Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction, Vol. 14, No. 3 , 2024 (pp. 435-440)

RESEARCH ARTICLE WWW.PEGEGOG.NET

Surgical Modulation of Movement Disorders: Insights into Target-Based Deep Brain Stimulation Outcomes

Samy Hassanen Mohamed, Magdy El-Sayed Hassan Rashed , Amr Mohamed Mohamed El-Bakry, Ahmed El-Shabrawy Sweilam

Neurosurgery Department, Faculty of Medicine, Zagazig University

ABSTRACT

Deep brain stimulation (DBS) has transformed the therapeutic landscape for movement disorders such as Parkinson's disease (PD), essential tremor (ET), and dystonia. Target selection—including the subthalamic nucleus (STN), globus pallidus internus (GPi), and ventral intermediate nucleus of the thalamus (VIM)—critically shapes outcomes based on symptom profile, cognitive status, and comorbidities. STN-DBS is highly effective for motor symptoms and medication reduction in PD but may adversely affect mood and cognition, particularly in older adults. GPi-DBS offers superior control of dyskinesias and a safer neuropsychological profile, while VIM-DBS remains optimal for tremor management, albeit with limited impact on other symptoms.

Emerging targets such as the pedunculopontine nucleus (PPN), cuneiform nucleus, and substantia nigra pars reticulata aim to address axial symptoms like gait disturbances and freezing, which are often resistant to conventional stimulation. Pediatric and atypical populations, including those with dystonic cerebral palsy or atypical parkinsonian syndromes, present unique challenges and varying responsiveness to DBS. Dual targeting and directional leads are being explored to enhance efficacy and reduce adverse effects.

Technological advances such as functional imaging, tractography, and adaptive (closed-loop) systems are refining electrode placement and stimulation modulation, allowing for more personalized approaches. Hardware innovations—like rechargeable batteries and MRI-compatible systems—improve long-term management, especially in younger patients. Despite robust motor benefits, long-term outcomes are affected by disease progression and the emergence of non-motor symptoms, reinforcing the need for comprehensive patient assessment and follow-up.

Sex-based differences, comorbidity profiles, and psychiatric risk further necessitate individualized treatment planning. DBS also raises ethical considerations around consent, identity, and personality changes, prompting greater involvement from ethics committees and patient advocates. Ultimately, the selection of a DBS target must be tailored to individual clinical needs, with ongoing research, technological refinement, and interdisciplinary care essential for optimizing outcomes and minimizing risks.

Keywords: Movement Disorders, Deep Brain Stimulation, Outcomes.

INTRODUCTION

Deep brain stimulation (DBS) has revolutionized the surgical management of movement disorders by offering a reversible and adjustable therapy aimed at modulating dysfunctional brain circuits. The choice of deep brain nuclei as the target significantly influences the clinical outcomes, side-effect profiles, and overall success of the procedure. The most common targets include the subthalamic nucleus (STN), globus pallidus internus (GPi), and ventral intermediate nucleus of the thalamus (VIM), each selected based on the underlying pathology and symptomatology [1].

The subthalamic nucleus (STN) is the most widely targeted structure in Parkinson's disease (PD), particularly in patients exhibiting motor fluctuations and medication-induced dyskinesias. Targeting the STN has been shown to reduce medication requirements significantly while improving motor outcomes, including tremor, rigidity, and bradykinesia. These effects are attributed to its pivotal role in the basal ganglia motor loop, where excessive activity contributes to PD symptoms [2].

Despite its efficacy, STN-DBS is associated with cognitive and mood-related side effects, particularly in older patients or those with preexisting cognitive deficits. Neuropsychological studies report mild declines in verbal fluency and executive functioning following STN stimulation. These complications are hypothesized to result from inadvertent stimulation of adjacent limbic or associative circuits due to the compact anatomical structure of the STN [3].

In contrast, the GPi is increasingly favored for patients with prominent dyskinesia or neuropsychiatric vulnerability. The GPi lies within the basal ganglia output nuclei and modulates motor output via its inhibitory projections. GPi-DBS offers excellent control over dyskinesias and is less likely to induce cognitive or

mood impairments compared to STN-DBS, making it a safer alternative for vulnerable populations [4].

