International Journal of
Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

Kirton, Int J Phys Med Rehabil 2013, 1:4
DOI: 10.4172/2329-9096.1000135

Letter to Editor Open Access

Modulation of Developmental Plasticity with Non-Invasive Brain Stimulation in Cerebral Palsy

Adam Kirton*

Section of Neurology, Alberta Children's Hospital Research Institute, Departments of Pediatrics and Clinical Neurosciences, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada

By definitions both historical and modern, cerebral palsy is considered a static disease. Such assumptions of an inability to change are not unreasonable given the complex and often severe nature of the underlying perinatal brain injuries. However, the same assumptions contradict the long suspected and increasingly understood ability for the developing brain to change. Our ability to measure and understand such plasticity in human children has expanded enormously in recent years, thanks in particular to technological progress in advanced neuroimaging and non-invasive brain stimulation. While complimentary to each other, only the latter carries the additional exciting possibility of actually modulating this plasticity to improve function.

Perinatal stroke probably represents the ideal human model of developmental motor plasticity following early brain injury. By definition, these are specific focal cerebrovascular diseases affecting cerebral arteries or veins resulting in regional brain injury occurring between 20 weeks gestation and 28 days of life [1]. Modern neuroimaging with MRI permits the accurate classification of perinatal stroke into specific disease states, the most common of which are ischemic and include large arterial lesions acquired near term and isolated subcortical venous strokes acquired prematurely [2,3]. Such specific, well circumscribed lesions of defined timing and mechanism in what is usually an otherwise healthy brain represent a very appealing model for the study of human developmental plasticity and neurorehabilitation in children.

You will not incur a more focused period of risk for ischemic stroke than the week you are born [4]. The pathophysiology of perinatal stroke is poorly understood with most cases being idiopathic [4]. As a result, no treatment or prevention strategies exist, suggesting perinatal stroke-induced disability will persist in the population. Combined with a common occurrence of >1:2500 live births, [4,5] the global burden is substantial. Most survivors of perinatal stroke suffer lifelong neurological disability and motor deficits are most common [6,7]. Much of term cerebral palsy is hemiparetic [8] and stroke is the leading cause [9,10]. Motor deficits typically emerge in the first year but evolve throughout development and are likely the single greatest contributor to decreased quality of life. Our ability to understand and treat such congenital hemiparesis is limited but improving.

Despite these many reasons to consider perinatal stroke as the perfect disease state to understand and improve function in cerebral palsy, evidence based rehabilitation strategies for motor deficits are lacking. Although there are still no clinical trials focused on perinatal stroke, exciting evidence is emerging for multiple motor rehabilitation therapies in children with hemiparetic cerebral palsy, many of whom presumably have perinatal stroke. The best studied is constraint induced movement therapy (CIMT) which promotes functional use of an impaired limb by physical constraint of the less-impaired limb coupled with repetitive motor practice [11-15]. In the presumably less plastic brains of adults with stroke, two weeks of CIMT can generate gains in upper extremity motor function lasting years [14,15]. Multiple pediatric trials support similar CIMT effectiveness in hemiparetic cerebral palsy [16-25]. These studies likely include a high proportion of perinatal stroke but their results likely remain clouded by the inevitable disease heterogeneity created in otherwise unspecified cerebral palsy samples. CIMT limitations include a modestly invasive nature, particularly for young children, and the exclusion of bimanual learning. CIMT trials dedicated to specific perinatal stroke diseases are now in progress (clinicaltrials. gov/NCT01189058) and promise to offer more specific indications and predictors of success as well as improved modeling to understand CIMT effects on plasticity and motor learning.

Hand-Arm Intensive Bimanual Therapy (HABIT) [20] has also been shown to improve function in hemiparetic cerebral palsy clinical trials [26,27]. The absence of constraint facilitates functional bimanual motor learning and removes the complications of casting. The safety, validity and effectiveness in enhancing motor learning are increasingly well established in children with hemiparesis [20,27-30] though applications to specific brain injuries such as stroke are still required. A recent comparison of CIMT and HABIT found comparable benefits but greater achievement of self-directed goals with HABIT [27]. Beyond this evidence for CIMT and HABIT, few other avenues to enhance function are available. Consensus-based pediatric stroke guidelines support early initiation of multimodal rehabilitation therapy [31,32]. The role of botulinum toxin injections in both upper and lower extremities is increasingly defined in cerebral palsy and may be particularly amendable to the more focal tone issues typical of perinatal stroke [24,33,34]. What virtually all of these reasonable approaches to rehabilitation are lacking is a fundamental understanding of the underlying central nervous system physiology and targets of intervention and the means by which they might be altered when therapy is "effective".

