

1 **Modulation of Neural Networks and Symptom Correlated in** 2 **Fibromyalgia: A Randomized Double-blind Factorial** 3 **Explanatory Clinical Trial of Home-Based Transcranial** 4 **Direct Current Stimulation**

5 Rael Lopes Alves^{1,2}, Maxciel Zortea^{2,3}, Paul Vicuña Serrano^{1,2}, Vani dos Santos Laranjeira^{1,2,†};
6 Betina Franceschini Tocchetto^{1,2}, Leticia Ramalho^{1,2}, Camila Fernanda da Silveira Alves^{1,2}, Rafaela
7 Brugnera Tomedi^{1,2}, Rodrigo Pereira de Almeida^{1,2}, Samara Machado Bruck^{1,2}, Liciane Medeiros^{2,4},
8 Paulo R. S. Sanches⁵, Danton P. Silva Jr.⁵, Iraci Lucena da Silva Torres^{1,7}, Felipe Fregni⁶, Wolnei
9 Caumo^{1,2,8,9,*}

10 ¹ Post-Graduate Program in Medical Sciences, School of Medicine, Universidade Federal do Rio
11 Grande do Sul (UFRGS), Brazil; ;

12 ² Laboratory of Pain and Neuromodulation at Hospital de Clínicas de Porto Alegre (HCPA), Porto
13 Alegre, Brazil;

14 ³ Health School, University of Vale do Rio dos Sinos (Unisinos), São Leopoldo/Porto Alegre,
15 Brazil.

16 ⁴ Post-Graduate Program in Health and Human Development, Universidade La Salle, Canoas,
17 Brazil,

18 ⁵ Laboratory of Biomedical Engineer at HCPA, Porto Alegre, Brazil,

19 ⁶ Laboratory of Neuromodulation and Center for Clinical Research Learning, Physics and
20 Rehabilitation Department, Spaulding Rehabilitation Hospital, Boston, MA, USA;

21 ⁷ Pharmacology of Pain and Neuromodulation: Pre-Clinical Investigations Research Group,
22 Universidade Federal Do Rio Grande Do Sul (UFRGS), Porto Alegre, Brazil;

23 ⁸ Pain and Palliative Care Service at HCPA, Brazil;

24 ⁹ Department of Surgery, School of Medicine, UFRGS, Brazil School of Medicine, UFRGS;

25

26 Corresponding author:

27 e-mail: wcaumo@hcpa.edu.br (WC)

28

29

30

31

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

32 **Abstract**

33 Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) might modulate neural activity and promote neural
34 plasticity. This factorial randomized clinical trial compared a-tDCS on the left dorsolateral
35 prefrontal cortex (l-DLPFC) or sham (s-tDCS), and a-tDCS or s-tDCS on the primary motor cortex
36 (M1) in the connectivity analyses in eight regions of interest (ROIs) across eight resting-state
37 electroencephalography (EEG) frequencies. We included 48 women with fibromyalgia, aged 30 to
38 65, randomly assigned to 2:1:2:1 to receive 20 sessions during 20 minutes of a-tDCS 2mA or s-
39 tDCS at home, over l-DLPFC or M1, respectively. EEG recordings were obtained before and after
40 treatment with eyes open (EO) and eyes closed (EC). In the EC condition, comparing pre to post-
41 treatment, the a-tDCS on l-DLPFC decreased the lagged coherence connectivity in the delta
42 frequency band between the right insula and left anterior cingulate cortex (ACC) ($t=-3.542$,
43 $p=.048$). The l-DLPFC a-tDCS compared to s-tDCS decreased the lagged coherence connectivity in
44 the delta frequency band between the right insula and left ACC ($t=-4.000$, $p=.017$). In the EO
45 condition, the l-DLPFC a-tDCS compared to M1 s-tDCS increased the lagged coherence
46 connectivity between the l-DLPFC and left ACC in the theta band ($t=-4.059$, $p=.048$). Regression
47 analysis demonstrated that the a-tDCS effect on the l-DLPFC was positively correlated with sleep
48 quality, while a-tDCS on l-DLPFC and M1 s-tDCS were positively correlated with pain
49 catastrophizing. The application of a-tDCS over the l-DLPFC has modulated the connectivity
50 between various brain regions involved in the affective-attentional aspects of pain, especially at
51 lower EEG frequencies during the resting state. These findings suggest that the effects of a-tDCS on
52 neural oscillations could serve as a neural marker associated with its impact on fibromyalgia
53 symptoms.

54 **Clinical Trial Registration:** identifier [NCT03843203].

55

56 **Introduction**

57 Fibromyalgia (FM) is a primary chronic pain condition classified as nociplastic pain due to
58 the absence of a straightforward pathophysiological process and intense emotional distress [1]. Its
59 symptoms include musculoskeletal pain, fatigue, non-restorative sleep, cognitive changes,
60 depressive symptoms, and other correlates of autonomic dysfunction, such as irritable bowel
61 syndrome and bladder tenesmus [2]. The exact mechanism underlying this syndrome is not fully
62 understood, but increased facilitatory modulation and dysfunctional descending inhibitory pathway
63 activity may contribute to central sensitization [3]. Neuroimaging studies provide further insight
64 into the underlying central nervous system (CNS) changes in central sensitization, demonstrating
65 significant structural, chemical, and functional alterations in pain-processing regions such as the
66 thalamus, periaqueductal gray (PAG), insula, cingulate, and somatosensory cortices [4, 5].

67 The neural network underlying the pain experience emphasizes the dynamics of functional
68 connectivity (FC) that underpin the pain experience [6]. FC is the degree to which activity between
69 a pair of brain regions covaries or correlates over time. In FM, the descending pain modulatory
70 system (DPMS) does not work as well when there is more functional connectivity (FC) between
71 pain processing areas like the left motor cortex (MC) and the left prefrontal cortex (PFC), as well as
72 between the left MC and the right PFC [7]. Another study in FM found an increased delta value of
73 FC in response to acute pain between the PFC and MC in genotypes BDNF Val/Met compared to
74 Val/Val [8]. In contrast, the Val/Val group showed decreased interhemispheric connectivity in these
75 areas, less efficiency of inhibitory DPMS, and a higher impact of fibromyalgia symptoms on quality
76 of life [8]. An analysis of frequency maps using electroencephalography (EEG) in FM revealed
77 anomalous FC at the bilateral precuneus, with right predominance, on the right inferior parietal
78 cortex, bilateral prefrontal cortex, medial cortex, and right anterior cingulate cortex (ACC) [9].
79 Coherence analysis of the brain signal showed apparent differences between FM and controls,

80 particularly in the bilateral frontotemporal region. Discriminatory analysis indicated a significant
81 difference in group interconnectivity patterns [9].

82 Even though there is evidence that dysfunctional processing in FM is caused by dysfunctional
83 connectivity and dysfunction of the DPMS [7,10], there is not much evidence about how treatment
84 affects these neural markers. Thus, it is crucial to investigate the effect of treatments on these neural
85 markers associated with the severity of pain symptoms, which can help develop effective treatments
86 for pain management and personalized treatment. Such neural features, including cerebral
87 oscillations and connectivity in response to treatment, can provide insights into the mechanisms of
88 action of the treatment and whether its efficacy in clinical outcomes is related to changes in these
89 neural markers. This way, personalized therapies based on each patient's neuroplasticity state can be
90 tailored. Following this rationale, it is reasonable to investigate the effect of neuromodulatory
91 therapies that counter-regulate dysfunctional neuroplasticity underpinning chronic pain. Among
92 these therapies is transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS), which modulates neural cortical
93 and subcortical networks. According to prior studies in FM, long-term tDCS at home (sixty
94 sessions) effectively reduced analgesic use by 55% and reduced pain scores [11]. Along the same
95 line, other trials with FM found that four weeks of home-based tDCS (HB-tDCS) improved pain-
96 related catastrophizing [12] and cognitive impairment [13]. This top-down effect of tDCS on
97 clinical outcomes might be related to the target area stimulated and the current type (anodal or
98 cathodal).

99 The primary motor cortex (M1) modulates neural networks associated with the somatosensory
100 system through cortical effects in the thalamic nucleus, anterior cingulate cortex (ACC), and
101 brainstem [14]. Anodal tDCS of M1 induces corticothalamic inhibition of the ventral posterolateral
102 nucleus (VPL), which is responsible for discriminatory sensitivity, and the ventral posteromedial
103 nucleus (VPM), which is responsible for nociceptive sensation. Stimulation of the dorsolateral
104 prefrontal cortex (DLPFC) decreases the activity of the midbrain-medial thalamic pathway, which

105 is involved in the modulation of structures related to the emotional perception of pain [14]. Thus,
106 the effect of tDCS depends on the site to be stimulated (DLPFC or M1) and the type of stimulation
107 (anodic or cathodic) and is likely related to the number of stimulation sessions. Even though there is
108 growing evidence of the clinical benefits of tDCS, there needs to be more literature regarding its
109 neurophysiological effects on areas involved in pain processing and oscillatory brain signatures.
110 Thus, additional studies are required to better understand the mechanisms of tDCS as a treatment
111 for pain and correlated symptoms.

112 This study aimed to test the hypothesis that self-administered active HB-tDCS, used for 20
113 sessions over four weeks, would improve brain oscillations associated with resting-state EEG more
114 than sham-(s)-tDCS. Specifically, the study investigated the effects of anodal-(a)-tDCS on the left
115 DLPFC and a-tDCS on the primary motor cortex (M1). Additionally, we examined how lagged
116 coherence connectivity may be related to the severity of clinical symptoms and brain-derived
117 neurotrophic factor (BDNF) levels. We also assessed protocol adherence through valid session
118 registry software. We hypothesized that active treatments would be superior to their respective
119 shams in improving cerebral oscillations associated with the pain networks in areas involved in pain
120 processing and clinical measures.