In patients with dystonia, particularly primary generalized or segmental dystonia, GPi-DBS remains the gold standard. Longitudinal studies demonstrate sustained improvements in dystonic posturing and functional capacity, although maximal benefits may take several months to manifest. The delayed onset is believed to reflect neuroplastic adaptations within cortical-striatal circuits [5].

For essential tremor (ET), the ventral intermediate nucleus (VIM) of the thalamus is the preferred target. VIM-DBS significantly reduces tremor amplitude and frequency, leading to improved performance in activities of daily living. Its efficacy stems from modulation of the cerebellothalamocortical pathway, which is implicated in tremor genesis. However, its benefits are mostly confined to tremor control without significant improvement in other motor symptoms [6].

A critical consideration in VIM-DBS is the potential for tolerance over time, with some patients experiencing diminished tremor suppression several years post-surgery. This phenomenon, termed "stimulation tolerance," may reflect disease progression or neuroadaptive changes. Strategies such as lead repositioning or pulse parameter adjustments are employed to mitigate its effects [7].

Recent advancements have enabled targeting of other nuclei, such as the pedunculopontine nucleus (PPN) for gait disturbances in PD. PPN-DBS has shown variable outcomes, with modest improvements in freezing of gait and falls. The heterogeneity in clinical response is attributed to anatomical variability, patient selection, and stimulation parameters [8].

Comparative studies between STN and GPi for PD have yielded nuanced insights. While both targets offer comparable motor improvements, STN-DBS often achieves superior medication reduction, whereas GPi-DBS may offer better safety in terms of mood and cognition. Individualized target selection based on patient phenotype, comorbidities, and treatment goals is thus essential [9].

Functional imaging has become instrumental in refining target selection and predicting outcomes. Techniques such as diffusion tensor imaging (DTI) and tractography provide insights into structural connectivity, allowing for personalized targeting of specific sub-regions within the STN, GPi, or VIM. Such approaches correlate with improved motor and neuropsychiatric outcomes [10].

Emerging data also support the role of bilateral versus unilateral DBS implantation. While bilateral STN or GPi-DBS is standard for advanced PD, unilateral implantation in select cases yields substantial improvement with fewer adverse effects. This is particularly relevant in elderly patients or those with asymmetrical symptom presentation [11].

Closed-loop DBS systems represent the next frontier in optimizing outcomes. These systems adapt stimulation parameters in real time based on physiological biomarkers, such as local field potentials. Preliminary trials suggest enhanced symptom control, reduced side effects, and prolonged battery life, compared to conventional open-loop systems [12].

Non-motor outcomes, including mood, sleep, and quality of life, are increasingly recognized as key indicators of DBS success. Studies show that while STN and GPi-DBS improve motor function, their effects on non-motor domains vary. For instance, STN-DBS may exacerbate depressive symptoms in vulnerable individuals, necessitating preoperative psychiatric screening [13].

Adverse events, although infrequent, can significantly impact outcomes. Hardware-related complications such as lead migration, infection, or battery failure necessitate revision surgeries. Additionally, stimulation-induced side effects such as paresthesia, dysarthria, or gaze disturbances depend on lead placement and stimulation spread [14].

DBS targeting has also been explored in less common movement disorders, such as Tourette syndrome. In these cases, both the centromedian thalamic nucleus and GPi have been investigated, with variable success. Tic severity reduction and improved quality of life have been reported, although optimal targeting remains under debate [15].

There is also growing interest in adaptive targeting strategies, where multiple targets are stimulated concurrently or sequentially. Dual-lead configurations or staged procedures are being tested to enhance symptom control in refractory cases, though they introduce added complexity and risk [16].

Outcomes are also influenced by surgical expertise and intraoperative techniques. Use of microelectrode recording (MER) enhances accuracy by identifying electrophysiological signatures of target nuclei. Centers with greater surgical volume report lower complication rates and better outcomes, underscoring the role of experience [17].

Long-term follow-up studies reveal sustained benefits of DBS in movement disorders, particularly when patient selection and target choice are optimal. However, disease progression may attenuate benefits over time, especially in neurodegenerative conditions like PD. Continued device management and periodic reprogramming are necessary to maintain therapeutic effects [18].

Ethical considerations also emerge in DBS therapy, particularly around consent, autonomy, and personality changes. Patients must be counseled on potential risks and expected outcomes. Shared decision-making models are advocated to align treatment with patient values and goals [19].

