medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.01.23285304; this version posted February 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Peripheral nerve induction of inhibitory brain circuits to treat Tourette syndrome: A randomized crossover trial

Ann M. Iverson, Washington University in St. Louis School of Medicine, St. Louis, MO (ORCID ID 0000-0001-8844-7752)

Amanda L. Arbuckle, Department of Psychiatry, Washington University in St. Louis (ORCID ID 0000-0001-8267-580X)

Keisuke Ueda, M.D., Department of Neurology, Washington University in St. Louis (ORCID ID 0000-0003-4087-6018)

David Y. Song, University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry, Rochester, NY (ORCID ID 0000-0002-2178-9480)

Emily C. Bihun, M.Ed., Department of Psychiatry, Washington University in St. Louis (ORCID ID 0000-0002-0426-4498)

Jonathan M. Koller, BSEE, BSBME, Department of Psychiatry, Washington University in St. Louis (ORCID ID 0000-0002-1409-5608)

Michael Wallendorf, Ph.D., Division of Biostatistics, Washington University in St. Louis (ORCID ID 0000-0003-3005-3026)

Kevin J. Black, M.D., Departments of Psychiatry, Neurology, Radiology, and Neuroscience, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO (ORCID ID 0000-0002-6921-9567)

Address questions to Dr. Black at kevin@WUSTL.edu or
MSC 8134-70-2205
660 S. Euclid Avenue
St. Louis, Missouri 63110-1010

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.01.23285304; this version posted February 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Abstract

A prior study showed that rhythmic, but not arrhythmic, 12 Hz stimulation of the median nerve (MNS) entrained sensorimotor cortex EEG signal, and found that 10 Hz MNS improved tics in Tourette syndrome (TS). However, no control condition was tested and stimulation blocks lasted only 1 minute. We set out to replicate the TS results and to test whether tic improvement occurs by the proposed cortical entrainment mechanism. Thirty-two people with TS, age 15-64, completed two study visits with repeated MNS on and off blocks in random order, one visit for rhythmic and one for arrhythmic MNS. Subjects and staff were blind to order; a video rater was additionally blind to stimulation and to order of visits and blocks. Rhythmic MNS at 10 Hz improved tics. Both rhythmic and arrhythmic 12 Hz MNS improved tic frequency, intensity and urges without significant difference. Participant masking was effective and there was no carryover effect. Several participants described dramatic benefit. Discomfort was minimal. MNS benefit did not persist after the end of stimulation. These results replicate the tic benefit from MNS, but show that the EEG entrainment hypothesis cannot explain that benefit. Another electrophysiological mechanism may explain benefit; alternatively, these data do not exclude a placebo effect.

Registration: ClinicalTrials.gov, NCT04731714.

Keywords (MeSH): "Tourette Syndrome/therapy"; "Tic Disorders/therapy"; "Transcutaneous Electric Nerve Stimulation"; "Randomized Controlled Trial"; "Cross-Over Studies"

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.01.23285304; this version posted February 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Tourette syndrome (TS) and other chronic tic disorders (CTD) are associated with a reduced quality of life, and current treatment options do not fully meet patient needs [1]. Medications are no more than 50-60% effective in randomized controlled trials, and patients often choose to discontinue medication treatments due to associated side effects [2]. Behavioral therapies require trained therapists who are familiar with tics, and patients must have the ability to attend regularly and actively participate [3]. However, weekly visits to psychologists are impractical for many patients, especially those in rural areas or with limited resources [4]. Patients desire new treatment options to improve their quality of life [5].

Morera Maiquez et al from the University of Nottingham recently proposed peripheral electrical stimulation of the median nerve (MNS) as a treatment for TS and other CTD [6]. The rationale included repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) treatment studies of TS, and a study showing that rhythmic, but not arrhythmic, transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) pulses entrained cortical oscillations [7]. They hypothesized that rhythmic peripheral nerve stimulation, which in distinction to TMS could be delivered portably, might also entrain cortical oscillations and improve tics if delivered at a frequency previously associated with decreases in motor activity. They chose the mu frequency range (8-14 Hz) due to prior associations with motor function.

The Nottingham group demonstrated that 12 Hz rhythmic stimulation of the median nerve evoked synchronous contralateral EEG activity over the primary sensorimotor cortex. The stimulation created small but statistically significant dampening of the initiation of voluntary movements, but did not cause meaningful distraction, as measured by performance on a cognitively demanding test. A follow-up study found similar effects of MNS on cortical activity using magnetoencephalography [8]. In 19 TS patients treated with 10 Hz MNS, blinded video ratings showed significant reduction in tic counts and tic severity during stimulation. Additionally, patients reported a reduced urge to tic during MNS. Some participants reported benefit lasting after MNS was turned off. While the results of this study suggest MNS as a promising potential treatment option, the TS experiment had no active control treatment.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.01.23285304; this version posted February 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

However, that study suggests an optimal control condition. Arrhythmic MNS did not evoke EEG activity as rhythmic stimulation did, nor did it decrease volitional movements in healthy volunteers. Participants could not distinguish between rhythmic and arrhythmic stimulation at the same mean frequency. These results make arrhythmic stimulation an ideal active control condition to test the proposed mechanism of MNS for tics and possibly to exclude a placebo effect.

