Greater sustained sensorimotor function recovery and neuropathic pain reduction with Cognitive Multisensory Rehabilitation compared to adaptive fitness in adults with spinal cord injury: a pilot clinical trial.

Ann Van de Winckel[1*], Sydney T. Carpentier[2], Sara Bottale[3], Jena Blackwood[2], Wei Deng[2], Lin Zhang[4], Timothy J. Hendrickson[5], Bryon A. Mueller[6], Ruhollah Nourian[7], Sheri Melander-Smith[8], Leslie R. Morse[9], Kelvin O. Lim[6]

[1] Division of Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation Science, Department of Family Medicine and Community Health, Medical School, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455, USA

[2] Rehabilitation Science Graduate Program, Department of Family Medicine and Community Health, Medical School, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455, USA

[3] Centro Studi di Riabilitazione Neurocognitiva - Villa Miari (Study Center for Cognitive Multisensory Rehabilitation), Santorso VI, Italy

[4] Division of Biostatistics, School of Public Health, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55414 USA

[5] Masonic Institute for the Developing Brain, University of Minnesota; Minnesota Supercomputing Institute, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, 55414, USA

[6] Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Medical School, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55454, USA

[7] Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, School of Medicine, University of Minnesota, MN, USA; Sports Medicine Research Center, Neuroscience Institute, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

[8] "Living forward", Minneapolis, Minnesota

[9] Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Miller Medical School, University of Miami, Miami, FL 33136, USA

*** Correspondence:**
Ann Van de Winckel
avandewi@umn.edu

Keywords: spinal cord injury, neuropathic pain, cognitive multisensory rehabilitation, sensory function, motor function, functional magnetic resonance imaging, adaptive fitness, mental body representations

List of acronyms

AIS: ASIA Impairment Scale

ANS: Autonomic Standards Assessment form

BARQ-R: Revised Body Awareness Rating Questionnaire

CHART-SF: Craig Handicap Assessment and Reporting Technique-Short Form

CMR: Cognitive Multisensory Rehabilitation

DN4: Douleur Neuropathique 4

FAS: Functionality Appreciation Scale

fMRI: functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging

ISNCSCI: International Standards for Neurological Classification of Spinal Cord Injury

KVIQ: Kinesthetic and Visual Imagery Questionnaire

MAIA-2: Multidimensional Assessment Interoceptive Awareness – version 2

MBR: Mental Body Representations

MCID: Minimum Clinically Important Difference

MSES: Moorong Self-Efficacy Scale

NPRS: Numeric Pain Rating Scale

PAS: Postural Awareness Scale

PHQ-9: Patient Health Questionnaire

PSFS: Patient-Specific Functional Scale

PSQI: Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index

SAI/TAI: State Trait Anxiety Inventory

SCI: Spinal Cord Injury

SCI-FI/AT: Spinal Cord Injury Functional Index/Assistive Technology

SCI-QOL: Spinal Cord Injury Quality of Life measurement system

TSK: Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia

VA: Veterans Affairs

Abstract

Introduction: Adults with spinal cord injury (SCI) often experience reduced or lost sensation and movement, impairing the ability of the brain to locate paralyzed body parts, which, in turn, compromises sensorimotor recovery. This disruption of the internal body map of the brain, or mental body representations (MBR), also contributes to neuropathic pain in about 69% of adults with SCI. Medications for neuropathic pain are often ineffective and can cause adverse reactions. Our previous pilot clinical trial showed that Cognitive Multisensory Rehabilitation (CMR), a physical therapy that

restores MBR, produced significant, lasting reductions in neuropathic pain, improved sensorimotor function, and enhanced brain function. Building on these results, we examined whether 8 weeks of CMR or adaptive fitness (1) improved sensorimotor function and reduced pain; (2) greater brain activity and connectivity related to sensorimotor function and MBR in adults with SCI.

Methods: Sixteen participants (52+/-8 years old, 13+/-10 years post-SCI) were randomized to 8 weeks of CMR or adaptive fitness (45 min, 3x/week). Ten participants had neuropathic pain of 3/10 or greater. Pain and sensorimotor function were assessed at baseline, post-intervention, and 3-month follow-up using the Numeric Pain Rating Scale (NPRS), ASIA Impairment Scale (AIS), and Neuromuscular Recovery Scale (NRS). Functional MRI included resting-state and 4 tasks: imagining feeling the left leg, imagining moving the left leg, whole-body movement imagery, and a sensation task.

Results: After CMR, participants improved on AIS with large effect sizes (touch: d=1.54; pinprick: d=1.83; lower limb motor function: d=1.32), while adaptive fitness had small/moderate effects (touch: d=0.49; pinprick: d=0.53; lower limb motor function: d=0.74). CMR also showed larger effect sizes for NRS (core: d=2.19; upper limb: d=0.69; lower limb: d=0.74) than fitness (core: d=0.73; upper limb: d=0.34; lower limb: d=0.00). Benefits persisted at follow-up. Highest neuropathic pain intensity reduced post-CMR and at 3-month follow-up (d=0.48; d=0.63). Pain increased slightly after fitness (n=6; d=-0.19; d=-0.41). CMR increased brain connectivity and activation during the leg imagery task. Increased activation during whole-body imagery was greater after CMR than fitness.

Discussion: These preliminary results support the potential of CMR to improve function and reduce neuropathic pain in adults with SCI, warranting larger confirmatory trials.

Clinicaltrial.gov: NCT05167032

1 Introduction

Spinal cord injury (SCI) imposes a severe dual burden on individuals, characterized not only by profound sensorimotor deficits but also by debilitating neuropathic pain, affecting about 69% of this population.(1–4) Traditional rehabilitation focuses heavily on functional motor recovery. Concurrent management of neuropathic pain is often reliant on pharmacological treatments that are frequently insufficient and can often cause significant adverse reactions. Consequently, there is an urgent need for effective, non-pharmacological interventions that address both functional recovery and pain to improve quality of life for adults with SCI.

A critical, yet often overlooked, driver of both poor sensorimotor recovery and neuropathic pain is the disruption of the brain's 'mental body representations' (MBR). MBR encompasses whole-body awareness, and the brain's ability to locate body parts in space via visuospatial body maps.(3–7) When SCI interrupts sensory and motor signals, the brain areas responsible for these maps—specifically the parietal operculum and insula for body awareness, the posterior parietal cortex for visuospatial body maps within the sensorimotor network, and the posterior cingulate cortex for self-location and body ownership—lose their normal input.(8–11)

We have previously demonstrated that SCI leads to weaker sensorimotor network connectivity and maladaptive neuroplasticity, compared to non-injured adults.(9) Without accurate MBR, the brain

cannot locate the (paralyzed) limbs, thus, severely limiting motor recovery (e.g., walking), even when residual muscle strength exists, because the brain does not know how or where to activate those muscles. This same maladaptive cortical reorganization is a well-documented contributor to neuropathic pain onset and maintenance.(3,4,12,13) As the parietal operculum and insula are key regions for both MBR and pain,(14,15) restoring MBR is expected to improve sensorimotor recovery and reduce neuropathic pain.

Our previous pilot clinical trial demonstrated that Cognitive Multisensory Rehabilitation (CMR)─a physical therapy approach designed specifically to restore MBR─ holds significant promise, increasing brain activity and connectivity in areas relevant for MBR and sensorimotor function.(10,16) The clinical sensorimotor recovery after CMR is consistent with other studies in stroke populations.(8,17–20) Our earlier case studies further showed that CMR helped restore vision, sensory, and motor function in a person with cortical blindness and quadriplegia, and, relieved phantom limb pain after amputation.(21,22)

Based on these findings, we investigated whether 8 weeks of CMR could yield greater sensorimotor recovery than an active control intervention. We selected adaptive fitness as the control because it is a standard, community-accessible exercise program, commonly provided to adults with SCI following clinical neurorehabilitation. While systematic reviews show that fitness training improves cardiovascular health and upper limb strength, these programs, excluding interventions needing more hands-on assistance like body-weight supported treadmill training, typically focus on non-paretic limbs and do not explicitly target MBR restoration or neuropathic pain relief.(23–25).

Because MBR disruption occurs regardless of pain status, we recruited a broad SCI cohort to target this underlying mechanism for sensorimotor recovery, rather than restricting inclusion to those with neuropathic pain. Still, we prospectively tracked neuropathic pain as an important secondary outcome. We hypothesized that CMR would restore MBR and thereby reduce neuropathic pain in participants presenting with it. We therefore aimed to determine if 8 weeks of CMR or adaptive fitness (1) improved sensory and motor function (primary) and reduced neuropathic pain when present (secondary), and (2) enhanced brain activity and connectivity related to sensorimotor function and body awareness.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Study design

Participants were recruited for this pilot randomized controlled trial between 6/2/2022 and 7/27/2023. The study followed the Declaration of Helsinki's principles (2013).(26) The University of Minnesota (UMN)'s Institutional Review Board approved the study (STUDY00014710) on 2/28/2022.

2.2 Recruitment

Participants were recruited via fliers in the Paralyzed Veterans of America newsletter, the Minneapolis Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Center, clinics and rehabilitation centers in the Twin Cities as part of the Minnesota Regional Spinal Cord Injury Model System, and clinicaltrial.gov (NCT05167032).

2.3 Participants

Participants were included if they had an incomplete or complete SCI at least 3 months ago and were medically stable. Participants were excluded if they had a ventilator dependency, uncontrolled seizure disorder, severe pressure sores hindering them from sitting for 45 min, cognitive and/or communicative disability (e.g., due to brain injury) precluding learning or following directions, other major medical complications, or pregnancy (current or planned). Participants with MRI contra-indications (stabilizing hardware is typically MRI safe) could enroll but would not receive an MRI.

2.4 Randomization

Participants were randomized via computer-generated allocation to 8 weeks of in-person CMR with a therapist or in-person adaptive fitness at the Courage Kenny Rehabilitation Institute (45 min, 3x/week). Raters, the biostatistician, brain technicians and brain imaging analysts were blinded to group allocation.

A CMR-certified teacher delivered all CMR sessions in Van de Winckel's wheelchair-accessible Brain Body Mind Lab. The sessions were video-recorded and logged. For adaptive fitness, a physiatrist assessed participants post-baseline in the Brain Body Mind Lab to confirm safety and provided written physical authorization (as was required by the adaptive fitness center). Training adherence was monitored via log sheet at the Courage Kenny Rehabilitation Institutes. Both interventions were classified as minimal risk: CMR due to low-intensity movements and kinesthetic imagery; and adaptive fitness as it is standard care available in the community for adults with SCI.

2.5 Study procedures

Neuropathic pain was assessed with the Numeric Pain Rating Scale (NPRS), and sensorimotor function was evaluated with the ASIA Impairment Scale (AIS), also called, International Standards for Neurological Classification of Spinal Cord Injury (ISNCSCI), and Neuromuscular Recovery Scale (NRS). All clinical and behavioral assessments (questionnaires) were conducted at baseline, post-intervention, and three-month follow-up. Functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) included resting-state and 4 tasks: 1- feeling the left leg; 2- imagining the feeling of moving the left leg, 3- whole-body movement imagery, and 4- a sensation task. MRI testing was performed at baseline and after post-intervention.

CMR sessions and AIS(27) exams were conducted in Van de Winckel's Brain Body Mind Lab at the University of Minnesota (UMN). MRI scanning took place at the UMN's Center for Magnetic Resonance Research (CMRR), with participants screened via a CMRR-prescreening questionnaire. Participants completed behavioral questionnaires on REDCap with trained study staff via secure UMN Zoom.

2.6 Aims

Our first aim was to determine whether 8 weeks of CMR or adaptive fitness improved sensory and motor function in adults with SCI, with CMR hypothesized to show greater improvement on performance-based clinical tests of sensorimotor function. Secondary outcomes included neuropathic pain intensity, spasm, mood, self-reported function, body awareness, self-efficacy, sleep, and SCI-related quality of life (namely, positive affect, resilience, self-esteem, ability to participate, pain behavior, and independence), all hypothesized to improve after CMR.

Our second aim was to determine whether 8 weeks of CMR or adaptive fitness increased brain activity and connectivity in MBR- and sensorimotor brain areas and networks in adults with SCI, assessed by resting-state and 4 task-based fMRI. We hypothesized that CMR would increase parietal

operculum, insula, and posterior cingulate cortex connectivity with other sensorimotor, body awareness, and visuospatial-related brain areas, concurrent with clinical sensorimotor improvements.

