medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299059; this version posted December 4, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Title:

Home-based transcranial direct current stimulation RCT in major depression

Authors:

Rachel D. Woodham, M.Sc. [a], Sudhakar Selvaraj, M.B.B.S., D.Phil. [b, c], Nahed Lajmi, M.Sc. [a], Harriet Hobday, M.Sc. [a], Gabrielle Sheehan, M.Sc. [a], Ali-Reza Ghazi-Noori, M.Sc. [a], Peter J. Lagerberg, M.Sc. [a], Maheen Rizvi, B.Sc. [b], Sarah S. Kwon, B.Sc. [b], Paulette Orhii, B.Sc. [b], David Maislin [d], Lucia Hernandez, Ph.D. [d], Rodrigo Machado-Vieira, M.D., Ph.D. [b], Jair C. Soares, M.D., Ph.D. [b], Allan H. Young MB, ChB., Ph.D. [e, f, g], Cynthia H.Y. Fu, M.D., Ph.D. [a, e]

Affiliations:

a) School of Psychology, University of East London, London, UK
b) Center of Excellence on Mood Disorders, Faillace Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, McGovern Medical School, University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston, Houston, TX, USA
c) Intra-Cellular Therapies Inc., USA
d) Biomedical Statistical Consulting, Philadelphia, PA, USA
e) Centre for Affective Disorders, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK
f) National Institute for Health Research Biomedical Research Centre at South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, King's College London, London, UK
g) South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, Bethlem Royal Hospital, Beckenham, UK

Author for correspondence:

Professor CHY Fu, University of East London, School of Psychology, Arthur Edwards Building, Water Lane, London E15 4LZ, UK

Tel: +44 (0)208 223 4119, Email: c.fu@uel.ac.uk, cynthia.fu@kcl.ac.uk

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299059; this version posted December 4, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Background

Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) has been proposed as a novel treatment in major depressive disorder (MDD). However, efficacy and safety of home-based tDCS treatment have not been investigated.

Methods

Fully remote, multisite, double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized superiority trial of home-based tDCS treatment in MDD was conducted in UK and USA. Participants were adults 18 years or older, having MDD diagnosis based on DSM-5 criteria, in current depressive episode of at least moderate severity, measured by score >=16 on 17-item Hamilton Depression Rating Scale (HDRS), without treatment resistant depression history. Protocol was 10-week blinded phase: 5 tDCS sessions per week for 3 weeks then 3 sessions per week for 7 weeks; followed by 10-week open label phase. tDCS montage was bifrontal, 30-minute sessions, active tDCS 2 mA, and sham tDCS 0 mA with brief ramp up and down to mimic active device. Primary outcome was HDRS change at week 10 in modified intention-to-treat analysis.

Results

174 MDD participants were randomized: active (n=87; mean age 37.1 $\pm$ 11.1 years) and sham (n=87; mean age 38.3 $\pm$ 10.9 years) treatment. Significant improvement in HDRS was observed in active (9.4 $\pm$ 6.25 points) relative to sham treatment (7.1 $\pm$ 6.10 points) (95% CI 0.5 to 4.0, p = 0.012), with no differences in discontinuation rates between active (n=13) and sham (n=12).

Conclusions

Home-based tDCS with remote supervision is a potential first line treatment for MDD that is acceptable and safe. Consideration of continuing effective safety monitoring is required.

Trial registration number

NCT05202119

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299059; this version posted December 4, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Major depressive disorder (MDD) is common, is the leading cause of disability worldwide, and the most significant precursor in suicide.[1] First line treatments are antidepressant medications and psychotherapy. However, a lack of remission is observed in over a third of MDD individuals to antidepressant medication as well as psychotherapy despite full treatment trials.[2,3]

Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) is a form of non-invasive brain stimulation that applies a weak (0.5-2 mA) direct current via scalp electrodes.[4] tDCS modulates cortical tissue excitability but does not directly trigger action potential in neuronal cells in contrast to repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS).[5] tDCS is applied through a flexible cap or band worn over the forehead. The anode electrode is typically placed over left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC) and cathode over right DLPFC, suborbital or frontotemporal region.[5] An individual patient data meta-analysis reported significantly greater clinical response (30.9% vs. 18.9%; number needed to treat (NNT) 9) and remission (19.9% vs. 11.7%; NNT 13) for active relative to sham tDCS. [6] tDCS is safe and well tolerated with no significant differences in attrition and adverse events between active and sham stimulation groups.[4] However, a course of tDCS treatment requires daily sessions for several weeks.[5,6] As it is portable and safe, tDCS could be provided at home,[4] and open-label trials indicate high acceptability and feasibility.[7–9]

Our home-based tDCS treatment protocol with real-time remote supervision by video conference has demonstrated high feasibility, acceptability and safety.[9] In the present trial, MDD participants were randomly allocated to either active or sham tDCS. The primary objective was efficacy of 10-week course of home-based, self-administered tDCS.

