

1
2 **An integrative clustering approach to tDCS individual response variability in cognitive**
3 **performance: beyond a null effect on working memory.**
4

5 Luque-Casado, Antonio,^{a(1)} Rodríguez-Freiría, Rocío,^{b(1)} Fogelson, Noa,^a Iglesias-Soler,
6 Eliseo,^b Fernández-del-Olmo, Miguel ^{a(*)}
7
8
9

10
11 (a) Area of Sport Sciences, Faculty of Sports Sciences and Physical Education. Center for
12 Sport Studies, King Juan Carlos University, Madrid, Spain.
13

14 (b) Department of Physical Education and Sport, Faculty of Sports Sciences and Physical
15 Education, University of A Coruña, Performance and Health Group, A Coruña, Spain
16
17
18
19

20 **Published in:** *Neuroscience*
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 ¹ **Contributed equally to this manuscript.**
28
29
30

31 ***Corresponding author:** Miguel Fernández del Olmo. Rey Juan Carlos University.
32 Departamental II, Campus Alcorcón. Avenida de Atenas s/n, 28922 Alcorcón, Madrid
33 e-mail: miguel.delolmo@urjc.es
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Abstract

1
2
3
4 Despite the growing interest in the use of transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) for the
5 modulation of human cognitive function, there are contradictory findings regarding the
6 cognitive benefits of this technique. Inter-individual response variability to tDCS may play a
7 significant role. We explored the effects of anodal versus sham tDCS over the left prefrontal
8 cortex (LPFC) on working memory performance, taking into account the inter-individual
9 variability. Twenty-nine healthy volunteers received an ‘offline’ anodal tDCS (1.5 mA,
10 15 min) to the left prefrontal cortex (F3 electrode site) in an intra-individual, cross-over,
11 sham-controlled experimental design. n-back and Sternberg task performance was assessed
12 before (baseline), immediately after tDCS administration (T1) and 5 minutes post-T1 (T2).
13 We applied an integrative clustering approach to characterize both the group and individual
14 responses to tDCS, as well as identifying naturally occurring subgroups that may be present
15 within the total sample. Anodal tDCS failed to improve working memory performance in the
16 total sample. Cluster analysis identified a subgroup of ‘responders’ who significantly
17 improved their performance after anodal (vs. sham) stimulation, although not to a greater
18 extent than the best baseline or sham condition. The proportion of ‘responders’ ranged from
19 15% to 59% across task conditions and behavioral outputs. Our findings show a high inter-
20 individual variability of the tDCS response, suggesting that the use of tDCS may not be an
21 effective tool to improve working memory performance in healthy subjects. We propose that
22 the use of clustering methods is more suitable in identifying ‘responders’ and for evaluating
23 the efficacy of this technique.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 **Keywords:** non-invasive brain stimulation; transcranial direct current stimulation; inter-
43 individual variability; cluster analysis; cognition; working memory.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Introduction

Working memory provides the ability to temporarily store and manipulate information over a short period of time, representing a critically relevant function in our daily activities (Weng et al., 2019). Working memory function supports a wide range of higher order cognitive skills (Johnson et al., 2013), and its dysfunction is a core feature in a range of neuropsychiatric disorders including depression (Baune et al., 2014), schizophrenia (Potkin et al., 2009), Parkinson's disease (Fallon et al., 2017) as well as in post-chemotherapy cognitive deficits (Wang et al., 2016). Therefore, investigation into methods that may boost working memory ability may be of clinical relevance.

Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) is an emerging form of non-invasive techniques of brain stimulation, that has come to the fore in recent years, as a promising tool for modulating spontaneous cortical activity (Nitsche and Paulus, 2000). It has been proposed that tDCS shifts target cortical areas excitability in a polarity-dependent manner, i.e., anodal stimulation induces hypopolarization, while cathodal induces hyperpolarization (Nitsche and Paulus, 2001; Zaghi et al., 2010). However, others suggest that both the outcomes and mechanisms of tDCS are far more complex (Giordano et al., 2017; Jamil et al., 2017; Kronberg et al., 2017). For a more detailed description of the mechanisms of tDCS see (To et al., 2016; Stagg et al., 2018).

Animal and human studies suggest that anodal tDCS modifies the threshold of action potentials and induces long-term potentiation (LTP)-like mechanisms (Fritsch et al., 2010). Thus, the use of tDCS as a potential therapeutic or enhancing tool for the modulation of motor or cognitive performance has grown exponentially. Indeed, a number of studies have been published over the last years, claiming that anodal tDCS over the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC) is able to benefit working memory performance in both healthy (Fregni et al., 2005; Hoy et al., 2013) and neuropsychiatric populations (Loo et al., 2012; Hoy et al., 2014). Nonetheless, the true enhancement potential of tDCS for working memory remains uncertain, with recent meta-analyses showing that the effects are reliable though small (Hill et al., 2016), limited to response times but not accuracy (Brunoni and Vanderhasselt, 2014; Dedoncker et al., 2016), or nonexistent (Horvath et al., 2015; Medina and Cason, 2017).

Several methodological aspects may contribute to the inconclusive findings in this field. The heterogeneity of the tDCS protocols that are employed is one important source of variability

1 in the efficacy of this technique (Dedoncker et al., 2016). Thus, tDCS protocols utilize
2 different variables for the stimulus duration, current intensity, electrode size, position and
3 polarity. Another key element is the use of a small sample size (average n=18 in within-
4 subjects designs), resulting in low statistical power (approximately 14% for the cognitive
5 studies in general, and 5% for the working memory studies in particular), and a small
6 proportion of studies that have been replicated (Medina and Cason, 2017). This is especially
7 critical when considering the influence of a wide variety of other individual factors such as
8 age, gender, hormones, cognitive ability or differences in head anatomy, which are also likely
9 to modulate the effects of tDCS (Wurzman et al., 2016). In fact, recent tDCS studies have
10 shown that only around 50% of individuals demonstrate the typical polarity-specific
11 modulation of motor cortex excitability (López-Alonso et al., 2014; Wiethoff et al., 2014).
12 Thus, due to publication bias (Medina and Cason, 2017), effect sizes in single studies with
13 small samples might be substantially overestimated (Minarik et al., 2016), while meta-
14 analyses may underestimate the efficacy of tDCS by including underpowered studies
15 reporting null effects (Héroux et al., 2017).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 New methodological approaches are required in order to account for the high variability in the
29 responsiveness to tDCS stimulation (Parkin et al., 2015; Filmer et al., 2020). A potentially
30 useful approach to address this issue would be the systematic use of formally agreed sample
31 stratification methods. A recent study has used this methodological approach to explore the
32 effects of tDCS over the DLPFC on working memory in healthy subjects (Luque-Casado et
33 al., 2019). The study showed that a single session of ‘offline’ anodal tDCS stimulation failed
34 to improve the memory span performance for the total sample of participants. Crucially, a
35 clustering procedure identified that only 47% of the subjects exhibited an increase in
36 performance after anodal tDCS, although it did not significantly exceed the baseline
37 performance. These findings highlighted the importance for the use of clustering methods in
38 order to determine tDCS-linked cognitive outcomes. However, some factors limited the
39 representativeness of this preliminary finding. Working memory was assessed using the digit
40 span task, a simple task that depends on the total number of remembered items, mainly
41 involving memory storage, with only limited demands on other working memory processes.
42 Consequently, a ceiling effect may have limited the tDCS effects from emerging in this study
43 (Tseng et al., 2012; Mancuso et al., 2016). In addition, the possibility that the efficacy of the
44 technique was selectively linked to more complex executive abilities (i.e., updating, shifting
45 and inhibition) (Wu et al., 2014; Nejati et al., 2017; Imburgio and Orr, 2018) or different
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 types of behavioral output (Brunoni and Vanderhasselt, 2014; Dedoncker et al., 2016), still
2 remain to be clarified.
3

