Prism Adaptation-Induced Modulation of Cortical Excitability of Upper and Lower Limb Muscles is Enhanced with Electrical Stimulation

Fisayo K Aloba[1,2], Jasmine M Hope[2], Jacob Spencer[2,3], Maithri Muthukumar[2], Taylor M Leone[2], Vyoma Parikh[2], Peii Chen[4,5], Michael R Borich[1,2], Trisha M Kesar[1,2]

1. Neuroscience Graduate Program, School of Medicine, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA. oaloba@emory.edu
2. Division of Physical Therapy, Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Emory University School of Medicine, 1441 Clifton Rd NE, R228, Atlanta, GA 30322 USA.
3. School of Applied Physiology, Georgia Institute of Technology, 555 14th St., Room 1309E, Atlanta, GA 30332, USA.
4. Center for Stroke Rehabilitation Research, Kessler Foundation, West Orange, NJ, USA.
5. Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Rutgers New Jersey Medical School, Newark, NJ, USA.

Corresponding Author:

Trisha Kesar, 1441 Clifton Rd NE, Emory Rehabilitation Hospital, Atlanta, Ga 30322, USA; tkesar@emory.edu

Abstract

Background: Prism adaptation (PA) is a behavioral training paradigm shown to induce immediate changes in visuospatial and motor function. PA may modulate the input and output stages of processing spatial cognitive information. However, the cortical plasticity mechanisms related to the behavioral effects of PA are poorly understood. Non-invasive sensorimotor electrical stimulation (Stim) may upregulate corticomotor excitability and is commonly used as a therapeutic adjunct during motor training. **Objective:** To evaluate the effects of combining PA with Stim on corticomotor excitability and visuo-spatial-motor behavior. Methods: We used a repeated-measures design to evaluate the effects of 1 session of PA with and without Stim in 15 young able-bodied individuals (18-35 years). Corticomotor output, intracortical inhibition, and facilitation were evaluated before and after PA with motor-evoked potentials (MEPs) elicited from single and paired-pulse transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) delivered to M1 hotspots of bilateral upper and left lower limbs. **Results:** Behaviorally, both PA+Stim and PA+Sham showed significant sensorimotor aftereffects (visuo-spatial and proprioceptive pointing). Neurophysiologically, suprathreshold MEP amplitude increased in the left first dorsal interossei, left tibialis anterior, and left soleus following the PA+Stim condition compared to the PA+Sham condition. Additionally, following PA+Stim, Short Interval Intra-Cortical Inhibition (SICI) increased in the left tibialis anterior and left soleus. **Conclusion:** Although both PA+Stim and PA+Sham had similar behavioral aftereffects, only PA+Stim increased cortical excitability in M1 representations of the left upper and lower limb (toward the direction of the PA aftereffect), suggesting that PA+Stim may elicit greater neurophysiological changes than PA alone.

Keywords: visuomotor adaptation; sensorimotor adaptation; non-invasive brain stimulation; young adults; neuroplasticity; electrical stimulation.

1. Introduction

Visuospatial-motor deficits are complex disorders involving the visual, perceptual, sensory, and motor systems[1,2]. These deficits are caused by dysfunctions in visuospatial and sensorimotor circuits of the brain that integrate visual and sensory inputs with motor commands to enable motor skills needed to carry out simple functional tasks such as reaching for a coffee cup or walking[1]. Prism adaptation (PA) is a sensorimotor paradigm used as a behavioral task to assess visuomotor adaptation capacity. Multiple sessions of PA are also used as tool to modulate higher spatial cognitive processes[6,7] and improve visuo-motor function. Right-shifting PA involves wearing prism lenses that shift visuospatial behavior towards the right hemispace, and the aftereffect is a perceptual and motor bias toward the left hemispace. The PA protocol consists of three phases. Before prisms are put on, the participant points at visual targets to obtain reference values (pre-adaptation pointing performance). When wearing prism lenses (*prism exposure)* that induce a rightward visual displacement of the entire visual field, during early adaptation, the participant initially incorrectly points to the right side of the target (because the image of the target has shifted to the right). The visual feedback of the error is immediately available to the participant. To correct this "error", the participant points leftward until perceived correct pointing to the object, which occurs by the late adaptation period. When prism glasses are removed, due to the sensorimotor adaptation, the participant continues aiming towards the left side of visual targets— measured as the prism aftereffect.[6,8-13] These effects of PA on visuo-motor behavior have been investigated in healthy individuals and also applied to individuals with spatial neglect.[6,14-16] Studies have shown that 1-2 sessions of PA can induce changes in visuo-spatial-motor behavior, with effects lasting from 24 hours to one week [6,16-18] These not only include improved perceived body-midline but generalize to other activities such as wheelchair navigation and transfers[17,19-22]

Visuo-spatial cognitive information processing involves the input stage, which comprises perception and attention, the representational stage comprising sensorimotor integration, and the motor output stage involving intentional movements. Different theories about how PA affects the various stages of cognitive information are debated. PA is thought to recalibrate spatial representation and strengthen the connection between perception and motor actions thereby influencing both lower-level sensorimotor behavior and higher cognitive processes like spatial awareness and attention[6,23]. However, other studies suggest that PA may primarily affect the motor-output stage[16,24,25]**.** The lack of clarity regarding the neural mechanisms underlying PA and high inter-individual variability in the magnitude of PA-induced behavioral effects calls for more investigation to determine the optimal protocol and neural mechanisms of PA.

Somatosensory electrical stimulation is a promising and accessible intervention to improve spatial representation and enhance the somatosensory inputs from the neglected or paretic side of the body[26] in post-stroke spatial neglect[27-29]. Somatosensory stimulation may modulate the transformation of spatial coordinates needed for visuo-spatial orientation[26]. Previous studies have used different stimulation techniques such as neck vibration[30] and transcranial direct current stimulation[31] (tDCS) in combination with PA to improve visuospatial and sensory deficits. Previous research shows that sensory stimulation delivered to a dermatome can increase the excitability of the primary motor cortex (M1) of the corresponding myotome [32-36]. Similarly, excitatory tDCS combined with PA modulates upper limb M1 excitability in young healthy adults[37]. Thus, sensory stimulation can prove to be a valuable adjunct to PA, helping improve the consistency and magnitude of the effects of PA on visuospatial behavior.

Understanding the neural mechanisms of how paradigms such as PA induce behavioral change is a necessary prerequisite to designing more personalized and effective rehabilitation

treatments. Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) is a non-invasive tool commonly used to evaluate training-induced plasticity in the changes in the corticospinal tract, the primary pathway governing voluntary motor control [38,39], including PA aftereffects and electrical stimulation[11,40,41]. Other studies have used fMRI[15,42-44], and EEG[45,46] to examine neural mechanisms of PA, however, TMS is a convenient and accessible method to compare cortical motor circuits before and after PA. Paired pulse TMS also provides the unique opportunity to evaluate faciliatory and inhibitory intracortical neural circuits that may contribute to overall primary motor cortex (M1) output [47].