121

122 **Materials and methods**

123 **Study design and eligibility**

124 The trial's protocol for the Certificate of Presentation for Ethical Appreciation (CAAE)
125 registry number is 36995020.3.0000.5327, and the study was approved by the Research Ethics
126 Committee at the Hospital de Clínicas de Porto Alegre (HCPA), Brazil, under registration in the
127 Institutional Review Board (IRB) number 2020-0369. Data collected were achieved in the
128 outpatient departments of the clinical research center of HCPA and in the research rooms of the
129 laboratory of pain and neuromodulation of HCPA. Informed consent was obtained from all

130 participating patients, who provided verbal and written consent to participate in the trial. The study
131 followed a randomized, double-blind, and sham-controlled design, ensuring that neither the patients
132 nor the researchers involved knew the treatment assignment. It is important to note that the
133 participants in the trial did not receive any form of compensation for their involvement.

134 The study started in September 2019 but was paused in March 2020 due to the COVID-19
135 pandemic. However, in November 2020, the study resumed with several modifications and
136 restrictions to prioritize the safety of participants and researchers. Data collection was completed in
137 November 2022. The collected data were available on the public repository figshare DOI:
138 <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.23542116.v1>.

139 We adjusted the study procedures to address the challenges posed by the pandemic. Specific
140 hospital visit dates were scheduled, and the duration of visits for psychophysical measures and
141 device-related activities was limited. Initially, the protocol required formal consent and face-to-face
142 assessments to gather information on clinical symptoms and demographic characteristics. However,
143 in response to the pandemic, online methods were implemented for information collection,
144 prioritizing the health and well-being of all involved in the study. Participants who had contracted
145 the virus before the data collection phase was temporarily paused were placed on hold until they
146 received a negative COVID-19 test result.

147 Once they tested negative, they underwent an evaluation to determine their eligibility for
148 inclusion in the study. These adaptations were implemented to ensure the research could continue
149 without interruption while adhering to the necessary safety measures during the pandemic.

150

151 **Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

152 We included in the study women aged 30 to 65, literate, and diagnosed with FM according
153 to the American College of Rheumatology (ACR) 2016 [15]. Participants needed to report a score
154 of 6 or higher on the Numerical Pain Scale (NPS 0-10) most of the time in the last three months.

155 Subjects were excluded in cases of pregnancy, if they had a neurological disease, a history of head
156 trauma or neurosurgery, or a history of alcohol or drug abuse in the last six months. Besides,
157 participants could not have decompensated systemic diseases, chronic inflammatory diseases,
158 uncompensated hypothyroidism, another metabolic disease, or be getting treatment for cancer.

159 We screened 133 FM participants eligible to participate in this study. However, 85 were
160 excluded for different reasons, such as living far away from the research center, having trouble
161 getting around on public transportation, being unemployed, etc. Some of the screened participants
162 did not fulfill the diagnostic criteria for FM. Besides, they were excluded if their pain levels were
163 lower than 6 (NPS 0–10) or they had another uncompensated clinical disease (rheumatoid arthritis,
164 lupus, hypothyroidism, etc.). So, 48 FM were included in the study, but 5 of them were excluded.
165 So, at the end, 43 subjects were included in the analysis. The sequence of screening and
166 assessments is presented in Fig 1.

167 ----- insert Fig 1 -----

168 **Fig 1. Flowchart of the study assessments.** FM = Fibromyalgia; ACR = American College of
169 Rheumatology; FIQ = Fibromyalgia Impact Questionnaire; BDI = Beck Depression Inventory; MINI = Mini
170 International Neuropsychiatric Interview; BP-PCS = Pain Catastrophizing Scale; BP-CSI = Central
171 sensitization inventory—Brazilian Portuguese version; PSQI = Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index; BDNF =
172 brain-derived neurotrophic factor; EEG= Electroencephalography; a-tDCS = active transcranial direct
173 current stimulation; s-tDCS= sham transcranial direct current stimulation; DLPFC = Dorsolateral prefrontal
174 cortex; M1= Motor cortex.

175

176 **Sample size justification**

177 The sample size was estimated based on the effect seen in a previous study [16] that looked
178 at how one session of transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) on the DLPFC affected EEG
179 resting-state measurements. The study reported an effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.10$) in the theta frequency band
180 in the active tDCS group compared to the sham group. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) with a

181 one-way repeated measures design was planned to determine the sample size for the current study,
182 considering both within-group and between-group effects. The effect size for the ANOVA was set
183 at $f = 0.33$, corresponding to the effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.10$). The significance level (α) was established at
184 0.05, with an error (β) equal to 0.90. Based on these parameters, the sample size was determined to
185 be 40 patients. We added 20% to account for potential dropouts, resulting in a final sample size of
186 48 patients. These patients were allocated into four unequal groups, with 16 patients in the active
187 tDCS groups targeting the M1 and DLPFC regions and eight in the s-tDCS groups targeting the M1
188 and DLPFC regions.

189

190 **Randomization**

191 To allocate patients to receive either a-tDCS or s-tDCS over the M1 or the DLPFC, a
192 randomization process was conducted using the website www.sealedenvelope.com. The allocation
193 ratio was set at 2:1:2:1, with 16 patients assigned to receive a-tDCS (either over M1 or DLPFC) and
194 eight patients assigned to receive s-tDCS (either over M1 or DLPFC). Randomization was
195 performed in six blocks of eight to ensure unpredictability and maintain blinding during the
196 allocation process. Two investigators, who were not involved in the patient's assessments,
197 conducted the randomization process before the recruitment phase. The randomized numbers were
198 placed inside sealed, brown envelopes, with the patient's entry sequence number written outside
199 each envelope. The engineer was responsible for programming the intervention device and opened
200 the sealed envelope corresponding to the patient after obtaining informed consent. This process
201 ensures that the allocation remains concealed until the appropriate time.

202

203 **Blinding**

204 All participants were unaware of which stimulation type (active or sham) they received
205 during the entire study sequence. The s-tDCS group's device was set up to provide the stimulation

206 three times: in the initial 30 seconds, in the middle 30 seconds, and in the last 30 seconds of the
207 stimulation. After the post-assessment, we evaluate the blinding effectiveness by asking all
208 participants which stimulation they suppose they received, active or sham, and measuring their
209 confidence level using a 5-point Likert scale.

210

211 **Intervention**

212 Participants received the programmed home-based transcranial direct current stimulation
213 device (HB-tDCS). The treatment was performed during weekdays over 4 weeks, totaling 20
214 sessions. Three devices were misprogrammed and exceeded the pre-defined number of sessions. We
215 decided not to withdraw these data from the analysis because they did not represent significant
216 differences in the number of sessions per group. The current applied was 2 mA for 20 minutes to
217 the active stimulation delivered using the anode electrode positioned over the left primary motor
218 cortex (M1) and cathodal stimulation over the contra-lateral supra-orbital area for the first
219 assembly. In the second montage, anodal stimulation was placed over the left (l)-DLPFC) and
220 cathodal stimulation over the right DLPFC. The active a-tDCS condition is composed of a ramp-up
221 time of 30 s for the current to go from zero to 2 mA and a ramp-down time that also takes 30 s for
222 the current to go from 2 mA to zero to end the stimulation. For sham s-tDCS conditions, the
223 montage was the same as a-tDCS. A 30-s ramp-up in intensity from zero to 2 mA was used for a-
224 tDCS and s-tDCS stimulation, as well as a ramp-down for about the same duration, as explained in
225 the blinding session. To improve the current supplied was used two silicone cannulas were attached
226 to 35 cm² (5x7 cm) electrodes coated in sponges wet with saline solution. The home-based tDCS
227 safety was evaluated using a questionnaire based on previously reported adverse events. Details
228 about the protocol can be seen in S2_Check list to use tDCS at home protocol and in the HB-tDCS
229 updated protocol [17].

230

231 **Outcomes and Instruments of assessments**

232 The primary outcome was the lagged coherence connectivity in different EEG frequency
233 bands (delta, theta, alpha-1, alpha-2, beta-1, beta-2, beta-3, and gamma) at resting state. These
234 measurements were taken between regions of interest (ROIs) in the pain network. The assessments
235 were conducted in a specific sequence, as shown in Fig 1.

236 **Assessment of primary outcome**

237 The electroencephalography was recorded using 18 scalp sites according to the 10–20
238 system, FP1, FP2, F7, F3, Fz, F4, F8, T7, C3, Cz, C4, T8, P7, P3, Pz, P4, P8, Oz, and the left ear
239 (EXT), with reference to the right ear (CMS/DRL). The procedures were conducted with subjects
240 sitting in a comfortable armchair, in a quiet place, and with the light of the room off. The EEG
241 system used was the ENOBIO 20, Neuroelectronics (Barcelona, SP), which comprises an EEG cap
242 with circular gel electrodes with a contact area of 1.75 cm². Impedance was 5 kΩ for all electrodes,
243 with high dynamic resolution (24 bits, 0.05uV) and a sampling rate of 500 Hz. A line noise filter
244 (60-Hz) was applied to remove main line artifacts from the EEG data.

245 We used the EEG resting-state paradigm collected for 8 minutes total, with 2 minutes
246 switched between EC and EO conditions. Participants were instructed to remain awake, relaxed,
247 and thinking-free. During the EO condition, participants were instructed to fixate their vision on a
248 small cross presented in front of them. The EC condition is the level of arousal at rest, and the EO
249 condition is the level of arousal at activation [18,19].

250 **Preprocessing and functional connectivity analysis**

251 The EEG data preprocessing was conducted with the open-source toolbox EEGLAB 14.1
252 [21], which ran in the MATLAB environment (The MathWorks Inc., Natick, Massachusetts, United
253 States). Artifact detection was performed through visual inspection, removing segments of bad
254 channels, if necessary. Continuous EEG data was band-pass filtered using a simple FIR filter with
255 cutoff frequencies of 0.5–40 Hz, resampled to 250 Hz, and split into 4.096 s epochs.