We designed the present study to replicate the results of the Nottingham study, to test the proposed mechanism of action using arrhythmic MNS as a control arm, and to systematically examine the duration of treatment benefit after stimulation ends.

Methods

Ethical approvals

The Washington University Human Research Protection Office (IRB) approved this study and deemed it a non-significant risk device study (approval # 202011092). Adult participants provided written informed consent, and participants under age 18 provided written documentation of assent and a parent provided written consent.

Participants

Participants were recruited through clinical referrals, referrals from the University of Nottingham research team, advertising and word of mouth. Recruitment and study completion occurred between June 2021 and April 2022.

Inclusion criteria for all subjects were: age 15-64 inclusive at initial screening visit, current DSM--5 Tourette's Disorder or Persistent (Chronic) Tic Disorder, and at least 1 tic per minute (on average) during the 5-minute baseline video session on the first visit (as scored during the session by the investigator). Exclusion criteria were: unable to complete study procedures for any reason, having an implanted device that could be affected by electrical current, pregnancy known to participant or (for children) to the parent, known or suspected primary genetic syndrome (e.g. Down syndrome, Fragile X), intellectual disability (known, or likely from history and examination), head trauma with loss of consciousness for more than 5 minutes, significant

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.01.23285304; this version posted February 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

neurologic disease (exceptions include febrile seizures or uncomplicated migraine), severe or unstable systemic illness, factors (such as exaggerated signs) that in the judgment of the principal investigator make the video recording or YGTSS an inaccurate assessment of tic severity, judged to be unlikely to complete study procedures or to return for later visits, change in somatic or psychotherapeutic treatment in the 2 weeks preceding the first stimulation visit, or planned change in somatic or psychotherapeutic treatment between the 2 stimulation visits.

A sample size of 32 participants was chosen, estimated to provide 75% power to detect clinically meaningful (25%) improvement in Yale Global Tic Severity Scale total tic scores (YGTSS TTS) [9], based on the mean response and variance in the original Nottingham study [6].

Trial Design

The study protocol was pre-registered prior to enrolling the first participant, and can be consulted for additional methodological details [10]. The study was a randomized, double-blind, crossover design with two study visits separated by a washout period of one week. A crossover design was chosen to maximize power, since carryover effect was expected to be negligible. Makeup sessions were allowed for technical or other problems, which occurred for 4 participants.

The two stimulation sessions were identical except that one session used rhythmic median nerve stimulation and the other used arrhythmic stimulation. Arrhythmic simulation used the same mean frequency, *i.e.* the same number of total pulses per minute, but the arrhythmic stimulation used a random inter-pulse interval. Session order was randomized using simple randomization via random.org, with half of participants receiving rhythmic stimulation first and half of participants receiving arrhythmic stimulation first. Author JMK, who was not present at the study visits, used the randomization sequence to program the stimulator. Participants and study staff present at the visit did not know the order of rhythmic and arrhythmic stimulation. Sessions were video recorded for later analysis by a blinded independent rater.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.01.23285304; this version posted February 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Prior to the first session, participants answered questions about family and medical history, treatment history, tic symptom history, current symptom status, and other comorbid symptom status. A clinician reviewed this information with the participants at the first visit, and performed a neurological and psychiatric examination as appropriate. Participants were told that stimulation would feel similar on the two days, but that on one day the stimulation would be given in a manner we expected would be effective and on the other day in a manner we expected would be ineffective, but that we did not know whether either or both would be effective.

A 5-minute baseline tic video was recorded and scored prior to the stimulation protocol to ensure the participant met the inclusion criterion of tics at a rate of at least one tic per minute. The stimulation protocol is described below. Prior to the second visit, participants updated health history, treatment, current tic symptoms and other comorbid symptom status. On the second visit, neurologic and psychiatric examinations were repeated as appropriate, and a second 5-minute baseline video was recorded prior to the stimulation protocol.

Clinical Assessment Measures

In addition to the YGTSS, assessments at baseline included the Diagnostic Confidence Index (DCI), a measure of classic features of Tourette syndrome [11], demographics, medical history and neuropsychiatric examination, and the following self-report symptom severity measures: the Adult Tic Questionnaire (ATQ) [12]; the Premonitory Urge for Tics Scale (PUTS) [13]; the ADHD Rating Scale [14], a self-report version [15] of the Yale-Brown Obsessive Compulsive Scale (Y-BOCS) Scale [16,17], the Social Responsiveness Scale (SRS-2), a validated self-report measure of current autistic trait severity [18], and the Edinburgh Handedness Inventory [19]. At the second visit, these assessments were repeated or reviewed.

Stimulation Protocol

A bar electrode with contacts 30 mm apart, center to center, was applied over the median nerve at the right wrist using conductive gel. The anode was distal. Stimulation threshold for movement of the thumb was determined for a train of 8 pulses at 12 Hz, with a pulse width of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.01.23285304; this version posted February 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

200 μs. Stimulation began at 2 mA and gradually increased until a twitch of the thumb was seen; this current was used for all remaining stimulation blocks on that study visit.