Methods

Trial design

All participants provided written informed consent. Ethical approval was provided by South Central-Hampshire B Research Ethics Committee, UK, and WIRB-Copernicus Group International Review Board, USA. Multisite, double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized, superiority trial of home-based tDCS in MDD (ClinicalTrials.gov NCT05202119) was conducted in England and Wales, UK, and Texas, USA, at University of East London and University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston, respectively.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299059; this version posted December 4, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Recruitment was from May 12, 2022 to March 10, 2023. Potential participants were recruited through Flow Neuroscience website, email lists and online marketing. Participants were directed to online pre-screening form hosted by contract research organization (CRO), followed by pre-screening CRO telephone call, and then screening interview with site researchers. All assessments were conducted by Microsoft Teams video conference. Final open-label follow up was conducted on August 23, 2023.

The trial consisted of a 10-week blinded treatment phase followed by 10-week open label phase. The blinded phase consisted of random assignment to sham or active tDCS treatment in 1:1 ratio, performed independently at each site. Block randomization was used with permuted block sizes of 4 and 6, conducted by the trial server and stored in dedicated database. The Sponsor, Flow Neuroscience, provided tDCS devices (Flow FL-100). The Sponsor had no role in data analysis, interpretation of data, decision to publish, or manuscript preparation.

Participants

Participants were adults >=18 years, with MDD in current depressive episode based on Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition (DSM-5) criteria[10] by structured assessment, Mini-International Neuropsychiatric Interview (MINI; Version 7.0.2).[11] Inclusion criteria included: at least a moderate severity of depressive symptoms, as measured by score >=16 on 17-item Hamilton Depression Rating Scale (HDRS);[12] being treatment free, or taking stable antidepressant medication, or in psychotherapy, for at least 6 weeks prior to enrolment, and agreeable to maintaining same treatment throughout the trial; under care of GP or psychiatrist. Exclusion criteria included: treatment resistant depression, defined as inadequate clinical response to two or more trials of antidepressant medication at an adequate dose and duration; significant suicide risk based on Columbia Suicide Severity Rating Scale (C-SSRS) Triage and Risk Identification Screener;[13] comorbid psychiatric disorder; and taking medications that affect cortical excitability (e.g., benzodiazepines, epileptics). Full criteria are presented in Supplementary Appendix.

Interventions

tDCS device is a headset placed over the forehead with two pre-positioned conductive rubber electrodes, each 23cm^2. Anode is positioned over F3 and cathode over F4 on international 10/20 EEG system. Active tDCS stimulation is 2 mA direct current stimulation for 30 minutes

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299059; this version posted December 4, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

with gradual ramp up over 120 seconds at the start and ramp down over 15 seconds at the end of each session. Sham tDCS stimulation is an initial ramp up from 0 to 1 mA over 30 seconds then ramp down to 0 mA over 15 seconds and repeated at session end to provide a tingling sensation which mimics active stimulation.

Blinded phase consisted of 5 tDCS sessions per week for 3 weeks followed by 3 tDCS sessions per week for 7 weeks. At week 10, participants and researchers were informed of treatment arm allocation. Open label phase consisted of active tDCS sessions for all participants. Participants in the initial active tDCS treatment arm were offered 3 sessions per week for 10 weeks, and participants in initial sham tDCS treatment arm were offered the active tDCS stimulation schedule, 5 sessions per week for 3 weeks then 3 sessions per week for 7 weeks.

tDCS stimulation was provided in study device app, and researchers had access to remote monitoring with real-time data use. Initial stimulation was supervised by video conference. Participants were asked to have video and microphone on during the session, were advised to sit or to lie down, and were able to engage in other tasks.

Blinding

Participants and researchers were unaware of trial-group assignments. We sought to have the same researcher present for same MDD participant for trial duration. A second researcher joined clinical reviews for independent ratings. Adequacy of blinding was assessed by asking about allocation (active or sham) and certainty from 1 (very uncertain) to 5 (very certain).

Clinical and Quality of Life Assessments

Assessments were performed by trained researchers and reviewed by consultant psychiatrists. Self-report measures were completed by participants in study app or online. Source records, electronic case report forms and data checking promoted outcome data quality. Assessments for depressive severity, suicidal ideation and manic symptoms were conducted at baseline and weeks 1, 4, 7, 10 and 20. Depressive severity was measured by clinician-rated scales, 17-item Hamilton Depression Rating Scale (HDRS),[12] Montgomery-Åsberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS),[14] and self-report scale, Montgomery-Åsberg Depression Rating Scale - self-report (MADRS-s);[15] suicide ideation, C-SSRS;[13] mania symptoms, Young Mania Rating Scale (YMRS).[16] At baseline, weeks 10 and 20, anxiety symptoms and quality of life were assessed by Hamilton Anxiety Rating Scale (HAMA),[17] and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299059; this version posted December 4, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

EQ-5D-3L,[18–20] which has five dimensions: mobility, self-care, usual activities, pain and discomfort, and anxiety and depression; with three severity levels.