4 In the current study, we proposed an intra-individual, cross-over, sham-controlled
5 experimental design aimed to test the hypothesis that anodal tDCS over the left prefrontal
6 cortex (LPFC) has a performance enhancing effect on working memory in healthy subjects.
7 To this end, we used a two-step methodological approach by exploring the behavioral
8 response to tDCS both in the whole sample size and an enriched sample obtained through a
9 cluster analysis procedure. This approach allowed us to stratifies the sample and identify the
10 subgroup of subjects in which the effect of the anodal tDCS was significantly different from
11 the effect of sham tDCS ('responders'), and whether this effect differs from 'non-responders'.
12 We used the n-back task and Sternberg task, two paradigms frequently employed as indexes
13 of working memory function in tDCS research in which inconclusive results have been
14 reported (Hill et al., 2016). Importantly, in order to guarantee a homogeneous range of
15 variation in performance avoiding floor or ceiling effects to detect the influence of stimulation
16 (Tseng et al., 2012; Luque-Casado et al., 2019), we individually assigned the level of task
17 difficulty based on a previous load-adaptive training session.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **Experimental procedures**

32 *Participants*

33 A total of 29 Caucasian healthy subjects (4 women), aged between 18 and 25 years (mean age
34 \pm SD: 19.8 ± 2.0), participated in the study from an initial sample of 31 subjects. Two subjects
35 were excluded after not completing all the experimental sessions of the study. Subjects with
36 neurological, psychiatric, including a past medical history of head injury or seizures, or other
37 contraindications to undergo the tDCS were excluded from the study. This study was
38 conducted in full compliance with the Declaration of Helsinki 1964 (updated in Fortaleza,
39 2013) and approved by the Local Ethics Committee of the University of A Coruña. All
40 participants signed a contraindication form and gave written informed consent before the
41 experimental sessions.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 *General procedure*

54 We used a double-blind, cross-over, sham controlled experimental design. The experiment
55 was carried out in five separate experimental sessions. First, a familiarization session was
56 performed in which participants initially practiced the two cognitive tasks (n-back and
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Sternberg). This session also allowed us to evaluate the level of task execution in order to
2 individually adapt the task difficulty in the subsequent experimental sessions. Then, each
3 participant performed four separate blind sessions corresponding to each stimulation
4 condition and cognitive task (anodal tDCS and sham tDCS for the n-back and Sternberg task).
5 The order of the sessions was counterbalanced and a ‘wash-out’ period was implemented in
6 order to minimize carry-over effects for stimulation condition and task interference. In all the
7 subjects we implemented a ‘wash-out’ period of exactly 15 days between each of the three
8 first sessions, and a seven days 'wash-out' period prior to the fourth session. Thus, there was
9 no variation in the duration of the 'wash-out' period across the participants. Each experimental
10 session began with a familiarization period in which participants initially completed the
11 cognitive task (n-back or Sternberg) as a practice trial. Then, after a 5-minute rest interval,
12 cognitive testing commenced with a baseline trial of the task, prior to the stimulation period.
13 Stimulation (anodal tDCS or sham tDCS) was carried out ‘offline’ and lasted a total of 15
14 minutes. The participants remained seated and were instructed to avoid unnecessary
15 movements during the stimulation period in order to minimize any possible interference.
16 Immediately after the stimulation, two trials (T1 and T2) of the task were performed,
17 separated by a 5-minute rest interval.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 *Cognitive tasks*

32 We used two different paradigms in order to evaluate working memory performance, the n-
33 back and the Sternberg task. In both cases, the level of difficulty was adapted to the execution
34 of each subject by considering an acceptable level of performance while allowing some range
35 of improvement (Fregni et al., 2005; Martin et al., 2013). To this aim, we established a level
36 of difficulty in which participants reached and maintained a percentage of response accuracy
37 between 80-85%. This procedure allowed us to homogenize the likelihood to detect any
38 impairment or improvement following tDCS by standardizing the baseline cognitive
39 performance.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 *n-back task*

52 We used a MATLAB pre-programmed application (Matlab 2010, Mathworks Inc.) to control
53 the stimulus presentation and response collection. We tested the performance in the n-back
54 task, and the maximum level of difficulty achieved by each subject (from a minimum ‘n’ of 2-
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

back to a maximum ‘n’ of 7-back). In order to individually adjust the difficulty, we established a response accuracy output between 80-85%.

The task comprised a total of 40 trials. Each trial began with the presentation of an uppercase letter in white color randomly generated from a set of 21 consonants. Each letter stimulus was presented for 500 ms in the middle of the screen on a gray background. Participants had to compare each new letter with that presented ‘n’ times before, and respond whether they matched or not by pressing two different keys on the PC Keyboard. The maximum time to give a response was 2000 ms and trials without response within this time period were considered as errors. The inter-stimulus interval lasted 1000 ms.

Sternberg task

We used the *Psychology Experiment Building Language* (PEBL) software (Mueller and Piper, 2014) to control the stimulus presentation and response collection. The task comprised a total of 75 trials divided into 3 blocks (25 trials per block). Each block included the presentation of a memory set containing ‘n’ letters, which the participants memorized for 15 seconds before the letters disappeared. In each trial, participants were then presented with a probe letter and where instructed to use a button press to indicate whether the probe was present or absent in the memory set. The probe stimulus was presented at the center of the screen in white color on a black background and was randomly generated from a set of 21 uppercase consonant letters.

We tested the individual task performance in the familiarization session in order to individually adjust the task difficulty level. The maximum level of difficulty achieved by each participant ranged from a minimum of 8 to a maximum of 14 letters. Thus, since the task was divided into 3 blocks of increasing difficulty, two different sequences of difficulty increase were established in order to maintain a response accuracy output between 80-85%. Each sequence was composed of 3 blocks of increasing difficulty as follows: Level 1 (memory set of 8, 10 and 12 letters for each block, respectively) and Level 2 (memory set of 10, 12 and 14 letters for each block, respectively). Participants were encouraged to respond as quickly and accurately as possible. Since the time until response was not limited, only the response accuracy output was taken into consideration in this task.

