Cognitive Training and Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation in Older Persons with HIV-associated Neurocognitive Disorder: A Randomized Trial

Raymond L Ownby* **and Jae Kim**

[1]Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Medicine, Nova Southeastern University, Fort Lauderdale, FL

Correspondence:

Dr. Ownby, Center for Collaborative Research Suite 430, 3301 College Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33314. E-mail: Ro71@nova.edu. Telephone: +1-954-262-1481

Abstract

Objective: HIV infection is associated with impaired cognition, and as individuals grow older, they may also experience age-related changes in mental abilities. Computer-based cognitive training (CCT) and transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) have both shown promise in improving cognition. This study evaluated the acceptability of CCT and tDCS to older adults with HIV-associated neurocognitive disorder, and assessed their impact on reaction time, attention, and psychomotor speed.

Methods: In a single-blind randomized study, 46 individuals with HIV-associated mild neurocognitive disorder completed neuropsychological measures and six 20-minute training sessions, receiving (1) CCT with active tDCS; (2) CCT with sham tDCS, or (3) watching educational videos with sham tDCS. Immediately after training and again one month later, participants completed follow-up assessments. Outcomes were evaluated via repeated measures mixed effects models.

Results: Participant ratings of the intervention were positive. Effects on reaction time were not significant, but measures of attention and psychomotor speed suggested positive effects of the intervention.

Conclusion: Both CCT and tDCS were well accepted by older persons with HIV infection. CCT and tDCS may improve cognitive in affected individuals.

Significance: CCT and tDCS may be useful in treating HIV-associated neurocognitive disorders.

[191 words]

Registered at ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT03440840).

Keywords: transcranial direct current stimulation, computer-delivered cognitive training, human immunodeficiency virus, cognition, HIV-associated neurocognitive disorder, mild neurocognitive disorder

Highlights

- Current treatment options for HIV-associated neurocognitive disorders (HAND) in persons 50 or older are limited.
- Both transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) and computer-delivered cognitive training (CCT) may have positive effects on cognition.
- This study showed that both cognitive training and transcranial direct current stimulation were acceptable to older persons with HAND and were associated with limited evidence of improved objective and subjective cognitive function.

1. Introduction

In spite of advances in the treatment of HIV infection with the development of combination antiretroviral treatments, individuals with HIV infection, even those with nondetectable viral loads, continue to develop HIV-related cognitive deficits (Heaton et al., 2010). HIV-associated neurocognitive disorders (HANDs) are significant in light of their impact on patients' everyday functioning (Thames, Arentoft, Rivera-Mindt, & Hinkin, 2013; Thames, Becker, et al., 2011; Thames, Kim, et al., 2011), medication adherence (Hinkin et al., 2002; Hinkin et al., 2004; Thames et al., 2013), and quality of life (Degroote, Vogelaers, & Vandijck, 2014; Degroote et al., 2013; Moore et al., 2014; Tozzi et al., 2003). HANDs may have an even greater impact on older persons, with both HIV and aging affecting cognition (Valcour et al., 2004; Wendelken & Valcour, 2012).

Currently-available treatments for HAND are limited. Drug studies have shown that stimulant medications may improve some symptoms of HAND (Hinkin et al., 2001), but their usefulness is limited by abuse potential and side effects (Cody & Vance, 2016; Watkins & Treisman, 2015). Other pharmacological treatments have been studied, but none has demonstrated efficacy (Decloedt et al., 2016; Nakasujja et al., 2013; Sacktor et al., 2011; Schifitto et al., 2007; Schifitto et al., 2009). Other researchers have argued for the utility of computer-delivered cognitive training (CCT) interventions for HAND (Vance, Fazeli, Ross, Wadley, & Ball, 2012), but specialized CCT software is not always readily available or affordable. Further, many programs created for CCT are not inherently interesting, reducing users' motivations for continued use outside of compensated studies. An

alternative strategy to commercial CCT software may be more readily available computer games (Bonnechère, Langley, & Sahakian, 2020; Zelinski & Reyes, 2009). Developers of cognitive training software programs often include gaming elements in the programs (Green & Seitz, 2015) to enhance their inherent interest, but a vast number of games are already available and have already demonstrated their commercial viability. This stems from the games' high levels of intrinsic interest, game play that engages users, and online social communities. Games such as first-person shooters (in which the participant uses some form of weapon to target enemies) have been shown to improve attention and reaction time (Green & Seitz, 2015) but their acceptability to users is limited by the violent nature of their content which often includes simulations of violence and gore (Green & Seitz, 2015; Wu & Spence, 2013).

An alternative to first person shooters is car racing games, which also require attention and cognitive speed but whose content may be more acceptable to users. One study, for example, showed that a purpose-built car racing game improved cognitive function in older persons (Anguera et al., 2013), and others have also argued for the effectiveness of commercially available games in improving and sustaining cognitive function in older adults (Basak, Boot, Voss, & Kramer, 2008; Bavelier et al., 2011; Belchior et al., 2016; Belchior, Marsiske, Sisco, Yam, & Mann, 2012; Zelinski & Reyes, 2009). Commercial games are successful precisely because of their ability to engage and sustain users' interest in playing them. One group showed that a commercially available game requiring psychomotor speed was more likely to result in long-term use compared to a commercial CCT program

(Belchior et al., 2016; Belchior et al., 2012). Computer games have been shown to have sustained cognitive training effects that may transfer to other domains (Cardoso-Leite & Bavelier, 2014) including cognitive control in older persons (Anguera et al., 2013). Games may thus be effective for training and can engage users in a sustained fashion.

In addition to cognitive training, a number of studies have shown that transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) combined with CCT can enhance cognition (Coffman, Trumbo, & Clark, 2012; B. J. Lawrence, Gasson, Bucks, Troeung, & Loftus, 2017; Blake J. Lawrence, Gasson, Johnson, Booth, & Loftus, 2018; Leshikar et al., 2017; Martin, Liu, Alonzo, Green, & Loo, 2014; Martin et al., 2013; Trumbo et al., 2016). tDCS involves the application of very small currents (1-2 mA) using a regulated direct current source, typically via sponge electrodes placed over the scalp in positions that allow specific brain structures to be stimulated. Studies of tDCS have shown enhancements of cognitive abilities, including verbal problem solving (Cerruti & Schlaug, 2009), working memory (Fregni et al., 2005; Heimrath, Sandmann, Becke, Muller, & Zaehle, 2012; Zaehle, Sandmann, Thorne, Jancke, & Herrmann, 2011), and learning in various contexts including in a computer-based threat detection simulation (Clark et al., 2012), and object location memory in the elderly (Floel et al., 2012).

Although the precise mechanism by which tDCS produces effects on cognition is not clear, one possible mechanism is particularly relevant to treatment of individuals with HIV infection. Direct current stimulation of neurons in the motor cortex has been shown to stimulate the activity of brain-derived neurotrophic

growth factor (BDNF) in that area (Fritsch et al., 2010) and it is possible that similar effects occur elsewhere in the brain. BDNF is affected by HIV infection (Avdoshina, Bachis, & Mocchetti, 2013; Bachis, Avdoshina, Zecca, Parsadanian, & Mocchetti, 2012), and also is related to cognitive decline in older persons (Buchman et al., 2016). An intervention that stimulates BDNF production in older persons with HIV might be expected to have a positive impact on cognition.

We previously completed a pilot study of game-based CCT with and without tDCS in older persons with HIV infection (Ownby & Acevedo, 2016). Results suggested that the intervention was acceptable to participants and that it may have had positive effects on their attention and working memory. In the follow-up study reported here, we further explore the acceptability and efficacy of a game-based CCT intervention combined with tDCS in older persons with HIV infection. We hypothesized that CCT with tDCS would be acceptable to persons 50 years of age and older with HAND. We also hypothesized that CCT would be associated with improved reaction time, psychomotor speed, and attention and that the combination of active tDCS with CCT would be superior to CCT alone.

2. Methods

2.1 Participants

Participants were individuals 50 years of age and older treated for HIV infection who reported cognitive difficulties and evidenced objective cognitive impairment in at least two neuropsychological domains without dementia. They thus met Frascati criteria for mild neurocognitive disorder (Antinori et al., 2007). Exclusion criteria included factors that might expose individuals to increased risk if they were treated

with tDCS, such as history of seizures or bipolar disorder (there have been reports of induced mania in studies of tDCS for depression (Brunoni et al., 2013; Galvez et al., 2011). Individuals using an extensive list of psychotropic medications were excluded, as drugs in these classes have been shown to modify the effects of tDCS (McLaren, Nissim, & Woods, 2018; Medeiros et al., 2012). These included medications with serotonergic (many antidepressants), dopaminergic (stimulant medications, antipsychotics), or gamma-aminobutyric acid-ergic activity (e.g., benzodiazepines). Left-handed participants were excluded as our intent was to stimulate the dominant dorsolateral prefrontal cortex.