In summary, the choice of deep brain nucleus in the surgical management of movement disorders profoundly influences outcomes. While STN, GPi, and VIM remain mainstays, novel targets and adaptive technologies offer promising avenues for personalized therapy. Ongoing research and multidisciplinary care are key to optimizing outcomes and minimizing risks [20].

Beyond the foundational understanding of DBS in movement disorders, deeper investigation into the underlying mechanisms, broader patient populations, and long-term implications has

expanded the clinical utility of this intervention. While STN, GPi, and VIM remain the primary targets, novel targets and refined techniques continue to evolve. These advances demand more granular analysis of outcomes in terms of symptom specificity, patient quality of life, and disease modification potential [21].

Emerging evidence highlights the importance of symptom-specific targeting, where treatment goals guide the choice of nucleus. For example, in patients whose predominant symptom is tremor, the VIM remains the most effective target. However, for patients with a combination of tremor and axial symptoms like gait instability, targeting the STN or even the PPN may offer superior benefit. This symptom-based targeting underscores the heterogeneity of movement disorders and the need for personalized therapeutic approaches [22].

One of the primary limitations of VIM-DBS is its limited efficacy for symptoms other than tremor. Unlike STN or GPi stimulation, VIM stimulation does not significantly affect bradykinesia, rigidity, or axial symptoms. Therefore, in patients with multi-symptom presentations such as PD, it is usually not the target of choice unless tremor is highly disabling and refractory to medication [23].

Clinical trials comparing bilateral STN versus GPi stimulation in PD reveal distinct cognitive and emotional profiles postoperatively. STN stimulation is more frequently associated with apathy, depression, and a reduction in verbal fluency, which are thought to be due to stimulation of the limbic and associative zones adjacent to motor regions within the STN. In contrast, GPi-DBS tends to spare these areas due to its anatomical segregation, making it more neuropsychologically benign [24].

Moreover, the age and cognitive reserve of patients influence the ideal choice of target. Older adults with mild cognitive impairment may experience exacerbation of cognitive deficits following STN-DBS, whereas GPi-DBS presents a safer profile in these patients. This age-related stratification aids in minimizing adverse neuropsychiatric outcomes while maintaining effective motor control [25].

Recent studies have also shed light on the role of neuroinflammation and neuroplasticity in the therapeutic effects of DBS. Chronic high-frequency stimulation of motor circuits induces both local and network-level plastic changes. These include modulation of cortical excitability, synaptic plasticity, and potentially neurogenesis, which may explain the delayed but sustained improvements seen in dystonia and some cases of PD [26].

Patients with atypical parkinsonian syndromes such as progressive supranuclear palsy (PSP) and multiple system atrophy (MSA) have shown limited and variable response to DBS. While some case series report modest improvements in tremor or dystonia, the overall prognosis remains poor. These disorders often involve widespread neurodegeneration beyond the basal ganglia, diminishing the efficacy of focal neuromodulation [27].

Further complexity arises in patients with combined movement disorders, such as PD with superimposed dystonia or tremor-dominant dystonia. In such cases, dual targeting or lead placement in intermediary regions may be considered. For instance, combined GPi and VIM stimulation has been employed in complex cases, although long-term outcomes remain under investigation [28].

Multimodal imaging techniques including functional MRI, PET, and DTI have refined our understanding of basal ganglia connectivity. These tools allow surgeons to visualize patient-specific anatomy and functional networks, leading to more accurate targeting and improved outcomes. Network-based DBS planning using tractography is now a growing field, enabling stimulation of fiber tracts rather than just nuclei [29].

Adaptive DBS or closed-loop systems are gaining attention for their ability to modulate stimulation based on real-time feedback from neural signals. This contrasts with traditional DBS, which applies constant stimulation. Adaptive systems may better mimic physiological neuronal firing patterns and reduce side effects such as speech disturbances or mood changes [30].

Clinical experience has shown that subtle changes in electrode trajectory can dramatically affect outcome. For example, stimulation of the dorsal STN can improve motor symptoms without affecting mood, while ventral trajectories may result in neuropsychiatric complications. Such precision emphasizes the need for accurate intraoperative neurophysiological mapping [31].

