

Effects of Deep Brain Stimulation on Cognition, Mood and Behaviour in Parkinson's Disease

a report by

Alexander I Tröster

Associate Professor, Department of Neurology, University of North Carolina School of Medicine, Chapel Hill

DOI:10.17925/ENR.2008.03.01.32

Disappointed by the limitations of pharmacotherapy, emboldened by technological advances in surgery and radiology and armed with a better understanding of pathophysiology, physicians and scientists in the 1980s charted a renaissance of surgery for movement disorders such as Parkinson's disease (PD). The desire for a safer alternative to lesional or ablative neurosurgery, coupled with observations that intra-operative electrical stimulation used for target identification could alleviate abnormal movements,^{1,2} prompted the exploration of fully implantable deep brain stimulation (DBS) systems in movement disorders in the late 1980s.³ Use of similar systems was applied to investigations in epilepsy, psychiatry and a variety of other neurological conditions in the late 1990s and early 2000s, probably for similar reasons to those that spurred DBS for movement disorders. In addition, experience with DBS in movement disorders, observations about the cognitive and behavioural effects associated with DBS and the availability of animal models catalysed the extension of DBS to new indications.⁴⁻⁷ This article focuses on summarising the neuro-behavioural outcomes of DBS in PD.

Neurobehavioural Effects of Deep Brain Stimulation in Parkinson's Disease

By far the most attention to neurobehavioural outcomes of DBS has been devoted to PD, and the majority of these studies have examined the outcome of subthalamic (STN) rather than thalamic or pallidal (GPI) DBS. Probably greater controversy attends the neurobehavioural outcomes after STN DBS than after GPI or thalamic DBS, and this probably reflects, at least in part, differences among studies in the sample characteristics, selection and exclusion criteria, length of follow-up, surgical technique, post-operative DBS programming and pharmacotherapy protocols, and the thoroughness and timing of the neuropsychological evaluation protocol. In general, studies employing cognitive screening instruments fail to detect neurobehavioural morbidity. While some may argue that the lack of change on screening instruments suggests that neuropsychological changes detected by

more extensive evaluations are not of clinical significance, a recent meta-analysis of the empirical data suggests that screening instruments may be insensitive even to clinically meaningful changes after DBS.⁸ Consequently, cognitive screening measures are probably useful in helping decide which surgical candidates can be excluded from further evaluation (including full neuropsychological evaluation), but insufficient to adequately document neurobehavioural outcomes of DBS.

Thalamic Deep Brain Stimulation

Four studies⁹⁻¹² have observed no widespread or significant changes in cognition, mood or behaviour after unilateral thalamic DBS, although one study suggested that statistically (but not necessarily clinically) significant declines in verbal memory are associated with left thalamic DBS. Few studies have examined mood after thalamic DBS, but one study⁹ found an improvement in depressive symptoms four to 10 days after surgery.

Pallidal Deep Brain Stimulation

Unilateral GPI DBS appears cognitively safe, although this conclusion is tempered by the limited number of small-sample studies published.¹³⁻¹⁵ Although patients in one study showed statistically significant declines in visuoconstructional ability and verbal fluency, the changes were rarely of clinical significance. Even when using a liberal criterion of impairment (a test score falling one standard deviation below the mean of normative samples), another study¹³ observed that only six of the 20 patients showed any increase, no matter how small, in the percentage of tests in the impaired range. These patients tended to be older and were taking higher medication dosages prior to surgery.

The safety of bilateral GPI DBS has been addressed in a handful of studies, and most found that the procedure is relatively safe from a cognitive standpoint.¹⁶⁻¹⁸ Nonetheless, a small minority of patients may develop cognitive morbidity. One case with magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)-confirmed electrode location had significant executive dysfunction ensuing from bilateral GPI DBS; importantly, when the stimulators were turned off, the impairment was partially reversed, thereby suggesting a direct role of stimulation in the neuropsychological deficit.¹⁹ Relatively isolated cognitive impairments were reported by the Toronto group in four patients.²⁰

Generally, studies using self-report measures of mood state have not observed improvements in depressive symptomatology, but two studies^{21,22} observed improvements in anxiety symptoms after GPI DBS. The clinical significance of these mean changes on symptom inventories is unclear. A case study reported hypomania and manic



Alexander I Tröster is an Associate Professor of Neurology at the University of North Carolina School of Medicine, Chapel Hill. He has received early career achievement and scientific contribution to clinical neuropsychology awards from the National Academy of Neuropsychology (NAN). He has edited a book on memory disorders and authored or co-authored more than 150 scientific and medical journal articles and numerous book chapters. Dr Tröster serves on the Editorial Boards of

four journals and as a reviewer for more than 25 other scientific and medical journals. He was a member of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Workgroup on Cognition and Emotion in Parkinson's Disease and the Deep Brain Stimulation Consensus Group of the Movement Disorders Society (MDS).

