



Neuromodulation as a Rehabilitation Tool in Aging, MCI, and Dementia





Benjamin M. Hampstead, PhD, ABPP/CN Associate Professor Neuropsychology Section Department of Psychiatry University of Michigan

Staff Psychologist VA Ann Arbor Healthcare System

Clinical Core Leader Michigan Alzheimer's Disease Core Center



Conflict and Disclosures

No conflicts of interest or disclosures

- While I may acknowledge commercial products/companies, I have no conflicts with them
- Content does not reflect the views of the US Government

Work in this area supported by grant(s) from:

Department of Veterans Affairs

B6366W IRX001381 IRX001534

National Institute on Aging:

R01AG058724 P30AG053760 Michigan Alzheimer's Disease Core Center



Enhancing Cognitively Oriented Treatments with tDCS

Combined mnemonic strategy training and high-definition transcranial direct current stimulation for memory deficits in mild cognitive impairment Benjamin M. Hampstead^{a,b,c,d,*}, Krishnankutty Sathian^{d,e,f,g}, Marom Bikson^h, Anthony Y. Stringer^{d,g}

Alzheimer's & Dementia: Translational Research & Clinical Interventions 3 (2017) 459-470

- Double-blind RCT combining MST and HD-tDCS over left (ventro)lateral PFC
- Goal of 100 patients with MCI (~70% complete)



So what is tDCS and what are the effects/indications?



Overview

Caveat: I have 15 minutes!

Non-Invasive Brain Stimulation (NIBS) overview

- Emphasis on transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS)
 - General parameters (how much & how long)
 - Current literature
 - Task-based fMRI changes using spatial navigation as a model
 - Future directions



Non-Invasive Brain Stimulation (NIBS)

- General term for methods that use magnetic fields, electrical current, ultrasound, light (etc) to modulate brain functioning without incision or implantation
- Several types of NIBS exist
 - Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS)
 - Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS)
 - Transcranial alternating current stimulation (tACS)
 - Transcranial random noise stimulation (tRNS)
 - Pulsed ultrasound
 - Laser / blue light
- Transcranial electrical stimulation (TES) <u>includes</u> electroconvulsive therapy (ECT) but is <u>NOT</u> defined by it!
 - E.g., ECT uses 700-900mA vs. 1-3mA for transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS)
 - ECT induces a seizure; NIBS aims to modulate functioning (we do NOT want a seizure) NeuroRehab Lab



The Basics of tDCS



- Modulates neuronal excitability using weak electric currents (~1-2mA)
- Current flows between 2(+) electrodes
 - Anode (+) = <u>excitatory</u>*
 - Cathode (-) = inhibitory*
- *effects appear to depend on cellular orientation relative to current flow





Radman, et al. Role of cortical morphology in uniform electric field stimulation. Brain Stim. 2013 Gyri level changes in outward/inward polarity



Benjamin M. Hampstead – MCI Symposium 2019. DO NOT REPRODUCE

uropsychological Rehabilitation Labora



How Much and How Long?

How Much?

• Milliamps (mA) delivered at the scalp



96% of sessions have used <2mA (no clear rationale: 33,000+ sessions)

Data from Bikson et al., Brain Stimulation, 2016



How Long?

- 50% used 20-minute session No clear rationale
- ~10% used > 20 minutes

• Limited ranges are unfortunate

Neurophysiological Effects

Most of our knowledge comes from the motor system



How Much and How Long Depends...

Thanks to Dr. Nitsche: Mohsayebi et al., under review

1mA = "inhibitory"

 We need dose response data for non-motor abilities, regions, and/or networks!



Ongoing Work

Treating mild cognitive impairment with High Definition transcranial direct current stimulation Hampstead (PI) – NIA R01 AG058724

STUD: <u>S</u>timulation <u>T</u>o <u>U</u>ndermine <u>D</u>ementia

Double blind RCT comparing sham, 1mA, 2mA, 3mA HD-tDCS for 5 sessions

- 140 patients with MCI
- Pre & post rsfMRI, Neuropsychological testing
- Amyloid and tau PET





Neuromodulation Appears Promising



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/neuaging

Neurobiology of Aging



Study name

Review

Effects of noninvasive brain stimulation on cognitive function in healthy aging and Alzheimer's disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Wan-Yu Hsu^a, Yixuan Ku^{a,b}, Theodore P. Zanto^a, Adam Gazzalev^{a,c,*}

