Individual contralesional recruitment in the context of structural reserve in early motor reorganization after stroke

Maike Mustin[1], Lukas Hensel[1], Gereon R. Fink[1,2], Christian Grefkes[3], Caroline Tscherpel[1,3]

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

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

[3] Medical Faculty, Goethe University Frankfurt, Department of Neurology, Frankfurt University Hospital, Frankfurt am Main, Germany

Corresponding author:

Dr. Caroline Tscherpel
Department of Neurology
Frankfurt University Hospital
Schleusenweg 2-16
60590 Frankfurt am Main, Germany
Phone: +49 69 6301 5769
Email: caroline.tscherpel@kgu.de

Running title: TMS responsivity after stroke

Word limit: 5278/6000

ABSTRACT

The concept of structural reserve in stroke reorganization assumes that the functional role of the contralesional hemisphere strongly depends on the brain tissue spared by the lesion in the affected hemisphere. Recent studies, however, have indicated that the impact of the contralesional hemisphere exhibits region-specific variability with concurrently existing maladaptive and supportive influences exerted by distinct contralesional regions. These findings challenge the concept of structural reserve's uniform deduction of the contralesional relevance and call for a more differentiated investigation of the interactions between contralesional motor regions and ipsilesional network structures.

We here explored the relationship between the behavioral role of key areas of the contralesional motor system and lesion-induced connectome disruption early after stroke. Accordingly, we analyzed online TMS interference data of twenty-five stroke patients pooled from two previous studies to disentangle interindividual differences in the functional roles of contralesional primary motor cortex (M1), contralesional dorsal premotor cortex (dPMC), and contralesional anterior interparietal sulcus (aIPS) for motor function early after stroke. Connectome-based lesion symptom mapping (CLSM) as well as lesion quantification of the corticospinal tract (CST) were used to investigate how rTMS effects depend on structural network properties of the ipsilesional hemisphere, i.e., the structural reserve.

At group and individual levels, online TMS interference with contralesional M1 and aIPS but not dPMC led to improved motor performance early after stroke, indicating a detrimental influence of both regions. Performance improvement following M1 interference was positively linked to ipsilesional CST lesion load, indicating a more detrimental influence of contralesional M1 on motor function early after stroke the higher the CST lesion load.

At the connectome level, a more disturbing role of contralesional M1 was related to a more severe disruption of the structural integrity of ipsilesional M1 in the affected motor network. In

stark contrast, a detrimental influence of contralesional aIPS was particularly found in case of less disruption of the ipsilesional M1 connectivity.

In summary, our findings indicate that contralesional areas distinctively interfere with motor performance early after stroke depending on ipsilesional structural integrity, extending the concept of structural reserve to regional specificity in recovery of function following brain lesions.

KEYWORDS

neuroplasticity, online TMS, disconnectivity, neuromodulation, lesion

ABBREVIATIONS

aIPS	cortex in anterior intraparietal sulcus
CST	corticospinal tract
dPMC	dorsal premotor cortex
DWI	diffusion-weighted imaging
EMG	electromyography
FDI	first dorsal interosseous muscle
FLAIR	fluid-attenuated inversion recovery
FOV	field of view
M1	primary motor cortex
MEP	motor evoked potential
MNI	Montreal Neurological Institute
NIHSS	National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale
RMT	resting motor threshold
rTMS	repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation
SD	standard deviation
SPM	statistical parametric mapping

TE	echo time
TMS	transcranial magnetic stimulation
TMS MTAT	TMS motor threshold assessment tool
TR	repetition time

INTRODUCTION

The inherent variability in stroke encompassing lesion characteristics and individual regenerative capacities entails a multitude of clinical manifestations and recovery trajectories at the inter-individual level. Stroke-induced alterations emerge from the local pathology, i.e. the ischemic lesion, over the lesioned hemisphere to contralesional areas, ultimately affecting network configurations and the functional processing in the entire brain[1,2].

A phenomenon frequently observed in functional MRI studies in stroke is increased neural activity within contralesional motor areas during simple motor tasks[3–5]. Furthermore, increased contralesional blood oxygen level dependent (BOLD) activity has been reported to be associated with better post-stroke motor function, suggesting a compensatory effect of increased contralesional activity in the light of the vicariation hypothesis[6–8]. However, there is also evidence for maladaptive contralesional effects, framing the concept of interhemispheric competition[9,10]. Accordingly, a decrease of inhibitory influences from the ipsilesional hemisphere are thought to result in a subsequent increase of contralesional neural activation and, in turn, enhanced inhibitory influences exerted by the contralesional hemisphere[11–14].

In order to reconcile contradicting findings concerning the role of contralesional areas in recovery of function, the concept of structural reserve considers contralesional network alterations depending on ipsilesional network characteristics[15,16]. Correspondingly, whether the influence of the contralesional hemisphere is compensatory or maladaptive is supposed to depend on the amount of ipsilesional unaffected structures spared by the stroke lesion and, thus, remaining functioning of ipsilesional motor areas and corticospinal tract (CST)[15,17,18]. In patients with a high structural reserve, competitive inhibition from the contralesional hemisphere is considered to be particularly prominent. In comparison, patients with reduced remaining resources in the ipsilesional hemisphere may rely more on compensatory recruitment of contralesional areas[15,19].

Online transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) interference is a technique to probe the contribution of specific cortical regions to motor function after stroke[20,21]. While offline TMS is delivered before or in the absence of a task, inducing after-effects with temporary changes in neural excitability, online TMS is applied concurrently to task execution, directly interfering with the ongoing neural activity[22,23]. TMS studies have contributed to our understanding of the role of contralesional brain regions in stroke reorganization, indicating that the contralesional hemisphere's involvement exhibits regional and temporal variability. While early after stroke, the contralesional primary motor cortex (M1) exerts rather maladaptive influences[24,25], this effect may shift towards a more supportive interaction in later, i.e., chronic stages[26,27]. For contralesional dorsal premotor cortex (dPMC), a relevant influence was identified only in the chronic stage - albeit uniformly supportive[28,29]. Furthermore, the impact of posterior parietal areas, i.e., contralesional intraparietal sulcus (aIPS), seems less vulnerable to these temporal dynamics with a rather generally detrimental role for post-stroke motor function[29,30].

The interregional differences outlined above challenge the concept of structural reserve, as they instead indicate that contralesional recruitment depends on region-specific interactions with distinct ipsilesional network configurations. In other words, for impacting on the functional relevance of the contralesional hemisphere, the structural reserve may more likely be subject to the regional specificity of different contralesional areas.

Therefore, we aimed to elaborate on previously identified effects of contralesional M1, dPMC, and aIPS in a pooled sample of two methodically equivalent online TMS studies[29,30] in relation to ipsilesional structural network resources. To delineate the structural reserve, i.e., the unaffected structures in the ipsilesional hemisphere and the CST, connectome lesion symptom mapping (CLSM) was employed to derive the lesion-induced disconnection severity of the ipsilesional motor network as well as the specific disintegration of ipsilesional M1 within the

ipsilesional motor network[31,32]. Likewise, the integrity of the CST was determined by probabilistic and z-axis corrected tract-specific lesion mapping[33,34].

Given the region-specificity of TMS effects observed in previous studies, we hypothesized that distinct properties of the ipsilesional structural network pathology differentially contribute to the functional relevance of contralesional motor areas.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Data Pooling

A pooled dataset was created based on the publications of Tscherpel et al. (2020c) and Hensel et al. (2020). Both studies share a comparable cohort and similar experimental design concercning the performed finger tapping task and the application of online TMS interference. To ensure the generalizability and reliability of the results, the subsamples were examined for comparability. No statistical differences were observed between the pooled samples, neither for demographic (age, sex) or clinical data (days post-stroke, National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale (NIHSS)) nor cortical excitability (RMT). A table summarizing all related comparisons is provided in Supplementary Material I. A significant between-sample difference was found for the average tapping speed in the sham condition, which resulted from a different predefined height reference (see below *Index finger tapping task*) for the tapping movements (patients: $F(2,22)=22.30$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=0.11$; controls: $F(2,21)=41.23$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=0.13$). To ensure comparability and account for the speed differences, we only used the sham-normalized TMS effects for further analyses. After sham normalization, we found no significant differences between the samples, neither for the patient group ($F(2,22)=2.30$, $p=0.143$) nor the healthy participants ($F(2,21)=0.13$, $p=0.821$).

