1 **Fixed-Life or Rechargeable Battery for Deep Brain Stimulation: Preference and**
2 **Satisfaction in Chinese Patients with Parkinson's Disease**

3 Xian Qiu^{1,2,3*}, Tingting Peng^{1,2*}, Zhengyu Lin^{1,2}, Kaiwen Zhu^{1,2}, Yuhan Wang^{1,2},
4 Bomin Sun^{1,2}, Keyoumars Ashkan⁴, Chencheng Zhang^{1,2}, Dianyou Li^{1,2}

5

6 ¹Department of Neurosurgery, Ruijin Hospital, Shanghai Jiao Tong University School
7 of Medicine, Shanghai, China

8 ²Center for Functional Neurosurgery, Ruijin Hospital, Shanghai Jiao Tong University
9 School of Medicine, Shanghai, China

10 ³School of Nursing, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China

11 ⁴Department of Neurosurgery, King's College Hospital, London, UK

12

13 *These two authors contributed equally to this work.

14

15 Correspondence :

16 Chencheng Zhang icczhang.org

17 Dianyou Li ldy11483@rjh.com.cn

18

19

20 **Objective**

21 To evaluate the preference and satisfaction in the Chinese Parkinson's disease (PD)
22 patients treated with deep brain stimulation (DBS).

23 **Background**

24 DBS is a widely used therapy for PD. There is now a choice between fixed-life
25 implantable pulse generators (IPGs) and rechargeable IPGs, each having their
26 advantages and disadvantages.

27 **Methods**

28 Two hundred and twenty PD patients treated with DBS completed a self-designed
29 questionnaire to assess long-term satisfaction and experience with the type of battery
30 they had chosen, and the key factors affecting their choices. The survey was
31 performed online and double-checked for completeness and accuracy.

32 **Results**

33 The median value of follow-up length was 18 months. The most popular way for
34 patients to learn about DBS surgery was through media (79/220, 35.9%), including
35 the Internet and television programs. 87.3% of the DBS used rechargeable IPGs (r-
36 IPG). The choice between rechargeable and non-rechargeable IPGs was significantly
37 associated with the patient's affordability ($\chi^2_{(1)} = 19.13$, $p < 0.001$). Interestingly, the
38 feature of remote programming significantly affected patients' choices between
39 domestic and imported brands ($\chi^2_{(1)} = 16.81$, $p < 0.001$). 87.7% of the patients were
40 satisfied with the stimulating effects as well as the implanted device. 40.6% of the
41 patients with r-IPGs felt confident handling their devices within one week after
42 discharge. More than half of the patients checked their batteries every week. The

43 mean interval for battery recharge was 4.3 days. 57.8% of the patients spent around
44 one-hour recharging, and 71.4% of them recharged the battery independently.

45 **Conclusion**

46 Most patients were satisfied with their choices of IPGs. The patients' financial status
47 and remote programming function were the two most critical factors in their decision.
48 The skill of using rechargeable IPG was easy to master by most patients.

49

50

51 **Introduction**

52 Deep brain stimulation (DBS) is a well-established neurosurgical treatment for
53 advanced Parkinson's disease (PD), which achieves its effects by continuous electrical
54 current delivery to the target brain area. The power comes from an implantable pulse
55 generator (IPG), which was initially designed to be non-rechargeable. Depending on
56 the diagnosis and parameter settings, these fixed-life batteries had to be replaced three
57 to five years after implantation. As the continuous stimulation calls for high energy
58 consumption, battery depletion is the most common reason for further surgery in DBS
59 patients.^{1,2} Despite the battery replacement is a minor surgical procedure compared
60 with the primary operation, several problematic issues such as infection risk and
61 wound healing may occur after several IPG replacements.³ Rechargeable batteries
62 were introduced in 2008. Compared to fixed-life ones, rechargeable batteries offer
63 several advantages, including smaller profile but longer battery life, requiring fewer
64 battery replacement surgeries, and fewer battery exhausted-related problems (e.g.,
65 injuries caused by worsening of symptoms).⁴ Research on the utility of rechargeable
66 batteries for DBS have demonstrated adequate tolerability, a high patient satisfaction
67 rate, and a favorable cost-effectiveness. However, patients are required to check the
68 battery status and regularly recharge by using a handheld device. The frequency and
69 duration of the recharge procedure depend on the power consumption of each patient.
70 Although it is not difficult to perform, the recharge procedure can be challenging for
71 PD patients as most of them are the elderly with various levels of cognitive deficits.⁵