2.7 Interventions

2.7.1 Cognitive Multisensory Rehabilitation

"Cognitive Multisensory Rehabilitation" (CMR) is a physical therapy approach from Italy that focuses on restoring MBR to improve actions and the way the body is interacting with the environment. Guided by the CMR-certified therapist, participants use body signals, sensations, and kinesthetic imagery to solve multisensory discrimination exercises that require participants, for example, differentiating various positions of the limbs in space, or recognizing different limb positions relative to other body parts. Through these exercises, participants also reintegrate correct touch and pressure sensation because the exercises can include the use of different textures or sponges with varying resistance that can be placed on or under different parts of the body according to the specific exercise. The multisensory discrimination exercises are used as a means to recover MBR but the key to this MBR restoration is the guidance that the therapist provides, for example, through left-right comparisons, contrasting past memories and present situations, body scans, comparison of their position or movements through demonstrations by the therapist or through drawings. While the CMR delivery is standardized, exercise choice and complexity as well as body parts addressed is personalized to each patient.

CMR addresses body part relationships such as (i) leg position in space and relative to the pelvis and the upper body (ii) the dimensions and length of the legs, the dimension of the pelvis, and sensation of the pelvis as a central body reference. (iii) the relationship between the left and right side of the body, and the relationship between the pelvis and the feet. Further, improvements in touch and pressure sensation are obtained through the experience of the exercise. By reinvolving these body parts in MBR, multisensory signals become consistently perceived and integrated. As sensory feedback is essential for movement, sensory gains create the conditions for motor recovery. Once the brain accurately maps the body, neuropathic pain and spasms are also reduced or resolved. Concrete examples of CMR exercises are provided in supplementary **Data Sheet 1**. Further details can be found in the protocol paper and our prior publication of CMR in adults with SCI-related neuropathic pain.(10,16)

2.7.2 Adaptive fitness

The active control intervention was an adaptive fitness program, reflecting standard, community-accessible exercise available to adults with SCI post-rehabilitation. Participants used state-of-the-art adaptive gym equipment at the Courage Kenny Rehabilitation Institutes in Golden Valley and Stillwater locations in Minnesota.

The fitness centers were specifically designed for accessibility, with equipment spaced for movement, transfers, and (if needed) caregiver assistance, and several machines accessible from a wheelchair. Equipment included treadmills, ellipticals, NuSteps, SciFit upper body ergometers, SkiErgs, rowing machines, upright and recumbent stationary bicycles, chest presses, rear rows, leg extensions, leg curls, leg presses, uppertones, free weights, and kettlebells. Bodyweight-supported treadmill training was excluded to ensure the program reflected standard exercises that participants could complete without the need for highly specialized robotic or harness equipment.

Prior to starting the intervention, participants completed an evaluation session with a trained fitness specialist at the Courage Kenny Rehabilitation Center. The specialist then designed a personalized adaptive fitness program tailored to their needs and preferences. Participants then performed their customized program under the supervision of a trained fitness specialist for 45min/session, 3x/week.

The 45 min workouts differed per person but could be, for example, “25-30 min on the Nustep + 15-20min leg press”; “cardio exercises + treadmill + chest and shoulder exercises”; “chest press + shoulder press + chest and back press + strings and free weights”; “stretching on the mat + legs, shoulders and biceps strengthening”.

2.8 Primary clinical outcomes

AIS (28,29) clinical exam identifies the extent and severity of SCI, and takes about 40 min to administer. It includes a pinprick test (sharp versus dull with a safety pin); a light touch test (with a cotton ball) and muscle strength testing, performed by a trained clinician or therapist. These sensation tests were scored from 0-54 per side (anus test excluded), and muscle strength for upper and lower limbs were scored from 0-25 per limb per side. Higher scores indicate better function. The AIS was assessed at baseline, post-intervention, and at the 3-month follow-up.

The NRS (29,30) includes 11 functional tasks focused on trunk balance, and activities with the trunk (core), arm and hand function, and lower extremity tasks (e.g., sit-to-stand, weight-bearing, taking steps, and stepping over an obstacle). It measures non-compensatory functional recovery with higher scores indicating better performance. NRS administration requires online training and certification and takes about 40 min to administer.

2.9 Secondary clinical outcomes

The Numeric Pain Rating Scale (NPRS) (31) was used to assess highest, average (i.e., most of the time), and lowest neuropathic pain intensity in the prior week, rated on a scale with scores ranging from 0 (no pain) to 10 (worst pain ever).

The Douleur Neuropathique 4 (DN4) is a diagnostic tool used to identify and assess neuropathic pain.(32)

For the Patient-Specific Functional Scale (PSFS), participants chose three functional activities that were important to them, for which progress was measurable, and that they were unable to do or complete at baseline because of their neuropathic pain. Participants rated them between 0 (unable to do the activity) and 10 (able to do the activity).(33)

The Spinal Cord Injury Functional Index/Assistive Technology (SCI-FI/AT) consists of 32 self-report items, rated by self-reported level of difficulty in doing daily activities with assistive devices if needed but not with the help of another human (i.e., 0-“unable to do” to 4-“no difficulty”). The scale reliably measures function in the domains of basic mobility, self-care, fine motor function, and ambulation. Test administration takes about 10 min.(34,35)

Muscle spasms were rated for frequency and severity with the Penn Spasm Frequency Scale.(36)

The Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI) consists of 7 components with total scores ranging from 0-21, where lower scores indicate less difficulty in the assessed areas, and a score >5 indicating poor sleep quality.(37)

The Spielberger State Trait Anxiety Inventory (SAI and TAI) assesses trait anxiety (general feelings) and state anxiety (present feelings). Both scales are scored from 20-80; lower scores indicate less anxiety.(38)

The Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9) consists of 9 items scoring symptoms of depression. Each item is scored from 0-3, with total scores ranging from 0-27; higher scores indicate greater symptoms of depression.(39)

The Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia (TSK) consists of 17 items scored from 1-4 (total 17-68) with lower scores indicating greater fear of re-injury.(40)

With the Autonomic Standards Assessment form (ANS), participants self-reported on cardiovascular health, bladder, bowel and sexual function, the latter three scored as normal, reduced, or absent.(41)

The Moorong Self-Efficacy Scale (MSES) consists of 16 items each scored from 1-7, with total global scores ranging from 16-112. The MSES assesses self-efficacy related to everyday life activities and is designed specifically for people with SCI. Higher scores indicate greater self-efficacy.(42,43)

The Functionality Appreciation Scale (FAS) assesses with 7 items how appreciative a person is for their body functionality.(44,45)

The Postural Awareness Scale (PAS) is a 12-item scale, assessing self-reported awareness of body posture.(46)

The Revised Body Awareness Rating Questionnaire (BARQ-R) is a 12-item scale assessing body states, e.g., how tension in the body affects one's body awareness and function in daily life. Each item is scored from 0-3, with total scores ranging from 0-36. Lower scores indicate better body awareness.(47,48)

The Multidimensional Assessment Interoceptive Awareness – version 2 (MAIA-2) (37 items) measures 8 interoception domains through self-report: noticing (awareness of uncomfortable, comfortable, and neutral body sensations); not-distracting (tendency to not ignore or distract oneself from sensations of pain or discomfort); not-worrying (tendency not to worry or experience emotional distress with sensations of pain or discomfort); attention regulation (ability to sustain and control attention to body sensations); emotional awareness (awareness of the connection between body sensations and emotional states); self-regulation (ability to regulate distress by attention to body sensations); body listening (active listening to the body for insight), and trusting (experience of one’s body as safe and trustworthy).(49)

The Kinesthetic and Visual Imagery Questionnaire (KVIQ) assesses the visual imagery clarity and kinesthetic imagery intensity of sensations from a first-person perspective (i.e., seeing/observing someone do it or imagining how it would feel to do it oneself). Each item is scored 1-5 and summed for a global score, higher scores indicating better imagery.(50)

The Spinal Cord Injury Quality of Life measurement system (SCI-QOL) encompasses 22 subdomains across 4 broad domains of physical-medical health, emotional health, social participation, and physical functioning. We used 6 short-form subscales: positive affect (10 items), resilience (8 items), self-esteem (8 items), ability to participate (10 items), independence (8 items), pain behavior (7 items).(51)

The Craig Handicap Assessment and Reporting Technique-Short Form (CHART-SF) assesses the degree by which a person with SCI remains with an impairment or disability. It measures the type and level of assistance needed physically and cognitively; mobility reflected by the level of physical activity and transportation needs; occupation (how time is spent); social interactions; and financial resources (economic self-sufficiency). Each of six domains is scored from 0-100, with total scores ranging from 0-600. Higher scores indicate less impairment.(52)

Participants attended weekly phone or Zoom check-ins with a research assistant, blinded to group allocation, who recorded any adverse events (also unrelated to the study), use of over-the-counter or prescribed medications for spasms (or for neuropathic pain, if present), recent illnesses, healthcare utilization and/or recent hospitalizations, and information related to community integration. The CMR therapist and staff at Courage Kenny recorded adherence. They also provided information about the content of the intervention performed that week. Another research staff member, not blinded to the intervention, asked about perceived effects of the intervention and content of the interventions. We allowed concomitant medication prescribed or recommended by their clinical care team throughout the trial, as well as other treatments/therapies related to their standard of care such as stretching. However, participants did not receive additional balance, gait, or strengthening exercise outside of the study interventions, or any additional pain management treatments aside from prescribed or over the counter medication.

2.10 Primary brain imaging outcomes

Brain imaging was performed on a Siemens 3-T Prisma scanner at CMRR. Participants were scanned for two hours. Full acquisition details are reported in a previous protocol paper.(10) Briefly, structural MRI acquisition included T1-weighted magnetization-prepared rapid acquisition with gradient echo (MPRAGE) [repetition time (TR)=2.5s; echo time (TE)=4.5ms; 0.8mm isotropic voxels], and T2-weighted sampling perfection with application-optimized contrasts using different flip angle evolution (SPACE) [TR=3.2s; TE=565ms; 0.8mm isotropic voxels].

Resting-state and task fMRI scans were acquired with T2*-weighted multiband echo planar acquisition tilted 30 degrees relative to the anterior commissure–posterior commissure (AC-PC) plane according to auto-align software, enabling whole-head blood-oxygen-level-dependent (BOLD)–contrast with optimal temporal and spatial resolution and to reduce signal dropout [TR = 0.8s; TE = 37ms; flip angle = 55degrees; 72 slices; multiband factor 8; 2mm isotropic voxels]. The resting-state fMRI imagery lasted 12min 10sec. Participants were asked to maintain eye fixation with a restful mind.

Resting-state connectivity and fMRI tasks characterized brain areas and networks involved in sensorimotor and MBR function in adults with SCI. Seeds in the parietal operculum, insula, and posterior cingulate cortex were selected based on our CMR work in stroke and SCI, as well as other research demonstrating their importance in MBR.(8–11)

<u>Task 1: Mental body scan (8 min 15 sec).</u> Participants focused with gentle, non-judgmental awareness on sensations of the left leg (having reduced sensation and movement). In other words, they perform a gentle focused mental body scan and register any feelings of sensation in that limb. We alternated this task with rest periods. This task was selected based on our prior work in adults with chronic low back pain showing parietal operculum and posterior parietal cortex activation after body awareness training (Qigong),(53) and evidence from other brain imaging research that mindful body scanning increases insula connectivity.(54)

<u>Task 2: Kinesthetic imagery of moving the limb (7 min 58 sec)</u>. Participants were asked to imagine

the feeling of moving the left leg without actually moving (i.e., gentle non-judgmental awareness of any sensations during an imagined movement), alternated with rest. We chose this task based on tasks with mindfulness meditation showing insula and parietal operculum activation.(55)

Task 3: Whole-body movement task (19 min 51 sec). After viewing a video demonstration, participants performed a kinesthetic imagery of a whole-body movement (a Qigong movement)(56) without moving. They imagined the feeling of being upright, hands moving symmetrically toward and away from the body in a horizontal line (at the level of the navel) with guided breathing, while imagining the legs bending and straightening. This task was selected based on studies showing substantial spatial overlap of areas activated during motor imagery vs. motor execution.(57–60) Our prior studies showed parietal operculum and posterior parietal cortex activation during this task in adults with chronic low back pain.(53)

Task 4: Sensory stimulation task (18 min 32 sec). The pads of the big toes and thumbs were gently stroked with a towel without participants' knowledge of when stroking occurred or where on the hand or feet it would occur. After the scan, participants were asked whether and where they felt stimulation. We chose this because in our previous CMR study in adults with SCI-related neuropathic pain, greater activation was found after CMR in the bilateral postcentral gyrus (sensory function), angular and supramarginal gyri, superior parietal lobe (part of the posterior parietal cortex, related to visuospatial body maps); left insula (pain processing, body awareness), and frontal operculum.(16)

2.11 Statistical analysis

2.11.1 Clinical outcome analysis

Sample size calculation: Based on our prior pilot study,(16) baseline to post-CMR average differences were 8.81±5.37 points for the pin prick test, 7.50±4.89 for the touch test, and 3.87±2.80 for lower limb motor function. Assuming similar effect CMR effects and no change after adaptive fitness, the sample size of 8 participants per group provides 89%, 85%, and 76% power to detect significant group differences for pin prick, touch, and lower limb motor function, respectively, at an overall two-sided significance level of $\alpha=0.05$ with Bonferroni-correction for the three primary endpoints. The present data are essential to determine effect sizes to power a future larger randomized controlled trial.

