Increased activation of the caudate nucleus and parahippocampal gyrus in Parkinson’s disease patients with dysphagia after repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation: a case-control study
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Abstract
Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) has been shown to effectively improve impaired swallowing in Parkinson’s disease (PD) patients with dysphagia. However, little is known about how rTMS affects the corresponding brain regions in this patient group. In this case-control study, we examined data from 38 PD patients with dysphagia who received treatment at Beijing Rehabilitation Medicine Academy, Capital Medical University. The patients received high-frequency rTMS of the motor cortex once per day for 10 successive days. Changes in brain activation were compared via functional magnetic resonance imaging in PD patients with dysphagia and healthy controls. The results revealed that before treatment, PD patients with dysphagia showed greater activation in the precentral gyrus, supplementary motor area, and cerebellum compared with healthy controls, and this enhanced activation was weakened after treatment. Furthermore, before treatment, PD patients with dysphagia exhibited decreased activation in the parahippocampal gyrus, caudate nucleus, and left thalamus compared with healthy controls, and this activation increased after treatment. In addition, PD patients with dysphagia reported improved subjective swallowing sensations after rTMS. These findings suggest that swallowing function in PD patients with dysphagia improved after rTMS of the motor cortex. This may have been due to enhanced activation of the caudate nucleus and parahippocampal gyrus. The study protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee of Beijing Rehabilitation Hospital of Capital Medical University (approval No. 2018bkky017) on March 6, 2018 and was registered with Chinese Clinical Trial Registry (registration No. ChiCTR 1800017207) on July 18, 2018.
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Introduction
Dysphagia is a common symptom of Parkinson’s disease (PD), with an incidence of 82% (Takizawa et al., 2016). The onset is insidious, and the severity is progressive in PD with dysphagia (PWD). In total, 95–100% of patients with early-stage PD exhibit dysphagia, and most develop moderate to severe dysphagia and have difficulty swallowing 10–11 years after motor symptoms appear (Luchesi et al., 2015; Takizawa et al., 2016). Abnormal motor patterns, decreased coordination, and common oropharynx symptoms are characteristic of
Participants and Methods

Participants

This was a case-control study. Between January 2019 and December 2019, the recruitment information was released in China through WeChat official accounts, chat groups, websites, leaflets, and face-to-face briefings with patients, family members, and doctors. A total of 84 PD patients were recruited, of whom 7 PD patients without dysphagia were excluded. Forty-seven individuals with PWD completed all of the examinations and treatments, but nine MRI datasets were of poor quality. Finally, the study included 38 PWD patients (23 men, 15 women, aged 60.32 ± 8.03 years, disease duration 6.89 ± 2.77 years, Hoehn-Yahr stage 2.13 ± 0.52, Unified Parkinson’s Disease Rating Scale Part III (UPDRS-III) 26.76 ± 11.81, Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) 23.92 ± 4.40. Thirty-three healthy participants aged 40–80 years were recruited as controls (HCs). As three MRI datasets were of poor quality, we included data from 30 healthy participants (11 men, 19 women, aged 56.23 ± 9.73 years). The experiment was conducted at the Beijing Rehabilitation Hospital of Capital Medical University.

The inclusion criteria for PWD were as follows: i) patients fulfilled the Movement Disorder Society clinical diagnostic criteria for PD (Postuma et al., 2015); ii) patients were considered to have dysphagia and met one or more of the following criteria via videofluoroscopic swallowing examination (VFSE) (Mosier et al., 1999): a) oral transport time > 1.5 seconds; b) pharyngeal transport time > 1.0 second; c) pharyngeal delay time: under 60 years > 0.36 second, over and equal to 60 years > 0.24 second; d) upper esophageal sphincter opening time > 0.51 second; e) pharyngeal cavity residue (epiglottis valley, piriform sinus) > 25%; and f) Leakage Aspiration Scale score > 2; iii) patients were aged between 40 and 80 years. The inclusion criteria for HCs were good health and age between 40 and 80 years.

