Intermittent Theta-burst Transcranial Temporal Interference Stimulation focusing on the Putamen improves Motor Functions in Parkinson's Disease – A randomized, controlled Trial

Johannes Stalter MD[1,2,3*], Heiko Stecher PhD[4], Linda Bergmann MSc[5], Pedro Arizpe-Gómez MSc[5], Andreas Hein PhD[5], André Aleman PhD[3,6], Christoph S. Herrmann PhD [4,7], Karsten Witt MD[1,2,7]

1) Department of Neurology, Carl von Ossietzky University Oldenburg, 26122 Oldenburg, Germany

2) University Hospital of Neurology, Evangelical Hospital Oldenburg, 26122 Oldenburg, Germany

3) University of Groningen, Cognitive Neuroscience Center, University Medical Center Groningen, 9713 GZ Groningen, The Netherlands

4) Experimental Psychology Lab, Carl von Ossietzky University Oldenburg, 26129 Oldenburg, Germany

5) Assistance Systems and Medical Device Technology, Carl von Ossietzky University Oldenburg, 26129 Oldenburg, Germany

6) Faculty of Psychology and Neuroscience, Maastricht University, Maastricht, The Netherlands

7) Center of Neurosensory Sciences, Carl von Ossietzky University Oldenburg, 26129 Oldenburg, Germany

Words: 4987

Tables: 3

Figures: 4

References: 47

*Correspondence to: Johannes Stalter, MD

Johannes.stalter@uni-oldenburg.de

Dept. Of Neurology, University Oldenburg

Heiligengeisthöfe 4

26121 Oldenburg

Lower Saxony, Germany

Abstract

Transcranial temporal interference stimulation (tTIS) is a non-invasive method designed to target deep brain regions, such as the basal ganglia, without affecting overlying cortical areas. This study investigated intermittent theta-burst (iTBS) tTIS effects on symptom severity in Parkinson's disease (PD) and motor learning behavior, a condition associated with – among others – basal ganglia dysfunction. We hypothesized that iTBS-tTIS applied to the right putamen would alleviate PD symptoms and improve motor learning expressed by the contra-lateral hand.

This randomized, double-blinded, crossover trial included 19 PD patients (mean age 64 years, 14 males) and 19 age- and sex-matched healthy controls (mean age 68.6 years). Structural MRI data were obtained for each participant, and individualized electric field simulations were performed to predict field strength in the right putamen. The motor part of the Movement Disorder Society's Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (MDS-UPDRS III) served as a primary outcome parameter, an alternating finger tapping task (aFTT) and Motor learning assessed through a sequential finger-tapping tasks (sFTT) were secondary outcome parameters.

ITBS-tTIS significantly reduced MDS-UPDRS motor scores in PD patients and the stimulation induced changes in motor performance correlated with the electric field strength in the targeted putamen region. No significant effects were found for motor performance or motor learning in either group. These findings indicate that iTBS-tTIS in general holds potential as a non-invasive approach for deep brain stimulation in PD.

Running title: tTIS in Parkinson's disease **Keywords:** Parkinson's disease; Neuromodulation; Temporal Interference Stimulation; Motor Learning; Deep Brain Stimulation

1 Introduction

Transcranial temporal interference stimulation (tTIS) is a newly developed technique to non-invasively stimulate regions in the depth of the brain without affecting the overlying cortex.[1] This method tackles the issues of the depth-focality tradeoff of "conventional" non-invasive brain stimulation techniques, such as alternating or direct current stimulation. Methodologically, tTIS is performed by applying two very-high frequency oscillations which are slightly different in frequency (e.g. 2 kHz and 2.1 kHz) and are overlapping in the region of interest (ROI) in deep brain regions such as the basal ganglia.[1] This way, the currents interfere with each other resulting in a carrier frequency that is amplitude-modulated (AM) at the delta of both frequencies (envelope frequency; in this example 0.1 kHz, i.e. 100 Hz) targeting the ROI. This AM-frequency then stimulates only the deep laying regions (Figure 1A). For an overview of this technique, see recent reviews.[2,3] By calculating the optimal electrode montage together with the applied current, the target region can be individually optimized and steered without physically moving the electrodes.[1] This technique has been proven safe and effective for stimulating regions in the depth of the brain in humans in various studies.[4–6]

In Parkinson's disease (PD), disturbances in the motor network can be attributed to known, altered oscillations in anatomically segregated pathways that were targeted by electric stimulation as a treatment option.[7] PD is characterized by a loss of dopamine neurons in the substantia nigra with a consecutive dysfunction in the neural loops connecting the basal ganglia with cortical areas involved in motor as well as in cognitive and limbic functions.[8] The motor dysfunctions are expressed by an increase of ß-oscillations with an anti-kinetic effect and a decrease of -oscillations that diminishes their prokinetic effects.[9–11] The use of deep brain stimulation (DBS) or dopaminergic drug treatment in Parkinson's disease decreases the ß-power in the subthalamic nucleus (STN) in parallel with an improvement of motor symptoms.[9,12,13] Conventional invasive DBS is limited by its invasiveness, and alternative non-invasive neurostimulation methods would expand the range of therapeutic options available. Previous non-invasive brain stimulation methods, such as transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) and (repetitive) transcranial magnetic stimulation ((r)TMS), have not been sufficiently effective in the long term, possibly due to their low focal intensity or limited depth of stimulation. tTIS may overcome these disadvantages and can be applied with different stimulation settings, such as excitatory low frequences, inhibitory high frequences and in an intermittent theta burst (iTBS) protocols that had been shown to elicit

long lasting excitatory features using different stimulation modalities such as transcranial magnetic stimulation, ultrasound stimulation or electric field stimulation.[14] tTIS therefore offers the potential to combine the positive effects of a cost-effective non-invasive therapy option with very little side-effects. Recently, it has been highlighted that there is a need for individualized electrical field simulation of non-invasive electrical stimulation to account for interindividual differences in anatomical variability.[15–17] This may be even more important when pathologically altered brains are stimulated. To take this into consideration, the electrical fields produced by tTIS can be simulated on a single subject level with individual, segmented MRI scans.[15]