Fortunately, recent progress has advanced new understandings of developmental plasticity in perinatal stroke-induced hemiparetic cerebral palsy. Combining animal studies with modern advanced neuroimaging and brain stimulation in children has generated new models of motor developmental plasticity [35]. At the root of this model is the relative balance of cortical motor control between the ipsilateral and contralateral hemispheres. Excessive control of an affected upper extremity by the ipsilateral (i. e. non-lesioned) hemisphere likely represents an example of maladaptive developmental plasticity in perinatal stroke [36]. Such ipsilateral projections are normal at birth but the majority are typically withdrawn in early development, persisting to a mild degree in some individuals but often becoming prominent following contralateral injury. This model has been developed by combining elegant animal work [37] with transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) studies [38,39] in human children. TMS

***Corresponding author:** Adam Kirton, Section of Neurology, Alberta Children's Hospital Research Institute, Departments of Pediatrics and Clinical Neurosciences, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada, Tel: 403-955-7816; Fax: 403-955-7609; E-mail: adam.kirton@albertahealthservices.ca

Received April 27, 2013; **Accepted** May 18, 2013; **Published** May 20, 2013

Citation: Kirton A (2013) Modulation of Developmental Plasticity with Non-Invasive Brain Stimulation in Cerebral Palsy. Int J Phys Med Rehabil 1: 135. doi:10.4172/2329-9096.1000135

delivers focused magnetic fields to discrete functional regions of cortex, inducing localized electrical currents that depolarize upper motor neurons to generate motor evoked potentials measureable in target muscles with surface EMG. TMS can define bilateral corticospinal inputs while characterizing cortical neurophysiology. This in turn has defined the normal evolution of corticospinal control whereby ipsilateral connections present at birth are gradually withdrawn during early development [40]. More sophisticated methods can quantify complex cortical neurophysiology. Safety and tolerability of TMS in children is now well established (Rajapakse, Trnds neurosci 2013, in press).

This exciting progress has generated not only an increased understanding of disease-specific neurophysiology but has identified real central therapeutic targets and possible means by which they might be affected [35]. Specifically, interventions that enhance motor control and learning within the lesioned hemisphere, or discourage control by the unlesioned hemisphere, would be expected to encourage a more favorable balance of motor control. If such modulation could occur in combination with motor skill training (e.g. occupational therapy) during susceptible timeframes in motor development, perhaps enhanced functional improvements could be realized. Consistent with the plasticity model outlined above, preliminary functional imaging studies suggest that effective CIMT shifts motor function toward the lesioned hemisphere [41-45]. Similar CIMT-induced cortical reorganization has been demonstrated in adults with functional MRI [42,46-48] and TMS [41,49-55] and small studies of children with hemiparetic cerebral palsy [44,45,56]. What is required therefore are other means of modulating such cortical control systems.

Can non-invasive brain stimulation modulate cortical motor systems to enhance function in children with cerebral palsy? Brain stimulation given repeatedly can produce lasting changes in brain function with potential therapeutic effects. Repetitive TMS (rTMS) studies have established this principle in health and disease over the past two decades [57-59]. High frequency rTMS (>5-10 Hz) stimulates cortex which both animal [60-62] and adult [58] stroke studies suggest can facilitate motor function. In contrast, low frequency rTMS (~1 Hz) inhibits cerebral cortex [63,64].

Additional appealing features of rTMS include a well established safety profile and excellent tolerability, including recent evidence in children. (Rajapakse, Trans Neurosci 2013, inpress) rTMS is amenable to randomized, sham-controlled clinical trials [65]. Repetitive (rTMS) studies report no significant adverse events [66-68]. Daily rTMS administered for weeks in animals [69] as well as adults with stroke [70-74] and our recent pediatric stroke trials [75,76] also appear safe. Evidence from our group and others has also shown no adverse effects of non-lesioned motor cortex inhibitory rTMS on normal hand function [75,77].

