

Journal Pre-proofs

Research article

Comparison between conventional and neuronavigated strategies to assess corticospinal responsiveness in unfatigued and fatigued knee-extensor muscles

C. Barbi, G. Vernillo, M. Emadi Andani, G. Giuriato, F.G. Laginestra, A. Cavicchia, G. Fiorini Aloisi, C. Martignon, A. Pedrinolla, F. Schena, M. Venturelli


PII: S0304-3940(23)00310-5
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2023.137351>
Reference: NSL 137351

To appear in: *Neuroscience Letters*

Received Date: 6 December 2022
Revised Date: 27 May 2023
Accepted Date: 12 June 2023

Please cite this article as: C. Barbi, G. Vernillo, M. Emadi Andani, G. Giuriato, F.G. Laginestra, A. Cavicchia, G. Fiorini Aloisi, C. Martignon, A. Pedrinolla, F. Schena, M. Venturelli, Comparison between conventional and neuronavigated strategies to assess corticospinal responsiveness in unfatigued and fatigued knee-extensor muscles, *Neuroscience Letters* (2023), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2023.137351>

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.



Comparison between conventional and neuronavigated strategies to assess corticospinal responsiveness in unfatigued and fatigued knee-extensor muscles

C. Barbi¹, G. Vernillo², M. Emadi Andani¹, G. Giuriato¹, F.G. Laginestra¹, A. Cavicchia¹, G. Fiorini Aloisi¹, C. Martignon¹, A. Pedrinolla¹, F. Schena¹, M. Venturelli¹

¹ Department of Neuroscience, Biomedicine, and Movement, University of Verona, Italy.

² Department of Biomedical Sciences for Health, University of Milan, Italy.

Corresponding author

Massimo Venturelli, Ph.D.

Department of Neurosciences, Biomedicine and Movement Sciences, University of Verona, Verona, Italy

E-mail: massimo.venturelli@univr.it

Authors' ORCID numbers:

Chiara Barbi: 0000-0002-0043-1148

Gianluca Vernillo: 0000-0003-2580-4470

Mehran Emadi Andani:

Gaia Giuriato: 0000-0002-8149-9450

Fabio Giuseppe Laginestra: 0000-0003-4767-7249

Camilla Martignon: 0000-0001-6506-4409

Anna Pedrinolla: 0000-0001-8888-619X

Federico Schena: 0000-0002-9461-8391

Massimo Venturelli: 0000-0002-2469-8787

Comparison between conventional and neuronavigated strategies to assess corticospinal responsiveness in unfatigued and fatigued knee-extensor muscles

Journal Pre-proofs

ABSTRACT

In studying neuromuscular fatigability, researchers commonly use functional criteria to position and hold the transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) coil during testing sessions. This could influence the magnitude of corticospinal excitability and inhibition responses due to imprecise and unsteady positions of the coil. To reduce coil position and orientation variability, neuronavigated TMS (nTMS) could be used. We evaluated the accuracy of nTMS and a standardized function-guided procedure for maintaining TMS coil position both in unfatigued and fatigued knee extensors. Eighteen participants (10F/8M) volunteered in two identical and randomized sessions. Maximal and submaximal neuromuscular evaluations were performed with TMS three times before (PRE_1) and three times after (PRE_2) a 2 min resting session and one time immediately after (POST) a 2-min sustained maximal voluntary isometric contraction (MVIC). The located “hotspot” [the location that evoked the largest motor-evoked potential (MEP) responses in the *rectus femoris*] was maintained either with or without nTMS. MEP, silent period (SP) and the distance between the “hotspot” and the actual coil position were recorded. A time \times contraction intensity \times testing session \times muscle interaction was not observed for MEP, SP, and distance. Bland-Altman plots presented adequate agreements for MEP and SP. Spatial accuracy of TMS coil position over the motor cortex did not influence corticospinal excitability and inhibition in unfatigued and fatigued knee extensors. The variability in MEP and SP responses may be due to spontaneous fluctuations in corticospinal excitability and inhibition, and it is not altered by the spatial stability of the stimulation point.

Keywords: Corticospinal excitability, corticospinal inhibition, neuromuscular fatigability; neuronavigator, transcranial magnetic stimulation.

1. INTRODUCTION

During fatiguing contractions, the modulation of the motoneuronal excitatory drive to the muscle can be due to changes in supraspinal inputs and in the intrinsic properties of the motoneurons ¹. The state of the excitability or inhibition of the central nervous system can be detected with transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS). Indeed, the evoked responses at the muscle level represent a measure of the amount of the central activation or inhibition ². Stimulation of the primary motor cortex using TMS results in a transient cortical excitation (motor-evoked potential, MEP) followed by a period of near-silence in the EMG signal (silent period, SP). However, MEPs and SPs present a high degree of variability ³ due to (e.g.) the position and size of the electrodes on the muscle ⁴, the level of muscle activation ⁵, and the type of coil used ⁶. Importantly, the coil positioning (location, orientation, and tilt) may also affect the amplitude of the TMS-evoked responses, likely due to imprecise and unsteady positions of the coil during the testing sessions ⁶. Accordingly, accurate and stable positioning of the coil is difficult to achieve, and various methods of positioning the coil have been used in the literature.