E: trostera@neurology.unc.edu

episodes after unilateral or bilateral GPi DBS,²³ but this morbidity may relate to an interaction between stimulation and medication. Similarly, it is unclear whether hypersexuality reported in isolated cases^{24,25} reflects a possible dopamine dysregulation syndrome, medication–stimulation interactions or a phenomenon that is part of hypomania.

Subthalamic Deep Brain Stimulation

Controversy exists concerning the frequency, nature and extent of cognitive changes after STN DBS and the factors underlying such changes. The reported frequencies under which neurobehavioural changes occur after STN DBS are quite variable. A recent review²⁶ estimated that cognitive problems (unelaborated upon) are observed in 41% of patients after STN DBS. However, examination of clinical studies suggests that profound changes in cognition are fairly rare. Rodriguez-Oroz and colleagues,²⁷ who carefully defined severity of impairment, found that severe impairments (incapacitating ones) occurred in 1–2% of cases. Moderate impairments (requiring treatment or exerting mild functional impact) and mild deficits (without functional impact) occurred in about 20% of patients. This latter figure is quite similar to that reported in another series,²⁸ but considerably higher than the approximate 4% incidence of cognitive impairment observed in a recent, controlled, multicentre trial (although it is not clear how this impairment was defined).²⁹

Most studies employing formal neuropsychological evaluations have been uncontrolled and used fairly small samples, and methodological limitations of these studies have been reviewed.^{30–34} These studies, with few exceptions,^{20,35–39} have observed small and circumscribed cognitive changes, most often in verbal fluency (timed oral word generation according to different phonemic or semantic constraints).^{16,17,37,39–58} Even among studies reporting more widespread cognitive declines there is disagreement as to the clinical meaningfulness of these changes. Alegret and co-workers³⁵ interpreted the changes not to be of clinical significance, in contrast to Saint-Cyr et al.³⁸ and Smeding et al.³⁹

The safety of bilateral pallidial deep brain stimulation has been addressed in a handful of studies, and most found that the procedure is relatively safe from a cognitive standpoint.

As many of the neuropsychological studies of STN DBS have small sample sizes, greater weight should be given to the five controlled neuropsychological studies (excluding studies limited to language or cognitive screening evaluations), even though each has significant methodological and/or conceptual limitations. The first controlled neuropsychological study of STN DBS⁴⁵ compared outcomes in eight patients with bilateral STN DBS, eight patients undergoing unilateral pallidotomy and eight unoperated PD patients. In that study, a selective decline in semantic verbal fluency was observed in the STN DBS group. Similar findings were observed in three other controlled studies^{48,50,59} and one study was helpful in defining the roles of surgery and stimulation in the changes.⁵⁰ While the procedure as a whole (surgery

plus stimulation) was associated with subtle declines in delayed verbal recall and language, the effect of stimulation *per se* (comparing test performance with stimulators turned on and off relative to change observed in a control group) revealed no significant changes.

Controversy exists concerning the frequency, nature and extent of cognitive changes after subthalamic deep brain stimulation and the factors underlying such changes.

Another controlled study has found more widespread and serious cognitive changes³⁹ among 99 STN DBS patients evaluated within three months before surgery and six months after surgery compared with 36 medically treated PD patients tested six months apart. The STN DBS group had more marked decline in overall level of cognitive function (approaching statistical significance), verbal fluency, delayed recall and visual attention, and showed diminished positive effect and increased emotional lability after surgery. However, as noted by the authors of the study, some effects may have been medication-related. For example, the decline in memory was no longer significant from the change in the control group once anticholinergic medication intake was accounted for.

