Published in final edited form as:

Neurosci Lett. 2016 August 26; 629: 105–109. doi:10.1016/j.neulet.2016.06.056.

Working Memory Capacity Differentially Influences Responses to tDCS and HD-tDCS in a Retro-Cue task

Filiz Gözenman^{1,2} and Marian E. Berryhill¹

¹University of Nevada, Department of Psychology, Program in Cognitive and Brain Sciences
University of Nevada, Reno, NV 89557

²Yasar University, Department of Psychology Izmir, Turkey

Abstract

There is growing interest in non-invasive brain stimulation techniques. A drawback is that the relationship between stimulation and cognitive outcomes for various tasks are unknown. Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) provides diffuse current spread, whereas high-definition tDCS (HD-tDCS) provides more targeted current. The direction of behavioral effects after tDCS can be difficult to predict in cognitive realms such as attention and working memory (WM). Previously, we showed that in low and high WM capacity groups tDCS modulates performance in nearly equal and opposite directions on a change detection task, with improvement for the high capacity participants alone. Here, we used the retro-cue paradigm to test attentional shifting among items in WM to investigate whether WM capacity (WMC) predicted different behavioral consequences during anodal tDCS or HD-tDCS to posterior parietal cortex (PPC). In two experiments, with 24 participants each, we used different stimulus categories (colored circles, letters) and stimulation sites (right, left PPC). The results showed a significant (Experiment 1) or trending (Experiment 2) WMC x stimulation interaction. Compared to tDCS, after HD-tDCS the retro-cueing benefit was significantly greater for the low WMC group but numerically worse for the high WMC group. These data highlight the importance of considering group differences when using non-invasive neurostimulation techniques.

1. Introduction

Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) usage is growing rapidly due to a strong safety profile, [1, 2] tolerable use, [3] affordability, and ability to address structure-function and translational questions in various domains (working memory (WM): [4–17]; perception: [18, 19]; motor processing: [20, 21]; episodic memory: [22–24]). However, tDCS can have heterogeneous effects across participants performing cognitive tasks, [5, 11, 12] compared to relatively predictable effects on motor tasks. [25]. For example, we found that anodal tDCS

Address correspondence to: Marian E. Berryhill, University of Nevada, 1664 N. Virginia St., Mail Stop 296, Reno, NV 89557, Tel: 775-682-8692, Fax: 775-784-1126, mberryhill@unr.edu.

The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH, NIGMS or NEI.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

to right parietal cortex paired with a change detection WM task *selectively* benefited the high working memory capacity (WMC) group [7, 26]. Group differences may be an *essential* overlooked factor in recent meta-analyses of tDCS effects claiming that tDCS is ineffective on cognitive tasks [27, 28]. One perceived limitation of tDCS is the distribution of current, which makes it difficult to conclusively link structure and function [29, 30]. HD-tDCS is an alternative that provides focal stimulation by using smaller electrodes and configuring them in a ring-like pattern to constrain current flow [31]. Current modeling recommends HD-tDCS for more targeted neuromodulation [32–36] and suggests that it induces longer lasting effects compared to conventional tDCS [31].

However, to our knowledge no studies employing a cognitive task compare tDCS and HD-tDCS effects. We tested if these techniques interacted with WMC. Individuals with low WMC might benefit more from focal HD-tDCS because it is more locally intense than tDCS. Feedback and financial incentive restores tDCS benefits to low WMC [26], indicating that modified tDCS paradigms can be effective in this population. HD-tDCS might also boost benefits in the high WMC group, or conversely it might impair their performance by decreasing signal-to-noise ratio in the targeted area or not change the performance as a result of the ceiling effects [37]. Comparing tDCS and HD-tDCS will provide a greater sense of what facilitates WM, and in whom. Moreover, these investigations will be translational for future training and rehabilitation approaches. To sum up, we hypothesize that high WMC participants benefit on tasks with WM demands from a diffuse, general ‘boost’ provided by tDCS, whereas HD-tDCS might benefit low WMC group in particular, by enhancing the activity of one node in the larger WM network. We employed a retrospective cueing (retro-cue) task that measures attentional reorienting to items currently held in WM [16, 38–41]. We previously found that cathodal tDCS over frontal (F4) or parietal (P4) sites disrupted retro-cue performance [16]. Our ancillary goal was to optimize performance in low and high WMC participants via anodal tDCS/HD-tDCS.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Stimulation Protocol

