Deep Brain Stimulation Programming and Parameter Tuning in Parkinson's Disease: A Comprehensive Clinical Guide

Introduction to Neuromodulation in Parkinson's Disease

Deep brain stimulation (DBS) represents one of the most profound therapeutic advancements in the management of advanced Parkinson's disease (PD). Conceived as a highly effective, reversible, and tunable alternative to irreversible ablative neurosurgical procedures such as pallidotomy and thalamotomy, DBS has fundamentally transformed the therapeutic landscape for patients suffering from medically refractory motor fluctuations, levodopa-induced dyskinesia, and medication-resistant resting tremor.[1] The clinical deployment of this technology has grown exponentially over the past three decades. The United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) initially approved DBS for the treatment of essential and Parkinsonian tremor in 1997, subsequently expanding the indication to encompass advanced Parkinson's symptoms in 2002, and further extending approval for earlier stages of the disease in 2016 for patients who have been diagnosed for at least four years and whose motor symptoms are inadequately controlled with oral pharmacotherapy.[4] Most recently, in 2024 and 2025, regulatory bodies have approved the commercial utilization of closed-loop, adaptive deep brain stimulation (aDBS) algorithms, marking a paradigm shift in how electrical therapy is delivered to the human brain.[4]

Despite these monumental regulatory and technological milestones, the surgical implantation of the deep brain stimulation electrode represents only the anatomical prerequisite for successful therapy. The ultimate clinical efficacy of the intervention relies entirely upon the meticulous, postoperative programming of the implantable pulse generator (IPG).[6] Programming is an iterative, highly nuanced, and notoriously labor-intensive process that seeks to tailor the electrical field to the unique neuroanatomy and pathological electrophysiological environment of the individual patient.[7] Historically, this endeavor has been profoundly empirical, relying on the subjective clinical acumen of movement disorder specialists who must manually navigate an extensive, multidimensional parameter space consisting of voltage, pulse width, frequency, and complex electrode contact configurations.[7] This traditional monopolar review process is fraught with inefficiencies, typically requiring more than a dozen hours of specialized clinical labor per patient distributed over multiple longitudinal follow-up visits spanning three to six months.[1] Consequently, the sheer complexity of device programming represents a

significant bottleneck in clinical practice, limiting broader accessibility to the therapy despite an estimated 263,000 DBS devices having been implanted globally.[7]

The inherent complexity of programming is further compounded by the rapid introduction of next-generation hardware. The evolution from simple cylindrical ring contacts to segmented directional leads that enable horizontal current steering, alongside advanced stimulation paradigms such as temporal interleaving and fractionalized multiple independent current control (MICC), has exponentially increased the degrees of freedom available to the programmer.[1] While these engineering innovations theoretically expand the therapeutic window by allowing precise sculpting of the volume of tissue activated (VTA) to avoid side-effect-inducing neural tracts, they threaten to overwhelm standard heuristic programming approaches.[3]

Therefore, there is an urgent clinical imperative to transition from purely subjective, symptom-driven programming paradigms toward objective, biomarker-driven, and algorithmically assisted methodologies.[7] The advent of sensing-enabled IPGs, capable of recording local field potentials (LFPs) directly from the implanted basal ganglia electrodes, provides a real-time window into the neurophysiological state of the patient.[13] This continuous stream of physiological data forms the foundation of adaptive DBS, which dynamically modulates stimulation intensity based on beta-band oscillatory power, a proven biomarker that correlates strongly with the fluctuating dopaminergic state and symptom severity of the patient.[4] This comprehensive analysis exhaustively details the explainable parameters of DBS, targeted anatomical programming strategies, side-effect mitigation protocols, and the integration of novel electrophysiological, kinematic, and artificial intelligence technologies within the modern clinical programming workflow.

Core Explainable Parameters in Neurostimulation

The clinical efficacy of deep brain stimulation is dictated by the precise physical manipulation of the electrical field generated at the electrode-tissue interface. This electrical field is governed by three primary explainable parameters: amplitude, pulse width, and frequency.[6] Understanding the independent biophysical properties and the synergistic neurophysiological impacts of these variables is absolutely essential for rational, data-driven programming.

The total energy delivered to the surrounding neural tissue can be mathematically quantified using the Total Electrical Energy Delivered (TEED) equation. The TEED metric serves as a vital clinical proxy for estimating both the rate of IPG battery consumption and the relative spatial exposure of brain tissue during parameter titration:

$$TEED = \frac{(Voltage^2 \times Frequency \times PulseWidth)}{Impedance}$$

By analyzing clinical trial conditions where the TEED is held constant while individual parameters

are systematically varied, researchers have been able to isolate the specific physiological contributions of amplitude, frequency, and pulse width to the resolution of distinct Parkinsonian symptoms.[17]

Amplitude: Voltage and Current Control

Amplitude determines the spatial extent, or penetration, of the electrical field into the surrounding brain parenchyma.[6] Historically measured in voltage (V), modern IPG systems increasingly utilize current-controlled stimulation measured in milliamperes (mA). Current-controlled systems are generally preferred in contemporary practice because they automatically adjust the voltage output to compensate for longitudinal fluctuations in tissue impedance at the electrode-tissue interface, thereby ensuring a stable volume of neural activation over the lifespan of the device.[1]

Extensive clinical evidence overwhelmingly identifies amplitude as the single most critical determinant for modulating pathological basal ganglia activity and achieving target engagement.[17] The relationship between the stimulation amplitude and clinical improvement in the classic Parkinsonian triad—resting tremor, rigidity, and bradykinesia—is highly linear up to the point of side-effect induction.[17] Studies utilizing double-blind, randomized evaluations of subthalamic nucleus (STN) stimulation have conclusively demonstrated that voltages of $\geq$ V (or the equivalent current amplitude) yield the most profound and statistically significant clinical improvements across all primary motor signs.[17] However, as the amplitude increases, the VTA expands outward in a roughly spherical pattern (when utilizing traditional omnidirectional ring contacts). This geometric expansion increases the probability of current spread into adjacent, non-target anatomical tracts, such as the internal capsule, thereby defining the absolute upper limit of the therapeutic window.[6]

Frequency

Frequency, measured in Hertz (Hz), defines the rate of electrical pulses delivered per second. The therapeutic mechanisms underlying DBS in Parkinson's disease are fundamentally frequency-dependent.[18] Pathological activity within the basal ganglia in PD is characterized by hypersynchronous oscillatory bursting, particularly within the beta frequency band (13–30 Hz).[20] Chronic, high-frequency stimulation is theorized to act as an informational lesion; it disrupts these pathological low-frequency oscillations and replaces them with a regularized, stimulus-entrained firing pattern that restores physiological information flow through the cortico-basal ganglia-thalamocortical loops.

