The Effect of High-frequency Cortical Stimulation on SEEG-recorded Interictal Epileptiform Discharges

Ahdyie Ahmadi[1], Hellen Kreinter Rosembaun[3], Benjamin Corrigan[2], Mohamad Abbass[3], Greydon Gilmore[3] , Nasim Mortazavi[1], Jorge G. Burneo[3,6,7], David A. Steven[3,6], Giovanni Pellegrino[3], Jonathan C. Lau[3], Keith W. MacDougall[3], Michelle-Lee Jones[3], Julio Martinez-Trujillo[2], Ana Suller Marti[3,4,5*]

1. Graduate Program of Neuroscience, Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada
2. Department of Physiology and Pharmacology, Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada
3. Department of Clinical Neurological Sciences, Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada
4. Department of Paediatrics, Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada
5. Department of Psychiatry, Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada
6. Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada.
7. Neuroepidemiology Unit, Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada

* Correspondence to: Epilepsy Program, Western University, 339 Windermere RD, London, Ontario, N6A5A5 Canada. E-mail address: ana.sullermarti@lhsc.on.ca.

Abstract: More than 15 million patients worldwide suffer from drug-resistant epilepsy (DRE). Surgical removal of the seizure onset zone (SOZ), the brain region(s) responsible for epileptogenic discharge initiation, is the best available treatment for these patients. The post-surgical outcome depends on the successful identification and resection of the SOZ. Therefore, finding robust biomarkers of epileptogenicity that allow clinicians to accurately localize the SOZ is of paramount importance. Most commonly, SOZ mapping localizes ictal activity occurring spontaneously or evoked by cortical stimulation (CS) during presurgical evaluation of patients with epilepsy using stereoelectroncephalography (SEEG). Mapping events such as interictal epileptiform discharges (IEDs), paroxysmal hypersynchronic electrical discharges that often occur outside ictal discharges or during CS, have been less used for SOZ localization. We test the hypothesis that IEDs triggered by CS via SEEG investigation can contribute to the mapping of the SOZ. We evaluated the impact of CS on IEDs in patients investigated with SEEG on epilepsy surgery investigation. We recorded intracranial signals from thirty DRE patients (seizure-free post-surgery). Bipolar and high frequency (50 Hz) CS was performed with a pulse width of 300 µs and current spanning 1–6 mA. IEDs were automatically detected pre- and post- stimulation, and their normalized absolute changes were quantified within and outside the SOZ (identified by ictal discharges). We found that IED rates significantly increased post-stimulation compared to pre-stimulation within the SOZ, while no significant change was observed outside the SOZ (Mann-Whitney U test, p-value <0.001, AUC=98% for SOZ and 71% for non-SOZ). This effect was present regardless of whether the stimulation was applied to the SOZ or non-SOZ regions, indicating a broader effect of stimulation on the SOZ. Our results offer a quantitative tool for identifying epileptogenic areas in patients with DRE, enhancing the mapping and localization of the SOZ and potentially improving surgical outcomes.

Keywords: Interictal Epileptiform Discharges, Cortical Stimulation, Seizure Onset Zone, Stereoelectroencephalography

1. Introduction

Epilepsy is a long-term neurological disorder marked by recurring seizures impacting around 50 million people globally (Fisher et al. 2014). More than 15 million individuals suffer from drug-resistant epilepsy (DRE), a condition defined by persistent seizures despite undergoing two trials of properly chosen anti-seizure medications (Guery and Rheims 2021). Approximately 60% of patients with DRE have focal epilepsy, in which a defined brain region termed the seizure onset zone (SOZ) initiates seizures (Rosenow and Lüders 2001). Surgical removal or disconnection of these regions and neuromodulatory treatments can potentially eliminate seizures entirely (Li et al. 2021a). However, their success largely relies on the precise identification of the SOZ during a comprehensive epilepsy evaluation involving non-invasive and invasive investigations (Jobst et al. 2010). If phase I evaluation fails to provide sufficient information to localize the SOZ, invasive electrode implantation may be performed for intracranial monitoring of electrical activity during phase II (Baumgartner et al. 2019). This can be achieved by implanting depth electrodes and monitoring brain activity using stereoelectroencephalography (SEEG), which is considered the "gold standard" for SOZ localization (Smith and Stacey 2021). The goal of SEEG monitoring is to detect ictal activity during seizures and determine its origin, the SOZ, which guides its surgical resection.

