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Basal Ganglia Pathways Associated With Therapeutic Pallidal Deep Brain Stimulation for Tourette Syndrome


ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND: Deep brain stimulation (DBS) targeting the globus pallidus internus (GPi) can improve tics and comorbid obsessive-compulsive behavior (OCB) in patients with treatment-refractory Tourette syndrome (TS). However, some patients' symptoms remain unresponsive, the stimulation applied across patients is variable, and the mechanisms underlying improvement are unclear. Identifying the fiber pathways surrounding the GPi that are associated with improvement could provide mechanistic insight and refine targeting strategies to improve outcomes.

METHODS: Retrospective data were collected for 35 patients who underwent bilateral GPi DBS for TS. Computational models of fiber tract activation were constructed using patient-specific lead locations and stimulation settings to evaluate the effects of DBS on basal ganglia pathways and the internal capsule. We first evaluated the relationship between activation of individual pathways and symptom improvement. Next, linear mixed-effects models with combinations of pathways and clinical variables were compared in order to identify the best-fit predictive models of tic and OCB improvement.

RESULTS: The best-fit model of tic improvement included baseline severity and the associative pallido-subthalamic pathway. The best-fit model of OCB improvement included baseline severity and the sensorimotor pallido-subthalamic pathway, with substantial evidence also supporting the involvement of the prefrontal, motor, and premotor internal capsule pathways. The best-fit models of tic and OCB improvement predicted outcomes across the cohort and in cross-validation.

CONCLUSIONS: Differences in fiber pathway activation likely contribute to variable outcomes of DBS for TS. Computational models of pathway activation could be used to develop novel approaches for preoperative targeting and selecting stimulation parameters to improve patient outcomes.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpsc.2020.11.005

Tourette syndrome (TS) is a complex neuropsychiatric disorder characterized by repetitive involuntary movements or vocalizations referred to as tics. TS is also frequently associated with comorbidities, such as obsessive-compulsive behavior (OCB) and other behavioral and psychiatric disorders (1–3). Deep brain stimulation (DBS) therapy can effectively reduce tic severity, improve comorbidities such as OCB, and improve the quality of life for select patients with severe, treatment-refractory TS (4). Several open-label and retrospective studies have reported significant symptom improvements with DBS (5–8), and randomized controlled trials have shown mainly positive results with some conflicting evidence (9–12). Although many patients with TS have experienced substantial improvements with DBS, outcomes remain variable across patients, with only 54% of patients experiencing at least a 50% improvement in tics (13). It is critical to determine how to apply DBS in order to consistently improve tics and comorbidities in individual patients.

The underlying pathophysiology of TS and comorbid OCB is not fully understood; however, both are thought to involve the cortico-basal ganglia-thalamo-cortical (CBGTC) networks, which comprise partially segregated loops involved in sensorimotor, limbic, and associative processing (14,15). Based on the involvement of the CBGTC circuitry in TS, the most common DBS targets are the globus pallidus internus (GPI) (anteromedial and posteroventral subregions) and regions of the centromedial thalamus (13). The anteromedial GPI may be a particularly effective target for patients with TS and prominent comorbid OCB (16,17), or potentially patients with treatment-refractory obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD) without TS (18). Recent studies have investigated the neurophysiological activity in the GPI associated with tics (19–21) and the potential
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mechanisms of GPI DBS for TS (22,23). However, the reported mechanisms have yet to be directly linked to symptom improvement, and it remains unclear how to optimally modulate the CBGTC circuitry with GPI DBS to improve symptoms effectively.

The stimulation applied during GPI DBS is variable across patients owing to differences in lead location and stimulation parameters, and stimulation often extends outside the target (24,25). Variability in stimulation with GPI DBS also applies to nearby fiber pathways with varying activation levels across patients, stimulation settings, and even hemispheres. Our previous work revealed that stimulation location alone was not predictive of tic or OCB improvement (24). However, our recent study found that structural connectivity of the site of stimulation to distributed cortical and subcortical networks predicted tic improvement following GPI DBS (26). This work provided preliminary evidence that differences in stimulation were linked to clinical outcomes, but it is unknown which local fiber pathways should be modulated to improve tics or comorbid OCB. The need to identify effective neuroanatomical structures for stimulation is especially critical in TS because the time course for patients’ symptoms to respond to DBS can be on the order of months (24,27), and the acute effects of stimulation on tics or OCB are often not immediately observed during programming sessions.