2.2 Procedures

2.2.1 Recruitment and eligibility determination

Individuals were initially recruited from participants in a previous unrelated study. Individuals were also recruited from several local organizations providing services to individuals treated for HIV infection and by referrals from other participants. Participants were first screened by telephone for the presence of subjective cognitive impairments using questions developed by the European AIDS Clinical Society (European AIDS Clinical Society, 2015) as well for types of medication use, ability to bring lab results to the first study visit, and interest in participating in a study of CCT and tDCS. All participants were required to be in active treatment for HIV and stable on their current regimen of antiretroviral medications for at least one month. Persons who met initial inclusion and exclusion criteria were scheduled for an in-person visit to determine final eligibility.

At the in-person visit, participants completed a battery of neuropsychological measures (measures marked with an asterisk in Table 1) chosen to assess domains commonly affected in persons with HIV infection (S. P. Woods, Moore, Weber, & Grant, 2009). These included attention and working memory using the Digit Span subtests of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, 4th edition, or WAIS-IV (Wechsler, 2008) and psychomotor speed with the Coding subtest of the WAIS-IV and Grooved Pegboard Test (Lafayette Instrument Company, 2002). Executive function was assessed with the Trail Making Test, Part B (Lezak, 2004). Verbal fluency was assessed with the Verbal Fluency test of the Delis-Kaplan Executive Function System (Delis, Kaplan, & Kramer, 2001). Verbal learning and memory were assessed with the Hopkins Verbal Learning Test—Revised or HVLT-R (Brandt & Benedickt, 2001), and visual learning and memory with the Brief Visuospatial Memory Test, or BVMT-R (Benedict, Schretlen, Groninger, Dobraski, & Sphritz, 1996).

Individuals were considered eligible if their performance in at least two of these domains was one standard deviation or more below the measure's mean according to test norms. All participants were currently in active treatment for HIV, and routine monitoring of treatment response and immune status was part of their care. We required that participants furnish recent lab results at study entry, as well as bring all their medications to the eligibility visit, so that we could examine pill bottles and verify that they met eligibility requirements. Individuals who met entry criteria then completed the additional assessments as described in the next section.

2.2.2 Acceptability.

We used several strategies to evaluate the feasibility and acceptability of the CCT with tDCS intervention to participants. We used a questionnaire based on the Technology Acceptance Model, or TAM (Venkatesh & Bala, 2008; Venkatesh, Morris, Davis, & Davis, 2003), the dimensions of which have received substantial support for use with digital health technologies (Binyamin & Zafar, 2021). The model specifies that users' perceptions of an application's ease of use and usefulness are determinants of their future behavioral intent to use the application. We hypothesized that if the intervention were viewed favorably by participants, their average rating on the Usefulness and Ease of Use scales of this questionnaire would be significantly different from the midpoint of the scale in a positive direction.

Another scale was developed based on a model balancing risks and benefits of a treatment was used to develop a questionnaire assessing users' perceptions of the balance between an intervention's risks and benefits (Atkinson, Kumar, Cappelleri, & Hass, 2005; Atkinson et al., 2004). Participants were asked, for example, if they experienced benefits from the intervention and adverse effects from it. They were then asked to provide an overall judgment as to whether the benefits of the intervention outweighed its adverse effects.

2.2.3 Cognitive measures

In order to evaluate possible cognitive effects of the intervention more comprehensively, participants additional assessments after determination of their eligibility. Use of these measures allowed tests of the study's hypothesis that

participants receiving the active interventions would display better performance than control participants in reaction time, attention, and psychomotor speed.

In order to assess the effects of the intervention on participants' reaction time, they completed the California Computerized Assessment Package (Miller, 2013). In order to further assess the impact of the intervention on executive functions, participants also completed the Stroop Color Word Test (Golden, 1978), the Iowa Gambling Task (Bechara, Damasio, Tranel, & Damasio, 2005), and the Design Fluency subtest of the Delis-Kaplan Executive Function System (Delis et al., 2001). Finally, to assess whether the intervention had an impact on everyday functional performance, participants completed the Medication Management Test—Revised, a measure of the person's ability to understand and carry out medication-related tasks (Albert et al., 1999) and the University of San Diego Scales of Observed Performance (Patterson, Goldman, McKibbin, Hughs, & Jeste, 2001), assessing their ability to perform everyday tasks such as making a medical appointment and paying a bill. Finally, in order to provide an estimate of participants' premorbid level of functioning, they completed the Wechsler Test of Adult Reading (Wechsler, 2001).

Insert Table 1 about here

2.2.4 Other self-report measures.

The assessment battery also included the Patient's Assessment of Own Functioning or PAOF (Chelune, Heaton, & Lehman, 1986), a more extensive

measure of self-reported cognitive difficulties across language, perception, and memory previously used in studies of HIV-related cognitive impairment (Rourke, Halman, & Bassel, 1999) as well as the Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression scale or CESD (Radloff, 1977), a self-report measure of depressive symptoms. Participants completed self-report measures using automated computer assisted self-interview (ACASI) software that read questions aloud and that only required tapping a computer screen to record responses.

2.2.5 Compensation

After completing baseline procedures, participants were scheduled for the first training visit. Participants were compensated with US $80 for the baseline and follow-up sessions, and $40 for each training visit.

2.2.6 Computer-based cognitive training

At the first training visit (after completion of baseline assessments), individuals were assigned to treatment condition via a predetermined computer-generated randomization schedule. The schedule was generated via random numbers in a predetermined block (n = 3) randomization scheme. Participants were enrolled by the study coordinator (who was blind to treatment assignment) and assigned by the unblinded principal investigator who also conducted all training sessions.

Individuals were first oriented to tDCS procedures and the computer game controller (standard Xbox game controller connected via USB interface to a PC running the Windows™ 10 operating system). The investigator sat at another desk behind and to the participant's left so that the tDCS device and the investigator recording performance were not visible during training. The investigator controlled

the computer and the game via a wireless mouse. All individuals participated in tDCS with anode placement over the left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex and cathode over the right supraorbital area, with locations determined according to the 10-20 placement system (F3 and FP2) (Acharya, Hani, Cheek, Thirumala, & Tsuchida, 2016). Electrodes were 5 x 5 cm sponges (Soterix EASYPads; Soterix Medical: New York). They were moistened with approximately 7 cc of sterile saline and held in place with an elastic band. Current was supplied using a ActivaDose II iontophoresis device (Gilroy, CA: Activatek) with flat carbon electrodes inserted into the dual riveted sponges. Impedances were assessed before each session and kept below 20K ohms prior to stimulation.

Participants were informed that they might feel nothing or minor itching or burning at the onset of tDCS, and that the feeling might continue or go away during the training session (Brunoni et al., 2013). Participants were encouraged to attend to the computer screen as the game and tDCS were initiated. For individuals assigned to active treatment, tDCS was begun and continued for 20 minutes at a current of 1.5 mA. For individuals assigned to sham tDCS, the tDCS device was turned on and the current allowed to ramp up to 1.5 mA over a period of 30s. The device was then turned off with current ramped down over 30s out of sight of the participant.

In this study we used an off-the-shelf computer car racing game that is free to download on some versions of Windows™, was sufficiently easy for even novice gamers, and was popular, thus suggesting it would be acceptable to participants. *GT Racing 2* (Gameloft SE: Paris, France) requires that participants drive a

simulated car over multiple timed race courses. Each course required that the user achieve a basic level of proficiency before moving on to the next level. The initial difficulty level allows the game to provide considerable steering and braking assistance to the person playing, guaranteeing their ability to play the game and be successful. The game is visually attractive and provides a variety of race courses that stimulate and hold user interest. All participants were able to navigate successfully at least the first four courses of the game over six training sessions.

Participants were allowed to work through the game at their own pace, subject to its restrictions. For example, in order to progress through the game, participants had to finish a race in first, second, or third place or finish a course in a specified time prior to accessing the next course. Participants completed at least five trials of each course before progressing to the next one. At the conclusion of each training session, participants responded to three questions via ACASI that asked how they would rate their thinking ability, mood, and level of discomfort during that session. All participants completed six training sessions over the next two weeks, with most sessions completed with one day intervening between sessions (e.g., Monday, Wednesday, and Friday).

All activities with each participant were completed within a three-week interval. After the final training session, participants again completed the neuropsychological battery administered by an assessor blind to treatment condition with self-report measures administered by computer in a private office. Finally, approximately 30 days after the follow-up assessment participants returned and again completed the battery of cognitive and self-report measures. All data

were collected in the General Clinical Research Center at the Center for Collaborative Research on the campus of Nova Southeastern University beginning in January 2018 and ending in November 2019. The study was concluded at the end of the period of funding support.

