

RUNNING HEAD: tDCS, mPFC, Exposure Therapy

Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) targeting the medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC) modulates functional connectivity and enhances inhibitory safety learning in obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD)

Thomas G. Adams^{1,2,4}, Josh M. Cisler⁶, Benjamin Kelmendi^{2,4}, Jamilah R. George^{2,6}, Stephen A. Kichuk², Christopher L. Averill^{2,4,7,8}, Alan Anticevic², Chadi G. Abdallah^{2,4,7,8}, & Christopher Pittenger^{2,3}

¹ University of Kentucky, Department of Psychology

Yale University: ² School of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry, ³ Child Study Center

⁴ Clinical Neuroscience Division of the National Center for PTSD, West Haven VA Medical Center

⁵ University of Wisconsin, Department of Psychiatry

⁶ University of Connecticut, Department of Psychological Sciences

⁷ Michael E. DeBakey VA Medical Center

⁸ Baylor College of Medicine, Menninger Department of Psychiatry

Corresponding Author:

Thomas Adams, PhD
105 Kastle Hall
University of Kentucky
Department of Psychology
Lexington, KY 40506
tgad224@uky.edu
859-257-6841

Abstract

Background: Psychotherapy based on fear extinction is a mainstay of treatment for obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD). The default mode network (DMN) is important to safety signal processing, fear extinction, and exposure-based therapies. The medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC) is an anchor of the DMN. Neuromodulation targeting the mPFC might augment therapeutic learning and thereby enhance response to exposure-based therapies.

Methods: To characterize the effects of mPFC neuromodulation, 17 community volunteers completed resting-state fMRI scans before and after receiving 20 minutes of frontopolar multifocal transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS). To examine the effects of tDCS on therapeutic learning, 24 patients with OCD were randomly assigned (double-blind, 50:50) to receive active or sham tDCS immediately before completing a two-day exposure and response prevention (ERP) challenge.

Results: After tDCS, frontal pole functional connectivity with regions in the anterior insula and basal ganglia decreased, while connectivity in the middle and superior frontal gyri increased ($p < .001$, corrected). Functional connectivity between DMN and salience network (SN) increased after tDCS ($p < .001$). OCD patients who received active tDCS exhibited more rapid within- and between-trial therapeutic extinction learning ($p < .05$) during the ERP challenge compared to those who received sham tDCS.

Conclusion: tDCS targeting the mPFC may modulate SN and DMN functional connectivity and can accelerate therapeutic learning. Though limited by small samples, these promising findings motivate further exploration of the effects of tDCS on neural and behavioral targets associated with exposure-based treatments for OCD and for other anxiety and related disorders.

Keywords: transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS); default mode network (DMN); salience network (SN); exposure and response prevention (ERP); obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD); fear extinction

Trial Registration: ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT03572543

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

Background

Approximately 28% of the American population will meet criteria for a disorder characterized by pathological anxiety during their lifetime.¹ These disorders are often severe, intractable, and disabling.^{2,3} Obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD) afflicts approximately 1 in 40 Americans and has been ranked as a top 5 cause of disability among all mental illnesses.^{4,5} Exposure-based cognitive-behavioral therapies are among the most efficacious treatments for OCD and other disorders of dysregulated anxiety.^{6,7} However, partial response and relapse are common, and a sizeable minority of patients is treatment refractory.^{8,9} Synergy between brain-based and psychotherapeutic strategies is an exciting avenue for the development of new therapeutic strategies to address this profound clinical need.^{10,11}

Exposure therapies depend on fear extinction.¹² Extinction is a basic learning process whereby a fear is inhibited through the acquisition, consolidation, and recall of new “safety” learning.^{13,14} Animal, human, and clinical research suggests that extinction learning occurs primarily within a circuit consisting of the medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC),¹⁵ hippocampus, and amygdala.¹⁶⁻¹⁸ Individuals with anxiety and related disorders, including OCD, have extinction learning deficits and abnormal recruitment of fear extinction circuitry, particularly the mPFC.^{16,19-25} Moreover, deficient extinction learning, mPFC hypoactivity, and mPFC hypoconnectivity are associated with an attenuated response to exposure-based CBT.²⁶⁻³⁴

Recent work suggests that the default mode network (DMN), a network of functionally interconnected regions anchored by the mPFC, posterior cingulate cortex (PCC), and inferior parietal lobes,^{35,36} supports the detection of safety cues and the acquisition and expression of safety learning.³⁷ DMN connectivity is abnormal in a range of anxiety and related disorders, including OCD, and these abnormalities are associated with treatment response,³⁸⁻⁴⁶ including response to exposure-based CBT.⁴⁷⁻⁴⁹

These findings suggest that modulation of activity and/or long-term potentiation (LTP)-like

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

plasticity within the DMN, particularly within the mPFC, may influence the processing of danger and safety cues, augment fear extinction, and ultimately improve the efficacy and efficiency of exposure-based CBT.^{10, 14, 50} Multiple groups have begun testing whether non-invasive brain stimulation of the mPFC can augment extinction learning and the efficacy of exposure-based therapies.^{55,63,64}

Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) is a safe, relatively inexpensive, and easily administered technique that can modulate the probability of neuronal firing by depolarizing or hyperpolarizing neurons under the anode and cathode, respectively.⁵¹ These effects can last up to 90 minutes after stimulation,⁵²⁻⁵⁵ due in part to the effects of tDCS on neurotrophic factors and LTP-like plasticity.⁵⁶ tDCS has been shown to modulate functional connectivity of the area(s) being stimulated and augment functional connections between intrinsic networks.^{57, 58}

Several previous studies have investigated whether tDCS can modulate extinction learning in humans, four of which indirectly targeted the vmPFC.⁵⁹⁻⁶⁵ Anodal tDCS applied before and during extinction training modestly enhances extinction acquisition,^{59, 63, 65} while anodal tDCS applied during the consolidation of extinction learning (after training) marginally improved extinction recall after a 24-hour delay.⁶⁰ One study applied anodal tDCS over the frontal pole (anode over nasion/Fpz) *during* extinction training and found no beneficial effects on the acquisition or recall of extinction learning, compared to sham tDCS.⁶⁴ The ability of tDCS to enhance extinction learning via mPFC modulation therefore remains unclear.