256 Epochs containing artifacts were automatically excluded from the analysis. Rejection
257 thresholds were fixed according to artifact characteristics from non-filtered continuous EEG as
258 following [21]:

259 a) 50 μ V thresholds were set for FP1 and FP2 electrodes and 100 μ V thresholds for other electrodes
260 to eliminate eye blinks and other quick movements from non-filtered continuous EEG were
261 eliminated,

262 b) 50 μ V thresholds were used for slow waves (0-1 Hz band), while 30 μ V thresholds were used for
263 fast waves (20-35 Hz band) to eliminate artifacts associated with slow head or body movements,

264 Brain connectivity was computed establishing the minimum threshold to be 40 seconds for
265 each resting-state condition (EO, EC) [22]. Subjects or conditions below this threshold was rejected
266 for the analysis.

267 Standardized low-resolution brain electromagnetic tomography (sLORETA) was used to
268 measure the functional connectivity, which compute the linear dependence (coherence) of the
269 electric neuronal activity from several brain regions [23, 24, 25]. The LORETA-Key software is
270 freely available (<https://www.uzh.ch/keyinst/NewLORETA/Software/Software.htm>).

271 EEG electrodes coordinates employed by the software are based on the MRI anatomical
272 template from Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI152) which slice and classify the neocortical
273 volume (limited to the gray matter) in 6239 voxels of dimension 5mm³ [26, 27, 28].

274 However, due to the volume conduction and the low spatial resolution of EEG, the
275 dependence measures are highly contaminated with instantaneous, non-physiological effects. In this
276 sense, was developed of capable coherence measures that appraise the lagged connectivity between
277 various brain locations to verify the existence of distributed cortical networks. Lagged coherence
278 connectivity expresses the coherence measured by the corrected standardized covariance of scalp
279 electric potentials, extracting the instantaneous linear dependence [25, 29]. The lagged coherence

280 becomes the adequate way to measure electrophysiological connectivity, removing the confounding
 281 effect of instantaneous dependence due to volume conduction and low spatial resolution [25].

282 The sLORETA functional images of lagged coherence were computed to follow the
 283 frequencies band: delta (1 ± 3.5 Hz), theta (4 ± 7.5 Hz), alpha-1 (8 ± 10 Hz), alpha-2 ($10\text{-}12$ Hz), beta-1
 284 (13 ± 18 Hz), beta-2 (18.5 ± 21 Hz), beta-3 (21.5 ± 30 Hz), and gamma (30.5 ± 44 Hz).

285 To generate the regions of interest (ROIs) a voxel-wise approach was implemented, MNI
 286 coordinates of the areas under the electrode were determined by sLORETA. A size 10-mm-diameter
 287 sphere was defined from the seed points centered in the following ROIs [30, 31]: left and right
 288 primary somatosensory cortex (BA01) [32], the left and right insular cortex (BA47-BA48) [33, 34],
 289 the left and right anterior cingulate cortex (BA24) [35], and the left and right dorsolateral prefrontal
 290 cortex (BA09-BA10-BA46) [35], according to previous studies on the pain network. The
 291 coordinates are shown in Table 1.

292

293 **Table 1. Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) coordinates of regions of interest (ROI).**

Seed	MNI coordinates			Brodmann Area
	x	y	z	
Left S1	-48	-24	52	BA01
Right S1	52	-16	44	
Left INS	-48	12	-2	BA47 and BA48
Right INS	36	6	6	
Left ACC	-2	8	30	BA24
Right ACC	1	8	30	
Left DLPFC	-2	46	-16	BA09, BA10 and BA46 ^d
Right DLPFC	2	46	-16	

294 ACC stands for anterior cingulate cortex, INS for insula, DLPFC for dorsolateral prefrontal cortex, and S1
295 for primary somatosensory.

296

297 The artifact-free EEG intervals were converted into ASCII files and then put into the
298 sLORETA software. The segmented EEG intervals recorded in resting-state were analyzed by
299 means of a fast Fourier transform algorithm, with 2 seconds of intervals according to the following
300 frequencies: delta (2 ± 3.5 Hz), theta (4 ± 7.5 Hz), alpha-1 (810 Hz), alpha-2 (10-12Hz), beta-1
301 (13 ± 18 Hz), beta-2 (18.5 ± 21 Hz), beta-3 (21.5 ± 30 Hz), gamma (30.5 ± 44 Hz) [23].

302 **Pain measures and correlated symptoms, sleep quality, depressive symptoms,**
303 **socio-demographic variables, clinical and psychiatric disorders, central**
304 **sensitization, and serum BDNF**

305 All instruments utilized to evaluate pain and correlated measures, psychological tests, and
306 sleep quality are validated for the Brazilian population, including the Fibromyalgia Impact
307 Questionnaire (FIQ) [36], Beck Depression Inventory-II [37], the Brazilian Pain Catastrophizing
308 Scale (BP-PCS) [38], and the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI) [39].

309 a. The Fibromyalgia Impact Questionnaire (FIQ) was used to assess the impact of fibromyalgia on
310 the quality of life. It includes questions about how symptoms interfere with work, including
311 housework, as well as aspects like memory, anxiety, balance, and sensitivity to various stimuli.
312 The maximum total score on the FIQ is 100 [36].

313 b. To evaluate global pain experienced over a 24-hour period throughout the four weeks of
314 treatment, a Numeric Pain Scale (NPS) was utilized. The NPS measures pain intensity on a
315 scale from 0 to 10, where 0 represents no pain and 10 represents the worst pain experienced in
316 the majority of the 24-hour period across most days of the week.

- 317 c. The Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI) evaluates sleep quality and disturbances over the
318 past month. The sum of the scores from seven components yields the global PSQI score, which
319 ranges from 0 to 21. A higher score indicates poorer sleep quality [39].
- 320 d. The Beck Depression Inventory - Second Edition (BDI-II) is a self-report instrument consisting
321 of 21 items. Its purpose is to measure the intensity of depression [37].
- 322 e. The Brazilian Portuguese translation of the Pain Catastrophizing Scale (BP-PCS) comprises 13
323 items divided into three domains: magnification, helplessness, and rumination. The questions
324 aim to assess the patient's feelings and thoughts related to pain and measure pain-related
325 catastrophizing [38].
- 326 g. Enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) was used to measure blood levels of BDNF.
327 Monoclonal antibodies specific for BDNF were employed from R&D Systems (MN, USA;
328 ChemiKine BDNF Sandwich ELISA kit, CYT306; Chemicon/Millipore, Billerica, MA, USA).
329 The inter-assay variance was evaluated using two plates per kit on two different days within the
330 same week. All procedures followed the manufacturer's recommendations, and the lowest
331 detection limit for BDNF was 7.8 pg/ml. Optical density measurements at 450 nm were
332 conducted using the Promega GloMax®-Multi Microplate Reader. Additionally, the Bio-Plex®-
333 200 instrument from Bio-Rad was used for multiplexing assay measurements. Total protein was
334 assessed using bovine serum albumin following the Bradford method.
- 335 h. A standardized questionnaire was utilized to collect demographic data and medical
336 comorbidities. Patients were asked to furnish details concerning their age, gender, educational
337 background, marital status, and lifestyle choices. Additionally, they provided information about
338 their overall health condition, including clinical and psychiatric diagnoses.
- 339 i. Mini-International Neuropsychiatric Interview (MINI) is a short (15–30 min) structured
340 psychiatric diagnostic interview aimed to screen for DSM-IV and ICD-10 diagnoses [40].
- 341 j. The central sensitization inventory (CSI) is a tool that identifies key symptoms related to

342 central sensitization processes by quantifying the severity of these symptoms. It consists of two
343 parts: Part A is a 25-item self-report questionnaire designed to assess symptoms related to
344 health and Part B (not rated) is designed to determine if one or more specific disorders [41].

345

346 **Statistical Analysis**

347 Descriptive statistics were employed to summarize the main demographic characteristics of
348 the sample. The Shapiro-Wilk test was used to assess the data distribution. To compare continuous
349 variables between groups, independent sample t-tests were utilized. The chi-squared and Fisher's
350 exact tests were employed for comparing categorical variables between groups. Within-group
351 analyses were conducted using paired t-tests to examine differences between baseline and treatment
352 end measures.

353 Significant differences in lagged coherence for each frequency band across the eight regions
354 of interest (ROIs) were determined using a t-test for multiple comparisons. These differences were
355 utilized to construct a correlation matrix for generating connectivity maps. Statistical nonparametric
356 mapping (SnPM) with 5000 permutations was performed to identify cortical voxels that exhibited
357 significant differences.

358 The correlation matrices were used to see how stimulation affected changes in lagged
359 coherence when the eyes were EO or EC at different levels of analysis. We compared lagged
360 coherence within groups in the EO and EC conditions.

361 Linear regressions were performed separately for the eyes open (EO) and eyes closed (EC)
362 conditions. A test with 5000 permutations was utilized to determine the significance threshold and
363 correct for multiple comparisons. All analyses were conducted using two-tailed tests, and a type I
364 error of 5% was accepted. A two-tailed type I error of 0.05 was used for all analyses. The statistical
365 analysis was conducted using the sLORETA software. All statistical analyses were performed
366 using two-tailed tests at the 5% significance level with SPSS, version 22.0 (SPSS, Chicago, IL).

367

368 Results

369 Demographic and clinical characteristics of the subjects

370 We included 48 women with fibromyalgia. However, we examined a total of 43 participants
 371 who were randomly assigned to one of the following treatment groups: a-tDCS on DLPFC (n=16),
 372 a-tDCS on M1 (n=13), s-tDCS on DLPFC (n=8), or s-tDCS on M1 (n=6). Five patients were
 373 excluded from the analyzes. Table 2 provides an overview of the subjects' baseline demographic
 374 and clinical characteristics.

