

## ***Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation as a Treatment of Depression and Other Disorders***

**Effective:** May 1, 2017

**Next Review:** February 2018

**Last Review:** April 2017

### **IMPORTANT REMINDER**

Medical Policies are developed to provide guidance for members and providers regarding coverage in accordance with contract terms. Benefit determinations are based in all cases on the applicable contract language. To the extent there may be any conflict between the Medical Policy and contract language, the contract language takes precedence.

PLEASE NOTE: Contracts exclude from coverage, among other things, services or procedures that are considered investigational or cosmetic. Providers may bill members for services or procedures that are considered investigational or cosmetic. Providers are encouraged to inform members before rendering such services that the members are likely to be financially responsible for the cost of these services.

### **DESCRIPTION**

Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) is a noninvasive method of delivering electrical stimulation to the brain. The technique involves placement of a small coil over the scalp; a rapidly alternating current is passed through the coil wire, producing a magnetic field that passes unimpeded through the brain. In contrast to electroconvulsive therapy, transcranial magnetic stimulation does not require anesthesia and does not induce convulsions. Repetitive TMS (rTMS) is being evaluated as a treatment of depression and other psychiatric/neurologic brain disorders.

### **MEDICAL POLICY CRITERIA**

- I Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) of the brain may be considered **medically necessary** as a treatment of *major depressive disorder* when all of the following criteria are met:
  - A Confirmed diagnosis of severe major depressive disorder (single or recurrent) documented by standardized rating scales (see Policy Guidelines) that reliably measure depressive symptoms; AND

B Any one of the following conditions is present:

1. Trials of at least four psychopharmacologic regimens, has been ineffective, not tolerated (as evidenced by distinct side effects), or is contraindicated (see Policy Guidelines); or
2. History of response to TMS in a previous depressive episode (at least 3 months since the prior episode); or
3. Is a candidate for electroconvulsive therapy (ECT) and ECT would not be clinically superior to TMS (e.g., in cases with psychosis, acute suicidal risk, catatonia, or life-threatening inanition TMS should not be utilized); AND

C Failure of a trial of a psychotherapy (see Policy Guidelines) known to be effective in the treatment of major depressive disorder, conducted for a minimum duration of 6 weeks at least 1 time per week, without significant improvement in depressive symptoms, as documented by standardized rating scales (see Policy Guidelines) that reliably measure depressive symptoms.

II Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) of the brain is considered **investigational** as a treatment for all other indications, including but not limited to:

- A Alcohol dependence
- B Alzheimer's disease
- C Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD)
- D Autism
- E Bipolar mania
- F Bulimia nervosa (BN)
- G Depression (including major depressive disorder which does not meet criteria I. above)
- H Dysphagia
- I Epilepsy
- J Fibromyalgia
- K Migraine
- L Obsessive compulsive disorder (OCD)
- M Pain
- N Panic Disorder
- O Parkinson's disease
- P Posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD)
- Q Schizophrenia
- R Spasticity
- S Spinal cord injury
- T Stroke rehabilitation

- U Tinnitus
- V Tourette's syndrome

*NOTE: A summary of the supporting rationale for the policy criteria is at the end of the policy.*

## POLICY GUIDELINES

### DEPRESSION RATING SCALES

Assessment tools to diagnose severe major depressive disorder may include, but not limited to the following depression rating scales:

- Beck Depression Inventory (BDI)
- Inventory of Depressive Symptomatology Clinician-related (IDS-C)
- Quick Inventory of Depressive Symptomatology Self-reported (QIDS-SR)
- Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS)
- Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ9)

### PSYCHOTHERAPY METHODS

The following methods of psychotherapy are recommended by the American Psychiatric Association to treat major depressive disorder:<sup>[1]</sup>

- Cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT)
- Interpersonal therapy (IPT)
- Psychodynamic therapy
- Problem-solving therapy (in individual and group formats)

### CONTRAINDICATIONS

Contraindications to TMS include:

- Seizure disorder or any history of seizure with increased risk of future seizure; OR
- Presence of acute or chronic psychotic symptoms or disorders (such as schizophrenia, schizophreniform or schizoaffective disorder) in the current depressive episode; OR
- Neurologic conditions that include epilepsy, cerebrovascular disease, dementia, increased intracranial pressure, having a history of repetitive or severe head trauma, or with primary or secondary tumors in the central nervous system (CNS); OR
- Presence of an implanted magnetic-sensitive medical device located 30 centimeters or less from the TMS magnetic coil or other implanted metal items, including but not limited to a cochlear implant, implanted cardioverter defibrillator (ICD), pacemaker, deep brain stimulator, vagus nerve stimulator, or metal aneurysm clips or coils, staples, or stents.

## CROSS REFERENCES

1. [Dopamine Transporter Single-Photon Emission Computed Tomography](#), Radiology, Policy No. 57

## BACKGROUND

### Regulatory Status

The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) granted 510(k) approval for the following devices:

- Brainsway™ H-Coil Deep TMS System (Brainsway, Ltd.) received FDA clearance for the treatment of depressive episodes in patients suffering from major depressive disorder who have failed to respond to antidepressant medications in their current episode of depression.
- Cerena™ TMS device (Eneura Therapeutics) received de novo marketing clearance for the acute treatment of pain associated with migraine headache with aura. Warnings, precautions, and contraindications include the following:
  - The device is only intended for use by patients experiencing the onset of pain associated with a migraine headache with aura.
  - The device should not be used on headaches due to underlying pathology or trauma.
  - The device should not be used for medication overuse headaches.
  - The device has not been demonstrated as safe or effective when treating cluster headache or chronic migraine headache.
  - The device has not been shown to be effective when treating during the aura phase.
  - The device has not been demonstrated as effective in relieving the associated symptoms of migraine (photophobia, phonophobia, and nausea).
  - Safety and effectiveness have not been established in pregnant women, children under the age of 18, and adults over the age of 65.
- Magvita TMS Therapy System® is indicated for the treatment of Major Depressive Disorder in adult patients who failed to receive satisfactory improvement from prior antidepressant medication in the current episode.
- NeuroStar® (formerly known as NeoPulse®) TMS Therapy system (Neuronetics, Inc.) received de novo clearance for the treatment of major depressive disorder in adults who have failed a six-week course of one antidepressant medication.
- Rapid<sup>2</sup> Therapy System from Magstim Company Limited is indicated for the treatment of Major Depressive Disorder in adult patients who have failed to achieve satisfactory improvement from prior antidepressant medication in the current episode.
- SpringTMS® received FDA clearance for the treatment of migraines, with aura.

The de novo 510(k) review process allows novel products with moderate or low-risk profiles and without predicates which would ordinarily require premarket approval as a class III device to be down-classified in an expedited manner and brought to market with a special control as a class II device.

## EVIDENCE SUMMARY

Systematic reviews (SRs) and well-designed randomized controlled trials (RCTs) comparing active transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) to sham devices are needed in order to establish safety and efficacy of this treatment for any condition.

## DEPRESSION

### Systematic Reviews and Technology Assessments

Nordenskjöld (2016) published a SR that evaluated ethical and economic factors involving deep transcranial magnetic stimulation (dTMS) using the Hesel-coil (H-coil), an enhanced form of rTMS for patients with depression.<sup>[2]</sup> One RCT was identified, which lacked evidence to support dTMS for depression. At this time, the authors stated dTMS should be limited to clinical trials.

Kedzior (2016) published a SR that evaluated cognitive function i.e. memory, attention, and psychomotor coordination after dTMS, using the H-coil system for patients with major psychiatric disorders.<sup>[3]</sup> Thirteen studies were included, with most being of poor quality. Patients had either unipolar or bipolar depression or schizophrenia and showed short-term improvements. Although short-term cognitive function improved, more long-term sham controlled studies are needed beyond the daily stimulation phase.

BlueCross BlueShield Association (BCBSA) Technology Evaluation Center (TEC) published three technology assessments on TMS for depression; with the most recent assessment published in 2013.<sup>[4-6]</sup>

The 2013 Assessment included seven recent meta-analyses from 2010 or later, with the four largest meta-analyses including 24-34 trials.<sup>[6]</sup> All of these meta-analyses evaluated endpoints at the completion of TMS treatment which was between 1-5 weeks. Despite the analyses conclusions that TMS is superior to sham as a short-term treatment of medication-resistant depression; conclusions reached in these studies are uncertain due to the following methodological limitations:

- All seven meta-analyses used the same two randomized trials<sup>[7,8]</sup> which employed a “forced dropout strategy” for patients failing to improve after three weeks of active treatment. The incorporation of these studies into a pooled effects analysis may have biased results because randomization was not preserved; therefore, results may not be useful in reaching conclusions regarding treatment effects. Analysis which accounted for this potential confounding factor was not reported;
- Only one of the seven meta-analyses assessed the quality of trials used in pooled analyses and only one analysis addressed issues regarding publication bias;
- No evidence was reported regarding changes or augmentation of anti-depression medication.
- Equivocal efficacy in the three largest sham-controlled trial of TMS;
- Uncertain clinical significance of the short-term anti-depressant effects found in meta-analyses, which are also at high risk of bias due to the inclusion of numerous small trials;
- Limited evidence beyond the acute period of treatment; and
- Lack of comparison with standard therapy (a second course of antidepressant therapy) in the population for whom TMS is indicated (patients who have failed one six-week course of antidepressant medication).

The 2013 assessment concluded that, “Concerns about conclusions from the meta-analyses center on the potential for publication bias, and inclusion of the problematic six-week results

from two trials. It has not yet been demonstrated whether TMS improves health outcomes in the investigational setting.”

In 2014, the Washington State Health Care Authority conducted a Technology Assessment and updated review of the current literature comparing TMS to sham and ECT.<sup>[9]</sup> The review included the AHRQ assessment noted below plus three additional RCTs. The WA TEC review came to the following conclusions:

“Although the three RCTs published after the AHRQ report did not consistently detect statistically significant differences between rTMS and sham stimulation, the overall body of evidence is consistent with regard to direction of the results. A small quantity of data suggested that the durability of effect, i.e., the continued advantage of active rTMS over sham rTMS, may not last beyond two or three weeks after the end of treatment; rTMS may serve primarily to accelerate recovery (low-quality evidence).”

In addition the WA TEC assessment concluded that a review of five RCTs, “suggested that rTMS may be as effective as ECT under certain circumstances, but under other circumstances, ECT may be superior; this evidence is based on low quality evidence because of unexplained inconsistency in study results.”

A 2011 Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) report, which was considered in the 2013 BCBSA TEC assessment, reported on nonpharmacologic interventions for treatment-resistant depression (TRD) in adults.<sup>[10]</sup> Indirect evidence which compared nonpharmacologic including rTMS, vagus nerve stimulation (VNS), or psychotherapy, with a control or sham procedure in tier 1 populations (i.e., patients had two or more prior treatment failures with medications). The number of these trials with the same or similar control group was very small, so they could not pool them quantitatively. They assessed the potential benefits of nonpharmacologic interventions versus controls by calculating mean changes in depressive severity, relative risks of response, and relative risks of remission.

rTMS was beneficial relative to controls receiving a sham procedure for all three outcomes (severity of depressive symptoms, response rate, remission rate). rTMS produced a greater decrease in depressive severity (high strength of evidence). Specifically, rTMS averaged a decrease in depressive severity measured by the Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression (HAM-D) of more than five points relative to sham control, and this change meets the minimum threshold of the three- point HAM-D difference that is considered clinically meaningful. Response rates were greater with rTMS than sham (also high strength of evidence); those receiving rTMS were more than three times as likely to achieve a depressive response as patients receiving a sham procedure. Finally, rTMS was also more likely to produce remission than the control procedure (moderate strength of evidence); patients receiving rTMS were more than six times as likely to achieve remission as those receiving the sham.

