Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation Modulates Brain Connectivity in Children with Self-limited Epilepsy with Centrotemporal Spikes

Xiwei She [a], Wendy Qi [a], Kerry C. Nix [a], Miguel Menchaca [a], Christopher C. Cline [b], Wei Wu [b], Zihuai He [a], Fiona M. Baumer [a*]

[a] Department of Neurology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

[b] Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

*** Corresponding Author:** Fiona M. Baumer
290 Campus Drive, E259
Stanford, CA 94305
fbaumer@stanford.edu

Running title: Effects of rTMS on Connectivity in SeLECTS

Thumbnail:



Figure 0: Children with self-limited epilepsy with centrotemporal spikes (SeLECTS), a common pediatric epilepsy syndrome, experience frequent interictal epileptiform discharges (IEDs) and had higher connectivity compared to normal controls. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) serves as a potential therapeutic tool for modulating both IED frequency and hyperconnectivity in this cohort.

Abstract

Interictal epileptiform discharges (IEDs) are brief bursts of hypersynchronous cortical activity that occur between seizures and have been linked to cognitive deficits in some pediatric epilepsy syndromes. IEDs may impair cognition by altering connectivity between the cortex from which they emerge and other brain networks, making connectivity a novel therapeutic target. Here, we test whether repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS), a non-invasive form of neuromodulation that reduces cortical excitability, can modulate connectivity and reduce IEDs in pediatric epilepsy patients.

We recruited 19 children with self-limited epilepsy with centrotemporal spikes (SeLECTS), a common focal pediatric epilepsy syndrome in which children have motor cortex IEDs and develop language dysfunction. SeLECTS IEDs increase connectivity between motor and language cortices and this hyperconnectivity is associated with worse language performance. Using a crossover design with a wash-out period, we compared the effect of active vs. sham low-frequency (1Hz) rTMS applied to the motor cortex from which the IEDs most frequently emerged. We measured connectivity before and after the rTMS by applying single pulses of TMS to the motor cortex while recording EEG (spTMS-EEG). This perturbational method generates TMS-evoked potentials (TEPs) at the site of stimulation that spread across the brain. We focused on six regions of interest: the bilateral motor cortices (implicated in epilepsy) and the bilateral inferior frontal and superior temporal regions (important for language). We quantified connectivity in two ways. First, we specifically interrogated connectivity between the stimulated motor cortex and other regions by calculating the area under the curve (AUC) of the TEPs, a time-domain metric, at each of these regions of interest. Second, we calculated connectivity between all regions using the weighted phase lag index (wPLI), a phase-domain metric. Finally, we counted IEDs in the five minutes before and after the rTMS.

Active, but not sham, rTMS significantly and globally decreased wPLI connectivity between multiple regions, with the greatest reductions seen in the superior temporal region connections in the stimulated hemisphere. Interestingly, rTMS did not alter AUC of the TEPs, suggesting that the modulatory effects of rTMS may extend beyond the stimulated cortex itself and affect a broader downstream network. Additionally, there was a trend suggesting that rTMS decreases IED frequency. These findings underscore the potential of low-frequency rTMS to target pathologic hyperconnectivity and reduce IEDs in children with SeLECTS and potentially other pediatric epilepsy syndromes.

Introduction

Interictal epileptiform discharges (IEDs) are brief bursts of abnormal hypersynchronous cortical activity that occur in patients with epilepsy outside of seizures. Children with epilepsy who experience frequent IEDs often suffer cognitive and behavioral deficits,[1] but how IEDs cause these impairments is not fully understood. Prior studies suggest that IEDs induce aberrant hyperconnectivity between the epileptic cortex, where IEDs originate, and distant brain regions, including key nodes in attention and language networks.[2,3] This hyperconnectivity can persist even during periods without IEDs.[4] Furthermore, hyperconnectivity is associated with worse performance on language tasks.[5] Together, these findings suggest that therapies aimed at reducing hyperconnectivity may help alleviate cognitive deficits in children with epilepsy.

Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) combined with electroencephalography (EEG) has emerged as a powerful tool for investigating and modulating the neurophysiological properties of the brain.[6,7] Single pulses of TMS can be applied to activate specific brain regions, while EEG (spTMS-EEG) captures the resultant network responses in the form of TMS evoked potentials (TEPs). TEPs can be measured locally at the stimulated site to assess cortical excitability. For example, the negative peak approximately 100 milliseconds after the TMS pulse (N100) represents long-range inhibitory responses associated with GABA-B receptor activity.[8] TEPs can also be measured globally throughout the brain, providing information on how efficiently the stimulated cortex excites other regions across several synapses.[9] Moreover, brain connectivity can be investigated by analyzing the relationship of inter-regional spTMS-EEG responses using measurements such as phase synchronization.[10,11]

In addition to the biologic information that can be gathered with spTMS-EEG, TMS can be applied in repetitive patterns (rTMS) to non-invasively modulate brain activity. Studies of healthy adults show that rTMS can suppress or facilitate cortical excitability depending upon the stimulation pattern used,[12] with low-frequency stimulation (≤ 1 Hz) generally reducing excitability. Furthermore, rTMS can also affect excitability of structurally and functionally connected brain regions.[13] In adult patients with epilepsy, several sham-controlled trials suggest that rTMS can suppress IEDs,[14,15] and modulate connectivity as measured by functional resonance imaging (fMRI).[16] However, controlled studies in pediatric epilepsy patients are still lacking.

This study investigates the therapeutic potential of rTMS on modulating IEDs and hyperconnectivity in pediatric epilepsy. We assessed the impact of 1 Hz rTMS on cortical excitability, connectivity, and IED frequency using spTMS-EEG in 19 children with self-

limited epilepsy with centrotemporal spikes (SeLECTS). SeLECTS is the most common pediatric epilepsy syndrome, and several features of the disorder make it an excellent model for this study. First, children with SeLECTS have very frequent IEDs emerging from the motor cortex, a region that can easily be stimulated by TMS. Second, high connectivity between epileptic motor cortices and language cortices (superior temporal and inferior frontal gyri) develops in SeLECTS, possibly due to IEDs, and this high connectivity is associated with poor language function.[4,5] Third, SeLECTS is one of the most "homogenous" epilepsy syndromes: children are generally otherwise healthy, have grossly normal brain anatomy, and are often not treated with antiseizure medications because seizures themselves are rare and often limited to sleep,[17] thus limiting patient-specific variability seen in many other epilepsies. Using a crossover design, we delivered active or sham 1 Hz rTMS to the motor cortex with the highest frequency of IEDs observed on prior clinical EEGs. Single-pulse TMS was applied to the same motor cortex, with spTMS-EEG analyses focused on six regions of interest: the stimulated and contralateral motor cortices (regions implicated in the epilepsy), as well as the bilateral inferior frontal and superior temporal regions (regions important for language).[18,19] We investigated three neural measurements: 1) TEPs measured at the stimulated motor cortex and at the other five regions of interest, which provide a time-domain assessment of cortical excitability and functional connectivity, respectively; 2) the weighted phase lag index (wPLI)[10] between regions, a phase-domain connectivity measure that is robust against the confounding effects of volume conduction that can obscure temporal domain connectivity analysis; and 3) frequency of IEDs. We aim to determine if 1 Hz rTMS modulates aberrant hyperconnectivity and IEDs, thus offering a step toward developing novel treatments for epilepsy.

Methods

Participants

Children were eligible if they were between the ages of 5–18 years and had a diagnosis of SeLECTS based on appropriate seizure semiology (hypersalivation, facial/hemibody twitching, or nocturnal tonic-clonic), and centrotemporal IEDs on EEG.[17] We excluded children with a history of: prematurity (<35 weeks); abnormal brain MRI; serious neurologic problems (i.e., other seizure disorders other than simple febrile seizures, head trauma with prolonged loss of consciousness, cerebrovascular accident or neuro-inflammatory disease); or focal deficits on neurologic exam. Children were recruited from Lucile Packard Children's Hospital and were also referred in by affiliated child neurologists in the community. This study was approved by the Stanford University Institutional Review Board. Written consent was obtained from parents and assent from children. Antiseizure medication use, and serum level were recorded.