72

73 In addition to battery options, rapid technological development in the last decade has
74 made neurologists and neurosurgeons—face the challenge of selecting an ideal

75 individualized DBS system based on multiple variables such as lead geometry and
 76 different programming platforms.⁶ Factors including DBS target, the amount of
 77 current needed, patient's overall health condition and their ability to deal with
 78 interactive devices and recharging, social support network, and personal financial
 79 status are of prime importance in delivering individualized therapy to patients.
 80 Another critical area that has not been fully explored is the influence of patient's
 81 individual preferences and lifestyle concerns on the choice of the DBS device. The
 82 patient's decision on DBS battery choice and the influencing factors of the decision
 83 have only been investigated in a few studies in Europe.^{5,7-9}

84

85 Neuromodulation with implantable devices is one of the most technologically driven
 86 disciplines within neurosurgery. In recent years, there has been a considerable
 87 expansion in choices of available DBS hardware allowing for more personalized
 88 therapies, maximizing the benefits and acceptability, whilst minimizing the risks. At
 89 the same time, DBS specialists also face the challenge of selecting among a mass of
 90 options to choose the most appropriate device for each patient. Understanding why
 91 and how patients make their choices is critical not only to improve patient
 92 acceptability and satisfaction of the therapy but also to innovate the next generation
 93 devices. In China, three DBS manufacturers (Medtronic, PINS and SceneRay) are
 94 currently offering non-rechargeable (nr-IPG) and rechargeable IPGs (r-IPG) from
 95 1998 and 2013, 2013 and 2014, 2016 and 2019, respectively (Supplementary Figure
 96 1). In this article, we sought to report patients' satisfaction and preferences for the
 97 type of IPGs they chose.

98

99 **Method**

100 Participants

101 Patients diagnosed with idiopathic PD who had undergone DBS surgery in the
 102 Department of Functional Neurosurgery in Ruijin Hospital Affiliated to Shanghai Jiao
 103 Tong University School of Medicine were invited to participate in this survey. During
 104 routine clinical practice, our patients were offered a choice of r-IPG or nr-IPG, as well
 105 as of international or domestic brand, after a comprehensive and detailed explanation
 106 of each option. Patients implanted with either nr-IPG or r-IPG were included in this
 107 study. Totally 768 patients with PD who had received DBS surgeries in our center
 108 were contacted for this study.

109

110 Questionnaire

111 An internet-based questionnaire (powered by www.wjx.cn) was developed and was
 112 distributed via an online chat software Wechat. The questions comprised of various
 113 aspects of the DBS devices that the patients had chosen, including
 114 (but not limited to) patients' demographics, factors that impacted patients' choices,
 115 patients' satisfaction about their choices and DBS surgery. In particular, several
 116 questions were designed specifically for patients with an r-IPG device: the feasibility
 117 and reliability of the battery recharge, the interval and duration of the recharge, and
 118 the convenience of post-operative management of r-IPG. All patients provided their
 119 consent for data collection and analysis at the beginning of the questionnaire before
 120 study participation. This study was approved by Ruijin Ethical Committee.

121

122 Statistical analysis

123 Data were analyzed with the SPSS software (Version 23.0. Amonk, NY: IBM Corp.).
 124 Continuous variables were expressed as Mean $\pm$ SD or median value with
 125 interquartile range (IQR). Categorical variables were presented as frequencies (%).
 126 We used Fisher's exact test to assess the-relationship between patient's affordability
 127 and the choice of r-IPG versus nr-IPG. We used Pearson's or Yates' continuity
 128 corrected Chi-square test to evaluate the influencing factors for patients' choices of
 129 international versus domestic manufacturers in r-IPG group, and to compare the
 130 satisfaction rate between patients with r-IPG and nr-IPG. A p-value < 0.05 was
 131 considered significant.

132

133 **Results**

134 Demographic data

135 220 patients (135 men and 85 women) with PD completed the survey and were
 136 available for analysis. The response rate was 28.6% (220/768). Among them, 192
 137 (87.3%) patients were implanted with r-IPGs and 28 (12.7%) patients with nr-IPGs.
 138 142 (64.5%) patients had chosen a device from the international manufacturer (i.e.,
 139 Medtronic) and 78 (35.5%) patients had chosen a device from domestic manufacturers
 140 (i.e., PINS or SceneRay). Overall, the mean age was 62.8 ± 9.8 years. The median
 141 value of the follow-up length was 18 (IQR: 8–36) months. Demographic data was
 142 listed in Table 1.