Two experiments tested 24 participants each in 3 counterbalanced sessions: anodal tDCS, anodal HD-tDCS, sham. Experimental sessions were conducted at least 24 hours apart. Electrode sites were chosen using HD/tDCS Explore software (Soterix Medical Inc., NY, USA). A continuous current stimulator delivered tDCS (Eldith MagStim, GmbH, Germany) through two $5 \times 7 \text{ cm}^2$ electrodes housed in saline soaked sponges. The anode sat over right (P4: Experiment 1) or left (P3: Experiment 2) posterior parietal cortex; the reference was on the contralateral cheek. HD-tDCS was delivered over these sites via ring 4×1 montage (Soterix Medical Inc., New York). The electrodes were $\sim .5''$ in diameter. Four cathodal electrodes sat equidistantly around the anode (Experiment 1: Pz, C4, P8, O2; Experiment 2: Pz, C3, P7, O1). The ring 4×1 montage has been utilized in a study combining HD-tDCS with functional Near-Infrared Spectroscopy [42].

Before HD-tDCS, we applied .5 ml .5% Lidocaine under electrodes to reduce discomfort [43], and 1.5 ml Signagel (Parker Laboratories, NJ, USA) to improve conductance. Active stimulation was 1.5 mA for 20 minutes. Sham was delivered by tDCS or HD-tDCS (50%).

Sham involved a 20 s ramp up/down of current at the beginning and the end of stimulation with no current during the interim to blind participants to stimulation condition.

2.2. Task Design

First, to get an independent baseline measure of WMC, participants completed the computerized automated operation span (OSpan) task before the first session. It is a task of divided attention in which participants solve true/false arithmetic problems while simultaneously encoding and maintaining a letter sequence [44]. The task lasted for ~5 minutes. A median split of the OSpan scores determined high and low WMC groups in each experiment. Next, participants completed 20 practice retro-cue trials. Stimulation started at the beginning of the practice session and lasted 20 minutes. After practice participants completed the retro-cue task [16, 38–41]. Trials began with fixation (1200 ms), followed by a delay (200 ms), and a 4-item stimulus array (Experiment 1: 300 ms, Experiment 2: 56 ms). In Experiment 1, the stimuli were colored circles (5.5°) drawn from a set of 10 color patches. In Experiment 2, the stimuli were letters drawn from the 21 consonants ($1^\circ \times 1^\circ$). Stimuli were placed in each quadrant at 6° (Experiment 1) or 3.5° (Experiment 2) from fixation. Next, a black and white noise mask ($10.5^\circ \times 15^\circ$, 700 ms) appeared and then a blank screen (300 ms) before the retro-cue appeared: neutral ('X', $1.4^\circ \times 1.4^\circ$) or valid ('arrow', $1.4^\circ \times 1.1^\circ$, 100 ms). After a second delay (400 ms), the probe screen appeared. The probe screen preserved the stimulus configuration by indicating locations with empty annuli (Experiment 1) or parentheses (Experiment 2); the probe location contained either an old or a new stimulus item. Participants reported whether the probe stimulus matched the object-location conjunction shown at encoding ('O': match, or 'N': non-match, 50% each). Participants received visual feedback (correct/incorrect) and initiated the next trial via key press. The task began after 5 minutes of stimulation and lasted ~15 minutes (200 trials, rest after each block of 50), meaning the end of the task coincided with the end of stimulation. Participants repeated a new three-letter word during Experiment 1 to prevent verbal rehearsal of the color patches for each block. Verbal rehearsal of the letters was not prevented in Experiment 2.

2.3. Analysis

For both experiments, we conducted a repeated measures of 3-way ANOVA with 2 cue-type (Valid, Neutral) $\times$ 3 stimulation (tDCS, HD-tDCS, sham) $\times$ 2 WMC group (High, Low) on WM raw accuracy and median response times (RT). To further understand the attentional reorienting interaction, we calculated the retro-cue benefit (RCB accuracy: valid trial % - neutral trial %; RCB RT: neutral trial RT - valid trial RT) and conducted a repeated measures of 2-way ANOVA with the between-subjects factor of WMC group (High, Low) and the within-subjects factor of stimulation (tDCS, HD-tDCS, sham).