375

376 **Table 2. Demographic and clinical characteristics of the study sample are presented.** Values
 377 are reported as mean (SD) for continuous variables, median (IQ) or % for categorical variables
 378 (n=43).

	a-tDCS DLPFC	s-tDCS DLPFC	a-tDCS M1	s-tDCS M1	
	GROUP	GROUP	GROUP	GROUP	
	(N=16)	(N=8)	(N=13)	(N=6)	
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	P- values
	Median (IQ 25- 75)	Median (IQ 25- 75)	Median (IQ 25- 75)	Median (IQ 25- 75)	
Demographic measures					
	48.75 (9.04)	45.88 (10.41)	49.38 (11.54)	44.17 (9.06)	
Age (years)	47.50 (42.75, 56.50)	43.00 (36.25, 57.25)	53.00 (38.00, 59.00)	42.50 (35.50, 55.00)	0.680
	12.00 (3.83)	12.50	11.62 (3.79)	13.83 (3.31)	
Years of formal study	11.00 (9.25, 16.00)	12.00 (9.50, 16.00)	11.00 (10.00, 14.50)	14.50 (11.75, 16.25)	0.694
NPS	8.47 (1.30)	8.66 (1.02)	8.19 (1.52)	7.13 (1.48)	0.172

	8.60 (7.47, 9.60)	9.11 (7.44, 9.42)	8.10 (7.10, 9.65)	7.85 (6.10, 8.02)	
American College of Rheumatology (ACR) diagnosis tool	23.38 (3.79)	24.50 (3.38)	23.50 (2.71)	20.83 (3.48)	
Employed (Yes/No)%	23.00 (21.00, 25.00)	24.00 (21.75, 26.00)	24.00 (21.50, 25.75)	20.00 (18.50, 23.50)	0.256
Smoking (Yes/No)%	11/5 (68.8%)	5/3 (62.5%)	7/6 (53.8%)	3/5 (50.0%)	-
Drinking (Yes/No)%	4/12 (25%)	1/7 (12.5%)	3/10 (23.1%)	1/5 (16.7%)	-
	7/9 (43.8%)	4/4 (50.0%)	7/9 (43.8%)	2/4 (33.3%)	-
Clinical comorbidity					
HAS (Yes/No)%	6/10 (37.5%)	2/6 (25.0%)	3/10 (23.1%)	2/4 (33.3%)	-
Cardiac Disease (Yes/No)%	0/16 (0.0%)	0/8 (0.0%)	1/12 (7.7%)	1/5 (16.7%)	-
Diabetes Disease (Yes/No)%	2/14 (12.5%)	1/7 (12.5%)	0/13 (0.0%)	1/5 (16.7%)	-
Hypothyroidism (Yes/No)%	3/13 (18.8%)	2/6 (25.0%)	2/11 (15.4%)	1/5 (16.7%)	-
Asma (Yes/No)%	6/10 (37.5%)	1/7 (12.5%)	6/10 (37.5%)	1/5 (16.7%)	-
Epilepsy (Yes/No)%	0/16 (0.0%)	0/8 (0.0%)	0/13 (0.0%)	0/6 (0.0%)	-
Renal Insufficiency (Yes/No)%	0/16 (0.0%)	1/7 (12.5%)	0/13 (0.0%)	0/6 (0.0%)	-
Biochemical measures					
	51.66 (42.49)	31.67 (25.76)	39.17 (18.46)	40.98 (36.94)	
Serum BDNF (pg/ml)	31.48 (19.12, 89.20)	26.49 (11.54, 42.13)	30.67 (24.28, 58.36)	23.78 (14.75, 86.57)	0.533
Mood, pain-related and sleep quality measures					
Beck Depression Inventory (BDI)	24.56 (13.25)	28.25 (8.56)	22.46 (9.49)	16.33 (8.91)	
	21.50 (13.50, 37.00)	28.50 (21.50, 36.50)	22.00 (14.50, 29.00)	14.00 (10.50, 23.00)	0.240
Brazilian Portuguese Central Sensitization Inventory (BP-CSI)	65.00 (15.90)	64.75 (8.27)	62.92 (15.46)	56.67 (9.11)	
	63.50 (52.25, 79.75)	65.50 (58.25, 73.00)	69.00 (48.00, 77.00)	59.00 (49.25, 63.25)	0.642
Brazilian Portuguese Pain Catastrophizing Scale	34.25 (13.09)	38.63 (9.72)	38.23 (7.99)	27.17 (8.65)	
	35.50 (29.75, 41.00)	41.00 (33.50, 41.00)	41.00 (32.00, 41.00)	27.50 (18.75, 41.00)	0.158

	42.00)	43.50)	45.00)	32.25)	
Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (total score)	12.44 (4.09)	11.75 (4.49)	12.54 (3.25)	10.67 (1.36)	0.731
Fibromyalgia Impact Questionnaire (FIQ) (total score)	68.58 (17.00)	69.78 (9.83)	68.94 (16.58)	55.59 (19.82)	
	76.06 (62.05, 79.59)	72.30 (67.98, 76.31)	68.68 (59.18, 81.30)	61.51 (37.21, 71.87)	0.332
Psychiatric disorder					
Major Depressive Disorder - MDD (current) (Yes/No) ^a %	10/6 (62.5%)	5/3 (62.5%)	6/6 (50.0%)	1/5 (16.7%)	-
Generalized Anxiety Disorder ^b - GAD (Yes/No) %	4/11 (26.7%)	2/6 (25.0%)	1/11 (8.3%)	3/3 (50.0%)	-
Medication					
Antidepressant (Yes/No) %	11/5 (68.8%)	5/3 (62.5%)	7/6 (53.8%)	5/1 (83.3%)	-
Anticonvulsivant (Yes/No) %	3/13 (18.8%)	3/5 (37.5%)	2/11 (15.4%)	3/3 (50.0%)	-
Benzodiazepines (Yes/No)%	4/12 (25%)	2/6 (25.0%)	0/13 (0.0%)	1/5 (16.7%)	-
Opioid analgesic (Yes/No)%	6/10 (37.5%)	2/6 (25.0%)	2/11 (15.4%)	2/4 (33.3%)	-
Non-opioid analgesic (Yes/No)%	16/0 (100%)	8/0 (100%)	12/1 (92.3%)	6/0 (100%)	-
HAS ^a (Yes/No) ^a %	6/9 (40.0%)	2/6 (25.0%)	4/9 (30.8%)	3/3 (50.0%)	-

379 ^an=42

380 ^bn=41.

381

382 Primary outcome

383 Effect of treatment between-groups on lagged coherence connectivity in EC and

384 EO conditions

385 In the EC condition, when it was assessed the comparisons of lagged coherence connectivity
 386 expressed by Δ -means (pre-minus post-treatment) according to the treatment group (a-tDCS and s-
 387 tDCS) applied over left DLPC, we found that the a-tDCS over left DLPFC decreased connectivity

388 between right insula and left ACC in the delta frequency band (see Fig 2A). In EC and EO
389 conditions, statistical significance was not identified between a-tDCS vs. s-tDCS over DLPFC or
390 M1 in all frequency bands.

391 ----- insert Fig 2 -----

392 **Fig 2. Connectivity maps and color maps of between-group analysis of the tDCS intervention.** The
393 colored edge represents connections with significant differences. (A) Maps shows decreased connectivity
394 between left ACC and right INS in the a-tDCS on DLPFC group in the delta frequency band. (B) a-tDCS
395 over DLPFC group exhibits decreased connectivity in the theta frequency band between the left DLPFC and
396 left ACC. Values are given in t-values. ACC = anterior cingulate cortex; INS = insula; DLPFC = dorsolateral
397 prefrontal cortex; SI = primary somatosensory cortex. * $p < 0.05$.

398

399 In the EO condition, when it was assessed, the comparison of lagged coherence connectivity
400 expressed by Δ -means (pre-minus post-treatment) according to the treatment group a-tDCS applied
401 over the left DLPFC exhibits increased connectivity in the theta frequency band between the left
402 DLPFC and left ACC compared with sham-tDCS (pre-minus post-treatment) over M1 (see Fig 2B).
403 In contrast, in the EC condition, we did not find a difference between these groups.

404 The lagged coherence analysis in EO and EC conditions doesn't show differences in the a-
405 tDCS pre- to post-treatment (Δ s) between DLPFC compared to M1, as well as between a-tDCS over
406 M1 compared with s-tDCS over DLPFC.

407 **Effect of treatment within-groups on lagged coherence connectivity in EC and** 408 **EO conditions**

409 In the EC condition, when it was assessed the comparisons of lagged coherence connectivity
410 expressed by Δ -means (pre-minus post-treatment) according to the treatment group (a-tDCS and s-
411 tDCS) applied over target brain areas nominally left DLPC and M1, we found that the a-tDCS over
412 left DLPFC decreased connectivity between right insula and left ACC in the delta frequency band

413 (see Fig 3A). In EC and EO conditions, statistical significance was not identified in the sham
414 DLPFC stimulation, and in active stimulation over M1, for all frequency bands.

415 ----- insert Fig 3 -----

416 **Fig 3. Connectivity maps and color maps of within-group analysis of the tDCS intervention.** The
417 colored edge represents connections with significant differences. Data represent the delta-value of the mean
418 oscillation of the frequency band from pre- to post-treatment in each brain region. (A) The maps demonstrate
419 decreased connectivity between the left ACC and right INS in the a-tDCS on DLPFC group in the delta
420 frequency band in EO condition. (B) The s-tDCS on M1 group exhibits increased connectivity in the gamma
421 frequency band between the right and left INS. Values are given in t-values. ACC = anterior cingulate
422 cortex; INS = insula; DLPFC = dorsolateral prefrontal cortex; SI = primary somatosensory cortex. * $p < 0.05$.

423

424 In the EO condition, when it was assessed the comparisons of lagged coherence connectivity
425 expressed by Δ -means (pre-minus post-treatment) s-tDCS over on M1 demonstrated decreased
426 lagged coherence connectivity between left and right insula in the gamma frequency band in EO
427 condition (see Fig 3B).