A quantitative meta-analysis⁸ of peer-reviewed English-language studies from 1990 to April 2006 that reported interval or ratio data provided pre- and post-operative data on at least one standardised neuro-psychological test, and provided sufficient information to allow calculation of effect sizes, identified 28 studies that met inclusion criteria. These studies yielded a maximum combined sample size of 612 for calculation of the effect size of changes in various domains of cognition. Given the large number of techniques used in the literature, the tests were assigned to the functional domains they are commonly accepted to measure (e.g. verbal memory, language, attention). Analyses revealed that STN DBS (considered in its entirety as a treatment procedure) was associated with moderate declines in verbal fluency and mild declines in verbal memory and executive function. Mild improvements were observed in psychomotor/information processing speed.

Overall, the uncontrolled, controlled and meta-analytic findings agree that STN DBS is relatively safe from a cognitive perspective. However, it should be borne in mind that meta-analysis does not, despite attaching greater weight to studies with larger samples, redress the methodological shortcomings of the studies included in the analyses. In addition, research has been unable to reliably identify factors underlying cognitive declines after STN DBS, but potential factors include advanced patient age, pre-existing cognitive impairment, misplacement of electrodes and/or current spread to limbic and associative territories, stimulation parameters, depression, apathy and changes in medication after surgery.

Mood changes and psychiatric complications after STN DBS have received increasing attention. A meta-analysis of 22 studies published

between 1993 and 2004⁶⁰ estimated that about 7% of patients develop depression after STN DBS, that hypomania or a manic episode occurs in about 2% and that other psychiatric disorders such as hypersexuality, lability, psychosis and hallucinations occur in 4% of patients. Similar figures were reported in a review by Temel and colleagues:²⁶ depression 8%, hypomania or mania 4%, anxiety disorders <2% and personality changes, hypersexuality, apathy and aggressiveness <0.5%. These figures coincide with the overall rate of psychiatric matters requiring treatment (9%) in a controlled study of 99 patients.³⁹

Potential mechanisms underlying psychiatric phenomena after deep brain stimulation include pre-operative vulnerability, stimulation, effects of surgery and psychosocial stressors and adaptation.

Despite the similarity of average estimates, the range of the reported rates of behavioural alterations is quite broad:³² depression 1.5–25%, attempted and completed suicide 0.5–2.9% and (hypo)mania 4–15%. One retrospective analysis reported transient mood disturbance in as many as 64% of patients.⁶¹ Factors possibly related to this variability in outcomes include patient selection/exclusion criteria, especially with regard to psychiatric illness, ascertainment and definition methods, surgical and post-operative management differences, rigour of study methodology and surgical experience of a centre (in that morbidity typically decreases as centre experience increases).⁶² An informal review of studies raises the hypothesis that earlier published studies, studies with small samples (both of these factors may be associated with the experience of treatment centres) and studies with longer follow-up are apt to report a higher incidence of post-operative psychiatric morbidity. For example, one study of 11 patients over five years reported mania/hypersexuality in almost 20% and apathy in almost 10%.⁴¹ Another study of 37 cases collected between 1996 and 1999, using five-year follow-up, reported attempted suicide or suicide in 13.5%, apathy in 22%, disinhibition in 35%, psychosis and/or hallucinations in 27%, aggression in 8% and dopamine dysregulation syndrome (levodopa addiction) in 8%. In contrast, a recent controlled study of 78 patients using a six-month follow-up reported depression in 5%, suicide in 1% and psychosis in 5%.²⁹

Potential mechanisms underlying psychiatric phenomena after DBS include pre-operative vulnerability,⁶³ stimulation, effects of surgery, psychosocial stressors and adaptation and alterations in medication after surgery. Stimulation in or around the STN has been observed to acutely lead to visual hallucinations,⁶⁴ pseudobulbar crying,⁶⁵ laughter and euphoria^{4,66} and depression.^{67,68} Acute mood changes are typically provoked by stimulation, dorsal or ventral, to the target for motor symptom control,⁶⁹ whereas apathy is associated with ventral and medial STN DBS,⁵⁵ hypomania with anteromedial STN DBS⁷⁰ and delusions with medial stimulation.⁷¹ Aggression occurs with stimulation in the region of the triangle of Sano,⁷² although aggression has also been observed after stimulation via accurately placed STN electrodes.⁷³

