



Feasibility of Computerized Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy Combined With Bifrontal Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation for Treatment of Major Depression

Emma S. Welch, MS^{*}; Anne Weigand, PhD[†]; Julia E. Hooker, BA[†];
Noah S. Philip, MD^{‡,§} ; Audrey R. Tyrka, MD, PhD^{*,§}; Daniel Z. Press, MD[†];
Linda L. Carpenter, MD^{*,§} 

Background: Cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) is effective in the treatment of major depressive disorder (MDD). Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation (tDCS) has demonstrated preliminary antidepressant effects and beneficial effects on cognitive function.

Objective: We investigated the feasibility and acceptability of using tDCS to enhance the effects of computer-based CBT for treatment of MDD.

Materials and Methods: In a randomized, double-blind, sham-controlled study, 14 patients with MDD on stable or no pharmacotherapy received active or sham bifrontal tDCS for four weeks with concurrent CBT.

Results: Ten participants completed the protocol. Three withdrew from the study because of lack of efficacy or dislike of the eCBT program. One was discontinued from the protocol by the investigators. Treatment was well tolerated, and most side-effects were mild and consistent with prior tDCS research. Pooled data from both groups showed significant baseline to endpoint improvement in depression ($p = 0.008$). Overall percent change on the HAM-D-21 was 28.98%. The study was underpowered to detect differences in tDCS treatment groups.

Conclusions: Combining tDCS with computer-based CBT is feasible for MDD. Further work is needed to evaluate potential synergistic effects of combined tDCS and CBT.

Keywords: Depression, transcranial direct current stimulation, cognitive behavior therapy

Conflict of Interest: The authors reported no conflict of interest.

INTRODUCTION

Major depressive disorder (MDD) remains a common and inadequately treated illness. There is a pressing need to devise novel, easily accessible, and more effective antidepressant strategies. Several studies support the clinical use of transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) as a therapy for MDD (1–5). Furthermore, tDCS has been shown to enhance cognitive functions such as working memory (2,6,7). Cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) is an evidence-based psychotherapy for MDD (8,9), which maintains efficacy when presented in a computerized form (electronic CBT, or eCBT) (10–12). Recently, the combination of tDCS with CBT has been proposed, suggesting interactive effects of both methodologies on cognitive functions such as top-down emotional control (13). These effects, the possible enhancement by tDCS of working memory during CBT, and the antidepressant effects of the both therapies separately make a combined treatment protocol an intriguing possibility. Here, we present the first systematic research on this promising combined approach. As it is uncertain what effects the timing of stimulation relative to other treatments has on outcomes (6,14), we investigated the feasibility, acceptability, and potential antidepressant effect of bifrontal tDCS concurrent with eCBT, to inform the design of a larger clinical trial to treat depression.

Address correspondence to: Linda L. Carpenter, MD, Butler Hospital, 345 Blackstone Blvd, Providence RI 02906, USA. Email: linda_carpenter_md@brown.edu

^{*} Mood Disorders Research Program, Butler Hospital, Providence, RI, USA;

[†] Department of Neurology, Berenson-Allen Center for Noninvasive Brain Stimulation, Harvard Medical School and Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Boston, MA, USA;

[‡] Center for Neurorestoration and Neurotechnology, Providence VA Medical Center, Providence, RI, USA; and

[§] Department of Psychiatry and Human Behavior, Alpert Medical School of Brown University, Providence, RI, USA

For more information on author guidelines, an explanation of our peer review process, and conflict of interest informed consent policies, please go to <http://www.wiley.com/WileyCDA/Section/id-301854.html>

Current Address: Anne Weigand, Berlin School of Mind and Brain, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Luisenstrasse 56, 10117 Berlin, Germany.

Current Address: Julia E. Hooker, Syracuse University Department of Psychology, 430 Huntington Hall, Syracuse, NY 13244, USA.