TMS Experiments

Overview (Fig. 1A): The experiment was conducted over two separate sessions with a minimum of 6 days between sessions to allow time for the effects of rTMS to wash-out. Experimental procedures for each session were identical with the exception that in one session, children underwent active rTMS while on the other they underwent sham rTMS. Session order was randomized. All sessions were conducted in the late morning or early afternoon, with participants comfortably seated in a semi-reclined position.

EEG Recordings: EEG recordings were acquired using a 64-channel BrainVision actiCHamp Pulse amplifier with actiCAP slim active electrodes, at a sampling rate of 25 kHz. Electrode impedances were kept below 10 kΩ to ensure that setup time was feasible for children, although impedances lower than 5 kΩ are preferred for spTMS-EEG in adults. [20,21]

TMS Set-up: TMS was administered using a MagVenture MagPro X100 stimulator equipped with a Cool-B65 figure-8 coil. The TMS application was guided by the Localite TMS Navigator system for neuro-navigation, registered to a representative magnetic resonance image (MRI) from unbiased average age-appropriate templates.[22] Electromyographic (EMG) recordings were measured from the bilateral abductor pollicis brevis (APB) muscles, sampled at 25 kHz and high-pass filtered at 1 Hz. The motor hotspot of each hemisphere was identified as the location eliciting the largest EMG deflection in the APB EMG electrode when the hand was relaxed. On both days, the resting motor threshold (rMT) for each motor cortex was

determined as the minimum intensity required to evoke a peak-to-peak EMG signal of at least 50 μV in at least 5 out of 10 pulses.[23] Younger children and people taking anti-seizure medications can have elevated motor thresholds.[24–27] If no EMG deflection was observed at maximal stimulator output (MSO), hot-spotting was performed with the hand slightly contracted and the rMT was defined as 100% MSO. Active motor threshold measurement was not attempted due to the inability of pediatric patients to reliably exert a specific amount of pressure, resulting in inconsistent measurements. To minimize auditory and somatosensory contamination of EEG signals, in-ear headphones playing noise were used, matching the frequency of TMS clicks.[28] The volume was adjusted to a level where children reported difficulty hearing the click but experienced no discomfort. We additionally applied a foam layer to the coil surface to reduce TMS-induced vibration. Participant alertness was confirmed and maintained throughout the session through observation and monitoring of EEG signals.

Repetitive TMS: The hemisphere for rTMS targeting was selected based on the laterality of IEDs observed on prior clinical EEGs, choosing the hemisphere with the most frequent IEDs. We administered 1000 pulses of 1 Hz active or sham rTMS to the identified motor hotspot in the ipsilateral hemisphere, set at 90% of rMT as determined on the experimental day. Participants underwent the active and sham rTMS on two sessions separated by at least 6 days, with condition order (active, sham) randomized on a per-participant basis (Fig. 1A).

Single-Pulse TMS: Before and after the session of rTMS on both experimental days, participants underwent a 200-pulse block of spTMS-EEG, to the same hemisphere of rTMS administration. Stimulation intensity of spTMS was administered at 120% rMT (or 100% MSO for those with rMT ≥ 84% MSO), with pulses jittered at random intervals between 2 and 3 seconds. The spTMS-EEG data were used as probes to assess the impact of rTMS.

Regions of Interest (ROIs):

We categorized the hemispheres as either ipsilateral or contralateral to the rTMS administration (Fig. 1B). We focused on six regions of interest: the ipsilateral and contralateral frontal, motor, and temporal regions. We chose these regions as IEDs emerge from the motor cortex in SeLECTS and inferior frontal and superior temporal regions are important for language processing.[18,19]



Figure 1. Investigate the impact of 1 Hz rTMS on children with SeLECTS using a sham-controlled crossover rTMS-spTMS-EEG protocol. A: Experimental set-up of the rTMS-spTMS-EEG protocol. B: Regions of interest: ipsilateral and contralateral hemisphere of the frontal (green), motor (red), and temporal (blue) regions to the site of rTMS administration.

spTMS-EEG Data Preprocessing

We preprocessed the pre- and post-rTMS spTMS–EEG data together using EEGLAB[29] running in the MATLAB environment (version 2023a). For each participant, the data were epoched from -1000 to 1500 milliseconds around the spTMS pulse. The preprocessing procedure was primarily adapted from the AARATEP pipeline,[24,30] a custom-designed pipeline specifically created for spTMS-EEG preprocessing. A summary of the relevant procedures is provided here. To eliminate the primary spTMS pulse artifact, an interpolation procedure was applied within a time window spanning from -2 to 12 milliseconds relative to the pulse onset, involving fitting autoregressive models to 20 milliseconds of data both before and after the interpolation timespan. Subsequently, the data were down-sampled to 1 kHz, baseline-corrected by subtracting the mean within the -500 to -10 millisecond timespan from all data points and subjected to a high-pass filter to retain frequencies above 1 Hz. Piecewise extrapolation and filtering were applied to minimize convolutional spreading of post-stimulation responses into the pre-stimulation period. Bad channel rejection was performed using a data-driven Wiener noise estimation method.[31] Further noise reduction utilized the SOUND algorithm,[32] with a lambda regularization parameter of $10^{-1.5}$. Line noise was attenuated by a Butterworth band stop filter (58-62 Hz). Independent component analysis, with classification by the ICLabel algorithm,[33] was used to identify and eliminate artifacts. Following the ICLabel step, components were screened for remaining artifacts during the 11 to 30-millisecond time window, where TMS-induced muscle artifacts typically occur. This rejection rule was inspired by a similar approach from the TESA toolbox.[34] The final preprocessed signals were obtained

after low-pass filtering below 200 Hz and re-referencing to a common average. After such an automatic preprocessing pipeline, trials with noticeable movement or muscle artifacts were rejected through visual inspection conducted by a research assistant (WQ) and confirmed by a board-certified epileptologist (FB).

Measurements

TMS Evoked Potentials (TEPs; Fig. 2A): TEPs are a series of positive and negative peaks measured from the EEG signal immediately following spTMS that are thought to reflect cortical reactivity and the propagation along functional pathways.[6,9] TEPs are the most typically-used outcome measure from spTMS-EEG studies.[21] They can be measured at the site of stimulation directly under the coil, where they reflect a mixture of local and long-range excitatory and inhibitory inputs to that region.[8] We therefore used the **local TEP** as a *measurement of cortical excitability*. TEPs can also be measured in brain regions distant from the stimulated cortex, where they can be used as a *measure of connectivity* between the stimulated and recorded regions.[9,35] We used the **remote TEPs** as our first *measurement of connectivity, specifically connectivity between the stimulated motor cortex and the remote region of interest*. For both TEP measurements, we first averaged EEG signals from multiple single pulse TMS epochs to create a "grand average" TEP from which we derived the following measurements:

<u>*Local TEP*</u>: We measured the amplitude and latency of the P60 and N100 peaks at the stimulated motor cortex (Fig. 2B). We focused on these peaks because TEPs in children are simpler in morphology compared to adults, and are characterized by a positive peak at 60ms (P60) and a negative peak at 100ms (N100).[25,36,37] The P60 amplitude was defined as the maximum positive deflection occurring between 30-80 ms, while the N100 was defined as the most prominent negative deflection within 80-150 ms following spTMS. The latency of each component was recorded as the time elapsed from the delivery of the TMS pulse to the occurrence of its respective peak.