We summarized all quantitative variables with descriptive statistics at each time point per group. We used R for all statistical analyses. Given the small sample size, we reported Cohen's d effect sizes per group for pre-post changes and pre-3-month follow-up changes in sensorimotor function measures and other clinical outcomes.(61)

A UMN Clinical and Translational Science Institute data integrity monitor and quality assurance reviewer monitored the study every 6 months.

2.11.2 Brain imaging analysis

Preprocessing was done through the Human Connectome Project preprocessing pipeline. We used the CONN functional connectivity toolbox to process fMRI data with established standardized controls for multiple comparisons (Statistical Parametrical Mapping family-wise error correction methods).(62) Data underwent realignment, scrubbing, artifact detection, and CompCor denoising.

For the primary analyses, we used voxel-wise whole-brain seed-based functional connectivity analysis of resting-state data using Pearson correlation coefficients, focused on parietal operculum, insula, and posterior cingulate cortex regions-of-interest for resting-state connectivity and exploratory multivariate pattern analyses. Task-based fMRI underwent the same preprocessing pipeline. We estimated voxel-wise brain activation for each participant using a general linear model.

Within-group pre-post changes in fMRI task-based brain activation and resting-state connectivity (with Fisher's Z transformation) were tested using paired t-tests or Wilcoxon signed-rank tests.

We tested the effect of CMR on brain imaging outcomes using mixed-effects models implemented in FSL. Cluster-based correction for multiple comparisons was performed using a cluster-forming threshold of $Z > 2.3$ and a cluster-level significance threshold of $p < 0.05$ to control the family-wise Type I error rate.

3 Results

Fig. 1 displays the CONSORT flow diagram. Of 27 recruited participants with SCI, 3 were excluded (baclofen pump, cognitive impairment from brain injury, inability to self-transfer), and 8 withdrew during the study for various reasons [e.g., illnesses unrelated to the study (n=2), i.e., acute ulcer wound, COVID-19; the baseline fitness level of participants was too high to participate in the study (n=3); or were not responding to communication after consenting (n=3)]. We collected MRI scans for 13 participants at baseline. Reasons for not having an MRI were either a bullet in the body or a heating risk of a Songer cable as part of a cervical fusion.

Sixteen adults were randomized to the interventions. The group had an average age of 52 ± 8 years (range of 38-64 years), 6 women, and 12 men; 25% African American, 75% White non-Hispanic adults, and 19% living in rural areas. They were 13 ± 10 years after SCI (range of 1-29 years). Six adults had tetraplegia, one had Brown-Sequard, and 10 had paraplegia. There were no significant baseline differences in AIS or NRS outcomes between the groups. The demographic and clinical information of the 16 participants are detailed in **Table 1**.

All 8 participants completed the *CMR intervention* and all 8 completed the 3-month follow-up phase. In the fitness group, 8 participants started the 8-week *adapted fitness intervention* and one person withdrew during the intervention phase because of pneumonia. Of the remaining 7 that completed the 8-week intervention, 6 participants completed the 3-month follow-up phase (1 did not respond to communication at the time of the follow-up testing). All participants averaged 135 min/week (3 sessions of 45min/week) of intervention throughout the 8 weeks. On occasion, missed sessions due to illness were made up the following week. The final analysis included 15 participants in total: 8 participants in the CMR group and 7 people in the fitness group, with n=6 for the 3-month follow-up in the fitness group.

3.1 Clinical outcomes

Clinical outcomes for Aim 1 are reported in **Table 2** with effect sizes for post-intervention and 3-month follow-up vs baseline, reflecting the dual burden of SCI across sensorimotor function and neuropathic pain.

CMR yielded greater sensorimotor improvements than adaptive fitness post-intervention. AIS effect sizes were large for CMR (touch: Cohen's d=1.54; pinprick: d=1.83; lower limb motor function: d=1.32) and small-to-moderate for adaptive fitness (touch: d=0.49; pinprick: d=0.53; lower limb motor function: d=0.74, **Fig. 2**). NRS effect sizes were also larger for CMR (core: d=2.19; upper

limb: d=0.69; lower limb: d=0.74) than adaptive fitness (core: d=0.73; upper limb: d=0.34; lower limb: d=0.00, **Fig. 3**).

At 3-month follow-up compared to baseline, CMR maintained large AIS effect sizes (touch: d=1.73; pinprick d=2.07; lower limb motor function: d=1.28, **Fig. 2**) and moderate-to-large NRS effect sizes (core: d=1.74; upper limb: d=0.79; lower limb: d=0.78). Adaptive fitness group showed moderate AIS effect sizes (touch: d=0.56; pinprick d=0.74; lower limb motor function: d=0.63) and moderate-to-large NRS effect sizes (core: d=0.62; upper limb: d=0.85; lower limb: d=0.65, **Fig. 3**).

Notably, 53% of participants across both groups (n=4 in each group) achieved maximum upper limb NRS scores at baseline, reflecting 7 individuals with paraplegia, and 1 person with quadriplegia. The person with quadriplegia had a dislocated rather than a fractured spine, which may have contributed to a complete motor recovery, yet the participant still had moderate pinprick sensory impairment throughout the trunk at baseline. In sum, this expected ceiling effect constrained the observable upper limb change scores across the cohort.

Neuropathic pain results across the full cohort (n=15), showed a tendency toward divergent outcomes between the two interventions. However, interpretation is limited by the small sample size, given that only 10 out 15 participants had neuropathic pain at baseline, and with large NPRS standard deviations, reflecting substantial inter-individual variability (baseline highest neuropathic pain severity range 3-10/10).

Accounting for this variability and the fact that 5 participants did not have pain at baseline (3 in the CMR group, 2 in the adaptive fitness group), CMR showed small post-intervention effect sizes for pain reduction (highest NPRS: d=0.48; average NPRS: d=0.46) and small-to-moderate effects at 3-month follow-up, compared to baseline (highest NPRS: d=0.63; average NPRS: d=0.31). CMR also reduced severity of neuropathic pain characteristics (DN4) with a moderate effect size sustained at follow-up (d=0.59 at both timepoints).

The adaptive fitness group showed a tendency toward increased neuropathic pain post-intervention (highest NRPS, d=-0.19) and neuropathic pain characteristics (DN4, d=-0.38), but a slight decrease in average pain (NPRS, d=0.38). At 3-month follow-up compared to baseline, highest NPRS was unchanged (d=0.00), average NPRS slightly decreased (d=0.41), neuropathic pain characteristics slightly worsened in severity (d=-0.41).

In the CMR group, 2 participants took neuropathic pain medication. One reduced Lyrica by 88% at the 3-month follow-up, along with 2-point reduction in highest neuropathic pain. The other participant reduced medical cannabis by 50% while maintaining the Gabapentin dosage, with no change in pain intensity levels. All medication dosage changes were authorized by their treating physicians. In the fitness group, 2 out of the 4 participants on pain medication increased Gabapentin by 50-66% (one reporting more tingling, the other a 2-point reduction in highest pain at follow-up). Another person reduced Hydrocodone by 29% post-intervention but increased it by 12.5% at follow-up (compared to the baseline dosage), while keeping Amitriptyline stable and pain slightly worsening by one point. The last participant maintained stable Gabapentin and Baclofen dosages across the study with no pain changes.

Beyond our sensorimotor and neuropathic pain indices, we evaluated a comprehensive suite of secondary clinical measures to capture the broader functional and psychosocial impacts of the interventions. These outcomes were analyzed across the full cohort (n=15) except for SCI-FI/AT, which has a separate scoring system for paraplegia and quadriplegia.

3.1.1 Function

Both groups showed large PSFS effect sizes, for self-identified functional goal attainment (CMR: d=1.99, adaptive fitness: d=1.07), sustained at follow-up (CMR: d=1.95; adaptive fitness: d=1.81).

For SCI-FI/AT paraplegia, CMR (n=5) showed large effect sizes for basic mobility (d=1.47), self-care (d=1.41), and fine motor function (d=1.38), with moderate improvements in ambulation (d=0.61), all maintained at follow-up (d=1.37; d=1.41; d=1.27; d=0.61, respectively). The adaptive fitness results (n=4 at post-intervention; n=3 at follow-up) were more varied and should be interpreted cautiously given the small sample size. Basic mobility improved moderately post-intervention (d=0.78) but decreased to baseline levels at follow-up. Self-care declined after the fitness intervention, then improved at follow-up (d=0.58). Fine motor function was unchanged after fitness (d=0.00) but improved at follow-up (d=0.58). Finally, ambulation improved post-intervention (d=0.50) and further at follow-up (d=1.09).

For adults with quadriplegia (n=3 per group), CMR showed large improvements in SCI-FI/AT basic mobility (d=1.16) and self-care (d=1.16) at both timepoints, versus moderate-to-large fitness improvements (selfcare: d= 0.58; basic mobility: d=0.87). All 3 CMR participants had maximum fine motor scores at baseline (d=0.00) precluding improvement. Fitness showed large fine motor function gains (d=1.00) at both timepoints. Ambulation improved in both groups, with moderate CMR effect sizes (d=0.58) and large fitness effect sizes (d=1.12) at both timepoints.

Mobility, as indexed by the CHART-S, reflected gains following CMR (d=1.18) compared to adaptive fitness (d=0.37), with moderate effect sizes in both groups at the 3-month follow-up (d=0.76 for CMR; d=0.55 for fitness).

3.1.2 Body awareness and motor imagery

KVIQ showed large CMR effect sizes at both timepoints (d=1.02; d=1.07) while fitness showed moderate improvements post-intervention (d=0.73) but a decline at follow-up (d=-0.60).

CMR produced immediate and sustained FAS improvements (d=0.61; d=0.52), whereas fitness had minimal impact (d=-0.13; d=0.10, respectively). PAS improved moderately in both groups post-intervention (CMR: d=0.60; fitness: d=0.54) but there were only small improvements compared to baseline at follow-up (CMR: d=0.25; fitness: d=0.34).

BARQ-R (body tension, emotional body awareness, awareness of breathing) showed no immediate post-intervention effects, but there were moderate CMR improvements (d=0.59) and a small fitness improvement (d=0.43) at follow-up.

Pertaining to interoception, the eight domains of MAIA-2 showed small improvements immediately post-CMR (ranging from d=0.11 to 0.43), except for attention regulation (d=-0.42), growing to small-to-large improvements at follow-up (ranges of d=0.11 to 1.14; except for attention regulation: d=-0.12). Fitness only improved in 3 subdomains with small-to-moderate effect sizes (d=0.25 to 0.77), while 5 subdomains worsened (d=-0.38 to -1.37). This pattern persisted at follow-up (3 improved: d=0.04- 0.15; 5 subdomains worsened compared to baseline levels: d=-0.24 to -0.66).

3.1.3 Spasticity, autonomic function, sleep, and psychosocial wellbeing

523 Spasticity frequency and intensity improved comparably in both groups post-intervention and at
524 follow-up (ranges d=0.38 to 0.65) except for spasm frequency in the CMR group at follow-up, which
525 was unchanged compared to baseline (d=0.00).

