



Transcranial direct current stimulation: a potential modality for stroke rehabilitation

A thesis by publication submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

By

Jodie Marquez
MAppMgt (Health)
BappSc (Physiotherapy)

The Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine
University of Newcastle

July 2017

Supervisors

Professor Mark Parsons

BMed, PhD, FRACP

Senior Staff Specialist Neurologist, John Hunter Hospital, Newcastle, Australia

Professor Jim Lagopoulos

BSc, MBiomedE, PhD, FAINM

Director, Sunshine Coast Mind & Neuroscience Institute, University of the Sunshine Coast

Dr Andrew Bivard

BSc, BBiomed(Hons), PhD

Early Career Research Fellow, National Health and Medical Research Council, Australia

Professor Neil Spratt

B Med Sci (Hons), B Med (Hons), PhD, FRACP

Senior Staff Specialist Neurologist, John Hunter Hospital, Newcastle, Australia

Career Development Fellow, National Health and Medical Research Council, Australia

Declarations

Statement of Originality

I Jodie Marquez hereby declare that this thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. I give consent to the final version of my thesis being made available worldwide when deposited in the University's Digital Repository, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

Statement of Authorship

I Jodie Marquez hereby certify that this thesis is submitted in the form of a series of published papers of which I am a joint author. I have included as part of this thesis a written statement from each co-author, and endorsed by the Faculty Assistant Dean (Research Training), attesting to my contribution to the joint publications.

Statement of Ethical Conduct

In addition, ethical approval from the Hunter New England Area Health Service Ethics Committee, and co registration from the University of Newcastle Human Ethics Committee was granted for the clinical studies presented in this thesis. In each instance, participants were required to read an information statement and provide informed written consent prior to the collection of any data.

Name: Jodie Marquez

Date: 20/07/17

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to all those who have guided me throughout the course of this project. To Professor Mark Parsons for sharing his wealth of knowledge in all things stroke but more importantly for his friendship and sense of humour which has been the highlight of my PhD experience; to Associate Professor Jim Lagopoulos for introducing me the joys of tDCS; and to Professor Neil Spratt and Dr Andrew Bivard who stepped in to provide invaluable supervisory guidance when their workloads were already at capacity. Your generosity with time, experience and knowledge has been invaluable and greatly appreciated.

Thank you to the staff at The University of Newcastle for their encouragement, friendship and assistance. In particular Associate Professor Frini Karayanidis who has been an excellent mentor from across the campus, Associate Professor Peter Stanwell for making work feel like home, and Dr Heidi Janssen for sharing her research experiences. I must offer a special thank you to Dr Alexander Conley for his unwavering tolerance of my loud laughter and endless conversation whilst we cleaned EEG caps with toothbrushes during data collection on countless weekends. Above all, I am incredibly grateful for the support of my conference colleague and lifelong friend Di Marsden who has endured the trials and travels of PhD studies every step of the way with me.

I would like to extend a very special thank you to all the people who volunteered their time to participate in my research projects and the ancillary staff who assisted with recruitment and patient bookings, especially Gail Marriott who made many phone calls on my behalf. To Maddison, my daughter extraordinaire, a very special thank you for all the assistance with excel, formatting, editing, and above all, tolerance of my general technical ineptitude.

To the Physiotherapy students at the University of Newcastle whose enthusiasm for knowledge has been a constant inspiration to me. My quest for evidence and improved intervention strategies for people with stroke is fuelled by their questions and my desire to have better answers for them.

Finally, I dedicate this thesis to my children, Maddison and Ethan, for their patience and complete acceptance of the frequently late dinners and postponed games of handball.

Publications, Presentations and Awards

Peer Reviewed Publications Included in this Thesis

- Marquez J**, Conley A, Karayanidis F, Miller J, Lagopoulos J, and Parsons M. (2017). Determining the benefits of transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) on functional upper limb movement in chronic stroke. *International Journal of Rehabilitation Research*. In Press.
- Marquez J**, Conley A, Karayanidis F, Lagopoulos J, and Parsons M. (2015). Anodal direct current stimulation in the healthy aged: Effects determined by the hemisphere stimulated. *Restorative Neurology and Neuroscience* 33 (4):509-19
- Marquez J**, van Vliet P, McElduff P, Lagopoulos J, Parsons M. (2015). Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS): Does it have merit in stroke rehabilitation? A systematic review. *International Journal of Stroke* 10 (3):306-16
- Marquez J**, Bivard A, Visser M, Lagopoulos J, and Parsons M. (2017). The physiological effects of cathodal and anodal direct current stimulation (tDCS) in older adults. *Functional Neurology*. Under Review.