The authors of the AHRQ report identified three fair trials compared rTMS with a sham procedure and found no significant differences. However, too few patients were followed during the relapse prevention phases in two of the three studies, and patients in the third received a co-intervention providing insufficient evidence for a conclusion.

A Cochrane SR included 16 RCTs. The authors concluded that there was no strong evidence of benefit from TMS when used in the treatment of depression, finding no difference between

TMS and sham TMS based on results of the Beck Depression Inventory or Hamilton Depression Rating Scale (HDRS).<sup>[11]</sup>

Berlim (2013) reported a SR on the effect of rTMS for accelerating and enhancing the clinical response to antidepressants.<sup>[12]</sup> Data were obtained from six double-blind RCTs with a total of 392 patients. Response was defined as a 50% or greater reduction in the HDRS or the Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS). At an average of 2.7 weeks after the start of the combined treatments, response rates were significantly higher with rTMS + antidepressant treatment compared to sham rTMS (43.3% vs 26.8%; odds ratio [OR] =2.50; p=.025); however, remission rates were not significantly different. At the end of the studies (average of 6.8 weeks), response and remission rates were significantly higher with combined high-frequency rTMS + antidepressant treatment compared to sham rTMS (response: 62% vs 46%, OR =1.9, p=0.49; remission: 53.8% vs 38.6%, OR 2.42, p=.007).

Additional reviews of RCTs exhibited consistent results.<sup>[13-16]</sup> Each analysis identified a number of limitations of the included studies such as small patient populations, short study time-lines, confounding co-therapies, and inconsistency with TMS treatment parameters. The meta-analyses concluded that TMS indicated some effect when compared to the sham groups, but the clinical significance of this effect and its impact on health outcomes was not demonstrated. The above analyses concluded that additional, larger long-term studies were needed to better define optimal treatment parameters including frequency, positioning, and equipment for TMS.

### **Randomized Controlled Trials**

Fitzgerald (2016) published a two arm parallel design RCT evaluating rTMS for patients with refractory bipolar depression.<sup>[17]</sup> Forty-nine patients participated in the study and received rTMS or sham stimulation. The authors concluded there was no difference in depression between the groups, The study was limited in size.

Several RCTs not included above also had significant limitations which did not allow reliable conclusions to be made about the effectiveness of TMS as a treatment for depression. Limitations of individual studies and the body of the literature as a whole include one or more of the following:

- Standardized optimal treatment parameters for TMS have not been established. Studies varied with respect to frequency, location, intensity, and duration. Many studies did not mention repeat treatments using TMS after their intervention phase or in the follow-up assessments.<sup>[18-25]</sup>
- There were significant (greater than 10%) or unclear loss to follow-up and/or poorly defined intention-to-treat (ITT) analyses.<sup>[18-24,26,27]</sup>
- Use of co-therapies such as antidepressants, unequal distribution of co-therapies between treatment and sham groups, sham devices in which potential for some therapeutic effect was possible, and mental health counseling were allowed but not quantified in the results, potentially confounding the findings.<sup>[18-23,26,28-30]</sup>
- Follow-up of all study subjects was over a short period of time, less than 6 months, so durability of the results are unknown.<sup>[18-28,30-32]</sup>
- Study populations were small, less than 100 patients total, making results unreliable and difficult to apply to patients requiring treatment in the general population.<sup>[18-23,25-28,30-39]</sup>

- Statistical power calculations were inadequate or unclear, and/or the study failed to enroll a sufficient number of participants in order to have adequate statistical power to reliably detect differences between the treatment groups.<sup>[25]</sup>
- Randomization methods were not clearly stated or weak methods of randomization were used (e.g. one provider randomly assigned patients to groups using their own personal judgment).<sup>[19-21,25,26,28,31,32]</sup>
- Strict inclusion/exclusion criteria were used which were not representative of patients requiring treatment in the general population, for example, a mild to moderate level of depression or illness, no comorbidities (or only a few that were well controlled), and treatment resistance to standard therapies to name a few.<sup>[18-21,23,26,28,32]</sup>
- Studies used previously published unreliable data for new and/or further analyses.<sup>[40,41]</sup>

## **TMS COMPARED TO ELECTROCONVULSIVE THERAPY FOR TREATMENT OF DEPRESSION**

### **Systematic Reviews and Technology Assessments**

Sehatzadeh (2016) published a Health Quality Ontario technology assessment evaluating the impact on health outcomes when patients with refractory unipolar depression received rTMS. Twenty-nine RCTs were identified, of which 27 compared rTMS to sham and six compared rTMS to electroconvulsive therapy (ECT). The authors concluded there is little data to evaluate the long-term effects of rTMS and that ECT was more effective in improving depression.

Berlim (2013) identified 7 RCTs with a total of 294 patients that directly compared rTMS and ECT treatment for patients with major depression.<sup>[42]</sup> After an average of 15.2 sessions of high-frequency rTMS, 33.6% of patients were classified as remitters compared to 52% of patients who were classified as remitters following an average of 8.2 ECT sessions. The pooled odds ratio was 0.46, indicating a significant difference ( $p=0.04$ ) in outcome favoring ECT. There was no significant difference in dropout rates for the two treatments

The 2011 AHRQ report, noted above, found the available head-to-head literature concerning the efficacy of the nonpharmacologic interventions for tier one TRD was limited to two fair trials (both in major depressive disorder-only populations).<sup>[10]</sup> One compared electroconvulsive therapy (ECT) and rTMS, and the other compared ECT and ECT plus rTMS. They showed, with low strength of evidence, no differences between treatment options for depressive severity, response rates, and remission rates. No trial involved a direct comparison of psychotherapy with another nonpharmacologic intervention and there were no trials identified which directly compared rTMS to any other intervention for maintenance of remission or prevention of relapse.

The AHRQ authors concluded, “that comparative clinical research on nonpharmacologic interventions in a treatment-resistant depression (TRD) population is in its infancy, and many clinical questions about efficacy and effectiveness remain unanswered. Interpretation of the data was substantially hindered by varying definitions of TRD and the paucity of relevant studies. The greatest volume of evidence is for ECT and rTMS; however, even for the few comparisons of treatments that are supported by some evidence, the strength of evidence is low for comparative benefits,” reflecting low confidence that the evidence reflects the true effect and indicating that further research is likely to change the confidence in these findings.



The finding of low strength is most notable in two cases: ECT and rTMS did not produce different clinical outcomes in TRD, and ECT produced better outcomes than pharmacotherapy.

The AHRQ report further concluded, “no trials directly compared the likelihood of maintaining remission for nonpharmacologic interventions. The few trials addressing adverse events, subpopulations, subtypes, and health-related outcomes provided low or insufficient evidence of differences between nonpharmacologic interventions. The most urgent next steps for research are to apply a consistent definition of TRD, to conduct more head-to-head clinical trials comparing nonpharmacologic interventions with themselves and with pharmacologic treatments, and to delineate carefully the number of treatment failures following a treatment attempt of adequate dose and duration in the current episode.”

Rosa et al. reported no significant difference between ECT and TMS in forty-two patients with treatment-resistant depression; however, response rates for both groups were low.<sup>[43]</sup> The number of remissions (score of seven or less on the HDRS) totaled three (20%) for ECT and two (10%) for TMS.

The 2001 Cochrane Review found electroconvulsive therapy was more effective than TMS.<sup>[11]</sup>

### **Randomized Controlled Trials**

No RCTs were identified, after the above SRs.

### **Section Summary**

The current evidence is insufficient to determine whether TMS is better than or as effective as electroconvulsive therapy (ECT) for the treatment of depression. Although evidence regarding TMS compared to sham demonstrated a statistically significant improvement in depression, the clinical significance of these findings to change health outcomes in patients with depression has not been demonstrated. In addition, the overall body of evidence regarding TMS versus sham studies, contain a variety of methodological limitations. Studies which compare TMS with electroconvulsive therapy are few which limit the possibility of proper assessment or conclusion. Despite the weaknesses in the published clinical evidence, TMS has become a recognized standard of care for treatment resistant major depressive disorder.

## **POST TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER**

### **Systematic Review**

Trevizol (2016) published a SR to evaluate the effects of rTMS on post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD).<sup>[44]</sup> The five studies included showed rTMS statistically superior to sham stimulation. Despite improvements, the authors concluded this SR was limited in size and additional RCTs are needed to determine clinical impact.

### **Randomized Control Trials**

No RCTs were identified.

## **SCHIZOPHRENIA**

### **Systematic Reviews and Technology Assessments**

Dollfus (2016) published a SR to evaluate the impact of the placebo effect in studies involving rTMS on visual hallucinations for patients with schizophrenia.<sup>[45]</sup> Twenty-one articles with 303 patients were reviewed. The authors concluded that the placebo in rTMS studies cause bias and that the design of such studies should be carefully evaluated.

A 2015 Cochrane SR included 41 studies with a total of 1473 participants.<sup>[46]</sup> Based on very low-quality evidence, there was a significant benefit of temporoparietal TMS compared to sham for global state (seven RCTs) and positive symptoms (five RCTs). The evidence on cognitive state was equivocal. For prefrontal rTMS compared to sham, the evidence on global state and cognitive state was of very low quality and equivocal. The authors concluded that there is insufficient evidence to support or refute the use of TMS to treat symptoms of schizophrenia, and although there is some evidence to suggest that temporoparietal TMS may improve certain symptoms such as auditory hallucinations and positive symptoms of schizophrenia, the results were not robust enough to be unequivocal.

A 2013 SR included 17 RCTs (n=398) that evaluated low-frequency rTMS of the left temporoparietal cortex for the treatment of auditory hallucinations.<sup>[47]</sup> The mean effect size for severity of auditory hallucinations (all studies) was -0.42. The odds ratio for the response to treatment, defined as a 30% reduction or greater, was 2.94 (6 trials, n=181). No significant differences were found between active rTMS and sham for positive or negative symptoms.

A 2012 SR included 17 double blind sham RCTs (total n=337) of the effect of TMS on auditory hallucinations.<sup>[48]</sup> When measured at the end of treatment, the mean effect size of TMS directed at the left temporoparietal area was 0.40 (moderate) and the effect size of TMS directed at all brain regions was 0.33 (small). For the 5 trials that examined outcomes of TMS one month after treatment, the effect was no longer significant.

A 2011 BCBSA TEC Assessment evaluated TMS as an adjunct treatment for schizophrenia.<sup>[49]</sup> Five meta-analyses were reviewed, along with randomized controlled trials (RCTs) in which measurements were carried out beyond the treatment period. A meta-analysis of the effect of TMS on positive symptoms of schizophrenia (hallucinations, delusions, and disorganized speech and behavior) did not find a significant effect of TMS. Four meta-analyses that looked specifically at auditory hallucinations showed a significant effect of TMS. It was noted that outcomes were evaluated at the end of treatment, and the durability of the effect was unknown. The Assessment concluded that the available evidence is insufficient to demonstrate that TMS is effective as a treatment of schizophrenia.

### **Randomized Controlled Trials**

Li (2016) published a RCT evaluating the efficacy of rTMS in patients with Schizophrenia.<sup>[50]</sup> Forty-seven patients received rTMS over the left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (n=25) or sham stimulation (n= 22). Patients were evaluated at baseline, four weeks and eight weeks, using the Scale for the Assessment of Negative Symptoms (SANS). No significant differences were seen at two weeks, but at eight weeks the SANS score improved significantly in the rTMS group vs. the control group. The authors concluded there is a delayed positive effect in symptoms, for schizophrenia patients receiving rTMS. This study was limited in size and did not include follow-up past eight weeks.

