Human Applications of Transcranial Temporal Interference Stimulation: A Systematic Review

Ilya Demchenko, MSc[1,2,3]; Ishaan Tailor, BA[1]; Sina Chegini, BMSc[1]; Haochen Yu, BSc[1]; Fatemeh Gholamali Nezhad, PhD[1]; Alice Rueda, PhD[1,3]; Anne Kever, PhD[4,5]; Sridhar Krishnan, PhD PEng[3,6]; Abhishek Datta, PhD[7,8]; Jed A. Meltzer, PhD[2,5,9]; Simon J. Graham, PhD PEng[2,10,11]; Tom A. Schweizer, PhD[2,12,13,14]; Sumientra Rampersad, PhD[15,16]; Edward S. Boyden, PhD[17,18]; Ines R. Violante, PhD[19,20]; Robert Chen, MBBChir MA MSc[2,21,22,23]; Andres M. Lozano, MD PhD[2,14,21]; Venkat Bhat, MD MSc[1,2,3,12,13,24*]

Affiliations:

[1]*Interventional Psychiatry Program, St. Michael's Hospital – Unity Health Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada*

[2]*Institute of Medical Science, Temerty Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada*

[3]*Institute for Biomedical Engineering, Science and Technology (iBEST), Keenan Research Centre for Biomedical Science, St. Michael's Hospital – Unity Health Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada*

[4]*BARLO Multiple Sclerosis Centre and Division of Neurology, St. Michael's Hospital-Unity Health Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada*

[5]*Department of Psychology, Faculty of Arts & Science, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada*

[6]*Department of Electrical, Computer, and Biomedical Engineering, Toronto Metropolitan University, Toronto, ON, Canada*

[7]*Research and Development, Soterix Medical, Inc., Woodbridge, NJ, United States*

[8]*Department of Biomedical Engineering, City College of New York, New York, NY, United States*

[9]*Rotman Research Institute, Baycrest Hospital, Toronto, ON, Canada*

[10]*Physical Sciences Platform, Sunnybrook Research Institute, Toronto, ON, Canada*

[11]*Department of Medical Biophysics, Temerty Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada*

[12]*Keenan Research Centre for Biomedical Science, St. Michael's Hospital – Unity Health Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada*

[13]*Neuroscience Research Program, St. Michael's Hospital – Unity Health Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada*

[14]*Division of Neurosurgery, Department of Surgery, Temerty Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada*

[15]*Department of Physics, University of Massachusetts Boston, Boston, MA, United States*

[16]*Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Northeastern University, Boston, MA, United States*

[17]*Department of Brain and Cognitive Sciences, Media Arts and Sciences, and Biological Engineering, McGovern Institute for Brain Research and Koch Institute for Integrative Cancer Research, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, United States*

[18]*Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Chevy Chase, MD, United States*

[19]*Healthcare Engineering, School of Biomedical Engineering & Imaging Sciences, King's College London, London, United Kingdom*

[20]*School of Psychology, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of Surrey, Guilford, United Kingdom*

[21]*Krembil Brain Institute, Toronto Western Hospital-University Health Network, Toronto, ON, Canada*

[22]*Edmond J. Safra Program in Parkinson's Disease, Morton and Gloria Shulman Movement Disorders Clinic, Toronto Western Hospital – University Health Network, Toronto, ON, Canada*

[23]*Division of Neurology, Department of Medicine, Temerty Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada*

[24]*Department of Psychiatry, Temerty Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada*

***Corresponding Author:**

Venkat Bhat, MD MSc

Associate Professor of Psychiatry, University of Toronto

Director, Interventional Psychiatry Program, St. Michael's Hospital

Staff Psychiatrist, St. Michael's Hospital & University Health Network

t: +1-416-360-4000 x 76404 e: venkat.bhat@utoronto.ca

Highlights

- tTIS engages the motor cortex, basal ganglia, and hippocampus across human studies
- 20 studies show tTIS is safe and well-tolerated in healthy and clinical cohorts
- One tTIS session improves bradykinesia and tremor in Parkinsonism within 1 hour
- Multi-session trials now test tTIS in epilepsy, depression, and other disorders
- Robust Phase 2 trials are needed to study the efficacy of tTIS in patient populations

Abstract

Background. Many neurological and psychiatric disorders involve dysregulation of subcortical structures. Transcranial temporal interference stimulation (tTIS) is a novel, non-invasive method developed to selectively modulate these regions and associated neural circuits.

Methods. A systematic review was conducted to evaluate human applications of tTIS (PROSPERO ID: CRD42024559678). MEDLINE, Embase, APA PsycINFO, CENTRAL, ClinicalTrials.gov, and WHO ICTRP were searched comprehensively up to December 12, 2024. Studies involving human applications of tTIS were eligible. Methodological quality was appraised using the NIH and modified Oxford Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine instruments.

Results. Forty-eight records were reviewed (20 published studies, 28 ongoing trials). Of published studies, 16 single-session and 4 multi-session studies assessed safety, mechanistic outcomes, or therapeutic effects of tTIS. Stimulation was most commonly delivered at beta (20 Hz) or gamma (30-130 Hz) envelope frequencies. Neuroimaging studies supported target engagement of the motor cortex, basal ganglia, and hippocampus in humans, particularly when stimulation was paired with behavioural tasks. Preliminary clinical findings in small samples demonstrated acute symptom improvements in bradykinesia and tremor within 60 minutes following a single tTIS session in Parkinson's disease and essential tremor. Reported adverse events across studies were mild (e.g., tingling, itching). Emerging trials increasingly utilize multi-session protocols (2-40 sessions) and are extending tTIS to patients with neurological and psychiatric disorders, particularly epilepsy and depression.

Conclusions. Phase 1 studies demonstrate that tTIS is safe, well-tolerated, and capable of engaging deep brain targets in humans. Well-controlled Phase 2 trials are needed to study its target engagement and therapeutic potential in patient populations.

Introduction

Neurological and psychiatric disorders affect nearly a quarter of the global population over the course of a lifetime and account for more than 15% of global Disability-Adjusted Life Years (DALYs) [1,2]. Many of these conditions involve dysregulation of subcortical structures, driving efforts to develop interventions capable of targeting deep brain regions [3]. Invasive deep brain stimulation (DBS) has shown relatively high response rates in treatment-resistant populations (40-70%) but carries inherent risks associated with surgical implantation, including hemorrhage, infection, and hardware complications [3,4].

In contrast, non-invasive neuromodulation techniques such as transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) and transcranial electrical stimulation (tES) offer safer alternatives with fewer adverse effects but typically yield more modest response rates (33-45%) due to limited penetration into deep brain tissue [5,6]. Transcranial ultrasound is another promising approach with excellent spatial precision for subcortical targets, yet its broader clinical adoption is hindered by skull-induced acoustic attenuation, complex parameter tuning, and safety concerns such as unintended tissue heating [7–9].

These challenges have spurred a growing interest in transcranial temporal interference stimulation (tTIS), a novel technique designed to non-invasively modulate deep brain targets [10–12]. tTIS applies two slightly different high-frequency currents (e.g., 2.00 and 2.01 kHz) that generate a low-frequency envelope at a focal interference site (e.g., 10 Hz) [10,13]. Neurons within this zone respond selectively to the envelope due to their low-pass filtering properties,

while surrounding tissues remain minimally affected [10,14,15]. This systematic review aims to synthesize current evidence on human applications of tTIS.