Additional Peer Reviewed Publications Associated with this Thesis

- Conley AC, Fulham WR, **Marquez JL**, Parsons MW, and Karayanidis F. (2016). No Effect of Anodal Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation Over the Motor Cortex on Response-Related ERPs during a Conflict Task. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* 10:384
- Conley AC, **Marquez JL**, Parsons MW, Fulham WR, Heathcote A, and Karayanidis F. (2015). Anodal tDCS over the Motor Cortex on Prepared and Unprepared Responses in Young Adults. *PLoS One* 10 (5):e0124509
- Marquez J**, and Parsons M. (2017). Chapter 26: Electrical and magnetic brain stimulation to enhance recovery post stroke. In: Hankey G. and Saver J. (eds) *Stroke Treatment and Prevention: An Evidenced-Based Approach* (2nd edition). Cambridge University Press. In Press.

Published Abstracts

- Marquez J**, Parsons M, Stoginovsky E, Conley A, Lagopoulos J, and Karayinidis F. (2014). Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS): Anodal or Cathodal stimulation for chronic stroke – which is better? Cerebrovascular Diseases 37:300-300. 23rd *European Stroke Conference, Nice*.
- Marquez JL**, van Vliet P, McElduff P, Lagopoulos J, Parsons MW. (2013). Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS): Is it effective as a stroke therapy? A systematic review. *International Journal of Stroke. SMART Strokes Australasian Nursing and Allied Health Conference, Brisbane*.

Marquez JL, van Vliet P, Miller J, Lagopoulos J, Parsons MW. (2013). Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS): A randomised controlled trial to investigate the effects on upper limb function in chronic stroke. *International Journal of Stroke*. *24th Annual Scientific Meeting of the Stroke Society of Australasia, Darwin*.

Additional Conference Presentations

Conley A, **Marquez J**, Wong A, Cooper P, Parsons M, Karayanidis F. Effect of anodal tDCS on cortical activation during response preparation and activation. *Priority Research Centre for Translational Neuroscience and Mental Health: Postgraduate and Postdoctoral Conference, Newcastle, October 2014*

Conley A, **Marquez J**, Parsons MW, Lagopoulos J, Karayanidis F. Effects of anodal tDCS over the primary motor cortex on response preparation and execution. *39th Australasian Experimental Psychology Conference, Sydney, April 2012*.

Conley AC, **Marquez JL**, Parsons MW, Fulham WR, Lagopoulos J, Karayanidis F. Sustained effects of anodal tDCS over the dominant motor cortex on response preparation processes. *ACNS 2012 Australasian Cognitive Neuroscience Conference. Brisbane, November 2012*.

Marquez J, Conley A, Lagopoulos J, Karayinidis F, Parsons M. Transcranial direct current stimulation of the motor cortex in the healthy aged. *Priority Research Centre for translational Neuroscience and Mental Health: Postgraduate and Postdoctoral Conference, Newcastle, November 2011*.

Awards

Best RHD Confirmation Presentation 2012 – School of Health Sciences, University of Newcastle.

Scholarships and Grants

Equity Research Fellowship, University of Newcastle 2013 - \$21,458

Small Project Research Grant, National Stroke Foundation 2012 - \$17,366

Early Career Researcher Grant, University of Newcastle 2011 - \$9,500

Table of Contents

Supervisors.....	i
Declaration.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Publications and Presentations.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	1
List of Tables and Figures.....	7
List of Abbreviations.....	8
Thesis Abstract	10
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	12
1.1 History of transcranial brain stimulation.....	12
1.1.1 Emergence of tDCS.....	12
1.1.2 Mechanism of action.....	14
1.1.3 Alternate forms of brain stimulation.....	16
1.1.4.1 Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation (TMS).....	16
1.1.4.2 Theta Burst Stimulation (TBS) and Paired Associative Stimulation (PAS).....	18
1.1.4.3 Transcranial Alternating Current Stimulation (TACS).....	18
1.1.4.4 Transcranial Random Noise Stimulation (tRNS).....	19
1.1.4.5 High Definition tDCS (HD-tDCS).....	20
1.1.4.6 Comparison of different modalities.....	21
1.2 Application of tDCS.....	21
1.2.1 The tDCS device.....	21
1.2.2 The Sham/control condition.....	23
1.2.3 Electrode positioning.....	23
1.2.4 Electrode size.....	26
1.2.5 Electrode shape.....	27
1.2.6 Current intensity.....	28
1.2.7 Current density.....	29
1.2.8 Duration of stimulation.....	30
1.2.9 Frequency of stimulation sessions.....	31