The study exclusion criteria were: i) a history of other diseases affecting swallowing function (e.g., gastrointestinal diseases after radiotherapy for head and neck tumors); ii) severe pneumonia, renal or cardiac dysfunction; iii) current indwelling nasogastric tube or gastrostomy; iv) cardiac pacemaker, nerve stimulator, metal artery clamp, and other magnetic resonance examination or rTMS contraindications found in vivo; and v) cognitive impairment (a Mini-mental State Examination score ≤ 17 reflects illiteracy, ≤ 20 reflects a primary school level, ≤ 24 reflects a middle school and secondary school level; MoCA score < 26).

Withdrawal was defined using the following criteria: i) incomplete rTMS treatment or lack of cooperation with fMRI examination; ii) incomplete fMRI data or unmet data processing requirements; and iii) lack of informed consent or incomplete experiments. The study protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee of Beijing Rehabilitation Hospital of Capital Medical University (approval No. 2018bbky017) on March 6, 2018 (Additional file 1). All participants were volunteers and provided written informed consent (Additional file 2) prior to engaging in the study. All study protocols were in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki of 1975 and the applicable revisions at the time of the investigation. This study was registered with the Chinese Clinical Trial Registry (registration No. ChiCTR 1800017207) on July 18, 2018.

Assessment

Patients with PWD were evaluated using the UPDRS-III, Hoehn-Yahr stage and VFSE while in their best condition after taking medicine (“ON” period). The PWD patients underwent the dysphagia handicap index (DHI), Mr. Tengdao’s swallowing curative effect evaluation of swallowing (MTSCEEOS), and a complete fMRI examination before and after treatment. The HCs underwent a task state fMRI examination. All examinations were conducted by two experienced doctors. The UPDRS-III is the third part of the Movement Disorder Society-sponsored revision of the UPDRS (MDS-UPDRS), published in 2008 (Goetz et al., 2008). It is used to evaluate movement function and contains 33 items with 0–4 points each for a total score of 132. A higher score indicates worse function. The Hoehn-Yahr Scale, which comprises levels 0–5, was used to record the degree of motor dysfunction in the PD patients (Goetz et al., 2008). A higher level on the scale was associated with a greater degree of dysfunction. The DHI includes three components with a total of 25 items. The items comprise nine physiological and functional aspects, respectively, and seven emotional aspects, for a total score of 0–100 (Khedr et al., 2019). A higher score was associated with a worse subjective evaluation. The MTSCEEOS scores were divided into 10 grades, ranging from 1–10 to indicate more severe to less severe swallowing difficulty (Wang et al., 2012).

rTMS Intervention

The PWD patients received high frequency rTMS (OSF-6/T; OSF Medical Technology Limited Company, Wuhan, China). The rTMS protocol was as follows: intensity > 90% motion threshold, frequency = 10 Hz, train duration = 2.00 seconds, interval time...
Demographic data from Parkinson's disease with dysphagia

### Before

| Item               | Healthy controls | PWD group before | P | t |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------|---|---|
| Gender (male/female) | 23/15            | 11/19            |   |   |
| Age (yr)           | 60.32±8.03       | 56.23±9.73      |   |   |
| Disease duration (yr) | 6.89±2.77      | NA              |   |   |
| Hoehn-Yahr stage | 2.13±0.52        | NA              |   |   |
| UPDRS-III          | 26.76±11.81      | NA              |   |   |
| MoCA              | 23.92±4.40       | NA              |   |   |

Data are expressed as mean ± SD, except for gender, which are expressed as number. MoCA: Montreal Cognitive Assessment; NA: not applicable; UPDRS-III: Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale-III.

### After

| Item               | Healthy controls | PWD group after | P | t |
|--------------------|------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Gender (male/female) | 23/15            | 11/19           |   |   |
| Age (yr)           | 60.32±8.03       | 56.23±9.73      |   |   |
| Disease duration (yr) | 6.89±2.77      | NA              |   |   |
| Hoehn-Yahr stage | 2.13±0.52        | NA              |   |   |
| UPDRS-III          | 26.76±11.81      | NA              |   |   |
| MoCA              | 23.92±4.40       | NA              |   |   |

Data are expressed as mean ± SD, and were analyzed by Wilcoxon rank-sum test. DHI: Dysphagia handicap index; MTSCEEOS: Mr. Tengdao’s swallowing curative effect evaluation of swallowing.