There seems to be a disparity between studies reporting post-operative depression and those using symptom rating scales and self-report inventories showing improvements in mood symptoms. Several studies using patient-report inventories have reported improvement in depressive symptomatology.^{16,38,74,75} Similarly, studies disagree as to whether apathy does or does not increase after STN DBS.^{55,76} On the one hand, studies reporting post-operative incidence of behavioural changes typically do not report a change from the pre-operative state, leaving it possible that the incidence of psychiatric conditions actually improves from pre-operative levels. Indeed, a study has shown that the incidence of psychiatric illness may be greater among PD surgical candidates (before surgery) than among the PD population in general.⁷⁷ Alternatively, patients completing inventories or responding to questions on rating scales may underestimate or be relatively unaware of behavioural changes, as may be indicated by discrepancies in the report of patients and their care partners.³⁸

A topic of increasing interest has been the phenomenon of pathological gambling, and isolated cases of this condition have been reported after DBS.^{39,78} A large retrospective study⁷⁹ identified seven persons who had displayed pathological gambling prior to surgery among 598 patients who underwent STN DBS. The deleterious urge to gamble lessened after surgery, resolving on average 18 months after surgery, but the condition of two patients worsened transiently. An abatement in gambling and other symptoms of dopamine dysregulation syndrome (e.g. off-period dysphoria, non-motor fluctuations) paralleled the course of dopaminergic medication reduction after electrode implantation. Another study of two cases also reported improvement in pathological gambling after STN DBS and concurrent reduction in dopaminergic medication.⁸⁰

Comparisons of Unilateral versus Bilateral and Pallidal versus Subthalamic Deep Brain Stimulation

To determine whether second surgery (i.e. a staged bilateral procedure) carries cognitive risks relative to the first surgery, Fields et al.²¹ examined neuropsychological functioning in six patients before surgery, two months after the first GPi DBS operation and again three months after the second operation. No patient experienced significant declines in cognition and delayed recall was improved relative to baseline following the second operation.

Rothlind and co-workers⁵⁷ recently reported on a randomised comparison of staged, bilateral GPi and STN DBS in 42 patients and also found that minimal cognitive changes ensued from the second relative to the first operation. Semantic verbal fluency (the ability to quickly name items belonging to a category such as fruits) declined after left DBS regardless of whether the left side was operated on first or second. Although phonemic verbal fluency also declined after left DBS only, a significant effect of the second surgery was not demonstrated.

It is unclear whether GPi DBS is safer than alternative procedures such as pallidotomy or STN DBS. Studies by Merello et al.¹⁵ and Fields et al.⁸¹ found the cognitive safety of GPi DBS and pallidotomy to be comparable. Although some suggest that bilateral GPi DBS may entail less cognitive morbidity than bilateral STN DBS,^{27,74,82} the only randomised comparison of the cognitive effects of GPi and STN DBS has failed to reveal substantial differences between the two treatments.⁵⁷ A larger randomised trial comparing the effects



More out of levodopa. More out of life.

When symptoms develop due to shortening of levodopa/DDCI dose effectiveness, lengthen the levodopa effect and prescribe **Stalevo**.

NICE recommends: *In view of problems with reduced concordance, people with later PD requiring or taking entacapone should be offered a triple combination preparation of levodopa, carbidopa and entacapone.*¹

STALEVO (levodopa / carbidopa / entacapone)

PRESCRIBING INFORMATION

Indication: Treatment of patients with Parkinson's disease and end-of-dose motor fluctuations not stabilised on levodopa/dopa decarboxylase (DDC) inhibitor treatment. **Dosage and administration:** Orally with or without food. One tablet contains one treatment dose and may only be administered as whole tablets. Optimum daily dosage must be determined by careful titration of levodopa in each patient preferably using one of the three tablet strengths. Patients receiving less than 70-100mg carbidopa a day are more likely to experience nausea and vomiting. The maximum Stalevo dose is 10 tablets per day. Usually Stalevo is to be used in patients who are currently treated with corresponding doses of standard release levodopa/DDC inhibitor and entacapone. See SPC for details of how to transfer these patients and those not currently treated with entacapone. **Children and adolescents:** Not recommended. **Elderly:** No dosage adjustment required. **Mild to moderate hepatic impairment, severe renal impairment (including dialysis):** Caution advised. **Contraindications:** Hypersensitivity to active substances or excipients. Severe hepatic impairment. Narrow-angle glaucoma. Pheochromocytoma. Concomitant use of non-selective monoamine oxidase inhibitors (e.g. phenelzine, tranylcypromine). Concomitant use of a selective MAO-A inhibitor and a selective MAO-B inhibitor. Previous history of Neuroleptic Malignant Syndrome (NMS) and/or non-traumatic rhabdomyolysis. **Warnings and precautions:** Not recommended for treatment of drug-induced extrapyramidal reactions. Administer with caution to: patients with severe cardiovascular or pulmonary disease, bronchial asthma, renal, hepatic or endocrine disease, or history of peptic ulcer disease or of convulsions, or past or current psychosis; patients receiving concomitant antipsychotics with dopamine receptor-blocking