Another limitation of this literature is that it investigates the extinction of fear conditioning administered in the laboratory, which may not engage the same mechanisms as chronically dysregulated anxiety in neuropsychiatric disorders. A single study has extended this work to extinction of neuropsychiatric symptomatology. van 't Wout and colleagues recently reported the effects of tDCS targeting the vmPFC (via the ventrolateral PFC) on therapeutic learning during virtual reality exposure among 12 military veterans with PTSD.⁶⁶ Compared to sham tDCS,

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

veterans who received anodal tDCS (2mA) simultaneously with six sessions of VR exposure evinced accelerated between-trial reductions in physiological arousal and reduced PTSD symptomatology.⁶⁶

No studies of tDCS in extinction learning have reported on the neural effects of the brain stimulation protocol used, and all have used bipolar tDCS: a single anode and a single cathode. In bipolar tDCS, electrical flux is greatest beneath the anode and cathode, but the passed current also has significant effects on most of the surrounding and intervening neural tissue.^{67, 68} Indeed, this is what has allowed previous work to indirectly target the vmPFC, via electrodes placed on the ventrolateral PFC and contralateral mastoid process. Multifocal or high-definition tDCS provides far greater spatial precision than bipolar tDCS by using more than two electrodes to deliver stimulation, typically one stimulation electrode and four or more return electrodes.^{67, 68} Modeling of electrical fields produced by multifocal tDCS suggest that the effects of the stimulation electrode are concentrated below the electrode, while the effects of the return electrodes are small and distributed.⁶⁸ This comports with neuroimaging data.⁶⁸

We tested the effects of multifocal tDCS targeting the mPFC on resting functional connectivity and on extinction learning during therapeutic exposure in patients with OCD. In Study 1, community volunteers completed resting-state functional magnetic resonance imaging (rs-fMRI) scans before and after administration of frontopolar multifocal tDCS. In Study 2, OCD patients received active or sham frontopolar multifocal tDCS immediately before completing 50 minutes of individualized *in vivo* exposure exercises to examine the effects of tDCS on therapeutic extinction learning.

Methods: Study 1

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

Eighteen adult community volunteers were recruited from the greater New Haven area. Volunteers completed a brief phone screen to probe for common psychiatric diagnoses; formal diagnostic interviews were not conducted. After providing informed consent and completing a Yale Human Investigations Committee (HIC/IRB)-approved informed consent form, volunteers completed standard tDCS and MRI safety screening tools,^{69,70} a demographic form, and self-report ratings of depression, anxiety, and OCD (**Supplementary Table 1**).^{71,72} Participants then underwent structural MRI and baseline resting state fMRI (rs-fMRI) scans (details below). Volunteers were then escorted to a nearby room to receive 20-minutes of tDCS targeting the mPFC (details below). Immediately following tDCS, volunteers were returned to the scanner bay to complete a post-tDCS rs-fMRI scan. Participants completed the *tDCS Adverse Effects Questionnaire*,⁷⁰ and compensated \$50 for their time.

MRI Acquisition and Processing: Imaging data were collected on a Siemens Prisma 3T system using a 64-channel foam-padded phased array head coil. An HCP-style multiband fMRI sequence was used for rs-fMRI acquisition. Two runs of approximately six minutes (504 volumes) were completed before and after tDCS. Participants were instructed to rest with their eyes open during scanning and were video monitored to ensure they stay awake. Image preprocessing was completed using AFNI software using standard steps as previously reported.⁷³ See Supplemental Materials for sequence and processing details.

Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation (tDCS): tDCS was delivered using a battery driven Starstim transcranial electric stimulator (Neuroelectronics®, Cambridge, MA) through 1cm² ceramic electrodes. Twenty minutes of facilitatory multifocal tDCS targeting the mPFC was administered to all volunteers. Current was ramped in and out for 30 seconds at the beginning and end of stimulation to mitigate sensory effects. A single anode was placed over the frontal pole (Fpz [10-20 EEG] at 1.5mA) and five return electrodes (cathodes) were arranged in a circumferential array (AF7, AF8, F3, F4, and Fz at 0.3mA, **Figure 1a**). Modelling of electrical

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

field distribution suggests that this electrode montage concentrates positive current in the frontal pole beneath the anode, while negative current is of limited strength beneath the five cathodes (**Figure 1b**).

Methods: Study 2

Twenty-six individuals with a primary diagnosis of OCD were recruited from the greater New Haven community for Study 2. All interested individuals first completed a phone screen to determine preliminary eligibility. After passing the initial phone screen, volunteers were invited to complete an in-person screening intake that included a psychiatric interview with or supervised by a doctoral-level clinician. Evaluations includes, a structured diagnostic interview [Mini International Neuropsychiatric Interview (MINI)⁷⁴ or Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV Axis I Disorders (SCID-I)⁷⁵], and the Yale-Brown Obsessive-Compulsive Scale (YBOCS) Checklist and Severity Scale.^{76, 77} Co-morbid psychosis, autism, mania, active substance abuse, and major neurological disease were grounds for exclusion. Participants were medication free or stably (≥ 4 weeks) medicated with an SSRI. Anxiolytics (particularly benzodiazepines) can interfere with extinction learning and exposure therapy and thus were grounds for exclusion,^{78, 79} as were medications that might lower seizure threshold (e.g., psychostimulants).⁸⁰

On the first day of the experiment, OCD patients provided informed consent and signed a Yale HIC/IRB-approved consent form. They then completed standard tDCS safety screening tools,^{69, 70} a demographics form, and self-report ratings of depression, anxiety, and OCD (**Supplementary Table 1**).^{71, 72, 81} To complete the *ERP Challenge* OCD patients were provided standard ERP psychoeducation and were taught to use a 0-to-100-point subjective units of distress scale (SUDS) to rate their emotional distress throughout the experiment. Next, OCD patients began the two-day *ERP Challenge*, which was used to assess therapeutic extinction learning.⁸² On each day of the ERP Challenge, OCD patients completed five 10-min. trials of an

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

individualized *in vivo* exposure exercise (see **Supplemental Table 2** for example exercises). SUDS was reported every minute of the ERP Challenge to monitor within- and between-trial therapeutic extinction learning. See Supplemental Materials for full details. OCD patients were randomized to receive Active- (as per Study 1) or Sham-tDCS (see below) before completing 50 minutes of individualized exposure. The patient and experimenter administering the ERP Challenge were blind to tDCS condition. Day 1 concluded with completion of the *tDCS Adverse Effects Questionnaire*⁷⁰ and a single 5-point scale to assess the degree to which they believed that they received real (active) or placebo (sham) tDCS. OCD patients returned 18-36 hours later to complete a second day of the same exposure exercises to examine the return of fear; no tDCS was administered on Day 2. After this second exposure exercise, participants were debriefed and compensated \$80 for their time.

Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation (tDCS): Active-tDCS procedures were identical to those described for Study 1. Sham-tDCS used the same multifocal montage, but current was ramped in/out for 30 seconds at the beginning and end of a 20-minute period during which no current was delivered. Both the OCD patients and the experimenter administering the ERP Challenge were blind to experimental assignment, though the staff administering the tDCS was not.

Results: Study 1

Analytic Strategy: Functional connectivity to a seed region beneath the point of anodal stimulation was computed following previously published procedures and standard AFNI software (see **Supplemental Materials**).⁸³ A linear mixed effects model (LME) was calculated using 3dLME to estimate the effects of tDCS on each voxel's connectivity with this seed region. The main effects of tDCS (pre vs. post) and scan run (first vs. second) and the tDCS*Run interaction were modelled as fixed effects and the intercept was modelled as a random effect.

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

Cluster-level thresholding (3dclustersim) using an autocorrelated function (-acf in 3dFWHMx) was applied to the resulting LME group-level effects to control for voxelwise comparisons with a corrected $p < .05$ (two-tailed given an uncorrected $p < .001$).⁸⁴ This resulted in a necessary cluster size of 30.6 face-connected voxels (NN1). Cluster size, coordinates, descriptives, and peak F -values for all significant clusters are presented in **Table 1**.