Methods

Search Strategy

This systematic review followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (PROSPERO ID: CRD42024559678) [16]. A comprehensive search of OVID (MEDLINE, Embase, APA PsycINFO) and CENTRAL was conducted on December 12, 2024, with a supplementary PubMed search to capture unindexed publications. Clinical trial records were searched on ClinicalTrials.gov and the World Health Organization International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (WHO ICTRP). The search terms were synonyms of temporal interference and electrical stimulation (**eMethods** in the **Supplement**).

Study Selection

Two reviewers independently conducted first-level (i.e., titles and abstracts) and second-level (i.e., full-text) screening, and discrepancies were resolved through consensus with a third party. Primary research articles and clinical trial records were included in the review if they administered tTIS to human participants (list of eligibility criteria in **eMethods** in the **Supplement**).

Data Extraction and Appraisal of Methodological Quality

Extracted data included bibliographic information, participant characteristics, study design, collected outcomes, stimulation parameters, and results (list of variables in **eMethods** in the **Supplement**). Two reviewers independently assessed the quality of evidence using National Institutes of Health tools for controlled intervention studies and uncontrolled pretest-postest designs and a rating scheme adapted from the Oxford Centre for Evidence-based Medicine (**eTables 1-3** in the **Supplement**) [17].

Statistical Analysis

Analyses were performed in R (v.4.4.2) [18]. Frequency counts were used to summarize study characteristics, stimulation parameters, outcomes, and adverse events (AE). Efficacy was assessed using an adapted classification framework [19]. For studies with individual-level data, Hedge's *g* and mean differences with 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated. AE rates were analyzed using χ^2 tests with Yates's continuity correction ($P < .05$). Due to outcome heterogeneity, meta-analysis was not performed.

Results

Study Selection

The initial search across all databases yielded a total of 3,769 records (PRISMA flow diagram in **eFigure 1** in the **Supplement**). After removing 1,575 duplicates, 2,194 records were screened by title and abstract. Eighty underwent full-text review, resulting in 48 included records: 20 published studies/protocols and 28 ongoing clinical trials available between 2018-2024 (**Figure 1A**).

Research Design and Participants

Of the 20 published studies, 18 were randomized controlled trials (RCTs) [20–37], including 11 within-subjects crossover designs [20,22,24–28,31,34–36]; two used uncontrolled pretest-posttest designs [38,39] (**Figure 1B, eTable 4** in the **Supplement**). Fifteen involved healthy participants [20–29,31,32,34,35,37], one included both healthy and traumatic brain injury (TBI) participants [33], three studied Parkinson's disease (PD) or essential tremor (ET) [36,38,39], and one published protocol [30] targets major depressive disorder (MDD) (**Figures 1C-D**). Sixteen studies were single-session [20–26,28,29,31,32,34–36,38,39]; four used multi-session protocols of 2-10 sessions (**eTable 5** in the **Supplement**) [27,30,33,37]. Sham (0 mA current) was used in 14 studies [20–23,25,26,29–34,36,37], transcranial alternating current stimulation (tACS) as an active control in 7 studies [22,23,25,27,32,33,35], and transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) as a comparator in 2 studies [24,28].

Among the 28 ongoing trials, 16 use multi-session protocols with 2-40 sessions (**eTable 6** in the **Supplement**). Nineteen trials focus on therapeutic applications of tTIS: 7 in MDD, 3 in epilepsy, 2 each in PD and addiction, and 1 each in Alzheimer's disease, bipolar disorder, cerebral palsy, disorders of consciousness, or stroke (**Figure 1D**).



Figure 1. Trends, Study Designs, and Clinical Populations in Human tTIS Research. A, Number of published studies and ongoing clinical trials involving human tTIS from 2018 and 2024. **B,** Study design types among published human tTIS studies and ongoing clinical trials. **C,** Sample size distribution in published human tTIS studies and ongoing clinical trials. **D,** Study populations by condition in published human tTIS studies and ongoing clinical trials.

Abbreviations: AD = Alzheimer's disease; BD = Bipolar disorder; CP = Cerebral palsy; DoCs = Disorders of consciousness; ET = Essential tremor; MDD = Major depressive disorder; PD = Parkinson's disease; PPCGD = Pretest-posttest control group design; PPD = Pretest-posttest design; RCT = Randomized controlled trial; TBI = Traumatic brain injury; WSD = Within-subjects design.

Methodological Quality of Studies

RCTs [20–37] showed moderate-to-high quality, with good baseline comparability of participants (16/18 studies) [20–28,30,31,33–37], intervention adherence (17/18 studies) [20–31,33–37], and outcome assessment (18/18 studies) [20–37] (**eTable 1** in the **Supplement**). The mean quality score was 10.2 ± 1.4 out of 14 (range: 8-14). Several studies lacked detailed reporting of randomization methods (7/18 studies) [21,22,24,25,29,31,33], allocation concealment (13/18 studies) [20–22,24–27,29,31,33–36], and power calculations (9/18 studies) [23–25,29–31,34,35,37]. The two uncontrolled studies [38,39] had consistent intervention delivery, outcome assessment, and low attrition (2/2 studies) but moderate quality (mean score: 7.0 ± 0.0 out of 11), as they failed to fully address sample size adequacy and the use of statistics (**eTable 2** in the **Supplement**). China was the leading contributor to the field (**Figures 2A-B**), and most published work focused on safety (16 studies) [20–23,26,29–39] and behavioural outcomes (13 studies) [20–23,26,27,29–32,34,35,37] (**Figure 2C, eTables 4-6** in the **Supplement**).



Figure 2. Global Landscape and Methodological Characteristics of Human tTIS Studies and Ongoing Clinical Trials. A, Geographic distribution of published human tTIS studies, highlighting regions actively contributing to the field. **B,** Geographic distribution of ongoing human tTIS clinical trials, reflecting current global research efforts. **C**, Outcome measures reported in published human tTIS studies and those being collected in ongoing clinical trials. **D,** tTIS envelope frequency bands used in published human tTIS studies and ongoing clinical trials, showing variation in stimulation parameters. **Abbreviations:** MRI = Magnetic resonance imaging.

Brain Targets and Stimulation Parameters

Envelope frequencies ranged from 5-130 Hz in published studies. Nine studies administered beta-range tTIS (20 Hz) [20,21,24,28,29,31,33,34,37], and nine used gamma-range tTIS (30-130 Hz) [20,21,29,30,33,34,36,38,39] (**Figure 2D**, **Table 1**). Carrier frequencies ranged from 0.90-20.07 kHz; 14 studies used pairs centred around 2 kHz [20,21,23–28,31,33–35,37,39]. Amplitudes ranged from 0.5-15 mA (zero-to-peak); 17 studies applied 1-2 mA/channel with 5-30 s ramp-ins and 10-30 min of stimulation [20,21,23–28,30–37,39] (**eTable 7** in the **Supplement**).