<u>*Remote TEPs*</u>*:* We measured the area under the curve (AUC) of both local and remote TEPs at all ROIs. We focused on this measurement as it provides a quantitative measure of the overall signal magnitude and temporal characteristics, and has been reported with significant changes after rTMS.[38,39] The AUC for each TEP was computed by numerically integrating the absolute values of the EEG signal over a predefined time window for each electrode. We analyzed the AUC during the 10 to 1000 millisecond window post-spTMS to encompass the

full range of spTMS-EEG responses, and during the 10 to 80 millisecond window to focus on the early local responses.[36,37]

Weighted phase lag index (wPLI):

We used the wPLI as a second method to assess connectivity between ROIs (Fig. 2C). Different from AUC, wPLI focuses on phase domain metrics and is particularly robust against the confounding effects of volume conduction in sensor-based EEG signals.[10] Beta-band (13–30 Hz spectral band) wPLI connectivity was calculated from cleaned TEP data between 10 to 1000 ms post-spTMS using cross-spectral density within MATLAB-based Fieldtrip's connectivity toolbox implementation. We chose the beta band because such lower frequency bands are more commonly associated with specific anatomical regions,[40,41] and has been demonstrated to detect changes of connectivity in patients.[42]

To calculate wPLI connectivity, first the phase difference between signals from two electrodes (e.g., iF1 and iM1 exemplified in Fig. 2C) was measured based on all time points in the 10-1000 ms window of the signal for each epoch. wPLI measures the consistency of phase leading or lagging relationships, assigning greater weight based on the magnitude of the imaginary component, thereby mitigating the impact of common source artifacts typically associated with volume conduction. Then, such phase differences from all epochs were used to yield the wPLI between that pair of electrodes. Next, the wPLI value for every electrode pair spanning to the two regions of interest were averaged to identify a single region-to-region connectivity value:

$$wPLI(iF-iM) = \frac{wPLI(iF1-iM1)+\ldots+wPLI(iF1-iMm)+wPLI(iF2-iM1)+\ldots+wPLI(iFf-iMm)}{f*m}$$

where *iF*=ipsilateral frontal, *iM*=ipsilateral motor, 1=first electrode in frontal or motor region, *f*=last electrode in frontal regions, *m*=last electrode in motor region, *f***m*=total number of unique electrode pairs between regions.

Frequency of Interictal Epileptiform Discharges (IEDs):

IEDs were manually counted during the blocks of EEG when spTMS was being applied, initially by a trained research assistant (WQ) and confirmed by a board-certified epileptologist (FMB) who were blinded to timing (pre vs. post rTMS) or session (sham vs. active rTMS day).



Figure 2. Measuring cortical excitability and connectivity from spTMS-EEG data. A: Representative EEG signals measured immediately after single pulses of TMS (spTMS) , with exemplary IEDs. One second of EEG is epoched around each spTMS with a matched number of epochs analyzed before and after the rTMS; B: TEP peak amplitudes and latencies as well as area under the curve (AUC) are calculated after averaging all epochs and all channels within a region of interest together. Here we illustrate a TEP from the ipsilateral motor (iM) region; C: Illustration of wPLI calculation between the ipsilateral frontal (iF) and ipsilateral motor (iM) regions.

Statistical Analyses

Statistical analyses were conducted using MATLAB (version 2023a) and Statistical Analysis System (SAS) OnDemand for Academics.[43] In our primary analysis, we assessed the change seen in excitability, connectivity, and IED frequency *within* each session. We used paired t-tests to compare the pre- and post-rTMS recordings for the following measurements: (a) amplitude and latency of evoked potentials (P60 and N100) measured under the stimulation coil from the ipsi-motor region; (b) AUC for evoked potentials measured in all six ROIs; (c) wPLI between the six ROIs (15 unique region-to-region pairs); and (d) IED frequency. Here, we tested the hypothesis that these measures would change (be reduced) after active rTMS but not after sham rTMS.

As a secondary analysis, we directly compared the changes induced by active vs. sham rTMS. We calculated a change score for each of the four measurements (post-pre) for each of the two sessions (active, sham) and then compared the changes with paired t-tests.

Given the multiple ROIs investigated in the cortical excitability (local TEP peak amplitude and latency) and connectivity (TEP AUC and wPLI) analyses, we adjusted our significance threshold using a principal component analysis method, which accounts for the effective number of independent tests.[44] This method is suitable when data in each comparison are not completely independent, as is the case with EEG where signal represents summated activity from multiple brain regions. For the analysis of IED frequency, the significance threshold was set to 0.05.

Previous studies have found that frequency-based connectivity measures, including wPLI, are acutely elevated at the time of an IED.[4] To quantify the influence of IEDs on the wPLI analysis, we tested whether: (a) IED frequency during the baseline recordings (pre-rTMS) was associated with baseline connectivity; and (b) change in IED frequency (post vs. pre-rTMS) was associated with change in connectivity. We tested these associations using a generalized estimated equations (GEE) model with exchangeable correlation matrix, which can handle repeated measurements.[45] Additionally, to understand if rTMS exerted an impact on connectivity beyond its influence on IED frequency, we conducted a sensitivity analysis in which we removed epochs containing IEDs from the pre- and post-rTMS EEGs and the used t-tests to compare pre- and post-rTMS wPLI between our ROIs.

Change of Excitability in Participants with a Lower rMT (Supplementary Material 1)

We conducted a sensitivity analysis focusing on a subgroup of participants with a rMT lower than 84% MSO (so the intensity of spTMS did not exceed 100% MSO) to investigate impact of motor threshold as a factor in the change of cortical excitability after rTMS.

Change of wPLI Connectivity in Alpha and Theta Frequency Bands After rTMS (Supplementary Material 2)

To gain a further understanding of the impact of rTMS on connectivity across different frequency bands, we assessed whether rTMS affected wPLI connectivity in the theta (4–7 Hz) and alpha (8–12 Hz) frequency bands.

Change of Evoked Power after rTMS (Supplementary Material 3)

To further explore the effects of rTMS on brain activity, we analyzed changes in evoked power, another frequency domain measure associated with behavioral states, in the theta (4–7 Hz), alpha (8–12 Hz), and beta (13–30 Hz) frequency bands after active or sham 1 Hz rTMS.

Results

Participants

Twenty-two right-handed children with SeLECTS were initially enrolled for the rTMS sessions. However, three children were excluded: two children were unable to tolerate the full session, and one could not stay awake. Thus, nineteen right-handed children with SeLECTS, aged 7-13 years (mean 10.02 ± 1.44), were included in the analyses. The average age of SeLECTS onset was 7.61 ± 2.83 years. Eleven participants (57.9%) were taking antiseizure medications (5 on levetiracetam, 4 on oxcarbazepine, and 2 on both). The resting motor threshold (rMT) in the ipsilateral hemisphere was 89.4 ± 13.3% of maximum stimulator output (MSO). The average number of IEDs was 21.7 per 5-minute block; however, six children had the majority of IEDs (more than 10 IEDs per 5-minute block), three had rare IEDs (fewer than 10 IEDs per 5-minute block), and the remaining children were IED-free during the entire session. All 19 participants completed both days of spTMS and rTMS sessions, and no medications were changed between experimental sessions.

Impact of rTMS on Cortical Excitability

Local TEP: The amplitude and latency of the P60 and N100 peak did not change after active rTMS nor after sham rTMS (Fig. 3B & Supplementary Table 7). Additionally, there was no difference in change induced by active vs. sham rTMS.

Impact of rTMS on Functional Connectivity

Remote TEP: The AUC of the remote TEP did not change after active or sham rTMS (Fig. 3C & Supplementary Table 8) at any of the regions of interest. Additionally, there was no difference in the impact of sham vs. active rTMS on any of the AUC.



Figure 3: Impact of 1 Hz rTMS on cortical excitability. A: Comparison of the shape of the group-average (n=19) local TMS evoked potentials (TEPs) at the stimulated site; B: Comparison of specific peak amplitudes and latencies at the stimulated site; C: Change in the area under the curve (AUC) of the TEP in the 10-80 milliseconds (left panel) and 10-1000 milliseconds (right panel) time windows for the six regions of interest.

wPLI: In the phase domain, we found that active but not sham rTMS reduced wPLI connectivity between several brain regions (Fig. 4 & Supplementary Table 9). A significant connectivity reduction was observed after active rTMS between seven region-pairs (double asterisks in Fig. 4). These included connectivity between the ipsilateral frontal region and the: (a) contralateral frontal; (b) ipsilateral temporal; (c) contralateral temporal; and (d) contralateral motor regions. The wPLI was also reduced between the ipsilateral temporal region and the: (a) contralateral frontal; and (b) contralateral-motor regions. Finally, connectivity decreased between the ipsilateral motor and contralateral temporal regions. In addition, there was a trend of globally reduced connectivity across all regions, though some did not meet significance (single asterisks in Fig. 4). In contrast, after sham rTMS, there was no significant change in connectivity between any regions.