2.3 Human subjects approval and trial registration

This protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Nova Southeastern University (protocol number 2017-410) and was registered on ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT03440840).

2.4 Data Analyses

Planned sample size was determined prior to beginning the study using the mixed effects model simulation routine in PASS 16 (Hintze, 2018). The power analysis showed that a final sample size of 90 (30 per treatment group) would have a power of 0.88 to detect interactions of group membership with time (number of evaluations) with a small effect size (Brydges, 2019; Cohen, 1988).

Data analyses were completed in several steps. Preliminary analyses of data and descriptive statistics were obtained using SPSS version 26 (Armonk NY: IBM). Chi-square and one-way ANOVA tests evaluating the relations of participant ratings of the acceptability and feasibility of the intervention to group assignment were also completed in SPSS. Analyses of treatment effects were completed using R version 4.0.2 (R Core Team, 2020) package *lme4* (Bates, Maechler, Bolker, & Walker, 2015) for mixed effects models. Significance of model effects (interaction of treatment group assignment with time) was assessed using the likelihood ratio test (Kuznetsova, Brockhoff, & Christensen, 2017). We evaluated outcomes both

through tests of statistical significance as well as approximations of effect size from χ^2 values from likelihood ratio tests and *t* values obtained in tests of between-group differences obtained using *emmeans* (Lenth, 2020). Effect sizes were converted to the more familiar *d* statistic using the package *esc* (Ludecke, 2019). As a post-hoc assessment not included in the original study protocol the probability of finding the observed number of treatment effects in the hypothesized direction was evaluated using the exact binomial test in the package *stats.*

3. Results

The CONSORT diagram (Moher, 1998) for the study is presented in Figure 1. Demographic, educational and baseline scores for cognitive and functional measures for participants by treatment group are presented in Table 2. We screened 155 potential participants, and included 46 in the study. Reasons for excluding potential participants are listed in Figure 1. The most frequent reasons for exclusion were use of psychotropic medications, and a personal or family history of bipolar disorder. We thus were not able to include the full number of participants in the study as originally envisioned (planned N = 30 per group).

Insert Figure 1 about here

Insert Table 2 about here

Possible relations of covariates to cognitive variables were explored via parametric (Pearson) and nonparametric (Spearman) correlations. As correlations of age, gender, education, race, and immune status (natural log of viral load) with cognitive variables were often substantial and judged to be potentially meaningful confounders, we included them as covariates in mixed effects random intercept models assessing differences in performance before and after training, with or without tDCS and control.

3.1 Acceptability to participants

As hypothesized, participants rated the intervention significantly more positively than the midpoint of the Usefulness subscale of the TAM scale. The mean rating for all participants was 4.33 (SD = 1.27; scale range 0 to 6), and this rating was significantly greater than the neutral midpoint (t [40] = 6.71, $p < 0.001$). We also found that they rated its ease of use positively with a mean rating of 5.04 (SD = 0.95), ratings that were again significantly greater than the scale midpoint (t [43] = 5.04, $p < 0.001$). Ratings suggested that overall, they enjoyed the intervention (mean = 4.73; SD = 1.30) and would use it again if given the opportunity (mean = 4.62; SD = 1.25). Participants' ratings did not vary by treatment group (all ps > 0.35).

On the scale which asked participants to assess the intervention's risks and benefits, participant ratings again suggested a positive evaluation, with a mean rating of 4.53 (SD = 1.20; scale range 0 to 6) on the item "overall the good outweighs the bad" and a rating of 4.70 (SD = 1.01) on the item "overall

satisfaction." Forty-three of 46 participants (93%) indicated they were satisfied with the intervention.

3.2 Cognitive and functional outcomes

Results of evaluations of models with and without interactions of treatment group with time (evaluations) are presented in Table 3.

Insert Table 3 about here

We found mixed evidence across cognitive domains to support the hypothesis that CCT with and without tDCS might result in improvements in cognitive functioning relative to control. For the Digit Span Forward subtest, the interaction of treatment group by time approached statistical significance and represented a large effect size. The difference between active tDCS and the control group (Figure 2) also approached statistical significance (t [61.3] = 2.19, p = 0.08; d = 0.79). Other subtests hypothesized to assess attention showed similar positive but nonsignificant interactions.

Insert Figure 2 about here

Results did not support the hypothesis that persons receiving CCT with or without tDCS would show improved reaction time. Although the observed interactions were in the hypothesized direction, they were not significant and represented at best a very small effect size.

Results again provided limited support for the hypothesis that CCT with tDCS might result in improved psychomotor speed compared to control (Figure 3). Although the overall interaction of group by time was not significant for Trails B, the comparison of the active treatment group to control approached significance (t [67.2] = 2.37, p = 0.053; d = 0.85), a difference that became significant at second follow-up (t [67.2] = 3.03, p = 0.01; d = 1.09).

Insert Figure 3 about here

We found support for the hypothesis of improvement in psychomotor speed with a significant interaction of group by time for the WAIS-IV Coding subtest, although examination of the interaction plot suggests the effect was primarily due to the performance of persons in the CCT with sham tDCS (Figure 4). The between group difference from CCT + sham was not significant at immediate follow-up (t [45.6] = 1.02, p = 0.57; d = 0.37) but approached significance at one-month follow-up (t [45.6] = 2.21, p = 0.08; d = 0.79).

Insert Figure 4 about here

This pattern was again found in results for the HVLT total score, with a significant interaction of group by time resulting from differential improvement in both treatment groups, with significant difference between the CCT + active tDCS group and control at immediate follow-up (t [69.6] = 2.51, p = 0.04; d = 0.90) and a substantial but no longer significant difference at one-month follow-up (t [69.6] = 2.05, p = 0.11; d = 0.73; Figure 5).

Insert Figure 5 about here

Although we did not pose specific hypotheses for the effects of CCT with or without tDCS on executive function for this study, in exploratory analyses we evaluated the intervention's effects on this domain with several measures. A significant interaction of group by time was found for the Stroop with a large effect size, but as with several other measures, the finding was related to substantial improvement in the CCT with sham stimulation group. Other interactions were again positive but nonsignificant, with effect sizes in the moderate range.

As with executive function, we did not propose specific hypotheses for the two functional measures included in the assessments, but explored the intervention's effect on them. Results suggest a moderate but nonsignificant effect size for the MMT with a negligible effect size for the UPSA.

Given the large number of outcomes and our use of effect sizes to evaluate treatment effects, in an unplanned post-hoc analysis, we evaluated the overall impact of the study intervention based on the number of effect sizes for cognitive

variables that were in the hypothesized direction (showing an interaction of group by time favoring one of the active treatment groups). The average effect size was 0.52, with 17 effects equal to or greater than 0.16, a small effect size (Brydges, 2019). The probability of this outcome compared to chance (equal distribution of positive effects across all groups) was significantly different (p = 0.04). It is thus improbable that the observed effects of the intervention were only due to chance. It should be acknowledged, that this analysis included positive effects for either treatment group and did not support the original hypothesis that the effects of CCT with active tDCS would be superior to CCT with sham tDCS.

Self-report outcomes

Evaluations of treatment by time interactions of participant self-report on the PAOF subscales (PAOF Memory, χ^2 [4] = 1.86, p = 0.76, d = 0.41; Cognition subscale, χ^2 [4] = 0.37, p = 0.98, d = 0.18) and the CESD (χ^2 [4] = 3.38, p = 0.50, d = 0.56) did not result suggest substantial between-group differences in response to the intervention. Examination of the interaction plots for the PAOF subscales (not presented) showed that mean scores for all three groups improved to a similar extent over the three evaluations. Participants reported similar levels of depression (CESD) across groups and evaluations, except that participants in the active treatment group reported better mood at the one-month follow-up evaluation. Although the test of between groups differences were not significant, the within-group change from the immediate follow-up to the one-month follow-up for the CCT with active tDCS group approached significance and represented a large effect size (t [78.2] = 2.17, p = 0.08, d = 0.78).

Evaluation of participant ratings of how well they could think and remember resulted in an interaction that again approached statistical significance (χ^2 [10] = 17.47, p = 0.06, d = 1.59). Examination of the interaction plot (Figure 6) suggests that persons in the active treatment group reported better ability to think over the final three training sessions, although between-group differences were not statistically significant (t [106.8] = 1.57, p = 0.26, d = 0.56).

Insert Figure 6 about here

---

4. Discussion

The purpose of this study was to explore the feasibility, acceptability and efficacy of CCT using commercial gaming software with or without tDCS in persons with HIV-related cognitive deficits. Given the limited sample size, our analyses evaluated outcomes by assessing effect sizes and inspecting graphs of covariate-corrected baseline and follow-up performances across groups. Results showed that the majority of participants had positive views of the intervention and believed its benefits outweighed any risks. Ratings of its usefulness and usability were positive.