However, seizures are unpredictable and often infrequent, making ictal recordings costly, time-consuming, and risky (Staba et al. 2014). Furthermore, even with intracranial recordings and qualitative analyses to define the SOZ, predicting surgical outcomes for individual patients remains difficult, with success rates ranging from 30% to 70% (Li et al. 2021a). To address this, a quantitative approach that estimates the most epileptogenic regions through the identification of relevant biomarkers can be proposed (Engel et al. 2013). Intracranial recordings from patients with epilepsy frequently capture other electrophysiological disturbances, such as interictal epileptiform discharges (IEDs), which occur more often than seizures and can expedite and enhance the identification of the SOZ (Makhalova et al. 2023). As part of the presurgical evaluation, extraoperative electrical stimulation (CS) at a frequency of 50 Hz is primarily used to map the eloquent cortex, helping to prevent or minimize the risk of unintended neurological damage (Marti et al. 2022). This technique also offers the opportunity to delineate seizure networks and cortical connectivity (Matsumoto et al. 2017).

To find SOZ biomarkers, some studies have reported the effects of intraoperative CS on IEDs detected in intracranial recordings using subdural grids. Nakatani et al. found that high-frequency stimulation of

SOZ decreases the amplitude of spikes and the number of IEDs (Nakatani et al. 2020). Similar results were documented by Kinoshita et al.(Kinoshita et al. 2004; Kinoshita et al. 2005). These studies provide valuable insights into the clinical utility of cortical stimulation for managing epilepsy through neuromodulation techniques. Nevertheless, in certain situations, particularly while using SEEG, stimulation techniques have been utilized to trigger seizures. In this regard, little is known about how IED rates change in response to 50 Hz cortical stimulation using SEEG, and whether analysis of the changes in IEDs before and after stimulation could provide insights into localizing SOZ. In this study, we will quantify CS-induced IEDs in different brain regions in patients implanted with SEEG electrodes to determine whether they can provide information to localize the SOZ. We hypothesize that high-frequency (50 Hz) CS increases the number of IEDs within epileptogenic regions.

2. Methods

2.1 Patients

We recruited patients with drug-resistant epilepsy (18 years and older) who underwent invasive presurgical evaluation (phase II) at our center. The study received approval from our institution's research ethics board, and all participants provided written informed consent before they were included in this study. Our dataset comprised 135 patients at the time of analysis, of which 108 underwent high-frequency cortical stimulation. Patients who received any form of neuromodulation—including deep brain stimulation, responsive neurostimulation, or vagus nerve stimulation —were excluded from the analysis. The final cohort included 26 patients who underwent resection and four patients who underwent ablation, all of whom became seizure-free following intervention (**Figure 1**). This selection ensured that the treated areas included the SOZ.

A total of 30 patients (18 female; age range: 18-59 years; mean age = 31.36 years; standard deviation = 11.12) were analyzed in this study. Detailed patient information is summarized in **Table 1**.

2.2 Electrode implantation

SEEG is an invasive technique for monitoring brain electrical activity utilizing depth electrodes. Depth electrodes typically feature a diameter of 0.86 mm with platinum contacts, each 2.29 mm long (Ad Tech Medical®, WI, USA). The number of contacts per electrode ranges from four to eighteen with an intercontact distance of three to six millimetres based on the electrode type. Before surgery, the placement of electrodes was planned to target specific areas of the brain potentially involved in seizure initiation. Following implantation, the position of electrodes was confirmed using computed tomography co-registered with preoperative MRI (Marti et al. 2022).

2.3 Electrical Cortical Stimulation (CS)

Electrical cortical stimulation (CS) was conducted following the recording of interictal data and typical electroclinical seizures. During stimulation, a precise 3-dimensional map of the contacts in relationship to cortical areas (topography) and other brain structures was readily available. Before the CS session, we established a list of channels to be stimulated. The channels were categorized into the most epileptogenic and least epileptogenic areas based on IED activity and ictal discharges observed during presurgical monitoring and typical electroclinical seizures. The least epileptogenic areas are characterized as regions displaying minimal or no IEDs during monitoring and showing no significant involvement in ictal discharges during the seizure evolution and propagation. These areas were considered less likely to contribute to seizure generation. On the other hand, the more epileptogenic areas are defined as regions exhibiting the highest frequency of IEDs during presurgical monitoring, as well as consistent involvement in ictal discharges during spontaneous seizures. These areas were typically associated with the SOZ and are primary targets for CS or surgical resection. Contacts covering the putative SOZ were reserved for the end of the stimulation session, due to the potential occurrence of seizures (Marti et al. 2022). Electrical stimuli were delivered using the Nicolet Cortical Stimulation device (Natus)®. Stimulation parameters typically used range from 1 to 8 mA, with a pulse width of 300 µs, at 50 Hz (**Table 2**). Stimulation was applied at lower intensities for 1–3 seconds or until clinical symptoms, seizures or after-discharges, appear. After-discharges are characterized by rhythmic waves, repetitive epileptiform potentials, or a combination of both, triggered by the stimulus (Blume et al., 2004). For this analysis, we did not include low frequency stimulation.