1.3	Proposed Effects of tDCS.....	33
1.3.1	Specificity of effects.....	34
1.3.2	Duration of effects.....	34
1.3.3	Measures used to assess the effects of tDCS.....	35
1.3.4	Factors which may influence the effects of tDCS.....	37
1.3.5	Summary of the effects of tDCS.....	43
1.4	Safety.....	44
1.4.1	Safety protocols.....	44
1.4.2	Sensory discomfort.....	45
1.4.3	Adverse events.....	45
1.4.4	Regulations of use.....	47
1.4.5	Summary of safety considerations.....	47
1.5	Stroke and tDCS.....	48
1.5.1	Stroke in Australia.....	48
1.5.2	Stroke morbidity.....	48
1.5.3	Stroke recovery.....	49
1.5.4	Stroke rehabilitation.....	49
1.5.5	Proposed mechanism of tDCS in stroke.....	50
1.5.5.1	Anodal tDCS.....	51
1.5.5.2	Cathodal tDCS.....	52
1.5.5.3	Bihemispheric tDCS.....	53
1.5.6	Additional considerations for tDCS in stroke.....	53
1.5.6.1	Time since stroke.....	53
1.5.6.2	Stroke severity and location.....	54
1.5.6.3	tDCS as an adjunct therapy.....	55
1.5.6.4	Risk of seizure.....	56
1.6	Conclusion.....	56

Chapter 2. Effect of tDCS in the Healthy Aged.....	58
2.1 Publication details and author affiliations.....	58
2.2 Co-author statement of contribution.....	58
2.3 Synopsis.....	60
2.4 Abstract.....	61
2.5 Introduction.....	62
2.6 Methods.....	63
2.6.1 Subjects.....	63
2.6.2 Study design.....	64
2.6.3 tDCS.....	64
2.6.4 Data analysis.....	65
2.7 Results.....	66
2.7.1 Participant characteristics.....	66
2.7.2 Functional motor measures.....	66
2.7.3 Go/no-go task behavioural results.....	69
2.7.4 Electrophysiological results.....	70
2.7.5 Participant tolerance.....	70
2.8 Discussion.....	71
2.8.1 Major findings.....	71
2.8.2 Limitations.....	73
2.8.3 Clinical implications.....	73
2.9 Conclusion.....	74
2.10 Acknowledgements.....	74
2.11 Disclosure statement.....	74
2.12 References.....	75
 Chapter 3. Physiological Effect of tDCS in the Healthy Aged.....	 79
3.1 Publication details and author affiliations.....	79
3.2 Co-author statement of contribution.....	79
3.3 Synopsis.....	81

3.4	Abstract.....	82
3.5	Introduction.....	83
3.6	Methods.....	84
	3.6.1 Subjects.....	84
	3.6.2 Study design.....	85
	3.6.3 tDCS.....	85
	3.6.4 MRI.....	85
	3.6.5 Data analysis.....	87
3.7	Results.....	87
	3.7.1 Participant characteristics.....	87
	3.7.2 Functional performance.....	87
	3.7.3 Spectroscopy findings.....	88
	3.7.4 Cerebral blood flow changes.....	88
	3.7.5 Functional connectivity.....	90
3.8	Discussion.....	91
	3.8.1 Dominant versus Non dominant hemisphere stimulation.....	91
	3.8.2 Spectroscopy findings.....	92
	3.8.3 Resting connectivity changes.....	92
	3.8.4 Cerebral blood flow changes.....	93
	3.8.5 Strengths and Limitations.....	93
3.9	Conclusion.....	94
3.10	Acknowledgements.....	94
3.11	Disclosure statement.....	94
3.12	References.....	95
	Chapter 4. Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of the Stroke Literature.....	98
4.1	Publication details and author affiliations.....	98
4.2	Co-author statement of contribution	98
4.3	Synopsis.....	100
4.4	Abstract.....	101
4.5	Introduction.....	102