Our results clearly show that participants found the intervention (as well as the control) acceptable. The majority of ratings on factors such as usefulness and ease of use were positive, and nearly all participants indicated that they felt the benefits

of the intervention outweighed any drawbacks. Further exploration of ways to make the intervention even more positive for persons with HAND appear warranted.

Cognitive testing before and after training suggested the presence of a positive effects of tDCS on learning, memory, and motor speed compared to control. Although only a few outcomes were statistically significant or approached it, those which were significant were associated with large effect sizes. Outcomes with moderate or smaller effect sizes may thus have been nonsignificant due to low power related to the sample size rather than a lack of effect. A post-hoc evaluation of the probability of arriving at the observed set of effect sizes by chance suggested that our findings were not due to chance. Further, effect sizes obtained in this study are similar to those reported by other researchers, including in a meta-analysis of studies with older adults (Indahlastari et al., 2021).

Consistent with other research, the combination of cognitive training and anodal tDCS at the left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex was associated with improvement in attention as measured by digit span (Martin et al., 2013; Park, Seo, Kim, & Ko, 2014; Santos et al., 2018). Contrary to our hypothesis, however, there was no evidence of a substantial impact of the intervention on reaction time. Others have reported that tDCS may have a facilitating effect on reaction time with anodal stimulation over primary motor cortex, but Molero-Chamizo et al. found that the effect was time dependent (Molero-Chamizo et al., 2018). Others have also failed to find an effect of tDCS (Coppens, Staring, Nonnekes, Geurts, & Weerdesteyn, 2019; Seidel & Ragert, 2019) on reaction time. Our hypothesis of an effect on reaction time was based primarily on the nature of the training task (a

fast-paced computer game), but neither statistical tests nor inspection of mean plots by groups (not presented) suggested an effect for either of the active treatment groups.

We found more substantial improvements in measures of psychomotor speed, including a significant interaction of group by time for the WAIS-IV Coding subtest. Although the overall interaction for Trails B was not significant, inspection of group mean plots was consistent with relatively greater improvement on this measure for the two active treatment groups, and post-hoc between groups tests showed a significant difference between the control and CCT + active tDCS group after treatment while none was found at baseline.

A significant effect was also found for the Stroop Color-Word Test, a measure often interpreted as assessing a person's ability to inhibit well-learned responses (Scarpina & Tagini, 2017). Others have observed a positive effect of tDCS on Stroop (Loftus, Yalcin, Baughman, Vanman, & Hagger, 2015; Lu et al., 2021; Perrotta, Bianco, Berchicci, Quinzi, & Perri, 2021), while Frings et al. found that cathodal stimulation of the left DLPFC disrupted Stroop performance (Frings, Brinkmann, Friehs, & van Lipzig, 2018), with the negative effect of cathodal vs anodal stimulation expected.

We found limited support for the impact of the intervention on functional measures, with a moderate effect size but nonsignificant results for the Medication Management Test but no evidence of an effect on the UPSA. This is similar results reported by Vance et al. (2021) who found limited effects of cognitive training on various measures of everyday function.

Self-report measures of mood or subjective cognitive functioning did not differ between groups, with one exception. The failure to find group differences may have been related to self-reported improvements across all groups, including the control. The one exception were self-reports of how well the participant perceived their thinking and memory, for which the CCT + active tDCS group gave substantially more positive reports over the last several sessions of the intervention.

The finding of possible treatment effects later during the training period suggests that the intervention's effects may have continued after training ended, with continuing improvements at one-month follow-up in psychomotor speed (Trail Making Test, Part B; Figure 3) and verbal learning (Hopkins Verbal Learning Test; Figure 5). We also found an improvement in depression self-report (Center for Epidemiological Studies – Depression) at one-month follow-up. This possibly delayed effect of tDCS on mood was also reported by Li (2019). Given the evidence for improvement during the second week of training, it is possible that a more intensive and longer intervention might have resulted in greater effects. This possibility should be explored in future studies.

Strengths of the study include the single-blind sham-controlled design, which was effective in our pilot study as it has been in other studies (A. J. Woods et al., 2016). All baseline and outcome data were collected either by an assessor blind to participants' treatment assignment or by way of computer administration without the presence of researchers, again reducing the likelihood of experimenter bias. We collected information about participants' subjective experience of the

interventions as well; their comments supported objective test results. Our participants were in many respects typical of those who might be expected to benefit from cognitive interventions based on their age, education, and cognitive deficits. Another strength is the clear characterization of study participants with respect to concurrent medication use, although this in turn limited our ability to recruit participants.

Limitations of this study include the small sample size. In spite of intensive recruiting efforts in the local community, including newspaper and online advertising, multiple contacts with community organizations and local infectious disease practitioners, and contacts with participants in previous studies we were not able to recruit the planned number of participants for the study. As shown in Figure 1, we were able to contact a number of potential participants that might have been adequate for planned sample size for the study, but exclusion due to validity concerns related to psychotropic medication use and safety concerns related to history of bipolar disorder, a large number of potential participants were not eligible. This limitation in turn may have affected the ability to test the statistical significance of outcomes, although in several cases when we found large effect sizes, we also found statistically significant results. Generalizing our results based only on observed effect sizes is a limitation. Finally, it should be acknowledged that while we found a number of positive effects on cognitive measures in the two CCT groups, the original hypothesis that CCT with active tDCS would be superior to CCT with sham tDCS was not supported.

Another limitation is that we did not use a true double-blind controlled design. This raises the concern about possible bias caused by the investigators. We took several actions to reduce the likelihood of experimenter effects. These included positioning the investigator and the tDCS device out of sight of the participant during stimulation, providing neutral suggestions about what the participants might experience during stimulation, and collecting most self-report data via computer assisted self-interview with the investigators out of the room. All baseline and follow-up assessments were conducted by an assessor blind to the participant's treatment assignment or by way of a computer without the presence of a researcher. Thus, while we took a number of steps to reduce possible bias in the research design, they did not eliminate it.

Given the importance of cognitive deficits for affected persons' functional status and quality of life as well as lack of effective alternative treatments, these results have potential clinical significance. We found evidence of a moderate though nonsignificant effect of the intervention on a test of medication taking, a critically important skill for persons with HIV infection.

Future research should focus on continuing to explore the potential efficacy of CCT and tDCS with this population. A more detailed exploration of factors such as intensity and duration of stimulation and length and frequency of training sessions as well as the optimal timing of follow-up assessments may yield more effective treatment protocols with greater impacts on participants' functional status.

Funding

This work was supported by a grant from the US National Institutes on Aging to Dr. Ownby (grant R21AG056256).

Figure Captions

Figure 1. CONSORT diagram

Figure 2. WAIS-IV Digit Span Forward subtest score by Group and Time

Figure 3. Trail Making Test, Part B by Group and Time

Figure 3 footnote: Lower scores indicate better performance

Figure 4. WAIS-IV Coding subtest scores by Group and Time

Figure 5. Hopkins Verbal Learning Test total score, Part B by Group and Time

Figure 6. Participants' Self-rated Thinking and Memory by Group and Training Session

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

References

Acharya, J. N., Hani, A., Cheek, J., Thirumala, P., & Tsuchida, T. N. (2016). American Clinical Neurophysiology Society guideline 2: Guidelines for standard electrode position nomenclature. *J. Clin. Neurophysiol, 33*(4), 308-311. doi:10.1097/WNP.0000000000000316 [doi]

Albert, S. M., Weber, C. M., Todak, G., Polanco, C., Clouse, R., McElhiney, M., . . . Marder, K. (1999). An observed performance test of medication management ability in HIV: Relation to neuropsychological status and medication adherence outcomes. *AIDS and Behavior, 3*(2), 121-128. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1025483806464

Anguera, J. A., Boccanfuso, J., Rintoul, J. L., Al-Hashimi, O., Faraji, F., Janowich, J., . . . Gazzaley, A. (2013). Video game training enhances cognitive control in older adults. *Nature, 501*(7465), 97-101. doi:nature12486 [pii];10.1038/nature12486 [doi]

Antinori, A., Arendt, G., Becker, J. T., Brew, B. J., Byrd, D. A., Cherner, M., . . . Wojna, V. E. (2007). Updated research nosology for HIV-associated neurocognitive disorders. *Neurology, 69*(18), 1789-1799. Retrieved from http://www.neurology.org/content/69/18/1789.abstract

Atkinson, M. J., Kumar, R., Cappelleri, J. C., & Hass, S. L. (2005). Hierarchical construct validity of the treatment satisfaction questionnaire for medication (TSQM version II) among outpatient pharmacy consumers. *Value. Health, 8 Suppl 1*, S9-S24. doi:S1098-3015(10)60485-8 [pii];10.1111/j.1524-4733.2005.00066.x [doi]