3. Results

To test for fatigue, we compared performance on the first and second halves of the experiments for each stimulation condition. A 2-way ANOVA on raw accuracy with within factors of cue-type (Valid, Neutral) and half (First, Second) showed the expected main effect

of cue-type (p 's $< .001$), but no main effect of experimental half or interaction (all p 's $> .226$), suggesting fatigue was not a concern.

High and low WMC groups were based on median OSPAN scores per experiment (Experiment 1: low WMC: 6–20; high WMC: 24–43; Experiment 2: low WMC: 4–26; high WMC: 27–43). In Experiment 1, the 3-way ANOVA on raw accuracy showed a significant main effect of cue-type such that performance benefited from a valid cue ($F_{1, 22} = 118.86$, $p < .001$; $\eta^2 = .84$; valid Mean (standard error) = 85.69 (1.55); neutral: $M = 76.45$ (1.57)). The significant main effect of group ($F_{1, 22} = 7.40$, $p = .01$; $\eta^2 = .25$) showed worse performance in the low WMC group ($M = 76.97$ (2.12)) compared to the high WMC group ($M = 85.17$ (2.12)). The main effect of stimulation was not significant ($F_{2, 44} = .53$, $p = .59$). Importantly, the 3-way interaction of stimulation $\times$ WMC group $\times$ cue-type reached significance ($F_{2, 44} = 4.01$, $p = .025$; $\eta^2 = .15$). To characterize this interaction two 2-way ANOVAs (cue-type $\times$ stimulation) are conducted. The results yielded significant cue-type effects for both WMC groups (p 's $< .001$), but no main effects of stimulation (both p 's $> .20$). A significant cue-type and stimulation interaction emerged for the low WMC group only (low WMC $p = .012$, high WMC $p = .65$). No other interactions reached significance (all p 's $> .26$). A 2-way ANOVA on RCB accuracy data showed that there were no main effects of stimulation ($F_{2, 44} = 1.39$, $p = .26$) or WMC group ($F_{1, 22} = .13$, $p = .71$), Figure 1 (left). Importantly, there was an interaction of WMC group $\times$ stimulation ($F_{2, 44} = 4.01$, $p = .025$, $\eta^2 = .15$). To characterize the interaction, we ran separate 1-way ANOVAs on stimulation condition per WMC group and found no significant differences for the high WMC group ($p = .50$), but a significant effect for the low WMC group ($p = .01$). Bonferroni corrected pairwise comparisons showed that the RCB was significantly smaller after tDCS (Mean (SE) = 5.66 (1.72) compared to HD-tDCS (Mean (SE) = 12.68 (2.01), $p = .03$), but neither condition was different from sham ($M = 10.31$ (1.63), versus tDCS: $p = .28$, versus HD-tDCS: $p = .63$). The high WMC group showed a different pattern with a numerically lower RCB after HD-tDCS ($M = 7.21$ (1.98), $p = 1$) and an unchanged RCB after tDCS ($M = 9.60$ (1.87), $p = 1$) compared to sham ($M = 9.95$ (1.57)).

A 3-way ANOVA on raw RT also showed a main effect of cue-type ($F_{1, 22} = 116.61$ $p < .001$; $\eta^2 = .84$; Valid $M = 910.93$ (42.39); Neutral: $M = 1118.29$ (46.72)). The interaction of cue-type $\times$ stimulation approached significance ($F_{2, 44} = 2.95$ $p = .06$; $\eta^2 = .11$). No other main effects or interactions were significant (all p 's $> .35$). The 2-way ANOVA on RCB RT data yielded a significant main effect of stimulation ($F_{2, 44} = 3.16$, $p = .05$, $\eta^2 = .12$) with the lowest RCB for the sham stimulation. However none of the pairwise comparisons were significant (all p 's $> .10$). The main effect of WMC group ($F_{1, 22} = 1.47$, $p = .24$) and the interaction ($F_{2, 22} = 1.42$, $p = .25$) were not significant.