TMS & tDCS DAT: 11 studies, n=200

ES = 1.35Adjusted ES = 0.78

DAT	Effect size	Lower limit	Upper limit
Cotelli et al., 2006 (L DLPFC)	3.27	2.17	4.36
Cotelli et al., 2006 (R DLPFC)	3.89	2.67	5.11
errucci et al., 2008	0.66	-0.24	1.56
Cotelli et al., 2008 (mild/L DLPFC)	1.33	0.44	2.21
Cotelli et al., 2008 (mild/R DLPFC)	1.35	0.47	2.24
Cotelli et al., 2008 (moderate to severe/L DLPFC)	1.76	0.82	2.71
Cotelli et al., 2008 (moderate to severe/R DLPFC)	1.79	0.84	2.74
Boggio et al., 2009 (L DLPFC)	0.76	-0.15	1.66
Boggio et al., 2009 (L temproal cortex)	0.56	-0.33	1.45
Cotelli et al., 2011	0.62	-0.65	1.89
Boggio et al., 2012	0.27	-0.45	0.99
Ahmed et al., 2012 (20 Hz/mild to moderate)	2.00	0.95	3.05
Ahmed et al., 2012 (20 Hz/severe)	1.30	-0.15	2.74
Ahmed et al., 2012 (1 Hz/mild to moderate)	0.03	-0.81	0.87
Ahmed et al., 2012 (1 Hz/severe)	0.83	-0.61	2.28
Rabey et al., 2013	0.96	-0.11	2.04
Eliasova et al., 2014	0.06	-0.82	0.94
Cotelli et al., 2014	0.01	-0.79	0.81
(hedr et al., 2014 (atDCS)	3.62	2.26	4.98
Khedr et al., 2014 (ctDCS)	3.00	1.81	4.19
Pooled effect size	1.35	0.86	1.84
random effects model)			

Statistics for each study

p-Value

0.00

0.00

0.15

0.00

0.00

0.00

0.00

0.10

0.22

0.34

0.46

0.00

0.08

0.94

0.26

0.08

0.89

0.98

0.00

0.00

0.00

Relative

weight

4.88

4.62

5.29

5.33

5.32

5.20

5.19

5.28

5.31

4.50

5.65

4.98

4.14

5.42

4.14

4.93

5.34

5.50

4.32

4.67

Mean effect size and 95% CI





tDCS Specifically...

How do we assess neurophysiological effect?

• Ensure target engagement – fMRI as example

- Enhanced semantic word retrieval in MCI to HOC levels (Meinzer et al., 2015)
 - fMRI based changes suggested tDCS may have "restorative" effect

DAT:

MCI

- <u>Global functioning</u> Yes (Khedr et al., 2014) and No (Suemoto et al., 2014; Boggio et al., 2012)
- No change in <u>attention</u> or <u>working memory</u> (Ferrucci et al., 2008; Boggio et al., 2009)
- No change in neuropsychiatric symptoms (Suemoto et al., 2014)
- <u>Memory</u> is consistently improved with stimulation over the temporal cortex (e.g., T3 &/or T4)
- Visual recognition memory improved with single session (Boggio et al., 2009) & persisted for 1-month after 5 sessions (Boggio et al., 2012)
- Verbal recognition memory improved after single session (Ferrucci et al., 2008; Marceglia et al., 2016)
 - Enhanced high-frequency alpha and beta oscillations in TPJ (Marceglia et al., 2016)

et al., 2016) NeuroRehab Lab

Measuring Neurophysiology – Spatial Navigation



Measuring Neurophysiology – Spatial Navigation

12 cognitively intact older adults3 sessions eachRandomized order of central anode, cathode, and shamDifferent stimulus sets each session – also randomized

Center electrode over Pz Ring: Oz, Cz, P7, P8 2mA for 20 minutes Memory encoding (offline ~20m) Memory test after (~80m post)





Hampstead et al., in preparation

Measuring Neurophysiology – Spatial Navigation

No significant change in memory as a function of polarity

Hampstead et al., in preparation



A Follow-Up in Controls and MCI

22 Cognitively intact older adults (CIOA) & 20 MCI.

1 Active, 1 Sham session (randomized, counterbalanced) – Different stimuli



Benjamin M. Hampstead – MCI Symposium 2019. DO NOT REPRODUCE



Hampstead et al., in preparation

Increased Hippocampal BOLD but Reduced Connectivity



Single Sessions may NOT be Representative



Benjamin M. Hampstead – NANS 2019. DO NOT REPRODUCE

What Really Matters – How Much in the Brain?

Models allow us to relate dose at the scalp (mA) to the electric field/current intensity in the brain (V/m)

- A linear relationship is generally accepted
- BUT what is the brain's response? Is it also linear? Measurements and models of electric fields in the *in vivo* human brain during transcranial electric stimulation



NeuroRehab Lab

DO NOT REPRODUCE

Translation: Individualized Montages

57 year old, right handed, female Presents with

- Progressive language deficits (~ last 3-4 years) consistent with logopenic variant primary progressive aphasia
- Depression & anxiety
- History of severe motor vehicle accident (~25 years prior)





Summary

TDCS and other forms of NIBS may hold promise

- Memory seems to show some consistent effects
- tDCS can alter measures of neurophysiology
 - Integrate neuroimaging to select and verify targets?

We need:

- Dose-response curves for non-motor abilities
 - How much? (mA vs. V/m)
 - How long? (length per session; number/timing of sessions)
 - Where? (pad vs. HD, montage, individualized models)
 - When? (Functional targeting?)



Acknowledgements

UM/VA Ann Arbor

- Scott Peltier, PhD
- Sean Ma, PhD
- Annalise Rahman-Filipiak, PhD
- Jaclyn M. Reckow PhD
- Sarah Garcia, PhD
- Shannon Donofry, MS
- Ari Bhaumik, MS
- Oliver Calhoun
- Stephen Schlaefflin
- Albert Chen
- Julia Laing
- Allison Moll

Penn State University

- K. Sathian, MD, PhD
- Frank Hillary, PhD
- Einat Brenner

City College of New York

Marom Bikson, PhD

Emory University

• Anthony Y Stringer, PhD

Soterix Medical, Inc.

• Abhi Datta, PhD

Participants and their families Michigan Alzheimer's Disease Center