Source(s) of financial support: A grant from the Roddy-Holden Foundation (Austin, TX, USA) supported purchase of tDCS equipment for this study. The efforts of Drs. Carpenter, Tyrka, Ms. Welch, and research staff of the Butler Hospital Mood Disorders Research Program were supported by internal research funds. Dr. Philip's effort was supported by a Career Development Award (IK2 CX000724) from the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (Clinical Sciences Research and Development) and the Center for Neurorestoration and Neurotechnology at the Providence VA Medical Center (Rehabilitation Research and Development). This study did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public or commercial sectors.

METHODS

Participants

Patients with current primary MDD were recruited through flyers and clinician referrals. Study enrollment required a Hamilton depression rating scale (HAM-D-28) (15) score ≥ 18 and a stable psychotropic regimen (or no psychiatric medications) for at least six weeks prior to screening. Specific exclusion criteria included a lifetime history of bipolar, psychotic, or obsessive-compulsive disorder, lifetime history of head injury with loss of consciousness, significant neurological disorders, pregnancy, breastfeeding, or prior exposure to tDCS or formal CBT. The study was carried out in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and written consent was obtained on forms approved by the Institutional Review Boards of Butler Hospital and Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center.

Assessments

MDD was diagnosed with the Mini International Neuropsychiatric Interview (16). Depression severity was assessed with the HAM-D-21, and by self-report on the Inventory of Depressive Symptomatology (IDSSR) (17) and the Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9) (18). Global illness severity (baseline and endpoint) and clinical change at endpoint were assessed with the clinical global impressions (CGI) scales (19). Adverse events were assessed by a standard questionnaire following each treatment session (20). Participants were asked to rate ten adverse events associated with tDCS on a scale from 1 to 4 (1 = absent, 2 = mild, 3 = moderate, and 4 = severe). The questionnaire also contained an "other" category to narratively capture other emergent events. In addition, participants were instructed to spontaneously report the presence and intensity of any potential adverse events at any time.

Study Design

Participants were randomly assigned to receive 12 sessions (three days per week for four weeks) of active or sham tDCS administered concurrently with 12 modules of CBT delivered via computer-based modules. This design was chosen for several reasons, including matching both prior tDCS studies and clinical CBT delivery. First, while some studies investigating tDCS and depression have used a five sessions per week protocol, others used a three sessions per week protocol (21,22). Furthermore, the standard frequency of CBT sessions is approximately twice weekly (23). Additionally, because this was a feasibility study, we selected a visit frequency that we felt would be achievable for our depressed participants. In line with our design, a recent study combining rTMS with CBT used a protocol allowing a treatment frequency ranging from two to three sessions per week to twice a day, as determined by the therapist and participant (24). HAM-D-21 was administered at baseline and within 72 hours of the last treatment session, and self-report scales were administered at sessions 3, 6, and 9. Subjects and raters were blinded to treatment group but tDCS technicians were unblinded. At completion or withdrawal from the study, participants and raters were asked to guess whether they had received active or sham tDCS, to rate how certain they were of their guess, and to provide what rationale informed their guess.

eCBT

CBT was delivered using modified modules of the eCBT software Good Days Ahead (Empower Interactive, Moraga, CA, USA). Modules involved watching a series of videos, reading text, and typing in responses to module-specific exercises presented on the computer screen. Activities and skills included identifying negative thoughts, substituting positive thoughts, and activity schedules. Participants met with a trained clinician prior to their first treatment session and after completion or withdrawal from the study. tDCS/eCBT sessions did not involve interaction with a clinician unless the participant experienced an unexpected or severe adverse event, experienced a worsening of psychiatric symptoms, or requested to speak with a clinician. Sessions were fully supervised by a trained technician until both tDCS and eCBT was completed to ensure safety and provide technical support. Study technicians were instructed to be courteous but not to engage with patients in a therapeutic manner. After each session, participants were given printed "homework" pages for practicing the eCBT skills presented in the corresponding module. Time spent on homework, as well as participant feedback, was recorded at the start of each session for the previous session's exercises. Homework was voluntary, and participation was not contingent on its completion.