Primary and Secondary Outcomes in Clinical and Quality of Life Measures

Primary efficacy outcome was estimated mean group difference in depressive severity as measured by HDRS at week 10 compared to baseline in active and sham treatment arms. Secondary outcomes were all at week 10: clinical response, >=50% reduction from baseline in HDRS, MADRS and MADRS-s; clinical remission, HDRS score <=7, MADRS score <=10, and MADRS-s score <=12; clinician-rated depressive severity, MADRS; self-report, MADRS-s; and quality of life, EQ-5D-3L.

Exploratory outcomes included correlation between adherence to stimulation and HDRS, MADRS decrease in active treatment arm at week 10; changes in anxiety symptoms from baseline to week 10; and presence of hypomanic/manic symptoms at week 10.

Neuropsychological functioning was assessed by Rey Auditory Verbal Learning Test (RAVLT)[21] for memory and verbal learning and Symbol Digit Modalities Test (SDMT)[22] for psychomotor speed and visuospatial attention at baseline, weeks 10 and 20. Order and versions were counterbalanced. Assessments were mailed to participants, completed by pen and paper during session, and recorded by screenshot.

Treatment acceptability was assessed by our treatment acceptability questionnaire (TAQ)[9] at baseline, weeks 10 and 20. Full description of exploratory outcomes is presented in Supplementary Appendix.

Adverse events

Adverse events were assessed at each visit, and participants were able to contact the research team by a dedicated cell number at any time. tDCS Adverse Events Questionnaire (AEQ)[23] was administered at weeks 10 and 20.

Statistical Analysis

Sample size calculation was based on Brunoni et al,[24] with two-sample t-test for mean difference with 80% power and one-sided Type 1 error 0.025, resulting in a sample size of 176 MDD participants. To increase power to 87.6%, sample size was increased to 216. Assuming

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299059; this version posted December 4, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

20% attrition rate, total sample size was 270 participants. Interim analysis was performed when 90 MDD participants completed week 10, which included both futility assessment and sample size re-estimation.[25]

Intent to treat (ITT) analysis consisted of all randomized participants and classified according to intended treatment. Participants excluded prior to randomization were considered screen failures. Modified intent-to-treat (mITT) analysis set included ITT participants who received at least 1 tDCS session (active or sham) and excluded participants randomized in error.

Primary effectiveness outcome was estimated mean group difference in HDRS scores in participants randomized to active and sham treatments using a mixed model for repeated measures (MMRM). The model included the baseline value for HDRS-17, usage of antidepressant use, psychotherapy treatment, age, and sex. Missing data was categorized by the reason for missingness (missing at random or not) and differentially imputed based on that classification. If *p*-value were less than one-sided $p = 0.025$, then endpoint would be declared positive. Secondary outcomes were: HDRS clinical response and remission, EQ-5D-3L change, and change in ratings, response and remission in MADRS and MADRS-s.

Standard deviations are provided based Cochran's[26] conversion of SE to SD weighted by sample size. Type 1 error was controlled by only testing the 3 named secondary endpoints after meeting the primary endpoint; nominal *p*-values are provided for all other evaluations.

Results

Patients

Based on blinded interim analysis, recruitment was ended early. 174 MDD participants were enrolled, randomised to active (n=87) and sham (n=87) treatment. 153 participants completed the protocol-specified number of sessions. One participant who was randomised did not continue and did not receive any treatment, therefore mITT sample was 173 participants. There were no significant differences in withdrawal rates between groups.

Primary Outcome

In the primary hypothesis, significant improvement was observed in change in HDRS depressive severity from baseline to week 10 in active tDCS treatment arm, HDRS decrease 9.4 $\pm$ 6.25 points (estimated week 10 HDRS, mean 9.6 $\pm$ 6.02), as compared to sham tDCS

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299059; this version posted December 4, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

treatment arm, HDRS decrease 7.1 ± 6.10 points (estimated week 10 HDRS, mean 11.7 ± 5.96) (95% CI 0.5 to 4.0, $p = 0.012$) (Figure 1).

Secondary Outcomes

Based on HDRS ratings, active tDCS treatment arm showed a significantly greater clinical response of 54.4% relative to sham response of 26.9% ($p = 0.001$) (Post hoc Odds Ratio (OR) 3.25 (lower bound (LB) 1.57, upper bound (UB) 6.74), and the active treatment arm showed significantly greater remission rate 44.9% relative to sham arm 21.8% ($p = 0.004$) (Post hoc OR 2.93 (LB 1.41, UB 6.09).