Adapting to right-shifting prisms leads to visuospatial motor behavior toward the left hemi-space after prism removal. Previous literature suggests that this aftereffect is induced through changes in the dorsal fronto-parietal networks (superior parietal lobule, intraparietal sulcus, and dorsolateral prefrontal cortex, which are responsible for spatial processing and attention control, and are connected to the primary motor cortex[48]. Thus, we hypothesize that leftward aftereffects of PA may lead to an increase in contralateral M1 excitability, evidenced by the increase in left upper as well as lower limb muscle motor-evoked potential (MEP) elicited by TMS. The objective of this study was to test this hypothesis in a group of young neurologically unimpaired individuals as the first step toward developing clinical treatments that combine PA and somatosensory electrical stimulation. We used TMS to evaluate the effects of PA without (Sham) and with somatosensory stimulation (Stim) on corticomotor excitability and visuo-motor behavior.

2. Methods

2.1 Participants

Sixteen young able-bodied individuals (9 female, 7 male, age 26.7± 4.4 years) participated in a repeated-measures crossover study design involving two conditions: PA combined with sham

stimulation (PA+Sham) and with somatosensory electrical stimulation (PA+Stim) (Table 1). The average time between the 2 sessions was 27±8.7 days. One participant withdrew from the study due to discomfort during TMS (Total N= 15). Handedness was determined based on self-report, and 1 participant was left-handed. All participants had normal or corrected-to-normal vision. Participants were excluded if they had a history of or evidence of orthopedic, physical, or neurological pathology, pregnancy (female), presence of skin conditions, bruises, or cuts at the stimulation electrode placement site, impaired sensation in the left upper limb, concurrent enrollment in upper limb rehabilitation or another investigational study, evidence of any medical conditions interfering with study procedures, cardiac pacemaker or other implanted electronic devices, and any contraindications to TMS[40]. All participants provided written informed consent, and the experimental protocol was approved by the Emory University Institutional Review Board and registered on clinicaltrials.gov.

2.2 Study Procedures

Participants completed two experimental sessions comprising PA+Sham and PA+Stim with approximately a 3-week wash-out period between sessions. We randomized the order of sessions such that half the participants completed PA+Sham first and the other half completed PA+Stim first. (Figure 1. Each experimental session comprised 3 parts in the following order:

1) Pre-PA measurement of cortical neurophysiology using TMS, spatial bias using two visuo-spatial behavioral pointing tasks, one with eyes open and the other with eyes closed, and a line bisection task

2) PA session with somatosensory or sham stimulation (PA+Stim or PA+Sham)

3) Post-PA measurement of cortical neurophysiology, visuo-spatial pointing, and line bisection tasks.

Participants were blinded to when they received Stim or Sham with PA in both sessions.

Participant Setup and EMG Placement

Surface electromyography (EMG) signals were recorded from bilateral first dorsal interossei (FDI) muscles (Kendall© 24mm Ag/AgCl, H124sG), left tibialis anterior (TA), and left soleus muscles (Biopac© 35 mm A/AgCl, EL502).

Single and Paired Pulse TMS Measurements

During the TMS measurements, participants were in a quiet seated position in a standard chair, back supported legs bent at 90 and hands resting on a firm foam bar while recording from bilateral FDI muscles, and were in a quiet standing position during the recording of left TA and left soleus responses, with both hands resting on a bar. Single monophasic and paired TMS pulses (Magstim 200^2, MagStim, Wales, UK) were delivered using a 50mm hand-held double circular coil positioned at a 45^0 angle from the midsagittal plane to target the FDI muscles, and a 70mm figure-of-eight custom batwing coil positioned to target the left TA and left soleus muscles, to induce posterior-anterior (PA) current in M1 in response to TMS. A real-time neuronavigation system (BrainSight, Rogue Research) was used to determine and consistently maintain coil position at the location of bilateral FDI as well as left soleus hotspots, identified as the cortical site on the contralateral motor cortex that generated the largest and most consistent MEPs from the respective targeted muscles. Motor-evoked potentials (MEPs) in response to TMS pulses were collected at the sampling rate of 2000 Hz and band-pass filtered at 10-1000Hz using a 6-channel wireless EMG System (Biopac© Systems Inc. MP160WSW, AcqKnowledge software). The resting

motor threshold (RMT) for bilateral FDI and active motor threshold (AMT) for soleus, were determined using the ML-PEST method (maximum likelihood model of parameter estimation by sequential testing (PEST) software[49].

Resting motor threshold was determined as the minimum intensity that generated ≥ 0.05mA MEP peak-to-peak amplitude for bilateral FDI, and active motor threshold was determined as the minimum intensity that generated >0.1mA MEP amplitude for the TA/soleus. A total of 10 - 20 suprathreshold TMS pulses were delivered to measure corticomotor excitability. Next, three sets of paired TMS pulses were delivered to obtain measures of intracortical circuit excitability-intracortical facilitation (ICF), short intracortical inhibition (SICI), and long intracortical inhibition (LICI). The paired-pulse stimulation parameters were sent at conditioning pulse 80% (FDI) or 90% of motor threshold (soleus and TA), test pulse at 130% above motor threshold, and interstimulus interval 12ms for ICF; conditioning pulse 80% (FDI) or 70% (soleus), test pulse 130%, and interstimulus interval 2ms for SICI; and conditioning pulse 130%; test pulse 130%, and interstimulus interval 100ms for LICI.

Post-PA TMS data were collected using the same hotspot and TMS intensities as Pre-PA. During the second session, we used the TMS hotspot from the initial session, confirmed the hotspot location, and determined the MEP thresholds again to collect the TMS data.

Visuo-spatial Motor Behavior Measurements

To assess the sensorimotor effects of PA, the Kessler Foundation Prism Adaptation Treatment (KF-PAT®) protocol and devices were used [50] . The proprioceptive pointing task requires participants to point straight from the chest with the right upper limb until full arm extension while closing their eyes. The other pointing task, i.e., visuo-proprioceptive pointing,

requires participants to point straight from the chest to visual targets placed to their left, right, and center with their arms covered using a cloth to obscure visual feedback of the upper limb and hands.

Line Bisection Task

A line bisection[51] task was performed by participants, who were asked to mark the center of each of 16 horizontal lines (240mm length and 3mm thick) using a mouse with their right hand. The lines were presented one at a time, black on a white background. The stimuli were displayed on a 15-inch computer monitor, at the participants' eye level and 16 cm away from participant. The participant's arm was obscured during the task.

Prism Adaptation

During the prism exposure, participants wore left-base wedged prism lenses (Bernell™ Deluxe Prism Training Glasses, 20-diopter) fitted in goggles that blocked peripheral views, put on a visual field occluder which covered the torso and upper arms, blocking the participant's view of their proximal arm movements. Participants performed 120 pointing movements with their right arm fully extended toward visual targets located at 0^0 or 21^0 to the right or left of a board that was oriented to the participant's median plane.

Electrical Stimulation and Sham Stimulation Setup

Surface rectangular electrical stimulation electrode pads (2" x 4") were placed on the left upper limb over the belly of the triceps and biceps muscles in the upper arm, and smaller 2" x2" square pads were placed on the ventral aspect of the left forearm muscles. Electrical stimulation

intensity was customized according to each participant's sensory threshold, determined as the lowest intensity at which the stimulation was perceived, and motor threshold, determined as the lowest intensity that elicited a visible muscle twitch. During PA+Stim, stimulation was delivered at approximately the midpoint of sensory and motor thresholds for the duration of 20 minutes during prism exposure (i.e. above sensory threshold). During PA+Sham, stimulation electrodes were placed on the arm and forearm as described above, threshold was determined, and then the stimulation device was turned off. Stimulation was delivered using an EmpiÓ TENS unit, at a pulse rate of 100Hz and pulse with of 300µsec.