In this study, we applied iTBS tTIS in a randomized, double-blinded crossover study design in a disease model for deep brain regions. By targeting the right putamen, we aim to improve motor functions in PD patients. We hypothesized that the application of an iTBS stimulation via tTIS to the right putamen reduces the severity of motor symptoms in PD patients. To ensure correct tTIS stimulation we test the iTBS-tTIS on motor learning in healthy seniors as demonstrated previously. In an exploratory approach the strength of the simulated e-field in the right putamen is correlated with the clinical effect of the stimulation. Thus, our study tries to assess the efficiency and feasibility of using iTBS tTIS in Parkinson's disease.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Participants

Patients were recruited from the outpatient clinic at the University Hospital for Neurology Oldenburg, Germany. Inclusion criteria are a clinical diagnosis of PD according to the MDS-criteria.[18] However, no prerequisites were made regarding disease severity. Healthy participants were recruited via newspapers and matched by age and sex. Participants as well as patients were included in the study if they were right-handed (according to *Edinburgh Handedness Scale*), without a history of neurological or psychiatric diseases (except for PD in the PD group). In addition, contraindications for MRI or electrical neurostimulation had to be absent. Further exclusion criteria were the intake of anticholinergic medication and the cognitive deficits exceeding a Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) sumscore lower than 18 points to ensure that all participants understand the test instructions. All participants gave written informed consent before inclusion in the study. Sample size was calculated using

PASS (Version 20.0.9) based on previous results of studies using tTIS. The study was conducted according to the Declaration of Helsinki, was approved by the local ethics committee and preregistered in the German Registry of Clinical Trials (DRKS00030841).

2.2 Study design

PD patients were examined while taking their regular antiparkinsonian medication, which had been stable for at least four weeks prior to the study and throughout the study period. In the first session, a detailed clinical examination took place and MRI data were obtained for all participants. After this, the randomization took place according to a Matlab-based randomization sequence. Stimulation scripts were prepared in a way, that none of the experimenters was able to see the actual condition. All involved people, including participants and outcome assessors, were blinded throughout the whole study participation. The study setup was identical for both conditions. The second session contained a baseline measurement of all experimental motor tasks (MDRS-UPDRS III, alternating Finger-tapping task, sequential finger-tapping task) described below, followed by the same order of tasks with real stimulation or the sham condition. At the end of the motor tests, a questionnaire about the adverse effects of non-invasive neurostimulation was given to participants in each stimulation or sham stimulation condition. The third session was equivalent to the second session, but with the corresponding stimulation/sham condition (Figure 1C). Between the sessions, a wash-out phase of minimum 10 days was established. The study was conducted in a randomized, double-blind cross-over design.

Figure 1



Figure 1: A) The first two rows illustrate two high-frequency signals (2 kHz and 2.1 kHz). The third row presents their combination, resulting in an amplitude-modulated tTIS signal characterized by three distinct peaks. These peaks are highlighted in red in the fourth row, which depicts ten trains of three peaks each over a two-second period. The fifth row illustrates the intermittent theta-burst pattern, where each two-second train is followed by an eight-second pause. This pattern repeats throughout the stimulation, with a 30-second ramp-up and ramp-down period at the beginning and end of the stimulation, respectively. For illustration purposes, the signal is shown as zero whenever no amplitude modulation occurs. During these times, both signals were oscillating at 2 kHz. (B) Simulation of transcranial temporal interference stimulation using electrode placements at F5/C5 and F6/C6, with a peak-to-peak current of 2 mA for each electrode pair. The color bar indicates the voltage gradient (V/m), representing the current reaching deep brain regions. The crosshairs mark the putamen. This simulation was generated using the MATLAB © toolbox SimNIBS 4.0 (Saturnino et al., 2019). A transversal section (upper figure) and a sagittal section (lower figure) are shown. (C) Study protocol: All participants were randomized (dice symbol) and double-blinded for assignment to the two study arms in a cross-over study design. (MRI = Magnetic Resonance Imaging; MDS-UPDRS III = Movement Disorder Society – Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale motor part; sFTT = Sequential Finger-Tapping Task, aFFT = Alternating Finger-Tapping Task).

2.3 MRI data

Structural imaging was acquired in the neuroimaging unit at Carl von Ossietzky University in Oldenburg using a 3.0 Tesla MRI system (Siemens Magnetom Prisma, Syngo MR E11, Siemens Medical Solutions, Erlangen, Germany) using a 64-channel head–neck-coil. A T1-weighted Magnetization Prepared Rapid Gradient Echo Sequence (MPRAGE; number of slices = 224; echo time TE = 255 ms; repetition time TR = 2,000 ms; flip angle = 9°; field of view = 240 × 240 mm; acquisition matrix = 320 × 320; voxel size = 0.8 × 0.8 × 0.8) was obtained together with a T2-weighted scan and a fluid-attenuated inversion recovery (FLAIR) sequence.

2.4 Simulation

To simulate the effect of stimulation, the software SimNIBS 4.1 and the equations given by Grossman et al. were used.[1,19] First, individual scans were segmented and the conductivity of each type of tissue was assigned for skin, bone, cerebrospinal fluid, gray and white matter. Using this individual mesh, simulation of the stimulation on a single-subject level with the SimNIBS 4.1 toolbox was computed. This allows to model the exact current flow from one electrode to another and the e-field strengths that are generated in each region of the brain. Simulations were run with an injected current of 2 mA peak-to-peak for electrode pairs positioned at F5-F6 and CP5-CP6 with 5x5 cm conducting rubber electrodes. Using the melb-atlas[20], we were able to simulate the electrical field in defined brain regions, such as the right putamen adapted to the individual neuroanatomy of each participant (see Figure 1B for a simulation of e-field current).