Based on MADRS ratings, active tDCS treatment arm showed a significant improvement from baseline to week 10, mean improvement 11.3 ± 8.81 relative to sham treatment 7.7 ± 8.47 ($p = 0.006$). In clinical response, active treatment arm showed a significantly greater response of 63.0% relative to sham response of 31.6% ($p < 0.001$) (Post hoc OR 3.70 (LB 1.82, UB 7.52)). In clinical remission, active treatment arm showed a significantly greater remission rate 57.5% relative to sham 29.4% ($p = 0.002$) (Post hoc OR 3.26 (LB 1.53, UB 6.94).

Based on self-report MADRS-s ratings, active tDCS treatment arm showed significant improvement from baseline to week 10, mean improvement 9.9 ± 8.94, relative to sham, improvement 6.2 ± 9.13 ($p = 0.009$). In clinical response, active treatment arm showed a significantly greater response of 49.1% relative to sham response of 24.0% ($p = 0.004$) (Post hoc OR 3.06 (LB 1.43, UB 6.56)). In clinical remission, active treatment arm showed significantly greater remission rate 53.8% relative to sham 23.4% ($p = 0.002$) (Post hoc OR 3.83 (LB 1.61, UB 9.13) (Table 2).

There was no significant difference in quality of life between treatment arms as measured by EQ-5D-3L ($p = 0.33$).

Exploratory Outcomes

In anxiety symptoms, there were no significant differences between active, mean HAMA improvement 6.6 ± 6.1 (mean HAMA 8.2 ± 5.7), relative to sham treatment arm 4.9 ± 5.9 (mean HAMA 9.3 ± 4.9) ($p = 0.08$). In hypomanic symptoms, YMRS mean score was 1.3 ± 1.4 in active treatment arm at week 10 and 1.8 ± 1.7 in sham treatment arm, which was statistically significant ($p = 0.03$).

In active treatment arm, 78% participants thought they were receiving active tDCS, and in the sham treatment arm, 59% participants thought they were receiving active tDCS.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299059; this version posted December 4, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

In neuropsychological assessments, there were no significant differences in RAVLT or SDMT between treatment arms.

Adverse events and safety

At week 10, there were increased reports of skin redness ($p < 0.001$), skin irritation (difference 6.9% (1.9% to 14.5%) $p = 0.03$) and trouble concentrating ($p = 0.03$) in active relative to sham, and no differences in headache, neck pain, scalp pain, itching, burning sensation, sleepiness, or acute mood changes between treatment arms. Two participants in the active group reported burns at the left electrode site from using sponges which had dried out. Both burns healed, and neither developed into skin lesions. Both participants had informed the research team at the next study visit and were advised that they could take a break until the burn had healed. There were no serious adverse events related to the device, and no participants developed mania or hypomania.

Discussion

In this international, sham-controlled RCT, active tDCS stimulation was associated with significantly greater improvements in depressive symptoms, greater clinical response rates, and greater remission rates relative to sham stimulation at 10 weeks. Improvements were evident for participants who were medication-free as well as participants who were taking regular antidepressant medication. The effects were evident at week 10, supporting a recent IPD analysis which found that tDCS effect sizes continue to increase up to 10 weeks as compared to sham stimulation.[27]

The findings support clinic-based studies, in which active tDCS shows greater efficacy than sham tDCS in MDD, particularly in first episode and recurrent MDD.[5,28–30] In a recent large trial though, Bukhardt et al.[31] did not observe any significant effects in a 6-week trial of adjunctive tDCS treatment to antidepressant medication. However, the trial had included participants with a history of poor treatment response to multiple antidepressant medications, and treatment resistant depression is negatively correlated with clinical efficacy[5,28–30].

The present protocol demonstrated greater efficacy and safety relative to recent home-based tDCS trials.[32,33] One trial had terminated early, enrolling 11 MDD participants, due to adverse events of skin lesions from an accumulation of skin burns.[32] Another trial was a single-blind RCT of tDCS augmentation to antidepressant medication, consisting of hybrid clinic- and home-based tDCS sessions, which found improved self-report depressive symptoms but not

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299059; this version posted December 4, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

in clinician-based ratings at 6 weeks.[33] The present protocol was a fully remote, double-blind, sham-controlled RCT with real-time clinical assessments by video conference.

Safety was monitored using real-time assessments through video conference and the availability of a dedicated study number with 24-hour access to researchers. Electrical burns are an unanticipated side effect, usually resulting from application of tap water to moisten sponges,[34,35] insufficient moistening with conductive saline solution,[36] or pre-existing skin lesions. We had two cases of reported skin burn, both due to insufficient sponge moistening, but neither developed into skin lesions and participants continued treatment. There were no serious adverse events related to the device and no incidents of serious suicide risk. Active stimulation though was associated with higher rates of skin redness, irritation and dry skin relative to sham.[23,37]

Limitations include a predominantly white ethnicity in the sample, limited sub-group analysis as antidepressant medication type was not controlled for and impedance and current intensity were not analyzed. As history of hospital admissions and treatment resistant depression were exclusion criteria, the findings may not be generalisable to these groups.

