

Changes in slow and fast alpha bands in subjects submitted to different amounts of functional electrostimulation

Bruna Velasques^{a,g,*}, Marlo Cunha^{a,g}, Sergio Machado^{a,g}, Daniel Minc^a, Alexandre Abrumhosa^{d,e}, Andressa Silva^{d,e}, Luis Basile^c, Maurício Cagy^b, Roberto Piedade^a, Pedro Ribeiro^{a,d,e,f,g}

^a Brain Mapping and Sensory Motor Integration, Institute of Psychiatry of the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (IPUB/UFRJ), Brazil

^b Division of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Institute of Health Community, Federal Fluminense University (UFF), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

^c Division of Neurosurgery, University of São Paulo Medical School, Brazil

^d Laboratory of Psychophysiology, Faculdade de Psicologia e Fonoaudiologia, UMESP, Brazil

^e Castelo Branco University, Human Motricity Science, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

^f School of Physical Education, Bioscience Department (EEFD/UFRJ), Brazil

^g Brazilian Institute of Neural Bioscience (IBBN), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 11 February 2008

Received in revised form 8 June 2008

Accepted 10 June 2008

Keywords:

Functional electrostimulation

Electroencephalograph

Absolute power

Slow and fast alpha rhythm

Sensorimotor integration

ABSTRACT

Objective: To examine the changes in slow (8–10 Hz) and fast (10–12 Hz) alpha bands of EEG in three groups of subjects submitted to different amounts of functional electrostimulation (FES). Our hypothesis is that different amounts of electrostimulation may cause different patterns of activation in the sensorimotor cortex. In particular, we expect to see an increase in alpha power due to habituation effects. We examine the two bands comprised by alpha rhythm (i.e., slow and fast alpha), since these two sub-rhythms are related to distinct aspects: general energy demands and specific motor aspects, respectively. **Methods:** The sample was composed of 27 students, both sexes, aging between 25 and 40 years old. The subjects were randomly distributed in three groups: control ($n=9$), G24 ($n=9$) and G36 ($n=9$). A FES equipment (*Neuro Compact-2462*) was used to stimulate the right index finger extension. Simultaneously, the electroencephalographic signal was acquired. We investigated the absolute power in slow and fast alpha bands in the sensorimotor cortex. **Results:** The G36 indicated a significant increasing in absolute power values in lower and higher alpha components, respectively, when compared with the control group. Particularly, in the following regions: pre-motor cortex and primary motor cortex. **Discussion:** FES seems to promote cortical adaptations that are similar to those observed when someone learns a procedural task. FES application in the G36 was more effective in promoting such neural changes. The lower and higher components of alpha rhythms behave differently in their topographical distribution during FES application. These results suggest a somatotopic organization in primary motor cortex which can be represented by the fast alpha component.

© 2008 Elsevier Ireland Ltd. All rights reserved.

The functional electrostimulation (FES) is considered one useful tool to improve the process of functional rehabilitation. However, the effects of its application in relation to the brain dynamics have not been consistently explored. Few studies have investigated the effects of FES on the electroencephalographic activity (EEG). Ecard et al. [2] observed a reduction of the electroencephalographic variable (i.e., asymmetry inter-hemispheric) related to beta's rhythm (13–35 Hz) after electrostimulation in the right upper limb. The decrease in asymmetry was interpreted by researchers as an indicator of the electrocortical activity normalization. In another

experiment with FES on ischemic stroke victims, the authors argued that the normalization of the neural activity (i.e., a balance between the hemispheres) has been associated with a better clinical recovery [18]. Event-related synchronization (ERS) paradigm suggested that both limb movement and electrical stimulation of the dominant hand induced bursts of beta oscillations. Such oscillation patterns occurred within 1 s after movement/stimulation with a clear focus close to the corresponding sensorimotor representation area [8]. These oscillations might be indicative for a resonance-like behavior of connected sub-networks in sensorimotor areas. Event-related beta electroencephalographic changes during wrist movements induced by functional electrostimulation of the appropriate forearm muscles were studied. A prominent ERD was found immediately after the beginning of the FES movement. Moreover, beta ERS was seen after active wrist movements. Both changes were

* Corresponding author at: 1102, Rua Paula Brito St., Apt. #350, Andaraí, Rio de Janeiro 20541-190, RJ, Brazil. Tel.: +55 21 93043435.