Substantial evidence suggests rTMS can modulate neural networks [78] to enhance motor function in chronic adult stroke [70,79]. A recent meta-analysis provides an excellent summary [80]. Despite both the high burden of motor disability and probable greater brain plasticity in children, interventional stimulation studies have been extremely limited. We completed the first small pediatric rTMS randomized trial where 8 days of non-lesional inhibitory rTMS appeared to improve hand function in children with chronic subcortical stroke [75]. We are currently executing the PLASTIC CHAMPS study [76], a factorial randomized trial of contralesional rTMS and CIMT to enhance motor learning in children with perinatal stroke (www. clinicaltrials. gov/ NCT01189058). Interim safety analysis (n=38) confirms excellent safety, tolerability, and feasibility with no adverse events or drop-outs. The same trial has also provided important safety data, suggesting that contralesional inhibitory rTMS does not adversely influence affected hand function in children with prominent ipsilateral corticospinal projections. These trials have also confirmed the feasibility of measuring complex plastic neurophysiology with TMS and neuroimaging to determine both baseline and post-interventional changes in children with hemiparesis. Collectively, evidence supports the feasibility and potential efficacy of non-invasive stimulation trials in children with perinatal stroke-induced hemiparesis.

Potential limitations of rTMS include very focal administration and burdensome, immobile hardware that prevents simultaneous rehabilitation and co-activation of endogenous motor learning systems. New non-invasive brain stimulation technologies are emerging that may overcome some of these disadvantages. Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation (TDCS) applies two simple scalp electrodes (anode and cathode) to generate weak direct currents (1-2mA) that induce polarity-dependent changes in brain excitability [81]. TDCS induces regional, transient modulation of resting membrane potential and cortical neuronal excitability [82]. Anodal stimulation increases cortical excitability while cathodal stimulation decreases it, much like high and low frequency rTMS respectively. Modern commercial TDCS systems are painless, inexpensive, safe, and portable, allowing patients to remain mobile during active rehabilitation. TDCS is amenable to sham blinded clinical trials [83] and safety and tolerability in adults is well established with thousands tested and published guidelines [84-86].

Published consensus statements endorse the ability of TDCS to enhance motor learning in healthy and diseased adults [87]. TDCS can enhance motor learning in both animals and healthy adults when administered briefly over the motor cortex [88-91]. Adult studies have not only demonstrated enhanced motor skill learning with contralateral anodal or ipsilateral cathodal TDCS but are also elucidating the mechanisms of neuroplasticity involved [88,89]. The duration of effect clearly outlasts TDCS interventions by hours to days in a dose dependent fashion, confirming a therapeutic potential [92-95]. Recent trials provide Class I evidence that TDCS can enhance motor recovery in adults with chronic stroke [92,96-100]. Though fundamental mechanisms may differ, the same approach outlined above - stimulating the lesioned or inhibiting the unlesioned hemisphere (or both) [96] – enhances motor function. Despite such substantial evidence of feasibility, safety, and potential efficacy, TDCS is yet to be applied to the above model of plasticity following perinatal stroke.

It appears that cerebral palsy definitions that continue to suggest permanent, unmodifiable brain dysfunction may need to be revised to reflect a rapidly emerging understanding of developmental plasticity following early injury. Current models have defined real cortical therapeutic targets while modern technologies and therapies may provide the means to modulate them. With focal injury of defined timing and mechanism in an otherwise healthy brain, perinatal stroke provides the ideal human example. Whether the earliest windows of development provide the best opportunity for such intervention remains to be determined, but the proven ability to modulate elderly adult brains suggests children of all ages with cerebral palsy are an ideal population.

References

1. Raju TN, Nelson KB, Ferriero D, Lynch JK (2007) Ischemic perinatal stroke: summary of a workshop sponsored by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke. Pediatrics 120: 609-616.