2.3 Data Analyses

Each participant's neurophysiology data were analyzed using TMS GUI software[52]. Neurophysiologic dependent variables included suprathreshold MEP amplitude, SICI, LICI, and ICF (calculated as the ratio of the conditioned MEP amplitude versus the unconditioned MEP amplitude). Behavioral dependent variables included deviation during visuoproprioceptive pointing and proprioceptive pointing tasks, with deviation to the left measured as negative numbers and to the right as positive numbers, as well as the distance (in mm) between the line bisection mark and true center of a line. We used a 2-way ANOVA to evaluate the effects of 2 levels of training condition (Stim PA, Sham PA) and 2 levels of time (Pre, Post) on each dependent variable using IBM SPSS© statistics software (29.0.2.0 (20)). All post-hoc comparisons were Bonferroni adjusted. These statistical analyses were designed to address our primary research questions: a) Does PA+Sham affect corticomotor and intracortical excitability in the left upper limb, and does this effect transfer to the right upper limb or the left lower limb? b) Does PA+Stim increase corticomotor and intracortical excitability to a greater extent compared to PA+Sham? To answer

these questions, we conducted priori paired t-tests evaluating the effect of time within each training condition (PA+Sham and PA+Stim) irrespective of Anova interaction. Additionally, a priori planned paired t-tests were conducted to compare the pre to post change scores (Post minus Pre) in all dependent variables between the PA+Stim and PA+Sham conditions. At N=10-15 per group, Wald tests of interaction terms identified effect sizes of Cohen's d ≈ 1.2 with >80% power.

3. Results

3.1 Sensorimotor after-effects of PA on behavioral outcome measures

Visuo-proprioceptive pointing

For visuo-proprioceptive pointing (VPP), there was a significant main effect of time ($p = < 0.001$, $F = 100.842$), however, there was no significant condition by time interaction ($p = 0.876$, $F = 0.025$) and no significant main effect of training condition ($p = 0.524$, $F = 0.428$). The post-hoc paired comparisons showed a significant leftward VPP aftereffect from pre (-0.887cm ± 1.39 SD) to post (-4.467cm ± 1.40 SD) for both the PAT+Stim condition ($p = <0.001$) and for the PAT+Sham condition ($p = <0.001$) which significantly changed from pre (-0.673cm ± 1.62 SD) to post (-4.160cm ± 1.94 SD). The paired t-test comparing pre-post change scores between the PA+Stim and PA+Sham conditions showed no significant difference in the magnitude of training-induced change for PA+Stim (-3.52 ± 6.55 SD) vs PA+Sham (-3.49 ± 7.37 SD) condition ($p = 0.956$, $t = -0.056$). (Figure 2)

Proprioceptive Pointing

For proprioceptive pointing (PP), there was a significant main effect of time ($p = < 0.001$, $F = 30.661$), however, there was no significant condition by time interaction ($p = 0.646$, $F = 0.221$); and

no significant main effect of condition (p= 0.237, F= 1.526). The post-hoc paired comparisons showed a significant leftward PP aftereffect shift into the left space from pre (-0.533cm ± 3.25 SD) to post (-4.533cm ± 4.29 SD) for both the PAT+Stim condition (p= <0.001) and for the PAT+Sham condition (p= <0.002) which significantly increased from pre (1.173cm ± 1.94 SD) to post (-3.273cm ± 3.33 SD). The paired t-test comparing pre-post change scores between the PA+Stim and PA+Sham conditions showed that there was no significant difference in the magnitude of change for PA+Stim (-4.000 ± 13.27 SD) vs the PA+Sham (-3.45 ± 13.49 SD) condition (p= 0.646, t= -0.470). (Figure 2)

3.2 Cognitive after-effects of PA - computerized line bisection task

For performance on the computerized line bisection task, there was no significant condition by time interaction (p= 0.925, F= 0.009), no significant main effect of condition (p= 0.233, F = 1.565) nor time (p = 0.649, F= 0.217). The paired t-test comparing pre-post change scores showed no significant difference in the magnitude of the pre-post change scores in PA+Stim (0.113 ± 1.967 SD) vs the PA+Sham (0.160 ± 1.29 SD) condition (p= 0.947, F= 0.005).

3.3 Neurophysiological Outcome Measures

Effects of PA on TMS-evoked MEPs of bilateral upper limb and left lower limb muscles

For left FDI MEPs, there was a significant main effect of time (p= 0.038, F = 5.331), no significant effect of condition (p= 0.544, F=0.388), and a significant condition by time interaction (p= 0.026, F = 6.327). The post-hoc paired comparisons showed that MEP amplitude significantly increased from pre (0.875mV ± 0.71 SD) to post (1.655mV ± 1.14 SD) for the PA+Stim condition (p=0.002) but showed no significant change from pre (1.101mV ± 0.76 SD) to post (1.083mV ±

0.95 SD) for the PA+Sham condition (p= 0.941).

The paired t-test comparing pre-post change scores between the PA+Stim and PA+Sham conditions showed a significantly larger magnitude of change for PA+Stim (0.791mV ± 0.746 SD) vs PA+Sham (0.046mV ± 0.931 SD) condition (p= 0.026, t= 2.482). (Figure 3)

For the right FDI, there was a significant main effect of time (p= 0.053, F= 4.463), no significant effect of condition (p= 0.426, F= 0.672), and no significant condition by time interaction (p= 0.441, F= 0.630). The paired comparisons showed that MEP amplitude did not significantly change from pre (1.285mV ± 1.14 SD) to post (1.578mV ± 0.13 SD) for the PA+Stim condition (p = 0.279) but showed a trend for significant increase from pre (1.515mV ± 1.11 SD) to post (2.070mV ± 1.69 SD) for the PA+Sham condition (p= 0.051). The paired t-test comparing pre-post change scores between the PA+Stim and PA+Sham conditions showed that there was no significant difference in the magnitude of change for PA+Stim (0.293mV ± 1.006 SD) versus PA+Sham (0.556mV ± 1.009 SD) conditions (p= 0.441, t= -0.793). (Figure 3)

For left TA MEPs, there was no significant main effect of time (p= 0.101, F = 3.159), no significant main effect of condition (p = 0.139, F= 2.517), nor significant condition by time interaction (p= 0.735, F = 0.120). The paired comparisons showed that MEP amplitude significantly increased from pre (0.606mV ± 0.77 SD) to post (0.740mV ± 0.89 SD) for the PA+Stim condition (p= 0.023) but showed no significant change from pre (0.874mV ± 1.08 SD) to post (0.956mV ± 0.1.16 SD) for the PA+Sham condition (p = 0.528 ± 0.49 SD). The paired t-test comparing pre-post change scores between the PA+Stim and PA+Sham conditions showed that there was no significant difference in the magnitude of change for PA+Stim (0.134mV ± 0.185 SD) vs PA+Sham (0.082mV ± 0.455 SD) condition (p= 0.735, t= 0.347). (Figure 3)

For the left soleus MEPs, there was no significant main effect of time (p= 0.472, F = 0.552), no significant main effect of condition (p= 0.166, F = 2.172), but there was a trend for a significant condition by time interaction (p= 0.093, F = 3.323). The paired comparisons showed that MEP amplitude significantly increased from pre (0.363mV ± 0.25 SD) to post (0.429mV ± 0.32 SD) for the PA+Stim condition (p = 0.014) but showed no significant change from pre (0.536mV ± 0.49 SD) to post (0.516mV ± 0.45 SD) for the PA+Sham condition (p= 0.688). The paired t-test comparing pre-post change scores between the PA+Stim and PA+Sham conditions showed a statistical trend for a larger magnitude of change for PA+Stim (0.066mV ± 0.082 SD) vs PA+Sham (-0.021mV ± 0.179 SD) condition (p= 0.093, t= 1.823).