Participants

Twenty-five hospitalized stroke patients (8 female, 2 left-handed) within the first days after stroke (mean days post-stroke = 5.13 ± 4.81) presenting with unilateral mild to moderate motor impairment (mean NIHSS = 2.6 ± 2.0 SD) were recruited from the Department of Neurology of the University Hospital of Cologne (Table 1). The following inclusion criteria were applied in both studies[29,30]: (i) 40-90 years of age, (ii) first-ever ischemic stroke with a unilateral lesion verified by diffusion-weighted MRI (DWI), (iii) <10 days post-stroke, (iv) unilateral upper limb

motor deficit, (v) no contraindication to TMS (vi) no cerebral hemorrhage, (vii) no other neurological deficits, i.e., aphasia, apraxia, neglect, visual field deficits, and (viii) ability to perform the finger tapping task. Two patients of the original sample of Hensel et al. (2020) had to be excluded since the MRI was not performed within the first 48 hours after stroke and was, therefore, not comparable with the rest of the cohort for the present research question.

Furthermore, a sample of 23 healthy subjects resulted from the two datasets. For subjects who participated in both studies (n=7), we used the averaged sham-normalized values of both participations for further analyses. One healthy subject had to be excluded due to extreme values exceeding two standard deviations of TMS effects across all target regions, resulting in 22 data sets.

Both studies were conducted under the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the local ethics committee at the University Hospital of Cologne. Prior to the inclusion, all participants provided written informed consent.

Experimental Design

Three different brain regions, i.e., the contralesional M1, contralesional dPMC, and contralesional aIPS were probed in a single-blinded and sham-controlled experimental design[29,30] (Figure 1). A placebo stimulation over vertex served as a control condition (Sham). Neuro-navigated 10Hz repetitive TMS (rTMS) was performed time-locked to the execution of a finger tapping task (online TMS interference) to interfere with the ongoing brain activity and investigate the impact of the abovementioned areas of the extended motor network on task performance[22,23]. TMS was administered with 90% of the resting motor threshold (RMT). For a detailed description of the TMS protocol, RMT assessment, and TMS site definition, please see Supplementary Material II.

Index finger tapping task and 3D ultrasound movement kinematics

Participants performed repetitive finger tapping movements with their index finger in response to a visual cue (Figure 1). Both studies applied an alternating block design was applied that rotated through the different target regions in a pseudo-randomized order to prevent fatigue and habituation effects. Each region was addressed three times, resulting in a total of nine blocks, consisting of a recurring alternation between short tapping intervals and pauses (Tscherpel et al.: 2.0s of tapping, 3.0s of pause, 5 repetitions per block; Hensel et al.: 1.6s of tapping, 5.5s of pause, 7 repetitions per block). While all patients performed the task with their affected hand, the side of healthy control subjects was matched to the patients. All participants were instructed to maximize their tapping speed. In both studies, the subjects were given a reference that defined the intended height of the tapping movement. While in Tscherpel et al. (2020b, 2020c), a height reference for the tapping movement was set at 2.5cm to the ventral side of the fingertip, Hensel et al. (2020) used a wooden plate that limited the top of the tapping range at 2.5cm of the dorsal side of the index finger, resulting in smaller amplitudes compared to Tscherpel et al. (2020b, 2020c).

Throughout the experiment, the motor performance was recorded using an ultrasound-based 3D kinematic system (Zebris CMS20 motion analyzer system, Zebris Medical Company, Isny, Germany) tracking the position of the index finger in the mediolateral, anteroposterior, and vertical planes. The offline data analysis was performed using the 3DAWIN software package (version 1.2, MedCom, Munich). In both studies, a blinded data analysis was performed to avoid investigator bias. After a visual identification and removal of acquisition artifacts, the maximum velocity [mm/s] was extracted for each tapping movement and averaged across trials.

Besides controlling for the speed differences between both studies due to task design, the use of sham-normalized effects ($\text{relative effect} = \frac{\text{real} - \text{sham}}{\text{sham}}$) also controls for unspecific TMS side effects [35]. According to this normalization, positive values indicate an improvement in tapping

performance under stimulation compared to the sham condition, while negative values reflect a deterioration in performance.

Lesion mapping

For all included patients, standard MR images (1.5T MRI scanner, see Supplementary material III for further specifications) were taken as part of the clinical diagnostic procedure within 48h after stroke onset. An individual lesion map was manually drawn for each patient based on the DWI image (see Supplementary Material III for the preprocessing). Standard lesion characteristics were calculated, i.e., the number of affected voxels and lesion volume.

Tract-specific lesion mapping

The structural integrity of the CST was quantified using a z-axis corrected probabilistic mapping procedure[33,34], accounting for individual variations in brain anatomy and lesion location. Therefore, the calculation of the probabilistic CST lesion overlap[36] was determined separately for each slice and provided with an individual weighting factor according to the height of the lesion along the z-axis, adjusting for the width of the CST on the corresponding slice (Figure 2A). Maximum lesion extent was defined as the greatest extent of the infarct (number of voxels) within the CST relative to the full extent of the CST in the z-plane. The detailed implementation can be found in the Supplementary Material IV.

Network-specific disconnectivity mapping

A network-specific disconnectivity mapping approach was used to quantify the structural disruption within the ipsilesional motor network (Figure 2B). Using the Lesion Quantification Toolkit (LQT)[32], white matter disconnectivity matrices were created for each patient by

projecting the individual lesion map onto the HCP-842 human connectome atlas[37]. This approach enabled the determination of the degree of disruption across all fiber streamlines connecting cortical parcels[38], thereby characterizing the structural extent of the lesion with respect to affected gray matter and white matter tracts. Here, a subdivision of an initial parcellation of 100 parcels[38] focusing on an extended motor network was utilized. Based on the selected ROIs, in total 17 parcels of an extended motor network encompassing parcels in the pre- and postcentral gyri, the basal ganglia and brainstem, the middle frontal gyrus, and superior parietal lobe were included in the analysis (Supplementary Materials V provide a complete list of all included parcels)

The individual lesion-induced loss of structural resources was conceived employing graph theory using the averaged node strength of the disconnectivity matrix. Accordingly, the connection strength between a given parcel and every other parcel in the network of interest, i.e., the extended ipsilesional motor network, was computed over all connections associated with the respective parcel[39,40]. By applying this graph theoretical measure on disconnectivity data, the average node strength here reflects the degree of structural impairment, not the connectivity strength. In this way, we quantified the overall disconnectivity in the ipsilesional motor system described by the averaged node strength of all parcels in the extended motor network (cf. Supplementary materials IV) as well as the M1-specific node strength by the disconnectivity of the ipsilesional M1 and all nodes within the ipsilesional network of interest.

Statistical Analyses

Statistical analyses were performed using the SciPy Stats package (version 1.9.3) in Python (version 3.11) with the additional software packages NumPy (version 1.23.4), Pandas (version 1.5.1), Matplotlib (version 3.6.2), and Seaborn (version 0.11.0). Normal distribution was tested using the Kruskal-Wallis test and a non-parametric test was chosen in case of violation. TMS

effects were compared between stroke patients and healthy participants for each target region. To account for the individual heterogeneity of the TMS effect, we assessed the distribution of subjects exhibiting a statistically relevant positive or negative response to TMS. Given that the data of both groups approximated left-skewed distributions centered close to zero and assuming a slight to moderate deviation from normal distribution, a response was considered statistically relevant when exceeding ±1.5 standard errors of the aggregated mean (SEM) of the sham condition. The proportion of responders and non-responders in both groups was compared by Fisher's exact test.