Atkinson, M. J., Sinha, A., Hass, S. L., Colman, S. S., Kumar, R. N., Brod, M., & Rowland, C. R. (2004). Validation of a general measure of treatment satisfaction, the Treatment Satisfaction Questionnaire for Medication (TSQM), using a national panel study of chronic disease. *Health Qual. Life Outcomes, 2*, 12. doi:10.1186/1477-7525-2-12 [doi];1477-7525-2-12 [pii]

Avdoshina, V., Bachis, A., & Mocchetti, I. (2013). Synaptic dysfunction in human immunodeficiency virus type-1-positive subjects: inflammation or impaired neuronal plasticity? *J. Intern. Med, 273*(5), 454-465. doi:10.1111/joim.12050 [doi]

Bachis, A., Avdoshina, V., Zecca, L., Parsadanian, M., & Mocchetti, I. (2012). Human immunodeficiency virus type 1 alters brain-derived neurotrophic factor processing in neurons. *J. Neurosci, 32*(28), 9477-9484. doi:32/28/9477 [pii];10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0865-12.2012 [doi]

Basak, C., Boot, W. R., Voss, M. W., & Kramer, A. F. (2008). Can training in a real-time strategy video game attenuate cognitive decline in older adults? *Psychol. Aging, 23*(4), 765-777. doi:2008-19072-010 [pii];10.1037/a0013494 [doi]

Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software, 67*(1), 1-48. doi:doi:10.18637/jss.v067.i01.

Bavelier, D., Green, C. S., Han, D. H., Renshaw, P. F., Merzenich, M. M., & Gentile, D. A. (2011). Brains on video games. *Nat. Rev Neurosci, 12*(12), 763-768. doi:nrn3135 [pii];10.1038/nrn3135 [doi]

Bechara, A., Damasio, H., Tranel, D., & Damasio, A. R. (2005). The Iowa Gambling Task and the somatic marker hypothesis: some questions and answers. *Trends Cogn Sci, 9*(4), 159-162. doi:S1364-6613(05)00033-1 [pii];10.1016/j.tics.2005.02.002 [doi]

Belchior, P., Marsiske, M., Leite, W. L., Yam, A., Thomas, K., & Mann, W. (2016). Older adults' engagement during an intervention involving off-the-shelf videogame. *Games. Health J, 5*(3), 151-156. doi:10.1089/g4h.2015.0049 [doi]

Belchior, P., Marsiske, M., Sisco, S., Yam, A., & Mann, W. (2012). Older adults' engagement with a video game training program. *Act. Adapt. Aging, 36*(4), 269-279. doi:10.1080/01924788.2012.702307 [doi]

Benedict, R. B., Schretlen, D., Groninger, L., Dobraski, M., & Sphritz, B. (1996). Revision of the Brief Visuospatial Memory Test: Studies of normal performance, reliability and validity. *Psychological Assessment, 8*, 145-153. doi: https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.8.2.145

Binyamin, S. S., & Zafar, B. A. (2021). Proposing a mobile apps acceptance model for users in the health area: A systematic literature review and meta-analysis. *Health Informatics Journal, 27*(1), 1460458220976737. doi:10.1177/1460458220976737

Bonnechère, B., Langley, C., & Sahakian, B. J. (2020). The use of commercial computerised cognitive games in older adults: a meta-analysis. *Scientific Reports, 10*(1), 15276. doi:10.1038/s41598-020-72281-3

Brandt, J., & Benedickt, R. H. (2001). *Hopkins Verbal Learning Test--Revised: Professional manual*. Odessa FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Brunoni, A. R., Valiengo, L., Baccaro, A., Zanao, T. A., de Oliveira, J. F., Goulart, A., . . . Fregni, F. (2013). The sertraline vs. electrical current therapy for treating depression clinical study: results from a factorial, randomized, controlled trial. *JAMA Psychiatry, 70*(4), 383-391. doi:1568955 [pii];10.1001/2013.jamapsychiatry.32 [doi]

Brydges, C. R. (2019). Effect size guidelines, sample size calculations, and statistical power in gerontology. *Innovation in Aging, 3*(4). doi:10.1093/geroni/igz036

Buchman, A. S., Yu, L., Boyle, P. A., Schneider, J. A., De Jager, P. L., & Bennett, D. A. (2016). Higher brain BDNF gene expression is associated with slower cognitive decline in older adults. *Neurology, 86*(8), 735-741. doi:WNL.0000000000002387 [pii];10.1212/WNL.0000000000002387 [doi]

Cardoso-Leite, P., & Bavelier, D. (2014). Video game play, attention, and learning: how to shape the development of attention and influence learning? *Curr Opin Neurol, 27*(2), 185-191. doi:10.1097/WCO.0000000000000077

Cerruti, C., & Schlaug, G. (2009). Anodal transcranial direct current stimulation of the prefrontal cortex enhances complex verbal associative thought. *J. Cogn Neurosci, 21*(10), 1980-1987. doi:10.1162/jocn.2008.21143 [doi]

Chelune, G. J., Heaton, R. K., & Lehman, R. A. W. (1986). Neuropsychological and personality correlates of patients' complaints of disability. In G. Goldstein & R. E. Tarter (Eds.), *Advances in clinical neuropsychology, Vol. 3* (pp. 95-126). New York: Springer. (Reprinted from: Not in File).

Clark, V. P., Coffman, B. A., Mayer, A. R., Weisend, M. P., Lane, T. D., Calhoun, V. D., . . . Wassermann, E. M. (2012). TDCS guided using fMRI significantly accelerates learning to identify concealed objects. *Neuroimage, 59*(1), 117-128. doi:S1053-8119(10)01466-7 [pii];10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.11.036 [doi]

Cody, S. L., & Vance, D. E. (2016). The neurobiology of HIV and its impact on cognitive reserve: A review of cognitive interventions for an aging population. *Neurobiol. Dis, 92*(Pt B), 144-156. doi:S0969-9961(16)30011-0 [pii];10.1016/j.nbd.2016.01.011 [doi]

Coffman, B. A., Trumbo, M. C., & Clark, V. P. (2012). Enhancement of object detection with transcranial direct current stimulation is associated with increased attention. *BMC Neurosci, 13*, 108. doi:1471-2202-13-108 [pii];10.1186/1471-2202-13-108 [doi]

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.)*. New York: Routledge.

Coppens, M. J. M., Staring, W. H. A., Nonnekes, J., Geurts, A. C. H., & Weerdesteyn, V. (2019). Offline effects of transcranial direct current stimulation on reaction times of lower extremity movements in people after stroke: a pilot cross-over study. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation, 16*(1), 136. doi:10.1186/s12984-019-0604-y

Decloedt, E. H., Freeman, C., Howells, F., Casson-Crook, M., Lesosky, M., Koutsilieri, E., . . . Joska, J. A. (2016). Moderate to severe HIV-associated neurocognitive impairment: A randomized placebo-controlled trial of lithium. *Medicine (Baltimore), 95*(46), e5401. doi:10.1097/MD.0000000000005401

Degroote, S., Vogelaers, D., & Vandijck, D. M. (2014). What determines health-related quality of life among people living with HIV: an updated review of the literature. *Arch. Public Health, 72*(1), 40. doi:10.1186/2049-3258-72-40 [doi];5055 [pii]

Degroote, S., Vogelaers, D. P., Vermeir, P., Mariman, A., De, R. A., Van Der Gucht, B., . . . Vandijck, D. M. (2013). Socio-economic, behavioural, (neuro)psychological and

clinical determinants of HRQoL in people living with HIV in Belgium: a pilot study. *J. Int. AIDS Soc, 16*, 18643. doi:18643 [pii]

Delis, D. C., Kaplan, E., & Kramer, J. H. (2001). *Delis-Kaplan Executive Function System (D-KEFS)*. San Antonio TX: The Psychological Corporation.

European AIDS Clinical Society. (2015). *Guidelines 8.0*. Brussels: European AIDS Clinical Society.

