



Efficacy and safety of unilateral chronic Epidural Motor Cortical Stimulation in neurosurgical treatment of Advanced Parkinson's Disease

Peer review status:

Yes

Corresponding Author:

Prof. Angelo Lavano,
Full Professor of Neurosurgery, Department of Neurosurgery, University "Magna Graecia", 88100 - Italy

Submitting Author:

Prof. Angelo Lavano,
Full Professor of Neurosurgery, Department of Neurosurgery, University "Magna Graecia", 88100 - Italy

Other Authors:

Dr. Giusy Guzzi,
Assistant of Neurosurgery, Department of Neurosurgery, University "Magna Graecia", Viale Europa, Catanzaro, 88100 - Italy

Dr. Marisa De Rose,
Assistant of Neurosurgery, Department of Neurosurgery, University "Magna Graecia", Campus Salvatore Venuta, Viale Europa, Catanzaro, 88100 - Italy

Dr. Giuseppe Vescio,
Assistant of Neurosurgery, Department of Neurosurgery, University "Magna Graecia", Campus Salvatore Venuta, Viale Europa, 88100 - Italy

Dr. Federica Deodato,
Assistant of Neurosurgery, Department of Neurosurgery, University "Magna Graecia", Campus Salvatore Venuta, Viale Europa, 88100 - Italy

Dr. Attilio Della Torre,
Assistant of Neurosurgery, Department of Neurosurgery, University "Magna Graecia", Campus Salvatore Venuta, Viale Europa, 88100 - Italy

Mr. Francesco Lavano,
researcher, Department of Neurosurgery, University "Magna Graecia", Campus Salvatore Venuta, Viale Europa, 88100 - Italy

Article ID: WMC004524

Article Type: Clinical Trials

Submitted on: 24-Jan-2014, 11:42:57 AM GMT **Published on:** 24-Jan-2014, 12:46:26 PM GMT

Article URL: http://www.webmedcentral.com/article_view/4524

Subject Categories: NEUROSURGERY

Keywords: cortical stimulation, advanced Parkinson's Disease, motor cortex neuromodulation, neurosurgical treatment, efficacy, safety

How to cite the article: Guzzi G, De Rose M, Vescio G, Deodato F, Della Torre A, Lavano F, et al. Efficacy and

safety of unilateral chronic Epidural Motor Cortical Stimulation in neurosurgical treatment of Advanced Parkinson's Disease. WebmedCentral NEUROSURGERY 2014;5(1):WMC004524

Copyright: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License \(CC-BY\)](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Source(s) of Funding:

None

Competing Interests:

None

WebmedCentral Peer Reviewed: Yes

Efficacy and safety of unilateral chronic Epidural Motor Cortical Stimulation in neurosurgical treatment of Advanced Parkinson's Disease

Author(s): Guzzi G, De Rose M, Vescio G, Deodato F, Della Torre A, Lavano F, Lavano A

Abstract

Extradural Motor Cortex Stimulation (EMCS) is a minimally invasive therapy that has been employed in cases of neuropathic central pain. We believe that it might be proposed in Parkinson's disease (PD) for patients excluded or unresponsive to DBS. Ten patients with advanced PD underwent unilateral EMCS by epidural implanting of quadripolar plate electrode over M1 through a single burr hole after identification of the area with neuronavigation and neurophysiological tests. Clinical assessment was performed by Total UPDRS, UPDRS III total, UPDRS III-items 27-31, UPDRS IV and UPDRS II before implantation in off-medication and on-medication states and after surgery at 1, 3, 6, 12, 18, 24, 36 months in on-medication/on-stimulation and off-medication/on-stimulation states. We assessed changes of QoL with Parkinson's disease QoL scale (PDQoL-39), the dose of anti-Parkinson's disease medications with L-Dopa Equivalent Daily Dose (LEDD).

During OFF-medication state we observed moderate and transitory reduction of Total UPDRS and UPDRS Total scores, significant long-lasting improvement in UPDRS III items 27-31 score for axial symptoms. There was marked reduction of UPDRS IV score and LEDD and prolonged amelioration of activities of daily living. PDQL-39 improvement was significant from 6 months to 24 months evaluation. No severe complications and adverse events occurred. Despite the limited small sample, results suggested that in PD patients excluded from DBS treatment the unilateral MCS is a safe and minimally invasive surgical alternative with significant and prolonged effects on axial symptoms, complications of antiparkinsonian drugs therapy and activities of daily living.