2.5 Stimulation

The actual stimulation was applied by two pairs of electrodes placed at F5-F6/CP5-CP6 attached to the scalp using ten20 paste (Weaver & Co, Aurora, CO, USA) with an impedance below 10 kΩ. The electrode montage was adapted from Wessel et al. 2023 and adjusted for the slightly shifted target region (right putamen) according to the stimulation simulation.[4] The right putamen was chosen since all participants self-reported being right-handed according to the Edinburgh Handedness Test and motor skill learning often demonstrated a higher gain in the non-dominate hand.[21] All stimulations started and ended with a ramp up and a ramp down of 30 seconds, respectively. The stimulation signal consisted of two sinusoidal currents. One

current was always oscillating at 2 kHz, the other was switched back and forth between 2 and 2.1 kHz. If the two frequencies were different, this resulted in an amplitude-modulated signal with a carrier frequency of 2.05 kHz (mean of the two frequencies) and a modulation frequency of 100 Hz (difference of the two frequencies). The switching of the frequency of the second current was chosen to result in periods of 30 ms – each containing three cycles of the 100 Hz amplitude-modulated oscillations (Figure 1A) targeting the putamen, followed by 170 ms with both signals oscillating at 2 kHz. This pattern is repeated over two seconds followed by a period with both signals oscillating at 2 kHz for eight seconds. This way, we mimicked a so-called Theta-Burst stimulation (5 Hz) as shown by Wessel and colleagues.[4] The total duration of stimulation was 25 minutes. The stimulation signals were created with a custom-written Matlab (V*ersion R2022b*. Natick, Massachusetts: The MathWorks Inc.) script and were converted to voltage signals via a digital to analog converter (Ni-USB 6251, National Instruments, Austin, TX, USA). The voltage signal was delivered to two battery-driven, galvanically isolated constant current stimulators (Advanced DC Stimulator Plus, Neuroconn, Ilmenau, Germany) resulting in a stimulation signal with a current intensity of 2 mA peak-to-peak.

2.6 Clinical and Motor Assessments and Outcomes

The primary objective of the study was to investigate the effects of iTBI-tTIS on motor target variables. We considered the change in MDS-UPDRS Part III on the left-sided upper extremity to be the primary endpoint. Secondary endpoints include alternating tapping behavior evaluating proximal arm movements. We also examined finger sequence learning using the left hand, comparable to the study by Wessel et al..[4]

2.6.1 Clinical Assessment

For a clinical characterization of PD patients, the MDS-UPDRS was used that included cognitive and affective domains (part I), management of activities of daily living (part II) and a detailed motor examination (part III) and motor complication such as dyskinesias and motor fluctuations (part IV).[18] The MDS-UPDRS total score can reach a maximum of 132 points with higher scores indicating higher PD symptom severity. To compare the medication across PD patients, for each patient, the levodopa equivalent daily dosage was calculated according to the formulars of Joost et al. 2023.[22] The Montral Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) is used to

assess the overall cognitive abilities over several domains.[23, 24] In addition we measured cognitive processing speed using the Symbol Digit Modalities Test (SDMT).[25] To screen for clinical relevant depression, we used the Beck Depression Inventory II, where a cut-off of 21 points indicates a clinical manifest depression.[26] To ensure right-handedness, all participants filled in the Edinburgh Handedness.[27] The side-effects of the stimulation were recorded based on structured self-reports of the participants. The most often named side-effects in the literature were collected in a questionnaire, additionally the severity of the experienced sensations were asked on a scale from 0 to 4. After each session, the questionnaire had to be filled in.

2.6.2 Motor Assessments and Outcome Parameters

The primary outcome of this study was the changes in parkinsonian symptoms of the left upper extremity, defined as change in the MDS-UPDRS part III under stimulation compared against the sham effect in PD patients. The left side was chosen, as the right putamen was targeted with the stimulation montage. The sum-score of the items 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.15, 3.16, 3.17, 3.18 of the left upper extremity served as outcome parameter.

The secondary outcome parameters focused on the amplitude and speed of movements of proximal sections of the left upper extremity, as well as motor learning. Performance of these motor tasks was measured in each participant at baseline and under real or sham stimulation condition, respectively. The alternating finger tapping task (aFTT) measures the motor performance by counting the number of key presses that can be performed by participants within 5 minutes, including five times of 30 seconds of alternating finger tapping intersected by four 30 seconds of rest periods. The keys for this task were 30 centimeters apart. This task was included to assess the speed of proximal arm movements. Participants are asked to press both keys alternately as quickly as possible. The outcome of the aFTT is the total number of key taps in 30 seconds across five alternative tapping runs, analyzed using a repeated measurement design. The sequential finger-tapping task was used to assesses motor skill learning.[28] Participants were required to press four numeric keys on a computer keyboard with the fingers two to five of their left hand repeating a given five-element sequence (e.g. “4-2-3-1-2”, corresponding to the order “little finger– middle finger – ring finger – index finger – middle finger”) “as quickly and as accurately as possible” for a period of 30 seconds. Four different sequences were used in a counterbalanced order across the experimental runs. The numeric sequence is displayed on the screen in front of the participants at all times to

minimize the working memory component of the task. Each block consisted of ten 30-second trails of sequential finger-tapping followed a 30-second rest period. Due to the movement disorder that characterizes Parkinson's disease, we decided not to use the number of sequences correctly executed within 30 seconds as an outcome variable, as this may overestimate motor speed at the expense of motor accuracy. Instead, we selected an accuracy measure based on the quotient of correct finger taps in the given sequence divided by the total number of keystrokes achieved in 30 seconds. These quotients were then used for further statistical analysis. The first trial was excluded from the analysis to compensate for individual difficulties in getting used to the task.