Hasan (2016) published a multi-center sham-controlled RCT that evaluated rTMS impact on cognitive function i.e. working memory, attention, and verbal learning in patients with schizophrenia.<sup>[51]</sup> 156 schizophrenia patients with mainly negative symptoms received 10-Hz rTMS (n=77) or sham stimulation (n=79) for 15 sessions over three weeks. Assessments occurred two weeks prior to treatment and at days 21, 45, and 105. Data did not show statistically significant positive cognitive changes for the rTMS group. The authors concluded more multi-center RCTs are needed.

Koops (2016) published a double-blinded RCT that evaluated how Theta-burst (TB) rTMS impacted auditory verbal hallucinations (AVH) in schizophrenic patients refractory to medications.<sup>[52]</sup> Seventy-one patients received TB rTMS or sham stimulation for six visits. Evaluation occurred at baseline, after six treatments, within one week and at a follow-up one month later using the Psychotic Symptom Rating Scale (PSYRATS) and the Auditory Hallucinations Rating Scale (AHRs). No difference in outcomes was seen by either group.

Blumberger et al. examined the efficacy of priming stimulation (6 Hz) prior to low frequency stimulation (1 Hz) of Heschl's gyrus within the left temporoparietal cortex.<sup>[53]</sup> Fifty-four patients with medication resistant auditory hallucinations were randomized to receive 20 sessions of left-sided stimulation, priming, or sham TMS. Response rates on the Psychotic Symptoms Rating Scale did not differ between the 3 treatment groups.

A small (n=18) double-blind sham-controlled RCT from 2012 found no significant effect of deep TMS with an H1 coil on auditory hallucinations.<sup>[54]</sup>

## **Section Summary**

The evidence on TMS for the treatment of auditory hallucinations in schizophrenia consists of a number of small RCTs. Evidence to date shows small to moderate effects on hallucinations when measured at the end of treatment, but evidence suggests that TMS does not produce a durable treatment effect in patients with schizophrenia.

## **OTHER PSYCHIATRIC DISORDERS**

### **Systematic Reviews**

Elbeh (2016) published a clinical trial that evaluated the effects of varied frequencies of rTMS on OCD.<sup>[55]</sup> Forty-five patients were evenly randomized to receive 1Hz rTMS, 10Hz rTMS, or sham stimulation for ten sessions. Evaluations occurred at the last treatment session and three months after using the Yale-Brown obsessive compulsive scale (Y-BOCS), Hamilton Anxiety Rating Scale (HAM-A), and Clinical Global Impression - Severity scale (CGI-S). The 1Hz rTMS group showed promising impact for OCD, but more long-term sham controlled studies are needed.

Hawken (2016) published the results of a randomized double-blinded placebo-controlled clinical trial that evaluated the impact of six weeks of low frequency rTMS on patients with obsessive compulsive disorder (OCD) refractory to traditional treatments.<sup>[56]</sup> Twenty-two patients received rTMS (n=10) versus a placebo (n=12) for seven visits. Patients were evaluated with the Yale-Brown Obsessive Compulsive Scale (Y-BOCS) at baseline, day one, and weeks two, four, and six of treatments, along with two and six weeks after treatment. Six weeks after treatment the rTMS group's OCD symptoms significantly improved, but the authors

stated more studies are needed to evaluate long-term effects. This study was also limited in size.

A 2014 Cochrane review identified two RCTs with a total of 40 patients that compared low frequency rTMS with sham rTMS.<sup>[57]</sup> The larger of the two studies was a randomized, double-blind, sham-controlled trial in 21 patients with panic disorder with comorbid major depression.<sup>37</sup> Response was defined as a 40% or greater decrease on the Panic Disorder Severity Scale and a 50% or greater decrease on HAM-D. After four weeks of treatment, the response rate for panic was 50% with active rTMS and 8% with sham. The study had a high risk of attrition bias. The overall quality of evidence for the two studies was considered to be low, and the sample sizes were small, precluding any conclusions about the efficacy of rTMS for panic disorder.

A 2013 SR included 10 small RCTs totaling 282 patients with OCD.<sup>[58]</sup> Response rates of TMS augmentation therapy were 35% for active treatment and 13% for sham TMS. The pooled odds ratio (OR) was 3.39 and the number needed to treat (NNT) was five. There was no reported evidence of publication bias. Exploratory subgroup analysis suggested that the two most promising stimulation parameters were low frequency-TMS and non-dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC) regions (i.e., orbitofrontal cortex or supplementary motor area); however, additional studies are needed to evaluate low frequency TMS and non-DLPFC regions.

### **Randomized Controlled Trials**

A number of additional RCTs explored the efficacy of TMS for a variety of mental health disorders other than depression, including, but not limited to, bipolar mania, obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD), panic disorder, alcohol dependence, Alzheimer's disease, and ADHD. Many of these studies are preliminary (feasibility) studies and/or have serious methodological limitations that render outcomes unreliable. Some limitations of these studies include:

- Poorly defined or unmet endpoints<sup>[59-66]</sup>
- Significant or unclear loss to follow-up and poorly defined intention-to-treat (ITT) analyses<sup>[61,65,67-69]</sup>
- Lack of long-term follow up<sup>[59-72]</sup>
- Small patient populations<sup>[59-84]</sup>
- Lack of standardized optimal treatment parameters<sup>[59-64,66-70,72,85]</sup>
- Use of co-therapies<sup>[59-71]</sup>
- Strict inclusion/exclusion criteria which were not representative of patients requiring treatment in the general population<sup>[59-64,67,70-72]</sup>

### **Section Summary**

Current evidence is insufficient to determine the efficacy of TMS in patients with non-schizophrenic psychiatric disorders. Well-designed RCTs are needed which address the methodological limitations of current studies, noted above.

### **BULIMIA**

## **Systematic Reviews**

No SRs were identified.

## **Randomized Control Trials**

Gay (2016) published a double-blind randomized trial that evaluated the safety and efficacy of rTMS, for patients with bulimia nervosa.<sup>[86]</sup> Forty-seven woman with bulimia nervosa received ten sessions of high frequency rTMS or sham stimulation to the left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC). Follow-up occurred at 15 days post treatment and no improvements in binge symptoms were seen, within the rTMS group. The authors noted additional studies need to evaluate the methodology applied and consider rTMS to different target areas.

## **CEREBRAL PALSY**

### **Systematic Reviews**

No SRs were identified.

### **Randomized Control Trials**

Gupta (2016) published a RCT that evaluated motor function, after rTMS for cerebral palsy (CP) patients.<sup>[87]</sup> Forty-one spastic CP children who completed the study and were randomly assigned to receive physical therapy (n=12) alone, 5hz rTMS followed by physical therapy (n=15), or 10hz rTMS, (n=14) followed by physical therapy for 20 days. The gross motor function measure (GMFM) test was applied at baseline and after 20 treatments. Although the study showed improved motor function for the rTMS plus physical therapy groups, the authors concluded the results should not be interpreted as a final outcome, especially with previous studies showing lack of progress from this treatment. Larger studies evaluating long-term effects are needed.

## **EPILEPSY**

### **Systematic Reviews**

Chen (2016) published a SR that included seven RCTs to evaluate the effects of rTMS on health outcomes for patients with drug-resistant epilepsy.<sup>[88]</sup> Five of the RCTs were randomized and blinded. Five of the studies did not show reduction of seizure activity. The authors noted low quality of evidence and that more studies are needed to evaluate reduction in seizure activity, quality of life, and adverse outcomes.

Pereira (2016) published an update to a 2007 SR that evaluated the safety of rTMS for patients with epilepsy and how well the procedure was tolerated.<sup>[89]</sup> Sixteen new studies were identified totaling 48, for this SR. The authors concluded the risk of increased seizure activity with rTMS was small and adverse events for patients with epilepsy were similar to healthy patients. They also questioned data control, stated results should be interpreted with caution and more studies are needed.

### **Randomized Control Trials**

Seynaeve (2015) published a single-center randomized sham-controlled crossover clinical trial that determined if rTMS could reduce seizure activity in patients with epilepsy.<sup>[90]</sup> Eleven patients were enrolled and received either a figure-eight, round or sham coil. Fifteen thousand stimulations were received/day for ten weekdays; then patients were observed for the next ten weeks. The study concluded rTMS was not effective in reducing seizure activity and could actually increase seizure activity.

Sun (2012) reported a double-blind RCT of low frequency TMS to the epileptogenic zone for refractory partial epilepsy.<sup>[91]</sup> Sixty patients were randomized into two groups; one group received two weeks of TMS at 90% of resting motor threshold and the other group received TMS at 20% of resting motor threshold. Outcomes were measured for eight weeks after the end of treatment. With intent-to-treat analysis, high intensity TMS resulted in a significant decrease in seizures when compared to baseline (from 8.9 per week at baseline to 1.8 per week at follow-up) and when compared to low intensity TMS (from 8.6 at baseline to 8.4 per week at follow-up). High intensity TMS also decreased interictal discharges (from 75.1 to 33.6 per hour) and improved ratings on the Symptom Checklist-90. These initial results are promising, but require substantiation in additional trials.

## **HEADACHES/MIGRAINES**

### **Systematic Reviews**

No SRs were identified.

### **Randomized Control Trials**

Leung (2015) published a RCT that evaluated how rTMS improved headaches for military patients with mild traumatic brain injury (MTBI).<sup>[92]</sup> Twenty-four patients received rTMS or sham rTMS at the left motor cortex (LMC). Patients were evaluated one week and one month post treatment. Although the authors concluded rTMS is an effective treatment for MTBI headaches, this study did not evaluate long-term sustained impact.

Rapinesi (2016) published a RCT that evaluated the impact of dTMS on chronic migraines (CM).<sup>[93]</sup> Fourteen treatment-resistant patients were randomized to receive add-on high-frequency dTMS (n=7) or standard abortive or preventive antimigraine treatment (n=7). Twelve sessions were received over one-month time. Depression symptoms were evaluated during treatment and one month later. Although the authors concluded add-on dTMS is effective in decreasing the intensity and frequency of migraines, this study was limited in size and did not evaluate long-term effects.

## **FIBROMYALGIA**

### **Systematic Review**

Kninik (2016) published a SR that determined the effects repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) versus a sham stimulation had on fibromyalgia, depression and/or quality of life.<sup>[94]</sup> The SR included five RCTs of moderate quality. The authors concluded that rTMS had a superior effect on quality of life after 30 days, but more studies are needed to determine why and how rTMS impacts health outcomes and what treatment protocols are appropriate.

Saltychev (2016) published a SR that included seven RCTs with low risk of bias on adults with fibromyalgia. Pain was evaluated before, and at one week to one month after rTMS. The authors concluded there was moderate evidence rTMS was not more effective than sham stimulation.

A 2012 SR included four studies on transcranial direct current stimulation (tDMS) and five on TMS for treatment of fibromyalgia pain.<sup>[95]</sup> Four of the five TMS studies were double-blind RCTs, however the fifth included study was a case series of four patients who were blinded to treatment. Quantitative meta-analysis was not conducted due to variability in brain site, stimulation frequency/intensity, total number of sessions, and follow-up intervals. Results of four out of five of these studies reported significant decreases in pain and greater durability of pain reduction was observed overall, with stimulation of the primary motor cortex compared to the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex. However, all five TMS trials used in this analysis were limited by small sample size ( $n \leq 40$ ), continued use of concomitant medications and four had short-term follow-up ( $\geq 8$  weeks) which preclude the ability to reach conclusions regarding the ability of TMS to effect pain reduction scores in patients suffering with fibromyalgia.

### **Randomized Controlled Trials**

A 2013 RCT evaluated the effect of very low-intensity TMS in a sham-controlled double-blinded RCT of 54 patients with fibromyalgia.<sup>[96]</sup> TMS was performed once per week, for six weeks with 33 magnetic coils around the head. Authors reported a significant improvement in pain thresholds (+28%) across the 8 sessions and in the ability to perform daily activities (11%), perceived chronic pain (-39%) and sleep quality (75%). Fatigue, anxiety, depression, and severity of headaches were unaffected by treatment. Limitations of this study include small sample size and lack of long-term follow-up limiting conclusions regarding the benefit of TMS treatment for symptoms related to fibromyalgia.