There was a significant main effect of tDCS on functional connectivity within four clusters, all of which were in the right hemisphere, and all four of which shifted towards less negative/more positive functional connectivity following tDCS (**Figure 2A**). Negative functional connectivity between the frontal pole and two clusters centered in the basal ganglia and insula decreased following administration of tDCS (**Figure 2B**). A cluster comprising regions of anterior insula and putamen reduced in negative connectivity, while another cluster within the pallidum and caudate changed from negative to positive connectivity. Functional connectivity between the frontal pole and clusters centered in the right middle frontal gyrus (mFG) and superior frontal gyrus (sFG) increased following administration of tDCS (**Figure 2B**); both clusters changed from negative to positive connectivity.

Inspection of significant subcortical clusters suggested functional connectivity was reduced between the frontal pole and reward circuitry, particularly the anterior striatum (**Supplemental Figure 2**). Inspection of significant cortical structures suggested that the frontopolar seed mapped exclusively onto the DMN, the frontal sFG and mFG clusters mapped primarily onto the executive control network (ECN), and the anterior insula cluster mapped primarily onto the salience network (SN; **Supplemental Figure 3**).

To test whether the effects of tDCS were truly a lateralized effect or is simply an artifact of thresholding, we conducted exploratory analyses with relaxed voxelwise correction (uncorrected $p < .01$). In addition to the previously listed clusters in the right hemisphere, functional connectivity changes were observed in 12 additional clusters, including between the

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

frontal pole and the left superior and middle frontal gyri and the left basal ganglia. This suggests that most effects of tDCS are likely bilateral, though statistically stronger on the right. See **Supplemental Figure 1**.

To explore the effects of frontopolar anodal tDCS on inter-network connectivity, we conducted independent component analysis (ICA) of resting state data using previously published methods (see **Supplemental Materials**).^{73, 85, 86} Data were combined across all four scan runs for estimation of independent components to allow for within-subject (pre and post tDCS) contrasts of inter-network connectivity. To identify networks for second-level analyses, all functional networks were visually inspected for overlap with the mPFC or significant clusters from the seed-based analysis; artifact networks (e.g., motion or ventricle networks) were discarded. This resulted in the selection of seven networks: the SN, the right ECN (frontoparietal), three components of the DMN (ventral, posterior, medial), and two striatal networks. Linear mixed effects models (MATLAB fitlme.m) were used to examine the effects of tDCS on connectivity between the selected networks; intercept, tDCS, run, and tDCS*run were modelled as fixed effects and the intercept was modelled as a random effect. Bonferroni adjustment was used to correct for familywise error ($p \leq .007$).

The main effect of tDCS was significant in three models, all of which included the SN and a DMN component (**Figure 3A**). Negative intercept coefficients indicate that the SN was anticorrelated with all three DMN components at baseline (pre-tDCS). Significant positive main effects of tDCS indicate that these anticorrelations were reduced following administration of tDCS ($p_s \leq 0.005$; **Table 2** and **Figure 3B**). The main effects of tDCS for all remaining contrasts were non-significant following correction for multiple comparisons ($p_s > 0.007$), including contrasts between the SN and the right ECN and the two striatal networks.

Results: Study 2

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

We next tested whether multifocal tDCS targeting the frontal pole can enhance therapeutic extinction learning in patients with OCD. Participants were randomized to receive either active (real) or sham (placebo) tDCS before the first of two one-hour individualized exposure challenges, which were modeled on standard therapeutic exercises during exposure and response prevention (ERP) therapy (see Methods).

All analyses were completed using SPSS 22.⁸⁷ There were no significant differences in age or the distribution of gender and race between active and sham tDCS groups (all $ps > .10$; **Supplemental Table 1**). There were also no significant differences in the severity of OCD, anxiety, or depressive symptoms, nor were there differences in the percent of those on psychotropic medications at the time of the experiment (all $ps > .10$; **Supplemental Table 1**). There were no significant differences in SUDS ratings ($ps > .10$) immediately prior to or following administration of tDCS (but before beginning exposure; **Supplemental Figure 3A**). Importantly, both groups reported that they believed they were receiving Active stimulation, with no difference in confidence between groups (**Supplemental Figure 3B**), confirming that our Sham condition and blinding were effective.

Linear mixed effects (LME) modeling was used to examine the effects of tDCS on within- and between-trial therapeutic learning during Day 1 of the ERP Challenge (see **Table 2**). The intercept, mins (1-10), trials (1-5), group (sham tDCS [0] vs. active tDCS [1]) and all two- and three-way interactions were modeled as fixed effects. The intercept, mins, and trials were also modelled as random effects; only fixed effects are reported. There was a significant group*mins*trials interaction ($\beta = 0.31$, 95%C.I. = 0.15 to 0.46), suggesting that the mins*trials interaction varied by experimental group. Within-trial reductions in SUDS were greater for OCD patients in the active tDCS than in those in the sham-tDCS group (**Figure 4**; group*mins $\beta = -1.67$, 95%C.I. = -2.56 to -0.78). Similarly, between-trial reductions in SUDS were greater for OCD patients in the active tDCS group than in the sham-tDCS group (**Figure 4**; group*trials $\beta =$

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

-3.83, 95%C.I. = -7.63 to -0.05). On average, OCD patients in the active tDCS group reported a 64.6% reduction in SUDS from the beginning of the first trial to the end of the last trial of the ERP Challenge on Day 1, whereas those in the sham tDCS group reported only a 24.2% reduction ($t_{22}=5.58$, $p < .01$).

A LME model was used to examine the return of fear on day 2. The intercept, group, and time were all modelled as fixed effects; time was defined as SUDS ratings from the end of the last exposure trial on Day 1 (coded as 0) and the beginning of the first trial on Day 2 (coded as 1). Return of fear was similar across the two experimental groups (group*time $\beta = 10.83$, 95%C.I. = -8.24 to 29.91).

Discussion

We found that multifocal anodal frontopolar tDCS increased functional connectivity between the mPFC and right sFG and mFG and decreased negative functional connectivity between the mPFC and the right anterior insula and basal ganglia. Analyses of intrinsic functional networks revealed that frontopolar tDCS reduced functional connectivity between the SN and DMN. Frontopolar tDCS also accelerated therapeutic learning during an individualized ERP-like extinction exercise in patients with OCD. These findings suggest that targeted brain stimulation may modulate functional connectivity and can potentiate therapeutic learning during exposure-based CBT. If so, these effects might be harnessed to accelerate or enhance the clinical response to psychotherapy.

The simplest explanation of the behavioral findings is that frontopolar anodal tDCS directly modulates neuronal excitability in the frontal pole and mPFC,^{51, 88} thereby promoting intracellular processes in the mPFC that support LTP-like plasticity recruited during extinction learning.⁸⁹⁻⁹² It is also possible that frontopolar stimulation remotely modulated excitability or

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

LTP-like plasticity of other regions implicated in fear extinction, outside the region of direct stimulation. This latter idea is compelling given that functional connectivity changed between the frontal pole and several other areas implicated in fear extinction learning – though not commonly included in the canonical fear circuit – following administration of tDCS. These include the right dlPFC, the right anterior insula, anterior putamen, ventral caudate, and ventral pallidum.⁹³ For example, the dlPFC, which has been shown to be functionally connected to the vmPFC,⁹⁴ is important for the explicit regulation of emotions during fear extinction training.⁹⁵ These interpretations are speculative as these processes were not directly measured, and fMRI connectivity analyses and the behavioral study were performed in distinct groups of participants.

