Enhancing the Working Memory of Stroke Patients Using tDCS

ABSTRACT


Objectives: We investigated whether anodal transcranial direct current stimulation over the left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex affected the working memory performance of patients after a stroke.

Design: Ten patients (mean age 47.7 yrs) with cognitive deficits after a first-ever stroke participated in this single-blind, crossover, and sham-controlled experiment. Each patient was randomly assigned to undergo two transcranial direct current stimulation sessions: anodal dorsolateral prefrontal cortex and sham stimulation within 48 hrs of a washout period. All participants performed a two-back working memory task before and after the administration of the transcranial direct current stimulation. Accuracy (correction rate), recognition accuracy (correction rate-commission error rate), and response time were measured during each experiment.

Results: Repeated-measures analysis of variance indicated a significant interaction effect of transcranial direct current stimulation type and time on the recognition accuracy. Post hoc analyses revealed a significant difference between prestimulation and poststimulation in the anodal stimulation group but not in the sham stimulation group. Regarding the accuracy, the paired t test indicated significant improvement only after anodal transcranial direct current stimulation without a significant interaction effect between the two transcranial direct current stimulation types. The response time was not significantly different in the anodal and sham stimulation groups.

Conclusion: Our results demonstrated that anodal transcranial direct current stimulation over the left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex was associated with enhanced working memory performance as indexed by the recognition accuracy in patients after a stroke.
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Acquired brain damage after a stroke often results in chronic cognitive deficits. Such cognitive deficits can critically affect the activities of daily living and, when present, are poor predictors for long-term functional independence. Specifically, strokes are often associated with impairment of the working memory (WM), which is used for temporary storage and manipulation of information and plays a central role in long-term memory, language, and executive function. The cortical structures related to verbal WM include the prefrontal cortex, frontal eye field, supplementary motor area, and parietal cortex, as demonstrated in many neuroimaging studies. Among these regions, the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC, Brodman areas 9 and 46) plays a crucial role in WM such that verbal WM is handled mainly by the left hemisphere and spatial WM is a function of the right hemisphere. Understandably, memory enhancement is a major interest to those involved in cognitive neuroscience and rehabilitation. In addition to pharmacotherapeutic and psychotherapeutic approaches for enhancing memory, brain stimulation using magnetic or electrical stimulation techniques has recently been investigated.

Recent studies have highlighted the importance of noninvasive brain stimulation as a means of modulating cortical excitability. Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) has been reported as an effective method for manipulating human brain excitability through continuous application of a weak direct current on the scalp. The effect of tDCS varies depending on the polarity of the electrode; anodal polarization increases cortical excitability, whereas cathodal polarization decreases it. Recent human studies have demonstrated that anodal polarization increases the excitability of the motor, visual, and prefrontal cortices and improves motor skill, WM, and verbal fluency in both healthy subjects and patients with brain disorders. Our previous study demonstrated that anodal tDCS applied to the left DLPFC had a time-dependent positive impact on the WM of healthy participants. In patients with Parkinson’s disease, anodal DLPFC and sham stimulation) similar to that described elsewhere. The order of stimulation was randomly assigned for all participants. To avoid carryover effects, each stimulation session was separated by at least 48 hrs to wash out the effects of the previous run. To avoid a possible learning effect, two different WM tasks were designed and randomly distributed. Before starting the experiment, all patients participated in a familiarization session using different WM task set until response accuracy reached a plateau. In each experimental session, patients performed the two-back verbal WM task before the tDCS to establish a baseline measurement and at 25 mins after starting the stimulation (Fig. 1A).

Cognitive Paradigm and Experimental Procedure

A two-back verbal WM task, similar to those described elsewhere, was used as the cognitive paradigm. The exposure time and size of the stimuli were modified for patients with cognitive dysfunction. Stimuli were generated using SuperlabPro v.2.0 software (Cedrus Corporation, San Pedro, CA). A pseudorandom set of 10 Korean letters was displayed on a monitor, and the subjects were instructed to press a keyboard if the letter

METHODS

Subjects

Ten patients with a first-ever stroke participated in this study (seven males and three females). The mean age of the patients was 47.9 ± 8.9 yrs. The inclusion criteria were as follows: unilateral right hemisphere stroke, age younger than 70 yrs, and noticeable cognitive disorder after stroke. All participants were evaluated with the Korean version of Mini-Mental Status Examination, digit and visual span tests to screen the cognitive function. A formal neurocognitive test battery was also applied as needed. Patients were excluded from the study for the following reasons: seizure disorder, intracranial metal insertion or cardiac pacemaker, or history of other neuropsychiatric diseases. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants before inclusion in the study, and the study protocol was approved by our local Ethics Committee. The demographic and clinical characteristics of the participants are shown in Table 1.