Introduction

Deep Brain Stimulation (DBS) represents the gold standard for surgical treatment in patients with Parkinson's disease (PD) but unfortunately it is not

fully effective in controlling each motor sign and adverse effects are common. However, DBS cannot be always proposed to all PD patients because very often do not fill into the inclusion criteria for this procedure. Recently, other minimal invasive neuromodulation procedures with low morbidity-mortality and more suitable for cases excluded from DBS or unresponsive to DBS could be considered. Among these, Motor Cortex Stimulation (MCS) may be one of the new opportunities (2,3,4,10) first introduced by Canavero back in 2000. In 2003 Pagni spearheaded a Italian Multicenter Study on 41 PD patients treated with extradural MCS and long term results have been reported in 2008 (11). He showed that any symptom was modulated by MCS without a clear predictability. Thereafter, Pagni found a statistically significant improvement on the UDPRS III at 1, 3 and 6 months with a trend back to baseline thereafter and L-Dopa induced dyskinesias, painful dystonia and motor fluctuations were satisfactorily controlled. Other small case series of PD patients treated with extradural MCS (EMCS) have been reported with variable clinical results (1,6,8,12). Anyway all these previous studies were open-label since in 2011 Moro reported the double-blinded outcomes from unilateral subdural MCS (17).

The aim of this prospective observational study was to investigate the efficacy and the safety of unilateral extradural MCS in a select group of severe affected PD patients in which DBS was not indicated or refused.

Material and Methods

Ten patients affected by primary advanced Parkinson's Disease (6 men and 4 women, mean age 71 years; range 56 to 83 years old) were enrolled and underwent the unilateral implant of epidural plate electrode over the motor cortex between April 2007 and April 2010 at the Department of Neurosurgery of the University Hospital of Catanzaro .

The inclusion criteria were: idiopathic PD with at least 5 years duration, total UPDRS in OFF condition $\geq 40/180$, Hoehn and Yahr stage ≥ 3 , severe motor fluctuations plus disabling dyskinesias, UPDRS improvement to L-Dopa challenge test $\geq 30\%$, DBS

not indicated or refused, lack of eligibility for DBS (i.e. refused by the patient or contraindicated according to the Core Assessment Program for Surgical Interventional Therapies in PD (CAPSIT-PD) (32) with the only exception of the age criterion >70 years).

The exclusion criteria were: history of epileptic seizures, evidence of major psychiatric issue (except antiparkinsonian drug-induced), significant or unstable medical disorders (coagulopathies, serious heart or pulmonary disease, uncontrolled hypertension or diabetes), alcohol and drug abuse, severe cognitive deterioration, previous neurosurgical treatments.

Surgery was performed under local anaesthesia with a mild i.v. sedation if required. We used craniometer landmarks (10-20 EEG system) and Taylor-Hanghton lines to draw the central sulcus over the scalp. Primary motor cortex (M1) was identified with high resolution CT scan, MRI with fiducial markers and neuronavigation. A single burr hole was made in front of the central sulcus and a quadripolar plate electrode (Resume, Medtronic, Inc) was slipped epidurally over the motor strip at the hand knob. In all patients the electrode implant was monolateral and performed contralaterally to the most affected side. The correct position of the electrode was verified neurophysiologically using somatosensory evoked potentials (SSEPs) to identify the central sulcus and motor evoked potential (MEP) to identify the primary motor cortex (M1). For SSEPs the "N20/P20 wave phase reversal technique" was used: after stimulation of the contralateral medial nerve at the wrist using a 20 mA-100 microsec. monopolar square pulse at a rate of 4.32 HZ, SSEPs were recorded from the Resume electrode in monopolar montage (all referenced to the 10-20 location of Fpz). A cortical N20 potential was recorded over the sensory the sensory cortex and a cortical P20 potential was recorded over the motor cortex; the central sulcus was located between the two contacts showing the phase reversal.