tDCS+eCBT Sessions

Bifrontal tDCS was delivered using a Chattanooga Ionto device (DJO Global, Guildford Surrey, UK) and 25 cm² sponge electrodes, with the anode over left DLPFC (F3) and the cathode over right DLPFC (F4) informed by Fregni et al. (2). Active tDCS was applied at 2 mA for 30 min with a 2 min ramp-up at the beginning and a 30 sec ramp-down period at the end of stimulation. For sham, the current was ramped up to 2 mA over a 2 min period and then immediately ramped down to off over a 30 sec period. Technicians mimed turning off the tDCS device at the end of 30 min for sham participants to match the experience of active tDCS. The 2-min ramp-up period was chosen after we found that our initial participants were unable to tolerate a quicker (i.e., 30 sec) ramp-up period due to stimulation site discomfort. A 2-min ramp-up allowed all participants to reach 2 mA with tolerable sensations at the stimulation site. The eCBT module was started 5 min after start of stimulation (3 min after the completion of the ramp-up period). Modules were designed to last the majority of the stimulation time (30 min), however, participants navigated through each module at their own pace. If a participant finished the module prior to the completion of the 30-min active/sham tDCS, they were instructed to work on the homework exercises or review module material. The participant was asked not to read any other material or look at their phone to avoid exposure to potentially emotionally salient material during stimulation. If a participant had not yet finished the eCBT module after 30 min of active/sham tDCS, the device was turned off (or mimed) and the participant was allowed to complete the module.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A total of 18 participants consented; 14 met eligibility criteria and received at least one blinded tDCS+eCBT session (Table 1). As a result of screening and randomization procedures, the group sizes were unbalanced with nine assigned to active and five to sham tDCS. Five (55%) active and four (80%) sham participants

Table 1. Participant Clinical Characteristics and Treatment Outcomes.

Group	Total number of sessions	Sex	Age	Past treatment modalities	Concurrent medications	Baseline score (% change at endpoint)			Adverse events [†]	Disposition	Patient rated improvement
						IDSSR	PHQ9	HAMD-21			
1 Active	9	F	34	Inpatient, IOP, Psychotherapy, ECT, TMS, medication	Citalopram, lurasidone, trazadone, lorazepam, buspirone	43(2%)	17(-12%)	29(45%)	Unpleasant sensations under the electrode, sleepiness	Withdrew consent due to lack of efficacy	No change
2 Active	4	F	64	Psychotherapy, rTMS, medication	Methylphenidate, SAM-e, zolpidem	36(0%)	15(13%)	12*	Heart palpitations, ankle swelling	Early termination by PI	Not assessed
3 Sham	6	F	58	Psychotherapy, medication	Bupropion	38(-5%)	11(-9%)	16(0%)	Unpleasant sensations under the electrode	Withdrew consent due to lack of efficacy	No change
4 Active	7	F	62	Inpatient, IOP, psychotherapy, rTMS, medication	Amphetamine/dextroamphetamine, lorazepam, hydrocodone/acetaminophen	61(0%)	24(0%)	28(0%)	None	Withdrew consent due to lack of efficacy	Minimally worse
5 Sham	12	F	49	Medication	Citalopram	36(69%)	16(69%)	19(58%)	Unpleasant sensations under the electrode	Completed protocol	Very much improved
6 Sham	12	F	64	Inpatient, IOP, psychotherapy, medication	Venlafaxine, amphetamine/dextroamphetamine, diazepam	48(45%)	15(47%)	23(39%)	None	Completed protocol	Minimally improved
7 Active	12	F	32	Inpatient, IOP, psychotherapy, medication	Lamotrigine, bupropion, duloxetine	38(18%)	15(40%)	28(29%)	None	Completed protocol	Minimally improved
8 Sham	12	F	64	Psychotherapy, medication	Sertraline, bupropion, diphenhydramine	41(39%)	16(25%)	17(35%)	None	Completed protocol	Minimally improved
9 Active	12	F	59	Psychotherapy, Medication	Sertraline	21(-10%)	12(17%)	10(-10%)	Unpleasant sensations under the electrode, difficulty concentrating	Completed protocol	Minimally improved
10 Active	7	F	44	Inpatient, psychotherapy, medication	None	40(3%)	17(-6%)	19(-5%)	Unpleasant sensations under the electrode	Withdrew consent due to lack of efficacy /higher level of care	Minimally worse
11 Sham	12	M	67	Inpatient, psychotherapy, medication	Trazodone, bupropion, duloxetine, amphetamine/dextroamphetamine	26(15)	10(20)	14(29)	Unpleasant sensations under the electrode	Completed protocol	No change
12 Active	12	F	34	Psychotherapy, medication	Fluoxetine, bupropion	32(47)	10(40)	11(64)	Unpleasant sensations under the electrode, sleepiness, difficulty concentrating	Completed protocol	Much improved
13 Active	12	F	61	Psychotherapy, medication	Fluoxetine, bupropion	33(6%)	19(53%)	13(23%)	Headache, difficulty concentrating, sleepiness, neck Pain	Completed protocol	Minimally improved