To decrease the variability in TMS-evoked responses by controlling the coil positioning, studies have used neuronavigator systems. Navigated TMS (nTMS) has been developed for computer-assisted procedures and adapted to TMS. It employs anatomical data and an optically tracked frameless stereotaxic system ⁷ to integrate an individual's brain imaging data to better identify the motor cortex region of interest ⁸. It gives then the possibility to continuously control for the optimal stimulation site ("hotspot") and maintain it with an accuracy of 3 mm ⁹, limiting the localization errors and increasing the spatial accuracy (the reliability of the coil positioning during a series of TMS ¹⁰) during and between TMS sessions ¹¹.

In studying exercise-induced neuromuscular fatigability (a decline in the maximal force-generating capacity of a muscle ¹), the coil positioning during testing sessions are usually held using external landmarks on the skull ¹²⁻¹⁸. However, the strength and accuracy of the evoked responses during the testing sessions may be modulated by a different coil positioning before and after fatiguing sessions. Accordingly, small changes in the coil positioning could result in significantly different corticospinal responses, highlighting the necessity of considering this variability to avoid suboptimal stimulation. This is an important consideration in the study of neuromuscular fatigability because coil mispositioning after fatiguing sessions could lead to maximizing the physical variation in stimulus delivery and minimizing the repetition of optimally targeted stimulation. This would lead to lesser stability of MEP responses and less consistent modulation of local cortical excitability and inhibition. The retention of the coil positioning over the "hotspot" with nTMS could therefore help to reduce the within- and between-session variability in the corticospinal responsiveness. However, whether a higher accuracy of nTMS is maintained with neuromuscle fatigability is unknown. This information is important if nTMS has to be used to quantify changes in corticospinal responsiveness after a fatiguing task.

We aimed to evaluate the accuracy of nTMS and a standardized function-guided procedure for the maintenance of coil positioning both in unfatigued and fatigued knee extensors. We tested the hypothesis that the use of nTMS resulted in greater accuracy and stability in the corticospinal responses in unfatigued and fatigued conditions.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1. Participants

An a priori sample size of nine individuals was determined using G-Power 3.1, assuming an anticipated effect size (f) of 0.25, which is considered medium¹⁹, an alpha of 0.05, a beta of 0.2, a correlation among repetition measures of 0.5, and the nonsphericity correction ϵ of 1. To account for possible dropouts, eighteen healthy and physically active adults (10F/8M: 24 ± 3 years; 67 ± 14 kg; 170 ± 9 cm) volunteered for this study. Exclusion criteria were history of heart disease or hypertension, neurological disorders, lower-body injury in the previous 6 months, and contraindications to TMS²⁰. Participants were informed about the experimental protocol and all associated risks prior to giving written informed consent. This study conformed to the Declaration of Helsinki, except for registration in a database, and was approved by the local Ethics Committee.

2.2. Experimental protocol

Participants visited the lab on three different occasions. They were asked to abstain from caffeine on the day of the experiment and avoid performing vigorous exercise at least 24 h prior to each laboratory session. During the first visit, participants completed questionnaires about risks associated with the use of TMS²¹ and to assess leg dominance²². Thirteen and five participants had dominant right and left leg, respectively. During the familiarization, participants were instructed to extend their knee (in isometric conditions) “as hard as possible”. Familiarization consisted in 5-to-10 non-successive contractions, allowing participants to feel comfortable with the procedures. They also familiarized with submaximal knee extensors contractions, TMS and femoral nerve stimulation. During the second and third visits, in a randomized and counterbalanced order, participants performed the same protocol, and an experienced investigator (CB) was either allowed or not to use nTMS to maintain the coil positioning on the “hotspot”. To avoid the influence of different phases of the menstrual cycle on the neuromuscular assessment²³, the first day of menstruation was considered as day 1 of the cycle and women visited the lab on day 15 ± 3 of their menstrual cycle. The two test sessions were separated by 30 ± 5 days for all the participants, regardless of sex. Testing sessions were held at the same time of day for each participant to control for within-participant diurnal variation. Participants carried out a standardized warm-up consisting of three voluntary contractions at 10%, 30%, 50% and one at 70% of their maximal voluntary isometric contraction (MVIC) assessed during the familiarization. Each warm-up contraction was 5 s long, with 5 s of rest in between. The warm-up was followed by two 5-s isometric MVICs with 2 min of rest in between. Then participants performed six neuromuscular evaluations interspersed by at least 1 min of rest. The first three neuromuscular evaluations (PRE_1) were followed by a 2-min resting period and the coil was removed from the participants' head. At the end of the 2-min, the second three neuromuscular evaluations were performed (PRE_2). These procedures were conducted to control for the effect of coil repositioning on the corticospinal responsiveness, without the influence of fatigue. After PRE_2, participants sustained an MVIC for 2-min, immediately followed by the last neuromuscular evaluation (POST) (Figure 1). Participants were strongly and verbally encouraged throughout the sessions.

****Figure 1 near here****

2.2.1. Neuromuscular evaluation

The neuromuscular evaluation included four contractions: one 3-5 s MVIC, followed by 3-5 s contractions at 75% and 50% MVIC (to overcome the nonlinear behavior of MEP area for intensities below 50% MVIC ²⁴), and a 12-15 s contraction at 20% EMG. The 75% and 50% submaximal force targets were calculated from the corresponding MVIC, while the target for the 20% EMG was calculated from the root mean square of the EMGmax signal during the corresponding MVIC over a 200 ms time-window before TMS. Within each set, contractions were interspersed by 5 s. Participants were provided with visual feedback of the force produced and the target EMG signal on a computer screen using a custom-written MATLAB toolbox (The MathWorks, Inc., Natick, MA). During the MVIC (as well as the 75% and 50% MVIC), participants contracted to the required force level, and once it was achieved and plateaued, TMS was delivered. Participants were also asked to re-contract as quickly as possible to the pre-stimulus level of force after the TMS ²⁵. Once force plateaued again, femoral nerve stimulation was delivered. During the 20% EMG contraction, three TMS and one femoral nerve stimulation were delivered in a randomized order, interspersed by 3 s. All peak forces from the six MVIC trials were within 5% of each other during each of the two testing sessions.

