Title: Efficiency and efficacy of sensing-monopolar recordings from the subthalamic nucleus in Parkinson's disease at initial programming: a comparison to traditional methodology

Authors: John A. Thompson, PhD[1,2,3*], Erin M. Radcliffe, BS[1,4*], Steven Ojemann, MD[1,2], Daniel R. Kramer, MD[1], Pamela David-Gerecht, PhD[1], Michelle Case, PhD[5], Caleb Zarns, BS[5], Abbey Holt-Becker, PhD[5], Robert S. Raike, PhD[5], Alexander J. Baumgartner, MD[1,2], Drew S. Kern, MD[1,2]

Authors:
[1]University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Department of Neurosurgery
[2]University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Department of Neurology
[3]University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Department of Psychiatry
[4]University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Department of Bioengineering
[5]Medtronic, Inc., Neuromodulation
*Co-first authors made equal contributions to the work

Running title: DBS monopolar sensing for programming

Total Word Count: 3670
Abstract Word: 249
Movement Disorders
Type: Original Research

Corresponding Author:
John A. Thompson PhD
Associate Professor
Departments of Neurosurgery, Psychiatry and Neurology
University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus
Research Complex II, Rm 5119
12700 E 19th Ave, Aurora, Co 80045 | Mail Stop 8601
E: john.a.thompson@cuanschutz.edu
P: 303.724.8581

Abstract

Background: Optimizing deep brain stimulation (DBS) in Parkinson's disease (PD) requires a complex process for evaluating clinical benefit and adverse effects. Localizing the contact with maximum beta (13-30Hz) power using a novel in-clinic sensing-monopolar (SenseMP) recording may improve the efficiency of selecting clinically optimal DBS settings.

Objective: Compare the clinical outcomes of optimal programming settings determined by SenseMP versus standard-of-care monopolar review (ReviewMP) for DBS therapy in PD.

Methods: Ten PD patients (4F/6M, post-diagnosis = 9.2 ± 3.5 years; on/off percent change = 43.7 ± 14.0) with bilateral subthalamic nucleus (STN) DBS were recruited. Independent evaluation of unilateral STN DBS was assessed with both SenseMP to identify the DBS contact detecting maximum beta peak power and ReviewMP. MDS-UPDRS Part III assessments for unilateral symptoms were compared between SenseMP and ReviewMP, and the time to complete these two conditions was recorded.

Results: Change from baseline in overall clinical outcomes did not differ between conditions (SenseMP = 60.5%, ReviewMP = 60.1% (p = 0.85); 19 hemispheres), nor were there differences in sub-analysis for bradykinesia, rigidity, and tremor. Using SenseMP to identify and conduct single contact ReivewMP was more time efficient than ReviewMP: 16.3 ± 3.6 minutes vs. 124.3 ± 23.1 minutes (p = 5.46e-15). SenseMP identified the maximum beta contact in SenseBP pairs at a specific level (17/20 times).

Conclusion: This study demonstrates that SenseMP localization of maximum beta peak power for DBS contact selection provides equivalent clinical efficacy to ReviewMP at a fraction of the required time.

Introduction

Deep Brain Stimulation (DBS) of the subthalamic nucleus (STN) is a neurosurgical treatment option for Parkinson's Disease (PD) complicated by motor fluctuations, bothersome dyskinesias, and/or pharmacological-resistant tremor[1-5]. Optimal DBS targeting and subsequent programming within the sensorimotor region of the STN effectively attenuates cardinal PD motor symptoms and enables reduced medication dosages[6-10]. Although recent advances in DBS electrode design have enabled independent contact control and directional field steering, the increased complexity and flexibility of these designs create multiple degrees of freedom, decreasing the efficiency of standard programming protocols[11-16]. Given the increased time demands and challenges presented by this expanding parameter space, efficient and objective strategies for DBS contact selection and programming, guided by neuroimaging, kinematic assessments, computational tools, and electrophysiological biomarkers, are under development and aimed toward delivering patient-centered therapy within a feasible clinical workflow. Several studies support the use of LFP features, specifically within the beta range (13-30 Hz), as potential biomarkers for guiding DBS programming in PD, but lack an intuitive process to select final stimulation contact due to sensing configurations available on implanted devices today[17,18].

Current clinical-commercial tools permit spectral analysis of LFP features present in power spectral densities (PSDs). However, systematic strategies for quantifying and interpreting this data have not been standardized[19-21]. Available implementations use bipolar sensing (SenseBP) montages to determine the optimal DBS contact through meticulous comparison of maximal beta peak amplitudes present in LFP PSDs[19-21]. However, determining the largest peak amplitude differential between contact pairs is reliant on trial and error and requires expertise in interpreting computed measurements[12,18,19]. Furthermore, SenseBP configurations do not clarify which contact within or between a selected contact pair detects the maximal beta peak, complicating clinical interpretability.

115 In this study, we utilized an investigational Percept™ SP Advanced Sense research system to
116 enable a monopolar sensing (SenseMP) configuration for collecting LFP data. The contact
117 segment that detected the greatest beta peak power based on SenseMP was then clinically
118 programmed. Assessments of beta power measurements for each possible contact
119 configuration (segment and level) were determined for SenseMP and for SenseBP pairs.
120 Thereafter, standard-of-care monopolar review (ReviewMP) was performed. We then
121 compared the time required and clinical outcomes of SenseMP versus ReviewMP.