Table 1. Continued

Group	Total number of sessions	Sex	Age	Past treatment modalities	Concurrent medications	Baseline score (% change at endpoint)	Adverse events [†]	Disposition	Patient rated improvement
14	12	M	53	Psychotherapy, medication	Amphetamine/dextroamphetamine, lithium	IDSSR 27(0%) PHQ9 14(29%) HAM-D-21 10(-20%)	Unpleasant sensations under the electrode, difficulty concentrating	Completed protocol	Much improved

*Negative values for % change represent a worsening of symptoms on that measure.

[†]Adverse events rated moderate or severe in nature by the participant. None were serious.

[‡]PI terminated subject following report of heart palpitations, pedal edema, and new information about previously diagnosed cardiac condition (prior to enrollment). Endpoint assessments are missing, so %change could not be calculated. IOP, intensive outpatient program/day hospital; ECT, electroconvulsive therapy; rTMS, repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation therapy; SAMe, S-adenosyl methionine (nutritional supplement).

completed all the procedures. Length of current depressive episode was not known for all participants. For those who were able to provide that information ($n = 6$), the average length of the current episode was 3.2 years. In regard to participant blinding, the correct condition (active or sham) was guessed by 46% of participants. Significantly more active as compared to sham participants correctly guessed their condition; five out of eight active participants guessed the correct condition while only one sham participant correctly guessed the sham condition ($\chi^2 = 4.064$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.05$), suggesting that our sham protocol was adequate. The blinded condition was correctly guessed by the assessment rater in 50% of the cases.

Three active participants and one sham participant withdrew before completing 12 sessions because of a lack of efficacy and/or dislike of the eCBT program, and one (active) was discontinued due to onset of heart palpitations and ankle swelling that was thought to be unrelated to tDCS. Most participants had either a positive or neutral opinion of the study, demonstrating the general acceptability of the intervention. Negative opinions by two participants were related to the eCBT content. For example, one participant with a long and more severe history of depression expressed that the actor portraying a depressed person in the eCBT program seemed "too healthy" and did not accurately portray the participant's experience or thoughts. Another participant felt that the amount of information presented in each session was overwhelming. These concerns, which could not be addressed with our eCBT, could have been accommodated by a therapist during face-to-face CBT. However, the electronic platform was appreciated by other participants. One, for instance, enjoyed the eCBT because she found it "relaxing to take time by herself to focus on her thoughts." The eCBT platform, with its ease of deliverability, may have been ideally suited for those with less severe depression or with less prior exposure to psychotherapy while not meeting the needs of those with more severe depression or more complicated psychiatric histories. In addition, eCBT can provide a less expensive alternative to traditional face-to-face therapy and may also be useful in areas where access to in-person therapy is limited (12). Finally, eCBT allowed for a standardized treatment protocol against which to investigate the use of concurrent tDCS.