Rigorous parameter testing reveals that maximal therapeutic benefits for tremor, bradykinesia, and rigidity are achieved strictly at high frequencies, specifically at or above 130 Hz.[17] While measurable improvements in muscular rigidity may begin to emerge at frequencies as low as 33 Hz, and tremor reduction may be observed at 50 Hz, a distinct "ceiling effect" for overall motor benefit is generally established around 130 Hz.[17] Consequently, 130 Hz remains the

universal default starting frequency in standard clinical programming heuristics.[17] Testing higher frequencies, up to 185 Hz, can sometimes yield additional therapeutic benefits for patients presenting with highly refractory tremor; however, increasing the frequency to this degree significantly accelerates IPG battery depletion and must be weighed against device longevity.[17]

Conversely, low-frequency stimulation (LFS) in the context of standard amplitude and pulse width settings is not only clinically ineffective but can be overtly detrimental. For example, a stimulation rate of 5 Hz has been shown to significantly exacerbate akinesia, severely worsening the patient's ability to initiate voluntary movement.[17] Interestingly, recent experimental murine models and retrospective human data analyses indicate that low-frequency stimulation can relieve bradykinesia if, and only if, it is explicitly paired with massive compensatory adjustments, such as significantly greater pulse widths and higher amplitudes.[18] This complex interaction suggests that a composite metric incorporating all three parameters predicts therapeutic efficacy more accurately than analyzing frequency in isolation, though high-frequency stimulation remains the undisputed standard of care.[18]

Pulse Width

Pulse width, measured in microseconds (μs), defines the duration of each individual electrical pulse. Modulating the pulse width exploits the differential chronaxie properties of various neural elements within the brain.[6] Large, myelinated axons (such as those comprising the corticobulbar and corticospinal tracts) possess shorter chronaxies, meaning they are depolarized more readily by shorter pulse durations than smaller target neurons or unmyelinated fibers.[8]

The classical starting pulse width for PD programming is 60 μs, an empirically derived value that is highly effective for target engagement while remaining energy-efficient.[17] Clinical trials manipulating parameters under constant TEED paradigms have concluded that the most effective combination for treating PD motor signs is the highest tolerated amplitude paired with the narrowest possible pulse width.[17] Advancements in IPG hardware, such as the Boston Scientific Vercise system, now allow clinicians to lower the pulse width to levels well below 60 μs. Utilizing ultra-short pulse widths selectively narrows the electrical field's influence on large myelinated bystander tracts. This represents a highly critical, explainable parameter adjustment when patients experience dose-limiting side effects, such as dysarthria or facial muscle contractions, at the voltages necessary for symptom control.[21] By utilizing a narrower pulse width, the clinician can safely increase the amplitude to penetrate deeper into the target nucleus without inadvertently activating the adjacent internal capsule.[21]

Parameter Synergies and Programming Baselines

To synthesize these biophysical principles into actionable clinical heuristics, the established

relationships between core parameters and Parkinsonian symptoms are delineated in the following matrix.

Parameter Axis	Optimal Clinical Range	Physiological Effect & Clinical Consequence
Amplitude (Voltage/Current)	$\geq$ V (titrated to side effect threshold)	Yields linear improvement in tremor, rigidity, and bradykinesia. Represents the most critical factor for achieving robust target engagement.
Frequency (High)	$\geq$ Hz	Disrupts pathological beta oscillations. Exhibits a clinical ceiling effect for most motor symptoms at ~130 Hz. Frequencies >185 Hz may be deployed for highly refractory tremor.
Frequency (Low)	5 Hz to 50 Hz	Generally sub-therapeutic. A rate of 5 Hz significantly worsens akinesia. Frequencies between 33-50 Hz may begin to modestly improve rigidity but fail to control the full motor triad.
Pulse Width	$\leq$ μs	Narrow widths actively minimize the inadvertent activation of large myelinated bystander tracts, thereby allowing for higher therapeutic amplitudes without inducing capsular side effects.

Table 1: The biophysical impact of variations in core electrical parameters on Parkinson's

disease motor symptoms under controlled clinical paradigms.[17]

Anatomical Target Selection and Differential Programming: STN vs. GPi

The baseline parameters and overarching clinical programming goals are deeply influenced by the anatomical target selected during the preoperative surgical planning phase. In the treatment of Parkinson's disease, the two primary, FDA-approved targets for deep brain stimulation are the subthalamic nucleus (STN) and the globus pallidus internus (GPi).[21] While multiple Class I randomized controlled trials—including the landmark Veterans Affairs (VA) study and the Netherlands Subthalamic and Pallidal Stimulation (NSTAPS) trial—have rigorously demonstrated that both targets are equally effective in improving general quality of life and overall motor function, their distinct neuroanatomical connectivity and local environments necessitate fundamentally different programming strategies.[23]

Subthalamic Nucleus (STN) Programming Profile

The STN is a diminutive, densely packed, lens-shaped nucleus located immediately ventral to the thalamus and dorsal to the substantia nigra. Due to its dense cellular architecture and incredibly high degree of interconnectivity within the basal ganglia, STN DBS requires substantially less electrical energy to achieve widespread, potent neuromodulatory effects.[3]

A primary strategic advantage of STN DBS is its profound capacity to facilitate a massive reduction in postoperative dopaminergic medication. Programming an STN device is almost universally conducted in tandem with an aggressive, supervised tapering of oral levodopa and dopamine agonists.[2] Clinical studies demonstrate that STN DBS can achieve an average Levodopa Equivalent Daily Dose (LEDD) reduction of over 50%. Specifically, the 3-year outcomes of the NSTAPS trial revealed median LEDD reductions from 1,060 mg preoperatively down to 605 mg postoperatively in the STN cohort.[3] This aggressive medication reduction is an essential programming goal for patients suffering from severe dopaminergic side effects, such as medically refractory levodopa-induced dyskinesia or hyperdopaminergic neuropsychiatric behavioral syndromes, including impulse control disorders.[2] Furthermore, long-term longitudinal follow-up indicates that STN DBS may provide superior preservation of off-medication motor improvements for up to 15 years post-implantation compared to GPi stimulation.[24]