For Experiment 2, the 3-way ANOVA on raw accuracy showed a similar pattern, Figure 1 (right). As expected, there was a main effect of cue ($F_{1, 22} = 56.01$ $p < .001$; $\eta^2 = .71$; Valid $M = 87.77$ (1.54); Neutral: $M = 82.44$ (1.54)), but no main effect of stimulation ($F_{2, 44} = .108$, $p = .90$). A significant main effect of WMC group showed superior performance in the high WMC group compared to the low WMC group (High WMC $M = 88.41$ (2.29); Low WMC $M = 81.79$ (2.29); $F_{1, 22} = 4.16$, $p = .05$; $\eta^2 = .15$). The interaction of the WMC group $\times$ cue-type approached significance ($F_{1, 22} = 3.72$, $p = .07$; $\eta^2 = .14$). No other

interactions were significant (all p 's $> .58$). A 2-way ANOVA on RCB yielded no significant main effects of stimulation ($F_{2, 44} = .14$, $p = .87$), or interaction ($F_{1, 22} = 1.0$, $p = .38$). However, the main effect WMC group approached significance ($F_{1, 22} = 3.72$, $p = .07$; $\eta^2 = .14$).

A 3-way ANOVA on raw RT showed a significant main effect of cue ($F_{1, 22} = 152.11$, $p < .001$; $\eta^2 = .87$; Valid $M = 866.54$ (50.02); Neutral: $M = 1097.48$ (50.48)), WMC group ($F_{1, 22} = 5.37$, $p = .03$; $\eta^2 = .19$; High $M = 867.55$ (69.27); Low: $M = 1096.47$ (69.82) and an interaction of cue type $\times$ WMC group ($F_{1, 22} = 8.70$, $p = .01$; $\eta^2 = .28$). The low WMC group showed lower performance benefit from the valid cue compared to high WMC group. No other main effects or interaction were significant (all p 's $> .65$). A 2-way ANOVA on RCB RT data revealed no main effect of stimulation ($F_{2, 44} = .19$, $p = .83$), but the main effect of WMC group was significant ($F_{1, 22} = 8.70$, $p = .01$, $\eta^2 = .28$). The high WMC ($M = 286.18$ (26.81)) group showed a greater RT difference than the low WMC group ($M = 175.69$ (26.48)). The interaction of WMC group $\times$ stimulation was not significant ($F_{2, 22} = .35$, $p = .71$).

Because we used independent median splits of OSPAN scores to form the WMC groups in each experiment the boundaries between high and low WMC differed across experiments. We repeated the analyses in Experiment 2 using the criteria from Experiment 1. The 3-way ANOVA on the raw accuracy and RT data showed consistent main effects of cue type ($p < .001$). The significant main effect of WMC group and borderline significant effect of WMC group $\times$ cue-type disappeared ($p > .19$). The 2-way ANOVA on the RCB accuracy and RT showed the same non-significant main and interaction effects except the significant WMC group main effect disappeared ($p = .11$).

4. Discussion

One goal of this paper was to refine stimulation protocols to benefit retro-cue performance in a broader range of low and high WMC participants. The current data revealed a surprising WMC group $\times$ stimulation interaction in Experiment 1, and a similar trend in Experiment 2. The low and high WMC groups showed contradictory effects of HD-tDCS. For the low WMC group, the magnitude of the RCB improved after HD-tDCS and declined after tDCS. The effects were much weaker on the High WMC group, but showed a numerical drop in the magnitude of the RCB after HD-tDCS and no effect of tDCS. These data extend previous findings showing that low WMC participants do not always benefit from tDCS [11, 26]. One concern is that the participants were performing well and challenging tasks are important [45], but a look at overall accuracy indicates that improvement was possible.

Previously, we found that high WMC participants benefited from tDCS targeting parietal cortex on WM tasks with high-load [11]. Importantly, this work employed a WM task, whereas the current retro-cue paradigm reflects attentional orienting to items in WM. This extends our observations highlighting the heterogeneity of tDCS effects across tasks [45] and confirms that group differences are important to consider. In addition, HD-tDCS advocates promote its use to clarify structure-function relationships [31]. Future work is needed to clarify why differential stimulation approaches provide different outcomes and

why group differences matter. Pairing stimulation with neuroimaging techniques can clarify mechanism and optimal paradigms. A few papers have combined tDCS/HD-tDCS, offline and online respectively, with fNIRS to reveal direct relationships between activation and cognitive or motor performance, these observations show change in the blood flow [26, 42]. The study that measured the blood flow after the stimulation (offline) showed an increase in task related brain activations [26], whereas the other study measured the blood flow during the stimulation (online) showed a decrease [42]. Thus, the relationship between brain activation and cognitive/motor performance is not always straightforward after tDCS as the study in the latter suggests lower blood flow during the task was due to the increased cognitive performance [42]. Moreover, research combining tDCS and fMRI showed that anodal stimulation can enhance behavioral performance with no detected change in brain activation [46, 47].