When directly comparing changes after active vs. sham rTMS, there were significant differences for four region pairs (double daggers in Fig. 4). These included ipsilateral temporal to the: (a) ipsilateral frontal; (b)contralateral frontal; and (c) contralateral motor regions; as well as between the ipsilateral frontal and contralateral motor regions. These regions overlapped with the regions showing significant differences from baseline after active rTMS.



Figure 4. Impact of 1 Hz rTMS on wPLI connectivity. A: Active (blue) but not sham (orange) rTMS reduces connectivity in multiple brain regions in 19 children with SeLECTS. **p<0.0076 (adjusted significance threshold in pre- vs. post-active rTMS); ‡p<0.0071 (adjusted significance threshold in active vs. sham); */†p<0.05. i-: Ipsilateral-, c-: Contralateral-; -F: Frontal, -M: Motor, -T: Temporal. Regions are ordered based on the significance (p values). Dashed line represents no change from baseline. B: Black arrows connect the regions that had adjusted significant changes to the baseline after active rTMS.

Impact of rTMS on IED Frequency

There was no significant change in IED frequency with active or sham rTMS. However, after active rTMS, IED frequency trended toward lower (change of -11.2 ± 28.8 IEDs/5 mins, p=0.11) whereas after sham rTMS, IED frequency remained much more stable (change of 0.84 ± 15.7, p=0.83). There was no significant difference in change in IED frequency between the active vs. sham rTMS conditions (change of -12.1 ± 35.3; p=0.16) (Fig. 5).



Figure 5: Impact of rTMS on IED frequency in children with SeLECTS. A: Frequency of IEDs pre vs. post active rTMS; B: Frequency of IED pre vs. post sham rTMS; C: change of IED after active vs. sham rTMS. For clarity, each participant with frequent IEDs is represented with an individual color (P1-P6) while the remaining 13 participants with few or no IEDs (PN) are represented in gray.

Impact of IED Frequency on Baseline Connectivity and Connectivity Change

There was a significant positive correlation (p<0.0001) between IED frequency and baseline wPLI connectivity on both the active and sham rTMS sessions (Fig. 6A). Participants with more IEDs had higher baseline connectivity. There was also a significant correlation between the change of IEDs and the change of wPLI connectivity after both active and sham rTMS (Fig. 6B), such that those participants who had the greatest decrease in IEDs after either type of rTMS also had the greatest decrease in connectivity.



Figure 6: Association of interictal epileptiform discharges (IEDs) and brain connectivity. A: Baseline connectivity measured during both sessions was higher in those with higher baseline IED frequency. B: The change in connectivity is significantly associated with change in IED frequency during both the active and sham rTMS sessions. More participants showed a decrease in IEDs on the active day than the sham day. Each x-axis position contains one participant's connectivity values at all 15 regions of interest pairs. Colored points represent the sub-group of participants (P1-P6) who had frequent IEDs (>10/baseline). Gray points (PN) represent participants who had less than 10 IEDs during the baseline. The solid line is the model fit for the active session and the dashed line is the model fit for the sham session.

Impact of rTMS on wPLI Connectivity in IED-free Data

Given that we generally saw a reduction in IEDs after active rTMS and that IEDs themselves were associated with elevated connectivity, we assessed whether the observed reduction in wPLI connectivity (Fig.4) was solely attributable to the decreased IED frequency or could also be measured in IED-free epochs. The comparative analysis of pre- and post-rTMS wPLI values, under these stringent conditions, revealed a consistent global reduction in hyperconnectivity following active rTMS intervention (Fig. 7 & Supplementary Table 10). Notably, the connectivity between contralateral-frontal to: (a) ipsilateral-temporal; and (b) ipsilateral-

frontal; and ipsilateral-temporal to: (a) contralateral-motor; and (b) ipsilateral-frontal decreased significantly. No significant connectivity changes were observed in the sham rTMS group.

When directly comparing changes elicited by active and sham rTMS to each other, there was one region pair that had significant difference (ipsilateral-motor to contralateral temporal). Additionally, there was a trend of globally reduced connectivity across multiple region pairs, and these regions overlapped with the regions showing significant differences from baseline after active rTMS.



Figure 7: Impact of 1 Hz rTMS on wPLI connectivity **during IED-free periods**. A: Active (blue) but not sham (orange) rTMS reduces connectivity in multiple brain regions in 19 children with SeLECTS during IED-free period. **p<0.0086 (adjusted significance threshold in pre- vs. post-active rTMS); ‡p<0.0091 (adjusted significance threshold in active vs. sham); */†p<0.05. i-: Ipsilateral-, c-: Contralateral-; -F: Frontal, -M: Motor, -T: Temporal. Regions are ordered based on the significance (p values). B: Black arrows connect the regions that had adjusted significant changes to the baseline after active rTMS.

Impact of rTMS on Excitability in Participants with Lower rMT (Supplementary Material 1)

By including children with rMT lower than 84% of maximal stimulator output, these 7 remaining children also did not show significant changes in local TEP amplitude or latency or area under the curve of remote TEPs.

Change of wPLI Connectivity in Alpha and Theta Frequency Bands After rTMS (Supplementary Material 2)

The theta band wPLI, similar to the beta band results, exhibited a global reduction across numerous brain regions following rTMS. Four region pairs had a significant reduction in wPLI connectivity after active rTMS (contralateral temporal to contralateral motor and ipsilateral temporal, contralateral frontal to ipsilateral frontal and ipsilateral motor). There was also a trend of globally reduced connectivity across most regions. Consistent with the findings in the beta band, no regions demonstrated significant changes after sham rTMS.

In the alpha band, wPLI reductions after rTMS were less pronounced than those observed in the beta band. Significant wPLI reductions were observed after active rTMS in contralateral motor to ipsilateral temporal region only. There was a trend toward reduction ($p<0.05$ but greater than threshold) in four additional region pairs after active rTMS. In contrast, after sham rTMS, there was no significant change in connectivity between any regions.

Change of Evoked Power after rTMS (Supplementary Material 3)

rTMS did not exert a significant impact on evoked power measured across any frequencies or ROIs in either active or sham condition.

Discussion

Pediatric epilepsy is a common, severe neurologic disorder that diminishes quality of life not only due to seizures but also because it is associated with a host of other neuropsychiatric comorbidities. IEDs, which are pathologic bursts of hypersynchronous brain activity, cause instantaneous disruptions to attention and processing speed,[2] and increasing evidence suggests they lead to more long-term alterations in functional brain connectivity.[2–4,46,47] These changes are particularly problematic for children, in whom IEDs interact with brain networks during critical developmental windows. Current epilepsy therapies do not specifically target IEDs or connectivity, but several clinical trials suggests that 1 Hz rTMS can non-invasively reduce IED frequency in adults.[14,15] In this study of children with SeLECTS, the most common pediatric epilepsy syndrome, we assessed the impact of active vs. sham 1 Hz rTMS on three neurophysiologic measurements relevant to epilepsy pathology: cortical excitability (measured by TEPs), functional connectivity (measured using both TEPs and via a phase-based measure called wPLI), and IED frequency. We focused on SeLECTS because this cohort has frequent IEDs generated by the sensorimotor cortex, which can easily be targeted with rTMS, and macroscopically normal brain anatomy. We found that rTMS did not affect TEPs. Regardless of whether we assessed peak amplitude, latency or AUC, and irrespective of whether we measured at the site of stimulation, or distally in other brain regions, we did not find a significant change in TEPs after either active or sham rTMS. In contrast, we found that the wPLI decreased after active but not sham rTMS, with widespread reductions throughout the brain. Finally, though limited by our small sample size, we found a trend suggesting that IED frequency drops after active but not sham rTMS. This IED reduction explains some, though not all, of the reduction in wPLI connectivity seen after active rTMS.