The objective of this study was to identify the fiber pathways surrounding the GPI, including the basal ganglia and internal capsule pathways, that when stimulated were associated with improvement in tics and comorbid OCB in a multicenter cohort of patients who underwent bilateral GPI DBS for TS. Multiple outcome measures and stimulation settings per patient were used to evaluate the effects of stimulation over time with computational models of fiber activation. We first analyzed the relationship between activation of individual pathways and symptom improvement, and then we expanded to evaluate combinations of fiber pathways and clinical variables to identify predictive models of tic and comorbid OCB improvement. The present study aimed to provide preliminary evidence of the pathways involved in the underlying mechanisms of symptom improvement and develop novel predictive models that could guide the application of GPI DBS therapy for treatment-refractory TS to consistently improve symptoms.

METHODS AND MATERIALS
Cohort Data
Retrospective longitudinal data of patients who underwent bilateral DBS for TS targeted to the GPI were collected from the International TS DBS Registry and Database (28) in collaboration with the International Neuromodulation Registry (https://neuromodulationregistry.org). The dataset included demographics, preoperative structural T1-weighted magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), postoperative MRI or computed tomography, baseline and follow-up clinical rating scale scores, and stimulation settings. The inclusion criteria were high-quality pre- and postoperative imaging [described previously (24)], baseline clinical rating scale scores, and at least one follow-up time point with clinical rating scale scores and stimulation settings. The Yale Global Tic Severity Scale (YGTTSS) total score (29) was used to assess TS severity and impairment, and the Yale-Brown Obsessive-Compulsive Behavior Scale (Y-BOCS) total score (30) was used to assess the severity of comorbid OCB.

Preprocessing of Patient Imaging
The imaging of each patient was processed to carefully localize the neuroanatomical position of each DBS lead and register all patients’ preoperative imaging to a common atlas space. Detailed methods have been previously described (24). Briefly, for each patient, the postoperative imaging was used to manually localize the DBS leads using SCIRun 4 software (http://www.sci.utah.edu/cibe-software/scirun.html) and was rigidly registered to the preoperative MRI. The Advanced Normalization Tools (http://stnava.github.io/ANTS/) SyN algorithm (31) was used to nonlinearly register the preoperative MRI to a cohort atlas comprising imaging from TS DBS patients in the full dataset (24) that was also aligned to Montreal Neurological Institute space using the ICBM 2009b Nonlinear Asymmetric atlas (32,33). This series of image registrations yielded a set of transformations between Montreal Neurological Institute space and native preoperative space for each patient to compare the computational models of fiber tract activation across the cohort.

Computational Models of Fiber Tract Activation
Computational models were constructed to estimate the effects of DBS on the fiber pathways surrounding the GPI in order to identify the fiber tracts that were commonly activated during GPI DBS and identify those associated with symptom improvement. We modeled fiber pathways surrounding the GPI that were previously defined by expert anatomists (34), including basal ganglia pathways and subdivisions of the internal capsule (shown in Figure 1). We also modeled fiber pathways that were positively or negatively associated with OCD improvement in a recent study by Li et al. (35) to determine whether activation of these pathways was also associated with the neurophysiological effects of stimulation on the pathways, we computed the voltage solution of each stimulation setting, constructed axon models along the trajectory of each individual tract, and then simulated the axonal response to the stimulation. Details about the modeled fiber pathways and the computational modeling methods are provided in the Supplement.