### **Section Summary**

Additional studies are needed to establish effective treatment parameters in a larger number of subjects and to evaluate the durability of tDMS or TMS treatment effect in patients with fibromyalgia.

## **PAIN**

### **Systematic Reviews**

Gao (2016) published a SR that evaluated two RCTs and four cross-over RCTs that evaluated a total of 127 patients, with neuropathic pain (NP), after a spinal cord injury. Patients who received rTMS had less NP. However, the authors noted the results were not statistically significant and more studies are needed to confirm the health outcome impact of rTMS for NP.

### **Randomized Control Trials**

Ambriz-Tututi (2016) published a RCT that evaluated the impact of rTMS on patients with chronic low back pain.<sup>[97]</sup> Eighty-two patients received rTMS, sham stimulation, or physical therapy (PT) for one week and were evaluated with the visual analogue scale (VAS), Short Form McGill pain questionnaire (SF-MPQ), and the Short Form 36 Health Survey. The

authors concluded long-term reduction of pain in the rTMS group, but there was no apparent long-term outcome documented.

Malavera (2016) published a randomized, double-blinded, parallel group, single-center RCT to evaluate the impact of rTMS on phantom limb pain (PLP), for land mine victims.<sup>[98]</sup> Fifty-four patients received rTMS (n=27) or sham stimulation (n=27) five days a week for two weeks and were evaluated 15 and 30 days after treatments. The rTMS group showed significant PLP improvement up to 15 days after treatment, but as the authors noted the study was limited in size and may not have included enough assessment data, nor were the long-term effects evaluated

## **PARKINSON'S DISEASE**

### **Systematic Reviews**

Wagle (2016) published a SR that evaluated how rTMS improved motor symptoms in patients with Parkinson's disease.<sup>[99]</sup> Twenty-one clinical trials with an active and control arm were reviewed. The authors concluded that rTMS can improve motor function as an adjunct therapy, but had insufficient data to evaluate specific clinical conditions related to Parkinson's disease i.e. dyskinesia, bradykinesia, and gait. Larger studies are needed to evaluate clinical features that will have a positive long-term response.

A 2015 SR included 20 sham-controlled RCTs with a total of 470 patients with Parkinson disease.<sup>[100]</sup> Sample sizes ranged from 8 to 102. The total effect size of rTMS on Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (UPDRS) part III score was 0.46, which is considered a small to medium effect size, and the mean change in the UPDRS-III score (-6.42) was considered to be a clinically important difference. The greatest effect on motor symptoms was from high frequency rTMS over the primary motor cortex (standardized mean difference [SMD] of 0.77,  $p < 0.001$ ) and low-frequency rTMS over other frontal regions (SMD: 0.50,  $p = 0.008$ ). High frequency rTMS at other frontal regions and low frequency rTMS over the primary motor cortex did not have a statistically significant benefit. The largest study (described below) included in the SR was an exploratory, multicenter, double-blind trial that randomized 106 patients to 8 weeks of 1-Hz rTMS, 10 Hz rTMS, or sham stimulation over the supplementary motor area.<sup>[101]</sup> At 9 weeks, all groups showed a similar amount of improvement. It cannot be determined from these results if the negative results of the largest trial are due to a lack of effect of rTMS on motor symptoms in general or to the location of stimulation. Additional study with a larger number of subjects and longer follow-up is needed to determine if high frequency rTMS over the primary motor cortex improves motor symptoms in patients with Parkinson disease.

A SR from 2009 included 10 RCTs with a total of 275 patients with Parkinson's disease.<sup>[102]</sup> Seven of the studies were double-blind, one was not blinded and 2 of the studies did not specify whether the raters were blinded. In studies that used high frequency TMS there was a significant improvement on the Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (UPDRS) with a moderate effect size of -0.58. For low frequency TMS the results were heterogeneous and did not significantly reduce the UPDRS. The analyzed studies varied in outcomes reported, TMS protocol, patient selection criteria, demographics, stages of Parkinson's disease and duration of follow-up, which ranged from immediate to 16 weeks after treatment



## Randomized Controlled Trials

Makkos (2016) published a double-blinded placebo-controlled RCT to determine if rTMS can improve depression for patients with Parkinson disease (PD).<sup>[103]</sup> Forty-six patients with mild to moderate depression received rTMS (n=23) or sham stimulation (n=23) for 10 days. Patients were evaluated by the Montgomery-Åsberg Depression Rating Scale at baseline, one day into treatment and 30 days after treatment. The authors concluded results were promising for the rTMS group, but rTMS trials should further evaluate the effects of rTMS on PD patients with severe depression.

A 2013 exploratory multicenter double-blind trial randomized 106 patients to eight weeks of 1 Hz TMS, 10 Hz TMS, or sham stimulation over the supplementary motor area.<sup>[101]</sup> At 9 weeks all groups showed a similar amount of improvement. At the 20-week follow-up only the 1 Hz group showed a significant improvement (6.84 points) in the primary outcome measure, the UPDRS. There was no significant improvement in other outcome measures.

In 2012, Benninger et al. reported a double-blind sham-controlled RCT of brief (six sec) very high frequency (50 Hz) TMS over the motor cortex in 26 patients with mild to moderate Parkinson's disease.<sup>[104]</sup> Eight sessions of 50 Hz TMS did not improve gait, bradykinesia, or global and motor scores on the UPDRS compared to the sham-treated group. Activities of daily living were significantly improved a day after the intervention, but the effect was no longer evident at one month after treatment. Functional status and self-reported well-being were not affected by the treatment. No adverse effects of the very high frequency stimulation were identified.

Another study from 2012 randomized 20 patients with Parkinson's disease to 12 brief sessions (six min) of high frequency (5-Hz) TMS or sham TMS over the leg area of the motor cortex followed by treadmill training.<sup>[105]</sup> Blinded evaluation showed a significant effect of TMS combined with treadmill training on neurophysiological measures, and change in fast walking speed and the timed up and go task. Mean treadmill speed improved to a similar extent in the active and sham TMS groups.

## Section Summary

The current evidence is mixed regarding the treatment benefits of TMS in patients with Parkinson's disease. Additional well-designed, RCTs, which control for treatment effect and include a larger number of subjects and longer follow-up, is needed to determine if TMS improves motor symptoms in patients with Parkinson's disease.

## STROKE REHABILITATION

### Systematic Reviews

Liao (2016) published a SR that evaluated the impact of rTMS on dysphagia in stroke patients.<sup>[106]</sup> Six RCTs with a total of 163 patients were reviewed. The authors concluded that patients had improved, four weeks after treatment with low or high frequency rTMS. High frequency rTMS may be more beneficial than low frequency rTMS. This SR did not include long-term outcomes.

A 2015 meta-analysis included four RCTs on rTMS over the right pars triangularis for patients (N=137) with aphasia after stroke.<sup>[107]</sup> All of the studies used double-blinding, but therapists were not blinded. Every study used a different outcome measure, and the sample sizes were small (range from 12 to 40). Meta-analysis showed a medium effect size for naming ( $p=0.004$ ), a trend for a benefit on repetition ( $p=0.08$ ), and no significant benefit for comprehension ( $p=0.18$ ). Additional study in a larger number of patients is needed to determine with greater certainty the effect of this treatment on aphasia after stroke.

A 2014 meta-analysis assessed the effect of rTMS on recovery of hand function and excitability of the motor cortex after stroke.<sup>[108]</sup> Eight RCTs with a total of 273 participants were included in the review. The quality of the studies was rated moderate to high, although the size of the studies was small. There was variability in the time since stroke (five days to 10 years), in the frequency of rTMS applied (1 Hx to 25 Hx for one sec to 25 mins per day), and the stimulation sites (primary motor cortex or premotor cortex of the unaffected hemisphere). Meta-analysis found a positive effect on finger motor ability (4 studies,  $n=79$ , standardized mean difference of 0.58) and hand function (three studies,  $n=74$ , standardized mean difference of -0.82), but no significant change in motor evoked potential ( $n=43$ ) or motor threshold ( $n=62$ ).

A recent 2013 Cochrane review included 19 trials with a total of 588 participants on the effect of TMS for improving function after stroke.<sup>[109]</sup> The 2 largest trials included in the review showed that TMS was not associated with a significant improvement in the Barthel Index score. Four trials ( $n=73$ ) found no significant effect for motor function. Subgroup analysis for different stimulation frequencies or duration of illness also did not show a significant benefit of rTMS when compared to sham rTMS or no treatment. The review concluded that current evidence does not support the routine use of TMS for the treatment of stroke.

Hsu et al. reported a meta-analysis on the effect of TMS on upper limb motor function in patients with stroke in 2012.<sup>[110]</sup> Eighteen RCTs with a total of 392 patients were included in the meta-analysis. Most of the studies were double blind ( $n=11$ ) or single blind ( $n=3$ ). Eight studies applied low frequency (1 Hz) TMS over the unaffected hemisphere, five applied high frequency (5 Hz) TMS over the affected hemisphere, and two used both low- and high-frequency stimulation. Outcomes included kinematic motion analyses (five trials), hand grip (two trials), and the Wolf Motor Function Test (two trials). Meta-analysis of results showed a moderate effect size (0.55) for TMS on motor outcome, with a greater effect size of TMS in patients with subcortical stroke (mean effect size, 0.73) compared to non-specified lesion sites (mean effect size, 0.45), and for studies applying low frequency TMS (mean effect size, 0.69) compared to high frequency TMS (effect size, 0.41). Effect size of 0.5 or greater was considered to be clinically meaningful.

### **Randomized Controlled Trials**

Park (2016) published a single-blind RCT with a blind observer.<sup>[111]</sup> Thirty-five stroke patients received bilateral rTMS, unilateral rTMS, or sham stimulation for two weeks. Patients were evaluated at baseline, after the intervention and at a three-week follow-up. Although the authors stated bilateral rTMS is an effective additional treatment for dysphagia, this study was limited in size and did not evaluate long-term outcomes.

Du (2016) published a RCT that evaluated the impact of low or high frequency rTMS on dysphagia for post-stroke patients.<sup>[112]</sup> Patients received five sessions of sham, 3-Hz

ipsilesional, or 1-Hz contralesional rTMS. Evaluation occurred at baseline, and at the first, second and third month after treatment. The authors concluded high and low frequency rTMS appear to improve swallowing function in the early stroke phase.

In 2012, Seniow et al. reported a randomized double-blind sham-controlled pilot study of low frequency TMS (1 Hz at 90% of resting motor threshold for 30 min) to the contralesional motor cortex combined with physiotherapy in patients with moderate upper extremity hemiparesis following stroke.<sup>[113]</sup> Power analysis indicated that a sample size of 129 patients would be required to detect changes in functional motor ability, but only 40 patients met eligibility criteria over the four years of the study. Blinded analysis showed no significant difference in hand function or level of neurological deficit between active or sham TMS when measured either immediately after the three-week intervention or at 3-month follow-up.

## **Section Summary**

Evidence consists of a number of RCTs and SRs of the effect of TMS on recovery from stroke. Results are conflicting, and efficacy may depend on the location of the stroke and frequency of the TMS. Additional study is needed to determine whether TMS facilitates standard physiotherapy in patients with stroke.

## **TINNITUS**

### **Systematic Reviews**

No SRs were identified.