Figure 1: Workflow diagram of the study design

122

Methods

Subject Information

Our study was carried out in accordance with the Colorado Multiple Institution Review Board (COMIRB # 21-4938) and the Declaration of Helsinki, with written informed consent obtained from all study participants. Patients were recruited from the University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Advanced Therapies in Movement Disorders program. All PD subjects

Subject	Sex (F/M)	Age [1]	Disease Duration[1]	LEDD	MDS-UPDRS-III OFF/ON*	Duration[2]: Surgery to SV1	Duration[2]: SV1 to SV2
1	F	60's	8	715	30/15	42	2
2	F	50's	11	1860	44/21	28	1
3	F	50's	8	1097	47/33	41	1
4	M	60's	8	1198	31/9	34	1
5	M	60's	13	1460	47/39	20	1
6	M	60's	12	1454	48/24	25	7
7	M	40's	16	1863	49/30	34	1
8	F	70's	4	854	57/28	27	5
9	M	60's	6	1053	28/16	22	1
10	M	60's	6	969	49/32	40	3
MEAN	**4/6**	**61.4**	**9.20**	**1252**	**43/24.7**	**31.30**	**2.3**
STD	**-**	**6.69**	**3.71**	**397.2**	**9.8/9.4**	**8.04**	**2.11**

F: female, M: male, 1: in years, LEDD: levodopa equivalent daily dose, * pre-operative "ON" as being on medication and "OFF" as after at least 12 hours of withholding from medication, 2: in days, SV1: study visit 1, SV2 study visit 2, STD: standard deviation.

underwent a standardized evaluation process for DBS candidacy and had at least a score of 2 or greater for any item assessing upper limb bradykinesia (items 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8) and rigidity (item 3.3) of the Movement Disorder Society Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (MDS-UPDRS) Part III in the off-medication state [22]. Subsequently, subjects were implanted bilaterally into the STN with the Medtronic SenSight™ B33005 directional DBS leads connected to the Percept™ PC implantable neurostimulator with BrainSense™. The B33005 DBS lead consists of four levels (termed 0, 1, 2, and 3) with 0.5mm vertical spacing, and the middle two levels are segmented into thirds (1a, 1b, 1c and 2a, 2b, 2c). A contact ring (i.e., 0, 3 or summation of a middle contact arrangement (e.g., 1a, 1b, and 1c)) is termed "level," and an independent contact (e.g., 1a) is termed "segment". The surgical procedure has been previously described[23].

139

140 *Study Workflow*

141

142

143 For each session, subjects withheld dopaminergic medication for at least 12 hours prior to the
144 study visit. The following workflow was used for each session and is similar in design to
145 previous work (Figure 1)[19]. In the -medication/OFF-stimulation condition (baseline) with the
146 subject seated, eyes open and resting, a SenseMP recording was conducted for all levels (N=4)
147 and segments (N=6) of the DBS lead. The investigational-use Percept™ SP Advanced Sense
148 research system was used to collect LFP data to enable the SenseMP configuration. This
149 investigational system enabled collection of LFP data using the novel monopolar sensing
150 configuration, the Percept™ SP Advanced Sense research system takes measurements between
151 the electrode being sensed on the implanted DBS lead to a common reference electrode on the
152 other implanted DBS lead. This enables isolation of activity from a single contact or set of
153 contacts for SenseMP recordings. The implanted neurostimulator maintained standard
154 commercial operation, and stimulation was turned off and not affected while using the
155 research system. LFP data were collected from one hemisphere per session. A sensing montage
156 that iterated through 5 predetermined configurations (SenseMP Segment, SenseMP Level,
157 SenseBP Segment Set 1, SenseBP Segment Set 2, SenseBP Level) was performed to wirelessly
158 stream LFP data at 250Hz for 55 seconds per recording. All recordings passed through two low-
159 pass filters set to 100 Hz and two high-pass filters set to 1 Hz (for both bipolar and monopolar
160 contact configurations). We collected all possible monopolar configuration recordings (levels =
161 4, segments = 6, total configurations = 10) and all possible bipolar configurations (n = 15;
162 bipolar configurations are available on commercial systems). Three trials of each montage were
163 collected to account for variability. The contact level and segment identity, maximum beta peak
164 amplitude, and the frequency of the maximum beta peak were noted for each hemisphere. The
165 contact with the maximum beta peak determined by SenseMP was used for comparison to the
166 contact(s) identified by standard of care monopolar review (ReviewMP).

167

168 Subsequently, a traditional ReviewMP of all DBS levels (n=4) and segments (n=6) was
169 performed by a movement disorders neurologist (examiner) blinded to the outcomes of the
170 montage recordings[19]. Briefly, pulse width (60 μs) and frequency (125Hz) were maintained
171 while amplitude was increased by 0.2 mA increments up to 5mA or until stimulation-induced
172 adverse effects were observed. All side effects were recorded, including transient (those that
173 resolved within 1 min) and persistent (those that lasted >1 min or included muscle
174 contractions). Clinical benefit was determined by improvement in wrist and elbow rigidity.
175 Upon completion, the clinician selected the contact(s), either the level or segment, that
176 predominately had the greatest therapeutic window (TW), defined as the difference in DBS
177 amplitude thresholds for initial clinical benefit and stimulation-induced adverse effects.
178
179 The total duration required to complete sensing (SenseMP and SenseBP) and ReviewMP were
180 determined as follows: Recording of time was initiated for sensing once the research telemetry
181 communicator was positioned over the neurostimulator and stopped upon verification of
182 collection of all data at the conclusion of the third sensing research recording. For ReviewMP,
183 recording of time was initiated upon placement of the clinical telemetry communicator and
184 stopped at the end of testing the final contact. To determine the estimated time required to
185 conduct the ReviewMP of the SenseMP identified contact, we used the following calculation.
186 We estimated the total time per individual ReviewMP test (i.e., 0.2mA for 1ABC), by dividing
187 the total time required for ReviewMP by the number of individual amplitude tests. Then, with
188 the identified SenseMP contact, we computed the total duration for ReviewMP of that contact
189 (i.e., all amplitude tests for 1A), by multiplying the individual ReviewMP test time by the
190 number of amplitude tests for the identified contact. To this ReviewMP duration, we added the
191 time required to evaluate SenseMP Level and SenseMP Segment (55 seconds x2). This value
192 was compared to the total ReviewMP duration (Figure 2A).
193
194 Clinical outcomes were compared between SenseMP and ReviewMP contact configurations
195 based on random condition presentation and double blinding of the examiner and subject.
196 Furthermore, the examiner was not present during the acclimation of each condition to