Paired *t*-test of pooled data ($n = 14$) showed significant improvement in mean depression scale scores from baseline to the endpoint on HAM-D-21 (baseline: $M = 17.786$, $SE = 1.825$, endpoint: $M = 13.846$, $SE = 1.728$, $t = 3.156$, $p = 0.008$, $d = 0.603$), IDSSR (baseline: $M = 36.929$, $SE = 2.636$, endpoint: $M = 30.642$, $SE = 3.344$, $t = 2.575$, $p = 0.023$, $d = 0.055$), PHQ-9 (baseline: $M = 15.071$, $SE = 1.003$, endpoint: $M = 11.643$, $SE = 1.428$, $t = 3.212$, $p = 0.007$, $d = 0.743$), CGI improved at a trend level (baseline: $M = 4.46$, $SE = 0.144$, endpoint: $M = 3.667$, $SE = 0.333$, $t = 2.055$, $p = 0.067$, $d = 0.887$) The completer sample ($n = 9$) was too small for statistical comparison of active vs. sham groups. Two participants (one active and one sham) met categorical response criteria ($\geq 50\%$ reduction in score) on all measures and one sham participant met remission criteria on the IDSSR.

Side-effects included mild unpleasant sensations below the electrodes, endorsed by all participants, consistent with those commonly reported in tDCS studies (20); 66% in the active group and 60% in the sham group rated these sensations as moderate or severe in nature. Unpleasant sensations under the electrodes may stem from the intensity of stimulation and the impedance of the system (25). The intensity of stimulation can be manipulated by reducing the current being delivered to the scalp. Reducing the current density by increasing electrode size has been

suggested as one way to decrease intensity. However, studies have shown that larger electrodes are associated with equivalent or more unpleasant sensations than smaller electrodes (26). Additionally, increasing the size of the electrodes, while possibly reducing current density, raises the risk of delivering stimulation to regions of the brain outside of the dLPFC. Issues surrounding impedance may also have factored into participant discomfort. When impedance is high in a tDCS system, it can contribute to unpleasant sensations at the stimulation site (27). While the tDCS systems used in this study had an impedance limit past which the device would not operate, it did not allow technicians to monitor impedance values or set a user-identified impedance limit. The use of a device with these features may reduce the occurrence and severity of unpleasant sensations under the electrodes.

Other adverse events reported were sleepiness (66% active, 40% sham), and headache (55% active, 20% sham). Sleepiness has been previously reported with HD tDCS to the dLPFC (28). Whereas it is possible that tDCS contributes to feelings of sleepiness, depression is often accompanied by fatigue. It is also important to note that participants in both groups reported sleepiness. One of our sham participants attributed her sleepiness during the sessions to the fact that it was the only time during her day that she was able to sit down and rest. Headache has been previously reported during tDCS (20). Possible sources of headache are the stimulation itself, discomfort under the electrodes, the apparatus used to maintain contact between the scalp and electrodes, or, in our study, from reading on a computer screen.

Concentration difficulties were reported exclusively by participants in the active group. In fact, all participants in the active tDCS group and none in the sham group reported difficulty concentrating on content during the eCBT sessions. No participants reported this problem persisting outside of the tDCS+eCBT procedures. Possible explanations include direct neuromodulatory effect of active stimulation on cognitive function or distraction because of unpleasant sensations on the scalp. Mild discomfort and diminished ability to concentrate were not limited to the first few sessions, suggesting that delivery of "offline" tDCS (immediately before or after the eCBT) might have been better tolerated and allowed better focus during eCBT. There remains controversy about whether "online" (stimulation concurrent with cognitive task) tDCS produces superior effect on working memory (6,14).

Of note, our study included CBT homework, which was tracked but not required. All participants reported spending at least some time on homework, with participants spending an average of 0.41 hours on homework exercises between each session. Among participants who completed the protocol, the total amount of time spent on homework over the four-week study was highly variable, ranging from under one-half hour to more than 17 hours. Future studies should investigate whether time spent on homework exercises impacts efficacy outcomes, as is the case for standard CBT (29).

