Basal but not complex motor control relies on interhemispheric structural connectivity after stroke

Theresa Paul[1, †], Valerie M. Wiemer[1, †], Lukas Hensel[1], Matthew Cieslak[2], Caroline Tscherpel[1], Christian Grefkes[1,3], Scott T. Grafton[4], Gereon R. Fink[1,3], Lukas J. Volz[1]

[†]**These authors contributed equally to this work.**

[1] Medical Faculty, University of Cologne, and Department of Neurology, University Hospital Cologne, Cologne, Germany

[2] Department of Psychiatry, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, United States of America

[3] Institute of Neuroscience and Medicine, Cognitive Neuroscience (INM-3), Research Centre Juelich, Juelich, Germany

[4] Department of Psychological & Brain Sciences, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, United States of America

Corresponding author:

Lukas J. Volz, M.D.

Department of Neurology, University of Cologne

Kerpener Str. 62, 50937 Cologne, Germany

Email: Lukas.Volz@uk-koeln.de

Running title

Structural connectivity in motor stroke

Keywords

cortical reorganization, motor recovery, primary motor cortex, motor network, diffusion imaging, transcallosal fibers

List of abbreviations

cl = contralesional

CP = cerebral peduncle

CST = corticospinal tract

dMRI = diffusion magnetic resonance imaging

DSI = diffusion spectrum imaging

DTI = diffusion tensor imaging

FA = fractional anisotropy

gFA = generalized fractional anisotropy

il = ipsilesional

ODF = orientation distribution function

PLIC = posterior limb of the internal capsule

ROI = region of interest

TMS = transcranial magnetic stimulation

WM = white matter

Abstract

While numerous studies have shown that the microstructural integrity of the ipsilesional corticospinal tract (CST) plays a crucial role in motor recovery after stroke, only very few studies have assessed cortico-cortical motor connections. Considering the frequently reported association between fMRI-based cortico-cortical connectivity and motor impairment, cortico-cortical structural connectivity might be equally relevant for post-stroke motor control. Moreover, given the preeminence of the ipsilesional CST, the question arises whether potential associations between cortico-cortical connections and motor behavior are independent of CST integrity. To address these issues, diffusion spectrum imaging (DSI) in concert with a novel compartmentwise analysis approach was used to quantify structural connectivity defined as tractwise mean anisotropy between cortical core motor regions including bihemispheric primary motor cortex (M1), dorsal premotor cortex (PMd), ventral premotor cortex (PMv) and supplementary motor area (SMA). For each connection involving the ipsilesional M1, we probed for a correlation with basal and complex motor behavior and assessed dependence on CST anisotropy using partial correlation analyses. While both basal and complex motor performance were correlated with bilateral premotor - ipsilesional M1 as well as interhemispheric M1-M1 connectivity after stroke, complex motor skills showed a stronger dependence on CST integrity than basal motor skills. This indicates that basal motor commands may be exerted via alternative routes after CST damage. In particular, patients who underwent substantial recovery from the acute to the chronic stage featured a strong correlation between M1-M1 connectivity and basal motor control independent of CST integrity. Hence, motor signals involved in basal motor control might be relayed through the contralesional M1 and descend to the spinal level via non-crossing fibers of the contralesional CST. Finally, harnessing the informational wealth of cortico-cortical connectivity via stepwise linear regression explained a higher ratio of behavioral variance than the ipsilesional CST. Of note, basal but not complex motor control was equally well explained when excluding the CST as a possible predictor variable from the stepwise regression, corroborating the propensity of cortico-cortical connections to compensate for impairment of basal but not complex motor skills. In summary, our findings help to explain previous conflicting interpretations regarding a vicarious or maladaptive role of the contralesional M1. We identify transcallosal M1-M1 fibers as a critical structural reserve for successful recovery of basal motor functions. Finally, our results also highlight the potential of structural connectivity of the cortical motor network as a possible biomarker post-stroke.

Introduction

Diffusion MRI (dMRI) is commonly used to characterize white matter (WM) alterations associated with motor impairment following stroke.[1] It is well-established that the capacity for motor control depends on the microstructural integrity of descending motor tracts. In particular, preserved anisotropy of the ipsilesional CST is considered a robust biomarker for motor recovery.[2] At the same time, very little attention has been devoted to cortico-cortical structural connectivity, even though functional imaging studies suggest a pivotal role of interactions between cortical motor areas for motor performance after stroke.[3] Both resting-state functional connectivity and task-based effective connectivity have repeatedly been shown to relate to motor impairment in the acute and chronic stages. Specifically, both have concordantly emphasized the seminal role of connections between bilateral premotor areas and ipsilesional M1 as well as interhemispheric connections between bilateral homologs.[4–8] Given that fMRI-based connectivity is thought to at least partially arise from underlying structural connections,[9] one might assume that structural connectivity of this cortical motor network plays an equally important role in motor control after stroke.

However, studies on cortico-cortical structure-function relationships remain surprisingly scarce. On the one hand, previous studies have reported relationships between M1-M1 structural connectivity and motor performance.[10–15] Regarding ipsilesional premotor-M1 connectivity within the affected hemisphere, studies have reported inconclusive findings regarding specific connections.[10,16,17] On the other hand, data on the role of interhemispheric contralesional premotor - ipsilesional M1 connections or premotor homologs are missing and yet have to be investigated in a targeted hypothesis-driven manner. While atlas-based whole-brain analyses principally include these connections, atlas parcellations are typically not dedicated to isolate premotor areas hence limiting their interpretability.[18,19] Moreover, most studies typically focus on either cortical connectivity or CST integrity, raising the question whether the role of cortical motor network connectivity may partially depend on the extent of CST damage. One of the few region of interest (ROI)-based analyses of structural ipsilesional premotor-M1 connectivity reported that the role of cortico-cortical motor connections for residual motor performance critically depends on the integrity of the ipsilesional CST.[17] The authors argued that premotor-M1 connections only serve a compensatory role in patients suffering from severe CST damage. Thus, the question arises how and when cortico-cortical connections may contribute to motor control elicited by the damaged motor network. Moreover,

it is unclear whether such compensatory mechanisms support basal, complex, or rather specific aspects of motor control.

To address these issues, we assessed diffusion spectrum imaging (DSI) in a sample of chronic stroke patients. Using a novel approach,[20] compartmentwise generalized fractional anisotropy (gFA) was extracted from specific cortico-cortical tracts defined based on an HCP-template.[21] Tracts were defined for a network of core motor areas including the primary motor cortex (M1), dorsal premotor cortex (PMd), ventral premotor cortex (PMv) and supplementary motor area (SMA). We then systematically assessed the relationship of various cortico-cortical connections with basal and complex motor functions in chronic stroke patients. In line with functional and effective connectivity findings, we expected correlations for both basal and complex motor skills to emerge for bilateral premotor - ipsilesional M1 and interhemispheric M1-M1 connectivity. Given that basal motor commands such as lifting the arm against gravity might potentially be compensated via alternative routes such as non-crossing fibers of the contralesional CST,[22] we hypothesized a stronger dependence on ipsilesional CST integrity for complex than for basal motor skills. Importantly, all analyses were repeated controlling for ipsilesional CST integrity, which allowed us to assess whether the role of specific aspects of cortico-cortical structural connectivity in basal and complex motor control depends on the extent of CST damage. Finally, we addressed whether structural connectivity differs in patients with substantial motor recovery compared to patients with limited to no recovery from the acute to the chronic phase post-stroke. This approach allowed us to identify features of cortico-cortical structural connectivity associated with successful motor recovery. Advancing our mechanistic understanding of motor recovery might help to lay the foundation for targeted therapeutic interventions and to identify cortico-cortical connections as potential biomarkers for an individual's propensity to recover lost motor function via compensatory cortical routes.