These parameters were used to stimulate both the non-SOZ and SOZ (**Figure 2**). Stimulation began at 1 mA and intensity was incrementally increased until clinical symptoms appeared, after-discharges or seizures were triggered, or the maximum intensity was reached. The total duration of stimulation and the delivered charge were kept within established safety limits.

2.4 Preparing the data.

Intracranial recordings were sampled at 2048 Hz without applying a digital filter, and were collected at three stages: before, during, and after stimulation. Before CS, electrode locations were verified through CT scans. Noisy channels were excluded to ensure optimal data quality. For analysis, we used a bipolar derivation technique, subtracting consecutive channel signals, as stimulation was delivered in

bipolar mode. The data was segmented into pre-stimulation and post-stimulation periods (the signal segment following the application of maximum current over a pair of channels, as illustrated in **Figure 3**).

Additionally, Notch biquad filters with a 4 Hz bandwidth were used to attenuate the 60 Hz hum noise. Visual inspection was conducted to identify and remove potential artifacts. From the cleaned signals, IEDs were extracted. The preprocessing and IED extraction steps are detailed in **Figure 4**.

2.5 IED extraction

The visual analysis of multi-channel and long-term intracranial recordings is time-intensive and prone to biases. Consequently, robust techniques and algorithms for automatic IED detection have been developed in recent years. In our study, we utilized the IED detection algorithm developed by Janca (Janca et al. 2015). This IED detection algorithm adaptively models the statistical distributions of the signal envelopes and distinguishes signals encompassing IEDs from those representing background activity. In the frequency spectrum, IEDs are identified by a local increase in energy, particularly within the 14.3–50 Hz frequency range. Consequently, each contact underwent zero-phase filtering within a 10–60 Hz band using a combination of lowpass and high-pass Chebyshev digital filters (type II, 8th order) incorporating stopband ripple. All analysis was performed in MATLAB Rb2022. This detector outperforms a well-established detector and human readers (Janca et al. 2015). It also has the capability of detecting low-amplitude IEDs, which are typically overlooked by neurophysiologists and may provide a significant source of clinical insights.

2.6 Optimizing SEEG analysis during stimulation: key considerations

Several factors should be taken into account when analyzing intracranial recordings. Firstly, SEEG recordings involve multiple electrodes, typically ranging from 12 to 18, with each electrode containing up to 15 contacts (typically 10). Some contacts might record signals from the same IED 'generators'. Consequently, bipolar channels with the highest concentration of IEDs are primary generators and other channels may exhibit propagated IEDs (Köksal-Ersöz et al. 2022). Secondly, there is a growing body of evidence indicating that high-frequency CS can lead to not only local but also remote activations (Barborica et al. 2022). In essence, high-frequency CS delivered via SEEG primarily influences the targeted area, yet it can also impact neighboring and interconnected brain regions. In this context, contacts within the SOZ are thought to be more fragile, making them highly sensitive to minor perturbations(Li et al. 2021b). Thus, small cortical stimulations elsewhere might indirectly influence SOZ due to this heightened sensitivity.

As a result, we detected IEDs not only in the channels subjected to stimulation but also in all other non-stimulated contacts. In the next step, we calculated the IED rate (number of IED/time(s)), and the IED

rate change (IED rate (after stimulation) – IED rate (before stimulation)). To maintain consistency across all patient datasets, we normalized the IED rate changes (IED rate change/ maximum IED rate change).

2.7 Statistical analysis

The delineation of SOZ and non-SOZ regions was achieved by considering various examination results and a comprehensive clinical interpretation (interictal and ictal SEEG recordings). These identified areas were subsequently validated in the selected patient cohort (as detailed in **Table 1**), where individuals achieved seizure freedom post-treatment. Consequently, each contact within the intracranial electrode array was categorized based on this classification. Our analytical approach involved conducting two distinct analyses, one focusing on contacts directly subjected to stimulation and the other on those not influenced by stimulation. To assess differences between the SOZ and non-SOZ groups, we employed the Mann-Whitney U test ($p < 0.001$). Furthermore, we utilized the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve methodology to determine an optimal threshold value for the bimodal classifier, facilitating the classification of SOZ and non-SOZ regions.

2.8 Labeling contacts

Initially, SOZ and non-SOZ were determined through examination results and supplementary clinical interpretation (interictal and ictal SEEG recordings) done by two epileptologists. These identifications were confirmed by the seizure-free outcomes of the patients after undergoing surgery or ablation.

3 Results

3.1 Example patient

We first discuss the results of a right-hand dominant patient diagnosed with focal epilepsy suspected to be of right temporal lobe origin. The patient was implanted with six pairs of electrodes targeting the left and right amygdala, insula, anterior hippocampus, posterior hippocampus, orbital frontal, and posterior cingulate.