### Results

**Sociodemographic, clinical, and behavioral characteristics of the PWD group relative to rTMS treatment**

The sociodemographic characteristics of the subjects are shown in **Table 1**. After treatment, those in the PWD group had a lower DHI (z = −5.38, P < 0.05) and a higher MTSCEEOS score (z = −3.31, P < 0.05) compared with before treatment (**Table 2**).

### Task state fMRI

We used a block design to test brain activation related to the saliva-swallowing task. Five task blocks and five rest blocks were alternately carried out (**Figure 1**). Each block lasted 30 seconds. Chinese sentences and words were presented in red on a black background on a paper screen. During the scanning task, when “repeat swallowing, press the button after each swallow” appeared on the screen, the subjects swallowed saliva (lip closure, flat tongue at the bottom of the mouth, upper hyoid lift and circumpharyngeal muscle contraction). After each swallowing action, the subjects were required to press the button. Once they pressed the button, “stop” appeared on the screen, and the subjects rested for 30 seconds. During the task, the subjects kept their head motionless to concentrate on completing the swallowing task. Stimuli were presented using an T2 fluid projection and a paper screen located in front of the subjects’ feet. The subjects viewed the screen through a 45° angled mirror attached to the head coil of the MRI setup. The subjects were trained before scanning to ensure their cooperation and ability to complete the task. We used a General Electric signal 3.0T magnetic resonance scanner (General Electric Company, Boston, MA, USA) with an 8-channel head coil with foam filling and earplugs to limit patient head movements and reduce noise. All subjects underwent a routine scan to identify unrelated intracranial organic lesions. The whole brain was scanned using three-dimensional T1 bravo sequences. The scanning line was consistent with the T2 fluid attenuated inversion recovery sequence. The scanning parameters were as follows: repetition time = 8.1 ms, echo time = 3.1 ms, flip angle = 90°, field of view = 30 cm × 30 cm, matrix = 300 × 300, slices = 164, thickness = 1 mm. For task state fMRI, we adopted a gradient echo planar imaging sequence. The scanning line was consistent with the T2 fluid attenuated inversion recovery sequence, and the scanning parameters were as follows: repetition time = 2000 ms, repetition time = 30 ms, flip angle = 90°, field of view = 28 cm × 28 cm, matrix = 94 × 32, slices = 40, thickness = 4 mm, space = 1 mm.

### Task activation and regions of interest

Statistical parametric maps were calculated in the first-level analysis for each subject with a general linear model, and parameters for the swallowing fMRI paradigm model specification (http://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm) were introduced. After model estimation, a matrix was obtained for each subject showing higher brain activation conditions compared to the control condition (activation > control). These resulting ‘combined’ images from each group were entered into second-level one-sample t-tests to yield group-level activation. These resulting ‘combined’ images from each group were entered into the second-level to yield group-level activation. One-way analysis of variance test ($P < 0.05$, family wise error corrected for multiple comparisons) were used to assess the average fMRI activity during task in each group with SPM12 (Díez-Cirarda et al., 2017). Furthermore, a two-sample t-test was carried out to explore the differences in activation between HCs and PWD or before and after rTMS treatment in PWD (Díez-Cirarda et al., 2017). Finally, on the basis of a statistical parametric map for an F-test with three groups, regions of interest were created with a radius of 8 mm centered at the voxels with the local maxima of T values with SPM12. The signal change was analyzed for each group.

### Statistical analysis

Demographic and clinical variables were analyzed using SPSS 22.0 (IBM, Armonk, NY, USA). Differences in DHI and MTSCEEOS scores before versus after treatment in the PWD group were tested using the Wilcoxon rank-sum test. We tested differences in the average frequency of button presses during the 30 seconds among HCs, and before and after treatment in the PWD group using a one-way analysis of variance. The least significant difference (LSD) test was used to compare inter-group variables. The significance level was defined as $\alpha = 0.05$ with $P < 0.05$.
Behavioral performance during the fMRI in the PWD group relative to rTMS treatment
The average button press frequencies among HCs during the 30 seconds, and those before and after rTMS treatment in the PWD group were 5.93 ± 1.66, 5.94 ± 2.43, and 6.02 ± 2.09, respectively. No significant differences were found among the HCs or the PWD before and after rTMS treatment (P > 0.05).