However, the STN's highly compact size and immediate proximity to highly sensitive neuroanatomical structures make programming this target highly unforgiving. The therapeutic window within the STN is often significantly narrower than in the GPi.[3] Ventral spread of the electrical field into the substantia nigra pars reticulata or the medial forebrain bundle can rapidly induce acute, severe psychiatric side effects. These include acute hypomania, severe depression, or sudden subjective feelings of extreme anger and confusion.[23] Large multi-center

trials have consistently shown a higher risk of mood disturbances and a measurable deterioration in specific neurocognitive domains—most notably letter verbal fluency—following STN DBS compared to GPi DBS.[23] Consequently, programmers must meticulously avoid ventral field expansion if any mood or cognitive shifts are detected during the monopolar review.[25]

Globus Pallidus Internus (GPi) Programming Profile

The GPi is a substantially larger anatomical structure situated lateral to the internal capsule. Because of its larger volume and specific spatial fiber orientation, achieving comparable motor control via GPi DBS generally demands higher stimulation amplitudes and wider pulse widths than STN DBS.[3] Consequently, GPi programming places a significantly higher demand on the IPG battery, resulting in far more frequent battery depletion and surgical replacement cycles if non-rechargeable primary cell systems are utilized.[3] Data from the NSTAPS trial highlighted these parameter discrepancies; while stimulation frequencies were nearly identical between the two targets (134 $\pm$ 22 Hz for GPi versus 138 $\pm$ 18 Hz for STN), the pulse width required to achieve efficacy in the GPi group was significantly wider (70 $\pm$ 17 μs) compared to the STN group (63 $\pm$ 11 μs), and mean amplitudes were slightly higher (3.0 V vs 2.8 V).[24]

Despite the high energetic cost, the GPi is often selected as the preferred target for patients presenting with mild baseline cognitive decline, prominent axial symptoms (such as severe gait instability and freezing), or debilitating hyperkinesia.[3] The GPi exerts a highly potent, direct anti-dyskinetic effect. Unlike STN programming, which relies heavily on the indirect mechanism of medication reduction to manage dyskinesia, GPi programming suppresses dyskinetic movements directly, independent of any changes to the patient's pharmacological regimen.[3] Therefore, clinicians program GPi devices without the mandatory expectation of aggressive LEDD reduction.[3] Furthermore, the side-effect profile regarding mood and cognition is significantly more benign in the GPi, allowing clinicians to titrate amplitudes more aggressively with less concern for inducing psychiatric instability or cognitive decline.[23]

Clinical Programming Metric	**Subthalamic Nucleus (STN)**	**Globus Pallidus Internus (GPi)**
Medication Reduction (LEDD)	High (Average >50% reduction)	Low (Direct symptom suppression utilized instead)
Battery / Energy Demand	Low (Dense nucleus requires lower TEED)	High (Larger volume requires wider pulse widths and amplitudes)

Dyskinesia Management	Indirect (Achieved via post-op medication tapering)	Direct (Robust intrinsic anti-dyskinetic effect)
Cognitive & Psychiatric Risk	Higher risk (Verbal fluency decline, mood lability with ventral spread)	Lower risk (More benign neurocognitive safety profile)
Long-Term Efficacy Duration	Sustained off-medication motor improvements up to 15 years	Evidence suggests potential wear-off in efficacy between 5 to 10 years

Table 2: Differential programming considerations and clinical profiles for the primary deep brain stimulation targets in Parkinson's disease.[3]

Navigating the Therapeutic Window and Side Effect Management

The central, overriding objective of clinical DBS programming is to maximize the therapeutic window (TW). The TW is strictly defined as the functional gap between the minimum stimulation threshold required to alleviate Parkinsonian motor symptoms and the minimum threshold that elicits intolerable, stimulation-induced adverse effects.[6] Adverse side effects occur when the VTA expands beyond the intended sensorimotor territory of the target nucleus and inadvertently depolarizes adjacent, functionally distinct anatomical tracts.[8]

Anatomical Mapping of Adverse Effects

Understanding the precise spatial relationship between the implanted electrode and the surrounding tracts provides an explainable, mechanistic framework for troubleshooting adverse effects during the programming session:

1. **Corticobulbar and Corticospinal Tracts (CSBT):** These massive, heavily myelinated motor tracts run directly through the internal capsule, which is located immediately lateral to the STN and medial to the GPi. Lateral current spread in STN DBS (or medial spread in GPi DBS) directly activates the CSBT. This manifests clinically as focal muscle contractions, facial pulling, and profound dysarthria (speech impairment).[8] Post-operative mapping studies utilizing electromyography (EMG) to objectively detect motor evoked potentials indicate that subclinical CSBT activation occurs frequently at therapeutic thresholds, creating a hard, immutable limit on amplitude escalation.[28]
2. **Medial Lemniscus:** Located immediately posterior to the STN, activation of this ascending sensory pathway causes sudden, persistent paresthesia (tingling, buzzing, or numbness) in

the contralateral limbs.[8] While transient paresthesia upon initial stimulation activation is common and frequently habituates within seconds to minutes, persistent paresthesia is a definitive indicator of undesirable posterior current spread.