### **Randomized Control Trials**

Lehner (2016) published a two-arm parallel group RCT that evaluated 74 patients who received ten sessions of triple-site stimulation (n=25), single-site stimulation (n=24) or placebo (n=25).<sup>[114]</sup> Patients answered a tinnitus questionnaire day one and 12 and at follow-up three and six months later. The authors concluded rTMS reduces tinnitus severity in both groups the single and triple site groups, with no differences between them. Larger RCTs are needed to determine long-term effects, objective outcomes and appropriate treatment protocols.

## **OTHER MEDICAL INDICATIONS**

SRs and RCTs have been published exploring the efficacy of TMS for a variety of central nervous system-related disorders such as migraine headaches, central pain related to spinal cord injury, tinnitus, dysphagia, blepharospasm, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS), chronic pain, substance abuse, cravings and Alzheimer's disease.<sup>[85,115-159]</sup> In addition, symptom management in breast cancer has been examined as well.<sup>[160]</sup> All of these studies had one or more significant methodological limitations, including but not limited to small patient populations, short follow-up times, heterogeneous treatment parameters, continued use of concurrent therapies, and/or significant loss to follow-up. Generally, the authors agreed that larger, long-term rRCTs are needed, along with better defined optimal treatment parameters for administering TMS.

Umezaki (2015) published a single-blind RCT to evaluate the impact of rTMS on burning mouth syndrome (BMS).<sup>[161]</sup> Patients received rTMS (n=12) or sham TMS 9 (n=8). Patients were assessed until two months after treatment. The authors concluded the BMS pain improved two weeks into treatment, but more studies are needed to refine and improve TMS for BMS.

## PRACTICE GUIDELINE SUMMARY

### MOVEMENT DISORDER SOCIETY (MDS)

The MDS published an evidence-based review of treatments for motor (published in 2012) and non-motor (published in 2011) symptoms of Parkinson's disease.<sup>[162,163]</sup> The review found insufficient evidence to make adequate conclusions on the efficacy of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) for the treatment of depression in Parkinson's disease. In a 2012 update, MDS did note that evidence regarding TMS treatment of depression is growing;<sup>[164]</sup> however, data was still found to be insufficient for the recommendation of TMS as a treatment in Parkinson's patients with depression.

In 2008, the society also conducted a literature review describing current management practices for tic disorder and noted that studies results regarding the use of TMS as a treatment for tics varied.<sup>[165]</sup>

### AMERICAN PSYCHIATRIC ASSOCIATION (APA)<sup>[1]</sup>

In 2010, and reaffirmed in 2015, the American Psychiatric Association published an evidence-based guideline on treatment of patients with major depressive disorder. The guideline concluded that the evidence on transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) consists of studies with methodological limitations and inconsistent findings. For example, the guideline noted that "a substantial number of studies of TMS have been conducted, but most have had small sample sizes, and the studies overall have yielded heterogeneous results. Further complicating the interpretation of the TMS literature is the variability in stimulation intensities (relative to the motor threshold), stimulus parameters (e.g., pulses/second, pulses/session), anatomical localization of stimulation, and number of TMS sessions in the treatment course." The guideline also concluded that, based on the available evidence, TMS appears to be safe and well tolerated. However, the evidence is less consistent concerning the efficacy of TMS treatment. The guideline states that TMS "has shown small to moderate benefits in most [i.e. four] but not all [i.e. two] clinical trials and recent meta-analyses." Given the evidence, the guideline lists TMS as a treatment option for patients who do not respond adequately to pharmacotherapy; however the guideline does not include a strong recommendation for this treatment.

The APA made the following comment regarding the duration of psychotherapeutic treatment of major depression:

"Onset of benefit from psychotherapy tends to be a bit more gradual than that from medication, but no treatment should continue unmodified if there has been no symptomatic improvement after 1 month. Generally, 4–8 weeks of treatment are needed before concluding that a patient is partially responsive or unresponsive to a specific intervention."

## SUMMARY

It appears that transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) may improve depression for some people with major depressive disorder. Despite the weaknesses in the published clinical evidence and limited guideline support, TMS has become a recognized standard of care for treatment resistant major depressive disorder. Therefore, TMS may be considered medically necessary as a treatment of major depressive disorder when policy criteria are met.

There is not enough research to show that transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) improves health outcomes for all other conditions. No clinical guidelines based on research recommend TMS for any other condition. Therefore, TMS is considered investigational as a treatment of all other conditions.

## REFERENCES

1. Practice Guideline for the Treatment of Patients With Major Depressive Disorder, Third Edition. [cited 03/05/2017]; Available from: <http://psychiatryonline.org/content.aspx?bookid=28&sectionid=1667485>
2. Nordenskjold, A, Martensson, B, Pettersson, A, Heintz, E, Landen, M. Effects of Hesel-coil deep transcranial magnetic stimulation for depression - a systematic review. *Nordic journal of psychiatry*. 2016 Oct;70(7):492-7. PMID: 27093104
3. Kedzior, KK, Gierke, L, Gellersen, HM, Berlim, MT. Cognitive functioning and deep transcranial magnetic stimulation (DTMS) in major psychiatric disorders: A systematic review. *Journal of psychiatric research*. 2016 Apr;75:107-15. PMID: 26828370
4. TEC Assessment "Transcranial magnetic stimulation for depression." BlueCross BlueShield Association Technology Evaluation Center, Vol. 26, Tab 3.
5. TEC Assessment 2009. "Transcranial magnetic stimulation for depression." BlueCross BlueShield Association Technology Evaluation Center, Vol. 24, Tab 5.
6. TEC Assessment 2013. "Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation for Depression." BlueCross BlueShield Association Technology Evaluation Center, Vol. 28, Tab 9.
7. George, MS, Lisanby, SH, Avery, D, et al. Daily left prefrontal transcranial magnetic stimulation therapy for major depressive disorder: a sham-controlled randomized trial. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2010 May;67(5):507-16. PMID: 20439832
8. O'Reardon, JP, Solvason, HB, Janicak, PG, et al. Efficacy and safety of transcranial magnetic stimulation in the acute treatment of major depression: a multisite randomized controlled trial. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2007 Dec 1;62(11):1208-16. PMID: 17573044
9. Washington State Health Care Authority, Health Technology Assessment: Nonpharmacologic Treatments for Treatment-Resistant Depression. 2014 [cited 3/5/17]; Available from: [http://www.hca.wa.gov/assets/program/trd\\_final\\_findings\\_decision\\_052014\[1\].pdf](http://www.hca.wa.gov/assets/program/trd_final_findings_decision_052014[1].pdf)
10. Gaynes, BN, Lux, LJ, Lloyd, SW, et al. Nonpharmacologic Interventions for Treatment-Resistant Depression in Adults. *AHRQ Comparative Effectiveness Reviews*. 2011. PMID: 22091472

11. Rodriguez-Martin, JLR, Barbanoj-Rodriguez, MJ, Schlaepfer, TE, et al. Transcranial magnetic stimulation for treating depression (Cochrane Review). *The Cochrane Library*. 2001(4). PMID: No PMID Entry
12. Berlim, MT, Van den Eynde, F, Daskalakis, ZJ. High-frequency repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation accelerates and enhances the clinical response to antidepressants in major depression: a meta-analysis of randomized, double-blind, and sham-controlled trials. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2013 Feb;74(2):e122-9. PMID: 23473357
13. Burt, T, Lisanby, SH, Sackeim, HA. Neuropsychiatric applications of transcranial magnetic stimulation: a meta analysis. *Int J Neuropsychopharmacol*. 2002 Mar;5(1):73-103. PMID: 12057034
14. Holtzheimer, PE, 3rd, Russo, J, Avery, DH. A meta-analysis of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation in the treatment of depression. *Psychopharmacol Bull*. 2001 Autumn;35(4):149-69. PMID: 12397863
15. Martin, JL, Barbanoj, MJ, Schlaepfer, TE, Thompson, E, Perez, V, Kulisevsky, J. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for the treatment of depression. Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2003 Jun;182:480-91. PMID: 12777338
16. Couturier, JL. Efficacy of rapid-rate repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation in the treatment of depression: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Psychiatry Neurosci*. 2005 Mar;30(2):83-90. PMID: 15798783
17. Fitzgerald, PB, Hoy, KE, Elliot, D, McQueen, S, Wambeek, LE, Daskalakis, ZJ. A negative double-blind controlled trial of sequential bilateral rTMS in the treatment of bipolar depression. *J Affect Disord*. 2016 Jul 01;198:158-62. PMID: 27016659
18. Fregni, F, Santos, CM, Myczkowski, ML, et al. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation is as effective as fluoxetine in the treatment of depression in patients with Parkinson's disease. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2004 Aug;75(8):1171-4. PMID: 15258224
19. Poulet, E, Brunelin, J, Boeue, C, et al. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation does not potentiate antidepressant treatment. *Eur Psychiatry*. 2004 Sep;19(6):382-3. PMID: 15363481
20. Fitzgerald, PB, Benitez, J, de Castella, A, Daskalakis, ZJ, Brown, TL, Kulkarni, J. A randomized, controlled trial of sequential bilateral repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for treatment-resistant depression. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2006 Jan;163(1):88-94. PMID: 16390894
21. Isenberg, K, Downs, D, Pierce, K, et al. Low frequency rTMS stimulation of the right frontal cortex is as effective as high frequency rTMS stimulation of the left frontal cortex for antidepressant-free, treatment-resistant depressed patients. *Ann Clin Psychiatry*. 2005 Jul-Sep;17(3):153-9. PMID: 16433057
22. Avery, DH, Holtzheimer, PE, 3rd, Fawaz, W, et al. A controlled study of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation in medication-resistant major depression. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2006 Jan 15;59(2):187-94. PMID: 16139808
23. Rossini, D, Magri, L, Lucca, A, Giordani, S, Smeraldi, E, Zanardi, R. Does rTMS hasten the response to escitalopram, sertraline, or venlafaxine in patients with major depressive disorder? A double-blind, randomized, sham-controlled trial. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2005 Dec;66(12):1569-75. PMID: 16401159
24. Avery, DH, Isenberg, KE, Sampson, SM, et al. Transcranial magnetic stimulation in the acute treatment of major depressive disorder: clinical response in an open-label extension trial. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2008 Mar;69(3):441-51. PMID: 18294022