Delivering stimulation over bipolar channels can cause different events depending on whether they are in the epileptogenic zone or the propagation zone. These events can include afterdischarges, electrical

events such as subclinical EEG seizures, electroclinical events such as stimulation-induced seizures, and no stimulation-induced events (normal) (Spilioti et al. 2020).

The patient underwent 12 stimulation trials across both hemispheres, starting with the least epileptogenic channels and progressing to the most epileptogenic ones. The degree of epileptogenicity was determined during pre-stimulation monitoring by quantifying the ictal discharges observed in those channels (**Table 3**).

The bipolar stimulation trials were conducted over the following channels: left insula channels 1 and 2, left insula channels 3 and 4, left posterior hippocampus channels 1 and 2, left posterior hippocampus channels 3 and 4, left anterior hippocampus channels 1 and 2, left anterior hippocampus channels 3 and 4, right insula channels 1 and 2, right insula channels 3 and 4, right amygdala channels 1 and 2, right insula channels 2 and 3, right anterior hippocampus channels 1 and 2 and finally, right posterior hippocampus channels 1 and 2.

As shown in **Table 3**, stimulating the epileptogenic and SOZ identified during intracranial monitoring led to the emergence of afterdischarges and seizures. The maximum current delivered was adjusted based on the responses observed after each stimulation trial.

Considering all the factors discussed in **section 2.6**, the rate of IEDs was computed following each stimulation trial, with its pattern of occurrence across all channels depicted in **Figure 5**.

Stimulating the SOZ and adjacent areas resulted in a marked increase in IED rates (**Figure 5**). This elevated IED rate is also evident when adjacent areas to the SOZ are stimulated, suggesting that the enhanced excitability of the SOZ extends to neighbouring regions. By utilizing the cumulative number of IEDs recorded after each stimulation trial, we constructed an epileptogenicity map of the brain (with the exclusion of noisy channels) (**Figure 6**). Stimulation of regions that produced a lower number of IEDs did not trigger seizures. In contrast, stimulation of areas with the highest IED counts during the session induced seizures and afterdischarges. In this patient, the right amygdala and hippocampus exhibited significant epileptogenicity, producing IEDs and seizures. These findings indicate that the epileptogenic network involves the right mesial temporal region, including the amygdala and hippocampus, which also generated the highest number of IEDs during the stimulation session.

3.2 Results (all patients)

3.2.1 Effect of CS at the site of stimulation

To maintain consistency in results across all 30 patients, we calculated the normalized absolute change in IED rates for each contact point. This method allowed us to standardize the data, ensuring reliable comparisons of IED changes across various patients and stimulation sites. As previously mentioned, these patients were seizure-free post-surgery, enabling us to delineate SOZ and non-SOZs based on clinical assessments and surgical outcomes. The changes in IEDs' activity at the stimulation sites are shown in **Figure 7**. The x-axis shows the normalized absolute change in IED rate, which is a measure of how much the rate changed relative to pre-stimulation (it has been normalized to the highest change for each patient). The y-axis shows the population density of the recordings per value. Green bars represent changes in IEDs at the SOZ after SOZ stimulation and the purple bars represent changes in IEDs at non-SOZ regions after non-SOZ stimulation. The analysis demonstrated a statistically significant difference in CS-evoked IEDs between SOZ and non-SOZ regions (Mann-Whitney U test, $p < 0.001$).

To develop our quantitative method for SOZ identification, we employed a ROC curve to determine an optimal threshold value for a bimodal classifier. The red dashed line indicates a threshold value, which is used to classify recordings into SOZ or non-SOZ. The high population density of the purple bar indicates that a significant number of non-SOZ regions experienced minimal changes in IED rate activity following stimulation. A specificity of 0.97 indicates a high true negative rate and a sensitivity of 0.94 indicates a high true positive rate. Area under the curve of 0.98, suggests high discrimination between SOZ and non-SOZ based on IED rate change. This suggests that non-SOZ areas typically have less excitability or response to stimulation compared to SOZ regions, which aligns with the expected behavior where SOZ regions are more responsive to stimulation due to their epileptogenic nature.

3.3.2 Effect of stimulation at non-stimulated areas

Next, we determined changes in IED rates in non-stimulated areas. The analysis indicates a significant difference in IED rate changes between SOZ and non-SOZ regions (Mann-Whitney U test, p-value < 0.001). Similar to the stimulation site analysis, we utilized an ROC curve to establish a threshold for SOZ identification. To manifest a clear distinction between SOZ and non-SOZ, the logarithmic presentation of **Figure 8** is shown in **Figure 9**.

To improve the specificity and sensitivity of the bimodal classifier in our study, we focused on the highest change evoked at each contact following stimulation, rather than examining all recordings in non-stimulated regions. **Figure 10** shows the highest change at each contact in the areas that were not stimulated.

The results indicate an increase in the rate of IEDs at the SOZ, even in regions that were not directly stimulated. This demonstrates that the effect of stimulation extends beyond the immediate site of stimulation.