4.6	Methods.....	103
4.6.1	Identification of studies.....	103
4.6.2	Selection of studies.....	103
4.6.3	Interventions.....	105
4.6.4	Outcome measures.....	106
4.6.5	Data analysis.....	106
4.7	Results.....	107
4.7.1	Flow of studies through the review.....	108
4.7.2	Characteristics of studies.....	108
4.7.3	Effects of tDCS.....	112
4.7.4	Safety.....	115
4.8	Discussion.....	117
4.9	Conclusion.....	119
4.10	References.....	120
Chapter 5. Effect of tDCS on Arm Function in Chronic Stroke Patients.....		123
5.1	Publication details and author affiliations.....	123
5.2	Co-author statement of contribution	123
5.3	Synopsis.....	125
5.4	Abstract.....	126
5.5	Introduction.....	127
5.6	Methods.....	128
5.6.1	Subjects.....	128
5.6.2	Study design.....	128
5.6.3	tDCS.....	128
5.6.4	Outcome measures.....	129
5.6.5	Data analysis.....	129
5.7	Results.....	129
5.7.1	Participant characteristics.....	129
5.7.2	JTT performance.....	131
5.7.3	Grip strength measures.....	131

5.7.4 Effects according to disability.....	131
5.8 Discussion.....	135
5.9 Conclusion.....	137
5.10 Acknowledgements.....	137
5.11 Disclosure statement.....	137
5.12 References.....	138
Chapter 6. General Discussion.....	140
6.1 Summary of principal findings.....	140
6.2 Research Implications.....	141
6.3 Clinical implications.....	142
6.4 Conclusion.....	142
6.5 References.....	144
Chapter 7. Appendices	
7.1 Appendix I: Additional publication related to chapter 2.....	145
7.2 Appendix II: Additional review information related to chapter 4.....	159
Chapter 8. Bibliography.....	164

List of Tables

Table 1.1 Comparison of tDCS and TMS modalities.....	17
Table 1.2 Summary of factors affecting tDCS.....	43
Table 2.1 Demographic and baseline characteristics.....	67
Table 3.1 Stimulation effects on neurochemicals and cerebral blood flow.....	90
Table 3.2 Resting state functional connectivity changes following stimulation.....	90
Table 4.1 Inclusion criteria.....	103
Table 4.2 Summary of research design.....	104
Table 4.3 Summar of included studies.....	109
Table 4.4 Summary of findings of the included studies.....	116
Table 5.1 Description of chronic stroke patients.....	130
Table 5.2 Mean scores and ranges for each baseline measure.....	130

List of Figures

Figure 1.1 Neuroconn DC stimulator.....	21
Figure 1.2 Application of anodal stimulation to the motor cortex.....	24
Figure 2.1 Effects of tDCS on functional performance.....	68
Figure 2.2 Effects of tDCS on strength.....	69
Figure 2.3 Effects of tDCS on reaction time.....	70
Figure 3.1 Effects of stimulation on UL function.....	89
Figure 4.1 Flow of studies through the review.....	107
Figure 4.2 Effects of anodal stimulation on function in stroke.....	113
Figure 4.3 Effects of cathodal stimulation on function in stroke.....	113
Figure 4.4 Effects of bihemispheric stimulation on function in stroke.....	113
Figure 4.5 Effects of tDCS in chronic stroke.....	114
Figure 4.6 Effects of tDCS in subacute stroke.....	114
Figure 4.7 Effects of tDCS in mild stroke.....	115
Figure 4.8 Effects of tDCS in moderate/severe stroke.....	115
Figure 5.1 Change scores for each outcome measure.....	132
Figure 5.2 Change scores for patients with mild disability.....	133
Figure 5.3 Change scores for patients with moderate/severe disability.....	134

List of Abbreviations

Activities of daily living	ADLs
Arterial spin labelling	ASL
Blood-oxygenated dependent signal	BOLD
Brain derived neurotrophic factor	BDNF
Central nervous system	CNS
Cerebrospinal fluid	CSF
Constraint induced movement therapy	CIMT
Contingent negative variation	CNV
Cortical silent period	CSP
Diffusion tensor imaging	DTI
Dorsolateral prefrontal cortex	DLPFC
Echo time	TE
Echoplanar imaging	EPI
Electroconvulsive therapy	ECT
Electroencephalogram	EEG
Event related potential	ERP
Food and drug administration	FDA
Fuggyl meyer assessment	FM
Functional electrical stimulation	FES
Functional magnetic radiation imaging	fMRI
Glutamate	Glu
Glutamine + glutamate	Glx
High definition direct current stimulation	HD-tDCS
Inositol	Ins
Intra-cortical facilitation	ICF
Intrinsic connectivity contrast	ICC
Jebsen Taylor function test	JTT
Lactate	Lac
Long term potentiation	LTP
Low field magnetic stimulation	LFMS
Magnetic resonance imaging	MRI
Magnetic resonance spectroscopy	MRS
Montreal cognitive assessment	MoCA
Motor evoked potentials	MEPs
N-acetylaspartic acid	NAA
N-methyl-d-aspartate	NMDA
Paired associative stimulation	PAS
Primary motor cortex	M1