25. Myczkowski, ML, Dias, AM, Luvisotto, T, et al. Effects of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on clinical, social, and cognitive performance in postpartum depression. *Neuropsychiatric disease and treatment*. 2012;8:491-500. PMID: 23118543
26. Anderson, IM, Delvai, NA, Ashim, B, et al. Adjunctive fast repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation in depression. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2007 Jun;190:533-4. PMID: 17541116
27. Mogg, A, Pluck, G, Eranti, SV, et al. A randomized controlled trial with 4-month follow-up of adjunctive repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation of the left prefrontal cortex for depression. *Psychol Med*. 2008 Mar;38(3):323-33. PMID: 17935639
28. Fitzgerald, PB, Hoy, K, McQueen, S, et al. Priming stimulation enhances the effectiveness of low-frequency right prefrontal cortex transcranial magnetic stimulation in major depression. *J Clin Psychopharmacol*. 2008 Feb;28(1):52-8. PMID: 18204341
29. Janicak, PG, Nahas, Z, Lisanby, SH, et al. Durability of clinical benefit with transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) in the treatment of pharmacoresistant major depression: assessment of relapse during a 6-month, multisite, open-label study. *Brain Stimul*. 2010 Oct;3(4):187-99. PMID: 20965447
30. Ullrich, H, Kranaster, L, Sigges, E, Andrich, J, Sartorius, A. Ultra-high-frequency left prefrontal transcranial magnetic stimulation as augmentation in severely ill patients with depression: a naturalistic sham-controlled, double-blind, randomized trial. *Neuropsychobiology*. 2012;66(3):141-8. PMID: 22948250
31. Dang, T, Avery, DH, Russo, J. Within-session mood changes from TMS in depressed patients. *J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci*. 2007 Fall;19(4):458-63. PMID: 18070851
32. Jorge, RE, Moser, DJ, Acion, L, Robinson, RG. Treatment of vascular depression using repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2008 Mar;65(3):268-76. PMID: 18316673
33. Triggs, WJ, Ricciuti, N, Ward, HE, et al. Right and left dorsolateral pre-frontal rTMS treatment of refractory depression: a randomized, sham-controlled trial. *Psychiatry Res*. 2010 Aug 15;178(3):467-74. PMID: 20643486
34. Levkovitz, Y, Harel, EV, Roth, Y, et al. Deep transcranial magnetic stimulation over the prefrontal cortex: evaluation of antidepressant and cognitive effects in depressive patients. *Brain Stimul*. 2009 Oct;2(4):188-200. PMID: 20633419
35. Sobis, J, Jarzab, M, Hese, RT, et al. Therapeutic efficacy assessment of weak variable magnetic fields with low value of induction in patients with drug-resistant depression. *J Affect Disord*. 2010 Jun;123(1-3):321-6. PMID: 19896204
36. Hoeppner, J, Padberg, F, Domes, G, et al. Influence of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on psychomotor symptoms in major depression. *Eur Arch Psychiatry Clin Neurosci*. 2010 Apr;260(3):197-202. PMID: 19680706
37. Bares, M, Kopecek, M, Novak, T, et al. Low frequency (1-Hz), right prefrontal repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) compared with venlafaxine ER in the treatment of resistant depression: a double-blind, single-centre, randomized study. *J Affect Disord*. 2009 Nov;118(1-3):94-100. PMID: 19249105
38. Ray, S, Nizamie, SH, Akhtar, S, Prahara, SK, Mishra, BR, Zia-ul-Haq, M. Efficacy of adjunctive high frequency repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation of left prefrontal cortex in depression: a randomized sham controlled study. *J Affect Disord*. 2011 Jan;128(1-2):153-9. PMID: 20621361

39. Anderson, BS, Kavanagh, K, Borckardt, JJ, et al. Decreasing procedural pain over time of left prefrontal rTMS for depression: initial results from the open-label phase of a multi-site trial (OPT-TMS). *Brain Stimul.* 2009 Apr;2(2):88-92. PMID: 20161310
40. Janicak, PG, O'Reardon, JP, Sampson, SM, et al. Transcranial magnetic stimulation in the treatment of major depressive disorder: a comprehensive summary of safety experience from acute exposure, extended exposure, and during reintroduction treatment. *J Clin Psychiatry.* 2008 Feb;69(2):222-32. PMID: 18232722
41. Lisanby, SH, Husain, MM, Rosenquist, PB, et al. Daily left prefrontal repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation in the acute treatment of major depression: clinical predictors of outcome in a multisite, randomized controlled clinical trial. *Neuropsychopharmacology.* 2009 Jan;34(2):522-34. PMID: 18704101
42. Berlim, MT, Van den Eynde, F, Daskalakis, ZJ. Efficacy and acceptability of high frequency repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) versus electroconvulsive therapy (ECT) for major depression: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials. *Depression and anxiety.* 2013 Jul;30(7):614-23. PMID: 23349112
43. Rosa, MA, Gattaz, WF, Pascual-Leone, A, et al. Comparison of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation and electroconvulsive therapy in unipolar non-psychotic refractory depression: a randomized, single-blind study. *Int J Neuropsychopharmacol.* 2006 Dec;9(6):667-76. PMID: 16923322
44. Trevizol, AP, Barros, MD, Silva, PO, Osuch, E, Cordeiro, Q, Shiozawa, P. Transcranial magnetic stimulation for posttraumatic stress disorder: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Trends in psychiatry and psychotherapy.* 2016 Jan-Mar;38(1):50-5. PMID: 27074341
45. Dollfus, S, Lecardeur, L, Morello, R, Etard, O. Placebo Response in Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation Trials of Treatment of Auditory Hallucinations in Schizophrenia: A Meta-Analysis. *Schizophr Bull.* 2016;42:301-8. PMID: 26089351
46. Dougall, N, Maayan, N, Soares-Weiser, K, McDermott, LM, McIntosh, A. Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) for schizophrenia. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2015;8:CD006081. PMID: 26289586
47. Zhang, Y, Liang, W, Yang, S, Dai, P, Shen, L, Wang, C. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for hallucination in schizophrenia spectrum disorders: A meta-analysis. *Neural Regen Res.* 2013;8:2666-76. PMID: 25206578
48. Slotema, CW, Aleman, A, Daskalakis, ZJ, Sommer, IE. Meta-analysis of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation in the treatment of auditory verbal hallucinations: update and effects after one month. *Schizophr Res.* 2012 Dec;142(1-3):40-5. PMID: 23031191
49. TEC Assessment "Transcranial magnetic stimulation for the treatment of schizophrenia." BlueCross BlueShield Association Technology Evaluation Center, Vol. 26, Tab 6.
50. Li, Z, Yin, M, Lyu, XL, Zhang, LL, Du, XD, Hung, GC. Delayed effect of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) on negative symptoms of schizophrenia: Findings from a randomized controlled trial. *Psychiatry Res.* 2016 Jun 30;240:333-5. PMID: 27138827
51. Hasan, A, Guse, B, Cordes, J, et al. Cognitive Effects of High-Frequency rTMS in Schizophrenia Patients With Predominant Negative Symptoms: Results From a Multicenter Randomized Sham-Controlled Trial. *Schizophr Bull.* 2016;42:608-18. PMID: 26433217



52. Koops, S, van Dellen, E, Schutte, MJ, Nieuwdorp, W, Neggers, SF, Sommer, IE. Theta Burst Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation for Auditory Verbal Hallucinations: Negative Findings From a Double-Blind-Randomized Trial. *Schizophr Bull.* 2016;42:250-7. PMID: 26221051
53. Blumberger, DM, Christensen, BK, Zipursky, RB, et al. MRI-targeted repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation of Heschl's gyrus for refractory auditory hallucinations. *Brain Stimul.* 2012 Oct;5(4):577-85. PMID: 22410480
54. Rosenberg, O, Gersner, R, Klein, LD, Kotler, M, Zangen, A, Dannon, P. Deep transcranial magnetic stimulation add-on for the treatment of auditory hallucinations: a double-blind study. *Annals of general psychiatry.* 2012;11:13. PMID: 22559192
55. Elbeh, KA, Elserogy, YM, Khalifa, HE, Ahmed, MA, Hafez, MH, Khedr, EM. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation in the treatment of obsessive-compulsive disorders: Double blind randomized clinical trial. *Psychiatry Res.* 2016 Apr 30;238:264-9. PMID: 27086243
56. Hawken, ER, Dilkov, D, Kaludiev, E, Simek, S, Zhang, F, Milev, R. Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation of the Supplementary Motor Area in the Treatment of Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder: A Multi-Site Study. *International journal of molecular sciences.* 2016 Mar 22;17(3):420. PMID: 27011177
57. Li, H, Wang, J, Li, C, Xiao, Z. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) for panic disorder in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2014;9:CD009083. PMID: 25230088
58. Berlim, MT, Neufeld, NH, Van den Eynde, F. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) for obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD): an exploratory meta-analysis of randomized and sham-controlled trials. *Journal of psychiatric research.* 2013 Aug;47(8):999-1006. PMID: 23615189
59. Rosa, MO, Gattaz, WF, Rosa, MA, et al. Effects of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on auditory hallucinations refractory to clozapine. *J Clin Psychiatry.* 2007 Oct;68(10):1528-32. PMID: 17960967
60. Prikryl, R, Kasperek, T, Skotakova, S, Ustohal, L, Kucerova, H, Ceskova, E. Treatment of negative symptoms of schizophrenia using repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation in a double-blind, randomized controlled study. *Schizophr Res.* 2007 Sep;95(1-3):151-7. PMID: 17689931
61. Mogg, A, Purvis, R, Eranti, S, et al. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for negative symptoms of schizophrenia: a randomized controlled pilot study. *Schizophr Res.* 2007 Jul;93(1-3):221-8. PMID: 17478080
62. Sachdev, PS, Loo, CK, Mitchell, PB, McFarquhar, TF, Malhi, GS. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for the treatment of obsessive compulsive disorder: a double-blind controlled investigation. *Psychol Med.* 2007 Nov;37(11):1645-9. PMID: 17655805
63. Walpoth, M, Hoertnagl, C, Mangweth-Matzek, B, et al. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation in bulimia nervosa: preliminary results of a single-centre, randomised, double-blind, sham-controlled trial in female outpatients. *Psychother Psychosom.* 2008;77(1):57-60. PMID: 18087209
64. Martin, JL, Barbanoj, MJ, Perez, V, Sacristan, M. Transcranial magnetic stimulation for the treatment of obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2003(3):CD003387. PMID: 12917964
65. Mantovani, A, Aly, M, Dagan, Y, Allart, A, Lisanby, SH. Randomized sham controlled trial of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation to the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex

- for the treatment of panic disorder with comorbid major depression. *J Affect Disord.* 2013 Jan 10;144(1-2):153-9. PMID: 22858212
66. Watts, BV, Landon, B, Groft, A, Young-Xu, Y. A sham controlled study of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for posttraumatic stress disorder. *Brain Stimul.* 2012 Jan;5(1):38-43. PMID: 22264669
67. Kaptan, A, Yaroslavsky, Y, Applebaum, J, Belmaker, RH, Grisaru, N. Right prefrontal TMS versus sham treatment of mania: a controlled study. *Bipolar Disord.* 2003 Feb;5(1):36-9. PMID: 12656936
68. Cohen, H, Kaplan, Z, Kotler, M, Kouperman, I, Moisa, R, Grisaru, N. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation of the right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex in posttraumatic stress disorder: a double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *Am J Psychiatry.* 2004 Mar;161(3):515-24. PMID: 14992978
69. Isserles, M, Shalev, AY, Roth, Y, et al. Effectiveness of deep transcranial magnetic stimulation combined with a brief exposure procedure in post-traumatic stress disorder - A pilot study. *Brain Stimul.* 2012 Aug 18. PMID: 22921765
70. Schonfeldt-Lecuona, C, Gron, G, Walter, H, et al. Stereotaxic rTMS for the treatment of auditory hallucinations in schizophrenia. *Neuroreport.* 2004 Jul 19;15(10):1669-73. PMID: 15232304
71. Weaver, L, Rostain, AL, Mace, W, Akhtar, U, Moss, E, O'Reardon, JP. Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) in the treatment of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder in adolescents and young adults: a pilot study. *The journal of ECT.* 2012 Jun;28(2):98-103. PMID: 22551775
72. Rabey, JM, Dobronevsky, E, Aichenbaum, S, Gonen, O, Marton, RG, Khaigrekht, M. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation combined with cognitive training is a safe and effective modality for the treatment of Alzheimer's disease: a randomized, double-blind study. *J Neural Transm.* 2012 Oct 18. PMID: 23076723
73. Bloch, Y, Harel, EV, Aviram, S, Govezensky, J, Ratzoni, G, Levkovitz, Y. Positive effects of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on attention in ADHD Subjects: a randomized controlled pilot study. *World J Biol Psychiatry.* 2010 Aug;11(5):755-8. PMID: 20521875
74. Cordes, J, Thunker, J, Agelink, MW, et al. Effects of 10 Hz repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) on clinical global impression in chronic schizophrenia. *Psychiatry Res.* 2010 May 15;177(1-2):32-6. PMID: 20378181
75. Mishra, BR, Nizamie, SH, Das, B, Prahara, SK. Efficacy of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation in alcohol dependence: a sham-controlled study. *Addiction.* 2010 Jan;105(1):49-55. PMID: 20078462
76. Van den Eynde, F, Claudino, AM, Mogg, A, et al. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation reduces cue-induced food craving in bulimic disorders. *Biol Psychiatry.* 2010 Apr 15;67(8):793-5. PMID: 20060105
77. Boggio, PS, Rocha, M, Oliveira, MO, et al. Noninvasive brain stimulation with high-frequency and low-intensity repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation treatment for posttraumatic stress disorder. *J Clin Psychiatry.* 2010 Aug;71(8):992-9. PMID: 20051219
78. Sokhadze, E, Baruth, J, Tasman, A, et al. Low-frequency repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) affects event-related potential measures of novelty processing in autism. *Appl Psychophysiol Biofeedback.* 2010 Jun;35(2):147-61. PMID: 19941058