2.2.2. Force recording

Force was measured by a force transducer (S2tech 560 QDT, Milan, Italy) previously calibrated and connected to a high-speed acquisition system (PowerLab 16/30; ML880, ADInstruments, Australia). Signal output was amplified (INT2-L, London Electronics Limited, Sandy, Bedfordshire, United Kingdom) and sampled at 2000 Hz. The participants were comfortably seated in a custom-made chair with a 90° knee flexion. The force transducer was connected to the chair's bar and located in front of the participants' ankle joint. The participant's dominant leg was placed in a U-shaped hold to ensure a foothold for the frontal part of the ankle 2 cm above the external malleolus. The participants were asked to push against a compression load cell.

2.2.3. EMG signal

Continuous EMG signals from the *rectus femoris*, *vastus lateralis*, and *biceps femoris* were recorded using three pairs of self-adhesive surface electrodes (Ambu Neuroline 715; Ambu A/S, Ballerup, Denmark) in a bipolar configuration with a 20-mm interelectrode distance and reference on the patella. The EMG electrodes were placed according to standardized procedures ²⁶. The EMG signals were acquired and amplified by Quad Bio Amp (ML135, ADInstruments, Australia)

with a band pass filter (10-500 Hz). All signals were integrated and digitalized with PowerLab (16/30; ML880, ADInstruments, Australia) at a sampling rate of 2000 Hz.

2.2.4. Transcranial magnetic stimulation

Using a 110-mm double cone coil, single stimuli were delivered over the contralateral motor cortex with a magnetic stimulator (Magstim rapid², The Magstim Company Ltd, Whitland, UK), inducing a posterior-anterior current. To identify the vertex, the participants wore a tightly fitting white lycra swimming cap, and lines between preauricular points and from nasion toinion were drawn. Considering every centimeter, from the vertex to 2 cm posterior along the nasal-inion line and 1 cm laterally over the contralateral motor cortex, six points were drawn. For both testing sessions, an optically tracked frameless stereotaxic neuronavigation system (SofTaxis Navigator system, Electro Medical Systems, Bologna, Italy) was used to record coil position, orientation, and tilt for each stimulation. The coil positioning was recorded at each TMS trigger. During one session, the investigator controlled the coil positioning on the nTMS screen. During the other session, the investigator was not allowed to use the live feedback of the neuronavigation system, and the coil positioning was marked with a semi-permanent marker on the lycra-cap (to enable the investigator to reposition the coil correctly throughout). The nTMS can display and record all spatial information and brain target area thanks to an optical tracking system (Polaris Vicra, Northern Digital Inc., Canada) and two sets of spherical, retro-reflective markers placed on the coil handle and on the participant's forehead⁷. An individualized probabilistic head model was used to guide coil positioning. To create the head model, two sets of analogous cranial landmarks (nasion, left and right pre-auricular notches) were manually digitized from the participant's head using a stylus. The local coordinate system for the coil was also determined, specifying three points with a stylus: two described the transversal plane and one the origin. When the "hotspot" was identified, the same investigator had both spatial and numeric feedback provided through three configurable viewports. The feedback shown in the viewports was numeric (centimeters and degrees) and colored (red to green) and the investigator was able to check the matching accuracy of coil positioning with respect to the "hotspot" (determined as the point where the largest MEP amplitude in the *rectus femoris* was obtained during isometric muscle contraction at 20% MVIC at a 50% maximum stimulator output¹²⁻¹⁴). To calculate the distance between the point of stimulation and the "hotspot", the coordinates for each TMS trigger were recorded and then exported in XML format for offline analysis. The TMS intensity was determined by constructing a stimulus-response curve of four brief consecutive contractions at each of 20%, 30%, 40%, 50%, 60%, 70%, and 80% of the maximum stimulator output in a randomized order. A plateau in the curve was not reached in three participants; therefore, a further intensity of 90% was used. The adequate intensity was defined as the one inducing maximal MEP amplitudes in the *rectus femoris* and the minimum responses in the *biceps femoris*²⁷ (Figure 2). Mean stimulus intensities were $68 \pm 12\%$ and $68 \pm 11\%$ ($p = 0.791$) of maximum stimulator output for the TMS and nTMS testing sessions, respectively.

****Figure 2 near here****

2.2.5. Peripheral nerve stimulation

Single electrical stimuli of 1 ms duration were delivered using a constant-current stimulator (Digitimer DS7AH, Welwyn Garden City, United Kingdom) to the femoral nerve. Stimuli to the femoral nerve were delivered via a surface 3.2 cm round cathode (StimTrode, Axcelgaard Manufacturing, Fallbrook, CA) securely taped into the femoral triangle and a 3.2 cm round anode (StimTrode, Axcelgaard Manufacturing, Fallbrook, CA) placed between the greater trochanter and the iliac crest. Single stimuli were delivered incrementally in a relaxed muscle state until the compound muscle action potential's amplitude (M-wave) of *rectus femoris* (as well as twitch amplitudes) plateaued. A stimulus intensity of 120% of the intensity to elicit maximal M-wave amplitude (Mmax) and maximal twitch responses was used throughout the rest of the experiment. Stimulus intensity was determined at the start of each session. Mean stimulus intensities were 220 ± 69 mA and 195 ± 38 mA for the TMS and nTMS testing sessions, respectively ($p = 0.352$).