Many of the brain regions identified in our seed-based fMRI connectivity analysis are contained within three canonical brain networks: the DMN, the SN, and the right ECN; **Figure 2** and **Supplemental Figure 3**). Analysis of ICA components suggested that connectivity between the SN and DMN was most affected by tDCS. The observed effects of frontopolar tDCS on therapeutic learning may be mediated by modulation of inter-network relationships. SN activation – particularly in the right anterior insula – has been found to be triggered by salient cues, to inhibit the DMN, and to activate the ECN.⁹⁶⁻⁹⁸ In the present study, the frontal pole seed region (which is within the DMN) and the right anterior insula cluster (which is within the SN) were anticorrelated at baseline but moved toward zero functional connectivity following tDCS. Similarly, anticorrelations between the SN and all three DMN components were significantly reduced following tDCS. This reduced anticorrelation may have raised the threshold at which SN activation could inhibit or “switch off” the DMN. Since DMN activity has been implicated in safety learning, reduced DMN inhibition during the processing of emotionally arousing and salient stimuli (e.g., a contaminated object) may promote the processing and learning of safety signals during extinction.³⁷ Again, this is speculative, since we did not measure DMN activity during our therapeutic extinction learning task.

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

Extinction learning is typically considered a form of implicit learning, but explicit emotion regulation and learning processes are also important.⁹⁵ These explicit processes are commonly associated with ECN activation.^{95, 99} Increased functional connectivity between the frontal pole and dlPFC – an anchor of the ECN – following administration of tDCS may have increased the probability that these regions are co-activated, thus promoting both DMN-dependent implicit safety learning and ECN-dependent emotion regulation or explicit learning during therapeutic exposure. This interpretation is not supported by analyses of ICA networks, which showed no significant changes in connectivity between the right frontoparietal network and the SN or DMN.

Unexpectedly, we also observed significant reductions in functional connectivity between the mPFC and multiple areas in the subcortical reward circuitry, particularly in the striatum, following administration of frontopolar tDCS (**Figure 2A; Supplemental Figure 2**). This includes areas associated with fear extinction learning and the detection of safety signals and related approach behaviors.^{100,101} The two striatal networks identified in ICA analyses showed no significant changes in connectivity following frontopolar tDCS. However, the SN, which showed reduced connectivity following tDCS, included striatal areas that overlapped with the right anterior insula/putamen cluster identified in seed-based analyses. Elevated striatal activity is seen in individuals with OCD, both at rest and upon symptom provocation, and is moderated by treatment.^{102, 103} In our patient sample, tDCS may have modulated activity in cortico-striatal-thalamic loops and associated obsessive thinking or compulsive impulses, which might make the ERP Challenge less distressing. Future research should examine this idea in the context of fMRI-based OCD symptom provocation paradigms.^{104, 105}

Although promising, these findings have several important limitations. First, sample sizes were relatively small for both studies; replication with larger samples is necessary. Second, imaging and behavioral data were collected in distinct samples. This was necessary because our behavioral extinction task was designed to recapitulate procedures used during CBT for

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

OCD and was not compatible with MRI, but it weakens linkage of the two studies. Third, sample characteristics were not uniform across the two studies. The neural effects of frontopolar tDCS in community and OCD samples may differ. Ideally, future research should attempt to integrate stimulation, imaging, and therapeutic exposure into one protocol to allow investigators to examine if changes in functional connectivity mediate the effects of frontopolar tDCS on therapeutic learning. Lastly, study one utilized a within-subject design and lacked a control group. While within-subject functional connectivity is largely stable over time, particularly for fMRI protocols that implement reliability safeguards used in the present study (e.g., eyes open, awake, short re-test intervals),¹⁰⁶ a well-powered, double-blind, sham-controlled fMRI study is needed to make stronger inferences about the causal effects of frontopolar tDCS on functional connectivity. Study 2, conversely, utilized a double-blind, sham-controlled design. The OCD subject and the experimenter administering the ERP Challenge were both blind to the experimental condition, but the experimenter administering tDCS was not always blind. Predicted difficulty of exposures during exposure planning were nearly identical across the two groups, as were SUDS ratings immediately before and after tDCS administration and during the first several minutes of the first exposure trial. Nonetheless, replication efforts should ensure blinding of all individuals involved in data collection efforts.

These limitations aside, the present findings are both novel and promising. To the authors' knowledge, these are the first studies to examine *both* behavioral and neurobiological target engagement of tDCS in the context of therapeutic exposure. The present findings have clear implications for the treatment of anxiety and related disorders, including OCD. If replicated with larger samples and extended with samples of other anxious populations and over multiple sessions of tDCS and exposure, this strategy may lead to a novel means to accelerate recovery, reduce dropout, and improve response rates in the psychotherapeutic treatment of OCD, and perhaps of other disorders characterized by anxious pathology.

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

Acknowledgements

Dr. Adams and the reported studies were supported by the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH; K23MH111977, T32MH062994, and L30MH111037). Study one was also supported, in part, by the Clinical Neurosciences Division of the National Center for PTSD and the Department of Veteran Affairs. Brain stimulation equipment was loaned by Starstim® to support study pilots and was purchased using funds from the Detre Foundation (R13306). Study two was supported, in part, by an International Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder Foundation (IOCDF) Young Investigator Award and an American Psychiatric Association (APA) Psychiatric Fellowship Award (R12965). These studies were also supported by the State of Connecticut through its support of the Ribicoff Research Facilities at the Connecticut Mental Health Center. Dr. Anticevic is supported by the NIMH (R01MH108590). Dr. Abdallah is supported by the Beth K. and Stuart Yudofsky Chair in the Neuropsychiatry of Military Post Traumatic Stress Syndrome. Portions of these data were presented at annual conferences for the American College of Neuropsychopharmacology (ACNP) and Anxiety and Depression Association of America (ADAA). Dr. Pittenger is supported by the Taylor Family Foundation and the NIMH (R01MH116038 and K24MH121571). The views in this article are those of the authors, not of the State of Connecticut or of other funders. We would like to thank Eileen Billingslea, MA, and Suzanne Wasylink, APRN, for their assistance with IRB compliance, subject recruitment and screening, and budget management.

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

Disclosures

Dr. Adams, Dr. Cisler, Dr. Kelmendi, Ms. George, Mr. Kichuck, and Mr. Averill have no financial disclosures/conflicts to report. Dr. Anticevic consults and holds equity in Blackthorn Therapeutics. Dr. Abdallah has served as a consultant, speaker and/or on advisory boards for Genentech, Janssen, Psilocybin Labs, Lundbeck, Guidepoint and FSV7, and editor of *Chronic Stress* for Sage Publications, Inc.; He also filed a patent for using mTORC1 inhibitors to augment the effects of antidepressants (Aug 20, 2018). Dr. Pittenger serves as a consultant for Biohaven, Teva, Lundbeck, and Brainsway, receives royalties and/or honoraria from Oxford University Press and Elsevier, and has filed a patent on the use of NIRS neurofeedback in the treatment of anxiety, which is not relevant to the current work.