3. **Cerebellothalamic Tract:** Inferior to the thalamus, unintended stimulation of this network can induce stimulation-induced ataxia or severely exacerbate gait and balance impairments.[31]

Standardized Algorithms for Side Effect Mitigation

To standardize clinical responses to these complex spatial challenges, leading centers of excellence, such as the Toronto Western Hospital (TWH), have developed rigorously structured heuristic algorithms tailored to resolving distinct post-DBS symptoms.[21]

Managing Stimulation-Induced Dysarthria: Speech impairment is among the most common, functionally debilitating, and distressing side effects of DBS, reported in 9% up to 75% of patients depending on the specific target utilized and the assessment methodology employed.[31] When a patient presents with dysarthria, the clinician must first systematically determine if the speech deficit is an underlying feature of Parkinson's disease progression or if it is entirely stimulation-induced. This differentiation is achieved by evaluating the patient's speech performance in a completely OFF-stimulation and OFF-medication state.[21] If the dysarthria is confirmed to be stimulation-induced, the TWH algorithm recommends a progressive series of interventions:

- Immediately reducing the stimulation amplitude on the lateral-facing contacts to pull the electrical field away from the internal capsule.[21]
- Switching the programming from a standard monopolar configuration to a bipolar configuration. By utilizing a distal contact as the cathode and an adjacent proximal contact as the anode, the clinician can tightly restrict and shape the VTA, preventing wide spherical spread.[33]
- Reducing the pulse width to levels well below 60 μs. This explicitly exploits chronaxie differences, rendering the large, rapidly conducting CSBT fibers less excitable while maintaining therapeutic control over the smaller neurons of the target nucleus.[21]
- In highly refractory cases, deploying low-frequency stimulation (LFS) has shown anecdotal clinical success, particularly in the subset of patients who have a prior history of developmental stuttering.[21]

Managing Stimulation-Induced Dyskinesia: During the initial programming of an STN device, the sudden onset of dyskinesia at very low voltage thresholds is paradoxically considered a highly positive prognostic indicator. It serves as physiological confirmation of highly accurate electrode placement directly within the optimal sensorimotor territory.[21] However, this hyperkinesia must be actively managed to prevent patient distress. The immediate clinical response is not necessarily to alter the stimulation parameters; rather, the clinician must aggressively reduce the concurrent dose of oral levodopa, especially if the observed

dyskinesia is peak-dose or biphasic in nature.[21] If severe dyskinesia persists despite exhaustive medication optimization, the programming algorithm dictates:

- Initiating slow, micro-incremental amplitude titrations. Instead of standard 0.5 V jumps, the clinician uses ultra-fine adjustments of 0.05 V to 0.1 V per step, paired with extended clinical observation periods to prevent overshoot.[21]
- Shifting the active contact dorsally along the electrode array. Dorsal STN stimulation intentionally encroaches upon the overlying Zona Incerta (ZI) and the pallidofugal fibers, which convey GPi outflow to the motor thalamus. Activation of these specific dorsal elements has a heavily documented, direct anti-dyskinetic effect, thereby safely expanding the therapeutic window.[8]

Target Side Effect	Suspected Anatomical Locus	First-Line Programming Heuristic	Second-Line Rescue Strategy
Dysarthria / Facial Contraction	Internal Capsule (Corticobulbar Tract)	Reduce amplitude on lateral contacts; Decrease pulse width <60 μs	Switch to strict bipolar configuration; Test low-frequency stimulation
Persistent Paresthesia	Medial Lemniscus	Shift cathodic contact anteriorly	Utilize directional steering to direct current anterior-medial
Stimulation-Induced Dyskinesia	Optimal STN sensorimotor territory	Aggressive reduction of concurrent levodopa dosing	Micro-titrate amplitude (0.05V steps); Shift stimulation dorsally toward Zona Incerta
Worsening Akinesia	Inadequate frequency	Ensure frequency is $\geq$ Hz	Check for inappropriate low-frequency (e.g., 5 Hz) settings

Table 3: Explainable parameter adjustments and structured heuristics for the mitigation of common deep brain stimulation side effects.[8]

Advanced Hardware and Spatial Programming Strategies

When conventional parameter adjustments (amplitude, pulse width, frequency, and monopolar/bipolar configurations) fail to resolve dose-limiting side effects or inadequately control the patient's motor symptoms, clinicians must leverage the capabilities of advanced hardware. The introduction of segmented directional leads and multiple independent current control (MICC) technology has revolutionized the spatial programming of DBS systems.[3]

Directional Current Steering

Modern DBS electrodes—such as the Abbott Infinity, Boston Scientific Vercise/Cartesia, and Medtronic Percept lines—replace the traditional solid cylindrical ring contacts with segmented contacts. Typically, the middle two levels of the four-contact array are split into three distinct 120-degree radial segments.[9] This segmented architecture allows clinicians to actively steer the electrical field horizontally, activating tissue asymmetrically around the longitudinal axis of the lead.[8] Furthermore, MICC technology utilizes a dedicated power source for each individual electrode segment, allowing for the precise fractionalization of current and the creation of highly customized, non-spherical electrical fields.[1]

The primary clinical heuristic for deploying current steering is the avoidance of the corticobulbar and corticospinal tracts in cases of sub-optimal lead placement.[6] By activating a single segment facing away from the internal capsule, the volume of tissue activated is highly lateralized. At standard therapeutic current strengths (ranging from 1.5 to 3.5 mA), activating a single segment directs approximately 75% of the electrical field to one side of the electrode, radically minimizing current spread to the contralateral, side-effect-inducing structures.[27] The clinical impact of this technology is profound. The VANTAGE study and subsequent investigations have demonstrated that identifying the "best direction" and steering current accordingly can yield a massive 91% gain in the therapeutic window and a 31% reduction in the therapeutic current strength required for symptom suppression compared to omnidirectional stimulation.[6] Furthermore, utilizing directional stimulation does not negatively impact the predicted lifespan of the IPG; in fact, optimized steering can achieve an 85% total activation volume utilizing only 69% of the amplitude required by a non-directional configuration.[6]

Early vs. Delayed Steered Stimulation Algorithms: The introduction of directional leads presents a logistical challenge for the programmer. A single directional lead offers 8 potential cathodic configurations (2 full rings plus 6 individual segments) per hemisphere. Testing all combinations drastically increases the time burden of the initial monopolar review.[34] To manage this complexity, clinicians utilize two primary algorithmic heuristics:

- **Early Steered Stimulation (ESS):** A comprehensive, segment-by-segment review is conducted immediately upon system activation. The programmer meticulously evaluates the clinical thresholds for every single segment and selects the specific configuration

offering the widest therapeutic window from the outset. While highly rigorous and likely to yield the absolute optimal setting, this method more than doubles the time required for initial programming.[34]

- **Delayed Steered Stimulation (DSS):** The initial review is conducted solely in "ring mode," effectively simulating a conventional unsegmented lead by activating all three segments at a given level simultaneously. Directional steering is only introduced in a delayed fashion as a troubleshooting mechanism if side effects (e.g., capsular activation or severe dyskinesia) restrict the therapeutic window.[34]

Clinical outcome data reveals that both ESS and DSS approaches are equally effective at the 3-month follow-up regarding overall motor scores and battery consumption.[34] However, approximately 70% of electrodes initially programmed using the DSS strategy are eventually switched to steered mode to optimize their therapeutic window, resolve capsular side effects, or provide better STN coverage at lower amplitudes.[34] Nonetheless, DSS represents a far more time-efficient heuristic for initial clinic visits and is widely adopted as the standard of care unless immediate complications arise.