4 Discussion

This study investigated the effect of 50 Hz stimulation on IEDs during extra-operative intracortical stimulation, aiming to enhance the accuracy of SOZ localization. More specifically, the effect of stimulation both at the site of stimulation and non-stimulated areas was studied to monitor IED activity patterns across individual patients, localizing activated regions following stimulation. By selectively targeting specific brain regions, distinct patterns of epileptic activity were elicited. Response variability across patients underscored the heterogeneity of epileptogenic networks and highlighted the importance of personalized treatment approaches in epilepsy management. Our study revealed a significant change in IEDs at the SOZ following stimulation, even in regions not directly stimulated. This stimulation-induced activity emerged as a reliable biomarker for identifying epileptogenic zones.

The observed increase in the rate of IEDs following CS can be attributed to several underlying mechanisms. Stimulation induces depolarization of neurons in proximity to the stimulation sites, leading to an increased likelihood of synchronous firing. This phenomenon, known as depolarization block, results from the accumulation of sodium ions within neurons, causing a transient suppression of neuronal activity followed by a period of hyperexcitability (Călin et al. 2021). Furthermore, CS may alter the balance of excitatory and inhibitory neurotransmission, potentially leading to an overall increase in neuronal excitability within the stimulated region (Benali et al. 2011). The differential response of channels in SOZ and non-SOZ to CS underscores the underlying pathophysiological distinctions between these regions. In SOZ, the neural circuitry is characterized by a lower threshold for synchronized neuronal firing, likely due to an imbalance between excitatory and inhibitory inputs(Li et al. 2021a). CS may disrupt this delicate balance, leading to an increase in IED frequency. Conversely, in non-epileptogenic zones, the inhibitory mechanisms are more effective in suppressing abnormal neuronal firing, resulting in a comparatively muted response to CS (Kobayashi et al., 2021).

The study's findings align with the existing body of literature that highlights the intricate interplay between stimulation and neural network activation (Matsumoto et al. 2007; Trébuchon and Chauvel 2016; Matsumoto et al. 2017; Lundstrom et al. 2019; Guo et al. 2020; Kobayashi et al. 2021; Alcala-Zermeno et al. 2023). It is well-established that IEDs arise from the aberrant synchronization of neuronal populations, often driven by local excitatory-inhibitory imbalances. CS, acting as an external perturbation, further modulates this delicate network, potentially exacerbating the generation and propagation of IEDs. The

observed increase in IEDs following CS in the channels where seizures were triggered provides empirical evidence of this phenomenon.

Our study provides valuable insights into the clinical utility of CS for probing excitation in epilepsy. Nevertheless, in most conditions, stimulation techniques have been utilized to inhibit epileptic seizures (Kinoshita et al. 2004; Kinoshita et al. 2005; Jobst et al. 2010; Nakatani et al. 2020; Chiang et al. 2021; Alcala-Zermeno et al. 2023). Due to the paradoxical association of excessive or increased activity of interneuron and synchronized GABA-mediated inhibitory postsynaptic potentials with seizure generation, the reciprocal impacts of CS can be elucidated by considering the degree to which GABA-mediated modulation is involved (Nakatani et al. 2020).

4.1 Limitations and Future Directions

Standardized stimulation parameters and protocols at our institution ensured consistency across patients, enhancing the reliability and reproducibility of our findings. However, our study is not without limitations. The results may have limited generalizability due to the study's single-site design and the relatively small number of patients included. Future studies with larger cohorts and multi-center collaborations are warranted to validate the findings and further elucidate the role of stimulation on IEDs in SOZ localization. A long-term follow-up study is necessary to assess the durability of surgical outcomes and the risk of seizure recurrence.

Additionally, the number of electrodes implanted and the implantation areas varied across patients, as did the stimulation areas. This inconsistency prevented us from performing a structure-based analysis applicable to all patients. Furthermore, the pathology of epilepsy can influence biomarkers in intracranial electroencephalography data. The specific characteristics and patterns of epileptic activity detected in SEEG can differ based on the underlying pathology causing the epilepsy. Our cohort included patients with diverse pathologies and epilepsy types, therefore, future studies with larger sample sizes focusing on each specific pathology and epilepsy type are necessary to validate and extend our results.

4.2 Significance

Our results, derived from a single session of stimulation, revealed information comparable to that obtained from intracranial monitoring conducted over several days, as well as from other established modalities for SOZ identification. This finding underscores the critical importance of data gleaned from stimulation sessions. Such efficiency not only reduces the time required for effective diagnosis but also minimizes the risks and discomforts associated with prolonged invasive monitoring.

