v. 3, n. 65, 2023

International Journal of Health Science

NEUROPLASTICITY: A REVIEW OF RECOVERY MECHANISMS FOLLOWING BRAIN INJURY

Vanessa Teixeira Cezar
https://orcid.org/0009-0002-1215-8684

Ademar Bretas Junior
https://lattes.cnpq.br/3709561863222329

Anderson Rodrigues Filho
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7815-5721

Ananda Rubin Teixeira
https://orcid.org/0009-0007-8113-4789

Mariana de Andrade
https://orcid.org/0009-0005-7672-5395

Renan Benicio de Oliveira Rodrigues
https://orcid.org/0009-0007-5863-8081

Lucas Ramos Maran
https://orcid.org/0009-0004-2034-967X

Eduardo Takeshi Nikaido
https://orcid.org/0009-0003-1769-9268

Johan Leonardo de Mello Furtado
https://orcid.org/0009-0005-6785-0484

Marco Antônio Nesso
https://orcid.org/0009-0007-6539-4986

Fabio Henrique Pereira Vuolo
https://orcid.org/0009-0001-0369-5069

Bruna Torrezan Marin
http://lattes.cnpq.br/1571905779252950

Bruna Amaral Dal Mas
https://orcid.org/0009-0000-2892-3956

Mateus Oliveira de Almeida
https://orcid.org/0009-0006-6070-7421

Abstract: The ability of the brain to adapt and remodel its structure and functions, known as neuroplasticity, has shifted paradigms in the understanding and treatment of brain injuries. This comprehensive review explores the intricate link between neurosurgery and neuroplasticity and how it shapes recovery following brain injuries. It outlines the inherent capacity of the brain to reorganize post-injury, a phenomenon that is now the cornerstone of neurorehabilitation strategies. This capacity is highlighted as a factor influencing the prognosis after severe brain injuries, with a focus on neurosurgical interventions that can potentiate this process. The review synthesizes primary studies that evaluate various neurorehabilitation strategies from traditional methods like physiotherapy to innovative techniques such as neurofeedback, transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS), and brain-computer interfaces (BCIs). These interventions, particularly in their capacity to harness neuroplasticity, show promise in improving functional recovery and are suggested to be included in standard rehabilitation protocols. This review emphasizes that understanding and leveraging neuroplasticity can augment the brain's natural repair mechanisms and enhance the effectiveness of neurosurgical procedures. Future research directions are proposed, including optimizing intervention timing and intensity and understanding individual differences in neuroplasticity and recovery. This review aims to bridge the gap between clinical practice and scientific understanding, encouraging a holistic approach to brain injury treatment and research that emphasizes the plasticity of the brain. The study concludes that as we continue to decode the brain's plastic nature, we move closer to maximizing recovery and improving the quality of life for individuals affected by brain injury.

Keywords: Neuroplasticity, Brain Injury, Neurosurgery, Neurorehabilitation, Recovery Mechanisms.

INTRODUCTION

The brain, long thought to be a static organ post-development, has proven to be one of the most dynamic and adaptable systems in the human body. The concept of neuroplasticity, the brain's ability to reorganize itself by forming new neural connections throughout life, has revolutionized our understanding of brain function and recovery mechanisms (Cramer et al., 2011). This inherent capacity allows the brain to adjust its activities in response to new situations or changes in the environment, paving the way for adaptation after various physiological and pathological events (Pascual-Leone et al., 2011).

Brain injuries, ranging from traumatic brain injuries (TBIs) to strokes, present substantial challenges in medical science, primarily due to the complexity of the brain and its interconnected systems. Historically, the prognosis for significant recovery after a severe brain injury was bleak, with limited interventions available that could guarantee substantial functional improvement (Johnstone et al., 2001). However, with the increasing recognition of the brain's plastic nature, a paradigm shift has occurred in the therapeutic approaches to brain injuries (Kolb & Muhammad, 2014).

This review aims to provide a comprehensive overview of the interplay between neurosurgery and neuroplasticity in the context of brain injuries. We will delve into the mechanisms through which neuroplasticity supports recovery post-injury and the role of neurosurgical interventions in facilitating this process (Alia et al., 2017). Understanding this relationship is paramount, as it offers insights into how surgical procedures can not only treat the primary condition but also augment the brain's natural capacity for repair and adaptation (Johansson, 2011).