properties, particularly D2 receptor antagonists; patients receiving other medicinal products which may cause orthostatic hypotension. In patients with a history of myocardial infarction who have residual atrial nodal, or ventricular arrhythmias, monitor cardiac function carefully during initial dosage adjustments. Monitor all patients for the development of mental changes, depression with suicidal tendencies, and other serious antisocial behaviour. Patients with chronic wide-angle glaucoma may be treated with Stalevo with caution, provided the intra-ocular pressure is well controlled and the patient is monitored carefully. Caution when driving or operating machines. Doses of other antiparkinsonian treatments may need to be adjusted when Stalevo is substituted for a patient currently not treated with entacapone. Rhabdomyolysis secondary to severe dyskinesias or NMS has been observed rarely in patients with Parkinson's disease. Therefore, any abrupt dosage reduction or withdrawal of levodopa should be carefully observed, particularly in patients who are also receiving neuroleptics. Periodic evaluation of hepatic, haematopoietic, cardiovascular and renal function is recommended during extended therapy. Monitor weight in patients experiencing diarrhoea. Contains sucrose therefore should not be taken by patients with rare hereditary problems of fructose intolerance, glucose-galactose malabsorption or sucrase-isomaltase insufficiency. Pathological gambling, increased libido and hypersexuality have been reported in Parkinson's disease patients treated with dopamine agonists and other dopaminergic drugs such as Stalevo. For patients experiencing progressive anorexia, asthenia and weight loss within a short period, consider medical review (including liver function). **Undesirable effects:** *Levodopa/carbidopa* – Most common: dyskinesias including choreiform, dystonic

and other involuntary movements, nausea. Also mental changes, paranoid ideation and psychotic episodes, depression, cognitive dysfunction. Less frequently: irregular heart rhythm and/or palpitations, orthostatic hypotensive episodes, bradykinetic episodes (the 'on-off' phenomenon), anorexia, vomiting, dizziness, and somnolence. Reports of signs of pathological gambling, increased libido and hypersexuality, especially at high doses and generally reversible upon reduction of the dose or treatment discontinuation. *Entacapone* – Most frequently relate to increased dopaminergic activity, or to gastrointestinal symptoms. Very common: dyskinesias, nausea and urine discoloration. Common: insomnia, hallucination, confusion and paroniria, Parkinsonism aggravated, dizziness, dystonia, hyperkinesias, diarrhoea, abdominal pain, dry mouth, constipation, vomiting, fatigue, increased sweating and falls. Rare: Erythematous or maculopapular rash, hepatic function test abnormal. Very rare: anorexia, urticaria, weight decrease, agitation. Not known: Hepatitis, colitis. See SPC for further details. **Legal category:** POM. **Presentations, basic NHS costs and marketing authorization numbers:** Stalevo 50mg/12.5mg/200mg, 30 tablet bottle £21.72, 100 tablet bottle £72.40, MA numbers: EU/1/03/260/002-003; Stalevo 100mg/25mg/200mg, 30 tablet bottle £21.72, 100 tablet bottle £72.40, MA numbers: EU/1/03/260/006-007; Stalevo 150mg/37.5mg/200mg, 30 tablet bottle £21.72, 100 tablet bottle £72.40 MA numbers: EU/1/03/260/010-011. **Distributed by:** Orion Pharma (UK) Ltd, Oaklea Court, 22 Park Street, Newbury, Berkshire, RG14 1EA, UK. Full prescribing information is available on request. Stalevo is a registered trademark. **Date of Prescribing Information:** September 2007. **Item Date:** September 2007

STA2712 J17662



REFERENCE

1. NICE clinical guideline 35 (developed by the National Collaborating Centre for Chronic Conditions). Parkinson's disease: diagnosis and management in primary and secondary care, 2006. URL: www.nice.org.uk

Information about adverse event reporting can be found at www.yellowcard.gov.uk. Adverse events should also be reported to Orion Pharma (UK) Ltd on 01635 520300.