Common targets included the primary motor cortex (M1) [20,21,24,28,29,37], parieto-occipital cortex [22,25,32], basal ganglia [27,31,33,34,36,38,39], and hippocampus [26,33,35] (**Figure 3**). Theta-range tTIS was typically used for the hippocampus [26,33,35] and striatum [27,33]; alpha-range for parieto-occipital cortex [22,25,32]; beta-range for M1 and striatum [20,21,24,28,29,31,33,34,37]; 130 Hz for basal ganglia and subgenual anterior cingulate cortex [30,36,38,39]. Emerging trials often use 10 Hz or 130 Hz envelopes targeting brain regions such as the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex, amygdala, and nucleus accumbens, with 1.30-2.01 kHz carriers and 0.85-4.36 mA peak intensities (**eTable 8** in the **Supplement**).

Table 1. Summary of Stimulation Parameters in Human tTIS Studies

Study	Brain target	tTIS montage	Envelope frequency, Δf	Carrier frequencies, $f_1 \mid f_1 + \Delta f$	Zero-to-peak amplitude, $I_1 \mid I_2$	Ramp time	tTIS device manufacturer
Ma et al. (2022)	Left M1	30 mm away from M1 hotpot along FPZ-OZ & T3-T4 axes	20 Hz 70 Hz	2000 Hz | 2020 Hz 2000 Hz | 2070 Hz	1 mA | 1 mA	30 s	JUNTEX, Zhengzhou, China
Piao et al. (2022)	Left M1	FC3-C5 & CP3-C1	20 Hz 70 Hz	2000 Hz | 2020 Hz 2000 Hz | 2070 Hz	1 mA | 1 mA	30 s	Custom-built
von Conta et al. (2022)	Parieto-occipital cortex	C3-O1 & C4-O2	IAF	(1000 – IAF/2) Hz | (1000 + IAF/2) Hz	0.5 mA | 0.5 mA	10 s	NeuroConn GmbH, Ilmenau, Germany
Zhang et al. (2022)	dlPFC, IPL	5 cm around F4 and P4 (4 pairs)	6 Hz	2000 Hz | 2006 Hz	1 mA | 1 mA	15 s	Custom-built
Zhu et al. (2022)	Left M1	M1 hotspot: A1-A2, A1-B1, B1-B2, A2-B2	20 Hz	2000 Hz | 2020 Hz	1 mA | 1 mA	30 s	Soterix Medical, NJ, USA
Iszak et al. (2023)	Occipital cortex	O1-C3 & O2-C4	10 Hz	2000 Hz | 2010 Hz	2 mA | 2 mA	25 s	NeuroConn GmbH, Ilmenau, Germany
Violante et al. (2023)	Left hippocampus	e_1-e_2 and e_3-e_4 e_1 and e_3 on the left hemisphere's nasion plane 5 cm apart, e_2 and e_4 above the right eyebrow 16 cm apart	5 Hz	2000 Hz | 2005 Hz	2 mA | 2 mA 1 mA | 3 mA	5 s	Digitimer, Letchworth Garden City, UK; Keysight Technologies, Santa Rosa, CA, USA
Wessel et al. (2023)	Bilateral striatum	F3-F4 & TP7-TP8	100 Hz (iTBS)	2000 Hz | 2100 Hz every 5 s	2 mA | 2 mA	5 s	Digitimer, Letchworth Garden City, UK
Beanato et al. (2024)	Right hippocampus	P7-CP8 & FP1-FT8	100 Hz (cTBS;	2000 Hz | 2100 Hz every	2 mA | 2 mA	5 s	Digitimer, Letchworth

			iTBS)	5 s			Garden City, UK
Demchenko et al. (2024)	Bilateral sgACC	AF7-T7 & AF8-T8	130 Hz	1000 Hz | 1130 Hz	2 mA | 2 mA	30 s	Soterix Medical, NJ, USA
Liu et al. (2024)	Bilateral SN	F5-P5 & F6-PO8	130 Hz	900 Hz | 1030 Hz	0.75-1 mA | 0.75-1 mA	ns	Jiangsu Jinyuan Medical Technology Co., Xuzhou, Jiangsu, China
Modak et al. (2024)	Left caudate	F9-F10 & FP1-CPZ	20 Hz	2000 Hz | 2020 Hz	2 mA | 2 mA	30 s	Soterix Medical, NJ, USA
Thiele et al. (2024)	Parieto-occipital cortex	P4-I1/O1 & P3-I2/O2[a]	IAF	1000 Hz | 1000 + IAF Hz	1 mA | 1 mA	10 s	NeuroConn GmbH, Ilmenau, Germany
Vassiliadis et al. (2024a)[b]	Bilateral striatum	F3-F4 & TP7-TP8	20 Hz 80 Hz	1990 Hz | 2010 Hz 1960 Hz | 2040 Hz	2 mA | 2 mA	5 s	Digitimer, Letchworth Garden City, UK
Vassiliadis et al. (2024b)[c]	Bilateral striatum; left hippocampus	F3-F4 & TP7-TP8; F3-F4 & TP7-TP8	100 Hz (cTBS; iTBS) 20 Hz 80 Hz	2000 Hz | 2100 Hz every 5 s 1990 Hz | 2010 Hz 1960 Hz | 2040 Hz	0.5-2 mA | 0.5-2 mA	5 s	Digitimer, Letchworth Garden City, UK
Wang et al. (2024)	Left M1	3 cm away from C3 (2 pairs)	20 Hz 70 Hz	20000 Hz | 20020 Hz 20000 Hz | 20070 Hz	15 mA | 15 mA	30 s	Custom-built
Yang et al. (2024a)[d]	Right GPi	CP3-CP6 & F3-F6	130 Hz	1300 Hz | 1430 Hz	2.5 mA | 2 mA	30 s	Soterix Medical, NJ, USA
Yang et al. (2024b)[e]	Contralateral STN	Individualized	130 Hz	2000 Hz | 2130 Hz	1 mA | variable (determined by electromagnetic field modelling)	30 s	NeuroDome Medical Technology Co., Xi'an, Shaanxi, China
Zheng et al. (2024)	Bilateral M1 (leg area)	F3-P3 & F4-P4	20 Hz	2000 Hz | 2020 Hz	1 mA | 1 mA	30 s	National Instruments, TX, USA;

							World Precision Instruments, FL, USA
Zhu et al. (2024)	Left M1	M1 hotspot: A1-A2, A1-B1, B1-B2, A2-B2	20 Hz	2000 Hz | 2020 Hz	1 mA | 1 mA	30 s	Soterix Medical, NJ, USA

Abbreviations: Δf = Envelope frequency; dlPFC = Dorsolateral prefrontal cortex; f_1 = Carrier frequency; GPi = Globus pallidus internus; IAF = Individual alpha frequency; I_1, I_2 = Current intensity; IPL = Inferior parietal lobule; M1 = Primary motor cortex; sgACC = Subgenual anterior cingulate cortex; SN = Substantia nigra; STN = Subthalamic nucleus; tACS = Transcranial alternating current stimulation; tDCS = Transcranial direct current stimulation; tTIS = Transcranial temporal interference stimulation.

cTBS: bursts of 3 pulses at 100 Hz delivered at 5 Hz
iTBS: bursts of 3 pulses at 100 Hz repeated at 5 Hz for 2 s, interspersed with 8 s without any stimulation

[a] The second electrode in the electrode pair was positioned between I1 and O1 for channel 1, and between I2 and O2 for channel 2.
[b] Vassiliadis et al. (2024). *J Neural Eng*.
[c] Vassiliadis et al. (2024). *Nat Hum Behav*.
[d] Yang et al. (2024). *Mov Disord*.
[e] Yang et al. (2024). *Brain Stimul*.