Material and methods

Subjects

Twenty-five chronic stroke patients (mean age=66.68, std=11.25, 5 female, 20 male) formerly hospitalized at the University Hospital Cologne, Department of Neurology, were included (for detailed demographic and clinical information, see Supplementary Table 1). Inclusion criteria

were (1) age between 40 and 90 years, (2) first-ever ischemic stroke more than six months ago and (3) initial unilateral impairment of upper limb motor function. Exclusion criteria were defined as (1) any contraindications to MRI, (2) bihemispheric infarcts, (3) cerebral hemorrhage, (4) reinfarction or other neurological diseases, and (5) persistence of severe aphasia or neglect. All subjects provided informed consent prior to participation. The study was approved by the ethics committee of the Medical Faculty of the University of Cologne and was conducted in accordance with the declaration of Helsinki. Of note, while the sample was already included in a previous publication focusing on descending corticospinal and extrapyramidal pathways,[20] there is no overlap with the analyses presented in the present study as cortico-cortical connections were not included in our previous publication.

Behavioral motor tests

To differentially quantify the impairment of basal and complex motor control involving proximal and distal arm movements, motor impairment was assessed using the Action Research Arm Test (ARAT)[23] and the Motricity Index (MI) arm score.[24] The ARAT probes the successful execution of activities of daily living and therefore requires the complex interplay of motor synergies, emphasizing distal control of hand motor functions. In contrast, the MI-arm reflects more basal motor control with a focus on proximal and some distal upper limb movements (Fig. 1). The universally used National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale (NIHSS) arm subscore was used to quantify a patient's degree of motor recovery from the acute to the chronic stage post-stroke (holding arms 90° against gravity; levels 0: no drift, 1: drift, 2: arm falls before 10 s, 3: no effort against gravity, 4: no movement).[25] *Substantial* recovery was defined as NIHSS improvements of one point or more from the acute to the chronic stage (15 patients). Of note, the absence of a change in the NIHSS arm score should not be equated with no recovery as the NIHSS cannot capture nuanced differences. In other words, a patient who is able to perform all NIHSS items flawlessly might still have difficulties performing certain aspects of the ARAT. Therefore, patients without an increase in NIHSS arm scores are referred to as *non-substantial* recovery group (10 patients).



Figure 1: Schematic illustration of the assessment of motor control via the Action Research Arm Test (ARAT) and Motricity Index (MI) arm score. The MI-arm score (orange) reflects basal motor functions, with a precise delineation of the reliance on required muscle groups for proximal to distal movements. Conversely, the ARAT (green) quantifies more complex motor control of the affected arm that requires the interplay of different motor control policies, closely reflecting activities of daily living.

MRI acquisition and preprocessing

MRI data were recorded using a Siemens MAGNETOM Prisma 3 Tesla scanner (Siemens Medical Solutions, Erlangen, Germany). Preprocessing of diffusion data was performed using QSIPrep[26] and gFA-maps were generated in DSI Studio (https://dsi-studio.labsolver.org/; for a detailed description see[20]). Individual gFA-maps were normalized to MNI-space using ANTS.[27] Lesion masks were hand drawn in MRIcron (www.sph.sc.edu/comd/rorden/MRicron) and verified by a neurologist. Images with lesions affecting the right hemisphere were flipped along the mid-sagittal plane to facilitate group comparisons. To focus all subsequent analyses on WM voxels and exclude voxels located within the stroke lesion, gFA-maps were masked using both individual WM-masks derived from brain tissue segmentation and lesion masks.

Defining regions of the cortical motor network

As effective and functional connectivity within a motor network comprising core motor areas have frequently been linked to motor impairment after stroke,[4–6,28] we accordingly focused on

bilateral core motor areas including M1, PMv, PMd and SMA. Term-based fMRI meta-analyses were performed using the neurosynth.org database (https://www.neurosynth.org/). To define the location of the aforementioned areas, search terms included “motor cortex”, “dorsal premotor”, “ventral premotor”, and “supplementary motor”. Left hemispheric activation peak coordinates were extracted and used to create the final cortical ROIs in DSI Studio[29] (HCP1065 1-mm FIB file; Supplementary Fig. 1; Supplementary Table 2).

Generation of tract templates

Fiber bundles connecting cortical motor regions were defined via deterministic fiber tracking as implemented in DSI Studio[29] using the HCP-1065 template based on diffusion data of 1065 healthy subjects.[21] Deterministic fiber tracking was used to identify (1) intrahemispheric cortico-cortical fiber tracts between ipsilesional (il) M1 and ipsilesional premotor areas (ilPMd-ilM1, ilPMv-ilM1, ilSMA-ilM1), (2) interhemispheric cortico-cortical fiber tracts between ipsilesional M1 and contralesional (cl) premotor areas (clPMd-ilM1, clPMv-ilM1, clSMA-ilM1), as well as (3) interhemispheric tracts between homologous motor regions (clM1-ilM1, clPMd-ilPMd, clPMv-ilPMv, clSMA-ilSMA; Fig. 2). Detailed tracking parameters for each tract template are reported in the Supplementary Methods. To address whether potential associations between structural motor network connectivity and motor impairment were independent of CST integrity, we generated an additional CST mask originating from M1, PMd, PMv and SMA (see Supplementary Methods for tracking details). Importantly, the CST is known to be slightly asymmetrical for the left and right hemispheres in healthy subjects.[30] Considering that right-hemispheric lesions were flipped to the left hemisphere, we therefore created left- and right-hemispheric CST tracts and combined them into a single mask after flipping the right-hemispheric tract along the mid-sagittal plane. Thereby we ensured that all relevant voxels were captured (Fig. 2).



Figure 2: Cortico-cortical and descending motor network connections. Fiber tracts between core areas of the cortical motor network were created using deterministic fiber tracking based on the HCP1065-template[21] in DSI Studio (*upper row*). Motor tract templates used for gFA extraction are depicted as overlays in MRIcroGL *(lower row)*.[31] Note that for the ipsilesional CST, tracking was first performed in both hemispheres (*upper row*) and then combined into a single ipsilesional CST mask after flipping the right-hemispheric tract to the left (*lower row*). *blue = connection with PMd, green = connection with PMv, yellow = connections with SMA, red = M1-M1 homologous connection, purple = corticospinal tract.*

Extraction of tractwise anisotropy

To quantify structural connectivity, diffusion data of patients were compartmentalized using a DSI-based compartment-wise approach.[30] A deterministic mask was applied to whole-brain gFA-maps in order to differentiate voxels according to the number of trackable fiber directions.[30] This approach has been shown to facilitate the analyses of anisotropy in stroke patients.[20] Importantly, for all subsequent analyses, tractwise gFA-values were determined based on voxels with only one dominant fiber direction. Focusing the analysis on one-directional voxels helped us to overcome the methodological limitations of biased anisotropy estimations in voxels with multiple fiber directions (for a detailed discussion on the impact of compartmentalization on analyses of anisotropy please see [20,30]).