Programming Strategy	Methodological Approach	Time Efficiency	Clinical Indication / Rationale
Conventional Ring	Activates all segments at a level simultaneously	High (4 conditions/side)	Optimal lead placement confirmed; broad target engagement desired with minimal side effects.
Early Steered (ESS)	Exhaustive segment-by-segment threshold review at activation	Low (8+ conditions/side)	Suspected sub-optimal lead placement; highly challenging anatomy requiring immediate precision.
Delayed Steered (DSS)	Begins in ring mode; steering utilized only if side effects occur	Medium (Escalates only as needed)	Standard clinical default; balances time efficiency with the flexibility to troubleshoot if the

			therapeutic window narrows.

Table 4: Comparison of directional lead programming strategies and their clinical deployment heuristics.[34]

Interleaving Stimulation

Interleaving is a highly sophisticated temporal programming strategy employed when spatial steering is either insufficient or hardware-unavailable.[1] It involves the rapid, alternating sequential activation of two separate electrode contacts utilizing two entirely independent programs (e.g., Contact A fires its pulse, followed immediately by Contact B firing its pulse).[1] The critical advantage of interleaving is that each program can be configured with completely distinct voltage and pulse width parameters, allowing for highly customized, dual-focal stimulation.[1]

The clinical rationale for deploying interleaving centers on three complex scenarios:

1. **Dual Target Activation:** When a patient suffers from highly divergent symptoms that require the simultaneous stimulation of anatomically distinct sub-regions. For example, a clinician may interleave stimulation of the ventral STN (using parameters optimized for rigidity) with stimulation of the dorsal Zona Incerta (using different parameters optimized for refractory tremor or dyskinesia).[1]
2. **Side-Effect Circumvention:** When the therapeutic benefit at a primary contact requires a voltage that induces intolerable side effects, the programmer can interleave the primary contact at a sub-threshold voltage with a secondary adjacent contact at a sub-threshold voltage. The additive spatial effect in the overlapping tissue may provide therapeutic relief without triggering the adjacent tract.[1]
3. **Co-morbidities:** For complex patients presenting with overlapping diagnoses, such as concurrent Parkinson's disease and severe Essential Tremor, interleaving allows the simultaneous but distinct stimulation of two different functional networks (e.g., the thalamus and the STN).[1]

Despite its immense versatility, interleaving possesses major technical limitations. Most critically, existing commercial systems restrict both interleaved programs to identical frequencies.[1] This prevents the clinician from optimizing high-frequency benefits for tremor on one contact while utilizing lower frequencies for gait on another.[1] Furthermore, running two continuous, alternating stimulation pulses effectively doubles the IPG duty cycle. This leads to extremely rapid and severe battery depletion, making interleaving highly problematic for patients implanted with non-rechargeable devices.[1]

Electrophysiological Biomarkers and Adaptive DBS

(aDBS)

Perhaps the most transformative advancement in the history of DBS programming is the transition from purely clinical, symptom-driven evaluation to electrophysiologically guided tuning. This paradigm shift is facilitated by sensing-enabled IPGs capable of recording local field potentials (LFPs) directly from the implanted DBS electrodes.[14]

The Beta Band as an Objective Biomarker

In the Parkinsonian basal ganglia, the power of oscillatory electrical activity within the beta frequency band (13–30 Hz) serves as a highly robust, objective biomarker for the patient's clinical motor state.[13] Beta power fluctuates dynamically in direct correlation with symptom severity: it is highly elevated during the unmedicated "OFF" state (correlating with severe rigidity and bradykinesia) and is actively suppressed by the administration of dopaminergic medication and the application of high-frequency electrical stimulation.[20] By interrogating the LFP data recorded directly from the STN or GPi, clinicians can visualize the patient's objective neurophysiological status entirely independent of subjective reporting or transient clinical presentations in the office.[36] Randomized, blinded, cross-over clinical trials demonstrate that programming guided exclusively by beta-LFP mapping achieves a clinical efficacy equal to traditional, painstaking monopolar review, but accomplishes this significantly faster, cutting total clinical programming time by over 50%.[36]

The aDBS Programming Pipeline

The ultimate culmination of LFP sensing technology is adaptive DBS (aDBS). Recently approved for commercial use in 2024 and 2025 (most notably the Medtronic Percept system featuring BrainSense technology), aDBS transforms the IPG into a fully closed-loop brain-computer interface.[4] The ADAPT-PD pivotal trial successfully demonstrated the chronic safety and global clinical effectiveness of this approach.[15] In an aDBS system, the device continuously monitors the magnitude of the beta peak in real-time and automatically scales the stimulation amplitude up or down based on the instantaneous neurophysiological demand of the brain.[13] This continuous adaptation prevents the overtreatment that causes debilitating dyskinesia during medication "ON" states, and the undertreatment that leaves the patient frozen and immobile during medication "OFF" states.[13]

However, implementing aDBS introduces a highly novel, computationally intensive three-step algorithmic workflow for the clinician, fundamentally altering the standard programming paradigm [13]:

1. Biomarker Selection and Contact Identification: The foundation of successful aDBS is the identification of a stable, responsive beta peak. This is best accomplished by recording an LFP spectrogram while the patient is completely withdrawn from dopaminergic medication.[13] In approximately 18% of hemispheres, beta peaks may be completely obscured if the patient is

evaluated while "ON" medication, necessitating overnight withdrawal to ensure the system is tracking a legitimate signal.[13] If multiple peaks are present, the clinician must administer medication or continuous test stimulation to identify which specific peak is truly responsive to therapy.[13] The electrode contact exhibiting the highest beta signal-to-noise ratio is selected as the sensing contact, which ideally converges with the optimal therapeutic stimulation contact.[13] In cases of poor signal integrity, unilateral sensing from one hemisphere can be utilized to drive bilateral stimulation.[13]