197 minimize unblinding. The DBS amplitude for each condition was set at -0.2mA from the
198 stimulation-induced adverse effect or up to 4.8mA based on ReviewMP assessment. Following
199 a ~2-minute wash-in phase, the examiner performed a unilateral MDS-UPDRS of the following
200 items: wrist, elbow, ankle, and knee rigidity (item 3.3), bradykinesia (items 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7,
201 3.8), and tremor (items 3.15, 3.16, 3.17, and 3.18). Between conditions, stimulation was turned
202 off, and the subject was assessed until a return to clinical baseline in the OFF-medication/OFF-
203 stimulation state was confirmed by the examiner. Upon return to baseline, the examiner left
204 the room to allow for acclimation to the second condition, and then the steps described above
205 were then repeated. If the SenseMP and ReviewMP resulted in identical contact selection, then
206 only one clinical assessment was performed, and the examiner was not notified until exiting the
207 room. At the conclusion of both assessments, the blinded clinician selected the optimal
208 configuration based upon clinical examination. To quantify the percent difference between
209 each condition and the baseline OFF-medication / OFF-stimulation state at the beginning of the
210 session, the following equation was used: (ABS(OFF-stimulation – ON-stimulation)/OFF-
211 stimulation)*100. For the final clinical comparison, 19 out of 20 hemispheres were evaluated.
212 For one hemisphere (4L), annotation error led to the incorrect selection of the contact with the
213 maximum beta power for MDS-UPDRS comparison.
214
215 *Assessment of segment orientation*
216 Medtronic SureTune™ 4 imaging software was used to perform DBS lead orientation analysis.
217 Each subject had pre-operative anatomical imaging, including MRI T1 and T2 weighted, and a
218 post-operative CT scan performed within 24 hours post-implant, as part of standard-of-care for
219 DBS surgery. All images were imported into SureTune™ 4, and pre-operative MRI and post-
220 operative CT images were fused to identify the anatomical location of the DBS lead. The
221 Medtronic SenSight™ DBS lead has unique orientation markers that allow for automatic
222 orientation of the lead enabled by SureTune™ 4 software. The anatomical direction for each
223 segmented electrode was viewed from an axial slice and was recorded. The anatomical
224 directions included lateral, medial, anterior, and posterior.
225

226 *Statistical Analysis*

227 All statistical tests were conducted using MATLAB (v2024a). Mean differences in duration
228 between SenseMP and ReviewMP were tested using a two-sided paired t-test (alpha = 0.05).
229 Mean differences between MDS-UPDRS Part III total sub-scores were tested with an ANOVA,
230 and individual sub-scores for rigidity, bradykinesia, and tremor were compared between
231 conditions using Tukey's HSD post-hoc pairwise comparisons. Level representation and
232 segmented contact orientation differences between SenseMP and
233 ReviewMP were compared using a Chi-Square test for independence. Within-subject
234 hemispheric differences between SenseMP-determined maximum beta peak amplitudes and
235 frequencies were compared with a two-sided paired t-test. All count comparisons for SenseMP-
236 segment, SenseMP-level, SenseBP-segment, and SenseBP-level were conducted using Chi-
237 square goodness of fit assuming equal distributions as the null hypothesis.

238

239 **Results**

240 *Demographics*

241 Ten PD subjects (females = 4 / males = 6; 69.0 ± 4.5 years old at time of study; disease age of
242 onset: 61.4 ± 6.7; PD duration in years: 9.2 ± 3.5; mean ± standard deviation – throughout the
243 text, '±' will refer to the same descriptive statistics) participated in the study. Table 1
244 provides the demographics of the subjects. Sessions were conducted following lead
245 implantation surgery 18.2 ± 7.3 days post-implantable neurostimulator implant and 27.2 ± 6.3
246 days post-lead implant. Across subjects, sessions were separated by an average of 2.5 ± 2.5
247 days. Analysis was performed for both right and left hemispheres per subject for a total of 20
248 hemispheres.

249

250 *Within-subject comparisons of SenseMP beta parameters*

251 We previously described the variability of beta peak frequency and amplitude using the same
252 platform, excluding SenseMP[18]. Therefore, in the current study, we focused on SenseMP to
253 evaluate within-subject differences across trials. There was no difference in within-subject beta
254 peak frequency, amplitude, or contact determined by maximum beta power across three trials

(peak: $F(2,57) = 0.155$, $p = 0.85$; amplitude: $F(2,57) = 0.016$, $p = 0.98$; contact: $F(2,57) = 0.063$, $p = 0.93$). Analysis was therefore performed on resulting PSDs resulting from the average across the three recording samples.

Table 2 denotes subject and hemisphere-based observations of the beta peak frequency and power identified by SenseMP and the corresponding beta peak power of ReviewMP. No differences were observed between left and right hemispheres for the peak frequency at which the maximum beta power was derived (right Hz = 16.2 ± 2.22, left Hz = 16.9 ± 2.59; $t(9) = 1.07$, $p = 0.3$), or for the amplitude of the maximum beta microvolt peak (right µVp = 3.15 ± 2.46, left µVp = 3.09 ± 1.68); $t(9) = -0.101$, $p = 0.92$). The contact with the second-greatest beta peak was on the same level as the contact with the greatest beta peak in 17/20 cases. As an example, if 1c had the highest beta peak power measured on the segments, then the 1a or 1b segment had the second-highest beta peak. In 17/20 hemispheres, the SenseMP defined segment was on the level of the maximum beta peak. In the three hemispheres that differed, the level of the maximum beta peak was on the most ventral (2) or dorsal contact (1), which are not segmented. In these three cases, the SenseMP level with the second highest beta peak power was a segmented level and corresponded with the SenseMP segmented contact. In 19/20 hemispheres, SenseMP resulted in a segment contact. In all 19 cases that resulted in a segment contact, the SenseMP segment corresponded with the SenseMP level of segments (1abc or 2abc) that had the greatest beta power peak of only the segmented levels.