526 Autonomic function improved moderately with CMR at both timepoints (d=0.68) while fitness
527 showed slight worsening post-intervention that nearly resolved to baseline at follow-up (d=-0.55;
528 d=-0.18).

529 Both groups also experienced small improvements in sleep quality (PSQI; CMR: d=0.34 and 0.12;
530 fitness: d=0.31 and 0.22, respectively post-intervention and at 3-month follow-up).

531 Psychosocial wellbeing outcomes presented a more nuanced profile. Trait anxiety decreased
532 substantially more with CMR (d=1.53; d=1.59) than fitness (d=0.56; d=0.72) at both timepoints.
533 TSK improved in both groups at 3 months follow-up (CMR: d=0.75, fitness: d=0.78), but state
534 anxiety, PHQ-9, and MSES showed no meaningful changes in either group.

535 **3.2 Brain imaging outcomes**

536 For aim 2, baseline results confirmed the validity of our tasks and region-of-interest selections.
537 Resting state seeds (insula, parietal operculum, and post-cingulate cortex) connected with
538 sensorimotor areas (pre-and postcentral gyri), pain perception and body awareness regions (parietal
539 operculum and insula), and visuospatial body map areas (superior parietal lobe, supramarginal gyrus,
540 and angular gyrus). Task-based fMRI similarly showed baseline activation in these same brain
541 regions.

542 Concurrent with clinical improvements, resting-state fMRI showed increased brain connectivity after
543 CMR compared to baseline (**Fig. 4, Table 3**), specifically, stronger connectivity between the right
544 parietal operculum (as region-of-interest) and the right precentral gyrus (**Fig. 4A**), and between the
545 right posterior cingulate cortex (as region-of-interest) and the left precentral gyrus, left insula, and
546 left parietal operculum (parts OP1/OP4, (**Fig. 4B**). No connectivity changes were found in the fitness
547 group.

548 CMR also increased task-based brain activity compared to baseline: Imagining *feeling the left leg*,
549 activated the pre- and postcentral gyri, and superior parietal lobe to a greater extent post-CMR vs
550 baseline (**Fig. 5, Table 3**). The *whole-body imagery task* produced greater activation post-CMR in
551 the right pre- and postcentral gyrus, bilateral supramarginal gyrus, superior parietal lobe, and angular
552 gyrus (**Fig. 6A, Table 3**).

553 In the adaptive fitness group, we saw much smaller activation increases in the left supramarginal
554 gyrus and superior parietal lobe compared to baseline during the *whole-body imagery fMRI task* (**Fig.
555 6B, Table 3**).

556 **4 Discussion**

557 In this pilot clinical trial, our aims were to determine if 8 weeks of CMR or adaptive fitness
558 (1) improved sensory and motor function (primary) and reduced neuropathic pain when present
559 (secondary), and (2) enhanced brain activity and connectivity related to sensorimotor function and
560 body awareness.

The results provide promising preliminary evidence that CMR may address the dual burden of sensorimotor deficits and chronic neuropathic pain in adults with SCI. Both interventions yielded clinical benefits, but CMR produced greater sensorimotor function improvements (reflected by large effect sizes for AIS and NRS) than fitness. These gains should be interpreted in light of injury variability. For instance, upper limb NRS effect sizes were constrained by the fact that 8 participants (7 with paraplegia, 1 with quadriplegia) achieved a maximum score for this item at baseline. The remaining two participants with paraplegia did not reach maximum scores on NRS upper limb function due to a right frozen shoulder in one, and a high thoracal lesion (T4) limiting trunk balance during upper limb activities in the other.

Both groups showed large PSFS effect sizes and improvements on nearly all SCI-FI/AT measures for adults with quadriplegia. For adults with paraplegia, self-reported ease of performing daily functions was markedly better in the CMR group vs the fitness group. The CMR group experienced large improvements for basic mobility, selfcare, and fine motor function, and moderate improvement for ambulation across both time points. The fitness group showed more varied results, with no lasting basic mobility improvements, moderate self-care and fine motor function gains at follow-up, and large ambulation gains at follow-up.

These results show the importance of using both objective and subjective measures when assessing motor function. Objective measures do account for adaptive equipment use, whereas self-reported daily function does, which can produce divergent results. For example, the participants in the fitness group did not improve in objective measures as much as the CMR group for lower limb function; yet, participants with paraplegia self-reported on average that walking with adaptive equipment became easier after the fitness intervention and at follow-up.

Sensory function also improved more after CMR than after adaptive fitness. Given how closely MBR is integrated with sensorimotor function, it follows that both sensory and motor function improve when whole-body awareness, awareness of the relationship between body parts, and spatial body awareness are restored. Across our pilot studies, CMR consistently produces both sensory and motor function gains, which is encouraging, as sensory recovery has been difficult to achieve with other neurorehabilitation treatments.

To date, only one recent study of D'Amico et al. (2026)(63) examined the effects of cervical transcutaneous spinal cord stimulation combined with rehabilitation, finding that 55% of participants with chronic SCI increased total AIS sensory scores by more than 5.19 [the minimum clinically important difference, MCID, for acute and subacute SCI(64) populations; there is no current MCID available for chronic SCI].(63) Their study design did not include a control group or follow-up measures.(63) In comparison, our CMR group improved total AIS sensory scores by more than 7 points, at both post-intervention and at 3-months follow-up: touch improved post-CMR by 7.50±4.88 and 8.06±4.66 points at follow-up. Pinprick improved by 8.50±4.64 and 9.88±4.78 points, respectively. These are the largest improvements we have encountered in literature, sustained for at least 3 months. Notably, direct score comparisons are limited by differences in injury profile: D'Amico et al. (2026)(63) enrolled only participants with cervical incomplete lesion (with majority C4-C6; AIS C-D), whereas our cohort included 44% cervical incomplete lesions (C1-C7; majority of this subgroup AIS D). Nonetheless, our prior study in 26 adults with SCI-related neuropathic pain (where 53% had AIS A) demonstrated that CMR is also effective in persons with complete SCI (AIS A).(16) In our present study, fitness improved touch by 2.14±4.38 and 2.50±4.47 points; and pinprick 2.00±3.81 and 3.50±4.72 points, at the two timepoints.

605 Furthermore, CMR produced consistent small-to-moderate reductions in neuropathic pain and
606 symptom severity (DN4) while the fitness group showed no change or slight exacerbation of these
607 symptoms (except for a small decrease in average pain). With only 10 participants with pain (5 per
608 group) these findings are preliminary. However, our prior study in 26 adults with SCI-related
609 neuropathic pain demonstrated significant pain reduction after 6 weeks of CMR (highest NPRS:
610 almost 5-point reduction; average NPRS: 4-point reduction; 35% pain-free) sustained at 1-year
611 follow-up in a subgroup of 14 participants who agreed to be tested.(16)

612 Clinical improvements observed after CMR coincided with enhanced brain connectivity and
613 activation. Our earlier study demonstrated that adults with SCI have weaker connectivity networks
614 and less brain activation in areas responsible for sensorimotor function and MBR than healthy
615 adults.(9) In this study, following 8 weeks of CMR, resting-state connectivity strengthened between
616 the right parietal operculum and right precentral gyrus; and between the right posterior cingulate
617 cortex (as region-of-interest) and the left precentral gyrus, left insula, and left parietal operculum
618 (parts OP1/OP4).(65,66)

619 The posterior cingulate cortex plays a key role in self-localization, as identified in an out-of-body
620 fMRI study,(11) though the intraparietal-retrosplenial-hippocampal connections appear more relevant
621 in that context. Given our small sample size, we cautiously speculate that the observed connectivity
622 seen in our study between the posterior cingulate cortex and precentral cortex represents self-
623 localization of the 'actual body'/'of the self' being linked to motor areas to guide movements,
624 analogous to how the parietal operculum, insula, and posterior parietal cortex collects, integrates, and
625 transmits multisensory information for motor guidance.

626 *Imagery of feeling the left leg* increased activation in the pre- and postcentral gyri and superior
627 parietal lobe, while the *whole-body imagery task* activated the right pre- and postcentral gyrus,
628 bilateral supramarginal gyrus, superior parietal lobe, and angular gyrus to a greater extent post-CMR
629 vs baseline. Consistent with our prior CMR brain imaging findings, the brain not only processes and
630 interprets sensory information from the affected areas, but integrates multisensory and visuospatial
631 information into a coherent conscious spatial body awareness to accurately guide movements.(4,8–
632 10,67)

633 The fitness group showed markedly smaller activation increases compared to baseline, limited to the
634 left supramarginal gyrus and superior parietal lobe during *whole-body imagery*.

635 While causal relationships cannot be established, the concurrent improvements in MBR-related
636 networks and clinical outcomes support our central hypothesis that targeting MBR can address both
637 sensorimotor deficits and neuropathic pain. SCI-related sensory deficits create a mismatch between
638 expected and received sensations in the brain, disrupting MBR.(3–5) Given the brain is wired for
639 survival, when unable to locate the (paralyzed) body parts, the brain signals this incongruence
640 through spasms and neuropathic pain. We consistently observe that when participants regain
641 awareness of their body parts' location, spasms resolve and neuropathic pain diminishes.

642 Surveys confirmed that body awareness and imagery improved more with CMR than fitness. For
643 example, at 3-month follow-up, the CMR group showed moderate-to-large effect sizes for BARQ-R
644 and MAIA-2's subdomains of noticing, not worrying, emotional awareness, self-regulation and body
645 listening─no moderate or large effect sizes were seen in the fitness group. This confirms prior
646 findings in a larger SCI cohort showing improved BARQ-R (n=69), and MAIA-2's subscale 'not
647 worrying' (n=43) after CMR or Qigong.(68) By helping participants correctly identify sensations of

body positions, touch, pressure, and other multisensory variables, CMR reduces the brain's alarm response: sensations are recognized rather than flagged as unknown, diminishing neuropathic pain signaling.(69)

Participants reported that they were more attuned to their body signals, and reacted to them faster, e.g., when they felt they had a urinary tract infection. Nevertheless, none of the scales related to body awareness or interoception directly assessed SCI-specific MBR. We are currently developing a new SCI-BodyMap to address this gap.(70,71)

The clinical and neuroimaging findings parallel participant reports of increased body awareness after CMR─such as being able to accurate sense where there paralyzed limbs were in space, as well as the contact of the soles of the feet with the floor─which subsequently facilitated transfers and activities of daily living. Crucially, reports from participants in the CMR group encompassed benefits across several domains: sensory, motor, autonomic, and cognitive function. Here are some examples below:

[woman in her 50s] "*I think of parts of my body that I have not thought about in over 20 years and it's interesting. I find myself touching my feet and legs a bit differently and recognizing they are in fact still there. Sensation in the feet returns, also sensation on the soles of the feet. Transfers feel easier*."

[man in his 50s] "*The right big toe has woken up, and I have more and more ongoing sensation in the buttocks. This is different from other therapies. I am now able to get out of a low sports car without help. My hips move better and feel more free. I am able to get in the RV up the stairs and then sit down with weight equal[ly distributed] in my feet. I continue to walk faster with smart crutches*."

[man in his 30s] "*My right foot is not dragging anymore. I use a new way of walking now, more natural, faster and smoother, and I am not fatigued. I stand more on top of my feet. It was a no-brainer that it [CMR] was worth it*."

[man in his 30s] "*I used to lean on the right side all the time, now I am sitting straight. My left hand function is better now. I can hold the bottle with my left hand; I could not do that as well before. My handgrip is normal now. Before it would slip (grip was too weak) and that is not happening now. I stood up with a walker; I could not do that before for more than 20 years. Transfers are better. Before I could only transfer from right to left and now, I can also transfer from left to right. Neuropathy is half of what it used to be."*

[woman in her 60s] "*For the first time I was able to touch my left foot with my hand in crossed leg position, without back support by leaning my trunk a little forward and using the right foot as a support*."

[[man in his 30s] "*It is an interesting journey. The CMR helps me also with my depression and clear-thinking problem. I am at a point where I start getting more clarity, feeling awake, and clear thinking, like a runner's high. I no longer feel "crushing" pain on the right side. This week, I could feel my cat on my body on the left side during the night in an area I am usually not able to feel*."