143

144 Source of DBS information

145 The web and television media and doctor's referrals served as two important tunnels
146 for PD patients to know DBS before seeking surgery [36.1% (79/219) and 35.6%
147 (78/219), respectively]. The remaining quarter of the patients (25.5%, 56/219) came
148 to our center learned the information about DBS by word of mouth from other
149 patients (Table 2).

150

151 Influencing factors for patients' choices of rechargeable versus non-rechargeable
152 battery

153 As illustrated in Figure 1, approximately half of the patients (51.6%, 99/192) who had
154 chosen r-IPGs had a budget between 200 to 300 thousands RMB, while 53.6% (15/28)
155 of patients with nr-IPGs only had a budget between 100 to 200 thousands RMB. The
156 choice of r-IPG versus nr-IPG was significantly associated with the patient's
157 affordability ($p = 0.0001$). Concretely, the percentage of patients reporting 'concern' or
158 'serious concern' about economic issues was higher in the nr-IPG group (82.1%, 23/28)
159 than that in the r-IPG group (60.9%, 117/192) (Figure 2D). Interestingly, the need for
160 further surgeries to replace the battery, as well as the need for recharging the battery,
161 was considered a concern or a serious concern by 82.1% (23/28) and by 64.3% (18/28)
162 of the patients with nr-IPGs, respectively, also higher than r-IPG group (72.9%
163 (140/192) and 47.9% (92/192), respectively) (Figure 2B–2C). There was 46.4%
164 (13/28) of the patients with nr-IPGs and 51.6% (99/192) of the patients with r-IPGs
165 reported 'concern' or 'serious concern' about the size of the battery (Figure 2A).

166

167 Influencing factors for r-IPG patients' choices between international and domestic
168 manufacturers

169 Among 192 patients with r-IPGs, 136 (70.8%) patients had chosen a device from the
 170 international manufacturer (i.e., Medtronic), and 56 (29.2%) had chosen a device from
 171 the domestic manufacturer (i.e., PINS or SceneRay). The patient's economic issue, the
 172 international reputation of the product, as well as the product feature of remote
 173 programming significantly affected r-IPG patients' choices between international and
 174 domestic manufacturers ($p = 6.28E-7$, $5.40E-11$, and $3.68E-7$, respectively) (Figure
 175 3A–3C). Not surprisingly, the patient's choice was not influenced by clinicians ($p =$
 176 0.202) (Figure 3D).

177

178 Satisfaction

179 The majority of the patients (87.7%, 193/220) were satisfied with stimulating effects
 180 as well as the implanted device. 10% (22/220) of them claimed that their expectation
 181 had not been met after the surgery. The satisfaction rate among patients with r-IPGs
 182 (88.0% 169/192) showed no statistical significance compared with those with nr-IPGs
 183 (85.7%, 24/28) ($p = 0.969$) (Table 3). Also, no statistical significance was observed
 184 for the satisfaction rate between international and domestic manufacturers in patients
 185 with r-IPGs ($p = 0.729$). 92.7% (178/192) of the patients with r-IPGs and 92.9%
 186 (26/28) with nr-IPGs would choose the same type of device when completing the
 187 questionnaire.

188

189 Recharging process

190 The majority of the r-IPG patients (71.4%, 137/192) were capable of battery recharge
 191 independently. The remaining patients (28.6%, 55/192), however, needed partners to
 192 check and recharge the battery. Most of the patients with r-IPGs and their partners

193 (92.7%, 178/192) felt confident of handling their device; 43.8% (78/178) of them
194 reported the same confidence within one week after discharge from hospital. More
195 than half of the patients (64.1%, 123/192) checked the battery every week, and most r-
196 IPG patients (92.2%, 177/192) preferred recharging when the battery level was over
197 50%. The mean interval for battery recharge was 4.3 days. More than half of the
198 patients (57.8%, 111/192) spent around 1-hour recharging. Notably, 8.3% (16/192) of
199 the r-IPG patients reported at least one episode of recharge failure at some point, and
200 more than half of them (68.9%, 11/16) failed to perform troubleshooting (Table 4).

201

202 Life with an r-IPG

203 During the routine recharging process, most of the r-IPG patients (92.7%, 178/192)
204 preferred to sit or lie down to moving around. Only 26.6% (51/192) of the r-IPG
205 patients reported at least one travel history after implantation, 78.4% (40/51) of whom
206 recharged during their vacation. 11.5% (22/192) of the r-IPG patients continued their
207 professional occupation after the surgery, but only one patient had recharged the IPG
208 at work (Table 5).