Subject	Hemisphere	Peak Freq (Hz)	Configuration	Contact	Peak Amp (μVp)	TW (mA)
1	Left	15.6	SenseMP	2a	6.1	3.6
			ReviewMP	2b	2.5	4.6
			Level	2abc	3.7	1.6
	Right	14.6	SenseMP	2b	4.1	4.4
			ReviewMP	2b	4.1	4.4
			Level	2abc	3.1	2.6
2	Left	21.5	SenseMP	2b	3.0	4.6
			ReviewMP	2abc	2.7	3.6
	Right	16.6	SenseMP	2b	2.7	4.2
			ReviewMP	2b	2.7	4.2
			Level	2abc	1.8	1.4
3	Left	13.7	SenseMP	1b	4.1	4.6
			ReviewMP	1b	4.1	4.6
			Level	1abc	4.1	3.4
	Right	13.7	SenseMP	1a	3.4	2.4
			ReviewMP	2b	1.6	4.4
			SMP Level	1abc	2.6	3.2
			RMP Level	2abc	1.9	3.2
4	Left	16.6	SenseMP	3	5.6	2.6
			ReviewMP	2a	3.6	4.2
			RMP Level	2abc	3.0	2.4
	Right	17.6	SenseMP	1b	8.9	3.4
			ReviewMP	1b	8.9	3.4
			Level	1abc	7.7	1.4
5	Left	16.6	SenseMP	1a	2.1	2.4
			ReviewMP	1abc	1.2	2.6
	Right	15.6	SenseMP	1a	1.4	1.8
			ReviewMP	1abc	1.1	2.0
6	Left	17.6	SenseMP	1c	0.9	3.6
			ReviewMP	2b	0.7	4.2
			SMP Level	1abc	0.7	4.6
			RMP Level	2abc	0.6	4.4
	Right	20.5	SenseMP	1c	0.7	4.8
			ReviewMP	1c	0.7	4.8
			Level	1abc	0.6	4.4
7	Left	16.6	SenseMP	2a	3.0	4.0
			ReviewMP	2c	1.6	4.6
			Level	2abc	2.1	2.6
	Right	14.6	SenseMP	2c	2.2	4.0
			ReviewMP	2b	1.2	4.8
			Level	2abc	1.5	2.0
8	Left	16.6	SenseMP	2c	2.2	4.4
			ReviewMP	2a	1.1	3.2
			Level	2abc	1.5	1.6
	Right	16.6	SenseMP	2a	5.2	3.0
			ReviewMP	3	1.1	3.8
			SMP Level	2abc	3.3	2.6
9	Left	20.5	SenseMP	2b	1.9	4.4
			ReviewMP	2abc	1.1	3.2
	Right	18.6	SenseMP	2c	1.3	4.6
			ReviewMP	2a	0.9	4.4
			Level	2abc	0.9	3.2

10	Left	13.7	SenseMP	2c	2.0	4.0
			ReviewMP	2abc	1.4	4.0
	Right	13.7	SenseMP	1c	1.6	4.6
			ReviewMP	2abc	1.2	4.6
			SMP Level	1abc	1.3	4.4

Freq: frequency, Amp: amplitude, TW: therapeutic window, Level: summed segmented contacts of the level when SenseMP and ReviewMP selected a contact on the same level, RMP Level: level of ReviewMP selected segmented contact when SenseMP and ReviewMP levels differed, SMP Level: level of SenseMP selected segmented contact when SenseMP and ReviewMP levels differed; When ReviewMP selected a full level and SenseMP and ReviewMP resulted on the equivalent level, only 2 contact configurations are reported (to remove redundancy between equivalent ReviewMP, SMP Level, and RMP Level parameters).

Efficiency differences between SenseMP and ReviewMP

To represent utilization of SenseMP in clinical practice, the duration to complete ReviewMP of the SenseMP identified contact(s) with maximal peak beta power (ReviewMP[1]) was compared to the duration of ReviewMP. Across subjects, the duration of SenseMP (single recording for both monopolar configurations; levels and segments) combined with the ReviewMP of the SenseMP identified contact was 16.3 ± 3.6 minutes. The total average duration for the ReviewMP was 124.3 ± 23.67 minutes across all patients. These durations were significantly different between conditions ($t(19) = 22.02$, p = 5.46e-15; Figure 2A). The duration to complete ReviewMP was of greater variability compared with sensing across all subjects, as evident in the differences in standard deviation.

Motor outcome measures between SenseMP and ReviewMP

Combined MDS-UPDRS sub-scores for rigidity, bradykinesia, and tremor were not significantly different between conditions ($t(18) = -0.10$, $p = 0.91$). A complementary analysis was conducted on the percent difference values derived for each condition compared to baseline using a paired t-test ($t(18) = 0.185$, $p = 0.85$; mean percent difference SenseMP = 60.5 ± 15.3 and ReviewMP = 60.1 ± 13.5). In addition, an ANOVA for condition by sub-score (Figure 2B) demonstrated a non-significant omnibus for condition ($F(1,108) = 0.002$, $p = 0.96$) and condition by sub-scale interaction ($F(2,108) = 0.12$, $p = 0.887$). Post-hoc Tukey HSD comparisons for the sub-scores demonstrated no differences between conditions (rigidity: $t(108) = -0.38$, $p = 0.99$

297 (Figure 2C); bradykinesia: $t(108) = 0.308$, $p = 1$ (Figure 2D); tremor: $t(108) = 1.43e\text{-}15$, $p = 1$

298 (Figure 2E)).



Figure 2: *A*) Total time (minutes) to complete ReviewMP (black circles) and sensing of monopolar and bipolar recording configurations to derive the contact with maximum beta power (SenseMP) in addition to ReviewMP of the identified contact (ReviewMP[1]) (gold circles). ReviewMP took on average seven times longer to perform than sensing. There was greater variability in duration to complete ReviewMP compared with SenseMP + ReviewMP[1]. Means are expressed for both conditions with horizontal lines. P-value is indicative of significant difference. *B*) Comparison of optimal contacts defined by ReviewMP (black circles) and SenseMP (gold circles), assessed in a double-blind comparison, resulted in equivalent motor symptom outcomes as measured by MDS-UPDRS Part III, in which each point represents a sum of the unilateral hemi-body sub scores of *C*-*E*. *C*) Unilateral hemi-body sub scores for rigidity (MDS-UPDRS items 3.3). *D*) Unilateral hemi-body sub scores for bradykinesia (MDS-UPDRS items 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, and 3.8). *E*) Unilateral hemi-body sub scores for tremor (MDS-UPDRS items 3.15, 3.16, 3.17, and 3.18). Larger circles indicate the average for the sub scores as a function of the condition.