In order to infer the association between the ipsilesional structural network alterations and the functional relevance of contralesional motor regions, Spearman correlations were performed linking the lesion and disconnectivity measures to region-specific TMS effects in TMS-responsive patients. All statistical tests were two-tailed, a significance level of $p<0.05$ was considered statistically significant, and FDR-correction was used to control for multiple testing.

RESULTS

Behavioral and electrophysiological data

Patients and healthy controls showed a significant difference in finger tapping performance in the sham condition, confirming the patient's hand motor deficit ($t(1,46)=-2.34$, $p=0.012$, $d=0.74$). By contrast, there were no differences between patients and healthy controls regarding age ($p=0.74$), gender ($p=0.45$) or stimulation intensities ($p=0.87$).

TMS effects early after stroke

Comparing the sham-normalized performance changes induced by TMS, significant group differences in tapping performance were found for contralesional M1 ($U=164.0$, $p=0.026$, $d=0.51$, FDR-corrected) and contralesional aIPS ($U=172.0$, $p=0.026$, $d=0.74$, FDR-corrected) but not for dPMC ($p=0.051$) stimulation, indicating a behavioral improvement upon TMS interference with the two former regions in stroke patients in the first days after stroke (Figure 3).

We next analyzed the individual responses, i.e., motor performance improvement or deterioration upon TMS interference at an individual level. Accordingly, for ipsilesional M1, 11 out of 25 patients (44%) but only 2 out of 23 control subjects (8.7%) showed a positive response. For dPMC stimulation, 10 out of 25 patients (40%) demonstrated a positive response, and 3 out of 23 (13%) healthy participants. Finally, when interfering with aIPS activity, 12 out of 25 patients (48%) exhibited a positive effect, while only 3 out of 23 controls (13%) featured similar improvements. Correspondingly, Fisher's exact test revealed a significantly higher proportion of positive TMS responders in the patient sample for M1 ($T=0.12$, $p=0.048$, $OR=0.41$, FDR-corrected) and aIPS stimulation ($T=0.16$, $p=0.048$, $OR=0.39$, FDR-corrected). In contrast, dPMC stimulation effects ($p=0.050$) did not pass the statistical threshold (Figure 3). By contrast, there were no comparable effects for individual responses concerning the deterioration of motor performance (contralesional M1: 3 out of 25 patients (12%), 4 out of 23

controls (17.4%); contralesional dPMC: 2 out of 25 patients (8%), 2 out of 23 controls (8.7%); contralesional aIPS: 3 out of 25 patients (12%), 3 out of 23 controls (13%)).

Hence, a TMS-induced task improvement upon interference with contralesional M1 and aIPS in patients on the group level was accompanied by a greater proportion of individual positive TMS responses in patients upon contralesional M1 and aIPS interference.

General lesion characteristics

We specified TMS responsivity as the significant TMS-induced task improvement at the individual level of stroke patients. Next, we aimed at elucidating potential differences contributing to the responsivity of the distinct motor areas.

With regard to lesion characteristics, the lesion overlap indicated (i) one peak located at the posterior limb of the internal capsule (MNI coordinates: -27, -13, 6) and (ii) one in the medioventral part of the pons (MNI coordinates: -4, -20, -30) (Figure 4A). However, the lesion volume did not differ between TMS responders and non-responders for any of the stimulation sites ($p>0.4$). Likewise, we did not find differences between the group of TMS responders and the rest of the patients for the demographic, behavioral, or clinical data ($p>0.3$).

Impact of CST lesion load on TMS responsivity early after stroke

We further investigated the relationship between CST integrity and TMS responses. Within the group of M1 responders, i.e., the proportion of patients featuring a significant behavioral improvement upon TMS interference with M1 at the individual level, a positive association between the TMS-induced improvement of motor performance upon contralesional M1 stimulation and the maximum CST lesion extent ($r=0.76$, $p=0.014$, FDR-corrected) was observed. Hence, a more substantial disruption of CST fibers was linked to a more detrimental effect of the contralesional M1 on motor performance early after stroke (Figure 4C).

In a linear regression model, a variance explanation of 75% for M1 responsiveness was achieved based on the combined influence of CST lesion extent and the initial upper limb deficit (R^2=0.75, R^2_{corr}=0.61, p=0.004). In a hierarchical model considering both factors, only the involvement of the CST was selected, explaining 67% of the variance (R^2=0.67, R^2_{corr}=0.63, p=0.002) and implying that the initial deficit might add to the explanation of the contralesional M1 effect. However, the contribution of the CST lesion extent was crucial.

In contrast, comparable effects could not be found for aIPS or dPMC stimulation, underpinning the specificity of the interaction of ipsilesional CST affection, motor deficit, and contralesional M1 involvement.

Structural reserve of the ipsilesional motor network early after stroke

Based on the hypothesis of structural reserve, we finally tested the relationship between ipsilesional connectome integrity and the effect induced by TMS interference with the two contralesional motor areas of interest. Therefore, TMS responsivity of contralesional M1 and aIPS, i.e., the significant improvement in task performance upon TMS interference with the respective region at the individual patient level, were related to both (i) the averaged node strength and (ii) the M1-specific node strength obtained from the disconnectivity matrix, i.e., the lesion-induced structural damage with respect to white matter tracts of the ipsilesional hemisphere.

Accordingly, no significant associations were found between the more general ipsilesional motor network disconnectivity and the behavioral responsivity upon contralesional M1 or aIPS interference (all p-values>0.4).

By contrast, regarding the disruption of connections specific to ipsilesional M1, opposite dependencies were observed for TMS responsivity of contralesional M1 and aIPS: A positive association was found between the TMS-induced performance improvement upon contralesional M1 interference and the ipsilesional M1 network disruption (r=0.84, p=0.002,

FDR-corrected), indicating that a detrimental influence of contralesional M1 on motor function early after stroke was found explicitly in case of more severe ipsilesional M1 network disruption, i.e., decreased structural reserve (Figure 4D). IPS responsivity, i.e., improving motor performance upon interference with contralesional IPS, however, was negatively related to ipsilesional M1 network disruption (r=0.65, p=0.032, FDR-corrected). Hence, more detrimental influences from contralesional IPS were particularly found in patients with preserved connections between ipsilesional M1 and the ipsilesional motor network, i.e., greater structural reserve. Thus, albeit TMS interference with both contralesional M1 and contralesional aIPS induced concordant effects on behavioral outcomes, effects on the individual level and their distinct associations with ipsilesional network configurations emphasize the presence of divergent underlying mechanisms at the neural level.

Of note, there was no correlation between the TMS responsivity of contralesional M1 and aIPS (p=0.7), supporting the hypothesis of at least partly independent neural underpinnings driving TMS effects.

When computing connectivity for ipsilesional aIPS, no significant effects were found neither for TMS effects evoked by contralesional aIPS stimulation nor contralesional M1 stimulation (p-values>0.7), underlining the specificity of TMS effects for the ipsilesional M1 connectome. Furthermore, there was no correlation between M1-specific disconnectivity and maximum CST lesion load (r=0.38, p=0.18), suggesting that these two parameters contain differential information about ipsilesional structural network pathology, such as the functionality of the CST as a descending neural pathway in contrast to cortico-cortical and cortico-subcortical interconnectivity.