In summary, our protocol of home-based tDCS demonstrated significant clinical efficacy, response and remission in a 10-week course of treatment. MDD participants had at least a moderate severity of depressive symptoms, but treatment resistant depression was not included. Home-based tDCS could be a potential first line treatment for MDD that demonstrates efficacy and safety, but consideration of continuing safety monitoring is required.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299059; this version posted December 4, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure Legend

Figure 1. Change in depressive severity ratings over time. Shown are the estimated mean 17-item Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression (HDRS) rating scores from baseline to week 10 in the modified intention-to-treat analysis sample (n=173) for the active tDCS and sham tDCS treatment arms. Error bars represent ± 1 standard error (SE). HDRS scores range from 0 to 52 with higher values indicating more severe depressive symptoms. A significant improvement was observed in the change in HDRS ratings from baseline to week 10 in the active tDCS treatment arm, HDRS decrease 9.4 ± 6.25 (SD) (mean week 10 HDRS 9.6 ± 0.7 (SE)), as compared to sham tDCS treatment arm, HDRS decrease 7.1 ± 6.10 (SD) (mean week 10 HDRS 11.7 ± 0.7 (SE)) (95% CI 0.5 to 4.0, $p = 0.012$). The difference in change scores was also significant at week 4 ($p = 0.03$) with a greater score decrease in the active treatment arm. * = $p < 0.05$.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299059; this version posted December 4, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 1.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299059; this version posted December 4, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1. Demographic and clinical characteristics of patients at baseline

Characteristic	Active (N=87)	Sham (N=87)
Age	37.1 ± 11.1	38.3 ± 10.9
Gender		
Female	54 (62)	66 (76)
Race		
Asian	9 (10)	2 (2)
Black or African American	3 (3)	1 (1)
Native Hawaiian or Other	0 (0)	0 (0)
White	72 (83)	73 (84)
Other	3 (3)	11 (13)
Missing	0 (0)	0 (0)
Educational Level		
Less than High School/Secondary School	1 (1)	0 (0)
Some College	18 (21)	19 (22)
Diploma	9 (10)	7 (8)
Bachelor's or Professional Degree	37 (43)	37 (43)
Master's or Doctoral Degree	22 (25)	23 (26)
Prefer not to answer/Missing	0 (0)	1 (1)
Age of onset	22.1 ± 9.7	22.4 ± 8.8
Previous number of episodes	4.1 ± 5.3	4.8 ± 5.7
Previous number of suicide attempts	0.10 ± 0.34	0.16 ± 0.43
First episode MDD	18 (21)	10 (11)
Clinical ratings		
HDRS	19.2 ± 2.8	18.9 ± 2.6
MADRS	24.7 ± 4.7	23.9 ± 5.5
MADRS-s	26.8 ± 6.9	25.7 ± 6.3

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299059; this version posted December 4, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

HAMA	15.4 ± 4.6	14.3 ± 4.6
YMRS	2.1 ± 1.7	1.9 ± 1.6
RAVLT	57.9 ± 11.2	58.5 ± 13.4
SDMT	52.3 ± 10.1	50.4 ± 10.1
Antidepressant medication during trial	56 (64)	53 (61)
Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor	40 (46)	35 (40)
Non-selective monoamine reuptake inhibitor	1 (1)	3 (3)
Other antidepressant medications	18 (21)	17 (20)
Individual psychotherapy during trial	12 (14)	14 (16)
No antidepressant or psychotherapy during trial	25 (29)	32 (37)

Categorical variables are presented as number of participants with percentage in parentheses for gender, race, educational level, first episode MDD, antidepressant medication and individual medications, individual psychotherapy during trial and No antidepressant or psychotherapy during trial. Mean values are presented with '±' standard deviation values. Diploma, a certificate that signifies a certain level of education and practical experience. HDRS, Hamilton Depression Rating Scale; MADRS, Montgomery-Åsberg Depression Rating Scale; MADRS-s, Montgomery–Åsberg Depression Rating Scale-self report; HAMA, Hamilton Anxiety Rating Scale; YMRS, Young Mania Rating Scale; RAVLT, Rey Auditory Verbal Learning Test; SDMT, Symbol Digit Modalities Test. SDMT active, n=85, SDMT sham, n=85. Age of onset, active n=86, sham n=86. HDRS scores range from 0 to 52, MADRS scores range from 0 to 60, MADRS-s scores range from 0 to 54, with higher scores indicating more depression. RAVLT scores range from 0 to 75. SDMT scores range from 0 to 110. A significant difference between groups was found for race, $p = 0.012$. There were no significant differences any other characteristics