2.3. Data analysis

Force values were calculated as the difference between the baseline and the average of a 500 ms time-window before the TMS¹⁴. Area values for MEP and Mmax were measured between cursors marking the initial deflection from the baseline to the second crossing of the horizontal axis²⁸. We only reported MEP area to control for possible confounding effects of amplitude and/or duration of the MEP responses. To account for any changes in the muscle sarcolemmal excitability, MEP was normalized to the compound muscle action potential (Mmax) values (MEP/Mmax) recorded during the same contraction. The SP duration was measured by visually inspecting the interval from the stimulus to the return of continuous voluntary EMG²⁹. The distance between the “hotspot” and the stimulation point was calculated using the 3D Euclidean distance formula of two points, using the coordinates recorded during the session⁹. This distance can affect the excitability results (the higher the distance, the lower the MEP amplitude³⁰) more than the coil tilt or orientation³¹.

2.4. Statistical analysis

Normality of the data was confirmed by Shapiro-Wilk W test. A two-way repeated measures ANOVA [time (PRE_1, PRE_2 and POST) \times testing session (TMS and nTMS)] was employed to test possible differences in the MVIC force. To assess the within-participant stability of corticospinal responses, the coefficient of variation ($CV = 100 \times SD/mean$) values of MEP/Mmax and SP were computed for PRE_1 and PRE_2 for each contraction intensity and muscle. To interpret the CV values, an analytical goal of $\leq 15\%$ was used³². To assess relative reliability, and the corresponding 95% confidence interval (95% CI), two-way random effects, absolute agreement intraclass correlation coefficients ($ICC_{2,1}$) were also calculated. As a general rule, we considered values from 0.7 to 0.8, from 0.8 to 0.9, and > 0.9 questionable, good, and high, respectively³³. Then four-way repeated measures ANOVA [time (PRE_1, PRE_2 and POST) \times contraction intensity (100%, 75% and 50% MVIC) \times testing session (nTMS and TMS) \times muscle (*rectus*

femoris and *vastus lateralis*)] was employed to test possible differences in the variables of interest (CV, MEP/Mmax, SP and distance). The assumption of sphericity was checked using Mauchly's test and it was not violated for all the variables of interest ($p > 0.05$). Significant main and interaction effects were explored using Bonferroni-corrected tests. For PRE_1, PRE_2 and POST, and for each contraction intensity, Bland-Altman plots were drawn to establish the bias of MEP/Mmax and SP values determined from the TMS session and the nTMS session³⁴. To do so, we plotted the difference between the two testing sessions against their mean³⁴ and considered the values from the nTMS sessions as the criterion variable. Examination of the direction and magnitude of the scatterplot around the zero line provides an approximate indication of the systematic bias and random error, respectively³⁵. Confidence intervals defining the limits of agreement were established as ± 1.96 SD from the mean difference as an index of random error. An additional analysis was conducted to explore whether the degree of systematic error was uniform over the two sessions studied. To do so, a regression analysis was applied to model the relationship between the size of the mean measured values and individual participant differences between the sessions³⁶.

Statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS (version 28.0.0, IBM Corp., Somers, New York, NY). The level of significance was set at $\alpha < 0.05$.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Force

MVIC force data showed a time effect ($df = 1.042$, $F = 216.758$, $p < 0.001$), but not a testing session effect ($df = 1$, $F = 0.684$, $p = 0.414$) or an interaction ($df = 1.042$, $F = 4061.081$, $p = 0.587$). MVIC force data at PRE_2 (469 ± 154 N) was similar to PRE_1 (461 ± 149 N) ($p = 0.157$); however, both were $\sim 75\%$ greater than POST ($p < 0.001$) (Figure 3). The ICC value for force was 0.912 (95% CI 0.830-0.963).

****Figure 3 near here****

3.2. Corticospinal excitability, inhibition, and distance

CV of MEP/Mmax ($df = 3$, $F = 2.233$, $p = 0.085$) and SP ($df = 3$, $F = 0.183$, $p = 0.908$) did not show a time \times muscle \times contraction intensity \times testing session interaction between PRE_1 and PRE_2. Furthermore, MEP/Mmax ($df = 4.244$, $F = 1.079$, $p = 0.368$) and SP ($df = 3.773$, $F = 0.036$, $p = 0.997$) did not show a time \times muscle \times contraction intensity \times testing session interaction. Distance did not show a time \times contraction intensity \times testing session interaction ($df = 4.869$, $F = 0.297$, $p = 0.911$) (Supplementary Table 1). Considering the four contractions intensity, the three time points (PRE_1, PRE_2 and POST) and the two different sessions, the ICC values for MEP/Mmax, SP, and Distance were 0.951 (95% CI 0.924-0.971), 0.953 (95% CI 0.927-0.972), and 0.942 (95% CI 0.895-0.974), respectively.

3.3. Bias of MEP, SP, and distance

Individual differences were plotted against individual means for the MEP/Mmax and SP from the session with and without nTMS at PRE_1 (Supplementary Figure 1), PRE_2 (Supplementary Figure 2), and POST (Supplementary Figure 3). Overall, the Bland-Altman plots display an adequate agreement at all time points for MEP/Mmax and SP at all contraction intensities from the session with and without nTMS. The slopes of the regression lines from these analyses were not significantly different from zero (horizontal to x -axis) ($p \geq 0.068$), showing uniformity of systematic error.