Stimulation was delivered by an SI-200 Isolated Stimulator device (iWorx, Dover, NH[1]) which is designed to limit maximum delivered current to 20 mA. Timing of stimulation was precisely controlled by a Mega 2560 microcomputer (Arduino, Turin, Italy[2]) delivering TTL pulses to the stimulator. Arrhythmic stimulation used a set 1-minute sequence of 600 (for 10 Hz) or 720 (for 12 Hz) 200 μs pulses with randomly generated start-to-start pulse intervals between 10 and 200 ms for 10 Hz and between 10 and 164 ms for 12 Hz. Python and Arduino code and the arrhythmic stimulation parameters are available at https://github.com/BlackHershey/MNS/releases/tag/v1.0.0 .

At this point, video recording began, and clocks were synchronized for video and stimulation. MNS stimulation was then conducted as follows (see **Figure 1**): two 1-minute blocks of MNS on and two 1-minute blocks of MNS off (order randomized), followed by four alternating 5-minute blocks (MNS off, on, off, on), followed by from one to four 5-minute MNS off blocks until tics returned to baseline frequency (as judged by both the investigator and independently by the participant). Participants rated their urge to tic just prior to the conclusion of each block. The 1- and 5-minute blocks after baseline were conducted continuously without breaks.

[1] https://web.archive.org/web/20230125235627/https://iworx.com/products/stimulators/si-200-stimulus-isolator/?v=7516fd43adaa

[2] https://web.archive.org/web/20230125235755/https://docs.arduino.cc/hardware/mega-2560

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.01.23285304; this version posted February 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 1. **Diagram of study procedures during each visit.** A baseline 5-min Block 0 was followed by measurement of the stimulation threshold, then by 1-min Blocks 1-4, and finally by 5-min Blocks 5-12. Stimulation was ON in two of the four 1-min blocks (selected at random for each subject) and in Blocks 6 and 8, and was OFF in all other blocks.

Video Analysis

A movement disorders child neurologist (author KU) blind to treatment order (rhythmic MNS first or second), visit number (1 or 2), stimulation condition (on vs. off), and order (of the 1-minute or 5-minute blocks) used a simplified version of TicTimer Web software [20,21] to mark each occurrence of any tic, and a REDCap form to provide a maximal rating of motor and phonic tic severity, for each of the 5-minute blocks [22,23]. For the 1-minute blocks, he used Datavyu software to mark the occurrence of and provide a rating of the severity of each instance of any tic; motor and phonic tics were tracked separately [24].

Outcome Measures

Primary and secondary outcome measures were prespecified in the registered protocol [10]. Primary outcome measures comprised a replication of the Nottingham results (change in tic frequency and severity with 1-minute 10 Hz rhythmic MNS on *vs.* off) and a test of the proposed mechanism (change in tic frequency and severity during rhythmic *vs.* arrhythmic 12 Hz MNS on and off). Secondary outcome measures included visual analog scale (VAS) ratings of the urge to tic over the past minute, rated just prior to the end of each 5-min block, a test of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.01.23285304; this version posted February 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

duration of benefit (tic frequency in each 1-minute bin after the last block of active MNS), and the following at the end of the visit: Clinical Global Impression of Improvement (CGI-I) ratings by participant and investigator, rating of discomfort using the CGI Efficacy Index (a minor change from the registered protocol) [25], and participant and PI guess as to whether the visit used active or control stimulation. Any additional outcomes are exploratory.

Statistical Analysis

Outliers were determined at the level of the individual variables before the main analysis. The primary outcome measures were analyzed as follows. Conservatively, two-tailed *p* values are given unless otherwise stated, even though most hypotheses tested were directional.

Replication (1-minute blocks of rhythmic MNS)

Each occurrence of every tic during the last 40 s of on *vs.* off 1-minute stimulation epochs on the rhythmic MNS day was scored by the blinded rater using the Intensity item from the Yale Global Tic Severity Scale [YGTSS], which uses integer scores from 0 (no tics) to 5 (severe). The number of tics (tic frequency) and the mean of the intensity ratings in each block (tic intensity) comprised the dependent variables. This sample design replicated that of Study 3 from Morera Maiquez et al 2020 [6] though our analysis differed. We log transformed tic count to stabilize variance. We analyzed log tic count and mean tic intensity with a random effect repeated measures model where subject was random and correlation within subject was modeled with a compound symmetry covariance structure. Fixed effects were baseline measure (Block 0), block (Block 1, 2, 3, or 4), stimulation (on, off), stimulation lag (1 for blocks preceded by a block with active stimulation and 0 otherwise, to test for persistence of effect in consecutive blocks), and stimulation lag by stimulation interaction.

Randomized crossover trial (5-minute blocks of rhythmic *vs.* arrhythmic MNS)

The dependent variables for the 5-minute blocks in the crossover RCT were the number of tics in the block (tic frequency), the greater of the motor tic intensity rating and the phonic tic intensity rating, each rated once for the entire 5-minute block (tic intensity), and the strength of the urge to tic rated by visual analog scale just before the end of each block (tic urge). For the crossover design, we analyzed each of these 3 variables using a mixed random effect crossover

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.01.23285304; this version posted February 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

repeated measures model (Mixed procedure, SAS 9.4, Cary N.C.) where subject was a random effect and within-subject correlation was modeled with a first order autoregressive covariance structure. Fixed effects were baseline measure (Block 0), sequence (rhythmic or arrhythmic at first visit), treatment (rhythmic or arrhythmic), visit (first or second), block (5-minute blocks numbers 5, 6, 7, 8, or 9), and treatment by block interaction. A non-significant sequence indicated that carryover between visits was negligible such that both visits could be analyzed. We tested stimulation by comparing the mean of blocks with stimulation to those without.