DISCUSSION

We here show that TMS interference effects on contralesional M1 and contralesional aIPS activity are linked to the degree of network disruption caused by the ischemic lesion in the first days after stroke. To this end, a pooled dataset from two methodologically similar online TMS studies[29,30] was utilized to elaborate on the variability of previous findings regarding the recruitment of the contralesional hemisphere early post-stroke. Based on the concept of structural reserve proposing the functional relevance of the contralesional hemisphere in dependence on remaining unaffected structures of the ipsilesional motor system, we used a lesion mapping approach and graph theoretical measures to individually characterize the structural damage, i.e., the lesion-induced disconnectivity. Correspondingly, the relationship between ipsilesional M1 disconnectivity and contralesional TMS effects was opposite for M1 and aIPS, even though at both the group and individual behavioral level, interference with either of the two areas led to an improvement of motor performance of the stroke-affected hand. This observation emphasizes that the individual functional contribution of the contralesional hemisphere to motor function early after stroke can be demonstrated as a function of distinctive region-specific properties of the ipsilesional structural reserve spared by the lesion.

Motor reorganization in the frontoparietal network early after stroke

A frequently observed phenomenon post-stroke encompasses an increase of neural activity within the contralesional hemisphere during movements of the stroke-affected hand[5,10]. In the acute phase after stroke, higher levels of contralesional activation in sensorimotor cortex have been linked to more substantial spontaneous recovery in the first days after stroke[5]. As brain reorganization processes reach the chronic phase, bilateral activation returns into a more lateralized pattern of activity in the ipsilesional hemisphere accompanied with better motor

function[5,41]. Conversely, the persistence of bilateral neural activity in the chronic stage is associated with unfavorable trajectories of motor recovery[8].

However, the existing literature portrays conflicting results regarding the precise functional implications of enhanced contralesional activation. While some studies indicate compensatory influences from the contralesional hemisphere, consistent with the hypothesis of vicariation[7,8], others describe a detrimental impact of contralesional motor areas in line with the theory of interhemispheric competition[13,14,42]. Here, TMS studies have significantly advanced our understanding of local brain activation and its potential role in stroke motor recovery[26,28,29,43]. Collectively, these studies draw a time-, region-, and task-specific picture of the functionality of contralesional recruitment from the acute to the chronic phase[25,29]. Thus, to disaggregate the effects of specific contralesional regions is essential for the accurate identification of the individual region's contribution to plastic reorganization. This understanding will then be crucial to tailor personalized therapeutic approaches, including non-invasive brain stimulation[44].

To this aim, we here investigated the functional relevance of an extended motor network in the contralesional hemisphere involving contralesional M1, dPMC, and IPS for the execution of repetitive finger movements in the first weeks after stroke. As pivotal hubs controlling the execution and modulation of voluntary movements, the ipsi- and contralesional M1 have also emerged as central regions of interest in the field of stroke recovery research[42,45]. According to previous evidence from TMS experiments, the involvement of contralesional M1 particularly exhibits temporal variability[6]. While its impact in the acute stage is described as maladaptive[25], a supportive influence can be observed in the chronic stage, particularly in patients who have undergone functional recovery[26]. In line with that, we demonstrate that TMS interference led to an increase in finger tapping velocity, indicating a detrimental role of contralesional M1 in motor reorganization early after stroke. Notably, in contrast to the results of both original

publications, which could not find a significant involvement of contralesional M1[29,30], the pooled analysis expands the results of both by pushing the effect above the threshold with a bigger sample size.

Addressing stroke as a network disorder calls for a more integrated view on interactions within the motor network encompassing premotor and posterior-parietal cortex, forming distinct fronto-parietal circuits[46]. For example, several fMRI studies have demonstrated altered neural activity of contralesional posterior-parietal areas and its impact on the ipsilesional M1 in the context of motor reorganization post-stroke[5,47,48]. Accordingly, additional recruitment of ipsi- and contralesional posterior-parietal areas was associated with more significant motor impairment early after stroke[5]. In contrast, better motor function during recovery was linked to an activity decrease in contralesional intraparietal cortex[8].

Given the role of parietal regions in motor reorganization, online TMS studies have previously described a detrimental influence of contralesional aIPS on motor function already in the first weeks after stroke and lasting into the chronic phase[29,30]. Consistently, the current analysis corroborates these findings, showing improved finger tapping performance upon TMS interference with the contralesional aIPS in the early stages following a stroke.

The contralesional dPMC constitutes a crucial region within the frontoparietal network after stroke, and has been frequently addressed in the context of motor recovery[28,49]. Several studies have shown that the functional connectivity and activation patterns of contralesional dPMC are associated with motor impairment and recovery after stroke[50,51]. Specifically, increased activity and connectivity between contralesional dPMC and ipsilesional motor regions have been observed in patients with better motor recovery, suggesting a compensatory mechanism in the chronic phase after stroke[49,52]. These findings are consistent with TMS studies, which have similarly reported a positive influence restricted to the chronic stage of stroke recovery[29]. In line with that, the present pooled dataset of acute stroke patients did not reveal a significant

difference in motor performance between patients and healthy controls following TMS interference.

Integrity of the ipsilesional CST and contralesional TMS responsivity

In line with our findings, TMS responses exhibited substantial variability with only around 50% of patients demonstrating a significant improvement under stimulation[53–55]. However, response variability is not exclusive to TMS but echoes a common pattern of neuromodulating techniques, where responses can vary widely among individuals. For example, the therapeutic outcomes of deep brain stimulation (DBS) present a similar level of heterogeneity, often not directly linked to electrode positioning or stimulation intensity[56,57]. This has led to an increased focus on connectomic approaches incorporating structural and functional connectivity into DBS treatment planning, enabling personalized DBS that has shown promising results[58,59]. Similar approaches have found first consideration for TMS[60,61] and their implementation in TMS interventions in stroke rehabilitation may optimize therapy efficiency. Moreover, also in healthy individuals, TMS-induced neural activity has been shown to be predominantly predicted by the structural integrity of the stimulated network, further highlighting the significance of a network perspective[62]. However, these approaches require the prior identification of structural and functional network alterations post-stroke and their relevance for motor performance.

Despite two decades of intensive research on brain reorganization following stroke, data on the functional role of particular brain areas in relation to functional or structural network changes in the acute stage after stroke remain scarce. Novel methodological approaches like connectome-based lesion-symptom mapping (CSLM) enable an interesting new way of estimating the prevailing structural network by projecting lesion maps onto structural standard atlases[31,32].

Moreover, efforts have been undertaken to explain the heterogeneous influences of the contralesional hemisphere on motor reorganization and recovery within the bimodal balance–recovery model and the concept of structural reserve[15], putting the functional relevance of the contralesional hemisphere in the context of the structural capacities of the affected hemisphere. According to the theoretical framework of structural reserve, a more profound loss of ipsilesional network structures results in a compensatory recruitment of contralesional areas facilitating motor recovery. By contrast, the contralesional hemisphere exerts a predominantly detrimental impact on a less affected ipsilesional network.

In this context, it has to be acknowledged that the stroke patients included in the dataset exhibited mild to moderate impairments resulting from rather limited lesions to motor-related fibers in the ipsilesional hemisphere. Therefore, given the relatively preserved ipsilesional structural resources, it could be anticipated that these patients demonstrate a greater vulnerability to disturbing contralesional influences according to the concept of structural reserve.

However, the interregional functional differences within the contralesional hemisphere described above render the notion plausible that structural reserve has to be considered with equivalent regional specificity.

Thus, we further elaborated on the associations between behaviorally overlapping reactivity to TMS interference on contralesional M1 and aIPS and ipsilesional network structures spared by the lesion. As the primary pathway connecting the motor cortex with the spinal cord, the CST is the critical structure for transmitting motor commands to spinal motor neurons and peripheral muscles[63,64]. Hence, motor deficits after stroke highly depend on the lesion-induced severity of the CST damage[26,34,65]. A complete disruption of the CST leads to a complete loss of voluntary muscle control distal to the lesion, while an incomplete lesion of motor fibers within the CST can be relatively well compensated[34].

