

**HUMAN MOTOR CORTEX PLASTICITY
INDUCTION IS INFLUENCED BY MULTIPLE
FACTORS**

A thesis submitted for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY



THE UNIVERSITY
of ADELAIDE

SCHOOL OF MEDICAL SCIENCES

by

John Cirillo

B. Health Sciences (Hons)

Discipline of Physiology

School of Medical Sciences

The University of Adelaide

Adelaide, Australia

2012

Abstract.....	vi
Declaration	viii
Acknowledgements	x
1. Literature Review	1
<i>1.1. The human motor cortex.....</i>	<i>1</i>
1.1.1. The corticospinal system.....	4
1.1.2. GABA and its physiological importance	6
<i>1.2. Non-invasive techniques used to assess human motor cortical function</i>	<i>9</i>
1.2.1. Transcranial electric stimulation.....	10
1.2.2. Transcranial magnetic stimulation.....	11
1.2.2.1. Motor threshold	13
1.2.2.2. MEP Size	14
1.2.2.3. Input-Output Curve	15
1.2.2.4. Paired-pulse stimulation	15
1.2.2.5. Cortical Silent Period	18
<i>1.3. Cortical plasticity.....</i>	<i>19</i>
1.3.1. Mechanisms of cortical plasticity	20
1.3.2. Learning and use-dependent plasticity.....	24
1.3.3. Methods of experimentally-inducing plasticity	27
<i>1.4. Factors influencing cortical plasticity in human motor cortex.....</i>	<i>33</i>
1.4.1 Aerobic exercise and brain function	34
1.4.2. Ageing.....	36
1.4.3. Hemispheric asymmetries.....	38
1.4.4. Task complexity.....	41
1.4.5. Genetic variation.....	43
<i>1.5. Summary.....</i>	<i>45</i>

2. Motor cortex plasticity induced by paired associative stimulation is enhanced in physically active individuals	49
2.1. <i>Abstract</i>	49
2.2. <i>Introduction</i>	50
2.3. <i>Materials and Methods</i>	52
2.4. <i>Results</i>	57
2.5. <i>Discussion</i>	65
2.5.1. Corticospinal excitability in physically active and sedentary individuals	65
2.5.2. Increased synaptic plasticity in physically active individuals	68
2.5.3. Factors influencing PAS-induced plasticity in physically active individuals	71
3. Hemispheric differences in use-dependent corticomotor plasticity in young and old adults	75
3.1. <i>Abstract</i>	75
3.2. <i>Introduction</i>	76
3.3. <i>Materials and Methods</i>	78
3.3.1. Experimental arrangement	78
3.3.2. Experimental procedures	79
3.3.3. Motor training task	82
3.3.4. Data analysis	83
3.3.5. Statistical analysis	83
3.4. <i>Results</i>	84
3.4.1. Effect of age and hand on motor learning	86
3.4.2. Effect of age and hand on training-dependent corticomotor excitability	87
3.5. <i>Discussion</i>	90
3.5.1. Increased corticomotor plasticity for control of the left hand	91
3.5.2. Age-related changes in corticomotor plasticity and motor learning	94

4. Corticomotor excitability and plasticity following complex visuomotor training in young and old adults.....	99
4.1. <i>Abstract</i>	99
4.2. <i>Introduction</i>	100
4.3. <i>Materials and Methods</i>	101
4.3.1. Experimental arrangement	102
4.3.2. Experimental procedures	103
4.3.3. Training protocol	106
4.3.4. Data analysis	108
4.3.5. Statistical analysis.....	108
4.4. <i>Results</i>	109
4.4.1. Age-related differences in motor performance following visuomotor tracking ..	109
4.4.2. Age-related differences in corticomotor excitability following visuomotor tracking	113
4.5. <i>Discussion</i>	116
4.5.1. Reduced motor performance in old adults	116
4.5.2. Motor skill learning in young and old adults with visuomotor tracking.....	117
4.5.3. Change in MEP amplitude after visuomotor tracking in young and old adults...	118
4.5.4. SICI in young and old adults after complex visuomotor tracking	121
4.5.5. Association between corticomotor plasticity and motor learning.....	123
5. Differential modulation of motor cortex excitability in BDNF met allele carriers following experimentally-induced and use-dependent plasticity	128
5.1. <i>Abstract</i>	128
5.2. <i>Introduction</i>	128
5.3. <i>Materials and Methods</i>	130
5.3.1. Genotyping.....	131
5.3.2. Experimental arrangement	132
5.3.3. Experimental procedures	132

5.3.4. Interventions	135
5.3.5. Data analysis.	137
5.3.6. Statistical analysis.	138
5.4. <i>Results</i>	139
5.4.1. PAS and BDNF genotype	141
5.4.2. Motor performance and motor learning in different BDNF genotypes	143
5.4.3. Use-dependent plasticity in different BDNF genotypes	145
5.5. <i>Discussion</i>	147
6. General Discussion.....	156
6.1. <i>Aerobic exercise and motor cortex plasticity</i>	156
6.2. <i>Brain hemispheres, ageing, task complexity, and motor cortex plasticity</i>	157
6.4. <i>BDNF genotype and motor cortex plasticity</i>	163
6.5. <i>Limitations</i>	165
6.5.1. TMS and motor cortex plasticity	165
6.5.1.1. The MEP	165
6.5.1.2. MEP test size	166
6.5.1.3. SICI.....	167
6.5.2. Mechanisms of human motor cortex plasticity	168
6.5.3. Motor cortex excitability and motor learning in humans.....	168
6.5.4. Experimental design.....	169
6.6. <i>Future directions</i>	170
6.7. <i>Concluding remarks</i>	171
7. Appendices.....	172
7.1. <i>Appendix I: Publications arising from thesis.</i>	172
7.2. <i>Appendix II: Presentations and abstracts arising from thesis.</i>	173
8. Bibliography	174