428

429 **Secondary outcomes – exploratory analysis**

430 **Effect of treatment within-groups on the delta-value lagged coherence** 431 **connectivity in the EC and EO Conditions, sleep quality and pain** 432 **catastrophizing**

433 We conducted a series of linear regression analyses to investigate the relationship between
434 ROI connectivity in specific frequency bands (delta, theta alpha, beta, and gamma) and various
435 factors such as depressive symptoms, pain-related measures, sleep quality, and serum BDNF levels.
436 We present the variables that showed a statistically significant correlation with the frequency bands,
437 considering either EO or EC conditions.

438 In the EO condition, where participants received a-tDCS over the DLPFC, we observed a
439 positive correlation between sleep quality and the lagged coherence connectivity in the beta-3
440 frequency band. Specifically, this correlation was observed between the left insula and the left and
441 right primary somatosensory cortex (S1) (see Fig 4A).

442 ----- insert Fig 4 -----

443 **Fig 4. Connectivity and color maps of the linear regression analyses considering Δ -values of**
444 **differences pre- to post-treatment of ROI connectivity.** The Δ -values of ROI connectivity were correlated
445 with Δ -values of the following variables: depressive symptoms, pain-related, sleep quality, and serum
446 BDNF. (A) The a-tDCS over DLPFC group presented increased lagged coherence connectivity in the beta-3
447 band between left INS and left and right S1, which is correlated with sleep quality measures (PSQI) in EO
448 condition. (B) The a-tDCS over M1 group shows increased coherence connections in the delta frequency
449 band between right INS and left DLPFC, which is correlated with pain catastrophizing scores (Br-PCS) in
450 the EC condition. Values given in Cohen r = correlation coefficient (small=0.1; medium=0.3; large=0.5).
451 ACC = anterior cingulate cortex; INS = insula; mPFC = medial prefrontal cortex; S1 = primary
452 somatosensory cortex. * p <0.05.

453

454 In the EC condition, where participants received a-tDCS over the M1, we found that change
455 of pain catastrophizing from pre to treatment end was positively correlated with the lagged
456 coherence connectivity in the delta frequency band. This correlation was observed between the right
457 insula and the left DLPFC (see Fig 4B).

458

459

460 **Adherence, compliance, and side effects across the treatment**

461 The data in Fig 5 provides information on the average number of valid sessions completed
462 per group, indicating the level of adherence and compliance. The mean (SD) values reflect the
463 average number of valid sessions completed, while the median (IQ₂₅₋₇₅) values give the middle

464 range of valid session counts within each group. According to the total sample size, we planned 860
465 tDCS sessions and recorded 758 valid sessions, corresponding to 88.1% of the total amount.

466 ----- insert Fig 5 -----

467 **Fig 5.** Number of sessions according to a-tDCS on DLPFC, s-tDCS on DLPFC, a-tDCS on M1, and s-tDCS
468 on M1.

469

470 We predicted 320 sessions for the a-tDCS over the DLPFC group (n=16) and conducted 271
471 valid sessions that comprised 84.68% of the total. In the group where s-tDCS was applied over
472 DLPFC (n=8), 140 of the 160 estimated sessions were completed, equivalent to 87.5%. For the
473 group stimulated with a-tDCS on M1 (n=13), we administered 247 sessions of the 260 determined,
474 corresponding to 95% of the total sum. Finally, of the 120 sessions stipulated by the s-tDCS on the
475 M1 group (n=6), 100 were performed, computing 83.33%.

476 The side effects questionnaire included inquiries about various symptoms, including
477 headache, neck aches, tingling, redness, burning sensation, itching, somnolence, and decreased
478 concentration. The Fig 6 illustrates the reported symptoms and their severity classified as absence,
479 mild moderate and severe. It is important to note that no participants discontinued the treatment due
480 to uncomfortable side effects.

481 ----- insert Fig 6 -----

482 **Fig 6.** Side effects are presented as percentages (%).

483

484 **Discussion**

485 These findings expand the evidence regarding the effects of self-applied HB-tDCS based on
486 a trial with a factorial design in FM. The trial included twenty sessions of tDCS administered over
487 four weeks, targeting either the left DLPFC or the M1. The originality of this study lies in its
488 understanding of how tDCS affects frequency bands in particular brain regions which operate as

489 neurophysiological markers of neuroplasticity and how it affects related symptoms. Besides, they
490 showed that a-tDCS modulates different brain areas distinctly.

491 They revealed that a-tDCS over the DLPFC reduced connectivity within the delta frequency
492 band between the right insula and the left ACC. These brain regions are known to be involved in
493 cognitive and emotional processing. In pain processing, the insula encompasses sensory, affective,
494 and cognitive aspects. According to neuroimaging studies, during the experience of pain, there is
495 consistently heightened activity in the insula [42]. Additionally, increased glutamate levels cause
496 the insula to become more excitable, which increases pain hypersensitivity [43]. Thus, these results
497 provide valuable insights into the neurophysiological changes associated with the a-tDCS effects in
498 pain processing. Remarkably, these findings align with studies using a pharmacological treatment
499 for chronic pain, which reduced the insular cortex connectivity between these brain structures [44].
500 Since the insula is involved in sensory or affective aspects of pain, physiological processes also
501 support these findings. At the same time, the ACC evaluates and modulates the emotional and
502 cognitive aspects of pain [45]. In this way, the likely effect of a-tDCS in the interaction between
503 these two brain regions is vital for modulating the subjective experience of pain. Since the insula is
504 connected to other parts of the brain, such as the DLPFC, amygdala, ACC, mPFC, and orbitofrontal
505 cortices, these findings show how a-tDCS applied over the DLPFC might change the
506 neuroplasticity processes that underlie clinical outcomes related to pain and related symptoms.

507 The a-tDCS over the DLPFC group exhibited increased connectivity in the theta frequency
508 band between the left DLPFC and left ACC under the EC condition. This result highlights that the
509 a-tDCS over the DLPFC may enhance information integration and coordination between these two
510 brain regions, which have been related to cognitive processes and emotional regulation [46]. So, an
511 increased coupling (positive correlations) between these regions indicates that the improvement in
512 the adaptive regulation of cognition and emotions is linked to the effect of treatment. This statement
513 is supported by robust evidence of meta-analysis showing that the increased ACC activity is related

514 to a positive antidepressant response, including various drugs (e.g., selective serotonin reuptake
515 inhibitors (SSRIs), atypical antidepressants, ketamine), sleep deprivation, and repetitive transcranial
516 magnetic stimulation (rTMS) [46]. The current study gives insights that highlight the a-tDCS effect
517 on brain areas related to dysfunctional neurobiological processes of the pre-frontal cortex,
518 particularly on the left side, which have been found in individuals with chronic pain and FM [45].
519 Accordingly, in earlier studies, these regions have been found to have reduced activity associated
520 with difficulties in attentional control, increased pain perception, and emotional disturbances
521 observed in FM [47, 48]. Although this point of discussion is inferential, these connectivity
522 measures support the compression of the a-tDCS effect on the left PFC neural networks. Besides,
523 the effect of a-tDCS in this target area also reduced depressive symptoms. Overall, they are aligned
524 with specialized literature that also shows PFC dysfunction and structural changes in major
525 depressive disorders [49]. However, the interpretation of these results requires parsimony. Further
526 research is needed to investigate if these remaps of neural networks in pathways associated with
527 pain processing have a relevant clinical impact on patient-reported outcome measures (PROM).

528 The a-tDCS on the DLPFC decreased connectivity between the left ACC and right insula in
529 the delta frequency band under the EO condition. In contrast, the s-tDCS in the M1 group exhibited
530 decreased connectivity in the gamma frequency band between the right and left insula under the EO
531 condition. These findings indicate that distinct factors might modulate the connectivity between
532 brain regions besides of effect of electric current applied during active t-DCS. The effect found on
533 the ACC and right insula suggests that a-tDCS can modulate the affective-attentional circuits in
534 FM. They agree with the idea from earlier studies [50, 51] that dysfunctional neuroplasticity linked
535 to negative emotions and seen in chronic pain needs to be countered by regulating excitatory
536 activity in the ACC neurons. So, they offer evidence to support the biological plausibility of the
537 relationship between the a-tDCS effect and clinical symptoms related to FM, such as the
538 improvement in cognitive impairment, pain catastrophizing, and depressive symptoms [12, 13, 52].

539 Previous studies that show a connection between the oscillations in the delta frequency and
540 cognitive functions like attention, working memory, and emotional regulation support this
541 conclusion [53]. Thus, the increased connectivity between the left DLPFC and left ACC in the theta
542 frequency band implies enhanced communication and coordination between these regions, which
543 are known to be involved in emotional and cognitive processing. In this way, these findings are in
544 congruence with earlier studies that found that excitatory activity in ACC neurons is necessary for
545 the experience of pain-related negative emotions. Hence, they are aligned with the theoretical
546 perspective of earlier research, which suggests that modulating the ACC's activity can impact the
547 emotional aspects of pain perception [54]. As a result, a decrease in pain catastrophizing scores
548 from pre-treatment at the end of treatment suggests that there may be a connection between these
549 two brain areas and clinical improvement. This result backs up earlier studies that showed an a-
550 tDCS effect in the left dorsal ACC improved not only pain disability but also depression in patients
551 with chronic low back pain [55]. So, these results, which are backed up by evidence that shows both
552 biological plausibility and the effect on clinical symptoms, could be used to support frequency band
553 oscillations as neural markers of a-TDCS in different parts of the brain. However, future research
554 should focus on elucidating the precise mechanisms and functional implications of these
555 relationships in pain processing and whether the brain oscillation band might be a biomarker of
556 treatment response.

557 The s-tDCS in the M1 group exhibited decreased connectivity in the gamma frequency band
558 between the right and left insula under the EO condition. This result suggests a reduced level of
559 synchronized activity between these two regions in EO conditions. Gamma waves are one of the
560 fastest forms of brain activity, and several factors are related to their frequency oscillations. They
561 can vary depending on the specific context, and we do not have a clear explanation for this finding.
562 The balance between excitatory and inhibitory neurotransmission in the brain affects gamma
563 oscillations. Specifically, the inhibitory neurotransmitter gamma-aminobutyric acid (GABA) is

564 crucial in regulating gamma frequency oscillations. They are associated with various cognitive
565 processes, including attention, working memory, sensory perception, learning different aspects of
566 sensory information, and facilitating the formation and retrieval of memories.