Figure 3. Brain Targets in Human tTIS Studies and Ongoing Clinical Trials. A, Brain regions targeted in published human tTIS studies, illustrating early applications of the technique. **B,** Brain regions targeted in ongoing human tTIS clinical trials, reflecting current translational priorities and therapeutic goals. **Abbreviations:** dACC = Dorsal anterior cingulate cortex; dlPFC = Dorsolateral prefrontal cortex; GPi = Globus pallidus internus; IPL = Inferior parietal lobule; M1 = Primary motor cortex; NAc = Nucleus accumbens; PCu = Precuneus; PMC = Posteromedial cortex; Pulv = Pulvinar nuclei; Put = Putamen; S1 = Primary somatosensory cortex; sgACC = Subgenual anterior cingulate cortex; SN = Substantia nigra; STN = Subthalamic nucleus; V1 = Primary visual cortex; vmPFC = Ventromedial prefrontal cortex.

Safety and Tolerability Outcomes

Sixteen studies reported safety and tolerability outcomes [20–23,26,29–39]. In 10 studies differentiating AEs between tTIS and control groups [20,21,23,26,29,33,34,36,38,39], tTIS was associated with higher rates of tingling ($P < .05$) and itching ($P < .001$), with no serious AEs or epileptic activity (**Table 2**). Sensation ratings were comparable between tTIS and control groups [26,31,33], although older adults reported reduced intensity [33]. Across all studies, only one TBI participant withdrew due to strong sensations [33]. Among ongoing trials, 6/28 (21%) explicitly report plans to collect safety data.

Table 2. Pooled Frequencies of Adverse Events Reported in Human tTIS Studies

Adverse Event, *n* (%)	**tTIS** ***n* = 333**	**Control** ***n* = 282**	***χ2***	***P* Value**
Tingling	35 (11)	13 (5)	6.59	$P < 0.05$
Itching[a]	31 (11)	9 (3)	11.95	$P < 0.001$
Warmth	18 (5)	6 (2)	3.54	$P = 0.06$
Burning	8 (2)	4 (1)	0.34	$P = 0.05$
Headache	18 (5)	10 (4)	0.83	$P = 0.36$
Fatigue[b]	38 (13)	24 (10)	0.87	$P = 0.35$
Sleepiness/drowsiness	9 (3)	8 (3)	6.06×10^{-29}	$P > 0.99$
Dizziness/vertigo	13 (4)	9 (3)	0.07	$P = 0.80$
Nausea	5 (2)	2 (<1)	0.29	$P = 0.59$
Pain	6 (2)	6 (2)	2.11×10^{-32}	$P > 0.99$

[a] *n* (tTIS) = 281 participants, *n* (Control) = 282 participants. Yang et al. (2024a) excluded due to non-differentiation of itching from general discomfort.
[b] *n* (tTIS) = 283 participants, *n* (Control) = 232 participants. Ma et al. (2022) excluded due to an unclear number of participants reporting fatigue across sessions.

Clinical Outcomes

Three studies evaluated the clinical effects of 130 Hz tTIS targeting the globus pallidus internus (GPi) [36], subthalamic nucleus (STN) [39], and substantial nigra (SN) in PD and ET [38] (**eTable 9** in the **Supplement**). A double-blind RCT [36] targeting the GPi showed 14.7% reduction in overall symptom severity based on the Movement Disorder Society-Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale Part III [40] (MDS-UPDRS-III; $P = .02$), with significant improvements in bradykinesia (23.5%, $P = .01$) and tremor (15.3%, $P = .01$). A case series [38] involving 2 PD and 1 ET patients reported reduced tremor amplitude with tTIS over SN compared to tACS control. An open-label trial [39] targeting the STN showed 27.5% symptom reduction on MDS-UPDRS-III immediately post-stimulation, with moderate-to-large effect sizes for overall symptom severity (Hedge's $g = -0.92$), bradykinesia (Hedge's $g = -0.72$), and rigidity (Hedge's $g = -0.88$), and smaller effect sizes for tremor (Hedge's $g = -0.35$) and axial symptoms

(Hedge's g = -0.28) (**eTable 10** in the **Supplement**). Among ongoing trials, 21/28 (75%) plan to assess clinical or psychometric outcomes.

Behavioural Outcomes

Of 13 behavioural studies [20–23,26,27,29–32,34,35,37], six investigated motor function with tTIS targeting M1 [20,21,29,37] or striatum [27,34]. 20 Hz tTIS over M1 showed mixed results: no change in reaction time (RT), dexterity, or postural stability [20,21,29,37], but improved implicit motor learning [20] and vertical jump performance [37] (**eTable 11** in the **Supplement**). Striatal studies showed frequency-dependent effects: 100 Hz iTBS-patterned tTIS enhanced motor learning gains in a sequential finger tapping task [27], while 80 Hz disrupted reinforcement-related motor learning [34].

Five studies assessed tTIS effects on memory and cognition [22,23,26,31,35]. Working memory (WM) showed minimal to no improvement following tTIS [22,23,31]. In contrast, hippocampal tTIS improved spatial navigation efficiency [35] and episodic face-name recall [26]. Two visual studies showed no effects on mental rotation or phosphene induction [25,32]. Among ongoing trials, 19/28 (68%) plan to assess behavioural outcomes.

Neuroimaging Outcomes

Seven studies used functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) to validate target engagement following tTIS [24,26–28,31,34,35]. Two M1 studies showed increased resting-state activity and

functional connectivity (FC) in sensorimotor networks with tTIS [24,28]. Hippocampal tTIS reduced memory task-evoked activity, decreased FC within the anterior-temporal network, and disrupted spatial coding [26,35]. Three striatal studies [27,31,34] showed enhanced learning-related target activation and striatal-frontal FC with tTIS, suggesting plasticity during active learning but not at rest. Among ongoing trials, 12/28 (43%) plan to collect MRI data.

Neurophysiological Outcomes

Five studies investigated the neurophysiological effects of tTIS [21,22,25,29,32]. Alpha-range tTIS over parieto-occipital cortex yielded no changes in resting alpha power based on three studies [22,25,32]; one of those studies [32], however, found increased alpha event-related desynchronization during a mental rotation task. Two M1 studies [21,29] delivering beta- (20 Hz) or gamma-range (70 Hz) tTIS reported no significant band-power changes on the electroencephalography (EEG). Among ongoing trials, 15/28 (54%) include neurophysiological measures, and 5/28 (18%) will collect outcomes related to sleep or fatigue.