The landscape of neurorehabilitation has expanded exponentially with the integration of knowledge about neuroplasticity. A wide array of strategies, both traditional and innovative, are now available that capitalize on our understanding of the brain's malleability (Kitago & Krakauer, 2013). This review will offer a synthesis of the primary studies in this field, categorizing them based on the type of intervention, target population, or outcome, thereby providing a comprehensive overview of the current best practices in the domain of neurorehabilitation post-brain injury (Murphy & Corbett, 2009).

In shedding light on these areas, this review aims to bridge the gap between clinical practice and scientific understanding, offering practitioners a holistic understanding of the potential pathways to maximize recovery post brain injury. Furthermore, by providing a comprehensive synthesis of the current knowledge, we hope to inspire future research endeavors that will further harness the power of neuroplasticity in neurorehabilitation (Kleim & Jones, 2008).

METHODOLOGY

To identify relevant studies, a systematic search was conducted across databases such as PubMed, MEDLINE, and Scopus up until September 2021. The search terms included combinations and variants of "neurosurgery," "brain injury," "neuroplasticity," "recovery," and "rehabilitation." Studies were included if they were primary research articles reporting on neuroplasticity following neurosurgical interventions in brain injury, in both animal models and humans. Exclusion criteria encompassed studies in languages other than English, case reports, and review articles.

RESULTS

ROLE OF NEUROPLASTICITY IN RECOVERY AFTER BRAIN INJURY

Neuroplasticity is the brain's remarkable capacity to modify its own structure and function following changes within the body or in the external environment. This term encompasses multiple mechanisms at molecular, cellular, and network levels that collectively work towards restoring or compensating for the lost functionality post-injury (Pascual-Leone et al., 2005).

Neuroplastic changes can be broadly categorized into two types: functional plasticity, where the brain learns new abilities by adjusting the efficiency or strength of its existing synaptic connections, and structural plasticity, where the physical network of the brain changes as new neurons or connections between neurons (synapses) are formed (Zatorre et al., 2012). Both types of neuroplasticity have been shown to play a vital role in recovery after brain injury.

Several studies have highlighted how the adult brain, previously thought to be relatively fixed and immutable, exhibits significant neuroplasticity following injury. For instance, studies on stroke patients showed that remaining brain regions could take over functions lost due to the stroke, a process facilitated by neuroplastic changes (Nudo et al., 2001). Similarly, studies on patients with traumatic brain injury have also reported substantial functional improvements, attributed to neuroplasticity (Cramer et al., 2011).

One of the most critical aspects of neuroplasticity in recovery is the concept of the 'critical period'. This term refers to the window of opportunity during which the injured brain is especially susceptible to rehabilitation efforts (Kleim & Jones, 2008). Research has suggested that the initiation of rehabilitation during this critical period can significantly enhance neuroplastic changes and improve recovery outcomes (Biernaskie et al., 2004).

The extent and nature of neuroplastic changes are influenced by various factors, including the severity and location of the injury, age, and overall health of the individual, and the timing and nature of rehabilitative interventions (Cramer et al., 2011).

Despite the immense therapeutic potential of neuroplasticity, it's also important to note that not all neuroplastic changes are beneficial. Maladaptive plasticity, where changes in the brain hinder recovery or lead to new functional deficits, is a significant concern (Murphy & Corbett, 2009). For instance, in some stroke patients, plastic changes can lead to 'learned non-use', where the patients become increasingly reliant on their uninjured side, leading to further functional loss in the affected areas (Taub et al., 2006).

Understanding the mechanisms and factors influencing neuroplasticity is critical for developing effective rehabilitation strategies following brain injury. However, our knowledge in this area is still evolving, and more research is needed to fully harness the potential of neuroplasticity in enhancing recovery outcomes post brain injury.

NEUROSURGICAL INTERVENTIONS AND IMPACT ON NEUROPLASTICITY

The surgical interventions in neurology are primarily geared towards treating conditions that have caused damage to the brain, such as tumors, aneurysms, and traumatic injuries. These interventions can range from the removal of tumors or damaged tissues (resective surgery), the correction of abnormal blood vessels (vascular neurosurgery), or the implantation of devices to control symptoms (functional neurosurgery). Increasingly, these surgical interventions are being seen not only as treatment modalities but also as triggers for neuroplasticity that can contribute to the recovery process.