We first investigated the impact of 1 Hz rTMS on cortical excitability as quantified by TEPs and found that there was no change. Low frequency ($\leq$1 Hz) rTMS has been thought to induce inhibition, as it suppresses motor evoked potentials (MEPs).[13] We measured TEPs instead of MEPs because: (1) they can be measured throughout the brain and thus capture not only corticospinal but also cortico-cortical interactions; and (2) they can be measured at sub-motor threshold stimulation intensities, including in children whose motor thresholds exceed maximum stimulator output.[6] The precise generators of TEPs are not fully understood, but pharmacological studies suggest that the P60 may be associated with cortical inhibitory

mechanisms,[48] and the N100 is generally interpreted as a long-range inhibitory response related to GABA-B.[8] Prior studies investigating the effects of low-frequency rTMS on TEPs report mixed findings. A study of healthy adults found a significant increase in P60 and N100 amplitude after 1Hz rTMS,[38] whereas a study of children with untreated attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) observed a reduction in N100 amplitude.[49] In our pilot study of nine children with SeLECTS, we found no significant change in N100 after rTMS on the group level, though noted that children taking daily antiseizure medications showed a decrease in N100 amplitude after rTMS, whereas those not taking medications show little change.[25] Based on these prior studies, we initially hypothesized that 1 Hz rTMS would lead to a decrease in both P60 and N100 amplitudes, but we found no change in either P60 or N100 peaks. Several factors could explain this discrepancy from our original hypothesis. One consideration is that children typically have higher rMT than adults, and rMT decreases with age, presumably due to increasing myelination. While it is standard practice in adults to use rMT to set the stimulation intensity for spTMS-EEG studies,[21] this practice may be inappropriate in children, where the disassociation between the intensity needed to elicit an MEP vs. a TEP is wider. By using rMT to set stimulation intensity, we may be "over-stimulating" and hence hitting a ceiling effect with TEP amplitudes such that it is difficult to shift them with rTMS. However, arguing against a ceiling effect, we did not see greater shifts in TEPs in our sensitivity analysis looking only at children with lower rMT (Supplementary Materials 1). A second consideration is that the impact of 1 Hz rTMS might be disease-specific. For instance, children with ADHD might have reduced inhibitory input and thus be more responsive to inhibitory neuromodulation like rTMS.[49] In contrast, children with SeLECTS who have motor cortex pathology may develop compensatory long-range inhibition between other brain regions and the motor cortex to limit spread of IEDs.[50] Thus, additional inhibitory input to the motor cortex from rTMS might not significantly alter TEPs. A third consideration is that 1 Hz rTMS may not alter cortical excitability as previously accepted in the literature. For instance, a recent study systematically tested the effectiveness and reproducibility of both 1 Hz and 10 Hz rTMS protocols on 28 healthy adults and found that neither protocol significantly modulated corticospinal excitability as measured by MEPs.[51] Another study found that theta burst stimulation (TBS), another form of rTMS, did not produce reliable changes in TEPs in 24 healthy adults.[52] Therefore, the effects of rTMS on cortical excitability may be more variable and context-dependent than previously thought, necessitating further investigation into disease-specific responses and alternative mechanisms of action.

We next investigated the impact of rTMS on functional connectivity, defined as consistent patterns of co-activation in brain activity over time,[53] using two distinct methodologies: one using TEPs measured distal from the stimulated motor cortex and the other using the phase-based measure wPLI. The TEP method, also known as the inductive spTMS-EEG approach,[9] measures the overall magnitude of the evoked response within the time domain, with high values suggesting stronger connectivity. This method provides information on the immediate impact of TMS on the stimulated area and its direct projections, but is limited to interrogating connectivity of the stimulated cortex to other regions.[54] wPLI focuses on phase domain metrics and is particularly robust against the confounding effects of volume conduction in sensor-based EEG signals.[10] In contrast to TEPs, wPLI is less temporally specific but allows us to draw inferences on changes in connectivity between various regions after rTMS. While TEPs did not change, there was a significant decrease in wPLI connectivity after active but not sham rTMS, particularly between frontal and temporal regions. Why do inferences from these two connectivity measures differ? One possibility is that the inductive technique only measures direct connections between the stimulated motor region and distant areas, making it insensitive to changes between regions that were not directly stimulated, like the frontal-to-temporal connectivity changes detected by wPLI. This is supported by a prior study,[55] which demonstrated that applying rTMS to primary motor cortex (M1) increased the amplitude of TMS-evoked EEG responses in bilateral premotor cortices, while M1 excitability itself remained unchanged. Another possibility is that the phase-based measures are more sensitive to dynamics/changes of connectivity measured from sensor-based EEG. A prior TMS-EEG study also found that in adults with genetic generalized epilepsies, but not in controls, connectivity increased in the seconds after a single TMS pulse compared to that measured in the seconds before the pulse.[11] This study also used a phased-based metric called coherence and found significant differences in the theta and beta bands, supporting that phase-based measures can reveal pathology in epilepsy. While we unfortunately were not allowed to recruit children as controls for ethical reasons, this prior work helps contextualize our findings by suggesting that the reduction in connectivity after rTMS may indicate a normalization or brain responses. These past studies, together with our findings, highlight the importance of using phase-based measures in addition to the traditional TEP measures to better understand the effects of neuromodulatory interventions like rTMS on brain connectivity.

We also explored whether low-frequency rTMS modulates IEDs as this is a question of great therapeutic interest in pediatric epilepsy. Although we did not find a significant change in IEDs

after active or sham rTMS, our ability to draw conclusions was limited by the fact that only six participants exhibited frequent IEDs during the experiment. This is not entirely unexpected as IEDs are sleep-potentiated in SeLECTS.[4,47] We did not attempt to test the impact of rTMS on sleep, because it is difficult to maintain participants in a consistent sleep stage throughout TMS procedures, and TMS-EEG responses are state-dependent. Despite this limitation, there was a trend toward IED reduction with active but not sham rTMS. This is in line with findings from previous randomized and sham-controlled trials of rTMS for refractory focal epilepsy in adults during which IED frequency was also counted.[56–58] These trials found that active rTMS significantly decreased IEDs from baseline, ranging from a 16% to 66% reduction, leading the Cochrane review to conclude that there is reasonable evidence that rTMS is effective at reducing IEDs.[14,15] Moreover, two pilot studies recently examined the effects of a multi-dose course of 1Hz rTMS (5000 pulses administered over ten days) on IED frequency in SeLECTS. One showed that the IED frequency decreased significantly in 3 of 4 children after rTMS,[59] and the other reported that IED frequency was decreased on the group level (n=8) at 3 and 6 months after the rTMS.[60] These studies align well with our findings, underscoring the therapeutic potential of 1 Hz rTMS on modulating IEDs in epilepsy patients.

Since IEDs are associated with an instantaneous increase in phase-based connectivity measures,[2,4,61] we next investigated how much IED suppression explained the significant reduction in connectivity seen after rTMS. In effect, we wanted to test if changes in connectivity measured via quantitative analysis solely reflected the change in IED frequency seen in one-third of our cohort or was due to connectivity changes even during IED-free epochs. We first confirmed that the previously reported relationship between IEDs and connectivity held true in our data; children with higher IED frequency indeed had higher connectivity measurements at baseline and change in IED frequency after rTMS was strongly correlated with change in connectivity. After removing all IED–containing epochs, we still found significant reductions in connectivity with active but not sham rTMS, suggesting that the effect of rTMS is not solely due to IED suppression. It is worth noting that the directional nature of the relationship between IEDs and connectivity remains ambiguous. It is possible that rTMS primarily reduces IEDs and that this reduction leads to a change in connectivity. Alternatively, rTMS could primarily reduce connectivity which in turn could reduce the likelihood of an IED. Numerous studies reporting the correlation between IED frequency and connectivity have investigated the causal relationship between the two.[46,62–64] In a recent study, simulated IEDs were introduced into EEG recordings of eight healthy controls to investigate the impact of IEDs

