Automatic M1-SO Montage Headgear for Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation (TDCS) Suitable for Home and High-Throughput In-Clinic Applications

Helena Knotkova, PhD*†; Alexa Riggs, MPH*; Destiny Berisha, BEngc*‡; Helen Borges, MS‡; Henry Bernstein, MS‡; Vaishali Patel, BE*; Dennis Q. Truong, PhDc‡; Gozde Unal, PhDc‡; Denis Arce, BE§; Abhishek Datta, PhD§; Marom Bikson, PhD‡

Objectives: Non-invasive transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) over the motor cortex is broadly investigated to modulate functional outcomes such as motor function, sleep characteristics, or pain. The most common montages that use two large electrodes (25–35 cm²) placed over the area of motor cortex and contralateral supraorbital region (M1-SO montages) require precise measurements, usually using the 10–20 EEG system, which is cumbersome in clinics and not suitable for applications by patients at home. The objective was to develop and test novel headgear allowing for reproduction of the M1-SO montage without the 10–20 EEG measurements, neuronavigation, or TMS.

Materials and Methods: Points C3/C4 of the 10–20 EEG system is the conventional reference for the M1 electrode. The headgear was designed using an orthogonal, fixed-angle approach for connection of frontal and coronal headgear components. The headgear prototype was evaluated for accuracy and replicability of the M1 electrode position in 600 repeated measurements compared to manually determined C3 in 30 volunteers. Computational modeling was used to estimate brain current flow at the mean and maximum recorded electrode placement deviations from C3.

Results: The headgear includes navigational points for accurate placement and assemblies to hold electrodes in the M1-SO position without measurement by the user. Repeated measurements indicated accuracy and replicability of the M1 electrode position: the mean [SD] deviation of the M1 electrode (size 5 x 5 cm) from C3 was 1.57 [1.51] mm, median 1 mm. Computational modeling suggests that the potential deviation from C3 does not produce a significant change in brain current flow.

Conclusions: The novel approach to M1-SO montage using a fixed-angle headgear not requiring measurements by patients or caregivers facilitates tDCS studies in home settings and can replace cumbersome C3 measurements for clinical tDCS applications.

Keywords: At-home tDCS, fixed-angle M1 headgear, computational modeling, noninvasive neurostimulation, transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS)

Conflict of Interest: Drs. Bikson and Datta have equity in Soterix Medical Inc. The City University of New York has patents on brain stimulation with Drs. Bikson, Truong, and Datta as inventors. Dr. Arce is an employee of Soterix Medical. The remaining authors do not have conflicts of interest to disclose.

INTRODUCTION

Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) is a method of non-invasive neurostimulation utilizing low-intensity electrical current passed across the brain, typically with two large (25–35 cm²) saline-soaked sponge electrodes (anode and cathode) placed on the subject’s head (1–15). The position of tDCS electrodes on the scalp governs the pattern of underlying brain current flow, and which brain regions are stimulated (7,8). The position of electrodes on the scalp is therefore a critical factor (16–20).

tDCS stimulation of the motor cortex using a montage with electrodes placed on the surface of the head over the area of motor cortex and contralateral supraorbital region (M1-SO montage) has been frequently used in both research and clinical settings, not only for

modulation of motor function (21–24), but also when aiming for pain relief (25–30), or for modulation of sleep characteristics (31,32). To date, the M1 electrode position in the M1-SO montage can be determined using one of the following methods: 1) direct determination of the “hot spot” via evaluation of motor evoked potentials (MEPs) induced by the transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) of the motor area, with or without support by neuronavigational systems (1,33); or 2) using the electrode position measurements delineated by the International 10–20 EEG system (Fig. 1a), which require determining distances between the 10–20 anatomical landmarks (inion, nasion, vertex, preauricular points) in order to determine the C3 (or C4) point that corresponds with 20% of preauricular distance in coronal plane, measured from the vertex toward the preauricular point (34).

In research and clinical settings, the TMS approach is complex and costly, and has been used only in a minority of the overall pool of M1-SO tDCS applications. The more frequently used International 10–20 EEG system is cumbersome and prone to substantial operator error, especially under conditions of high throughput. Moreover, neither of these methods is suitable for replication in home settings. The problem of how to easily and reliably determine the electrode position and affix the electrode on the patient’s headgear at home represents a substantial barrier to implementing a novel at-home tDCS approach (35) which is much needed in order to decrease burden associated with facility-based tDCS applications. Thus, we aimed to develop and test a novel approach allowing for reproduction of M1-SO tDCS montage suitable for home settings by lay users, such as patients or their informal caregivers, without 10–20 EEG measurements for electrode placement.