The MEP was obtained by motor cortex focal anodal stimulation through two adjacent contacts of the same plate electrode with short train of stimuli (5 stimuli each, rate of 5 trains per second, 500 microsec. pulse, 4 millise. interspike interval). Muscle responses were recorded with EMG needles from Biceps Brachii, Abductor Pollicis Brevis and Quadriceps of the opposite hemibody.

After the neurophysiologic tests the plate electrode was placed over the long axis of the motor cortex and externalized with a percutaneous connection behind the ear. A external stimulation period of 2-3 weeks was performed for detection of the most beneficial

parameters of stimulation and the adverse effects. Starting from 24 hours after electrode implantation we checked all contacts in a bipolar setting using low frequencies (20-40 Hz) and high pulse widths (180-210 microsec): the amplitude was slowly raised until the appearance of adverse motor movements and sensory phenomenons and then it was decreased to the movement and sensation subthreshold voltage (2.5-4.0V). Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale for motor examination (UPDRS III total) was used to score the initial benefits of stimulation. The effect of each setting was assessed after 60 min of continuous ON-stimulation and after a subsequent washout period of 30 min OFF-stimulation.

The epidural electrode was then connected to a pulse generator (Solettra or Kinetra, Medtronic, Inc) implanted in a subclavicular subcutaneous pocket. Chronic stimulation began with the most efficacious setting obtained during test period (2.5-4.0V, 40Hz, 180 microsec,) continuously delivered night and day through the most distant contacts of the plate electrode under a bipolar configuration.

Patients were assessed preoperatively (baseline time) and after 1,3,6,12 months and at least every 6 months after surgery with both stimulator on (ON-Stim) and 2 weeks after switch off (OFF-Stim) by a neurologist who was blinded to the condition of the patient. The assessment was performed with Total UPDRS, UPDRS III total, UPDRS III items 27-31, UPDRS IV, UPDRS II. The evaluations were carried out 12 hours after medication withdrawal (off-med) and 90 minutes after the first levodopa dose (on-med). Anti-Parkinson's disease medications were not changed during the month before surgery and up to three months after surgery. Changes in the settings of stimulation were done from the 3 months follow-up and were directed by the clinical assessments at each follow-up visit; they included increase in amplitude and change in frequency. Effective and final stimulation parameters were 3.5-4.7V, 40-80Hz, 180 microsec., continuously delivered through contacts 0- /3+.

Quality of Life was assessed with the Parkinson's disease Quality of Life scale (PDQoL-39) preoperatively and 6, 12, 18, 24 months after surgery.

Dose of Anti-Parkinson's disease medications (L-Dopa and dopamine agonists) was evaluated with L-Dopa Equivalent Daily Dose (LEDD) at 6, 12, 18 and 36 months. Movie recordings for motor assessment before and after stimulation were performed.

Patients were followed-up for 36 months: eight patients brought the 36 months follow-up while two patients died after the 24 months of follow-up. There

were two substitutions of expired IPG respectively 30 months and 32 months after the implant.

The Statistical analysis of data was performed using nonparametric Wilcoxon signed-ranks paired sample test.

Results

Moderate improvement of both Total UPDRS and UPDRS III total in off-medication condition was observed in all patients, decreasing after 12 months in spite of changes in stimulation parameters and stimulation mode. Nevertheless Total UPDRS and UPDRS III total scores at 24 and 36 months were always lower than at preoperative evaluation. Improvement was only very moderate in the on-medication state.

The benefits on limbs tremor, rigidity and bradykinesia were simultaneous and bilateral, slight evident in the hemibody opposite to the stimulated side.

Greater significant and long-lasting improvement was observed in axial symptoms as measured by the UPDRS III items 27-31 OFF-med (mean percentage of decrease: 25% at 1 month, 30% at 3 months, 20% at 6 months, 22% at 12 months, 26% at 18 months, 24% at 24 months and 28% at 36 months).

Although the improvement of UPDRS III total score in off-medication was low, the clinical benefits of those items had important impact on both patient self-grooming and psychology and on the assistance needed. There was a subgroup of patients severely handicapped owing to difficult in standing and deambulation which were very significantly improved.