Discussion

This systematic review summarizes emerging trends in human tTIS research. While most studies to date have focused on safety and mechanistic outcomes in healthy participants and can thus be considered Phase 1 trials, preliminary clinical investigations—particularly in PD and ET—suggest that tTIS may offer acute motor symptom improvement. Across studies, tTIS was most commonly delivered at beta or gamma envelope frequencies to modulate neural oscillations implicated in motor control and cognitive functions [41,42]. Neuroimaging findings support the

engagement of the M1, basal ganglia, and hippocampus with tTIS, highlighting its potential as a non-invasive tool for targeted neuromodulation in humans.

Our review revealed several methodological trends that may guide future research. First, there is considerable heterogeneity in carrier frequencies (0.90-20.07 kHz) and current amplitudes (0.5-15 mA, zero-to-peak), reflecting the experimental nature of tTIS and ongoing efforts to optimize protocols. Carrier frequencies should be set to ≥2 kHz in order to minimize off-target neuronal activation, allowing only the low-frequency envelope to modulate focal neural activity [43–45]. According to recent safety guidelines [46,47], current amplitude should not exceed 16 mA at frequencies below 2.5 kHz, with higher thresholds permitted for higher frequencies. Current amplitudes generally remained below these safety limits, although higher intensities may be explored in future studies to maximize the field strength in the target. Safety outcomes were favourable across studies, with generally mild AEs (e.g., tingling, itching) and no serious AEs. These findings are in line with the largest human tTIS safety investigation to date [33], suggesting the overall tolerability of tTIS in humans. Of note, the higher current density in tTIS may elicit cutaneous sensations that could improve blinding efficiency relative to tACS [48].

Second, only four studies to date have employed multi-session tTIS protocols [27,30,33,37], although several upcoming trials plan to incorporate up to 40 sessions. This shift, along with expanding applications of tTIS in various neurological and psychiatric disorders, reflects a growing interest in the therapeutic potential of multi-session tTIS. Control conditions, however, remain variable across studies, underscoring the need for methodological standardization and rigorous blinding. tACS may serve as a better comparator than sham with no current (0 mA) to account for high-frequency carrier exposure and isolate tTIS-specific effects [49]. As tTIS is a

specialized form of tACS, both approaches produce similar sensory and physiological responses, making tACS a more mechanistically analogous control than sham.

Clinically, tTIS has primarily been explored in PD and ET [36,38,39], while its safety has also been demonstrated in individuals with TBI [33]. Motor improvements have been reported following the stimulation of basal ganglia targets in patients with PD and ET [36,38,39]. The greatest improvements were observed in rigidity and bradykinesia, consistent with effects seen in unilateral STN DBS [50]. The open-label trial [39] also reported a larger decrease in MDS-UPDRS-III scores compared to the RCT[36] (27.5% vs 14.7%), likely due to differences in study design (uncontrolled vs. sham-controlled; medication-OFF vs. medication-ON) and stimulation target (STN vs. GPi). Of note, the RCT [36] targeting the right GPi reported significant improvements particularly in contralateral motor function—consistent with the anatomy of motor control pathways [51]. In contrast, the open-label trial [39] observed stronger ipsilateral effects from unilateral STN stimulation, potentially reflecting cross-hemispheric connectivity within basal ganglia networks [50,52]. However, both studies involved small samples (8-15 patients) and assessed outcomes only up to 60 minutes after a single tTIS session, with no long-term follow-up data available. While these initial clinical findings may support the potential of tTIS to modulate motor circuits in movement disorders, larger RCTs are required to determine whether these acute benefits persist over multiple sessions and longer follow-ups.

Interestingly, bradykinesia and tremor have consistently emerged as symptoms showing potential benefits with tTIS targeting the basal ganglia. A case series [38] also reported reductions in resting tremor following bilateral SN stimulation in three patients, raising the possibility that tTIS may replicate some effects of DBS by modulating pathological beta oscillations (12–30 Hz)

[53–55]. The frequent use of 130 Hz envelopes mirrors conventional DBS protocols [56] and aligns with preclinical findings [57,58] of beta-range tTIS enhancing synaptic strength and plasticity in rodent motor circuits. However, mechanistic evidence in humans remains limited, and future studies incorporating EEG, fMRI, or invasive recordings of local field potentials through new DBS systems [59] should be considered.

In healthy populations, tTIS showed modest effects on motor outcomes, although some studies report frequency-dependent improvements in jump performance [37] or motor learning [20,27,34]. tTIS may help counteract age-related plasticity declines, based on findings [27] that striatal 100 Hz iTBS-patterned tTIS—approximating the lower therapeutic range of DBS [60]—accelerated motor adaptation in older adults. Replication of such findings is needed, and to determine their therapeutic value, future RCTs may consider evaluating tTIS as an adjunct to motor rehabilitation in aging populations or individuals with motor impairment.

Cognitive findings, on the other hand, remain variable. WM effects of tTIS remain limited [22,31], although some studies reported subtle improvements [23]. Hippocampal-targeted tTIS has shown promise in enhancing spatial navigation and episodic memory [26,35], particularly when stimulation was aligned with task-relevant timing and frequency. A key challenge in cognitive applications of tTIS is selecting behavioural tasks that accurately probe the function of targeted circuits [61,62]; such paradigms should be both sensitive and anatomically specific. As with other brain stimulation methods [63,64], tTIS appears to be more effective when the targeted network is actively engaged during stimulation rather than during the resting state, highlighting the importance of task-stimulation coupling to enhance both neural and behavioural effects [27].

One of the main advantages of tTIS is its potential for spatially selective targeting with minimized off-target effects [10,14,65,66]. Functional neuroimaging evidence supports this specificity, demonstrating successful neuromodulation of the motor [24,28], striatal [27,31,34], and hippocampal [26,35] circuits in humans. For instance, fMRI revealed striatal tTIS effects in the putamen, correlating with improved motor task performance [27]. Hippocampal tTIS using theta-range offsets reduced blood-oxygen-level-dependent (BOLD) signals during memory tasks and altered entorhinal activity [26,35], suggesting network-specific engagement. Region- and frequency-specific effects were also observed: 20 Hz tTIS over left M1 reduced dynamic FC variability yet increased mean FC strength within the sensorimotor network [28], while hippocampal theta-range tTIS modulated subregion-specific FC depending on current amplitude rations between stimulation channels (1:3 vs. 1:1 mA) [26]. Specifically, the 1:3 montage reduced FC in the middle and posterior hippocampal subregions, whereas the 1:1 montage primarily modulated anterior and middle subregions [26]. These findings highlight how stimulation parameters shape regional specificity, suggesting that tailoring envelope frequencies and amplitudes, along with optimizing electrode montages using individualized computational models [66,67], may enhance focality. Closed-loop protocols [68,69] may further improve precision and efficacy, maximizing target engagement.

Nevertheless, despite growing evidence of motor and some cognitive benefits, the ability of tTIS to reliably modulate brain oscillations remains inconsistent. Alpha-range tTIS has yielded no effects on resting alpha power [21,22,25], with some evidence for task-related modulation [32]. Beta- and gamma-range tTIS over M1 showed no EEG effects in two studies [21,29], suggesting that tTIS may be more effective in modulating task-specific rather than resting-state neural dynamics, depending on protocol design, task choice, and level of behavioural engagement

among study participants. Given high neural activation thresholds and tissue inhomogeneity, eliciting robust deep intracranial effects with low-intensity transcranial currents remains challenging [70,71]. Future work may explore alternative non-sinusoidal waveforms (e.g., pulse-width modulated tTIS [72]) or higher intensities to improve neural entrainment.