For both, n-back and Sternberg tasks 80-85% accuracy rate was chosen since it has been shown from pilot data to be adequate for keeping the subjects motivated during the

1 performance of the utilized tasks, in comparison with lower accuracy rates. In addition,
2 although a ceiling effect may not be completely ruled out, a previous study showed no ceiling
3 effects on behavior using similar accuracy rates (Corbin and Marquer, 2013).
4
5

6 *tDCS*

7
8 Anodal tDCS was delivered for 15-minutes at 1.5 mA through a pair of saline-soaked sponge
9 surface electrodes of 35 cm² (current density of 0.04 mA/cm²) connected to an aDC
10 stimulator (neuroConn). The stimulation parameters were chosen according to two meta-
11 analysis studies, which indicated that a current density greater than 0.029 mA/cm² for
12 stimulation periods greater than 10 minutes are more likely to have a significant effect in
13 cognitive tasks (Dedoncker et al., 2016; Hill et al., 2016).
14
15

16 The active electrode (anode) was placed over the left PFC and the reference electrode
17 (cathode) was placed over the contralateral supraorbital region (F3 and Fp2 electrode position
18 according to the International 10-20 EEG system, respectively). Current was faded in and out
19 for 10 seconds in both the anodal and sham stimulation conditions. For the sham tDCS
20 condition the current of the anodal tDCS was switched off after 60 seconds of stimulation.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 *Statistical analysis*

32
33 All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS software (SPSS, Chicago, IL). Two
34 different statistical approaches were employed in order to explore the effect of the tDCS: a
35 traditional analysis of variance (ANOVA) of repeated measures and a cluster analysis. In
36 order to control for any difference in baseline performance, all analyses were carried out using
37 the standardized units both in RT and response accuracy ($\Delta = [(T1 \text{ or } T2 - \text{baseline}) /$
38 $\text{baseline}]$). The normal distribution of data was corroborated by means of the Shapiro-Wilk
39 test and Q-Q plot inspection.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 *Analysis of variance*

50
51 Repeated-measures ANOVA with intra-subject factors Condition (anodal tDCS vs. sham
52 tDCS) and Trial (T1 and T2) or Condition (anodal tDCS vs. sham tDCS), Trial (T1 and T2)
53 and Set (Set 1, Set 2 and Set 3) were conducted in order to compare the performance in the n-
54 back task and the Sternberg task, respectively. We explored the potential order effect by
55 introducing Order (anodal-sham or sham-anodal) as the between-subject factor. The
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

interaction of the Order factor with any variable of interest (i.e., Condition, Trial or Set) was reported when applicable. Post-hoc analyses were conducted using Bonferroni corrections when necessary. Sphericity was tested by means of the Mauchley sphericity test and the Green-House Geisser correction was applied when violation of this assumption occurred.

Cluster analysis

In order to address the high inter-individual variability in response to non-invasive brain stimulation protocols (López-Alonso et al., 2014; Luque-Casado et al., 2019), a follow-up cluster analysis on the whole sample was applied to better characterize the subjects' response to tDCS, and to identify naturally occurring subgroups that may be present. Cluster analysis was carried out in two stages.

First, we used a hierarchical cluster analysis with the Ward clustering method and squared Euclidean distance as dissimilarity measure. We used this analysis in order to determine the number of clusters and the centroid for each of them and to identify outliers. To this end, a hierarchical relationship between the cases and/or clusters was represented in a standardized scale dendogram from 0 to 25, where the longer the distance, the greater the dissimilarity was between the clusters. In the present study, clusters were identified if the distance was lower than 7. We considered a case as an outlier if it had a greater dissimilarity compared to the rest of the cases without joining any of the identified clusters (Clatworthy et al., 2005), or if the distance was higher than 15.

Second, we performed a k-means cluster analysis using the number of clusters and the centroids identified in the first stage. The number of clusters was considered appropriate if there was a maximum of two changes in the cluster assignment of the subjects from the first analysis and if the distance between the centroids of the clusters was always greater than the distance of any individual case to the centroid within each cluster.

We assumed that some subjects would respond to the anodal tDCS at T1 and others at T2, due to possible different time courses of the tDCS. Therefore, we carried out two separate cluster analyses for T1 and for T2 using the normalized units of task performance ($\Delta T1$ or $\Delta T2$).

Cluster analysis 1 was performed for T1 in order to identify a subgroup that showed significant improvement in performance immediately after anodal tDCS vs. the sham condition. Cluster analysis 2 was performed for T2 in order to identify a subgroup that

1 showed significant improvement in performance in the subsequent 5 minutes after anodal
2 tDCS vs. the sham condition.

3
4 The definition of the clusters was based on the value of the centroids. A subgroup was
5 identified as ‘responder’ when subjects improved their performance after the anodal tDCS
6 (but not sham), or improved their performance to a greater extent after the anodal vs. the sham
7 condition. When the cluster analysis revealed a responsive subgroup, we proceed to test
8 whether the subjects in that group improved significantly their performance for the anodal in
9 comparison with the sham stimulation. Thus, we conducted a separate repeated-measures
10 ANOVA only for the ‘responders’ subgroup with Condition (anodal tDCS vs. sham tDCS)
11 and Trial (baseline, T1 or T2) as intra-subject factors in the n-back task and Condition (anodal
12 tDCS vs. sham tDCS), Trial (baseline, T1 and T2) and Set (Set 1, Set 2 and Set 3) for the
13 Sternberg task. Note that this analysis was performed on the absolute values of task
14 performance considering the baseline as a level of the Trial factor. This allowed us to identify
15 whether performance in T1 or T2 was significantly different in absolute terms from baseline
16 performance regardless of the magnitude of the change. Post-hoc analyses using Bonferroni
17 corrections were conducted when necessary. Finally, we also performed paired samples t-tests
18 of the normalized units of task performance ($\Delta T1$ or $\Delta T2$) in order to corroborate any tDCS
19 effects after controlling for baseline differences.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 **Results**

37
38 A total of 116 tDCS sessions (both anodal and sham) were performed. During the anodal
39 tDCS sessions 18 subjects (62%) occasionally experienced mild and transient adverse effects
40 during stimulation, such as ‘itching’, ‘burning’ or ‘discomfort’ but these did not disrupt the
41 stimulation sessions. During the anodal and sham tDCS sessions 53% and 52% of the subjects
42 believed that they were being stimulated, respectively, confirming the success of the blinding
43 procedure.
44
45
46
47
48

49 *n-Back*

50
51 The repeated-measures ANOVA comparing RT showed no significant effects for Condition,
52 Trial, or the Condition*Trial interaction. Similarly, the response accuracy did not show any
53 statistically significant main effects or interactions (Figure 1).
54
55
56
57

58 The factor Order did not show any significant interaction with the variables of interest, except
59 for the Condition*Trial*Order interaction of the response accuracy ($F_{1,27}=6.66$ $p=.02$).
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Further post-hoc analyses indicated a greater increase of the response accuracy from baseline in the anodal (vs. sham condition) at T2, only when anodal session was carried out first ($t_{12}=2.40$ $p=.03$). Importantly, the response accuracy achieved in the anodal condition at T2 for the group that performed the anodal condition first, did not significantly improve the baseline performance across groups and conditions. None of the remaining post-hoc comparisons reached statistical significance.