Structural connectivity and motor control after stroke

A potential relationship between anisotropy of cortico-cortical motor connections and different aspects of motor control after stroke was tested via Pearson correlations. In order to probe for a relationship with basal motor control, correlations were computed between the MI-arm score and tractwise mean gFA. The latter were extracted from one-directional voxels of the ipsilesional intrahemispheric connections (3 tracts), interhemispheric connections (3 tracts) and homologous connections (4 tracts). All p-values were FDR-corrected for multiple comparisons.[32] To probe for relationships with complex motor control, the analyses were repeated using the ARAT score.

To address the question whether the associations between cortico-cortical connectivity and motor control were dependent on CST damage, partial correlations were computed controlling for ipsilesional CST anisotropy. To exclude that using the whole ipsilesional CST biased results because of a small partial overlap of CST voxels with voxels containing cortico-cortical connections, partial correlations were also calculated for voxels of the corresponding ipsilesional posterior limb of the internal capsule (PLIC)[33–35] manually sectioned from z=-5 to 12. To further ensure that results were not driven by the direct impact of the lesion, all correlation analyses were repeated after excluding specific tracts in individual subjects that showed an overlap between the lesion and tract voxels of more than 20%.

Importantly, CST integrity has also been related to the degree of motor recovery after stroke.[1] However, recovery is multifaceted, with good outcomes potentially deriving from various distinct mechanisms at the network level. For example, a small lesion may lead to mild initial impairment which yields a good outcome (almost) independent of the degree of recovery. On the other hand, patients with lesions involving a large amount of brain tissue suffering from severe initial impairment may recover substantially during rehabilitation, also resulting in a good outcome at the chronic stage. Therefore, we wanted to assess the relationship between cortico-cortical motor network connectivity and motor outcome in a recovery-dependent manner. To this end, we divided the patient cohort into two subgroups featuring substantial or non-substantial upper limb recovery, as reflected by improvements in the NIHSS arm score between the acute and chronic phases. Correlation analyses with basal motor outcome scores were repeated for both subgroups.

Stepwise linear backward regressions

Stepwise linear backward regressions were computed to probe for the extent of explained variance in basal (MI-arm) and complex (ARAT) motor performance by the integrity of ipsilesional CST and cortico-cortical connectivity. To account for the relatively small sample size, we chose stepwise elimination based on the Bayesian information criterion (BIC, k = log(n), n = 25) rather than the Akaike information criterion (AIC). For a better appraisal of the ratio of explained variance by the combined model, we also assessed how much variance was accounted for by CST anisotropy alone. As CST damage is considered a valid biomarker for motor impairment post-stroke,[2] the direct comparison is a good indicator for the suitability of cortico-cortical structural connectivity as a potential biomarker.

Data availability statement

Data are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request. Tract templates used for the extraction of tractwise anisotropy can be downloaded from the following link: https://tinyurl.com/4ttnnzsr

Results

Correlation analyses

Basal upper limb motor control as reflected by the MI-arm was positively correlated with tractwise anisotropy (for an overview of mean tractwise gFA, please see Supplementary Fig. 2) of the homologous clM1-ilM1 connection, all intrahemispheric premotor-ilM1 connections as well as the interhemispheric clPMv-ilM1 connection (Table 1; Fig. 3A). Thus, higher levels of anisotropy were found in patients featuring higher levels of basal motor control of the stroke-affected arm. Conversely, homologous interhemispheric premotor connections consistently showed no significant associations with basal motor control (all p>.6).

Table1: Pearson correlations between basal motor control and cortico-cortical connections. Bold font indicates significance after FDR-correction (p<.05). Bold and italic font combined indicates significance before FDR-correction (p<.05).

connection	r	p	p (FDR)
homologous			
clM1-ilM1	**0.62**	**0.001**	**0.004**
clPMd-ilPMd	-0.15	0.486	0.607
clPMv-ilPMv	0.06	0.761	0.845
clSMA-ilSMA	0.00	0.983	0.983
intrahemispheric			
ilPMd-ilM1	**0.63**	**0.001**	**0.004**
ilPMv-ilM1	**0.72**	**<0.001**	**0.001**
ilSMA-ilM1	**0.54**	**0.005**	**0.013**
interhemispheric			
clPMd-ilM1	0.31	0.134	0.191
clPMv-ilM1	**0.53**	**0.006**	**0.013**
clSMA-ilM1	***0.43***	***0.031***	***0.051***

For motor control of complex arm and hand movements as measured by the ARAT, significant positive correlations were observed with anisotropy of the homologous clM1-ilM1 connection, all intrahemispheric premotor-ilM1 connections as well as interhemispheric clPMv-ilM1 and clSMA-ilM1 connections (Table 2; Fig. 3A). Thus, in accordance with our findings for basal motor control, higher tractwise anisotropy was associated with higher levels of complex upper limb motor control. Our findings are thus in line with the notion that structural motor network connectivity between ipsilesional M1 and (i) bihemispheric premotor areas as well as (ii) contralesional M1 support both basal and complex motor function of the paretic arm and hand in chronic stroke patients.

Table 2: Pearson correlations between complex motor control and cortico-cortical connections. Bold font indicates significance (p<.05, FDR-corrected).

connection	r	p	p (FDR)
homologous			
clM1-ilM1	**0.49**	**0.013**	**0.033**
clPMd-ilPMd	-0.14	0.506	0.633
clPMv-ilPMv	0.07	0.737	0.737
clSMA-ilSMA	0.09	0.684	0.737
intrahemispheric			
ilPMd-ilM1	**0.51**	**0.01**	**0.033**
ilPMv-ilM1	**0.59**	**0.002**	**0.018**
ilSMA-ilM1	**0.49**	**0.013**	**0.033**
interhemispheric			
clPMd-ilM1	0.28	0.183	0.261
clPMv-ilM1	**0.44**	**0.028**	**0.047**
clSMA-ilM1	**0.45**	**0.028**	**0.046**



Figure 3: Association between structural motor network connectivity and motor control after stroke. Tractwise anisotropy of several cortico-cortical connections showed a significant association with basal or complex motor control. (**A**) Correlation coefficients of significant Pearson correlations. (**B**) Significant partial correlations of cortico-cortical connections with motor behavior when controlling for ipsilesional CST damage. Solid lines indicate significance (p<.05) after FDR-correction, while dashed lines indicate significance before FDR-correction. Significance thresholds: *** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05. *M1 = primary motor cortex, PMd = dorsal premotor cortex, PMv = ventral premotor cortex, SMA = supplementary motor area, ilCST = ipsilesional corticospinal tract*