The current study showed that the stimulation benefit was modulated by WMC. Our conclusion provides another consciousness raising example: tDCS and HD-tDCS do not provide general benefits across participants. HD-tDCS is promising with its focality, but this may mean unless your electrodes are positioned very precisely you see more null effects.

This work is relevant for translational paradigms in clinical populations. It may be the case that for every task, group differences matter in ways that are difficult to anticipate. It is worth considering group differences or null findings may obscure differential effects of stimulation on performance. Optimistically, additional data will provide clarity regarding the important predictors for stimulation benefits. Future studies should investigate how stimulation changes behavior as a function of brain activity between different groups and techniques.

Acknowledgments

The authors declare no competing financial interests. Research reported in this manuscript was funded by NEI R15EY022775 to M. E. B and P20 GM103650 (P.I.: Michael Webster; Project Leader: M. E. B.).

References

1. Bikson M, Datta A, Elwassif M. Establishing safety limits for transcranial direct current stimulation. *Clin Neurophysiol.* 2009; 120(6):1033–4. [PubMed: 19394269]
2. Nitsche MA, et al. Safety criteria for transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) in humans. *Clin Neurophysiol.* 2003; 114(11):2220–2. author reply 2222–3. [PubMed: 14580622]
3. Kessler SK, et al. Differences in the experience of active and sham transcranial direct current stimulation. *Brain Stimul.* 2012; 5(2):155–62. [PubMed: 22037128]
4. Andrews SC, et al. 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(2):84–9. [PubMed: 21511208]
5. Berryhill ME, Jones KT. tDCS selectively improves working memory in older adults with more education. *Neurosci Lett.* 2012; 521(2):148–51. [PubMed: 22684095]
6. Berryhill ME, et al. A selective working memory impairment after transcranial direct current stimulation to the right parietal lobe. *Neurosci Lett.* 2010; 479(3):312–6. [PubMed: 20570713]
7. Blumberg EJ, Peterson MS, Parasuraman R. Enhancing multiple object tracking performance with noninvasive brain stimulation: a causal role for the anterior intraparietal sulcus. *Front Syst Neurosci.* 2015; 9:3. [PubMed: 25698943]