Effects of PA on SICI, LICI, and ICF of the bilateral upper limb and left lower limb muscles

For the magnitude of SICI in both left FDI and right FDI, there were no significant main effects or interaction effects, and no differences in within-session change in SICI (all p-values >0.1).

For SICI in the left TA, there was no significant main effect of time (p= 0.627, F = 0.254) nor condition (p = 0.367, F= 0.892), but there was a significant condition by time interaction (p= 0.023, F= 7.236). The post-hoc paired comparisons showed that left TA SICI significantly decreased from pre (60.553 ± 36.39 SD) to post (47.680 ± 36.66 SD) for the PA+Stim condition (p= 0.046) but showed no significant change from pre (43.335 ± 27.98 SD) to post (50.535 ± 27.19 SD) for the PA+Sham condition (p= 0.234). The paired t-test comparing pre-post change scores in SICI of the left TA between the PA+Stim and PA+Sham condition showed a larger magnitude of change for PA+Stim (-17.394 ± 223.730 SD) vs PA+Sham (6.673 ± 21.157 SD) condition (p= 0.010, t= -3.104). (Figure 4)

For SICI in the left soleus, there was a significant main effect of time ($p= 0.019$, $F = 7.788$), but no a significant main effect of condition ($p = 0.323$, $F= 1.081$) nor significant condition by time interaction ($p= 0.815$, $F = 0.058$). The paired comparisons showed a statistical trend for SICI decreasing from pre (71.629 ± 31.21 SD) to post (63.346 ± 13.46 SD) for the PA+Stim condition ($p= 0.067$) and no significant change from pre (67.509 ± 23.99 SD) to post (56.400 ± 23.99 SD) for the PA+Sham condition ($p= 0.115$). The paired t-test comparing pre-post SICI change scores in the PA+Stim versus PA+Sham conditions showed that there was no significant difference in training-induced change for PA+Stim (-15.870 ± 29.214 SD) versus PA+Sham (-7.681 ± 20.352 SD) conditions ($p= 0.515$, $t= -0.627$). (Figure 4)

For ICF of left FDI, right FDI, left TA, and left soleus, there were no significant main effects or interactions, and no differences in within-session change in ICF between PA+Stim versus PA+Sham (all p-values >0.1). Similarly, for LICI of all 4 muscles, there were no significant main effects or interactions, and no differences between PA+Stim versus PA+Sham in within-session change (all p-values > 0.1). (Figures 5& 6).

4. Discussion

Here, we evaluated the behavioral and neural effects of a single session of PA with rightward biasing prism glasses (to induce a leftward aftereffect) in combination with somatosensory electrical stimulation (PA+Stim) or sham stimulation (PA+Sham) delivered to the left upper limb (toward the direction of the PA aftereffect). Our results showed that in young healthy adults, as expected, a single session of both PA+Stim and PA+Sham induced a significant visuo-spatial behavioral aftereffect toward the left hemi-space, as shown by a significant leftward shift following PA during upper limb pointing movement tasks. We observed no differences

between PA+Stim versus PA+Sham training conditions in these behavioral after-effects. We also showed that the PA+Stim condition increased MEP amplitudes of the left FDI, while the PA+Sham condition did not induce significant changes in left FDI MEP amplitudes. Furthermore, there was a larger magnitude of training-induced change in left FDI corticomotor excitability induced by PA+Stim compared to PA+Sham. In contrast, for MEPs of the right FDI, there was no significant change from pre- to-post for the PA+Stim condition but we showed a trend for significant increase in MEP amplitude following the PA+Sham condition. Notably, we showed that only the PA+Stim condition increased MEP amplitudes in the left TA and left soleus muscles, with no significant change observed for the PA+Sham condition. Furthermore, there was a trend for significantly greater magnitude of training-induced change in left soleus corticomotor excitability for PA+Stim versus PA+Sham. Finally, the PA+Stim condition increased intracortical inhibition (measured via SICI) in the left TA and left soleus, but no significant change in SICI was induced by the PA+Sham condition. We found a larger magnitude of training-induced change in SICI following PA+Stim compared to PA+Sham in the left TA, with a statistical trend for a larger change in left soleus.

Behavioral aftereffects of PA were observed for both the Sham and Stim conditions

As expected, our results showed that right-shifting PA (both with Stim and Sham) induced a leftward aftereffect leading to a leftward shift in visuo-spatial orientation during upper limb pointing movement tasks in young healthy adults. This finding is consistent with our hypothesis and previous literature, supports the robust behavioral effects induced by only one session of PA, and shows the promise of PA as an intervention paradigm targeting visuo-spatial orientation and motor function[6,11,53]. We observed similar behavioral effects following PA+Stim and PA+Sham,

suggesting that adding somatosensory stimulation to PA may not induce marked augmentation of PA's behavioral effects within only one session.

PA induced significant changes in corticomotor excitability of the Left and Right FDI

We had hypothesized that PA will increase corticomotor excitability of the left FDI (toward the direction of prismatic aftereffect). Our prediction was based on the rationale that PA biases visuospatial motor behavior toward the left hemi-space by inducing changes in the right dorsal fronto-parietal networks (within the superior parietal lobule/intra-parietal sulcus and the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex) responsible for visuospatial attention and orientation, which in turn have connectivity to the primary motor cortex[48]. Our results supported our hypothesis, but only for the PA+Stim condition, as shown by a significant increase in contralateral corticomotor excitability after PA+Stim, and a significantly larger training-induced change in left FDI MEP amplitudes with PA+Stim versus PA+Sham. Our results are somewhat consistent with another study[11] that evaluated the behavioral and neural mechanisms of PA (alone) using TMS, because they also found that although the rightward shifting (leftward aftereffect) PA had behavioral aftereffects, PA did not significantly increase corticomotor excitability in the left FDI in young healthy adults.[11]

Previous theoretical models of intra- and inter- hemispheric interaction in people with neglect[54] suggest that right hemispheric visual attentional damage causes a functional imbalance within the left and right dorsal parieto-frontal attentional networks, with decreased activity in the right dorsal parieto-frontal network and subsequent hyperactivity of the left dorsal parieto-frontal network, creating a right-sided attentional circuit bias and left-sided neglect. Therefore, we hypothesized that following PA, there would also be a decrease in ipsilateral corticomotor excitability (i.e. right FDI MEP amplitude would decrease) in addition to an increase in left FDI

corticomotor excitability. Our results did not support this hypothesis, as our results in fact showed an increase no change in right FDI corticomotor excitability following PA+Sham. The findings of Magnani et al[11] were different from our current results, as they showed that the leftward aftereffect induced by PA was not accompanied by any significant change in corticomotor excitability in the ipsilateral (right) FDI.