--- Figure 1 here ---

The cluster analysis of the RT normalized values identified a subgroup of ‘responders’ of 12 (41%) and 13 (45%) subjects at T1 and T2, respectively (Figure 2). The clustering procedure did not report any outliers. The repeated-measures ANOVA comparing RT for the subgroup of ‘responders’ at T1 showed a significant main effect for Trial ($F_{1,11}=6.68$ $p=.025$), a non-significant effect for Condition and a significant Condition**Trial* interaction ($F_{1,11}=12.21$ $p<.005$). A paired samples t-test of the T1 baseline-normalized scores confirmed a significantly greater improvement in performance in anodal tDCS compared with sham tDCS ($t_{11}=-3.45$ $p=.005$). Further post-hoc analysis showed faster RT at T1 (vs. baseline) after anodal tDCS ($t_{11}=4.06$ $p=.002$) but not after sham tDCS. However, the RT performance at T1 after anodal tDCS was not significantly superior to baseline or T1 values during the sham tDCS (Table 1). The ANOVA for ‘responders’ at T2 showed non-significant main effect for Condition or Trial, but a significant Condition**Trial* interaction ($F_{1,12}=4.92$ $p=.047$). A paired samples t-test of the T2 baseline-normalized scores confirmed a significant improvement in performance after anodal tDCS with respect to sham tDCS ($t_{12}=-2.41$ $p=.033$). Post-hoc analysis showed a non-significant decrease in RT at T2 (vs. baseline) after anodal tDCS, accompanied by a significant increase in the sham condition tDCS ($t_{12}=-2.59$ $p=.02$). Importantly, the RT performance at T2 after anodal tDCS was not superior to baseline or T2 values in the sham tDCS (Table 1).

The cluster analysis of the response accuracy normalized scores did not show an appropriate consistency between clustering methods (hierarchical Ward and *k*-means) and thus did not identify a subgroup of ‘responders’ at T1 or T2 (Figure 2).

---Figure 2 here ---

n-back (reaction times [ms])				
	'Responders' T1 (n=12)		'Responders' T2 (n=13)	
	Baseline	T1	Baseline	T2
Anodal tDCS	753.6 (178.0)	699.3 (171.2)*	741.8 (230.4)	719.8 (216.1)
Sham tDCS	752.5 (148.4)	755.6 (167.2)	707.9 (211.4)	739.0 (228.0)*
Sternberg task (response accuracy [%])				
Set 1	'Responders' T1 (n=12)		'Responders' T2 (n=4)	
	Baseline	T1	Baseline	T2
Anodal tDCS	87.33 (9.47)	90.00 (6.66)	84.00 (9.09)	91.50 (6.81)*
Sham tDCS	90.67 (6.79)	88.17 (7.31)*	87.50 (8.85)	84.50 (11.82)
Set 2	'Responders' T1 (n=17)		'Responders' T2 (n=16)	
	Baseline	T1	Baseline	T2
Anodal tDCS	74.59 (8.49)	79.41 (7.90)	73.75 (9.52)	78.00 (7.16)
Sham tDCS	80.94 (8.40) [#]	75.29 (9.08)*	80.25 (9.03) [#]	73.88 (10.39)*
Set 3	'Responders' T1 (n=6)		'Responders' T2 (n=9)	
	Baseline	T1	Baseline	T2
Anodal tDCS	65.00 (5.48)	81.67 (7.84)*	68.22 (8.63)	80.67 (8.12)*
Sham tDCS	77.33 (8.45) [#]	80.67 (7.55)	76.22 (8.15) [#]	66.67 (10.39)

Table 1. Mean (\pm standard deviation) for the n-back and Sternberg task output as a function of Condition (anodal tDCS vs. sham tDCS) and Trial (Baseline, T1 or T2) in 'responders'. *Indicates statistical significant differences with respect to baseline ($p < .05$); [#]Indicates statistical significant differences between anodal tDCS and sham tDCS at baseline ($p < .05$).

Sternberg task

The repeated-measures ANOVA comparing response accuracy showed non-significant effects for Condition, Trial, Set, and interactions (Figure 3). The factor Order did not show any significant interaction with the variables of interest.

1
2 --- Figure 3 here ---
3
4

5 The cluster analysis of the response accuracy normalized scores identified the following
6 subgroups of ‘responders’: 12 subjects (46%) at T1 (3 outliers) and 4 subjects (15%) at T2 (2
7 outliers) for Set 1; 17 subjects (59%) at T1 (no outliers) and 16 subjects (57%) at T2 (1
8 outlier) for Set 2; 6 subjects (21%) at T1 (no outliers) and 9 subjects (32%) at T2 (1 outlier)
9 for Set 3 of the Sternberg task (Figure 4).
10

11 The repeated-measures ANOVA comparing response accuracy for the subgroup of
12 ‘responders’ showed non-significant effects for Condition and Trial in all the cases, except for
13 Set 3 at T1 (Condition, $F_{1,5}=25.80$ $p=.004$; Trial, $F_{1,5}=30.61$ $p=.003$). There was a significant
14 interaction between Condition and Trial in all the cases: Set1-T1 ($F_{1,11}=12.08$ $p=.005$), Set1-
15 T2 ($F_{1,3}=12.36$ $p=.039$), Set2-T1 ($F_{1,16}=20.65$ $p<.001$), Set2-T2 ($F_{1,15}=13.09$ $p=.003$), Set3-T1
16 ($F_{1,5}=22.47$ $p=.005$) and Set3-T2 ($F_{1,8}=38.89$ $p<.001$). Additionally, paired samples t-tests
17 on T1 and T2 change scores confirmed a significantly greater improvement in performance in
18 anodal tDCS (vs. sham tDCS) after baseline normalization in all the cases: Set1-T1 ($t_{11}=3.39$
19 $p=.006$), Set1-T2 ($t_3=3.30$ $p=.046$), Set2-T1 ($t_{16}=4.27$ $p=.001$), Set2-T2 ($t_{15}=3.74$ $p=.002$),
20 Set3-T1 ($t_5=5.66$ $p=.002$) and Set3-T2 ($t_8=7.52$ $p<.001$). Further post-hoc analyzes reported a
21 significant increase in performance after anodal tDCS (vs. baseline) in Set 1-T2 ($t_3=-5.00$
22 $p=.015$), Set 3-T1 ($t_5=-8.43$ $p<.001$) and Set 3-T2 ($t_8=-4.99$ $p=.001$), but not after sham tDCS;
23 and a significant impairment of performance after sham tDCS (vs. baseline) in Set1-T1
24 ($t_{11}=2.61$ $p=.024$), Set 2-T1 ($t_{16}=3.27$ $p=.005$) and Set 2-T2 ($t_{15}=2.98$ $p=.01$), but not after
25 anodal tDCS. However, the response accuracy after anodal tDCS at T1 or T2 was not
26 significantly superior to the performance in sham tDCS in any case (Table 1).
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 --- Figure 4 here ---
46
47