However, the significance of CST integrity in the context of contralesional involvement has yielded conflicting findings in the literature. While some studies have reported a positive link between ipsilesional CST integrity and contralesional recruitment[66,67], others have shown no significant relationship or even a negative association[50,68]. However, these inconsistent findings mainly accounted indirectly for contralesional involvement using fMRI. By assessing the functional involvement of the contralesional hemisphere with online TMS interference, our results indicate a positive relationship between ipsilesional CST lesion extent and motor performance improvement upon contralesional M1 interference as an index for a disturbing influence in early motor reorganization. In contrast to the hypothesis of structural reserve, the current results suggest that – at least for the ipsilesional CST and in the present sample consisting of mildly to moderately affected patients with a generally higher structural reserve - the ipsilesional hemisphere is, in particular, susceptible to maladaptive influences of contralesional M1 in case of less structural integrity of the CST. Specifically, this association was observed solely for the contralesional M1 effect and was absent for aIPS.

Contralesional significance in the context of ipsilesional network configurations

Previous studies have emphasized the role of interhemispheric structural connections in facilitating the interaction between ipsi- and contralesional structures to enhance motor recovery[69,70]. We here underpin the importance of the ipsilesional motor network in the context of structural reserve and contralesional influences. Our findings revealed distinct and opposite relationships between the reserve of the ipsilesional network and the effect of contralesional M1 and aIPS for post-stroke motor performance. Specifically, we found a correlation between ipsilesional M1 disconnectivity and a more disturbing influence of contralesional M1. Likewise, more extensive lesions to the ipsilesional CST were associated with a more disruptive influence of contralesional M1. These converging findings strongly challenge the concept of

structural reserve in terms of supportive contralesional influences. Instead, contralesional aIPS exerted a supportive influence for motor performance in patients with stronger ipsilesional M1 disconnectivity, supporting the hypothesis of structural reserve. These opposite effects concerning the influences originating from contralesional areas and their link to ipsilesional network properties vote for including regional specificity in the concept of structural reserve.

Concurrently, the findings emphasize the limitations of simplistic models like the concept of structural reserve in extensively capturing the complexity of the hemispheric interplay during reorganization after stroke. They further highlight the demand for a more nuanced understanding and comprehensive and individualizable models of the relationship between different contralesional motor regions and their unique contributions to motor recovery.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the present study's findings extend the concept of structural reserve by adding the factor region to explain the heterogeneous patterns of contralesional recruitment observed after stroke. Our data emphasize the significance of considering region-specific variations in contralesional recruitment within the context of the structural reserve of the ipsilesional motor network. This highlights the nuanced influence of distinct motor regions and underscores the need for a more personalized approach to understand the mechanisms of motor reorganization after stroke.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author, CT, upon reasonable request.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

GRF and CG were funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – Project-ID 431549029 – SFB 1451 (project C05). We thank Jana Freytag, Stella Ritter, and Katharina Lemberg for technical assistance.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors report no competing interests.

FIGURES LEGENDS



Figure 1. *Experimental setup.*

A During the applying 10Hz online TMS interference, all subjects performed a simple finger tapping task in response to a visual cue. **B** The experiment was set up in a pseudo-randomized block design addressing each target region thrice. Each trial consisted of alternating tapping and rest intervals. **C** The three contralesional target regions comprise the primary motor cortex (M1), the dorsal premotor cortex (dPMC), and the anterior intraparietal sulcus (aIPS). The parieto-occipital vertex served as a control condition (Sham).



Figure 2. *Lesion symptom mapping.*

A A probabilistic mapping procedure was utilized to assess the structural integrity of the corticospinal tract corrected for the width of the corticospinal tract on the z-axis. This method involved characterizing the extent of the lesion for each height of the tract and weighting it by the individual width at the level of each respective slice. **B** White matter disconnectivity topographies were created by projecting the individual brain lesion on the HCP-842 human connectome atlas. Based on the estimated damage to the fiber tracts, a lesion-specific disconnectivity profile was derived for each patient.



Figure 3. *Group comparisons between stroke patients and healthy control subjects and individual data points***.**

A A significant difference in finger tapping velocity between stroke patients and healthy control subjects was found for the stimulation of contralesional M1 and aIPS.

Accordingly, stroke patients early after stroke demonstrated an improvement in tapping performance upon contralesional online TMS interference. An equivalent group difference concerning dPMC could not be detected in the present sample. **B** It was demonstrated that the group of stroke patients comprised a significantly higher proportion of positive responders for the M1 and aIPS stimulation but not for dPMC. Patient data are shown in color while healthy controls are shown in gray.



Figure 4. *Relationship between ipsilesional network alterations and responsiveness to contralesional rTMS.*

A The lesion overlap of all patients indicated two peaks: one in the posterior limb of the internal capsule and one in the medioventral part of the pons. **B** The tract overlap

showed a dominant overlap with CST. **C** A positive relationship between the degree of ipsilesional CST lesion load and TMS responsivity to contralesional M1 stimulation was found. **D** A positive association was found linking the amount of contralesional M1 response to the degree of disconnectivity of the ipsilesional M1. A negative correlation was identified between the contralesional aIPS responses and ipsilesional M1 disconnectivity.

ID	Sample	Handedness	Hemisphere	Lesion Location	Days post stroke	NIHSS	TMS responsiveness
1	T	R	L	Internal capsule	2	9	
2	T	R	L	Striatocapsular	2	3	
3	T	R	L	Pons	7	4	
4	T	R	L	Thalamus, cortical (parietooccipital)	2	6	
5	T	R	L	Thalamus	4	6	
6	T	R	L	Internal capsule	3	3	
7	T	R	L	Basal ganglia	6	14	
8	T	R	L	Thalamus	6	8	
9	T	R	L	Basal ganglia	5	9	
10	T	R	L	Cortical (postcentral gyrus)	3	4	
11	T	R	L	Cortical (parietal, temporoparietal)	3	2	
12	T	R	L	Cortical (precentral gyrus)	2	3	
13	T	R	L	Cortical (frontal and temporal operculum, precentral gyrus)	3	3	
14	T	R	L	Cortical (precentral gyrus)	3	2	
15	H	R	2	Pons	7	4	
16	H	L	2	Centrum semiovale, Inferior parietal lobule, superior and middle temporal gyrus, posterior insula	3	1	
17	H	R	2	Centrum semiovale, caudate nucleus (caput), operculum, Inferior parietal lobule, superior and middle temporal gyrus, posterior insula	5	0	
18	H	R	2	Pons	4	3	
19	H	R	1	Pons	3	2	

20	H	R	1	Inferior frontal gyrus, insula, operculum, superior temporal gyrus	2	1	● ● ●
21	H	R	2	Medulla oblongata	5	6	● ● ●
22	H	R	2	Internal capsule	6	0	● ● ●
23	H	R	1	Pons	2	4	● ● ●
24	H	L	2	Precentral gyrus	2	0	● ● ●
25	H	R	1	Internal capsule, pallidum	9	1	● ● ●

● =M1 responsive ● = dPMC responsive ● = aIPS responsive

Table 1. *Overview of all demographic and clinical patient characteristics.*

REFERENCES

1. Krakauer JW, Carmichael ST, Corbett D, Wittenberg GF. Getting neurorehabilitation right: what can be learned from animal models? *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2012;26(8):923-931. doi:10.1177/1545968312440745

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

3. Ferris JK, Neva JL, Francisco BA, Boyd LA. Bilateral Motor Cortex Plasticity in Individuals With Chronic Stroke, Induced by Paired Associative Stimulation. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2018;32(8):671-681. doi:10.1177/1545968318785043

4. Gerloff C, Bushara K, Sailer A, et al. Multimodal imaging of brain reorganization in motor areas of the contralesional hemisphere of well recovered patients after capsular stroke. *Brain*. 2006;129(Pt 3):791-808. doi:10.1093/brain/awh713

5. 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. *Cerebral Cortex*. 2011;21(4):756-768. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhq140

6. Hallett M, de Haan W, Deco G, et al. Human brain connectivity: Clinical applications for clinical neurophysiology. *Clinical Neurophysiology*. 2020;131(7):1621-1651. doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2020.03.031