2. Acute Setup and Dual-Threshold Definition: Once the biomarker is isolated, the clinician establishes the absolute boundaries for stimulation. Rather than setting a single, fixed amplitude, the clinician defines a lower amplitude limit (averaging 0.33 mA below the patient's standard continuous DBS amplitude) and an upper amplitude limit (averaging 0.23 mA above the standard cDBS amplitude).[13] Crucially, the programmer must then define the dual LFP thresholds—an upper and lower electrophysiological boundary for beta power. The logic dictates that when the brain's beta power exceeds the upper threshold (indicating a worsening Parkinsonian state), the algorithm triggers an automatic ramp-up in stimulation amplitude toward the upper limit. Conversely, when beta power drops below the lower threshold (indicating sufficient dopaminergic medication effect), the stimulation automatically ramps down to conserve battery and prevent dyskinesia.[13]

3. Iterative Optimization and Artifact Management: The final step is chronic, iterative optimization over several weeks. The clinician reviews timeline data generated by the IPG during the patient's at-home usage to verify that the stimulation is correctly oscillating in phase with the patient's known medication cycles.[13] If the timeline shows the amplitude remaining permanently pinned at the lower limit, the upper LFP threshold is likely set too high, preventing the system from responding to sleep-related beta suppression and early-morning OFF states.[13] Conversely, if stimulation is pinned at the upper limit, the lower LFP threshold must be raised.[13] A major, persistent challenge in this iterative phase is the management of movement artifacts.[13] Ambulatory actions, such as walking, can generate broad-spectrum electrical noise that the system erroneously misinterprets as an elevation in true beta activity. This false signal triggers an inappropriate, rapid increase in stimulation, which can acutely induce severe gait-related dyskinesia.[13] Clinicians must rely on high-resolution spectrograms to differentiate true beta synchronization from artifactual broadband noise and adjust the adaptation rates or system boundaries accordingly.[13] Despite this immense complexity—with patients requiring an average of nearly 8 clinical visits to fully optimize the dual thresholds—aDBS has proven highly effective in mitigating persistent motor fluctuations, yielding statistically significant improvements in overall patient well-being compared to continuous stimulation.[13]

aDBS Pipeline Phase	Clinical Action Required	Potential Pitfalls & Troubleshooting

1. Biomarker Selection	Record LFPs in "OFF" medication state to locate beta peak; assign sensing contact.	Beta peak absent if patient is "ON" medication; Unilateral sensing required if signal-to-noise ratio is poor.
2. Threshold Definition	Define Upper/Lower stimulation limits (+0.23 mA / -0.33 mA); Define Upper/Lower LFP triggers.	Improper LFP thresholds lead to stimulation being permanently pinned at upper or lower limits, defeating the adaptive purpose.
3. Artifact Management	Review at-home timeline data; adjust adaptation rates to ignore broadband noise.	Walking/movement generates artifacts mimicking beta, causing inappropriate amplitude spikes and severe dyskinesia.

Table 5: The three-step clinical programming pipeline and troubleshooting heuristics for closed-loop, adaptive deep brain stimulation (aDBS).[13]

Algorithmic, Subjective, and Automated Programming Assistive Technologies

As the combinatorial complexity of directional segmented leads, temporal interleaving, and real-time LFP monitoring far exceeds human cognitive bandwidth, the field of neuromodulation is rapidly adopting advanced computational decision-support tools, predictive algorithms, and explainable artificial intelligence (XAI) to assist clinicians in traversing the parameter space.[7]

Image-Guided Visualization Software

Patient-specific computational modeling software—such as Boston Scientific's Guide XT and Abbott's Informity—integrates preoperative MRI scans, postoperative CT scans, and proprietary biophysical algorithms to generate highly precise, 3D visualizations of the implanted lead relative to the patient's individual neuroanatomy.[9] These advanced systems superimpose a predictive Volume of Tissue Activation (VTA) based on the currently selected electrical parameters directly onto the anatomical structures.[9] By "unblinding the brain," clinicians can visually evaluate whether a proposed directional setting or amplitude increase will impinge upon the internal capsule before ever applying the current to the patient.[9]

Furthermore, mapping large cohorts of patient outcomes to these standardized anatomical atlases has allowed researchers to delineate exact sub-nuclear targets for specific symptoms, isolating distinct neural tracts that govern axial rigidity versus distal tremor with unprecedented accuracy.[38]

Wearable Sensor-Based Functional Mapping (SBFM)

The inherently subjective nature of standard clinical scoring paradigms (such as the UPDRS Part III) introduces significant inter-rater variability and inaccuracies during parameter testing. Novel medical device systems seek to eliminate this subjectivity by utilizing wearable motion sensors to provide highly granular, objective kinematic data during programming sessions.[40] In systems deploying Sensor-Based Functional Mapping (SBFM), the clinician initiates a software-driven algorithm that systematically cycles through various parameter combinations autonomously.[1] The wearable sensors objectively quantify the exact degree of tremor or bradykinesia suppression for each iterative step. The software then processes this closed-loop data to automatically generate a symptom response map and recommends the absolute optimal setting designed to maximize symptom control while minimizing side effects and battery drain.[1] In randomized cross-over trials comparing SBFM to standard-of-care (SoC) programming, SBFM-guided programming yielded motor improvements statistically identical to those achieved by elite experts, but required drastically fewer parameter tests (a median of 9 iterations versus 31 manually) and reduced the median programming time from 39 minutes to just 22 minutes.[40]

Incorporating Subjective Patient Feedback

While objective kinematic assessments are vital, recent multi-center diagnostic trials emphasize the profound clinical utility of integrating subjective patient feedback directly into the programming loop. Utilizing a simple Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) to capture a patient's immediate, subjective perception of overall well-being during acute parameter screening provides an explainable, highly data-driven feedback mechanism.[11]