E-mail address: bruna.velasques@yahoo.com.br (B. Velasques).

maximal over the contralateral primary hand area. The main difference between active and induced stimulation movements was that in the latter case, ERD was detected prior to movement onset [7]. These findings suggest that sensorimotor processing during FES is similar when individuals have to use voluntary hand movements. Therefore, the aim of the study was to examine changes in slow (8–10 Hz) and fast (10–12 Hz) alpha bands of EEG in three groups of healthy individuals submitted to different amounts of electrostimulation. Our hypothesis is that different amounts of electrostimulation may produce different patterns of activation in the sensorimotor cortex. We expect to see an increase in alpha power due to habituation effects. In particular, we expect to detect different response patterns of the two bands comprised by alpha rhythm (i.e., slow and fast alpha), since these two sub-rhythms are related to distinct aspects, general energy demands and specific motor aspects, respectively [1,4,5].

The sample was composed of 27 students (16 male and 11 female), aging between 25 and 40 years old (32.5 ± 7.5), right-handed [9]. The subjects were randomly distributed in three groups: control ($n=9$), G24 ($n=9$) and G36 ($n=9$). Inclusion criteria were absence of mental or physical impairments (screened by a previous anamnesis) and absence of the use of psychoactive or psychotropic substances. Moreover, all individuals did not have any known neuromuscular disorders. All subjects signed a consent form and were aware of all the experimental protocol. The experiment was approved by the Ethics Committee of Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (IPUB/UFRJ).

All subjects seated comfortably in a sound and light-attenuated room during the test execution. The subjects sat in a chair, with arms supported on a table right in front of them, aiming to reduce muscle's artifacts. The participants were blindfolded to reduce potential visual stimuli and eyes blink. A FES equipment was used, Ibramed's brand model *Neuro Compact* (2462). We used an eight channel microcomputer-controlled stimulator (Ibramed, *Neuro Compact-2642*), with biphasic (fixed pulse width of $320 \mu\text{s}$ for each phase), rectangular with constant-current pulses to stimulate the hands' muscle of participants. The frequency of the stimulation pulses was set in 48.8 Hz to achieve a sufficiently smooth and strong contraction of the muscles without extensive fatigue. The current amplitude was set at 2×10^{-3} A. The device consists on a current source and was used to stimulate the right index finger extension. The hand was fixed on a table and a velcro's strip was used to immobilize all other fingers, leaving only the index finger free of stimulation. Skin's resistance was measured by a multimeter (ohmmeter) and ranged from 800Ω (ohms) to 1500Ω . The skin was scraped and cleaned with alcohol, it was also used a gel between the electrodes and the skin. The electrodes were set up at 5 cm from the lateral epicondylus on the lateral forearm side, and the other 12 cm from the first one, occupying the posterior forearm side, following the index finger extensor tendon's trajectory. The experiment consisted of trials and blocks. Each trial was determined by stimulation moment (i.e., time *on*) with 4.86 s of current passage, added to a resting moment (time *off*) with 8.39 s without current passage. Each block was composed of six trials. The control group simulated four blocks (i.e., 24 trials) with 1-min period between each block without electrostimulation been applied. The current intensity for this group was naught. The G24 group was exposed to four blocks (i.e., 24 trials) of FES with 1-min interval between each block, obeying the device conditions described before. Only the G36 group was exposed to six blocks (i.e., 36 trials) of FES with 1-min interval between each block under the same conditions of G24. For G24 (i.e., four blocks) were applied 5.693 pulses with a total time of 116.64 s. For G36 (i.e., six blocks) were delivered 8.539 pulses with a total time of 174.96 s. The control group only simulated the electrostimulation procedures as described above.