on connectivity estimates.[62] By analyzing connectivity during epochs with and without simulated IEDs and comparing these to connectivity derived from eight epilepsy patients with real IEDs, the study found that real but not simulated IEDs affect connectivity. This suggests that the hyperconnectivity observed in epilepsy patients may be attributed to the disease's inherent pathophysiological networks, rather than only an acute effect of the IEDs waveform. Another study focusing on SeLECTS patients applied novel causal modeling methods to EEG-fMRI data and found that IEDs have sufficient power to change the epilepsy-related network architecture and drive the increase of connectivity between the Rolandic area, central gyrus, and the thalamus.[46] Together, these findings suggest a potential causality relationship where IEDs may drive the hyperconnectivity observed in epilepsy, and that these connectivity changes persist beyond the periods when IEDs occur. Although our study did not directly investigate this causal link, the observed simultaneous reductions in both IED frequency and connectivity following active 1 Hz rTMS highlight the intervention's therapeutic potential in addressing hyperconnectivity associated with epilepsy. Furthermore, sensitivity analyses using IED-free data indicate that active 1 Hz rTMS affects overall connectivity beyond the modulation of IEDs. By excluding data containing IEDs from the connectivity analyses, we observed a less pronounced, yet still significant, global reduction in connectivity across multiple ROIs. Notably, the regions that exhibited the greatest reductions in connectivity closely corresponded with those identified in the analyses including IEDs. This consistency suggests that rTMS exerts a broader modulatory effect on hyperconnectivity, influencing neural networks even during IED-free periods.

Limitations and Future Directions:

There are certain limitations that warrant discussion. First, the spatial specificity of our findings is limited by the fact that analyses were conducted in sensor space due to lack of individual MRIs. While studies using source localization would be a valuable next step, we do note that the changes in wPLI connectivity after active rTMS affect multiple regions, suggesting that the impact of rTMS may be distributed rather than isolated to the motor cortex. This is particularly interesting given other studies have shown that motor cortex IEDs in SeLECTS also lead to instantaneous, widespread connectivity increases,[2–4] suggesting that activity in the motor cortex (whether it is spontaneous from the IEDs or induced by the TMS) may impact larger networks in SeLECTS. We do not think that volume conduction is a likely explanation for these widespread findings as our connectivity metric, wPLI, is extremely stringent against this phenomenon and was chosen for this reason.

A second limitation is that participants were not involved in a task during the excitability or connectivity measurements and thus we do not have a behavioral read-out confirming equal states of alertness throughout the experiment. TEPs and connectivity can be state-dependent and IEDs certainly are more prominent during drowsiness and sleep.[4,47] We did not include a task, as the children could not reliably perform one without inducing significant movement artifacts. However, we took brief 30-60 second breaks after each 5-minute spTMS block, during which we spoke with children to confirm they were awake and doing well. During the spTMS blocks, we additionally monitored the EEG to ensure we did not see signs of drowsiness such as increasing theta activity. Finally, we conducted a supplementary analysis looking at evoked power before and after the rTMS (Supplementary Materials 3), as the power of specific frequency bands changes with alertness; for example, theta band power increases in drowsiness,[65] whereas posterior alpha power is highest during a quiet, awake state.[66] We did not see significant changes in power after either active or sham rTMS. Given these experimental measures and analyses, we do not feel that our findings are attributable to state changes.

Third, our analysis was focused on changes at the group level, and did not account for clinical variables, such as the use of antiseizure medications, age, and sex, that may also influence the effects of rTMS.[27,67,68] The limited statistical power due to our small sample size restricted our ability to explore these factors comprehensively. We attempted to mitigate these differences with our crossover design and paired-analyses that account for within-participant variability. Future studies with larger cohorts could further examine the impact of these clinical variables on the efficacy of rTMS.

Finally, while this study shows that rTMS can reduce connectivity in children with SeLECTS, it does not establish the clinical utility or feasibility of doing so. Our study focused on the immediate impact of a single dose of rTMS on neurophysiologic outcome measures and did not measure the duration of effects. It is generally understood that the modulation induced by a single dose of rTMS may be transient, with more durable effects potentially requiring repeated doses over time.[69] In line with this, after the approximately one week wash-out period, we did not observe differences in baseline, pre-rTMS connectivity or IED frequency between sessions, suggesting the effects had dissipated. Additionally, this study did not evaluate the impact of rTMS on cognition, as we generally would not expect measurable changes in cognition within minutes of stimulation. Prior studies have identified aberrant connectivity as a feature of several pediatric epilepsy syndromes and have found it to be associated with worse

outcomes.[5] Therefore, we believe it is valuable to identify tools that can non-invasively and non-pharmacologically modulate connectivity. Similarly, while clinical utility of IED-suppression is still controversial,[70] having a treatment specifically targeted against IEDs will allow us to better and more safely answer these questions. Future studies will need to test the impact of multi-dose rTMS protocols in a longitudinal framework to comprehensively evaluate the effect of rTMS on functional connectivity, IEDs, and cognitive function.

Conclusion

This study shows that rTMS can modulate brain connectivity in pediatric epilepsy patients and suggests that it may also be an effective, non-pharmacological option for reducing IEDs. Together, these findings position rTMS as an important non-invasive method for probing how epilepsy and IEDs affect cognition and suggest that rTMS has therapeutic potential for the treatment of pediatric epilepsy and its cognitive comorbidities.

Data Availability

The data analyzed in this study was gathered as part of a larger clinical trial (NCT04325282) of spTMS-EEG in SeLECTS. There are no reproduced materials. The datasets generated and/or analyzed during the current study are not publicly available due to privacy concerns. The data is clinical data that has not been de-identified. But the code with example data used for illustrating the methodologies of TEP and connectivity analysis is publicly available at https://github.com/Pediatric-Neurostimulation-Laboratory/rTMSConnectivity. The full data is available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Author Contributions

X.S.: conceptualization, methodology, software, formal analysis, data curation, writing–original draft & editing, visualization. W.Q.: data curation, validation, writing–review & editing. K.C.N.: methodology, software, data curation, validation, writing–review & editing. M.M.: data curation, validation, writing-review & editing. C.C.C.: methodology, software, validation, writing–review & editing. W.W.: methodology, software, writing–review & editing. Z.H.: methodology, writing–review & editing. F.M.B.: conceptualization, methodology, formal analysis, data curation, validation, writing–drafting, review & editing, project administration, funding acquisition.

Acknowledgments

XS receives support from the Stanford Maternal & Child Health Research Institute (MCHRI Postdoctoral Support Fellowship). FMB's work is supported by a K23 Career Development Award (NINDS K23NS116110), the Doris Duke & Rita Allen Foundation, and a gift from the Principe & O'Farrell family.