48 Discussion

49 In the present study, we aimed to explore the effects of anodal vs. sham tDCS over the left
50 prefrontal cortex on the working memory performance, by considering inter-individual
51 variability in healthy subjects. To this end, we used a two-step methodological approach by
52 exploring the behavioral response to tDCS in two working memory task paradigms, both in
53 the whole sample size and in an enriched sample obtained through a cluster analysis
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 procedure. The results showed that a single session of ‘offline’ anodal tDCS stimulation did
2 not improve the working memory performance for the total sample of participants. The cluster
3 analysis identified a subgroup of ‘responders’ who significantly improved their performance
4 after anodal (vs. sham) stimulation. However, this tDCS induced improvement in task
5 performance still did not significantly exceed those observed during the baseline and sham
6 conditions.
7
8
9

10
11 The absence of any effect of anodal tDCS on the n-back or the Sternberg task performance in
12 the total sample is in agreement with previous evidence (Marshall et al., 2005; Teo et al.,
13 2011; Lally et al., 2013; Nilsson et al., 2015) and seems to challenge studies demonstrating
14 positive after-effects of tDCS on behavioral performance using the same tasks (Ohn et al.,
15 2008; Keeser et al., 2011; Mulquiney et al., 2011; Berryhill and Jones, 2012; Gladwin et al.,
16 2012; Hoy et al., 2013). Differences in the stimulation parameters, specifically of the current
17 density and density charge, stand out in the literature as the main contributing factors to
18 inconsistent results across studies (Dedoncker et al., 2016). Thus, the stimulation parameters
19 that we used (0.043 mA/cm² for 15 minutes) may not have been sufficient to elicit a
20 performance modulation. However, mixed results have been reported using current and
21 charge density values both higher (Keeser et al., 2011; Nilsson et al., 2015) and lower
22 (Mulquiney et al., 2011; Lally et al., 2013) than those used here, which reduces this
23 probability and points to the presence of other mediating factors that may account for the
24 inconclusive results.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 All the studies that are methodologically comparable to ours and that have reported a
38 beneficial effect of tDCS, used a relatively small numbers of subjects (average of n=13,
39 ranging from 10 to 18) resulting in low statistical power (Medina and Cason, 2017). By
40 contrast, the studies that have used larger sample sizes (average of n=25, ranging from 21 to
41 30), reported null tDCS after-effects on working memory performance (Lally et al., 2013;
42 Nilsson et al., 2015), or positive effects that were limited to a proportion of the total sample
43 (Berryhill and Jones, 2012). Thus, it seems that only a subset of individuals may experience
44 real enhancement effects (Ziemann and Siebner, 2015) and these may be overrepresented in
45 small sample sizes leading to inflated effect sizes (Minarik et al., 2016). Furthermore, using
46 large heterogeneous samples may mask a real effect in a subgroup of subjects, resulting in
47 overall null or small effect sizes. These are relevant methodological issues that affect the
48 reliability of tDCS studies.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 We propose that a cluster analysis is one methodological approach that may account for the
2 inter-individual variability often observed in tDCS studies, by identifying the presence of a
3 subgroup of ‘responders’ in the total sample. These ‘responders’ are subjects that either
4 improved their performance after the anodal (but not sham) tDCS condition, or improved their
5 performance to a greater extent after the anodal vs. the sham condition. The average
6 proportion of ‘responders’ in our total sample was about 40%, which is in line with reports of
7 47% of subjects showing positive tDCS after-effects on memory span performance (Luque-
8 Casado et al., 2019) and with the proportion of subjects having the typical polarity-specific
9 modulation in the excitability of the motor cortex (López-Alonso et al., 2014; Wiethoff et al.,
10 2014). However, our results showed that the proportion of ‘responders’ ranged from 15% to
11 59% and we were unable to identify ‘responders’ when we used the accuracy of response
12 index in the n-back task. These findings highlight the high variability and instability in the
13 individual response patterns, and that these may also vary across tasks and behavioral outputs.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Overall, our findings together with those of a recent study (Luque-Casado et al., 2019)
25 showed that even in the ‘responders’ subgroup, the effect of anodal tDCS on working
26 memory did not exceed the baseline or sham condition performance. We demonstrated these
27 findings across different cognitive tasks (i.e., digit span backwards, n-back and Sternberg),
28 involving different processes (i.e., storage, retrieval, updating, shifting and inhibition), and
29 type of behavioral output (RT and response accuracy). Thus, our results do not support the
30 hypothesis that a single session of ‘offline’ anodal tDCS over the left DLPFC is an effective
31 means to improve working memory performance. It has been shown that the effects of tDCS
32 on cognitive measures are less robust and less predictable compared with the more consistent
33 effects on motor outcomes, especially when using single-session tDCS designs in which there
34 are small effects amid high variability confounded by individual differences (Berryhill and
35 Martin, 2018). The mechanisms of non-invasive brain stimulation of the motor system are
36 understood to a greater extent, showing greater correspondence between input and output
37 (Fricke et al., 2011). However, in the case of tDCS of the DLPFC, the relationship between
38 the input and the behavioral outcomes is far more complex, since the tDCS induced-changes
39 in cortical excitability do not necessarily translate into behavioral effects (Hill et al., 2017,
40 2019). Furthermore, the mechanisms linking stimulation-induced changes in cortical
41 excitability with complex cognitive processes remain largely unknown (De Berker et al.,
42 2013; Bestmann et al., 2015; Bonaiuto and Bestmann, 2015).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Our findings support the growing consensus that variability in response to non-invasive brain stimulation is a consistent and significant issue in the field of tDCS and cognition research (Parkin et al., 2015; Guerra et al., 2017). So far, the assessment of the real effect of tDCS has probably been hindered (at least in part) by a possible publication bias (Medina and Cason, 2017), leading to over-reporting of a non-natural predominance of ‘responders’ among small sample sizes, contributing to the poor replicability in this research area (Héroux et al., 2017). Thus more systematic studies need to be performed in order to maximize consistent and replicable findings, especially when utilizing long term stimulation protocols in which more consistent broader cognitive benefits seem to emerge (Berryhill and Martin, 2018). A potentially useful approach is to analyze individual differences rather than averaging across a group, when comparing variables that may affect stimulation efficacy. Further investigating the factors contributing to the variability of tDCS effects on behavior may potentially facilitate the design of more effective tailored interventions of neuromodulation techniques (Ziemann and Siebner, 2015).