Duration of benefit

We tested whether tic frequency changed over the 5-20 minutes following the end of stimulation. Since duration of observation was longer in participants whose tics did not appear to have returned to baseline frequency—i.e., since data from Blocks 10-12 were not missing at random, we used a last observation carried forward (LOCF) analysis, as follows. For participants with < 20 min of post-MNS observation, the mean tic rate (tics/min) in the last observed 5-minute OFF block was carried forward for each minute through post-stimulation minute 20. As pre-registered, we compared post-MNS tic rate to tic frequency in Block 8, the last 5-minute stimulation block (testing for a change in tic rate after stimulation ended). We also repeated the analysis using as baseline Block 7, the last stimulation off block before the last stimulation block (testing for a change in tic rate induced by the last ON block). In both cases, since tic counts were non-normal, we used the nonparametric Friedman test.

Additional analyses

Success of blinding was assessed using the binomial distribution. For all the above, a p value < .05 was accepted as significant. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize data in Table 1 and CGI scores, with t test or χ^2 test as appropriate. Rater agreement used the Spearman correlation test since the underlying data were non-normal.

To test whether any individual characteristics predicted a differential response to rhythmic or arrhythmic stimulation, participants were assigned a score of their arrhythmic improvement subtracted from their rhythmic improvement. Improvement on each day was measured as the difference between the average number of tics in blocks with stimulation off and blocks with

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.01.23285304; this version posted February 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

stimulation on. Therefore, the difference score was positive for those participants who improved more on the rhythmic day and negative for those who improved more on the arrhythmic day. This difference score was compared against individual baseline characteristics using Spearman correlation for continuous variables and Mann-Whitney U test for categorical variables.

For comparisons of stimulation thresholds, descriptive statistics and paired t-tests were used to compare visit days and types of stimulation.

Results

A CONSORT checklist adapted for randomized crossover trials is attached in Supplementary Information [26].

Participants

32 participants enrolled in this study and completed both visit 1 and visit 2 (Figure 2). Half had rhythmic MNS on the first visit and the other half arrhythmic. One participant ended one visit early due to discomfort after the first 5-minute active MNS block on the arrhythmic day; all



Figure 2. Participant enrollment flowchart.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.01.23285304; this version posted February 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

other visits were completed in full, requiring a makeup visit in 4 cases. One participant's two visits occurred only 1 day apart; all others' two visits were separated by at least a week. The video recordings after baseline were lost from one participant's arrhythmic MNS visit, so N=31 for analyses of tic frequency and intensity with arrhythmic stimulation.

Participants spanned the allowed age range from 15 to 64 years. They had a typical tic history for patients at a referral center (DCI score mean = 60) and a wide range of current tic severities, on average moderately severe (mean YGTSS TTS = 26; see Table 1). No changes in treatment were reported between sessions for any of the participants.

Table 1: Participant characteristics

	Treatment Sequence		
Characteristic	**Arrhythmic then Rhythmic Stimulation (n=16)**	**Rhythmic then Arrhythmic Stimulation (n=16)**	**Total (n=32)**
Age (years, mean ± SD)	31.25 ± 16.16	36.81 ± 16.81	34.03 ± 16.51
Sex	9M, 7F	12M, 4F	21M, 11F
Handedness (EHI)	16R, 0L	14R, 2L	30R, 2L
Self-reported race:			
White	14	15	29
Black	1	0	1
Asian	0	1	1
More than one race	1	0	1
Hispanic or Latino	1	0	1
Tourette's Disorder, DSM-5	15	16	31
Persistent Motor Tic Disorder, DSM-5	1	0	1
Family history of tics (first degree relatives)	7	6	13
DCI score	61.69 ± 17.84	59.13 ± 22.54	60.41 ± 20.04
Marked distress / impairment in a life role, ever	16	16	32
Marked distress / impairment in a life role in the past week, visit 1	9	10	19
Phonic tics (lifetime)	15	15	30
Phonic tics (past week), visit 1	15	15	30
Complex tics (lifetime)	16	11	27
Complex motor	15	11	26

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.01.23285304; this version posted February 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Complex vocal	6	7	13
Complex tics (past week), visit 1	15	15	30
Complex motor	13	15	28
Complex vocal	7	3	10
Coprophenomena ever	5	4	9
Coprolalia	3	4	7
Copropraxia	3	2	5
Coprophenomena (past week), visit 1	3	2	5
Coprolalia	2	2	4
Copropraxia	1	2	3
Ever sought treatment or diagnosis	16	14	30
Lifetime adequate behavior therapy for tics or OCD	3	0	3
Currently taking medication for tics	4	3	7
YGTSS Total Tic Score	26.38 ± 8.75	25.25 ± 6.37	25.82 ±7.85
YGTSS Motor	16.38 ± 3.54	15.69 ± 3.40	16.04 ± 3.47
YGTSS Phonic	10.00 ± 6.38	9.56 ± 4.30	9.78 ± 5.55
YGTSS Impairment	20.63 ± 18.31	18.44 ± 13.51	19.54 ± 15. 52
ATQ score	40.06 ± 22.56	36.44 ± 20.54	38.25 ± 21.30
PUTS score	20.31 ± 7.53	22.50 ± 7.11	21.41 ± 7.29
Tics per minute before stimulation, Visit 1 (live rating)	16.91 ± 14.28	18.81 ± 17.18	17.86 ± 15.57
Tics per minute before stimulation, Visit 1 (blind rating)	11.84 ± 9.67	17.34 ± 19.85	14.74 ± 15.58
Tic intensity (YGTSS) before stimulation, Visit 1			
Motor	3.06 ± 1.39	3.44 ± 0.89	3.25 ± 1.16
Phonic	0.88 ± 1.50	1.38 ± 1.75	1.13 ± 1.62
Y-BOCS (self-rated)	7.81 ± 6.60	4.75 ± 5.00	6.28 ± 5.96
ADHD score past week (self-rated)	12.75 ± 12.05	13.00 ± 14.35	12.88 ± 13.04
SRS total (T score)	54.69 ± 12.92	51.63 ± 10.07	53.16 ± 11.50