There was marked attenuation of L-dopa-induced dyskinesias and dystonia with significant reduction of UPDRS IV score up to 18 months (mean percentage of decrease: 25.2% at 6 months, 37.3% at 12 months, 25.1% at 18 months, 13.5% at 24 months and 13.1% at 36 months).

Eight patients reported reduced OFF time in clinical fluctuations (UPDRS IV item 39 score from 3 to 1).

Mean UPDRS II score showed significant and prolonged amelioration of activities of daily living with most pronounced clinical benefits in speech, freezing and walking

Also LEDD documented evident reduction of L-dopa and dopamine agonists dosage (mean percentage of decrease: 40% at 6 months, 37% at 12 months, 31% at 18 months, and 25% at 36 months).

Concerning PDQL-39 the improvement was significant

from 6 months to 24 months evaluation (mean percentage: 25% at 6 months, 20% at 12 months, 18% at 24 months) with a following trend to return nearly to the baseline value.

In four patients there was early benefit while in six patients there was delay of 1-2 weeks between the starting of stimulation and full evidence of symptoms improvement.

No complications and no adverse events occurred except for the appearance of local pain on the implant site of the plate electrode described in three patients when switching the stimulation on; the bipolar coagulation of the dura around the electrode relieved this complication.

In two patients exhaustion of IPG occurred with worsening of symptoms within three and five days respectively; afterwards the IPG substitution both patients improved over previous baseline.

Discussion

Chronic MCS has been used not only in relieving refractory pain but also in improving a variety of movement disorders including PD, tremor and post-stroke dystonia (3,5,10,11,12,13,14,15,30,33). Single case reports, multicenter retrospective clinical review and small case series of advanced PD patients treated with EMCS have been reported with variable clinical results (1,2,3,4,6,8,10,12,30). There are only three prospective case series (1,8,12). Arle et al. (12) reported a significant effect on overall motor performance as assessed by UPDRS while Cilia et al. (8) found that extradural MCS produced no motor benefit but subjective improvement involving mainly axial symptoms as well as reduction in daily OFF time and dyskinesias. Gutierrez et al. (1) confirmed the absence of significant modification of UPDRS III scores with only mild daily life activities improvement and slightly reduction of LEDD. The methodology of these prospective studies was fairly consistent with a evident degree of intra-cohort variability. Anyway all these previous studies were open-label. In 2011 Moro et al. (17) reported the double-blinded outcomes at 3 months and unblinded outcomes at 1 year from unilateral subdural MCS in five patients with advanced PD. The authors concluded that no significant clinical benefits were evident in both outcomes. During chronic evaluation at 1 year they tested patients in OFF-stimulation condition after 2 hours and this is a too short period to valued the real MCS effectiveness.

Our study is a single-center prospective observational study and the results suggest that extradural MCS can

modulate the cardinal symptoms in advanced PD patients. The improvement concerned mainly axial symptoms and L-dopa-induced dyskinesias and dystonia. EMCS proved to be safe as no complications or adverse effects were reported.

Many previous data highlighted the strong involvement of motor cortex in PD (4). Functional neuroimaging studies showed that primary motor cortex (M1) is hypo-hyperactive in both early and late stages of PD. In patients with early untreated PD, fMRI showed M1 hypoactivation (27); conversely in advanced parkinsonism, M1 and lateral premotor cortex (L-PMC) were found to be hyperactive (26). M1 hyperactivity has been attributed to cortical reorganization resulting from drug-induced reafferentation of the deficient subcortical motor system (25).

Increasing of the corticospinal projections at rest resulting from a reduced intracortical inhibition could be implicated in rigidity (23) while intracortical or thalamocortical facilitatory inputs may not correctly activate all the cortical area involved in movement preparation and execution leading to bradykinesia (24).

Motor Cortex can be stimulated either not invasively using Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation (TMS) or invasively using surgically positioned stimulating plate electrode like in extradural or subdural Cortical Stimulation (MCS).

It has been showed that both repetitive TMS and MCS improve motor performances in PD (9,21,29).