To summarize, our results suggest that a single session of ‘offline’ anodal tCDS over the left prefrontal cortex is not an effective means to improve working memory performance in healthy subjects and confirms the existence of heterogeneous patterns of behavioral effects across participants. These findings highlight the need to optimize methodological approaches in order to account for individual variability and appropriate sample size selection. This will ensure a greater transparency and representativeness of the findings by providing further insight in to tDCS-linked cognitive outcomes.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by a ‘Juan de la Cierva’ postdoctoral grant from the Spanish ‘Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades’ (FJCI-2016-28405) to Antonio Luque-Casado, ‘Ramón y Cajal’ national fellowship program to Noa Fogelson and a project grant funded by ‘Rey Juan Carlos’ University (REtDCS) to Miguel Fernández-del-Olmo, Noa Fogelson and Antonio Luque-Casado. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

References

- 1
2
3 Baune BT, Fuhr M, Air T, Hering C (2014) Neuropsychological functioning in adolescents
4 and young adults with major depressive disorder--a review. *Psychiatry Res* 218:261–271.
5
6
7 Berryhill ME, Jones KT (2012) tDCS selectively improves working memory in older adults
8 with more education. *Neuroscience Letters* 521:148–151.
9
10
11 Berryhill ME, Martin D (2018) Cognitive Effects of Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation
12 in Healthy and Clinical Populations: An Overview. *J ECT* 34:e25–e35.
13
14
15 Bestmann S, de Berker AO, Bonaiuto J (2015) Understanding the behavioural consequences
16 of noninvasive brain stimulation. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 19:13–20.
17
18
19 Bonaiuto JJ, Bestmann S (2015) Understanding the nonlinear physiological and behavioral
20 effects of tDCS through computational neurostimulation. In: *Computational*
21 *Neurostimulation - Progress in Brain Research*, vol. 222 (Bestmann S, ed), pp 75–103
22 *Amsterdam: Elsevier.*
23
24
25
26
27 Brunoni AR, Vanderhasselt M-A (2014) Working memory improvement with non-invasive
28 brain stimulation of the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex: A systematic review and meta-
29 analysis. *Brain and Cognition* 86:1–9.
30
31
32
33 Clatworthy J, Buick D, Hankins M, Weinman J, Horne R (2005) The use and reporting of
34 cluster analysis in health psychology: a review. *Br J Health Psychol* 10:329–358.
35
36
37 Corbin L, Marquer J (2013) Is Sternberg's memory scanning task really a short-term memory
38 task? *Swiss Journal of Psychology* 72:181–196.
39
40
41 De Berker AO, Bikson M, Bestmann S (2013) Predicting the behavioral impact of
42 transcranial direct current stimulation: issues and limitations. *Front Hum Neurosci* 7:613.
43
44
45 Dedoncker J, Brunoni AR, Baeken C, Vanderhasselt M-A (2016) A Systematic Review and
46 Meta-Analysis of the Effects of Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation (tDCS) Over the
47 Dorsolateral Prefrontal Cortex in Healthy and Neuropsychiatric Samples: Influence of
48 Stimulation Parameters. *Brain Stimulation* 9:501–517.
49
50
51
52
53 Fallon SJ, Mattiesing RM, Muhammed K, Manohar S, Husain M (2017) Fractionating the
54 Neurocognitive Mechanisms Underlying Working Memory: Independent Effects of
55 Dopamine and Parkinson's Disease. *Cereb Cortex* 27:5727–5738.
56
57
58
59
60 Filmer HL, Mattingley JB, Dux PE (2020) Modulating brain activity and behaviour with
61
62
63
64
65

tDCS: Rumours of its death have been greatly exaggerated. *Cortex* 123:141–151.

1
2 Fregni F, Boggio PS, Nitsche M, Berman F, Antal A, Feredoes E, Marcolin MA, Rigonatti
3 SP, et al. (2005) Anodal transcranial direct current stimulation of prefrontal cortex
4 enhances working memory. *Exp Brain Res* 166:23–30.
5
6

7
8 Fricke K, Seeber AA, Thirugnanasambandam N, Paulus W, Nitsche MA, Rothwell JC (2011)
9
10 Time course of the induction of homeostatic plasticity generated by repeated transcranial
11 direct current stimulation of the human motor cortex. *J Neurophysiol* 105:1141–1149.
12
13

14 Fritsch B, Reis J, Martinowich K, Schambra HM, Ji Y, Cohen LG, Lu B (2010) Direct
15
16 Current Stimulation Promotes BDNF-Dependent Synaptic Plasticity: Potential
17
18 Implications for Motor Learning. *Neuron* 66:198–204.
19

20 Giordano J, Bikson M, Kappenman ES, Clark VP, Coslett HB, Hamblin MR, Hamilton R,
21
22 Jankord R, et al. (2017) Mechanisms and Effects of Transcranial Direct Current
23
24 Stimulation. *Dose Response* 15: 1559325816685467.
25

26 Gladwin TE, den Uyl TE, Fregni FF, Wiers RW (2012) Enhancement of selective attention by
27
28 tDCS: Interaction with interference in a Sternberg task. *Neuroscience Letters* 512:33–37.
29

30 Guerra A, López-Alonso V, Cheeran B, Suppa A (2017) Variability in non-invasive brain
31
32 stimulation studies: Reasons and results. *Neuroscience Letters*:133330.
33

34 Héroux ME, Loo CK, Taylor JL, Gandevia SC (2017) Questionable science and
35
36 reproducibility in electrical brain stimulation research. *PLOS ONE* 12:e0175635.
37

38 Hill AT, Fitzgerald PB, Hoy KE (2016) Effects of Anodal Transcranial Direct Current
39
40 Stimulation on Working Memory: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Findings
41
42 From Healthy and Neuropsychiatric Populations. *Brain Stimulation* 9:197–208.
43

44 Hill AT, Rogasch NC, Fitzgerald PB, Hoy KE (2017) Effects of prefrontal bipolar and high-
45
46 definition transcranial direct current stimulation on cortical reactivity and working memory
47
48 in healthy adults. *NeuroImage* 152:142–157.
49

50 Hill AT, Rogasch NC, Fitzgerald PB, Hoy KE (2019) Impact of concurrent task performance
51
52 on transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS)-Induced changes in cortical physiology
53
54 and working memory. *Cortex* 113:37–57.
55

56 Horvath JC, Forte JD, Carter O (2015) Quantitative Review Finds No Evidence of Cognitive
57
58 Effects in Healthy Populations From Single-session Transcranial Direct Current
59
60

Stimulation (tDCS). *Brain Stimul* 8:535–550.