209

210 Discussion

211 To the best of our knowledge, our cohort is the largest one by far including all three
212 DBS manufacturers in China and reporting the preference and satisfaction of fixed life
213 versus rechargeable battery in PD patients. This study presented Chinese patients'
214 views independent of clinical influences and revealed that most patients, around 80%,
215 opted for the rechargeable batteries. A significant factor contributing to this choice
216 was related to economic status. Nevertheless, it is the effect of surgery other than the

217 product being the main factor that determines patient satisfaction. The remote
218 programming feature significantly affected patients' choice of products, which is now
219 only available in Chinese domestic brands. The majority of the patients with r-IPG
220 felt confident of mastering the recharging process within a short time after discharge.
221 We did not observe a difference regarding recharging patterns for three manufacturers.
222 Patients mostly preferred to check and recharge the battery about once a week. The
223 amount of time that needs to be invested by the patient to handle and recharge the IPG
224 is around one hour. Our cohort showed that patients were able to continue their jobs
225 and to travel with r-IPGs, but only a few of our patients recharged their IPGs during
226 work or traveling.

227

228 While greater age, as well as more advanced functional impairment, may be
229 considered as barriers against r-IPG utilization, neither age nor education level had a
230 significant impact on the understanding and performance of the recharging process in
231 the current study. Even if there exists a difficulty, patients can seek help from
232 caregivers, as approximately 30% of r-IPG patients did in our study. Interestingly,
233 there were several patients checked their batteries every one year or more, meaning
234 that they recharged the IPG frequently but they did not check the IPG status as much.
235 Although it was not reported in these participants, we had patients who failed to get
236 timely recharge. Restarting power depleted IPGs needs continuous charging for more
237 than 5 hours. In most cases, power depletion did not cause irreversible consequences,
238 but one patient got aspiration pneumonia during the power-off period.

239

240 Inability to recharge the IPG could be annoying and might have serious adverse
241 consequences. In our study, most cases' problems were caused by malfunctioning
242 power banks that needed to be replaced. One patient reported that the device was shut
243 down unexpectedly without the patient's awareness, and the program controller was
244 used to restart the IPG. Another case involved an elderly patient, whose new caregiver
245 failed to recharge the IPG when the original caregiver was replaced at the nursing
246 home.

247

248 The research concerns patient's satisfaction have been reported before. Timmermann
249 et al.⁹ described a small prospective patient satisfaction cohort (N = 21) during a 3-
250 month follow-up. Jakobs et al.⁵ reported another small retrospective cohort (N = 35)
251 with a more extensive follow-up duration (mean value of 21.2 months). Their work
252 together indicated that there was no significant association between the satisfaction
253 rate and the number of training sessions. These two studies had limited subjects which
254 included the patients with PD, dystonia, and essential tremor together into the analysis.
255 Similarly, Jakobs et al. also pointed out that the majority of patients who claimed a
256 lack of confidence after the training program had only participated in only one single
257 session. They, therefore, proposed at least two training sessions for patients. In our
258 study, 178 (92.7%) patients felt confident of using their IPG, and such a high rate of
259 satisfaction is probably because our patients and their caregivers are encouraged to
260 participate in two training sessions: one before discharge and one at one week after
261 discharge. Waln and Jimenez-Shahed et al.¹⁰ reported patient satisfaction in a series of
262 31 patients of which 12 received r-IPGs as their initial implants. Interestingly, these
263 patients were more satisfied with their IPGs compared with patients who previously
264 had an nr-IPG implanted. In our study, we didn't explore the satisfaction rates

265 between multiple products but found the therapy efficacy was the dominating factor
266 of patients' general satisfaction.

267

268 Our results demonstrated that patient's affordability had a significant impact on the
269 choice of r-IPG versus nr-IPG in Chinese PD patients. Rizzi et al. estimated that more
270 than 223,000 EUR could be saved over nearly 8 years in 149 patients when they were
271 all implanted with r-IPG instead of nr-IPG¹¹. However, reimbursement policies largely
272 differ across countries and cities. As DBS electrodes and IPG are now only partly
273 reimbursed by insurance in China, DBS therapy remains to be a substantial financial
274 burden for many cases. The role of insurance policies, as well as other factors like the
275 longevity of individual life expectancy, should be elucidated in the further cost-
276 effective investigation.