4. DISCUSSION

We compared the accuracy between navigated TMS and a standardized function-guided procedure for the maintenance of coil positioning during testing sessions for the assessment of corticospinal responsiveness in unfatigued and fatigued knee extensors. Results suggest that the assessment of corticospinal excitability and inhibition using nTMS is as accurate as a standardized function-guided procedure. Therefore, we reject our hypothesis that the use of nTMS would have resulted in greater accuracy and stability in the corticospinal responses in unfatigued and fatigued conditions.

Using a standardized function-guided procedure method, the retention of the coil positioning during testing sessions is accurate only if the distance between the center of the coil and the primary motor cortex is minimal³⁷, and if the coil is correctly oriented³⁸. For example, during the MVICs we observed a mean distance between the nTMS and the standardized function-guided procedure of 0.51 ± 5.19 mm, 1.03 ± 4.37 mm, and 0.40 ± 5.50 mm for PRE_1, PRE_2, and POST, respectively. Accordingly, we observed a narrow spatial dispersion of the points and a narrow variation in the distance between nTMS and a standardized function-guided procedure. Therefore, TMS coil positioning with the standardized function-guided procedure are suitable both in unfatigued and fatigued conditions.

Although not unanimously agreed upon^{9, 10, 39}, our results suggest that spatial accuracy in the millimeter range seems to not influence the TMS-evoked responses in unfatigued conditions, as previously observed^{6, 40}. Indeed, corticospinal responsiveness was similar between the sessions performed with or without the use of nTMS and across maximal and submaximal contraction intensities. Furthermore, the relative stability of these responses (assessed with the coefficient of variation) was similar. The TMS-evoked responses can be highly variable because of independent fluctuations in the excitability of motor cortex neurons, spinal interneurons and motoneurons³. Therefore, controlling the TMS coil positioning over the intended area with nTMS could have helped to reduce this variability. However, this was not the case here since the level of spatial accuracy did not influence the level of spontaneous and independent fluctuations in corticospinal responses. Therefore, our results emphasize that stable positioning of the coil using a function-guided procedure is accurate enough to detect TMS-evoked responses in unfatigued conditions.

The real-time visualization and feedback of the TMS coil positioning provided by nTMS during testing sessions should lead to superior targeting and stabilization of stimulus delivery relative to a standardized function-guided procedure, particularly in fatigued conditions. However, we showed that similar precision in the TMS coil placement can be achieved either with or without nTMS during testing sessions. Therefore, a standardized function-guided procedure seems to be accurate enough to not affect the mean MEP and SP responses at the group level in fatigued conditions.

In conclusion, function-guided procedures seem to be accurate enough to not affect the corticospinal responsiveness at the group level in unfatigued and fatigued conditions. This procedure is easily applicable and could be applied in the study of excitatory (motor-evoked potential) and inhibitory (silent period) responses elicited by TMS in fatigued conditions. The main advantage is that it easily allows investigators to align the center of the TMS coil with the target site. In this way, a constant coil position over time can be assured. However, these procedures can be recommended if an adequately trained investigator can reliably identify the target region, as well as position and hold the TMS coil.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank our participants for their time and effort.

FUNDING

This work was partially supported by the Italian Ministry of Research and University (MIUR; Rome, Italy) 5-year special funding (<https://www.miur.gov.it/dipartimenti-di-eccellenza>).

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

All authors declared no competing interests.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

CB: Conceptualization; Data curation; Formal analysis; Methodology; Investigation; Visualization; Writing - review & editing. **GV:** Conceptualization; Formal analysis; Methodology; Validation; Visualization; Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **MEA:** Conceptualization; Data curation; Formal analysis; Methodology; Writing - review & editing. **GG, FGL, AC, GFA, CM, AP:** Investigation; Writing - review & editing. **FS:** Funding acquisition; Supervision; Writing - review & editing. **MV:** Conceptualization, Methodology; Funding acquisition; Supervision, Writing - review & editing.

DECLARATION OF COMPETING INTEREST

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Journal Pre-proofs

REFERENCES

1. Gandevia SC. Spinal and supraspinal factors in human muscle fatigue. *Physiol Rev.* 2001; 81(4):1725-1789.
2. Reis J, Swayne OB, Vandermeeren Y, et al. Contribution of transcranial magnetic stimulation to the understanding of cortical mechanisms involved in motor control. *J Physiol.* 2008; 586(2):325-351.
3. Kiers L, Cros D, Chiappa KH, Fang J. Variability of motor potentials evoked by transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol.* 1993; 89(6):415-423.
4. Dunnewold RJ, van der Kamp W, van den Brink AM, Stijl M, van Dijk JG. Influence of electrode site and size on variability of magnetic evoked potentials. *Muscle Nerve.* 1998; 21(12):1779-1782.
5. Darling WG, Wolf SL, Butler AJ. Variability of motor potentials evoked by transcranial magnetic stimulation depends on muscle activation. *Exp Brain Res.* 2006; 174(2):376-385.
6. Fleming MK, Sorinola IO, Newham DJ, Roberts-Lewis SF, Bergmann JH. The effect of coil type and navigation on the reliability of transcranial magnetic stimulation. *IEEE Trans Neural Syst Rehabil Eng.* 2012; 20(5):617-625.
7. Ambrosini E, Ferrante S, van de Ruit M, et al. StimTrack: An open-source software for manual transcranial magnetic stimulation coil positioning. *J Neurosci Methods.* 2018; 293:97-104.
8. Herwig U, Schonfeldt-Lecuona C, Wunderlich AP, et al. The navigation of transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Psychiatry Res.* 2001; 108(2):123-131.
9. Schonfeldt-Lecuona C, Thielscher A, Freudenmann RW, Kron M, Spitzer M, Herwig U. Accuracy of stereotaxic positioning of transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Brain Topogr.* 2005; 17(4):253-259.
10. Gugino LD, Romero JR, Aglio L, et al. Transcranial magnetic stimulation coregistered with MRI: a comparison of a guided versus blind stimulation technique and its effect on evoked compound muscle action potentials. *Clin Neurophysiol.* 2001; 112(10):1781-1792.
11. Herwig U, Padberg F, Unger J, Spitzer M, Schonfeldt-Lecuona C. Transcranial magnetic stimulation in therapy studies: examination of the reliability of "standard" coil positioning by neuronavigation. *Biol Psychiatry.* 2001; 50(1):58-61.
12. Vernillo G, Khassetarash A, Millet GY, Temesi J. Use of transcranial magnetic stimulation to assess relaxation rates in unfatigued and fatigued knee-extensor muscles. *Exp Brain Res.* 2021; 239(1):205-216.