2.7 Statistics

The data was analyzed and visualized using JASP Team (2025) (JASP [Version 0.95.4] and Matlab (V*ersion R2022b*. Natick, Massachusetts: The MathWorks Inc.). To analyze demographic data, a Wilcoxon rank test was used for non-normally distributed values. Motor performance and motor learning was assessed with a linear mixed effects (LME) model, the variables group, condition, block and trial were used as fixed effects, the subject factor was inserted into the model as a random intercept. The MDS-UPDRS part III was analyzed by calculating the difference between baseline and sham or baseline and stim condition. Wilcoxon rank test was used to compare those values.

3 Results

3.1 Demographic and neuropsychological characteristics

19 PD patients and 19 healthy seniors participated in the study, fulfilled the inclusion criteria and completed the study between October 2023 and June 2024. No significant differences were observed between groups in age or gender (see Table 1). Global cognitive competence as measured by the MoCA did not significantly differ between groups, while PD patients performed significantly lower in the SDMT (PD 36.4 ± 11.50 vs. HC 47.0 ± 8.44, p=0.002). No participants were screened as demented according to a MoCA Score < 18 points. BDI II scores also did not significantly differ between PD patients and HC. No participant was classified as depressed according to a BDI II score > 21 points. None of the participants

stated to be a smoker and all participants were right-handed according to the *Edinburgh Handedness Scale.* The mean time period between the two stimulation sessions was 10.31 days (HC mean 8.1 min/max 6/16, PD mean 10.58 min/max 6/15) across both groups.

Further clinical data of the PD patient group are given in Table 1. The third part of the MDS-UPDRS which is a clinical examination of current motor symptoms, revealed a mean of 19.26 (± 9.26) points. With a mean MDS-UPDRS III at the first session of 19.26 (± 8.89) and at the second session of 17.42 (± 8.84) ($p = 0.21$ for the Wilcoxon signed rank test), there was no significant difference between both stimulation sessions. The average Hoehn & Yahr stage was 2.3 (SD=0.4).

Eleven patients (57.89%) showed the left side to be the dominantly affected side, while eight patients (42.11%) were more impaired on the right side. The mean disease duration was 6.26 years (SD = 4.43). For the levodopa equivalent daily dose (LEDD) a mean of 494.93 mg (SD = 309.76) was calculated (clinical characteristics see table 1).

Table 1: Baseline and clinical characteristics

	PD group	HC group	p-value
Age (years, mean, SD)	64.70 (9.27)	68.60 (6.26)	p>0.05
Sex (m/f)	13/6	10/9	p>0.05
Handedness (r/l)	19/0	19/0	
MoCA (mean, SD)	22.90 (2.65)	22.6 (1.71)	p>0.05
SMDT (mean, SD)	36.4 (11.50)	47.0 (8.44)	p=0.002
BDI (mean, SD)	7.78 (6.15)	5.11 (4.18)	p>0.05

Clinical data of the PD group

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Dev.
UPDRS_I	19	0	18	6.94	5.14
UPDRS_II	19	0	16	8.36	4.51
UPDRS_III	19	7	41	19.0	9.26
UPDRS_IV	19	0	8	1.26	2.077

SD = Standard deviation; PD = Parkinson's disease; HC = Healthy controls; m= male; f = female; MoCA = Montreal Cognitive Assessment; SDMT= Symbol Digit Modality Test; BDI = Becks Depression Inventory; MDS-UPDRS = Movement Disorder Society – Unified Parkinson's Diseases Rating Scale

3.2 Clinical Outcomes

3.2.1 MDS-UPDRS

The change of the sum score of the MDS-UPDRS left sided items of the upper extremity between pre to during real stimulation and the pre to during sham condition reveals a significant greater improvement of the real stimulation compared to the sham stimulation (W = 30.5, p = 0.015, r = 0.49, Mann-Whitney-U test). Table 2 shows the changes for the MDS-UPDRS part III and the different sub-scores for bradykinesia, tremor and rigidity of the left upper extremities.

Table 2 Results of the left-sided MDS-UPDRS part III (upper extremity)

	Pre Stim	***during Stim***	***Change***	***Pre Sham***	***during Sham***	***Change***	***p-value***
Total (SD)	3.33 (2.92)	2.22 (1.57)	-1.11 (0.73)	1.72 (1.78)	2.88 (2.01)	1.16 (0.51)	0.015
Bradykinesia (SD)	3.37 (2.05)	3.50 (2.31)	-0.27 (0.47)	3.66 (2.08)	3.72 (1.65)	005 (0.30)	
Tremor (SD)	0.88 (1.29)	0.76 (1.04)	0.00 (0.21)	0.88 (1.02)	0.47 (0.51)	-0.41 (0.24)	
Rigidity (SD)	2.44 (1.90)	1.88 (1.80)	-0.58 (0.33)	1.72 (1.89)	1.88 (1.86)	0.16 (0.31)	

SD = Standard deviation, MDS-UPDRS = Movement Disorder Society – Unified Parkinson's Diseases Rating Scale

3.2.2 Simulation results

The calculation of the mean e-field strength in the right putamen showed a comparable e-field of both groups (PD: 0.226 V/m (SD = 0.022) vs. HC: 0.242 V/m (SD = 0.031), p = 0.07). One outlier was eliminated from the analysis (e-field = 0.36 V/m). Pearson correlation analysis revealed a significant negative correlation between the calculated e-field in the right putamen and the improvement of motor function of the contralateral MDS-UPDRS total score (p = 0.023, slope = - 78,2151 [MDS-UPDRS points / V]) (Figure 2).

Figure 2



Figure 2: Correlation of the calculated change in the left-sided MDS-UPDRS and the simulated e-field of the right putamen. Blue points indicate individual patient data; the red line shows the regression line. There is a significant correlation between the mean e-field and the MDS-UPDRS. (MDS-UPDRS = Movement Disorder Society – Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale.)