Activated brain regions in the PWD group relative to rTMS treatment
The activated brain regions in the HCs, as well as in the PWD group before versus after rTMS treatment, are shown in Table 3 and Figure 2 (corrected at the cluster level of P < 0.05 with family wise error). Compared with the HCs, the PWD group had enhanced activation in the precentral gyrus (PCG; left BA6, right BA4) before rTMS treatment and enhanced activation in the PCG (right BA4), postcentral gyrus (left BA1), and lingual gyrus (left BA19) after rTMS treatment, as shown in Table 4 and Figure 3 (uncorrected, P < 0.001, k > 10).

Figure 1 | Task-state functional magnetic resonance imaging procedure. Five task blocks and rest blocks were presented alternately. The Chinese sentences in each task block said “repeat swallowing, press the button after each swallowing action” and the Chinese word in each rest block said “stop”. In each task block, the subjects swallowed saliva repeatedly. After each swallowing action, the subjects were prompted to press the button. Then, “stop” appeared on the screen, and the subjects rested until the next trial. The experiment lasted 5 minutes.

Figure 2 | Functional magnetic resonance imaging showing changes in activation in individuals with Parkinson’s disease with dysphagia and healthy controls during the saliva-swallowing task.
(A) Healthy controls. (B, C) Parkinson’s disease with dysphagia patients before (B) and after (C) repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation treatment. Regions in which brain activation changed are shown in red or yellow. Results are corrected at the cluster level of P < 0.05 with family wise error. L: Left; R: right.

Figure 3 | Functional magnetic resonance imaging of brain activation changes in patients with Parkinson’s disease with dysphagia and healthy controls during a saliva-swallowing task.
Regions in which brain activation changed are shown in red and yellow. Results show significant activation (uncorrected, P < 0.001, k > 10). (A) Enhanced activation in the precentral gyrus (left BA6, right BA4) between the HCs and bPWD group. (B) Enhanced activation in the precentral gyrus (right BA4), postcentral gyrus (left BA1), and lingual gyrus (left BA19) between HCs and the aPWD group. (C) Enhanced activation in the right caudate and left parahippocampal gyrus between the bPWD and aPWD groups. aPWD: Parkinson’s disease with dysphagia after treatment; bPWD: Parkinson’s disease with dysphagia before treatment; HCs: healthy controls; L: left; R: right.

For the PWD group, activation intensity of the bilateral PCG, supplementary motor area (SMA), and cerebellum was higher after versus before rTMS, and higher than that in the HCs at both time points. The opposite was observed in the PHG, caudate, and left thalamus. Moreover, the activation intensity of the right thalamus in the PWD group was lower after rTMS versus before rTMS (Figures 4 and 5).

Figure 4 | Effect of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on the brain regions activated during the saliva-swallowing task in individuals with Parkinson’s disease with dysphagia.
Regions in which the brain activation changed after treatment are shown in red and yellow. Results were corrected at the cluster level of P < 0.05 with family wise error. aPWD: Parkinson’s disease with dysphagia after treatment; bPWD: Parkinson’s disease with dysphagia before treatment; HCs: healthy controls; L: left; R: right.

Figure 5 | Effect of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on the signal intensities of activated brain regions in individuals with Parkinson’s disease with dysphagia.
aPWD: Parkinson’s disease with dysphagia after treatment; bPWD: Parkinson’s disease with dysphagia before treatment; Cereb: cerebellum; HCs: healthy controls; ParaDeG: parahippocampal gyrus; PreG_L: precentral gyrus left; PreG_R: precentral gyrus right; SMA: Supplementary motor area; Tha_L: thalamus left; Tha_R: thalamus right.
Table 3 | Summarized activation in Parkinson’s disease patients with dysphagia and healthy controls

| Cluster size (voxels) | Hemisphere | Anatomical region          | Brodmann area | t score | x     | y     | z     |
|----------------------|------------|-----------------------------|---------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|
| Healthy controls     |            |                             |               |        |       |       |       |
| 1388                 | Left       | Precentral gyrus            | 4             | 7.25   | −40   | −12   | 46    |
| 226                  | Right      | Culmen                      | *             | 6.18   | 8     | −66   | −10   |
| 609                  | Right      | Culmen of vermis            | *             | 6.08   | −2    | −64   | −6    |
| 384                  | Left       | Postcentral gyrus           | 43            | 5.31   | 60    | −10   | 18    |
| 39                   | Right      | Cingulate gyrus             | 32            | 5.31   | 10    | 20    | 34    |
| 46                   | Left       | Thalamus                    | *             | 4.92   | −10   | −8    | 16    |