8. Boehringer A, et al. Cerebellar transcranial direct current stimulation modulates verbal working memory. *Brain Stimul.* 2013; 6(4):649–53. [PubMed: 23122917]
9. Dockery CA, et al. Cumulative benefits of frontal transcranial direct current stimulation on visuospatial working memory training and skill learning in rats. *Neurobiol Learn Mem.* 2011; 96(3): 452–60. [PubMed: 21763775]
10. Heimrath K, et al. Behavioral and electrophysiological effects of transcranial direct current stimulation of the parietal cortex in a visuo-spatial working memory task. *Front Psychiatry.* 2012; 3:56. [PubMed: 22723784]
11. Jones KT, Berryhill ME. Parietal contributions to visual working memory depend on task difficulty. *Front Psychiatry.* 2012; 3:81. [PubMed: 22973241]
12. London RE, Slagter HA. Effects of Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation over Left Dorsolateral pFC on the Attentional Blink Depend on Individual Baseline Performance. *J Cogn Neurosci.* 2015; 27(12):2382–93. [PubMed: 26284996]
13. Marshall L, et al. Bifrontal transcranial direct current stimulation slows reaction time in a working memory task. *BMC Neurosci.* 2005; 6:23. [PubMed: 15819988]
14. Pope PA, Brenton JW, Miall RC. Task-Specific Facilitation of Cognition by Anodal Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation of the Prefrontal Cortex. *Cereb Cortex.* 2015; 25(11):4551–8. [PubMed: 25979089]
15. Richmond LL, et al. Transcranial direct current stimulation enhances verbal working memory training performance over time and near transfer outcomes. *J Cogn Neurosci.* 2014; 26(11):2443–54. [PubMed: 24742190]
16. Tanoue RT, et al. Differential frontal involvement in shifts of internal and perceptual attention. *Brain Stimul.* 2013; 6(4):675–82. [PubMed: 23266133]
17. Zaehle T, et al. Transcranial direct current stimulation of the prefrontal cortex modulates working memory performance: combined behavioural and electrophysiological evidence. *BMC Neurosci.* 2011; 12:2. [PubMed: 21211016]
18. Elder GJ, et al. Effects of transcranial direct current stimulation upon attention and visuo-perceptual function in Lewy body dementia: a preliminary study. *Int Psychogeriatr.* 2016; 28(2):341–7. [PubMed: 26250473]
19. Zito GA, et al. Cathodal HD-tDCS on the right V5 improves motion perception in humans. *Front Behav Neurosci.* 2015; 9:257. [PubMed: 26441582]
20. Angius L, et al. The effect of transcranial direct current stimulation of the motor cortex on exercise-induced pain. *Eur J Appl Physiol.* 2015; 115(11):2311–9. [PubMed: 26148882]
21. Javadi AH, et al. Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation of the Motor Cortex Biases Action Choice in a Perceptual Decision Task. *J Cogn Neurosci.* 2015; 27(11):2174–85. [PubMed: 26151605]
22. Gray SJ, et al. Electrically stimulating prefrontal cortex at retrieval improves recollection accuracy. *Cortex.* 2015; 73:188–94. [PubMed: 26457823]
23. Lu Y, et al. Spatiotemporal neural pattern similarity supports episodic memory. *Curr Biol.* 2015; 25(6):780–5. [PubMed: 25728695]
24. Pergolizzi D, Chua EF. Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) of the parietal cortex leads to increased false recognition. *Neuropsychologia.* 2015; 66:88–98. [PubMed: 25448859]
25. Jacobson L, Koslowsky M, Lavidor M. tDCS polarity effects in motor and cognitive domains: a meta-analytical review. *Exp Brain Res.* 2012; 216(1):1–10. [PubMed: 21989847]
26. Jones KT, Gozenman F, Berryhill ME. The strategy and motivational influences on the beneficial effect of neurostimulation: a tDCS and fNIRS study. *Neuroimage.* 2015; 105:238–47. [PubMed: 25462798]
27. Horvath JC, Forte JD, Carter O. Evidence that transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) generates little-to-no reliable neurophysiologic effect beyond MEP amplitude modulation in healthy human subjects: A systematic review. *Neuropsychologia.* 2015; 66:213–36. [PubMed: 25448853]
28. Horvath JC, Forte JD, Carter O. Quantitative Review Finds No Evidence of Cognitive Effects in Healthy Populations From Single-session Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation (tDCS). *Brain Stimul.* 2015; 8(3):535–50. [PubMed: 25701175]