Stalevo
levodopa, carbidopa, entacapone

(including the neurobehavioural consequences) of simultaneous bilateral GPi with STN surgery is nearing completion.⁸³

Social Function after Subthalamic Deep Brain Stimulation

Few studies have attended to social adaptation after surgery, a complex matter that has been more adequately addressed in the epilepsy surgery literature. Recent studies consistently provide evidence that gains in motor function and quality of life (QOL) do not necessarily translate into improved social integration and adaptation.^{84,85} Familial relationships can be compromised after DBS,^{85,86} especially when expectations of outcomes and perceived levels of functioning diverge between patient and care partner. In addition, despite improvements in motor function and QOL, patients may not return to work. In one study, only nine of 16 with work before surgery had returned to work 18–24 months after surgery.⁸⁵ Predictors of, and barriers to, social adjustment remain to be identified.

Summary and Conclusions

A review of the literature and meta-analyses indicates DBS for movement disorders to be quite safe from a neurobehavioural standpoint (while improving motor symptoms and both the patient's and care partner's QOL). However, it is also clear that a small proportion of patients have moderate or severe neurobehavioural morbidity. If one combines the various cognitive and psychiatric morbidities reported across studies, it is reasonable to estimate that about 10% of patients with PD undergoing DBS will experience one or more transient or permanent neurobehavioural adverse events. Deserving detailed empirical investigation is the observation in a few small uncontrolled studies that improvements in motor symptoms and QOL may not necessarily translate into social (re)adjustment. Research will need to identify the patient, medico-surgical and psychosocial factors that are associated with neurobehavioural morbidity and preclude some patients from demonstrating gains in occupational, interpersonal, familial and marital functioning. ■