Quantification of Fiber Pathway Activation
Using the results of the fiber tract activation computational models, maps were generated to identify the fiber tracts within the pathways that were frequently activated during GPI DBS. We visualized the percentage of the total number of stimulation settings across all patients that activated each individual fiber tract in each pathway. Next, we characterized activation at the pathway level within each hemisphere. For each stimulation setting, the percent activation of each pathway was calculated for the left and right hemispheres separately (% activation =...
Figure 1. Fiber tract activation of the (A) basal ganglia pathways and (B) internal capsule pathways across all patients and stimulation settings. The colormap in panels (A) and (B) denotes the percentage of settings that activated each fiber tract across bilateral settings (n = 156) over all follow-up time points for the patients in the cohort (n = 35). (C) Boxplots and individual data points of the bilateral percent activation of the pathways across all patients and stimulation settings. A, anterior; GPe, globus pallidus externus; GPi, globus pallidus internus; I, inferior; L, lateral; M, medial; P, posterior; S, superior; STN, subthalamic nucleus.
number of active fibers/total number of fibers in pathway), and interhemispheric symmetry was calculated (see Supplement). For all remaining statistical models, we combined the two hemispheres by computing the bilateral percent activation of each pathway (the average of % left and % right) for each stimulation setting. To determine which pathways were commonly coactivated, pairwise Pearson correlations were performed of the bilateral percent activation for all pathways (Table S1).

### Statistical Analysis

#### Statistical Models of Pathway Activation and Clinical Outcomes

We first evaluated the relationship between activation of individual pathways and symptom improvement. Pearson correlations of the bilateral percent activation of each pathway and the raw improvement in the clinical rating scale scores (raw improvement = baseline score – follow-up score) were computed. A positive raw improvement score represented a reduction in symptom severity compared with baseline. The Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate (FDR) method was applied to correct for multiple comparisons (36). For all statistical analyses, a threshold of $p < .05$ was used to define statistical significance.

The Pearson correlations provide information about the general relationship between activation of individual pathways and symptom improvement. However, therapeutic effects of GPi DBS may be related to activation of combinations of fiber pathways and other clinical variables. We therefore compared models of different combinations of fiber pathways and clinical variables to identify the model that best predicted symptom improvement while accounting for repeated measures within patients. Linear mixed-effects models were generated with the raw improvement while accounting for repeated measures within variables to identify the model that best predicted symptom scores (raw improvement = baseline score – follow-up score) were computed. A positive raw improvement score represented a reduction in symptom severity compared with baseline. The Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate (FDR) method was applied to correct for multiple comparisons (36). For all statistical analyses, a threshold of $p < .05$ was used to define statistical significance.

The Pearson correlations provide information about the general relationship between activation of individual pathways and symptom improvement. However, therapeutic effects of GPi DBS may be related to activation of combinations of fiber pathways and other clinical variables. We therefore compared models of different combinations of fiber pathways and clinical variables to identify the model that best predicted symptom improvement while accounting for repeated measures within patients. Linear mixed-effects models were generated with the raw improvement in the clinical rating scale scores as the dependent variable. The models included patient-specific random intercepts, and the independent variables (fixed effects) included bilateral percent activation of each pathway, time point (in months since surgery), and baseline clinical rating scale score. We identified the best-fit model(s) for each clinical outcome measure by minimizing the Akaike information criterion (AIC) (37) [corrected for small sample sizes (38,39)] across the possible models with combinations of fiber pathways and clinical variables. Details about the AIC method for model selection are provided in the Supplement.

#### Prediction of Clinical Outcomes

We evaluated the predictive power of the best-fit model for each clinical outcome. Raw improvement scores were predicted using the fixed effects of the model in the whole cohort, and k-fold cross-validation ($k = 10$) was used to verify that the model was able to predict out-of-sample data and was not overfit to the present dataset. The predictive power of the models was evaluated by performing a Pearson correlation ($r_p$) as well as by performing a repeated-measures correlation ($r_{rm}$) (40) to compare the clinical scores and the predicted scores while accounting for repeated outcome measures for each patient. The prediction error in k-fold cross-validation was calculated for each data point (error = predicted score – clinical score), and a single prediction error was obtained for each patient by averaging across time points.