Experimental Design

The experimental design was based on two previous studies in which the effects of anodal tDCS on WM in healthy volunteers and patients with Parkinson’s disease were investigated. This study was designed as a single-blind, crossover, sham-controlled experiment. Each subject participated in two stimulation conditions (anodal DLPFC and sham stimulation) similar to that described elsewhere. The order of stimulation was randomly assigned for all participants. To avoid carryover effects, each stimulation session was separated by at least 48 hrs to wash out the effects of the previous run. To avoid a possible learning effect, two different WM tasks were designed and randomly distributed. Before starting the experiment, all patients participated in a familiarization session using different WM task set until response accuracy reached a plateau. In each experimental session, patients performed the two-back verbal WM task before the tDCS to establish a baseline measurement and at 25 mins after starting the stimulation (Fig. 1A).
presented was the same as the letter presented two stimuli previously (Fig. 1B). Each letter was displayed for 900 msecs, followed by a blank screen for 600 msecs between stimuli. The total number of targets was 30, and the total number of foil stimuli was 60. The accuracy (correction rate; number of correct responses/total targets) and the response time were measured. Also, recognition accuracy (correction rate-commission error rate) was considered an outcome that reflected the overall performance of the task. The patients reported a subjective feeling of fatigue and concentration after finishing each experiment, as assessed by the visual analog scale in which one represented “no concentration or no fatigue” and ten represented the “highest levels of concentration or fatigue.”

**tDCS Application**

Stimulation was applied using a constant-current regulator Phoresor II PM850 (Iomed Inc., Salt Lake City, UT). Saline-soaked electrodes (5 × 5 cm) were placed on the scalp in the following manner. For the anodal DLPFC stimulation, the anode was placed over the left DLPFC as determined by the International 10/20 Electroencephalogram System corresponding to F3, and the cathode was placed in the right supraorbital area. A constant current of 2 mA was administered for 30 mins. The electrode placement was identical for the sham DLPFC stimulation; however, the stimulator was turned on for only 10 secs during which the current intensity was gradually increased and then decreased to diminish the perception of the sham.

**Data Analysis**

All analyses were performed using the software package SPSS 15.0 (Chicago, IL). A repeated-measures analysis of variance was used to test whether there was an overall effect of the intervention (tDCS type) on each outcome measure across time (prestimulation vs. poststimulation). The results were further analyzed with two-tailed paired-sam-

---

**TABLE 1 Demographic and clinical characteristics of participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>Age, yrs</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Duration of Stroke, mos</th>
<th>Brain Lesion</th>
<th>Stroke Risk Factors</th>
<th>Digit Span Test</th>
<th>Visual Span Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HTN</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>FW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rt. BG hemorrhage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rt. MCA infarction</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rt. Cerebellar hemorrhage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rt. Frontal hemorrhage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rt. PICA infarction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rt. Parietal hemorrhage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rt. CR infarction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rt. Frontal hemorrhage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rt. BG hemorrhage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rt. MCA infarction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean ± SD 47.9 ± 8.7 M = 7, F = 3 2.4 ± 1.0 Hemorrhage = 6 Infarction = 4 4.8 ± 0.8 2.9 ± 1.0 2.9 ± 1.1 1.9 ± 1.2

M, male; F, female; HTN, hypertension; DM, diabetes mellitus; FW, forward; BW, backward; Rt., right; BG, basal ganglia; MCA, middle cerebral artery; PICA, posterior inferior cerebellar artery; CR, corona radiata.
ples $t$ tests for within-subjects comparisons using the Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons. All results are expressed as mean $\pm$ SD. Statistical significance refers to $P < 0.05$.

RESULTS

Ten patients completed the entire set of experiments. There were some adverse effects during tDCS that disappeared after a few seconds. Transient aching or burning sensations were reported in six cases, and transient skin redness at the electrode contact site was reported in three cases.

Repeated-measures analysis of variance indicated a significant interaction effect of tDCS type and time on the recognition accuracy ($F(1,18) = 5.433, P = 0.032$). Post hoc analyses with two-tailed paired-samples $t$ tests using the Bonferroni multiple-comparison correction revealed a significant difference between prestimulation and poststimulation in the anodal stimulation group ($t(9) = 3.863, P = 0.004$) but not in the sham stimulation group ($t(9) = 0.878, P = 0.403$). The significant effects on recognition accuracy were not the result of a difference at baseline across tDCS type; a two-tailed two-sample $t$ test comparing recognition accuracy at baseline did not show any significant difference ($t(18) = 0.751, P = 0.462$) (Table 2 and Fig. 2A).