300

301 *Comparison of therapeutic window between SenseMP and ReviewMP*

302 ANOVA comparison of the SenseMP Level, SenseMP Segment and ReviewMP indicated a
303 significant difference in the TW ($F(2,56)=9.48$, $p < 0.001$). Post-hoc Tukey's HSD tests indicated
304 that TW for ReviewMP (3.98 ± 0.76mA) and SenseMP of the segment (3.83 ± 0.87mA) were not
305 significantly different ($t(56) = 0.52$, $p = 0.86$). However, both SenseMP of the segment and
306 ReviewMP had greater TW than SenseMP of the level (2.85 ± 1.01mA; $t(56) = -3.4$, $p = 0.003$
307 and $t(56) = 4.01$, $p < 0.001$, respectively; Table 2). In three of the twenty hemispheres (2L, 8L,
308 9L), the contact selected by ReviewMP differed from the contact with the greatest TW, due to
309 the selected contact having a lower stimulation amplitude to eliminate upper extremity rigidity.
310 In one hemisphere (9R), the contact selected by ReviewMP was selected because it induced
311 dyskinesias at higher stimulation amplitudes.

312

313 *Comparison of SenseMP and ReviewMP in contact selection and therapeutic response*

314 Qualitative assessment and comparison of contact level localization between SenseMP and
315 ReviewMP demonstrated that for 15/20 hemispheres, the condition-derived optimal contact
316 configurations were on the same level (Figure 3A). In 5/20 hemispheres, the SenseMP and
317 ReviewMP selected segments were identical. In 7/20 hemispheres, ReviewMP selected a level,
318 while SenseMP only selected a level in 1/20 hemispheres, . Quantitative analysis demonstrated
319 no difference between SenseMP and ReviewMP for level localization of optimal contact
320 configurations ($\chi^2(3) = 5.33$, $p = 0.37$). For the 5 hemispheres determined to be on different
321 levels between conditions, the ReviewMP derived contact was superior to the SenseMP derived
322 contact level in 4/5 cases. Orientation analysis was conducted on the 8 hemispheres with
323 ReviewMP selecting segmented contacts that could be directly compared to the SenseMP
324 segments. Qualitative assessment (Figure 3B) demonstrated an apparent lateral bias for
325 segments selected by ReviewMP and, conversely, a medial bias for segments selected by
326 SenseMP. However, quantitatively this difference was non-significant ($\chi^2(7) = 9.3$, $p = 0.15$).

327

Visual inspection demonstrated more easily differentiated beta peaks with SenseMP compared with SenseBP for level (Figure 4A & 4B), which was even more apparent for segments (Figure 4C & 4D). Statistical analysis of the observed distribution for SenseBP level configuration based on maximum beta power (i.e., 0-level between contacts, 1-l



Figure 3: *A*) In 15/20 hemispheres, the SenseMP and ReviewMP contacts were localized within the same level, and for 5/20 hemispheres the SenseMP and ReviewMP contacts were localized one level apart. *B*) The distribution of segment orientations for SenseMP contacts exhibited a greater proportion in the medial region of STN, whereas the ReviewMP segment contacts appeared to have a greater proportion in the lateral region of STN. A: anterior, AL: anterior-lateral, AM: anterior-medial, L: lateral, M: medial, P: posterior, PL: posterior-lateral, PM: posterior-medial.

evel between contacts, and 2-level between contacts) demonstrated a significant difference in relative count (with respect to the expectation of equal representation; $\chi^2(2) = 6.1$, $p = 0.047$; 0-level = 7, 1-level = 11 and 2-level = 2) (Figure 4E & 4F). We next evaluated the alignment of the SenseMP maximum beta level with the SenseBP configuration, with respect to whether SenseMP level was aligned with the superior (top), inferior (bottom), or middle contacts of the SenseBP configuration. The analysis of the observed distribution of SenseMP for level



Figure 4: Comparison of SenseMP and SenseBP configurations. *A-D*) A single representative set of LFP recordings from a single subject's hemisphere. Power spectral density plots depict differences in power within the beta frequency range. *A*) SenseBP for contact levels. *B*) SenseMP for contact levels. *C*) SenseBP for segments. *D*) SenseMP for segments. *E*) Schematic representation and summary of contact configurations derived from the SenseBP levels with the highest beta power paired with their corresponding SenseMP level with the highest beta power. *F*) Number of hemispheres exhibiting the three possible bipolar configurations: No Level (0-level between contacts), One Level (1-level between contacts), and Two Levels (2-level between contacts). *G*) Number of hemispheres exhibiting the three possible corresponding positions of SenseMP level contacts with respect to the SenseBP configuration.