### RESULTS

#### Cohort Characteristics

The cohort included 35 patients who underwent bilateral GPi DBS for treatment-refractory TS, and the demographic and clinical characteristics are described in Table 1. The longitudinal dataset included a total of 90 follow-up data points combined across patients and over time with recorded YGTSS scores and stimulation settings. Of the 90 follow-up data points, there were 78 bilateral settings ($n = 156$ combined across hemispheres), and 12 patients had clinical outcome scores recorded at 1 month postsurgery before stimulation was turned on as an additional control to account for any microlesion effects (9). The present cohort is a subset of a larger cohort reported in our previous studies (24,26), which included detailed statistical analyses of the longitudinal clinical outcomes and visualization of the active contact locations.

#### Variability in Fiber Pathway Activation

The maps of fiber pathway activation across all patients and stimulation settings (Figure 1A, B) showed that a relatively higher proportion of stimulation settings activated the associative pallido-subthalamic pathway, the ansa lenticularis, the anterior lenticular fasciculus, and the prefrontal and premotor internal capsule pathways. The distributions of the bilateral percent activation of each pathway (Figure 1C) showed substantial variability in stimulation across the cohort. Select pathways showed notable asymmetric activation across hemispheres; however, relatively few patients were programmed with asymmetric stimulation settings (Figure S1). Pairwise correlations of the bilateral percent activation of the pathways showed common coactivation of the basal ganglia pathways and the internal capsule pathways (Table S1).

#### Fiber Pathways Associated With Tic Improvement

We first assessed the correlation between improvement in YGTSS scores and activation of the basal ganglia pathways and internal capsule pathways across all patients and stimulation settings (Table 2). The bilateral percent activation of the associative pallido-subthalamic pathway, the ansa lenticularis, and the internal capsule tracts projecting to the prefrontal cortex was significantly correlated with tic improvement ($p < .05$, FDR corrected); notably, these three pathways were surrounding the anterior pallidum.

Next, we identified the combinations of pathways and clinical variables that best predicted the raw YGTSS improvement scores (Table S2). The best-fit linear mixed-effects model with the minimum AIC (model 1) included baseline YGTSS score ($b = .62$, $p < .001$) and bilateral percent activation of the associative pallido-subthalamic pathway ($b = .39$, $p < .001$) (visualized in Figure 2A). There were no additional models within the threshold for having substantial empirical evidence compared with the best-fit model (38), including any models with combinations of fiber pathways that were significantly correlated with improvement (Table 2). For comparison, a model with only the clinical variables (baseline YGTSS score and time point since surgery) had an AIC over 26 points greater than model 1, indicating essentially no empirical support relative to the best-fit model.
The best-fit model with the minimum AIC (model 1 in Table S2) was used to predict raw YGTSS improvement scores at each follow-up time point for each patient (Figure 2). The clinical improvement scores and the predicted improvement scores were significantly correlated ($r_m = .69$; 95% confidence interval [CI], .52–.81; $p < .001$; $r_p = .42$; 95% CI, .41–.43; $p < .001$) (Figure 2B). The model was also predictive in k-fold cross-validation ($r_m = .65$; 95% CI, .47–.78; $p < .001$; $r_p = .36$; 95% CI, .35–.37; $p < .001$). The median error of the predicted scores compared with the clinical scores in k-fold cross-validation was 3.36 points (Figure 2C).

**Fiber Pathways Associated With OCB Improvement**

Across all patients and stimulation settings, improvement in the Y-BOCS total score was significantly correlated with bilateral percent activation of the sensorimotor pallido-subthalamic pathway ($r_p = .45$; 95% CI, .45–.46; $p < .001$, FDR corrected). In contrast, neither the pallido-thalamic pathways (lenticular fasciculus and ansa lenticularis) nor the negatively-associated pathway from Li et al. (35) ($r_p = .17$; 95% CI, .16–.18; $p = .201$) were significantly correlated with improvement.

The linear mixed-effects models of improvement in the Y-BOCS total score were signiﬁcantly correlated with improvement.