As to other outcome measures, the interaction effects of tDCS type and time were not significant. Nevertheless, the paired $t$ test showed that the accuracy was improved only after anodal tDCS ($P = 0.021$, Table 2 and Fig. 2B), without any significant difference at baseline between the two tDCS types. There were no significant differences in the response time between the prestimulation and poststimulation data for either condition ($P > 0.05$) (Table 2 and Fig. 2C). No significant changes were reported for fatigue and concentration after the experiments for either condition.

DISCUSSION

Anodal tDCS applied over the left DLPFC for 30 mins at an intensity of 2 mA was associated with enhanced verbal WM performance in patients after a stroke. Among the outcome measures, recognition accuracy was improved after anodal stimulation of the left DLPFC, with a significant interaction effect compared with the sham stimulation. Accuracy, which is a common measure of WM and has been used in a number of studies,12,13,17 was significantly improved after anodal tDCS stimulation, but without an interaction effect in analysis of variance, probably because of the small number of subjects in our study. These results suggest that anodal tDCS on the left DLPFC produced a positive effect on WM performance by improving both correct response and error detection rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2 Working memory performances at baseline and after intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anodal DLPFC Stimulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accuracy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poststimulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poststimulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are described as the mean $\pm$ SD.

*Significant at $P < 0.05$ vs. baseline.

DLPFC, dorsolateral prefrontal cortex.
A cognitive process such as WM consists of subcomponents, the corresponding states of which are temporally distinguishable by using a proper cognitive task. However, the effects of anodal tDCS on these individual processes in WM have not been investigated in detail. In a two-back WM task, the subject must perform multiple cognitive operations, including encoding of new stimuli, update and maintenance of past stimuli, and recognition response of whether each new stimulus matches the two-back stimulus. In neuroimaging studies, different prefrontal activation was shown in different phases or in response to the positive or negative probe of a WM task. The prefrontal cortex is considered to be involved in WM, particularly in processes that distinguish target and nontarget stimuli during recognition, so that stimulation on the prefrontal cortex can enhance the recognition component of WM. Even though the participants’ brain lesions were in the right hemisphere, the verbal WM among all participants enrolled in this study was improved after left DLPFC stimulation. The tDCS has been investigated as a potential tool for modulating motor, sensory, and cognitive function. Conceivably, anodal tDCS induces neuronal depolarization and enhances neuronal excitability, whereas cathodal tDCS has the opposite effects. The increased recognition accuracy of WM tasks after anodal stimulation in this study was thought to reflect enhanced local cortical excitability of the left DLPFC. No change in reaction time suggests that slowed responses cannot account for the enhanced recognition accuracy after anodal DLPFC stimulation.

A number of recent studies have reported on the beneficial effects of various types of anodal tDCS on WM in healthy participants and in patients with brain injuries. Fregni et al. reported that left prefrontal anodal stimulation for 10 mins at 1 mA in healthy participants enhanced WM performance; the effects depended on the stimulation site and polarity. Iyer et al. demonstrated that verbal fluency improved during anodal stimulation for 20 mins at 2 mA, and this improvement did not occur during sham or cathodal polarization. In contrast, Boggio et al. reported a change in prefrontal excitability and WM performance in patients with Parkinson’s disease with tDCS for 20 mins at 2 mA but not after stimulation at 1 mA. In our previous study with healthy participants, anodal tDCS applied over the left DLPFC at 1 mA enhanced the verbal WM in a time-dependent manner. The accuracy of WM tasks increased after 10 mins of tDCS, and this effect was further enhanced by 30 mins of stimulation. Referring to the two aforementioned studies, we applied tDCS for 30 mins at 2 mA to obtain the maximal effect from the stimulation. However, because of safety concerns, we did not extend the duration of the stimulation beyond 30 mins.

The limitations of this study include the following. First, the effect of different intensities and durations of the anodal DLPFC tDCS on WM performance was not investigated and needs further study to develop an optimal stimulation protocol in the clinical setting. Second, the possible confounding effect of the cathodal electrode on the performance of cognitive task was not taken into consideration in our analysis. Blindness of real vs. sham stimulation was also an issue not totally resolved. In addition, an attentional effect of tDCS on the performance of WM was not clearly separated by using control-task design. In future studies, specific WM components affected by tDCS need to be investigated by combined use of various neuroimaging methods. Examination of functional networks and local activations engaged in WM processing will improve our understanding of the effects of tDCS by analysis of patterns of brain activation accompanying the changes in cognitive performance.

In conclusion, the results of this study showed that anodal tDCS over the left DLPFC positively impacted WM in terms of the recognition accuracy in patients with cognitive deficits after a stroke. Anodal tDCS might therefore be a potential therapeutic modality for the treatment of cognitive deficits in stroke patients.
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