Partial correlation analyses

Partial correlation analyses were performed to control for the effect of ipsilesional CST integrity on tractwise correlations with motor behavior. For basal motor control, results of the partial correlation analyses were highly similar compared to our previously observed correlations (Fig. 3B). In particular, anisotropy of all intrahemispheric premotor-ilM1 connections (r>.59, p<.008, FDR-corrected) were associated with basal motor control (Supplementary Table 3). Regarding interhemispheric connectivity, clPMv-ilM1 connectivity also remained significant (r=.53, p=.018, FDR-corrected). Conversely, the correlation with anisotropy of the clM1-ilM1 tract only yielded a statistical trend (r=.45, p=.058, FDR-corrected) when controlling for ipsilesional CST integrity. In summary, structural connectivity between the ipsilesional M1 and

all ipsilesional premotor areas, as well as contralesional PMv and M1 was associated with basal motor control independent of ipsilesional CST integrity.

In contrast, the previously observed correlations between cortico-cortical connections and complex motor control were not fully independent from ipsilesional CST integrity (Fig. 3B). No significant partial correlations were observed after correction for multiple comparisons. Correlations for all intrahemispheric and one interhemispheric premotor-ilM1 connection (clPMv-ilM1) merely showed statistical trends instead ($r>.42$, $p<.096$, FDR-corrected; Supplementary Table 4). Of note, for the homologous ilM1-c1M1 tract, the partial correlation analysis did not even yield a significant association at an uncorrected level ($r=.26$, $p=.352$, FDR-corrected; $p=.211$, uncorrected), underlining the strong dependence of complex motor control on CST output. Thus, our findings outline the crucial role of ipsilesional CST integrity for complex motor control after stroke as compensatory effects at the cortical level seem to be limited in case of substantial ipsilesional CST damage. Conversely, the cortical motor network may compensate for the loss of basal motor control via altered premotor-ilM1 interactions, as well as with a possible use of the contralesional hemisphere via the clM1-ilM1 connection.

Computing partial correlations using anisotropy extracted from the ipsilesional PLIC instead of the entire CST yielded highly similar results for basic and complex motor control. This similarity renders a bias introduced by a potential overlap of voxels in ipsilesional CST and cortico-cortical connections unlikely (Supplementary Fig. 3B; Supplementary Table 5-6).

To further ensure that our current results were not biased by lesions directly affecting cortico-cortical connections, correlation analyses were repeated after excluding certain tracts in three patients that showed an overlap between the stroke lesion and tract of more than 20%. Importantly, Pearson correlations as well as partial correlations with the ipsilesional CST yielded highly similar results, corroborating the robustness of our findings (Supplementary Fig. 4; Supplementary Table 7-8).

Motor network connectivity and motor recovery

Patients were divided into subgroups with (N=15) and without (N=10) substantial recovery of arm motor function to assess whether the degree of recovery impacts the association between structural motor connectivity and motor control. Correlation analyses between tractwise anisotropy and basal motor control were repeated for both subgroups. For patients featuring

substantial recovery, basal motor control was strongly associated with mean anisotropy of the homologous clM1-ilM1 tract (r=.79, p=.004, FDR-corrected; Table 3; Fig. 4A) but showed no association with premotor-M1 connectivity. Conversely, for patients showing no substantial recovery of arm motor function, ipsilesional premotor-ilM1 connectivity was significantly correlated with motor control (all r>.81, p<.014, FDR-corrected; Table 3; Fig.4A). Of note, no significant association was observed for the clM1-ilM1 connection (p=.332, FDR-corrected). Importantly, partial correlation analyses yielded highly similar results (Fig. 4B; Supplementary Table 9), indicating that recovery-dependent differences in the reliance on cortico-cortical connections were largely independent of ipsilesional CST integrity. Excluding distinct cortico-cortical connections for patients (n=3) featuring a significant overlap of lesions with these connections for correlation analyses yielded highly similar results, corroborating the robustness of our findings (Supplementary Fig. 5; Supplementary Table 10-11).

In summary, while patients with substantial arm motor recovery seemed to heavily rely on interhemispheric connectivity between homologous clM1-ilM1 to ensure basal motor control, patients without substantial recovery of arm function featured no such association. Hence, our findings highlight an essential role of interhemispheric clM1-ilM1 connectivity in motor recovery, which may serve as a critical route to recruit the intact contralesional motor network and its descending pathways to compensate for the lesion-induced impairment of motor control after stroke.

Table 3: Pearson correlations of cortico-cortical connections with basal motor function for subgroups with different degrees of recovery. Bold font indicates significance after FDR-correction (p<.05). Bold and italic font combined indicates significance before FDR-correction (p<.05). Results are visualized in Fig. 4.

	substantial recovery			no substantial recovery		
connection	**r**	**p**	**p (FDR)**	**r**	**p**	**p (FDR)**
homologous						
clM1-ilM1	**0.79**	**<0.001**	**0.004**	0.44	0.199	0.332
clPMd-ilPMd	0.26	0.345	0.463	-0.45	0.193	0.332
clPMv-ilPMv	0.25	0.369	0.463	0.07	0.837	0.837
clSMA-ilSMA	0.33	0.224	0.463	-0.33	0.358	0.435
intrahemispheric						
ilPMd-ilM1	0.25	0.37	0.463	**0.85**	**0.002**	**0.01**
ilPMv-ilM1	***0.58***	***0.023***	***0.116***	**0.81**	**0.004**	**0.014**
ilSMA-ilM1	0.05	0.862	0.862	**0.9**	**<0.001**	**0.004**
interhemispheric						
clPMd-ilM1	0.22	0.421	0.468	0.33	0.355	0.435
clPMv-ilM1	0.31	0.267	0.463	***0.71***	***0.021***	***0.051***
clSMA-ilM1	0.5	0.06	0.199	0.3	0.392	0.435



Figure 4: Recovery-dependent subgroup analysis: association between structural motor network connectivity and basal motor control after stroke. (**A**) Significant Pearson correlations between tractwise mean gFA and basal or complex motor control for patients showing (i) substantial or (ii) no substantial recovery. (**B**) Significant partial correlations between tractwise mean gFA and basal motor control when controlling for ipsilesional CST integrity in patients featuring (i) substantial or (ii) no substantial recovery. Of note, only subjects featuring substantial recovery of arm motor control showed an association of clM1-ilM1 connectivity with basal motor control, highlighting a compensatory role of transcallosal fibers. Solid lines indicate significance (p<.05) after FDR-correction, while dashed lines indicate significance before FDR-correction. Significance thresholds: *** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05. *M1 = primary motor cortex, PMd = dorsal premotor cortex, PMv = ventral premotor cortex, SMA = supplementary motor area, ilCST = ipsilesional corticospinal tract*