2. Kirton A, Deveber G, Pontigon AM, Macgregor D, Shroff M (2008) Presumed perinatal ischemic stroke: vascular classification predicts outcomes. Ann Neurol 63: 436-443.
3. Kirton A, Armstrong-Wells J, Chang T, Deveber G, Rivkin MJ, et al. (2011) Symptomatic neonatal arterial ischemic stroke: the International Pediatric Stroke Study. Pediatrics 128: e1402-1410.
4. Mineyko A, Kirton A (2011) The black box of perinatal ischemic stroke pathogenesis. J Child Neurol 26: 1154-1162.
5. Lynch JK, Nelson KB (2001) Epidemiology of perinatal stroke. Curr Opin Pediatr 13: 499-505.
6. Lee J, Croen LA, Lindan C, Nash KB, Yoshida CK, et al. (2005) Predictors of outcome in perinatal arterial stroke: a population-based study. Ann Neurol 58: 303-308.
7. Wu YW, March WM, Croen LA, Grether JK, Escobar GJ, et al. (2004) Perinatal stroke in children with motor impairment: a population-based study. Pediatrics 114: 612-619.
8. Hagberg B, Hagberg G, Beckung E, Uvebrant P (2001) Changing panorama of cerebral palsy in Sweden. VIII. Prevalence and origin in the birth year period 1991-94. Acta Paediatr 90: 271-277.
9. Nelson KB, Lynch JK (2004) Stroke in newborn infants. Lancet Neurol 3: 150-158.
10. Nelson KB (2003) Can we prevent cerebral palsy? N Engl J Med 349: 1765-1769.
11. Taub E, Crago JE, Uswatte G (1998) Constraint-induced movement therapy: A new approach to treatment in physical rehabilitation. Rehabilitation Psychology 43: 152-170.
12. Taub E, Uswatte G, Pidikiti R (1999) Constraint-Induced Movement Therapy: a new family of techniques with broad application to physical rehabilitation--a clinical review. J Rehabil Res Dev 36: 237-251.
13. Taub E, Uswatte G, Elbert T (2002) New treatments in neurorehabilitation founded on basic research. Nat Rev Neurosci 3: 228-236.
14. Wolf SL, Winstein CJ, Miller JP, Taub E, Uswatte G, et al. (2006) Effect of constraint-induced movement therapy on upper extremity function 3 to 9 months after stroke: the EXCITE randomized clinical trial. JAMA 296: 2095-2104.
15. Wolf SL, Winstein CJ, Miller JP, Thompson PA, Taub E, et al. (2008) Retention of upper limb function in stroke survivors who have received constraint-induced movement therapy: the EXCITE randomised trial. Lancet Neurol 7: 33-40.
16. Eliasson AC, Krumlinde-sundholm L, Shaw K, Wang C (2005) Effects of constraint-induced movement therapy in young children with hemiplegic cerebral palsy: an adapted model. Dev Med Child Neurol 47: 266-275.
17. Taub E, Ramey SL, DeLuca S, Echols K (2004) Efficacy of constraint-induced movement therapy for children with cerebral palsy with asymmetric motor impairment. Pediatrics 113: 305-312.
18. Taub E, Griffin A, Nick J, Gammons K, Uswatte G, et al. (2007) Pediatric CI therapy for stroke-induced hemiparesis in young children. Dev Neurorehabil 10: 3-18.
19. Willis JK, Morello A, Davie A, Rice JC, Bennett JT (2002) Forced use treatment of childhood hemiparesis. Pediatrics 110: 94-96.
20. Charles J, Gordon AM (2006) Development of hand-arm bimanual intensive training (HABIT) for improving bimanual coordination in children with hemiplegic cerebral palsy. Dev Med Child Neurol 48: 931-936.
21. Deluca SC, Echols K, Law CR, Ramey SL (2006) Intensive pediatric constraint-induced therapy for children with cerebral palsy: Randomized, controlled, crossover trial. J Child Neurol 21: 931-938.
22. Sung IY, Ryu JS, Pyun SB, Yoo SD, Song WH, et al. (2005) Efficacy of forced-use therapy in hemiplegic cerebral palsy. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 86: 2195-2198.
23. Hoare B, Imms C, Carey L, Wasiak J (2007) Constraint-induced movement therapy in the treatment of the upper limb in children with hemiplegic cerebral palsy: a Cochrane systematic review. Clin Rehabil 21: 675-685.
24. Sakzewski L, Ziviani J, Boyd R (2009) Systematic review and meta-analysis of therapeutic management of upper-limb dysfunction in children with congenital hemiplegia. Pediatrics 123: e1111-1122.
25. Brady K, Garcia T (2009) Constraint-induced movement therapy (CIMT): pediatric applications. Dev Disabil Res Rev 15: 102-111.