13. Vernillo G, Temesi J, Martin M, Millet GY. Mechanisms of fatigue and recovery in upper versus lower limbs in men. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2018; 50(2):334-343.
14. Temesi J, Vernillo G, Martin M, Krüger RL, McNeil CJ, Millet GY. Sustained maximal voluntary contractions elicit different neurophysiological responses in upper- and lower-limb muscles in men. *Neuroscience.* 2019; 422:88-98.
15. Sidhu SK, Weavil JC, Thurston TS, et al. Fatigue-related group III/IV muscle afferent feedback facilitates intracortical inhibition during locomotor exercise. *J Physiol.* 2018; 596(19):4789-4801.
16. Rawji V, Modi S, Rocchi L, Jahanshahi M, Rothwell JC. Proactive inhibition is marked by differences in the pattern of motor cortex activity during movement preparation and execution. *J Neurophysiol.* 2022; 127(4):819-828.
17. Brownstein CG, Espeit L, Royer N, et al. Reductions in motoneuron excitability during sustained isometric contractions are dependent on stimulus and contraction intensity. *J Neurophysiol.* 2021; 125(5):1636-1646.
18. Finn HT, Bogdanovski O, Hudson AL, et al. The effect of acute intermittent hypoxia on human limb motoneurone output. *Exp Physiol.* 2022; 107(6):615-630.
19. Cohen J, ProQuest. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*, 2nd ed, Hillsdale, N.J, L. Erlbaum Associates; 1988.
20. Rossi S, Antal A, Bestmann S, et al. Safety and recommendations for TMS use in healthy subjects and patient populations, with updates on training, ethical and regulatory issues: Expert Guidelines. *Clin Neurophysiol.* 2021; 132(1):269-306.
21. Rossi S, Hallett M, Rossini PM, Pascual-Leone A. Screening questionnaire before TMS: an update. *Clin Neurophysiol.* 2011; 122(8):1686.
22. Elias LJ, Bryden MP, Bulman-Fleming MB. Footedness is a better predictor than is handedness of emotional lateralization. *Neuropsychologia.* 1998; 36(1):37-43.
23. Ansdell P, Brownstein CG, Skarabot J, et al. Menstrual cycle-associated modulations in neuromuscular function and fatigability of the knee extensors in eumenorrhic women. *J Appl Physiol (1985).* 2019; 126(6):1701-1712.
24. Goodall S, Romer LM, Ross EZ. Voluntary activation of human knee extensors measured using transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Exp Physiol.* 2009; 94(9):995-1004.
25. Mathis J, de Quervain D, Hess CW. Dependence of the transcranially induced silent period on the 'instruction set' and the individual reaction time. *Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol.* 1998; 109(5):426-435.

26. Botter A, Oprandi G, Lanfranco F, Allasia S, Maffiuletti NA, Minetto MA. Atlas of the muscle motor points for the lower limb: implications for electrical stimulation procedures and electrode positioning. *Eur J Appl Physiol*. 2011; 111(10):2461-2471.
27. Temesi J, Gruet M, Rupp T, Verges S, Millet GY. Resting and active motor thresholds versus stimulus-response curves to determine transcranial magnetic stimulation intensity in quadriceps femoris. *J Neuroeng Rehabil*. 2014; 11:40.
28. Martin PG, Gandevia SC, Taylor JL. Output of human motoneuron pools to corticospinal inputs during voluntary contractions. *J Neurophysiol*. 2006; 95(6):3512-3518.
29. Taylor JL, Butler JE, Allen GM, Gandevia SC. Changes in motor cortical excitability during human muscle fatigue. *J Physiol*. 1996; 490:519-528.
30. de Goede AA, Ter Braack EM, van Putten M. Accurate Coil Positioning is Important for Single and Paired Pulse TMS on the Subject Level. *Brain Topogr*. 2018; 31(6):917-930.
31. Schmidt S, Bathe-Peters R, Fleischmann R, Ronnefarth M, Scholz M, Brandt SA. Nonphysiological factors in navigated TMS studies; confounding covariates and valid intracortical estimates. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2015; 36(1):40-49.
32. Stokes M. Reliability and Repeatability of Methods for Measuring Muscle in Physiotherapy. *Physiotherapy Practice*. 1985; 1(2):71-76.
33. Vincent WJ, Weir JP. *Statistics in kinesiology*, Fifth edition. ed, Champaign, IL, Human Kinetics; 2021.
34. Bland JM, Altman DG. Statistical methods for assessing agreement between two methods of clinical measurement. *Lancet*. 1986; 1(8476):307-310.
35. Atkinson G, Nevill AM. Statistical methods for assessing measurement error (reliability) in variables relevant to sports medicine. *Sports Med*. 1998; 26(4):217-238.
36. Bland JM, Altman DG. Measuring agreement in method comparison studies. *Stat Methods Med Res*. 1999; 8(2):135-160.
37. Gershon AA, Dannon PN, Grunhaus L. Transcranial magnetic stimulation in the treatment of depression. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2003; 160(5):835-845.
38. Balslev D, Braet W, McAllister C, Miall RC. Inter-individual variability in optimal current direction for transcranial magnetic stimulation of the motor cortex. *J Neurosci Methods*. 2007; 162(1-2):309-313.
39. Julkunen P, Saisanen L, Danner N, et al. Comparison of navigated and non-navigated transcranial magnetic stimulation for motor cortex mapping, motor threshold and motor evoked potentials. *Neuroimage*. 2009; 44(3):790-795.