Stepwise linear backward regressions

First, we assessed the propensity of CST integrity to explain behavioral impairment. For basal motor control, 28% of variance (p=.007, R^2 = 27.72%, adjusted R^2= 24.58%, BIC=132.46) was explained by the ipsilesional CST. A highly similar result was obtained for complex motor control (p=.007, R^2=27.78%, adjusted R^2=24.64 %, BIC=130.88). Next, stepwise backward regression models were computed to assess how much variance could be explained by combining tractwise anisotropy of the cortico-cortical motor network with ipsilesional CST integrity (11 tracts in total). The resulting models explained a high amount of variance for both

basal and complex motor control. Specifically, 74% of variance in basal motor control ($p<.001$, $R^2=73.56\%$, adjusted $R^2=69.78\%$, BIC=113.76) and 63% of variance in complex motor control ($p=.001$, $R^2=63.22\%$, adjusted $R^2=53.54\%$, BIC=126.88) were captured. When excluding the ipsilesional CST and only using cortico-cortical connections to start the backward elimination process, both resulting models still explained a substantial amount of variance in basal ($p<.001$, $R^2=74.75\%$, adjusted $R^2=71.15\%$, BIC=112.6) and complex motor control ($p<.001$, $R^2=53.13\%$, adjusted $R^2=48.87\%$, BIC=123.29). Of note, while the ratio of explained variance in basal motor performance remained similar, explained variance in complex motor control considerably decreased after excluding the ipsilesional CST. Thus, the stepwise linear backward regression analyses showed that structural motor network connectivity holds valuable information on motor control across subjects. While basal motor control is readily explained by cortico-cortical connectivity, complex motor control of the paretic arm and hand crucially relies on the integrity of the ipsilesional CST.

Discussion

In the present study, we addressed how structural connectivity between cortical regions of the core motor network relates to different aspects of motor control in the chronic stage post-stroke. Our results show that both basal and complex motor skills were associated with structural connectivity between premotor areas and the ipsilesional M1 as well as interhemispheric M1-M1 connectivity. Importantly, tractwise correlations with complex motor skills exhibited a stronger dependence on ipsilesional CST integrity than those with basal motor control. Similarly, patients who had substantially recovered from the acute to the chronic stage exhibited a strong correlation between M1-M1 connectivity and basal motor control independent of CST integrity. Conversely, this correlation could not be observed in patients without substantial recovery who showed a stronger association with premotor-M1 connectivity. Thus, our findings are in line with the notion that successful recovery of basal motor control relies on the recruitment of the contralesional hemisphere to relay motor signals through alternative pathways. Further support for this notion stemmed from our stepwise linear regression analyses. Here, the explanation of variance in complex motor control depended on cortico-cortical connectivity and the ipsilesional CST, while basal motor control was most adequately explained by cortico-cortical connectivity alone. Finally, for both basal and complex motor control,

cortico-cortical structural connectivity explained motor behavior to a higher degree than the commonly used ipsilesional CST anisotropy, highlighting its potential to serve as a biomarker for motor recovery post-stroke.

Complex motor control

The control of complex arm and hand movements is assumed to rely on a network of distributed cortical and subcortical motor areas, as well as its descending pathways such as the CST.[36] At the cortical level, premotor areas are crucially involved in shaping motor commands in M1 via dense cortico-cortical connections.[37] In line with this assumption, we here observed significant correlations between complex motor skills and cortico-cortical connectivity from contralesional M1 and bilateral premotor areas to the ipsilesional M1 (Fig. 3A). However, when controlling for ipsilesional CST integrity, no significant correlations between cortico-cortical motor areas and complex motor control were observed (Fig. 3B). In other words, similar variance in complex motor control was captured by anisotropy of ipsilesional CST and cortico-cortical connectivity. Then again, partial correlations with intrahemispheric premotor-M1 connectivity still showed a trend towards significance, indicating a less pronounced reliance on CST integrity. An explanation for this observation may derive from previous results indicating that motor performance post-stroke critically relies on the task-dependent modulation of ipsilesional premotor-M1 connectivity.[4,6] Hence, premotor areas may use intact structural cortico-cortical connections to enhance recruitment of the ipsilesional M1. Given that ipsilesional M1 and premotor areas may struggle to generate descending motor output due to ipsilesional CST damage, enhanced cortical premotor-M1 interactions may not fully succeed in controlling movements of the paretic hand, stressing the significance of ipsilesional CST integrity.

This notion is well in line with earlier studies frequently reporting correlations between ipsilesional CST integrity and hand motor function.[2,35,38–40] Further support for the critical role of the ipsilesional CST stemmed from the stepwise regression analyses which performed best when including CST anisotropy in the starting model. In other words, the CST explained relevant behavioral variance in addition to the information contained in cortico-cortical connectivity. Thus, complex motor commands seem to critically rely on ipsilesional CST output signals. Of note, our findings suggest only a minimal degree of cortico-cortical compensation of complex motor control independent of CST anisotropy (cf. Fig 3). However, this does not generally preclude cortico-cortical compensation which may also arise in association to CST

damage. For example, higher degrees of compensation may result from more pronounced CST damage.

Support for this notion derives from recent work by Peters and colleagues who reported an association between structural M1-M1 connectivity and the Box and Block test that requires patients to move objects using a pinch grip with their paretic hand.[10] The observed correlation between structural M1-M1 connectivity and hand motor performance may reflect supportive influences exerted by the contralesional onto the ipsilesional M1, as previously described by models of effective motor connectivity after stroke.[4] While this interpretation remains speculative, future research combining structural and functional neuroimaging data is needed to assess how structural cortico-cortical connectivity may predetermine cortical reorganization to enable the recovery of complex motor control after stroke.

Basal motor control

We conceptualized basal motor control as simple movements that require only basic control of specific muscle synergies such as lifting the arm against gravity. Previous studies have reported an association of basal upper limb control with structural connectivity between ipsilesional premotor-M1[10,16] as well as transcallosal M1-M1[10,12,13]. Our present findings are well in line with these results: we observed strong associations of the MI-arm with anisotropy of all three ipsilesional premotor-M1 tracts, moderate to strong correlations with interhemispheric premotor-M1 connectivity, and a strong link with interhemispheric M1-M1 connectivity (Fig. 3A). These findings converge with recent studies reporting basal motor control to be associated with transcallosal M1-M1,[10–13] ipsilesional SMA-M1[10] and ipsilesional PMd-M1[16] connectivity. Another study also found a relationship between basal motor skills and structural PMv-M1 connectivity, yet exclusively in patients with severe CST damage.[17]