**Table 1. Cohort Demographics and Clinical Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Patients</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex, Male/Female</td>
<td>26/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at Surgery, Years</td>
<td>29.5 (9.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latest Follow-up Time Point, Months</td>
<td>24 (30, 1–81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Follow-up Time Points per Patient</td>
<td>3 (7, 1–8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YGTSS: Baseline ($n = 35$)</td>
<td>77.1 (20.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YGTSS: Raw Improvement (Latest Follow-up Time Point) ($n = 35$)</td>
<td>35.6 (23.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YGTSS: Baseline ($n = 12$ Patients With Off-Stimulation Data)</td>
<td>84.7 (12.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YGTSS: Raw Improvement (1 Month, Off Stimulation) ($n = 12$)</td>
<td>10.3 (16.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y-BOCS: Baseline ($n = 28$)</td>
<td>22.2 (11.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y-BOCS: Raw Improvement (Latest Follow-up Time Point) ($n = 28$)</td>
<td>7.5 (9.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y-BOCS: Baseline ($n = 11$ Patients With Off-Stimulation Data)</td>
<td>15.0 (8.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y-BOCS: Raw Improvement (1 Month, Off Stimulation) ($n = 11$)</td>
<td>2.1 (2.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are $n$, mean (SD), or median (interquartile range, range). Y-BOCS, Yale-Brown Obsessive Compulsive Scale; YGTSS, Yale Global Tic Severity Scale.

**Table 2. Correlations of Pathway Activation and Tic Improvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient ($r_p$)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associative Pallido-subthalamic</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.27–.29</td>
<td>.018 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensorimotor Pallido-subthalamic</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02–.04</td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenticular Fasciculus</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.21–.22</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ansa Lenticularis</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.30–.31</td>
<td>.013 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC: Prefrontal Cortex</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.33–.34</td>
<td>.008 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC: Premotor Cortex</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17–.18</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC: Motor Cortex</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07–.09</td>
<td>.531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CI, confidence interval; IC, internal capsule; $r_p$, Pearson correlation.

*p < .05, false discovery rate corrected.
improvement are unclear. The objective of this study was to identify the fiber pathways surrounding the GPi, including the basal ganglia pathways and the internal capsule, that were associated with improvement in tics and comorbid OCB. We report novel predictive approaches based on computational models of activation of major fiber pathways surrounding the GPi, which could be instrumental in guiding preoperative targeting or optimizing stimulation parameters for improving tics and OCB in future patients undergoing DBS therapy for TS.

Variability and Interhemispheric Symmetry in Pathway Activation

Computational models of stimulation showed that there was notable variability in pathway activation across all patients and stimulation settings (Figure 1). Stimulation frequently spread outside of the GPi, indicated by coactivation of the basal ganglia pathways and the internal capsule pathways (Table S1). Variability in pathway activation across patients is attributed to differences in lead location and trajectory relative to the fiber pathways combined with differences in stimulation settings. We observed similar variability in anatomical regions stimulated in a previous study (24), but by modeling the activation of individual fiber tracts, we were able to account for differences in fiber orientation relative to the electrodes (41).

The present study quantified interhemispheric symmetry of activation in patients with TS. Interhemispheric asymmetry of pathway activation was observed across patients and stimulation settings, particularly in the internal capsule pathways and the ansa lenticularis. Interhemispheric asymmetry could be caused by asymmetric lead locations, asymmetric stimulation settings, asymmetric electrode impedences, or a combination of these factors. Our data show that relatively few stimulation

---

**Table 3. Correlations of Pathway Activation and Obsessive-Compulsive Behavior Improvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient (r_p)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associative Pallido-subthalamatic</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.34–.35</td>
<td>.007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensorimotor Pallido-subthalamatic</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.41–.43</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenticular Fasciculus</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20–.21</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ansa Lenticularis</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02–.04</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC: Prefrontal Cortex</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.53–.54</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC: Premotor Cortex</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.43–.44</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC: Motor Cortex</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.39–.40</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CI, confidence interval; IC, internal capsule; r_p, Pearson correlation.