277

278 We recognize some limitations in this study. First, this study was undertaken in a
279 single institution, so there might be inherent biases. Second, as a cross-sectional study,
280 we are not able to identify how the patient's satisfaction developed over time as the
281 disease progresses. Third, the follow-up duration of the current study is not sufficient
282 to evaluate potential issues arising when r-IPGs are near the end of the recommended
283 run-time.

284

285 In conclusion, we found most patients were satisfied with their choices of IPG. The
286 patients' financial status and the product feature of remote programming were the two
287 most critical factors in their decision. The skill of using rechargeable IPG was easy to
288 be mastered by most patients.

289

290 **Funding**

291 This study was supported by the 2018 Shanghai Municipal Education Commission—
292 Gaoyuan Nursing Grant Support (Hlgy1804kyx).

293

294 **Acknowledgments**

295 We thank Ms. Kaile Zhang and Dr. Luciano Furlanetti for their kind support in this
296 study.

297

298

299 **References**

- 300 1. Kumar, N., Murgai, A. & Jog, M. Neurological Worsening After Implantable
301 Pulse Generator Replacement. *Can J Neurol Sci* (2019).
- 302 2. Niemann, M., Schneider, G.-H., Kühn, A., Vajkoczy, P. & Faust, K. Clinical
303 Efficacy of Bilateral Deep Brain Stimulation Does Not Change After Implantable
304 Pulse Generator Replacement but the Impedances Do: A Prospective Study.
305 *Neuromodulation* (2019).
- 306 3. Thrane, J. F., Sunde, N. A., Bergholt, B. & Rosendal, F. Increasing infection
307 rate in multiple implanted pulse generator changes in movement disorder patients
308 treated with deep brain stimulation. *Ster. Funct Neurosurg* (2014).
- 309 4. Hitti, F. L., Vaughan, K. A., Ramayya, A. G., McShane, B. J. & Baltuch, G. H.
310 Reduced long-term cost and increased patient satisfaction with rechargeable
311 implantable pulse generators for deep brain stimulation. *J Neurosurg* (2018).
- 312 5. Jakobs, M., Kloß, M., Unterberg, A. & Kiening, K. Rechargeable Internal
313 Pulse Generators as Initial Neurostimulators for Deep Brain Stimulation in Patients
314 With Movement Disorders. *Neuromodulation* (2018).
- 315 6. Okun, M. S. Tips for Choosing a Deep Brain Stimulation Device. *JAMA*
316 *Neurol.* **76**, 749–750 (2019).
- 317 7. Furlanetti, L. et al. Fixed-Life or Rechargeable Battery for Deep Brain
318 Stimulation: A Prospective Long-Term Study of Patient's Preferences. *Ster. Funct*
319 *Neurosurg* (2020).

- 320 8. Khaleeq, T., Hasegawa, H., Samuel, M. & Ashkan, K. Fixed-Life or
321 Rechargeable Battery for Deep Brain Stimulation: Which Do Patients Prefer?
322 Neuromodulation (2019).
- 323 9. Timmermann, L. et al. A new rechargeable device for deep brain stimulation: a
324 prospective patient satisfaction survey. Eur Neurol (2013).
- 325 10. Waln, O. & Jimenez-Shahed, J. Rechargeable deep brain stimulation
326 implantable pulse generators in movement disorders: patient satisfaction and
327 conversion parameters. Neuromodulation (2014).
- 328 11. Rizzi, M. et al. Internal Pulse Generators in Deep Brain Stimulation:
329 Rechargeable or Not? World Neurosurg. **84**, 1020–1029 (2015).
- 330

331 **Figure legend**

332 **Figure 1. Patients' budgets for DBS surgery.** Budgets were divided into four levels
333 and indicated by different grayscales. Values were presented either in absolute patient
334 number (A) or in percentage (B). Abbreviation: r-IPG = rechargeable IPG (N = 192);
335 nr-IPG: non-rechargeable IPG (N = 28).

336

337 **Figure 2. Influencing factors for choices of rechargeable versus non-rechargeable**
338 **battery.** The degree of influence was divided into five levels and indicated by
339 different grayscales. Values were presented as percentage. (A) battery dimension; (B)
340 need for further surgeries to replace the battery; (C) need for recharging the battery;
341 (D) economic issue. Abbreviation: r-IPG = rechargeable IPG (N = 192); nr-IPG: non-
342 rechargeable IPG (N = 28).

343

344 **Figure 3. Influencing factors for choices of international versus domestic**
345 **manufacturers in patients with rechargeable battery.** Values were presented as
346 percentage. (A) economic issue; (B) international reputation; (C) remote
347 programming feature; (D) clinician's advice. In current Chinese DBS marketing, the
348 international manufacturer refers to Medtronic (N = 136), and domestic manufacturers
349 refer to PINS and SceneRay (N = 56).