Simultaneously with the electrostimulation of the extensor muscle's finger, electroencephalographic signals were acquired. The synchronization between the electrostimulator and the electroencephalographic device was established by a pulse sent to the EEG's amplifier through the auxiliary channel input, which was obtained directly from the internal stimulator frequency generator's circuit (timer 555).

The International 10/20 System for electrodes [3] was used with the 20-channel EEG system Braintech-3000 (EMSA-Medical Instruments, Brazil). The 20 electrodes were arranged in a nylon cap (ElectroCap Inc., Fairfax, VA, USA) yielding monopole derivations referred to linked earlobes. In addition, two 9-mm diameter electrodes were attached above and on the external corner of the right eye, in a bipolar electrode montage, for eye-movement (EOG) artifacts monitoring. Impedance of EEG and EOG electrodes were kept under $5\text{--}10 \text{ k}\Omega$. Visual inspection and independent component analysis (ICA) were applied to remove possible sources of artifacts produced by the task. The data acquired had total amplitude of less than $100 \mu\text{V}$. The EEG signal was amplified with a gain of 22,000, analogically filtered between 0.01 Hz (high-pass) and 100 Hz (low-pass), and sampled at 240 Hz. The software *DataAcquisition* (Delphi 5.0), developed at the Brain Mapping and Sensorimotor Integration Laboratory was employed to filter the raw data: *notch* (60 Hz), high-pass of 0.3 Hz and low-pass of 25 Hz.

To obtain reference-free data, a classic estimator was applied for the power spectral density (PSD), or directly from the square modulus of the Fourier Transform (FT), which was performed by MATLAB 5.3 (Mathworks, Inc.). The number of samples was 800 ($4\text{s} \times 200 \text{ Hz}$) with rectangular windowing. Quantitative EEG parameters were reduced to 8-s periods time-locked with movement-offset or stimulation (the selected epoch started 4 s before and ended 4 s after the trigger, i.e., moment 1 and moment 2, respectively). Thereafter, all raw EEG trials were visually controlled and trials contaminated with ocular or muscle artifacts were discarded. The Fast Fourier Transform resolution was $1/4 \text{ s} = 0.25 \text{ Hz}$ (see FFT formula below). To examine stationary, the "Run-test" and "Reverse-Arrangement test" were applied. Specially, the stationary was accepted for each 4 s (epoch's duration in this period). In this manner, based in EEG free epochs (i.e., no artifacts), a threshold given by mean added up three standard deviation was established, and epochs with total power higher than this threshold were not integrated in the analysis. Fast Fourier Transform formula is described below:

$$F_n = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} f_k e^{-i2\pi n(k/N)} = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} f_k W^{kn}, \quad n = 0, \dots, N-1$$

In order to evaluate changes in power values in each investigated electrode (i.e., F3, Fz, F4, C3, Cz, C4, P3, Pz, P4), an ANOVA *three-way* (repeated measures), a pair-wise analysis and a post hoc test (Bonferroni's test) were used. The factors group (i.e., control, G24 and G36), moment (i.e., m1: pre-stimuli moment and m2: after-stimuli moment) and block (i.e., first to last block) were compared ($p < 0.05$). The EEG absolute power values were \log_{10} transformed by SPSS software (Version 15.0) to approximate a normal distribution.

ANOVA results demonstrated an interaction between group and moment factors for slow alpha band in F3 electrode ($p < 0.05$). A pair-wise analysis indicated a significant increase in absolute power values in G36 (mean = 3.64; S.D. = 0.99) compared with control group (mean = 3.16; S.D. = 0.95) only in m1 (pre-stimulation period) as observed in Fig. 1. In relation to fast alpha band, a group main effect was observed in C3 electrode ($p < 0.05$). A post hoc analysis demonstrated a significant increase in absolute power values in G36 (mean = 4.12; S.D. = 0.85) compared with control group




Fig. 1. Absolute power in slow alpha band. An interaction was observed between group and moment factors. *Significant difference between control and G36 groups ($p < 0.05$).




