January 2019. doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2019.01.001

66. Casali AG, Gosseries O, Rosanova M, et al. A Theoretically Based Index of Consciousness Independent of Sensory Processing and Behavior. *Sci Transl Med*. 2013;5(198):198ra105-198ra105. doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.3006294

67. Wang L, Yu C, Chen H, et al. Dynamic functional reorganization of the motor execution network after stroke. *Brain*. 2010;133(4):1224-1238. doi:10.1093/brain/awq043

68. Ding Q, Triggs WJ, Kamath SM, Patten C. Short Intracortical Inhibition During Voluntary Movement Reveals Persistent Impairment Post-stroke. *Front Neurol*. 2019;9:1105. doi:10.3389/fneur.2018.01105

69. Mooney RA, Ackerley SJ, Rajeswaran DK, et al. The Influence of Primary Motor Cortex Inhibition on Upper Limb Impairment and Function in Chronic Stroke: A Multimodal Study. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2019;33(2):130-140. doi:10.1177/1545968319826052

70. Beck S, Hallett M. Surround inhibition in the motor system. *Exp Brain Res*. 2011;210(2):165-172. doi:10.1007/s00221-011-2610-6

71. Murakami S, Okada Y. Contributions of principal neocortical neurons to magnetoencephalography and electroencephalography signals: MEG/EEG signals of neocortical neurons. *J Physiol*. 2006;575(3):925-936. doi:10.1113/jphysiol.2006.105379

72. Aberra AS, Wang B, Grill WM, Peterchev AV. Simulation of transcranial magnetic stimulation in head model with morphologically-realistic cortical neurons. *Brain Stimulat*. 2020;13(1):175-189. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2019.10.002

73. Portillo-Lara R, Tahirbegi B, Chapman CAR, Goding JA, Green RA. Mind the gap: State-of-the-art technologies and applications for EEG-based brain–computer interfaces. *APL Bioeng*. 2021;5(3):031507. doi:10.1063/5.0047237

74. Moradi Chameh H, Rich S, Wang L, et al. Diversity amongst human cortical pyramidal neurons revealed via their sag currents and frequency preferences. *Nat Commun*. 2021;12(1):2497. doi:10.1038/s41467-021-22741-9

75. Stagg CJ. Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy as a tool to study the role of GABA in motor-cortical plasticity. *NeuroImage*. 2014;86:19-27. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.01.009

76. Blicher JU, Near J, Næss-Schmidt E, et al. GABA Levels Are Decreased After Stroke and GABA Changes During Rehabilitation Correlate With Motor Improvement. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2015;29(3):278-286. doi:10.1177/1545968314543652

77. Passera B, Chauvin A, Raffin E, Bougerol T, David O, Harquel S. Exploring the spatial resolution of TMS-EEG coupling on the sensorimotor region. *NeuroImage*. 2022;259:119419. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2022.119419

Figures

Table 1. Patients' characteristics

Gender	Handedness	Hemisphere affected	RMT TP1 (% MSO)	FM UL TP1 (/60)	FM UL TP2 (/60)	FM UL TP3 (/60)	Days post-stroke TP1	Days post-stroke TP2	Days post-stroke TP3
19 F / 47 H	55 right-handed / 8 ambidextrous	32 Left / 34 Right	43 ± 9.8	46.8 ± 19	50.6 ± 17	55.1 ± 12	6.6 ± 2.3	26.9 ± 4.9	98.1 ± 8.6



Figure 1. Lesion heat map of the patients in the acute stage (TP1), N = 54. Note that few patients of the cohort did not undergo an MRI at the acute stage.



Figure 2. Heterogeneity of evoked cortical responses after the stimulation of ipsilesional motor cortex between stroke patients, along weeks post stroke and between stimulation condition. A. Examples of TMS-evoked potentials in two representative patients in the acute stage with different initial motor deficit. The signal amplitudes (µV) of the 62 EEG electrodes are overlaid in a butterfly view. Topographies of the evoked activity are plotted at specific latency indicated by black bars. The grey rectangle represents the time window interpolated around the TMS pulse (t = 0ms) not taken in the analysis. Note the difference in both maximum amplitude and spatial distribution of the signals, with the most affected patients exhibiting a simpler, larger and more spatially restricted activity, especially during the first 100ms. **B.** Protocol design and local TMS-evoked potentials from the ipsilesional electrodes close to the stimulation site, across the three timepoints, for each patient (one colored line represents one

patient). For representative purpose, the amplitudes were z-scored according to each patient's baseline [-200 to -5ms]. Note the inter-patients' variability in the evoked response, hampering the use of latency-specific component analysis. **C.** Local TEP after a single pulse (top) or a paired-pulse (PP, bottom) stimulation, for each patient (one colored line represents one patient). Note the intra-patients' variability in the evoked pattern depending on the stimulation condition used.