350

351 **Supplementary Figure 1. Size comparison between non-rechargeable (left**
352 **column) and rechargeable (right column) implantable pulse generators from**

353 **three manufacturers in China.** (A) – (B) Medtronic; (C) – (D) PINS; (E) – (F)

354 SceneRay.

Table 1. Demographic data.

Characteristics	Total	r-IPG	nr-IPG
Gender			
Men	135	114	21
Women	85	78	7
Age, year (Mean $\pm$ SD)	62.8 $\pm$ 9.8	62.5 $\pm$ 9.8	64.4 $\pm$ 10.0
Follow-up, month (Median, IQR)	18 (8–36)	19 (9–38)	15.5 (5.25–26.5)
Manufacturer			
Medtronic	142	136	6
PINS & SceneRay	78	56	22

Table 2. Approaches to learn about deep brain stimulation. (N = 219)*

Approaches	Number (%)
Media (i.e., Web and television)	79 (36.1%)
Doctor's referrals	78 (35.6 %)
Word of mouth from patients	56 (25.6%)
Others	6 (2.7%)

*One missing data.

Table 3. Satisfaction rate.

Questions	Group	
	r-IPG	nr-IPG
	(N = 192)	(N = 28)
1. Are you still happy with your choice of your device?		
Yes	169 (88.0%)	24 (85.7%)
No	23 (12.0%)	4 (14.3%)
1.1. If not, please specify.		
The stimulating effects did not meet your expectation.	18 (9.4%)	4 (14.3%)
Others	5 (2.6%)	0
2. Would you choose the same type of your device today?		
Yes	178 (92.7%)	26 (92.9%)
No	14 (7.3%)	2 (7.1%)

1 **Table 4. Recharging process for patients with r-IPG. (N = 192)**

Questions	Number (%)
1. Do you feel confident using your r-IPG?	
No	14 (7.3%)
Yes	178 (92.7%)
1.1. If yes, how long did it take to feel confident?	
Within 1 week	78 (40.7%)
1–2 weeks	27 (14.1%)
2–4 weeks	8 (4.2%)
More than 4 weeks	65 (34.0%)
2. How frequently do you check battery capacity of your r-IPG?	
Everyday	35 (18.2%)
Every week	123 (64.1%)
Every 2 weeks	6 (3.1%)
Every 4 weeks	17 (8.9%)
Every year	11 (5.7%)
3. Have you ever forgotten to recharge your r-IPG?	
No	156 (81.3%)
Yes	36 (18.7%)
4. How frequently do you recharge your r-IPG?	
Everyday	49 (25.5%)
2–4 days	28 (14.6%)
5–7 days	115 (59.9%)
5. How frequently do you recharge your recharger?	

Everyday	15 (7.8%)
Every week	104 (54.2%)
Every 2 weeks	31 (16.1%)
Every 4 weeks	37 (19.3%)
Not fixed	5 (2.6%)
6. At what level of battery capacity do you usually recharge your r-IPG?	
75–100%	101 (52.6%)
75–50%	76 (39.6%)
< 50%	15 (7.8%)
Warning sign	0
7. How long does recharging usually take?	
Less than 15 min	9 (4.7%)
15–30 min	37 (19.3%)
30–45 min	35 (18.2%)
45–60 min	40 (20.8%)
More than 60 min	71 (37.0%)
8. Do you check and recharge your r-IPG yourself?	
No	55 (28.6%)
Yes	137 (71.4%)
9. Have you ever been unable to recharge your battery?	
No	176 (91.7%)
Yes	16 (8.3%)
9.1. if yes, could you solve the problem on your own?	
No	11 (68.9%)

Yes	5 (31.2%)
-----	-----------

2

1 **Table 5. Life with a rechargeable IPG. (N = 192)**

Questions	Number (%)
1. Have you ever travelled since your DBS surgery?	
No	141 (73.4%)
Yes	51 (26.6%)
1.1. If yes, have you ever recharged during the vacation?	
No	11 (21.6%)
Yes	40 (78.4%)
2. Do you continue to work after DBS surgery?	
No	170 (88.5%)
Yes	22 (11.5%)
2.1. If yes, have you ever recharged during the work?	
No	21 (95%)
Yes	1 (5%)
3. Are you ambulatory during recharging?	
No	178 (92.7%)
Yes	14 (7.3%)

2