Transcutaneous Auricular Vagus Stimulation Improves Gait and Reaction Time in Parkinson's Disease

Recent studies have found that transcutaneous cervical vagus nerve stimulation (VNS) can improve gait symptoms in Parkinson's disease (PD).[1-3] Noninvasive VNS can be performed also on the auricular branch of the vagus nerve, with significant opportunities in terms of feasibility and costs. Data on the effects of transcutaneous auricular VNS (taVNS) in PD, however, are still missing. Hence we aimed at investigating the effects of taVNS on the gait of 12 patients with idiopathic PD, which were consecutively enrolled in a pilot-controlled study with a double-blind randomized crossover design, at the tertiary movement disorders clinic of our institution. Patients were selected according to the following criteria: (1) chronic levodopa therapy without a history of levodopa-induced dyskinesias, (2) walking difficulties but still able to walk unassisted (Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale [UPDRS] Part II item 15 = 1 or 2), and (3) modified Hoehn & Yahr score <3 while *on* medication. Patients with early signs of cognitive impairment or atypical parkinsonism and individuals on anticholinergics and/or affected by any other known condition able to influence the gait were not included. Therapy changes between visits were not allowed. taVNS was delivered either on the left internal tragus (real) or the earlobe (control) in trains lasting 30 seconds each, composed of 600 pulses (frequency 20 Hz; duration 0.3 millisecond) repeated every 4.5 minutes for 30 minutes (six cycles) (Supporting Information Materials). Patients were randomized to one stimulation and after 1 week, all subjects were crossed over to the other. Patients were evaluated before and after the stimulation with UPDRS Part III, a flanker test (reaction time), a digital 10-m timed up and go (10mTUG) test performed in duplicate (Mon4t clinic, https://mon4t.com), and a Visual Analogue Scale (VAS 0–10, "How do you perceive your walking performance?"). The flanker is an acknowledged VNS-responsive parameter,[4] while the 10mTUG provides data on total time (stand, rotation, sit, and gait time), gait speed, stride length, number of steps, mediolateral sway, and swing amplitude.[5] The experiments took place in the morning while all of the patients were *on* levodopa. The patients' awareness about the condition (i.e., whether real or control) was verified with a questionnaire (Supporting Information Materials). Variables are presented as mean ± standard deviation. Data were tested for normality (Shapiro–Wilks test), compared through *t* test or Wilcoxon signed rank test for paired data (JMP software v16.0; SAS Institute Inc.), and corrected for multiple comparisons with the Benjamini–Hochberg method (false discovery rate set at 0.05).[3] Demographic and disease features are reported in Table S1. All 12 subjects completed both the real and the control stimulation; no dropouts were reported. Baseline data were similar between the two visits (Table S2). The UPDRS Part III and the Visual Analogue Scale scores showed an improvement both after the real and the control stimulation, likely because of a placebo effect; however, both scales showed a better trend following the real stimulation. Stride length, swing amplitude, gait speed, and gait time showed significant changes only after the taVNS. Rotation time, stand time, and sit time did not show any significant variation. Finally, the flanker reaction time improved after taVNS, corroborating our findings. Differences across variables and conditions are reported in Table 1. This is the first experiment reporting a systematic evaluation of taVNS in PD. In this sample of patients with mild-to-moderate PD, the taVNS in add-on to levodopa improved several objective gait parameters. Despite direct data on duration not being collected, the putative taVNS effect persisted for the time duration of the UPDRS motor assessment, the flanker test (mean completion time 52 ± 13.7 seconds), and two consecutive gait assessments (single 10mTUG test mean completion time 28 ± 7.3 seconds). The latter might give useful information for future biomarker (eg, neurophysiological) studies.[6] Preclinical studies showed that VNS can improve structural and functional aspects of PD.[7] Even though its mechanism of action is still debated, VNS can entrain the ascending cholinergic and noradrenergic pathways,[6,8] which are involved in cognitive processing and in locomotor abilities.[4,7] In this study, taVNS improved some dopamine-dependent gait parameters (eg, stride length).[9] If proven true, this would add information to the growing literature on the association between the vagus nerve and the dopaminergic system.[10] However, despite our results being in line with recent noninvasive cervical VNS experiments,[1-3] it is still not possible to draw a firm conclusion. Indeed, we collected data on the gait of patients with PD through a single sensor. This is a trusted methodology, but the use of a more comprehensive gait analysis system would allow a more precise analysis of gait and of gait-related PD issues (ie, freezing).[1,3] Moreover, the study should be replicated on a larger sample, allowing a more robust statistical methodology, eventually exploring VNS dosage and duration.[11] Nonetheless, given the manageability of the portable commercialized taVNS devices, they may be considered a valuable tool in the neuromodulation landscape of PD. ●

---

*Correspondence to: Dr. Massimo Marano, Unit of Neurology, Neurophysiology and Neurobiology, Fondazione Policlinico Universitario Campus Bio-Medico, Viale Alvaro del Portillo, 200, 00128 Rome, Italy; E-mail: m.marano@policlinicocampus.it