Figure 3. **TMS-EEG cortical reactivity and evoked dynamics readouts and removal of the large component**. **A.** Schematic representation of the cortical reactivity (top) and evoked

dynamics (bottom) readouts. Cortical reactivity was captured by both the local mean field power (LMFP, top left) and the paired regression quality score (pRQS, top right). The LMFP was calculated by taking the area under the curve of the rectified signals over the local electrodes (see Materials and Methods) during the first 80ms after the interpolated window. The pRQS quantify the cortical reactivity and response stability by calculating the quality of regression of the local TEP into it corresponding trials, in each patient (see Raffin et al.[26]). Evoked dynamics were represented by the means of the number of deflections (bottom left) and the unpaired RQS (uRQS, bottom right). The number of deflections in the first 200ms was computed automatically as the number of peaks higher than two standard deviations from the mean amplitude in the baseline. The uRQS quantifies the similarity in evoked dynamics by computing the average quality of regression of the local TEP of one timepoint into trials of another timepoint. **B.** To investigate if the large component could mask relevant neuronal activity, the component, when visually detected, was removed during the second round of ICA decomposition, which leads to the creation of two datasets, with and without the large component.



Figure 4. Longitudinal evolution of cortical reactivity and evoked dynamics and their association with motor improvement. **A.** The ANCOVA showed a main effect of the Fugl-Meyer (FM) scores but no effect of timepoints (left). In the recovering group (RG), LMFP in the acute stage was associated with improvement of the FM hand between the first week (TP1) and the 3rd month (TP3, middle) and the reduction of LMFP in TP3 was related with better improvement in FM of the upper extremity (right). Kendall's correlations were performed thus values in the graphs correspond to ranks. Motor improvement was calculated as ((TP3 – TP1) / TP1) *100. **B.** Association between TMS-EEG readouts and lesions maps were assessed using a Voxel Lesion Symptoms Mapping. The number of deflections was found negatively correlated with lesions in the ROI of the internal capsule (depicted by red voxels). **C.** Post-hoc tests on uRQS revealed strong evidence for a difference in evoked dynamics between TP1 and both TP2 and TP3 when regressing the average signal of TP1 to trials in each timepoints. There was no evidence for a difference between timepoints when taking as reference the average signal from TP2 and TP3. Stars indicate a $BF_{10} > 10$.



Figure 5. **Paired-pulse stimulation revealed association between intracortical inhibition activity and motor recovery**. **A.** The number of deflections evoked in the PP condition in the acute stage was associated with better improvement of the FM hand. Increase in the number of deflections between TP1 and TP3 was found to be related to greater improvement in hand function. **B.** Removing the large component revealed associations with motor recovery. **(top)** The LMFP difference in the acute stage (TP1) between the single-pulse (SP) and paired-pulse (PP) conditions, called here SICI, was associated with better improvement of FM hand at 3 months post-stroke (TP3). **(bottom)** Increase in pRQS in SICI between the first and third weeks

was related to increase in key force at 3 months post-stroke. Note that here pRQS (SICI) corresponds to pRQS(SP) – pRQS(PP). Pale horizontal lines indicate the direction of the difference between timepoints. **C.** Unpaired RQS in PP between TP1 and TP2 showed an association with improvement in 9 Hole peg (9 HP) **(top right)**. The higher the ΔuRQS percentage, the higher the similarity between activities. Kendall's correlations were performed, thus values in the graphs correspond to ranks. D. Evolution of the TMS-evoked signals in few representative patients. **(Top)** Plots of TEP after a PP in TP1 and TP2. Respective evolution in uRQS and 9HP are expressed below each signal. Note that a lower value of uRQS(PP) between timepoints corresponds to a lower similarity of the evoked signals dynamics between timepoints. **(Bottom)** Amplitude of the evoked signal in each trial, for both conditions, at TP1 and TP2 for two patients. Note that, whereas patient P018 did not present any longitudinal change in inter-trials stability between SP and PP, patient P073 showed an abnormal high stability in PP compared to SP at TP1, followed by a regularization of this contrast at TP2 (see text).



Figure 6. Suggested model for the neural origin of the EEG-captured activity before and after removal of the large component. The present model suggest that the large component

might be mainly driven by the activity generated by large pyramidal cells from layer 5[18,72]. The remaining signal after removal of the large component would then predominantly be driven by more superficial layers and other neuronal population, such as interneurons.