Neurophysiological aftereffects of PA combined with upper limb motor training and Stim may carry over to the left lower limb

As stated above, we predicted that as rightward shifting PA will increase excitability in the left visuo-spatial attentional networks, the resulting enhancement in M1 output could potentially be generalized or carried over to the left lower limb, and not just be localized to the left upper limb. Thus, we evaluated whether PA resulted in increased corticomotor excitability for both left upper and left lower muscles, which, to our knowledge, has not been evaluated before. Somewhat consistent with our hypothesis, we did observe significantly increased corticomotor excitability in the left TA and left soleus muscle for the PA+Stim condition. Our results suggest that when PA is combined with somatosensory stimulation, we may see a greater magnitude of carryover of PA to lower limb neural output. Potentially, combining PA with a lower limb motor training task or adding somatosensory stimulation to the left lower limb may further augment these carryover effects to lower limb muscles, and merit more investigation. Our results suggest that more research is needed to evaluate and target lower limb neurophysiology following the administration of PA in individuals with post-stroke neglect. Additionally, because behavioral changes may accompany corticomotor excitability, we may also need to examine the corresponding effects of PA on lower muscle performance tasks such as leg pointing or placement with walking.

Neurophysiological aftereffects of PA on intracortical excitability and inhibition

We found no changes in ICF in bilateral upper limb or left lower limb muscles following either PA+Sham or PA+Stim. Notably, there was high inter-individual variability in the paired-pulse ICF data for both upper limbs and left upper limb, which may have influenced these results. Notably, however, SICI of the left TA increased significantly, and SICI of left soleus showed a statistical trend toward an increase in PA+Stim training condition. Previously, SICI has been shown to change during different brain states, increasing during rest, and reducing just before voluntary contraction or simple reaction task[55,56] in able-bodied individuals. Potentially, PA-induced increases in SICI may be partly related to the TMS measures being collected at rest. However, in contrast to our findings, Magnani et al[11] showed that rightward shifting PA alone (leftward aftereffect) produced an increase in ICF and no changes in SICI of the left upper limb muscles. Our study did not show any PA-induced changes in LICI. No previous studies have investigated the effects of PA on LICI. The effects of PA combined with Stim on intracortical inhibitory and facilitatory circuits merits more investigation in larger sample studies.

Adding Stim as an adjuvant to PA may augment PA-induced neuroplasticity

Previously, sensorimotor electrical stimulation has been shown to increase afferent input in the somatosensory cortex[57,58], which in turn can enhance the excitability of motor (M1)[34-36], and possibly visuo-spatial[28,29] cortical areas. Thus, we predicted that PA+Stim will further enhance the upregulatory effects of PA on left upper limb M1 (because stim is being delivered to the (left) UE), leading to more robust neurophysiological and behavioral after-effects with PA+Stim. Consistent with our hypothesis, we showed that PA+Stim indeed increased left FDI MEP amplitude. Furthermore, PA+Stim resulted in a significantly larger training-induced change in MEP amplitude

of the left FDI compared to PA+Sham (Figure 1, Panel B). Our current results may be somewhat in congruence with other studies which showed that PA combined with left neck extensor muscle somatosensory feedback (neck vibration stimulation)[59] as well as left[60] and right[61] M1 anodal cortical stimulation (a-tDCS) may have more robust effects on spatial neglect deficits and motor function than PA alone in chronic post-stroke individuals with spatial neglect [54]. Somewhat surprisingly, we did not observe corresponding larger behavioral aftereffects of PA+Stim compared to PA+Sham. Potentially, the greater increase in corticomotor excitability induced by PA+Stim versus PA+Sham may require more dosage (e.g. 5-10 sessions) to induce a behavioral change. Thus, we propose that future work should investigate the neural and behavioral additive effects of PA+Stim.

Furthermore, our current findings of significant effects of PA+Stim on corticomotor excitability of leg muscles suggest that right shifting PA (with leftward aftereffect) in conjunction with somatosensory stimulation has carryover effects to the corticomotor excitability and SICI of the left leg. We found that the MEP amplitudes of both the left TA and left soleus significantly increased from pre to post for the PA+Stim condition but not for the PA+Sham condition (Figure 2). Thus, potentially, when somatosensory stimulation is added to PA, the stimulation-induced changes in neural circuit excitability augment the PA-induced neuroplasticity, increasing the likelihood of carryover to lower limb muscles. Interestingly, left soleus and left TA SICI also showed significant decreases after PA+Stim, indicating greater intra-cortical inhibitory influences on M1 after PA+Stim. While another study showed that somatosensory stimulation to the median nerve (wrist) alone induced no changes in SICI or ICF[62]; to our knowledge, no other studies have looked at the effect of PA+Stim on both upper and lower limb muscles.

Clinical and research implications

While our behavioral data show that both PA+Stim and PA+Sham conditions induced similar sensorimotor aftereffects, the neurophysiological data show that the PA+Stim induced an increase in corticomotor excitability in the left FDI, left TA, and left soleus. The larger neurophysiological effects of PA+Stim suggest that this combined training paradigm might induce a more robust behavioral aftereffect that improves right hemispheric corticomotor excitability, perhaps with multiple PA+Stim sessions. PA+Stim potential to enhance corticomotor connections in the left space with transfer to the left lower limb presents a promising treatment avenue for patients with spatial neglect with motor deficits.

Limitations

The same order was used for neurophysiological and behavioral tests for all participants. Possibly by the time the last post-test was done (neurophysiology testing), some of the acute effects of PA could have been washed out or weakened, especially in young healthy adults due to the unimpaired neurophysiological system affecting the longevity and robustness of PA effects. However, our concerns were somewhat allayed by previous studies suggesting that the effects of 1-2 sessions of PA last from 24 hours to up to 1 week in post-stroke spatial neglect individuals. Because corticomotor excitability and inhibition can be state-dependent, our SICI, LICI, and ICF results collected at rest (left and right FDI) and quiet standing (TA/soleus) may be different compared to similar measures collected in an active state[63]. In our study, somatosensory stimulation was delivered to the left upper limb at supra-sensory but sub-motor threshold. Future studies can evaluate the effects of stimulation on PA with stimulation delivered at stronger intensities above motor threshold. Similarly, future work can evaluate the effects of combining PA

with stimulation delivered to different muscles such as neck or leg muscles in addition to or instead of the upper limb.

Consistent with previous PA literature, the behavioral training task done during PA was performed only with the right arm to match our PA protocol to the protocols used in stroke participants t with left spatial neglect, whose left arm may be paretic. However, this motor training paradigm may not be the most optimal as the left arm does not engage in motor practice, potentially reducing the neural and/or behavioral effects induced by PA. Additionally, the average session duration ranged from three to four hours, so fatigue could have affected the post-test behavioral and neurophysiologic data in some participants. Lastly, the lack of significant cognitive aftereffects of PA may be due to the fact that the participants had an intact neurophysiological system, and future studies should explore the cognitive aftereffects of PA in post-stoke individuals with spatial neglect.