References

1. Baumer FM, Cardon AL, Porter BE. Language dysfunction in pediatric epilepsy. *J Pediatr*. 2018;194:13-21.
2. Holmes GL, Lenck-Santini PP. Role of interictal epileptiform abnormalities in cognitive impairment. *Epilepsy Behav*. 2006;8(3):504-515.
3. Cheng D, Yan X, Xu K, Zhou X, Chen Q. The effect of interictal epileptiform discharges on cognitive and academic performance in children with idiopathic epilepsy. *BMC Neurol*. 2020;20:1-7.
4. Goad BS, Lee-Messer C, He Z, Porter BE, Baumer FM. Connectivity increases during spikes and spike-free periods in self-limited epilepsy with centrotemporal spikes. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2022;144:123-134.
5. Xiao F, An D, Lei D, et al. Real-time effects of centrotemporal spikes on cognition in rolandic epilepsy: an EEG-fMRI study. *Neurology*. 2016;86(6):544-551.
6. Tremblay S, Rogasch NC, Premoli I, et al. Clinical utility and prospective of TMS–EEG. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2019;130(5):802-844.
7. Kimiskidis V. Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) coupled with electroencephalography (EEG): biomarker of the future. *Rev Neurol (Paris)*. 2016;172(2):123-126.
8. Premoli I, Castellanos N, Rivolta D, et al. TMS-EEG signatures of GABAergic neurotransmission in the human cortex. *J Neurosci*. 2014;34(16):5603-5612.
9. Bortoletto M, Veniero D, Thut G, Miniussi C. The contribution of TMS–EEG coregistration in the exploration of the human cortical connectome. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 2015;49:114-124.
10. Vinck M, Oostenveld R, Van Wingerden M, Battaglia F, Pennartz CMA. An improved index of phase-synchronization for electrophysiological data in the presence of volume-conduction, noise and sample-size bias. *Neuroimage*. 2011;55(4):1548-1565.
11. Vlachos I, Kugiumtzis D, Tsalikakis DG, Kimiskidis VK. TMS-induced brain connectivity modulation in Genetic Generalized Epilepsy. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2022;133:83-93.
12. Maeda F, Keenan JP, Tormos JM, Topka H, Pascual-Leone A. Modulation of corticospinal excitability by repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2000;111(5):800-805.
13. Fitzgerald PB, Fountain S, Daskalakis ZJ. A comprehensive review of the effects of rTMS on motor cortical excitability and inhibition. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2006;117(12):2584-2596.
14. Walton D, Spencer DC, Nevitt SJ, Michael BD. Transcranial magnetic stimulation for the treatment of epilepsy. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2021;(4).
15. Chen R, Spencer DC, Weston J, Nolan SJ. Transcranial magnetic stimulation for the treatment of epilepsy. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2016;(8).
16. Liston C, Chen AC, Zebley BD, et al. Default mode network mechanisms of transcranial magnetic stimulation in depression. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2014;76(7):517-526.
17. Specchio N, Wirrell EC, Scheffer IE, et al. International League Against Epilepsy classification and definition of epilepsy syndromes with onset in childhood: Position paper by the ILAE Task Force on Nosology and Definitions. *Epilepsia*. 2022;63(6):1398-1442.
18. Ostrowski LM, Chinappen DM, Stoyell SM, et al. Children with Rolandic epilepsy have micro-and macrostructural abnormalities in white matter constituting networks necessary for language function. *Epilepsy Behav*. 2023;144:109254.
19. Kim HH, Chung GH, Park SH, Kim SJ. Language-related white-matter-tract deficits in children with benign epilepsy with centrotemporal spikes: A retrospective study. *J Clin Neurol Seoul Korea*. 2019;15(4):502.
20. Rossi S, Antal A, Bestmann S, et al. Safety and recommendations for TMS use in healthy subjects and patient populations, with updates on training, ethical and regulatory issues: Expert Guidelines. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2021;132(1):269-306.
21. Hernandez-Pavon JC, Veniero D, Bergmann TO, et al. TMS combined with EEG: Recommendations and open issues for data collection and analysis. *Brain Stimulat*. Published online 2023.
22. Fonov V, Evans AC, Botteron K, et al. Unbiased average age-appropriate atlases for pediatric studies. *Neuroimage*. 2011;54(1):313-327.
23. Rossini P. Applications of magnetic cortical stimulation. The international federation of clinical neurophysiology. *Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol Suppl*. 1999;52:171-185.
24. She X, Nix KC, Cline CC, et al. Stability of transcranial magnetic stimulation electroencephalogram evoked potentials in pediatric epilepsy. *Sci Rep*. 2024;14(1):9045. doi:10.1038/s41598-024-59468-8

25. Baumer FM, Pfeifer K, Fogarty A, et al. Cortical Excitability, Synaptic Plasticity & Cognition in Benign Epilepsy with Centrotemporal Spikes: A Pilot TMS-EMG-EEG Study. *J Clin Neurophysiol Off Publ Am Electroencephalogr Soc*. 2020;37(2):170.
26. Ziemann U, Lönnecker S, Steinhoff BJ, Paulus W. Effects of antiepileptic drugs on motor cortex excitability in humans: a transcranial magnetic stimulation study. *Ann Neurol Off J Am Neurol Assoc Child Neurol Soc*. 1996;40(3):367-378.
27. Määttä S, Könönen M, Kallioniemi E, et al. Development of cortical motor circuits between childhood and adulthood: A navigated TMS-HdEEG study. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2017;38(5):2599-2615.
28. Rosanova M, Casali A, Bellina V, Resta F, Mariotti M, Massimini M. Natural frequencies of human corticothalamic circuits. *J Neurosci*. 2009;29(24):7679-7685.
29. Delorme A, Makeig S. EEGLAB: an open source toolbox for analysis of single-trial EEG dynamics including independent component analysis. *J Neurosci Methods*. 2004;134(1):9-21.
30. Cline CC, Lucas MV, Sun Y, Menezes M, Etkin A. Advanced artifact removal for automated TMS-EEG data processing. In: *2021 10th International IEEE/EMBS Conference on Neural Engineering (NER)*. IEEE; 2021:1039-1042.
31. Mutanen TP, Kukkonen M, Nieminen JO, Stenroos M, Sarvas J, Ilmoniemi RJ. Recovering TMS-evoked EEG responses masked by muscle artifacts. *Neuroimage*. 2016;139:157-166.
32. Mutanen TP, Metsomaa J, Liljander S, Ilmoniemi RJ. Automatic and robust noise suppression in EEG and MEG: The SOUND algorithm. *Neuroimage*. 2018;166:135-151.
33. Pion-Tonachini L, Kreutz-Delgado K, Makeig S. ICLabel: An automated electroencephalographic independent component classifier, dataset, and website. *NeuroImage*. 2019;198:181-197.
34. Rogasch NC, Sullivan C, Thomson RH, et al. Analysing concurrent transcranial magnetic stimulation and electroencephalographic data: A review and introduction to the open-source TESA software. *Neuroimage*. 2017;147:934-951.
35. Miniussi C, Thut G. Combining TMS and EEG offers new prospects in cognitive neuroscience. *Brain Topogr*. 2010;22:249-256.
36. Belardinelli P, König F, Liang C, et al. TMS-EEG signatures of glutamatergic neurotransmission in human cortex. *Sci Rep*. 2021;11(1):8159.
37. Ziemann U. Transcranial magnetic stimulation at the interface with other techniques: a powerful tool for studying the human cortex. *The Neuroscientist*. 2011;17(4):368-381.
38. Casula EP, Tarantino V, Basso D, et al. Low-frequency rTMS inhibitory effects in the primary motor cortex: Insights from TMS-evoked potentials. *Neuroimage*. 2014;98:225-232.
39. Voineskos D, Blumberger DM, Rogasch NC, et al. Neurophysiological effects of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) in treatment resistant depression. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2021;132(9):2306-2316.
40. Hardmeier M, Hatz F, Bousleiman H, Schindler C, Stam CJ, Fuhr P. Reproducibility of functional connectivity and graph measures based on the phase lag index (PLI) and weighted phase lag index (wPLI) derived from high resolution EEG. *PloS One*. 2014;9(10):e108648.
41. da Silva FL. EEG and MEG: relevance to neuroscience. *Neuron*. 2013;80(5):1112-1128.
42. Stam CJ, Nolte G, Daffertshofer A. Phase lag index: assessment of functional connectivity from multi channel EEG and MEG with diminished bias from common sources. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2007;28(11):1178-1193.
43. Durner EF. An introduction to SAS® OnDemand for Academics. In: *Applied Plant Science Experimental Design and Statistical Analysis Using SAS® OnDemand for Academics*. CABI Wallingford UK; 2021:6-25.
44. Galwey NW. A new measure of the effective number of tests, a practical tool for comparing families of non-independent significance tests. *Genet Epidemiol Off Publ Int Genet Epidemiol Soc*. 2009;33(7):559-568.
45. Liang KY, Zeger SL. Longitudinal data analysis using generalized linear models. *Biometrika*. 1986;73(1):13-22.
46. Dai X jian, Yang Y, Wang Y. Interictal epileptiform discharges changed epilepsy-related brain network architecture in BECTS. *Brain Imaging Behav*. Published online 2022:1-12.
47. Li Y, Li Y, Sun J, et al. Relationship between brain activity, cognitive function, and sleep spiking activation in new-onset self-limited epilepsy with centrotemporal spikes. *Front Neurol*. 2022;13:956838.
48. Rogasch NC, Daskalakis ZJ, Fitzgerald PB. Mechanisms underlying long-interval cortical inhibition