339

340 identified maximum beta SenseBP contact did not result in a significant difference in relative
341 count (with respect to the expectation of equal representation; $\chi^2(2) = 4.9$, $p = 0.086$; Superior =
342 11, Inferior = 6, and Middle = 3). Notably, for 85% of the comparisons, the maximum SenseMP
343 level contact was one of the SenseBP contacts (17/20), with the remaining three SenseMP level
344 contacts identified as the 'middle' contact of a 1-level or 2-level between contact SenseBP
345 configuration (Figure 4E & 4G).
346
347 In an analysis of the three subject hemispheres identifying the SenseMP contact as between the
348 two SenseBP contacts, the difference in peak beta power between the maximum SenseMP
349 contact and a subsequent contact of SenseBP was minimal. For Subject 2L (i.e., Subject 2, Left
350 STN), the peak beta power of the SenseMP was 2.7μVp, and the second-best contact, as
351 identified by beta, had a peak beta power of 2.2μVp. Subject 6, for both left and right
352 hemispheres, had minimal difference (<0.1μVp difference), as assessed by SenseMP beta peaks
353 between two contacts, with the second highest peak contact being identified by SenseBP.
354
355 Segmental analysis indicated that the contacts of SenseBP consistently identified one of the
356 SenseMP contacts (20/20; $\chi^2(1) = 20$, $p = 7.74e\text{-}6$). In 12/20 cases, the SenseMP segment was
357 the superior contact; in 6/20 cases, it was the inferior contact of the two SenseBP contacts
358 ($\chi^2(1) = 2$, $p = 0.15$). Notably, only 2/20 cases of the bipolar configuration were on the same
359 level (e.g. 2a-2b) with all other 18/20 cases being on adjacent levels but on the same vertical
360 segment orientation (e.g. 1a-2a; $\chi^2(1) = 12.8$, $p = 3.46e\text{-}4$). In no case was there a deviation of
361 SenseBP being on different levels and of different segmental orientations (e.g. 1a-2c).
362 Furthermore, in no cases was the SenseMP segment between SenseBP contacts within the
363 same level.
364
365 **Discussion**
366 In this study, we compared the efficiency and efficacy of using maximum beta power recorded
367 during SenseMP versus traditional ReviewMP to select the optimal therapeutic DBS contact in
368 PD subjects undergoing initial programming with STN-DBS. The key findings from this study

369 were 1) no significant difference in clinical outcome, as measured by MDS-UPDRS Part III (Items
370 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.15, 3.16, 3.17, and 3.18) between SenseMP and ReviewMP, 2) non-
371 inferiority at time of initial programming of SenseMP for determination of initial DBS contact
372 selection, 3) an 85% shorter duration in obtaining contact selection using SenseMP as
373 compared to ReviewMP, 4) 75% agreement for contact level selection between SenseMP and
374 ReviewMP, 5) greater qualitative differentiation between contacts based on beta power
375 magnitude for SenseMP than SenseBP (commercially available sensing configuration), 6) 85%
376 agreement between SenseMP identified contact levels and one of the SenseBP contact levels.
377
378 Results from this study are well positioned within growing literature on the potential utility of
379 commercially accessible LFP montages in DBS programming based upon beta power[18-20].
380 Recently, in a randomized, blinded, three-condition trial in STN-DBS treated PD subjects, the
381 clinical efficacy and time efficiency of ReviewMP were compared to both imaging-guided and
382 SenseBP-guided programming[17], finding no difference in clinical efficacy but significantly
383 improved efficiency for both imaging-guided and SenseBP-guided compared to ReviewMP-
384 guided programming. In our study, the time duration to complete the SenseMP condition
385 included recordings for both SenseMP and SenseBP, repeated three times. Clinical efficiency is
386 also impacted by the capacity to differentiate between contacts based on maximum beta
387 power. In this regard, SenseMP qualitatively permits more clearly resolved differences between
388 contacts based on beta power, when compared to SenseBP, and does not require the use of
389 complex algorithms or real-time problem solving to determine the optimal contact within the
390 bipolar pair to program[18]. As exemplified by Binder et al., (2023)[17], there was ambiguity in
391 which contact to stimulate within SenseBP-identified pairs, resulting in the group electing to
392 evenly distribute stimulation between the two segmented contacts in the pair. The regional
393 bias appreciated in our study may corroborate recent reports validating that bradykinesia
394 suppression appears to result from more medial modulation of the STN, and beta power is
395 known to correlate more prominently with bradykinesia[24]. There is also evidence that rigidity
396 suppression may have a superior bias in the STN, which may partially explain our observation
397 that in 5/20 hemispheres, the ReviewMP optimal contact was more superior to the contact

398 selected by SenseMP[25]. Finally, the TW of SenseMP of the level, but not of the segment, was
399 significantly less compared with ReviewMP. In five conditions, the SenseMP level was more
400 ventral to ReviewMP contact(s) and had a lower threshold to induce dyskinesias (N=2),
401 paresthesias (N=2) and hyphophonia (N=1).
402
403 In this first use of SenseMP with fully implanted systems, we focused on identifying the contact
404 with maximum beta power, but other neurophysiological markers other than beta may be of
405 great value (e.g. alpha, gamma) and should also be studied, especially considering the
406 heterogeneity of PD symptoms. SenseMP is a potentially powerful tool in DBS programming;
407 however, it currently cannot be employed in patients with 1) unilateral implants, 2) bilateral
408 lead implants driven by separate neurostimulators, or 3) implanted systems with high
409 impedance. Consequently, the use of SenseBP will be of value in these scenarios and as our
410 study suggests, one of the contact pairs having the greatest peak beta may be selected for
411 programming. Finally, SenseMP resulted in a predominant bias to select segmented contacts
412 (19/20) due to the greater surface area of the contact as well as the surgical targeting strategy
413 in the current study.
414
415 There are several limitations to our study, though many are inherent and acknowledged in
416 clinical practice. For example, ReviewMP is highly operator-dependent and potentially prone to
417 bias, as evident in our study. In addition, a selected contact may have greater improvement of
418 motor symptoms at lower stimulation but also have a lower amplitude threshold to induce
419 adverse effects compared to an adjacent contact. Such a contact may have a lower TW but be
420 clinically more ideal since greater motor response is achieved with less stimulation[26].
421 Furthermore, although the MDS-UPDRS is an established and validated scale, subtle differences
422 in therapeutic response across tested contacts may not be adequately represented or
423 appreciated by the examiner. Another limitation of the study is that evaluations were only
424 performed in the acute setting and the long-term effects of programming by SenseMP are
425 unknown.
426