40. Jung NH, Delvendahl I, Kuhnke NG, Hauschke D, Stolle S, Mall V. Navigated transcranial magnetic stimulation does not decrease the variability of motor-evoked potentials. *Brain Stimul.* 2010; 3(2):87-94.

Journal Pre-proofs

FIGURE AND TABLES CAPTIONS

Figure 1. (Panel A) Experimental protocol completed in two different laboratory sessions with or without navigated transcranial magnetic stimulation (nTMS). Participants performed neuromuscular evaluations three times before (PRE_1) a 2 min resting session. During the 2 min resting session, the TMS coil was removed and repositioned before performing the other three neuromuscular evaluations (PRE_2). After 3 min, participants performed a fatiguing task constituting of a 2-min sustained maximal isometric contraction (MVIC). Immediately at the end (i.e., participants were not allowed to relax), they performed one neuromuscular evaluation (POST). **(Panel B)** The neuromuscular evaluation required participants to perform a sustained MVIC. Guidelines at 75% and 50% of maximal force were instantaneously displayed on the computer screen so that the contraction was sustained at 75% MVC and then 50% MVC. Motor cortex and femoral nerve stimulations were delivered at each force level once the participants produced the appropriate amount of force. At the end of this set of contractions, a sustained submaximal contraction at 20% EMG was performed. During this contraction, three motor cortex and one femoral nerve stimulations were delivered in a randomized order, interspersed by 3 s. Within each set, contractions were interspersed by 5 s. Each set of contractions lasted approximately 15 s.

Figure 2. Single-participant data showing raw electromyographic (EMG) responses evoked by transcranial magnetic stimulation in the *rectus femoris* and *vastus lateralis* during neuronavigator (nTMS) and non-neuronavigator (TMS) sessions before (PRE_1) and after (PRE_2) a 2 min resting session, as well as immediately after (POST) a 2-min sustained maximal voluntary isometric contraction (MVIC).

Figure 3. Participants' maximal voluntary isometric contraction forces before (PRE_1) and after (PRE_2) a 2 min resting session, as well as immediately after (POST) a 2-min sustained maximal voluntary isometric contraction. The values represent group means and standard deviations during neuronavigator (nTMS) and non-neuronavigator (TMS) sessions. * Time effect from PRE_2 ($p < 0.001$).

Supplementary Table 1 Transcranial magnetic stimulation-evoked responses and distance before (PRE_1) and after (PRE_2) a 2 min resting session, as well as immediately after (POST) a 2-min sustained maximal voluntary isometric contraction.

Supplementary Figure 1 Bland-Altman plots between the sessions with or without navigated transcranial magnetic stimulation for the variables of interest [i.e., motor-evoked potential normalized to maximal compound muscle action potential (MEP/Mmax), and silent period (SP)] for the first three neuromuscular evaluations (see “Experimental protocol” in the manuscript). The differences between the two sessions (y -axes) are plotted against the mean of the two testing


sessions (x -axes) for MEP/Mmax and SP for the two muscles (*rectus femoris* and *vastus lateralis* combined), during maximal (100% MVIC) and submaximal (75 and 50% MVIC, 20% EMG) voluntary isometric contractions. For each panel, the middle horizontal dashed line represents the mean difference between the two testing sessions (systematic bias) and the upper and lower dashed lines represent the 95% limits of agreements (random error, as $\pm 1.96 \times$ standard deviation). The solid line represents the slope of the regression.

Supplementary Figure 2 Bland-Altman plots between the sessions with or without navigated transcranial magnetic stimulation for the variables of interest [i.e., motor-evoked potential normalized to maximal compound muscle action potential (MEP/Mmax), and silent period (SP)] for the second three neuromuscular evaluations (see “Experimental protocol” in the manuscript). The differences between the two sessions (y -axes) are plotted against the mean of the two testing sessions (x -axes) for MEP/Mmax and SP for the two muscles (*rectus femoris* and *vastus lateralis* combined), as well as the distance during maximal (100% MVIC) and submaximal (75 and 50% MVIC, 20% EMG) voluntary isometric contractions. For each panel, the middle horizontal dashed line represents the mean difference between the two testing sessions (systematic bias) and the upper and lower dashed lines represent the 95% limits of agreements (random error, as $\pm 1.96 \times$ standard deviation). The solid line represents the slope of the regression.