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

References

1. Kessler RC, Petukhova M, Sampson NA, et al. Twelve-month and lifetime prevalence and lifetime morbid risk of anxiety and mood disorders in the United States. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research* 2012; 21: 169-184. DOI: 10.1002/impr.1359.
2. Emmelkamp P and Ehling T. *The Wiley Handbook of Anxiety Disorders*. John Wiley & Sons, 2014.
3. Kessler RC, Aguilar-Gaxiola S, Alonso J, et al. The global burden of mental disorders: an update from the WHO World Mental Health (WMH) surveys. *Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences* 2009; 18: 23-33.
4. Ruscio AM, Stein DJ, Chiu WT, et al. The epidemiology of obsessive-compulsive disorder in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Molecular psychiatry* 2010; 15: 53-63.
5. Ayuso-Mateos JL. Global burden of obsessive-compulsive disorder in the year 2000. *World Health Organization: Global program on evidence of health policy, global burden of disease 2000*.
6. Tuerk PW. Starting from something: augmenting exposure therapy and methods of inquiry. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 2014; 171: 1034-1037. DOI: 10.1176/appi.ajp.2014.14070880.
7. Adams TG, Brady RE, Lohr JM, et al. A meta-analysis of CBT components for anxiety disorders. *The Behavior Therapist* 2015; 38: 87-97.
8. McNally RJ. Mechanisms of exposure therapy: how neuroscience can improve psychological treatments for anxiety disorders. *Clinical Psychology Review* 2007; 27: 750-759. DOI: 10.1016/j.cpr.2007.01.003.
9. Hofmann SG and Smits JA. Cognitive-behavioral therapy for adult anxiety disorders: a meta-analysis of randomized placebo-controlled trials. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry* 2008; 69: 621-632. DOI: 10.4088/jcp.v69n0415.
10. Marin MF, Camprodon JA, Dougherty DD, et al. Device-based brain stimulation to augment fear extinction: implications for PTSD treatment and beyond. *Depression and Anxiety* 2014; 31: 269-278. DOI: 10.1002/da.22252.
11. Hofmann SG. Enhancing exposure-based therapy from a translational research perspective. *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 2007; 45: 1987-2001. DOI: 10.1016/j.brat.2007.06.006.
12. Singewald N, Schmuckermair C, Whittle N, et al. Pharmacology of cognitive enhancers for exposure-based therapy of fear, anxiety and trauma-related disorders. *Pharmacology & Therapeutics* 2015; 149: 150-190. DOI: 10.1016/j.pharmthera.2014.12.004.
13. Peters J, Kalivas PW and Quirk GJ. Extinction circuits for fear and addiction overlap in prefrontal cortex. *Learning & Memory* 2009; 16: 279-288. DOI: 10.1101/lm.1041309 [doi].
14. Craske MG, Treanor M, Conway CC, et al. Maximizing exposure therapy: an inhibitory learning approach. *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 2014; 58: 10-23. DOI: 10.1016/j.brat.2014.04.006.
15. Phelps EA, Delgado MR, Nearing KI, et al. Extinction learning in humans: Role of the amygdala and vmPFC. *Neuron* 2004; 43: 897-905. Article. DOI: 10.1016/j.neuron.2004.08.042.
16. Milad MR and Quirk GJ. Fear extinction as a model for translational neuroscience: Ten years of progress. *Annual Review of Psychology* 2012; 63: 129-151. Review. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.psych.121208.131631.
17. Sehlmeier C, Schöning S, Zwitserlood P, et al. Human fear conditioning and extinction in neuroimaging: a systematic review. *PloS one* 2009; 4: e5865.
18. Moustafa AA, Gilbertson MW, Orr SP, et al. A model of amygdala-hippocampal-prefrontal interaction in fear conditioning and extinction in animals. *Brain and Cognition* 2013; 81: 29-43. DOI: 10.1016/j.bandc.2012.10.005.

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

19. Duits P, Cath DC, Lissek S, et al. Updated meta-analysis of classical fear conditioning in the anxiety disorders. *Depression and Anxiety* 2015; 32: 239-253. DOI: 10.1002/da.22353.
20. Lissek S, Powers AS, McClure EB, et al. Classical fear conditioning in the anxiety disorders: a meta-analysis. *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 2005; 43: 1391-1424. DOI: 10.1016/j.brat.2004.10.007.
21. Milad MR, Furtak SC, Greenberg JL, et al. Deficits in conditioned fear extinction in obsessive-compulsive disorder and neurobiological changes in the fear circuit. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2013; 70: 608-618.
22. Milad MR, Pitman RK, Ellis CB, et al. Neurobiological basis of failure to recall extinction memory in posttraumatic stress disorder. *Biological Psychiatry* 2009; 66: 1075-1082. Article. DOI: 10.1016/j.biopsych.2009.06.026.
23. Brown VM, LaBar KS, Haswell CC, et al. Altered resting-state functional connectivity of basolateral and centromedial amygdala complexes in posttraumatic stress disorder. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 2014; 39: 351-359. DOI: 10.1038/npp.2013.197.
24. Jin C, Qi R, Yin Y, et al. Abnormalities in whole-brain functional connectivity observed in treatment-naive post-traumatic stress disorder patients following an earthquake. *Psychological Medicine* 2014; 44: 1927-1936. DOI: 10.1017/S003329171300250X.
25. Marusak HA, Peters C, Hehr A, et al. Poor between-session recall of extinction learning and hippocampal activation and connectivity in children. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory* 2018; 156: 86-95. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nlm.2018.10.007>.
26. Berry AC, Rosenfield D and Smits JAJ. Extinction retention predicts improvement in social anxiety symptoms following exposure therapy. *Depression and Anxiety* 2009; 26: 22-27.
27. Peres JF, Newberg AB, Mercante JP, et al. Cerebral blood flow changes during retrieval of traumatic memories before and after psychotherapy: a SPECT study. *Psychological Medicine* 2007; 37: 1481-1491. DOI: 10.1017/S003329170700997X.
28. Klumpp H, Keutmann MK, Fitzgerald DA, et al. Resting state amygdala-prefrontal connectivity predicts symptom change after cognitive behavioral therapy in generalized social anxiety disorder. *Biology of Mood & Anxiety Disorders* 2014; 4: 1-7.
29. Ball TM, Knapp SE, Paulus MP, et al. Brain activation during fear extinction predicts exposure success. *Depression and Anxiety* 2017; 34: 257-266.
30. Forcadell E, Torrents-Rodas D, Vervliet B, et al. Does fear extinction in the laboratory predict outcomes of exposure therapy? A treatment analog study. *International Journal of Psychophysiology* 2017; 121: 63-71.
31. Lange I, Goossens L, Michielse S, et al. Neural responses during extinction learning predict exposure therapy outcome in phobia: results from a randomized-controlled trial. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 2020; 45: 534-541.
32. Raeder F, Merz CJ, Margraf J, et al. The association between fear extinction, the ability to accomplish exposure and exposure therapy outcome in specific phobia. *Scientific Reports* 2020; 10: 1-11.
33. Scheveneels S, Boddez Y, Vervliet B, et al. The validity of laboratory-based treatment research: Bridging the gap between fear extinction and exposure treatment. *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 2016; 86: 87-94. DOI: 10.1016/j.brat.2016.08.015.
34. Waters AM and Pine DS. Evaluating differences in Pavlovian fear acquisition and extinction as predictors of outcome from cognitive behavioural therapy for anxious children. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 2016; 57: 869-876.
35. Andrews-Hanna JR, Reidler JS, Sepulcre J, et al. Functional-Anatomic Fractionation of the Brain's Default Network. *Neuron* 2010; 65: 550-562. DOI: 10.1016/j.neuron.2010.02.005.
36. Andrews-Hanna JR, Smallwood J and Spreng RN. The default network and self-generated thought: component processes, dynamic control, and clinical relevance. *Year in Cognitive Neuroscience* 2014; 1316: 29-52. DOI: 10.1111/nyas.12360.