29. Faria P, Hallett M, Miranda PC. A finite element analysis of the effect of electrode area and inter-electrode distance on the spatial distribution of the current density in tDCS. *J Neural Eng*. 2011; 8(6):066017. [PubMed: 22086257]
30. Keeser D, et al. Prefrontal transcranial direct current stimulation changes connectivity of resting-state networks during fMRI. *J Neurosci*. 2011; 31(43):15284–93. [PubMed: 22031874]
31. Kuo HI, et al. Comparing cortical plasticity induced by conventional and high-definition 4×1 ring tDCS: a neurophysiological study. *Brain Stimul*. 2013; 6(4):644–8. [PubMed: 23149292]
32. Bikson M, Rahman A, Datta A. Computational models of transcranial direct current stimulation. *Clin EEG Neurosci*. 2012; 43(3):176–83. [PubMed: 22956646]
33. Caparelli-Daquer, EM., et al. A pilot study on effects of 4×1 high-definition tDCS on motor cortex excitability. *Conf Proc IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc*; 2012; 2012. p. 735–8.
34. Datta A, et al. Gyri-precise head model of transcranial direct current stimulation: improved spatial focality using a ring electrode versus conventional rectangular pad. *Brain Stimul*. 2009; 2(4):201–7. 207.e1. [PubMed: 20648973]
35. Edwards D, et al. Physiological and modeling evidence for focal transcranial electrical brain stimulation in humans: a basis for high-definition tDCS. *Neuroimage*. 2013; 74:266–75. [PubMed: 23370061]
36. Shahid SS, et al. The value and cost of complexity in predictive modelling: role of tissue anisotropic conductivity and fibre tracts in neuromodulation. *J Neural Eng*. 2014; 11(3):036002. [PubMed: 24737098]
37. Filmer HL, Dux PE, Mattingley JB. Applications of transcranial direct current stimulation for understanding brain function. *Trends Neurosci*. 2014; 37(12):742–53. [PubMed: 25189102]
38. Berryhill ME, et al. Shifting attention among working memory representations: testing cue type, awareness, and strategic control. *Q J Exp Psychol (Hove)*. 2012; 65(3):426–38. [PubMed: 21846267]
39. Gozenman F, et al. Invalid retro-cues can eliminate the retro-cue benefit: Evidence for a hybridized account. *J Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform*. 2014; 40(5):1748–54. [PubMed: 25045904]
40. Griffin IC, Nobre AC. Orienting attention to locations in internal representations. *J Cogn Neurosci*. 2003; 15(8):1176–94. [PubMed: 14709235]
41. Matsukura M, Luck SJ, Vecera SP. Attention effects during visual short-term memory maintenance: protection or prioritization? *Percept Psychophys*. 2007; 69(8):1422–34. [PubMed: 18078232]
42. Muthalib M, et al. Effects of Anodal High-Definition Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation on Bilateral Sensorimotor Cortex Activation During Sequential Finger Movements: An fNIRS Study. *Adv Exp Med Biol*. 2016; 876:351–9. [PubMed: 26782232]
43. Guleyupoglu B, et al. Reduced discomfort during high-definition transcutaneous stimulation using 6% benzocaine. *Front Neuroeng*. 2014; 7:28. [PubMed: 25071548]
44. Unsworth N, et al. An automated version of the operation span task. *Behav Res Methods*. 2005; 37(3):498–505. [PubMed: 16405146]
45. Berryhill ME, et al. Hits and misses: leveraging tDCS to advance cognitive research. *Front Psychol*. 2014; 5:800. [PubMed: 25120513]
46. Holland R, et al. Speech facilitation by left inferior frontal cortex stimulation. *Curr Biol*. 2011; 21(16):1403–7. [PubMed: 21820308]
47. Holland R, et al. Modulation of frontal effective connectivity during speech. *Neuroimage*. 2016

Highlights

- We compared tDCS and HD-tDCS in two attentional orienting working memory (WM) tasks.
- An interaction emerged between tDCS type and high/low WM capacity groups.
- Low WM capacity participants benefited from HD-tDCS compared to tDCS.
- Group differences should be taken into account to understand the stimulation effects.

Figure 1.

The results from Experiment 1 (left) and Experiment 2 (right). The Retro-Cue Benefit (Accuracy % valid cue trials – neutral cue trials). Dark grey bars represent high WMC group (N= 12), light grey bars represent low WMC group (N=12). X-axes represent the stimulation sessions: anodal tDCS, anodal High-Definition tDCS (HD-tDCS) and control stimulation (Sham). In both of the experiments the main effects of the WMC group and stimulation session were not significant. Experiment 1 revealed significant interaction effect between the WMC group x the stimulation session ($p = .025$), and significant difference between tDCS and HD-tDCS sessions for the low WMC group ($p = .028$). Error bars represent standard error.

Table 1

The mean accuracy data for valid and neutral retro-cue trials for low and high WMC groups in Experiments 1 (color patches) and 2 (letters). Rows below Mean values represent Standard Error (SE).

Mean	N	Sham		tDCS		HD-tDCS	
SE		Valid	Neutral	Valid	Neutral	Valid	Neutral
<i>Exp1. Low WMC</i>	12	81.96	71.65	79.71	74.04	83.58	70.90
		3.04	2.81	3.26	3.33	2.99	3.20
<i>Exp1. High WMC</i>	12	90.28	80.33	91.31	81.70	87.29	80.08
		1.45	2.12	1.57	2.08	2.52	2.10
<i>Exp2. Low WMC</i>	12	86.26	79.31	83.95	78.23	85.24	77.77
		3.63	3.97	3.94	7.06	5.59	6.86
<i>Exp2. High WMC</i>	12	90.28	85.72	90.99	86.24	89.91	87.34
		2.35	2.83	1.47	3.39	2.36	2.54