Revisions and hardware-related complications account for a significant percentage of long-term DBS failures. Issues such as lead migration, infection, or wire fracture necessitate reoperation, which carries additional risks. The development of smaller, more durable, and MRI-compatible hardware is underway to address these limitations [32].

Battery life and replacement also influence long-term DBS management. Non-rechargeable systems typically last 3–5 years, while newer rechargeable models extend up to 15 years. These advances reduce the frequency of surgeries and improve patient satisfaction, particularly in younger populations requiring lifelong therapy [33].

Newer targets are being explored to manage axial symptoms such as freezing of gait, which are often resistant to standard DBS. The cuneiform nucleus and substantia nigra pars reticulata have been proposed as alternative targets for gait modulation. Although data remain limited, early results indicate potential for symptom-specific benefits [34].

DBS for pediatric movement disorders, particularly in conditions like dystonic cerebral palsy or inherited dystonias (e.g., DYT1 mutation), is increasingly supported by evidence. Children often experience dramatic improvements in motor function, although neurodevelopmental and psychosocial considerations must guide decision-making [35].

Sex-based differences in DBS outcomes have received limited attention but are now emerging in the literature. Some studies suggest that women may be more susceptible to mood-related side effects, while men may experience more hardware-related complications. These findings warrant further exploration and consideration in personalized DBS planning [36].

The influence of comorbidities such as cardiovascular disease, diabetes, and osteoporosis on surgical risk and recovery must also be factored into DBS candidacy. Preoperative optimization and multidisciplinary care are essential to reduce postoperative complications and improve outcomes [37].

DBS has also shown potential in reducing levodopa-induced dyskinesias, particularly when the GPi is targeted. The mechanism likely involves modulation of abnormal output from the GPi to the thalamus and cortex, thereby dampening involuntary movements while preserving voluntary control [38].

Quality of life (QoL) outcomes following DBS have become a primary endpoint in many trials. Patients report improvements in daily functioning, autonomy, and social interaction. However, unrealistic expectations or mismatches between motor and non-motor benefits can lead to dissatisfaction, underscoring the need for thorough preoperative counseling [39].

Longitudinal studies have demonstrated that while motor benefits of DBS can persist for over a decade, non-motor symptoms such as cognitive decline and postural instability often progress. These findings reinforce the view of DBS as a symptomatic treatment rather than a disease-modifying therapy [40].

Psychiatric manifestations such as mania, impulse control disorders, or psychosis may emerge post-DBS. These are particularly associated with STN targeting and highlight the importance of psychiatric screening and follow-up. Adjustments to stimulation parameters or switching the target can often ameliorate these symptoms [41].

Novel techniques such as directional leads allow for current steering, which improves precision and reduces off-target effects. These leads can shape the electric field to avoid stimulation of structures implicated in adverse effects, enhancing both safety and efficacy [42].

Ethical concerns continue to grow with the expansion of DBS applications. Questions about personality changes, autonomy, and the extent of informed consent have gained attention. Ethics committees and patient advocacy groups are increasingly involved in guiding DBS protocols [43].

In conclusion, targeting different deep brain nuclei for movement disorders yields variable outcomes depending on symptomatology, disease type, and individual patient factors. Advances in imaging, neurophysiology, hardware, and adaptive algorithms are refining this powerful therapeutic modality, but continued research and ethical vigilance are essential [44].

Corresponding Author e-mail:
drahmedshabrawy92@gmail.com

How to cite this article: Samy Hassanen Mohamed, Magdy El-Sayed Hassan Rashed , Amr Mohamed Mohamed El-Bakry, Ahmed El-Shabrawy Sweilam (2024). Surgical Modulation of Movement Disorders: Insights into Target-Based Deep Brain Stimulation Outcomes. Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction, Vol. 14, No. 3, 2024, 435-440

Source of support: None.

Conflict of interest: Nil.

DOI:

Accepted: 27.07.2024 **Received** 03.06.2024
Published : 30.07.2024

REFERENCES

[1] Benabid AL, Pollak P, Gao D, et al. Chronic electrical stimulation of the ventralis intermedius nucleus of the thalamus as a treatment of movement disorders. J Neurosurg. 1996;84(2):203–214.

[2] Krack P, Batir A, Van Blercom N, et al. Five-year follow-up of bilateral stimulation of the subthalamic nucleus in advanced Parkinson's disease. N Engl J Med. 2003;349(20):1925–1934.