*p < .05, false discovery rate corrected.
settings were asymmetric across hemispheres, which suggests that stimulation settings were not commonly titrated on a per-hemisphere basis in the present cohort. The data also suggest that asymmetric lead locations likely contributed more to the asymmetry than different stimulation settings across hemispheres. Interhemispheric differences in lead locations may be intentional, due to anatomical asymmetry within a patient (42), or unintentional, due to stereotactic error (43) or brain shift during lead implantation (44). Brain shift would be evident by a shift in lead location in the second implanted hemisphere, which was observed in our previous study (24), but it needs to be confirmed in future studies. Because this study was based on retrospective data, we were unable to compare the therapeutic effects of stimulation in one hemisphere over the other with sufficient statistical power. However, image-based predictors, including structural connectivity (26) and the fiber pathways in the present study, may enable DBS clinician programmers to refine stimulation settings within each hemisphere while accounting for lead location asymmetry. Future prospective studies should further investigate the contributions of stimulation in each individual hemisphere to the therapeutic response to DBS for TS.

**Tic Improvement Involves the Associative Pallido-subthalamic Pathway**

The results of this study indicate that Gpi DBS may reduce tic severity by stimulating the associative pallido-subthalamic pathway, the ansa lenticularis, and the prefrontal internal capsule pathway (Table 2). However, the best-fit model indicates that improvement may be mainly mediated by stimulation of the associative pallido-subthalamic pathway (Table S2, Figure 2A). Importantly, the best-fit model predicted out-of-sample data through cross-validation, which suggests that this model could be applied to de novo patients.

The “associative” pallido-subthalamic pathway connects the anterior pallidum (within the globus pallidus externus and crossing through the Gpi) and the anterior subthalamic nucleus, which includes both the associative and limbic subdivisions (45–47); therefore, the effects may be mediated by associative and/or limbic CBGTC networks. The involvement of associative and limbic networks in tic improvement following Gpi DBS agrees with the results of our previous study showing that connectivity to the prefrontal cortex was associated with improvement (26). Additionally, neuroimaging research has shown that structural and functional changes in associative and limbic networks are linked to TS symptoms (48–51). Therefore, DBS likely improves symptoms through modulating activity in distributed pathological networks, and the associative pallido-subthalamic pathway may mediate the effects.

The involvement of the associative pallido-subthalamic pathway in tic improvement suggests that the anteromedial (limbic/associative) Gpi may be more effective than the posteroverentral (sensorimotor) Gpi. However, previous studies have reported substantial tic improvement with DBS targeted to the posteroverentral Gpi (27,52,53). Based on the present results, the therapeutic effects of posteroverentral Gpi DBS may be due to modulation of posterior fibers in the associative pallido-subthalamic pathway, or modulation of the ansa lenticularis,
which courses from the posteroverentral GPI and inferior to the anterior GPI. These two targets may also operate through different functional mechanisms; the posteroverentral pallidum may directly suppress tic execution via sensorimotor networks (50,54), while the anteromedial GPI (i.e., the associative pallidus-subthalamus pathway) may enhance the ability to suppress tics via associative and limbic networks (55–57). Additionally, the sensorimotor, associative, and limbic pathways may not be as distinctly segregated as previously thought (58,59), and these networks are functionally integrated to some degree (60,61). Thus, tic improvement with DBS likely involves a combination of CBGTC networks to improve the complex motor and behavioral symptoms of TS.

Based on our findings, the anterior associative/limbic subregions of the subthalamic nucleus may be a potential DBS target for TS. The anterior subthalamic nucleus has been reported to be an effective target for DBS for OCD (62,63), and studies in nonhuman primates have shown that high-frequency stimulation of the anterior subthalamic nucleus reduced stereotyped behaviors resembling those observed in TS and OCD (64). Additionally, preliminary studies have reported tic improvement with motor subthalamic nucleus DBS in patients with TS (23,65,66). The subthalamic nucleus may be advantageous for a heterogeneous disorder such as TS; it is smaller than the GPI and may allow for simultaneous modulation of associative, limbic, and sensorimotor networks with relatively low stimulation amplitudes, which could be titrated based on motor and behavioral symptoms.