7. Rehme AK, Eickhoff SB, Rottschy C, Fink GR, Grefkes C. Activation likelihood estimation meta-analysis of motor-related neural activity after stroke. *NeuroImage*. 2012;59(3):2771-2782. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.10.023

8. Ward NS, Brown MM, Thompson AJ, Frackowiak RSJ. Neural correlates of motor recovery after stroke: a longitudinal fMRI study. *Brain*. 2003;126(11):2476-2496. doi:10.1093/brain/awg245

9. Bütefisch CM, Weβling M, Netz J, Seitz RJ, Hömberg V. Relationship Between Interhemispheric Inhibition and Motor Cortex Excitability in Subacute Stroke Patients. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2008;22(1):4-21. doi:10.1177/1545968307301769

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

11. Carrera E, Tononi G. Diaschisis: past, present, future. *Brain*. 2014;137(9):2408-2422. doi:10.1093/brain/awu101

12. Duque J, Hummel F, Celnik P, Murase N, Mazzocchio R, Cohen LG. Transcallosal inhibition in chronic subcortical stroke. *NeuroImage*. 2005;28(4):940-946. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2005.06.033

13. Kinsbourne M. Mechanisms of hemispheric interaction in man. In: *Hemispheric Disconnection and Cerebral Function*. Charles C Thomas; 1974:260-285.

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

15. Di Pino G, Pellegrino G, Assenza G, et al. Modulation of brain plasticity in stroke: A novel model for neurorehabilitation. *Nature reviews Neurology*. 2014;10. doi:10.1038/nrneurol.2014.162

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

17. Bertolucci F, Chisari C, Fregni F. The potential dual role of transcallosal inhibition in post-stroke motor recovery. *Restorative Neurology and Neuroscience*. 2018;36(1):83-97. doi:10.3233/RNN-170778

18. Cramer SC. Repairing the human brain after stroke: I. Mechanisms of spontaneous recovery. *Ann Neurol*. 2008;63(3):272-287. doi:10.1002/ana.21393

19. Brancaccio A, Tabarelli D, Belardinelli P. A New Framework to Interpret Individual Inter-Hemispheric Compensatory Communication after Stroke. *Journal of Personalized Medicine*. 2022;12(1):59. doi:10.3390/jpm12010059

20. Hallett M. Transcranial magnetic stimulation and the human brain. *Nature*. 2000;406(6792):147-150. doi:10.1038/35018000

21. Kobayashi M, Pascual-Leone A. Transcranial magnetic stimulation in neurology. *The Lancet Neurology*. 2003;2(3):145-156. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(03)00321-1

22. Lefaucheur JP, André-Obadia N, Antal A, et al. Evidence-based guidelines on the therapeutic use of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS). *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2014;125(11):2150-2206. doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2014.05.021

23. Rossi S, Hallett M, Rossini PM, Pascual-Leone A, Safety of TMS Consensus Group. Safety, ethical considerations, and application guidelines for the use of transcranial magnetic stimulation in clinical practice and research. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2009;120(12):2008-2039. doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2009.08.016

24. Bradnam LV, Stinear CM, Barber PA, Byblow WD. Contralesional hemisphere control of the proximal paretic upper limb following stroke. *Cereb Cortex*. 2012;22(11):2662-2671. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhr344

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

26. Lotze M, Beutling W, Loibl M, et al. Contralesional motor cortex activation depends on ipsilesional corticospinal tract integrity in well-recovered subcortical stroke patients. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2012;26(6):594-603. doi:10.1177/1545968311427706

27. Takeuchi N, Tada T, Toshima M, Chuma T, Matsuo Y, Ikoma K. Inhibition of the unaffected motor cortex by 1 Hz repetitive transcranical magnetic stimulation enhances motor performance and training effect of the paretic hand in patients with chronic stroke. *J Rehabil Med*. 2008;40(4):298-303. doi:10.2340/16501977-0181

28. 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 USA*. 2002;99(22):14518-14523. doi:10.1073/pnas.222536799

29. Tscherpel C, Hensel L, Lemberg K, et al. The differential roles of contralesional frontoparietal areas in cortical reorganization after stroke. *Brain Stimulation*. 2020;13(3):614-624. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2020.01.016

30. Hensel L, Tscherpel C, Freytag J, et al. Connectivity-Related Roles of Contralesional Brain Regions for Motor Performance Early after Stroke. *Cerebral Cortex*. 2020;(bhaa270). doi:10.1093/cercor/bhaa270

31. Bowren M, Bruss J, Manzel K, et al. Post-stroke outcomes predicted from multivariate lesion-behaviour and lesion network mapping. *Brain*. 2022;145(4):1338-1353. doi:10.1093/brain/awac010

32. Griffis JC, Metcalf NV, Corbetta M, Shulman GL. Lesion Quantification Toolkit: A MATLAB software tool for estimating grey matter damage and white matter disconnections in patients with focal brain lesions. *Neuroimage Clin*. 2021;30:102639. doi:10.1016/j.nicl.2021.102639

33. Feng W, Wang J, Chhatbar PY, et al. Corticospinal Tract Lesion Load - A Potential Imaging Biomarker for Stroke Motor Outcomes. *Ann Neurol*. 2015;78(6):860-870. doi:10.1002/ana.24510

34. Zhu LL, Lindenberg R, Alexander MP, Schlaug G. Lesion load of the corticospinal tract predicts motor impairment in chronic stroke. *Stroke*. 2010;41(5):910-915. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.109.577023

35. Tscherpel C, Hensel L, Lemberg K, et al. Age affects the contribution of ipsilateral brain regions to movement kinematics. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2020;41(3):640-655. doi:10.1002/hbm.24829

36. Chenot Q, Tzourio-mazoyer N, Rheault F, et al. *A Population-Based Atlas of the Human Pyramidal Tract in 410 Healthy Participants*. Neuroscience; 2018. doi:10.1101/251108

37. Glasser MF, Coalson TS, Robinson EC, et al. A multi-modal parcellation of human cerebral cortex. *Nature*. 2016;536(7615):171-178. doi:10.1038/nature18933

38. Schaefer A, Kong R, Gordon EM, et al. Local-Global Parcellation of the Human Cerebral Cortex from Intrinsic Functional Connectivity MRI. *Cereb Cortex*. 2018;28(9):3095-3114. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhx179

39. 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

40. Sporns O. Graph theory methods: applications in brain networks. *Dialogues Clin Neurosci*. 2018;20(2):111-121.

41. Grefkes C, Fink GR. Connectivity-based approaches in stroke and recovery of function. *The Lancet Neurology*. 2014;13(2):206-216. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(13)70264-3

42. Buetefisch CM. Role of the Contralesional Hemisphere in Post-Stroke Recovery of Upper Extremity Motor Function. *Front Neurol*. 2015;6. doi:10.3389/fneur.2015.00214

43. Werhahn KJ, Conforto AB, Kadom N, Hallett M, Cohen LG. Contribution of the ipsilateral motor cortex to recovery after chronic stroke. *Annals of Neurology*. 2003;54(4):464-472. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.10686

44. Grefkes C, Fink GR. Noninvasive brain stimulation after stroke: it is time for large randomized controlled trials! *Current Opinion in Neurology*. 2016;29(6):714-720. doi:10.1097/WCO.0000000000000395

45. Ameli M, Grefkes C, Kemper F, et al. Differential effects of high-frequency repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation over ipsilesional primary motor cortex in cortical and subcortical middle cerebral artery stroke. *Annals of Neurology*. 2009;66(3):298-309. doi:10.1002/ana.21725

46. Luppino G, Rizzolatti G. The Organization of the Frontal Motor Cortex. *Physiology*. 2000;15(5):219-224. doi:10.1152/physiologyonline.2000.15.5.219

47. Koch G, Fernandez Del Olmo M, Cheeran B, et al. Focal stimulation of the posterior parietal cortex increases the excitability of the ipsilateral motor cortex. *J Neurosci*. 2007;27(25):6815-6822. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0598-07.2007