Retrospective connectomic analyses pairing VAS scores with computational VTA modeling have revealed a striking convergence: the specific parameters eliciting the highest subjective patient ratings consistently localize exactly to the dorsolateral STN.[41] This anatomical region aligns perfectly with the established, optimal "sweet spots" derived from purely objective clinical data.[41] Furthermore, structural connectivity profiles of these VAS-guided VTAs demonstrate remarkably strong functional connections to the supplementary motor area (SMA) and primary motor cortex (M1), reinforcing the validity of the patient's subjective experience as a highly accurate proxy for therapeutic network engagement.[11] Subjective-guided programming achieves tremor and rigidity control equivalent to standard objective review but frequently achieves this at significantly lower stimulation intensities, highlighting it as an efficient, patient-centric mechanism for parameter tuning.[42]

Explainable AI and Machine Learning in Parameter Selection

Artificial intelligence represents the absolute frontier of personalized DBS programming. However, due to the high-stakes, life-altering nature of neurosurgery, traditional "black-box" AI models are widely rejected by clinicians who require transparent, mechanistic reasoning to guarantee patient safety.[43] Consequently, the integration of Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) has become a critical focus of research.[45]

Advanced machine learning architectures, specifically gradient-boosted models like XGBoost paired with SHapley Additive exPlanations (SHAP), are currently being deployed to unravel highly complex, multidimensional clinical outcomes, such as the differential effect of DBS parameters on severe gait impairment.[46] Gait is a notoriously complex, insufficiently understood target of DBS, with traditional mean-based metrics struggling to capture nuanced kinematic improvements.[46] By processing vast arrays of spatiotemporal data, XAI models can rank the precise features most indicative of a positive stimulation response.[45] For example, comprehensive SHAP analysis has identified highly specific, previously non-intuitive parameters—such as step width variability, step width asymmetry, bilateral interlimb coordination, and the anteroposterior margin of stability—as the most robust, physiologically grounded biomarkers for PD severity and DBS responsiveness.[46]

These explainable models generate explicit condition-action ("if-then") heuristic rules that translate deep physiological patterns into safe, actionable programming logic.[44] XAI decision-support systems evaluate the integrated matrix of structural neuroimaging, electrophysiological LFPs, wearable kinematic data, and subjective patient VAS feedback to propose a highly personalized, mathematically constrained optimization problem to the clinician.[45] The algorithm highlights the top-ranked parameter combinations, rendering the complex decision-making process inherently interpretable, extremely safe, and deeply rooted in the patient's individualized biological data.[7]

By mastering these core explainable parameters, anatomical nuances, and next-generation computational tools, the modern clinician can navigate the daunting complexity of DBS programming, ensuring that every patient achieves the maximum possible therapeutic benefit from their neuromodulatory implant.

Lähdeartikkelit

1. DBS Programming: An Evolving Approach for Patients with Parkinson's Disease - PMC, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5632902/
2. Deep Brain Stimulation in Parkinson's Disease - PMC - NIH, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3002606/
3. An update on best practice of deep brain stimulation in Parkinson's ..., avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6440024/

4. Deep Brain Stimulation (DBS) - Parkinson's Foundation, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.parkinson.org/living-with-parkinsons/treatment/surgical-treatment-options/deep-brain-stimulation
5. Medtronic earns U.S. FDA approval for the world's first Adaptive deep brain stimulation system for people with Parkinson's - Feb 24, 2025, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://news.medtronic.com/2025-02-24-Medtronic-earns-U-S-FDA-approval-for-the-worlds-first-Adaptive-deep-brain-stimulation-system-for-people-with-Parkinsons
6. Deep Brain Stimulation Programming for Movement ... - Frontiers, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/neurology/articles/10.3389/fneur.2019.00410/full
7. Are we ready for automated deep brain stimulation programming? - PMC, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12599573/
8. Understanding the Effects and Adverse Reactions of Deep Brain Stimulation: Is It Time for a Paradigm Shift Toward a Focus on Heterogenous Biophysical Tissue Properties Instead of Electrode Design Only? - Frontiers, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/human-neuroscience/articles/10.3389/fnhum.2018.00468/full
9. Visualization Evidence - Boston Scientific, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.bostonscientific.com/content/dam/bostonscientific/neuro/portfolio-group/Vercise%20Deep%20Brain%20Stimulation/MediaKit/documents/NM-696801-AA_Visulization%20Evidence%20Compendium.pdf
10. Evoked response signatures explain deep brain stimulation outcomes - medRxiv.org, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.10.04.24314308v1.full-text
11. Pairing Subjective Patient Rating and DBS Programming | Clinical Research Trial Listing (Parkinson's Disease (PD)) (NCT07336199) - TrialX, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.trialx.com/clinical-trials/listings/330722/pairing-subjective-patient-rating/
12. Proceedings of the 11th Annual Deep Brain Stimulation Think Tank: pushing the forefront of neuromodulation with functional network mapping, biomarkers for adaptive DBS, bioethical dilemmas, AI-guided neuromodulation, and translational advancements - Frontiers, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/human-neuroscience/articles/10.3389/fnhum.2024.1320806/full
13. Chronic adaptive deep brain stimulation for Parkinson's disease ..., avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12397205/
14. BrainSense™ Adaptive Deep Brain Stimulation (aDBS) - Medtronic, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.medtronic.com/content/dam/medtronic-wide/public/western-europ