TABLE 1   *Clinical and Digital Biomarker Differences Across Conditions*

	Control Stimulation			Real taVNS		
	T0	**T1**	***P* Value**	**T0**	**T1**	***P* Value**
UPDRS Part III	21.5 ± 7.8	19.7 ± 7.9	$0.003\star$	22.5 ± 7.5	20.1 ± 7.2	$0.002\star$
VAS	6.5 ± 1.6	7.6 ± 1.95	0.039	6.3 ± 1.5	7.6 ± 1.7	$0.011\star$
Reaction time (s)	1.61 ± 0.68	1.53 ± 0.66	0.230	1.69 ± 0.52	1.50 ± 0.47	$0.005\star$
Stand time (s)	1.83 ± 0.13	1.84 ± 0.16	0.846	1.80 ± 0.15	1.88 ± 0.15	0.129
Sit time (s)	4.29 ± 1.16	3.94 ± 0.92	0.080	3.95 ± 0.89	4.16 ± 1.19	0.392
Rotation time (s)	1.99 ± 0.07	1.99 ± 0.08	0.873	1.99 ± 0.08	2 ± 0.07	0.269
Total gait time (s)	19.57 ± 5.84	19.82 ± 7.19	0.569	21.95 ± 7.25	19.44 ± 5.8	$0.001\star$
Gait speed (m/s)	1.25 ± 0.29	1.27 ± 0.35	0.531	1.14 ± 0.33	1.26 ± 0.31	$0.029\star$
Steps (n)	25.7 ± 8.4	23.8 ± 8.1	0.056	25.3 ± 7.3	23.1 ± 8.1	0.264
Stride length (m)	0.61 ± 0.11	0.60 ± 0.13	0.722	0.58 ± 0.10	0.61 ± 0.11	$0.005\star$
Sway (m)	0.06 ± 0.08	0.07 ± 0.10	0.726	0.04 ± 0.01	0.04 ± 0.008	0.078
Swing amplitude (m)	0.54 ± 0.13	0.55 ± 0.16	0.691	0.54 ± 0.17	0.59 ± 0.21	$0.018\star$

taVNS, transcutaneous auricular vagus nerve stimulation; T0, baseline; T1, poststimulation; UPDRS, Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale; VAS, Visual Analogue Scale.
$\star$Statistically significant changes after correcting for multiple comparisons according to the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure.

Massimo Marano, MD, PhD[*] [iD], Gaia Anzini, MD, Gabriella Musumeci, PhD, Alessandro Magliozzi, MD, Valeria Pozzilli, MD, Fioravante Capone, MD, PhD and Vincenzo Di Lazzaro, MD
Unit of Neurology, Neurophysiology and Neurobiology, Department of Medicine, Fondazione Policlinico Universitario Campus Bio-Medico, Rome, Italy

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

References

1. Mondal B, Choudhury S, Simon B, Baker MR, Kumar H. Noninvasive vagus nerve stimulation improves gait and reduces freezing of gait in Parkinson's disease. Mov Disord 2019;34:917–918.

2. Morris R, Yarnall AJ, Hunter H, Taylor JP, Baker MR, Rochester L. Noninvasive vagus nerve stimulation to target gait impairment in Parkinson's disease. Mov Disord 2019;34:918–919.

3. Mondal B, Choudhury S, Banerjee R, et al. Non-invasive vagus nerve stimulation improves clinical and molecular biomarkers of Parkinson's disease in patients with freezing of gait. NPJ Parkinsons Dis 2021;7:46

4. Sellaro R, van Leusden JW, Tona KD, Verkuil B, Nieuwenhuis S, Colzato LS. Transcutaneous Vagus nerve stimulation enhances post-error slowing. J Cogn Neurosci 2015;27:2126–2132.

5. Marano M, Motolese F, Rossi M, Magliozzi A, Yekutieli Z, Di Lazzaro V. Remote smartphone gait monitoring and fall prediction in Parkinson's disease during the COVID-19 lockdown. Neurol Sci 2021;42:3089–3092.

6. Capone F, Motolese F, Di Zazzo A, et al. The effects of transcutaneous auricular vagal nerve stimulation on pupil size. Clin Neurophysiol 2021;132:1859–1865.

7. Farrand AQ, Helke KL, Gregory RA, Gooz M, Hinson VK, Boger HA. Vagus nerve stimulation improves locomotion and neuronal populations in a model of Parkinson's disease. Brain Stimul 2017;10:1045–1054.

8. Badran BW, Dowdle LT, Mithoefer OJ, et al. Neurophysiologic effects of transcutaneous auricular vagus nerve stimulation (taVNS) via electrical stimulation of the tragus: a concurrent taVNS/fMRI study and review. Brain Stimul 2018;11:492–500.

9. Hirata K, Hattori T, Kina S, Chen Q, Ohara M, Yokota T. Striatal dopamine denervation impairs gait automaticity in drug-Naïve Parkinson's disease patients. Mov Disord 2020;35:1037–1045.

10. Neuser MP, Teckentrup V, Kühnel A, Hallschmid M, Walter M, Kroemer NB. Vagus nerve stimulation boosts the drive to work for rewards. Nat Commun 2020;11:3555

11. Farrand AQ, Verner RS, McGuire RM, Helke KL, Hinson VK, Boger HA. Differential effects of vagus nerve stimulation paradigms guide clinical development for Parkinson's disease. Brain Stimul 2020; 13:1323–1332.

Supporting Data

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article at the publisher's web-site.