METHODS

Approach

The 10–20 EEG positioning system was taken as a standard for determining the M1 electrode scalp target (Fig. 1a). Specifically, C3 on the left hemisphere and C4 on the right represent the reference points over which a large tDCS electrode is centered in the conventional M1-SO montage. Given the position of C3 (C4), we have aimed for a solution utilizing a fixed-angle approach for headgear that would closely match the C3 (C4) standard without the actual measurement and would allow for fail-safe electrode insertion (Fig. 1b).

The guiding imperatives for the headgear design were accuracy, replicability, and ease of use. To assure that the final design solution met the guiding imperatives, the prototype of the headgear was evaluated at repeated placements of the headgear on the head in a sample of 30 subjects, and by computational modeling, as specified later.

Subjects

The sample consisted of 30 volunteers (14 M, 16 F) recruited at the City College of New York of City University of New York. Inclusion criteria required subjects to be 18 years of age or older. The participants provided verbal consent to participate in the accuracy and replicability assessment of the headgear, as described later. Each subject was required to participate in one 30- to 45-min long session. The procedure was approved by the CUNY IRB.

Accuracy and Replicability Assessment

The head circumference of each subject was measured in order to determine the appropriate size of the headgear to be used (S: 52–55.5 cm, M: 55.5–58.5 cm, L: 58.5–62 cm, XL: 62–65 cm). Appropriate measurements for the M1-SO position, as well as deviations from the ideal C3 position, were determined manually by a trained tDCS assistant using the measurement protocol for the 10–20 EEG system. The total of 600 repeated placements were performed, 20 placements for each subject under two conditions: 1) “assisted placement”—the headgear was placed on the subject’s head by a designated member of the study team (ten repetitions/subject); 2) “self-placement”—the headgear was placed on the head by the
subject utilizing navigational marks on the headgear viewed in a mirror (again ten repetitions/subject). In both assisted and self-placement conditions, the researcher measured the distance between the target point initially marked via manual 10–20 EEG measurements and where the corresponding electrode in the headgear laid after each repetition.

Data Analysis

Independent variables included size of the headgear and placement condition (self-placement vs. assisted placement). Size was treated as a categorical variable and included three levels: small, medium, and large/extra-large. Large and extra-large were collapsed for computations due to rarity of size extra-large. For subjects with head circumference on the border between headgear size selection (e.g., 55.5 cm between sizes S and M), the headsize that resulted in the best fit (based on sponge contact with the head and subject comfort) was selected and only this size was used in the analysis. The dependent variable was the measurement in mm from the ideal position of C3, and the error values (misplacements in anterior or posterior direction from C3) were treated as an absolute value.

SPSS version 24 was used for all analyses, including descriptive statistics and bivariate analysis. Descriptive statistics were conducted to report the mean (SD), median, minimum, and maximum for self- vs. assisted placement. The Shapiro-Wilk test was conducted to test for normality, and as measurements were not normally distributed nonparametric tests were employed for further analysis. Wilcoxon Rank-Sum Test was used as a nonparametric alternative to the paired sample’s T test to compare means across placement conditions. The Kruskal-Wallis test was used as a nonparametric alternative to the ANOVA test to compare means across different sizes.

Mean deviation from the C3 position and maximum error of placement then served as the entry parameters for computational modeling in order to estimate any potential changes in the brain current flow.

Computational Modeling

Finite element models of M1-SO stimulation were solved comparing C3 electrode placement methods. Previously modeled reference data (36) were used as a template for a magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)-derived finite element modeling emission microscopy (FEM) model. High resolution (1 mm³) MRIs were segmented into seven conductive tissue regions (skin, fat, skull, cerebrospinal fluid, gray matter, white matter, and air) (37). The position of the C3 point was located in the model using a standard procedure as delineated by the instructions” by practitioners and patients is addressed in the Discussion; but in principle a pre-set electrode position headgear with snap electrodes presents less complexity and potential for error than manually inter-connected rubber bands and electrodes with multistep preparation.