Whereas our study was underpowered to detect differences in efficacy between groups, several studies of tDCS for the treatment of depression have shown significant improvement in symptoms in the active tDCS group as compared to sham (1–5). However, a recently published study by Loo et al. investigated tDCS alone as a treatment for MDD (5). Counter to prior reports, they found more patients met remission criteria in the sham tDCS group than in the active tDCS group, raising the question of whether there were previously unknown counter-therapeutic effects of active tDCS. Other possible interpretations of the negative results of that controlled trial concern the question of the optimal dose of tDCS

for treating MDD and potential biologically active effects of brief or low-intensity current delivered during sham stimulation.

The limitations of this pilot study are those inherent to small feasibility studies. However, these preliminary results suggest that tDCS enhancement of eCBT merits further evaluation in a larger trial for development of a potentially novel treatment for major depression. Future studies must achieve suitable participant tolerability to decrease the drop-out rate and allow focus on the CBT skills provided in the modules. We believe that by addressing the side-effects and participant feedback discussed in this study, achieving such tolerability will be possible. Factors to consider in the design of future studies include selection of an appropriate tDCS device with built-in impedance controls, improving participant response to the eCBT program, increasing participant comfort during stimulation and/or delivering tDCS and eCBT separately, and considering engagement with homework in relation to efficacy.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Asi Polly Gobin for assistance with data management and research staff Daniella Amri, Laura Dzgoeva, S. Louisa Carpenter, Lysianne Beynel, and Ella Gambel for data collection and assistance. We thank all of the participants. The opinions herein represent those of the authors and not the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs.

Authorship Statements

Drs. Carpenter, Philip, Weigand, Press, Tyrka, and Ms. Welch designed the study, interpreted data, and contributed to drafting the manuscript. Dr. Carpenter, Dr. Press, Ms. Welch, and Ms. Hooker conducted the study, including patient recruitment, administration of stimulation procedures, and data collection. All authors had complete access to the study data, contributed to, and approved the final manuscript.

How to Cite this Article:

Welch E.S., Weigand A., Hooker J.E., Philip N.S., Tyrka A.R., Press D.Z., Carpenter L.L. 2018. Feasibility of Computerized Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy Combined With Bifrontal Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation for Treatment of Major Depression. *Neuromodulation* 2018; E-pub ahead of print. DOI:10.1111/ner.12807

REFERENCES

1. Brunoni AR, Valiengo L, Baccaro A et al. The sertraline vs. electrical current therapy for treating depression clinical study: results from a factorial, randomized, controlled trial. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2013;70:383–391.
2. Fregni F, Boggio PS, Nitsche MA, Rigonatti SP, Pascual-Leone A. Cognitive effects of repeated sessions of transcranial direct current stimulation in patients with depression. *Depress Anxiety* 2006;23:482–484.
3. Loo CK, Alonzo A, Martin D, Mitchell PB, Galvez V, Sachdev P. Transcranial direct current stimulation for depression: 3-week, randomised, sham-controlled trial. *Br J Psychiatry* 2012;200:52–59.
4. Philip NS, Nelson BG, Frohlich F, Lim KO, Widge AS, Carpenter LL. Low-intensity transcranial current stimulation in psychiatry. *Am J Psychiatry* 2017;174:628–639.

