







































Study	Sample Size	Main Results
Pollo et al., 2014	11 PD (STN) 2 ET (Vim)	 TW 41.3% wider and TCS 43% lower with directional vs. omnidirectional stimulation
Contarino et al., 2014	8 PD (STN)	o TW wider with directional vs. omnidirectional stimulation
Steigerwald et al., 2016	7 PD (STN)	 TW variations from -100% to +440% with directional vs. omnidirectional stimulation
		 Best TW improvement with the best directional contact at the le effective level
Dembek et al., 2017	10 PD (STN)	o TW wider with directional vs. omnidirectional stimulation
		 SET higher with directional vs. omnidirectional stimulation
Rebelo et al., 2018	3 PD (Vim) 3 DT (Vim) 2 ET (Vim)	 TW wider and TCS lower with directional vs. omnidirectional stimulation
		 TEED 6-18% lower with directional vs. omnidirectional stimulation

L

Data from the PROGRESS Study			
Enrollment	234 PD patients (157 males; 77 females)		
Demographics	Age: 61.7 ±8.4 years; PD duration since onset: 11.7 ±7.6 years;		
Number of centers	37 centers, from 7 countries		
Lead Configuration	2 central segmented contacts (3 segments each), 1 proximal and 1 distal ring contacts; 1-3-3-1		
Clinical Setting	Prospective, blinded subject, blinded observer, crossover study of directional versus non-directional stimulation		
Study Endpoints and Results	 Superiority benchmark: In 90.6% of patients, TW was wider with direction stimulation as compared to non-directional stimulation (p < 0.001) Clinicians' and Patients' preference: 58.5% of clinicians and 52.8% of patients preferred directionality 20.2% of clinicians and 21.8% of patients expressed no preference 21.2% of clinicians and 25.9% of patients preferred non-directionality 		
1	21.2% of clinicians and 25.9% of patients preferred non-directionality		