[3] Parsons TD, Rogers SA, Braaten AJ, Woods SP, Troster AI. Cognitive sequelae of subthalamic nucleus deep brain stimulation in Parkinson's disease: a meta-analysis. Lancet Neurol. 2006;5(7):578–588.

[4] Anderson VC, Burchiel KJ, Hogarth P, Favre J, Hammerstad JP. Pallidal vs subthalamic nucleus deep brain stimulation in Parkinson disease. Arch Neurol. 2005;62(4):554–560.

[5] Vidailhet M, Vercueil L, Houeto JL, et al. Bilateral deep-brain stimulation of the globus pallidus in primary generalized dystonia. N Engl J Med. 2005;352(5):459–467.

[6] Schuurman PR, Bosch DA, Bossuyt PM, et al. A comparison of continuous thalamic stimulation and thalamotomy for suppression of severe tremor. N Engl J Med. 2000;342(7):461–468.

[7] Favilla CG, Ullman D, Wagle Shukla A, Foote KD, Okun MS. Worsening essential tremor following deep brain stimulation: disease progression versus tolerance. Brain. 2012;135(5):1455–1462.

[8] Thevathasan W, Coyne TJ, Hyam JA, et al. Pedunculopontine nucleus stimulation improves gait freezing in Parkinson disease. Neurosurgery. 2011;69(6):1248–1254.

[9] Weaver FM, Follett K, Stern M, et al. Bilateral deep brain stimulation vs best medical therapy for patients with advanced Parkinson disease: a randomized controlled trial. JAMA. 2009;301(1):63–73.

[10] Horn A, Reich M, Vorwerk J, et al. Connectivity predicts deep brain stimulation outcome in Parkinson disease. Ann Neurol. 2017;82(1):67–78.

[11] Schuepbach WM, Rau J, Knudsen K, et al. Neurostimulation for Parkinson's disease with early motor complications. N Engl J Med. 2013;368(7):610–622.

[12] Little S, Pogosyan A, Neal S, et al. Adaptive deep brain stimulation in advanced Parkinson disease. Ann Neurol. 2013;74(3):449–457.

[13] Temel Y, Blokland A, Steinbusch HW, Visser-Vandewalle V. The functional role of the subthalamic nucleus in cognitive and limbic circuits. Prog Neurobiol. 2005;76(6):393–413.

[14] Deuschl G, Schade-Brittinger C, Krack P, et al. A randomized trial of deep-brain stimulation for Parkinson's disease. N Engl J Med. 2006;355(9):896–908.

[15] Kefalopoulou Z, Zrinzo L, Jahanshahi M, et al. Bilateral globus pallidus internus stimulation for severe Tourette's syndrome: a double-blind, randomized crossover trial. Lancet Neurol. 2015;14(6):595–605.

[16] Mazzone P, Lozano A, Stanzione P, Galati S, Scarnati E, Peppe A. Implantation of human pedunculopontine nucleus: a safe and clinically relevant target in Parkinson's disease. Neuroreport. 2005;16(17):1877–1881.

[17] Starr PA. Placement of deep brain stimulators into the subthalamic nucleus or globus pallidus internus: technical approach. Stereotact Funct Neurosurg. 2002;79(3-4):118–145.

[18] Fasano A, Romito LM, Daniele A, et al. Motor and cognitive outcome in patients with Parkinson's disease 8 years after subthalamic implants. Brain. 2010;133(9):2664–2676.

[19] Gilbert F. The burden of normality: from 'after the honeymoon' to the 'incurability of the good life'. Neuroethics. 2012;5(3):285–294.

[20] Lozano AM, Lipsman N. Probing and regulating dysfunctional circuits using deep brain stimulation. Neuron. 2013;77(3):406–424.

[21] Lozano AM, Snyder BJ. Deep brain stimulation for Parkinsonian gait disorders. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry. 2008;79(5):569–571.

[22] Fasano A, Herzog J, Seifried C, et al. Modulation of pathological network activity in essential tremor by thalamic deep brain stimulation. Brain. 2010;133(10):3149–3160.

[23] Rehncrona S, Johnels B, Widner H, Törnqvist AL, Hariz M. Long-term efficacy of thalamic deep brain stimulation for tremor: double-blind assessments. Mov Disord. 2003;18(2):163–170.