- Hassler R, et al., *Brain*, 1960;83:337–50.
- Siegfried J, Lippitz B, *Stereotact Funct Neurosurg*, 1994;62(1–4):71–5.
- Benabid AL, Pollak P, Louveau A, et al., *Appl Neurophysiol*, 1987;50(1–6):344–6.
- Benabid AL, Koudsié A, Benazzouz A, et al., *J Neurol*, 2001;248(Suppl. 3):37–47.
- Benabid AL, Minotti L, Koudsié A, et al., *Neurosurgery*, 2002;50(6):1385–91, discussion 1391–2.
- Mayberg HS, Lozano AM, Voon V, et al., *Neuron*, 2005;45(5):651–60.
- Nuttin B, Cosyns P, Demeulemeester H, et al., *Lancet*, 1999;354(9189): 1526.
- Parsons TD, Rogers SA, Braaten AJ, et al., *Lancet Neurol*, 2006;5(7):578–88.
- Caparros-Lefebvre D, Blond S, Pêcheux N, et al., *Revue Neurologique*, 1992;148(2): 117–22.
- Tröster AI, Fields JA, Wilkinson SB, et al., *Neurosurg Focus*, 1997;2(3):1–6.
- Loher TJ, Gutbrod K, Fravi NL, et al., *J Neurol*, 2003;250(6):707–13.
- Woods SP, Fields JA, Lyons KE, et al., *Acta Neurochirurgica*, 2001;143:1273–8.
- Vingerhoets G, van der Linden C, Lannoo E, et al., *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*, 1999;66(3):297–304.
- Tröster AI, Fields JA, Wilkinson SB, et al., *Neurology*, 1997;49(4):1078–83.
- Merello M, Nouzeilles MI, Kuzis G, et al., *Mov Disord*, 1999;14(1):50–56.
- Ardouin C, Pillon B, Peiffer E, et al., *Ann Neurol*, 1999;46(2):217–23.
- Pillon B, Ardouin C, Damier P, et al., *Neurology*, 2000;55(3):411–18.
- Ghika J, Villemure JG, Fankhauser H, et al., *J Neurol*, 1998;89(5):713–18.
- Dujardin K, Krystkowiak P, Defebvre L, et al., *Neuropsychologia*, 2000;38(9):1305–15.
- Trepanier LL, Kumar R, Lozano AM, et al., *Brain Cogn*, 2000;42(3):324–47.
- Fields JA, Tröster AI, Wilkinson SB, et al., *Clin Neurol Neurosurg*, 1999;101(3):182–8.
- Higginson CI, Fields JA, Tröster AI, *Neuropsychiatry Neuropsychol Behav Neurol*, 2001;14(2):117–21.
- Miyawaki E, Perlmutter JS, Tröster AI, et al., *Brain Cogn*, 2000;42(3):417–34.
- Krause M, Fogel W, Heck A, et al., *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*, 2001;70(4):464–70.
- Roane DM, Yu M, Feinberg TE, Rogers JD, *Neuropsychiatry Neuropsychol Behav Neurol*, 2002;15(4):247–51.
- Temel Y, Kessels A, Tan S, et al., *Parkinsonism Relat Disord*, 2006; 12(5):265–72.
- Rodriguez-Oroz MC, Obeso JA, Lang AE, et al., *Brain*, 2005;128(10):2240–49.
- Kleiner-Fisman G, Fisman DN, Sime E, et al., *J Neuro*, 2003;99(3):489–95.
- Deuschl G, Schade-Brittinger C, Krack P, et al., *N Engl J Med*, 2006;355(9):896–908.
- Okun MS, Rodriguez RL, Mikos A, et al., *Clin Neuropsychol*, 2007;21(1):162–89.
- Tröster AI, Fields JA, *Surgical Treatment of Parkinson's Disease and Other Movement Disorders*, Totowa: Humana Press, 2003;213–40.
- Voon V, Kube C, Krack P, et al., *Mov Disord*, 2006;21(Suppl. 14):S305–27.
- Burn DJ, Troster AI, *J Geriatr Psychiatry Neurol*, 2004;17(3):172–80.
- Woods SP, Rippeth JD, Conover E, et al., *Clin Neuropsychol*, 2006;20:27–38.
- Alegret M, Junqué C, Valdeoriola F, et al., *Arch Neurol*, 2001;58(8):1223–7.
- Alegret M, Valdeoriola F, Martí M, et al., *Mov Disord*, 2004;19(12):1463–9.
- Castelli L, Perozzo P, Zibetti M, et al., *Eur Neurol*, 2006;55(3):136–44.
- Saint-Cyr JA, Trépanier LL, Kumar R, et al., *Brain*, 2000; 123(10):2091–2108.
- Smeding HM, Speelman JD, Koning-Haanstra M, et al., *Neurology*, 2006;66(12):1830–36.
- Brusa L, Pierantozzi M, Peppe A, et al., *J Neural Transm*, 2001;108(8–9):1021–7.
- Contarino MF, Daniele A, Sibilla AH, et al., *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*, 2007;78(3):248–52.
- Dujardin K, Defebvre L, Krystkowiak P, et al., *J Neurol*, 2001;248:603–11.
- Erola T, Karinen P, Heikkinen E, et al., *Parkinsonism Relat Disord*, 2005;11(2):89–94.
- Funkiewiez A, Ardouin C, Caputo E, et al., *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*, 2004;75(6):834–9.
- Gironell A, Kulisevsky J, Rami L, et al., *J Neurol*, 2003;250(8):917–23.
- Jahanshahi M, Ardouin CM, Brown RG, et al., *Brain*, 2000;123(6):1142–54.
- Moretti R, Torre P, Antonello RM, et al., *Eur J Neurol*, 2001;8(6):726–7.
- Moretti R, Torre P, Antonello RM, et al., *Parkinsonism Relat Disord*, 2003;10(2):73–9.
- Morrison CE, Borod JC, Brin MF, et al., *Neuropsychiatry Neuropsychol Behav Neurol*, 2000;13(3):204–19.
- Morrison CE, Borod JC, Perrine K, et al., *Arch Clin Neuropsychol*, 2004;19(2):165–81.