Parkinson’s disease patients with dysphagia

Before repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation treatment

| Cluster size (voxels) | Hemisphere | Anatomical region          | Brodmann area | t score | x     | y     | z     |
|----------------------|------------|-----------------------------|---------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|
| 2884                 | Left       | Precentral gyrus            | 6             | 9.84   | −44   | −8    | 34    |
| 1946                 | Right      | Precentral gyrus            | 4             | 9.37   | 58    | −4    | 20    |
| 1543                 | Right      | Insula                      | 13            | 5.83   | 38    | −2    | 10    |
| 1368                 | Right      | Cingulate gyrus             | 32            | 5.96   | −8    | 16    | 34    |
| 55                   | Left       | Cuneus                      | 30            | 6.38   | −8    | −70   | 10    |
| 31                   | Left       | Thalamus                    | *             | 5.01   | −12   | −18   | 2     |
| 28                   | Right      | Insula                      | 13            | 4.85   | 36    | 16    | 4     |

After repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation treatment

| Cluster size (voxels) | Hemisphere | Anatomical region          | Brodmann area | t score | x     | y     | z     |
|----------------------|------------|-----------------------------|---------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|
| 6214                 | Left       | Precentral gyrus            | 6             | 9.04   | −50   | −8    | 32    |
| 3261                 | Right      | Postcentral gyrus           | 6             | 8.31   | −60   | −10   | 24    |
| 1673                 | Right      | Precentral gyrus            | 6             | 8.32   | 52    | −4    | 32    |
| 870                  | Left       | Thalamus                    | *             | 7.15   | −12   | −16   | 4     |
| 74                   | Right      | Thalamus                    | *             | 5.73   | 12    | −16   | 0     |
| 21                   | Right      | Caudate                     | *             | 5.13   | 12    | −6    | 16    |

Data were analyzed by one-way analysis of variance test followed by the least significant difference test and all results were corrected at the cluster level of P < 0.05 family wise error. * Indicates the brain area is not noted in the way of Brodmann area.

Table 4 | Comparison of activated brain regions between groups

| Cluster size (voxels) | Hemisphere | Anatomical region          | Brodmann area | t score | x     | y     | z     |
|----------------------|------------|-----------------------------|---------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|
| bPWD-aPWD            |            |                             |               |        |       |       |       |
| 13                   | Left       | Parahippocampal gyrus       | 19            | 3.63   | −36   | −42   | −4    |
| 11                   | Right      | Caudate                     | *             | 3.58   | 32    | −42   | 8     |
| bPWD-HCs             |            |                             |               |        |       |       |       |
| 26                   | Left       | Precentral gyrus            | 6             | 3.58   | −44   | −6    | 32    |
| 15                   | Right      | Precentral gyrus            | 4             | 3.55   | 58    | −6    | 22    |
| aPWD-HCs             |            |                             |               |        |       |       |       |
| 18                   | Right      | Precentral gyrus            | 4             | 3.92   | 40    | −22   | 62    |
| 30                   | Left       | Lingual gyrus               | 19            | 3.92   | −12   | −54   | 0     |
| 20                   | Left       | Postcentral gyrus           | 1             | 3.84   | −44   | −28   | 60    |

aPWD: PWD after treatment; bPWD: PWD before treatment; HCs: healthy controls. * Indicates the brain area is not noted in the way of Brodmann area.