From a mechanistic perspective, stronger structural cortico-cortical connections may allow for a more flexible and efficient transmission of motor signals, thereby enabling increased influences of bilateral premotor areas onto ipsilesional M1.[4] Alternatively, retrograde coupling from M1 onto premotor areas might also play a role in compensating motor skills. In this case, output signals that cannot be transmitted through damaged CST fibers originating from M1 might be relayed via CST fibers descending from premotor areas. Of note, partial correlations keeping the influence of ipsilesional CST anisotropy constant revealed that associations between cortico-cortical connections and basal motor control were largely independent of CST integrity (Fig. 3B). This did not only hold true for premotor-M1 connections, but correlations

between interhemispheric M1-M1 connectivity and basal motor control also showed a less pronounced dependence on corticospinal integrity compared to complex motor control. Further support for this notion derives from the stepwise backward regression results. While variance in basal motor performance was well captured by cortico-cortical connections, adding ipsilesional CST anisotropy to the initial connections of the starting model did not improve model performance. This (partial) independence from CST integrity may seem somewhat surprising and leads to the question how basal motor skills can be controlled via alternative motor output pathways such as the non-crossing fibers of the contralesional CST or extrapyramidal tracts.[22]

Interhemispheric M1-M1 connectivity and motor recovery

The role of the contralesional M1 in motor recovery after stroke remains a topic of on-going debate. While some interpret the commonly observed overactivation of the contralesional M1 to serve a vicarious role by contributing to motor control of the paretic hand,[41–44] other results favor a maladaptive influence of the contralesional M1.[45–47] Maladaptation is frequently conceptualized to result from increased inhibitory influences exerted by the contralesional M1 onto the ipsilesional M1 as demonstrated by transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS)[46] and fMRI-based effective connectivity[45]. In keeping with this view, inhibiting the contralesional M1 via repetitive TMS in subacute stroke patients resulted in diminished inhibition of the ipsilesional by the contralesional M1 alongside improved motor performance of the paretic hand.[48]

Conversely, the contralesional M1 may also take on a supportive role by either (i) directly supporting the ipsilesional M1[4] or by (ii) offering an alternative route for descending motor commands to circumvent the damaged ipsilesional CST. In the latter case, ipsilesional M1 motor signals may be projected via interhemispheric callosal fibers to contralesional M1, which offers access to the intact contralesional CST.[22] As non-crossing CST fibers innervate predominantly proximal arm and shoulder muscles,[36] one would expect this pathway to support proximal arm and shoulder movements rather than fine motor control of the hand and fingers. Thus, compensation via the contralesional hemisphere might be heavily task-dependent and primarily support basal motor commands involving proximal muscle groups. Support for this view stems from an online TMS-study reporting a detrimental effect of contralesional M1 activation on finger tapping frequency but not grip strength.[49]

Notably, our current findings underline the notion of a task-dependent role of the contralesional M1 and highlight CST damage as an additional factor that might influence the impact of the contralesional hemisphere on stroke recovery. Specifically, the relationship between M1-M1 anisotropy and motor impairment showed a stronger dependence on CST integrity in case of complex as opposed to basal motor skills. As basal motor control measured by the MI-arm score emphasizes the use of proximal muscle groups (except for the item pinch grip, cf. Fig. 1), one may speculate that basal motor commands were transmitted via transcallosal fibers to recruit the contralesional M1. This hypothesis nicely aligns with previous studies reporting an association between callosal anisotropy and (basal) motor performance.[10–13] Further support for this notion derives from our current recovery-dependent findings. Patients featuring substantial recovery of arm motor function showed strong correlations between interhemispheric M1-M1 connectivity and basal motor control independent from ipsilesional CST integrity (Fig. 4). Consistent with our present findings, Stewart and colleagues reported anisotropy of callosal motor regions to be linked to (basal) motor control in patients with favorable motor outcomes at the chronic stage. In contrast, this relationship did not manifest in patients with poor motor outcome.[13] Hence, recovery of basal motor function might depend on a patient's ability to recruit the contralesional M1 via interhemispheric callosal fibers. The individual level of structural transcallosal connectivity might predetermine such recruitment, thereby serving as a structural reserve, as suggested by the positive correlation observed for well-recovered patients. This notion is supported by a recent study by Peng and colleagues, who reported effective connectivity from ipsilesional onto contralesional M1 to be correlated with transcallosal anisotropy.[50] In other words, stronger recruitment of the contralesional by the ipsilesional M1 might be enabled by higher levels of transcallosal structural connectivity.

In summary, our findings suggest a task-dependent role of the contralesional M1 in motor control after stroke. For complex motor control, the functional relevance of the contralesional M1 depends on ipsilesional CST integrity and may assume a maladaptive role especially in patients suffering from extensive CST damage. Conversely, basal motor performance showed less reliance on CST anisotropy, possibly indicating that basal motor skills can be compensated via recruitment of the contralesional M1 to access alternative routes for descending motor output signals relayed from ipsilesional M1. Patients who achieved substantial recovery between the acute and chronic phases seemed to rely on this alternative transcallosal route.

Clinical relevance

Our current findings highlight the potential of structural cortico-cortical motor network connectivity as a biomarker to predict motor impairment following stroke. Structural scans can be easily integrated into the clinical routine as they only require little patient compliance.[51,52] For example, the DSI scanning protocol used in the present study has a relatively fast acquisition time of only 11 minutes. While ipsilesional CST anisotropy has repeatedly been suggested as a biomarker,[2] cortico-cortical connectivity has yet to be considered. A possible reason might lie in the difficulty to accurately estimate anisotropy in voxels with multiple fiber directions. We here overcame this problem using a compartmentwise approach that differentiates voxels according to the number of trackable fiber directions,[30] allowing us to estimate tractwise anisotropy solely from one-directional voxels. Stepwise backward regression analyses yielded a high ratio of explained variance for both basal and complex motor skills, by far exceeding the ratio of explained variance achieved by CST integrity alone (complex motor control: 28% explained by CST anisotropy, 63% explained by stepwise regression model; basal motor control: 28% explained by CST anisotropy, 75% explained by stepwise regression model). Adding CST integrity as a variable to the starting model of the stepwise backward regression increased the percentage of explained variance for complex but not basal motor skills. Thus, a potential biomarker should ideally be task-specific and differentiate between basal and complex motor skills. More specifically, our results suggest that a biomarker for basal motor skills should consist of cortico-cortical structural connectivity, while a biomarker for complex motor skills should consider cortico-cortical connectivity and CST integrity in concert.

Limitations

A major limitation pertains to the limited sample size of 25 chronic stroke patients. While this sample size is not unusual for hypothesis-driven imaging studies in patient cohorts, a larger sample size would allow for additional analyses. One may argue that our result may have been biased by lesions affecting cortico-cortical connections. However, most patients featured subcortical lesions that primarily affected the internal capsule. Thus, cortico-cortical tracts were hardly ever directly affected. Moreover, repeating the analysis without subjects showing a significant lesion overlap yielded highly similar results (cf. Supplementary Fig. 4-5). Thus, while we cannot confidently determine the origin of low or high anisotropy values across subjects, a considerable lesion-induced bias seems unlikely. Conversely, all subjects showed some form of CST damage. To accurately depict secondary degeneration processes within the

CST rather than portraying the direct effect of the lesion, we applied lesion masks prior to the extraction of tractwise anisotropy. Therefore, CST anisotropy should accurately depict Wallerian degeneration rather than direct lesion effects.