26. Gordon AM, Schneider JA, Chinnan A, Charles JR (2007) Efficacy of a hand-arm bimanual intensive therapy (HABIT) in children with hemiplegic cerebral palsy: a randomized control trial. Dev Med Child Neurol 49: 830-838.
27. Gordon AM, Hung YC, Brandao M, Ferre CL, Kuo HC, et al. (2011) Bimanual Training and Constraint-Induced Movement Therapy in Children With Hemiplegic Cerebral Palsy: A Randomized Trial. Neurorehabil Neural Repair 25: 692-702.
28. Gordon AM, Chinnan A, Gill S, Petra E, Hung YC, et al. (2008) Both constraint-induced movement therapy and bimanual training lead to improved performance of upper extremity function in children with hemiplegia. Dev Med Child Neurol 50: 957-958.
29. Skold A, Josephsson S, Eliasson AC (2004) Performing bimanual activities: the experiences of young persons with hemiplegic cerebral palsy. Am J Occup Ther 58: 416-425.
30. Kuhnke N, Juenger H, Walther M, Berweck S, Mall V, et al. (2008) Do patients with congenital hemiparesis and ipsilateral corticospinal projections respond differently to constraint-induced movement therapy?. Dev Med Child Neurol 50: 898-903.
31. Paediatric Stroke Working Group. Stroke in Childhood: Clinical Guidelines for Diagnosis, Management and Rehabilitation. London: Royal College of Physicians of London (UK); 2004.
32. Monagle P, Chan AK, Goldenberg NA, Ichord RN, Journeycake JM, et al. (2012) Antithrombotic therapy in neonates and children: Antithrombotic Therapy and Prevention of Thrombosis, 9th ed: American College of Chest Physicians Evidence-Based Clinical Practice Guidelines. Chest 141: e737S-e801S.
33. Russo RN, Crotty M, Miller MD, Murchland S, Flett P, et al. (2007) Upper-limb botulinum toxin A injection and occupational therapy in children with hemiplegic cerebral palsy identified from a population register: a single-blind, randomized, controlled trial. Pediatrics 119: e1149-1158.
34. Hoare BJ, Wallen MA, Imms C, Villanueva E, Rawicki HB, et al. (2010) Botulinum toxin A as an adjunct to treatment in the management of the upper limb in children with spastic cerebral palsy (UPDATE). Cochrane Database Syst Rev 20: CD003469.
35. Kirton A (2013) Modeling developmental plasticity after perinatal stroke: defining central therapeutic targets in cerebral palsy. Pediatr Neurol 48: 81-94.
36. Eyre JA, Smith M, Dabydeen L, Clowry GJ, Petacchi E, et al. (2007) Is hemiplegic cerebral palsy equivalent to amblyopia of the corticospinal system? Ann Neurol 62: 493-503.
37. Martin JH, Friel KM, Salimi I, Chakrabarty S (2007) Activity- and use-dependent plasticity of the developing corticospinal system. Neurosci Biobehav Rev 31: 1125-1135.
38. Eyre JA (2007) Corticospinal tract development and its plasticity after perinatal injury. Neurosci Biobehav Rev 31: 1136-1149.
39. Staudt M (2007) Reorganization of the developing human brain after early lesions. Dev Med Child Neurol 49: 564.
40. Eyre JA, Taylor JP, Villagra F, Smith M, Miller S (2001) Evidence of activity-dependent withdrawal of corticospinal projections during human development. Neurology 57:1543-1554.
41. Liepert J, Bauder H, Wolfgang HR, Miltner WH, Taub E, et al. (2000) Treatment-induced cortical reorganization after stroke in humans. Stroke 31: 1210-1216.
42. Schaechter JD, Kraft E, Hilliard TS, Dijkhuizen RM, Benner T, et al. (2002) Motor recovery and cortical reorganization after constraint-induced movement therapy in stroke patients: a preliminary study. Neurorehabil Neural Repair 16: 326-338.
43. Wittenberg GF, Chen R, Ishii K, Bushara KO, Eckloff S, et al. (2003) Constraint-induced therapy in stroke: magnetic-stimulation motor maps and cerebral activation. Neurorehabil Neural Repair 17: 48-57.
44. Juenger H, Linder-Lucht M, Walther M, Berweck S, Mall V, et al. (2007) Cortical neuromodulation by constraint-induced movement therapy in congenital hemiparesis: an FMRI study. Neuropediatrics 38: 130-136.
45. Sutcliffe TL, Gaetz WC, Logan WJ, Cheyne DO, Fehlings DL (2007) Cortical reorganization after modified constraint-induced movement therapy in pediatric hemiplegic cerebral palsy. J Child Neurol 22: 1281-1287.