The ability to rely on stimulation-based information is particularly vital in scenarios where ictal activity does not occur during presurgical monitoring. Additionally, it becomes crucial when prolonged patient hospitalization is infeasible due to infection risks or other medical complications. In such cases, the efficiency of single-session stimulation in providing critical diagnostic information ensures that patients receive timely and accurate evaluations without the need for extended and potentially hazardous monitoring periods.

From another perspective, controlled stimulation sessions facilitate the study of connected neural pathways via tracking generation and propagation patterns of stimulation-induced IEDs, enabling the identification of fragile and highly interconnected nodes. This capability is pivotal for advancing our understanding of neural network dynamics and pathophysiology.

In certain instances, it is challenging to evoke patients' typical seizures due to specific limitations of the patient's condition. Consequently, stimulation may need to be limited to language mapping while avoiding areas that might evoke seizures. Therefore, monitoring the effect of stimulation on interictal phenomena can be critical.

4.3 Conclusions

In summary, this research illustrated the excitatory effects of the high-frequency intracortical stimulation at the SOZ, evidenced by an increase in the rate of IEDs, which suggests that stimulation-induced IEDs can be used as a biomarker to identify the SOZ. The study indicates that stimulation via SEEG can potentially evoke cortical excitability, enhancing excitation while decreasing inhibition. These findings suggest that tracking changes in IEDs post-stimulation may help in identifying the optimal stimulation parameters in therapies for DRE patients. Our study underscores the transformative potential of high-frequency CS in the management of drug-resistant epilepsy, leading to personalized and tailored treatment strategies and subsequently improved patient outcomes. By leveraging advanced neurophysiological techniques and computational approaches, we can unravel the complex dynamics of epileptogenic networks and develop targeted interventions tailored to each patient's unique pathophysiology.

Figures



Figure 1. Patients' flowchart



Figure 2. Biphasic stimulation mode



Figure 3. Analyzed segment.



Figure 4. Preprocessing Pipeline



Figure 5. IED generation pattern over all channels after each stimulation trial. RPHc: right posterior hippocampus; RAHc: right anterior hippocampus; RIn: right insula; RAm: right amygdala; LAHc: left anterior hippocampus; LPHc: left posterior hippocampus; LPIn: left insula.



Figure 6. Epileptogenicity map based on the total number of IEDs. IED: Interictal epileptiform discharges. IED: interictal epileptiform discharges; RPHc: right posterior hippocampus; RAHc: right anterior hippocampus; RIn: right insula; RAm: right amygdala; LAHc: left anterior hippocampus; LPHc: left posterior hippocampus; LPIn: left insula; RPCg: right posterior cingulate; ROFr: right orbitofrontal; LOFr: left orbitofrontal.



Figure 7. The effect of stimulation at the SOZ and non-SOZ (site of stimulation).

A significant difference between the two groups (Mann-Whitney U test, p-value <0.001).

Threshold value: 0.2 (ROC). Specificity: 0.97. Sensitivity: 0.94. AUC: 0.98. IED: Interictal epileptiform discharges; SOZ: Seizure onset zone; non-SOZ: non-seizure onset zone.



Figure 8. The effect of stimulation at non-stimulated areas.

A significant difference between the two groups (Mann-Whitney U test, p-value <0.001).

Threshold value: 0.05 (ROC). Specificity: 0.73. Sensitivity: 0.57. AUC: 0.71. IED: Interictal epileptiform discharges; SOZ: Seizure onset zone; non-SOZ: non-seizure onset zone.



Figure 9. The logarithmic presentation of **Figure 9**. IED: Interictal epileptiform discharges; SOZ: Seizure onset zone; non-SOZ: non-seizure onset zone.



Figure 10. The effect of stimulation at non-stimulated areas (highest changes). A significant difference between the two groups (Mann-Whitney U test, p-value <0.001). Threshold value: 0.36 (ROC). Specificity: 0.98. Sensitivity: 1. AUC: 0.99. IED: Interictal epileptiform discharges; SOZ: Seizure onset zone; non-SOZ: non-seizure onset zone.

Tables

Table 1. Patient profile

Nu	Nu. of elect	Nu. Stim trial	Diagnosis	Pathology
1	10	11	Lt TLE	HS
2	8	17	Rt MTLE	NS
3	13	26	Lt TLE	RG
4	8	42	Lt MTLE	RG
5	11	36	Lt TLE	NO
6	9	21	Lt OLE/TLE	RG
7	10	59	Lt FLE/ TLE	MTS
8	12	8	Lt TLE	NO
9	7	11	Lt MTLE	NO
10	11	8	Lt TLE	MTS
11	12	29	Rt FLE	FCD
12	19	11	Rt MFLE	NO
13	8	24	Rt FLE	FCD
14	9	2	Rt MTLE	MTS
15	10	1	Rt TLE	RG
16	14	10	Rt TLE	NO
17	8	40	Rt TLE	HS
18	13	64	Lt FLE	NO
19	10	50	Rt TLE	RG
20	14	24	Rt TLE	NS
21	9	28	Rt FLE	NO
22	16	24	Lt ILE	NO
23	13	36	Lt OLE	FCD
24	8	6	Rt FLE	NS
25	8	10	Lt MTLE	NO
26	8	31	Rt MTLE	MTS
27	15	21	Rt FLE	NS
28	14	24	Lt MTLE	MTS
29	9	23	Lt MTLE	MTS
30	12	12	Rt TLE	MTS