48. Schulz R, Koch P, Zimerman M, et al. Parietofrontal motor pathways and their association with motor function after stroke. *Brain*. 2015;138(7):1949-1960. doi:10.1093/brain/awv100

49. Fridman EA, Hanakawa T, Chung M, Hummel F, Leiguarda RC, Cohen LG. Reorganization of the human ipsilesional premotor cortex after stroke. *Brain*. 2004;127(4):747-758. doi:10.1093/brain/awh082

50. Bestmann S, Swayne O, Blankenburg F, et al. The Role of Contralesional Dorsal Premotor Cortex after Stroke as Studied with Concurrent TMS-fMRI. *J Neurosci*. 2010;30(36):11926-11937. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5642-09.2010

51. Rushworth MFS, Johansen-Berg H, Göbel SM, Devlin JT. The left parietal and premotor cortices: motor attention and selection. *NeuroImage*. 2003;20:S89-S100. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2003.09.011

52. Hensel L, Lange F, Tscherpel C, et al. Recovered grasping performance after stroke depends on interhemispheric frontoparietal connectivity. *Brain*. 2023;146(3):1006-1020. doi:10.1093/brain/awac157

53. Bai Z, Zhang J, Fong KNK. Effects of transcranial magnetic stimulation in modulating cortical excitability in patients with stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*. 2022;19(1):24. doi:10.1186/s12984-022-00999-4

54. Chen MH, Huang LL, Lee CF, et al. A controlled pilot trial of two commercial video games for rehabilitation of arm function after stroke. *Clin Rehabil*. 2015;29(7):674-682. doi:10.1177/0269215514554115

55. Hildesheim FE, Silver AN, Dominguez-Vargas AU, et al. Predicting Individual Treatment Response to rTMS for Motor Recovery After Stroke: A Review and the CanStim Perspective. *Frontiers in Rehabilitation Sciences*. 2022;3. Accessed November 23, 2023. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fresc.2022.795335

56. Hitti FL, Ramayya AG, McShane BJ, Yang AI, Vaughan KA, Baltuch GH. Long-term outcomes following deep brain stimulation for Parkinson's disease. *J Neurosurg*. Published online January 18, 2019:1-6. doi:10.3171/2018.8.JNS182081

57. Martinez-Ramirez D, Jimenez-Shahed J, Leckman JF, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Deep Brain Stimulation in Tourette Syndrome: The International Tourette Syndrome Deep Brain Stimulation Public Database and Registry. *JAMA Neurology*. 2018;75(3):353-359. doi:10.1001/jamaneurol.2017.4317

58. Hollunder B, Rajamani N, Siddiqi SH, et al. Toward Personalized Medicine in Connectomic Deep Brain Stimulation. Published online September 25, 2021. Accessed November 23, 2023. http://arxiv.org/abs/2109.12327

59. Rajamani N, Horn A, Hollunder B. Chapter 25 - Outlook: Towards personalized connectomic deep brain stimulation. In: Horn A, ed. *Connectomic Deep Brain Stimulation*. Academic Press; 2022:527-542. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-821861-7.00009-9

60. Harita S, Momi D, Mazza F, Griffiths JD. Mapping Inter-individual Functional Connectivity Variability in TMS Targets for Major Depressive Disorder. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*. 2022;13. Accessed December 22, 2023. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyt.2022.902089

61. Menardi A, Ozdemir RA, Momi D, et al. Effect of group-based vs individualized stimulation site selection on reliability of network-targeted TMS. *NeuroImage*. 2022;264:119714. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2022.119714

62. Momi D, Wang Z, Griffiths JD. TMS-evoked responses are driven by recurrent large-scale network dynamics. Fornito A, Frank MJ, Meier J, Pigorini A, eds. *eLife*. 2023;12:e83232. doi:10.7554/eLife.83232

63. Brouwer B, Ashby P. Corticospinal projections to upper and lower limb spinal motoneurons in man. *Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol*. 1990;76(6):509-519. doi:10.1016/0013-4694(90)90002-2

64. Lemon RN. Descending pathways in motor control. *Annu Rev Neurosci*. 2008;31:195-218. doi:10.1146/annurev.neuro.31.060407.125547

65. DeVetten G, Coutts SB, Hill MD, et al. Acute Corticospinal Tract Wallerian Degeneration Is Associated With Stroke Outcome. *Stroke*. 2010;41(4):751-756. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.109.573287

66. 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

67. Ward NS, Newton JM, Swayne OBC, et al. Motor system activation after subcortical stroke depends on corticospinal system integrity. *Brain*. 2006;129(Pt 3):809-819. doi:10.1093/brain/awl002

68. 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

69. Mattos DJS, Rutlin J, Hong X, Zinn K, Shimony JS, Carter AR. White matter integrity of contralesional and transcallosal tracts may predict response to upper limb task-specific training in chronic stroke. *NeuroImage: Clinical*. 2021;31:102710. doi:10.1016/j.nicl.2021.102710

70. Radlinska BA, Blunk Y, Leppert IR, Minuk J, Pike GB, Thiel A. Changes in callosal motor fiber integrity after subcortical stroke of the pyramidal tract. *J Cereb Blood Flow Metab*. 2012;32(8):1515-1524. doi:10.1038/jcbfm.2012.37

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

I. Comparability of subsamples

Patients:

	mean ± SD		
	Tscherpel et al.	Hensel et al.	Group Differences
Age	69.36 ± 9.45	66.36 ± 11.89	t(1,23) = 0.59, p = 0.555
RMT	48.79 ± 20.58	53.82 ± 37.83	t(1,23) = -1.01, p = 0.302
Days Post Stroke	4.07 ± 3.21	3.73 ± 5.10	t(1,23) = 0.42, p = 0.678
NIHSS	3.14 ± 1.61	1.91 ± 0.87	t(1,23) = 1.54, p = 0.137

Controls:

	mean ± SD		
	Tscherpel et al.	Hensel et al.	Group Differences
Age	64.44 ± 10.05	66.15 ± 8.57	t(1,22) = 1.68, p = 0.594
RMT	48.39 ± 15.87	51.29 ± 21.64	t(1,22) = -1.06, p = 0.307

II. TMS protocol, RMT assessment, and contralesional targets

Synchronized to a finger tapping task (see below), brief trains of 10Hz rTMS were administered to interfere with the ongoing brain activity concurrent with task execution[1–3]. The onset of the stimulation was coupled to a visual cue initiating a finger-tapping movement. The stimulation lasted throughout the whole duration of the respective tapping interval for two seconds. The coupling was implemented using the behavioral experimental software NeuroBs Presentation (Version 9.9, Neurobehavioral Systems, USA). The stimulation was performed using a MagStim SuperRapid[2] stimulator (The MagStim Co. Ltd, Whitland, United Kingdom) along with a MagStim 70mm Double Air Film Coil. The position of coil placement was tracked and recorded using a frameless stereotactic neuronavigational system (BrainSight V.2.0.7; Rogue Research Ltd; Montreal, Canada) which enables precise navigation within the individual subject's anatomy based on an anatomical MRI (acquisition parameters for healthy controls in Tscherpel et al. and all participants in Hensel et al.: 3T MR image, MDEF sequence, (Siemens Trio 3T scanner (Siemens Medical Solution), voxel size: 1.0 x 1.0x1.0mm^3, FOV 256mm, 176 sagittal slices, TR 2250ms. TE 3.95ms; acquisition parameters for stroke patients in Tscherpel et al.: 1.5 MR image using standard sequences within the clinical routine (1.5T MRI scanner;

Philips, Guildford, Great Britain) [DWI: TR=3.9ms, TE=0.095s, FOV=230mm, 22 axial slices, voxel size=1.8x2.99x6.0mm^3, T2: TR=5.6s, TE=0.11ms, FOV=230mm, 22 axial slices, voxel size=0.9x1.12x6.0mm^3; FLAIR: TR=6.0ms, TE=0.10ms, FOV=230mm, 22 axial slices, voxel size=0.9x0.9x6.0mm^3)).