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299059; this version posted December 4, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2. Primary and secondary outcomes: changes in depressive severity as measured by HDRS, MADRS and MADRS-s and quality of life as measured by EQ-5D-3L following a 10-week course of active or sham tDCS sessions

Measure	Active (n = 87)	Sham (n = 86)	Difference or Odds Ratio (95% CI)	Cohen's D or NNT	P value
Primary Outcome					
Decrease in HDRS score	9.4 ± 6.25	7.1 ± 6.10	2.3 (0.5 to 4.0)	0.37	0.012
Secondary Outcomes					
HDRS					
Clinical response	41 (54.4%)	21 (26.9%)	3.25 (1.57 to 6.74)	4	0.001
Clinical remission	34 (44.9%)	17 (21.8%)	2.93 (1.41 to 6.09)	4	0.004
MADRS					
Decrease in score	11.3 ± 8.81	7.7 ± 8.47	3.6 (1.1 to 6.1)	0.41	0.006
Clinical response	46 (63.0%)	25 (31.6%)	3.70 (1.82 to 7.52)	3	<0.001
Clinical remission	42 (57.5%)	25 (29.4%)	3.26 (1.53 to 6.94)	4	0.002
MADRS-s					
Decrease in score	9.9 ± 8.94	6.2 ± 9.13	3.7 (0.9 to 6.4)	0.41	0.009
Clinical response	30 (49.1%)	14 (24.0%)	3.06 (1.43 to 6.56)	4	0.004
Clinical remission	32 (53.8%)	18 (23.4%)	3.83 (1.61 to 9.13)	3	0.002
EQ-5D-3L					
Change in score	0.07 ± 0.15	0.07 ± 0.17	0.02 (-0.02 to 0.06)	-	0.33

HDRS, Hamilton Depression Rating Scale; MADRS, Montgomery-Åsberg Depression Rating Scale; MADRS-s, Montgomery-Åsberg Depression Rating Scale-self report. EQ-5D-3L, quality of life measure[18–20] (https://euroqol.org); CI, confidence interval; NNT, number needed to treat; mean values are presented with '±' standard deviation values. HDRS, MADRS, MADRS-s change ratings are the decrease in total ratings from baseline to week 10. Between-group differences are shown for the changes in scores from baseline to week 10, and odds ratios are shown for the outcomes for clinical response and remission. Percentages for clinical response and remission outcomes are estimated based on odds ratios. HDRS scores range from 0 to 52 (minimal clinically significant difference = 3 points), MADRS scores range from 0 to 60; MADRS-s scores range from 0 to 54, with higher scores indicating more depression. Clinical response was defined as a decrease in the score (indicating less depressive severity) of 50% or more from baseline to week 10. Clinical remission was defined as: HDRS score of 7 or less; MADRS score of 10 or less; MADRS-s score of 12 or less.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299059; this version posted December 4, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 3. Unanticipated adverse events at 10 weeks

Event category	Active tDCS (N=87)	Sham tDCS (N=86)	Difference (95% CI)	P Value
Ear and labyrinth disorders	2 (2.3)	2 (2.3)	0.0 (-6.2 to 6.0)	0.99
Eye disorders	3 (3.4)	1 (1.2)	2.3 (-3.3 to 8.9)	0.62
Gastrointestinal disorders	2 (2.3)	1 (1.2)	1.1 (-4.5 to 7.0)	0.99
General disorders and administration site conditions	3 (3.4)	2 (2.3)	1.1 (-5.2 to 8.0)	0.99
Infections and infestations	1 (1.1)	1 (1.2)	0.00 (-5.5 to 5.3)	0.99
Injury, poisoning and procedural complications	2 (2.3)	0 (0.0)	2.3 (-2.2 to 8.1)	0.49
Nervous system disorders	7 (8.0)	8 (9.3)	-1.3 (-10.4 to 8.0)	0.79
Psychiatric disorders	4 (4.6)	4 (4.7)	-0.1 (-7.5 to 7.3)	0.99
Skin and subcutaneous tissue disorders	17 (19.5)	7 (8.1)	11.4 (1.0 to 22.3)	0.05
Vascular disorders	1 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	1.1 (-3.3 to 6.4)	0.99
Number of participants with adverse events at week 10				
>=1 Mild adverse event	21 (24.1)	14 (16.3)	7.9 (-4.5 to 20.3)	0.25
>=1 Moderate adverse event	13 (14.9)	18 (9.3)	5.6 (-4.5 to 16.1)	0.35
>=1 Severe adverse event	3 (3.4)	1 (1.2)	2.3 (-3.3 to 8.9)	0.62
Serious adverse events during the trial				
Hospitalisation for hypertension	1 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	1.1 (-3.3 to 6.4)	0.99
Death	0	0	___	___
New onset mania or hypomania	0	0	___	___