Supplementary Figure 3 Bland-Altman plots between the sessions with or without navigated transcranial magnetic stimulation for the variables of interest [i.e., motor-evoked potential normalized to maximal compound muscle action potential (MEP/Mmax), and silent period (SP)] for the neuromuscular evaluation after the fatiguing task (see “Experimental protocol” in the manuscript). The differences between the two sessions (y -axes) are plotted against the mean of the two testing sessions (x -axes) for MEP/Mmax and SP for the two muscles (*rectus femoris* and *vastus lateralis*), as well as the distance during maximal (100% MVIC) and submaximal (75 and 50% MVIC, 20% EMG) voluntary isometric contractions. For each panel, the middle horizontal dashed line represents the mean difference between the two testing sessions (systematic bias) and the upper and lower dashed lines represent the 95% limits of agreements (random error, as $\pm 1.96 \times$ standard deviation). The solid line represents the slope of the regression.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

CB: Data curation; Formal analysis; Investigation; Visualization; Writing - review & editing. **GV:** Conceptualization; Formal analysis; Methodology; Validation; Visualization; Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **MEA, GG, FGL, AC, GFA, CM, AP:** Investigation; Writing - review & editing. **FS:** Funding acquisition; Supervision; Writing - review & editing. **MV:** Conceptualization, Methodology; Funding acquisition; Supervision, Writing - review & editing.







	<i>TMS</i>						<i>nTMS</i>				
	MEP/Mmax		SP		Distance	MEP/Mmax		SP		Distance	
	(mV·s)		(ms)		(mm)	(mV·s)		(ms)		(mm)	
	RF	VL	RF	VL		RF	VL	RF	VL		
<i>100% MVIC</i>	PRE_1	0.541 ± 0.134	0.546 ± 0.152	257 ± 39	257 ± 39	5.7 ± 4.1	0.551 ± 0.171	0.511 ± 0.120	250 ± 45	251 ± 45	5.2 ± 2.5
	PRE_2	0.530 ± 0.124	0.550 ± 0.107	263 ± 35	264 ± 36	6.0 ± 4.2	0.560 ± 0.156	0.558 ± 0.127	251 ± 46	252 ± 46	4.9 ± 2.6
	POST	0.736 ± 0.216	0.667 ± 0.254	329 ± 87	330 ± 91	7.0 ± 4.7	0.714 ± 0.219	0.645 ± 0.318	320 ± 56	322 ± 56	6.6 ± 5.3
<i>75% MVIC</i>	PRE_1	0.746 ± 0.128	0.653 ± 0.179	262 ± 38	263 ± 38	6.8 ± 4.4	0.750 ± 0.156	0.667 ± 0.128	246 ± 47	246 ± 49	3.4 ± 1.9
	PRE_2	0.719 ± 0.128	0.657 ± 0.164	260 ± 38	261 ± 38	6.5 ± 3.9	0.730 ± 0.124	0.659 ± 0.134	250 ± 47	252 ± 47	3.8 ± 2.3
	POST	0.721 ± 0.218	0.607 ± 0.194	305 ± 39	307 ± 38	7.0 ± 4.6	0.842 ± 0.169	0.642 ± 0.250	305 ± 62	306 ± 62	4.3 ± 4.0
<i>50% MVIC</i>	PRE_1	0.843 ± 0.184	0.648 ± 0.145	252 ± 43	253 ± 43	6.3 ± 4.5	0.824 ± 0.159	0.669 ± 0.162	244 ± 44	246 ± 44	2.9 ± 1.8
	PRE_2	0.802 ± 0.147	0.666 ± 0.109	257 ± 37	258 ± 37	5.8 ± 3.6	0.822 ± 0.174	0.657 ± 0.138	247 ± 44	249 ± 44	3.1 ± 1.9
	POST	0.693 ± 0.138	0.564 ± 0.163	295 ± 42	296 ± 42	5.9 ± 3.8	0.750 ± 0.128	0.553 ± 0.196	291 ± 54	293 ± 54	2.6 ± 1.7
<i>20% EMG</i>	PRE_1	0.778 ± 0.188	0.684 ± 0.187	261 ± 40	261 ± 38	6.1 ± 3.9	0.755 ± 0.169	0.616 ± 0.214	255 ± 39	257 ± 39	2.7 ± 1.1

PRE_2	0.710 ± 0.181	0.630 ± 0.188	270 ± 43	272 ± 42	6.0 ± 4.1	0.733 ± 0.173	0.602 ± 0.204	258 ± 36	260 ± 36	2.8 ± 1.3
POST	0.639 ± 0.20	0.471 ± 0.176	292 ± 50	293 ± 50	5.2 ± 3.1	0.723 ± 0.186	0.585 ± 0.312	268 ± 57	269 ± 57	3.1 ± 2.1

nTMS: Testing session with navigated transcranial magnetic stimulation, TMS: Testing session without navigated transcranial magnetic stimulation, MEP/Mmax: Motor evoked potential normalized to the compound muscle action potential, SP: silent period, MVIC: maximal voluntary isometric contraction, RF: *rectus femoris*, VL: *vastus lateralis*. Values are mean ± standard deviation.

HIGHLIGHTS

- The use of neuronavigated TMS should lead to superior targeting and stabilization of stimulus delivery.
- The use of neuronavigated TMS does not influence the corticospinal responses in unfatigued and fatigued muscle, relative to a standardized function-guided procedure.
- Function-guided procedures seem as accurate as neuronavigated TMS in the assessment of corticospinal excitability and inhibition in unfatigued and fatigued muscle, providing a trained investigator can reliably position and hold the TMS coil.