567 We found that when the a-tDCS was put on the DLPFC, the oscillations in the beta-3 band
568 caused the PSQI scores to drop more from the beginning of treatment to the end of treatment in the
569 EC condition. These results revealed that the connectivity between the left insula and the right and
570 left primary sensory cortex (S1) is positively correlated with the improvement in sleep quality
571 score. Previous studies found that increased brain connectivity between S1 and the left insula was
572 linked to increased self-reported attention to the pain stimulus and increased clinical pain in the
573 chronic low back [56, 57]. Another study using fMRI found decreased resting-state functional
574 connectivity between the left somatosensory cortex (S1) and the periaqueductal gray (PAG) (S1-
575 PAG rs-FC). This reduced connectivity between these two structures was related to the severity of
576 dysfunction in the descending pain modulatory system (DPMS). Also, the S1-PAG rs-FC in the left
577 brain hemisphere was positively correlated with a central sensitization symptom and negatively
578 correlated with sleep quality and pain scores [10]. Although we do not have a clear explanation for
579 these findings as well as their relationship with the tDCS effect, we are aware that this is an
580 exploratory analysis that agrees with previous research that individuals with fibromyalgia may
581 exhibit increased connectivity patterns between different brain regions, including the insula and the
582 S1 area [56, 57]. This relationship between reduced connectivity between the left insula and S1 and
583 the improvement in sleep quality indicates that altered connectivity within the brain's networks,
584 specifically between the left insula and the DMN, may contribute to comprehending the possible
585 impact of a-tDCS to remap the function in the neural networks, which is responsible for disrupted
586 sleep patterns. The association between reduced connectivity and improved sleep quality suggests
587 that it was related to the a-tDCS effect over the DLPFC.

588 The main concerns in interpreting these findings that must be considered are: First, it is
589 essential to note that although patients received thorough training in using the tDCS device, we did
590 not remotely monitor their sessions, and the researcher was available to solve any problem with the
591 device at any time. One needs to be cautious when comparing directly with studies that employed
592 electrode placement and exposure supervision. *Second*, the adherence rate is consistent with past
593 research that supported this method of self-application for prolonged tDCS use at home [11, 12].
594 *Third*, the tDCS system utilized in this study offers an efficient technical solution that allows
595 medical engineers, who were not directly involved in the patient's care, to program the device
596 according to the randomization sequence. This approach ensures the blinding of both the research
597 team and patients, eliminating bias in the study design. *Fourth*, while the randomization procedure
598 ensured that groups receiving active tDCS (a-tDCS) and sham tDCS (s-tDCS) were balanced, it is
599 crucial to recognize that various confounding factors may affect electrophysiological signals. These
600 variables include psychiatric comorbidities such as depression, anxiety, and sleep disturbances, as
601 well as medication use, especially opioids, which can change the cortical reaction, and side effects
602 that are difficult to entirely control [58]. *Fifth*, we have chosen to allocate participants in a ratio of
603 2:1 based on the rationale that fibromyalgia causes significant long-term suffering. This allocation
604 ratio is intended to prioritize the active treatment group as we believe that by treating more
605 individuals actively, we can potentially increase adherence to the treatment. Moreover, having a
606 larger sample size in the active group enhances our ability to identify any potential side effects
607 associated with the treatment [59, 60]. By implementing this allocation strategy, we aim to
608 maximize the benefits for participants while ensuring a comprehensive evaluation of the treatment's
609 effectiveness and safety. *Sixth*; our study revealed a high adherence rate exceeding 85% for both
610 active tDCS (a-tDCS) and sham tDCS (s-sham tDCS) sessions. We employed a rigorous and
611 replicable methodology to showcase the effectiveness and practicality of tDCS in a home setting.
612 *Seventh*, despite using a standardized protocol to collect the data, we needed to exclude five

613 patients. This issue may reduce the power of certain analyses and increase type I and type II errors.
614 Therefore, it is essential to interpret the outcomes of secondary variables in an explanatory manner.
615 *Eight* studies using 18 EEG electrodes for source localization may have limitations in capturing the
616 full complexity and fine-grained details of brain activity across different regions [61]. Despite the
617 trade-off between the practical rules of electrode placement and spatial resolution, these data offer
618 valuable insights into neural pain processing and correlated symptoms. Numerous studies, including
619 those on FM, obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD), tinnitus, and autism spectrum disorder (ASD),
620 support this strategy [62, 30, 63-66]. Finally, to mitigate potential bias related to sex, we
621 specifically recruited female participants for our study. This choice was made because previous
622 research shows that a-tDCS over the DLPFC leads to a greater flow of current toward the frontal
623 regions in women [66], and other research shows that women tend to respond better to a-tDCS than
624 men [67].

625 The application of a-tDCS over the l-DLPFC has been shown to modulate the connectivity
626 between various brain regions involved in the affective-attentional aspects of pain, especially at
627 lower EEG frequencies during the resting state. These findings suggest that the effects of a-tDCS on
628 neural oscillations could serve as a neural marker that is associated with its impact on fibromyalgia
629 symptoms.

630

631 **Author Contributions**

632 **Conceptualization:** ILST FF WC

633 **Data curation:** FF WC

634 **Formal analysis:** RLA MZ WC

635 **Funding acquisition:** PRSS DPSJ ILST WC

636 **Investigation:** RLA PVS BFT VSL RBT RPA SMB LM

637 **Methodology:** RLA MZ PRSS DPSJ WC

638 **Project administration:** MZ LR CFSA PRSS DPSJ WC

639 **Resources:** PRSS DPSJ ILST WC

640 **Supervision:** MZ LR CFSA WC

641 **Visualization:** RLA WC

642 **Writing-original draft:** RLA MZ WC

643 **Writing-review & editing:** RLA WC

644

645 **Acknowledgments**

646 The authors would like to thank all the patient volunteers and the Hospital de Clínicas de Porto
647 Alegre for the logistic support. We also would like to thank the Laboratory of Pain and
648 Neuromodulation staff for the effort and helps to conduct this study, mainly to great researcher Vani
649 dos Santos. Remembering her keeps inspiring us.

650

651 **References**

- 652 1. Treede RD, Rief W, Barke A, Aziz Q, Bennett MI, Benoliel R, et al. Chronic pain as a
653 symptom or a disease: the IASP Classification of Chronic Pain for the International
654 Classification of Diseases (ICD-11). *Pain*. 2019 Jan;160(1):19-27. doi:
655 10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001384. PMID: 30586067.
656
- 657 2. Duruturk N, Tuzun EH, Culhaoglu B. Is balance exercise training as effective as aerobic
658 exercise training in fibromyalgia syndrome? *Rheumatol Int*. 2015 May;35(5):845-54. doi:
659 10.1007/s00296-014-3159-z. PMID: 25903448.
660
- 661 3. Harte SE, Harris RE, Clauw, DJ. The neurobiology of central sensitization. *J Appl Behav*
662 *Res*. 2018; 23:e12137. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jabr.12137>
663
- 664 4. Smallwood J, Gorgolewski KJ, Golchert J, Ruby FJ, Engen H, Baird B, et al. The default
665 modes of reading: modulation of posterior cingulate and medial prefrontal cortex
666 connectivity associated with comprehension and task focus while reading. *Front Hum*
667 *Neurosci*. 2013 Nov 12;7:734. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2013.00734. PMID: 24282397.
668
- 669 5. Kenshalo DR Jr, Isensee O. Responses of primate SI cortical neurons to noxious stimuli. *J*
670 *Neurophysiol*. 1983 Dec;50(6):1479-96. doi: 10.1152/jn.1983.50.6.1479. PMID: 6663338.
671

- 672 6. Peyron R, Fauchon C. The posterior insular-opercular cortex: An access to the brain
673 networks of thermosensory and nociceptive processes? *Neurosci Lett*. 2019 May 29;702:34-
674 39. doi: 10.1016/j.neulet.2018.11.042. Epub 2018 Nov 29. PMID: 30503920.
675
- 676 7. de Oliveira Franco Á, da Silveira Alves CF, Vicuña P, Bandeira J, de Aratanha MA, Torres
677 ILS, et al. Hyper-connectivity between the left motor cortex and prefrontal cortex is
678 associated with the severity of dysfunction of the descending pain modulatory system in
679 fibromyalgia. *PLoS One*. 2022 May 27;17(5):e0247629. doi:
680 10.1371/journal.pone.0247629. PMID: 35622879.
681
- 682 8. de Oliveira Franco Á, de Oliveira Venturini G, da Silveira Alves CF, Alves RL, Vicuña P,
683 Ramalho L, et al. Functional connectivity response to acute pain assessed by fNIRS is
684 associated with BDNF genotype in fibromyalgia: an exploratory study. *Sci Rep*. 2022 Nov
685 6;12(1):18831. doi: 10.1038/s41598-022-23476-3. PMID: 36336706.
686
- 687 9. Martín-Brufau R, Gómez MN, Sanchez-Sanchez-Rojas L, Nombela C. Fibromyalgia
688 Detection Based on EEG Connectivity Patterns. *J Clin Med*. 2021 Jul 25;10(15):3277. doi:
689 10.3390/jcm10153277. PMID: 34362061.
690
- 691 10. Soldatelli M, Franco ÁO, Picon F, Duarte JÁ, Scherer R, Bandeira J, et al. Primary
692 somatosensory cortex and periaqueductal gray functional connectivity as a marker of the
693 dysfunction of the descending pain modulatory system in fibromyalgia. *Korean J Pain*. 2023
694 Jan 1;36(1):113-127. doi: 10.3344/kjp.22225. PMID: 36581601.
695
- 696 11. Brietzke AP, Zortea M, Carvalho F, Sanches PRS, Silva DPJ, Torres ILDS, et al. Large
697 Treatment Effect With Extended Home-Based Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation Over
698 Dorsolateral Prefrontal Cortex in Fibromyalgia: A Proof of Concept Sham-Randomized
699 Clinical Study. *J Pain*. 2020 Jan-Feb;21(1-2):212-224. doi: 10.1016/j.jpain.2019.06.013.
700 PMID: 31356985.
701
- 702 12. Caumo W, Alves RL, Vicuña P, Alves CFDS, Ramalho L, Sanches PRS, et al. Impact of
703 Bifrontal Home-Based Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation in Pain Catastrophizing and
704 Disability due to Pain in Fibromyalgia: A Randomized, Double-Blind Sham-Controlled
705 Study. *J Pain*. 2022 Apr;23(4):641-656. doi: 10.1016/j.jpain.2021.11.002. PMID: 34785366.
706
- 707 13. Serrano PV, Zortea M, Alves RL, Beltrán G, Bavaresco C, Ramalho L, et al. The effect of
708 home-based transcranial direct current stimulation in cognitive performance in fibromyalgia:
709 A randomized, double-blind sham-controlled trial. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2022 Nov
710 24;16:992742. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2022.992742. PMID: 36504629.
711
- 712 14. Zortea M, Ramalho L, Alves RL, Alves CFDS, Braulio G, Torres ILDS, et al. Transcranial
713 Direct Current Stimulation to Improve the Dysfunction of Descending Pain Modulatory
714 System Related to Opioids in Chronic Non-cancer Pain: An Integrative Review of
715 Neurobiology and Meta-Analysis. *Front Neurosci*. 2019 Nov 18;13:1218. doi:
716 10.3389/fnins.2019.01218. PMID: 31803005.
717
- 718 15. Wolfe F, Clauw DJ, Fitzcharles MA, Goldenberg DL, Häuser W, Katz RL, et al. 2016
719 Revisions to the 2010/2011 fibromyalgia diagnostic criteria. *Semin Arthritis Rheum*. 2016
720 Dec;46(3):319-329. doi: 10.1016/j.semarthrit.2016.08.012. PMID: 27916278.
721