The Motor cortex region is the final common link between deeper circuitry coordinating movement and the spinal cord itself. It is one of the few areas in which the pyramidal and extrapyramidal systems interact. Movement disorders may therefore respond to some type of stimulation of cells in this region. The motor cortex is connected to the basal ganglia indirectly via a cortico-striatal pathway and directly via a cortico-subthalamic circuit. MCS may exert its effect modulating the subthalamic nucleus (STN) directly or through the loop cortex-striatum-lateral globus pallidus-STN (1). Chronic MCS may alter not only the firing patterns in the basal ganglia but also, due to its location, the interactions between the pyramidal and extrapyramidal systems (12). MCS may also modulate the activity of supplementary motor area (SMA) or modulate the "suppressor cortical system" (11).

The topography and extension of the somatotopic representations within the motor cortex showed modification in advanced PD with progressive enlargement and displacement of hand motor map: this can explain the improvement of axial symptoms

with plate electrode implanted over the motor strip at the hand knob (11).

Bilateral effects of unilateral MCS are due to bi-directional interconnectivity between motor cortex and other neural structures located in the cortex, basal ganglia and thalamus. Transcallosal pathways are the most responsible for these bilateral effects; inter-hemispheric conduction pathways exist between the hand representations of motor cortex but also weaker transcallosal connection for body parts outside hand areas which explains why the hand area should be targeted for MCS in PD (18).

The clinical changes induced by MCS are usually delayed; time consuming process of synaptic plasticity, long-term potentiation or depression, expression of secondary messengers or polarization of brain tissue may consequently also be hypothesized as possible reasons for this delay (2,5,11,16,22). Also the observed benefit persisting for some days after IPG failures might be due to a plastic modification of the central neural circuits.

The choice of stimulation parameters is made on an empirical basis. The amplitude of stimulation is always subthresholded for movements and sensations while both low and high frequency are used with positive results (1,11,12,28,29). We utilized low frequency stimulation (40-60 Hz) with 180 microsec pulse width according with Canavero's works (5,29).

Long-term L-dopa syndrome symptoms, dyskinesia and dystonia, are significantly reduced in most of reported patients treated with MCS: the explanation might be that the doses of dopaminergic drugs are reduced besides a direct effect of cortical stimulation on symptoms (7,13).

Clinical effects of MCS cannot be compared with STN DBS because of the different inclusion criteria and the small number of patients treated by MCS. However STN DBS appears to be more effective on motor symptoms while MCS on axial symptoms (7,10,11,22,30,31).

Complication rate and adverse events are low for extradural MCS (19, 20, 31). Occurrence of sporadic epileptic seizures has been reported during test stimulation in a minority of patients while epilepsy evoked by chronic MCS has not been reported. Indeed, stimulation parameters used in human series are not either clinically and electroencephalographically epileptogenic (19). The most serious complication is epidural hematoma which is very rare making the risk of peri-operative hemorrhage much lower compared to DBS in which most reported series suggest intracerebral hemorrhagic risk <2%, with a range of

0.2% to 9.5% (34,35). Local pain in the site of plate electrode implant is also reported during the stimulation: it may be relieved by superficial denervation of the dura performed with its incision and resuturing around the electrode or with bipolar coagulation on its surface (20).

Several authors suggested that MCS has a long standing effectiveness (7,11) while other authors reported short lasting benefits within the first 12 months (12). In our patients there was a reduction of effects after 12 months of stimulation documented by Total UPDRS and UPDRS III total evaluations, despite increases of stimulation amplitude and changes in the other stimulation parameters. This reduction may be due to habituation of the cortex to stimulation but also the progression of PD may be considered. Conversely benefits on axial symptoms, L-Dopa induced dyskinesias and activities of daily living were more long-lasting.

Conclusions

Extradural MCS moderately improves main symptoms in severe advanced PD patients with greater effectiveness on axial symptoms and complications of anti-Parkinson's disease medication treatment; also anti-Parkinson's disease drug intake is reduced. Results are less evident than DBS but EMCS can be performed without use of frame-based stereotactic techniques and does not require intracerebral introduction of micro or macroelectrodes with consequent lower risk of hemorrhage. Moreover unilateral extradural MCS is effective bilaterally with reduction of the procedure costs if compared with DBS.

Extradural MCS should be proposed as effective and safe neurosurgical option for advanced PD in selected patients with predominant axial symptoms, gait disturbances and therapy complication when other methods of treatment have failed.