Replicating the University of Nottingham TS study

Both the number of tics (least squares [l.s.] mean tic count 12.1 off, 8.9 on; stimulation effect p=.01) and the intensity ratings for tics (l.s. mean tic count 2.5 off, 2.3 on; p=.079) decreased during 1-minute 10 Hz rhythmic stimulation. The decrease in tic intensity was statistically significant only if assessed with a one-tailed test (p=.04).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.01.23285304; this version posted February 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Testing the hypothesized electrophysiological mechanism of benefit

Tic frequency

Using the 12 Hz MNS frequency from the EEG experiment from Morera Maiquez et al, there was no evidence of a between-visit carryover effect on tics (sequence p = .42). On average, participants had 28% fewer tics on visit 2 than on visit 1 (l.s. difference 22.5, 95% confidence interval [CI] 8.3-36.8; p = .0022). There were 19% fewer tics on average when stimulation was on than off (l.s. difference 14.4, 95% CI 9.1-19.6; block effect p<.0001). However, arrhythmic and rhythmic stimulation had similar effects (l.s. estimate of differential treatment effect 0.96, 95% CI (-12.9, 14.8), treatment effect p=.89, treatment × block p=.92; see **Figure 3**).



Figure 3. **Tic frequency response to MNS**

Tic intensity

There was no evidence of a carryover effect (sequence p = .41). Tic intensity was similar on the first and second visits (p = .94). Tic intensity was significantly though minimally affected by stimulation (l.s. means 3.23 off, 3.11 on, difference 0.12, 95% CI 0.01-0.23; p=.02), but arrhythmic and rhythmic stimulation had similar effects (l.s. estimate of differential treatment effect 0.03, 95% CI (-0.19, 0.26), treatment effect p = .77, treatment × block p = .80; see **Figure 4**).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.01.23285304; this version posted February 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 4. **Tic intensity response to MNS**

Urge to tic

There was no evidence of a carryover effect on urge to tic (sequence p=0.27), nor was there a difference in urge to tic between visit 1 and visit 2 (p=.59). Urge to tic improved during stimulation (l.s. difference 10.8, 95% CI 7.9-13.7; *p*<.0001), but there was no difference between arrhythmic and rhythmic stimulation (l.s. estimate of differential treatment effect -0.6, 95% CI (-6.1, 4.8), treatment p=.82, treatment × block p=.88) (see **Figure 5**).



Figure 5. **Tic urge response to MNS**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.01.23285304; this version posted February 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Duration of benefit after the end of stimulation

In the 1-minute blocks, the stimulation lag variable was not significant for either analysis (all *p*s > .2), suggesting no carryover for more than 20 seconds after stimulation. More directly, there was no significant change in tic frequency comparing the 20 minutes after to the 5 minutes before the last MNS ON block (Block 7, rhythmic p=.684, arrhythmic p=.356). (Compared to the last stimulation block, Block 8, rhythmic p=.314, arrhythmic p=.239.) **Error! Reference source not found.** shows median tic frequency before, during and after the last active stimulation block (see also Supplementary Figure 1).



Figure 6. **Tic frequency after stimulation ends.** Median tic frequency in Block 7 (the OFF block before the last active 5-min stimulation block) is plotted at time = 2.5 min, median tic frequency in Block 8 (the last ON block) at 7.5 min, and median tic frequency for each of the 20 subsequent minutes with stimulation OFF is plotted at times 10.5-29.5 min. The last 15 minutes include LOCF data as described in Methods. Vertical bars represent 25th and 75th percentiles.

Clinical Response and Harms

Most participants reported substantial benefit from stimulation: 25 of 32 rated at least one visit as "much improved" or "very much improved" on the CGI-I. Investigator ratings were similar (26 of 32). Mean ± SD CGI-I participant ratings of response were 2.69 ± 1.03 (rhythmic) and 2.39

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.01.23285304; this version posted February 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

± 0.99 (arrhythmic), where 2 = much improved and 3 = minimally improved. CGI-I investigator ratings were similar, 2.41 ± 0.91 (R) and 2.56 ± 1.01 (A).

There were no serious adverse events. In fact, stimulation was well tolerated by participants, with discomfort rated as none or minimal on 57 of the 64 visits. Further details from the CGI–Efficacy Index are shown in the supplementary file.