3.3 Alternating Finger Tapping Task

The LME applied to the aFTT data showed significant effects for trial (chi^2 = 13.987, p = 0.007), block (chi^2 = 104.916, p < 0.001) and stim (chi^2 = 64.322, p < 0.001) while group presented only a trend (chi^2 = 3.087, p = 0.079). The interaction block x stim (chi^2 = 50.825, p < 0.001), block x group (chi^2 = 48.761, p < 0.001) and stim x group (chi^2 = 51.066, p < 0.001) were significant. Bonferroni adjusted post-hoc tests revealed a significant stimulation effect in the HC group compared to sham (estimate = 27.179; SE = 2.835; df = ∞; 95% CI 21.622 – 32.736; z = 9.586; p < .001), as well as a corresponding greater stimulation effect for HC than for PD (estimate = -24.846; SE = 4.065; df = ∞; 95% CI -32.813 – -16.878; z = -6.112; p < 0.001). It is noteworthy that the baseline in the tTIS session for the HC group was significantly lower than the baseline in the sham session. Therefore, most likely the

significant stimulation effect was driven by a poor performance in the HC group. No significant effects were found for the PD group (figure3).

Figure 3



Figure 3: Hits are defined as key presses on two different buttons. There was a significant improvement between the baseline and tTIS in the control group. No significant change was observed in the Parkinson's disease group. HC = Healthy controls; PD = Parkinson's disease.

3.4 Sequential Finger Tapping Task

The linear mixed effect model (LME) showed significant effects of block ($chi^2 = 10.967$, $p < 0.001$), stim ($chi^2 = 11.929$, $p < 0.001$), Group ($chi^2 = 7.823$, $p = 0.005$) and trial ($chi^2 = 31.304$, $p < 0.001$). Investigating the interactions, stim x group were significant ($chi^2 = 10.342$, $p = 0.001$). The Bonferroni adjusted post-hoc tests however did not reach a significant level for either group (figure 4).

Figure 4



Figure 4: Results of the Sequential Finger-Tapping Task. Upper panel: Sham sessions for both groups. Lower panel shows the data of the real stimulation tTIS sessions. Lines represent the marginal means while dots and triangles show individual data. Mean accuracy is calculated as the results of key presses within a correct sequence with all key presses of the trial. Again, No significant effects of real or sham stimulation were observed in either group. HC = Healthy controls; PD = Parkinson's disease.

3.5 Side effects of non-invasive neurostimulation

No severe side effects were reported in any group for any the condition. Table 3 shows the reported side effects and how often they were reported during stimulation or sham stimulation. Due to the low number of total reported side-effects, no statistical analysis was performed.

Table 3: Described side effects during and after transcranial temporal interference stimulation

Symptom	Total_count	Ratio sham condition	Ratio stim condition
Headache	4	0.75	0.25
Neck pain	3	0.33	0.66
Local pain	2	0.5	0.5
Missensation	5	0.2	0.8
Burning sensation	4	0.5	0.5
Heading	4	0.25	0.75
Redness	13	0.46	0.53
Fatigue	19	0.47	0.52
Concentration problems	6	0.33	0.66
Mood changes	1	0	1

4 Discussion

In this study, iTBS-tTIS was combined with clinical examinations and motor tasks in a group of Parkinson's patients in comparison to a healthy control group. Most importantly, a short stimulation of the putamen was able to improve the online MDS-UPDRS score as a clinical marker of symptom severity. Stimulation-induced changes in MDS-UPDRS part III correlated significantly with the simulated e-field in the right putamen. Furthermore, the HC group significantly profited from the stimulation regarding the motor performance as measured with the aFTT. tTIS had no significant effect on motor-learning behavior, neither in the HC nor in the PD group. No severe adverse side-effects were observed.

Baseline characteristics show a well-matched selection of participants, with the Parkinson specific data suggesting a clinically mildly affected patient group with a moderate daily LEDD and a short disease duration. The influence of cognitive impairment as a driver for differences in the performance was ruled out by the comparable results in the MoCA and the BDI. The results of the SDMT in turn showed an impairment of the processing speed as expected by PD patients. Since the cognitive processing speed can have an influence on the motor speed, especially in tapping tasks in Parkinson's disease, these results match with the generally lower scores in the tasks used in this study.[29] This should be kept in mind when evaluating the following task results.

No severe adverse side effects were reported by the participants. Adverse side effect that occurred were mostly of very short duration and lasted the longest until a few minutes after stimulation. The distribution between sham and stim condition was rather even, given the small number of reported cases. It is noteworthy that an erythema of the skin and fatigue were the most common side effects. A possible explanation might be that a red pen was used to mark the positions of the stimulation electrodes, and fatigue was reported only after study sessions of approximately two hours. Therefore, these factors are likely to be causal for the reported side effects.

Rationale of the stimulation paradigm

As temporal interference stimulation is thought to work on a subthreshold level, we did not aim to interfere with the firing rate directly – as done in conventional DBS. Instead, we chose the intermittent theta-burst pattern as described by Wessel et al.[4] The theta-burst pattern is derived from hippocampal slices and was proven in many TMS studies to have a beneficial effect on brain plasticity.[30] In addition, this pattern has already been proven to modulate

behavioral outcomes when applied to the basal ganglia. For the current intensity, we used a value of 2 mA (peak-to-peak) since this was found to be safe in previous studies in our lab and is below the recommended maximum current density in skin of 0.1 mA/cm^2 (= 2.5 mA zero-to-peak for 25cm^2 electrodes).[6]

Improvement of Parkinson's disease symptoms

In this study, we were able to enhance the performance of PD patients in a clinical test, namely the MDS-UPDRS by using high gamma frequency with an intermittent theta-burst pattern over a short period of time. Furthermore, when correlating the improvement in the UPDRS with the individually calculated e-field in the ROI, a significant correlation could be shown, i.e. higher simulated e-fields were shown in participants with greater improvement under stimulation. This may provide a causal connection between the experimental stimulation and the online clinical effects on patients.