References

- Gutiérrez JC, Seijo JF, Alvare Vega MA, González FF, Lozano Aragonese B, Blázquez M. Therapeutic extradural cortical stimulation for Parkinson's Disease: Report of six cases and review of the literature. *Clinical Neurology and Neurosurgery*. 2009; 111: 703-707
- Canavero S, Paolotti R. Extradural motor cortex stimulation for advanced Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord* 2000; 15: 169-171
- Canavero S, Paolotti R, Boninalzi V, Castellano G, Greco-Crasto S, Rizzo L et al. Extradural motor cortex stimulation for advanced Parkinson's disease: report of two cases. *J Neurosurg* 2002; 97: 1208-1211
- Canavero S, Boninalzi V, Paolotti R, Castellano G, Greco-Castro S, Rizzo L. Extradural motor cortex stimulation for movement disorders: a review. *Neurol Res* 2003; 25:118-22
- Canavero S, Boninalzi V. Extradural cortical stimulation for movement disorders. *Acta Neurochir Suppl* 2007; 97 (2): 223-232
- Cioni B, Bentivoglio AR, Daniele A, De Simone C, Fasano A, Piano C, Zinno M, Meglio M. Motor cortex stimulation for Parkinson's Disease. A prospective double-blind randomized study with cross-over. Ongoing clinical trial. *Acta Neurochir Suppl* 2008; 150:933-1012
- Cioni B, De Simone C, Tufo T, Meglio M. Motor Stimulation for movement disorders. In *Handbook of Stereotactic and Functional Neurosurgery*, Lavano A, Landi A, Lanotte M. Editors, Minerva Medica Torino, 2011: p. 85-96
- Cilia R, Landi A, Vergani F, Sganzerla E, Pezzoli G, Antonini A. Extradural Motor Cortex Stimulation in Parkinson's disease. *Movement Disorders* 2007; 22: 111-114
- Ikeguci M, Touge T, Nashiyama Y, Takeuchi H. Effects of successive repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on motor performances and brain perfusion in idiopathic Parkinson's disease. *J Neurol Sci* 2003; 209:41-46
- Pagni CA, Altibrandi MG, Bentivoglio A, Caruso G, Cioni B et al. Extradural Motor Cortex Stimulation (EMCS) for Parkinson's disease. History and first results by the study group of the Italian Neurosurgical Society. *Acta Neurochir Suppl* 2005; 93: 113-119
- Pagni CA, Albanese A, Bentivoglio A, Broggi G, Canavero S et al. Results by motor cortex stimulation in treatment of focal dystonia, Parkinson's disease and post-ictal spasticity. The experience of the Italian Study Group of the Italian Neurosurgical Society. *Acta Neurochir Suppl* 2008; 101: 13-21
- Arle JE, Shils JL. Motor cortex stimulation for pain and movement disorders. *Neurotherapeutics* 2008; 5(1): 37-49
- Katayama Y, Oshima H, Fukaya C, Kawamata T, Yamamoto T. Control of post-stroke movement disorders using chronic motor cortex stimulation. *Acta Neurochir Suppl* 2002; 79: 89-92
- Franzini A, Ferroli P, Servello D, Broggi G. Reversal of thalamic hand syndrome by long term motor cortex stimulation. *J Neurosurg* 2000; 94: 873-875
- Franzini A, Ferroli P, Dones I, Marras C, Broggi G. Chronic motor cortex stimulation for movement