e/products/neurological/deep-brain-stimulation/adbs-scientific-compendium.pdf
15. Groundbreaking study published in the Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA) Neurology demonstrates effectiveness of Medtronic BrainSense™ Adaptive deep brain stimulation for people with Parkinson's, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://news.medtronic.com/Groundbreaking-study-published-in-the-Journal-of-the-American-Medical-Association-JAMA-Neurology-demonstrates-effectiveness-of-Medtronic-BrainSense-TM-Adaptive-deep-brain-stimulation-for-people-with-Parkinsons
16. Medtronic BrainSense™ Adaptive Deep Brain Stimulation named a 2025 TIME Best Inventions, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://news.medtronic.com/2025-10-09-Medtronic-BrainSense-TM-Adaptive-Deep-Brain-Stimulation-named-a-2025-TIME-Best-Inventions
17. The impact on Parkinson's disease of electrical parameter settings in ..., avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.neurology.org/doi/10.1212/WNL.59.5.706
18. Multiple stimulation parameters influence efficacy of deep brain stimulation in parkinsonian mice - JCI, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.jci.org/articles/view/122390
19. Multiple stimulation parameters influence efficacy of deep brain stimulation in parkinsonian mice - PMC, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6715414/
20. A Single-Center Experience with Local Field Potential-Guided Initial Deep Brain Stimulation Programming in Parkinson's Disease (P4-11.005) | Neurology, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.neurology.org/doi/10.1212/WNL.0000000000202111
21. Programming Deep Brain Stimulation for Parkinson's Disease: The ..., avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.alphaomega-eng.com/Files/programming%20for%20PD.pdf
22. Deep Brain Stimulation Clinical Coverage Criteria - Fallon Health, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://fallonhealth.org/providers/criteria-policies-guidelines/-/media/Files/ProviderPDFs/MedicalPolicies/DeepBrainStim090125.ashx
23. Guidelines on Subthalamic Nucleus and Globus Pallidus Internus Deep Brain Stimulation for the Treatment of Patients with Parkinson's Disease - Congress of Neurological Surgeons (CNS), avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.cns.org/guidelines/subthalamic-nucleus-globus-pallidus-intermus-deep-brain-stimulation-parkinson/congress-of-neurological-surgeons-systematic-revie
24. GPi vs STN deep brain stimulation for Parkinson disease | Neurology, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.neurology.org/doi/10.1212/WNL.0000000000002401
25. Cognition and Mood in Parkinson Disease in STN versus GPi DBS: The COMPARE Trial - PMC, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2692580/
26. Comparison of the Long-Term Efficacy of Targeting the Subthalamic Nucleus

Versus the Globus Pallidus Interna for Deep Brain Stimulation Treatment of Motor Dysfunction in Patients With Parkinson's Disease: A Meta-Analysis Study - PMC, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11614509/
27. Deep Brain Stimulation Programming (Chapter 6), avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/deep-brain-stimulation-management/deep-brain-stimulation-programming/055C7E5E6574F92622CAD1962D238F7D
28. Localization of Deep Brain Stimulation Contacts Using Corticospinal/Corticobulbar Tracts ... - PMC, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5450375/
29. Prediction of pyramidal tract side effect threshold by intra-operative electromyography in subthalamic nucleus deep brain stimulation for patients with Parkinson's disease under general anaesthesia - PMC, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11500464/
30. Motor evoked potentials as a side effect biomarker for deep brain stimulation programming, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2025.01.24.25320924v1.full-text
31. Management of essential tremor deep brain stimulation-induced side effects - Frontiers, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/human-neuroscience/articles/10.3389/fnhum.2024.1353150/full
32. Deep brain stimulation in Parkinson's disease: state of the art and future perspectives - PMC, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9491408/
33. Responsive Deep Brain Stimulation: A New Hope for Controlling Stimulation-Induced Dysarthria in Essential Tremor - PMC, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11934957/
34. Programming Directional Deep Brain Stimulation in Parkinson's ..., avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://karger.com/sfn/article/99/6/484/826810/Programming-Directional-Deep-Brain-Stimulation-in
35. The guiding effect of local field potential during deep brain stimulation surgery for programming in Parkinson's disease patients - PubMed, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37830232
36. Feasibility of local field potential-guided programming for deep brain stimulation in Parkinson's disease: A comparison with clinical and neuro-imaging guided approaches in a randomized, controlled pilot trial - PubMed, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37619891/
37. AI-driven precision diagnosis and treatment in Parkinson's disease: a comprehensive review and experimental analysis - Frontiers, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/aging-neuroscience/articles/10.3389/fnagi.2025.1638340/full
38. New Deep Brain Stimulation Algorithm May Help Personalize Parkinson's Disease Treatment | Mass General Brigham, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.massgeneralbrigham.org/en/about/newsroom/press-releases/new-d

eep-brain-stimulation-algorithm-for-parkinsons
39. Update on Current Technologies for Deep Brain Stimulation in Parkinson's Disease - JMD : Journal of Movement Disorders, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.e-jmd.org/journal/view.php?number=302
40. Algorithm-Guided Deep Brain Stimulation Programming Using Automated Motion Sensor-Based Functional Mapping Improves Programming Efficiency (P5-11.005) | Neurology, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.neurology.org/doi/10.1212/WNL.98.18_supplement.981
41. Subjective patient rating as a novel feedback signal for DBS programming in Parkinson's disease - PubMed, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/40081467
42. Subjective Patient Rating as a Novel Feedback Signal for DBS Programming in Parkinson's Disease | Request PDF - ResearchGate, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/389751428_Subjective_Patient_Rating_as_a_Novel_Feedback_Signal_for_DBS_Programming_in_Parkinson's_Disease
43. Discovering Themes in Deep Brain Stimulation Research Using Explainable Artificial Intelligence - PMC, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10045890/
44. Cartesian genetic programming for diagnosis of Parkinson disease through handwriting analysis: Performance vs. interpretability issues | Request PDF - ResearchGate, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346852516_Cartesian_genetic_programming_for_diagnosis_of_Parkinson_disease_through_handwriting_analysis_Performance_vs_interpretability_issues
45. Using Explainable AI to Identify Disease-Relevant and Deep Brain Stimulation Treatment-Sensitive Gait Features in Parkinson's Disease | medRxiv, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2025.11.27.25341152v1
46. Using Explainable AI to Identify Disease-Relevant and Deep Brain Stimulation Treatment-Sensitive Gait Features in Parkinson's, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.research-collection.ethz.ch/bitstreams/788f5b72-8a19-44e9-a660-0d92e01a8cf8/download
47. Emerging Trends in Neuro Engineering and Neural Computation - National Academic Digital Library of Ethiopia, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, http://ndl.ethernet.edu.et/bitstream/123456789/35482/1/Emerging%20Trends%20in%20Neuro%20Engineering%20and%20Neural%20Computation.pdf
48. Proceedings of ICCM 2025 - The Applied Cognitive Science Lab, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://acs.ist.psu.edu/papers/ICCM2025Proceedings.pdf
49. Predicting Cognitive Decline in Parkinson's Disease Using Artificial Neural Networks: An Explainable AI Approach - MDPI, avattu helmikuuta 21, 2026, https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3425/15/8/782