- 722 16. Kim J, Jang KI, Roh D, Kim H, Kim DH. A direct comparison of the electrophysiological
723 effects of transcranial direct and alternating current stimulation in healthy subjects. *Brain*
724 *Res.* 2020 Nov 15;1747:147065. doi: 10.1016/j.brainres.2020.147065. PMID: 32818525.
725
- 726 17. Carvalho F, Brietzke AP, Gasparin A, Dos Santos FP, Vercelino R, Ballester RF, et al.
727 Home-Based Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation Device Development: An Updated
728 Protocol Used at Home in Healthy Subjects and Fibromyalgia Patients. *J Vis Exp.* 2018 Jul
729 14;(137):57614. doi: 10.3791/57614. PMID: 30059026.
730
- 731 18. Barry RJ, Clarke AR, Johnstone SJ, Magee CA, Rushby JA. EEG differences between eyes-
732 closed and eyes-open resting conditions. *Clin Neurophysiol.* 2007 Dec;118(12):2765-73.
733 doi: 10.1016/j.clinph.2007.07.028. PMID: 17911042.
734
- 735 19. Barry RJ, De Blasio FM, Fogarty JS, Clarke AR. Natural alpha frequency components in
736 resting EEG and their relation to arousal. *Clin Neurophysiol.* 2020 Jan;131(1):205-212. doi:
737 10.1016/j.clinph.2019.10.018. PMID: 31812081.
738
- 739 20. Delorme A, Makeig S. EEGLAB: an open source toolbox for analysis of single-trial EEG
740 dynamics including independent component analysis. *J Neurosci Methods.* 2004 Mar
741 15;134(1):9-21. doi: 10.1016/j.jneumeth.2003.10.009. PMID: 15102499.
742
- 743 21. Ponomarev VA, Mueller A, Candrian G, Grin-Yatsenko VA, Kropotov JD. Group
744 Independent Component Analysis (gICA) and Current Source Density (CSD) in the study of
745 EEG in ADHD adults. *Clin Neurophysiol.* 2014 Jan;125(1):83-97. doi:
746 10.1016/j.clinph.2013.06.015. PMID: 23871197.
747
- 748 22. Jäncke L, Alahmadi N. Resting State EEG in Children With Learning Disabilities: An
749 Independent Component Analysis Approach. *Clin EEG Neurosci.* 2016 Jan;47(1):24-36.
750 doi: 10.1177/1550059415612622. PMID: 26545819.
751
- 752 23. Pascual-Marqui RD, Michel CM, Lehmann D. Low resolution electromagnetic tomography:
753 a new method for localizing electrical activity in the brain. *Int J Psychophysiol.* 1994
754 Oct;18(1):49-65. doi: 10.1016/0167-8760(84)90014-x. PMID: 7876038.
755
- 756 24. Pascual-Marqui RD. Standardized low-resolution brain electromagnetic tomography
757 (sLORETA): technical details. *Methods Find Exp Clin Pharmacol.* 2002;24 Suppl D:5-12.
758 PMID: 12575463.
759
- 760 25. Pascual-Marqui, RD. Instantaneous and lagged measurements of linear and nonlinear
761 dependence between groups of multivariate time series: frequency decomposition.
762 arXiv:0711.1455 [Preprint]. 2007. Available from: <https://arxiv.org/abs/0711.1455>
763
- 764 26. Mazziotta J, Toga A, Evans A, Fox P, Lancaster J, Zilles K, et al. A probabilistic atlas and
765 reference system for the human brain: International Consortium for Brain Mapping (ICBM).
766 *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci.* 2001 Aug 29;356(1412):1293-322. doi:
767 10.1098/rstb.2001.0915. PMID: 11545704.
768
- 769 27. Fuchs M, Kastner J, Wagner M, Hawes S, Ebersole JS. A standardized boundary element
770 method volume conductor model. *Clin Neurophysiol.* 2002 May;113(5):702-12. doi:
771 10.1016/s1388-2457(02)00030-5. PMID: 11976050.

- 772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
28. Jurcak V, Tsuzuki D, Dan I. 10/20, 10/10, and 10/5 systems revisited: their validity as relative head-surface-based positioning systems. *Neuroimage*. 2007 Feb 15;34(4):1600-11. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2006.09.024. PMID: 17207640.
 29. Pascual-Marqui, RD. Coherence and phase synchronization: generalization to pairs of multivariate time series, and removal of zero-lag contributions. arXiv:0706.1776v3 [Preprint]. 2007. Available from: <http://arxiv.org/abs/0706.1776>
 30. Coben R, Mohammad-Rezazadeh I, Cannon RL. Using quantitative and analytic EEG methods in the understanding of connectivity in autism spectrum disorders: a theory of mixed over- and under-connectivity. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2014 Feb 26;8:45. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2014.00045. PMID: 24616679.
 31. Bosch-Bayard J, Biscay RJ, Fernandez T, Otero GA, Ricardo-Garcell J, Aubert-Vazquez E, et al. EEG effective connectivity during the first year of life mirrors brain synaptogenesis, myelination, and early right hemisphere predominance. *Neuroimage*. 2022 May 15;252:119035. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2022.119035. PMID: 35218932.
 32. Dai YJ, Zhang X, Yang Y, Nan HY, Yu Y, Sun Q, et al. Gender differences in functional connectivities between insular subdivisions and selective pain-related brain structures. *J Headache Pain*. 2018 Mar 14;19(1):24. doi: 10.1186/s10194-018-0849-z. PMID: 29541875.
 33. Wang Z, Yuan M, Xiao J, Chen L, Guo X, Dou Y, et al. Gray Matter Abnormalities in Patients with Chronic Primary Pain: A Coordinate-Based Meta-Analysis. *Pain Physician*. 2022 Jan;25(1):1-13. PMID: 35051138.
 34. Cifre I, Sitges C, Fraiman D, Muñoz MÁ, Balenzuela P, González-Roldán A, et al. Disrupted functional connectivity of the pain network in fibromyalgia. *Psychosom Med*. 2012 Jan;74(1):55-62. doi: 10.1097/PSY.0b013e3182408f04. PMID: 22210242.
 35. Fauchon C, Meunier D, Failletot I, Pomares FB, Bastuji H, Garcia-Larrea L, et al. The Modular Organization of Pain Brain Networks: An fMRI Graph Analysis Informed by Intracranial EEG. *Cereb Cortex Commun*. 2020 Nov 25;1(1):tgaa088. doi: 10.1093/texcom/tgaa088. PMID: 34296144.
 36. Marques AP, Santos AMB, Assumpção A, Matsutani LA, Lage LV, Pereira CAB. Validação da versão brasileira do Fibromyalgia Impact Questionnaire (FIQ). *Rev Bras Reumatol Engl Ed*. 2006; 46(1), 24–31.
 37. Gomes-Oliveira MH, Gorenstein C, Lotufo Neto F, Andrade LH, Wang YP. Validation of the Brazilian Portuguese version of the Beck Depression Inventory-II in a community sample. *Braz J Psychiatry*. 2012 Dec;34(4):389-94. doi: 10.1016/j.rbp.2012.03.005. PMID: 23429809.
 38. Sehn F, Chachamovich E, Vidor LP, Dall-Agnol L, de Souza IC, Torres IL, et al. Cross-cultural adaptation and validation of the Brazilian Portuguese version of the pain catastrophizing scale. *Pain Med*. 2012 Nov;13(11):1425-35. doi: 10.1111/j.1526-4637.2012.01492.x. PMID: 23036076.