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

37. Marsteller L, Burianová H and Reutens DC. Adaptive contextualization: a new role for the default mode network in affective learning. *Human Brain Mapping* 2017; 38: 1082-1091.
38. Fitzgerald KD, Welsh RC, Stern ER, et al. Developmental alterations of frontal-striatal-thalamic connectivity in obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* 2011; 50: 938-948.e933. DOI: 10.1016/j.jaac.2011.06.011.
39. Stern ER, Fitzgerald KD, Welsh RC, et al. Resting-state functional connectivity between fronto-parietal and default mode networks in obsessive-compulsive disorder. *PloS one* 2012; 7: e36356-e36356.
40. Jang JH, Kim J-H, Jung WH, et al. Functional connectivity in fronto-subcortical circuitry during the resting state in obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Neuroscience Letters* 2010; 474: 158-162.
41. Daniels JK, Frewen P, McKinnon MC, et al. Default mode alterations in posttraumatic stress disorder related to early-life trauma: a developmental perspective. *Journal of Psychiatry and Neuroscience* 2011; 36: 56-59. DOI: 10.1503/jpn.100050.
42. Daniels JK, McFarlane AC, Bluhm RL, et al. Switching between executive and default mode networks in posttraumatic stress disorder: alterations in functional connectivity. *Journal of Psychiatry and Neuroscience* 2010; 35: 258-266.
43. Lanius RA, Bluhm RL, Coupland NJ, et al. Default mode network connectivity as a predictor of post-traumatic stress disorder symptom severity in acutely traumatized subjects. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica* 2010; 121: 33-40. Article. DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-0447.2009.01391.x.
44. Miller DR, Hayes SM, Hayes JP, et al. Default Mode Network Subsystems Are Differentially Disrupted in Posttraumatic Stress Disorder. *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging* 2017; 2: 363-371. Article. DOI: 10.1016/j.bpsc.2016.12.006.
45. Sripada RK, King AP, Welsh RC, et al. Neural dysregulation in posttraumatic stress disorder: evidence for disrupted equilibrium between salience and default mode brain networks. *Psychosomatic Medicine* 2012; 74: 904-911. DOI: 10.1097/PSY.0b013e318273bf33.
46. Wu RZ, Zhang JR, Qiu CJ, et al. Study on resting-state default mode network in patients with posttraumatic stress disorder after the earthquake. *Sichuan Da Xue Xue Bao Yi Xue Ban* 2011; 42: 397-400.
47. Reggente N, Moody TD, Morfini F, et al. Multivariate resting-state functional connectivity predicts response to cognitive behavioral therapy in obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2018; 115: 2222-2227.
48. Feusner J, Moody T, Lai TM, et al. Brain connectivity and prediction of relapse after cognitive-behavioral therapy in obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Frontiers in Psychiatry* 2015; 6: 74.
49. Moody T, Morfini F, Cheng G, et al. Mechanisms of cognitive-behavioral therapy for obsessive-compulsive disorder involve robust and extensive increases in brain network connectivity. *Translational Psychiatry* 2017; 7: e1230.
50. Craske MG, Kircanski K, Zelikowsky M, et al. Optimizing inhibitory learning during exposure therapy. *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 2008; 46: 5-27. Article. DOI: 10.1016/j.brat.2007.10.003.
51. Nitsche MA, Cohen LG, Wassermann EM, et al. Transcranial direct current stimulation: State of the art 2008. *Brain Stimulation* 2008; 1: 206-223. DOI: 10.1016/j.brs.2008.06.004.
52. Stagg CJ, Best JG, Stephenson MC, et al. Polarity-sensitive modulation of cortical neurotransmitters by transcranial stimulation. *The Journal of Neuroscience* 2009; 29: 5202-5206. DOI: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4432-08.2009.
53. Stagg CJ and Nitsche MA. Physiological basis of transcranial direct current stimulation. *Neuroscientist* 2011; 17: 37-53. DOI: 10.1177/1073858410386614.

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

54. Nitsche MA and Paulus W. Sustained excitability elevations induced by transcranial DC motor cortex stimulation in humans. *Neurology* 2001; 57: 1899-1901. DOI: 10.1212/wnl.57.10.1899.
55. Nitsche MA and Paulus W. Excitability changes induced in the human motor cortex by weak transcranial direct current stimulation. *The Journal of Physiology* 2000; 527: 633-639. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-7793.2000.t01-1-00633.x.
56. Fritsch B, Reis J, Martinowich K, et al. Direct Current Stimulation Promotes BDNF-Dependent Synaptic Plasticity: Potential Implications for Motor Learning. *Neuron* 2010; 66: 198-204. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2010.03.035>.
57. Peña-Gómez C, Sala-Lonch R, Junqué C, et al. Modulation of large-scale brain networks by transcranial direct current stimulation evidenced by resting-state functional MRI. *Brain Stimulation* 2012; 5: 252-263.
58. Kunze T, Hunold A, Haeisen J, et al. Transcranial direct current stimulation changes resting state functional connectivity: A large-scale brain network modeling study. *Neuroimage* 2016; 140: 174-187. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.02.015>.
59. van't Wout M, Mariano TY, Garnaat SL, et al. Can transcranial direct current stimulation augment extinction of conditioned fear? *Brain Stimulation* 2016; 9: 529-536. DOI: 10.1016/j.brs.2016.03.004.
60. van't Wout M, Longo SM, Reddy MK, et al. Transcranial direct current stimulation may modulate extinction memory in posttraumatic stress disorder. *Brain and Behavior* 2017; 7: e00681. Article. DOI: 10.1002/brb3.681.
61. Ganho-Avila A, Goncalves OF, Guiomar R, et al. The effect of cathodal tDCS on fear extinction: A cross-measures study. *PLoS One* 2019; 14: e0221282. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0221282.
62. Lipp J, Draganova R, Batsikadze G, et al. Prefrontal but not cerebellar tDCS attenuates renewal of extinguished conditioned eyeblink responses. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory* 2020; 170: 107137. DOI: 10.1016/j.nlm.2019.107137.
63. Vicario CM, Nitsche MA, Hoysted I, et al. Anodal transcranial direct current stimulation over the ventromedial prefrontal cortex enhances fear extinction in healthy humans: A single blind sham-controlled study. *Brain Stimulation* 2020; 13: 489-491. Letter. DOI: 10.1016/j.brs.2019.12.022.
64. Abend R, Jalon I, Gurevitch G, et al. Modulation of fear extinction processes using transcranial electrical stimulation. *Translational Psychiatry* 2016; 6: e913. DOI: 10.1038/tp.2016.197.
65. Dittert N, Huttner S, Polak T, et al. Augmentation of Fear Extinction by Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation (tDCS). *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience* 2018; 12: 76. Article. DOI: 10.3389/fnbeh.2018.00076.
66. van 't Wout-Frank M, Shea MT, Larson VC, et al. Combined transcranial direct current stimulation with virtual reality exposure for posttraumatic stress disorder: Feasibility and pilot results. *Brain Stimulation* 2019; 12: 41-43. Article. DOI: 10.1016/j.brs.2018.09.011.
67. Ruffini G, de Lara CM-R, Martinez-Zalacain I, et al. Optimized Multielectrode tDCS Modulates Corticolimbic Networks. *Brain Stimulation* 2017; 10: e14-e14. DOI: 10.1016/j.brs.2016.11.064.
68. Ruffini G, Fox MD, Ripolles O, et al. Optimization of multifocal transcranial current stimulation for weighted cortical pattern targeting from realistic modeling of electric fields. *Neuroimage* 2014; 89: 216-225. DOI: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.12.002.
69. Bikson M, Datta A and Elwassif M. Establishing safety limits for transcranial direct current stimulation. *Clinical Neurophysiology* 2009; 120: 1033-1034. DOI: 10.1016/j.clinph.2009.03.018 [doi].