Lt: Left, Rt: Right, TLE: Temporal lobe epilepsy, MTLE: Mesial temporal lobe epilepsy, OLE: Occipital lobe epilepsy, FLE: Frontal lobe epilepsy, HS: Hippocampal sclerosis, RG: Reactive gliosis, MTS: Mesial temporal sclerosis, ILE: Insular lobe epilepsy, FCD: Focal cortical dysplasia, NS: Nonspecific changes, NO: No information

Table 2. Stimulation Parameters

Parameters for High Frequency	
Stimulation Mode	Bipolar
Stimulation Frequency	50 Hz
Current	1–8 mA
Stimulation Time	5 s
Inter Stimulation Interval	≥10 s
Pulse Width	300 μs

Table 2. Stimulation trials

Trial	Channels	Current	Event
1	LIn 1-2	1-6 mA	Normal
2	LIn 3-4	1-6 mA	Normal
3	LPHc 1-2	1-6 mA	Normal
4	LPHc 3-4	1-6 mA	Normal
5	LAHc 1-2	1-6 mA	Afterdischarges
6	LAHc 3-4	1-6 mA	Normal
7	RIn 1-2	1-4 mA	Normal
8	RIn 3-4	1-4 mA	Afterdischarges
9	RAm 1-2	1-3 mA	Seizure
10	RIn 2-3	1-5 mA	Afterdischarges
11	RAHc 1-2	1-4 mA	Seizure
12	RPHc 1-2	1-4 mA	Afterdischarges

References

Alcala-Zermeno, J.L., Starnes, K., Gregg, N.M., Worrell, G. and Lundstrom, B.N. 2023. Responsive neurostimulation with low-frequency stimulation. *Epilepsia* 64(2), pp. e16–e22. doi: 10.1111/epi.17467.

Barborica, A. et al. 2022. Imaging the effective networks associated with cortical function through intracranial high-frequency stimulation. *Human Brain Mapping* 43(5), pp. 1657–1675. doi: 10.1002/hbm.25749.

Baumgartner, C., Koren, J.P., Britto-Arias, M., Zoche, L. and Pirker, S. 2019. Presurgical epilepsy evaluation and epilepsy surgery [version 1; peer review: 2 approved]. *F1000Research* 8. doi: 10.12688/f1000research.17714.1.

Benali, A. et al. 2011. Theta-burst transcranial magnetic stimulation alters cortical inhibition. *Journal of Neuroscience* 31(4), pp. 1193–1203. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1379-10.2011.

Blume, W.T., Jones, D.C. and Pathak, P. 2004. Properties of after-discharges from cortical electrical stimulation in focal epilepsies. *Clinical Neurophysiology* 115(4), pp. 982–989. doi: 10.1016/j.clinph.2003.11.023.

Călin, A., Ilie, A.S. and Akerman, C.J. 2021. Disrupting epileptiform activity by preventing parvalbumin interneuron depolarization block. *Journal of Neuroscience* 41(45), pp. 9452–9465. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1002-20.2021.

Chiang, S., Khambhati, A.N., Wang, E.T., Vannucci, M., Chang, E.F. and Rao, V.R. 2021. Evidence of state-dependence in the effectiveness of responsive neurostimulation for seizure modulation. *Brain Stimulation* 14(2), pp. 366–375. doi: 10.1016/j.brs.2021.01.023.

Engel, J. et al. 2013. Epilepsy biomarkers. *Epilepsia* 54(SUPPL.4), pp. 61–69. doi: 10.1111/epi.12299.

Ezzyat, Y. and Suthana, N. [no date]. *Brain Stimulation*.

Fisher, R.S. et al. 2014. ILAE Official Report: A practical clinical definition of epilepsy. *Epilepsia* 55(4), pp. 475–482. doi: 10.1111/epi.12550.

Guery, D. and Rheims, S. 2021. Clinical management of drug resistant epilepsy: A review on current strategies. *Neuropsychiatric Disease and Treatment* 17, pp. 2229–2242. doi: 10.2147/NDT.S256699.

Guo, Z. hao et al. 2020. Epileptogenic network of focal epilepsies mapped with cortico-cortical evoked potentials. *Clinical Neurophysiology* 131(11), pp. 2657–2666. doi: 10.1016/j.clinph.2020.08.012.