Conclusion

Our current findings highlight the seminal importance of structural cortico-cortical motor network connectivity for distinct aspects of motor control post-stroke. Our data emphasize that complex motor control depends on an interplay of cortico-cortical information integration and descending motor commands via the ipsilesional CST. Thus, severe CST damage seems to preclude the control of complex motor functions of the paretic hand. Conversely, our findings suggest that basal motor control can be successfully compensated via alternative routes: Interhemispheric pathways between bilateral M1 seem to play a crucial role in relaying motor commands to the contralesional motor cortex which may help to access intact descending pathways such as non-crossing fibers of the contralesional CST.[22] Patients who underwent substantial recovery from the acute to the chronic stage post-stroke seemed to heavily rely on this route as reflected by a strong correlation between M1-M1 connectivity and basal motor control independent of CST integrity. This dissociation of the role of interhemispheric M1-M1 connectivity observed across basal and complex motor functions may help to explain conflicting previous notions of a vicarious or maladaptive role of the contralesional M1 in motor recovery after stroke. Finally, our results identify cortico-cortical structural connectivity combined with CST integrity as a possible biomarker for basal and complex motor functions after stroke which is emphasized by the high degree of explained behavioral variance when using both in concert.

Funding

GRF gratefully acknowledges support from the Marga and Walter Boll Stiftung, Kerpen, Germany. CG and GRF are funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – Project-ID 431549029 – SFB 1451. STG was supported by the Institute for Collaborative Biotechnologies under Cooperative Agreement W911NF-19-2-0026 with the Army Research Office.

Competing interests

The authors report no competing interests.

Supplementary material

Supplementary material is available online.

References

1. Koch P, Schulz R, Hummel FC. Structural connectivity analyses in motor recovery research after stroke. *Ann Clin Transl Neurol*. 2016;3(3):233-244. doi:10.1002/acn3.278
2. Boyd LA, Hayward KS, Ward NS, et al. Biomarkers of stroke recovery: Consensus-based core recommendations from the Stroke Recovery and Rehabilitation Roundtable. *Int J Stroke*. 2017;12(5):480-493. doi:10.1177/1747493017714176
3. Grefkes C, Ward NS. Cortical Reorganization After Stroke. *Neurosci*. 2014;20(1):56-70. doi:10.1177/1073858413491147
4. Rehme AK, Eickhoff SB, Wang LE, Fink GR, Grefkes C. Dynamic causal modeling of cortical activity from the acute to the chronic stage after stroke. *Neuroimage*. 2011;55(3):1147-1158. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.01.014
5. Rehme AK, Grefkes C. Cerebral network disorders after stroke: evidence from imaging-based connectivity analyses of active and resting brain states in humans. *J Physiol*. 2013;591(1):17-31. doi:10.1113/jphysiol.2012.243469
6. Paul T, Hensel L, Rehme AK, et al. Early motor network connectivity after stroke: An interplay of general reorganization and state-specific compensation. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2021;42(16):5230-5243. doi:10.1002/hbm.25612
7. Carter AR, Shulman GL, Corbetta M. Why use a connectivity-based approach to study stroke and recovery of function? *Neuroimage*. 2012;62(4):2271-2280. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.02.070
8. Golestani AM, Tymchuk S, Demchuk A, Goodyear BG. Longitudinal Evaluation of Resting-State fMRI After Acute Stroke With Hemiparesis. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2013;27(2):153-163. doi:10.1177/1545968312457827
9. Rubinov M, Sporns O. Complex network measures of brain connectivity: Uses and interpretations. *Neuroimage*. 2010;52(3):1059-1069. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2009.10.003
10. Peters DM, Fridriksson J, Stewart JC, et al. Cortical disconnection of the ipsilesional primary motor cortex is associated with gait speed and upper extremity motor impairment in chronic left hemispheric stroke. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2018;39(1):120-132. doi:10.1002/hbm.23829
11. Chen JL, Schlaug G. Resting State Interhemispheric Motor Connectivity and White Matter Integrity Correlate with Motor Impairment in Chronic Stroke. *Front Neurol*. 2013;4. doi:10.3389/fneur.2013.00178
12. Hayward K, Ferris JK, Lohse KR, et al. Observational Study of Neuroimaging Biomarkers of Severe Upper Limb Impairment After Stroke. *Neurology*. Published online May 12, 2022:1-42. doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000200517
13. Stewart JC, Dewanjee P, Tran G, et al. Role of corpus callosum integrity in arm function differs based on motor severity after stroke. *NeuroImage Clin*. 2017;14:641-647. doi:10.1016/j.nicl.2017.02.023
14. Wang LE, Tittgemeyer M, Imperati D, et al. Degeneration of corpus callosum and recovery of motor function after stroke: A multimodal magnetic resonance imaging study. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2012;33(12):2941-2956. doi:10.1002/hbm.21417
15. Lindenberg R, Zhu LL, Rüber T, Schlaug G. Predicting functional motor potential in

chronic stroke patients using diffusion tensor imaging. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2012;33(5):1040-1051. doi:10.1002/hbm.21266

16. Schulz R, Braass H, Liuzzi G, et al. White matter integrity of premotor–motor connections is associated with motor output in chronic stroke patients. *NeuroImage Clin*. 2015;7:82-86. doi:10.1016/j.nicl.2014.11.006

17. Schulz R, Park E, Lee J, et al. Interactions Between the Corticospinal Tract and Premotor–Motor Pathways for Residual Motor Output After Stroke. *Stroke*. 2017;48(10):2805-2811. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.117.016834

18. Schlemm E, Schulz R, Bönstrup M, et al. Structural brain networks and functional motor outcome after stroke—a prospective cohort study. *Brain Commun*. 2020;2(1):1-13. doi:10.1093/braincomms/fcaa001

19. Kalinosky BT, Schindler-Ivens S, Schmit BD. White matter structural connectivity is associated with sensorimotor function in stroke survivors. *NeuroImage Clin*. 2013;2(1):767-781. doi:10.1016/j.nicl.2013.05.009

20. Paul T, Cieslak M, Hensel L, et al. The role of corticospinal and extrapyramidal pathways in motor impairment after stroke. *medRxiv*. Published online 2022. doi:https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.06.22274684

21. Yeh FC, Panesar S, Fernandes D, et al. Population-averaged atlas of the macroscale human structural connectome and its network topology. *Neuroimage*. 2018;178(April):57-68. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.05.027

22. Schaechter JD, Fricker ZP, Perdue KL, et al. Microstructural status of ipsilesional and contralesional corticospinal tract correlates with motor skill in chronic stroke patients. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2009;30(11):3461-3474. doi:10.1002/hbm.20770

23. Lyle RC. A performance test for assessment of upper limb function in physical rehabilitation treatment and research. *Int J Rehabil Res*. 1981;4(4):483-492.