79. Kang, JI, Kim, CH, Namkoong, K, Lee, CI, Kim, SJ. A randomized controlled study of sequentially applied repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation in obsessive-compulsive disorder. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2009 Dec;70(12):1645-51. PMID: 19709504
80. Mantovani, A, Simpson, HB, Fallon, BA, Rossi, S, Lisanby, SH. Randomized sham-controlled trial of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation in treatment-resistant obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Int J Neuropsychopharmacol*. 2010 Mar;13(2):217-27. PMID: 19691873
81. Vercammen, A, Knegtering, H, Bruggeman, R, et al. Effects of bilateral repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on treatment resistant auditory-verbal hallucinations in schizophrenia: a randomized controlled trial. *Schizophr Res*. 2009 Oct;114(1-3):172-9. PMID: 19679450
82. Praharaaj, SK, Ram, D, Arora, M. Efficacy of high frequency (rapid) suprathreshold repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation of right prefrontal cortex in bipolar mania: a randomized sham controlled study. *J Affect Disord*. 2009 Oct;117(3):146-50. PMID: 19178948
83. Cotelli, M, Calabria, M, Manenti, R, et al. Improved language performance in Alzheimer disease following brain stimulation. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2010 Jun 23. PMID: 20574108
84. Amiaz, R, Levy, D, Vainiger, D, Grunhaus, L, Zangen, A. Repeated high-frequency transcranial magnetic stimulation over the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex reduces cigarette craving and consumption. *Addiction*. 2009 Apr;104(4):653-60. PMID: 19183128
85. Khedr, EM, Abo-Elfetoh, N, Rothwell, JC. Treatment of post-stroke dysphagia with repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Acta Neurol Scand*. 2009 Mar;119(3):155-61. PMID: 18771521
86. Gay, A, Jaussest, I, Sigaud, T, et al. A Lack of Clinical Effect of High-frequency rTMS to Dorsolateral Prefrontal Cortex on Bulimic Symptoms: A Randomised, Double-blind Trial. *European eating disorders review : the journal of the Eating Disorders Association*. 2016 Nov;24(6):474-81. PMID: 27633286
87. Gupta, MR, Bablu Lal; Bhatia, Dinesh; Mukherjee, Arun Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation Therapy in Spastic Cerebral Palsy Children Improves Motor Activity. *Journal of Neuroinfectious Diseases* 2016 2016;7(4):1-4. PMID:
88. Chen, R, Spencer, DC, Weston, J, Nolan, SJ. Transcranial magnetic stimulation for the treatment of epilepsy. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2016 Aug 11(8):CD011025. PMID: 27513825
89. Pereira, LS, Muller, VT, da Mota Gomes, M, Rotenberg, A, Fregni, F. Safety of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation in patients with epilepsy: A systematic review. *Epilepsy & behavior : E&B*. 2016 Apr;57(Pt A):167-76. PMID: 26970993
90. Seynaeve, L, Devroye, A, Dupont, P, Van Paesschen, W. Randomized crossover sham-controlled clinical trial of targeted low-frequency transcranial magnetic stimulation comparing a figure-8 and a round coil to treat refractory neocortical epilepsy. *Epilepsia*. 2016 Jan;57(1):141-50. PMID: 26642974
91. Sun, W, Mao, W, Meng, X, et al. Low-frequency repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for the treatment of refractory partial epilepsy: a controlled clinical study. *Epilepsia*. 2012 Oct;53(10):1782-9. PMID: 22950513

92. Leung, A, Shukla, S, Fallah, A, et al. Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation in Managing Mild Traumatic Brain Injury-Related Headaches. *Neuromodulation : journal of the International Neuromodulation Society*. 2016 Feb;19(2):133-41. PMID: 26555886
93. Rapinesi, C, Del Casale, A, Scatena, P, et al. Add-on deep Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation (dTMS) for the treatment of chronic migraine: A preliminary study. *Neurosci Lett*. 2016 Jun 03;623:7-12. PMID: 27132086
94. Knijnenik, LM, Dussan-Sarria, JA, Rozisky, JR, et al. Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation for Fibromyalgia: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Pain practice : the official journal of World Institute of Pain*. 2016 Mar;16(3):294-304. PMID: 25581213
95. Marlow, NM, Bonilha, HS, Short, EB. Efficacy of transcranial direct current stimulation and repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for treating fibromyalgia syndrome: a systematic review. *Pain practice : the official journal of World Institute of Pain*. 2013 Feb;13(2):131-45. PMID: 22631436
96. Maestu, C, Blanco, M, Nevado, A, et al. Reduction of pain thresholds in fibromyalgia after very low-intensity magnetic stimulation: a double-blinded, randomized placebo-controlled clinical trial. *Pain research & management : the journal of the Canadian Pain Society = journal de la societe canadienne pour le traitement de la douleur*. 2013 Nov-Dec;18(6):e101-6. PMID: 24308025
97. Ambriz-Tututi, M, Alvarado-Reynoso, B, Drucker-Colin, R. Analgesic effect of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) in patients with chronic low back pain. *Bioelectromagnetics*. 2016 Aug 22. PMID: 27548757
98. Malavera, A, Silva, FA, Fregni, F, Carrillo, S, Garcia, RG. Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation for Phantom Limb Pain in Land Mine Victims: A Double-Blinded, Randomized, Sham-Controlled Trial. *The journal of pain : official journal of the American Pain Society*. 2016 Aug;17(8):911-8. PMID: 27260638
99. Wagle Shukla, A, Shuster, JJ, Chung, JW, et al. Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation (rTMS) Therapy in Parkinson Disease: A Meta-Analysis. *PM & R : the journal of injury, function, and rehabilitation*. 2016 Apr;8(4):356-66. PMID: 26314233
100. Chou, YH, Hickey, PT, Sundman, M, Song, AW, Chen, NK. Effects of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on motor symptoms in Parkinson disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA neurology*. 2015 Apr;72(4):432-40. PMID: 25686212
101. Shirota, Y, Ohtsu, H, Hamada, M, Enomoto, H, Ugawa, Y. Supplementary motor area stimulation for Parkinson disease: a randomized controlled study. *Neurology*. 2013;80:1400-5. PMID: 23516319
102. Elahi, B, Chen, R. Effect of transcranial magnetic stimulation on Parkinson motor function--systematic review of controlled clinical trials. *Mov Disord*. 2009 Feb 15;24(3):357-63. PMID: 18972549
103. Makkos, A, Pal, E, Aschermann, Z, et al. High-Frequency Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation Can Improve Depression in Parkinson's Disease: A Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Study. *Neuropsychobiology*. 2016;73:169-77. PMID: 27093063
104. Benninger, DH, Iseki, K, Kranick, S, Luckenbaugh, DA, Houdayer, E, Hallett, M. Controlled study of 50-Hz repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for the treatment of Parkinson disease. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2012 Nov-Dec;26(9):1096-105. PMID: 22593114

105. Yang, YR, Tseng, CY, Chiou, SY, et al. Combination of rTMS and treadmill training modulates corticomotor inhibition and improves walking in Parkinson disease: a randomized trial. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2013 Jan;27(1):79-86. PMID: 22785003
106. Liao, X, Xing, G, Guo, Z, et al. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation as an alternative therapy for dysphagia after stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Rehabil*. 2017;31:289-98. PMID: 27113337
107. Li, Y, Qu, Y, Yuan, M, Du, T. Low-frequency repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for patients with aphasia after stroke: A meta-analysis. *J Rehabil Med*. 2015 Sep;47(8):675-81. PMID: 26181486
108. Le, Q, Qu, Y, Tao, Y, Zhu, S. Effects of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on hand function recovery and excitability of the motor cortex after stroke: a meta-analysis. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*. 2014 May;93(5):422-30. PMID: 24429509
109. Hao, Z, Wang, D, Zeng, Y, Liu, M. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for improving function after stroke. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2013;5:CD008862. PMID: 23728683
110. Hsu, WY, Cheng, CH, Liao, KK, Lee, IH, Lin, YY. Effects of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on motor functions in patients with stroke: a meta-analysis. *Stroke; a journal of cerebral circulation*. 2012 Jul;43(7):1849-57. PMID: 22713491
111. Park, E, Kim, MS, Chang, WH, et al. Effects of Bilateral Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation on Post-Stroke Dysphagia. *Brain Stimul*. 2017 Jan - Feb;10(1):75-82. PMID: 27593709
112. Du, J, Yang, F, Liu, L, et al. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for rehabilitation of poststroke dysphagia: A randomized, double-blind clinical trial. *Clinical neurophysiology : official journal of the International Federation of Clinical Neurophysiology*. 2016 Mar;127(3):1907-13. PMID: 26778719
113. Seniow, J, Bilik, M, Lesniak, M, Waldowski, K, Iwanski, S, Czlonkowska, A. Transcranial magnetic stimulation combined with physiotherapy in rehabilitation of poststroke hemiparesis: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2012 Nov-Dec;26(9):1072-9. PMID: 22588639
114. Lehner, A, Schecklmann, M, Greenlee, MW, Rupprecht, R, Langguth, B. Triple-site rTMS for the treatment of chronic tinnitus: a randomized controlled trial. *Sci Rep*. 2016;6:22302. PMID: 26927363
115. Mohammad YM, Kothari R, Hughes G et al. Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation (TMS) relieves migraine headache. Platform presentation at the American Headache Society annual scientific meeting in Los Angeles, June 23, 2006.
116. Defrin, R, Grunhaus, L, Zamir, D, Zeilig, G. The effect of a series of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulations of the motor cortex on central pain after spinal cord injury. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2007 Dec;88(12):1574-80. PMID: 18047871
117. Saitoh, Y, Hirayama, A, Kishima, H, et al. Reduction of intractable deafferentation pain due to spinal cord or peripheral lesion by high-frequency repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation of the primary motor cortex. *J Neurosurg*. 2007 Sep;107(3):555-9. PMID: 17886555
118. Passard, A, Attal, N, Benadhira, R, et al. Effects of unilateral repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation of the motor cortex on chronic widespread pain in fibromyalgia. *Brain*. 2007 Oct;130(Pt 10):2661-70. PMID: 17872930
119. Pomeroy, VM, Cloud, G, Tallis, RC, Donaldson, C, Nayak, V, Miller, S. Transcranial magnetic stimulation and muscle contraction to enhance stroke recovery: a randomized