Floel, A., Suttorp, W., Kohl, O., Kurten, J., Lohmann, H., Breitenstein, C., & Knecht, S. (2012). Non-invasive brain stimulation improves object-location learning in the elderly. *Neurobiol. Aging, 33*(8), 1682-1689. doi:S0197-4580(11)00176-X [pii];10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2011.05.007 [doi]

Fregni, F., Boggio, P. S., Nitsche, M., Bermpohl, F., Antal, A., Feredoes, E., . . . Pascual-Leone, A. (2005). Anodal transcranial direct current stimulation of prefrontal cortex enhances working memory. *Exp. Brain Res, 166*(1), 23-30. doi:10.1007/s00221-005-2334-6 [doi]

Frings, C., Brinkmann, T., Friehs, M. A., & van Lipzig, T. (2018). Single session tDCS over the left DLPFC disrupts interference processing. *Brain Cogn, 120*, 1-7. doi:10.1016/j.bandc.2017.11.005

Fritsch, B., Reis, J., Martinowich, K., Schambra, H. M., Ji, Y., & Cohen, L. G. (2010). Direct current stimulation promotes BDNF-dependent synaptic plasticity: potential implications for motor learning. *Neuron, 66*. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2010.03.035

Galvez, V., Alonzo, A., Martin, D., Mitchell, P. B., Sachdev, P., & Loo, C. K. (2011). Hypomania induction in a patient with bipolar II disorder by transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS). *J. ECT, 27*(3), 256-258. doi:10.1097/YCT.0b013e3182012b89 [doi]

Golden, C. J. (1978). *Stroop Color Word Test*. Chicago: Stoelting.

Green, C. S., & Seitz, A. R. (2015). The impacts of video games on cognition (and how the government can guide the industry). *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 2*(1), 101-110.

Heaton, R. K., Clifford, D. B., Franklin, D. R., Jr., Woods, S. P., Ake, C., Vaida, F., . . . Grant, I. (2010). HIV-associated neurocognitive disorders persist in the era of potent antiretroviral therapy: CHARTER Study. *Neurology, 75*(23), 2087-2096. doi:75/23/2087 [pii];10.1212/WNL.0b013e318200d727 [doi]

Heimrath, K., Sandmann, P., Becke, A., Muller, N. G., & Zaehle, T. (2012). Behavioral and electrophysiological effects of transcranial direct current stimulation of the parietal cortex in a visuo-spatial working memory task. *Front Psychiatry, 3*, 56. doi:10.3389/fpsyt.2012.00056 [doi]

Hinkin, C. H., Castellon, S. A., Durvasula, R. S., Hardy, D. J., Lam, M. N., Mason, K. I., . . . Stefaniak, M. (2002). Medication adherence among HIV+ adults: effects of cognitive dysfunction and regimen complexity. *Neurology, 59*(12), 1944-1950. Retrieved from http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12499488

Hinkin, C. H., Castellon, S. A., Hardy, D. J., Farinpour, R., Newton, T., & Singer, E. (2001). Methylphenidate improves HIV-1-associated cognitive slowing. *J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci, 13*(2), 248-254. doi:10.1176/jnp.13.2.248 [doi]

Hinkin, C. H., Hardy, D. J., Mason, K. I., Castellon, S. A., Durvasula, R. S., Lam, M. N., & Stefaniak, M. (2004). Medication adherence in HIV-infected adults: effect of patient age, cognitive status, and substance abuse. *AIDS, 18 Suppl 1*, S19-25. doi:10.1097/00002030-200418001-00004

Hintze, J. (2018). *PASS 16*. Kaysville UT: NCSS, LLC.

Indahlastari, A., Hardcastle, C., Albizu, A., Alvarez-Alvarado, S., Boutzoukas, E. M., Evangelista, N. D., . . . Woods, A. J. (2021). A systematic review and meta-analysis of transcranial direct current stimulation to remediate age-related cognitive decline in healthy older adults. *Neuropsychiatr Dis Treat, 17*, 971-990. doi:10.2147/NDT.S259499

Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoff, P. B., & Christensen, R. H. B. (2017). lmerTest package: Tests in linear mixed effects models. *Journal of Statistical Software, 82*, 1-26. doi:10.18637/jss.v082.i13

Lafayette Instrument Company. (2002). *Grooved Pegboard Test user instructions*. Lafayette IN: Lafayette Instrument Company.

Lawrence, B. J., Gasson, N., Bucks, R. S., Troeung, L., & Loftus, A. M. (2017). Cognitive training and noninvasive brain stimulation for cognition in Parkinson's disease: A meta-analysis. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair, 31*(7), 597-608. doi:10.1177/1545968317712468

Lawrence, B. J., Gasson, N., Johnson, A. R., Booth, L., & Loftus, A. M. (2018). Cognitive training and transcranial direct current stimulation for mild cognitive impairment in Parkinson's Disease: A randomized controlled trial. *Parkinson's Disease, 2018*, 4318475. doi:10.1155/2018/4318475

Lenth, R. (2020). Estimated marginal means, aka least-squares means. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=emmeans

Leshikar, E. D., Leach, R. C., McCurdy, M. P., Trumbo, M. C., Sklenar, A. M., Frankenstein, A. N., & Matzen, L. E. (2017). Transcranial direct current stimulation of dorsolateral prefrontal cortex during encoding improves recall but not recognition memory. *Neuropsychologia, 106*, 390-397. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2017.10.022

Lezak, M. (2004). *Neuropsychological assessment, Fifth edition.* New York: Oxford.

Li, M.-S., Du, X.-D., Chu, H.-C., Liao, Y.-Y., Pan, W., Li, Z., & Hung, G. C.-L. (2019). Delayed effect of bifrontal transcranial direct current stimulation in patients with treatment-resistant depression: a pilot study. *BMC Psychiatry, 19*(1), 180. doi:10.1186/s12888-019-2119-2

Loftus, A. M., Yalcin, O., Baughman, F. D., Vanman, E. J., & Hagger, M. S. (2015). The impact of transcranial direct current stimulation on inhibitory control in young adults. *Brain Behav, 5*(5), e00332. doi:10.1002/brb3.332

Lu, H., Gong, Y., Huang, P., Zhang, Y., Guo, Z., Zhu, X., & You, X. (2021). Effect of repeated anodal HD-tDCS on executive functions: Evidence from a pilot and single-blinded fNIRS study. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 14*(609). doi:10.3389/fnhum.2020.583730

Ludecke, D. (2019). Effect size computation for meta analysis. Vienna, Austria: R Core Team. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=esc

Martin, D. M., Liu, R., Alonzo, A., Green, M., & Loo, C. K. (2014). Use of transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) to enhance cognitive training: effect of timing of stimulation. *Exp. Brain Res, 232*(10), 3345-3351. doi:10.1007/s00221-014-4022-x [doi]

Martin, D. M., Liu, R., Alonzo, A., Green, M., Player, M. J., Sachdev, P., & Loo, C. K. (2013). Can transcranial direct current stimulation enhance outcomes from cognitive training? A randomized controlled trial in healthy participants. *Int. J. Neuropsychopharmacol, 16*(9), 1927-1936. doi:S1461145713000539 [pii];10.1017/S1461145713000539 [doi]

McLaren, M. E., Nissim, N. R., & Woods, A. J. (2018). The effects of medication use in transcranial direct current stimulation: A brief review. *Brain Stimulation: Basic, Translational, and Clinical Research in Neuromodulation, 11*(1), 52-58. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2017.10.006

Medeiros, L. F., de Souza, I. C., Vidor, L. P., de Souza, A., Deitos, A., Volz, M. S., . . . Torres, I. L. (2012). Neurobiological effects of transcranial direct current stimulation: A review. *Frontiers in Psychiatry, 3*(110). doi:10.3389/fpsyt.2012.00110

Miller, E. N. (2013). *California Computerized Assessment Package Manual, 2nd ed.* Palm Springs, CA: Eric N. Miller.

Moher, D. (1998). CONSORT: an evolving tool to help improve the quality of reports of randomized controlled trials. Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials. *JAMA, 279*(18), 1489-1491. doi:10.1001/jama.279.18.1489

Molero-Chamizo, A., Alameda Bailén, J. R., Garrido Béjar, T., García López, M., Jaén Rodríguez, I., Gutiérrez Lérida, C., . . . Rivera-Urbina, G. N. (2018). Poststimulation time interval-dependent effects of motor cortex anodal tDCS on reaction-time task performance. *Cogn Affect Behav Neurosci, 18*(1), 167-175. doi:10.3758/s13415-018-0561-0

Moore, R. C., Fazeli, P. L., Jeste, D. V., Moore, D. J., Grant, I., & Woods, S. P. (2014). Successful cognitive aging and health-related quality of life in younger and older adults infected with HIV. *AIDS Behav, 18*(6), 1186-1197. doi:10.1007/s10461-014-0743-x [doi]

Nakasujja, N., Miyahara, S., Evans, S., Lee, A., Musisi, S., Katabira, E., . . . Sacktor, N. (2013). Randomized trial of minocycline in the treatment of HIV-associated cognitive impairment. *Neurology, 80*(2), 196-202. doi:10.1212/WNL.0b013e31827b9121

Ownby, R. L., & Acevedo, A. (2016). A pilot study of cognitive training with and without transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) to improve cognition in older persons with HIV-related cognitive impairment. *Neuropsychiatr Dis Treat, 12*, 2745-2754. doi:https://doi.org/10.2147/NDT.S120282

Park, S.-H., Seo, J.-H., Kim, Y.-H., & Ko, M.-H. (2014). Long-term effects of transcranial direct current stimulation combined with computer-assisted cognitive training in healthy older adults. *Neuroreport, 25*. doi:10.1097/wnr.0000000000000080

Patterson, T. L., Goldman, S., McKibbin, C. L., Hughs, T., & Jeste, D. V. (2001). UCSD Performance-Based Skills Assessment: development of a new measure of everyday functioning for severely mentally ill adults. *Schizophr Bull, 27*(2), 235-245. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.schbul.a006870

Perrotta, D., Bianco, V., Berchicci, M., Quinzi, F., & Perri, R. L. (2021). Anodal tDCS over the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex reduces Stroop errors. A comparison of different tasks and designs. *Behavioural Brain Research, 405*, 113215. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2021.113215

R Core Team. (2020). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R foundation for statistical computing.

Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 1*, 385-481.

Rourke, S. B., Halman, M. H., & Bassel, C. (1999). Neurocognitive complaints in HIV-infection and their relationship to depressive symptoms and neuropsychological functioning. *J. Clin. Exp. Neuropsychol, 21*(6), 737-756. doi:10.1076/jcen.21.6.737.863 [doi]

Sacktor, N., Miyahara, S., Deng, L., Evans, S., Schifitto, G., Cohen, B. A., . . . team, A. A. (2011). Minocycline treatment for HIV-associated cognitive impairment: results from a randomized trial. *Neurology, 77*(12), 1135-1142. doi:10.1212/WNL.0b013e31822f0412

Santos, V. S. d. S. d., Zortea, M., Alves, R. L., Naziazeno, C. C. d. S., Saldanha, J. S., Carvalho, S. d. C. R. d., . . . Caumo, W. (2018). Cognitive effects of transcranial direct current stimulation combined with working memory training in fibromyalgia: a

randomized clinical trial. *Scientific Reports, 8*(1), 12477. doi:10.1038/s41598-018-30127-z

Scarpina, F., & Tagini, S. (2017). The Stroop Color and Word Test. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*(557). doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00557

Schifitto, G., Navia, B. A., Yiannoutsos, C. T., Marra, C. M., Chang, L., Ernst, T., . . . Lipton, S. A. (2007). Memantine and HIV-associated cognitive impairment: a neuropsychological and proton magnetic resonance spectroscopy study. *AIDS, 21*(14), 1877-1886. doi:10.1097/QAD.0b013e32813384e8 [doi];00002030-200709120-00007 [pii]

Schifitto, G., Yiannoutsos, C. T., Ernst, T., Navia, B. A., Nath, A., Sacktor, N., . . . Clifford, D. B. (2009). Selegiline and oxidative stress in HIV-associated cognitive impairment. *Neurology, 73*(23), 1975-1981. doi:WNL.0b013e3181c51a48 [pii];10.1212/WNL.0b013e3181c51a48 [doi]

Seidel, O., & Ragert, P. (2019). Effects of transcranial direct current stimulation of primary motor cortex on reaction time and tapping performance: A comparison between athletes and non-athletes. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 13*(103). doi:10.3389/fnhum.2019.00103

Thames, A. D., Arentoft, A., Rivera-Mindt, M., & Hinkin, C. H. (2013). Functional disability in medication management and driving among individuals with HIV: a 1-year follow-up study. *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol, 35*(1), 49-58. doi:10.1080/13803395.2012.747596

Thames, A. D., Becker, B. W., Marcotte, T. D., Hines, L. J., Foley, J. M., Ramezani, A., . . . Hinkin, C. H. (2011). Depression, cognition, and self-appraisal of functional abilities in HIV: An examination of subjective appraisal aersus objective performance. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist, 25*(2), 224-243. doi:10.1080/13854046.2010.539577

Thames, A. D., Kim, M. S., Becker, B. W., Foley, J. M., Hines, L. J., Singer, E. J., . . . Hinkin, C. H. (2011). Medication and finance management among HIV-infected adults: The impact of age and cognition. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology, 33*(2), 200-209. doi:10.1080/13803395.2010.499357

Tozzi, V., Balestra, P., Galgani, S., Murri, R., Bellagamba, R., Narciso, P., . . . Wu, A. W. (2003). Neurocognitive performance and quality of life in patients with HIV infection. *AIDS Res. Hum. Retroviruses, 19*(8), 643-652. doi:10.1089/088922203322280856 [doi]

Trumbo, M. C., Matzen, L. E., Coffman, B. A., Hunter, M. A., Jones, A. P., Robinson, C. S. H., & Clark, V. P. (2016). Enhanced working memory performance via transcranial direct current stimulation: The possibility of near and far transfer. *Neuropsychologia, 93*(Pt A), 85-96. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2016.10.011

Valcour, V., Shikuma, C., Shiramizu, B., Watters, M., Poff, P., Selnes, O., . . . Sacktor, N. (2004). Higher frequency of dementia in older HIV-1 individuals: the Hawaii Aging with HIV-1 Cohort. *Neurology, 63*(5), 822-827. doi:63/5/822 [pii]

Vance, D. E., Fazeli, P., Azuero, A., Frank, J. S., Wadley, V. G., Raper, J. L., . . . Ball, K. (2021). Can individualized-targeted computerized cognitive training improve everyday functioning in adults with HIV-associated neurocognitive disorder? *Applied Neuropsychology: Adult*, 1-12. doi:10.1080/23279095.2021.1906678

Vance, D. E., Fazeli, P. L., Ross, L. A., Wadley, V. G., & Ball, K. K. (2012). Speed of processing training with middle-age and older adults with HIV: a pilot study. *J. Assoc. Nurses AIDS Care, 23*(6), 500-510. doi:S1055-3290(12)00008-8 [pii];10.1016/j.jana.2012.01.005 [doi]

Venkatesh, V., & Bala, H. (2008). Technology Acceptance Model 3 and a research agenda on interventions. *Decision Sciences, 39*(2), 273-315. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5915.2008.00192.x

Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *MIS Quarterly, 27*(3), 425-478. doi:10.2307/30036540

Watkins, C. C., & Treisman, G. J. (2015). Cognitive impairment in patients with AIDS--Prevalence and severity. *HIV AIDS (Auckl.), 7*, 35-47. doi:10.2147/HIV.S39665 [doi];hiv-7-035 [pii]

Wechsler, D. (2001). *The Wechsler Test of Adult Reading*. San Antonio: The Psychological Corporation.

Wechsler, D. (2008). *Manual for the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale--IV.* San Antonio TX: Pearson Assessment.

Wendelken, L. A., & Valcour, V. (2012). Impact of HIV and aging on neuropsychological function. *J Neurovirol, 18*(4), 256-263. doi:10.1007/s13365-012-0094-1 [doi]

Woods, A. J., Antal, A., Bikson, M., Boggio, P. S., Brunoni, A. R., Celnik, P., . . . Nitsche, M. A. (2016). A technical guide to tDCS, and related non-invasive brain stimulation tools. *Clin Neurophysiol, 127*(2), 1031-1048. doi:S1388-2457(15)01088-3 [pii];10.1016/j.clinph.2015.11.012 [doi]

Woods, S. P., Moore, D. J., Weber, E., & Grant, I. (2009). Cognitive neuropsychology of HIV-associated neurocognitive disorders. *Neuropsychol. Rev, 19*(2), 152-168. doi:10.1007/s11065-009-9102-5 [doi]

Wu, S., & Spence, I. (2013). Playing shooter and driving videogames improves top-down guidance in visual search. *Atten. Percept. Psychophys, 75*(4), 673-686. doi:10.3758/s13414-013-0440-2 [doi]

Zaehle, T., Sandmann, P., Thorne, J. D., Jancke, L., & Herrmann, C. S. (2011). Transcranial direct current stimulation of the prefrontal cortex modulates working memory performance: combined behavioural and electrophysiological evidence. *BMC Neurosci, 12*, 2. doi:1471-2202-12-2 [pii];10.1186/1471-2202-12-2 [doi]

Zelinski, E. M., & Reyes, R. (2009). Cognitive benefits of computer games for older adults. *Gerontechnology, 8*(4), 220-235. Retrieved from http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25126043

Table 1. Cognitive and Functional Measures Used

Domain	Measure
Reaction Time	*California Computerized Assessment Package (CalCap*) [66]
Attention	**Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, 4th Ed.,* Digit Span subtest [99]
	Wechsler Memory Scale, 4th ed., Symbol Span subtest *[101]*
Psychomotor Speed	**Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale,* 4th ed., Coding subtest [100]
	*Trail Making Test, Part A [78]
	*Grooved Pegboard [51]
Other measures included for exploratory purposes	
Premorbid function	Wechsler Test of Adult Reading [98]
Executive function	*Trail Making Test, Part B [78]
	*Verbal and Design Fluency from D-KEFS [36]
	Stroop Color Word Test [42]
	Iowa Gambling Task [12]
Learning and Memory	*Hopkins Verbal Learning Test – Revised [15]
	*Brief Visuospatial Memory Test – Revised [16]
Functional Status	Medication Management Test – Revised [2]
	University of California San Diego Performance-based Skills Assessment [74, 70]
**Note:* Measures used to establish eligibility are marked with an asterisk.	