Strengths and Limitations

Strengths of this review include its comprehensive coverage of both clinical and basic tTIS studies, detailed consideration of ongoing clinical trials, and critical synthesis of methodological, safety, therapeutic, and mechanistic dimensions. Limitations include the small number of RCTs, publication bias, and heterogeneity in stimulation protocols, which collectively constrain reproducibility and generalizability. Future research should prioritize well-designed RCTs, multimodal mechanistic validation of tTIS effects, and systematic optimization of stimulation parameters—particularly under task engagement—to advance tTIS from experimental technique to clinically viable intervention.

Conclusions

Preliminary Phase 1 studies demonstrate the safety, tolerability, and short-term clinical benefits of tTIS in PD and ET, with evidence of target engagement of motor, striatal, and hippocampal circuits across healthy and clinical populations. However, existing evidence is limited by small sample sizes and lack of follow-up data, limiting conclusions about its therapeutic potential. Phase 2 trials are now needed to gather initial clinical efficacy data in patient populations, explore the effects of multi-session protocols, and assess the durability of effects. These trials

should ideally use tACS as a control condition and pair tTIS with carefully designed behavioural tasks tailored to the targeted neural circuits to maximize therapeutic specificity.

Acknowledgements

Conflict of Interest Disclosures

IT, **SC**, **HY**, **FG**, **AR**, **AK**, **SK**, **JAM**, **SJG**, **TAS**, and **SR** report no conflicts of interest. **ID** is a Vanier Scholar supported by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (award number 513715). **AD** is an employee of Soterix Medical, Inc. and is supported by the National Institutes of Health (grant numbers 1UG3NS139014-01 and R01EB035129), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (grant number 80NSSC22CA071), and the United States Department of Defense (grant number W81XWH22C0111). **ESB** is an inventor on the Temporal Interference (TI) Stimulation patent and a co-founder of TI Solutions, a for-profit company. **IRV** is supported by the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (grant number BB/S008314/1). **RC** has received research funding from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, the Parkinson Foundation, the National Organization for Rare Disorders, and the Dystonia Medical Research Foundation. He has served as a consultant for AbbVie, Ipsen, and Merz, and participated in a research study sponsored by AbbVie. **AML** holds the Hudson Chair in Neurosurgery and is a consultant for Abbott, Boston Scientific, and Functional Neuromodulation Inc. **VB** is supported by an Academic Scholar Award from the Department of Psychiatry at the University of Toronto and has received research support from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, the Brain & Behavior Research

Foundation, the Ontario Ministry of Health Innovation Funds, the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada, the Department of National Defence (Government of Canada), the New Frontiers in Research Fund, the American Foundation for Suicide Prevention, the University of Toronto Connaught Fund, the University of Toronto Excellence in Mental Health Seed Fund, and investigator-initiated trials supported by Roche Canada, Eisai Canada, Novartis, Associated Medical Services Inc. Healthcare, and the National Research Council of Canada.

Funding

None.

Data Access, Responsibility, and Analysis

ID and **VB** have full access to all the data in the manuscript and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

References

[1] GBD 2016 Neurology Collaborators. Global, regional, and national burden of neurological disorders, 1990-2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. Lancet Neurol 2019;18:459–80. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(18)30499-X.

[2] GBD 2019 Mental Disorders Collaborators. Global, regional, and national burden of 12 mental disorders in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. The Lancet Psychiatry 2022;9:137–50. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(21)00395-3.

[3] Lozano AM, Lipsman N, Bergman H, Brown P, Chabardes S, Chang JW, et al. Deep brain stimulation: current challenges and future directions. Nat Rev Neurol 2019;15:148–60. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41582-018-0128-2.

[4] Fenoy AJ, Simpson RK. Risks of common complications in deep brain stimulation surgery: management and avoidance: Clinical article. JNS 2014;120:132–9. https://doi.org/10.3171/2013.10.JNS131225.

[5] Camacho□Conde JA, Gonzalez□Bermudez MDR, Carretero□Rey M, Khan ZU. Brain stimulation: a therapeutic approach for the treatment of neurological disorders. CNS Neurosci Ther 2022;28:5–18. https://doi.org/10.1111/cns.13769.

[6] Hyde J, Carr H, Kelley N, Seneviratne R, Reed C, Parlatini V, et al. Efficacy of neurostimulation across mental disorders: systematic review and meta-analysis of 208 randomized controlled trials. Mol Psychiatry 2022;27:2709–19. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41380-022-01524-8.

[7] Darmani G, Bergmann TO, Butts Pauly K, Caskey CF, de Lecea L, Fomenko A, et al. Non-invasive transcranial ultrasound stimulation for neuromodulation. Clin Neurophysiol 2022;135:51–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2021.12.010.

[8] Murphy KR, Nandi T, Kop B, Osada T, Lueckel M, N'Djin WA, et al. A practical guide to transcranial ultrasonic stimulation from the IFCN-endorsed ITRUSST consortium. Clin Neurophysiol 2025;171:192–226. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2025.01.004.

[9] Sarica C, Fomenko A, Nankoo J-F, Darmani G, Vetkas A, Yamamoto K, et al. Toward focused ultrasound neuromodulation in deep brain stimulator implanted patients: Ex-vivo thermal, kinetic and targeting feasibility assessment. Brain Stimul 2022;15:376–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2021.12.012.

[10] Grossman N, Bono D, Dedic N, Kodandaramaiah SB, Rudenko A, Suk H-J, et al. Noninvasive Deep Brain Stimulation via Temporally Interfering Electric Fields. Cell 2017;169:1029-1041.e16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2017.05.024.

[11] Grossman N, Okun MS, Boyden ES. Translating Temporal Interference Brain Stimulation to Treat Neurological and Psychiatric Conditions. JAMA Neurol 2018;75:1307. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaneurol.2018.2760.

[12] Lozano AM. Waving Hello to Noninvasive Deep-Brain Stimulation. N Engl J Med 2017;377:1096–8. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMcibr1707165.

[13] Mirzakhalili E, Barra B, Capogrosso M, Lempka SF. Biophysics of Temporal Interference Stimulation. Cell Systems 2020;11:557-572.e5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cels.2020.10.004.

[14] Rampersad S, Roig-Solvas B, Yarossi M, Kulkarni PP, Santarnecchi E, Dorval AD, et al. Prospects for transcranial temporal interference stimulation in humans: A computational study. NeuroImage 2019;202:116124. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.116124.

[15] Yatsuda K, Yu W, Gomez-Tames J. Population-level insights into temporal interference for focused deep brain neuromodulation. Front Hum Neurosci 2024;18:1308549. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2024.1308549.

[16] Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021:n71. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71.

[17] National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute. Study Quality Assessment Tools 2019.

[18] R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing 2024.