- 822 39. Bertolazi AN, Fagondes SC, Hoff LS, Dartora EG, Miozzo IC, de Barba ME, et al.
823 Validation of the Brazilian Portuguese version of the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index. *Sleep*
824 *Med.* 2011 Jan;12(1):70-5. doi: 10.1016/j.sleep.2010.04.020. PMID: 21145786.
825
- 826 40. Amorim P. Mini International Neuropsychiatric Interview (MINI): validação de entrevista
827 breve para diagnóstico de transtornos mentais. *Rev Bras Psiquiatr.* 2000; 22 (3), 06-115.
828
- 829 41. Caumo W, Antunes LC, Elkfury JL, Herbstrith EG, Busanello Sipmann R, et al. The Central
830 Sensitization Inventory validated and adapted for a Brazilian population: psychometric
831 properties and its relationship with brain-derived neurotrophic factor. *J Pain Res.* 2017 Sep
832 1;10:2109-2122. doi: 10.2147/JPR.S131479. PMID: 28979158.
833
- 834 42. Galambos A, Szabó E, Nagy Z, Édes AE, Kocsel N, Juhász G, et al. A systematic review of
835 structural and functional MRI studies on pain catastrophizing. *J Pain Res.* 2019 Apr
836 11;12:1155-1178. doi: 10.2147/JPR.S192246. PMID: 31114299.
837
- 838 43. Harris RE, Sundgren PC, Craig AD, Kirshenbaum E, Sen A, Napadow V, et al. Elevated
839 insular glutamate in fibromyalgia is associated with experimental pain. *Arthritis Rheum.*
840 2009 Oct;60(10):3146-52. doi: 10.1002/art.24849. PMID: 19790053.
841
- 842 44. Čeko M, Shir Y, Ouellet JA, Ware MA, Stone LS, Seminowicz DA. Partial recovery of
843 abnormal insula and dorsolateral prefrontal connectivity to cognitive networks in chronic
844 low back pain after treatment. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 2015 Jun;36(6):2075-92. doi:
845 10.1002/hbm.22757. Epub 2015 Feb 3. PMID: 25648842.
846
- 847 45. Seminowicz DA, Moayed M. The Dorsolateral Prefrontal Cortex in Acute and Chronic
848 Pain. *J Pain.* 2017 Sep;18(9):1027-1035. doi: 10.1016/j.jpain.2017.03.008. Epub 2017 Apr
849 8. PMID: 28400293.
850
- 851 46. Pizzagalli DA. Frontocingulate dysfunction in depression: toward biomarkers of treatment
852 response. *Neuropsychopharmacology.* 2011 Jan;36(1):183-206. doi: 10.1038/npp.2010.166.
853 Epub 2010 Sep 22. PMID: 20861828.
854
- 855 47. Dennis TA, Solomon B. Frontal EEG and emotion regulation: electrocortical activity in
856 response to emotional film clips is associated with reduced mood induction and attention
857 interference effects. *Biol Psychol.* 2010 Dec;85(3):456-64. doi:
858 10.1016/j.biopsycho.2010.09.008. PMID: 20863872; PMCID: PMC2976487.
859
- 860 48. Baliki MN, Mansour AR, Baria AT, Apkarian AV. Functional reorganization of the default
861 mode network across chronic pain conditions. *PLoS One.* 2014 Sep 2;9(9):e106133. doi:
862 10.1371/journal.pone.0106133. PMID: 25180885.
863
- 864 49. Pizzagalli DA, Roberts AC. Prefrontal cortex and depression. *Neuropsychopharmacology.*
865 2022 Jan;47(1):225-246. doi: 10.1038/s41386-021-01101-7. Epub 2021 Aug 2. Erratum in:
866 *Neuropsychopharmacology.* 2021 Aug 19;: PMID: 34341498.
867
- 868 50. Cao H, Gao YJ, Ren WH, Li TT, Duan KZ, Cui YH, et al. Activation of extracellular signal-
869 regulated kinase in the anterior cingulate cortex contributes to the induction and expression
870 of affective pain. *J Neurosci.* 2009 Mar 11;29(10):3307-21. doi:
871 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4300-08.2009. PMID: 19279268.

- 872
873 51. Bliss TV, Collingridge GL, Kaang BK, Zhuo M. Synaptic plasticity in the anterior cingulate
874 cortex in acute and chronic pain. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2016 Aug;17(8):485-96. doi:
875 10.1038/nrn.2016.68. PMID: 27307118.
876
877 52. Fregni F, El-Hagrassy MM, Pacheco-Barrios K, Carvalho S, Leite J, Simis M, et al.
878 Evidence-Based Guidelines and Secondary Meta-Analysis for the Use of Transcranial Direct
879 Current Stimulation in Neurological and Psychiatric Disorders. *Int J*
880 *Neuropsychopharmacol*. 2021 Apr 21;24(4):256-313. doi: 10.1093/ijnp/pyaa051. PMID:
881 32710772.
882
883 53. Harmony T. The functional significance of delta oscillations in cognitive processing. *Front*
884 *Integr Neurosci*. 2013 Dec 5;7:83. doi: 10.3389/fnint.2013.00083. PMID: 24367301.
885
886 54. Xiao X, Ding M, Zhang YQ. Role of the Anterior Cingulate Cortex in Translational Pain
887 Research. *Neurosci Bull*. 2021 Mar;37(3):405-422. doi: 10.1007/s12264-020-00615-2. Epub
888 2021 Feb 10. PMID: 33566301.
889
890 55. Mariano TY, Burgess FW, Bowker M, Kirschner J, Van't Wout-Frank M, et al. Transcranial
891 Direct Current Stimulation for Affective Symptoms and Functioning in Chronic Low Back
892 Pain: A Pilot Double-Blinded, Randomized, Placebo-Controlled Trial. *Pain Med*. 2019 Jun
893 1;20(6):1166-1177. doi: 10.1093/pm/pny188. PMID: 30358864.
894
895 56. Kim J, Loggia ML, Cahalan CM, Harris RE, Beissner F Dr Phil Nat, Garcia RG, et al. The
896 somatosensory link in fibromyalgia: functional connectivity of the primary somatosensory
897 cortex is altered by sustained pain and is associated with clinical/autonomic dysfunction.
898 *Arthritis Rheumatol*. 2015 May;67(5):1395-1405. doi: 10.1002/art.39043. PMID: 25622796.
899
900 57. Kim J, Mawla I, Kong J, Lee J, Gerber J, Ortiz A, et al. Somatotopically specific primary
901 somatosensory connectivity to salience and default mode networks encodes clinical pain.
902 *Pain*. 2019 Jul;160(7):1594-1605. doi: 10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001541. PMID:
903 30839429.
904
905 58. Zortea M, Beltran G, Alves RL, Vicuña P, Torres ILS, Fregni F, et al. Spectral Power
906 Density analysis of the resting-state as a marker of the central effects of opioid use in
907 fibromyalgia. *Sci Rep*. 2021 Nov 22;11(1):22716. doi: 10.1038/s41598-021-01982-0.
908 PMID: 34811404.
909
910 59. Dumville JC, Hahn S, Miles JN, Torgerson DJ. The use of unequal randomisation ratios in
911 clinical trials: a review. *Contemp Clin Trials*. 2006 Feb;27(1):1-12. doi:
912 10.1016/j.cct.2005.08.003. PMID: 16236557.
913
914 60. Hey SP, Kimmelman J. The questionable use of unequal allocation in confirmatory trials.
915 *Neurology*. 2014 Jan 7;82(1):77-9. doi: 10.1212/01.wnl.0000438226.10353.1c. Epub 2013
916 Dec 4. PMID: 24306005.
917
918 61. Michel CM, Brunet D. EEG Source Imaging: A Practical Review of the Analysis Steps.
919 *Front Neurol*. 2019 Apr 4;10:325. doi: 10.3389/fneur.2019.00325. PMID: 31019487.
920

- 921 62. Painold A, Faber PL, Reininghaus EZ, Mörk S, Holl AK, Achermann P, et al. Reduced
922 Brain Electric Activity and Functional Connectivity in Bipolar Euthymia: An sLORETA
923 Source Localization Study. *Clin EEG Neurosci*. 2020 May;51(3):155-166. doi:
924 10.1177/1550059419893472. Epub 2019 Dec 17. PMID: 31845595.
925
- 926 63. Yoshimura M, Pascual-Marqui R, Nishida K, Kitaura Y, Mii H, Saito Y. P2-3-8 Change of
927 cross frequency coupling by symptom provocation in Obsessive Compulsive Disorder
928 (OCD) based on sLORETA. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2018; 29(5): e39. doi:
929 10.1016/j.clinph.2018.02.103
930
- 931 64. Vanneste S, Heyning PV, Ridder DD. Contralateral parahippocampal gamma-band activity
932 determines noise-like tinnitus laterality: a region of interest analysis. *Neuroscience*. 2011
933 Dec 29;199:481-90. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroscience.2011.07.067. PMID: 21920411.
934
- 935 65. Vanneste S, Ost J, Van Havenbergh T, De Ridder D. Resting state electrical brain activity
936 and connectivity in fibromyalgia. *PLoS One*. 2017 Jun 26;12(6):e0178516. doi:
937 10.1371/journal.pone.0178516. PMID: 28650974.
938
- 939 66. Russell MJ, Goodman TA, Visse JM, Beckett L, Saito N, Lyeth BG, Recanzone GH. Sex
940 and Electrode Configuration in Transcranial Electrical Stimulation. *Front Psychiatry*. 2017
941 Aug 14;8:147. doi: 10.3389/fpsy.2017.00147. PMID: 28855877.
942
- 943 67. Kuo MF, Paulus W, Nitsche MA. Sex differences in cortical neuroplasticity in humans.
944 *Neuroreport*. 2006 Nov 6;17(16):1703-7. doi: 10.1097/01.wnr.0000239955.68319.c2.
945 PMID: 17047457.
946


947 **Supporting Information**

948 **S1_File. CONSORT Checklist**


949 **S2_File. Check list to use tDCS at home protocol**

950 **S3_File. Protocol and Ethical Approval**


951 **S1_Table. Supporting Data**




Figure

A.

Threshold value
($t = -3.566, p = .017$)


**B.**

Threshold value
($t = -4.047, p = .048$)




Figure


A.




Threshold value
($t = -3.530$, $p = .048$)









B.




Threshold value
($t = -6.734$, $p = .044$)




Figure



Figure



Figure



Figure