Table 2. Baseline characteristics of treatment groups

	Active + CT (n =16)		Sham + CT (n = 15)		Control (n = 15)	
Gender	13 Men, 3 Women		13 Men, 2 Women		11 Men, 4 Women	
Race	5 White, 11 Black		7 White, 8 Black		5 White, 10 Black	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Age (years)	57.06	4.99	58.80	4.13	61.07	6.28
Education (years)	11.94	3.45	14.00	3.59	13.33	3.39
WTAR VIQ[a]	96.75	14.56	102.40	16.10	95.93	14.84
WAIS-IV Forward[b]	8.31	1.66	9.67	2.13	8.27	2.22
WAIS-IV Backward	6.56	1.55	7.53	2.75	7.00	1.93
WAIS-IV Sequence	7.44	1.97	7.73	2.69	6.93	1.98
WAIS-IV Total	22.31	3.96	24.93	6.75	22.2	4.92
WMS-IV Symbol Span	16.13	5.10	16.07	7.42	12.53	4.05
Simple Reaction Time (ms)	638.31	123.37	620.87	127.66	653.84	122.89
Choice Reaction Time (ms)	538.63	99.33	523.33	90.75	542.64	122.29
HVLT Total	21.69	3.16	20.40	5.90	19.53	3.83
HVLT Delayed	6.81	2.56	6.47	2.48	5.60	2.50
BVMT Total	14.50	4.66	15.13	8.63	11.80	6.93
BVMT Delayed	6.38	2.78	6.40	3.46	4.53	3.44
Trails A	42.81	16.37	43.93	20.10	46.20	11.01
Trails B	98.88	33.40	117.53	40.20	117.73	37.45
Pegs R	99.50	22.96	94.73	21.35	101.47	23.05
WAIS-IV Coding	48.94	9.28	51.67	13.70	46.07	15.52
Stroop	29.69	6.98	32.27	9.66	24.80	9.87
IGT	-6.67	22.84	7.73	26.70	-4.67	29.51
MMT	11.94	2.59	13.53	3.56	11.53	4.53

UPSA	79.75	10.71	80.20	16.40	76.73	13.72

[a]WTAR VIQ = Wechsler Test of Adult Reading estimated verbal IQ;
[b]WAIS-IV Forward = Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, 4th Ed (WAIS-IV) Digit Span Forward subtest; WAIS-IV Backward = WAIS-IV Digit Span Backward subtest; WAIS-IV Sequence = WAIS-IV Sequencing subtest; WAIS-IV Total = WAIS-IV Digit Span total of three subtests; WMS-IV Symbol = Wechsler Memory Scale, 4th ed, Symbol Span subtest; Simple Reaction Time = California Computerized Assessment Package Simple Reaction task; Choice Reaction Time = California Computerized Assessment Package Choice Reaction task; HVLT Total = Hopkins Verbal Learning Test total score; HVLT Delayed = Hopkins Verbal Learning Test delayed recall score; BVMT Total = Brief Visuospatial Memory Test--Revised total score; BVMT Delayed = Brief Visuospatial Memory Test--Revised delayed recall score; Trails A = Trail Making Test, Part A; Trails B = Trail Making Test, Part B; Pegs R = Grooved Pegboard, right hand performance; WAIS-IV Coding = WAIS-IV Coding subtest; Stroop = Stroop Color-Word test score; IGT = Iowa Gambling Task Net Total score; Verbal Fluency = DKEFS Category Fluency subtest; Design Fluence = DKEFS Design Fluency subtest; MMT = Medication Management Test—Revised score; UPSA Total = UCSD Performance-Based Skills Assessment; subtest.

Table 3. Likelihood ratio test and effect sizes for the interaction of group by time

	χ^2	df	*p*	*d*
WAIS-IV Forward[a]	9.03	4	***0.06***	0.99
WAIS-IV Backward	2.56	4	0.82	0.38
WAIS-IV Sequence	4.06	4	0.40	0.62
WAIS-IV Total	6.55	4	0.16	0.82
WMS-IV Symbol Span	2.79	4	0.59	0.51
Simple Reaction Time	0.19	4	0.66	0.13
Choice Reaction Time	0.29	4	0.59	0.16
Trails A	1.14	4	0.89	0.32
Trails B	3.85	4	0.43	0.60
Pegs R[b]	4.54	4	0.34	(0.66)
WAIS-IV Coding	11.80	4	***0.02***	1.17
HVLT Total	4.37	4	0.36	0.65
HVLT Delayed	2.13	4	0.71	0.44
BVMT Total (note)	6.86	4	0.14	0.84
BVMT Delayed	0.81	4	0.94	0.27
Stroop	9.64	4	***0.046***	1.03
IGT Net Total	5.34	4	0.25	0.73
Verbal Fluency	5.84	4	0.21	0.76
Design Fluency	5.94	4	0.20	0.77
MMT	2.30	4	0.68	0.46
UPSA Total	2.40	4	0.66	0.02

[a]WAIS-IV Forward = Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, 4th Ed (WAIS-IV) Digit Span Forward subtest; WAIS-IV Backward = WAIS-IV Digit Span Backward subtest; WAIS-IV Sequence = WAIS-IV Sequencing subtest; WAIS-IV Total = WAIS-IV Digit Span total of three subtests; WMS-IV Symbol = Wechsler Memory Scale, 4th ed, Symbol Span subtest; Simple Reaction Time = California Computerized Assessment Package Simple Reaction task; Choice Reaction Time = California Computerized Assessment Package Choice Reaction task; HVLT Total = Hopkins Verbal Learning Test total score; HVLT Delayed = Hopkins Verbal Learning Test delayed recall score; BVMT Total = Brief Visuospatial Memory Test--Revised total score; BVMT Delayed = Brief Visuospatial Memory Test--Revised delayed recall score; Trails A = Trail Making Test, Part A; Trails B = Trail Making Test, Part B; Pegs R = Grooved Pegboard, right hand performance; WAIS-IV Coding = WAIS-IV Coding subtest; Stroop = Stroop Color-Word test score; IGT = Iowa Gambling Task Net Total score; Verbal Fluency = DKEFS Category Fluency subtest; Design Fluence = DKEFS Design Fluency subtest; MMT = Medication Management Test—Revised score; UPSA Total = UCSD Performance-Based Skills Assessment; subtest.


Enrollment
Screened by Telephone
(n = 155)
Excluded (n = 95; medications = 38; bipolar disorder = 21; left handed = 16; family history of bipolar disorder = 13; seizure disorder = 6; loss of consciousness = 5; no cognitive complaints = 4; several had multiple reasons for exclusion)
Assessed for Eligiblity (n = 60)
Excluded (n = 14; chose not to participate = 9; did not meet entry criteria = 5)
Allocation
Randomization (n = 46)
Active
Allocated (n = 16)
Received (n = 16)
Sham
Allocated n = 15
Received n = 15
Control
Allocated n = 15
Received n = 15
Follow-Ups
Lost to Follow-Up
(n = 1)
Discontinued
Intervention
(n = 1)
Lost to Follow-Up
(n = 0)
Lost to Follow-Up
n = 0
Lost to Follow-Up
n = 0
Lost to Follow-Up
n = 0
Analysis
Analyzed (n = 15)
Analyzed (n = 14)
Analyzed (n = 15)


Active tDCS
Sham tDCS
Control
10.0
9.5
9.0
8.5
WAIS Digit Span Forward
Baseline
Follow-up 1
Follow-up 2
Evaluations


Trails B (s)
110
100
90
80
70
Active tDCS
Sham tDCS
Control
Baseline
Follow-up 1
Follow-up 2
Evaluations


65
60
55
50
WAIS Coding
Active tDCS
Sham tDCS
Control
Baseline
Follow-up 1
Follow-up 2
Evaluations


Active tDCS
Sham tDCS
Control
28
26
24
22
HVLT Total
Baseline
Follow-up 1
Follow-up 2
Evaluations


Active tDCS
Sham tDCS
Control
3.4
3.2
3.0
2.8
2.6
2.4
Thinking
1
2
3
4
5
6
Training Sessions