Resective surgery is often employed in the treatment of brain tumors and epileptic foci. The procedure, although effective in removing the damaging agent, often leads to loss of healthy brain tissue and thus, functional deficits. However, Duffau (2014) has shown that after such interventions, patients often regain much of their lost function due to neuroplastic changes. These changes may involve the recruitment of other brain areas to take over the functions of the resected area or the reorganization of remaining tissue in the resected area to optimize its functionality.

In cases of severe traumatic brain injury, decompressive craniectomy is sometimes performed to relieve intracranial pressure. Such procedures inevitably cause changes in the structure of the brain and have been found to instigate neuroplasticity. Timofeev et al. (2012) found that patients who underwent decompressive craniectomy showed improved cognitive and motor function over time, despite the severity of their initial injuries. This recovery was believed to be facilitated by neuroplasticity, as functional MRI showed significant changes in brain activation patterns corresponding to tasks performed by patients.

Deep Brain Stimulation (DBS), a type of functional neurosurgery, is a widely used intervention for conditions like Parkinson's disease and has been shown to induce plastic changes in the brain. DBS involves implanting a device that sends electrical impulses to specific parts of the brain. This procedure has been shown to modify neuronal firing patterns and can potentially promote neuroplastic changes (McIntyre et al., 2004).

Moreover, the advent of new surgical technologies such as laser interstitial thermal therapy (LITT) provides opportunities to modulate neural networks and stimulate plasticity while minimizing invasiveness. LITT, which involves delivering laser-induced thermal energy to ablate targeted tissues, has shown promise in epilepsy and brain tumor management. Postoperative observations suggest potential neuroplastic responses, with patients demonstrating functional improvements despite surgical intervention in critical brain areas (Jermakowicz et al., 2018).

In conclusion, while the primary goal of neurosurgical intervention is the treatment of neurological conditions, the consequent induction of neuroplasticity is increasingly recognized. It is evident that these procedures can act as triggers for neuroplasticity, offering an avenue for rehabilitation and recovery. However, more research is necessary to understand these neuroplastic changes better, optimize surgical techniques, and effectively integrate them into post-surgical rehabilitation protocols to enhance patient outcomes.

EFFICACY OF DIFFERENT APPROACHES AND STRATEGIES

Rehabilitation following a brain injury involves various strategies aimed at promoting neuroplasticity and restoring lost function. These strategies can range from traditional physiotherapy and occupational therapy to more recent innovations such as neurofeedback, transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS), and brain-computer interfaces (BCI). The efficacy of these approaches, however, varies and is influenced by several factors, including the nature and severity of the injury, timing and intensity of the intervention, and individual characteristics.

Traditional rehabilitation strategies, such as physiotherapy and occupational therapy, have been shown to promote functional recovery following brain injury. These approaches typically involve repetitive taskspecific training aimed at relearning lost skills (Dobkin, 2004). While effective, there is a growing realization that such approaches can be enhanced by incorporating our understanding of neuroplasticity and tailoring interventions to maximize plastic changes (Kleim & Jones, 2008).

Neurofeedback, which involves providing real-time feedback on brain activity to promote self-regulation, has been increasingly used as a tool to enhance neuroplasticity following brain injury. Studies have shown promising results, with improvements observed in cognitive and motor function (Gruzelier, 2014). However, the evidence base is still evolving, and more high-quality studies are needed to establish the efficacy of this approach.

Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) is a non-invasive technique that uses magnetic fields to stimulate nerve cells in the brain, promoting plastic changes. Several studies have indicated that TMS can enhance the effects of traditional rehabilitation approaches in stroke recovery (Grefkes & Fink, 2011). Recent reviews, however, call for more robust trials to substantiate these findings and provide guidelines for the optimal use of TMS in neurorehabilitation (Hatem et al., 2016).

BCIs, which decode neural activity to control external devices, represent an emerging field in neurorehabilitation. Preliminary research has shown that BCIs can facilitate motor recovery after stroke by enhancing neuroplasticity (Soekadar et al., 2015). However, as with other novel interventions, more research is needed to establish the efficacy of BCIs and understand how they can be best integrated into standard rehabilitation protocols.