One of the hallmarks of PD is the impaired movement, especially a slowing down and a reduction of the movement.[31] According to the MDS-UPDRS, this is measured with the amplitude and the velocity of finger tapping, fist closing or limb movement.[32] Typically, these parameters are decreasing more over the examination time compared to healthy controls. These clinical measurements are used as a marker for the success of conventional deep brain stimulation and drug therapy in clinical practice. Dopaminergic dysfunction in PD is particularly pronounced in the substantia nigra's (SNc) pars compacta.[33] The neurons in this region project to the putamen, a fact that can be demonstrated clinically by reduced tracer uptake in the Dopamine Transporter scan of this region.[34] In the pathophysiological model of PD, due to the degeneration of dopaminergic neurons in the substantia nigra the inhibiting effect of the putamen to the globus pallidus internus (GPi) is decreased. In parallel, the inhibition of the subthalamic nucleus (STN) decreases. These two mechanisms lead to an extensive excitation of the GPi, which in turn functions as the "exit nucleus" of the basal ganglia (BG) loop.[35,36] Conventional DBS is using the STN as the target region, i.e. changing the output of the basal ganglia loop.[37] By choosing the "entrance" of the basal ganglia loop, i.e. the putamen as the target region, the basal ganglia system in general can be altered. In addition, it is thought that not only pathological frequencies but also pathological neuronal firing patterns are phenomena closely connected with PD.[38] Therefore it can be assumed that changing the entrance of the basal ganglia loop into a more physiological way, the effects on the following structures are not only changing the firing rate but also modulate the firing

pattern. This is of special interest when considering the other loops of the BG, namely the limbic and the cognitive loop.

By improving patients in this early disease stadium with tTIS, it opens the therapy approach even for patients in earlier stadiums of the disease and not, like conventional DBS, as therapy option in a stage when motor complications occur. The online improvement of motor symptoms in Parkinson's disease using tTIS in the region of the putamen with a plasticity modulating stimulation paradigm as shown in this study can be therefore interpreted as a proof of feasibility and therefore paves to way for this technique as a new treatment principal. Only few studies investigated the effects of tTIS in Parkinson's disease.[39–43] In contrast to the present study, those other studies chose a stimulation paradigm closely related to the paradigm of conventional DBS, using tTIS to disrupt neuronal firing and therefore improve motor symptoms in Parkinson's disease. By using an intermitted theta burst approach, we used neuronal plasticity effects to modulate Parkinson's disease symptoms.

Simulation of applied e-fields

Using an individualized approach to simulate the electrical fields for each individual, not only were individual differences taken into account, but also differences related to the pathological changes during the course of the neurodegenerative disease. Interestingly, there are no significant differences between the mean values when both groups are compared. Since a threshold of 0.2 V/m is thought to be necessary to sufficiently stimulate neurons on a subthreshold level, the individual e-field data for both groups show the potential of tTIS to stimulate deep brain regions.[44,45] The comparability of both groups regarding the individualized e-fields might be explained by the short disease duration of the PD group. To our knowledge, no study investigated this so far and this finding adds valuable insights into the question of how individualized tTIS should be performed in a clinical setting, especially regarding the need of individual simulation in dependence of the disease duration in neurodegenerative diseases.

Effects on motor learning

In this study, the motor learning behavior of older healthy participants and PD patients could not be improved by shortly stimulating the right putamen with a 100 Hz intermittent theta burst stimulation paradigm. The missing improvement in motor learning in the PD group could be explained by a theory raised by Seidler et al.[46] According to the principals of this hypothesis, the learned motor behavior needs to be translated into the corresponding

movement pattern, causing a potential difference between motor learning and motor performance. In other words, if the motor execution is impaired, the motor learning takes place but cannot be executed, also called a learning-performance dissociation. Since the motor execution is impaired in Parkinson's disease, this could be one part of a potential explanation for the missing improvement in the sFTT in the Parkinson's disease group. Another part may be strong placebo effect that is typical in patients with PD, which diminished potential stimulation effects for the task.[47] Besides these disease-specific reasons, there are additional potential explanations which need to be considered for both groups. This applies, for example, for the stimulation pattern, that is thought to cause a change in neuroplasticity which takes some time to fully take place. The relatively short stimulation duration could therefore be a main issue for the missing effects. For tTIS, there is to date no established dose-dependency known, representing a second potential reason related to the stimulation time.

Effects on alternative finger-tapping

Like the motor learning behavior, the motor performance as measured by an alternating finger tapping task showed no significant reaction to iTB-tTIS, in either of the groups, when taking the shift in the baseline for HC in the stimulation session. Considering the relatively similar pattern of both groups across all conditions, it seems likely that there was a strong ceiling effect in the behavioral data as there was no real improvement or diminished worsening in the groups under stimulation or sham. In addition, the limitations for the results of the sFTT might apply to this task as well.

Limitations

Besides the limitations mentioned above, the PD group in this study was relatively mildly affected, so results might not differ significantly from those of the healthy group. Furthermore, there was a certain heterogeneity in the PD group, mostly regarding the MDS-UPDRS which might have limited the effects in the presented study. A relatively short stimulation duration as well as low amplitude may be considered as stimulation-related limitations

Future Directions

In this study, we were able to prove the feasibility and short-term clinical impact of this stimulation technique leading to its investigation as a potential treatment option in PD. By

modulating neuronal activity, this cost-effective and safe method opens a new field of neuro-enhancement and techniques to understand cognitive functioning not only for cortical regions but also deeper layers of the brain. Because of its side-effect profile and the low costs, it can also be used as a research tool to further investigate brain function in healthy and pathologically altered states. This together with the directly clinically measured improvement in PD symptoms can be interpreted as a proof for its feasibility and its potential as a new therapeutical approach.

In future studies, larger groups of more severely affected patients should be investigated. Additionally, investigations regarding the dose-dependency and potential after-effects should take place. Since no severe adverse side-effects were reported in our study, which is in line with other experiments, one could think of higher stimulation currents to further improve the effects of non-invasive deep brain stimulation.[5] The combination of tTIS and functional MR-imaging opens another interesting field, especially when applied in a disease model like Parkinson's disease.

5 Data availability

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author, upon reasonable request.