[19] Heim N, Bobou M, Tanzer M, Jenkinson PM, Steinert C, Fotopoulou A. Psychological interventions for interoception in mental health disorders: A systematic review of

randomized-controlled trials. Psychiatry Clin Neurosci 2023;77:530–40. https://doi.org/10.1111/pcn.13576.

[20] Ma R, Xia X, Zhang W, Lu Z, Wu Q, Cui J, et al. High Gamma and Beta Temporal Interference Stimulation in the Human Motor Cortex Improves Motor Functions. Front Neurosci 2022;15:800436. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2021.800436.

[21] Piao Y, Ma R, Weng Y, Fan C, Xia X, Zhang W, et al. Safety Evaluation of Employing Temporal Interference Transcranial Alternating Current Stimulation in Human Studies. Brain Sciences 2022;12:1194. https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci12091194.

[22] von Conta J, Kasten FH, Schellhorn K, Ćurčić-Blake B, Aleman A, Herrmann CS. Benchmarking the effects of transcranial temporal interference stimulation (tTIS) in humans. Cortex 2022;154:299–310. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2022.05.017.

[23] Zhang Y, Zhou Z, Zhou J, Qian Z, Lü J, Li L, et al. Temporal interference stimulation targeting right frontoparietal areas enhances working memory in healthy individuals. Front Hum Neurosci 2022;16:918470. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2022.918470.

[24] Zhu Z, Xiong Y, Chen Y, Jiang Y, Qian Z, Lu J, et al. Temporal Interference (TI) Stimulation Boosts Functional Connectivity in Human Motor Cortex: A Comparison Study with Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation (tDCS). Neural Plast 2022;2022:1–7. https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/7605046.

[25] Iszak K, Gronemann SM, Meyer S, Hunold A, Zschüntzsch J, Bähr M, et al. Why Temporal Inference Stimulation May Fail in the Human Brain: A Pilot Research Study. Biomedicines 2023;11:1813. https://doi.org/10.3390/biomedicines11071813.

[26] Violante IR, Alania K, Cassarà AM, Neufeld E, Acerbo E, Carron R, et al. Non-invasive temporal interference electrical stimulation of the human hippocampus. Nat Neurosci 2023. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-023-01456-8.

[27] Wessel MJ, Beanato E, Popa T, Windel F, Vassiliadis P, Menoud P, et al. Noninvasive theta-burst stimulation of the human striatum enhances striatal activity and motor skill learning. Nat Neurosci 2023. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-023-01457-7.

[28] Zhu Z, Tang D, Qin L, Qian Z, Zhuang J, Liu Y. Syncing the brain's networks: dynamic functional connectivity shifts from temporal interference. Front Hum Neurosci 2024;18:1453638. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2024.1453638.

[29] Wang Y, Zeng GQ, Wang M, Zhang M, Chang C, Liu Q, et al. The safety and efficacy of applying a high-current temporal interference electrical stimulation in humans. Front Hum Neurosci 2024;18:1484593. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2024.1484593.

[30] Demchenko I, Rampersad S, Datta A, Horn A, Churchill NW, Kennedy SH, et al. Target engagement of the subgenual anterior cingulate cortex with transcranial temporal interference stimulation in major depressive disorder: a protocol for a randomized sham-controlled trial. Front Neurosci 2024;18:1390250. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2024.1390250.

[31] Modak P, Fine J, Colon B, Need E, Cheng H, Hulvershorn L, et al. Temporal interference electrical neurostimulation at 20 Hz beat frequency leads to increased fMRI BOLD activation in orbitofrontal cortex in humans. Brain Stimulation 2024;17:867–75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2024.07.014.

[32] Thiele C, Rufener KS, Repplinger S, Zaehle T, Ruhnau P. Transcranial temporal interference stimulation (TTIS) influences event related alpha activity during mental rotation. Psychophysiology 2024;61:e14651. https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.14651.

[33] Vassiliadis P, Stiennon E, Windel F, Wessel MJ, Beanato E, Hummel FC. Safety, tolerability and blinding efficiency of non-invasive deep transcranial temporal interference stimulation: first experience from more than 250 sessions. J Neural Eng 2024;21:024001. https://doi.org/10.1088/1741-2552/ad2d32.

[34] Vassiliadis P, Beanato E, Popa T, Windel F, Morishita T, Neufeld E, et al. Non-invasive stimulation of the human striatum disrupts reinforcement learning of motor skills. Nat Hum Behav 2024. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-024-01901-z.

[35] Beanato E, Moon H-J, Windel F, Vassiliadis P, Wessel MJ, Popa T, et al. Noninvasive modulation of the hippocampal-entorhinal complex during spatial navigation in humans. Sci Adv 2024;10:eado4103. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.ado4103.

[36] Yang C, Xu Y, Feng X, Wang B, Du Y, Wang K, et al. Transcranial Temporal Interference Stimulation of the Right Globus Pallidus in Parkinson’s Disease. Movement Disorders 2024:mds.29967. https://doi.org/10.1002/mds.29967.

[37] Zheng S, Fu T, Yan J, Zhu C, Li L, Qian Z, et al. Repetitive temporal interference stimulation improves jump performance but not the postural stability in young healthy males: a randomized controlled trial. J NeuroEngineering Rehabil 2024;21:38. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12984-024-01336-7.

[38] Liu R, Zhu G, Wu Z, Gan Y, Zhang J, Liu J, et al. Temporal interference stimulation targets deep primate brain. NeuroImage 2024;291:120581. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2024.120581.

[39] Yang C, Xu Y, Du Y, Shen X, Li T, Chen N, et al. Transcranial temporal interference subthalamic stimulation for treating motor symptoms in Parkinson's disease: A pilot study. Brain Stimulation 2024;17:1250–2. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2024.10.012.

[40] Goetz CG, Tilley BC, Shaftman SR, Stebbins GT, Fahn S, Martinez□Martin P, et al. Movement Disorder Society□sponsored revision of the Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (MDS□UPDRS): Scale presentation and clinimetric testing results. Movement Disorders 2008;23:2129–70. https://doi.org/10.1002/mds.22340.

[41] Barone J, Rossiter HE. Understanding the Role of Sensorimotor Beta Oscillations. Front Syst Neurosci 2021;15:655886. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnsys.2021.655886.

[42] Guan A, Wang S, Huang A, Qiu C, Li Y, Li X, et al. The role of gamma oscillations in central nervous system diseases: Mechanism and treatment. Front Cell Neurosci 2022;16:962957. https://doi.org/10.3389/fncel.2022.962957.

[43] Neudorfer C, Chow CT, Boutet A, Loh A, Germann J, Elias GJb, et al. Kilohertz-frequency stimulation of the nervous system: A review of underlying mechanisms. Brain Stimulation 2021;14:513–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2021.03.008.

[44] Ravasio CR, Kondabolu K, Zhou S, Lowet E, San Antonio E, Mount RA, et al. Kilohertz electrical stimulation evokes robust cellular responses like conventional frequencies but distinct population dynamics. Commun Biol 2025;8:19. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-024-07447-0.