in the human motor cortex: a TMS-EEG study. *J Neurophysiol*. 2013;109(1):89-98.
49. Helfrich C, Pierau SS, Freitag CM, Roeper J, Ziemann U, Bender S. Monitoring cortical excitability during repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation in children with ADHD: a single-blind, sham-controlled TMS-EEG study. *PloS One*. 2012;7(11):e50073.
50. Englot DJ, Konrad PE, Morgan VL. Regional and global connectivity disturbances in focal epilepsy, related neurocognitive sequelae, and potential mechanistic underpinnings. *Epilepsia*. 2016;57(10):1546-1557.
51. Magnuson J, Ozdemir MA, Mathieson E, et al. Neuromodulatory effects and reproducibility of the most widely used repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation protocols. *Plos One*. 2023;18(6):e0286465.
52. Ozdemir RA, Boucher P, Fried PJ, et al. Reproducibility of cortical response modulation induced by intermittent and continuous theta-burst stimulation of the human motor cortex. *Brain Stimulat*. 2021;14(4):949-964.
53. Lang EW, Tomé AM, Keck IR, Górriz-Sáez J, Puntonet CG. Brain connectivity analysis: a short survey. *Comput Intell Neurosci*. 2012;2012(1):412512.
54. Ozdemir R, Momi D, Vink J, et al. What do EEG and MRI connectivity measure? Evaluating human brain connectivity with TMS-EEG. *Brain Stimul Basic Transl Clin Res Neuromodulation*. 2023;16(1):198-199.
55. Esser S, Huber R, Massimini M, Peterson M, Ferrarelli F, Tononi G. A direct demonstration of cortical LTP in humans: a combined TMS/EEG study. *Brain Res Bull*. 2006;69(1):86-94.
56. Fregni F, Otachi PT, Do Valle A, et al. A randomized clinical trial of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation in patients with refractory epilepsy. *Ann Neurol*. 2006;60(4):447-455.
57. Sun W, Mao W, Meng X, et al. Low-frequency repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for the treatment of refractory partial epilepsy: a controlled clinical study. *Epilepsia*. 2012;53(10):1782-1789.
58. Joo EY, Han SJ, Chung SH, Cho JW, Seo DW, Hong SB. Antiepileptic effects of low-frequency repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation by different stimulation durations and locations. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2007;118(3):702-708.
59. Jin G, Chen J, Du J, et al. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation to treat benign epilepsy with centrotemporal spikes. *Brain Stimulat*. 2022;15(3):601-604.
60. Yang Y, Han Y, Wang J, et al. Effects of altered excitation–inhibition imbalance by repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for self-limited epilepsy with centrotemporal spikes. *Front Neurol*. 2023;14:1164082.
61. Adebimpe A, Aarabi A, Bourel-Ponchel E, Mahmoudzadeh M, Wallois F. Functional brain dysfunction in patients with benign childhood epilepsy as revealed by graph theory. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(10):e0139228.
62. Hu DK, Mower A, Shrey DW, Lopour BA. Effect of interictal epileptiform discharges on EEG-based functional connectivity networks. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2020;131(5):1087-1098.
63. Su J, Khoo HM, von Ellenrieder N, et al. fMRI functional connectivity as an indicator of interictal epileptic discharges. *NeuroImage Clin*. 2019;24:102038.
64. Clemens B, Puskás S, Spisák T, et al. Increased resting-state EEG functional connectivity in benign childhood epilepsy with centro-temporal spikes. *Seizure*. 2016;35:50-55.
65. Hobson JA, Pace-Schott EF. The cognitive neuroscience of sleep: neuronal systems, consciousness and learning. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2002;3(9):679-693.
66. Bazanova O, Vernon D. Interpreting EEG alpha activity. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 2014;44:94-110.
67. Määttä S, Säisänen L, Kallioniemi E, et al. Maturation changes the excitability and effective connectivity of the frontal lobe: a developmental TMS–EEG study. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2019;40(8):2320-2335.
68. Kallioniemi E, Saari J, Ferreri F, Määttä S. TMS-EEG responses across the lifespan: measurement, methods for characterisation and identified responses. *J Neurosci Methods*. 2022;366:109430.
69. Thut G, Pascual-Leone A. A review of combined TMS-EEG studies to characterize lasting effects of repetitive TMS and assess their usefulness in cognitive and clinical neuroscience. *Brain Topogr*. 2010;22:219-232.
70. Sanchez Fernandez I, Loddenkemper T, Galanopoulou AS, Moshé SL. Should epileptiform discharges be treated? *Epilepsia*. 2015;56(10):1492-1504.


Single-pulse TMS 200 Pulses
1 Hz Repetitive TMS 1000 Pulses
Single-pulse TMS 200 Pulses
Single-pulse TMS 200 Pulses
1 Hz SHAM Repetitive TMS 1000 Pulses
Single-pulse TMS 200 Pulses


NZ
Fp1
FpZ
Fp2
AF7
AF3
AFZ
AF4
AF8
F9
F7
F5
F3
F1
Fz
F2
F4
F6
F8
F10
FT9
FT7
FC5
FC3
FC1
FCZ
FC2
FC4
FC6
FT8
FT10
A1
T9
T7
C5
C3
C1
Cz
C2
C4
C6
T8
T10
A2
TP9
TP7
CP5
CP3
CP1
CPZ
CP2
CP4
CP6
TP8
TP10
P9
P7
P5
P3
P1
Pz
P2
P4
P6
P8
P10
PO7
PO3
POZ
PO4
PO8
O1
OZ
O2
IZ
Frontal
Motor
Temporal


P60
N100
10
5
0
-5
-10
-15
-20
-25
-100
0
100
200
300
400
500
600
700
800
900
1000


Epoch #N-1
Epoch #1
Epoch #N
Epoch #2
eal


Epoch #N-1
Epoch #N
Epoch #1
Epoch #2
eal


Active rTMS
Amplitude (uV)
20
10
0
-10
-20
0
200
400
600
800


Sham rTMS
20
10
0
-10
-20
0
200
400
600
800


Pre
Post
Pre
Post


Pre
Post
Pre
Post


iF
cF
iM
cM
iT
cT
-400
-300
-200
-100
0
100
200
300


iF
cF
iM
cM
iT
cT
-4000
-3000
-2000
-1000
0
1000
2000
3000


cF – iT
cM – iT
iF – cM
iF – iT
iF – cF
iM – cT
iF – cT
iF – iM
iT – cT
cF – cT
cF – cM
cF – iM
iM – iT
cM – cT
iM – cM
Active
Sham
-0.2
-0.15
-0.1
-0.05
0
0.05
0.1
0.15
0.2


Nz
FpZ
AFZ
Fz
FCZ
Cz
CPZ
Pz
POZ
OZ
IZ
F9
F10
A1
A2
T10
P5
P3
P1
P4
P6
P9
P10
PO7
PO8
O1
O2
Frontal
Motor
Temporal


p = 0.11
200
150
100
50
0
Pre
Post
p = 0.83
200
150
100
50
0
Pre
Post
Change of IEDs \ 5 mins
p = 0.16
50
0
-50
-100
-150
Active
Sham


Active: y = 0.107 + 0.002 * x (p < 0.0001)
Sham: y = 0.082 + 0.002 * x (p < 0.0001)
Baseline wPLI
1
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0
0
20
40
60
80
100
120
140
160
180


Active: y = - 0.022 + 0.002 * x (p < 0.0001)
Sham: y = 0.005 + 0.001 * x (p < 0.0001)
Change of wPLI
0.2
0.1
0
-0.1
-0.2
-0.3
-140
-120
-100
-80
-60
-40
-20
0
20
40


cF – iT
cM – iT
iF – cF
iF – iT
iF – cM
iF – cT
iF – iM
cF – cT
iM – cT
iT – cT
cF – cM
cF – iM
cM – cT
iM – cM
iM – iT
Active
Sham
-0.2
-0.15
-0.1
-0.05
0
0.05
0.1
0.15
0.2


NZ
AFZ
F9
F10
Fz
FCZ
A1
T9
Cz
T10
A2
CPZ
P5
P3
P1
Pz
P2
P4
P6
P9
P10
PO7
POZ
PO4
PO8
O1
OZ
O2
IZ
Frontal
Motor
Temporal