RESULTS

The final design (Fig. 2a–d) for the M1-SO montage without the 10–20 EEG measurements includes a headgear with a connected horizontal (frontal) and vertical (coronal) strap connection in a three-dimensional angle that is closed in an orthogonal junction of both strap planes. This replicates a constant typical angle formed between the horizontal and the vertical plane for the M1-SO montage guided by the 10–20 EEG system. Each strap bends to contour the head and includes assemblies to fix electrode position, accommodating either snap-on pre-moisturized electrodes or conventional saline-soaked ones (Fig. 2c,d), of size 5 × 5 cm or 5 × 7 cm. The headgear was designed in four sizes—S, M, L, and XL—to accommodate for head sizes with preauricular-point distances ranging from 32 cm (S) to 38 cm (XL), and has additional elastic elements in the form of small diamond-shaped cuts on both frontal and coronal straps (Fig. 2a) facilitating appropriate fit within sizes.

The horizontal strap has a center-point mark for visual adjustment in the horizontal plane, with the headgear position otherwise self-correcting when placed snugly on the head. The horizontal strap has two possible positions for the SO electrode from the fixed center point, to allow for customization of the SO electrode position due to variations in facial shape, and is designed to accommodate only one of those positions after adjustment, so that a misplacement of the SO electrode by the user in home settings is unlikely.

The vertical strap accommodates a single M1 electrode with the targeted center corresponding with the virtual position of C3 on the left hemisphere (or C4 on the right hemisphere) at the distance of 6.5 cm from the vertex point of the headgear for the S size (6.5 cm ~ 20% of 32–33 cm reflecting preauricular-point distance for which the S size is fitted), and 7.5 cm for the XL size (37–38 cm preauricular-point distance). The selection of the headgear requires a single fitting session to select the size and the SO electrode position, which can be done when the headgear is dispensed to the user.

An assessment of the total of 600 repeated electrode placements using the size-fitted headgear in 30 subjects (size S n = 8; M n = 16; L = 5; XL = 1) with ten repeated measurements under each of the two conditions (self-placement and assisted placement) yielded 160 repeated placements for headgear of size S, 320 placements for size M, and 120 placements for size L/XL. The overall evaluation indicated accuracy and replicability of the electrode position over C3 using the headgear, as compared to the manually determined C3: the overall mean [SD] deviation of the center of the electrode from C3 during repeated placement of the headgear on the head was 1.57 [1.51] mm, median 1 mm, range 0–7 mm. The errors included both anterior and posterior displacements and no systematic direction of the errors was noted. The outlier four measurements of 7 mm deviation were not excluded from computations and served in the computational model as the value of maximal error of placement. There was no significant difference of displacement across
sizes of headgear ($p = 0.665$), indicating that the headgear size had no significant effect on accuracy of the placement. There was a significant difference ($p = 0.001$) between the self-placement and proxy-assisted placement: mean [SD] 1.76 mm [1.61], median 1 range 0–7 mm; and 1.38 mm [1.38], median 1, range 0–6 mm, respectively.

The computational modeling (Fig. 3a–c) predicted that the potential displacement of the M1 electrode of size $5 \times 5$ cm from the ideal position (C3) by the mean 1.57 mm, or by the outlying recorded maximal error of placement of 7 mm, does not significantly change the brain current flow. In all cases, comparable peak electric field magnitude and distributions were predicted, with a characteristic

**Figure 2.** Images of the automatic tDCS headgear suitable for home use and high-throughput clinic use. The headgear (a) is size-fitted (S, M, L, XL) and has additional elastic elements in the form of small diamond-shaped cuts on both frontal and coronal straps facilitating appropriate fit within sizes. The headgear is labeled and allows for electrode positioning in only the set locations. The center point (blue arrow) supports accurate self-placement by user. The headgear accommodates either snap-on pre-moisturized electrodes (b) or conventional saline-soaked ones (not shown). The center point (blue arrow) supports accurate self-placement by user. The SO electrode is positioned using a frontal strap (c) while the M1 electrode is position via a coronal strap (d). [Color figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com]