Fig. 2. Absolute power on fast alpha component. A main effect for group was observed. *Significant difference between control and G36 groups ($p < 0.05$).

(mean = 3.24; S.D. = 0.79) as observed in Fig. 2. Additionally, it was presented the spatial distribution of the effects for fast alpha band as observed in Fig. 3.

The aim of the study was to examine the changes in lower (8–10 Hz) and higher (10–12 Hz) alpha bands of EEG in three groups of subjects submitted to different amounts of electrostimulation. Our hypothesis is that different amounts of electrostimulation cause different patterns of activation in the sensorimotor cortex. Specially, we expect to observe an increase in alpha power due to habituation effects. Moreover, we anticipated to detect different response patterns of the two bands comprised by alpha rhythm (i.e., lower and higher alpha), since these two sub-rhythms are related




Fig. 3. Spatial distribution of the effects was represented above with all electrodes included on the analysis for three distinct regions in the higher alpha band. C3 electrode behaves differently between the control and G36 ($*p < 0.05$).

to distinct aspects, general energy demands and specific motor aspects, respectively [1,4,5]. The results obtained in the present study suggest a significant difference between the G36 and the control group. In relation to the lower alpha, the interaction between group and moment factors indicated higher power values in G36 during m1 (i.e., moment) for the F3 electrode. The F3 electrode is placed over the left pre-motor cortex. Experiments have suggested the involvement of the pre-motor cortex during contralateral upper limb's movement [13,11,17]. When subjects had to learn visual-motor tasks, a progressive increase in alpha power was seen proportionally to the subject's skill [15]. These authors suggested that the motor learning process provides a reduction of activity in cortical areas as a consequence of automaticity. In other words, the brain becomes more efficient, developing economic strategies that only require those neural populations directly involved during the acquisition of procedural memory. This focal activation occurs simultaneously to the deactivation of other cognitive regions that became less relevant after the learning consolidation [15,10]. In our experiment, the power increasing in F3 electrode suggests that FES technique (i.e., G36 group) produced a similar effect to the motor learning over the cortical activity. In relation to higher alpha rhythm analysis, the difference between G36 and control occurred in the C3 electrode. The C3 electrode is placed over the left primary motor cortex and controls the motor execution patterns [17,16]. The group main effect observed indicates a higher power level in the G36 group when compared with the control. Therefore, FES application in the G36 group seems to have reduced activation intensity in the primary motor cortex during the movement induced by electrostimulation. Thus, our hypothesis is that FES promotes cortical adaptations that are similar to those observed when someone learns a procedural task [15,14]. One of these adaptations is the habituation of the specific sensorimotor circuits that become more efficient and economic to receive, conduct and react to the stimuli often presented [6]. Additionally, we verified a difference in the topographical distribution of lower and higher alpha rhythms in pre-motor and primary motor cortex. Researchers have suggested that lower alpha is related to non-specific brain processes to the type of task (i.e., energetic demands communes to different types of tasks). The higher alpha, however, is associated with specific sensorimotor processes and appears over the primary motor area which represents the used limb [8,12]. Our data suggest a somatotopic organization in primary motor cortex, which can be represented by the higher alpha component. On the other hand, the spread topographical distribution of lower alpha, demonstrated by other experiments [8], has not been observed in our study. One possible explanation is that during FES induced movement there is not voluntary motor intention by individuals. Thus, cortical areas related to planning, judgment and attention requested during a voluntary movement, cannot participate when the movement is induced by FES technique. We recommend new investigations to elucidate other EEG variables for a better understanding of the FES influence over the cortical dynamic. Moreover, different populations, other than healthy subjects, should also be considered for new experiments, for example, patients suffering from Parkinson Disease as an attempt to observe specific variables such as anticipatory movements, motor planning and execution. A limitation of the study present is have not accompanied the long-term changes in absolute power (i.e., post-experimental moments).

Acknowledgements

Marlo Cunha is supported by CNPq doctoral program grant. Sergio Machado is supported by CAPES master program grant. Brain Mapping and Sensory Motor Integration Lab is supported

by FAPERJ and Brazilian Institute of Neural Bioscience (IBBN). We thank Edson Colona for technical assistance with the experimental apparatus.