[45] Lee J-I, Werginz P, Kameneva T, Im M, Fried SI. Membrane depolarization mediates both the inhibition of neural activity and cell-type-differences in response to high-frequency stimulation. Commun Biol 2024;7:734. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-024-06359-3.

[46] Cassarà AM, Newton TH, Zhuang K, Regel SJ, Achermann P, Pascual□Leone A, et al. Recommendations for the Safe Application of Temporal Interference Stimulation in the Human Brain Part I: Principles of Electrical Neuromodulation and Adverse Effects. Bioelectromagnetics 2025;46:e22542. https://doi.org/10.1002/bem.22542.

[47] Cassarà AM, Newton TH, Zhuang K, Regel SJ, Achermann P, Pascual□Leone A, et al. Recommendations for the Safe Application of Temporal Interference Stimulation in the Human Brain Part II: Biophysics, Dosimetry, and Safety Recommendations. Bioelectromagnetics 2025;46:e22536. https://doi.org/10.1002/bem.22536.

[48] O'Connell NE, Cossar J, Marston L, Wand BM, Bunce D, Moseley GL, et al. Rethinking Clinical Trials of Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation: Participant and Assessor Blinding Is Inadequate at Intensities of 2mA. PLoS ONE 2012;7:e47514. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0047514.

[49] Peterchev AV. One's Trash Is Another's Treasure: Subthreshold Kilohertz Brain Modulation as a Side Effect and as an Intervention. Brain Stimulation 2025:S1935861X25000579. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2025.03.004.

[50] Tabbal SD, Ushe M, Mink JW, Revilla FJ, Wernle AR, Hong M, et al. Unilateral subthalamic nucleus stimulation has a measurable ipsilateral effect on rigidity and bradykinesia in parkinson disease. Experimental Neurology 2008;211:234–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.expneurol.2008.01.024.

[51] Heming EA, Cross KP, Takei T, Cook DJ, Scott SH. Independent representations of ipsilateral and contralateral limbs in primary motor cortex. eLife 2019;8:e48190. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.48190.

[52] Hasegawa H, Fischer P, Tan H, Pogosyan A, Samuel M, Brown P, et al. The Effect of Unilateral Subthalamic Nucleus Deep Brain Stimulation on Contralateral Subthalamic Nucleus Local Field Potentials. Neuromodulation: Technology at the Neural Interface 2020;23:509–14. https://doi.org/10.1111/ner.13155.

[53] Mathiopoulou V, Lofredi R, Feldmann LK, Habets J, Darcy N, Neumann W-J, et al. Modulation of subthalamic beta oscillations by movement, dopamine, and deep brain stimulation in Parkinson's disease. Npj Parkinsons Dis 2024;10:77. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41531-024-00693-3.

[54] Bahadori-Jahromi F, Salehi S, Madadi Asl M, Valizadeh A. Efficient suppression of parkinsonian beta oscillations in a closed-loop model of deep brain stimulation with amplitude modulation. Front Hum Neurosci 2023;16:1013155. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2022.1013155.

[55] Müller EJ, Robinson PA. Suppression of Parkinsonian Beta Oscillations by Deep Brain Stimulation: Determination of Effective Protocols. Front Comput Neurosci 2018;12:98. https://doi.org/10.3389/fncom.2018.00098.

[56] Ramasubbu R, Lang S, Kiss ZHT. Dosing of Electrical Parameters in Deep Brain Stimulation (DBS) for Intractable Depression: A Review of Clinical Studies. Front Psychiatry 2018;9:302. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2018.00302.

[57] Liu X, Qi S, Hou L, Liu Y, Wang X. Noninvasive Deep Brain Stimulation via Temporal Interference Electric Fields Enhanced Motor Performance of Mice and Its Neuroplasticity Mechanisms. Mol Neurobiol 2024;61:3314–29. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12035-023-03721-0.

[58] Qi S, Liu X, Yu J, Liang Z, Liu Y, Wang X. Temporally interfering electric fields brain stimulation in primary motor cortex of mice promotes motor skill through enhancing neuroplasticity. Brain Stimulation 2024;17:245–57. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2024.02.014.

[59] Sarica C, Iorio-Morin C, Aguirre-Padilla DH, Najjar A, Paff M, Fomenko A, et al. Implantable Pulse Generators for Deep Brain Stimulation: Challenges, Complications, and Strategies for Practicality and Longevity. Front Hum Neurosci 2021;15:708481. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2021.708481.

[60] Currie AD, Wong JK, Okun MS. A review of temporal interference, nanoparticles, ultrasound, gene therapy, and designer receptors for Parkinson disease. Npj Parkinsons Dis 2024;10:195. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41531-024-00804-0.

[61] Parkin BL, Ekhtiari H, Walsh VF. Non-invasive Human Brain Stimulation in Cognitive Neuroscience: A Primer. Neuron 2015;87:932–45. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2015.07.032.

[62] Bestmann S, Walsh V. Transcranial electrical stimulation. Current Biology 2017;27:R1258–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2017.11.001.

[63] Silvanto J, Muggleton N, Walsh V. State-dependency in brain stimulation studies of perception and cognition. Trends in Cognitive Sciences 2008;12:447–54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2008.09.004.

[64] Miniussi C, Harris JA, Ruzzoli M. Modelling non-invasive brain stimulation in cognitive neuroscience. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews 2013;37:1702–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2013.06.014.

[65] Acerbo E, Jegou A, Luff C, Dzialecka P, Botzanowski B, Missey F, et al. Focal non-invasive deep-brain stimulation with temporal interference for the suppression of epileptic biomarkers. Front Neurosci 2022;16:945221. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2022.945221.

[66] Karimi N, Amirfattahi R, Zeidaabadi Nezhad A. Neuromodulation effect of temporal interference stimulation based on network computational model. Front Hum Neurosci 2024;18:1436205. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2024.1436205.

[67] Botzanowski B, Acerbo E, Lehmann S, Kearsley SL, Steiner M, Neufeld E, et al. Focal control of non-invasive deep brain stimulation using multipolar temporal interference. Bioelectron Med 2025;11:7. https://doi.org/10.1186/s42234-025-00169-6.

[68] Agnihotri SK, Cai J. Investigating the Effects of Transcranial Alternating Current Stimulation on Cortical Oscillations and Network Dynamics. Brain Sciences 2024;14:767. https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci14080767.

[69] Zarubin G, Gundlach C, Nikulin V, Villringer A, Bogdan M. Transient Amplitude Modulation of Alpha-Band Oscillations by Short-Time Intermittent Closed-Loop tACS. Front Hum Neurosci 2020;14:366. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2020.00366.

[70] Butson CR, McIntyre CC. Tissue and electrode capacitance reduce neural activation volumes during deep brain stimulation. Clin Neurophysiol 2005;116:2490–500. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2005.06.023.

[71] Nishimoto H, Kodera S, Otsuru N, Hirata A. Individual and group-level optimization of electric field in deep brain region during multichannel transcranial electrical stimulation. Front Neurosci 2024;18:1332135. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2024.1332135.

[72] Luff CE, Dzialecka P, Acerbo E, Williamson A, Grossman N. Pulse-width modulated temporal interference (PWM-TI) brain stimulation. Brain Stimulation 2024;17:92–103. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2023.12.010.