Discussion

Only two previous studies have used fMRI to examine PAD (Suntrup et al., 2013; Gao et al., 2019): one used magnetoencephalography and the other used resting-state fMRI. To the best of our knowledge, the present study is the first to use task-state fMRI to study rTMS-induced changes in activation in PAD patients using the saliva-swallowing task and not the autonomous water-swallowing task or the reflex water-swallowing task (Perry et al., 2018; Kober et al., 2019). The latter two tasks are difficult to accomplish in PWD patients who are restricted by recumbency. In addition, considering that decreased coordination between the oral and pharyngeal phases causes salivation (Pfeiffer, 2018), saliva swallowing was safer and closer to the pathological state of PWD patients. Our
No previous studies have published rTMS protocol for dysphagia in PD patients. The rTMS protocols used in clinical settings are generally based on existing protocols (such as those for dysphagia in stroke patients) and are designed on an individualized basis. However, unlike stroke, the brain sites involved in PDW are often bilateral, unfixed, extensive, and progressive (Kober et al., 2019). Kikuchi et al. (2013) and Gao et al. (2019) suggested that there was hemispheric imbalance in PDW. During autonomous swallowing, the CSMA is the largest and most stable activated area, and it exhibits the strongest signal (Hamdy et al., 1999; Mosier et al., 1999; Suntrup et al., 2013; Maidan et al., 2017). This was in line with the present results. Thus, stimulation of the bilateral cortex could help to improve the observed imbalance, and this would be consistent with the pathological changes observed in PDW. The CSMA (including the PCG) was activated in the HC, pre-rTMS PDW, and post-rTMS PDW groups, which coincided with previous results (Hamdy et al., 1999; Mosier et al., 1999; Suntrup et al., 2013; Maidan et al., 2017). This is supported by previous studies that identified sensory and motor neurons related to facial, oral, and throat muscles in this region, as these were activated when saliva entered the throat from the mouth during our study. Furthermore, the CSMA participates in autonomous action (e.g., autonomous swallowing), and might be the highest center for initiating swallowing.

The front part of the premotor area, which stores motor memory, is an advanced center for planning and selecting motor programs, as well as guiding and regulating the swallowing process. The posterior part of the premotor area, which is located near the primary motor area, has two-way connections and overlapping functions (Hamdy et al., 1999; Mosier et al., 1999). The primary motor area accepts movement planning information (e.g., swallowing) from the front part of the premotor area, and implements the movement plan (e.g., swallowing) through the fiber connections from the posterior part of the premotor area. Together, the SMA and the premotor area form Brodmann area 6 (Hamdy et al., 1999; Mosier et al., 1999). The SMA plays an important role in complex temporal movement and in movement initiation and execution (Hamdy et al., 1999; Mosier et al., 1999). The insula, which is the main taste cortex, is associated with the ventral posterolateral thalamus (the sensory representative area of the face and mouth, and the termination replacement relay station of first stage taste afferent neurons) through the anterior thalamus (Hamdy et al., 1999; Mosier et al., 1999).

Through positron emission tomography technology, Kikuchi et al. (2013) found that glucose metabolism was reduced in the SMA (BA6) and anterior cingulate gyrus in PDW patients compared with normal controls. Furthermore, they found that the bilateral medial frontal lobe, medial cingulate cortex, thalamus, and upper, middle, and lower orbital frontal lobe were hypometabolic 3 years after a PDW diagnosis. Compared with HCs, they observed enhanced activation in PDW patients before and after rTMS in the PCG (BA4, 6) and lingual gyrus (BA19). This indicates that swallowing function was weakened in these patients such that an increased activation volume and intensity were needed to maintain swallowing function. These results are consistent with the findings of the present study. Gao et al. (2019) found that PDW patients (n = 13) exhibited enhanced functional connectivity in the left cerebellar tonsil, cerebellum (BA8, 9), and fusiform compared with a normal control group (n = 10). According to these two studies, PDW patients maintain a baseline swallowing state by enhancing connections of the left cerebellar tonsil, cerebellum (BA8, 9), and fusiform gyrus in the quiet state (i.e., when no swallowing action is performed). Enhanced activation of the PCG, lingual gyrus, and other brain regions occurs in a compensatory manner after initiating a swallowing action.