[man in his 50s]: *"I did not know that internal map was incongruent with reality; it's very revealing; a 180-degree paradigm shift. Fine tuning what needs to be finetuned. Very interesting stuff. I had no clonus in the left leg during sessions last week. I do not have restless leg syndrome anymore at night, and that used to wake me up before. I can now transfer from a lower surface to my chair whereas previously, the treatment table needed to be significantly higher. Overall, transfers are better now."*

[woman in her 50s] *"(week 2): I can cut my nails with both hands now which I was not able to do before. (week 5): all my goals are reached: I can now bike 12 miles, clip toenails (before it would slip), I can climb a ladder, I can snap with both hands (left better than right). Feet and hands are not going numb anymore, and at night when I lay on my side, my legs do not go numb anymore. My hands and feet do not feel cold anymore*."

Participants also applied what they learned in CMR to daily life, such as thinking about being grounded; knowing where the feet are; improved transfers and body weight shifting; greater attentiveness to leg and foot sensations; better awareness of when to reposition in the wheelchair.

For the fitness group, feedback included noticeable balance improvements, which helped with walking, increased strength, having more energy, and easier transfers. One person would have preferred one-on-one workouts with a personal trainer (instead of oversight by a trainer), but overall, the group enjoyed working out in the adaptive fitness gym.

Our findings must be interpreted within several limitations. Most importantly, the small sample size(1) precludes definitive efficacy claims and warrants a larger controlled trial, particularly for neuropathic pain, given the wide variability in the present cohort; (2) prevented between-group neuroimaging comparisons and mediation analyses to establish causal brain-outcome links; and (3) precluded subanalyses by injury level (paraplegia vs quadriplegia) or other SCI-related variables. Regarding health disparities, 25% were of minority race, none were veterans, 19% lived rurally, 38% were women, and 25% had significant economic distress or income below the official poverty level. While we achieved some satisfactory levels of recruitment of patients with healthy disparities, we aim to recruit more veterans in future studies, given their higher prevalence of SCI compared to community members (in 2019, 42,000 or about 14% of all adults with SCI were veterans, numbers that are likely higher today).(72,73) A remotely delivered CMR version could also extend reach to more participants living in rural locations.

Despite these limitations, the large CMR effect sizes for objectively assessed sensorimotor recovery (AIS and NRS), alongside indications of reduced neuropathic pain and enhanced body awareness are clinically noteworthy. The small-to-moderate effect sizes in the adaptive fitness group support its viability as active control in a larger trial. Notably, this study demonstrated potential for improvements in sensation and movement even up to 29 years after SCI, consistent with our prior work showing gains up to 56 years post-SCI.(16)

Villiger et al. (2013)'s pilot study with virtual reality-augmented lower limb training combining action observation and training, reported reduced neuropathic pain beyond MCID in 5 of 9 adults with incomplete SCI (ASIA D).(74) While mirror therapy and augmented reality with mirror therapy, have been explored to create a perceptual illusion of movement (e.g. walking) for pain relief with varying results,(75–77) to our knowledge, CMR is the only therapeutic approach that *consciously* targets MBR restoration using the participants' own body parameters, with consistent evidence of increased brain function after CMR. The therapist's guidance in restoring MBR is *central* to these gains. Together, these preliminary results indicate that targeting maladaptive cortical changes may yield greater dual-burden recovery than standard adaptive fitness, strongly warrant larger randomized controlled efficacy trials.

5 Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

6 Author Contributions

Every author contributed to the study: Conceptualization (AVdW, LM); Funding acquisition (AVdW); Data curation (AVdW, SC, WD); Formal analysis and data interpretation (AVdW, LZ, TH, KL, BM, LM); Cognitive Multisensory Rehabilitation intervention (SB, JB); Recruitment (AVdW); Data collection (AVdW, SC, WD, BM); Supervision (AVdW); Validation (AVdW, SC, WD, LZ); Visualization (AVdW, LZ); Consultant with lived experience of SCI (SMS); PM&R screening for adaptive fitness readiness (RN); SCI study doctor (LM); Writing – original draft (AVdW); Writing – review & editing (AVdW, SC, SB, JB, WD, LZ, TH, BM, SMS, RN, LM, KL). We confirm that more than one author has directly accessed and verified the underlying data reported in the manuscript (AVdW, SC, JB, LZ).

7 Funding

The Paralyzed Veterans of America Research Foundation Grant #3187 funded this study (IRB no. STUDY00014710; ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT05167032). Additional support was provided by the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences of the National Institutes of Health Award Number #UM1TR004405, the Biotechnology Research Center: P41EB015894, the National Institute of Neurological Disorders & Stroke Institutional Center Core Grants to Support Neuroscience Research: P30 NS076408; and the High-Performance Connectome Upgrade for Human 3T MRI scanner: 1S10OD017974. Image processing resources were provided by the Minnesota Supercomputing Institute (MSI) at the University of Minnesota. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health. None of the funding sources had a role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report. None of the authors have been paid to write this article. Authors were not precluded from accessing data in the study, and they accept responsibility to submit for publication.

8 Acknowledgments

We thank Dr. Marina Zernitz, Director of the Centro Studi di Riabilitazione Neurocognitiva - Villa Miari (Study Center for Cognitive Multisensory Rehabilitation), Italy, for her consultancy with the content of the CMR training protocol. We would like to thank the MRI technicians Wendy Elvendahl and Matthew White for their help with data acquisition. We would like to extend our profound thanks to Marc Noël for the critical review of the manuscript.

9 Data Availability Statement

The datasets generated for this study can be found in the Dryad repository, DOI: 10.5061/dryad.v6wwpzhbb upon publication of the manuscript in a peer-reviewed journal.

References

1. Leemhuis E, Esposito RM, De Gennaro L, Pazzaglia M. Go virtual to get real: Virtual reality as a resource for spinal cord treatment. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021 Feb 13;18(4):1819.

2. Kim HY, Lee HJ, Kim TL, Kim E, Ham D, Lee J, et al. Prevalence and Characteristics of

770 Neuropathic Pain in Patients With Spinal Cord Injury Referred to a Rehabilitation Center. Ann
771 Rehabil Med. 2020 Dec;44(6):438–49.

772 3. Leemhuis E, Giuffrida V, De Martino ML, Forte G, Pecchinenda A, De Gennaro L, et al.
773 Rethinking the body in the brain after spinal cord injury. J Clin Med. 2022 Jan 13;11(2):388.

774 4. Vastano R, Costantini M, Widerstrom-Noga E. Maladaptive reorganization following SCI: The
775 role of body representation and multisensory integration. Prog Neurobiol. 2022
776 Jan;208(102179):102179.

777 5. Osinski T, Martinez V, Bensmail D, Hatem S, Bouhassira D. Interplay between body schema,
778 visuospatial perception and pain in patients with spinal cord injury. Eur J Pain. 2020
779 Aug;24(7):1400–10.

780 6. SCI Data Sheet. TraumaticSpinal cord injury facts and figures at a glance [Internet]. [cited 2026
781 Jan 19]. Available from: https://bpb-us-
782 w2.wpmucdn.com/sites.uab.edu/dist/f/392/files/2025/02/2025-Facts-and-Figures.pdf

783 7. Mehling WE, Wrubel J, Daubenmier JJ, Price CJ, Kerr CE, Silow T. Body Aware-ness: a
784 phenomenological inquiry into the common ground of mind-body therapies. Philos Ethics
785 Humanit Med. 2011;6.

786 8. Van de Winckel A, De Patre D, Rigoni M, Fiecas M, Hendrickson TJ, Larson M, et al.
787 Exploratory study of how Cognitive Multisensory Rehabilitation restores parietal operculum
788 connectivity and improves upper limb movements in chronic stroke. Sci Rep. 2020 Nov
789 20;10(1):20278.

790 9. Van de Winckel A, Carpentier ST, Deng W, Bottale S, Zhang L, Hendrickson T, et al.
791 Identifying Body Awareness-Related Brain Network Changes after Cognitive Multisensory
792 Rehabilitation for Neuropathic Pain Relief in Adults with Spinal Cord Injury: Delayed
793 Treatment arm Phase I Randomized Controlled Trial [Internet]. medRxiv. 2023 [cited 2023 Feb
794 10]. p. 2023.02.09.23285713. Available from:
795 https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.02.09.23285713v1

796 10. Van de Winckel A, Carpentier S, Deng W, Bottale S, Hendrickson T, Zhang L, et al. Identifying
797 Body Awareness-Related Brain Network Changes After Cognitive Multisensory Rehabilitation
798 for Neuropathic Pain Relief in Adults With Spinal Cord Injury: Protocol of a Phase I
799 Randomized Controlled Trial. Top Spinal Cord Inj Rehabil. 2022 Nov 15;28(4):33–43.

800 11. Guterstam A, Björnsdotter M, Gentile G, Ehrsson HH. Posterior cingulate cortex integrates the
801 senses of self-location and body ownership. Curr Biol. 2015 Jun;25(11):1416–25.

802 12. Donegan T, Ryan BE, Sanchez-Vives MV, Świdrak J. Altered bodily perceptions in chronic
803 neuropathic pain conditions and implications for treatment using immersive virtual reality. Front
804 Hum Neurosci. 2022 Nov 17;16:1024910.

805 13. Pazzaglia M, Haggard P, Scivoletto G, Molinari M, Lenggenhager B. Pain and somatic sensation
806 are transiently normalized by illusory body ownership in a patient with spinal cord injury. Restor
807 Neurol Neurosci. 2016 Apr 11;34(4):603–13.

808 14. Peyron R, Fauchon C. The posterior insular-opercular cortex: An access to the brain networks of

809 thermosensory and nociceptive processes? Neurosci Lett. 2019 May 29;702:34–9.

810 15. Li X, Wang L, Chen Q, Hu Y, Du J, Chen X, et al. The Reorganization of Insular Subregions in
811 Individuals with Below-Level Neuropathic Pain following Incomplete Spinal Cord Injury.
812 Neural Plast. 2020 Mar 10;2020:2796571.

813 16. Van de Winckel A, Carpentier ST, Deng W, Bottale S, Zhang L, Hendrickson TJ, et al.
814 Preliminary efficacy of cognitive multisensory rehabilitation for neuropathic pain in chronic
815 spinal cord injury: a phase I randomized controlled trial. Sci Rep [Internet]. 2026 Mar 20;
816 Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41598-026-44859-w

817 17. Chanubol R, Wongphaet P, Chavanich N, Werner C, Hesse S, Bardeleben A, et al. A
818 randomized controlled trial of Cognitive Sensory Motor Training Therapy on the recovery of
819 arm function in acute stroke patients. Clin Rehabil. 2012 Dec;26(12):1096–104.

820 18. Lee S, Bae S, Jeon D, Kim KY. The effects of cognitive exercise therapy on chronic stroke
821 patients' upper limb functions, activities of daily living and quality of life. J Phys Therapy Sci.
822 2015 Sep;27(9):2787–91.

823 19. Sallés L, Martín-Casas P, Gironès X, Durà MJ, Lafuente JV, Perfetti C. A neurocognitive
824 approach for recovering upper extremity movement following subacute stroke: a randomized
825 controlled pilot study [Internet]. Vol. 29, Journal of Physical Therapy Science. 2017. p. 665–72.
826 Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1589/jpts.29.665

827 20. Morreale M, Marchione P, Pili A, Lauta A, Castiglia SF, Spallone A, et al. Early versus delayed
828 rehabilitation treatment in hemiplegic patients with ischemic stroke: proprioceptive or cognitive
829 approach? Eur J Phys Rehabil Med. 2016 Feb;52(1):81–9.

830 21. Zernitz M, Rizzello C, Rigoni M, Van de Winckel A. Case Report: Phantom limb pain relief
831 after cognitive multisensory rehabilitation. Frontiers in Pain Research [Internet]. 2024;5.
832 Available from: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpain.2024.1374141

833 22. De Patre D, Van de Winckel A, Panté F, Rizzello C, Zernitz M, Mansour M, et al. Visual and
834 motor recovery after "Cognitive Therapeutic Exercises" in cortical blindness: a case study. J
835 Neurol Phys Ther. 2017;41(3):164–72.

836 23. Harvey LA, Glinsky JV, Bowden JL. The effectiveness of 22 commonly administered
837 physiotherapy interventions for people with spinal cord injury: a systematic review. Spinal Cord.
838 2016 Nov;54(11):914–23.

839 24. Zhang YH, Hu HY, Xiong YC, Peng C, Hu L, Kong YZ, et al. Exercise for Neuropathic Pain: A
840 Systematic Review and Expert Consensus. Front Med. 2021 Nov 24;8:756940.