Proprioceptive neuromuscular facilitation	PNF
Purdue peg board test	PPBT
Reaction time	RT
Regional cerebral blood flow	rCBF
Repetition time	TR
Repetitive Transcranial magnetic stimulation	rTMS
Resting membrane threshold	RMT
Resting state functional Magnetic resonance imaging	Rs-fMRI
Short interval intra-cortical inhibition	SICI
Simple reaction time	SRT
Supplementary motor area	SMA
Theta burst stimulation	TBS
Total creatin	Cr+Pcr
Transcranial alternating current stimulation	tACS
Transcranial direct current stimulation	tDCS
Transcranial magnetic stimulation	TMS
Transcranial random noise stimulation	tRNS
Voxel-based morphometry	VBM
Wolf motor function test	WMFT

Thesis Abstract

Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation (tDCS) is a form of non-invasive brain stimulation which has been investigated in a broad range of neuropsychiatric conditions and as a method to modulate cognitive performance in healthy individuals. It is generally accepted that the main mechanism by which tDCS modulates brain function is via a neural membrane polarization shift which can, in turn, lead to diverse changes in single neuron, synaptic and network activity (Peterchev, Wagner et al. 2012). However, the direction of polarization shift is sensitive to the stimulation dose, the state of brain activity at the time of stimulation and individual anatomy (Bikson and Rahman 2013). This results in a large inter individual variability to the neurophysiological and behavioural response to tDCS. Given the simplicity of tDCS and the complexity of brain function, we sought to unveil some of the physiological mechanisms underpinning the effects of tDCS in order to better our understanding of the variability in response to tDCS and to allow us to predict those most likely to respond. Ultimately our objective was to direct the translation of the research evidence into therapeutic applications of tDCS for stroke patients.

The aim of this research was to determine the potential application of tDCS in the stroke population. At the commencement of this PhD research project, keen interest in the use of tDCS as a potential therapeutic tool in neuromotor conditions, such as stroke, was emerging. As tDCS is portable, relatively inexpensive, free from major adverse effects, and easily applied concurrently with other interventions, it is ideally suited for use in stroke rehabilitation therapy. The goal of tDCS in stroke is to increase cortical excitability of the lesioned hemisphere and/or reduce excitability on the non-lesioned hemisphere to restore interhemispheric balance (Mordillo-Mateos, Turpin-Fenoll et al. 2012).

The vast majority of literature investigating tDCS has been conducted in young, healthy subject. As stroke patients are typically more senior and have age related changes in cortical structure, function and excitability, we began our investigation into the functional and physiological effects of tDCS in a healthy, aged population. We found that the hemispheres responded differently to tDCS and the response appeared to be task specific, but it was not mediated by age. However, a subsequent multimodal imaging study did not support these findings and failed to reveal a difference when tDCS was applied to the dominant or non-dominant hemisphere but showed that the effects were diffuse and determined by the type of stimulation.

In a systematic review of the stroke literature we synthesised the evidence from 15 studies and confirmed the safety and acceptability of this modality in the stroke population.

We concluded that tDCS may be effective in enhancing motor performance, atleast in the short term. Those most likely to benefit were patients with chronic stroke and/or mild to moderate impairments. However these positive findings were not consistent across all studies and the size of the treatment effect was at best modest and may not translate to clinically meaningful change for some or all patients. We used this evidence to conduct a randomised controlled trial in chronic stroke patients and found that neither anodal nor cathodal stimulation resulted in statistically significant improvement in upper limb performance. A secondary analysis was performed and identified that those with moderate or severe disability responded positively to cathodal stimulation with improved gross motor function.

This thesis, in conjunction with the rapidly growing body of evidence in this field, highlights the inconsistency in the effects of tDCS at both an intraindividual level and between subjects, and the transient nature of these effects which limits the clinical value of this intervention. Further scrutiny of the mechanisms underpinning the effects of tDCS is required for the rational advancement of tDCS as a clinical modality in stroke rehabilitation.