46. Johansen-Berg H, Dawes H, Guy C, Smith SM, Wade DT, et al. (2002) Correlation between motor improvements and altered fMRI activity after rehabilitative therapy. Brain 125: 2731-2742.

47. Hodics T, Cohen LG (2005) Functional neuroimaging in motor recovery after stroke. Top Stroke Rehabil 12: 15-21.

48. Hodics T, Cohen LG, Cramer SC (2006) Functional imaging of intervention effects in stroke motor rehabilitation. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 87: S36-42.

49. Liepert J, Miltner WH, Bauder H, Sommer M, Dettmers C, et al. (1998) Motor cortex plasticity during constraint-induced movement therapy in stroke patients. Neurosci Lett 250: 5-8.

50. Liepert J, Graef S, Uhde I, Leidner O, Weiller C (2000) Training-induced changes of motor cortex representations in stroke patients. Acta Neurol Scand 101: 321-326.

51. Liepert J (2006) Motor cortex excitability in stroke before and after constraint-induced movement therapy. Cogn Behav Neurol 19: 41-47.

52. Hamzei F, Liepert J, Dettmers C, Weiller C, Rijntjes M (2006) Two different reorganization patterns after rehabilitative therapy: an exploratory study with fMRI and TMS. Neuroimage 31: 710-720.

53. Liepert J (2005) Transcranial magnetic stimulation in neurorehabilitation. Acta Neurochir Suppl 93: 71-74.

54. Ro T, Noser E, Boake C, Johnson R, Gaber M, et al. (2006) Functional reorganization and recovery after constraint-induced movement therapy in subacute stroke: case reports. Neurocase 12: 50-60.

55. Tarkka IM, Könonen M, Pitkänen K, Sivenius J, Mervaalat E (2008) Alterations in cortical excitability in chronic stroke after constraint-induced movement therapy. Neurol Res 30: 504-510.

56. Walther M, Juenger H, Kuhnke N, Wilke M, Brodbeck V, et al. (2009) Motor cortex plasticity in ischemic perinatal stroke: a transcranial magnetic stimulation and functional MRI study. Pediatr Neurol 41: 171-178.

57. Pascual-Leone A, Tormos JM, Keenan J, Tarazona F, Cañete C, et al. (1998) Study and modulation of human cortical excitability with transcranial magnetic stimulation. J Clin Neurophysiol 15: 333-343.

58. Khedr EM, Ahmed MA, Fathy N, Rothwell JC (2005) Therapeutic trial of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation after acute ischemic stroke. Neurology 65: 466-468.

59. Naeser MA, Martin PI, Nicholas M, Baker EH, Seekins H, et al. (2005) Improved picture naming in chronic aphasia after TMS to part of right Broca's area: an open-protocol study. Brain Lang 93: 95-105.

60. Adkins-Muir DL, Jones TA (2003) Cortical electrical stimulation combined with rehabilitative training: enhanced functional recovery and dendritic plasticity following focal cortical ischemia in rats. Neurol Res 25: 780-788.

61. Plautz EJ, Barbay S, Frost SB, Friel KM, Dancause N, et al. (2003) Post-infarct cortical plasticity and behavioral recovery using concurrent cortical stimulation and rehabilitative training: a feasibility study in primates. Neurol Res 25: 801-810.

62. Teskey GC, Flynn C, Goertzen CD, Monfils MH, Young NA (2003) Cortical stimulation improves skilled forelimb use following a focal ischemic infarct in the rat. Neurol Res 25: 794-800.