Conclusions

Using a dose-matched, repeated-measures, sham-controlled study design, our results suggest that PA+Stim may yield larger neurophysiological effects compared to PA alone. Our study provided new evidence that PA may increase corticomotor excitability of the left upper limb (toward the direction of the leftward aftereffect) in young healthy adults, suggesting that PA modulated connections between visuospatial cortical circuits and the primary motor cortex. This study also revealed that neural effects of PA may transfer from the left upper limb to the left lower limb in young healthy adults, especially when PA is combined with Stim. These carryover effects of PA to lower limb have both clinical and neurophysiological implications on the potential uses of PA in the rehabilitation of lower limb and gait deficits in individuals with post-stroke spatial

neglect. Future studies could evaluate whether PA+Stim enhances the effectiveness of PA in individuals with spatial neglect, especially in people who do not respond to traditional PA alone. Additionally, based on our current results, the effects of combining PA with Stim on carryover effects to lower limb muscles should be further investigated and may inform the design of novel rehabilitative strategies to improve lower limb and walking function. Future research is needed to elucidate the mechanisms of PA and to optimize the therapeutic protocols of PA and adjuvant stim or motor training for clinical applications.

TABLE AND FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1:

Overview of study design. Participants were randomized to receive TMS and behavioral assessments pre and post one session of PAT. We allowed for at least 3 weeks washout period before receiving the opposite condition (PAT+ Sham or PAT + Stim).

Figure 2: Effects of PA combined with Stim and Sham on visuospatial-motor behavior: **A)** Representative sample of pointing behavior data with eyes open before, during, and after PA. **B)** Pre- and post-PA visuoproprioceptive pointing (VPP) performance during the PA+Sham and PA+Stim conditions. Note that there was a significant leftward VPP aftereffect, as shown by a shift from pre (-0.887cm ± 1.39 SD) to post (-4.467cm ± 1.40 SD) for both the PAT+Stim condition (p= <0.001) and for the PAT+Sham condition (p= <0.001). **C)** Pre- and post-PA proprioceptive pointing (PP) performance during PA+Sham and PA+Stim conditions. We observed a significant leftward PP aftereffect, as shown by a shift or deviation toward the left space from pre to post for both the PAT+Stim condition (p= <0.001) and for the PAT+Sham condition (p= <0.002). **D)** Graph comparing change scores in both PA+Sham and PA+Stim in visuoproprioceptive (eyes open) and proprioceptive pointing (eyes closed). There was no significant difference in magnitude of change between the 2 conditions**.**

Figure 3: Effects of PA combined with Stim and Sham on corticomotor excitability. A) TMS-evoked MEPs for the left FDI muscle from a representative participant at pre and post PA training with Sham (left) and Stim (right) conditions. The graphs in panels **B-E** show MEP

amplitudes at Pre and Post PA+Sham and PA+Stim (left) and pre to post change in MEP amplitudes for PA+Sham and PA+Stim for the left FDI (A), right FDI (B), left TA (C), and left soleus (E) muscles. **B)** Left FDI MEPs showed a significant increase at Post versus Pre in the PA+Stim condition (p= 0.002). Training-induced change scores showed a significantly larger magnitude of change in left FDI MEP amplitudes for PA+Stim (0.791mV ± 0.746 SD) vs PA+Sham (0.046mV ± 0.931 SD) condition (p= 0.026, t= 2.482). **C)** For the right FDI, there is a trend for significant increase in MEP amplitudes from pre (1.515mV ± 1.11 SD) to post (2.070mV ± 1.69 SD) for the PA+Sham condition (p= 0.051). There was no significant difference between PA+Sham and PA+Stim in the magnitude of change in right FDI MEP amplitudes. **D)** Left TA MEPs showed a significant increase for the PA+Stim condition (p= 0.023). There was no significant difference in magnitude of change in left TA MEPs between the 2 conditions. **E):** Left soleus MEPs showed a significant increase in the PA+Stim condition (p= 0.014). Pre-post change scores for left soleus MEP amplitude showed a statistical trend for a larger magnitude of change for PA+ Stim (p= 0.093, t=1.823)

Figure 4: Effects of PA combined with Stim and Sham on short-interval intracortical facilitation (SICI). The figure shows SICI at Pre and Post time points for the PA+Sham and PA+Stim conditions for the left FDI (A), right FDI (B), left TA (C), and left soleus muscles (D). There was no significant difference between SICI at Pre versus Post in the PA+Sham nor PA+Stim conditions for left FDI (A) or right FDI (B). There was a significant increase at Post versus Pre in SICI in in the left TA (C) (p= 0.046), and a trend toward significant increase in SICI in the left soleus (D) (p= 0.067) for the PA+Stim condition. E) Graph comparing training-induced change scores (post minus pre) for PA+Sham and PA+Stim in the 4 muscles evaluated in our study (left

FDI, right FDI, left TA, left soleus). In the left TA, pre-post change scores were significantly larger magnitude for the PA+Stim (-17.394 ± 223.730 SD) versus PA+Sham (6.673 ± 21.157 SD) condition (p= 0.010, t= -3.104).

Figure 5: Effects of PA combined with Stim and Sham on intracortical facilitation (ICF). The figures show ICF for the PA+Sham and PA+Stim conditions at Pre and Post time points for Left FDI (A), right FDI (B), left TA (C), and left soleus (D) muscles. There was no significant change in ICF in any muscle from pre to post for either the PA+Sham or PA+Stim conditions (p>0.1). E) Graph showing training-induced change scores (Post minus Pre) for both the PA+Sham and PA+Stim for each of the 4 muscles (left FDI, right FDI, left TA, and left soleus). There were no significant differences in the magnitude of change scores between the 2 conditions for any muscle.

Figure 6: Effects of PA combined with Stim and Sham on long interval cortical inhibition (LICI). The figure shows the magnitude of LICI pre and post PA+Sham and PA+Stim in the left FDI (A), right FDI (B), left TA (C), and left soleus (D). Panel E shows graphs comparing change scores in both PA+Sham and PA+Stim in each of the 4 muscles. There were no significant differences in magnitude of change between the 2 conditions.

TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1: Study participant demographics

	Age (Years)	Gender	Race	Order of Stim 1st session	Order of Stim 2nd session	Time between sessions (Days)	Handedness
1	30-35	Male	White	Sham	Stim	28	Right
2	20-25	Female	Asian	Stim	Sham	16	Right
3	20-25	Female	White	Stim	Sham	20	Right
4	20-25	Female	White	Sham	Stim	20	Right
5	25-30	Female	Black	Sham	Stim	21	Right
6	25-30	Male	Black	Sham	Stim	21	Left
7	25-30	Female	White	Stim	Sham	29	Right
8	25-30	Female	Black	Sham	Stim	18	Right
9	25-30	Male	Asian	Stim	Sham	45	Right
10	25-30	Male	Asian	Sham	Stim	26	Right
11	20-25	Male	Asian	Stim	Sham	35	Right
12	30-35	Male	Asian	Sham	Stim	28	Right
13	20-25	Female	White	Stim	Sham	33	Right
14	25-30	Male	Black	Sham	Stim	19	Right
15	20-25	Female	White	Stim	Sham	41	Right
	26.7± 4.4	7M, 8F	-	-	-	27±8.7	-


Pre
Post
TMS
& Behavioral
assessment
PAT+Stim
TMS
& Behavioral
assessment
Study Sample
Randomized
Pre
Post
TMS
& Behavioral
assessment
PAT+Sham
TMS
& Behavioral
assessment
Washout
(>3weeks)
Pre
Post
TMS
& Behavioral
assessment
PAT+Stim
TMS
& Behavioral
assessment
Pre
Post
TMS
& Behavioral
assessment
TMS
& Behavioral
assessment