**Figure 3.** An MRI-derived computational model of brain current flow using the M1-SO montage. a. Ideal position based on the International EEG 10–20 positioning system. b. M1 electrode displacement by the mean error, using the headgear. c. M1 electrode displacement by the maximum error for the headgear. Consistent with previous simulations and recording, the M1-SO montage produces diffuse current flow across the frontal cortex and deep brain regions. Using the automatic headgear, under average or maximal recorded displacement from the ideal position, the resulting brain current flow patterns are not significantly changed. Electric field magnitude for all M1 electrode positions resulted in the comparable EF scale: 0–0.35 V/m on the cortex and 0–0.14 V/m at the thalamus. [Color figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com]
clustering of electric field hotspots in gyri between stimulation electrodes. Previous studies have predicted much greater (twofold) differences in cortical electric field magnitude due to inter-individual anatomical variability (36,37). Variability due to electrode placement error is comparatively small.

**DISCUSSION**

In the presented work, we have developed a tDCS headgear allowing for reliable electrode placement in the M1-SO montage that is suitable for home settings or high-throughput clinics. At-home tDCS is needed not only for patients with low functional status or disabilities, but to broadly reduce costs driven by the tDCS personnel time and effort, and to enhance subject retention and compliance with tDCS interventions that involve repeated sessions spanning over weeks. For the objectives of this study, the headgear was positioned by a subject or proxy, following the guidelines for headgear placement (Figs. 1 and 2), establishing that using the headgear as prescribed supports precise positioning. The results indicated that accuracy of the placement was maintained across the headgear sizes. The results also suggested that the accuracy of placement further increased under the condition of assisted placement. However, the observed difference of the mean misplacement by 1.76 mm under self-placement as compared to 1.38 mm under assisted placement, although statistically significant, is minor when considered in the overall context of tDCS that utilizes large electrodes and generates currents with low spatial specificity.

We did not assess adherence to the headgear placement instructions in the sense of reliability in a subject population or course of treatment, including for home use. In translating tDCS to home use, the novel headgear represents a technological prerequisite for reproducible tDCS applications. It is of crucial importance that tDCS deployment to lay users, such as patients or their family caregivers, includes thorough subject selection and comprehensive training, paired with sufficient resources for adherence and outcome monitoring, in accordance with good practices and guidelines for tDCS in home settings (35). Further, specific training plans must reflect user-specific limitations in both physical and cognitive domains. For this reason, compliance in the headgear use must be tested in an application-specific set, after which the headgear accepts electrodes in only this pre-set position. The headgear is designed to allow attachment of electrodes. The headgear and electrodes can then be self-applied on the head using basic center-point mark on the headgear. Across head sizes, the M1 electrode was positioned by users within the median distance of 1 mm from C3. Given the size of the electrode (5 cm), this deviation is minimal and indeed did not alter predicted brain current flow (on an absolute scale <5% (36), or as compared to >200% inter-individual difference (4)).

The verified precision was achieved by using natural articulation of the headgear placed on the head with triangulation based on the horizontal and coronal headgear strap; the three-dimensional angle between the straps, curvature of the straps, and fixed position of electrodes along the straps provides accuracy. The principle of triangulation can be generalized to various headgear, electrode, and connector design, as long as the essential geometric features are maintained. A further important feature is the combination of elasticity and stiffness to ensure an even and secure position of the electrode against the skin, verified by inspection and impedance testing. Any headgear should not obscure electrode placement or encourage fluid spread between electrodes; for this reason, elastic caps known from EEG practice are contraindicated.

Our headgear design and this report do not address other essential features or guidelines pertaining to at-home tDCS that relate to stimulation hardware and protocols, such as dose control or compliance monitoring (35). Headgear design is a necessary but not a sufficient component.

Our approach approximates the C3 point. Based on our modeling, we predict that small variation in the resulting position may not significantly affect brain current flow. Our approach to using the headgear itself as the measurement/positioning system is analogous to prior work optimized for DLPFC tDCS (so called “OLE” montage (40)); a difference in the OLE montage is that it was designed to optimize brain current flow rather than approximate any given EEG 10–20 placement. This report thus presents the first verified design for tDCS-placement headgear that provides remarkable precision and facilitates the development of similar headgear for other EEG 10–20 based montages. Such headgear will support the rational and safe transition of tDCS to home use and may be adopted in clinics where it would reduce operator burden and potential for errors. The use of this novel headgear, however, does not replace/negate the need for proper user training and monitoring, and further evaluations of the headgear in various tDCS populations of potential users are warranted.
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