OCB Improvement Involves the Sensorimotor Pallido-subthalamus Pathway and Internal Capsule

The results indicate that activation of the sensorimotor pallido-subthalamus pathway was particularly important in mediating OCB improvement, and the level of activation of this pathway combined with baseline severity significantly predicted outcomes across the cohort and for out-of-sample data. There was also substantial evidence to support the involvement of the internal capsule pathways projecting to the prefrontal cortex, motor cortex, and premotor cortex (Table S3, Figure 3A). Interestingly, these results indicate that OCB improvement may depend on modulating a combination of sensorimotor, associative, and limbic networks.

The involvement of the prefrontal and premotor internal capsule pathways in OCB improvement agrees with our previous study showing that associative/prefrontal and premotor networks are involved in improvement in OCB in patients receiving GPI DBS for TS (26). No other studies have investigated correlates of OCB reduction in patients with TS to the best of our knowledge. However, previous open-label studies have reported that transcranial magnetic stimulation to the supplementary motor area, part of the premotor network, reduces OCB in patients with TS (67–69). Additionally, the present results may be of interest for future studies of DBS for treatment-refractory OCD without TS. Previous studies have shown that the clinical efficacy of DBS for OCD was associated with modulation of associative and limbic networks, including prefrontal networks (35,70–72). In line with these studies, our results confirm the involvement of specific fiber pathways projecting to the prefrontal cortex that have been previously associated with OCD improvement across surgical targets for DBS for OCD, as reported by Li et al. (35). Therefore, activation of these prefrontal fiber pathways may improve OCD symptoms across primary diagnoses (i.e., OCD vs. TS with comorbid OCB). Additionally, our results suggest that anteromedial GPI DBS could be a viable surgical target to improve OCD symptoms by modulating these therapeutic fiber pathways. These results collectively support the idea that modulation of pathways involved in prefrontal and premotor networks is associated with improvement in OCB in patients with or without TS; therefore, these networks could potentially be used to perform symptom-guided therapy.

In contrast, our results also indicate that OCB improvement in patients with TS is associated with modulation of the sensorimotor pallido-subthalamus pathway and of the internal capsule projecting to the motor cortex. Although surprising, this finding may indicate that the mechanisms are specific to the pathophysiology of comorbid OCB in TS, which has been hypothesized to differ from OCD alone (73,74). Studies have found that patients with TS and comorbid OCB experience less anxiety or cognitive phenomena and more sensory phenomena preceding repetitive behaviors than patients with OCD without TS (75,76), which may partially explain the involvement of sensorimotor networks. Previous neuroimaging studies have reported that TS with comorbid OCB is associated with structural, functional, and metabolic changes in limbic and associative areas, similar to patterns found across OCD cohorts (77). However, in patients with TS and comorbid OCB, these changes also extend into the motor cortex and supplementary motor area (49,78,79). Therefore, our results suggest that improvement in comorbid OCB in TS DBS patients may involve modulating the prefrontal, sensorimotor, and premotor pathways, which differs from what is known about DBS for OCD. Additional studies are needed to investigate the underlying mechanisms as they relate to the specific pathophysiology of TS and comorbid OCB.