Free-text Responses

Some patients experienced dramatic benefit from the stimulation. Comments from four participants who rated tics on the rhythmic MNS day as "very much improved" included "palpable relief from my need to tic … first time in 50 years I did not feel the urge to tic," a "calm, … almost a little euphoric feeling," "a sense of just peace, or … not sure how to describe it, maybe what people without Tourette's feel like … no urge, or almost," and "no tics at all when it [MNS] was on." However, this dramatic benefit was not exclusive to rhythmic stimulation. Three participants who self-rated as "much improved" on the arrhythmic MNS day reported feeling "more at ease, less feelings of jittery," "less urge to tic," and "urge [to tic] decreased." The supplementary file contains further participant comments on the stimulation.

Participants' future treatment plans

Many participants were interested in the possibility of a portable device that would deliver stimulation similar to the stimulation they had just received (25 of 32 on the rhythmic day, 28 of 32 arrhythmic). Not surprisingly, 31 of the 32 participants who completed this study agreed to take part in an open-label follow-up study, which provided them with their own TENS device to take home and use [27].

Adequacy of blinding

Participants guessed no better than chance whether they were receiving the expected efficacious treatment or the control treatment (30 of 64 correct, binomial $p = .73$). The investigator (KJB) guessed 40 of 64 correctly ($p = .03$). A separate author (KU) performed the blinded ratings for tic frequency and tic intensity.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.01.23285304; this version posted February 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Individual characteristics predicting improvement with MNS

We compared responders (investigator CGI-I rating of 1 or 2 on rhythmic stimulation day) to non-responders on the following characteristics: age, sex, history of complex motor or vocal tics, voluntary tic suppression, and coprophenomena, YGTSS TTS, PUTS score, SRS total T score, and ADHD total score and subscores. None differed significantly between groups, though complex vocal tics were more common in responders (p=.075).

Other exploratory analyses

We tested whether any of these individual characteristics predicted a differential response to rhythmic or arrhythmic stimulation (see Methods). Only the ADHD hyperactivity-impulsiveness subscore correlated significantly with participants' improvement difference score (rho=−.45, p=0.01), in that those with greater hyperactivity-impulsiveness were more likely to improve on the arrhythmic day.

Eight participants rated improvement R > A (rhythmic better than arrhythmic), and 15 rated A > R. The investigator rated 12 as R > A and 11 as A < R. Tic number in the blind tic counts decreased more on the rhythmic day in 12 participants and on the arrhythmic day in 18.

The stimulation threshold was similar on the two visits (p=0.37), median 7.1 mA (IQR 5.8-8.0, range 3.2-12.0) on visit 1 and 6.6 (5.9-8.45, range 4.2-15.6) on visit 2. The stimulation threshold was also similar for both types of stimulation (p=0.21), median 7.1 mA (IQR 5.55-8.15, range 3.2-15.6) for arrhythmic stimulation and 6.6 mA (IQR 6.0-8.2, range 4.0-12.4) for rhythmic stimulation.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.01.23285304; this version posted February 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Tic counts for the first visit's baseline session from the investigator, "live," and from the blinded rater correlated significantly (Spearman's rho=0.66, p<0.0001) (**Figure 7**).



Figure 7. **Correlation between investigator and blind rater rating of baseline tic frequency.**

Discussion

This study is the first controlled trial to test median nerve stimulation as a treatment for tics. We report two main conclusions. Our first aim was to replicate the results of Morera Maiquez et al using identical stimulation and assessments. We confirm that 1 minute of 10 Hz rhythmic MNS improved tic frequency and intensity compared to 1-minute MNS-off blocks. However, we did not find evidence to support their suggestion that benefit might last after MNS is turned off; this information is crucial for designing chronic treatment.

We next tested the 12 Hz stimulation from the Nottingham EEG experiment. Tic frequency and intensity by blinded ratings and self-reported urge to tic all improved significantly during 5-minute active stimulation blocks. However, they improved similarly with arrhythmic stimulation, which does not entrain cortical EEG. Therefore, contralateral somatomotor cortex power and coherence in the mu frequency range does not mediate the improvement in tics.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.01.23285304; this version posted February 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

We were not able to disprove a placebo explanation for the benefit. Our study after all provided a somewhat dramatic form of treatment which many of the participants expected might be effective, having seen news coverage of the 2020 report. Nevertheless, the improvement in tics with MNS was clinically substantial—in fact, remarkable in several participants. MNS may have true efficacy, given the severity and chronicity of TS in this sample and the number of past treatments they had tried without meaningful benefit, usually including treatments known to be efficacious and thus likely carrying similar expectation of benefit. MNS did not create substantial distraction from a demanding cognitive task, arguing against one possible mechanism for nonspecific benefit [6]. One may hypothesize that arrhythmic stimulation exerts benefit on tics but does so via a different electrophysiological mechanism than entraining sensorimotor cortex at a frequency associated with decreased voluntary movement. In that case, a different control condition may reveal differential efficacy for the active treatment arm, demonstrating benefit not explained by a placebo effect.

Alternatively, rhythmic and arrhythmic MNS may benefit different subgroups of participants. In fact, participants with greater self-rated hyperactivity-inattentiveness responded more favorably to arrhythmic than to rhythmic stimulation. However, this result was from an exploratory analysis, uncorrected for the number of variables examined.

We also show that MNS was well tolerated, and all participants but one joined a follow-on open-label study with a portable stimulator, results of which are reported separately [27].