63. Pascual-Leone A, Amedi A, Fregni F, Merabet LB (2005) The plastic human brain cortex. Annu Rev Neurosci 28: 377-401.

64. Chen R, Classen J, Gerloff C, Celnik P, Wassermann EM, et al. (1997) Depression of motor cortex excitability by low-frequency transcranial magnetic stimulation. Neurology 48: 1398-1403.

65. Lisanby SH, Gutman D, Luber B, Schroeder C, Sackeim HA (2001) Sham TMS: intracerebral measurement of the induced electrical field and the induction of motor-evoked potentials. Biol Psychiatry 49: 460-463.

66. Quintana H (2005) Transcranial magnetic stimulation in persons younger than the age of 18. J ECT 21: 88-95.

67. Rossini PM, Desiato MT, Caramia MD (1992) Age-related changes of motor evoked potentials in healthy humans: non-invasive evaluation of central and peripheral motor tracts excitability and conductivity. Brain Res 593: 14-19.

68. Lin KL, Pascual-Leone A (2002) Transcranial magnetic stimulation and its applications in children. Chang Gung Med J 25: 424-436.

69. Liebetanz D, Fauser S, Michaelis T, Czeh B, Watanabe T, et al. (2003) Safety aspects of chronic low-frequency transcranial magnetic stimulation based on localized proton magnetic resonance spectroscopy and histology of the rat brain. J Psychiatr Res 37: 277-286.

70. Takeuchi N, Chuma T, Matsuo Y, Watanabe I, Ikoma K (2005) Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation of contralesional primary motor cortex improves hand function after stroke. Stroke 36: 2681-2686.

71. Naeser MA, Martin PI, Nicholas M, Baker EH, Seekins H, et al. (2005) Improved naming after TMS treatments in a chronic, global aphasia patient--case report. Neurocase 11: 182-193.

72. Kauffmann CD, Cheema MA, Miller BE (2004) Slow right prefrontal transcranial magnetic stimulation as a treatment for medication-resistant depression: a double-blind, placebo-controlled study. Depress Anxiety 19: 59-62.

73. Klein E, Kolsky Y, Puyerovsky M, Koren D, Chistyakov A, et al. (1999) Right prefrontal slow repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation in schizophrenia: a double-blind sham-controlled pilot study. Biol Psychiatry 46: 1451-1454.

74. Pascual-Leone A, Rubio B, Pallardó F, Catalá MD (1996) Rapid-rate transcranial magnetic stimulation of left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex in drug-resistant depression. Lancet 348: 233-237.

75. Kirton A, Chen R, Friefeld S, Gunraj C, Pontigon AM, et al. (2008) Contralesional repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for chronic hemiparesis in subcortical paediatric stroke: a randomised trial. Lancet Neurol 7: 507-513.

76. Kirton A, Andersen J, Hoyt-Hallett G, O'Byrne C, Yager J, et al. (2010) Measuring plastic change in pediatric interventional therapies with TMS: Methodology of the PLASTIC CHAMPS clinical trial. Proceedings of the First International Workshop on Synaptic Plasticity: From bench to bed side , PS1-21.

77. Werhahn KJ, Conforto AB, Kadom N, Hallett M, Cohen LG (2003) Contribution of the ipsilateral motor cortex to recovery after chronic stroke. Ann Neurol 54: 464-472.

78. Speer AM, Benson BE, Kimbrell TK, Wassermann EM, Willis MW, et al. (2009) Opposite effects of high and low frequency rTMS on mood in depressed patients: relationship to baseline cerebral activity on PET. J Affect Disord 115: 386-394.

79. Mansur CG, Fregni F, Boggio PS, Riberto M, Gallucci-Neto J, et al. (2005) A sham stimulation-controlled trial of rTMS of the unaffected hemisphere in stroke patients. Neurology 24: 1802-1804.

80. Hsu WY, Cheng CH, Liao KK, Lee IH, Lin YY (2012) Effects of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on motor functions in patients with stroke: a meta-analysis. Stroke 43: 1849-1857.

81. Zaghi S, Acar M, Hultgren B, Boggio PS, Fregni F (2010) Noninvasive brain stimulation with low-intensity electrical currents: putative mechanisms of action for direct and alternating current stimulation. Neuroscientist 16: 285-307.