- proof-of-principle and feasibility investigation. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2007 Nov-Dec;21(6):509-17. PMID: 17409389
120. Malcolm, MP, Triggs, WJ, Light, KE, et al. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation as an adjunct to constraint-induced therapy: an exploratory randomized controlled trial. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*. 2007 Sep;86(9):707-15. PMID: 17709994
121. Valle, AC, Dionisio, K, Pitskel, NB, et al. Low and high frequency repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for the treatment of spasticity. *Dev Med Child Neurol*. 2007 Jul;49(7):534-8. PMID: 17593127
122. Khedr, EM, Rothwell, JC, Ahmed, MA, El-Atar, A. Effect of daily repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for treatment of tinnitus: comparison of different stimulus frequencies. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2008 Feb;79(2):212-5. PMID: 18202212
123. Rossi, S, De Capua, A, Ulivelli, M, et al. Effects of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on chronic tinnitus: a randomised, crossover, double blind, placebo controlled study. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2007 Aug;78(8):857-63. PMID: 17314192
124. Kirton, A, Chen, R, Friefeld, S, Gunraj, C, Pontigon, AM, Deveber, G. Contralesional repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for chronic hemiparesis in subcortical paediatric stroke: a randomised trial. *Lancet Neurol*. 2008 Jun;7(6):507-13. PMID: 18455961
125. Andre-Obadia, N, Mertens, P, Gueguen, A, Peyron, R, Garcia-Larrea, L. Pain relief by rTMS: differential effect of current flow but no specific action on pain subtypes. *Neurology*. 2008 Sep 9;71(11):833-40. PMID: 18779511
126. Hamada, M, Ugawa, Y, Tsuji, S. High-frequency rTMS over the supplementary motor area for treatment of Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord*. 2008 Aug 15;23(11):1524-31. PMID: 18548577
127. Gabis, L, Shklar, B, Baruch, YK, Raz, R, Gabis, E, Geva, D. Pain reduction using transcranial electrostimulation: a double blind "active placebo" controlled trial. *J Rehabil Med*. 2009 Mar;41(4):256-61. PMID: 19247545
128. Takeuchi, N, Tada, T, Tushima, M, Chuma, T, Matsuo, Y, Ikoma, K. Inhibition of the unaffected motor cortex by 1 Hz repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation enhances motor performance and training effect of the paretic hand in patients with chronic stroke. *J Rehabil Med*. 2008 Apr;40(4):298-303. PMID: 18382826
129. Kranz, G, Shamim, EA, Lin, PT, Kranz, GS, Hallett, M. Transcranial magnetic brain stimulation modulates blepharospasm: a randomized controlled study. *Neurology*. 2010 Oct 19;75(16):1465-71. PMID: 20956792
130. Chang, WH, Kim, YH, Bang, OY, Kim, ST, Park, YH, Lee, PK. Long-term effects of rTMS on motor recovery in patients after subacute stroke. *J Rehabil Med*. 2010 Sep;42(8):758-64. PMID: 20809058
131. Soler, MD, Kumru, H, Pelayo, R, et al. Effectiveness of transcranial direct current stimulation and visual illusion on neuropathic pain in spinal cord injury. *Brain*. 2010 Sep;133(9):2565-77. PMID: 20685806
132. Anders, M, Dvorakova, J, Rathova, L, et al. Efficacy of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for the treatment of refractory chronic tinnitus: a randomized, placebo controlled study. *Neuro Endocrinol Lett*. 2010;31(2):238-49. PMID: 20424590
133. Kim, BR, Kim, DY, Chun, MH, Yi, JH, Kwon, JS. Effect of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on cognition and mood in stroke patients: a double-blind, sham-controlled trial. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*. 2010 May;89(5):362-8. PMID: 20407301

134. Martiny, K, Lunde, M, Bech, P. Transcranial low voltage pulsed electromagnetic fields in patients with treatment-resistant depression. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2010 Jul 15;68(2):163-9. PMID: 20385376
135. Lipton, RB, Dodick, DW, Silberstein, SD, et al. Single-pulse transcranial magnetic stimulation for acute treatment of migraine with aura: a randomised, double-blind, parallel-group, sham-controlled trial. *Lancet Neurol*. 2010 Apr;9(4):373-80. PMID: 20206581
136. Filipovic, SR, Rothwell, JC, Bhatia, K. Low-frequency repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation and off-phase motor symptoms in Parkinson's disease. *J Neurol Sci*. 2010 Apr 15;291(1-2):1-4. PMID: 20153482
137. Kumru, H, Murillo, N, Samso, JV, et al. Reduction of spasticity with repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation in patients with spinal cord injury. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2010 Jun;24(5):435-41. PMID: 20053952
138. Takeuchi, N, Tada, T, Tushima, M, Matsuo, Y, Ikoma, K. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation over bilateral hemispheres enhances motor function and training effect of paretic hand in patients after stroke. *J Rehabil Med*. 2009 Nov;41(13):1049-54. PMID: 19894000
139. Khedr, EM, Abo-Elfetoh, N. Therapeutic role of rTMS on recovery of dysphagia in patients with lateral medullary syndrome and brainstem infarction. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2010 May;81(5):495-9. PMID: 19828479
140. Kang, BS, Shin, HI, Bang, MS. Effect of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation over the hand motor cortical area on central pain after spinal cord injury. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2009 Oct;90(10):1766-71. PMID: 19801069
141. Khedr, EM, Abdel-Fadeil, MR, Farghali, A, Qaid, M. Role of 1 and 3 Hz repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on motor function recovery after acute ischaemic stroke. *Eur J Neurol*. 2009 Dec;16(12):1323-30. PMID: 19780802
142. Arfeller, C, Vonthein, R, Plontke, SK, Plewnia, C. Efficacy and safety of bilateral continuous theta burst stimulation (cTBS) for the treatment of chronic tinnitus: design of a three-armed randomized controlled trial. *Trials*. 2009;10:74. PMID: 19698089
143. Di Lazzaro, V, Pilato, F, Profice, P, et al. Motor cortex stimulation for ALS: a double blind placebo-controlled study. *Neurosci Lett*. 2009 Oct 16;464(1):18-21. PMID: 19682544
144. Khedr, EM, Etraby, AE, Hemedda, M, Nasef, AM, Razek, AA. Long-term effect of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on motor function recovery after acute ischemic stroke. *Acta Neurol Scand*. 2010 Jan;121(1):30-7. PMID: 19678808
145. Loo, CK, Sainsbury, K, Mitchell, P, Hadzi-Pavlovic, D, Sachdev, PS. A sham-controlled trial of left and right temporal rTMS for the treatment of auditory hallucinations. *Psychol Med*. 2010 Apr;40(4):541-6. PMID: 19656432
146. Marcondes, RA, Sanchez, TG, Kii, MA, et al. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation improve tinnitus in normal hearing patients: a double-blind controlled, clinical and neuroimaging outcome study. *Eur J Neurol*. 2010 Jan;17(1):38-44. PMID: 19614962
147. Borckardt, JJ, Smith, AR, Reeves, ST, et al. A pilot study investigating the effects of fast left prefrontal rTMS on chronic neuropathic pain. *Pain Med*. 2009 Jul-Aug;10(5):840-9. PMID: 19594842

148. Jayaram, G, Stinear, JW. The effects of transcranial stimulation on paretic lower limb motor excitability during walking. *J Clin Neurophysiol*. 2009 Aug;26(4):272-9. PMID: 19584748
149. Brighina, F, Palermo, A, Panetta, ML, et al. Reduced cerebellar inhibition in migraine with aura: a TMS study. *Cerebellum*. 2009 Sep;8(3):260-6. PMID: 19156474
150. Arias, P, Vivas, J, Grieve, KL, Cudeiro, J. Double-blind, randomized, placebo controlled trial on the effect of 10 days low-frequency rTMS over the vertex on sleep in Parkinson's disease. *Sleep Med*. 2010 Sep;11(8):759-65. PMID: 20674489
151. Lorenz, I, Muller, N, Schlee, W, Langguth, B, Weisz, N. Short-term effects of single repetitive TMS sessions on auditory evoked activity in patients with chronic tinnitus. *J Neurophysiol*. 2010 Sep;104(3):1497-505. PMID: 20592125
152. Emara, TH, Moustafa, RR, Elnahas, NM, et al. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation at 1Hz and 5Hz produces sustained improvement in motor function and disability after ischaemic stroke. *Eur J Neurol*. 2010 Sep;17(9):1203-9. PMID: 20402755
153. Short, EB, Borckardt, JJ, Anderson, BS, et al. Ten sessions of adjunctive left prefrontal rTMS significantly reduces fibromyalgia pain: a randomized, controlled pilot study. *Pain*. 2011 Nov;152(11):2477-84. PMID: 21764215
154. Ahmed, MA, Darwish, ES, Khedr, EM, El Serogy, YM, Ali, AM. Effects of low versus high frequencies of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on cognitive function and cortical excitability in Alzheimer's dementia. *J Neurol*. 2012 Jan;259(1):83-92. PMID: 21671144
155. Kim, L, Chun, MH, Kim, BR, Lee, SJ. Effect of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on patients with brain injury and Dysphagia. *Annals of rehabilitation medicine*. 2011 Dec;35(6):765-71. PMID: 22506204
156. Fang, J, Zhou, M, Yang, M, Zhu, C, He, L. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for the treatment of amyotrophic lateral sclerosis or motor neuron disease. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2013;5:CD008554. PMID: 23728676
157. O'Connell, NE, Wand, BM, Marston, L, Spencer, S, Desouza, LH. Non-invasive brain stimulation techniques for chronic pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2014;4:CD008208. PMID: 24729198
158. Jansen, JM, Daams, JG, Koeter, MW, Veltman, DJ, van den Brink, W, Goudriaan, AE. Effects of non-invasive neurostimulation on craving: a meta-analysis. *Neuroscience and biobehavioral reviews*. 2013 Dec;37(10 Pt 2):2472-80. PMID: 23916527
159. O'Connell, NE, Wand, BM, Marston, L, Spencer, S, Desouza, LH. Non-invasive brain stimulation techniques for chronic pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2010(9):CD008208. PMID: 20824873
160. Lyon, DE, Schubert, C, Taylor, AG. Pilot study of cranial stimulation for symptom management in breast cancer. *Oncol Nurs Forum*. 2010 Jul;37(4):476-83. PMID: 20591807
161. Umezaki, Y, Badran, BW, DeVries, WH, Moss, J, Gonzales, T, George, MS. The Efficacy of Daily Prefrontal Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation (rTMS) for Burning Mouth Syndrome (BMS): A Randomized Controlled Single-blind Study. *Brain Stimul*. 2016 Mar-Apr;9(2):234-42. PMID: 26597930
162. Seppi, K, Weintraub, D, Coelho, M, et al. The Movement Disorder Society Evidence-Based Medicine Review Update: Treatments for the non-motor symptoms of Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord*. 2011 Oct;26 Suppl 3:S42-80. PMID: 22021174



163. Update on treatments for motor symptom of PD. [cited 03/06/2017]; Available from: <http://www.movementdisorders.org/MDS-Files1/PDFs/EBM-Papers/update-on-treatments-for-motor-symptoms-of-PD.pdf>
164. Update: Treatments for non-motor symptoms of parkinsons disease. [cited 03/05/2017]; Available from: <http://display.mds.prod.titanclient.com/MDS-Files1/PDFs/EBM-Papers/EBM-NMS-Updated15Jan2014.pdf>
165. Shprecher, D, Kurlan, R. The Management of Tics. *Movement Disorders*. 2009 Jan 15;24(1):15-24. PMID: No PMID Entry. [cited 03/05/2017]; Available from: [http://www.movementdisorders.org/MDS-Files1/Resources/PDFs/md\\_article21.pdf](http://www.movementdisorders.org/MDS-Files1/Resources/PDFs/md_article21.pdf)
166. BlueCross BlueShield Association Medical Policy Reference Manual "Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation as a Treatment of Depression and Other Psychiatric/Neurologic Disorders." Policy No. 2.01.50

## CODES

Codes	Number	Description
CPT	90867	Therapeutic repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) treatment; initial, including cortical mapping, motor threshold determination, delivery and management
	90868	;subsequent delivery and management, per session
	90869	;subsequent motor threshold re-determination with delivery and management
HCPCS	None	

**Date of Origin:** April 2002