- disorders: a promising perspective. *Neurol Res* 2003; 25(2): 123-126
16. Drouot X, Oshino S, Jarraya B, Besret L, Kishima H et al. Functional recovery in a primate model of Parkinson's disease following motor cortex stimulation. *Neuron* 2004; 44: 408-419
17. Moro E, Schwalb JM, Piboolnurak P, Poon YW et al. Unilateral subdural motor cortex stimulation improves essential tremor but not Parkinson's disease. *Brain* 2011, June: 1-10
18. Canavero S. Cerebral-Surface. In *Essential Neuromodulation*, Arle J and Shils J Editors, Elsevier Inc 2011: p. 19-42
19. Saitoh Y, Hosomi K. From Localization to surgical implantation. In *Textbook of therapeutic cortical stimulation*, Canavero S. Editor, Nova Science Publishers, Inc, New York 2009: p 17-32
20. Pirotte B, Voordecker P, Levivier M, Baleriaux D.. Principles of surgical implantation and complication avoidance. In *Textbook of therapeutic cortical stimulation*, Canavero S. Editor, Nova Science Publishers, Inc, New York 2009: p 33-44
21. Khedr E. Non invasive stimulation for treatment of movement disorders In *Textbook of therapeutic cortical stimulation*, Canavero S. Editor, Nova Science Publishers, Inc, New York 2009, p. 183-200
22. Priori A, Lefaucheur JP. Chronic epidural motor cortex stimulation for movement disorders. *Lancet Neurol* 2007; 6:279-286
23. Lefaucheur JP. Motor cortex dysfunction revealed by cortical excitability studies in Parkinson's disease: influence of antiparkinsonian treatment and cortical stimulation. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2005; 116: 244-253
24. Chen R, Kumar S, Garg RR, Lang AE. Impairment of motor cortex activation and deactivation in Parkinson's disease. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2001; 112: 600-607
25. Rascol O, Sabatini U, Brefel C et al. Cortical motor overactivation in parkinsonian patients with L-dopa peak-dose dyskinesia. *Brain* 1998; 121: 527-533
26. Haslinger B, Erhard P, Kampfe N, et al. Event-related functional magnetic resonance imaging in Parkinson's disease before and after levodopa. *Brain* 2001; 124: 558-570
27. Buhmann C, Glauche V, Sturenburg HJ, Oechsner M, Weiller C, Buchel C. Pharmacologically modulated fMRI-cortical responsiveness to levodopa in drug-naive hemiparkinsonian patients. *Brain* 2003; 126:451-461
28. Cioni B, Bentivoglio AR, De Simone C, Fasano A, Pino C, Policicchio D, Perrotti V, Meglio M. Invasive cortical stimulation for Parkinson's Disease and Movement Disorders. In *Textbook of therapeutic cortical stimulation*, Canavero S. Editor, Nova Science Publishers, Inc, New York 2009: p 202-215
29. Canavero S. Invasive cortical stimulation for Parkinson's disease (PD): why, where and how. In *Textbook of therapeutic cortical stimulation*, Canavero S. Editor, Nova Science Publishers, Inc, New York 2009: p 217-227
30. Benvenuti E, Cecchi F, Colombini A, Gori G. Extradural motor cortex stimulation as a method to treat advanced Parkinson's Disease: new perspective in geriatric medicine. *Aging Clin Exp Res* 2006; 18:347-348
31. Sakas D, Panourias G. Cortical stimulation versus Deep Brain Stimulation in neurological and psychiatric disorders: current state and future prospects. In *Textbook of therapeutic cortical stimulation*, Canavero S. Editor, Nova Science Publishers, Inc, New York 2009: p 399-42
32. Defer GL, Widner H, Marie RM, Renny P, Lavivier M. Core assessment program for surgical interventional therapies in Parkinson's disease (CAPSIT-PD). *Mov Disord* 1999;14:572-584
33. Lyons KE, Wilkinson SB, Pahwa R. Stimulation of the motor cortex for disabling essential tremor. *Clin Neurol Neurosurg* 2006; 108:564-567
34. Videnovic A, Metman LV. Deep brain stimulation for Parkinson's disease: prevalence of adverse events. *Mov. Disord* 2008; 23:343-349
35. Voges J, Hilker R, Betzel K, Kiening KL. Thirty days complication rate following surgery performed for deep brain stimulation. *Mov Disord* 2007; 22: 1486-1489

Illustrations

Illustration 1

Epidural plate electrode implanted on Motor Cortex



Reviews

Review 1

Review Title: Cortex or STN?

Posted by [Dr. Jonathan Norton](#) on 07 Mar 2014 05:18:51 PM GMT

1	Is the subject of the article within the scope of the subject category?	
2	Are the interpretations / conclusions sound and justified by the data?	
3	Is this a new and original contribution?	
4	Does this paper exemplify an awareness of other research on the topic?	
5	Are structure and length satisfactory?	
6	Can you suggest brief additions or amendments or an introductory statement that will increase the value of this paper for an international audience?	
7	Can you suggest any reductions in the paper, or deletions of parts?	
8	Is the quality of the diction satisfactory?	
9	Are the illustrations and tables necessary and acceptable?	
10	Are the references adequate and are they all necessary?	
11	Are the keywords and abstract or summary informative?	