1
2 Hoy KE, Arnold SL, Emonson MRL, Daskalakis ZJ, Fitzgerald PB (2014) An investigation
3 into the effects of tDCS dose on cognitive performance over time in patients with
4 schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Research* 155:96–100.
5
6

7
8 Hoy KE, Emonson MRL, Arnold SL, Thomson RH, Daskalakis ZJ, Fitzgerald PB (2013)
9 Testing the limits: Investigating the effect of tDCS dose on working memory enhancement
10 in healthy controls. *Neuropsychologia* 51:1777–1784.
11
12

13
14 Imburgio MJ, Orr JM (2018) Effects of prefrontal tDCS on executive function:
15 Methodological considerations revealed by meta-analysis. *Neuropsychologia* 117:156–166.
16
17

18
19 Jamil A, Batsikadze G, Kuo H-I, Labruna L, Hasan A, Paulus W, Nitsche MA (2017)
20 Systematic evaluation of the impact of stimulation intensity on neuroplastic after-effects
21 induced by transcranial direct current stimulation. *The Journal of Physiology* 595:1273–
22 1288.
23
24

25
26 Johnson MK, McMahon RP, Robinson BM, Harvey AN, Hahn B, Leonard CJ, Luck SJ, Gold
27 JM (2013) The relationship between working memory capacity and broad measures of
28 cognitive ability in healthy adults and people with schizophrenia. *Neuropsychology*
29 27:220–229.
30
31
32

33
34 Keeser D, Padberg F, Reisinger E, Pogarell O, Kirsch V, Palm U, Karch S, Möller H-J, et al.
35 (2011) Prefrontal direct current stimulation modulates resting EEG and event-related
36 potentials in healthy subjects: A standardized low resolution tomography (sLORETA)
37 study. *NeuroImage* 55:644–657.
38
39
40

41
42 Kronberg G, Bridi M, Abel T, Bikson M, Parra LC (2017) Direct Current Stimulation
43 Modulates LTP and LTD: Activity Dependence and Dendritic Effects. *Brain Stimulation:*
44 *Basic, Translational, and Clinical Research in Neuromodulation* 10:51–58.
45
46

47
48 Lally N, Nord CL, Walsh V, Roiser JP (2013) Does excitatory fronto-extracerebral tDCS lead
49 to improved working memory performance? *F1000Res* 2:219.
50
51

52
53 Loo CK, Alonzo A, Martin D, Mitchell PB, Galvez V, Sachdev P (2012) Transcranial direct
54 current stimulation for depression: 3-week, randomised, sham-controlled trial. *British*
55 *Journal of Psychiatry* 200:52–59.
56
57

58
59 López-Alonso V, Cheeran B, Río-Rodríguez D, Fernández-Del-Olmo M (2014) Inter-
60 individual variability in response to non-invasive brain stimulation paradigms. *Brain*
61
62
63
64
65

Stimul 7:372–380.

- 1
2 Luque-Casado A, Fogelson N, Iglesias-Soler E, Fernandez-Del-Olmo M (2019) Exploring the
3 effects of Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation over the prefrontal cortex on working
4 memory: A cluster analysis approach. *Behav Brain Res* 375:112144.
5
6
7
8 Mancuso LE, Ilieva IP, Hamilton RH, Farah MJ (2016) Does Transcranial Direct Current
9 Stimulation Improve Healthy Working Memory?: A Meta-analytic Review. *Journal of*
10 *Cognitive Neuroscience* 28:1063–1089.
11
12
13
14 Marshall L, Mölle M, Siebner HR, Born J (2005) Bifrontal transcranial direct current
15 stimulation slows reaction time in a working memory task. *BMC Neurosci* 6:23.
16
17
18 Martin DM, Liu R, Alonzo A, Green M, Player MJ, Sachdev P, Loo CK (2013) Can
19 transcranial direct current stimulation enhance outcomes from cognitive training? A
20 randomized controlled trial in healthy participants. *Int J Neuropsychopharmacol* 16:1927–
21 1936.
22
23
24
25
26 Medina J, Cason S (2017) No evidential value in samples of transcranial direct current
27 stimulation (tDCS) studies of cognition and working memory in healthy populations.
28 *Cortex* 94:131–141.
29
30
31
32 Minarik T, Berger B, Althaus L, Bader V, Biebl B, Brotzeller F, Fusban T, Hegemann J, et al.
33 (2016) The Importance of Sample Size for Reproducibility of tDCS Effects. *Front Hum*
34 *Neurosci* 10:453.
35
36
37
38 Mueller ST, Piper BJ (2014) The Psychology Experiment Building Language (PEBL) and
39 PEBL Test Battery. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods* 222:250–259.
40
41
42 Mulquiney PG, Hoy KE, Daskalakis ZJ, Fitzgerald PB (2011) Improving working memory:
43 Exploring the effect of transcranial random noise stimulation and transcranial direct
44 current stimulation on the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex. *Clinical Neurophysiology*
45 122:2384–2389.
46
47
48
49
50 Nejadi V, Salehinejad MA, Nitsche MA, Najian A, Javadi A-H (2017) Transcranial Direct
51 Current Stimulation Improves Executive Dysfunctions in ADHD: Implications for
52 Inhibitory Control, Interference Control, Working Memory, and Cognitive Flexibility. *J*
53 *Atten Disord*:1087054717730611.
54
55
56
57
58 Nilsson J, Lebedev AV, Lövdén M (2015) No Significant Effect of Prefrontal tDCS on
59 Working Memory Performance in Older Adults. *Front Aging Neurosci* 7:230.
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Nitsche MA, Paulus W (2000) Excitability changes induced in the human motor cortex by
2 weak transcranial direct current stimulation. *The Journal of Physiology* 527:633–639.
3
- 4 Nitsche MA, Paulus W (2001) Sustained excitability elevations induced by transcranial DC
5 motor cortex stimulation in humans. *Neurology* 57:1899–1901.
6
7
- 8 Ohn SH, Park C-I, Yoo W-K, Ko M-H, Choi KP, Kim G-M, Lee YT, Kim Y-H (2008) Time-
9 dependent effect of transcranial direct current stimulation on the enhancement of working
10 memory. *Neuroreport* 19:43–47.
11
12
- 13 Parkin BL, Ekhtiari H, Walsh VF (2015) Non-invasive Human Brain Stimulation in Cognitive
14 Neuroscience: A Primer. *Neuron* 87:932–945.
15
16
- 17 Potkin SG, Turner JA, Brown GG, McCarthy G, Greve DN, Glover GH, Manoach DS, Belger
18 A, et al. (2009) Working memory and DLPFC inefficiency in schizophrenia: The FBIRN
19 study. *Schizophr Bull* 35:19–31.
20
21
22
- 23 Stagg CJ, Antal A, Nitsche MA (2018) Physiology of Transcranial Direct Current
24 Stimulation. *J ECT* 34:144–152.
25
26
- 27 Teo F, Hoy KE, Daskalakis ZJ, Fitzgerald PB (2011) Investigating the Role of Current
28 Strength in tDCS Modulation of Working Memory Performance in Healthy Controls.
29 *Frontiers in Psychiatry* 2:45.
30
31
32
33
- 34 To WT, Hart J, Ridder DD, Vanneste S (2016) Considering the influence of stimulation
35 parameters on the effect of conventional and high-definition transcranial direct current
36 stimulation. *Expert Review of Medical Devices* 13:391–404.
37
38
39
- 40 Tseng P, Hsu T-Y, Chang C-F, Tzeng OJL, Hung DL, Muggleton NG, Walsh V, Liang W-K,
41 et al. (2012) Unleashing Potential: Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation over the Right
42 Posterior Parietal Cortex Improves Change Detection in Low-Performing Individuals. *J*
43 *Neurosci* 32:10554–10561.
44
45
46
47
- 48 Wang L, Apple AC, Schroeder MP, Ryals AJ, Voss JL, Gitelman D, Sweet JJ, Butt ZA, et al.
49 (2016) Reduced prefrontal activation during working and long-term memory tasks and
50 impaired patient-reported cognition among cancer survivors postchemotherapy compared
51 with healthy controls. *Cancer* 122:258–268.
52
53
54
55
- 56 Weng W, Liang J, Xue J, Zhu T, Jiang Y, Wang J, Chen S (2019) The Transfer Effects of
57 Cognitive Training on Working Memory Among Chinese Older Adults With Mild
58 Cognitive Impairment: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Front Aging Neurosci* 11:212.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65


