Effects of Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation (tDCS) on Operator Vigilance: A Double-Blind, Sham-Controlled Study

E. Susan Duncan[1], Surani G. Nakkawita[1], Heather Lucas[1], Owen T. Carmichael[2], Marcio de Queiroz[1]

1. Louisiana State University
2. Pennington Biomedical Research Center

Introduction

Problem:
- Society is increasingly reliant on automation
- Monitoring such systems is essential but tedious
- Vigilance decrement in human operators creates significant safety risks[1]

Proposed Solution:
- Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) is safe, portable, and relatively inexpensive
- Previous work suggests anodal tDCS applied to left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (dlPFC) can improve task vigilance[2,3]

Methods

Design
- 21 healthy young adults completed 2 sessions
- Active or sham tDCS; order counterbalanced
- 7 or 14 days between sessions, same time/day

Task
- Computerized version of Mackworth clock test[4]
- ~8% of 3600 trials required response
- Evenly distributed across three 10-minute blocks

Stimulation
- Neuroconn DC-Stimulator Plus
- 5 x 7 cm sponge-covered rubber electrodes
  - Anode: F3 (left dlPFC)
  - Cathode: Fp2 (contralateral forehead)
  - 2 mA x first 20 minutes of task

Statistics
- Linear mixed effects model (subjects = random)

Results

Performance Accuracy

Correct Responses (True Hits)

Main Effects
- Session: $p = 0.022$
- Block: $p = 0.015$

Interaction
- Session * Block * Stimulation: $p = 0.049$

Fitted regression models for correct (above) and incorrect (below) responses.

Incorrect Responses (False Alarms)

Main Effects
- Session: $p = 0.004$
- Block: $p = 0.003$
- Stimulation: $p = 0.009$

Current Modeling

Simulated[5] voltage measures (mV) given electrode placement and current intensity.

Individual Responses

Session 1 — Active / Sham
Session 2 — Active / Sham

Individual performance for true hits. Color-coding conserved across plots.

Discussion

- Findings suggest future promise for enhanced operator vigilance

- Some effects likely obscured by:
  - Interaction between attention and task familiarity
  - Individual variability in tDCS response

- Modulating stimulation via real-time feedback may yield more consistent, optimal vigilance performance
  - Neural vigilance marker: Sensitive to endogenous/exogenous factors affecting attention
  - Dynamic stimulation parameters: Online adaptation of intensity/waveform based on individualized traits and states

References

1. Mosier, K. L. & Skitka, L. J. (1996). Human decision makers and automated decision aids: made for each other? In R. E. Parasuraman & M. E. Mouloua (Eds.), *Automation and human performance: Theory and applications* (pp.201-220). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
2. Nelson, J. T., McKinley, R. A., Golob, E. J., Warm, J. S., & Parasuraman, R. (2014). Enhancing vigilance in operators with prefrontal cortex transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS). *Neuroimage*, 85, 909-917.
3. McIntire, L. K., McKinley, R. A., Goodyear, C., & Nelson, J. (2014). A comparison of the effects of transcranial direct current stimulation and caffeine on vigilance and cognitive performance during extended wakefulness. *Brain stimulation*, 7(4), 499-507.
4. Mackworth, N. H. (1948). The breakdown of vigilance during prolonged visual search. *Quarterly journal of experimental psychology*, 1(1), 6-21.
5. Huang, Y., Datta, A., Bikson, M., & Parra, L. C. (2019). Realistic volumetric-approach to simulate transcranial electric stimulation—ROAST—a fully automated open-source pipeline. *Journal of neural engineering*, 16(5), 056006.

Acknowledgments