Janca, R. et al. 2015. Detection of Interictal Epileptiform Discharges Using Signal Envelope Distribution Modelling: Application to Epileptic and Non-Epileptic Intracranial Recordings. *Brain Topography* 28(1), pp. 172–183. doi: 10.1007/s10548-014-0379-1.

Jobst, B.C., Darcey, T.M., Thadani, V.M. and Roberts, D.W. 2010. Brain stimulation for the treatment of epilepsy. In: *Epilepsia*. pp. 88–92. doi: 10.1111/j.1528-1167.2010.02618.x.

Kinoshita, M. et al. 2004. Electric stimulation on human cortex suppresses fast cortical activity and epileptic spikes. *Epilepsia* 45(7), pp. 787–791. doi: 10.1111/j.0013-9580.2004.60203.x.

Kinoshita, M. et al. 2005. Electric cortical stimulation suppresses epileptic and background activities in neocortical epilepsy and mesial temporal lobe epilepsy. *Clinical Neurophysiology* 116(6), pp. 1291–1299. doi: 10.1016/j.clinph.2005.02.010.

Kobayashi, K. et al. 2021. Cortico-cortical evoked potential by single-pulse electrical stimulation is a generally safe procedure. *Clinical Neurophysiology* 132(5), pp. 1033–1040. doi: 10.1016/j.clinph.2020.12.022.

Köksal-Ersöz, E. et al. 2022. Signal processing and computational modeling for interpretation of SEEG-recorded interictal epileptiform discharges in epileptogenic and non-epileptogenic zones. *Journal of Neural Engineering* 19(5). doi: 10.1088/1741-2552/ac8fb4.

Li, A. et al. 2021a. Neural fragility as an EEG marker of the seizure onset zone. *Nature Neuroscience* 24(10), pp. 1465–1474. doi: 10.1038/s41593-021-00901-w.

Li, A. et al. 2021b. Neural Fragility of the Intracranial EEG Network Decreases after Surgical Resection of the Epileptogenic Zone. Available at: http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2021.07.07.21259385.

Lundstrom, B.N., Gompel, J. Van, Khadjevand, F., Worrell, G. and Stead, M. 2019. Chronic subthreshold cortical stimulation and stimulation-related EEG biomarkers for focal epilepsy. *Brain Communications* 1(1). doi: 10.1093/braincomms/fcz010.

Makhalova, J. et al. 2023. The role of quantitative markers in surgical prognostication after stereoelectroencephalography. *Annals of Clinical and Translational Neurology* 10(11), pp. 2114–2126. doi: 10.1002/acn3.51900.

Marti, A.S. et al. 2022. Extraoperative electrical stimulation mapping in epilepsy presurgical evaluation: a proposal and review of the literature. *Clinical Neurology and Neurosurgery* 214. doi: 10.1016/j.clineuro.2022.107170.

Matsumoto, R., Kunieda, T. and Nair, D. 2017. Single pulse electrical stimulation to probe functional and pathological connectivity in epilepsy. *Seizure* 44, pp. 27–36. doi: 10.1016/j.seizure.2016.11.003.

Matsumoto, R., Nair, D.R., LaPresto, E., Bingaman, W., Shibasaki, H. and Lüders, H.O. 2007. Functional connectivity in human cortical motor system: A cortico-cortical evoked potential study. *Brain* 130(1), pp. 181–197. doi: 10.1093/brain/awl257.

Nakatani, M. et al. 2020. Electrical cortical stimulations modulate spike and post-spike slow-related high-frequency activities in human epileptic foci. *Clinical Neurophysiology* 131(8), pp. 1741–1754. doi: 10.1016/j.clinph.2020.03.042.

Rosenow, F. and Lüders, H. 2001. *Presurgical evaluation of epilepsy*.

Smith, G. and Stacey, W.C. 2021. The accuracy of quantitative EEG biomarker algorithms depends upon seizure onset dynamics. *Epilepsy Research* 176. doi: 10.1016/j.eplepsyres.2021.106702.

Spilioti, M., Winston, J.S., Centeno, M., Scott, C., Chowdhury, F. and Diehl, B. 2020. The nature, frequency and value of stimulation induced seizures during extraoperative cortical stimulation for functional mapping. *Seizure* 81, pp. 71–75. doi: 10.1016/j.seizure.2020.07.027.

Staba, R.J., Stead, M. and Worrell, G.A. 2014. Electrophysiological Biomarkers of Epilepsy. *Neurotherapeutics* 11(2), pp. 334–346. doi: 10.1007/s13311-014-0259-0.

Trébuchon, A. and Chauvel, P. 2016. Electrical Stimulation for Seizure Induction and Functional Mapping in Stereoelectroencephalography. *Journal of Clinical Neurophysiology* 33(6), pp. 511–521. doi: 10.1097/WNP.0000000000000313.