841 25. Boldt I, Eriks-Hoogland I, Brinkhof MWG, de Bie R, Joggi D, von Elm E. Non-pharmacological
842 interventions for chronic pain in people with spinal cord injury. Cochrane Database Syst Rev.
843 2014 Nov 28;(11):CD009177.

844 26. World medical association declaration of Helsinki. JAMA. 2013 Nov 27;310(20):2191.

845 27. Kirshblum S, Snider B, Rupp R, Read MS, International Standards Committee of ASIA and
846 ISCoS. Updates of the International Standards for Neurologic Classification of Spinal Cord

847 Injury: 2015 and 2019. Phys Med Rehabil Clin N Am. 2020 Aug;31(3):319–30.

848 28. de Oliveira BIR, Howie EK, Dunlop SA, Galea MP, McManus A, Allison GT. SCIPA Com:
849 outcomes from the spinal cord injury and physical activity in the community intervention. Spinal
850 Cord. 2016 Oct;54(10):855–60.

851 29. Rupp R, Schuld C, Biering-Sørensen F, Walden K, Rodriguez G, Kirshblum S, et al. A
852 taxonomy for consistent handling of conditions not related to the spinal cord injury (SCI) in the
853 International Standards for Neurological Classification of SCI (ISNCSCI). Spinal Cord
854 [Internet]. 2021 Jun 9; Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41393-021-00646-0

855 30. Ginis KAM, Martin Ginis KA, van der Scheer JW, Latimer-Cheung AE, Barrow A, Bourne C, et
856 al. Evidence-based scientific exercise guidelines for adults with spinal cord injury: an update and
857 a new guideline [Internet]. Vol. 56, Spinal Cord. 2018. p. 308–21. Available from:
858 http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41393-017-0017-3

859 31. Farrar JT, Young JP, LaMoreaux L, Werth JL, Poole MR. Clinical importance of changes in
860 chronic pain intensity measured on an 11-point numerical pain rating scale. Pain. 2001
861 Nov;94(2):149–58.

862 32. Bouhassira D, Attal N, Alchaar H, Boureau F, Brochet B, Bruxelle J, et al. Comparison of pain
863 syndromes associated with nervous or somatic lesions and development of a new neuropathic
864 pain diagnostic questionnaire (DN4). Pain. 2005 Mar;114(1-2):29–36.

865 33. Westaway MD, Stratford PW, Binkley JM. The patient-specific functional scale: validation of its
866 use in persons with neck dysfunction. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther. 1998 May;27(5):331–8.

867 34. Keeney T, Slavin M, Kisala P, Ni P, Heinemann AW, Charlifue S, et al. Sensitivity of the SCI-
868 FI/AT in Individuals With Traumatic Spinal Cord Injury. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2018
869 Sep;99(9):1783–8.

870 35. Slavin MD, Ni P, Tulsky DS, Kisala PA, Heinemann AW, Charlifue S, et al. Spinal Cord
871 Injury–Functional Index/Assistive Technology Short Forms. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2016 Oct
872 1;97(10):1745–52.e7.

873 36. Penn RD, Savoy SM, Corcos D, Latash M, Gottlieb G, Parke B, et al. Intrathecal baclofen for
874 severe spinal spasticity. N Engl J Med. 1989 Jun 8;320(23):1517–21.

875 37. Buysse DJ, Reynolds CF 3rd, Monk TH, Berman SR, Kupfer DJ. The Pittsburgh Sleep Quality
876 Index: a new instrument for psychiatric practice and research. Psychiatry Res. 1989
877 May;28(2):193–213.

878 38. Spielberger CD, Gorsuch RL, Lushene R, Vagg PR, Jacobs GA. Manual for the State-Trait
879 Anxiety Inventory. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press; 1983.

880 39. Kalpakjian CZ, Toussaint LL, Albright KJ, Bombardier CH, Krause JK, Tate DG. Patient health
881 Questionnaire-9 in spinal cord injury: an examination of factor structure as related to gender. J
882 Spinal Cord Med. 2009;32(2):147–56.

883 40. Roelofs J, van Breukelen G, Sluiter J, Frings-Dresen MHW, Goossens M, Thibault P, et al.
884 Norming of the Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia across pain diagnoses and various countries.

885 Pain. 2011 May;152(5):1090–5.

886 41. Krassioukov A, Biering-Sørensen F, Donovan W, Kennelly M, Kirshblum S, Krogh K, et al.
887 International standards to document remaining autonomic function after spinal cord injury. J
888 Spinal Cord Med. 2012 Jul;35(4):201–10.

889 42. Middleton JW, Tate RL, Geraghty TJ. Self-Efficacy and Spinal Cord Injury: Psychometric
890 Properties of a New Scale. Rehabil Psychol. 2003 Nov;48(4):281–8.

891 43. Middleton JW, Tran Y, Lo C, Craig A. Reexamining the Validity and Dimensionality of the
892 Moorong Self-Efficacy Scale: Improving Its Clinical Utility. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2016
893 Dec;97(12):2130–6.

894 44. Alleva JM, Tylka TL, Kroon Van Diest AM. The Functionality Appreciation Scale (FAS):
895 Development and psychometric evaluation in U.S. community women and men. Body Image.
896 2017 Dec;23:28–44.

897 45. Feng S, McDaniel S, Van de Winckel A. Finding functionality: Rasch analysis of the
898 Functionality Appreciation Scale in community-dwelling adults in the US. Front Rehabil Sci.
899 2023 Oct 2;4:1222892.

900 46. Cramer H, Mehling WE, Saha FJ, Dobos G, Lauche R. Postural awareness and its relation to
901 pain: validation of an innovative instrument measuring awareness of body posture in patients
902 with chronic pain. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. 2018 Apr 6;19(1):109.

903 47. Dragesund T, Strand LI, Grotle M. The Revised Body Awareness Rating Questionnaire:
904 Development Into a Unidimensional Scale Using Rasch Analysis. Phys Ther. 2018 Feb
905 1;98(2):122–32.

906 48. Carpentier S, Deng W, Blackwood J, Van de Winckel A. Rasch validation of the revised body
907 awareness rating questionnaire (BARQ-R) in adults with and without musculoskeletal pain.
908 BMC Musculoskelet Disord. 2024 Oct 9;25(1):799.

909 49. Mehling WE, Acree M, Stewart A, Silas J, Jones A. The Multidimensional Assessment of
910 Interoceptive Awareness, Version 2 (MAIA-2). PLoS One. 2018 Dec 4;13(12):e0208034.

911 50. Malouin F, Richards CL, Jackson PL, Lafleur MF, Durand A, Doyon J. The Kinesthetic and
912 Visual Imagery Questionnaire (KVIQ) for assessing motor imagery in persons with physical
913 disabilities: a reliability and construct validity study. J Neurol Phys Ther. 2007 Mar;31(1):20–9.

914 51. Tulsky DS, Kisala PA, Victorson D, Tate DG, Heinemann AW, Charlifue S, et al. Overview of
915 the Spinal Cord Injury--Quality of Life (SCI-QOL) measurement system. J Spinal Cord Med.
916 2015 May;38(3):257–69.

917 52. Hall K, Dijkers M, Whiteneck G, Brooks CA, Krause JS. The Craig Handicap Assessment and
918 Reporting Technique (CHART): Metric Properties and Scoring. Top Spinal Cord Inj Rehabil.
919 1998 Jul 1;4(1):16–30.

920 53. Van de Winckel A, Zhang L, Hendrickson T, Lim KO, Mueller BA, Philippus A, et al.
921 Identifying body awareness-related brain network changes after Spring Forest Qigong™ practice
922 or P.Volve low-intensity exercise in adults with chronic low back pain: a feasibility Phase I

Randomized Clinical Trial. medRxiv [Internet]. 2023 Mar 1; Available from: http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2023.02.11.23285808

54. Sevinc G, Hölzel BK, Hashmi J, Greenberg J, McCallister A, Treadway M, et al. Common and Dissociable Neural Activity After Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction and Relaxation Response Programs. Psychosom Med. 2018 Jun;80(5):439–51.

55. Zeidan F, Vago DR. Mindfulness meditation-based pain relief: a mechanistic account. Ann N Y Acad Sci. 2016 Jun;1373(1):114–27.

56. Van de Winckel A, Carpentier S, Deng W, Zhang L, Battaglino R, Morse L. Using remotely delivered Spring Forest Qigong^{TM} to reduce neuropathic pain in adults with spinal cord injury: protocol of a quasi-experimental feasibility clinical trial. Pilot Feasibility Stud. 2023 Aug 22;9(1):145.

57. Burianová H, Marstaller L, Sowman P, Tesan G, Rich AN, Williams M, et al. Multimodal functional imaging of motor imagery using a novel paradigm. Neuroimage. 2013 May 1;71:50–8.

58. Batula AM, Mark JA, Kim YE, Ayaz H. Comparison of Brain Activation during Motor Imagery and Motor Movement Using fNIRS. Comput Intell Neurosci. 2017 May 4;2017:5491296.

59. Guillot A, Collet C, Nguyen VA, Malouin F, Richards C, Doyon J. Brain activity during visual versus kinesthetic imagery: an fMRI study. Hum Brain Mapp. 2009 Jul;30(7):2157–72.

60. Kilintari M, Narayana S, Babajani-Feremi A, Rezaie R, Papanicolaou AC. Brain activation profiles during kinesthetic and visual imagery: An fMRI study [Internet]. Vol. 1646, Brain Research. 2016. p. 249–61. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2016.06.009

61. Lachenbruch PA, Cohen J. Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences (2nd ed.). J Am Stat Assoc. 1989 Dec;84(408):1096.

62. Whitfield-Gabrieli S, Nieto-Castanon A. *Conn* : A functional connectivity toolbox for correlated and anticorrelated brain networks. Brain Connect. 2012 Jun;2(3):125–41.

63. D'Amico J, Gelenitis K, Inanici F, Field-Fote EC, Tefertiller C, Moritz C. Improved sensation with transcutaneous spinal cord stimulation following chronic Spinal Cord Injury. IEEE Trans Neural Syst Rehabil Eng. 2026;34:10–9.

64. Scivoletto G, Tamburella F, Laurenza L, Molinari M. Distribution-based estimates of clinically significant changes in the International Standards for Neurological Classification of Spinal Cord Injury motor and sensory scores. Eur J Phys Rehabil Med. 2013 Jun;49(3):373–84.

65. Eickhoff SB, Jbabdi S, Caspers S, Laird AR, Fox PT, Zilles K, et al. Anatomical and functional connectivity of cytoarchitectonic areas within the human parietal operculum. J Neurosci. 2010 May 5;30(18):6409–21.

66. Eickhoff SB, Schleicher A, Zilles K, Amunts K. The human parietal operculum. I. Cytoarchitectonic mapping of subdivisions. Cereb Cortex. 2006;16(2):254–67.

67. Berlucchi G, Aglioti SM. The body in the brain revisited. Exp Brain Res. 2010 Jan;200(1):25–

35.

68. Carpentier S, Van de Winckel A. Changes in body and interoceptive awareness after Cognitive Multisensory Rehabilitation or Qigong in adults with spinal cord injury [Internet]. medRxiv. medRxiv; 2025. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.64898/2025.12.12.25342154

69. Maggio MG, Bonanno M, Calderone A, Rizzo A, Bulut N, Bahramizadeh M, et al. Remapping body representation using virtual reality in chronic neuropathic pain: Systematic review. J Med Internet Res. 2025 Jun 3;27:e71074.

70. Carpentier S, Bottale S, Cenci N, Cracchiolo M, De Patre D, Gorosito J, et al. Development of the SCI-BodyMap: Measuring mental body representations in adults with spinal cord injury [Internet]. medRxiv. medRxiv; 2026. Available from: https://doi.org/10.64898/2026.01.23.26343891

71. Carpentier S, Bottale S, Cenci N, Cracchiolo M, De Patre D, Gorosito JP, et al. Development of the SCI-BodyMap-measuring mental body representations in adults with spinal cord injury: Protocol for item generation, reliability, and validity testing. JMIR Res Protoc. 2025 Sep 8;14:e72370.