Limitations

Crossover studies are potentially subject to carryover effects. However, the primary outcome measures showed no evidence of such effects, consistent with the 1-week separation of the two visits and no evidence that the benefit from MNS lasted even minutes after stimulation ended. Second, the investigator guessed the type of stimulation correctly statistically more often than chance would explain, though with only 62% accuracy. Fortunately, participants remained blinded (guessing correctly 47% of the time), and none of the key outcome measures were influenced by the investigator. Third, we did not test other variations on MNS, so we cannot

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.01.23285304; this version posted February 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

address the specificity of the median nerve (*vs.* any other peripheral nerve), specificity of 10-12 Hz as the stimulation frequency, or whether there is a lateral preference for MNS benefit.

Future directions and conclusion

We are interested in testing some of the unanswered questions listed in the previous paragraph, and investigating the mechanism by which MNS improves the severity of tics and the urge to tic. The Nottingham group is performing an RCT of subchronic MNS using a portable wristwatch-style pulse generator in TS.[3] Informed by preliminary results from the present study, they are using a sub-motor-threshold stimulus as the control condition.

In summary, MNS is well tolerated and reduces tics, but not via the initially proposed mechanism of increased EEG power and coherence at 10-12 Hz over contralateral motor cortex.

[3] https://web.archive.org/web/20230126030424/https://www.neupulse.co.uk/median-nerve-stimulation-on-tourette-syndrome-trial/

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.01.23285304; this version posted February 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge help from Drs. Morera Maiquez and Jackson regarding study design and methods, and from Dr. Amy Robichaux-Viehoever for help testing Datavyu. Sarah Grossen created Figure 7. An earlier version of this manuscript appeared on medRxiv (DOI 10.1101/2023.02.01.23285304).

Funding

Supported by the Washington University Institute of Clinical and Translational Sciences (NIH CTSA grant UL1TR002345) and by the Washington University Yearlong Research Program Dean's Fellowship (to author AMI). REDCap is additionally supported by the Siteman Comprehensive Cancer Center and NCI Cancer Center Support Grant P30CA091842.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: KJB
Data curation: ECB, DYS
Formal analysis: MW, AMI
Funding acquisition: KJB
Investigation: ALA, KU, DYS, ECB, JMK, KJB
Project administration: KJB
Software: JMK, DYS
Supervision: KJB
Visualization: AMI, KJB
Writing (original draft preparation): AMI, ALA, KJB
Writing (review and editing): all authors

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.01.23285304; this version posted February 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

References

1. Evans, J.; Seri, S.; Cavanna, A.E. The effects of Gilles de la Tourette syndrome and other chronic tic disorders on quality of life across the lifespan: a systematic review. *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry* **2016**, *25*, 939-948, doi:10.1007/s00787-016-0823-8.
2. Thomas, R.; Cavanna, A.E. The pharmacology of Tourette syndrome. *J Neural Transm (Vienna)* **2013**, *120*, 689-694, doi:10.1007/s00702-013-0979-z.
3. Scahill, L.; Woods, D.W.; Himle, M.B.; Peterson, A.L.; Wilhelm, S.; Piacentini, J.C.; McNaught, K.; Walkup, J.T.; Mink, J.W. Current controversies on the role of behavior therapy in Tourette syndrome. *Mov Disord* **2013**, *28*, 1179-1183, doi:10.1002/mds.25488.
4. Lin, L., Stamm, K, and Christidis, P. *2015 County-Level Analysis of U.S. Licensed Psychologists and Health Indicators*; American Psychological Association, March 2016 2015.
5. Cuenca J, G.C., Kendall T, et al. Perceptions of treatment for tics among young people with Tourette syndrome and their parents: a mixed methods study. *BMC Psychiatry* **2015**, doi:10.1186/s12888-015-0430-0.
6. Morera Maiquez, B.; Sigurdsson, H.P.; Dyke, K.; Clarke, E.; McGrath, P.; Pasche, M.; Rajendran, A.; Jackson, G.M.; Jackson, S.R. Entraining movement-related brain oscillations to suppress tics in Tourette syndrome. *Curr Biol* **2020**, *30*, 2334-2342 e2333, doi:10.1016/j.cub.2020.04.044.
7. Thut, G.; Veniero, D.; Romei, V.; Miniussi, C.; Schyns, P.; Gross, J. Rhythmic TMS causes local entrainment of natural oscillatory signatures. *Curr. Biol.* **2011**, *21*, 1176-1185, doi:10.1016/j.cub.2011.05.049.
8. Houlgreave, M.S.; Morera Maiquez, B.; Brookes, M.J.; Jackson, S.R. The oscillatory effects of rhythmic median nerve stimulation. *Neuroimage* **2022**, *251*, 118990, doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2022.118990.
9. Jeon, S.; Walkup, J.T.; Woods, D.W.; Peterson, A.; Piacentini, J.; Wilhelm, S.; Katsovich, L.; McGuire, J.F.; Dziura, J.; Scahill, L. Detecting a clinically meaningful change in tic severity in Tourette syndrome: a comparison of three methods. *Contemp. Clin. Trials* **2013**, *36*, 414-420, doi:10.1016/j.cct.2013.08.012.
10. Black, K.J.; Wallendorf, M.; Viehoever, A. Peripheral induction of inhibitory brain circuits to treat Tourette's: pilot (public registration). *OSF* **2021**, 8jtep, doi:10.17605/OSF.IO/8JTEP.
11. Robertson, M.M.; Banerjee, S.; Kurlan, R.; Cohen, D.J.; Leckman, J.F.; McMahon, W.; Pauls, D.L.; Sandor, P.; van de Wetering, B.J.M. The Tourette Syndrome Diagnostic Confidence Index: Development and clinical associations. *Neurology* **1999**, *53*, 2108-2112, doi:10.1212/WNL.53.9.2108.
12. Abramovitch, A.; Reese, H.; Woods, D.W.; Peterson, A.; Deckersbach, T.; Piacentini, J.; Scahill, L.; Wilhelm, S. Psychometric Properties of a Self-Report Instrument for the Assessment of Tic Severity in Adults With Tic Disorders. *Behav Ther* **2015**, *46*, 786-796, doi:10.1016/j.beth.2015.06.002.
13. Woods, D.W.; Piacentini, J.; Himle, M.B.; Chang, S. Premonitory Urge for Tics Scale (PUTS): initial psychometric results and examination of the premonitory urge phenomenon in youths with tic disorders. *J Dev Behav Pediatr* **2005**, *26*, 397-403, doi:10.1097/00004703-200512000-00001.
14. Conners, C.K.; Sitarenios, G.; Parker, J.D.; Epstein, J.N. The revised Conners' Parent Rating Scale (CPRS-R): factor structure, reliability, and criterion validity. *J Abnorm Child Psychol* **1998**, *26*, 257-268, doi:10.1023/a:1022602400621.
15. Scahill, L.; King, R.A.; Schultz, R.T.; Leckman, J.F. Selection and use of diagnostic and clinical rating instruments. In *Tourette's syndrome -- tics, obsessions, compulsions: Developmental psychopathology and clinical care*, Leckman, J.F., Cohen, D.J., Eds.; John Wiley & Sons, Inc.: New York, 1999; pp. 310-324.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.01.23285304; this version posted February 6, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