82. Nitsche MA, Paulus W (2000) Excitability changes induced in the human motor cortex by weak transcranial direct current stimulation. J Physiol 527 Pt 3: 633-639.

83. Gandiga PC, Hummel FC, Cohen LG (2006) Transcranial DC stimulation (tDCS): a tool for double-blind sham-controlled clinical studies in brain stimulation. Clin Neurophysiol 117: 845-850.

84. Brunoni AR, Amadera J, Berbel B, Volz MS, Rizzerio BG, et al. (2011) A systematic review on reporting and assessment of adverse effects associated with transcranial direct current stimulation. Int J Neuropsychopharmacol 14: 1133-1145.

85. Nitsche MA, Cohen LG, Wassermann EM, Priori A, Lang N, et al. (2008) Transcranial direct current stimulation: State of the art 2008. Brain Stimul 1: 206-223.

86. Poreisz C, Boros K, Antal A, Paulus W (2007) Safety aspects of transcranial direct current stimulation concerning healthy subjects and patients. Brain Res Bull 72: 208-214.

87. Reis J, Robertson EM, Krakauer JW, Rothwell J, Marshall L, et al. (2008) Consensus: Can transcranial direct current stimulation and transcranial magnetic stimulation enhance motor learning and memory formation? Brain Stimul 1: 363-369.

88. Reis J, Schambra HM, Cohen LG, Buch ER, Fritsch B, et al. (2009) Noninvasive cortical stimulation enhances motor skill acquisition over multiple days through an effect on consolidation. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 106: 1590-1595.

89. Fritsch B, Reis J, Martinowich K, Schambra HM, Ji Y, et al. (2010) Direct

current stimulation promotes BDNF-dependent synaptic plasticity: potential implications for motor learning. Neuron 66: 198-204.

90. Boggio PS, Alonso-Alonso M, Mansur CG, Rigonatti SP, Schlaug G, et al. (2006) Hand function improvement with low-frequency repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation of the unaffected hemisphere in a severe case of stroke. Am J Phys Med Rehabil 85: 927-930.

91. Vines BW, Nair DG, Schlaug G (2006) Contralateral and ipsilateral motor effects after transcranial direct current stimulation. Neuroreport 17: 671-674.

92. Hummel F, Cohen LG (2005) Improvement of motor function with noninvasive cortical stimulation in a patient with chronic stroke. Neurorehabil Neural Repair 19: 14-19.

93. Hummel FC, Heise K, Celnik P, Floel A, Gerloff C, et al. (2009) Facilitating skilled right hand motor function in older subjects by anodal polarization over the left primary motor cortex. Neurobiol Aging 31: 2160-2168.

94. Nitsche MA, Schauenburg A, Lang N, Liebetanz D, Exner C, et al. (2003) Facilitation of implicit motor learning by weak transcranial direct current stimulation of the primary motor cortex in the human. J Cogn Neurosci 15: 619-626.

95. Nitsche MA, Paulus W (2001) Sustained excitability elevations induced by transcranial DC motor cortex stimulation in humans. Neurology 57: 1899-1901.

96. Lindenberg R, Renga V, Zhu LL, Nair D, Schlaug G (2010) Bihemispheric brain stimulation facilitates motor recovery in chronic stroke patients. Neurology 75: 2176-2184.

97. Hummel F, Celnik P, Giraux P, Floel A, Wu WH, et al. (2005) Effects of non-invasive cortical stimulation on skilled motor function in chronic stroke. Brain 128: 490-499.

98. Hummel FC, Voller B, Celnik P, Floel A, Giraux P, et al. (2006) Effects of brain polarization on reaction times and pinch force in chronic stroke. BMC Neurosci 7: 73.

99. Fregni F, Boggio PS, Mansur CG, Wagner T, Ferreira MJ, et al. (2005) Transcranial direct current stimulation of the unaffected hemisphere in stroke patients. Neuroreport 16: 1551-1555.

100. Boggio PS, Nunes A, Rigonatti SP, Nitsche MA, Pascual-Leone A, et al. (2007) Repeated sessions of noninvasive brain DC stimulation is associated with motor function improvement in stroke patients. Restor Neurol Neurosci 25: 123-129.