72. Fyffe DC, Williams J, Tobin P, Gibson-Gill C. Spinal cord injury veterans' disability benefits, outcomes, and health care utilization patterns: Protocol for a qualitative study (preprint) [Internet]. JMIR Preprints. 2019. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.2196/preprints.14039

73. Spinal Cord Injury [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2026 Mar 15]. Available from: https://www.google.com/url?q=https://www.research.va.gov/topics/sci.cfm%23:~:text%3DSCIs%2520are%2520estimated%2520to%2520affect,SCI/Ds%2520throughout%2520their%2520lives&sa=D&source=docs&ust=1773564426696396&usg=AOvVaw22Fw4G92z-LXYx68YPPY_d

74. Villiger M, Bohli D, Kiper D, Pyk P, Spillmann J, Meilick B, et al. Virtual reality-augmented neurorehabilitation improves motor function and reduces neuropathic pain in patients with incomplete spinal cord injury. Neurorehabil Neural Repair. 2013 Oct;27(8):675–83.

75. Mouraux D, Brassinne E, Sobczak S, Nonclercq A, Warzée N, Sizer PS, et al. 3D augmented reality mirror visual feedback therapy applied to the treatment of persistent, unilateral upper extremity neuropathic pain: a preliminary study. J Man Manip Ther. 2017 Jul;25(3):137–43.

76. Moseley LG. Using visual illusion to reduce at-level neuropathic pain in paraplegia. Pain. 2007 Aug;130(3):294–8.

77. Jordan M, Richardson EJ. Effects of virtual walking treatment on spinal cord injury-related neuropathic pain: Pilot results and trends related to location of pain and at-level neuronal hypersensitivity. Am J Phys Med Rehabil. 2016 May;95(5):390–6.

994 **11 Figure legends**

995 **Fig. 1. CONSORT flow diagram.**

996 **Fig. 2. AIS exam.** Bar graphs show average left and right scores for touch, pinprick sensation, and
997 lower limb strength at baseline, post-intervention, and 3-month follow-up for the CMR and adaptive
998 fitness groups.

999 **Fig. 3. NRS exam.** Bar graphs show scores for core strength, upper limb and lower limb function at
1000 baseline, post-intervention, and 3-month follow-up for the CMR and adaptive fitness groups.

1001 **Fig. 4. Pre-post CMR changes in connectivity strength.** (**A**) Stronger parietal operculum network
1002 connectivity after 8 weeks of CMR: right parietal operculum (ROI) to right precentral gyrus (PreCG).
1003 (**B**) Stronger posterior cingulate cortex network connectivity after CMR: right posterior cingulate
1004 cortex (ROI) to left precentral gyrus (PreCG), left insula (INS), and left parietal operculum
1005 (OP1/OP4).

1006 **Fig. 5. Pre-post CMR changes in brain activity during leg kinesthetic imagery.** Post-CMR,
1007 enhanced brain activity was observed in the right pre- and postcentral gyri, and right superior parietal
1008 lobe.

1009 **Fig. 6. Pre-post changes in brain activity during whole-body imagery for CMR and adaptive**
1010 **fitness.** (**A**) Post-CMR increased activation in the supplementary motor area (SuppMotor), right pre-
1011 and postcentral gyrus (PreCG, PostCG), bilateral supramarginal gyrus (SMG), superior parietal lobe
1012 (SPL), and angular gyrus (AG). (**B**) Post-adaptive fitness, only smaller areas of the left supramarginal
1013 gyrus (SMG) and superior parietal lobe (SPL) were activated.

Fig. 1


Assessed for eligibility
• Adults with SCI (n=27)
Excluded (n=3)
• Not meeting inclusion criteria (n=3; baclofen pump, brain injury with cognitive problems, inability to self-transfer)
Baseline behavioral and clinical assessments (n=24)
Baseline MRI testing (n=11-13 depending on fMRI task)
• no MRI data for n=8, reasons: MRI not allowed because of a bullet in the body (n=2), Songer cable (n=1), pacemaker (n=1), not enough information to identify safety of cervical fusion and mitral valve replacement (n=1); Functional Electrical Stimulation (FES) implant (n=1); did not show up to testing (n=1)
Reasons for dropout after baseline testing (illnesses unrelated to the study (n=2), i.e., acute ulcer wound, COVID-19); the baseline fitness level of participants was too high to participate in the study (n=3); or not responding to communication (n=3)
Randomized for intervention: (n=16)
GROUP A: CMR intervention (n=8)
n=0 discontinued treatment
Received and completed the allocated intervention (n=8)
Completed the 3-month follow-up (n=8)
Included in Intention-To-Treat
• Pre-post behavioral and clinical assessments (n=8); pre-post MRI (n=3)
• 3-month follow-up assessments (n=8)
• Excluded from analysis (n=0)
GROUP B: Adaptive fitness (n=8)
n=1 discontinued because of pneumonia
Received and completed allocated intervention (n=7)
Completed the 3-month follow-up (n=6)
• Lost to 3-month follow-up (not responding to communication (n=1)
Included in Intention-To-Treat
• Pre-post behavioral and clinical assessments (n=8); pre-post MRI (n=2-5 depending on fMRI task)
• 3-month follow-up assessments (n=6)
• Excluded from analysis (n=0)

Fig. 2


CMR - Experimental group (n=8)
AIS exam: sensory and motor function
A higher score is a better outcome
Score Range
60
50
40
30
20
10
0
43
50
51
40
49
50
9
13
13
BASELINE CMR
POST-CMR
3 MONTH FOLLOW-UP
Touch /54
Pin Prick /54
Leg strength /25
Adaptive fitness - Comparison group (n=7)
AIS exam: sensory and motor function
A higher score is a better outcome
Score Range
60
50
40
30
20
10
0
45
47
46
41
43
42
13
14
15
BASELINE ADAPTIVE FITNESS
POST-ADAPTIVE FITNESS
3 MONTH FOLLOW-UP
Touch /54
Pin Prick /54
Leg strength /25

Fig. 3


CMR - Experimental group (n=8)
Neuromuscular Recovery Scale
A higher score is a better outcome
Score Range
160
140
120
100
80
60
40
20
0
27
31
33
136
142
143
15
17
17
Core /47
Arm /144
Leg /35
BASELINE CMR
POST-CMR
3 MONTH FOLLOW-UP
Adaptive fitness - Comparison group (n=7)
Neuromuscular Recovery Scale
A higher score is a better outcome
Score Range
160
140
120
100
80
60
40
20
0
35
37
39
131
132
131
15
15
17
Core /47
Arm /144
Leg /35
BASELINE ADAPTIVE FITNESS
POST-ADAPTIVE FITNESS
3 MONTH FOLLOW-UP

Fig. 4


A
RSFC-Paroper, CMR
PreCG
3.9
1.9
R
L
B
RSFC-PCC, CMR
PreCG
5.1
1.9
R
L
INS
OP1/OP4

Fig. 5



Fig. 6


Whole-body imagery
A
CMR
SuppMotor
PreCG
PostCG
SMG
SPL
SMG
AG
R
L
4.5
1.9
B
Adaptive fitness
SPL
SMG
R
L
3.5
1.9

Supplementary Table 1. Demographic and clinical characteristics of adults with spinal cord injury.

	Adults with SCI (n=16)
Age, years, mean±SD, range (years)	51.63±8.00 (38-64)
Sex assigned at birth, n (%) Male Female	 10 (62.50) 6 (37.50)
Gender Identity, n (%) Male Female Other	 10 (62.50) 6 (37.50) 0 (0.00)
Ethnicity, n (%) Hispanic Non-Hispanic	 0 (0.00) 16 (100.00)
Race, n (%) White Asian African American/Black Multi-racial Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Other	 12 (75.00) 0 (0.00) 4 (25.00) 0 (0.00) 0 (0.00) 0 (0.00)
Veteran, n (%) Yes No	 0 (0.00) 16 (100.00)
Location of residence, n (%) Rural City or suburb	 3 (18.75) 13 (81.25)

Marital status	
Single	5 (31.25)
Living with significant other or partner	0 (0.00)
Married	7 (43.75)
Separated	1 (6.25)
Widowed	0 (0.00)
Divorced	3 (18.75)
Other	0 (0.00)
Unknown	0 (0.00)
Baseline neuropathic pain intensity level experienced in the prior week, mean±SD, scored between 0-10 (n=10)	
High	6.30±2.41
Average	3.80±3.05
Low	0.20±0.42
Mini-Mental State Examination-Short Form (MMSE-SF), mean±SD, scored between 0-16	15.19±0.91
Time since spinal cord injury, years, mean±SD, range (years)	12.44±10.28 (1-29)
Etiology of SCI, n (%)	
Traumatic	
Motorized accident (motorcycle, car, snowmobile, plane)	10 (62.50)
Bike accident	1 (6.25)
Fall from greater than standing height	2 (12.50)
Gunshot wound	2 (12.50)
Non-traumatic	
Complications from surgery	1 (6.25)
Spinal cord injury lesion level, n (%)	
Cervical (C3-C7)	7 (43.75)
Thoracal (T4-T12)	6 (37.50)
Lumbar (L1-L3)	3 (18.75)
Sacral	0 (0.00)

Type of paralysis	
Quadriplegia	6 (37.50)
Brown-Sequard	1 (6.25)
Paraplegia	9 (56.25)
AIS level, n (%)	
A	1 (6.25)
B	4 (25.00)
C	4 (25.00)
D	7 (43.75)
Ambulation, n (%)	
Walking without assistance	2 (12.50)
Combined use of walking with and without assistance	1 (6.25)
Walking with assistance	0 (0.00)
Combined use of walking with assistance and manual wheelchair	2 (12.50)
Manual Wheelchair	6 (37.50)
Combined use of Manual and Motorized Wheelchair	2 (12.50)
Motorized Wheelchair	3 (18.75)
Neuropathic pain medication taken at baseline, n (%) (n=5)	
Amitriptyline	1 (20.00)
Baclofen	1 (20.00)
Gabapentin	3 (60.00)
Hydrocodone	1 (20.00)
Lyrica	1 (20.00)
Medical cannabis (CBD/THC)	1 (20.00)

Supplementary Table 2. Primary and secondary outcome measures at three time points.

Outcome measures	Time point 1 Baseline (mean±SD)		Time point 2 Post-intervention (mean±SD)		Time point 3 Post-CMR (mean±SD)		Effect size Pre – Post		Effect size Pre – 3MFU	
	CMR group	Adaptive Fitness group	CMR group	Adaptive Fitness group	CMR group	Adaptive Fitness group	CMR group	Adap. Fitness group	CMR group	Adap. Fitness group
n	(n=8)	(n=7)	(n=8)	(n=7)	(n=8)	(n=6)				
Highest NPRS	3.38±3.29	5.14±4.02	2.50±2.33	5.43±3.64	2.00±2.45	4.33±3.72	0.48	-0.19	0.63	0.00
Average NPRS	1.50±2.51	3.71±3.40	0.38±0.74	3.57±3.46	0.63±1.19	2.83±2.40	0.46	0.38	0.35	0.41
Lowest NPRS	0.25±0.71	0.29±0.49	0.25±0.71	0.29±0.49	0.25±0.71	0.33±0.52	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
DN4	3.50±2.67	4.57±2.64	2.88±2.10	4.71±2.63	2.88±2.10	5.00±2.76	0.59	-0.38	0.59	-0.41
n	(n=8)	(n=7)	(n=8)	(n=7)	(n=8)	(n=6)				
AIS exam										
- sensory touch (Avg L, R)	42.69±7.69	44.57±5.66	50.19±4.99	46.71±6.41	50.75±4.53	45.50±5.74	1.54	0.49	1.73	0.56
- sensory pin (Avg L, R)	40.00±6.44	40.79±8.66	48.50±6.08	42.79±7.89	49.88±4.85	42.08±5.83	1.83	0.53	2.07	0.74
- lower limb motor function	9.31±8.29	12.64±7.99	12.69±8.23	13.79±8.69	13.00±8.55	14.58±9.35	1.32	0.74	1.28	0.63
NRS										
- core	27.00±11.66	35.00±12.78	31.38±11.08	36.57±13.26	33.13±11.58	39.17±12.94	2.19	0.73	1.74	0.62
- arm function	135.75±9.84	131.00±19.86	141.75±5.26	131.86±20.12	142.63±3.89	131.17±19.44	0.69	0.34	0.79	0.85
- standing	15.13±10.56	15.43±12.35	16.88±11.96	15.43±12.35	17.13±11.98	17.00±13.56	0.74	0.00	0.78	0.65
PSFS	2.00±0.84	2.24±2.11	7.46±2.65	4.00±2.36	7.79±2.82	6.56±1.75	1.99	1.07	1.95	1.81