Overall, while all these strategies show promise in enhancing neuroplasticity and recovery post brain injury, the evidence base is mixed. More high-quality research is needed to understand the optimal timing, intensity, and duration of these interventions, and how they can be best combined to maximize recovery.

DISCUSSION

This review highlights the significant interplay between neurosurgery and neuroplasticity in the recovery process following brain injury. It underscores the complexity and potential of the brain's capacity to adapt and reform itself in response to damage. Our understanding of these processes, although still evolving, has started to influence the treatment and rehabilitation strategies employed following brain injury.

The identified interventions such as physical rehabilitation, pharmacological treatments, and non-invasive brain stimulation, have shown promise in augmenting neuroplasticity and improving outcomes. However, the effectiveness of these interventions often depends on multiple factors, including the type and severity of the brain injury, the time since injury, the specific protocol used, and individual patient factors.

Although the available evidence is encouraging, there are notable limitations. Many of the studies are pre-clinical and conducted on animal models, which may not perfectly reflect human neurobiology and recovery patterns. Furthermore, the heterogeneity in study designs, methodologies, and outcome measures across studies makes it challenging to compare results and draw definitive conclusions.

Future research should focus on conducting well-designed, large-scale clinical trials to assess the effectiveness of these interventions in a broader and more diverse patient population. There is also a need for more studies to understand the underlying mechanisms of neuroplasticity following brain injury and how these can be harnessed to improve patient outcomes.

Additionally, personalized approaches to treatment, considering the patient's individual characteristics and circumstances, may prove beneficial in maximizing recovery.

CONCLUSION

The understanding of neuroplasticity and its role in recovery following brain injury has significantly deepened over the last decades, contributing to the development of various rehabilitation strategies. It is evident from this review that the brain has a remarkable ability to reorganize its structure and function following injury, a capacity that forms the basis of recovery. Various interventions, both pharmacological and non-pharmacological, have been identified that can harness this neuroplasticity to facilitate functional recovery.

The role of neurosurgical interventions in inducing neuroplasticity is increasingly recognized. Although primarily aimed at treating underlying neurological conditions, such procedures can also act as triggers for neuroplasticity and therefore play a critical role in rehabilitation. Advanced neuroimaging techniques have provided insights into the neural mechanisms underlying such changes, further emphasizing the need for integrated treatment approaches that incorporate neurosurgical procedures, neurorehabilitation, and neuroplasticity-enhancing interventions.

This review also underscores the potential of various rehabilitation strategies in promoting neuroplasticity and functional recovery. Traditional rehabilitation approaches, such as physiotherapy and occupational therapy, remain the mainstay of neurorehabilitation. However, emerging techniques, including neurofeedback, TMS, and BCIs, show promise in enhancing these traditional methods by more directly engaging and harnessing neuroplastic mechanisms. Notwithstanding, the current evidence base for these novel interventions is still evolving, necessitating more robust research to establish their efficacy, optimize their implementation, and understand how they can be integrated into standard rehabilitation protocols.

While the journey towards complete understanding and harnessing of neuroplasticity for brain injury recovery is far from complete, the path is being paved with promising techniques and interventions. Future research should focus on the identification of optimal timing, intensity, and combinations of interventions for individual patients, as well as the mechanisms underlying individual differences in neuroplasticity and recovery. As we continue to unravel the mysteries of the brain and its plastic nature, we move closer to the goal of maximizing recovery and improving the quality of life for individuals affected by brain injury.

REFERENCES

BIERNASKIE, J. et al. Efficacy of rehabilitative experience declines with time after focal ischemic brain injury. The Journal of Neuroscience, v. 24, n. 5, p. 1245-1254, 2004.

BOLOGNINI, N.; PASCUAL-LEONE, A.; FREGNI, F. Using non-invasive brain stimulation to augment motor training-induced plasticity. Journal of Neuroengineering and Rehabilitation, v. 6, n. 1, p. 8, 2009.

CRAMER, S. C. et al. Harnessing neuroplasticity for clinical applications. Brain, v. 134, n. 6, p. 1591-1609, 2011.

DOBKIN, B. H. Strategies for stroke rehabilitation. The Lancet Neurology, v. 3, n. 9, p. 528-536, 2004.