Wiethoff S, Hamada M, Rothwell JC (2014) Variability in response to transcranial direct current stimulation of the motor cortex. *Brain Stimul* 7:468–475.


Wu Y-J, Tseng P, Chang C-F, Pai M-C, Hsu K-S, Lin C-C, Juan C-H (2014) Modulating the interference effect on spatial working memory by applying transcranial direct current stimulation over the right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex. *Brain Cogn* 91:87–94.


Wurzman R, Hamilton RH, Pascual-Leone A, Fox MD (2016) An Open Letter Concerning Do-It-Yourself Users of Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation. *Ann Neurol* 80:1–4.

Zaghi S, Acar M, Hultgren B, Boggio PS, Fregni F (2010) Noninvasive brain stimulation with low-intensity electrical currents: putative mechanisms of action for direct and alternating current stimulation. *Neuroscientist* 16:285–307.

Ziemann U, Siebner HR (2015) Inter-subject and Inter-session Variability of Plasticity Induction by Non-invasive Brain Stimulation: Boon or Bane? *Brain Stimulation* 8:662–663.










Figure Captions

1
2
3
4 **Figure 1.** Median (horizontal line) and interquartile range (horizontal dotted line)
5 reaction times (A) and response accuracy (B) in the total sample as a function of
6 Condition (anodal tDCS [red] and sham tDCS [gray]) and Trial (baseline [BSL], trial 1
7 [T1] and trial 2 [T2]) in the n-back task. The shaded area (violin) illustrates kernel
8 density estimation to show the distribution shape of the data.
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16 **Figure 2.** Cluster representation for the ‘responders’ subgroup in n-back task using the
17 normalized reaction times (A) and response accuracy (B) for anodal and sham tDCS
18 condition at Trial 1 and 2 (i.e., $\Delta = [(T1 \text{ or } T2 - \text{baseline})/\text{baseline}]$). The definition of
19 the ‘responders’ clusters was based on the value of the centroids (represented when
20 applicable). The remaining identified clusters are merged as a ‘non-responders’
21 subgroup for representation purposes. Cluster analysis on response accuracy did not
22 report sufficient consistency between clustering methods (hierarchical Ward and *k*-
23 means) for the identification of homogeneous subgroups (‘non-clustered’ cases).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32
33
34 **Figure 3.** Median (horizontal line) and interquartile range (horizontal dotted line)
35 response accuracy in the total sample as a function of Condition (anodal tDCS [red] and
36 sham tDCS [gray]), Trial (baseline [BSL], trial 1 [T1] and trial 2 [T2]) and Set (1, 2 and
37 3) in the Sternberg task. The shaded area (violin) illustrates kernel density estimation to
38 show the distribution shape of the data.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Figure 4.** Cluster representation for the ‘responders’ subgroup as a function of Set (1, 2
47 and 3) in Sternberg task using the normalized response accuracy for anodal and sham
48 tDCS condition at Trial 1 and 2 (i.e., $\Delta = [(T1 \text{ or } T2 - \text{baseline})/\text{baseline}]$). The definition
49 of the ‘responders’ clusters was based on the value of the represented centroids. The
50 remaining identified clusters are merged as a ‘non-responders’ subgroup for
51 representation purposes.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 1. Mean (\pm standard deviation) for the n-back and Sternberg task output as a function of Condition (anodal tDCS vs. sham tDCS) and Trial (Baseline, T1 or T2) in ‘responders’.

n-back (reaction times [ms])				
	‘Responders’ T1 (n=12)		‘Responders’ T2 (n=13)	
	Baseline	T1	Baseline	T2
Anodal tDCS	753.6 (178.0)	699.3 (171.2)*	741.8 (230.4)	719.8 (216.1)
Sham tDCS	752.5 (148.4)	755.6 (167.2)	707.9 (211.4)	739.0 (228.0)*
Sternberg task (response accuracy [%])				
Set 1	‘Responders’ T1 (n=12)		‘Responders’ T2 (n=4)	
	Baseline	T1	Baseline	T2
Anodal tDCS	87.33 (9.47)	90.00 (6.66)	84.00 (9.09)	91.50 (6.81)*
Sham tDCS	90.67 (6.79)	88.17 (7.31)*	87.50 (8.85)	84.50 (11.82)
Set 2	‘Responders’ T1 (n=17)		‘Responders’ T2 (n=16)	
	Baseline	T1	Baseline	T2
Anodal tDCS	74.59 (8.49)	79.41 (7.90)	73.75 (9.52)	78.00 (7.16)
Sham tDCS	80.94 (8.40) [#]	75.29 (9.08)*	80.25 (9.03) [#]	73.88 (10.39)*
Set 3	‘Responders’ T1 (n=6)		‘Responders’ T2 (n=9)	
	Baseline	T1	Baseline	T2
Anodal tDCS	65.00 (5.48)	81.67 (7.84)*	68.22 (8.63)	80.67 (8.12)*
Sham tDCS	77.33 (8.45) [#]	80.67 (7.55)	76.22 (8.15) [#]	66.67 (10.39)

*Indicates statistical significant differences with respect to baseline ($p < .05$);

[#]Indicates statistical significant differences between anodal tDCS and sham tDCS at baseline ($p < .05$).