Abstract

The primary motor cortex (M1) has the essential role of controlling voluntary movement, but is also a crucial site for learning new motor skills and recovery of motor function after injury. The development of non-invasive brain stimulation techniques, particularly transcranial magnetic stimulation, has significantly contributed to our understanding of human M1 and its ability to alter in structure and function (cortical plasticity). However, large within- and between-subject differences in the capacity for cortical plasticity exist in humans. This thesis examined factors capable of influencing human M1 plasticity and motor learning, focussing on the effects of exercise, ageing, hand preference and genetics.

Study 1 examined whether regular exercise influenced plasticity in human M1. Individuals with increased physical activity levels had increased M1 excitability and enhanced neuroplasticity. This was the first study to demonstrate that participation in regular physical activity offers a generalised neuroplastic enhancement within M1. Therefore, these results suggest that participation in regular physical activity may offer global benefits to human M1 function.

Study 2 addressed the influence of age (young and old adults) and hand preference (dominant and non-dominant) on human M1 plasticity and motor learning for a simple motor task. In contrast to previous studies, the extent of plasticity was not diminished in old compared with young adults for either hand following simple ballistic training. However, neuroplasticity was enhanced in the right hemisphere (left non-dominant hand) compared with the left hemisphere (right dominant hand) with training. This finding suggests that there is greater strengthening of corticomotor circuits for control of the left compared with the right hand during simple ballistic training. Subsequently, Study 3 examined the effect of advancing age on a complex task, which more likely engages M1 and increases attentional demand. Following training of complex visuomotor tracking, the extent of plasticity remained similar between young and old

adults, suggesting that a reduction in plasticity is not an obligatory consequence of the ageing process. The findings from Studies 2 and 3 demonstrate that older adults may have a similar neuroplastic capacity under some circumstances, and identifying factors for this maintenance may guide healthy ageing interventions aimed at promoting brain health across the life-span

In Study 4, it was found that the modulation of M1 excitability was strongly influenced by a common polymorphism in the *BDNF* gene, but the effect was dependent on the intervention used. The most pronounced differences in plasticity between *BDNF* genotypes were observed following the complex motor task, but this did not influence motor learning. Although there was no effect on motor performance and short-term motor learning in healthy young subjects, the differences in brain plasticity between *BDNF* genotypes may be more important for the recovery of motor function after neurological injury.

These findings suggest that sustained regular exercise, hand preference, and *BDNF* genotype contribute to the variability of M1 plasticity in healthy adults. Therefore, to further understand factors that influence M1 plasticity, future studies should assess these subject characteristics as potential confounding factors in the response. Furthermore, there may be potential to capitalise on these factors to optimise M1 plasticity and recovery of motor function following neurological injury.

Declaration

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution to John Cirillo and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

The author acknowledges that copyright of published works contained within this thesis (as listed below) resides with the copyright holder(s) of those works.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library catalogue, the Australasian Digital Theses Program (ADTP) and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

Cirillo J., Lavender A.P., Ridding M. C., & Semmler J. G. (2009) *Motor Cortex Plasticity Induced by Paired Associative Stimulation is Enhanced in Physically Active Individuals*. J Physiol 587, 5831-5842.

Cirillo J., Rogasch N. C., and Semmler J. G. (2010) *Hemispheric differences in use-dependent corticomotor plasticity in young and old adults*. Exp Brain Res 205, 57-68.

Cirillo J., Todd G., and Semmler J. G. (2011) *Corticomotor excitability and plasticity following complex visuomotor training in young and old adults*. Eur J Neurosci, 34, 1847-1856

Cirillo J., Hughes J., Ridding M.C., Thomas P.Q., Semmler J.G. (2012) *Differential modulation of motor cortex excitability in BDNF met allele carriers following experimentally-induced and use-dependent plasticity*. Submitted to Eur J Neurosci

Signed .

.....

Date

5/4/12

.....

Acknowledgements

I would like to express sincere gratitude to my two supervisors for all their help and intellectual guidance over the last few years. To my co-supervisor Associate Professor Mike Ridding for his prompt feedback and assistance, particularly with TMS; and to my principal supervisor Dr. John Semmler for his patience and encouragement, but more importantly for his invaluable support and guidance.

I would also like to thank all subjects who participated in my experiments, particularly those who were involved in multiple experiments conducted throughout my studies. Your contribution was not only important in allowing me to complete my studies, but also made conducting experiments more enjoyable.

Many thanks to all students and staff, past and present, in the human movement control group in the Discipline of Physiology for their help, friendship, and support. In particular I would like to thank Dr. Tamara Dartnall, Dr. Andrew Lavender, Dr. Paul Thomas, Dr. Gabrielle Todd, James Hughes, and Nigel Rogasch.

Finally, I would like to thank my family with all my heart for their continual love and support during my PhD journey. To my mother and father for their continual support and encouragement as I pursued my studies further. Finally, but definitely not least, to my wife Monica for her understanding and encouragement, but also her support throughout my PhD, particularly the final stages.

Now that another chapter in life has almost been finalised, I look forward to seeing what the future will hold for the remaining chapters.