An adverse event was present if the participant rated that it was at least possibly associated with the intervention. Participants rated the severity of the adverse events as mild, moderate, or severe, which were assessed by the investigator. Adverse event categories are displayed as number of participants with percentage in parentheses. Difference between groups is displayed as a percentage. P values represent difference between groups. Analyses were completed on all participants who completed at least one tDCS session. The serious adverse event was not related to the intervention.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299059; this version posted December 4, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 4. Anticipated adverse events at 10 weeks as measured by the tDCS Adverse Events Questionnaire.[23]

	Active (N=87)				Sham (N=86)				
Adverse event category	**Total**	**Mild**	**Moderate**	**Severe**	**Total**	**Mild**	**Moderate**	**Severe**	**P Value**
Headache	36 (42)	24 (28)	11 (13)	1 (1)	29 (36)	18 (22)	9 (11)	2 (2)	0.42
Neck Pain	2 (2)	0 (0)	2 (2)	0 (0)	4 (5)	1 (1)	3 (4)	0 (0)	0.43
Scalp pain	18 (21)	14 (16)	3 (4)	1 (1)	10 (12)	7 (9)	3 (4)	0 (0)	0.15
Itching	43 (51)	37 (44)	3 (4)	3 (4)	35 (43)	28 (35)	7 (9)	0 (0)	0.08
Burning sensation	37 (44)	32 (38)	4 (5)	1 (1)	31 (38)	25 (31)	6 (7)	0 (0)	0.42
Skin redness	54 (64)	42 (49)	11 (13)	1 (1)	15 (19)	13 (16)	2 (2)	0 (0)	<0.001
Sleepiness	10 (12)	5 (6)	4 (5)	1 (13)	12 (15)	9 (11)	2 (2)	1 (1)	0.65
Trouble concentrating	12 (14)	8 (9)	3 (4)	1 (1)	3 (4)	2 (2)	1 (1)	0 (0)	0.03
Acute mood change	7 (8)	3 (4)	3 (4)	1 (1)	6 (7)	5 (6)	1 (1)	0 (0)	1.00

Values are number of participants with percentage in parentheses. An adverse event was present if the participant rated that it was at least remotely possible that it was associated with the intervention. Participants rated the severity of the adverse events as mild, moderate, or severe. P values represent group differences of the total number of events per event category.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299059; this version posted December 4, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

1. World Health Organization. Depression and other common mental disorders: Global health estimates. No.WHO/MSD/MER/2017.2. 2017. (https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/254610/WHO-MSD-MER-2017.2-eng.pdf)

2. Cuijpers P, Karyotaki E, Weitz E, Andersson G, Hollon SD, van Straten A. The effects of psychotherapies for major depression in adults on remission, recovery and improvement: A meta-analysis. J Affect Disord 2014;159:118–26.

3. Rush AJ, Trivedi MH, Wisniewski SR, et al. Acute and longer-term outcomes in depressed outpatients requiring one or several treatment steps: A STAR*D report. Am J Psychiatry 2006;163(11):1905–17.

4. Woodham R, Rimmer RM, Mutz J, Fu CHY. Is tDCS a potential first line treatment for major depression? Int Rev Psychiatry 2021;33(3):250–65.

5. Mutz J, Vipulananthan V, Carter B, Hurlemann R, Fu CHY, Young AH. Comparative efficacy and acceptability of non-surgical brain stimulation for the acute treatment of major depressive episodes in adults: Systematic review and network meta-analysis. BMJ 2019;364:1079.

6. Moffa AH, Martin D, Alonzo A, et al. Efficacy and acceptability of transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) for major depressive disorder: An individual patient data meta-analysis. Prog Neuropsychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry 2020;99:109836.

7. Alonzo A, Fong J, Ball N, Martin D, Chand N, Loo C. Pilot trial of home-administered transcranial direct current stimulation for the treatment of depression. J Affect Disord 2019;252:475–83.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299059; this version posted December 4, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

8. Borrione L, Klein I, Razza LB, Suen P, Brunoni AR. Use of app-based psychological interventions in combination with home-use transcranial direct current stimulation for the treatment of major depressive disorder: A case series. J Affect Disord 2021;288:189–90.

9. Woodham R, Rimmer RM, Young AH, Fu CHY. Adjunctive home-based transcranial direct current stimulation treatment for major depression with real-time remote supervision: An open-label, single-arm feasibility study with long term outcomes. J Psychiatr Res 2022;153:197–205.

10. American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, (DSM-5®). Fifth. American Psychiatric Association; 2013.

11. 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. J Clin Psychiatry 1998;59 Suppl 20:22-33;quiz 34-57.