n	(n=5)	(n=4)	(n=5)	(n=4)	(n=5)	(n=3)				
SCI-FI/AT paraplegia										
- basic mobility	29.20±3.70	25.75±11.30	33.40±2.41	26.50±10.97	33.60±2.30	29.33±11.55	1.47	0.78	1.37	0.00
- self-care	23.20±5.81	28.75±6.29	30.20±6.65	28.50±6.61	30.20±6.65	31.67±4.51	1.41	-0.50	1.41	0.58
- fine motor function	29.00±2.55	30.00±4.00	30.80±1.79	30.00±4.00	31.00±1.41	30.33±2.89	1.38	0.00	1.27	0.58
- ambulation	5.00±6.86	4.50±5.45	5.80±7.95	5.00±6.27	5.80±7.95	7.67±7.09	0.61	0.50	0.61	1.09
n	(n=3)	(n=3)	(n=3)	(n=3)	(n=3)	(n=3)				
SCI-FI/AT quadriplegia										
- basic mobility	32.67±4.93	33.00±3.61	33.33±4.62	34.33±2.08	33.33±4.62	34.33±2.08	1.16	0.87	1.16	0.87
- self-care	35.33±0.58	33.33±4.62	36.00±0.00	33.67±4.04	36.00±0.00	33.67±4.04	1.16	0.58	1.16	0.58
- fine motor function	32.00±0.00	28.67±1.15	32.00±0.00	30.67±2.31	32.00±0.00	30.67±2.31	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
- ambulation	7.67±11.59	11.67±10.21	8.67±13.32	14.00±12.17	8.67±13.32	14.00±12.17	0.58	1.12	0.58	1.12
n	(n=8)	(n=7)	(n=8)	(n=7)	(n=8)	(n=6)				
Spasms										
- frequency	0.25±0.46	1.00±0.82	0.00±0.00	1.00±0.82	0.00±0.00	0.67±0.82	0.54	0.54	0.00	0.41
- severity	0.50±1.07	1.00±0.82	0.00±0.00	0.86±0.69	0.00±0.00	0.67±0.82	0.47	0.38	0.47	0.65
PSQI	9.50±4.14	6.57±5.00	8.00±4.96	5.71±5.06	9.00±6.07	4.67±3.88	0.34	0.31	0.12	0.22
Trait Anxiety Inventory	35.25±15.66	37.14±9.67	33.25±15.27	34.43±9.32	32.38±15.00	32.83±7.88	1.53	0.56	1.59	0.72
State Anxiety Inventory	26.88±8.46	29.86±10.30	28.25±8.84	29.86±7.67	26.25±8.96	32.67±7.17	-0.35	0.00	0.13	-0.64
PHQ-9	3.88±7.04	3.71±2.93	4.25±7.50	4.14±3.98	4.50±7.37	3.50±3.27	-0.29	-0.25	-0.68	0.10
TSK	33.50±7.69	33.00±5.97	35.63±8.05	31.71±2.75	31.00±8.00	28.83±4.79	-0.77	0.32	0.75	0.78
ANS	31.38±6.97	33.29±6.82	32.00±7.01	32.86±6.77	32.00±7.01	32.83±6.18	0.68	-0.55	0.68	-0.18
MSES	90.38±22.46	97.86±13.52	88.63±22.28	96.57±20.10	92.50±19.18	95.83±11.79	-0.27	-0.17	0.25	-0.17

FAS	3.02±0.89	3.18±0.75	3.46±0.63	3.14±0.75	3.37±0.52	3.24±0.61	0.61	-0.13	0.52	0.10
PAS	44.13±12.35	50.71±6.40	51.13±10.09	55.57±8.62	46.75±11.40	52.83±6.18	0.60	0.54	0.25	0.34
BARQ-R	17.63±5.58	17.00±6.35	17.75±4.83	17.71±4.23	15.63±6.14	16.17±4.75	-0.02	-0.17	0.59	0.43
MAIA-2										
- noticing	3.63±0.99	3.50±0.69	3.75±0.80	4.18±0.40	3.84±1.09	3.54±0.56	0.14	0.77	0.78	0.11
- not distracted	1.52±1.08	1.36±1.05	1.63±0.79	1.88±1.27	1.60±0.90	1.42±0.75	0.11	0.34	0.11	0.04
- not worrying	2.50±1.06	2.86±0.51	2.78±0.38	2.63±0.27	3.13±0.52	2.77±0.50	0.29	-0.54	0.61	-0.24
- attention regulation	3.88±0.89	3.69±1.03	3.50±0.83	3.20±0.99	3.75±0.99	3.02±0.64	-0.42	-0.48	-0.12	-0.66
- emotional awareness	2.93±1.44	2.91±1.60	3.20±0.76	2.69±1.35	3.38±1.43	2.73±0.78	0.25	0.25	0.57	0.15
- self-regulation	3.06±1.75	3.29±0.91	3.28±1.41	2.61±0.72	3.41±1.61	2.88±0.52	0.25	-1.37	0.86	-0.29
- body listening	1.83±1.11	2.62±1.42	2.21±1.31	1.62±1.42	2.58±1.24	1.78±0.66	0.43	-1.06	1.14	-0.42
- trusting	3.21±1.67	3.86±1.41	3.46±1.56	3.38±1.34	3.46±1.69	3.50±1.38	0.39	-0.38	0.35	-0.33
KVIQ	44.75±4.10	45.14±7.13	48.38±2.00	45.71±7.41	48.88±1.73	44.83±7.81	1.02	0.73	1.07	-0.60
SCI-QOL (T-scores)										
- positive affect	55.51±9.16	56.47±7.11	51.84±6.59	55.89±9.65	54.80±8.75	52.77±6.26	-0.58	-0.14	-0.14	-0.79
- resilience	50.70±10.02	52.93±7.86	51.18±8.02	51.67±10.48	53.93±10.21	52.20±8.09	0.08	-0.16	0.71	-0.48
- self-esteem	30.89±12.18	28.90±11.27	32.34±9.76	31.36±7.47	28.80±11.87	30.02±8.67	0.31	0.45	-0.49	0.08
- ability to participate	46.33±4.89	48.24±5.40	47.04±4.18	46.11±5.73	49.04±4.51	45.67±1.56	0.17	-0.57	0.65	-0.30
- independence	44.59±2.45	45.56±6.79	44.95±1.83	44.61±5.06	43.50±2.54	45.07±3.15	0.18	-0.35	-0.37	-0.07
- pain behavior	51.40±8.85	52.51±10.58	50.51±8.79	49.86±11.87	45.85±9.36	52.02±8.84	0.12	0.47	0.89	0.20
CHART-SF										
- physical independence	97.19±3.85	98.71±2.56	97.19±3.85	98.82±2.59	97.19±3.85	99.83±0.41	0.00	0.38	0.00	0.41
- cognitive independence	100.00±0.00	100.00±0.00	100.00±0.00	100.00±0.00	100.00±0.00	100.00±0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

- mobility	65.25±26.14	76.79±32.98	75.38±18.94	80.00±34.37	77.50±17.33	92.33±11.83	1.18	0.37	0.76	0.55
- occupation	65.00±39.65	63.93±45.18	70.94±33.20	66.79±42.32	86.09±63.75	76.25±37.21	0.36	0.44	0.47	0.41
- social interaction	87.88±18.07	83.86±22.03	93.50±17.98	86.00±19.45	93.50±17.98	83.67±20.21	0.60	0.38	0.60	-0.41
- economic self-sufficiency	78.52±39.77	78.29±31.32	78.52±39.77	78.29±31.32	78.52±39.77	76.40±33.87	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Legend: ANS: Autonomic Standards Assessment Form; BARQ-R: Revised Body Awareness Rating Questionnaire; CHART-SF: Craig Handicap Assessment and Reporting Technique; DN4: Douleur Neuropathique (Neuropathic pain) 4; FAS: Functionality Appreciation Scale; ISNCSCI-AIS exam: International Standards for Neurological Classification of SCI American Spinal Cord Injury Association Impairment Scale; KVIQ: Kinesthetic and Visual Imagery Questionnaire; MAIA-2: Multidimensional Assessment of Interoceptive Awareness Version 2; MSES: Moorong Self-Efficacy Scale; NPRS: Numeric Pain Rating Scale (used to measure neuropathic pain in the prior week); NRS: Neuromuscular Recovery Scale; PAS: Postural Awareness Scale; PSFS: Patient Specific Functional Scale; SCI: spinal cord injury; PHQ-9: Patient Health Questionnaire-9; PSQI: Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index; SCI-FI/AT: Spinal Cord Injury Functional Index/Assistive Technology Short Forms; SCI-QOL: Spinal Cord Injury-Quality of Life scales; TSK: Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia. **Note:** Positive and negative effect size values indicate whether there was improvement or worsening, respectively, of outcome measures. One person in the adaptive fitness group withdrew before the follow-up testing, so averages and SD are calculated n-1 for this time point. Effect sizes pre-3MFU also reflect the reduced n. All *p*-values are adjusted using Benjamini-Hochberg False Discovery Rate (FDR) for multiple comparison corrections

Supplementary Table 3. Brain imaging outcomes for resting-state and task-based fMRI in adults with SCI.

	Z score	*p*-value (FWE-corrected)	Cluster extent (voxels)	Hemi-sphere	x (mm)	y (mm)	z (mm)	
Resting-state functional connectivity Right Parietal Operculum seed Post-CMR > Baseline in adults with SCI								
Cluster 1	3.97	0.026	415	Right	60	0	36	**Precentral Gyrus** Postcentral Gyrus Middle Frontal Gyrus
Resting-state functional connectivity Right Posterior Cingular Cortex seed Post-CMR > Baseline in adults with SCI								
Cluster 1	4.59	<0.001	10951	Right	2	-24	74	(one single large cluster that spans across left and right hemisphere) Frontal Pole **Precentral Gyrus** Postcentral Gyrus Superior Frontal Gyrus Middle Frontal Gyrus **Insular Cortex** Superior Parietal Lobule Supramarginal Gyrus, anterior division Juxtapositional Lobule Cortex (formerly Supplementary Motor Cortex) **Parietal Operculum Cortex** Frontal Operculum Cortex Central Opercular Cortex Anterior Cingulate Gyrus Paracingulate Gyrus Inferior Frontal Gyrus, pars triangularis Inferior Frontal Gyrus, pars opercularis
fMRI task: Imagining feeling the left leg Post-CMR > Baseline in adults with SCI								
Cluster 1	4.37	<0.001	1168	Right	30	-46	82	**Precentral Gyrus** **Postcentral Gyrus** **Superior Parietal Lobule** Juxtapositional Lobule Cortex (formerly Supplementary Motor Cortex)
fMRI task: Whole-body imagery Post-CMR > Baseline in adults with SCI								
Cluster 1	4.42	<0.001	25819	Right	2	4	78	**Juxtapositional Lobule Cortex (formerly Supplementary Motor Cortex)** Frontal Pole

								Anterior Cingulate Gyrus Posterior Cingulate Gyrus
Cluster 2	3.35	<0.001	1174	Left	-8	-64	-8	Lingual Gyrus Lateral Occipital Cortex, superior division Precuneous Cortex **Supramarginal Gyrus, anterior division** **Supramarginal Gyrus, posterior division** **Angular Gyrus** **Superior Parietal Lobule**
Cluster 3	3.5	<0.001	485	Right	50	-50	4	**Supramarginal Gyrus, anterior division** **Supramarginal Gyrus, posterior division** Superior Parietal Lobule
Cluster 4	2.97	0.006	296	Right	12	62	28	Superior Frontal Gyrus Middle Frontal Gyrus Inferior Frontal Gyrus, pars triangularis Inferior Frontal Gyrus, pars opercularis **Precentral Gyrus** **Postcentral Gyrus** Insular Cortex Central Opercular Cortex Parietal Operculum Cortex
fMRI task: Whole Body Imagery Post-adaptive fitness > Baseline in adults with SCI								
Cluster 1	3.56	<0.001	481	Left	-30	-52	48	**Superior Parietal Lobule** **Supramarginal Gyrus, posterior division** Angular Gyrus Precentral Gyrus Postcentral Gyrus Parietal Operculum Cortex Frontal Pole Lateral Occipital Cortex, superior division Planum Temporale