In both studies, M1 was defined as the location that generated the highest motor evoked potentials (MEPs) with the coil held tangentially in a 45° posterior-anterior orientation[4,5]. Using an EMG acquisition system (Powerlab 26T, LabChart software package, Version 8.0, AD Instruments, New Zealand) the MEP amplitudes were recorded from the first interosseus (FDI) muscle using Ag/AgCI surface electrodes (Tyco Healthcare) in a belly-to-tendon montage filtered 0.5Hz high pass and 30-300Hz bandpass. While Tscherpel et al. (2020a, 2020b) defined the target positions of dPMC and aIPS by MNI coordinates, Hensel et al. (2020) used subject-specific fMRI coordinates. For the dPMC stimulation, the coil was placed tangentially to the skull in a 45° anterior-posterior position[6,7]. For the aIPS inference, the coil was oriented in 90° latero-medial orientation[8]. The parieto-occipital vertex served as a control condition approached at an angle of 45°, which is a commonly used and reliable control position in TMS experiments due to its relative cortex distance, enabling the assessment of potential non-specific effects of TMS[9,10].

For all target regions, the intensity of the stimulator output was set to 90% of the resting motor threshold (RMT) as determined by the TMS Motor Threshold Assessment Tool (MTAT, Version 2.0) which provides a reliable estimate of the 50µV RMT derived by a maximum-likelihood procedure[11].

III. Lesion mapping

To ensure a uniformly standardized approach of preprocessing of the lesion maps, 1.5T scans collected during the clinical routine were consistently used to generate them. Acquisition parameters for MRI scans for lesion mask generation: 1.5 MR image using standard sequences within the clinical routine (1.5T MRI scanner; Philips, Guildford, Great Britain) [DWI: TR=3.9ms, TE=0.095s, FOV=230mm, 22 axial slices, voxel size=1.8x2.99x6.0 mm^3, T2: TR=5.6s, TE=0.11ms, FOV=230mm, 22 axial slices, voxel size=0.9x1.12x6.0 mm^3; FLAIR: TR=6.0ms, TE=0.10ms, FOV=230mm, 22 axial slices, voxel size=0.9x0.9x6.0 mm^3)

Lesion maps were created using the imaging software MRIcron (Version 1.0.2, Georgia Institute of Technology)[12]. All right-sided lesions (n=6) were flipped to the left side. SPM12 (Statistical Parametric Mapping; The Wellcome Centre for Human Neuroimaging, London, UK) was used for the preprocessing routine of the lesion maps. Accordingly, lesion maps were co-registered to the individual FLAIR and DWI images before the normalization of the lesion maps into MNI space (MNI152_T1[13]) was applied.

IV. Calculation of corticospinal tract integrity using a z-corrected CST mapping approach

i. Calculation of the probabilistic CST overlap per slice:

$$CST_{Prob} = CST_{Lesion} \times CST_{Atlas}$$

ii. Computation of an individual lesion weighting per slice as a quotient of the probabilistic lesion volume and the probabilistic CST volume along the z-axis:

$$V_{Weighted} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} CST_{Prob}}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} CST_{Atlas}} \quad for\ k = 1, \ldots, n$$

i. Determination of the weighted lesion volume for each slice along the z-axis:

$$CST_{Weighted} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} CST_{Prob} \times V_{Weight}$$

ii. Calculation of the maximum lesion extension as the maximum of $CST_{Weighted}$:

$$CST_{max} = max\,(CST_{Weighted})$$

V. The extended motor network within the LQT toolbox

		MNI coordinates			
ID	Name	X	Y	Z	Network Label
8	LH_SomMotA_1	-39	-22	60	3
9	SomMotA_2	-11	-25	65	3
10	LH_SomMotB_Aud_1	-53	-21	9	4
11	LH_SomMotB_S2_1	-37	-20	17	4
12	LH_SomMotB_S2_2	-54	-10	15	4
13	LH_SomMotB_Cent_1	-55	-7	35	4
15	LH_DorsAttnA_ParOcc_1	-47	-70	12	5
16	LH_DorsAttnA_SPL_1	-25	-67	49	5
31	LH_ContA_IPS_1	-37	-53	47	11
32	LH_ContA_PFCl_1	-43	34	21	11
50	LH_TempPar_1	-57	-49	13	17
101	Caudate nucleus (Left)	-11	-17	9	18
103	Lenticular nucleus, putamen (Left)	-11	12	10	18
105	Lenticular nucleus, pallidum (Left)	-24	5	3	18
107	Thalamus (Left)	-18	1	1	19
101	Caudate nucleus (Left)	-11	-17	9	18
135	Brainstem	1	-28	-36	21

REFERENCES

1. Hensel L, Tscherpel C, Freytag J, et al. Connectivity-Related Roles of Contralesional Brain Regions for Motor Performance Early after Stroke. *Cerebral Cortex*. 2020;(bhaa270). doi:10.1093/cercor/bhaa270
2. Tscherpel C, Hensel L, Lemberg K, et al. The differential roles of contralesional frontoparietal areas in cortical reorganization after stroke. *Brain Stimulation*. 2020;13(3):614-624. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2020.01.016
3. Tscherpel C, Hensel L, Lemberg K, et al. Age affects the contribution of ipsilateral brain regions to movement kinematics. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2020;41(3):640-655. doi:10.1002/hbm.24829
4. Barker AT, Jalinous R, Freeston IL. Non-invasive magnetic stimulation of human motor cortex. *Lancet*. 1985;1(8437):1106-1107. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(85)92413-4
5. Rossini PM, Burke D, Chen R, et al. Non-invasive electrical and magnetic stimulation of the brain, spinal cord, roots and peripheral nerves: Basic principles and procedures for routine clinical and research application. An updated report from an I.F.C.N. Committee. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2015;126(6):1071-1107. doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2015.02.001
6. Lefaucheur JP, André-Obadia N, Antal A, et al. Evidence-based guidelines on the therapeutic use of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS). *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2014;125(11):2150-2206. doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2014.05.021
7. Wagner T, Valero-Cabre A, Pascual-Leone A. Noninvasive human brain stimulation. *Annu Rev Biomed Eng*. 2007;9:527-565. doi:10.1146/annurev.bioeng.9.061206.133100
8. Blankenburg F, Ruff C, Bestmann S, et al. Studying the Role of Human Parietal Cortex in Visuospatial Attention with Concurrent TMS–fMRI. *Cerebral cortex (New York, NY : 1991)*. 2010;20:2702-2711. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhq015

9. Bestmann S, Baudewig J, Siebner HR, Rothwell JC, Frahm J. Subthreshold high-frequency TMS of human primary motor cortex modulates interconnected frontal motor areas as detected by interleaved fMRI-TMS. *Neuroimage*. 2003;20(3):1685-1696. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2003.07.028

10. Rossi S, Hallett M, Rossini PM, Pascual-Leone A, Safety of TMS Consensus Group. Safety, ethical considerations, and application guidelines for the use of transcranial magnetic stimulation in clinical practice and research. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2009;120(12):2008-2039. doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2009.08.016

11. Awiszus F. Chapter 2 TMS and threshold hunting. In: Paulus W, Tergau F, Nitsche MA, Rothwell JG, Ziemann U, Hallett M, eds. *Supplements to Clinical Neurophysiology*. Vol 56. Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation and Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation. Elsevier; 2003:13-23. doi:10.1016/S1567-424X(09)70205-3

12. Rorden C, Karnath HO, Bonilha L. Improving lesion-symptom mapping. *J Cogn Neurosci*. 2007;19(7):1081-1088. doi:10.1162/jocn.2007.19.7.1081

13. Fonov V, Evans A, Mckinstry R, Almli CR, Collins L. Unbiased nonlinear average age-appropriate brain templates from birth to adulthood. *Neuroimage*. 2009;47. doi:10.1016/S1053-8119(09)70884-5