5. Loo CK, Husain MM, McDonald WM et al. International randomized-controlled trial of transcranial Direct Current Stimulation in depression. *Brain Stimul* 2018; 11:125–133.
6. Hill AT, Fitzgerald PB, Hoy KE. Effects of Anodal transcranial direct current stimulation on working memory: a systematic review and meta-analysis of findings from healthy and neuropsychiatric populations. *Brain Stimul* 2016;9:197–208.
7. Andrews SC, Hoy KE, Enticott PG, Daskalakis ZJ, Fitzgerald PB. Improving working memory: the effect of combining cognitive activity and anodal transcranial direct current stimulation to the left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex. *Brain Stimul* 2011;4:84–89.
8. Driessen E, Hollon SD. Cognitive behavioral therapy for mood disorders: efficacy, moderators and mediators. *Psychiatr Clin North Am* 2010;33:537–555.
9. Wiles N, Thomas L, Abel A et al. Cognitive behavioural therapy as an adjunct to pharmacotherapy for primary care based patients with treatment resistant depression: results of the CoBaT randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet* 2013; 381:375–384.
10. Eells TD, Barrett MS, Wright JH, Thase M. Computer-assisted cognitive-behavior therapy for depression. *Psychotherapy (Chic)* 2014;51:191–197.
11. Johansson R, Nyblom A, Carlbring P, Cuijpers P, Andersson G. Choosing between Internet-based psychodynamic versus cognitive behavioral therapy for depression: a pilot preference study. *BMC Psychiatry* 2013;13:268.
12. Wright JH, Wright AS, Albano AM et al. Computer-assisted cognitive therapy for depression: maintaining efficacy while reducing therapist time. *Am J Psychiatry* 2005;162:1158–1164.
13. Bajbouj M, Aust S, Spies J et al. PsychotherapyPlus: augmentation of cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) with prefrontal transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) in major depressive disorder-study design and methodology of a multicenter double-blind randomized placebo-controlled trial. *Eur Arch Psychiatry Clin Neurosci* 2017.
14. Martin DMLR, Alonzo A, Green M, Loo CK. Use of transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) to enhance cognitive training: effect of timing of stimulation. *Exp Brain Res* 2014;232:3345–3351.
15. Hamilton M. A rating scale for depression. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 1960;23: 56–62.
16. 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.
17. Rush AJ, Gullion CM, Basco MR, Jarrett RB, Trivedi MH. The Inventory of Depressive Symptomatology (IDS): psychometric properties. *Psychol Med* 1996;26: 477–486.
18. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JB. The Patient Health Questionnaire-2: validity of a two-item depression screener. *Med Care* 2003;41:1284–1292.
19. Guy W. *ECDEU assessment manual for psychopharmacology*. Rockville, MD: U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, 1976.
20. 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;14:1133–1145.
21. Nitsche MA, Boggio PS, Fregni F, Pascual-Leone A. Treatment of depression with transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS): a review. *Exp Neurol* 2009;219:14–19.
22. Martin DM, Teng JZ, Lo TY et al. Clinical pilot study of transcranial direct current stimulation combined with Cognitive Emotional Training for medication resistant depression. *J Affect Disord* 2018;232:89–95.
23. Bruijninks SJ, Bosmans J, Peeters FP et al. Frequency and change mechanisms of psychotherapy among depressed patients: study protocol for a multicenter randomized trial comparing twice-weekly versus once-weekly sessions of CBT and IPT. *BMC Psychiatry* 2015;15:137.
24. Donse L, Padberg F, Sack AT, Rush AJ, Arns M. Simultaneous rTMS and psychotherapy in major depressive disorder: clinical outcomes and predictors from a large naturalistic study. *Brain Stimul* 2018;11:337–345.
25. McFadden JL, Borckardt JJ, George MS, Beam W. Reducing procedural pain and discomfort associated with transcranial direct current stimulation. *Brain Stimul* 2011;4:38–42.
26. Turi Z, Ambrus GG, Ho KA, Sengupta T, Paulus W, Antal A. When size matters: large electrodes induce greater stimulation-related cutaneous discomfort than smaller electrodes at equivalent current density. *Brain Stimul* 2014;7:460–467.
27. Hahn C, Rice J, Macuff S, Minhas P, Rahman A, Bikson M. Methods for extra-low voltage transcranial direct current stimulation: current and time dependent impedance decreases. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2013;124:551–556.
28. Shekhawat GS, Vanneste S. High-definition transcranial direct current stimulation of the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex for tinnitus modulation: a preliminary trial. *J Neural Transm (Vienna)* 2018;125:163–171.
29. Rees CS, McEvoy P, Nathan PR. Relationship between homework completion and outcome in cognitive behaviour therapy. *Cogn Behav Ther* 2005;34:242–247.