12. Hamilton M. A rating scale for depression. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 1960;23(1):56–62.

13. Posner K, Brown GK, Stanley B, et al. The Columbia-Suicide Severity Rating Scale: Initial validity and internal consistency findings from three multisite studies with adolescents and adults. Am J Psychiatry 2011;168(12):1266–77.

14. Montgomery SA, Åsberg M. A new depression scale designed to be sensitive to change. Br J Psychiatry J Ment Sci 1979;134:382–9.

15. Svanborg P, Åsberg M. A comparison between the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) and the self-rating version of the Montgomery Åsberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS). J Affect Disord 2001;64(2–3):203–16.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299059; this version posted December 4, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

16. Young RC, Biggs JT, Ziegler VE, Meyer DA. A rating scale for mania: reliability, validity and sensitivity. Br J Psychiatry 1978;133(5):429–35.

17. Hamilton M. The assessment of anxiety states by rating. Br J Med Psychol 1959;32(1):50–5.

18. Brooks R. EuroQol: the current state of play. Health Policy 1996;37(1):53–72.

19. EuroQol - a new facility for the measurement of health-related quality of life. Health Policy 1990;16(3):199–208.

20. Rabin R, Charro F de. EQ-5D: a measure of health status from the EuroQol Group. Ann Med 2001;33(5):337–43.

21. Rey A. L'Examen Clinique en Psychologie. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France; 1964.

22. Smith A. Symbol digit modalities test. Los Angeles, CA: Western Psychological Services; 1991.

23. Brunoni AR, Amadera J, Berbel B, Volz MS, Rizzerio BG, Fregni F. A systematic review on reporting and assessment of adverse effects associated with transcranial direct current stimulation. Int J Neuropsychopharmacol 2011;14(8):1133–45.

24. Brunoni AR, Moffa AH, Sampaio-Junior B, et al. Trial of electrical direct-current therapy versus escitalopram for depression. N Engl J Med 2017;376(26):2523–33.

25. Lachin JM. A review of methods for futility stopping based on conditional power. Stat Med 2005;24(18):2747–64.

26. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, et al. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions version 6.4 (updated August 2023). Cochrane; 2023. (www.training.cochrane.org/handbook)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299059; this version posted December 4, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

27. Nikolin S, Moffa A, Razza L, et al. Time-course of the tDCS antidepressant effect: An individual participant data meta-analysis. Prog Neuropsychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry 2023;125:110752.

28. Brunoni AR, Moffa AH, Fregni F, et al. Transcranial direct current stimulation for acute major depressive episodes: Meta-analysis of individual patient data. Br J Psychiatry 2016;208(6):522–31.

29. Meron D, Hedger N, Garner M, Baldwin DS. Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) in the treatment of depression: Systematic review and meta-analysis of efficacy and tolerability. Neurosci Biobehav Rev 2015;57:46–62.

30. Mutz J, Edgcumbe DR, Brunoni AR, Fu CHY. Efficacy and acceptability of non-invasive brain stimulation for the treatment of adult unipolar and bipolar depression: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised sham-controlled trials. Neurosci Biobehav Rev 2018;92:291–303.

31. Burkhardt G, Kumpf U, Crispin A, et al. Transcranial direct current stimulation as an additional treatment to selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors in adults with major depressive disorder in Germany (DepressionDC): a triple-blind, randomised, sham-controlled, multicentre trial. The Lancet 2023;402(10401):545–54.

32. Kumpf U, Palm U, Eder J, et al. TDCS at home for depressive disorders: an updated systematic review and lessons learned from a prematurely terminated randomized controlled pilot study. Eur Arch Psychiatry Clin Neurosci 2023;273:1403–20.

33. Oh J, Jeon S, Ha TH, et al. Effect of home-based self-administered transcranial direct stimulation in patients with mild to moderate major depressive disorder: a single-arm, multicentral trial. Clin Psychopharmacol Neurosci 2023;21(2):271–8.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299059; this version posted December 4, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

34. Frank E, Wilfurth S, Landgrebe M, Eichhammer P, Hajak G, Langguth B. Anodal skin lesions after treatment with transcranial direct current stimulation. Brain Stimul Basic Transl Clin Res Neuromodulation 2010;3(1):58–9.

35. Palm U, Keeser D, Schiller C, et al. Skin lesions after treatment with transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS). Brain Stimul Basic Transl Clin Res Neuromodulation 2008;1(4):386–7.

36. Kortteenniemi A, Lehto SM, Javadi A-H. Delayed, distant skin lesions after transcranial direct current stimulation. Brain Stimulat 2019;12(1):204–6.

37. Moffa AH, Brunoni AR, Fregni F, et al. Safety and acceptability of transcranial direct current stimulation for the acute treatment of major depressive episodes: Analysis of individual patient data. J Affect Disord 2017;221:1–5.