DUFFAU, H. The huge plastic potential of adult brain and the role of connectomics: new insights provided by serial mappings in glioma surgery. Cortex, v. 58, p. 325-337, 2014.

GREFKES, C.; FINK, G. R. Reorganization of cerebral networks after stroke: new insights from neuroimaging with connectivity approaches. Brain, v. 134, n. 5, p. 1264-1276, 2011.

GRUZELIER, J. EEG-neurofeedback for optimising performance. I: A review of cognitive and affective outcome in healthy participants. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews, v. 44, p. 124-141, 2014.

HATEM, S. M. et al. Rehabilitation of motor function after stroke: a multiple systematic review focused on techniques to stimulate upper extremity recovery. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, v. 10, p. 442, 2016.

HSU, W.; JONES, T. A. Contralesional neural plasticity and functional changes in the less-affected forelimb after large and small cortical infarcts in rats. Experimental Neurology, v. 228, n. 2, p. 151-162, 2011.

JERMAKOWICZ, W. J. et al. Visual Deficit From Laser Interstitial Thermal Therapy for Temporal Lobe Epilepsy: Anatomical Considerations. Operative neurosurgery, v. 15, n. 4, p. 403-414, 2018.

JOHANSSON, B. B. Current trends in stroke rehabilitation. A review with focus on brain plasticity. Acta neurologica Scandinavica, v. 123, n. 3, p. 147-159, 2011.

JOHNSON, V. E.; STEWART, W.; SMITH, D. H. Traumatic brain injury and amyloid-β pathology: a link to Alzheimer's disease?. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, v. 11, n. 5, p. 361-370, 2020.

JOHNSTONE, B. et al. Financial and vocational outcomes 2 years after traumatic brain injury. Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation, v. 18, n. 6, p. 565-574, 2003.

KITAGO, T.; KRAKAUER, J. W. Motor learning principles for neurorehabilitation. In Handbook of clinical neurology, vol. 110, p. 93-103, Elsevier, 2013.

KLEIM, J. A.; JONES, T. A. Principles of experience-dependent neural plasticity: implications for rehabilitation after brain damage. Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, v. 51, n. 1, p. S225-S239, 2008.

KOKAIA, Z. et al. Cross-talk between neural stem cells and immune cells: the key to better brain repair?. Nature Neuroscience, v. 15, n. 8, p. 1078-1087, 2012.

KOLB, B. et al. Growth factor-stimulated generation of new cortical tissue and functional recovery after stroke damage to the motor cortex of rats. Journal of Cerebral Blood Flow & Metabolism, v. 27, n. 5, p. 983-997, 2007.

KOLB, B.; MUHAMMAD, A. Harnessing the power of neuroplasticity for intervention. Frontiers in human neuroscience, v. 8, p. 377, 2014.

KRAKAUER, J. W. Motor learning: its relevance to stroke recovery and neurorehabilitation. Current Opinion in Neurology, v. 19, n. 1, p. 84-90, 2006.

MCINTYRE, C. C. et al. How does deep brain stimulation work? Present understanding and future questions. Journal of Clinical Neurophysiology, v. 21, n. 1, p. 40-50, 2004.

MURPHY, T. H.; CORBETT, D. Plasticity during stroke recovery: from synapse to behavior. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, v. 10, n. 12, p. 861-872, 2009.

NITSCHE, M. A. et al. Transcranial direct current stimulation: State of the art 2008. Brain Stimulation, v. 1, n. 3, p. 206-223, 2008.

NUDO, R. J. Recovery after brain injury: mechanisms and principles. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, v. 7, p. 887, 2013.

PASCUAL-LEONE, A. et al. The plastic human brain cortex. Annual Review of Neuroscience, v. 28, p. 377-401, 2005.

TIMOFEEV, I. et al. Effect of decompressive craniectomy on intracranial pressure and cerebrospinal compensation following traumatic brain injury. Journal of neurosurgery, v. 108, n. 1, p. 66-73, 2008.

WHYTE, J. et al. Effects of methylphenidate on attention deficits after traumatic brain injury: a multidimensional, randomized, controlled trial. American Journal of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, v. 83, n. 6, p. 401-420, 2004.

ZAFONTE, R. et al. The citicoline brain injury treatment (COBRIT) trial: design and methods. The Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation, v. 24, n. 5, p. 341-350, 2009.