Figure 1


A
Representative Pointing Data
Deviation (cm)
10
5
0
-5
-10
Pre PAT Exposure
Initial Pointing with Goggles ON
Final Pointing with Goggles ON
Post PAT Exposure
B
Visual Proprioceptive Pointing
Deviation (cm)
2
0
-2
-4
-6
-8
-10
**
**
Pre
Post
PAT+Sham
Pre
Post
PAT+Stim
C
Proprioceptive Pointing
Deviation (cm)
6
4
2
0
-2
-4
-6
-8
-10
-12
**
**
Pre
Post
PAT+Sham
Pre
Post
PAT+Stim
D
PAT+ Sham
PAT+ Stim
PAT+ Sham
PAT+ Stim
Pre-Post Change
0
-2
-4
-6
Visual-Proprioceptive Pointing
Proprioceptive Pointing

Figure 2


A
Representative suprathreshold MEPs at Pre and Post for PAT+Sham (left) and PAT+Stim (right) conditions
Pre
Post
mV
msecs
Left FDI
Right FDI
B
C
MEP Amplitude (mV)
Pre-Post Change
Pre
Post
PAT+Sham
PAT+Stim
**
*
Left TA
Left Soleus
D
E

Figure 3


A
Left FDI
SICI (Conditioning/Test) %
Increased Inhibition
Pre
Post
PAT+Sham
PAT+Stim
B
Right FDI
C
Left TA
**
D
Left SOL
*
E
Pre-Post Change in SICI
Left FDI
Right FDI
Left Soleus
Left TA

Figure 4


A
Left FDI
ICF
(Conditioning/Test) %
Increased
Facilitation
Pre
Post
PAT+Sham
PAT+Stim
B
Right FDI
C
Left TA
D
Left Soleus
E
Pre-Post Change in ICF
Left
FDI
Right
FDI
Left
Soleus
Left
TA

Figure 5


A
Left FDI
LICI
(Conditioning/Test) %
Increased
Inhibition
Pre Post
PAT+Sham
Pre Post
PAT+Stim
B
Right FDI
C
Left TA
D
Left SOL
E
Pre-Post Chang in LICI
Left
FDI
Right
FDI
Left
Soleus
Left
TA

Figure 6

REFERENCES

1. Bai S, Liu W, Guan Y. The Visuospatial and Sensorimotor Functions of Posterior Parietal Cortex in Drawing Tasks: A Review. *Front Aging Neurosci.* 2021;13:717002.
2. Kantak SS, Stinear JW, Buch ER, Cohen LG. Rewiring the brain: potential role of the premotor cortex in motor control, learning, and recovery of function following brain injury. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.* 2012;26(3):282-292.
3. Goedert KM, Chen P, Foundas AL, Barrett AM. Frontal lesions predict response to prism adaptation treatment in spatial neglect: A randomised controlled study. *Neuropsychol Rehabil.* 2020;30(1):32-53.
4. Chen P, Hreha K, Kong Y, Barrett AM. Impact of spatial neglect on stroke rehabilitation: evidence from the setting of an inpatient rehabilitation facility. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2015;96(8):1458-1466.
5. Adair JC, Barrett AM. Spatial neglect: clinical and neuroscience review: a wealth of information on the poverty of spatial attention. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* 2008;1142:21-43.
6. Rossetti Y, Rode G, Pisella L, et al. Prism adaptation to a rightward optical deviation rehabilitates left hemispatial neglect. *Nature.* 1998;395(6698):166-169.
7. Boukrina O, Chen P. Neural Mechanisms of Prism Adaptation in Healthy Adults and Individuals with Spatial Neglect after Unilateral Stroke: A Review of fMRI Studies. *Brain Sci.* 2021;11(11).
8. Barrett AM, Goedert KM, Basso JC. Prism adaptation for spatial neglect after stroke: translational practice gaps. *Nat Rev Neurol.* 2012;8(10):567-577.

9. Pisella L, Rode G, Farnè A, Tilikete C, Rossetti Y. Prism adaptation in the rehabilitation of patients with visuo-spatial cognitive disorders. *Curr Opin Neurol.* 2006;19(6):534-542.

10. Azouvi P, Jacquin-Courtois S, Luauté J. Rehabilitation of unilateral neglect: Evidence-based medicine. *Ann Phys Rehabil Med.* 2017;60(3):191-197.

11. Magnani B, Caltagirone C, Oliveri M. Prismatic adaptation as a novel tool to directionally modulate motor cortex excitability: evidence from paired-pulse TMS. *Brain Stimul.* 2014;7(4):573-579.

12. Panico F, Rossetti Y, Trojano L. On the mechanisms underlying Prism Adaptation: A review of neuro-imaging and neuro-stimulation studies. *Cortex.* 2020;123:57-71.

13. Prablanc C, Panico F, Fleury L, et al. Adapting terminology: clarifying prism adaptation vocabulary, concepts, and methods. *Neurosci Res.* 2020;153:8-21.

14. Heilman KM, Bowers D, Watson RT. Performance on hemispatial pointing task by patients with neglect syndrome. *Neurology.* 1983;33(5):661-664.

15. Saj A, Cojan Y, Vocat R, Luauté J, Vuilleumier P. Prism adaptation enhances activity of intact fronto-parietal areas in both hemispheres in neglect patients. *Cortex.* 2013;49(1):107-119.

16. Fortis P, Chen P, Goedert KM, Barrett AM. Effects of prism adaptation on motor-intentional spatial bias in neglect. *Neuroreport.* 2011;22(14):700-705.

17. Luauté J, Halligan P, Rode G, Jacquin-Courtois S, Boisson D. Prism adaptation first among equals in alleviating left neglect: a review. *Restor Neurol Neurosci.* 2006;24(4-6):409-418.

18. Farnè A, Rossetti Y, Toniolo S, Làdavas E. Ameliorating neglect with prism adaptation: visuo-manual and visuo-verbal measures. *Neuropsychologia.* 2002;40(7):718-729.

19. Fortis P, Maravita A, Gallucci M, et al. Rehabilitating patients with left spatial neglect by prism exposure during a visuomotor activity. *Neuropsychology.* 2010;24(6):681-697.

20. Jacquin-Courtois S, Rode G, Pisella L, Boisson D, Rossetti Y. Wheel-chair driving improvement following visuo-manual prism adaptation. *Cortex.* 2008;44(1):90-96.

21. Keane S, Turner C, Sherrington C, Beard JR. Use of fresnel prism glasses to treat stroke patients with hemispatial neglect. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2006;87(12):1668-1672.

22. Watanabe S, Amimoto K. Generalization of prism adaptation for wheelchair driving task in patients with unilateral spatial neglect. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2010;91(3):443-447.

23. Rode G, Pagliari C, Huchon L, Rossetti Y, Pisella L. Semiology of neglect: An update. *Ann Phys Rehabil Med.* 2017;60(3):177-185.

24. Chaudhari A, Pigott K, Barrett AM. Midline Body Actions and Leftward Spatial "Aiming" in Patients with Spatial Neglect. *Front Hum Neurosci.* 2015;9:393.

25. Goedert KM, Zhang JY, Barrett AM. Prism adaptation and spatial neglect: the need for dose-finding studies. *Front Hum Neurosci.* 2015;9:243.

26. Kerkhoff G. Modulation and rehabilitation of spatial neglect by sensory stimulation. *Prog Brain Res.* 2003;142:257-271.