6 Funding

The study was partly funded by the German Research Council (DFG), under the Research Training Group Neuromodulation of Motor and Cognitive Function in Brain Health and Disease (RTG 2783).

7 Competing interests

The authors declare no conflict of interest relevant to the presented work. The following financial interests/personal relationships are declared: CSH holds a patent on brain stimulation. JS received speaker fees from Roche Pharma. KW received travel expense reimbursement and speaker fees from BIAL, Stadapharma, Eisai and Project funding from the DFG as well as from the state of Lower Saxony. HS, LB, PAG, AH, AA declare no competing interests.

8 References

1. Grossman N, Bono D, Dedic N, et al. Noninvasive Deep Brain Stimulation via Temporally Interfering Electric Fields. *Cell*. 2017;169(6):1029-1041.e16. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2017.05.024
2. Stalter J, Aleman A, Witt K, Herrmann CS. Scientific Methods to Enhance Cognitive Performance and Brain Plasticity: Transcranial Alternating Current/Temporal Interference Stimulation. In: Barbey A, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Enhancement and Brain Plasticity*. Oxford University Press; 2025. doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780197677131.001.0001
3. Hummel FC, Wessel MJ. Non-invasive deep brain stimulation: interventional targeting of deep brain areas in neurological disorders. *Nat Rev Neurol*. 2024;20(8):451-452. doi:10.1038/S41582-024-00990-8
4. Wessel MJ, Beanato E, Popa T, et al. Noninvasive theta-burst stimulation of the human striatum enhances striatal activity and motor skill learning. *Nature Neuroscience 2023*. Published online October 19, 2023:1-12. doi:10.1038/s41593-023-01457-7
5. 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(2). doi:10.1088/1741-2552/AD2D32
6. 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. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2022.05.017
7. Deuschl G, Schade-Brittinger C, Krack P, et al. A randomized trial of deep-brain stimulation for Parkinson's disease. *N Engl J Med*. 2006;355(9):896-908. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa060281
8. Volkmann J, Daniels C, Witt K. Neuropsychiatric effects of subthalamic neurostimulation in Parkinson disease. *Nat Rev Neurol*. 2010;6(9):487-498. doi:10.1038/nrneurol.2010.111
9. Doyle LMF, Kühn AA, Hariz M, Kupsch A, Schneider GH, Brown P. Levodopa-induced modulation of subthalamic beta oscillations during self-paced movements in patients with Parkinson's disease. *Eur J Neurosci*. 2005;21(5):1403-1412. doi:10.1111/j.1460-9568.2005.03969.x
10. Tinkhauser G, Pogosyan A, Tan H, Herz DM, Kühn AA, Brown P. Beta burst dynamics in Parkinson's disease OFF and ON dopaminergic medication. *Brain*. 2017;140(11):2968-2981. doi:10.1093/brain/awx252
11. Neumann WJ, Steiner LA, Milosevic L. Neurophysiological mechanisms of deep brain stimulation across spatiotemporal resolutions. *Brain*. 2023;146:4456-4468. doi:10.1093/brain/awad239
12. Kühn AA, Kempf F, Brücke C, et al. High-frequency stimulation of the subthalamic nucleus suppresses oscillatory beta activity in patients with Parkinson's disease in parallel with improvement in motor performance. *J Neurosci*. 2008;28(24):6165-6173. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0282-08.2008
13. Köhler RM, Binns TS, Merk T, et al. Dopamine and deep brain stimulation accelerate the neural dynamics of volitional action in Parkinson's disease. *Brain*. 2024;147(10):3358-3369. doi:10.1093/brain/awae219

14. Kricheldorff J, Göke K, Kiebs M, et al. Evidence of Neuroplastic Changes after Transcranial Magnetic, Electric, and Deep Brain Stimulation. *Brain Sci*. 2022;12(7). doi:10.3390/brainsci12070929
15. Saturnino GB, Puonti O, Nielsen JD, Antonenko D, Madsen KH, Thielscher A. SimNIBS 2.1: A Comprehensive Pipeline for Individualized Electric Field Modelling for Transcranial Brain Stimulation. *Brain and Human Body Modeling: Computational Human Modeling at EMBC 2018*. Published online January 1, 2019:3-25. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-21293-3_1
16. Kasten FH, Duecker K, Maack MC, Meiser A, Herrmann CS. Integrating electric field modeling and neuroimaging to explain inter-individual variability of tACS effects. *Nature Communications 2019 10:1*. 2019;10(1):1-11. doi:10.1038/s41467-019-13417-6
17. von Conta J, Kasten FH, Ćurčić-Blake B, Aleman A, Thielscher A, Herrmann CS. Interindividual variability of electric fields during transcranial temporal interference stimulation (tTIS). *Sci Rep*. 2021;11(1):20357. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-99749-0
18. Postuma RB, Berg D, Stern M, et al. MDS clinical diagnostic criteria for Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord*. 2015;30(12):1591-1601. doi:10.1002/MDS.26424
19. Thielscher A, Antunes A, Saturnino GB. Field modeling for transcranial magnetic stimulation: A useful tool to understand the physiological effects of TMS? *Annu Int Conf IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc*. 2015;2015:222-225. doi:10.1109/EMBC.2015.7318340
20. Tian Y, Margulies DS, Breakspear M, Zalesky A. Topographic organization of the human subcortex unveiled with functional connectivity gradients. *Nature Neuroscience 2020 23:11*. 2020;23(11):1421-1432. doi:10.1038/s41593-020-00711-6
21. Sawamura D, Sakuraba S, Suzuki Y, et al. Acquisition of chopstick-operation skills with the non-dominant hand and concomitant changes in brain activity. *Sci Rep*. 2019;9. doi:10.1038/S41598-019-56956-0
22. Jost ST, Kaldenbach MA, Antonini A, et al. Levodopa Dose Equivalency in Parkinson's Disease: Updated Systematic Review and Proposals. *Movement Disorders*. 2023;38(7):1236-1252. doi:10.1002/mds.29410
23. Nasreddine ZS, Phillips NA, Bédirian V, et al. The Montreal Cognitive Assessment, MoCA: a brief screening tool for mild cognitive impairment. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2005;53(4):695-699. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2005.53221.x
24. Hoops S, Nazem S, Siderowf AD, et al. Validity of the MoCA and MMSE in the detection of MCI and dementia in Parkinson disease. *Neurology*. 2009;73(21):1738-1745. doi:10.1212/WNL.0B013E3181C34B47
25. Smith A. Symbol Digit Modalities Test (Revised). *Western Psychological Services*. Published online 1973. doi:https://doi.org/10.1037/t27513-000
26. Hautzinger M, Keller F, Kühner C. Beck Depressions-Inventar (BDI-II). Revision. *Nervenarzt*. 2006;62(11):689-696.
27. Veale JF. Edinburgh Handedness Inventory - Short Form: a revised version based on confirmatory factor analysis. *Laterality*. 2014;19(2):164-177. doi:10.1080/1357650X.2013.783045
28. Walker MP, Brakefield T, Morgan A, Hobson JA, Stickgold R. Practice with sleep makes perfect: Sleep-dependent motor skill learning. *Neuron*. 2002;35(1):205-211. doi:10.1016/S0896-6273(02)00746-8
29. Menon V, Hegde S, Pratyusha P, et al. Motor Speed Matters! Cognitive Profile of Parkinson's Disease Patients with and without Deficits in Motor Speed. *Neurol India*. 2021;69(3):604-608. doi:10.4103/0028-3886.317232