427 This study demonstrates that SenseMP STN DBS programming may be a time-efficient and
428 clinically effective tool in DBS programming for PD patients. It is likely that SenseMP will allow
429 practitioners to focus on testing contacts with ReviewMP that have the greatest therapeutic
430 benefit, thus better utilizing clinical time. It will be important to evaluate potential future
431 research endeavors and clinical application of SenseMP as this technology becomes more
432 widely available.
433
434 **Figure Legends**
435
436 **Figure 1:** Workflow diagram of the study design
437
438 **Figure 2:** *A*) Total time (minutes) to complete ReviewMP (black circles) and sensing of
439 monopolar and bipolar recording configurations to derive the contact with maximum beta
440 power (SenseMP) in addition to ReviewMP of the identified contact (ReviewMP[1]) (gold circles).
441 ReviewMP took on average seven times longer to perform than sensing. There was greater
442 variability in duration to complete ReviewMP compared with SenseMP + ReviewMP[1]. Means
443 are expressed for both conditions with horizontal lines. P-value is indicative of significant
444 difference. *B*) Comparison of optimal contacts defined by ReviewMP (black circles) and
445 SenseMP (gold circles), assessed in a double-blind comparison, resulted in equivalent motor
446 symptom outcomes as measured by MDS-UPDRS Part III, in which each point represents a sum
447 of the unilateral hemi-body sub scores of *C*-*E*. *C*) Unilateral hemi-body sub scores for rigidity
448 (MDS-UPDRS items 3.3). *D*) Unilateral hemi-body sub scores for bradykinesia (MDS-UPDRS
449 items 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, and 3.8). *E*) Unilateral hemi-body sub scores for tremor (MDS-UPDRS
450 items 3.15, 3.16, 3.17, and 3.18). Larger circles indicate the average for the sub scores as a
451 function of the condition.
452
453 **Figure 3:** *A*) In 15/20 hemispheres, the SenseMP and ReviewMP contacts were localized within
454 the same level, and for 5/20 hemispheres the SenseMP and ReviewMP contacts were localized
455 one level apart. *B*) The distribution of segment orientations for SenseMP contacts exhibited a

456 greater proportion in the medial region of STN, whereas the ReviewMP segment contacts
457 appeared to have a greater proportion in the lateral region of STN. A: anterior, AL: anterior-
458 lateral, AM: anterior-medial, L: lateral, M: medial, P: posterior, PL: posterior-lateral, PM:
459 posterior-medial.
460
461 **Figure 4:** Comparison of SenseMP and SenseBP configurations. *A-D*) A single representative set
462 of LFP recordings from a single subject's hemisphere. Power spectral density plots depict
463 differences in power within the beta frequency range. *A*) SenseBP for contact levels. *B*)
464 SenseMP for contact levels. *C*) SenseBP for segments. *D*) SenseMP for segments. *E*) Schematic
465 representation and summary of contact configurations derived from the SenseBP levels with
466 the highest beta power paired with their corresponding SenseMP level with the highest beta
467 power. *F*) Number of hemispheres exhibiting the three possible bipolar configurations: No Level
468 (0-level between contacts), One Level (1-level between contacts), and Two Levels (2-level
469 between contacts). *G*) Number of hemispheres exhibiting the three possible corresponding
470 positions of SenseMP level contacts with respect to the SenseBP configuration.
471
472 **Table 1**: Subject Demographics
473
474 **Table 2**: SenseMP and ReviewMP of lead segment and level
475
476 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:** We are grateful for the patients who participated in this study.
477 Funding for this investigator-initiated study was provided by Medtronic.
478
479 **COMPETING INTERESTS:** JAT declares the following competing financial interest: received
480 research funding from Medtronic and the following non-financial competing interest: used
481 investigational system provided by Medtronic, DSK received research funding from Medtronic
482 and the following non-financial competing interest: used investigational system provided by
483 Medtronic. AHB, CZ, MC, RSR declare both financial and non-financial competing interests as

484 employees of Medtronic. SO has received fellowship support funding from Medtronic, Boston
485 Scientific and Abbott. EMR and AJB declare no competing financial or non-financial interests.
486
487 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS:** EMR: collected data, drafted original version, revised final draft;
488 DRK: revised final draft; SO: collected data; MC: contributed analysis tools, revised paper; CZ:
489 contributed analysis tools, revised paper; AHB: contributed analysis tools, revised paper; RR:
490 contributed analysis tools, revised paper; AJB: collected data; DSK: conceived of study, collected
491 data, drafted original version, revised final draft; JAT: conceived of study, collected data,
492 developed analysis tools, drafted original version, revised final draft.
493
494 **References**
495

496 1. Benabid AL, Benazzouz A, Hoffmann D, Limousin P, Krack P, Pollak P. Long-term electrical
497 inhibition of deep brain targets in movement disorders. *Mov Disord*. 1998;13 Suppl 3:119-25.
498 doi:10.1002/mds.870131321
499 2. Krack P, Batir A, Van Blercom N, et al. Five-year follow-up of bilateral stimulation of the
500 subthalamic nucleus in advanced Parkinson's disease. *N Engl J Med*. Nov 13 2003;349(20):1925-34.
501 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa035275
502 3. Kühn AA, Kempf F, Brücke C, et al. High-frequency stimulation of the subthalamic nucleus
503 suppresses oscillatory beta activity in patients with Parkinson's disease in parallel with improvement in
504 motor performance. *J Neurosci*. Jun 11 2008;28(24):6165-73. doi:10.1523/jneurosci.0282-08.2008
505 4. Kühn AA, Kupsch A, Schneider GH, Brown P. Reduction in subthalamic 8-35 Hz oscillatory activity
506 correlates with clinical improvement in Parkinson's disease. *Eur J Neurosci*. Apr 2006;23(7):1956-60.
507 doi:10.1111/j.1460-9568.2006.04717.x
508 5. Limousin P, Krack P, Pollak P, et al. Electrical stimulation of the subthalamic nucleus in advanced
509 Parkinson's disease. *N Engl J Med*. Oct 15 1998;339(16):1105-11. doi:10.1056/nejm199810153391603
510 6. Dembek TA, Roediger J, Horn A, et al. Probabilistic sweet spots predict motor outcome for deep
511 brain stimulation in Parkinson disease. *Ann Neurol*. Oct 2019;86(4):527-538. doi:10.1002/ana.25567
512 7. Horn A, Neumann WJ, Degen K, Schneider GH, Kühn AA. Toward an electrophysiological "sweet
513 spot" for deep brain stimulation in the subthalamic nucleus. *Hum Brain Mapp*. Jul 2017;38(7):3377-
514 3390. doi:10.1002/hbm.23594
515 8. Ince NF, Gupte A, Wichmann T, et al. Selection of optimal programming contacts based on local
516 field potential recordings from subthalamic nucleus in patients with Parkinson's disease. *Neurosurgery*.
517 Aug 2010;67(2):390-7. doi:10.1227/01.Neu.0000372091.64824.63
518 9. Thompson JA, Oukal S, Bergman H, et al. Semi-automated application for estimating
519 subthalamic nucleus boundaries and optimal target selection for deep brain stimulation implantation
520 surgery. *J Neurosurg*. May 18 2018;130(4):1224-1233. doi:10.3171/2017.12.Jns171964
521 10. Zaidel A, Spivak A, Grieb B, Bergman H, Israel Z. Subthalamic span of beta oscillations predicts
522 deep brain stimulation efficacy for patients with Parkinson's disease. *Brain*. Jul 2010;133(Pt 7):2007-21.
523 doi:10.1093/brain/awq144