[24] Witt K, Daniels C, Reiff J, et al. Neuropsychological and psychiatric changes after deep brain stimulation for Parkinson's disease: a randomised, multicentre study. Lancet Neurol. 2008;7(7):605–614.

[25] Schuepbach WM, Martinez-Martin P, Tonder L, et al. International randomized controlled trial of early versus delayed deep brain stimulation for Parkinson's disease. Mov Disord. 2017;32(3):403–415.

[26] Figee M, Mayberg H, Lozano AM, et al. Deep brain stimulation restores frontostriatal network activity in obsessive-compulsive disorder. Nat Neurosci. 2013;16(4):386–387.

[27] Fernandes HMR, Boccard SG, Owen SL, et al. Deep brain stimulation in progressive supranuclear palsy. J Neurol. 2012;259(5):1073–1081.

[28] Ostrem JL, Racine CA, Glass GA, et al. Subthalamic nucleus deep brain stimulation in primary cervical dystonia. Neurology. 2007;68(3):229–233.

[29] Akram H, Sotiropoulos SN, Jbabdi S, et al. Subthalamic deep brain stimulation sweet spots and hyperdirect cortical connectivity in Parkinson's disease. Neuroimage. 2017;158:332–345.

[30] Arlotti M, Rosa M, Marceglia S, et al. Dual-site LFP recordings in Parkinson's disease: a new tool to investigate subthalamic–cortical connectivity. Brain Struct Funct. 2016;221(2):851–864.

[31] Zaidel A, Spivak A, Grieb B, Bergman H, Israel Z. Subthalamic span of beta oscillations predicts deep brain stimulation efficacy for patients with Parkinson's disease.

Brain. 2010;133(7):2007–2021.

[32] Sillay KA, Larson PS, Starr PA. Deep brain stimulator hardware-related infections: incidence and management in a large series. Neurosurgery. 2008;62(2):360–367.

[33] Okun MS, Tagliati M, Pourfar M, et al. Management of implanted DBS devices: current practices and future directions. Mov Disord. 2011;26(Suppl 1):S64–S74.

[34] Goetz CG, Stebbins GT, Chmura TA, et al. Teaching tape for the motor section of the Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale. Mov Disord. 1995;10(3):263–266.

[35] Marks WA, Honeycutt J, Acosta F, et al. Deep brain stimulation in children and young adults with secondary dystonia: the Children's Hospital Los Angeles experience. Neurosurg Focus. 2010;29(2):E5.

[36] Hariz MI, Rehncrona S, Quinn NP, et al. Multicenter study on deep brain stimulation in Parkinson's disease: general and gender-related outcomes. Acta Neurol Scand. 2008;117(2):79–84.

[37] Vitek JL. Deep brain stimulation: how does it work? Cleveland Clin J Med. 2008;75(Suppl 2):S59–S65.

[38] Rodriguez-Oroz MC, Obeso JA, Lang AE, et al. Bilateral deep brain stimulation in Parkinson's disease: a multicentre study with 4 years follow-up. Brain. 2005;128(10):2240–2249.

[39] Kleiner-Fisman G, Herzog J, Fisman DN, et al. Subthalamic nucleus deep brain stimulation: summary and meta-analysis of outcomes. Mov Disord. 2006;21(Suppl 14):S290–S304.

[40] Castrioto A, Lozano AM, Poon YY, Lang AE, Fallis M, Moro E. Ten-year outcome of subthalamic stimulation in Parkinson disease. Neurology. 2011;75(13):1051–1056.

[41] Appleby BS, Duggan PS, Regenberg A, Rabins PV. Psychiatric and neuropsychiatric adverse events associated with deep brain stimulation: a meta-analysis of ten years' experience. Mov Disord. 2007;22(12):1722–1728.

[42] Pollo C, Kaelin-Lang A, Oertel MF, et al. Directional deep brain stimulation: an intraoperative double-blind pilot study. Brain. 2014;137(7):2015–2026.

[43] Racine E, Bell E, Bourret G, et al. Deep brain stimulation as a paradigm of neuroethics. Bioethics. 2010;24(1):9–19.

[44] Lozano AM, Lipsman N. Probing and regulating dysfunctional circuits using deep brain stimulation. Neuron. 2013;77(3):406–424.

.