Previous neuroimaging and pathophysiological studies on dopamine loss in the striatum have suggested that the pattern of dopamine loss in the basal ganglia is inhomogeneous (Winogrodzka et al., 2003; Pasquini et al., 2019). In other words, the dopaminergic neurotransmitters binding with the striatal neurons in the shell nucleus were asymmetrically reduced, and that in comparison, the ones in the head of the caudate body were retained. The gradient of dopaminergic loss is largely preserved in all PD patients (Pasquini et al., 2019). Im et al. (2018) and Kim et al. (2019) showed that caudate damage can increase the risk of aspiration and prolong the recovery time of swallowing. Hence, caudate injury is likely observed in the occurrence of dysphagia in PD patients and is potentially associated with gradient changes in dopaminergic loss. In this study, we found no significant pre-rTMS caudate activation in the PDW group compared with the HCs, while the PDW group exhibited post-rTMS improvements in swallowing quality and enhanced caudate activation compared with the HCs. This confirmed the previous hypothesis that the caudate is associated with the occurrence of dysphagia in PDW patients. High-frequency rTMS can stimulate the release of neurotransmitters in the caudate of healthy persons and PDW patients, leading to enhanced neuromodulation (Strafella et al., 2001; Sacheli et al., 2019). Therefore, it is possible that a caudate-associated abnormal dopaminergic damage gradient could inhibit the ability of the caudate to perform normal compensatory functions, and thus participates in the pathophysiological processes that underlie impaired swallowing in PAD patients. High-frequency rTMS may promote homeostasis in caudate-associated dopamine levels by altering neurotransmitter release, which in turn could improve swallowing function.

The DHI assesses swallowing function using three aspects and can be greatly affected by the subjective feelings of patients. The PHG is part of the limbic system and is closely related to emotion. Activation of the PHG has been found to increase with exercise and positive events (Loeffler et al., 2018; Loprinzi, 2019). In this study, transient saliva swallowing activity did not enhance PHG activation. However, rTMS might have enhanced pleasure by promoting PHG activation, which in turn improved subjective feelings of swallowing.

Differences in the intensity of brain activation among the three groups might be related to the degree of injury in each region, compensatory ability, and the selectivity of the rTMS effect on specific brain regions. Braak proposed that pathological changes spread from the peripheral to the central nervous system, but not all types of PD patients conform to this hypothesis (Jellinger, 2019). The diversity of symptoms in PDW reflects the complexity of location, extent, and compensatory capacity in PD. All patients included in this study had a Hoehn-Yahr stage below 3. Thus, their condition may not have developed to the point of involving the substantia nigra, midbrain, or deep anterior cerebral nuclei. According to Braak’s hypothesis, the neocortex was also not likely to be involved in these patients. Hulme et al. (2013) found that the ability or mechanism of neurons to express plasticity might be recruited in non-specific ways under pathological conditions.
which could explain the compensatory enhancement of the PCG, SMA, and cerebellar activation intensity in the PWD patients before and after rTMS treatment. The activation intensity of the PHG and caudate was significantly reduced in the PWD group before rTMS treatment, indicating that the PHG and caudate were not the main compensatory mechanisms, but that they might be related to the occurrence and progression of dysphagia in PD. After treatment, the activation intensity of the PHG and caudate increased. This was associated with rTMS-induced reduction in the inhibition state of the PHG and caudate, likely via neurotransmitter regulation. Dysphagia is associated with thalamic injury (Kooshkabadi et al., 2013). However, deep brain stimulation of the subthalamic nucleus restored some motor patterns in the pharyngeal phase to performance levels approximating those of “normal” swallowing but did not improve the degree of hyoid bone excursion or oral phase measures in PD patients (Ciucci et al., 2008). Thalamic metabolism in PWD patients gradually decreased as onset time increased (Kikuchi et al., 2013). The changes in the thalamic activation intensity observed in the three groups in this study might be related to the short duration of disease in the PWD patients and relative functional retention of the thalamus.

There were three limitations in this study. First, the sample was relatively small. Second, PD patients without dysphagia were not included. Finally, we did not use objective evaluation methods such as VFSE after treatment. However, that activation of the right caudate and left parahippocampal gyrus was enhanced in PD patients with dysphagia reflects that neuroplasticity was induced by high-frequency rTMS. Thus, these regions may be potential therapeutic targets for precise treatment. Finally, our data indicate that the task paradigm was safe and effective for patients with a high risk of aspiration.

In conclusion, the saliva-swallowing task appears to be a safe and effective experimental paradigm for assessing patients with a high risk of aspiration such as those with PWD. Enhanced activation of the PCG, postcentral gyrus, and lingual gyrus functions in a compensatory manner after initiating swallowing action in PWD. rTMS treatment led to improved subjective swallowing sensations and enhanced activation of the caudate and PHG in PAD patients, providing evidence for rTMS-induced neuroplasticity and a potential treatment for dysphagia in Parkinson’s disease.
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