30. Huang YZ, Edwards MJ, Rounis E, Bhatia KP, Rothwell JC. Theta burst stimulation of the human motor cortex. *Neuron*. 2005;45(2):201-206. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2004.12.033
31. Lees AJ, Hardy J, Revesz T. Parkinson's disease. *The Lancet*. 2009;373(9680):2055-2066. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(09)60492-X
32. Goetz CG, Tilley BC, Shaftman SR, 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(15):2129-2170. doi:10.1002/mds.22340
33. Ehringer H, Hornykiewicz O. Distribution of noradrenaline and dopamine (3-hydroxytyramine) in the human brain and their behavior in diseases of the extrapyramidal system. *Klin Wochenschr*. 1960;38(24):1236-1239. doi:10.1007/BF01485901
34. Fahn S, Sulzer D. Neurodegeneration and Neuroprotection in Parkinson Disease. *NeuroRx*. 2004;1(1):139. doi:10.1602/NEURORX.1.1.139
35. Rivlin-Etzion M, Marmor O, Heimer G, Raz A, Nini A, Bergman H. Basal ganglia oscillations and pathophysiology of movement disorders. *Curr Opin Neurobiol*. 2006;16(6):629-637. doi:10.1016/j.conb.2006.10.002
36. Kravitz A V, Freeze BS, Parker PRL, et al. Regulation of parkinsonian motor behaviours by optogenetic control of basal ganglia circuitry. *Nature*. 2010;466(7306):622-626. doi:10.1038/nature09159
37. Schuepbach WMM, Rau J, Knudsen K, et al. Neurostimulation for Parkinson's Disease with Early Motor Complications. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2013;368(21):2037-2038. doi:10.1056/nejmc1303485
38. Hammond C, Bergman H, Brown P. Pathological synchronization in Parkinson's disease: networks, models and treatments. *Trends Neurosci*. 2007;30(7):357-364. doi:10.1016/J.TINS.2007.05.004
39. Yang C, Xu Y, Feng X, et al. Transcranial Temporal Interference Stimulation of the Right Globus Pallidus in Parkinson's Disease. *Movement Disorders*. 2025;40(6):1-9. doi:10.1002/MDS.29967
40. Yang C, Xu Y, Du Y, et al. Transcranial Temporal Interference Subthalamic Stimulation for Treating Motor Symptoms in Parkinson's Disease: A Pilot Study. *Brain Stimul*. 2024;17(6):1250-1252. doi:10.1016/J.BRS.2024.10.012
41. Lamoš M, Bočková M, Missey F, et al. Noninvasive Temporal Interference Stimulation of the Subthalamic Nucleus in Parkinson's Disease Reduces Beta Activity. *Movement Disorders* . 2025;40(6):1051-1060. doi:10.1002/MDS.30134
42. Li T, Yang C, Xu Y, et al. Transcranial temporal interference stimulation of the globus pallidus internus ameliorates gait variability in early- to mid-stage Parkinson's disease: A pilot study. *Brain Stimul*. 2026;19(1). doi:10.1016/j.brs.2025.103007
43. Yang C, Xu Y, Du Y, et al. Transcranial Temporal Interference STN Stimulation Alleviates Motor Symptoms in Parkinson's Disease A Pilot Randomized Controlled Study. *SSRN*. 2025;Preprint. doi:https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5677263
44. Louviot S, Tyvaert L, Maillard LG, Colnat-Coulbois S, Dmochowski J, Koessler L. Transcranial Electrical Stimulation generates electric fields in deep human brain structures. *Brain Stimul*. 2022;15(1):1-12. doi:10.1016/J.BRS.2021.11.001
45. Huang Y, Liu AA, Lafon B, et al. Measurements and models of electric fields in the in vivo human brain during transcranial electric stimulation. *Elife*. 2017;6(e18834.). doi:10.7554/ELIFE.18834

46. Seidler RD, Purushotham A, Kim SG, U□urbil K, Willingham D, Ashe J. Cerebellum activation associated with performance change but not motor learning. *Science*. 2002;296(5575):2043-2046. doi:10.1126/science.1068524
47. Quattrone A, Barbagallo G, Cerasa A, Stoessl AJ. Neurobiology of placebo effect in Parkinson's disease: What we have learned and where we are going. *Movement Disorders*. 2018;33(8):1213-1227. doi:10.1002/mds.27438