11. Butson CR, McIntyre CC. Current steering to control the volume of tissue activated during deep brain stimulation. *Brain Stimul*. Jan 2008;1(1):7-15. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2007.08.004
12. Cagnan H, Denison T, McIntyre C, Brown P. Emerging technologies for improved deep brain stimulation. *Nat Biotechnol*. Sep 2019;37(9):1024-1033. doi:10.1038/s41587-019-0244-6
13. Connolly AT, Vetter RJ, Hetke JF, et al. A Novel Lead Design for Modulation and Sensing of Deep Brain Structures. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*. 2016;63(1):148-157. doi:10.1109/TBME.2015.2492921
14. Dembek TA, Reker P, Visser-Vandewalle V, et al. Directional DBS increases side-effect thresholds-A prospective, double-blind trial. *Mov Disord*. Oct 2017;32(10):1380-1388. doi:10.1002/mds.27093
15. Timmermann L, Jain R, Chen L, et al. Multiple-source current steering in subthalamic nucleus deep brain stimulation for Parkinson's disease (the VANTAGE study): a non-randomised, prospective, multicentre, open-label study. *Lancet Neurol*. Jul 2015;14(7):693-701. doi:10.1016/s1474-4422(15)00087-3
16. Tinkhauser G, Pogosyan A, Debove I, et al. Directional local field potentials: A tool to optimize deep brain stimulation. *Mov Disord*. Jan 2018;33(1):159-164. doi:10.1002/mds.27215
17. Binder T, Lange F, Pozzi N, et al. Feasibility of local field potential-guided programming for deep brain stimulation in Parkinson's disease: A comparison with clinical and neuro-imaging guided approaches in a randomized, controlled pilot trial. *Brain Stimul*. Sep-Oct 2023;16(5):1243-1251. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2023.08.017
18. Lewis S, Radcliffe E, Ojemann S, et al. Pilot Study to Investigate the Use of In-Clinic Sensing to Identify Optimal Stimulation Parameters for Deep Brain Stimulation Therapy in Parkinson's Disease. *Neuromodulation: Technology at the Neural Interface*. 2024/04/01/ 2024;27(3):509-519. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurom.2023.01.006
19. Baker S, Radcliffe, E, Baumgarter, A, Kramer, D, Ojemann, Kern, D, Thompson, JA. Towards an objective, standardized beta frequency peak detection algorithm to inform adaptive deep brain stimulation programming in Parkinson's disease. *PREPRINT (Version 1) Research Square* 2024;doi:https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-3994762/v1
20. Strelow JN, Dembek TA, Baldermann JC, et al. Low beta-band suppression as a tool for DBS contact selection for akinetic-rigid symptoms in Parkinson's disease. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord*. Jul 2023;112:105478. doi:10.1016/j.parkreldis.2023.105478
21. Swinnen B, Buijink AW, Piña-Fuentes D, de Bie RMA, Beudel M. Diving into the subcortex: The potential of chronic subcortical sensing for unravelling basal ganglia function and optimization of deep brain stimulation. *Neuroimage*. Jul 1 2022;254:119147. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2022.119147
22. Goetz CG, Fahn S, Martinez-Martin P, et al. Movement Disorder Society-sponsored revision of the Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (MDS-UPDRS): Process, format, and clinimetric testing plan. *Mov Disord*. Jan 2007;22(1):41-7. doi:10.1002/mds.21198
23. Abosch A, Timmermann L, Bartley S, et al. An international survey of deep brain stimulation procedural steps. *Stereotact Funct Neurosurg*. 2013;91(1):1-11. doi:10.1159/000343207
24. Rodriguez-Rojas R, Pineda-Pardo JA, Mañez-Miro J, et al. Functional Topography of the Human Subthalamic Nucleus: Relevance for Subthalamotomy in Parkinson's Disease. *Mov Disord*. Feb 2022;37(2):279-290. doi:10.1002/mds.28862
25. Akram H, Sotiropoulos SN, Jbabdi S, et al. Subthalamic deep brain stimulation sweet spots and hyperdirect cortical connectivity in Parkinson's disease. *Neuroimage*. Sep 2017;158:332-345. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2017.07.012
26. Busch JL, Kaplan J, Bahners BH, et al. Local Field Potentials Predict Motor Performance in Deep Brain Stimulation for Parkinson's Disease. *Mov Disord*. Dec 2023;38(12):2185-2196. doi:10.1002/mds.29626

Conflict of interest: Robert Raike, Abbey Becker, and Michelle Case are Medtronic employees. In this study, they provided technical support and assistance in imaging analysis. They were not involved in the conduct of patient care and did not influence the interpretation of the results. Drew Kern and John Thompson received funding from Medtronic to support this study. Study concept, execution, analysis, and interpretation were developed independently by Drew Kern and John A Thompson.

Funding: Medtronic Collaboration Grant