16. Goodman, W.K.; Price, L.H.; Rasmussen, S.A.; Mazure, C.; Fleischmann, R.L.; Hill, C.L.; Heninger, G.R.; Charney, D.S. The Yale-Brown Obsessive Compulsive Scale. I. Development, use, and reliability. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* **1989**, *46*, 1006-1011, doi:10.1001/archpsyc.1989.01810110048007.
17. Goodman, W.K.; Price, L.H.; Rasmussen, S.A.; Mazure, C.; Delgado, P.; Heninger, G.R.; Charney, D.S. The Yale-Brown Obsessive Compulsive Scale. II. Validity. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* **1989**, *46*, 1012-1016, doi:10.1001/archpsyc.1989.01810110054008.
18. Constantino, J.N.; Davis, S.A.; Todd, R.D.; Schindler, M.K.; Gross, M.M.; Brophy, S.L.; Metzger, L.M.; Shoushtari, C.S.; Splinter, R.; Reich, W. Validation of a brief quantitative measure of autistic traits: comparison of the social responsiveness scale with the autism diagnostic interview-revised. *J Autism Dev Disord* **2003**, *33*, 427-433, doi:10.1023/a:1025014929212.
19. Oldfield, R.C. The assessment and analysis of handedness: the Edinburgh inventory. *Neuropsychologia* **1971**, *9*, 97-113, doi:10.1016/0028-3932(71)90067-4.
20. Black, J.K.; Koller, J.M.; Black, K.J. TicTimer software for measuring tic suppression. *F1000Res* **2017**, *6*, 1560, doi:10.12688/f1000research.12327.2.
21. Black, J.K.; Koller, J.M.; Black, K.J. TicTimer Web: software for measuring tic suppression remotely [version 2; peer review: 2 approved]. *F1000Research* **2021**, *9*, 1264, doi:10.12688/f1000research.26347.2.
22. Harris, P.A.; Taylor, R.; Thielke, R.; Payne, J.; Gonzalez, N.; Conde, J.G. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)--a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform* **2009**, *42*, 377-381, doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010.
23. Harris, P.A.; Taylor, R.; Minor, B.L.; Elliott, V.; Fernandez, M.; O'Neal, L.; McLeod, L.; Delacqua, G.; Delacqua, F.; Kirby, J.; et al. The REDCap consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. *J Biomed Inform* **2019**, *95*, 103208, doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2019.103208.
24. Datavyu Team *A Video Coding Tool*, New York University: Databrary Project, 2014.
25. Iverson, A.; Ueda, K.; Arbuckle, A.; Bihun, E.C.; Song, D.; Viehoever, A.; Wallendorf, M.; Black, K.J. Public (MNS pilot). *OSF* **2020**, shuj4, doi:10.17605/OSF.IO/8JTEP.
26. Dwan, K.; Li, T.; Altman, D.G.; Elbourne, D. CONSORT 2010 statement: extension to randomised crossover trials. *BMJ* **2019**, *366*, l4378, doi:10.1136/bmj.l4378.
27. Iverson, A.M.; Arbuckle, A.L.; Song, D.; Bihun, E.C.; Black, K.J. Median nerve stimulation for treatment of tics: A 4-week, open trial with ecological momentary assessment. *OSF Preprints* **2022**, n6f7q, doi:10.31219/osf.io/n6f7q.