27. Pitzalis S, Spinelli D, Vallar G, Di Russo F. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation effects on neglect: a visual-evoked potential study. *Front Hum Neurosci.* 2013;7:111.

28. Vallar G, Rusconi ML, Barozzi S, et al. Improvement of left visuo-spatial hemineglect by left-sided transcutaneous electrical stimulation. *Neuropsychologia.* 1995;33(1):73-82.

29. Guariglia C, Lippolis G, Pizzamiglio L. Somatosensory stimulation improves imagery disorders in neglect. *Cortex.* 1998;34(2):233-241.

30. Duncan PW, Zorowitz R, Bates B, et al. Management of Adult Stroke Rehabilitation Care: a clinical practice guideline. *Stroke.* 2005;36(9):e100-143.

31. O'Shea J, Revol P, Cousijn H, et al. Induced sensorimotor cortex plasticity remediates chronic treatment-resistant visual neglect. *Elife.* 2017;6.

32. Hamdy S, Rothwell JC, Aziz Q, Singh KD, Thompson DG. Long-term reorganization of human motor cortex driven by short-term sensory stimulation. *Nat Neurosci.* 1998;1(1):64-68.

33. Ridding MC, Brouwer B, Miles TS, Pitcher JB, Thompson PD. Changes in muscle responses to stimulation of the motor cortex induced by peripheral nerve stimulation in human subjects. *Exp Brain Res.* 2000;131(1):135-143.

34. Ridding MC, McKay DR, Thompson PD, Miles TS. Changes in corticomotor representations induced by prolonged peripheral nerve stimulation in humans. *Clin Neurophysiol.* 2001;112(8):1461-1469.

35. Charlton CS, Ridding MC, Thompson PD, Miles TS. Prolonged peripheral nerve stimulation induces persistent changes in excitability of human motor cortex. *J Neurol Sci.* 2003;208(1-2):79-85.

36. Kaelin-Lang A, Luft AR, Sawaki L, Burstein AH, Sohn YH, Cohen LG. Modulation of human corticomotor excitability by somatosensory input. *J Physiol.* 2002;540(Pt 2):623-633.

37. Bracco M, Mangano GR, Turriziani P, Smirni D, Oliveri M. Combining tDCS with prismatic adaptation for non-invasive neuromodulation of the motor cortex. *Neuropsychologia.* 2017;101:30-38.

38. Rossini PM, Barker AT, Berardelli A, et al. Non-invasive electrical and magnetic stimulation of the brain, spinal cord and roots: basic principles and procedures for routine clinical application. Report of an IFCN committee. *Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol.* 1994;91(2):79-92.

39. 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.

40. 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.

41. Rossi S, Hallett M, Rossini PM, Pascual-Leone A, Group SoTC. 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.

42. Danckert J, Ferber S, Goodale MA. Direct effects of prismatic lenses on visuomotor control: an event-related functional MRI study. *Eur J Neurosci.* 2008;28(8):1696-1704.

43. Chapman HL, Eramudugolla R, Gavrilescu M, et al. Neural mechanisms underlying spatial realignment during adaptation to optical wedge prisms. *Neuropsychologia.* 2010;48(9):2595-2601.

44. Luauté J, Schwartz S, Rossetti Y, et al. Dynamic changes in brain activity during prism adaptation. *J Neurosci.* 2009;29(1):169-178.

45. Martín-Arévalo E, Laube I, Koun E, Farnè A, Reilly KT, Pisella L. Prism Adaptation Alters Electrophysiological Markers of Attentional Processes in the Healthy Brain. *J Neurosci.* 2016;36(3):1019-1030.

46. Bracco M, Veniero D, Oliveri M, Thut G. Prismatic Adaptation Modulates Oscillatory EEG Correlates of Motor Preparation but Not Visual Attention in Healthy Participants. *J Neurosci.* 2018;38(5):1189-1201.

47. Kujirai T, Caramia MD, Rothwell JC, et al. Corticocortical inhibition in human motor cortex. *J Physiol.* 1993;471:501-519.

48. Bartolomeo P, Thiebaut de Schotten M, Chica AB. Brain networks of visuospatial attention and their disruption in visual neglect. *Front Hum Neurosci.* 2012;6:110.

49. Awiszus F. TMS and threshold hunting. *Suppl Clin Neurophysiol.* 2003;56:13-23.

50. Chen P, Chen CC, Hreha K, Goedert KM, Barrett AM. Kessler Foundation Neglect Assessment Process uniquely measures spatial neglect during activities of daily living. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2015;96(5):869-876.e861.

51. Goedert KM, Chen P, Boston RC, Foundas AL, Barrett AM. Presence of Motor-Intentional Aiming Deficit Predicts Functional Improvement of Spatial Neglect With Prism Adaptation. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.* 2014;28(5):483-493.

52. Cunningham D, Zhang B, Cahn A. Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation (TMS) Analysis Toolbox: A user friendly open source software for basic and advanced analysis and data sharing of TMS related outcomes. Brain Stimulation; 2021.

53. Chen P PR, Abdou A, Barrett AM,. Effects of Prism Adaptation Treatment on balance abilities of a Stroke Survivor with Spatial Neglect. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation.* 2019;*100*(12):e177.

54. He BJ, Snyder AZ, Vincent JL, Epstein A, Shulman GL, Corbetta M. Breakdown of functional connectivity in frontoparietal networks underlies behavioral deficits in spatial neglect. *Neuron.* 2007;53(6):905-918.

55. Reynolds C, Ashby P. Inhibition in the human motor cortex is reduced just before a voluntary contraction. *Neurology.* 1999;53(4):730-735.

56. Ibáñez J, Spampinato DA, Paraneetharan V, Rothwell JC. SICI during changing brain states: Differences in methodology can lead to different conclusions. *Brain Stimul.* 2020;13(2):353-356.

57. Rosenkranz K, Rothwell JC. Differential effect of muscle vibration on intracortical inhibitory circuits in humans. *J Physiol.* 2003;551(Pt 2):649-660.

58. Rosenkranz K, Rothwell JC. The effect of sensory input and attention on the sensorimotor organization of the hand area of the human motor cortex. *J Physiol.* 2004;561(Pt 1):307-320.

59. Choi HS, Lee BM. A Complex Intervention Integrating Prism Adaptation and Neck Vibration for Unilateral Neglect in Patients of Chronic Stroke: A Randomised Controlled Trial. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2022;19(20).

60. Vallar G, Guariglia, C. and Rusconi, M.L. Modulation of the neglect syndrome by sensory stimulation. In: P. Thief and H.-O. Karnath (Eds.), Parietal Lobe Contributions to Orientation in 30 Space. In. Berlin: Springer; 1997:555-578.

61. Làdavas E, Giulietti S, Avenanti A, et al. a-tDCS on the ipsilesional parietal cortex boosts the effects of prism adaptation treatment in neglect. *Restor Neurol Neurosci.* 2015;33(5):647-662.

62. Farias da Guarda SN, Conforto AB. Erratum to: Effects of somatosensory stimulation on corticomotor excitability in patients with unilateral cerebellar infarcts and healthy subjects - preliminary results. *Cerebellum Ataxias.* 2016;3:11.

63. Opie GM, Ridding MC, Semmler JG. Age-related Differences in Pre- and Post-synaptic Motor Cortex Inhibition are Task Dependent. *Brain Stimul.* 2015;8(5):926-936.