24. Demeurisse G, Demol O, Robaye E. Motor Evaluation in Vascular Hemiplegia. *Eur Neurol*. 1980;19(6):382-389. doi:10.1159/000115178

25. Brott T, Adams HP, Olinger CP, et al. Measurements of acute cerebral infarction: a clinical examination scale. *Stroke*. 1989;20(7):864-870. doi:10.1161/01.STR.20.7.864

26. Cieslak M, Cook PA, He X, et al. QSIPrep: an integrative platform for preprocessing and reconstructing diffusion MRI data. *Nat Methods*. 2021;18(7):775-778. doi:10.1038/s41592-021-01185-5

27. Avants BB, Epstein CL, Grossman M, Gee JC. Symmetric diffeomorphic image registration with cross-correlation: evaluating automated labeling of elderly and neurodegenerative brain. *Med Image Anal*. 2008;12(1):26-41. doi:10.1016/j.media.2007.06.004

28. Volz LJ, Sarfeld AS, Diekhoff S, et al. Motor cortex excitability and connectivity in chronic stroke: a multimodal model of functional reorganization. *Brain Struct Funct*. 2015;220(2):1093-1107. doi:10.1007/s00429-013-0702-8

29. Yeh FC, Verstynen TD, Wang Y, Fernández-Miranda JC, Tseng WYI. Deterministic diffusion fiber tracking improved by quantitative anisotropy. *PLoS One*. 2013;8(11):1-16. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0080713

30. Volz LJ, Cieslak M, Grafton ST. A probabilistic atlas of fiber crossings for variability reduction of anisotropy measures. *Brain Struct Funct*. 2018;223(2):635-651. doi:10.1007/s00429-017-1508-x

31. Rorden C, Brett M. Stereotaxic Display of Brain Lesions. *Behav Neurol*. 2000;12(4):191-200. doi:10.1155/2000/421719

32. Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. Controlling the False Discovery Rate : A Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing Author (s): Yoav Benjamini and Yosef Hochberg Source : Journal of the Royal Statistical Society . Series B (Methodological), Vol . 57 , No . 1 (1995), Publi. *J R Stat Soc*. 1995;57(1):289-300.

33. Doughty C, Wang J, Feng W, Hackney D, Pani E, Schlaug G. Detection and Predictive Value of Fractional Anisotropy Changes of the Corticospinal Tract in the Acute Phase of a Stroke. *Stroke*. 2016;47(6):1520-1526. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.115.012088

34. Archer DB, Vaillancourt DE, Coombes SA. A Template and Probabilistic Atlas of the Human Sensorimotor Tracts using Diffusion MRI. *Cereb Cortex*. 2018;28(5):1685-1699. doi:10.1093/CERCOR/BHX066

35. Lindenberg R, Renga V, Zhu LL, Betzler F, Alsop D, Schlaug G. Structural integrity of corticospinal motor fibers predicts motor impairment in chronic stroke. *Neurology*. 2010;74(4):280-287. doi:10.1212/WNL.0b013e3181ccc6d9

36. Lemon RN. Descending Pathways in Motor Control. *Annu Rev Neurosci*. 2008;31(1):195-218. doi:10.1146/annurev.neuro.31.060407.125547

37. Strick PL, Dum RP, Rathelot JA. The Cortical Motor Areas and the Emergence of Motor Skills: A Neuroanatomical Perspective. *Annu Rev Neurosci*. 2021;44(1):425-447. doi:10.1146/annurev-neuro-070918-050216

38. Puig J, Blasco G, Daunis-I-Estadella J, et al. Decreased Corticospinal Tract Fractional Anisotropy Predicts Long-term Motor Outcome After Stroke. *Stroke*. 2013;44(7):2016-2018. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.111.000382

39. Stinear CM, Barber PA, Smale PR, Coxon JP, Fleming MK, Byblow WD. Functional potential in chronic stroke patients depends on corticospinal tract integrity. *Brain*. 2007;130(Pt 1):170-180. doi:10.1093/brain/awl333

40. Peters DM, Fridriksson J, Richardson JD, et al. Upper and Lower Limb Motor Function Correlates with Ipsilesional Corticospinal Tract and Red Nucleus Structural Integrity in Chronic Stroke: A Cross-Sectional, ROI-Based MRI Study. Tambasco N, ed. *Behav Neurol*. 2021;2021:1-10. doi:10.1155/2021/3010555

41. Biernaskie J, Szymanska A, Windle V, Corbett D. Bi-hemispheric contribution to functional motor recovery of the affected forelimb following focal ischemic brain injury in rats. *Eur J Neurosci*. 2005;21(4):989-999. doi:10.1111/j.1460-9568.2005.03899.x

42. Johansen-Berg H, Rushworth MFS, Bogdanovic MD, Kischka U, Wimalaratna S, Matthews PM. The role of ipsilateral premotor cortex in hand movement after stroke. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*. 2002;99(22):14518-14523. doi:10.1073/pnas.222536799

43. Lotze M, Markert J, Sauseng P, Hoppe J, Plewnia C, Gerloff C. The role of multiple contralesional motor areas for complex hand movements after internal capsular lesion. *J Neurosci*. 2006;26(22):6096-6102. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4564-05.2006

44. Rehme AK, Fink GR, von Cramon DY, Grefkes C. The Role of the Contralesional Motor Cortex for Motor Recovery in the Early Days after Stroke Assessed with Longitudinal fMRI. *Cereb Cortex*. 2011;21(4):756-768. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhq140

45. Grefkes C, Nowak DA, Eickhoff SB, et al. Cortical connectivity after subcortical stroke assessed with functional magnetic resonance imaging. *Ann Neurol*. 2008;63(2):236-246. doi:10.1002/ana.21228

46. Murase N, Duque J, Mazzocchio R, Cohen LG. Influence of interhemispheric interactions on motor function in chronic stroke. *Ann Neurol*. 2004;55(3):400-409. doi:10.1002/ana.10848

47. Takeuchi N, Izumi SI. Maladaptive Plasticity for Motor Recovery after Stroke: Mechanisms and Approaches. *Neural Plast*. 2012;2012:1-9. doi:10.1155/2012/359728

48. Grefkes C, Nowak DA, Wang LE, Dafotakis M, Eickhoff SB, Fink GR. Modulating cortical connectivity in stroke patients by rTMS assessed with fMRI and dynamic causal modeling. *Neuroimage*. 2010;50(1):233-242. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2009.12.029

49. Volz LJ, Vollmer M, Michely J, Fink GR, Rothwell JC, Grefkes C. Time-dependent functional role of the contralesional motor cortex after stroke. *NeuroImage Clin*. 2017;16(June):165-174. doi:10.1016/j.nicl.2017.07.024

50. Peng Y, Liu J, Hua M, Liang M, Yu C. Enhanced Effective Connectivity From Ipsilesional to Contralesional M1 in Well-Recovered Subcortical Stroke Patients. *Front Neurol*. 2019;10(AUG):1-8. doi:10.3389/fneur.2019.00909

51. Horn U, Grothe M, Lotze M. MRI Biomarkers for Hand-Motor Outcome Prediction and Therapy Monitoring following Stroke. *Neural Plast*. 2016;2016:1-12. doi:10.1155/2016/9265621

52. Bonkhoff AK, Grefkes C. Precision medicine in stroke: towards personalized outcome predictions using artificial intelligence. *Brain*. 2022;145(2):457-475. doi:10.1093/brain/awab439