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

70. Brunoni AR, Amadera J, Berbel B, et al. A systematic review on reporting and assessment of adverse effects associated with transcranial direct current stimulation. *The International Journal of Neuropsychopharmacology* 2011; 14: 1133-1145.
71. Löwe B, Kroenke K, Herzog W, et al. Measuring depression outcome with a brief self-report instrument: sensitivity to change of the Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9). *Journal of Affective Disorders* 2004; 81: 61-66.
72. Spitzer RL, Kroenke K, Williams JBW, et al. A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder: the GAD-7. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 2006; 166: 1092-1097. DOI: 10.1001/archinte.166.10.1092.
73. Cisler JM, Esbensen K, Sellnow K, et al. Differential Roles of the Salience Network During Prediction Error Encoding and Facial Emotion Processing Among Female Adolescent Assault Victims. *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging* 2019; 4: 371-380. DOI: 10.1016/j.bpsc.2018.08.014.
74. Sheehan DV, Lecrubier Y, Sheehan KH, et al. The Mini-International Neuropsychiatric Interview (M.I.N.I.): The development and validation of a structured diagnostic psychiatric interview for DSM-IV and ICD-10. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry* 1998; 59: 22-33.
75. First MB and Gibbon M. *The Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV Axis I Disorders (SCID-I) and the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV Axis II Disorders (SCID-II)*. John Wiley & Sons Inc, 2004.
76. Goodman WK, Price LH, Rasmussen SA, et al. The Yale-Brown Obsessive Compulsive Scale: II. Validity. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 1989; 46: 1012-1016. DOI: 10.1001/archpsyc.1989.01810110054008.
77. Goodman WK, Price LH, Rasmussen SA, et al. The Yale-Brown obsessive compulsive scale: I. Development, use, and reliability. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 1989; 46: 1006-1011.
78. Bouton ME, Kenney FA and Rosengard C. State-dependent fear extinction with two benzodiazepine tranquilizers. *Behavioral Neuroscience* 1990; 104: 44-44.
79. Spiegel DA and Bruce TJ. Benzodiazepines and exposure-based cognitive behavior therapies for panic disorder: conclusions from combined treatment trials. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 1997; 154: 773-781.
80. McClintock SM. Consensus recommendations for the clinical application of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) in the treatment of depression. *The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry* 2018; 79: 35-48.
81. Abramowitz JS, Deacon BJ, Olatunji BO, et al. Assessment of obsessive-compulsive symptom dimensions: Development and evaluation of the Dimensional Obsessive-Compulsive Scale. *Psychological Assessment* 2010; 22: 180-198. DOI: 10.1037/a0018260.
82. Steketee G, Chambless DL, Tran GQ, et al. Behavioral avoidance test for obsessive compulsive disorder. *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 1996; 34: 73-83.
83. Zielinski MJ, Privratsky AA, Smitherman S, et al. Does development moderate the effect of early life assaultive violence on resting-state networks? An exploratory study. *Psychiatry Research: Neuroimaging* 2018; 281: 69-77. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pscychresns.2018.08.016>.
84. Eklund A, Nichols TE and Knutsson H. Cluster failure: Why fMRI inferences for spatial extent have inflated false-positive rates. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2016; 113: 7900-7905. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1602413113.
85. Cisler JM, Elton A, Kennedy AP, et al. Altered functional connectivity of the insular cortex across prefrontal networks in cocaine addiction. *Psychiatry Research* 2013; 213: 39-46. DOI: 10.1016/j.pscychresns.2013.02.007.
86. Calhoun VD, Adali T, Pearlson GD, et al. A method for making group inferences from functional MRI data using independent component analysis. *Human Brain Mapping* 2001; 14: 140-151.
87. IBM. SPSS Statistics for Windows. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp., 2016.

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

88. Nitsche MA, Kuo M-F, Paulus W, et al. Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation: Protocols and Physiological Mechanisms of Action. In: Knotkova H and Rasche D (eds) *Textbook of Neuromodulation*. New York: Springer, 2015, pp.101-111.
89. Herry C and Garcia R. Prefrontal cortex long-term potentiation, but not long-term depression, is associated with the maintenance of extinction of learned fear in mice. *The Journal of Neuroscience* 2002; 22: 577-583. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1523/jneurosci.22-02-00577.2002>.
90. Burgos-Robles A, Vidal-Gonzalez I, Santini E, et al. Consolidation of fear extinction requires NMDA receptor-dependent bursting in the ventromedial prefrontal cortex. *Neuron* 2007; 53: 871-880. DOI: 10.1016/j.neuron.2007.02.021.
91. Santini E, Ge H, Ren K, et al. Consolidation of fear extinction requires protein synthesis in the medial prefrontal cortex. *Journal of Neuroscience* 2004; 24: 5704-5710. DOI: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0786-04.2004.
92. Santini E, Muller RU and Quirk GJ. Consolidation of extinction learning involves transfer from NMDA-independent to NMDA-dependent memory. *Journal of Neuroscience* 2001; 21: 9009-9017. DOI: 21/22/9009.
93. Fullana MA, Albajes-Eizagirre A, Soriano-Mas C, et al. Fear extinction in the human brain: A meta-analysis of fMRI studies in healthy participants. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* 2018; 88: 16-25. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2018.03.002>.
94. Uddin LQ, Kelly AM, Biswal BB, et al. Functional connectivity of default mode network components: correlation, anticorrelation, and causality. *Human Brain Mapping* 2009; 30: 625-637. DOI: 10.1002/hbm.20531.
95. Delgado MR, Nearing KI, Ledoux JE, et al. Neural circuitry underlying the regulation of conditioned fear and its relation to extinction. *Neuron* 2008; 59: 829-838. DOI: 10.1016/j.neuron.2008.06.029.
96. Sridharan D, Levitin DJ and Menon V. A critical role for the right fronto-insular cortex in switching between central-executive and default-mode networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 2008; 105: 12569-12574. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.0800005105.
97. Goulden N, Khusnulina A, Davis NJ, et al. The salience network is responsible for switching between the default mode network and the central executive network: replication from DCM. *Neuroimage* 2014; 99: 180-190.
98. Sidlauskaite J, Wiersma JR, Roeyers H, et al. Anticipatory processes in brain state switching: Evidence from a novel cued-switching task implicating default mode and salience networks. *NeuroImage* 2014; 98: 359-365.
99. Ertl M, Hildebrandt M, Ourina K, et al. Emotion regulation by cognitive reappraisal: The role of frontal theta oscillations. *NeuroImage* 2013; 81: 412-421. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.05.044>.
100. Christianson JP, Fernando ABP, Kazama AM, et al. Inhibition of Fear by Learned Safety Signals: A Mini-Symposium Review. *The Journal of Neuroscience* 2012; 32: 14118-14124. DOI: 10.1523/jneurosci.3340-12.2012.
101. Rogan MT, Leon KS, Perez DL, et al. Distinct Neural Signatures for Safety and Danger in the Amygdala and Striatum of the Mouse. *Neuron* 2005; 46: 309-320. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2005.02.017>.
102. Chamberlain SR, Blackwell AD, Fineberg NA, et al. The neuropsychology of obsessive compulsive disorder: the importance of failures in cognitive and behavioural inhibition as candidate endophenotypic markers. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews* 2005; 29: 399-420. DOI: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2004.11.006.
103. Chamberlain SR, Menzies L, Hampshire A, et al. Orbitofrontal dysfunction in patients with obsessive-compulsive disorder and their unaffected relatives. *Science* 2008; 321: 421-422. DOI: 10.1126/science.1154433.