References

- [1] L.I. Aftanas, S.A. Golocheikine, Human anterior and frontal midline theta and lower alpha reflect emotionally positive state and internalized attention: high-resolution EEG investigation of meditation, *Neurosci. Lett.* 310 (1) (2001) 57–60, 7.
- [2] L. Ecard, A. Silva, M. Neto, H. Veiga, M. Cagy, R. Piedade, P. Ribeiro, The effects of functional electrical stimulation on cortical interhemispheric asymmetry, *Arq. Neuropsiquiatr.* 65 (2007) 642–646.
- [3] H. Jasper, The ten-twenty electrode system of international federation, *Electroencephalogr. Clin. Neurophysiol.* 10 (10) (1958) 371–375.
- [4] W. Klimesch, EEG alpha and theta oscillations reflect cognitive and memory performance: a review and analysis., *Brain Res. Brain Res. Rev.* 29 (2–3) (1999) 169–195.
- [5] W. Klimesch, M. Doppelmayr, H. Russegger, T. Pachinger, J. Schwaiger, Induced alpha band power changes in the human EEG and attention, *Neurosci. Lett.* 244 (2) (1998) 73–76, 13.
- [6] P. Luu, D.M. Tucker, R. Stripling, Neural mechanisms for learning actions in context, *Brain Res.* 1179 (2007) 89–105.
- [7] G. Müller, C. Neuper, R. Rupp, C. Keinrath, H. Gerner, G. Pfurtscheller, Event-related beta EEG changes during wrist movements induced by functional electrical stimulation of forearm muscle in man, *Neurosci. Lett.* 340 (2003) 143–147.
- [8] C. Neuper, G. Pfurtscheller, Event-related dynamics of cortical rhythms: frequency-specific features and functional correlates, *Int. J. Psychophysiol.* 43 (2001) 41–58.
- [9] R. Oldfield, The assessment and analysis of handedness: the Edinburgh inventory, *Neuropsychology* 9 (1971) 97–113.
- [10] G. Pfurtscheller, F. da Silva, Event-related EEG/MEG synchronization and desynchronization: basic principles, *Clin. Neurophysiol.* 110 (1999) 1842–1857.
- [11] G. Pfurtscheller, C. Neuper, Motor imagery activates primary sensorimotor area in humans, *Neurosci. Lett.* 239 (1997) 65–68.
- [12] G. Pfurtscheller, C. Neuper, Krausz, Functional dissociation of lower and upper frequency mu rhythms in relation to voluntary limb movement, *Clin. Neurophysiol.* 111 (2000) 1873–1879.
- [13] G. Pfurtscheller, M. Pregenzer, C. Neuper, Visualization of sensorimotor areas involved in preparation for hand movement based on classification of μ and central β rhythms in single EEG trials in man, *Neurosci. Lett.* 181 (1994) 43–46.
- [14] J. Schouenborg, Learning in sensorimotor circuits, *Curr. Opin. Neurobiol.* 14 (6) (2004) 693–697.
- [15] E. Smith, L. McEvoy, A. Gevins, Neurophysiological indices of strategy development and skill acquisition, *Cogn. Brain Res.* 7 (1999) 389–404.
- [16] A. Stancák, G. Pfurtscheller, Desynchronization and recovery of β rhythms during brisk and slow self-paced finger movements in man, *Neurosci. Lett.* 196 (1995) 21–24.
- [17] W. Szurhaj, P. Derambure, E. Labyt, F. Cassim, J. Bourriez, J. Isnard, J. Guieu, F. Mauguère, Basic mechanisms of central rhythms reactivity to preparation and execution of a voluntary movement: a stereoelectroencephalographic study, *Clin. Neurophysiol.* 114 (2003) 107–119.
- [18] F. Tecchio, F. Zappasodi, M. Tombini, Brain plasticity in recovery from stroke: an MEG assessment, *Neuroimage* 32 (2006) 1326–1334.