- Perozzo P, Rizzone M, Bergamasco B, et al., *J Neurol Sci*, 2001;192(1–2):9–15.
- Smeding HM, Esselink RA, Schmand B, et al., *J Neurol*, 2005;252(2):176–82.
- Whelan BM, Murdoch BE, Theodoros DG, et al., *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*, 2003;74(11):1543–50.
- Witt K, Pulkowski U, Herzog J, et al., *Arch Neurol*, 2004; 61(5):697–700.
- Drapier D, Drapier S, Sauleau P, et al., *J Neurol*, 2006;253(8):1083–91.
- De Gaspari D, Siri C, Landi A, et al., *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*, 2006;77(4):450–53.
- Rothlind JC, Cockshott RW, Starr PA, Marks WJ, *J Int Neuropsychol Soc*, 2007;13(1):68–79.
- Bordini BJ, Garg A, Gallagher CL, et al., *Stereotact Funct Neurosurg*, 2007;85(2–3):113–20.
- Cilia R, Siri C, Marotta G, et al., *Parkinsonism Relat Disord*, 2007;13(5):290–94.
- Kleiner-Fisman G, Herzog J, Fisman DN, et al., *Mov Disord*, 2006;21(Suppl. 14):S290–304.
- Gan J, Xie-Brustolin J, Mertens P, et al., *J Neurol*, 2007;254(1):99–106.
- Voges J, Waerzeggers Y, Maarouf M, et al., *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*, 2006;77(7):868–72.
- Houeto JL, Mesnage V, Mallet L, et al., *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*, 2002;72(6):701–7.
- Diederich NJ, Alesch F, Goetz CG, *Clin Neuropharmacol*, 2000;23(5):287–9.
- Okun MS, Raju DV, Walter BL, et al., *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*, 2004;75(6):921–3.
- Kumar R, Lozano AM, Sime E, et al., *Neurology*, 1999;53(3):561–6.
- Bejjani BP, Damier P, Arnulf I, et al., *N Engl J Med*, 1999;340(19):1476–80.
- Houeto JL, Damier P, Bejjani PB, et al., *Arch Neurol*, 2000;57(4):461–5.
- Okun MS, Green J, Saben R, et al., *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*, 2003;74(11):1584–6.
- Mallet L, Schupbach M, N'Diaye K, et al., *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 2007;104(25):10661–6.
- Chen SY, Lin SZ, Lee TW, *J Psychiatr Res*, 2004;38(6):637–8.
- Bejjani BP, Houeto JL, Hariz M, et al., *Neurology*, 2002;59(9):1425–7.
- Sensi M, Eleopra R, Cavallo MA, et al., *Parkinsonism Relat Disord*, 2004;10(4):247–51.
- Volkman J, Allert N, Voges J, et al., *Neurology*, 2001;56(4):548–51.
- Kalteis K, Standhardt H, Krysin-Exner I, et al., *J Neural Transm*, 2006;113(9):1191–1206.
- Czernecki V, Pillon B, Houeto JL, et al., *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*, 2005;76(6):775–9.
- Voon V, Saint-Cyr J, Lozano AM, et al., *J Neurosurg*, 2005;103(2):246–51.
- Smeding HM, Goudriaan AE, Foncke EM, et al., *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*, 2007;78(5):517–19.
- Ardouin C, Voon V, Worbe Y, et al., *Mov Disord*, 2006;21(11):1941–6.
- Bandini F, Primavera A, Pizzorno M, Cocito L, *Parkinsonism Relat Disord*, 2007;13(6): 369–71.
- Fields JA, Tröster AI, Wilkinson SB, et al., *Neurology*, 1998;50(Suppl. 4):A389.
- Anderson VC, Burchiel KJ, Hogarth P, et al., *Arch Neurol*, 2005;62(4):554–60.
- Follett K, Weaver F, Stern M, et al., *Arch Neurol*, 2005;62(10):1643–4, author reply 1644–45.
- Houeto JL, Mallet L, Mesnage V, et al., *Arch Neurol*, 2006;63(8):1090–95.
- Schupbach M, Gargiulo M, Welter ML, et al., *Neurology*, 2006;66(12):1811–16.
- Perozzo P, Rizzone M, Bergamasco B, et al., *Neurol Sci*, 2001;22(1):81–2.

tel / fax: +44 (0) 1732 457 683

email: info@epda.eu.com

Widening perspectives

www.epda.eu.com

epda plus promoting international understanding and awareness supporting national parkinson's organisations
promoting informed choices parkinson's awareness providing access to best practices quality of life issues
euroyapmeet conferences encouraging interaction between scientific and patient communities epda charter
managing your pd **promoting a constructive dialogue between science and society** patient information
professional information european participation in life survey global declaration on parkinson's disease
real life real pd survey parkinson's decision aid pdns core competencies medical and surgical information
epnn journal world pd day supporting research initiatives patient guide to living with parkinson's disease
patient guide to healthy eating infopark coping strategies multidisciplinary conferences flexicard

www.rewriteTomorrow.eu.com



EPDA

EUROPEAN PARKINSON'S DISEASE ASSOCIATION