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

104. Rauch SL, Shin LM, Dougherty DD, et al. Predictors of Fluvoxamine Response in Contamination-related Obsessive Compulsive Disorder: A PET Symptom Provocation Study. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 2002; 27: 782-791. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0893-133X\(02\)00351-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0893-133X(02)00351-2).
105. Baioui A, Pilgramm J, Merz CJ, et al. Neural response in obsessive-compulsive washers depends on individual fit of triggers. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* 2013; 7: 143-143. DOI: [10.3389/fnhum.2013.00143](https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00143).
106. Noble S, Scheinost D and Constable RT. A decade of test-retest reliability of functional connectivity: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *NeuroImage* 2019; 203: 116157. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.116157>.

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

Table 1. Summary of peak areas of change in functional connectivity with the frontopolar seed from pre- to post-tDCS (cluster corrected [> 30.6 voxels], $p < .001$). Cluster size (# voxels) and x,y,z coordinates (MNI) provided.

LME Main Effects	Pre-tDCS <i>M(SE)</i>	Post-tDCS <i>M(SE)</i>	<i>F</i>-value (<i>d</i>)
tDCS (pre vs. post)			
R. Anterior Insula / Putamen -27.0, -20.2, +7.5 (50 vox)	-0.211 (0.016)	-0.078 (0.023)	20.55 (2.27)
R. Pallidum / Caudate -19.5, -2.8, +5.0 (34 vox)	-0.118 (0.042)	0.026 (0.041)	34.67 (2.94)
R. Superior Frontal Gyrus -37.0, -30.2, +35.0 (34 vox)	-0.004 (0.013)	0.111 (0.017)	19.75 (2.22)
R. Middle Frontal Gyrus -27.0, -57.8, +10.0 (44 vox)	-0.054 (0.041)	0.108 (0.041)	22.35 (2.36)

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

Table 2. Fixed effect estimates (linear mixed effects model) of the intercept and the main effect of tDCS on connectivity between the salience network (SN) and subnetworks of the default mode network (DMN) and a cingulo/SMA network. All effects are significant at $p < .05$ with Bonferroni correction for familywise error ($ps \leq .005$).

(Inter-Network Connectivity)	Intercept B (SE)	tDCS B (SE)	Upper - Lower C.I. (95%)	Cohen's d
SN to Anterior DMN	-0.21 (0.03)	0.05 (0.02)	0.02 to 0.09	0.73
SN to Posterior DMN	-0.30 (0.03)	0.05 (0.02)	0.02 to 0.08	0.77
SN to Ventral/Medial DMN	-0.12 (0.03)	0.06 (0.02)	0.03 to 0.09	0.94
SN to Cingulo/SMA	0.32 (-.03)	-0.05 (0.01)	-0.07 to -0.19	0.85

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy


Table 3. Linear mixed effects modeling of within- (mins) and between-trial (trials) learning during Day 1 of exposure with response prevention (ERP) challenge among OCD patients who received active tDCS ($n = 12$) or sham tDCS ($n = 12$) immediately before completing five 10-min trials of *in vivo* exposure. The significant group*mins and group*trials interactions identify accelerated within- and between-trial extinction learning in the active tDCS group relative to the sham tDCS group (see **Figure 4**).

Fixed Factors	Beta (SE)	95% C.I.	
		Lower	Upper
Intercept	51.41 (4.40)	42.33	60.48
Mins	-.49 (.31)	-1.12	0.14
Trials	-2.47 (1.30)	-5.15	0.21
Group	-5.54 (6.22)	-18.37	7.30
Mins*Trials	-.01 (.06)	-0.12	0.11
Group*Mins	-1.67 (.44)**	-2.56	-0.78
Group*Trials	-3.83 (1.84)*	-7.63	-0.04
Group*Mins*Trials	.31 (.08)**	0.15	0.46

Note; * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$. SUDS = Subjective Units of Distress

tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy


Figure 1. 1.5 mA multifocal tDCS was administered using a Starstim transcranial electric stimulator, with a 1 cm² anode over Fpz (10-20 EEG) surrounded by five cathodes in a circumferential array (AF3, AF4, F3, FZ, and F4). Simulation of the electrical fields produced by this montage was performed using Stimweaver and showed enhance electrical field potentials throughout the mPFC, particularly the frontopolar cortex and adjacent cortices, with limited effects on surrounding grey matter, including in brain tissue beneath the cathodes.




tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

Figure 2. (A) Seed-based functional connectivity analyses with stringent cluster correction ($p < .001$, cluster sizes > 31 voxels) before and after administration of tDCS identified reduced negative functional connectivity between the frontopolar (FP) seed (red) and the right anterior insula / putamen (AI/put; green) and pallidum / caudate (pal/cau; orange), and increased functional connectivity between the FP and the right superior and middle frontal gyri ([sFG] blue and [mFG] yellow). **(B)** Mean connectivity between FP and each of these clusters before and after tDCS.

A.




B.




tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

Figure 3. Inter-network connectivity between the salience network (SN) and subnetworks of the default mode network ([DMN] ventral, posterior, and medial) significantly ($p < .005$, significant after Bonferroni correction) decreased following administration of frontopolar tDCS.

A.




B.



tDCS, DMN, Exposure Therapy

Figure 4. Despite nearly identical SUDS ratings at the beginning of the ERP Challenge (min. 1 of trial 1), OCD patients who received active tDCS reported significantly greater within-trial (solid lines, $p \leq .05$) and between-trial (dashed lines, $p \leq .01$) therapeutic extinction learning than those who received sham stimulation.



Note. SUDS = Subjective Units of Distress (0-100)