The Role of Stimulation Duration in Symptom Improvement

Stimulation duration alone may not be a key factor in predicting symptom improvement, as the models with only follow-up time point and baseline severity had essentially no empirical support compared with the best-fit pathway activation models (Tables S2 and S3). Our previous research showed that there may be a long time course, on the order of months, for tic improvement with DBS (24), and other studies report similar time courses of the response to DBS for OCD (80,81) and dystonia (82,83). It remains unclear whether it requires months for symptoms to respond to DBS or to identify effective stimulation parameters. The present results indicate that tic and OCB improvement are more dependent on stimulation parameters and activation of specific pathways than just stimulation duration. Our findings suggest that the fiber pathways that were associated with tic or OCB improvement could be used to prospectively identify stimulation parameters for each hemisphere based on lead locations in individual patients. Applying such an optimization framework could potentially decrease the amount of time required to identify therapeutic settings and provide symptom relief to patients more quickly.
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Implications for Targeting and Stimulation Programming

Our study found that modulation of specific basal ganglia and internal capsule pathways during GPI DBS for TS is linked to improvement in tics and comorbid OCB, and that activation of these pathways quantified by computational models of DBS could be used to predict outcome scores in future patients. These findings have important implications for both targeting and stimulation programming to reduce symptom severity effectively. A combination of lead location and stimulation settings is important for modulating the therapeutic pathways, and intuitively, a well-placed lead would require lower stimulation amplitudes to produce therapeutic effects. Indeed, based on the present findings and our previous work (26), lead location seems to be more imperative than stimulation settings in GPI DBS. Because the GPI is an elongated shape, a lead located in the far posterior subregion of the GPI would require relatively high stimulation amplitudes in order to reach the target pathways in the anterior GPI for tic improvement. Therefore, implanting in the anterior GPI would enable activating the target pathways and networks associated with tic improvement while limiting power consumption or side effects. Additionally, directional leads could be leveraged to steer the stimulation if the lead is within a few millimeters from the target pathway, and implanting multiple leads surrounding the target may provide more robust activation and finer control over the stimulation field (84). Different pathways and stimulation targets may be more effective for specific clinical phenotypes of TS. The results of the present study provide a basis to further differentiate the fiber pathways associated with the response to DBS in specific symptom profiles, including variations in motor tics, vocal tics, and comorbidities. Given the heterogeneous symptoms across patients and a lack of acute biomarkers of response to stimulation, there is a critical need for data-driven, patient-specific approaches to programming DBS for TS. This is especially important because our previous results suggest that symptom improvement with DBS can be slow, perhaps because multiple programming sessions are often necessary to identify effective stimulation parameters (24). We envision a future in which clinicians could utilize an individual patient’s baseline symptom severities, anatomy, and lead location to efficiently optimize stimulation settings to maximize activation of the therapeutic pathways in each hemisphere to alleviate the patient’s symptoms.

Limitations

The present dataset was retrospective, and the majority of information was gleaned from open-label studies from several clinic sites and therefore may be biased. With so few TS cases implanted worldwide, it is imperative to pool data from multiple sites to yield generalizable knowledge, as we have reported in the present and previous studies (24,26). We utilized the YGTSS total score as a total measure of TS severity, including tic severity and overall impairment, which may be imperfect in measuring symptom severity. However, the variability in clinical rating scale scores was partially accounted for by using repeated measures per patient. Although our results are preliminary in understanding the therapeutic mechanisms of GPI DBS for TS, prospective studies are needed for validation.

We used tracts that were defined by expert neuroanatomists, with guidance from detailed histological atlases and MRI data (85). Using these tracts provided a reasonable estimate of each pathway’s trajectory relative to surrounding nuclei; however, manual identification of these pathways may introduce biases that could influence the results, including variations in start/end points and tract density of the pathways. In particular, the ansa lenticularis tracts in the dataset do not traverse to the posterior GPI, as shown in previous anatomical studies (86). Additionally, the fiber pathways do not account for patient-specific variability or any TS-specific alterations in these pathways. Although diffusion-weighted imaging could potentially be used to delineate these tracts in individual patients, tractography has its own biases, and it can be difficult to reliably delineate pathways with complex geometries and crossing and kissing fibers (87,88). Other pathways may be relevant to the response to DBS for TS beyond the set of predetermined pathways. In our computational models, a single impedance value was used because patient-specific impedance measurements were not available, which may over- or underestimate the fiber tract activation in some patients. Additionally, we modeled fiber tract activation; however, other neurophysiological effects of stimulation may be relevant to the therapeutic mechanisms that could be explored in future studies.
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