Rating: 5

Comment:

No

Invited by the author to make a review on this article? : Yes

Experience and credentials in the specific area of science:

I am a neurophysiologist who performs DBS with a neurosurgeon.

Publications in the same or a related area of science: No

How to cite: Norton J.Cortex or STN?[Review of the article 'Efficacy and safety of unilateral chronic Epidural Motor Cortical Stimulation in neurosurgical treatment of Advanced Parkinson's Disease ' by Lavano A].WebmedCentral Neurosurgery 1970;5(3):WMCRW003014

Review 2

Review Title: Efficacy and safety of chronic Epidural Motor Cortex Stimulation in neurosurgicale treatment of advanced Parkinsons Disease

Posted by Dr. Riccardo Ricciuti on 22 Feb 2014 11:02:24 AM GMT

1	Is the subject of the article within the scope of the subject category?	
2	Are the interpretations / conclusions sound and justified by the data?	
3	Is this a new and original contribution?	
4	Does this paper exemplify an awareness of other research on the topic?	
5	Are structure and length satisfactory?	
6	Can you suggest brief additions or amendments or an introductory statement that will increase the value of this paper for an international audience?	
7	Can you suggest any reductions in the paper, or deletions of parts?	
8	Is the quality of the diction satisfactory?	
9	Are the illustrations and tables necessary and acceptable?	
10	Are the references adequate and are they all necessary?	
11	Are the keywords and abstract or summary informative?	

Rating: 6

Comment:

I thank the group of Catanzaro that is ever critical about clinical and research aspects on functional neurosurgery, this paper is the prove.

Invited by the author to make a review on this article? : Yes

Experience and credentials in the specific area of science:

Im corcened in movement disorders surgical theraphy

Publications in the same or a related area of science: Yes

References:

22 – IMPATTO DELLA NEUROMODULAZIONE CRONICA BILATERALE DEL NUCLEO SUBTALAMICO SULLA DISABILITA' E SULLA QUALITA' DELLA VITA NELLA MALATTIA DI PARKINSON: STUDIO CONTROLLATO CON FOLLOW UP A DUE ANNI. M.Capecci, D.Burini, V.G.Bombace, G.Riccardi, R.A.Ricciuti, M.Scerrati, L.Provinciali, M.G.Ceravolo. Eur Med Phys; 39 (S1 to issue n.3); pp. S235 – S238, 2003 23- CHRONIC BILATERAL SUBTHALAMIC NUCLEUS STIMULATION IN A PATIENT WITH HOMOZYGOUS DELETION IN THE PARKIN GENE. Capecchi M, Passamonti L, Annesi F, Annesi G, Bellesi M, Cirò-Candiano C, Ricciuti RA et al Movement Disorders. Volume 19, Issue 12, Pages 1450 – 1452 – Jul 2004 24- STIMOLAZIONE CEREBRALE PROFONDA DEL NUCLEO SUBTALAMICO (DATI PRELIMINARI IN DUE CASI DI EPILESSIA FARMACORESISTENTE). A. Paggi, A. Ortenzi, N. Foschi, R. Ricciuti et Al. Bollettino Lega Italiana Epilessia 125/126 363-365, 2004 25- FUNCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT AFTER SUBTHALAMIC STIMULATION IN PARKINSON'S DISEASE: A CONTROLLED STUDY WITH 2 YEARS FOLLOW-UP. Capecchi M, Ricciuti RA, Burini D, Bombace VG, Provinciali L, Iacoangeli M, Scerrati M and Ceravolo MG Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery and Psychiatry, 76:769-774, 2005

How to cite: Ricciuti R.Efficacy and safety of chronic Epidural Motor Cortex Stimulation in neurosurgicale treatment of advanced Parkinsons Disease[Review of the article 'Efficacy and safety of unilateral chronic Epidural Motor Cortical Stimulation in neurosurgical treatment of Advanced Parkinson's Disease ' by Lavano A].WebmedCentral Neurosurgery 1970;5(2):WMCRW003009